

a warrant. The exclusionary rule does not apply in this case.

REASONING:

1. The interests protected by the "knock-and-announce" rule include human life and limb (because an unannounced entry may provoke violence from a surprised resident), property (because citizens presumably would open the door upon an announcement, whereas a forcible entry may destroy it), and privacy and dignity of the sort that can be offended by a sudden entrance.

2. Contrary to Hudson's argument that without suppression there will be no deterrence, many forms of police misconduct are deterred by civil-rights suits and by the consequences of increasing professionalism of police forces, including a new emphasis on internal police discipline.

3. When the "knock-and-announce" rule does apply, it is not easy to determine precisely what officers must do. How many seconds' wait are too few? Our "reasonable wait time" standard--see U.S. v. Banks, Legal Bulletin No. 274--held that the proper measure was not how long it would take the resident to reach the door, but how long it would take to dispose of the suspected drugs. The 15-to-20 seconds' time in the Banks' case would necessarily be extended when, for instance, the suspected contraband was not easily concealed.

NOTE TO SUBSCRIBERS TO THE ALASKA LEGAL BRIEFS MANUAL:

File Legal Bulletin No. 309 numerically under Section R of the manual.