

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT OF MAINE

State of Maine v. Saad Zackaria

2026 ME 2 (Supreme Judicial Court of Maine 2026) · No. Cum-24-86 · Decided January 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The Maine Supreme Judicial Court affirmed Saad Zackaria’s convictions for aggravated assault and assault with a dangerous weapon. The court held that Zackaria lacked an objectively reasonable expectation of privacy in the shelter’s common area and shower room under the circumstances, and that the delay before trial did not violate his right to a speedy trial under the Maine Constitution.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Judicial Court of Maine
WRITING FOR THE COURT	CONNORS, J.; STANFILL, C.J.; MEAD, J.; LAWRENCE, J.; DOUGLAS, J.; LIPEZ, J.
JURISDICTION	Maine Supreme Judicial Court
DECIDED	January 13, 2026
DOCKET	Cum-24-86
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from judgment of conviction following jury trial
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Motion to suppress: factual findings reviewed for clear error, legal conclusions de novo; speedy trial claim reviewed for abuse of discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Saad Zackaria v. State of Maine

TOPICS

- search and seizure
- fourth amendment
- speedy trial
- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal law
- constitutional law
- evidence
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court erred in denying defendant's motion to suppress evidence obtained at Preble Street Resource Center
2. Whether defendant was deprived of his right to a speedy trial guaranteed under the Maine Constitution

HOLDINGS

1. The trial court did not err in denying the motion to suppress because under the totality of the circumstances, defendant did not have an objectively reasonable expectation of privacy in the shower room or common area of the resource center.
2. The trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying defendant's motion to dismiss for failure to provide a speedy trial under the Maine Constitution.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that '[t]he right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated.' U.S. Const. amend. IV.” (¶ 12)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On June 15, 2021, Portland police responded to reports of an assault on Congress Street where two victims described being hit and poked by an African-American male with short spiky hair wearing a green shirt. Based on descriptions, officers identified Saad Zackaria and located him at Preble Street Resource Center. Officers, let in by staff, found Zackaria at a sink in the common area. He walked to an open shower room, leaving the door ajar while picking items off the floor. Officers opened the door, asked him to exit, and observed sharp objects on the floor, leading to his arrest.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendant was charged and indicted for aggravated assault with a dangerous weapon and assault with a dangerous weapon. He filed motions to suppress and to dismiss for failure to provide a speedy trial, both of which were denied. After a jury trial, he was found guilty on all counts and sentenced. He appealed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- State v. Gerry, 2016 ME 163, ¶ 2, 150 A.3d 810
- State v. Marquis, 2018 ME 39, ¶ 15, 181 A.3d. 684
- State v. Lovett, 2015 ME 7, ¶ 6, 109 A. 3d 1135
- State v. Ormsby, 2013 ME 88, ¶ 9, 81 A.3d 336
- State v. Akers, 2021 ME 43, ¶ 25, 259 A.3d 127
- State v. Bridges, 513 A.2d 1365, 1367 (Me. 1986)

- State v. Sylvain, 2023 ME 5, ¶ 11, 814 A.2d 984
- State v. Sargent, 2009 ME 125, ¶10, 984 A.2d 831
- Ohio v. Robinette, 519 U.S. 33, 39 (1996)
- State v. Carton, 2016 ME 119, ¶ 16, 145 A.3d 555
- Minnesota v. Olson, 495 U.S. 91, 96-97 (1990)
- Cmty. for Creative Non-Violence v. Unknown Agents of U.S. Marshals Serv., 791 F. Supp. 1, 6 (D.D.C. 1992)
- Prophete v. Acevedo-Smith, 743 F. Supp. 3d 440, 447 (E.D.N.Y. 2024)
- State v. Fillion, 2009 ME 23, ¶ 12, 966 A.2d 405
- Walker v. Gatsios, No. 19 C 6072, at 3 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 11, 2024)
- People v. Vinson, 161 A.D. 3d 493, 494 (N.Y. App. Div. 2018)
- State v. Limberhand, 788 P.2d 857, 861 (Idaho Ct. App. 1990)
- City of Tukwila v. Nalder, 770 P.2d 670, 674 (Wash. Ct. App. 1989)
- State v. Biggar, 716 P.2d 493, 495 (Haw. 1986)
- State v. Mudloff, 36 P.3d 326, 328 (Kan. Ct. App. 2001)
- State v. Christen, 2009 ME 78, ¶ 14, 976 A.2d 980
- State v. Athayde, 2022 ME 41, ¶ 20, 277 A.3d 387
- Barker v. Wingo, 407 U.S. 514, 530-31 (1972)
- State v. Norris, 2023 ME 60, ¶ 14, 302 A.3d 1
- State v. Engroff, 2025 ME 83, ¶ 26, 345 A.3d 91
- Winchester v. State, 2023 ME 23, ¶¶ 27, 37, 291 A.3d 707
- State v. Engroff, 2025 ME 83, ¶ 30, 345 A.3d 91
- State v. Norris, 2023 ME 60, ¶ 24, 302 A.3d 1
- State v. Furrow, 424 A.2d 694, 698 (Me. 1981)
- State v. Castro, 402 P.3d 688, 693 (N.M. 2017)
- Winchester v. State, 2023 ME 23, ¶ 29, 291 A.3d 707
- Winchester v. State, 2023 ME 23, ¶ 30, 291 A.3d 707
- State v. Kirn, 530 P.3d 1, 13 (Mont. 2023)
- Hakeem v. Beyer, 990 F.2d 750, 761 (3d Cir. 1993)
- Taylor v. State, 792 S.E.2d 101, 108 (Ga. App. Ct. 2016), aff'd, 810 S.E.2d 113 (Ga. 2018)
- United States v. Ogiekpolo, 122 F.4th 1296, 1308 (11th Cir. 2024)
- State v. Engroff, 2025 ME 83, ¶ 39, 345 A.3d 91