Legal Considerations for Oral Fluids in New York State



Vehicle & Traffic Law

VTL 1194(2) Evidential Testing

Chemical test =
Breath,
Blood,
Urine, or
Saliva

Vehicle & Traffic Law

2. Chemical tests. (a) When authorized. App operates a motor vehicle in this state have given consent to a chemi following: breath, blood ag content of the blood determining the a provided the mistered by or at the direction with respect to a chemical test of breath, at the divection of a police officer:

Department of Health Regs

10 NYCRR 59.1 – definitions

(k) Saliva means oral fluid.

Department of Health Regs

10 NYCRR 59.3

Permitting process for analysis of "blood, urine, and saliva."

Permitting process is the same because the science is the same

In Court

No NY cases yet.

But, the foundation arguments already exist.

Basic Legal Principles Applicable to All Sample Collections

Schmerber v. California, 384 U.S. 757 (1966)

- No implication of self incrimination (5th Amendment) with biological samples
- But it is a search
- Blood samples generally require warrants unless there are "exigent circumstances" or consent

Basic Legal Principles Applicable to All Sample Collections

Birchfield v. North Dakota, 579 U.S. 438 (2016)

- Distinguishes privacy interests between blood and breath
- Provides argument that OF is less invasive, like breath

Maryland v. King, 569 U.S. 435, 446 (2013)

- Analogous collection of OF for DNA testing approved
- OF considered "gentler" than blood draw

AAA Use of Oral Fluid to Detect Drugged Drivers: A Toolkit

https://publicaffairsresources.aaa.biz/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/FINAL-OF-Report-09.07.22.pdf

Very useful overview of Oral Fluid Testing (Jen Limoges)

AAA Use of Oral Fluid to Detect Drugged Drivers: A Toolkit

Cites to a California case admitting the results from a Draeger 5000 (as an evidential test) finding: "the correct scientific procedures were used . . . [t]he court further finds that there is sufficient reliable evidence of the drug screening test administered." People v. Junior Salas (Register of Actions Kern County, California Case Number BF15363A. November 30, 2015) (The decision and an excerpt of testimony is in the appendix)

AAA Use of Oral Fluid to Detect Drugged Drivers: A Toolkit

Also includes an unpublished NY County Supreme Court case from 2007 finding the OF test could be relied upon in a probation revocation, after a hearing on the test's reliability.

People v. Gonzales, SCI #1092/06, also in the appendix

Other Resources

National Traffic Law Center(NTLC) Monographs including APRI: "Drug Toxicology for Prosecutors"

https://ndaa.org/wp-content/uploads/Drug-Toxicology-for-Prosecutors.pdf

DWI Prosecutor's Handbook

https://ndaa.org/resource/dwi-prosecutors-handbook/

Evidential Oral Fluid Testing

The Legal Pitfalls of Using Oral Fluid Testing:





Roadside Oral Fluid Screening:



Roadside OF Testing Devices







VTL §1194(1)(b)



Establish Agency Protocol Considerations

- Should be similar to PBT use but...
- New technology receives greater scrutiny
- Training, certification, device maintenance
- Record-keeping
- > Protocols must incorporate expected admissibility requirements
- On-scene script?
- Consent form?

Example: NYPD



PATROL GUIDE

PURPOSE

To investigate vehicle collisions in which death, serious injury and likely to die, or critical injury has occurred and to present facts to the District Attorney.

DEFINITION

<u>CRITICAL INJURY</u> – A critical injury will be determined based upon the on-scene assessment of Emergency Medical Services (EMS) personnel.

PROCEDURE

After responding to a vehicular collision in which death, serious injury and likely to die, or a critical injury has occurred, follow normal vehicle collision procedures and, in addition:

Can also be used on some, but not all DRE call-out cases



	(Print Name)		([ate of Birth)	(
		(Addre	ess)		
ght to refuse. I u		oral fluid will the	reafter be submitte	oles and I understand th d for analysis. I am givin any kind.	
			(Signatur	e of Consenter)	
			(Time an	d Date)	
		_	(Time an	d Date)	
mber of the Service Witne	ess, Rank/Name (Print)	Tex No.	(Time an	d Date)	

a right to refuse. I understand that my oral fluid will	consent to the New York City Police Department to take oral fluid samples and I understand that I have ght to refuse. I understand that my oral fluid will thereafter be submitted for analysis. I am giving my cont knowingly, voluntarily, intelligently and without threats or promises of any kind.		
	(Signature of Consenter)		
	(Time and Date)		

Prosecution Considerations:

- Discovery....
- > Frye Hearing?
 - Who will testify?
 - Manufacturer Representative?
 - Law Enforcement member responsible for maintaining OF devices?
- Foundation testimony until the device becomes commonplace

Amanda Nissen

Assistant Counsel (518) 457-6137 amanda.nissen@troopers.ny.gov





Maureen McCormick

Special Assistant District Attorney
Suffolk County District Attorney's Office
Maureen.McCormick@suffolkcountyny.gov
c.516-382-2435