FBI INFO.	
CLASSIFIED BY: NSICG	
REASON: 1.4 (C)	
DECLASSIFY ON: 12-31-2038	
DATE: 10-23-2017	

b6 b7C

b1 b3 b7A b7E

SECRETANOFORN

**UNITED STATES** 

## FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT

WASHINGTON, D.C.

	/(S)	b1 b3 b7A
(S) MEMORANDUM OPINION		
On the government filed an application se electronic surveillance of communications intende	eeking authority to conduct	(S)
		(S)
		(0)
		1

SECREP 4410 EORY

## SECRETANOFORN

		(S)
The key question for the Court is whether the activities proposed by the government constitute electronic surveillance or physical search under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). The government contends that the onstitutes electronic surveillance specifically under Section 1801(f)(4), which reads:		b1 b3 b7A b7E
(f) "Electronic surveillance" means—  (4) the installation of use of an electronic, mechanical, or other surveillance device in the United States for monitoring to acquire information, other than from a wire or radio communication, under circumstances in which a person has a reasonable expectation of privacy and a warrant would be required for law enforcement purposes.		
A "physical search" under FISA means:  any physical intrusion within the United States into premises or property that is intended to result in a seizure, reproduction, inspection, or alteration of information, material or property, under circumstances in which a person has a reasonable expectation of privacy and a warrant would be required for law enforcement purposes, but does not include  (A) "electronic surveillance", as defined in section 1801(f) of this title  50 U.S.C. § 1821(5).¹ The definition of "physical search" specifically does not include anything that could be defined as "electronic surveillance" under Section 1801(f). Therefore, the Court agrees with the government that if the proposed activities constitute electronic surveillance under Section 1801(f), then they cannot constitute a physical search. (See Mem. of Law at 12 n.16.)		
	10)	h1
	(S)	b1 b3 b7A b7E

	(S)	b1 b3 b7A b7E
// // // //		
	(S)	
<sup>3</sup> The Court, in deciding this matter, does not reach the government's argument regarding the use of the term "intercept" or "interception" as used in the FISA legislative history or in Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. Mem. of Law at 13-16. First, the term is not used in the definition of "electronic surveillance" under FISA's Section and where a particular term is provided the Court should endeavor to define that term	e	b1 b3 b71 b71
SECRET/NOFORN	(S)	

and the second of the second o	_
SECRET/NOFO	ME
VEC BEST WATERILE	< 13
2111101	_

	Sen	(S)
Conclusion	ž.	
		b1
		b3
		b7A
		b7E

MARTIN LC FELDMAN
Judge, United States Foreign
Intelligence Surveillance Court

Clerk, FISC, certify that this document is a true and correct convert the original

SECRETANGEORN

4

b6 b7C