

CONCURRING OPINION BY ACOBA, J.

I concur in the result, but do not agree with the adoption of a totality of circumstances test, which in my opinion would be too nebulous for purposes of applying our State Constitution's prohibition against unreasonable seizures. Because of its undifferentiated contours, a totality of circumstances test would be ineffective in confining a reckless driving exception to "very narrow circumstances."

In contrast, the New Jersey Supreme Court has adopted the following "tenets" in evaluating anonymous tips justifying vehicle traffic stops: (1) "The information [from the caller] must convey an unmistakable sense that the caller has witnessed an ongoing offense[,]" (2) the offense "implicates a risk of imminent death or serious injury to a particular person such as a vehicle's driver or to the public at large[,]" (3) "the call [was] close in time to [the caller's] first-hand observations[,]" (4) the "caller must provide a sufficient quantity of information, such as an adequate description of the vehicle, its location and bearing, or similar innocent details, so that the officer, and the court, may be certain that the vehicle stopped is the same as the one identified by the caller[,]" and (5) "the officer conducting the stop" must verify or observe such details. State v. Golotta, 837 A.2d 359, 369 (N.J. 2003) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). I believe the New Jersey

Supreme Court test is most faithful to a reasoned safeguarding of the right against unreasonable seizures and would be adopted appropriately under our constitution.