

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 18-556

STATE OF KANSAS, PETITIONER

v.

CHARLES GLOVER

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF KANSAS

MOTION OF THE UNITED STATES FOR LEAVE TO
PARTICIPATE IN ORAL ARGUMENT AS AMICUS CURIAE
AND FOR DIVIDED ARGUMENT

Pursuant to Rules 28.4 and 28.7 of the Rules of this Court, the Solicitor General, on behalf of the United States, respectfully moves for leave to participate in the oral argument in this case as amicus curiae supporting petitioner and requests that the United States be allowed ten minutes of argument time. On June 24, 2019, the United States filed a brief as amicus curiae supporting petitioner. Petitioner has consented to an allocation of ten minutes of its argument time to the United States.

This case concerns whether the Fourth Amendment permits a police officer to conduct a brief investigatory traffic stop when

the officer learns that the registered owner of a moving vehicle has a revoked driver's license, and the owner has no information inconsistent with the owner being the vehicle's driver. The resolution of this question affects federal interests. Federal law enforcement agents conduct traffic stops in national parks and on other federal land. Federal interests are also implicated because it is not uncommon for evidence obtained in traffic stops by state and local police officers to be used in federal prosecutions, such as when a traffic stop yields evidence of violations of federal law. In addition, federal agents rely on the inference that it is reasonably possible that a vehicle is being driven by its registered owner in order to perform a range of law-enforcement activities, and those activities may be affected by the decision in this case.

The United States has participated in oral argument as amicus curiae in other cases concerning the lawfulness of traffic stops under the Fourth Amendment. In particular, the government participated in oral argument as amicus curiae in Navarette v. California, 572 U.S. 393 (2014), and Arizona v. Johnson, 555 U.S. 323 (2009). The government's participation in oral argument in this case will provide the Court with the federal perspective on the question presented here, and division of argument will therefore materially assist the Court in its consideration of the case.

Respectfully submitted.

NOEL J. FRANCISCO
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record

JULY 2019