

The summaries of the Colorado Court of Appeals published opinions constitute no part of the opinion of the division but have been prepared by the division for the convenience of the reader. The summaries may not be cited or relied upon as they are not the official language of the division. Any discrepancy between the language in the summary and in the opinion should be resolved in favor of the language in the opinion.

SUMMARY
August 20, 2026

2026 COA 64

No. 22CA1593, *People v. Anderson* — Constitutional Law — Fourth Amendment — Colorado Constitution — Article II, Section 7 — Searches and Seizures — Warrantless Search — DNA Evidence; Criminal Procedure — Court Order for Nontestimonial Identification

In this criminal appeal, a division of the court of appeals considers whether a warrantless search, seizure, and testing of DNA evidence collected from a suspect's garbage violates the United States Constitution's or the Colorado Constitution's guarantee against unreasonable search and seizure.

In a divided opinion, the majority, relying on the well-established principle that there is no privacy interest in abandoned property, concludes that the collection of the evidence containing DNA from the defendant's garbage didn't require a search warrant. Further, relying on the constitutionality of Crim. P. 41.1 — which allows the government to collect and test nontestimonial

identification evidence (including DNA) from suspects on less than probable cause — the majority concludes that warrantless testing of DNA deposited on lawfully obtained abandoned property for the purpose of identification doesn't violate the Fourth Amendment or the Colorado Constitution.

Because the division also concludes that the trial court properly admitted other acts evidence and that the prosecution didn't engage in reversible misconduct, the division affirms the conviction.

The partial dissent, applying Colorado Supreme Court precedent interpreting article II, section 7 of the Colorado Constitution, reaches a contrary conclusion. The dissent concludes that Coloradans have a reasonable privacy expectation that the government will not search and seize the DNA they inevitably leave on trash they discard without the government first obtaining a warrant or complying with some other judicially recognized exception to the warrant requirement. Because, in this case, the government failed to obtain a warrant or comply with one of the narrow exceptions to the warrant requirement before seizing and

searching the disputed DNA, the partial dissent would reverse the defendant's conviction.

The special concurrence, recognizing the concerns raised by the partial dissent, emphasizes that the majority opinion narrowly applies to DNA testing used for identification purposes and urges the General Assembly to continue to focus on protecting citizens' well-grounded privacy interests in their genetic code.

Court of Appeals No. 22CA1593
Arapahoe County District Court No. 21CR314
Honorable Darren Vahle, Judge

The People of the State of Colorado,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

David Dwayne Anderson,

Defendant-Appellant.

JUDGMENT AFFIRMED

Division VI
Opinion by JUDGE WELLING
Kuhn, J., specially concurs
Schutz, J., concurs in part and dissents in part

Announced August 20, 2026

Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General, Paul Koehler, Senior Counsel, Cata A. Cuneo, Assistant Attorney General, Denver, Colorado, for Plaintiff-Appellee

Megan A. Ring, Colorado State Public Defender, Jessica A. Pitts, Deputy State Public Defender, Denver, Colorado, for Defendant-Appellant

¶ 1 Defendant, David Dwayne Anderson, appeals his 2022 conviction for a murder that occurred in 1981. In 2020, Anderson became a suspect in the 1981 homicide after law enforcement, using subsequently developed technology — including DNA sequencing and genetic genealogy analysis — identified Anderson as a potential source of biological evidence left at the scene of the crime. Relying on this investigative lead and without a warrant, investigators inspected Anderson’s garbage, which he had left in a publicly shared dumpster, and seized a discarded soda can. Still without a warrant, investigators analyzed DNA deposited on that soda can, which matched the DNA profile that had been found on evidence at the crime scene. Based in large part on this DNA match, law enforcement was able to establish probable cause to obtain an arrest warrant and a search warrant to seize and test DNA evidence obtained directly from Anderson, ultimately linking him to the 1981 homicide.

¶ 2 On appeal, Anderson contends that the warrantless search and seizure of his garbage and the subsequent warrantless DNA testing of genetic material found on the soda can violated the United States Constitution’s and the Colorado Constitution’s

guarantees against unreasonable searches and seizures. Applying the well-established principle that there is no privacy interest in abandoned property, we conclude that the collection of an empty soda can — and the DNA evidence on it — didn't require a search warrant. Further, relying on the constitutionality of Crim. P. 41.1 — which allows the government to collect and test nontestimonial identification evidence (including DNA) from a suspect on less than probable cause — we conclude that the warrantless testing of DNA deposited on lawfully obtained abandoned property for the purpose of identification doesn't violate the Fourth Amendment or the Colorado Constitution.

¶ 3 For these reasons, we reject Anderson's claim that the trial court erred by refusing to suppress evidence obtained from the search and seizure of his garbage and the fruits of that search — namely, his DNA profile. Because we also conclude that the trial court properly admitted other acts evidence and that the prosecution didn't engage in reversible misconduct, we affirm the conviction.

I. Background

A. S.Q.'s Murder and the Immediate Investigation

¶ 4 In 1981, S.Q.'s father found her dead in her home in Cherry Hills Village. S.Q. was near the front entrance of her home, naked from the waist down and with her arms above her head. Her shirt was pulled up over her head, exposing her chest, and a towel covered her face. S.Q. had been shot in the head twice and stabbed in the back multiple times.

¶ 5 Evidence showed that S.Q. was likely shot through her bedroom window and struck in the head while she was in bed. It was postulated at trial that the killer then entered S.Q.'s home through her bedroom window because the screen had been removed and toiletries were found underneath the window on the outside of S.Q.'s home. While inside, the killer stabbed S.Q.

¶ 6 Semen was found inside S.Q.'s vagina, on the carpet underneath her, and on the towel covering her face.¹ S.Q. had bruising on the front of her right hip. Investigators found a knife

¹ An investigator testified at trial that, when S.Q.'s father found her, he moved the towel on her face to cover her genitals. After arriving at the scene, investigators moved the towel back to S.Q.'s face.

and underwear near the front entrance of S.Q.'s home. The knife looked similar to other knives in S.Q.'s kitchen. Investigators also discovered that S.Q.'s phone line had been cut.

¶ 7 At the scene, investigators collected serological evidence, among other items of physical evidence. Investigators also took vaginal and anal swabs. However, none of the items or serological evidence that was collected was tested for DNA because forensic DNA analysis wasn't available to investigators, or even widely contemplated, at the time of S.Q.'s murder in 1981.

¶ 8 Investigators looked at some suspects over the years, but the case went cold.

B. Anderson's Arrest and Trial

¶ 9 Although the case went cold, investigators later performed serological and DNA analysis on the evidence found at the scene and the swabs collected from S.Q.'s person. Over the years, a DNA profile of the suspected perpetrator was developed.

¶ 10 In 2020, a genetic genealogy company contacted a detective with the Cherry Hills Village Police Department and informed him that, using genetic genealogy, the private company had identified Anderson and two of his brothers as potential sources of the DNA

found at the crime scene. After working to eliminate one of the brothers, investigators focused on Anderson.

¶ 11 A contractor with the genetic genealogy company was sent at the direction of a detective from the Cherry Hills Village Police Department and an investigator with Office of the District Attorney for the Eighteenth Judicial District (DA's Office) to surreptitiously collect Anderson's DNA. In 2021, the contractor went to Anderson's home in Nebraska and looked through a dumpster at his apartment complex. The contractor found a trash bag that appeared to contain Anderson's trash and from that bag collected an empty soda can, among other items .

¶ 12 After seizing the soda can, investigators swabbed it and submitted the swab to the Colorado Bureau of Investigation lab for DNA testing. That testing revealed that the DNA found on the soda can matched DNA found at the scene of S.Q.'s murder.

¶ 13 Using the information gathered during the investigation, including the results of the genetic genealogy analysis and the DNA testing of genetic material found on the soda can collected from Anderson's trash, a detective from the Cherry Hills Village Police Department, with the assistance of an investigator with the DA's

Office, prepared an affidavit in support of a request for a search warrant to obtain a buccal swab from Anderson and a warrant for Anderson's arrest. A Nebraska district court judge issued the requested warrants. The search warrant the judge issued noted that the detective had filed the search warrant affidavit "in conformity with the provisions of Colorado Rules of Criminal Procedure 41(b) and (c)."

¶ 14 After obtaining the warrants, Nebraska law enforcement officers arrested Anderson in Nebraska. While Anderson was in custody in Nebraska, the Cherry Hills Village Police Department detective and the Eighteenth Judicial District investigator interviewed him. At the end of the interview, the investigator took a buccal swab from Anderson. Testing of the buccal swab confirmed that Anderson's DNA matched the previously unknown DNA profile from evidence left at the scene of S.Q.'s murder.

¶ 15 Anderson was extradited from Nebraska and charged with two counts of murder in the first degree – (after deliberation) and felony murder. The case went to a jury trial, but the jury hung and the court declared a mistrial. The case was retried a few months later and the jury found Anderson guilty as charged. The court

sentenced Anderson to life in the Department of Corrections’ custody with discretionary parole after twenty years — the maximum sentence applicable at the time of the offense.

II. Analysis

¶ 16 On appeal, Anderson contends that (1) the trial court erred by denying his motions to suppress evidence collected from the search of his garbage because investigators failed to obtain a warrant to search and seize his garbage and to perform DNA testing on genetic material deposited on an item seized from it; (2) the trial court erred by admitting prejudicial CRE 404(b) evidence; and (3) the prosecutor committed reversible misconduct during his trial. We address, and reject, each contention in turn below.

A. Constitutional Challenges to the Garbage Search and DNA Testing

¶ 17 Anderson contends that the trial court erred by denying his motion to suppress evidence because police failed to obtain a warrant to (1) search his garbage and seize items from it and (2) conduct DNA testing of genetic material found on the soda can recovered during the search to determine if the DNA recovered from

the soda can matched DNA left at the crime scene. We aren't persuaded by either contention.

1. Additional Facts

¶ 18 Before trial, Anderson filed a motion to suppress evidence obtained from the search and seizure of his garbage and the fruits of that search. He argued that the Colorado Constitution provides greater protections than the United States Constitution for searches of secured trash bags placed in a dumpster and that the search of his garbage was unreasonable. He further argued that, without this evidence, law enforcement couldn't have obtained the warrants for his arrest and to obtain a buccal swab from him. Thus, Anderson argued, the fruits of those warrants must be suppressed at trial.

¶ 19 Anderson also filed a motion to suppress evidence obtained from the seizure and DNA testing of genetic material found on the soda can and the fruits of that testing, even if the seizure of the soda can itself wasn't unlawful. In this motion, he argued that the collection and analysis of "unavoidably shed DNA" requires a warrant under the United States and Colorado Constitutions, independent of whether a warrant was required for the seizure of the item the DNA was deposited on. He argued that, because a

warrant wasn't obtained to test the DNA found on the soda can, the fruits of the warrants for his arrest and to obtain a buccal swab from him must be suppressed.

¶ 20 After a hearing, the court denied both motions. The court concluded that there was no privacy interest in garbage that had been put out for "public pickup." And further, with respect to the genetic material found on the soda can, the court concluded that a warrant issued with probable cause wasn't "necessitated by the law" because the evidence "was essentially abandoned property." The trial court also noted the lack of Colorado or Tenth Circuit case law on the issues raised in Anderson's motions and said that "[t]aking DNA off of items that have been left by suspects has been happening in solving cases and being used in courts for years."

2. General Legal Principles and Standard of Review

¶ 21 Individuals are protected from unreasonable searches and seizures by the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and article II, section 7 of the Colorado Constitution.

¶ 22 The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution states,

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

¶ 23 Similarly, article II, section 7 of the Colorado Constitution states,

The people shall be secure in their persons, papers, homes and effects, from unreasonable searches and seizures; and no warrant to search any place or seize any person or things shall issue without describing the place to be searched, or the person or thing to be seized, as near as may be, nor without probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation reduced to writing.

¶ 24 A search occurs “when the government infringes on an individual’s reasonable expectation of privacy.” *People v. Seymour*, 2023 CO 53, ¶ 20 (citing *Katz v. United States*, 389 U.S. 347, 361 (1967) (Harlan, J., concurring)). And a seizure of property occurs “when there is some meaningful interference with an individual’s possessory interests in that property.” *Id.* (quoting *United States v. Jacobsen*, 466 U.S. 109, 113 (1984)). “Whether an individual’s expectation of privacy is reasonable depends on two factors. ‘[F]irst,

has the individual manifested a subjective expectation of privacy in the object of the challenged search? Second, is society willing to recognize that expectation as reasonable?” *People v. Holmes*, 981 P.2d 168, 171 (Colo. 1999) (quoting *California v. Ciraolo*, 476 U.S. 207, 211 (1986)).

¶ 25 A warrantless search or seizure is “presumptively unreasonable and, thus, unconstitutional, unless an exception to the warrant requirement applies.” *People v. Ramos*, 2022 CO 16, ¶ 6.

¶ 26 We review a suppression order as a mixed question of law and fact. *People v. Brown*, 2019 CO 63, ¶ 8. We will defer to the trial court’s findings of fact if they “are supported by competent evidence,” but we review the application of law de novo. *Id.*; *People v. McKnight*, 2019 CO 36, ¶ 21.

3. Warrantless Search of Anderson’s Garbage

¶ 27 We first address Anderson’s contention that the trial court erred by denying his motion to suppress evidence collected from his garbage and the fruits of that search because the warrantless search of his garbage violated his constitutional rights.

a. Anderson Didn't Retain a Privacy Interest in His Garbage

¶ 28 The protections provided by the Fourth Amendment and article II, section 7 of the Colorado Constitution don't apply in all contexts. Indeed, both the United States Supreme Court and the Colorado Supreme Court have held that an individual doesn't retain a reasonable privacy interest in the garbage that they leave outside the curtilage of their home for disposal. *See California v. Greenwood*, 486 U.S. 35, 40 (1988) ("Here, we conclude that respondents exposed their garbage to the public sufficiently to defeat their claim to Fourth Amendment protection."); *People v. Hillman*, 834 P.2d 1271, 1277-78 (Colo. 1992) (concluding that the defendant "did not have a reasonable expectation of privacy in his garbage when he placed his garbage adjacent to the sidewalk, rendering it readily accessible to the public"). These decisions are in line with the legal principle that "[a]n individual forfeits his expectation of privacy in property when he voluntarily abandons the property." *People in Interest of D.E.J.*, 686 P.2d 794, 796 (Colo. 1984).

¶ 29 In addressing Anderson's claim of a privacy interest in his garbage, we are bound by our supreme court's determination that

individuals don't have a privacy interest in garbage left outside the curtilage of their home. *See People v. Cox*, 2021 COA 68, ¶ 8 ("Both this court and the trial court are bound by supreme court decisions."). And, in this case, the trial court found that Anderson's garbage, including the soda can, was found in a public dumpster that contained comingled garbage from households other than Anderson's. This finding supports the conclusion that the garbage was abandoned outside the curtilage of Anderson's home and readily accessible to the public. Because Anderson's garbage was abandoned, he no longer retained a privacy interest in the soda can or the other items collected from his garbage. *See Greenwood*, 486 U.S. at 40; *Hillman*, 834 P.2d at 1277-78. Thus, investigators didn't need a warrant to collect and examine his garbage.

b. This Case Isn't Distinguishable from *Greenwood* or *Hillman*

¶ 30 Notwithstanding the binding nature of *Greenwood* and *Hillman*, Anderson contends that his case is distinguishable from both cases for four reasons: (1) his garbage was located in a dumpster rather than on a curb; (2) the garbage collected for evidence wasn't contraband; (3) while garbage put out for collection may be accessible to the public, a search of that garbage for the

purpose of collecting evidence for DNA testing is different because only law enforcement — and certainly not the general public — has the resources to conduct DNA testing; and (4) the collection of garbage for the purpose of testing for DNA is different because individuals have a significant privacy interest in their DNA. Below, we address these arguments specifically as they relate to *Greenwood* and *Hillman*. We further address Anderson’s latter two contentions — those related to DNA-specific privacy interests — in Part II.A.4 of this opinion.

¶ 31 First, we aren’t persuaded that trash deposited in a shared dumpster is materially different from trash left on a curb. The analyses in *Greenwood* and *Hillman* relied, at least in part, on the fact that the defendants had placed their garbage outside the curtilage of their homes and in a publicly accessible place, not that either had placed his garbage on the curb. *Greenwood*, 486 U.S. at 40; *Hillman*, 834 P.2d at 1277. Thus, as long as it’s placed outside the curtilage of the home, the exact location of abandoned garbage isn’t dispositive, so long as it’s publicly accessible. And we see no distinction between a public dumpster and a curb, as both are publicly accessible and beyond the curtilage of the home.

Accordingly, the absence of a “curb” in this case bears no weight when assessing Anderson’s privacy interest.

¶ 32 Second, we aren’t persuaded by Anderson’s contention that collecting noncontraband rather than contraband distinguishes this case from *Greenwood* and *Hillman*. Again, this is a distinction without a difference. True, in *Greenwood* and *Hillman*, the police did collect contraband, *Greenwood*, 486 U.S. at 37-38 (deciding whether defendant retained a privacy interest in his trash containing evidence of narcotics use); *Hillman*, 834 P.2d at 1271-72 (deciding whether defendant retained a privacy interest in his trash containing marijuana plants), and here they didn’t. But the legal status of the evidence itself isn’t relevant under *Greenwood* or *Hillman*. Indeed, the initial determination of the defendants’ privacy interests in *Hillman* and *Greenwood* wasn’t based on the status of the evidence as contraband but rather on the location of the evidence and its accessibility to the public. *Greenwood*, 486 U.S. at 40-41; *Hillman*, 834 P.2d at 1277-78. In this case, the trial court found that Anderson had “essentially abandoned” the garbage he left in a publicly accessible dumpster. And it’s of no moment that the soda can wasn’t contraband because, regardless of the soda

can's status as noncontraband, Anderson no longer maintained a privacy interest in it.

¶ 33 Third, we reject Anderson's contention that the DNA evidence collected in this case is distinguishable from the evidence collected in *Greenwood* and *Hillman* because only law enforcement — and not the general public — has the resources to analyze DNA evidence. Again, *Greenwood* and *Hillman* didn't rely on the technology available to the public when determining an individual's privacy interest in items left in their garbage. See *Greenwood*, 486 U.S. at 40-41; *Hillman*, 834 P.2d at 1277-78. Anderson cites *Kyllo v. United States*, 533 U.S. 27, 34 (2001), as support for his contention that the limited availability of DNA testing technology — and its unavailability to the general public — distinguishes his case. In *Kyllo*, the United States Supreme Court held that law enforcement's use of thermal imaging technology to obtain information about activities occurring inside the defendant's home that otherwise could have been obtained only by "physical 'intrusion into a constitutionally protected area'" constituted a search, "*at least where . . . the technology in question is not in general public use.*" *Id.* (emphasis added) (quoting *Silverman v. United States*, 365 U.S. 505,

512 (1961)). While the Court in *Kyllo* certainly emphasized the accessibility of technology to the public when determining if its deployment constituted a search, *Kyllo* is inapposite because there the technology was used to invade a space where the defendant retained a privacy interest. In contrast, Anderson didn't retain a privacy interest in his garbage (whereas *Kyllo* had an ongoing privacy interest in the activity in the interior of his home). Thus, Anderson suffered no "intrusion into a constitutionally protected area." *Id.* (quoting *Silverman*, 365 U.S. at 512).

¶ 34 Finally, we reject Anderson's contention that his case is distinct from *Greenwood* and *Hillman* because the scouring of his trash *for DNA* implicates significant privacy interests that weren't implicated in *Greenwood* and *Hillman*. In other words, DNA is different. Indeed, DNA evidence is different in that we constantly and involuntarily shed DNA everywhere we go and its analysis may reveal a treasure trove of personal information about an individual beyond the person's identity. Further, the amount of information available from DNA is only increasing with technological advances. But still this contention fails for the same reason as Anderson's previous contentions. *Greenwood* and *Hillman* didn't rely on the

amount of information that could be obtained from a person's garbage or whether the privacy interest in the garbage would be significant if it had remained inside the curtilage of the home. Therefore, the significance of Anderson's privacy interest doesn't place this case beyond the reach of *Greenwood* or *Hillman*.

¶ 35 Accordingly, we reject Anderson's contention that the trial court erred by denying his motion to suppress the search of his garbage and the fruits of that search for failure to obtain a warrant before rooting through his garbage.

4. Warrantless Testing of the DNA on Anderson's Garbage

¶ 36 We next address Anderson's independent contention that the trial court erred by denying his motion to suppress the results of the warrantless DNA testing (even if the warrantless seizure of the item on which the DNA was deposited was lawful) because people have an expectation of privacy in their genetic code. The gravamen of Anderson's contention is that, even if the soda can on which his DNA was deposited was lawfully seized, the government still needed to obtain a warrant before testing any DNA found on such an item because he has a distinct privacy interest in his DNA. We reject this contention when, as was the case here, the DNA testing is

exclusively for the purpose of identification by comparison to an existing sample.²

¶ 37 We begin our analysis by examining what the Colorado Supreme Court has said about the constitutionality of Crim. P. 41.1, which authorizes the seizure and testing of nontestimonial identification evidence (including DNA) obtained from a free person — that is, evidence obtained from a suspect for whom there isn’t probable cause to arrest — based on less than probable cause. We then turn to Anderson’s other arguments in support of his contention that a warrant — or some other advance approval by a neutral and detached magistrate — is constitutionally required before a free person’s DNA is tested.

a. Crim. P. 41.1

¶ 38 If Anderson is correct that a warrant is constitutionally required before DNA deposited on a lawfully obtained piece of trash

² At oral argument, the People argued that this case didn’t implicate the government’s testing of DNA to extract medical information or to build a database of “abandoned” samples. The record contains nothing refuting that claim. Nonetheless, such uses of “abandoned” DNA would raise many of the concerns identified by the partial dissent and special concurrence and could alter the conclusion we reach today.

can be tested, then surely the constitution must require a warrant — or an equally rigorous showing of probable cause — before law enforcement may obtain an order to seize and test biological material taken directly from a suspect prior to the suspect’s arrest. But Crim. P. 41.1 provides otherwise.

¶ 39 Crim. P. 41.1 permits a judge to issue an order authorizing the collection of “nontestimonial identification” evidence from a suspect even before the suspect’s arrest. Crim. P. 41.1(a)-(b), (d).

Nontestimonial identification evidence includes, but isn’t limited to, blood, urine, and saliva samples. Crim. P. 41.1(h)(2). And Crim. P. 41.1 orders are routinely used to collect buccal swabs from a suspect to compare the suspect’s DNA profile with DNA profiles developed from crime scene evidence. *See, e.g., People v. Castro-Velasquez*, 2026 CO 49, ¶ 5 (law enforcement obtained a Crim. P. 41.1 order to collect a buccal swab from a suspect prior to the suspect’s arrest); *People v. Smiley*, 2023 CO 36, ¶ 4 (same).

¶ 40 Before a court may issue a Crim. P. 41.1 order, however, the court must be satisfied that (1) “there is probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed”; (2) “there are reasonable grounds, *not amounting to probable cause to arrest,*” to “suspect”

that the person subject to the order “committed the offense”; and (3) the results of the nontestimonial identification procedure will be “of material aid” in determining whether the person named in the order committed the offense. Crim. P. 41.1(c)(1)-(3) (emphasis added). In other words, “Crim. P. 41.1 allows law enforcement to obtain a judicial order to collect certain kinds of nontestimonial identification evidence (like the DNA at issue here) *without probable cause to believe that the suspect has committed a crime.*” *Castro-Velasquez*, ¶ 1 (emphasis added).

¶ 41 In contrast to what a Crim. P. 41.1 order requires, a search warrant may be issued only “upon a showing of *probable cause.*” *People v. Kerst*, 181 P.3d 1167, 1171 (Colo. 2008) (emphasis added) (first citing U.S. Const. amend. IV; and then citing Colo. Const. art. II, § 7); *see also Kentucky v. King*, 563 U.S. 452, 459 (2011) (“[A] warrant may not be issued unless probable cause is properly established and the scope of the authorized search is set out with particularity.”). And the “reasonable grounds” requirement for obtaining a Crim. P. 41.1 order is a *lower* standard than the probable cause standard for obtaining a search warrant. *See People v. Davis*, 669 P.2d 130, 134 (Colo. 1983) (“Reasonable grounds to

suspect’ is synonymous with ‘reasonable suspicion to believe’ and requires a lower quantum of proof than probable cause.” (citation omitted)). Thus, Crim. P. 41.1 permits the seizure and testing of a suspect’s DNA for nontestimonial identification purposes based on a less stringent standard than that required for a search warrant.

¶ 42 It stands to reason, however, that if Anderson were correct that a warrant is required before a free person’s DNA is tested for identification purposes, then Crim. P. 41.1 wouldn’t survive constitutional scrutiny. But it has. *See People v. Madson*, 638 P.2d 18, 31-33 (Colo. 1981) (“Our evaluation of Crim. P. 41.1 leads us to conclude that it does not violate either the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution or Article II, Section 7, of the Colorado Constitution.”).

¶ 43 In *Madson*, prior to his arrest, the defendant was subjected to a Crim. P. 41.1 order authorizing the police to take him into custody “for the purpose of obtaining various forms of identification evidence, including a photograph and a handwriting exemplar.” *Id.* at 22. Prior to trial, Madson sought to suppress the identification evidence obtained pursuant to the Crim. P. 41.1 order, arguing that Crim. P. 41.1 “is facially unconstitutional because it permits an

investigatory detention on less than probable cause in contravention of the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and [a]rticle II, [s]ection 7, of the Colorado Constitution.” *Id.* at 31. In rejecting this contention, the court concluded that even though the execution of a Crim. P. 41.1 order authorizes the seizure of a suspect’s person on less than probable cause, it survives constitutional scrutiny because “[t]he rule is limited to nontestimonial identification evidence only.” *Id.* at 32. And like what is authorized by Crim. P. 41.1 — and what was found constitutional in *Madson* — the testing performed in this case was exclusively for identification purposes.

¶ 44 Simply put, we can’t square imposing a warrant requirement to test lawfully obtained biological material for purposes of suspect identification with the supreme court’s determination that “Crim. P. 41.1 passes constitutional scrutiny.” *Madson*, 638 P.2d at 32. Because our supreme court has held that search and seizure pursuant to Crim. P. 41.1 is constitutional, Anderson’s contention that a search warrant was required to test his DNA must fail.

¶ 45 Still, Anderson argues that reliance on *Madson* is misplaced in this particular context because it was decided in 1981, long before

the advent of DNA testing. It's certainly true that when *Madson* was decided, DNA testing wasn't a tool in law enforcement's arsenal. See *Brooks v. People*, 975 P.2d 1105, 1111 (Colo. 1999) (observing that DNA testing was a relatively new and novel field in 1999 "because the potential of DNA typing technology for forensic purposes was first recognized in the mid-1980's, first applied in the late 1980's, and involves techniques which are continuously evolving" (quoting *Fishback v. People*, 851 P.2d 884, 890 (Colo. 1993))). But that doesn't mean we can ignore its holding regarding the constitutionality of Crim. P. 41.1. See *People v. Whiteaker*, 2022 COA 84, ¶ 17 ("It matters not that the supreme court authority is old or that we purportedly discern a better rule of law. It is the prerogative of the supreme court alone to overrule its cases." (quoting *DIA Brewing Co. v. MCE-DIA, LLC*, 2020 COA 21, ¶ 63)), *aff'd on other grounds sub nom. Schaden v. DIA Brewing Co.*, 2024 CO 25, ¶¶ 29-30.

¶ 46 Implicit in Anderson's contention in this regard is that, if our supreme court were presented with a case like this one involving the seizure and testing of DNA for nontestimonial identification, then *Madson's* reach would be limited. True or not, overruling or

narrowing *Madson* is the supreme court's prerogative and its prerogative alone. We can't decline to follow *Madson* because of advances in technology in the decades after its announcement. See *People v. Melendez*, 2024 COA 21M, ¶ 19 (“[W]e are bound by the rule[s] as expressed by the Colorado Supreme Court, and we are not free to depart from [its] precedent.” (quoting *People v. Robson*, 80 P.3d 912, 914 (Colo. App. 2003))).

¶ 47 Thus, the point remains: Crim. P. 41.1 permits the testing of a free person's DNA without the need for a warrant. Given that our supreme court has found such a regime constitutional, we must reject Anderson's contention that either the United States or Colorado Constitution requires the government to secure a warrant before performing DNA testing for identification purposes on genetic material deposited on the lawfully seized soda can found in his garbage. Applying *Madson*, we can't say that testing of lawfully obtained genetic materials *for identification purposes* requires a warrant.

b. Anderson's Further Contentions Don't
Support a Different Result

¶ 48 Notwithstanding the supreme court's rejection of a challenge to the constitutionality of Crim. P. 41.1, Anderson urges us to consider (1) that a warrant is constitutionally required before the government may search a lawfully seized cell phone; and (2) that, even if a warrant isn't required, some judicial intervention based on less than that required for a search warrant should always be required before the government performs DNA testing. Neither of these considerations alter our conclusion.

i. Searching a Cell Phone Isn't Analogous to Testing DNA for the
Purpose of Identification

¶ 49 As noted at the outset, Anderson's argument that a warrant is required before lawfully seized DNA can be tested is predicated on the fact that testing of a person's DNA has the potential to expose a trove of personal, private, and highly sensitive genetic information to the government's prying eyes. We don't dispute that DNA testing implicates serious and profound privacy concerns, and that those concerns only become more acute as the technology advances. *See, e.g.*, § 10-3-1104.6(1)(a), (c), C.R.S. 2025 (recognizing that "[g]enetic information is the unique property of the individual to whom the

information pertains” and that individuals have an important “privacy and . . . autonomy” interest in their “genetic information”); *United States v. Amerson*, 483 F.3d 73, 85 (2d Cir. 2007) (“We are mindful of the vast amount of sensitive information that can be mined from a person’s DNA and the very strong privacy interests that all individuals have in this information.”). We also recognize that it’s a reality of modern life that we involuntarily and unavoidably shed testable amounts of DNA as we go about our lives. *See, e.g., State v. Carbo*, 6 N.W.3d 114, 132 (Minn. 2024) (Procaccini, J., concurring) (“When we venture into public spaces, we simply cannot help but shed our DNA.”); *State v. Burns*, 988 N.W.2d 352, 393 (Iowa 2023) (McDermott, J., dissenting) (“A DNA specimen can come from the shedding of any human cells — skin, blood, saliva, sweat, hair, and on and on. DNA is released when someone sneezes, speaks, or touches something.”).

¶ 50 Based on these characteristics, Anderson likens the testing performed on lawfully seized DNA to the search of a lawfully seized cell phone. He points out that more than a decade ago the Supreme Court made clear that before even a lawfully seized cell phone can be searched, law enforcement must obtain a search

warrant. *See Riley v. California*, 573 U.S. 373, 401 (2014) (“Our holding, of course, is not that the information on a cell phone is immune from search; it is instead that a warrant is generally required before such a search, *even when a cell phone is seized incident to arrest.*” (emphasis added)). And this warrant requirement has been extended to cell phone location information (CSLI) and cell phone location history that we voluntarily share with third parties such as our cell phone carriers and Google. *See Carpenter v. United States*, 585 U.S. 296, 316 (2018) (extending *Riley* to hold that “the Government must generally obtain a warrant supported by probable cause before acquiring [CSLI] records” from a cell phone carrier); *Chatrue v. United States*, 609 U.S. ___, ___, 2026 WL 1855568, at *16 (2026) (extending *Riley* and *Carpenter* to “hold that police officers invade a cell-phone user’s reasonable expectation of privacy when they access his Location History . . . [from] a third-party tech company”). And Anderson reasons that, like information on and generated by cell phones, DNA is deserving of expanded protections — namely, a warrant issued by a neutral and detached magistrate — before any testing is performed.

¶ 51 We might come to a different conclusion if the government were analyzing Anderson’s DNA to extract his health information or building a touch DNA database. We aren’t, however, persuaded that when DNA testing is employed solely for the purpose of identification, as it was here, the analogy holds up. The Court rested its holding that a warrant is required to search the contents of a cell phone on the fact that cell phones, “[w]ith all they contain and all they may reveal, . . . hold for many Americans ‘the privacies of life.’” *Riley*, 573 U.S. at 403 (quoting *Boyd v. United States*, 116 U.S. 616, 630 (1886)). The same is true for CSLI and cell phone location history. See *Carpenter*, 585 U.S. at 320 (“In light of the deeply revealing nature of CSLI, its depth, breadth, and comprehensive reach, and the inescapable and automatic nature of its collection, the fact that such information is gathered by a third party does not make it any less deserving of Fourth Amendment protection.”); *Chatrue*, 609 U.S. at ___, 2026 WL 1855568, at *11 (observing that location history “provides an even more fine-tuned picture of a person’s movements than CSLI” and “allows police officers to reconstruct ‘retrospective[ly],’ and with no real effort, people’s comings and goings in any area” (quoting *Carpenter*, 585

U.S. at 312)). And, as we previously noted, it's true that DNA testing has the potential to reveal as much, if not more, personal, private, and sensitive information about a person.

¶ 52 But the analogy fails when the purpose and use of the testing of the lawfully obtained DNA is limited to identification, as it was here. Instead, when used for identification purposes only, DNA is more akin to a fingerprint than the data from a cell phone. See *Maryland v. King*, 569 U.S. 435, 451 (2013) (“A DNA profile is useful to the police because it gives them a form of identification to search the records already in their valid possession. In this respect the use of DNA for identification is no different than matching an arrestee’s face to a wanted poster of a previously unidentified suspect; or matching tattoos to known gang symbols to reveal a criminal affiliation; or matching the arrestee’s fingerprints to those recovered from a crime scene.”). And a warrant is certainly not required before law enforcement can use a lawfully obtained fingerprint for identification purposes. See, e.g., *United States v. Dionisio*, 410 U.S. 1, 15 (1973) (noting that fingerprinting “involves none of the probing into an individual’s private life and thoughts that marks an interrogation or search” (quoting *Davis v. Mississippi*,

394 U.S. 721, 727 (1969))); *United States v. Farias-Gonzalez*, 556 F.3d 1181, 1188 (11th Cir. 2009) (“The police can obtain both photographs and fingerprints without conducting a search under the Fourth Amendment.”). Accordingly, we reject the notion that *Riley’s*, *Carpenter’s*, and *Chatrie’s* warrant requirements extend to DNA testing when such testing is performed exclusively for the purpose of identification.

¶ 53 We save for another day the question of whether the State can test lawfully obtained DNA for a purpose other than identification without a warrant. *See King*, 569 U.S. at 464-65 (“If in the future police analyze [DNA] samples to determine, for instance, an arrestee’s predisposition for a particular disease or other hereditary factors not relevant to identity, that case would present additional privacy concerns not present here.”); *Galvan v. People*, 2020 CO 82, ¶ 45 (“[C]ourts are well-advised to ‘wait for cases to come’ to them and to ‘decide only questions presented by the parties.’” (quoting *United States v. Sineneng-Smith*, 590 U.S. 371, 376 (2020))).

ii. Judicial Intervention

¶ 54 At oral argument, Anderson’s counsel contended that some prior judicial intervention — even if it’s based on something less

than probable cause — should always be required before law enforcement performs DNA testing. Although there are sound policy arguments for imposing such a requirement, Anderson doesn't offer us a legal basis in either statute or case law that supports the imposition of such a requirement. Nor are we aware of a constitutional basis to require judicial intervention prior to a search based on less than probable cause.

¶ 55 To be sure, there are exceptions to the search warrant requirement that permit law enforcement to lawfully perform a limited search or seizure on a basis amounting to less than probable cause. *See Ramos*, ¶ 6. Such exceptions include, but aren't limited to, "stop and frisk" detentions, *see* § 16-3-103, C.R.S. 2025; *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1, 30 (1968); *Stone v. People*, 485 P.2d 495, 497 (Colo. 1971); temporary investigatory detentions of property, *see People v. Tallent*, 174 P.3d 310, 313 (Colo. 2008) (citing *United States v. Place*, 462 U.S. 696, 706 (1983)); *People v. Ortega*, 34 P.3d 986, 993 (Colo. 2001); and protective sweeps of a person's home, *Maryland v. Buie*, 494 U.S. 325, 334 (1990), to name a few. But none of these require *prior* approval by a neutral

magistrate.³ Instead, the sufficiency of the basis for the limited intrusion is subject to judicial scrutiny after the fact.

¶ 56 Simply put, we don't see, and Anderson doesn't offer, a rationale rooted in the United States or Colorado Constitution for us to impose a *requirement* of advance judicial approval before lawfully obtained DNA is tested. To be sure, our supreme court or the legislature could promulgate a rule or statute requiring some form

³ The argument that Anderson presents on appeal is that a warrant or some other prior judicial approval is required before a free person's DNA is seized and tested, not simply that some degree of particularized suspicion — such as reasonable suspicion — is required before the government can lawfully seize and test such evidence, even when the item on which it's deposited is lawfully seized. Indeed, it's apparent that law enforcement here had at least some degree of particularized suspicion that Anderson committed the 1981 homicide at the time the trash pull was performed and the DNA testing was conducted. After all, prior to performing the trash pull near Anderson's home, law enforcement already had the genetic genealogy analysis that implicated Anderson as a potential source of the DNA found at the crime scene and had eliminated one of Anderson's two brothers as a potential suspect. In any event, because Anderson doesn't raise the issue of whether some level of particularized suspicion is required before the government may test lawfully obtained DNA without a warrant, we don't reach or address the question. Instead, we limit our analysis to whether a warrant (or other prior judicial approval) was required in the circumstances presented by this case. *See Galvan v. People*, 2020 CO 82, ¶ 45 (The party presentation principle requires a court to rely "on the parties to frame the issues to be decided and assigns to courts the role of neutral arbiters of the matters raised.").

of judicial intervention less than a warrant to test DNA. (Indeed, that's exactly what Crim. P. 41.1 is.) But under these circumstances, we decline the invitation to fashion such a requirement out of whole cloth.

¶ 57 Accordingly, we must conclude that the trial court didn't err by denying Anderson's motion to suppress evidence for failure to obtain a search warrant to test his DNA.

B. Admission of CRE 404(b) Evidence

¶ 58 Anderson next contends that the trial court erred by admitting prejudicial other acts evidence under CRE 404(b). We aren't persuaded.

1. Additional Facts

¶ 59 Before trial, the People filed a notice of intent to introduce other acts evidence under CRE 404(b). The notice indicated that the evidence the People sought to introduce was of an "attempted murder and burglary" in 1981 in which "[Anderson] entered the victim's home via removal of a screen window, and assaulted the female victim with a deadly weapon." The exhibit attached to the notice further detailed that the victim was J.L.B., Anderson's ex-girlfriend, and that the attack occurred in her home as she was

walking into her room in the basement. According to J.L.B., after she walked past her closet, “someone stepped . . . behind her and threw a jacket on her head.” She was then thrown face down on the ground as the assailant struck her in the head with a blunt object. J.L.B. thought the assailant might be Anderson and she called out his name and told him he “was going to kill her.” The assailant then stopped hitting her, and J.L.B. rolled over and removed the jacket from her head. When she did, she saw Anderson. J.L.B. later learned that Anderson “used a chair to access her parents’ bedroom window, popped the screen in, and pulled open the window.” The People indicated that they intended to offer this evidence for the purpose of proving intent, knowledge, common scheme or plan, modus operandi, and identity of the defendant as the perpetrator, and to disprove any defenses pertaining to an alternative suspect.

¶ 60 Anderson objected to the introduction of this evidence, and the court held a hearing on the issue. At the hearing, the People contended that there was a “striking similarity of the proffered evidence to the conduct in this case.” In response, Anderson

argued that the evidence was too dissimilar to be admissible under CRE 404(b).

¶ 61 After hearing the parties' arguments, the trial court found that there were "significant commonalities." In particular, the court noted,

These are . . . private homes. These private homes are less than a mile from one another. These two incidents are 47 days apart, less than two months apart so the same timeframe; very, very similar geography; that in each of the incidents, someone enters the home through a window; that that window is entered by removing a screen, setting a screen to the side; prying or pushing open the window in some manner; and then climbing into the window That person enters the home and then specifically enters apparently to attack a woman. There's no evidence in either case that things are stolen, that these are burglaries, common burglaries for the purpose of committing theft inside. That these are very specifically targeted to attack a woman inside who is alone in the house.

¶ 62 Ultimately, the trial court concluded that the evidence was admissible as CRE 404(b) evidence for the purpose of proving "identity of the perpetrator." At trial, J.L.B. testified about Anderson's assault on her in 1981.

¶ 63 The court gave the jury the following contemporaneous limiting instruction when J.L.B. testified:

You may consider this evidence only as it may relate to the identity of the person who committed the murder of [S.Q.] Each juror must decide for himself or herself whether this evidence relates to the issue of identity. And if so, what weight to afford the evidence. Such evidence is not and may not be considered as evidence of Mr. Anderson's character or propensity. No juror may think that because Mr. Anderson has been accused of an assault by [J.L.B.] that he is a bad person or a violent person or that he's likely to be guilty of any crime charged in this case. Each juror must presume that Mr. Anderson is innocent of all the charges in this case, and must evaluate those charges on their own merits.

¶ 64 The court included a similar limiting instruction in the final written instructions it gave to the jury. The written instruction read as follows:

Certain evidence can only be used for a specific and limited purpose. The jury must only consider this evidence for its proper purpose and not for any other purpose. In this case, such evidence includes testimony and evidence relating to the allegations made by [J.L.B.] of an incident on September 22, 1981 when Mr. Anderson assaulted her in her home.

You may consider this evidence only as it may relate to the identity of the person who committed the murder of [S.Q.]. Each juror

must decide for himself or herself whether the evidence relates to the issue of identity, and, if so, what weight to afford that evidence.

Such evidence is not and may not be considered as evidence of Mr. Anderson's character or propensity. No juror may think that because Mr. Anderson has been accused of an assault by [J.L.B.] that he is a "bad person" or a "violent person" or that he is likely to be guilty of any crime charged in this case. Each juror must presume that Mr. Anderson is innocent of all charges in this case and must evaluate those charges on their own merits.

2. Legal Principles

¶ 65 Under CRE 404(b)(1), "[e]vidence of any other crime, wrong, or act is not admissible to prove a person's character to show that on a particular occasion the person acted in conformity with the character." But evidence of another crime, wrong, or act "may be admissible for another purpose, such as proving motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, absence of mistake, or lack of accident." CRE 404(b)(2). To be admissible pursuant to CRE 404(b), the evidence must survive the four-part test set forth in *People v. Spoto*, 795 P.2d 1314, 1318 (Colo. 1990), which requires that the evidence

(1) relate to a material fact; (2) be logically relevant; (3) have a logical relevance that "is

independent of the intermediate inference, prohibited by CRE 404(b), that the defendant has a bad character” and committed the crime charged because he acted in conformity with that bad character; and (4) have a probative value that is not substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice.

Perez v. People, 2015 CO 45, ¶ 25 (quoting *Spoto*, 795 P.2d at 1318).

¶ 66 “Trial courts have substantial discretion to decide whether to admit evidence of prior bad acts.” *Id.* at ¶ 22 (citing *People v. Snyder*, 874 P.2d 1076, 1080 (Colo. 1994)). We review a trial court’s evidentiary rulings for an abuse of discretion. *Yusem v. People*, 210 P.3d 458, 463 (Colo. 2009). We “only disturb [the trial court’s] ruling on appeal if it was manifestly arbitrary, unreasonable, or unfair” or was based on a misapplication of law. *Id.*

3. The Trial Court Didn’t Err

¶ 67 Anderson concedes that identity was a material fact in the case and that the admitted evidence was, therefore, relevant. Anderson contends, however, that the trial court erred by determining that the relevance of the evidence was independent of the inference prohibited by CRE 404(b) and that the probative value

wasn't substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice.

We address these two contentions below.

a. Prong 3: Relevance Independent of an Impermissible Inference

¶ 68 First, the record supports the trial court's conclusion that the evidence is relevant independent of the prohibited inference that Anderson has a bad character and, acting in conformity with that bad character, killed and sexually assaulted S.Q.

¶ 69 *Spoto's* third prong "does not demand the absence of the bad character inference but merely requires that the proffered evidence be logically relevant independent of that inference." *People v. Lancaster*, 2022 COA 82, ¶ 47 (quoting *Snyder*, 874 P.2d at 1080). In other words, "the third *Spoto* prong requires that other acts have non-propensity relevance." *People v. Morales*, 2012 COA 2, ¶ 31. And this requirement is met "where there is 'similarity' between the charged and uncharged acts, showing a 'specific tendency' on the defendant's part." *Id.* (quoting *People v. McBride*, 228 P.3d 216, 227 (Colo. App. 2009)). A lack of similarity, however, "raises the risk that the other act 'does not show a specific tendency that can be separated from the prohibited inference that [a defendant acted

badly] in the past and therefore' must have committed the charged offense." *Id.* (quoting *McBride*, 228 P.3d at 227).

¶ 70 Anderson contends that the prior act wasn't adequately similar to the charged crime to survive *Spoto's* third prong. But the trial court found, with record support, that there were several similarities between the murder of S.Q. and Anderson's assault on his ex-girlfriend, including that

- the perpetrator broke into private homes;
- the perpetrator broke in through a window by removing the screen;
- the break-ins occurred while women were alone in the home;
- the perpetrator attacked women at close range; and
- nothing was stolen from the homes.

¶ 71 While there are some discrepancies between the two crimes, such as whether the victim was killed and whether the victim had a prior relationship with the alleged perpetrator, the similarities are predominant and substantial enough to demonstrate Anderson's identity as the perpetrator independent of any inference of bad character. In other words,

the relevance of the evidence is not that it shows [Anderson] as the type of person who sexually assaults women, which would be the prohibited bad character inference. Rather, “[t]he inference relied on arises . . . from the demonstration of [Anderson’s] pattern of using a particular technique to accomplish a particular end.”

People v. Shores, 2016 COA 129, ¶ 42 (quoting *People v. Rath*, 44 P.3d 1033, 1041 (Colo. 2002)).

¶ 72 Further, the trial court found that S.Q.’s and J.L.B.’s homes were close to one another and that the attacks occurred less than two months apart. This supports the conclusion that the other acts evidence could properly be considered independent of the prohibited bad character inference. *See Morales*, ¶ 33 (considering that the charged offenses and other acts “involved homes relatively close to each other, and the incidents took place within about two weeks of each other” when concluding that the other acts evidence “showed that defendant had a ‘specific tendency’ to target homes undergoing renovation”). Thus, this evidence that Anderson had perpetrated a similar crime, using similar methods, close in time to when and nearby where S.Q. was sexually assaulted and murdered is probative of Anderson’s identity as the perpetrator of the charged

crimes. And this probative value is sufficiently independent of the impermissible inference that because Anderson committed a different bad act, he must have committed this one.

b. Prong 4: Unfair Prejudice

¶ 73 The fourth *Spoto* prong requires us to perform a CRE 403 analysis and determine “if the probative value of the evidence is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice.”

Yusem, 210 P.3d at 467. In deference to the trial court, “we assume the maximum probative value a reasonable fact finder might give the evidence and the minimum unfair prejudice to be reasonably expected from its introduction.” *Morales*, ¶ 23. When performing a CRE 403 balancing test, we consider factors such as

the importance of the fact of consequence for which the evidence is offered, the strength and length of the chain of inferences necessary to establish the fact of consequence, the availability of alternative means of proof, whether the fact of consequence for which the evidence is offered is being disputed, and, if appropriate, the potential effectiveness of a limiting instruction in the event of admission.

Yusem, 210 P.3d at 467-68 (quoting *Vialpando v. People*, 727 P.2d 1090, 1096 (Colo. 1986)).

¶ 74 In this case, the above factors weigh in favor of admissibility.

First, the fact of consequence for which this evidence was offered — the identity of the perpetrator — is of substantial importance.

Indeed, as the trial court noted, identity was the primary question in the case.

¶ 75 Second, the People had strong, but limited, evidence to prove Anderson’s identity as the perpetrator. While DNA evidence is strong proof that Anderson had contact with S.Q., it was the only direct evidence linking Anderson to the murder. And Anderson disputed that he was the one who murdered and sexually assaulted S.Q. Anderson also called the probity of the DNA evidence into question by contending that he had consensual sex with S.Q. in the five days before her death. He further called the validity of the DNA evidence into question by introducing evidence that an alternative suspect may have been responsible for the crimes against S.Q. That the inference to be drawn from the DNA evidence was heavily disputed increases the probative force of the other acts evidence. *Cf. id.* at 468 (“[T]he prior act evidence offers minimal probative value to prove the listed purposes . . . because these purposes were either not disputed or could be proved by alternative methods.”).

¶ 76 Finally, the trial court gave a thorough and detailed limiting instruction telling the jury the limited purpose for which it could consider the evidence. The court gave this instruction contemporaneously with the admission of the evidence and as part of its final written instructions. And there's no indication that the jury failed to heed these instructions or that the prosecutor invited the jury to misuse the evidence. Therefore, we presume that the jury followed the court's limiting instruction. *See People v. Rowe*, 2012 COA 90, ¶ 46 ("Absent evidence to the contrary, we must presume the jury followed the court's limiting instructions and did not rely on the evidence for an improper purpose.").

¶ 77 Accordingly, the trial court didn't abuse its discretion by admitting evidence of Anderson's assault on his ex-girlfriend under CRE 404(b). Because we conclude that the trial court didn't abuse its discretion by admitting evidence of Anderson's assault on J.L.B. under CRE 404(b), we need not address the People's alternative argument that such evidence was also admissible under the doctrine of chances.

C. Prosecutorial Misconduct

¶ 78 Anderson next contends that the prosecutor committed reversible misconduct. We aren't persuaded.

1. Additional Facts

¶ 79 During closing argument, the prosecutor discussed the DNA evidence in this case and attempted to explain why Anderson's alternative suspect defense wasn't viable. The prosecutor then abruptly switched gears, stating, "And reason and your common sense tells you, there is only one way this went down." At that point, the prosecutor displayed a slide for the jury depicting S.Q. as she was found after her murder. The photo on the slide had been admitted as evidence during trial. It was taken from a distance outside of S.Q.'s home through her open front door, showing S.Q.'s unclothed body from the waist down lying on the floor; S.Q.'s body from the waist up wasn't visible in the photograph.

"ACCOUNTABILITY" was written in large font above the photo.

With the slide visible to the jury, the prosecutor said, "[H]ere's how her father saw her." Anderson immediately objected, but the trial court overruled the objection. The prosecutor then said,

At the end of all of this, when you look at the facts and you look at the law, we're asking you to hold [Anderson] accountable for something that took place a very long time ago that could have happened yesterday. We're asking you to hold him accountable because he's guilty so find him guilty.

2. Legal Principles and Standard of Review

¶ 80 Prosecutors have “a duty to refrain from using improper methods to produce a conviction.” *People v. Nardine*, 2016 COA 85,

¶ 34. In closing argument, it's proper for a prosecutor to include “the facts in evidence and the reasonable inferences drawn from those facts, as well as the law on which the jury has been instructed.” *People v. Buckner*, 2022 COA 14, ¶ 18. But a prosecutor must refrain from “arguments calculated to inflame the passions and prejudices of the jury, denigrate defense counsel, misstate the evidence, or assert a personal opinion as to the credibility of witnesses.” *Nardine*, ¶ 35.

¶ 81 When reviewing a prosecutorial misconduct claim, we engage in a two-step analysis. *People v. Wend*, 235 P.3d 1089, 1096 (Colo. 2010). Our first step is to “determine whether the prosecutor's questionable conduct was improper based on the totality of the circumstances.” *Id.* If the conduct was improper, our second step

is to determine “whether such actions warrant reversal according to the proper standard of review.” *Id.* Because each step is “analytically independent” of the other, we could conclude that “a prosecutor’s conduct [was] improper, but . . . uphold the trial court’s verdict because the errors were harmless.” *Id.*

¶ 82 The standard of review used to determine whether prosecutorial impropriety warrants reversal depends on whether the alleged error was preserved. *Id.* at 1097. If, as in this case, a defendant objects to a prosecutor’s misconduct and the prosecutor’s misconduct doesn’t infringe on a defendant’s constitutional rights, we review for nonconstitutional harmless error. *Id.*; see also *Hagos v. People*, 2012 CO 63, ¶ 12. Under this standard, “reversal is warranted if the error affects the substantial rights of the parties, meaning ‘the error substantially influenced the verdict or affected the fairness of the trial proceedings.’” *People v. Martinez*, 2020 COA 141 ¶ 28 (quoting *Zapata v. People*, 2018 CO 82, ¶ 61).

3. The Prosecutor’s Accountability Argument

¶ 83 In context, the prosecutor’s oral statement, requesting that the jury “hold [Anderson] accountable,” wasn’t improper. This is

because it was made after the prosecutor argued how the DNA evidence introduced at trial established Anderson’s guilt and it was framed as a request that the jury hold Anderson accountable because he was guilty. *See People v. Tran*, 2020 COA 99, ¶ 68 (concluding that the prosecutor’s accountability argument wasn’t improper “because the prosecutor made [the] comment immediately after arguing that the evidence established [the defendant’s] guilt and that if ‘[y]ou commit the crime, you have to be convicted of it”).

¶ 84 But the prosecutor’s use of the accountability slide is a closer call. Anderson contends that it was improper because it served no other purpose than to inflame the passions of the jury by asking the jurors to hold Anderson accountable for crimes against a sympathetic victim. *See Buckner*, ¶ 40 (“A prosecutor may not ‘pressure jurors by suggesting that guilty verdicts are necessary to do justice for a sympathetic victim.’” (quoting *People v. Marko*, 2015 COA 139, ¶ 221)). Even assuming the use of this slide was improper, we only reverse if the prosecutor’s impropriety wasn’t harmless. *See Wend*, 235 P.3d at 1096. And we conclude that any impropriety was harmless for four reasons.

¶ 85 First, the slide was shown as part of a proper accountability argument, as discussed above. Second, the prosecutor’s accountability argument, including the slide, was a brief part of the closing argument, further mitigating any prejudice to Anderson. *See People v. Garcia*, 2021 COA 80, ¶ 40 (concluding that a prosecutor’s “appeal to justice was so minimally prejudicial that reversal is not required under any standard” and noting that “[t]he prosecutor’s argument was brief and a small part of summation”), *aff’d*, 2023 CO 30. Third, the display of this slide was in the middle of a lengthy closing argument, and it wasn’t the last thing the prosecutor showed the jurors before they deliberated, mitigating the slide’s impact. *See Buckner*, ¶¶ 41, 44, 54 (concluding that a prosecutor’s accountability argument warranted reversal in part because “the last thing a prosecutor asked the jury to do before it began deliberating was to give the victim justice” and “[t]he prejudice resulting from this statement likely was exacerbated by its timing”). And fourth, although the picture showed S.Q. naked from the waist down, the jury couldn’t see any injuries to S.Q. (Indeed, as the People accurately point out in their answer brief, there were far more graphic pictures of S.Q.’s body admitted during trial.)

Thus, while the picture of S.Q. surely appealed to the sympathies of the jurors, any prejudice to Anderson was minimized because the picture was taken at a distance from S.Q.'s body and through an open door.

¶ 86 We acknowledge that even if the evidence of guilt was not overwhelming — but considering the context in which the slide was shown — any impropriety in the prosecutor's use of the slide was ultimately harmless. Therefore, even if the court erred by overruling Anderson's objection, the error doesn't warrant reversal.

III. Disposition

¶ 87 The judgment is affirmed.

JUDGE KUHN specially concurs.

JUDGE SCHUTZ concurs in part and dissents in part.

JUDGE KUHN, specially concurring.

¶ 88 I join the majority opinion in this case, but I write separately to highlight that the opinion’s conclusion, at least for me, rests upon a key premise: The government used the DNA in this investigation as a fingerprint, not as a cell phone. In other words, while DNA can reveal a tremendous amount of private information, in this case it was used *only* for identification purposes. However, the issues inherent in other potential collections and uses of DNA that Anderson raises in his briefing — and those highlighted by the partial dissent — are indeed concerning.

¶ 89 In 1969, the Colorado Supreme Court adopted Crim. P. 41.1. *People v. Harris*, 762 P.2d 651, 653 n.3 (Colo. 1988). It adopted the rule after the United States Supreme Court suggested that limited detentions for fingerprinting may not violate the Fourth Amendment if they were authorized by a judicial officer before the detention. *See People v. Luna-Solis*, 2013 CO 21, ¶ 36 (Bender, C.J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (citing *Davis v. Mississippi*, 394 U.S. 721, 727-28 (1969)). The rule permits the collection of nontestimonial identification evidence, Crim. P. 41.1,

and it was eventually interpreted to allow the collection of DNA for identification as well, *see Luna-Solis*, ¶ 23.

¶ 90 The use of DNA for forensic purposes wasn't first recognized until the mid-1980s, and it wasn't applied until the late 1980s. *See Fishback v. People*, 851 P.2d 884, 890 (Colo. 1993), *abrogated by People v. Shreck*, 22 P.3d 68 (Colo. 2001). Indeed, the Colorado Supreme Court didn't address the applicable standard for determining the admissibility of DNA typing evidence until 1993. *See id.* At that — and underpinning the rationale of Crim. P. 41.1 — DNA typing could be used like a fingerprint to compare a defendant's DNA profile to DNA evidence from a crime scene.

¶ 91 In the investigative context, DNA typing utilizes a selected technique to profile a suspect's genetic structure and compare it to genetic material found at a crime scene to see if they match. *Fishback*, 851 P.2d at 885; *see also* Ming W. Chin, Michael Chamberlin & Amy Rojas, *Forensic DNA Evidence: Science and the Law* §§ 2:1 to :4, Westlaw (database updated May 2026) (describing DNA profiling). If there is a match, then the statistical significance of the match is calculated to determine the likelihood of a match

occurring between the crime scene sample and a random third person who is not the suspect. *Fishback*, 851 P.2d at 885.

¶ 92 In the intervening four decades since DNA typing's emergence, DNA technology has advanced at a staggering pace. As relevant to this case, experts now routinely testify about DNA profiles built from touch DNA. As its name suggests, when someone touches an item, they may leave a trace amount of their DNA behind. And as one expert succinctly put it, "DNA is pretty much everywhere." *People v. Ortega*, 2016 COA 148, ¶ 32.

¶ 93 The analysis of touch DNA was originally made possible through polymerase chain reaction (PCR) based methods, which were used to amplify a sample and enable analysis of an extremely tiny amount of DNA. Aubrey A. Butler, Note, *Fingerprints of Injustice: The Truth Behind Artificial Intelligence and Algorithmic-Driven Evidence*, 28 Chap. L. Rev. 419, 432 (2025); see also *United States v. Morrow*, 374 F. Supp. 2d 51, 56-60 (D.D.C. 2005) (describing PCR amplification). But because a PCR-based analysis amplifies tiny amounts of DNA, it is most useful on a pure sample left by a single individual. Butler, 28 Chap. L. Rev. at 432.

PCR-based DNA analysis is less reliable at accurately separating genetic profiles in a mixed sample. *Id.*

¶ 94 With advances in artificial intelligence, however, multiple companies now claim that they can solve the problem of a tiny mixed sample through probabilistic genotyping. *Id.* The proprietors of this technology claim that, unlike traditional DNA analysis, the software in probabilistic genotyping systems can calculate from a mixed sample the likelihood that a suspect's DNA is in the evidence sample relative to a random person's DNA. *Id.* Though the scientific community may have concerns with this technology outside of well-established and validated ranges for the number of contributors to a mixed sample of DNA, results are nonetheless being introduced in criminal cases. See Brandon L. Garrett & Cynthia Rudin, *The Right to a Glass Box: Rethinking the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Criminal Justice*, 109 Cornell L. Rev. 561, 586 (2024); see also Timothy Lau & Alex Biedermann, *Assessing AI Output in Legal Decision-making With Nearest Neighbors*, 124 Penn. St. L. Rev. 609, 648-49 (2020) (highlighting concerns in the process of comparing samples).

¶ 95 As the experts in this case testified, in the early 1980s, when this crime was committed, forensic markers could only identify a sample as occurring in one person out of several thousand. By the time of trial, in 2022, the prosecution was able to present an expert who had matched a DNA sample from carpet fibers at the crime scene to Anderson. The expert testified that the probability of selecting an unrelated individual at random from the population matching the profile was approximately 1 in 680 octillion.¹ That's a leap of more than twenty-five orders of magnitude in four decades.

¶ 96 But with such significant technological advancements also comes the potential for significant invasions into people's privacy. DNA technology now has the capability of revealing a massive amount of information about the subjects of its analysis. After all, DNA "is the body's instruction manual." Jessica Gabel Cino, *Deploying the Secret Police: The Use of Algorithms in the Criminal Justice System*, 34 Ga. St. U.L. Rev. 1073, 1080 (2018) (quoting D.P. Lyle, *Forensic Science* 179 (2012)). It determines key characteristics of a human being, from height to musical ability to

¹ That is, 1 in 680,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000.

medical conditions. *Id.*; see *Maldonado v. GeneDx, Inc.*, 2024 COA 121, ¶¶ 6-7 (discussing genetically transmitted disease). And that information can now be extracted from exceptionally small samples that we inevitably and unpreventably leave behind. This means that — like the ubiquitous cell phone — our DNA can now reveal more details about our private lives than ever before from testable quantities of DNA that we leave everywhere we go.

¶ 97 The partial dissent ably highlights the numerous privacy risks made possible by advancing DNA technology and the amount of personal information that could be gleaned from a DNA sample. The exploding field of artificial intelligence and machine learning will only continue to shrink the requisite sample size and increase the amount of available information in these minute amounts of DNA that we leave as we move through the world. As these systems continue to advance, society will have to grapple with the fact that we have no meaningful choice in “abandoning” our DNA — it is a fact of living. *Cf. Carpenter v. United States*, 585 U.S. 296, 315 (2018) (“Cell phone location information is not truly ‘shared’ as one normally understands the term. . . . Apart from disconnecting the phone from the network, there is no way to avoid leaving behind a

trail of location data.”). And a legal framework permitting the unfettered use, retention, and cataloging of that “abandoned” DNA is indeed concerning.

¶ 98 So while my decision in this case is driven by the use of DNA as a fingerprint, not a cell phone, I am mindful of the immense and ever increasing amount of information that we can extract from that DNA. I am also mindful of the tremendous potential for abuse inherent in such personal information residing in the hands of the government or, indeed, a private actor. The partial dissent highlights various actions our General Assembly has taken to address a variety of DNA privacy issues, primarily in the insurance context. I urge legislators to continue to focus on these vital privacy concerns as DNA technology continues to evolve.

JUDGE SCHUTZ, concurring in part and dissenting in part.

¶ 99 DNA “can reveal a breathtaking amount of private information.” *Banks v. United States*, 490 F.3d 1178, 1191 (10th Cir. 2007). It carries the genetic instructions for “a particular person’s entire biological development and function.” *State v. Burns*, 988 N.W.2d 352, 389 (Iowa 2023) (McDermott, J., dissenting). An individual’s DNA can reveal extremely personal information, including “phenotypic propensities,” Jonathan Kimmelman, *Risking Ethical Insolvency: A Survey of Trends in Criminal DNA Databanking*, 28 J.L. Med. & Ethics 209, 209 (2000),¹ “familial lineage[,] and predisposition to over four thousand types of genetic conditions and diseases,” Leigh M. Harlan, Note, *When Privacy Fails: Invoking a Property Paradigm to Mandate the Destruction of DNA Samples*, 54 Duke L.J. 179, 188 (2004). And because people involuntarily shed it everywhere they go, it can also be used to identify where a person has been. It bears emphasizing that these uses are based only on our current understanding of

¹ Black’s Law Dictionary defines a phenotype as “[a] living organism’s physical characteristics and behavior.” Black’s Law Dictionary 1384 (12th ed. 2024).

DNA and the information encoded in it. The potential future uses of DNA are as vast as they are unknown.

¶ 100 The fundamental question presented in this case is whether the government and its private agents may surreptitiously root through a person's garbage, seize a discarded soda can that contains DNA, and then gather and use that DNA without obtaining a warrant. I agree with the majority that the warrantless search of a person's garbage and the seizure of a soda can found in that garbage is consistent with the Colorado Constitution. But I respectfully disagree with the majority's conclusion that article II, section 7 of the Colorado Constitution tolerates law enforcement's seizing and testing of DNA contained on the soda can without first obtaining a warrant or complying with a judicially recognized exception to the warrant requirement. I write separately to explain the basis for my conclusion.

I. Applicable Law

A. Standard of Review

¶ 101 When reviewing a trial court's ruling on a suppression motion, the appellate court defers to its factual findings absent clear error but reviews de novo its legal conclusions, including any

determinations as to reasonable expectations of privacy. *People v. Galvador*, 103 P.3d 923, 927 (Colo. 2005).

B. The Colorado Constitution Applies

¶ 102 As a preliminary matter, it is important to note that even though the seizure and search of the soda can and Anderson's DNA occurred in Nebraska, the constitutionality of that search is governed by Colorado and federal law. *See People v. Taylor*, 804 P.2d 196, 198 (Colo. App. 1990) ("[I]f there was a violation of the defendant's Colorado constitutional rights, then exclusion of the evidence would be mandated even though the evidence may have been properly seized under the laws of the situs state.").

¶ 103 The majority opinion includes a thorough discussion about whether law enforcement's conduct violated the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. But because I believe it is dispositive, I begin by considering whether law enforcement's conduct violated article II, section 7 of the Colorado Constitution. *Cf. Sterling v. Cupp*, 625 P.2d 123, 126 (Or. 1981) ("The proper sequence is to analyze the state's law, including its constitutional law, before reaching a federal constitutional claim . . . because the state does not deny any right claimed under the federal

Constitution when the claim before the court in fact is fully met by state law.”).

II. Search and Seizure Under the Colorado Constitution

¶ 104 As with the Fourth Amendment, article II, section 7 of the Colorado Constitution prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures. *People v. Licona-Ortega*, 2022 COA 27, ¶ 20. “A warrantless search is presumed to violate the constitutional provisions prohibiting unreasonable searches and seizures.” *Id.* And “[to] overcome this presumption, the prosecution has the burden of establishing that the warrantless search was justified by one of the narrowly defined exceptions to the warrant requirement.” *Id.*

¶ 105 A search occurs under article II, section 7 of the Colorado Constitution when the government infringes on an individual’s reasonable expectation of privacy, and a seizure of property occurs when there is some meaningful interference with an individual’s possessory interests in that property. *People v. Seymour*, 2023 CO 53, ¶ 20.

¶ 106 A claimed privacy interest warrants constitutional protection when (1) “the individual ‘exhibited an actual (subjective) expectation

of privacy” and (2) “the expectation [is] one that society is prepared to recognize as ‘reasonable.’” *Id.* at ¶ 22 (quoting *People v. Gutierrez*, 222 P.3d 925, 932 (Colo. 2009), in turn quoting *Katz v. United States*, 389 U.S. 347, 361 (1967) (Harlan, J., concurring)). A defendant bears the burden of demonstrating a legitimate expectation of privacy. *See People v. Montoya*, 914 P.2d 491, 492 (Colo. App. 1995).

¶ 107 I agree with the majority’s conclusion that under controlling Colorado Supreme Court precedent, article II, section 7 does not prohibit the warrantless search of garbage that a person sets out on the curb. *See People v. Hillman*, 834 P.2d 1271, 1271-72 (Colo. 1992).

¶ 108 But *Hillman* was a close call. *See* 834 P.2d at 1278-83 (Quinn, J., joined by Lohr and Kirshbaum, JJ., dissenting). The privacy concerns that animated the dissent are worthy of emphasis:

The notion that a person has no reasonable expectation of privacy [in garbage placed on the curb] has a certain superficial attraction. This attraction, however, quickly disappears when the implications for personal privacy are considered. I venture to say that most persons would experience a great sense of personal insecurity at the prospect of police officers, without any cause whatever, opening a

securely tied and opaque trash bag, the contents of which are hidden from public view, and then searching the bag to determine the activities, behavior, habits, and lifestyles of persons who deposited the trash in front of their home for disposition by a trash collector. The court's decision today condones that very practice and in so doing denigrates [article II, section 7] of the Colorado Constitution.

Id. at 1278.

¶ 109 Nevertheless, we, like the trial court, are bound to follow *Hillman*. Thus, I perceive no error in the trial court's conclusion that the initial search and seizure of Anderson's garbage did not violate article II, section 7.

¶ 110 But Anderson also argues that the seizure of the soda can for the purpose of gathering and analyzing his DNA presents a second search and seizure that was conducted in violation of article II, section 7. The majority opinion rejects this argument, concluding that the government may seize garbage for the purpose of collecting and analyzing a person's DNA without any judicial oversight. It is on this issue that I respectfully part company with my colleagues.

III. Privacy Interest in DNA

¶ 111 Colorado has a rich tradition of ensuring that the Colorado Constitution's prohibition against unreasonable searches and

seizures is interpreted in a manner that “protect[s] a person’s legitimate expectation of privacy from unreasonable governmental intrusions.” *People v. Sporleder*, 666 P.2d 135, 139 (Colo. 1983).

¶ 112 In service to this central purpose, the Colorado Supreme Court has declined to follow in lockstep formation with the United States Supreme Court’s interpretation of the Fourth Amendment:

Although [a]rticle II, [s]ection 7 of the Colorado Constitution is substantially similar to its federal counterpart, we are not bound by the United States Supreme Court’s interpretation of the Fourth Amendment when determining the scope of state constitutional protections. *E.g.*, *Charnes v. DiGiacomo*, [612 P.2d 1117 (Colo. 1980)]; [*City & County of Denver v. Nielson*, 194 Colo. 407, 572 P.2d 484 (1977)]; *People v. Hoinville*, 191 Colo. 357, 553 P.2d 777 (1976). *See also* [William J.] Brennan, *State Constitutions and the Protection of Individual Rights*, 90 Harv. L. Rev. 489 (1977); [Robin B. Johansen,] Note, *The New Federalism: Toward a Principled Interpretation of the State Constitution*, 29 Stan. L. Rev. 297 (1977).

Id. at 140. And the Colorado Supreme Court “has historically relied upon a broader definition of what constitutes a legitimate expectation of privacy from government intrusion than that of its federal counterpart, the Fourth Amendment.” *Galvador*, 103 P.3d at 927.

¶ 113 In *Sporleder*, the Colorado Supreme Court acknowledged that the United States Supreme Court interpreted the Fourth Amendment to permit law enforcement to install a pen register — “a device that registers the numbers dialed from a telephone,” Merriam-Webster Dictionary, <https://perma.cc/5X2R-KKD3> — on a suspect’s phone without a warrant. *Sporleder*, 666 P.2d at 140 (citing *Smith v. Maryland*, 442 U.S. 735 (1979)). This was so, the United States Supreme Court reasoned, because a defendant’s subjective expectation of privacy in their telephone records is not “one that society is prepared to recognize as ‘reasonable.’” *Smith*, 442 U.S. at 742-43 (quoting *Katz*, 389 U.S. at 361 (Harlan, J., concurring)). Thus, the United States Supreme Court concluded that the warrantless installation of the pen register did not violate the Fourth Amendment. *Id.* at 745-46.

¶ 114 Despite the Fourth Amendment holding in *Smith*, the Colorado Supreme Court reached a contrary conclusion based on article II, section 7:

The pen register recorded each telephone number dialed by the defendant as well as the date and time of each telephone call. Knowledge of these facts can often yield inferential knowledge of the content of the

conversation itself. In addition, a pen register record holds out the prospect of an even greater intrusion in privacy when the record itself is acquired by the government, which has a technological capacity to convert basic data into a virtual mosaic of a person's life.

Sporleder, 666 P.2d at 141-42.

¶ 115 Recognizing this threat, the court concluded that “[t]he defendant’s expectation of privacy in the numbers dialed on her home telephone is an expectation that we are prepared to recognize as reasonable under [a]rticle II, [s]ection 7 of the Colorado Constitution.” *Id.* at 142. Thus, the court held that the installation of the pen register, without first obtaining a warrant, violated article II, section 7. *Id.* at 144.

¶ 116 *Sporleder* was not an anomaly. In the years before and after its announcement, the Colorado Supreme Court has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to ensuring that article II, section 7 protects Coloradans against unreasonable searches and seizures. *See, e.g., Charnes*, 612 P.2d at 1121 (A “bank depositor has a reasonable expectation of privacy in the bank records of his financial transactions.”); *People v. Oates*, 698 P.2d 811, 815-16 (Colo. 1985) (“We conclude that the broader definition of what

constitutes a legitimate expectation of privacy under the Colorado Constitution encompasses the expectation that purchased commercial goods [there, a drum of chemicals] will be free of government surveillance devices”); *People v. McKnight*, 2019 CO 36, ¶ 49 (“Because we have concluded that the sniff from a dog trained to detect marijuana is a search under article II, section 7, it follows that the search must be justified by probable cause.”); *Seymour*, ¶ 32 (“Accordingly, we conclude that [a defendant] has a reasonable expectation of privacy in [their] Google search history under article II, section 7 of the Colorado Constitution.”). The recent decisions in *McKnight* and *Seymour* warrant amplification.

¶ 117 In *McKnight*, the court noted that marijuana remains illegal under federal law and therefore is considered contraband and not entitled to Fourth Amendment protection. *McKnight*, ¶ 37. In contrast, possession of a certain amount of marijuana in Colorado does not violate state law. Thus, the distinction between the legal status of the thing being searched was relevant to the court’s analysis.

¶ 118 The court acknowledged that the operative language of article II, section 7 largely mirrors that of the Fourth Amendment.

Nevertheless, the court emphasized that these similarities do not mandate that Colorado’s search and seizure jurisprudence must mirror that of the Fourth Amendment:

[B]ecause the protections afforded by both article II, section 7 and the Fourth Amendment are “highly generalized,” we discern no reason to reflexively assume that there must be “just one meaning over a range of differently situated sovereigns.” [Jeffrey S. Sutton, *51 Imperfect Solutions: States and the Making of American Constitutional Law* 174 (2018)]. Criminal law has traditionally been considered best left to the expertise of the state courts as the vast majority of criminal prosecutions take place in state, rather than federal, court. See Shirley S. Abrahamson, *Criminal Law and State Constitutions: The Emergence of State Constitutional Law*, 63 Tex. L. Rev. 1141, 1150 (1985) (“Criminal law is an area of traditional concern for state judges. It is an area of law in which state judges have special experience and expertise.”)

Id. at ¶ 39.

¶ 119 The supreme court applied this same sense of independent judgment in *Seymour* by concluding that a person’s Google search history is entitled to protection under article II, section 7. In reaching this conclusion, the court discussed the two prongs of the privacy expectation analysis. *Seymour*, ¶¶ 21-33.

¶ 120 The court noted that “the first (or subjective) prong is an ‘important, but not dispositive, element.’” *Id.* at ¶ 23 (quoting *Gutierrez*, 222 P.3d at 932). On this prong, the court noted that the defendant had taken some measures to protect his search history, thereby evidencing his subjective desire to protect his privacy interests. *Id.* These prophylactic measures included using a search engine with strict privacy protections. *Id.*

¶ 121 The court then turned to the “second (or objective) prong[, which] more typically dictates whether constitutional protections apply.” *Id.* at ¶ 24. In assessing this component, the court noted that “courts must consider not only the precise technology at issue, but also ‘more sophisticated systems that are already in use or in development.’” *Id.* (quoting *Carpenter v. United States*, 585 U.S. 296, 313 (2018), in turn quoting *Kyllo v. United States*, 533 U.S. 27, 36 (2001)).

¶ 122 In applying the often determinative second factor, the court drew on the United States Supreme Court’s conclusion under the Fourth Amendment that a person has a privacy interest in their cell site location information (CSLI). *Carpenter* held that “an individual’s 127-day location history provided an ‘intimate window

into a person’s life, revealing not only his particular movements, but through them his “familial, political, professional, religious, and sexual associations.”” *Seymour*, ¶ 25 (quoting *Carpenter*, 585 U.S. at 311, in turn quoting *United States v. Jones*, 565 U.S. 400, 415 (2012) (Sotomayor, J., concurring)). Thus, the court concluded that a person has a reasonable privacy expectation in protecting their Google search history.

¶ 123 As these cases illustrate, the Colorado Supreme Court has recognized — often in the face of conflicting federal precedent — that article II, section 7 protects Coloradans’ privacy interests in a wide array of property, including bank records, pen registers, commercially purchased goods, legally possessed marijuana, and Google search histories.

IV. Reasonable Expectation of Privacy in One’s DNA

¶ 124 I turn now to the question of whether Coloradans have a reasonable expectation of privacy in their DNA. For the reasons explained more fully below, I answer this question affirmatively.

¶ 125 In urging us not to recognize a person’s reasonable privacy interest in their own DNA, the People draw heavily from our garbage-related precedent, and the theory of abandonment on

which it is predicated. The People remind us that Anderson threw away his empty soda can without taking any steps to prevent the can — or his DNA deposited on that can — from being taken by the public, in general, or law enforcement, in particular.

¶ 126 The People’s argument has some initial appeal. Indeed, the majority opinions of at least two state supreme courts have relied on abandonment principles to conclude that a person does not have a reasonable expectation of privacy in the DNA contained in their discarded garbage. *See Burns*, 988 N.W.2d at 367; *State v. Sharpe*, 343 A.3d 408, 426 (Conn. 2025).² But I reject this argument because it is inconsistent with the realities of involuntarily shed DNA and the common understanding and legal meaning of the term abandon.

¶ 127 All of us shed DNA wherever we go and without any thought or control. When we cough, sneeze, or sweat, we leave a DNA trail.

² As noted in the majority opinion in *State v. Sharpe*, there is also a substantial body of jurisprudence from federal and state jurisdictions other than Colorado concluding that a person has no privacy interest in the DNA contained in certain bodily fluids — such as saliva — discarded in public, for example by spitting, discarding cigarettes, and discarding napkins or drinking devices. *See* 343 A.3d 408, 416-17 (Conn. 2025).

When we use a fork to eat, a straw or a can to drink, or paper to transact personal, business, or commercial transactions, we leave our DNA on the objects we touched. Unless we go through the world in some form of hermetically sealed bubble, we leave a record of our DNA. But critically, this is not the product of a voluntary choice or action. It is the inevitable consequence of existing.

¶ 128 The concept of abandonment is generally understood to require some form of intentional act by the abandoning party. Thus, Merriam-Webster defines abandon as “to give up with the intent of never again claiming a right or interest in.” Merriam-Webster Dictionary, <https://perma.cc/2X99-2V6Z>. Black’s Law Dictionary, defines abandon in the property context as follows: “To relinquish or give up (something) with the intention of never again reclaiming one’s rights or interest in.” Black’s Law Dictionary 1 (12th ed. 2024); *see also People in Interest of M.C.*, 2012 COA 64, ¶ 33 (applying general reference dictionary and Black’s Law Dictionary definitions to interpret the term “abandon” as used in a Colorado’s wildlife statutes).

¶ 129 But DNA is released without voluntary or intentional action taken by the source of that DNA. True enough, people routinely

intentionally discard personal property — such as a soda can — with no intention of ever reclaiming it or the DNA that is attached to it. And in doing so, it is rational to assume that the person is abandoning any right to the soda can, which another person or the government can collect, discard, or recycle as they see fit.

¶ 130 By discarding a soda can, however, a reasonable person does not manifest an intention to give the government — much less the whole world — the keys to their genetic code and all of the intimacies that accompany it. Like a cell phone seized incident to an arrest, DNA holds a plethora of information that is not readily observable, but which, when searched, provides a window into the deeply personal matters that we reasonably expect to remain private. *See Riley v. California*, 573 U.S. 373, 403 (2014) (requiring law enforcement to obtain a warrant before searching a cell phone that was properly obtained incident to an arrest because cell phones “hold for many Americans ‘the privacies of life’” (quoting *Boyd v. United States*, 116 U.S. 616, 630 (1886))).

¶ 131 DNA is much more akin to a pen register, or CSLI data, a Google search history, or blood, rather than a discarded piece of aluminum. Like a pen register, DNA “holds out the prospect of an

even greater intrusion in privacy when the record itself is acquired by the government, which has a technological capacity to convert basic data into a virtual mosaic of a person’s life.” *Sporleder*, 666 P.2d at 142. Like CSLI data, DNA holds intimate details of a person’s activities and actions. *See Carpenter*, 585 U.S. at 310. DNA can also be used, in some circumstances, to determine where a person has been and to confirm their sexual activity. *See Seymour*, ¶ 25 (discussing concerns that CSLI data could be used to identify a person’s “particular movements” and “sexual associations” (quoting *Carpenter*, 585 U.S. at 311)). Finally, like blood, DNA “places in the hands of law enforcement authorities a sample that can be preserved and from which it is possible to extract information beyond a simple [breathalyzer test].” *Birchfield v. North Dakota*, 579 U.S. 438, 464 (2016) (distinguishing warrantless search of a breathalyzer, which is permitted, from taking an involuntary blood draw without a warrant, which is not).

¶ 132 Given these considerations, I cannot conclude that a person abandons their right to protect their DNA simply by discarding their trash.

¶ 133 Turning to the second element of the privacy inquiry, I am convinced that the protection of a person’s DNA is a privacy interest that Coloradans are willing to recognize as reasonable.

¶ 134 The objective reasonableness of this privacy expectation is revealed by the other privacy interests that the Colorado Supreme Court has already concluded are objectively reasonable, including the phone numbers a person dials, the smell of potentially legally possessed marijuana that emanates from their vehicle, and their Google search history.

¶ 135 As an additional objective check on the reasonableness of Coloradans’ privacy interest in their own DNA, I look to legislation that protects our private medical information generally. *See, e.g.*, § 13-90-107(1)(d), C.R.S. 2025 (establishing physician patient-privilege); *Alcon v. Spicer*, 113 P.3d 735, 738 (Colo. 2005) (physician-patient privilege extends to communication and medical records regarding medical assessment and treatment); *see also* §§ 6-1-1301 to -1314, C.R.S. 2025 (Colorado Privacy Act); § 6-1-1302(1)(a)(I), C.R.S. 2025 (“The people of Colorado regard their privacy as a fundamental right and an essential element of

their individual freedom”); § 6-1-1314 (placing limitations on the collection and use of consumers’ biometric data).

¶ 136 On a more granular level, the Colorado General Assembly has enacted section 10-3-1104.7, C.R.S. 2025, which recognizes that “[g]enetic information is the unique property of the individual to whom the information pertains,” § 10-3-1104.7(1)(a), and that “[a]ny information concerning an individual obtained through the use of genetic techniques may be subject to abuses if disclosed to unauthorized third parties without the willing consent of the individual to whom the information pertains,” § 10-3-1104.7(1)(b). Similarly, subsection (1)(c) provides as follows: “To protect individual privacy and to preserve individual autonomy with regard to the individual’s genetic information, it is appropriate to limit the use and availability of genetic information.” § 10-3-1104.7(1)(c).

¶ 137 In view of these privacy interests, the statute places restrictions on the use of genetic materials: “Information derived from genetic testing shall be confidential and privileged. Any release, for purposes other than diagnosis, treatment, or therapy, of genetic testing information that identifies the person tested with the test results released requires specific written consent by the person

tested.” § 10-3-1104.7(3)(a). These statutes objectively reflect Colorado’s understanding that a person’s DNA and related genetic materials are confidential and privileged, and that those materials generally may not be used without the specific written consent of the person from whom they were obtained.

¶ 138 It is also true, as the People point out, that section 10-3-1104.7(4) provides an exception to this limitation on use:

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (3) of this section, in the course of a criminal investigation or a criminal prosecution, *and to the extent allowed under the federal or state constitution*, any peace officer, district attorney, or assistant attorney general, or a designee thereof, may obtain information derived from genetic testing regarding the identity of any individual who is the subject of the criminal investigation or prosecution for use exclusively in the criminal investigation or prosecution without the consent of the individual being tested.

(Emphasis added.)

¶ 139 In discussing section 10-3-1104.7(4), the People emphasize that DNA “may be used to ‘identi[f]y . . . any individual who is the subject of the criminal investigation or prosecution for use exclusively in the criminal investigation or prosecution’ of that person.” But in doing so, the People do not quote — much less

acknowledge — the portion of section 10-3-1104.7(4) that limits law enforcement’s use of DNA “*to the extent allowed under the federal or state constitution.*” (Emphasis added.) This language returns us to the fundamental issue: the People’s failure to comply with article II, section 7 or a judicially recognized exception to the warrant requirement.

V. “Trust Us”

¶ 140 Which leads to the People’s “trust us” argument. The People suggest that Coloradans have no objectively reasonable expectation of privacy in their DNA because they do — or should — trust the government to use their DNA for purely benevolent purposes, like exonerating the innocent and convicting criminals. While I appreciate the spirit of the argument, I find it misguided. I simply do not believe objectively reasonable Coloradans are willing to assume that the government can be trusted for all time to never use their seized DNA and related data for improper purposes.

¶ 141 The reasons for my skepticism are illustrated by the contrary argument that the prosecutor made to justify the warrantless search in this case:

The question is did law enforcement rightly own the trash when they picked it up? And if law enforcement rightly owned it — and when I say “owned it,” was not infringing upon any of this defendant’s rights by taking it from where they took it — they can do whatever the heck they want with it because the defendant has no privacy interest in it.

They can test it, they can look at it, they can burn it if they want to; but they are not infringing on this defendant’s constitutional rights because he has no privacy interest in it.

The prosecution then extended its abandonment theory to the DNA contained on the discarded soda can: “Because that’s what we’re talking about, Judge. We’re talking about shed DNA on items that have been thrown out.”

¶ 142 Shortly after hearing this argument, the trial court rejected the motion to suppress, reasoning as follows:

And so the [c]ourt has found that the police lawfully took the trash from the dumpster, and that it was essentially abandoned property, and that because they were able to take that lawfully abandoned property, it is searchable by them. . . .

. . . I can’t find that there’s a privacy interest in the DNA left on a [soda can] thrown into public trash.

So it’s a very interesting and well-written motion, but I just don’t think I can support it by the law for me at the level that I’m at to

change the law. So [the motion to suppress] is denied.

¶ 143 Irrespective of the current actors' intentions, neither our history, nor our present,³ nor our future prospects reflect that governmental actors are somehow immunized from the temptation to use personal information for improper purposes, even when motivated by good or ambivalent motives. As Justice Brandeis long ago counseled, "Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent." *Olmstead v. United States*, 277 U.S. 438, 479 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting), *overruled by Katz v. United States*, 389 U.S. 347 (1967). And, of course, the government and its private agents are not immune from simple lapses or oversights when gathering, storing, and protecting sensitive personal information.

¶ 144 In addition to reflecting a healthy degree of skepticism regarding governmental actions, Colorado statutes also express

³ As the People acknowledge, Yvonne "Missy" Woods, a former analyst with the Colorado Bureau of Investigation, developed the DNA profile from the soda can seized in this case. The accuracy of Woods's work is currently the subject of intense scrutiny. See Chris Perez, *Colorado Legal System Prepares to Untie Knot Created by Disgraced CBI Analyst*, Westword (June 10, 2024), <https://perma.cc/2KBE-XZLZ>.

Coloradans’ sense of concern over how private entities may use personal genetic data. Indeed, section 10-3-1104.7 limits the use of genetic data by insurance companies, and the Colorado Privacy Act is intended to limit the gathering and use of biometric data by persons who deliver commercial products or services to Colorado residents. § 6-1-1304(1)(a)(I)(A), C.R.S. 2025.

¶ 145 These statutes express Coloradans’ objective expectation of privacy concerning the use of their personal biometric data. Yet the People’s central theory is that DNA and its properties are of such little consequence to Coloradans that their unavoidable discarding of that material amounts to an abandonment of any privacy interest in their DNA. And if one accepts that proposition, then the person who gathers that DNA — whether the government or a private business — can “do whatever the heck they want with it because the defendant has no privacy interest in it.”

¶ 146 Indeed, that is precisely what happened in this case. A private genetic genealogy company surreptitiously seized a discarded soda can containing Anderson’s DNA and delivered it to the government for the purpose of searching Anderson’s DNA. If we are to sanction this type of activity, it approves a process whereby private

companies with an economic motive can surreptitiously seize anyone's DNA from their garbage and then use that DNA for their own private enterprise — or deliver it to the government for any use that the government sees fit.

¶ 147 Seemingly accepting the People's "trust us" argument, the majority opinion, *supra* ¶ 52, reasons that the privacy concerns emanating from the unfettered search and seizure of a person's DNA pose no concerns "when the purpose and use of the testing of the lawfully obtained DNA is limited to identification, as it was here." But the implicit conclusion that Anderson's DNA was "lawfully obtained" begs the question that we must decide: Can the government search and seize people's DNA from their garbage without first obtaining a warrant or, at the very minimum, an authorizing court order under Crim. P. 41.1?

¶ 148 Moreover, I see nothing in the record that placed any limitation on the government's use of the DNA seized in this case. Recall, the prosecution's sole argument to the trial court was that it and its private agents may search and seize any discarded garbage because the disposing person has abandoned any privacy interest in the garbage and the DNA it may contain. And the sole basis for

the trial court’s denial of the suppression motion was its acceptance of this abandonment argument. Consistent with that theory, the trial court placed no limitation on who could use the seized DNA or how it could be used.⁴

¶ 149 This is a result I cannot abide. As evidenced by Colorado’s article II, section 7 jurisprudence, and the recent legislation concerning DNA and biometric data, such a reality is inconsistent with Coloradans’ reasonable privacy expectations.

⁴ The majority opinion, *supra* ¶ 53, states that it intends to “save for another day the question of whether the State can test lawfully obtained DNA for a purpose other than identification without a warrant.” But the majority opinion greenlights the seizing and testing of any person’s DNA from their discarded garbage by accepting the People’s abandonment theory — that is, by abandoning their garbage, Coloradans also abandon any interest in the DNA they inevitably deposit on that garbage. If we accept that proposition, I respectfully suggest there will be no “other day” to address or attempt to limit the use of another person’s discarded DNA, whether by the government or a private actor. As the prosecutor argued to the trial court, if a person or the government can seize and search DNA on discarded garbage based on an abandonment theory, “they can do whatever the heck they want with it They can test it, they can look at it, they can burn it[,] . . . but they are not infringing on this defendant’s constitutional rights because he has no privacy interest in it.”

VI. Crim. P. 41.1

¶ 150 I turn now to the People’s appellate argument that the existence of Crim. P. 41.1 excuses the government’s failure to obtain a warrant or court order before conducting the search and seizure of Anderson’s DNA. Crim. P. 41.1(a) provides that “[a] nontestimonial identification order” may be issued by a judge. Under Crim. P. 41.1(c), “An order shall issue only on an affidavit or affidavits sworn to or affirmed before the judge” And the affidavit must establish that “there is probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed”; “there are reasonable grounds, not amounting to probable cause to arrest, to suspect that the person named . . . committed the offense”; and “the results of specific nontestimonial identification procedures will be of material aid in determining whether the person named in the affidavit committed the offense.” Crim. P. 41.1(c)(1)-(3).

¶ 151 As the majority points out, the Colorado Supreme Court has concluded that the use of Crim. P. 41.1 may — under specifically defined circumstances and subject to prior judicial approval — be used to obtain certain identifying information. *See People v. Madson*, 638 P.2d 18, 31-32 (Colo. 1981). In *Madson*, the court

noted that Crim. P. 41.1 “was an outgrowth” of statements made in various United States Supreme Court opinions “suggesting that limited intrusions based on less than probable cause might be constitutionally permissible under narrowly defined circumstances.”

Id. at 31. As the court explained,

These cases suggest that limited intrusions into privacy on less than probable cause are reconcilable with Fourth Amendment guarantees when the following conditions exist. First, there must be an articulable and specific basis in fact for suspecting criminal activity at the outset. Second, the intrusion must be limited in scope, purpose and duration. Third, the intrusion must be justified by substantial law enforcement interests. Last, there must be an opportunity at some point to subject the intrusion to the neutral and detached scrutiny of a judicial officer before the evidence obtained therefrom may be admitted in a criminal proceeding against the accused.

Id. at 31-32.

¶ 152 In emphasizing the importance of judicial approval of such an invasion of a person’s privacy, the court quoted from the United States Supreme Court’s opinion in *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1, 21 (1968):

The scheme of the Fourth Amendment becomes meaningful only when it is assured

that at some point the conduct of those charged with enforcing the laws can be subjected to the more detached, neutral scrutiny of a judge who must evaluate the reasonableness of a particular search or seizure in light of the particular circumstances.

¶ 153 In addressing *Madson*'s constitutional challenge, the Colorado Supreme Court emphasized that Crim. P. 41.1(c) "requires prior judicial approval for the order and imposes conditions of execution calculated to adequately safeguard the constitutional interests of the person affected." *Madson*, 638 P.2d at 32.

¶ 154 The People argue that the simple existence of Crim. P. 41.1 allows the government to search a person's DNA without violating article II, section 7 of the Colorado Constitution. I disagree for multiple reasons.

¶ 155 First, *Madson* did not involve the seizure and search of DNA, or anything similar, that would allow the government access to the genetic privacies of a person. Second, DNA testing did not exist on any scale when *Madson* was decided, and therefore the court was not required to confront the breathtaking level of intimate details that DNA testing can reveal. These factors counsel for the limited

consideration of *Madson* in the context of this case, even if the government had complied with Crim. P. 41.1.

¶ 156 And that brings me to the most critical flaw in relying on Crim. P. 41.1 to excuse the government's failure to obtain a warrant: It is undisputed that the government did not even attempt to comply with the rule. Indeed, the People raise Crim. P. 41.1 for the first time on appeal. But even then, the People fail to explain how the existence of an alternative procedure that is designed to excuse — in strictly prescribed circumstances — the need to obtain a formal warrant can be relied on to excuse the failure to obtain a search warrant or comply with the alternative procedure.

¶ 157 The logic of the People's rationale appears to be as follows:

- the government failed to comply with process Y (the warrant requirement);
- compliance with process X (the Crim. P. 41.1 procedure) excuses compliance with process Y;
- the government failed to comply with process X;
- nonetheless, the simple existence of process X excuses the failure to comply with process Y.

But that is illogical. The correct logical result follows:

- the failure to comply with process Y (the warrant requirement);
- coupled with the failure to comply with process X (the Crim. P. 41.1 procedure);
- proves the failure to comply with process Y (the warrant requirement).

¶ 158 Thus, I reject the argument that the mere existence of Crim. P. 41.1 forecloses a conclusion that the search of Anderson’s DNA without a warrant violated article II, section 7 of the Colorado Constitution.

¶ 159 Nor can the People, on appeal, attempt to backfill a factual or legal basis for the proposition that the prosecution could have obtained a Crim. P. 41.1 order had it applied for one prior to seizing Anderson’s DNA. The prosecution presented no such evidence or legal argument in the trial court. This, despite the fact that Anderson’s counsel had filed a lengthy written motion arguing that law enforcement’s search and seizure of his DNA violated article II, section 7.

¶ 160 The prosecution filed no response to Anderson’s motion. And at the motions hearing, the prosecution did not attempt to justify its

failure to obtain a warrant or Crim. P. 41.1 identification order.

Instead, the prosecution argued only its theory that Anderson had abandoned any privacy interest in his discarded garbage and the DNA located thereon. Indeed, the trial court noted that absence of such an evidentiary or legal argument when making its ruling:

From what I know of the facts, I think there is likely absolutely reasonable suspicion, and there might have been probable cause at the time they took the defendant's trash. *But I don't have enough information to make those findings because it just simply hasn't been presented either in the court file or in the testimony.*

(Emphasis added.) Thus, the only argument presented to and decided by the trial court was the prosecution's abandonment theory. And for the reasons previously articulated, I reject the notion that a person abandons any privacy interest in their DNA simply by discarding their garbage.

VII. Other Warrant Exceptions

¶ 161 Nor did the prosecution present to the trial court any evidence or argument that some other exception excused the government's failure to obtain a warrant to search and seize Anderson's DNA.

Indeed, even on appeal the People do not attempt to argue that some unspecified warrant exception applied.

¶ 162 Despite the absence of evidence or argument, the majority opinion reasons that neither a warrant nor a Crim. P. 41.1 identification order was required because there are other narrow exceptions to the warrant requirement that excuse the failure to obtain prior judicial authorization for a search or seizure. Specifically, the majority opinion, *supra* ¶ 55, refers to the “stop and frisk” exception, temporary investigatory detentions of property, and protective sweeps. But again, none of these exceptions were presented to, or decided by, the trial court, and none of the exceptions, or any others, are even referenced in the People’s appellate brief. Nor does the majority suggest that any of these exceptions are applicable here.

¶ 163 Thus, the existence of these exceptions cannot excuse the government’s failure to obtain a warrant. *See Licon-Ortega*, ¶ 20 (“A warrantless search is presumed to violate the constitutional provisions prohibiting unreasonable searches and seizures,” and “the prosecution has the burden of establishing that the

warrantless search was justified by one of the narrowly defined exceptions to the warrant requirement.”).

VIII. Get a Warrant

¶ 164 The People also argue that no warrant was required in this case because “Coloradans should fully expect that law enforcement agencies would use that technology to solve difficult cases like [the subject] murder.” But this argument presents a false choice.

¶ 165 Indeed, Coloradans should expect law enforcement to use DNA evidence and other investigative tools to exonerate the innocent and convict the guilty. But Coloradans do not need to choose between effective police investigations and compliance with their constitutional rights.

¶ 166 The answer to how that balance must be effectuated is simple: “Get a warrant.”⁵ See *Riley*, 573 U.S. at 403 (“Our answer to the question of what police must do before searching a cell phone

⁵ Because, as previously noted, the government did not seek to comply with Crim. P. 41.1 before seizing Anderson’s DNA, I do not address whether compliance with Crim. P. 41.1 would excuse the failure to obtain a warrant to seize and search a person’s DNA. I would leave that decision until we are presented with a case in which the government actually sought and obtained a Crim. P. 41.1 order to obtain and search a person’s DNA.

seized incident to an arrest is accordingly simple — get a warrant.”). A warrant enables the requested search, if justified, while at the same time “guarantee[ing] the privacy, dignity, and security of persons against certain arbitrary and invasive acts by officers of the Government or those acting at their direction.” *Skinner v. Ry. Lab. Execs.’ Ass’n*, 489 U.S. 602, 613-14 (1989).

¶ 167 Finally, there is little downside to requiring the government to obtain a warrant before seizing and searching a person’s DNA. If probable cause exists, a judicial officer can typically execute a warrant within minutes or hours after law enforcement submits the request. See Crim. P. 41(c)(3) (permitting law enforcement to submit an affidavit requesting a judicial officer to issue a warrant, and a judicial officer to sign the warrant, via electronic means). And in issuing the warrant, the judicial officer can place limits on the extent of the search authorized and the uses for which the search is permitted. And if the warrant is not supported by probable cause, the judicial officer can deny the warrant request and thereby preserve the person’s genetic confidences.

¶ 168 This process effectuates the balance between effective law enforcement and protecting the privacy interests of Coloradans.

IX. Suppression Required

¶ 169 In the trial court and on appeal, Anderson argued that suppression of the disputed DNA evidence was required. And the People do not contest Anderson's argument that suppression is required if his DNA was obtained in violation of the Colorado Constitution. *See McKnight*, ¶ 61 (exclusion is the appropriate remedy for a violation of article II, section 7). In accordance with the controlling precedent, and in the absence of any reasoned argument from the People explaining why the exclusionary rule does not apply in this context, I agree with Anderson that the trial court erred by denying his motion to suppress the unconstitutionally obtained DNA evidence.

¶ 170 Relatedly, Anderson argues that the improper admission of his DNA and the resulting identification of him as the source of the DNA at the crime scene requires reversal. The People make no contrary argument suggesting that the error was harmless.⁶

⁶ This implicit concession is not surprising. Even after receiving the disputed DNA evidence, the first trial resulted in a hung jury.

Accordingly, I would conclude that the erroneous admission of the seized DNA evidence mandates reversal of Anderson's conviction.⁷

X. Conclusion

¶ 171 The issues presented in this case raise profound issues with respect to our willingness to protect basic human autonomy in controlling our genetic material. In the final analysis, I conclude that Coloradans have an objectively reasonable expectation that their genetic material will remain private, absent the issuance of a warrant or compliance with a judicially recognized, and constitutionally compliant, alternative procedure. Because I conclude that the court erred by denying Anderson's motion to suppress, I would reverse Anderson's conviction and remand the case for further proceedings consistent with this conclusion.

⁷ Because I would reverse based on the violation of article II, section 7 of the Colorado Constitution, I do not discuss the remaining issues addressed by the majority.