Statement of Significance With Footnotes

This subject merits recognition of an Ohio Historical Marker because this criminal case from Cleveland, Ohio, resulted in a landmark opinion issued in 1968 by Chief Justice Earl Warren of the Supreme Court of the United States. In 1964, Cuyahoga County Judge Bernard Friedman clearly stated a new standard of law that provided that police may stop and frisk a suspect for weapons for their safety if they have reasonable suspicion the person has or is about to commit a crime. It is not often that the ruling of a local judge is adopted and affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. However, in Terry v. Ohio, the nation's highest court affirmed the ruling of Judge Bernard Friedman, which defined the limits of police action for when they “stop and frisk” suspects based on their suspicion of criminal activity. Since 1968, the standard of law articulated in the Terry case has become a bedrock of Fourth Amendment analysis. A search of the Terry v. Ohio case in the legal database LexisNexis indicates that it has been cited in 31,881 court opinions.

This case still remains relevant and is regarded as one of the most important criminal cases in the modern history of the Supreme Court of the United States. Terry is regularly studied across law schools and police academies across America. To this day, police officers, lawyers, and courts, continue to refer to the decision of Terry v. Ohio to determine whether police action of “stopping and frisking” criminal suspects is constitutional.
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The Supreme Court of the United States has never overturned *Terry* nor has it revisited the specific legal issue from *Terry*. Courts continue to determine the legality of police searches in cases with legal issues closely related to *Terry*. In fact, just within this past week, the majority of the Supreme Court of United States ruled in *Utah v. Strieff* that it was legal for police to search someone, even after that person has been stopped without lawful cause, as long that individual has an outstanding warrant.

*Terry vs. Ohio* is closely connected to the history of Cuyahoga County, Ohio. Cleveland defense attorney Louis Stokes and Assistant Cuyahoga County Prosecuting Attorney Reuben Payne first argued the issues of this case in the Cuyahoga County Courthouse in 1964. Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas Judge Bernard Friedman heard the case and found that Officer McFadden had not violated the defendants' Fourth Amendment rights. Eighth District Court of Appeals Judges Joseph Silbert, Joseph Artl, and J.J.P. Corrigan later affirmed the decision of Judge Bernard Friedman. The argument before the Eighth District Court of Appeals was held in the Main Courtroom of the Old Courthouse, located at 1 lakeside Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. Interestingly enough, the Ohio Supreme Court held that
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there was no substantial constitutional question in this case\textsuperscript{17}. The Supreme Court of the United States later accepted review directly from the Eighth District Court of Appeals and affirmed the decisions of Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Judge Bernard Friedman and the judges from the Eighth District Court of Appeals of Ohio\textsuperscript{18}.

Many of the key participants in this case served important roles in Ohio history. Reuben Payne was a black male born in Scio, Ohio, in 1922\textsuperscript{19}. Mr. Payne graduated from Western University and Cleveland-Marshall College of Law\textsuperscript{20}. He worked as an assistant law librarian and for the United States General Accounting Office\textsuperscript{21}. Mr. Payne was working the Cuyahoga County Prosecutor's Office at the time of the Terry case and would later become one of Cleveland's leading criminal defense attorneys\textsuperscript{22}. Defense attorney Louis Stokes, was also a black male from Ohio who received his law degree from Cleveland-Marshall College of Law\textsuperscript{23}. Stokes eventually became one of Cleveland's foremost criminal defense lawyers\textsuperscript{24}. Stokes helped his brother Carl B. Stokes win election as Mayor of Cleveland\textsuperscript{25}. Stokes himself was later elected as an Ohio Congressman where he served for 30-years\textsuperscript{26}. Judge Bernard Friedman was a white male born in Poland in 1909 and immigrated with his family to the United States and graduated from Western Reserve School of Law\textsuperscript{27}. Judge Friedman served in a variety of public
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positions, including Special Counsel to the Attorney General of the State of Ohio, an attorney with the Public Works administration, and as Cuyahoga County’s deputy registrar of motor vehicles.

The Ohio Historical Society previously determined that the officer from the Terry case, Detective Martin J. McFadden deserved to be recognized for his work when it awarded a historical marker in his honor. The historical marker built in honor of Detective Martin J. McFadden now stands near the intersection of Euclid Avenue and Huron Road in Cleveland, Ohio.

Even though this case started as a routine matter for all participants, the decision’s effects upon American jurisprudence were profound. From a simple and routine case that started in Cleveland, Ohio, the Supreme Court of the United States created a “reasonable suspicion” standard for “stop and frisk” cases instead of the higher standard of “probable cause” that the Court was seriously considering. An Ohio Historical Marker should be made to recognize the significance of this case and its close connection with Ohio history.
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