

*This opinion is nonprecedential except as provided by
Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 136.01, subd. 1(c).*

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS
A25-0636**

Lisa Marie Hellerud-Schuth, petitioner,
Appellant,

vs.

Commissioner of Public Safety,
Respondent.

**Filed December 8, 2025
Affirmed
Schmidt, Judge**

Carver County District Court
File No. 10-CV-24-1415

Robert M. Christensen, Robert M. Christensen, P.L.C., Minneapolis, Minnesota (for appellant)

Keith Ellison, Attorney General, Cassandra L. Buehler, Assistant Attorney General, St. Paul, Minnesota (for respondent)

Considered and decided by Schmidt, Presiding Judge; Bratvold, Judge; and Bentley, Judge.

NONPRECEDENTIAL OPINION

SCHMIDT, Judge

Appellant challenges the district court's order sustaining the revocation of her driver's license. Because the record supports the district court's determination that law enforcement had reasonable, articulable suspicion to initiate the traffic stop, we affirm.

FACTS

A law enforcement officer on patrol observed an individual on a motorcycle who was behind a car being driven by appellant Lisa Marie Hellerud-Schuth. The officer saw Hellerud-Schuth's car turn off the road towards a construction zone, then immediately merge back into the traffic lane. The officer observed that Hellerud-Schuth did not yield to the motorcycle when she abruptly reentered traffic and that the motorcycle hit its brakes and swerved. The officer turned on the squad car lights to initiate a traffic stop. The officer arrested Hellerud-Schuth for driving while intoxicated.

Respondent commissioner of public safety revoked Hellerud-Schuth's license. Hellerud-Schuth challenged the revocation of her license, arguing that the officer lacked reasonable, articulable suspicion to initiate the traffic stop. The district court held an implied consent hearing at which the officer testified. The district court also received into evidence the officer's squad-car camera footage.

After the implied consent hearing, the district court sustained the revocation of Hellerud-Schuth's license. Hellerud-Schuth appeals.

DECISION

Hellerud-Schuth challenges the district court's order sustaining the revocation of her license. Hellerud-Schuth argues that the officer lacked reasonable, articulable suspicion to stop her vehicle. We disagree.

Both the United States and Minnesota Constitutions prohibit unreasonable searches and seizures. U.S. Const. amend. IV; Minn. Const. art. I, § 10. "[A] limited investigatory stop of a motorist" is constitutionally permissible "if the state can show that the officer had

a particularized and objective basis for suspecting the particular person stopped of criminal activity.” *State v. Anderson*, 683 N.W.2d 818, 822-23 (Minn. 2004) (quotation omitted). “Generally, if an officer observes a violation of a traffic law, no matter how insignificant the traffic law, that observation forms the requisite particularized and objective basis for conducting a traffic stop.” *Id.* at 823.

On appeal from an order revoking a driver’s license following an implied-consent hearing, we review questions about the legality of a traffic stop de novo. *Mesenburg v. Comm’r of Pub. Safety*, 969 N.W.2d 642, 646 (Minn. App. 2021), *rev. denied* (Minn. Mar. 15, 2022). But “when the district court hears testimony on the legality of investigatory stops, the district court’s factual findings are entitled to deference” and are reviewed under the clear-error standard. *State v. Wagner*, 637 N.W.2d 330, 336 (Minn. App. 2001) (citation omitted).

The district court made the following findings of fact after hearing testimony from the officer who initiated the stop and after watching the squad car footage: (1) the officer on patrol observed a car driving in front of a motorcycle; (2) the officer saw the car try to turn into a construction site; (3) the officer observed that the car “quickly right[ed] its course and veer[ed] back onto the roadway”; (4) as the car veered back into the road, the officer saw the car “disregard[] oncoming traffic”; (5) as the car moved back into the road, the officer saw the motorcycle “brake and swerve to avoid a collision”; (6) the officer “testified that he was concerned for the driver’s disregard for the right of way of traffic”; and (7) the officer then “activated his emergency lights and initiated a traffic stop.”

Citing the squad-car video, Hellerud-Schuth argues that the district court's findings of fact—and its decision to credit the officer's testimony—are clearly erroneous. But the squad-car video does not, as Hellerud-Schuth contends, demonstrate that the district court clearly erred by crediting the officer's testimony.¹ The video does not conclusively show whether the motorcycle swerved to avoid Hellerud-Schuth's vehicle. The video does, however, corroborate the officer's testimony that the motorcycle braked after Hellerud-Schuth veered back into traffic.

The video was not the only evidence that was presented to the district court. The district court also heard testimony from the officer. The officer testified:

OFFICER: . . . [S]o the car pulled into that construction entrance, which is actually gated off, and then quickly did . . . an abrupt turn back onto [the road].

ATTORNEY: And what did you observe as the car made that abrupt turn back onto [the road]?

OFFICER: So it was clear that the person made this turn and abrupt action back onto [the road] without looking at traffic, because the motorcyclist that had been in front of me and behind the vehicle that we're talking about was now right about where this vehicle had turned off . . . the motorcyclist had to swerve and brake to avoid a collision.

. . . .

ATTORNEY: When [Hellerud-Schuth] [v]eered back onto the road, did the motorcyclist have to brake their vehicle?

OFFICER: Yes.

ATTORNEY: Did the motorcyclist have to veer their vehicle?

¹ This is far from a situation in which an officer testified that the traffic light was red and the squad-car video conclusively shows that the light was green.

OFFICER: Yes.

ATTORNEY: And was there any other basis for the traffic stop that you haven't told the Court?

OFFICER: I don't think so.

Contrary to Hellerud-Schuth's argument, the video corroborates the officer's testimony as it depicts Hellerud-Schuth attempting to turn into a construction zone and veering back into the road, and the motorcycle breaking in response to Hellerud-Schuth's driving conduct. Because the officer's testimony and the video support the district court's findings, we conclude that we cannot disturb them. *See Wagner*, 637 N.W.2d at 336.

Affirmed.