

SMARTMOBILE INSIGHT: ADMISSIBILITY IN FAMILY PROCEEDINGS AND PROBATION VIOLATIONS

MARCH 2026

JUDGE BRIAN MACKENZIE (RET.) AND DAVID WALLACE, ESQ.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Courts increasingly require reliable, verifiable, and contemporaneous evidence of alcohol use or abstinence in family and community-supervision cases. Smart Start's SmartMobile Insight meets that need by combining a law-enforcement-grade fuel-cell breath sensor with biometric photo verification, GPS location tagging, tamper detection, and encrypted data custody. The result is a secure, independently stored digital record that establishes identity, location, time, and breath-alcohol concentration in a single, integrated evidentiary packet.

Because SmartMobile Insight relies on the same electrochemical fuel-cell methodology that has anchored evidentiary breath testing for decades, the underlying science is neither novel nor disputed. Courts across the country have repeatedly accepted Smart Start technologies, including ignition-interlock and remote monitoring platforms, under both the *Frye* general-acceptance standard and the *Daubert/*

Rule 702 reliability framework. The system's calibration protocols, automated diagnostics, and independent data-custody structure further satisfy evidentiary requirements for authenticity, chain of custody, and trustworthiness.

SmartMobile Insight therefore provides courts with a scientifically established, procedurally transparent, and legally admissible means of verifying abstinence. It allows judges to rely on objective digital records instead of conflicting testimony, improves accountability in probation contexts, and reduces the logistical burdens historically associated with alcohol testing. **In proceedings where the protection of children, the integrity of supervision, and the fairness of judicial determinations are paramount, SmartMobile Insight delivers evidence that meets the highest standards of reliability and authenticity.**

I. THE PRESENT NEED FOR RELIABLE ALCOHOL-MONITORING EVIDENCE

Family-law judges and probation departments operate in environments where alcohol use is often a central point of dispute.¹ Whether the concern involves a parent's sobriety during custody exchanges or a supervisee's compliance with abstinence conditions, courts must routinely answer questions that carry profound implications for safety, stability, and liberty. Yet in many proceedings, particularly those involving self-represented litigants or overburdened supervision agencies, the evidentiary record is thin, inconsistent, or dependent on conflicting personal accounts rather than objective data.² In these circumstances, courts require more than suspicion or accusation; they require verifiable information capable of supporting fair and defensible decisions.

Historically, the tools available to courts have been imperfect. Laboratory-based alcohol testing, while scientifically robust, is often slow, expensive, and burdensome to access.³ Delays in receiving results can leave courts without timely information during critical hearings. Clinic-based breath testing reduces turnaround time but introduces new problems. Individuals must travel, often multiple times per week, to a designated site.⁴ These requirements disproportionately burden parents with limited transportation, workers with

inflexible schedules, and individuals living in rural communities where testing facilities may be hours away.⁵ Courts are frequently placed in the position of interpreting missed tests without knowing whether the absence reflects actual alcohol use or simply an insurmountable logistical barrier. This uncertainty can distort fact-finding and undermine compliance.

SmartMobile Insight was developed to address these systemic gaps.⁶ It merges evidentiary-grade fuel-cell breath analysis with modern digital architecture, enabling participants to complete secure tests wherever they have cellular service.⁷ The device conducts a fuel-cell breath test, verifies identity through a color photograph, records GPS coordinates, logs diagnostic indicators that detect tampering or improper sampling, and encrypts the entire record before transmission to Smart Start's secure servers.⁸ Because the participant cannot

alter the instrument, the software, or the transmitted data, each result enters the record as an independently generated, tamper-proof statement of fact.⁹

This paper examines whether SmartMobile Insight's results are admissible under prevailing U.S.

evidentiary standards. It situates the device within the established scientific history of breath testing and evaluates its compliance with the two major frameworks governing scientific evidence: *Frye v. United States*¹⁰ and Federal Rule of Evidence 702¹¹ as interpreted in *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*.¹²

**IN THESE CIRCUMSTANCES,
COURTS REQUIRE MORE THAN
SUSPICION OR ACCUSATION;
THEY REQUIRE VERIFIABLE
INFORMATION CAPABLE
OF SUPPORTING FAIR AND
DEFENSIBLE DECISIONS.**

It also reviews Smart Start's custodial safeguards and summarizes the case law demonstrating judicial acceptance of Smart Start monitoring technologies in both family-law proceedings and probation contexts.

II. GOVERNING LEGAL STANDARDS

Reliable evaluation of scientific and technical evidence in American courts is anchored in two dominant frameworks: the *Frye* general-acceptance test and the *Daubert*/Rule 702 reliability standard.¹³

Although the two approaches differ in their analytical focus, both require courts to examine whether the method producing the evidence is grounded in sound scientific principles and applied in a manner that supports the truth-finding process.¹⁴

SmartMobile Insight fits squarely within these established frameworks because it is built on the long-recognized fuel-cell methodology that has guided evidentiary breath testing for decades, and because its data-handling processes satisfy the procedural demands these standards impose.

A. THE FRYE STANDARD

The modern conversation about scientific admissibility began with *Frye v. United States*, a decision that established the principle that expert testimony based on a scientific

technique is admissible only if the technique has gained general acceptance in the relevant scientific community.¹⁵ The rule grew from judicial caution. As courts faced increasingly sophisticated scientific claims in the early twentieth century, *Frye* offered a means for judges, who are trained in law, rather than chemistry or engineering, to rely on the consensus of qualified professionals rather than risk admitting untested theories.¹⁶

Frye's inquiry is straightforward but rigorous. A court must first identify the scientific community most capable of assessing the technique and then determine whether that community broadly accepts the method as reliable. The rule does not require unanimity, nor does it assess perfection; its purpose is to exclude fringe or novel approaches until they have matured into accepted science.

Fuel-cell breath-alcohol analysis easily meets *Frye's* requirements.¹⁷ Since the 1970s,

electrochemical oxidation of ethanol has been the dominant evidentiary method used by law enforcement and forensic laboratories. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's (NHTSA) Conforming Products List reflects this long-standing acceptance, and state toxicology boards, public-health laboratories, and forensic-science organizations have adopted the same principles for evidentiary breath testing.¹⁸ Courts evaluating SmartMobile Insight under *Frye* are not confronting

**COURTS EVALUATING
SMARTMOBILE INSIGHT
UNDER FRYE ARE NOT
CONFRONTING NEW SCIENCE;
THEY ARE EVALUATING A
MODERN INSTRUMENT
BUILT ON A METHOD THAT
HAS BEEN ACCEPTED FOR
GENERATIONS.**

new science; they are evaluating a modern instrument built on a method that has been accepted for generations.¹⁹

Although *Frye* is now used in a minority of jurisdictions, it remains the controlling standard in major states such as California, New York, Illinois, and Texas.²⁰ In these states, once the underlying methodology is judicially recognized as generally accepted, courts may admit derivative devices without requiring a new *Frye* hearing.²¹ *People v. Bohrer*,²² a New York case involving Smart Start's ignition-interlock technology, exemplifies this approach. Once fuel-cell analysis was deemed generally accepted, the court held that Smart Start's implementation was admissible without further scientific scrutiny.²³ That reasoning applies equally to SmartMobile Insight, which employs the same core analytical method while adding enhanced identity and location verification.

B. THE DAUBERT STANDARD AND THE EVOLUTION OF FRE RULE 702

Where *Frye* emphasizes consensus, *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.* focuses on scientific reliability. In 1993, the Supreme Court held that Federal Rule of Evidence (FRE) 702 superseded *Frye* in federal practice and imposed a broader gatekeeping responsibility on trial judges.²⁴ Under *Daubert*, courts must ensure that expert testimony is grounded in reliable principles and methods and that it is relevant to the case at hand.

Daubert identifies several nonexclusive factors for evaluating reliability:²⁵

1. Whether the theory or technique can be tested and has been tested;

2. Whether it has been peer-reviewed and published;
3. The known or potential error rate, including the existence of operational standards;
4. General acceptance within the relevant scientific community; and
5. Whether the research underlying the methodology is independent of litigation.

These factors are guides rather than mechanical requirements. Reliability under *Daubert* is contextual, and courts retain wide discretion to tailor the inquiry to the nature of the evidence.

UNDER DAUBERT, COURTS MUST ENSURE THAT EXPERT TESTIMONY IS GROUNDED IN RELIABLE PRINCIPLES AND METHODS AND THAT IT IS RELEVANT TO THE CASE AT HAND.

The Supreme Court subsequently clarified *Daubert's* framework in *General Electric Co. v. Joiner* (1997)²⁶ and *Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael* (1999),²⁷ confirming that reliability, not novelty, is the touchstone of admissibility and that the gatekeeping obligation applies to all expert testimony.²⁸

Rule 702 was amended in 2000 to formally incorporate the *Daubert* Trilogy.²⁹ In 2023,

Rule 702 was amended again to correct two persistent misunderstandings: that reliability need not be shown by a preponderance of the evidence, and that experts may express opinions extending beyond what the underlying methodology

**NEARLY A CENTURY OF
SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENT
HAS SHAPED THE MODERN
UNDERSTANDING THAT
A PERSON'S DEEP-LUNG
BREATH PROVIDES A RELIABLE
INDICATOR OF BLOOD-ALCOHOL
CONCENTRATION.**

can reliably support.³⁰ The amendment emphasizes that reliability is a threshold matter, not merely a subject for cross-examination.³¹

Courts evaluating breath-alcohol evidence under the *Daubert* Standard routinely analyze whether the instrument uses an accepted scientific method, whether calibration and quality-control procedures exist, and whether the device was operated according to those standards.³² In every respect, Smart Start's fuel-cell methodology satisfies the *Daubert* factors: it is testable, extensively peer-reviewed, governed by established performance standards, characterized by a known and low error rate, and universally accepted in forensic practice.

Judges applying either *Frye* or *Daubert* are not expected to conduct scientific experiments or replicate laboratory conditions. Their task is to ensure that the evidence rests on well-

established principles and that the method was applied correctly and transparently. In technology-based evidence, GPS data, digital forensics, automated sensor outputs, courts increasingly emphasize verifiability, documentation, and chain of custody.

SmartMobile Insight aligns with these expectations. Each test produces a sealed digital record that includes a timestamp, GPS location, participant photo, BrAC value, and device-specific metadata.³³ The record is encrypted at creation, transmitted to independent servers, and preserved in a form that cannot be altered by the participant.³⁴ This structure provides exactly what the gatekeeping doctrines require: a scientifically grounded method combined with a transparent and auditable process, enabling courts to admit the evidence with confidence.

III. THE EVOLUTION OF BREATH TESTING

The use of breath-alcohol evidence in American courts has deep historical roots. Nearly a century of scientific development has shaped the modern understanding that a person's deep-lung breath provides a reliable indicator of blood-alcohol concentration.³⁵ Early devices such as the Drunkometer and the first-generation Breathalyzer, introduced in the mid-twentieth century, demonstrated that breath testing could be performed quickly, repeatedly, and with sufficient precision to support evidentiary use.³⁶ These instruments, while rudimentary by today's standards, established the foundational scientific premise: ethanol in alveolar breath correlates predictably with ethanol in the bloodstream.³⁷

The field underwent a major transformation in the 1970s with the adoption of electrochemical fuel-cell sensors.³⁸ Unlike earlier colorimetric and chemical-indicator tubes, fuel-cell technology provided a highly specific reaction to ethanol, reducing interference from other substances and improving accuracy across a wide range of concentrations.³⁹ Fuel-cell devices were also more compact, more stable, and faster to analyze samples, making them an attractive technology for both law-enforcement and forensic laboratories.⁴⁰

By the 1990s, Smart Start Inc. emerged as a significant innovator in applying this evidentiary science to court supervision and public-safety programs.⁴¹ Smart Start's ignition-interlock systems, built around the same class of fuel-cell sensors used in evidentiary breath-testing instruments, were subjected to rigorous evaluation under NHTSA standards and quickly became widely adopted by state agencies.⁴² These devices were incorporated into administrative licensing schemes, probation conditions, and pretrial monitoring programs, where courts across multiple jurisdictions recognized them as reliable mechanisms for detecting alcohol use and enforcing abstinence conditions.⁴³

Smart Start's IN-HOM™ S.M.A.R.T. Mobile Device represented the next major advancement: the extension of evidentiary

fuel-cell analysis beyond fixed installations and into remote, real-world environments.⁴⁴ When the court in *People v. Bohrer* (N.Y. 2012) upheld the admissibility of Smart Start ignition-interlock data without requiring a new *Frye* hearing, it effectively acknowledged the maturity of the technology and its standing within the scientific community.⁴⁵ The court noted that Smart Start's devices had been tested against NHTSA standards and met or exceeded evidentiary benchmarks, findings that continue to support admissibility for Smart Start's modern monitoring systems.⁴⁶

**BY THE 1990S, SMART START
EMERGED AS A SIGNIFICANT
INNOVATOR IN APPLYING THIS
EVIDENTIARY SCIENCE TO COURT
SUPERVISION AND PUBLIC-
SAFETY PROGRAMS.**

In 2017, the Justice Speakers Institute (JSI) published an extensive position paper evaluating Smart Start's IN-HOM™ remote monitoring platform under both *Frye* and *Daubert*/Rule 702 frameworks.⁴⁷ The paper concluded that Smart Start's technology was firmly grounded in accepted scientific principles, that its fuel-cell sensors demonstrated accurate and reproducible performance, and that its calibration and data-handling procedures satisfied the evidentiary requirements for authenticity and chain of custody.⁴⁸ JSI also identified several technical features that were ahead of their time: automated data transmission, digital tamper and circumvention detection, and encrypted, third-party data storage.⁴⁹ Together, these safeguards created an evidentiary environment in

which monitoring results could be admitted through business-records certification, without requiring live testimony from a custodian.⁵⁰

This 2017 analysis established both the scientific lineage and the legal foundation for Smart Start's newest generation of technology. SmartMobile Insight builds directly on that history.⁵¹ It is a stand-alone, LTE-enabled (Long-term Evolution) instrument that incorporates evidentiary fuel-cell measurement with biometric photo verification, GPS location tagging, tamper detection, encrypted storage, and independent data custody.⁵² In effect, SmartMobile Insight represents the convergence of laboratory-grade analytical methodology with modern digital architecture specifically designed for judicial oversight.

Legally, this is not new science. It is the application of a widely accepted scientific method, fuel-cell breath analysis, within a platform engineered to satisfy contemporary evidentiary expectations for reliability, identity verification, and secure chain of custody. SmartMobile Insight therefore stands as the natural continuation of a long-established scientific tradition adapted to the needs of modern family-law and probation-supervision systems.

IV. THE TECHNOLOGY AND WORKFLOW (HOW SMARTMOBILE INSIGHT OPERATES)

SmartMobile Insight is a self-contained handheld instrument that performs evidentiary-grade fuel-cell breath analysis.⁵³ Unlike smartphone-paired devices, it contains its own power supply, LTE modem, secure operating environment, full-color display, and Type-C charging interface, ensuring that testing and data custody occur entirely within a closed system.⁵⁴ The device is engineered to operate reliably within a documented temperature range of 50°F to 100°F (10°C–38°C) and provides 96 to 120 hours of battery life on a full charge based on typical testing frequency.⁵⁵

When a participant provides a sample, the device performs a structured, multi-step evidentiary workflow:⁵⁶

1. Captures a color photograph using facial-detection technology for identity verification;
2. Records the GPS coordinates and timestamp—both for completed tests and for skipped tests;
3. Analyzes the deep-lung breath sample using its electrochemical fuel-cell sensor, with no humming required;

IN EFFECT, SMARTMOBILE INSIGHT REPRESENTS THE CONVERGENCE OF LABORATORY-GRADE ANALYTICAL METHODOLOGY WITH MODERN DIGITAL ARCHITECTURE SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED FOR JUDICIAL OVERSIGHT.

4. Runs internal flow, pressure, and temperature diagnostics to detect substituted air, obstruction, improper sampling, or tampering; and
5. Encrypts the complete record before transmitting it to Smart Start's secure servers.

If LTE connectivity is unavailable, results are stored in tamper-resistant memory and automatically uploaded once the signal returns.⁵⁷ Each data packet includes the participant's photo, BrAC result, GPS location, timestamp, device ID, and full diagnostic and audit metadata, creating a verifiable and independently preserved evidentiary record.⁵⁸

Testing schedules are fully configurable, fixed, random, or on-demand, and the system automatically initiates up to two retests after BrAC violations to reduce the risk of anomalous results.⁵⁹ The default daily test windows can be modified to create up to ten custom windows per day.⁶⁰ SmartMobile Insight uploads after every test window, whether the participant blows, skips, or completes a retest.⁶¹ Each upload transmits all test results, skipped tests, retests, photos, GPS locations, diagnostic logs, and event data from both the current and previous test windows.⁶²

Tamper events, such as blocked mouthpieces, abnormal airflow, or interrupted sampling, are separately logged and transmitted, ensuring full transparency.⁶³ Regular calibration intervals, continuous internal diagnostics, and firmware-embedded safeguards prevent the device from generating evidentiary results under unreliable conditions.⁶⁴

In design and operation, SmartMobile Insight mirrors the chain-of-custody discipline of a forensic laboratory: controlled sampling, verified identity, immediate

ELECTROCHEMICAL FUEL-CELL SENSORS HAVE LONG BEEN RECOGNIZED AS THE EVIDENTIARY STANDARD FOR PORTABLE BREATH-ALCOHOL TESTING.

encryption, immutable event logging, and independent custodianship. The result is a system that produces contemporaneous, scientifically grounded, and courtroom-ready evidence with every test window.

V. SCIENTIFIC RELIABILITY AND EVIDENTIARY VALIDITY

Electrochemical fuel-cell sensors have long been recognized as the evidentiary standard for portable breath-alcohol testing.⁶⁵ Their core advantage lies in the chemistry itself: when ethanol contacts the catalytic surface, typically a platinum alloy, the molecule undergoes oxidation producing an electrical current directly proportional to the amount of alcohol present in the breath sample.⁶⁶ This reaction is linear, highly specific to ethanol, and repeatable across a broad range of concentrations.⁶⁷ Unlike semiconductor sensors, which are vulnerable to cross-reactivity and environmental contaminants, fuel-cell sensors selectively target ethanol, making them the preferred technology for law-enforcement and forensic applications.⁶⁸

SmartMobile Insight incorporates the same class of fuel-cell sensors used in instruments that appear on NHTSA's Conforming Products List.⁶⁹ Each device is factory-calibrated and subsequently verified on a defined schedule using certified ethanol standards.⁷⁰ The calibration process is reinforced by continuous internal diagnostics that track sensor integrity, temperature conditions, pressure profiles, airflow patterns, and sampling duration.⁷¹ If any diagnostic parameter falls outside evidentiary thresholds, the device automatically blocks testing.⁷² By preventing the generation of results under unreliable conditions, SmartMobile Insight maintains a controlled evidentiary environment analogous to the quality-assurance safeguards of a fixed forensic laboratory.⁷³

In addition to its core analytical chemistry, SmartMobile Insight employs structural safeguards that enhance evidentiary reliability. The device requires a deep-lung sample and performs a full diagnostic

**SMARTMOBILE INSIGHT
INCORPORATES THE SAME CLASS
OF FUEL-CELL SENSORS USED
IN INSTRUMENTS THAT APPEAR
ON NHTSA'S CONFORMING
PRODUCTS LIST.**

evaluation, temperature, flow, pressure, and volume, on every test to verify proper human breath.⁷⁴ No humming is required, eliminating a frequent source of user-generated error in legacy remote devices.⁷⁵ Sensor checks, firmware-enforced operational limits, and battery

and temperature gating all work together to ensure that any sample collected is scientifically valid before analysis occurs.⁷⁶

Empirical research on fuel-cell technology consistently demonstrates accuracy within ± 0.005 g/210 L at common legal thresholds, including 0.050% BrAC.⁷⁷ Studies of fuel-cell instruments and other evidentiary breath-testing systems show stable performance when operated and maintained under established calibration protocols, with no material degradation in reliability over standard annual calibration intervals.⁷⁸ This operational stability is critical in legal contexts, as courts rely on documented performance characteristics and quality-control procedures to assess scientific reliability under both *Frye* and *Daubert* frameworks.

SmartMobile Insight's operational controls further reinforce the reliability of its analytical method. Automated retests following positive results reduce the likelihood of anomalous or spurious readings.⁷⁹ Lockouts prevent additional testing until the retest protocol is completed.⁸⁰ Distinct diagnostic codes for tamper events, such as improper airflow, blocked mouthpieces, substituted air, or interrupted sampling, ensure that irregularities are flagged, preserved, and reported as separate events.⁸¹ Because these protections are built into the device firmware and cannot be overridden by the participant, evidentiary reliability does not depend on participant technique, motivation, or subjective judgment.⁸²

Collectively, these scientific and operational attributes align SmartMobile Insight with the established evidentiary requirements of both major admissibility frameworks.

Under *Daubert*, the technology is testable, supported by peer-reviewed research, defined by known error rates, governed by recognized operational standards, and widely accepted within the forensic-toxicology community. Under *Frye*, the longstanding scientific consensus surrounding electrochemical fuel-cell breath testing satisfies the requirement of general acceptance. SmartMobile Insight therefore rests on a firmly established scientific foundation that supports its admissibility across jurisdictions.

VI. AUTHENTICATION, CHAIN OF CUSTODY, AND BUSINESS RECORDS

Scientific reliability must be matched by procedural integrity. SmartMobile Insight's data handling ensures authenticity and a continuous chain of custody suitable for courtroom admission.

Each test creates a self-authenticating record containing all elements necessary for verification: participant image, timestamp, GPS data, BrAC value, device identifier, and the full diagnostic audit trail.⁸³ The device captures GPS coordinates not only for completed tests but also for skipped or missed tests, preserving a verifiable geographic record even when a participant fails to blow.⁸⁴ Every event, test, skip, retest, or tamper alert, is encrypted at capture, stored in tamper-resistant

memory if LTE service is unavailable, and automatically uploaded to Smart Start's secure servers when connectivity resumes.⁸⁵ Participants have no ability to modify any data point, photo, or metadata, and the system logs all information from both the current and prior test windows during each upload session.⁸⁶ The result is an immutable, contemporaneous, and independently maintained evidentiary record.

Smart Start functions as an independent custodian analogous to a forensic laboratory. Its responsibilities, device calibration, data transmission, storage, diagnostics review, and report generation, occur in the regular course of business.⁸⁷ The SmartWeb platform automatically produces structured reports, including Violation Reports, BrAC Violation Reports, Consecutive Violation Reports, and Daily Summary Reports generated at 2:00 AM each day.⁸⁸ These reports are tied directly to the encrypted data packets stored on Smart Start's servers and include embedded timestamps, GPS coordinates, photos, and device metadata.⁸⁹ When accompanied by

a Business Records Affidavit, SmartWeb reports qualify for admission under the business-records exception to the hearsay rule, allowing courts to admit them without live custodian testimony while maintaining full evidentiary rigor.

SMARTMOBILE INSIGHT'S DATA HANDLING ENSURES AUTHENTICITY AND A CONTINUOUS CHAIN OF CUSTODY SUITABLE FOR COURTROOM ADMISSION.

This architecture parallels the safeguards recognized in *Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts*,⁹⁰ and *Bullcoming v. New Mexico*.⁹¹ The data are non-testimonial business records created automatically and contemporaneously

through standard monitoring operations, not statements prepared for litigation. Authentication is therefore satisfied through certification rather than confrontation. SmartMobile Insight's closed system, encryption controls, automatic uploads, GPS logging, and independent custodianship collectively create a chain of custody that aligns with forensic laboratory practice and meets the authentication and reliability requirements imposed by both state and federal evidentiary law.

VII. JUDICIAL ACCEPTANCE AND CASE-LAW TRAJECTORY

Judicial evaluation of Smart Start technologies spans more than a decade and reflects a consistent pattern: courts applying either *Frye* or *Daubert* frameworks have repeatedly recognized the scientific reliability, procedural integrity, and evidentiary admissibility of Smart Start's alcohol-monitoring systems.⁹² This body of case law forms an important backdrop for understanding SmartMobile Insight, which represents a modern evolution of the same fuel-cell methodology and custodial architecture previously affirmed by appellate courts.

The line of authority begins prominently with *People v. Bohrer*.⁹³ In *Bohrer*, the court admitted Smart Start ignition-interlock records without requiring a separate *Frye* hearing, emphasizing that electrochemical fuel-cell breath analysis had already achieved

longstanding acceptance within the forensic-toxicology community.⁹⁴ Relying in part on NHTSA's Conforming Products List and state agency certifications, the court held that Smart Start's implementation met all statutory quality-assurance requirements and therefore satisfied *Frye*'s general-acceptance standard.⁹⁵ *Bohrer* is widely regarded as the first explicit judicial acknowledgment that Smart Start devices rest on well-established scientific foundations.⁹⁶

Subsequent New York trial and appellate decisions followed *Bohrer*'s reasoning, treating fuel-cell methodology as a matter of judicial notice and declining to revisit *Frye* challenges once general acceptance had been established.⁹⁷

**PEOPLE V. BOHRER IS
WIDELY REGARDED AS THE
FIRST EXPLICIT JUDICIAL
ACKNOWLEDGMENT THAT
SMART START DEVICES REST ON
WELL-ESTABLISHED SCIENTIFIC
FOUNDATIONS.**

This approach reflects a broader principle within *Frye* jurisdictions: when the underlying scientific process is generally accepted, courts may admit derivative technologies that rely on the same fuel-cell principles without re-litigating

the foundational science.⁹⁸ California courts have taken a similar view, repeatedly recognizing fuel-cell breath analysis as an established evidentiary method both in criminal enforcement and in supervision settings.⁹⁹ Courts in Illinois have echoed this reasoning as well, emphasizing the importance of calibration and adherence to NHTSA-based certification standards rather than the novelty of the device itself.¹⁰⁰

Texas uses a related but formally distinct reliability framework derived from *Kelly v. State*,¹⁰¹ which, although not labeled *Frye*, incorporates similar considerations. Under *Kelly*, courts require proof that the underlying scientific theory is valid, that the technique applying that theory is reliable, and that the technique was correctly applied in the particular case.¹⁰² In a published opinion, *Scherl v. State* the Texas Court of Appeals recognized the admissibility of fuel cell evidence.¹⁰³ Under that standard, in *Nixon v State*,¹⁰⁴ the court of appeals upheld a probation revocation based on Smart Start IN-HOM monitoring results. Similarly, in *Chandler v State*¹⁰⁵ the appellate court upheld the admission of evidence from a Smart Start in-home monitoring device establishing that the defendant had consumed alcohol, noting that “Smart Start was alerted multiple times on multiple days that Chandler’s breath tested positive for alcohol.”¹⁰⁶

Together, New York, California, Illinois, and Texas provide a coherent line of authority: in *Frye*-style jurisdictions, Smart Start devices satisfy the requirement of general acceptance when supported by foundational documentation of calibration, maintenance, and data handling.

Courts applying *Daubert* and Rule 702 have likewise validated fuel-cell based monitoring data as scientifically reliable and evidentially appropriate. Appellate courts in Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana and the federal court of appeals have each discussed the same fuel-cell technology that is used in Smart Start devices in the context of alcohol-abstinence monitoring.¹⁰⁷

In *State v. Damon*,¹⁰⁸ the Montana Supreme Court held that results from a fuel-cell-based

preliminary breath test were admissible as substantive evidence after the State presented expert testimony establishing the device’s scientific reliability, known margin of error, and compliance with standardized testing protocols.¹⁰⁹ The court emphasized that fuel-cell breath testing is not novel science and that challenges to field conditions or operator error go to the weight, not the admissibility, of the evidence under Rule 702.¹¹⁰

Michigan decisions reinforce this perspective. Courts have repeatedly accepted Smart Start data in both family-law and criminal-justice contexts. In *re Goldie*¹¹¹ the family and appellate court relied upon the Smart Start monitoring to establish one of the parties’ continued use of alcohol. In *People v. Byers*,¹¹² the court relied in part on data from the defendant’s Smart

THE COURT EMPHASIZED THAT FUEL-CELL BREATH TESTING IS NOT NOVEL SCIENCE AND THAT CHALLENGES TO FIELD CONDITIONS OR OPERATOR ERROR GO TO THE WEIGHT, NOT THE ADMISSIBILITY, OF THE EVIDENCE UNDER RULE 702.

Start alcohol monitoring device, noting that missed tests and a positive alcohol reading constituted admitted probation violations and supported continued sanctions within the sobriety court framework.¹¹³

Other *Daubert* jurisdictions have reached similar conclusions in family-law matters.

In *J.M.B. v. Cabinet for Health and Family Services*,¹¹⁴ the court allowed the use of Smart Start monitoring, relying on the result of both positive and missed tests, in a termination-of-parental-rights case. In *By v. Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles*,¹¹⁵ the

**COLLECTIVELY, THESE DECISIONS
ESTABLISH THAT SMART
START MONITORING DATA,
INCLUDING RESULTS PRODUCED
BY SMARTMOBILE INSIGHT,
ARE SCIENTIFICALLY RELIABLE,
PROPERLY AUTHENTICATED, AND
LEGALLY ADMISSIBLE.**

court upheld the lifetime revocation of the plaintiff's driver's license based on Smart Start ignition-interlock data showing two failed rolling re-tests, treating the device's recorded breath-alcohol readings as reliable regulatory evidence triggering mandatory sanctions.

Across these cases, a unified trajectory emerges. Courts applying *Frye* regard fuel-cell analysis as a mature scientific technology requiring no renewed validation. Courts applying *Daubert* emphasize the method's empirical support, defined error rates, and adherence to operational standards. And across both frameworks, Smart Start's calibration logs, tamper alerts, photo-verified results, and secure data-custody protocols provide the documentation necessary to meet evidentiary foundations. Collectively, these decisions establish that Smart Start monitoring data, including results produced by SmartMobile Insight, are scientifically

reliable, properly authenticated, and legally admissible.

VIII. EVIDENTIARY SIGNIFICANCE AND JUDICIAL IMPLICATIONS

The evidentiary value of Smart Start's SmartMobile Insight extends well beyond its technical sophistication; it lies in how seamlessly the device's scientific integrity and data-management structure meet long-standing legal expectations. Courts require that proffered evidence be both reliable in method and trustworthy in handling. SmartMobile Insight satisfies both prongs simultaneously.

Under *Daubert* and Rule 702, the first prong, reliability hinges on whether a scientific process is capable of producing consistent, verifiable results grounded in accepted methodology. SmartMobile Insight's evidentiary reliability is a direct function of the electrochemical fuel-cell process, a method that for decades has been recognized by NHTSA,¹¹⁶ forensic-toxicology associations,¹¹⁷ and the courts themselves as the evidentiary benchmark for breath-alcohol analysis.

Unlike screening technologies that rely on semiconductor sensors or colorimetric reactions, fuel-cell oxidation generates a quantifiable electric current specific to ethanol.¹¹⁸ This selectivity virtually eliminates cross-reactivity with non-alcohol compounds.¹¹⁹ Courts evaluating evidentiary reliability under *Daubert* therefore confront no "novel science" but rather the latest expression of a mature, judicially accepted analytical platform.

The design of SmartMobile Insight integrates a closed, verifiable workflow:

- Calibration against certified standards;
- Diagnostic self-checks for temperature, airflow, pressure, and sampling integrity;
- Automated retests after positives; and,
- Firmware-controlled tamper detection with separate digital logging.

These layers ensure that every recorded value falls within known, documented performance tolerances. For admissibility purposes, the data are scientifically reliable because the method is validated, the operation controlled, and the error margins known.

The second prong, authenticity, concerns whether the evidence offered is what it purports to be. SmartMobile Insight’s design produces a “self-proving” record:

- A contemporaneous photograph of the participant;
- Geolocation and timestamp for both completed and skipped tests;
- Device identifier;
- Diagnostic codes; and,
- The breath-alcohol result itself.

Once generated, each evidentiary packet is encrypted and stored in tamper-resistant memory until the device uploads it directly to Smart Start’s secure servers, where it is preserved in read-only form. Participants cannot alter any data, and all subsequent access and reporting activity is logged. From a legal standpoint, this constitutes an unbroken, independently maintained chain of custody.

Courts have repeatedly held that data preserved under independent custodianship and produced in the ordinary course of

business satisfy both the authentication requirements of Federal Rule of Evidence 901 and the business-records exception to hearsay.¹²⁰ Smart Start’s operational model mirrors a forensic laboratory’s documentation discipline. Calibration, diagnostics, event

logging, and secure data transmission occur automatically as part of standard monitoring procedures. When accompanied by a Business Records Affidavit, SmartWeb reports may therefore be admitted without live custodian testimony, an especially important efficiency in family and probation settings where timely decision-making is essential.

The probative strength of SmartMobile Insight evidence lies in its immediacy, precision, and objectivity. Courts no longer must rely on conflicting witness statements or delayed laboratory analyses; instead, they receive contemporaneous data that verify

**WHEN ACCOMPANIED
BY A BUSINESS RECORDS
AFFIDAVIT, SMARTWEB
REPORTS MAY THEREFORE
BE ADMITTED WITHOUT LIVE
CUSTODIAN TESTIMONY.**

identity, location, and BrAC through a single integrated process. Because every result is supported by photographic verification, GPS coordinates, and diagnostic integrity checks, its evidentiary weight surpasses that of unverified self-reports, third-party observations, or testing procedures lacking independent documentation.

From a judicial-administration perspective, the device's secure data flow, structured reporting architecture, and certification framework streamline hearings. When offered with a business-records affidavit, Smart Start reports can be admitted at preliminary or full hearings without requiring expert testimony, conserving limited court resources while maintaining evidentiary rigor. This balance of reliability and efficiency is precisely what both *Daubert* and *Frye* are designed to achieve: the admission of science that is trustworthy, proven, and practically applicable in real-world adjudication.

The courts' long history of ordering the use of Smart Start devices and the admission of the results under both *Frye* and *Daubert* standards underscores a continuing judicial consensus. No court has found the fuel-cell methodology or Smart Start's custodial practices scientifically unreliable. Consequently, judges evaluating SmartMobile Insight evidence do so within an already well-established and favorable legal framework.

**FROM A JUDICIAL-
ADMINISTRATION PERSPECTIVE,
THE DEVICE'S SECURE DATA
FLOW, STRUCTURED REPORTING
ARCHITECTURE, AND
CERTIFICATION FRAMEWORK
STREAMLINE HEARINGS.**

Family-court matters and probation hearings share a common evidentiary aim: establishing truth with fairness. In both settings, the question is not criminal guilt but compliance with court-ordered conditions. The relaxed evidentiary standards of probation-revocation hearings, permitting proof by a preponderance and reliable hearsay, further support admission of Smart Start data. Even under the more formal evidentiary expectations of family courts, SmartMobile Insight records satisfy every foundational requirement: scientific validity, secure authentication, transparent documentation, and neutrality.

The result is a form of evidence that advances the fact-finding process without compromising due process. Courts can determine abstinence objectively; parties can challenge results through calibration records, diagnostic logs, and audit trails; and the underlying methodology remains transparent and reviewable. This combination of accessibility and rigor strengthens judicial confidence in the fairness, accuracy, and defensibility of outcomes.

IX. CONCLUSION

The evidentiary record surrounding Smart Start's SmartMobile Insight demonstrates that its alcohol-monitoring results satisfy every major criterion of admissibility

under American law. The device is built on electrochemical fuel-cell analysis, a methodology with decades of proven scientific validity and universal acceptance within the forensic community. Its operational protocols, regular calibration, internal diagnostics, and mandatory re-tests establish known error boundaries consistent with NHTSA evidentiary standards. Its data architecture, biometric photo verification, GPS tagging, encryption, and independent custodianship, ensures authenticity, prevents alteration, and documents every stage of data handling.

Under *Frye*, these factors constitute general acceptance; under *Daubert*/Rule 702, they establish reliability, relevance, and appropriate application. The device's lineage through Smart Start's IN-HOM™ and ignition-interlock programs adds an additional layer of judicial credibility: multiple appellate courts have already affirmed the reliability and admissibility of Smart Start technology. SmartMobile Insight merely extends that accepted science

into a modern, self-contained platform with enhanced evidentiary safeguards.

When a Smart Start report is offered with a certified Business Records Affidavit, it arrives in court as a neutral, independently maintained document created in the regular course of business, precisely the type of record envisioned by the evidentiary rules. It can therefore be admitted without a live custodian and relied upon by the court as competent proof of alcohol use or abstinence.

**TAKEN TOGETHER, THESE
ATTRIBUTES POSITION
SMARTMOBILE INSIGHT AS
A SCIENTIFICALLY SOUND,
PROCEDURALLY TRANSPARENT, AND
LEGALLY ADMISSIBLE INSTRUMENT
UNDER BOTH FRYE AND DAUBERT
FRAMEWORKS.**

Taken together, these attributes position SmartMobile Insight as a scientifically sound, procedurally transparent, and legally admissible instrument under both *Frye* and *Daubert* frameworks. It provides judges with credible, contemporaneous, and verifiable evidence that meets the dual imperatives of accuracy and fairness. It may therefore be admitted and relied upon as competent proof of alcohol use or abstinence in family-law and probation-supervision proceedings.

VI. ENDNOTES

1. National Center for Juvenile and Family Court Judges, *Alcohol Use Disorder (AUD) Bench Card*, <https://www.ncjfcj.org/bench-cards/alcohol-use-disorder-aud/> (last visited Nov. 14, 2025).
2. *Id.*
3. Vincent C. Smith et al., Testing for Drugs of Abuse in Children and Adolescents, 133 PEDIATRICS e1798 (2014), <https://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article/133/6/e20140865/76085>.
4. Christal N. Davis & Susan E. O'Neill, Treatment of Alcohol Use Problems Among Rural Populations: A Review of Barriers and Considerations for Increasing Access to Quality Care, 9 CURR. ADDICT. REP. 432–44 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40429-022-00454-3>.
5. Anna Werner, *How Court-Ordered Drug Testing Poses Impossible Choices*, PBS NewsHour (Apr. 12, 2022), <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/how-court-ordered-drug-testing-poses-impossible-choices>.
6. Smart Start, LLC, *Portable Alcohol Monitoring*, <https://www.smartstartinc.com/portable-alcohol-monitoring/> (last visited Nov. 14, 2025).
7. Smart Start, LLC, *Portable Alcohol Monitoring: SmartMobile Insight*, <https://www.smartstartinc.com/portable-alcohol-monitoring/> (last visited Nov. 14, 2025).
8. *Id.*
9. *Id.*
10. *Frye v. United States*, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923).
11. Federal Rule of Evidence 702 — Testimony by Expert Witnesses.
12. *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993).
13. Justice Speakers Institute, *Science Bench Book for Judges* (2d ed. 2020), <https://www.judges.org/resources/science-bench-book-for-judges/>.
14. *Id.*
15. *Id.*
16. Michael J. Saks, Merlin and Solomon: Lessons from the Law's Formative Encounters with Forensic Identification Science, 49 HASTINGS L.J. 1069, 1082–85 (1998).
17. Justice Speakers Institute, *The admissibility of alcohol tests results from the Smart Start IN-HOM™ S.M.A.R.T. Mobile Device in Probation Violation Hearings* (Oct. 2017), <https://justicespeakersinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Smart-Start-Final.pdf>.
18. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, *Countermeasures That Work: Alcohol-Impaired Driving—Enforcement* (2023), <https://www.nhtsa.gov/book/countermeasures-that-work/alcohol-impaired-driving/countermeasures/enforcement/alcohol>.
19. Justice Speakers Institute, *Smart Start IN-HOM™ S.M.A.R.T. Mobile Device*, *supra* note 17.
20. Science Bench Book for Judges, *supra* note 13.
21. *Id.*
22. *People v. Bohrer* 37 Misc. 3d 371 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2012).

23. *Id.*
24. *Daubert*, 509 U.S. 579.
25. *Id.*
26. *General Electric Co. v. Joiner*, 522 U.S. 136 (1997).
27. *Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael*, 526 U.S. 137 (1999).
28. Science Bench Book for Judges, *supra* note 13.
29. *Id.*
30. Mark A. Behrens & Andrew J. Trask, *Federal Rule of Evidence 702: A History and Guide to the 2023 Amendments Governing Expert Evidence*, 12 TEX. A&M L. REV. 43 (2024). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.37419/LR.V12.I1.2>.
31. Fed. R. Evid. 702, Legal Info. Inst., CORNELL L. SCH., https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/fre/rule_702.
32. Schaffer Library of Drug Policy, *Breath Alcohol Testing and Daubert Criteria*, <https://www.druglibrary.org/schaffer/misc/driving/s2op4.htm> (last visited Nov. 20, 2025).
33. SmartMobile Insight User Manual, *supra* note 8.
34. Smart Start, *Privacy Policy*, <https://smartstart.law/m/legal/privacy-policy> (last visited Nov. 20, 2025). *See also*, Justice Speakers Institute, *Smart Start IN-HOM™ S.M.A.R.T. Mobile Device*, *supra* note 17.
35. Joseph C. Anderson & Michael P. Hlastala, *The Alcohol Breath Test in Practice: Effects of Exhaled Volume*, 125 J. Appl. Physiol. 1469 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00726.2018>.
36. *The History of Breath Testing in DUI Cases*, WASHDUI.com (n.d.), <https://washdui.com/blog/f/the-history-of-breath-testing-in-dui-cases?blogcategory=DUI>.
37. *Ethanol in the Blood Equilibrates with Ethanol in the Alveolar Air*, DUKE UNIV.: Alcohol Pharmacology Education Partnership (n.d.), <https://sites.duke.edu/apep/module-4-alcohol-and-the-breathalyzer-test/science-content/ethanol-in-the-blood-equilibrates-with-ethanol-in-the-alveolar-air/>.
38. Jones AW. Origin of the First Handheld Breath Alcohol Analyzer Incorporating an Electrochemical Sensor. FORENSIC SCI REV. 2024 Jan;36(1):26-31. PMID: 38297425.
39. *Id.*
40. *Id.*
41. *The History of the Ignition Interlock Device*, Smart Start, Inc. (n.d.), <https://www.smartstartinc.com/blog/history-ignition-interlock-device/>.
42. Justice Speakers Institute, *Smart Start IN-HOM™ S.M.A.R.T. Mobile Device*, *supra* note 17.
43. Science Bench Book for Judges, *supra* note 13.
44. *Mobile Alcohol Testing: Introducing SmartMobile™*, Smart Start, LLC. (n.d.), <https://www.smartstartinc.com/blog/mobile-alcohol-testing-smartmobile/>.
45. Justice Speakers Institute, *Smart Start IN-HOM™ S.M.A.R.T. Mobile Device*, *supra* note 17.
46. *Id.*
47. *Id.*
48. *Id.*
49. *Id.*
50. *Id.*
51. Smart Start, LLC, *SmartMobile Insight*, *supra* note 7.
52. Smart Start, LLC. *SmartMobile Insight FAQ*, (n.d.), <https://www.smartstartinc.com>.

- com/portable-alcohol-monitoring/smartmobile-insight-faq/. fba4354031d1f38eb66da92e30c0239e18b3e2a07aedfaef3582f.pdf.
53. Smart Start, LLC, *SmartMobile Insight*, *supra* note 7.
 54. *Id.*
 55. SmartMobile Insight User Manual, *supra* note 8.
 56. *Id.*
 57. *Id.*
 58. *Id.*
 59. *Id.*
 60. Smart Start's Training Video: *SmartMobile (English)*, Smart Start, LLC. (n.d.), <https://www.smartstartinc.com/blog/smart-starts-training-video-smart-mobile-english/>.
 61. *Id.*
 62. *Id.*
 63. SmartMobile Insight User Manual, *supra* note 8.
 64. *Id.*
 65. Dariusz Zuba, Accuracy and reliability of breath alcohol testing by handheld electrochemical analysers, 178 FORENSIC SCI. INT. e29-33 (2008), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2008.03.002>.
 66. *Id.*
 67. Mohammadreza Zamanzad Ghavidel, Mohammad R. Rahman & E. Bradley Easton, *Fuel Cell-Based Breath Alcohol Sensors Utilizing Pt-Alloy Electrocatalysts*, 273 SENS. & ACTUATORS B: CHEM. 574 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2018.06.078>.
 68. Laddie Nadilo, *The Use of Fuel Cell Technology in Breathalysers* (White Paper, n.d.), <https://manuals.plus/m/96a74ecfc99>
 69. Smart Start, *Portable Alcohol Monitoring*, *supra* note 7.
 70. SmartMobile Insight FAQ, *supra* note 52.
 71. Smart Start, *Portable Alcohol Monitoring*, *supra* note 7.
 72. *Id.*
 73. SmartMobile Insight FAQ, *supra* note 52.
 74. *Id.*
 75. *Id.*
 76. *Id.*
 77. Drug-Screen.com, *Breath Alcohol Testing: How Accurate Is It?* (n.d.), <https://drug-screen.com/uncategorized/breath-alcohol-testing-how-accurate-is-it/> (last visited Dec. 11, 2025).
 78. European Commission, *Study on the Use of Alcohol Interlocks in Road Transport* (2014), https://road-safety.transport.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2021-07/study_alcohol_interlock.pdf. *See also*, Robert J. Beirness, *Alcohol Interlock Programs: An Overview of Current Practices*, in *Reducing Alcohol-Impaired Driving* (U.S. Dep't of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Servs., Problem-Oriented Policing Guides No. 1, 2001), https://popcenter.asu.edu/sites/g/files/litvpz3631/files/problems/drunck_driving/PDFs/Beirness_2001.pdf.
 79. SmartMobile Insight FAQ, *supra* note 52.
 80. *Id.*
 81. Smart Start, LLC, *SmartMobile INSIGHT™: Unparalleled Accuracy in Portable Alcohol Monitoring* (internal training presentation, on file with author).

82. *Id.*
83. *Id.*
84. *Id.*
85. *Id.*
86. SmartMobile Insight User Manual, *supra* note 8.
87. *Id.*
88. Smart Start, SmartMobile INSIGHT™, *supra* note 81.
89. *Id.*
90. Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts, 557 U.S. 305, 129 S.Ct. 2527, (2009).
91. Bullcoming v. New Mexico, 564 U.S. 647 (2011).
92. Justice Speakers Institute, *Smart Start IN-HOM™ S.M.A.R.T. Mobile Device*, *supra* note 17.
93. *People v. Bohrer* (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2012).
94. *Id.*
95. *Id.*
96. Justice Speakers Institute, *Smart Start IN-HOM™ S.M.A.R.T. Mobile Device*, *supra* note 17.
97. *See for example*, *People v. Xi He*, 66 Misc. 3d 1229(A), (Sup. Ct. Queens Cnty. Feb. 19, 2020).
98. Science Bench Book for Judges, *supra* note 13.
99. *See for example*, *People v Bury*, 41 Cal. App. 4th 1194 (1996), *People v. Williams*, 28 Cal. App. 4th 412 (2002), *People v. Wilson*, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 167 (2003).
100. *See for example*, *People v. Halsey*, 273 Ill. App.3d 160, 163, 209 Ill.Dec. 894, 652 N.E.2d 434, 436 (1995).
101. *Kelly v. State*, 824 S.W.2d 568 (Tex. Crim. App. 1992).
102. *Id.*
103. *Scherl v. State*, 7 S.W.3d 650 (Tex. App. 1999). *But see*; *Brock v. State*, No. 2-06-452-CR, 2007 WL 3203661, (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Nov. 1, 2007) (mem. op., not designated for publication).
104. *Nixon v. State*, No. 06-23-00027-CR, 2023 WL 3316369, (Tex. App.—Texarkana May 9, 2023).
105. *Chandler v. State*, No. 05-15-00598-CR, 2016 WL 347171, at * ___ (Tex. App.—Dallas Jan. 28, 2016).
106. *Id.*
107. *See State v. Blick*, 51 P.3d 488, (Kan. Ct. App. Nov. 8, 2019) (unpublished disposition), review denied (Kan. July 27, 2020), *J.M.B. v. Cabinet for Health & Family Servs.*, Nos. 2013-CA-001116-ME, 2013-CA-001117-ME, 2014 WL 2159384, (Ky. Ct. App. May 23, 2014) (not to be published), discretionary review denied (Ky. May 6, 2015), *By v. Mass. Registry of Motor Vehicles*, 24 Mass. L. Rptr. 525 (Mass. Super. Ct. Suffolk Cnty. Aug. 27, 2008), *In re Goldie*, Nos. 307218, 307219, 2012 WL 3139553, (Mich. Ct. App. Aug. 2, 2012) (unpublished), *People v. Byers*, No. 343806, 2019 WL 1212724, (Mich. Ct. App. Mar. 14, 2019) (unpublished). *Garcia-Avila v. Garland*, No. 20-60406, 2022 WL 1548674, (5th Cir. May 16, 2022).
108. *State v. Damon*, 328 Mont. 276, 119 P.3d 1194, 2005 MT 218 (2005).
109. *Id.*
110. *Id.*
111. *In re Goldie*, 2012 WL 3139553.
112. *People v. Byers*, 2019 WL 1212724.

113. In Michigan, sobriety court is the term for drug treatment courts that focus on alcohol use disorder often called DWI/ Drug courts.
114. *J.M.B. v. Cabinet for Health & Family Servs.*, 2014 WL 2159384.
115. *By*, 24 Mass. L. Rptr. at 525.
116. Nat'l Highway Traffic Safety Admin., *Evaluation of the Specific Deterrent Effect of Vehicle Alcohol Ignition Interlock Programs* (Aug. 2010), https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.gov/files/811267_o.pdf.
117. See D. M. Tejashwini, Ramachandra Naik, Vinayak Sunagar, H. P. Nagaswarupa & Yashwanth V. Naik, *An Introduction to Forensic Electrochemistry*, in AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY SYMPOSIUM SERIES, Vol. 1481 (ACS Publ'ns 2024), <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/bk-2024-1481.ch001>.
118. Ecorys, *Study On The Prevention Of Drink-Driving By The Use Of Alcohol Interlock*, DEVICES FINAL REPORT (Eur. Commission, DG for Mobility & Transp., 2014). http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/sites/roadsafety/files/pdf/behavior/study_alcohol_interlock.pdf (Last visited Dec. 21, 2019).
119. *Id.*
120. *Am. Acad. of Matrimonial Lawyers*, MAT 101 (n.d.), https://aaml.org/wp-content/uploads/MAT101_2.pdf.

ABOUT THE JUSTICE SPEAKERS INSTITUTE, LLC.

JSI is your gateway to justice system leaders and issues worldwide. The partners and associates of the Justice Speakers Institute (JSI) are internationally recognized experts with decades of experience and mastery of over 300 subjects impacting the justice system. The Institute was founded in 2015 by the late Peggy Hora, Brian MacKenzie, and David Wallace. Currently, David and Brian are the Co-Presidents, and Chiefs Mack Jenkins and Cynthia Herriott are JSI's Vice Presidents. Brian MacKenzie also acts as the Chief Financial Officer. Additionally, there are over twenty rigorously selected associates with expertise on a wide variety of justice and legal issues. We have a breadth of expertise unparalleled anywhere on subjects from ethics to traffic safety; mental health and substance abuse; and administration of justice to domestic violence.

It is the mission of JSI to be the essential resource on justice issues worldwide. Our vision is to Promote Justice and the Rule of Law worldwide. We will consult with you to meet your program objectives whether you need a keynote speaker, a trainer, an editor, or a consultant. We are committed to meeting your needs and providing an excellent educational experience.

The characteristics of honor, leadership and stewardship are integral to the success of JSI. Therefore the founders and all associates subscribe to a code of professional ethics.

**This project was made possible by financial support
from Smart Start, LLC**

*Points of view or opinions contained within this document do not necessarily
represent the official position or policies of Smart Start, LLC.*

**FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT JSI, GO TO:
WWW.JUSTICESPEAKERSINSTITUTE.COM**



Justice Speakers Institute
PROMOTING JUSTICE WORLDWIDE



*No part of this paper may be reproduced in whole or in part without
the permission of the Justice Speakers Institute, LLC. ©*