

Bond Case Briefs

Municipal Finance Law Since 1971

- [MSRB Request for Comment Rule D-15 Defining the Term Sophisticated Municipal Market Professional.](#)
- [Amid Data Center Boom, Public Utilities Push for More Flexibility with IRS Bond Rules.](#)
- [NFMA Advanced Seminar on High Yield Bonds.](#)
- [Liquidity Impact of Municipal Bond ETFs on Municipal Securities Market: An Updated MSRB Analysis](#)
- [Fitch: Federal Spending Cuts Push More Fiscal Risk to State, Local Governments](#)
- [GFOA Annual Conference.](#)
- And Finally, Can't Be Too Vigilant With One's Porous Items is brought to us this week by [Hadley v. City of South Bend, Indiana](#), in which police arrived at a residential house to execute a search warrant. Despite credible protests from the owner and her 15-yo son that they'd never heard of the guy, the officers were undeterred. Did the officers simply open the unlocked door and request that the fugitive step outside for a chat? They did not. "They broke windows and launched thirty cannisters of tear gas into the home. The gas destroyed all 'porous' items in the house, like clothing and beds (Hadley had to sleep in her car for days until toxic fumes from the gas dissipated). Police also wrecked internal security cameras, punched holes in the walls, ransacked furniture and a closet, and tore down a panel on a wall and a fan in a bathroom." Guy wasn't there. Never had been. But what are you gonna do? Not at all surprising that the owner sued. What is surprising, nay shocking, is the dollar amount she demanded. \$16k. Sixteen thousand dollars. We're not even seeing a request for attorneys' fees. Suppose those are just coming off the top. Plenty to go around. Let's go ahead and - *arguendo* - agree that the entirety of this home's interior is worth \$16k. THEN WHY THE INTERIOR SECURITY CAMERAS?