



County Technical Assistance Service

Published on e-Li (<http://ctas-eli.ctas.tennessee.edu>)

October 20, 2021

Telephone Use

Dear Reader:

The following document was created from the CTAS electronic library known as e-Li. This online library is maintained daily by CTAS staff and seeks to represent the most current information regarding issues relative to Tennessee county government.

We hope this information will be useful to you; reference to it will assist you with many of the questions that will arise in your tenure with county government. However, the *Tennessee Code Annotated* and other relevant laws or regulations should always be consulted before any action is taken based upon the contents of this document.

Please feel free to contact us if you have questions or comments regarding this information or any other e-Li material.

Sincerely,

The University of Tennessee
County Technical Assistance Service
226 Capitol Blvd. Suite 400
Nashville, TN. 37219
615-532-3555 phone
615-532-3699 fax
ctas@tennessee.edu
www.ctas.tennessee.edu

Table of Contents

Telephone Use	3
Monitoring Inmate Telephone Conversations	4

Telephone Use

Reference Number: CTAS-1416

Pursuant to state regulations the jail must have a policy and procedure providing reasonable private access to a telephone for the prisoners. The policy and procedure must be in writing and posted so as to be conspicuous to the prisoners and must set forth any limitations. At a minimum, the procedure must include (1) the hours during which telephone access will generally be provided, (2) a statement regarding the privacy of telephone communications, and (3) inmates with hearing and/or speech disabilities shall be afforded access to a Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD), or comparable equipment. Public telephones with volume control shall be made available to inmates with a hearing impairment. Information regarding the availability of TDD communication devices shall be posted. Inmates with hearing and/or speech impairments shall be afforded access similar to those inmates without impairments. [Rules of the Tennessee Corrections Institute, Rule 1400-1-.12\(5\)](#).

An inmate has no constitutional right to telephone use, *Griffin v. Cleaver*, 2005 WL 1200532, *6 (D. Conn. 2005), nor does he have a constitutional right to make private telephone calls. *Cook v. Hills*, 3 Fed.Appx. 393, *1 (6th Cir. 2001). See also *Washington v. Reno*, 35 F.3d 1093, 1100 (6th Cir. 1994) (concluding that prisoners have no entitlement to unlimited use of a telephone); *Benzel v. Grammer*, 869 F.2d 1105 (8th Cir. 1989) (same); *Lopez v. Reyes*, 692 F.2d 15, 17 (5th Cir. 1982) (A jail inmate in maximum security has no right to unlimited telephone use.); *Frazier v. Coughlin*, 81 F.3d 313, 317-318 (2d Cir. 1996) (holding that 30-day loss of recreation, commissary privileges, packages and telephone use did not state a cognizable claim for denial of due process).

Jail officials have the right to limit an inmate's access to phone calls "to the extent that such limitations are designed to achieve legitimate penological interests." *Leslie v. Sullivan*, 2000 WL 34227530, *7 (W.D. Wis. 2000). "Prisoners are not entitled to unlimited visits or inexpensive phone calls to their family members under the Constitution." *Id.* See also *Martin v. Tyson*, 845 F.2d 1451, 1458 (7th Cir. 1988) (per curiam) (upholding policy limiting pretrial detainee's telephone access to every other day); *Pope v. Hightower*, 101 F.3d 1382, 1385 (11th Cir. 1996) (upholding policy limiting use to preapproved calling list of at most 10 people); *Washington v. Reno*, 35 F.3d 1093, 1100 (6th Cir. 1994) (upholding policy limiting use to preapproved list of at most 30 people); *Benzel v. Grammer*, 869 F.2d 1105, 1108-09 (8th Cir. 1989) (upholding policy limiting use by inmates in disciplinary segregation to preapproved list of at most three people).

An inmate's "right to telephone access, if any, is subject to rational limitations based upon legitimate security and administrative interests of the penal institution. 'The exact nature of telephone service to be provided to inmates is generally to be determined by prison administrators, subject to court scrutiny for unreasonable restrictions.'" *Arney v. Simmons*, 26 F.Supp.2d 1288, 1293 (D. Kan. 1998) (upholding restrictions placed on inmates' telephone access, including 10-person telephone call lists modified at 120-day intervals, monitoring of telephone calls, prohibition on international calls from inmate telephones, and prohibition on inclusion of public officials on call lists) (citations omitted).

In *Spurlock v. Simmons*, 88 F.Supp.2d 1189 (D. Kan. 2000), the court held that limiting a hearing-impaired inmate to two 30-minute telephone calls per week on a special facility TDD telephone, while permitting other inmates unlimited access to the inmate telephone system, did not violate the due process clause, *id.* at 1193, and did not violate the deaf inmate's equal protection rights. *Id.* at 1194. Further, the court found that prison officials did not discriminate against the deaf inmate in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) or the Rehabilitation Act. The court found that, as a matter of law, the plaintiff had meaningful access to a telephone. *Id.* at 1195-1196. See also *Hansen v. Rimel*, 104 F.3d 189 (8th Cir.1997) (finding no equal protection violation for failure to provide special telephone to disabled inmate).

In *Boriboune v. Litscher*, 91 Fed.Appx. 498, 499-500 (7th Cir. 2003), the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals upheld a prison policy prohibiting inmates from communicating on the telephone in a language other than English without first receiving approval. The court found that the prisons' policy was reasonably related to its interest in maintaining security, which is a legitimate penological concern. See also *Sisneros v. Nix*, 884 F.Supp. 1313 (S.D. Iowa 1995) (finding regulation requiring mail to and from prisoners be in English language did not violate prisoner's First Amendment rights or his 14th Amendment Equal Protection rights).

Monitoring Inmate Telephone Conversations

Reference Number: CTAS-1417

The monitoring of inmate telephone calls is common in jails in Tennessee. Noting that the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution protects persons from unreasonable searches and seizures in places in which they have a reasonable expectation of privacy, the Tennessee Court of Criminal Appeals has held that a person does not have a reasonable expectation of privacy on a jailhouse telephone. *State v. Erwin*, 2001 WL 314340, *6 (Tenn. Crim. App. 2001), citing *State v. Hutchison*, 1987 WL 14331, at *5-6 (Tenn. Crim. App. 1987); *State v. Rudolph Munn*, 1999 WL 177341, at *12 (Tenn. Crim. App. 1999), *perm. app. granted*, (Tenn. 1999).

Inmates have no constitutional privacy right to unmonitored nonprivileged telephone calls from a correctional facility. *Washington v. Meachum*, 680 A.2d 262, 275 (Conn. 1996). "No such right has previously been found to exist in any jurisdiction in the country under either the federal constitution or any state constitution...." *Id.*

The courts applying the federal constitution have consistently concluded that whatever limited privacy rights inmates retain do not include a right to make unmonitored, non-privileged telephone calls. *United States v. Workman*, 80 F.3d 688, 694 (2d Cir. 1996) ("[o]nly a single participant in a conversation need agree to the monitoring in order to satisfy the requirements of the Fourth Amendment" and inmate use of prison telephone with knowledge of monitoring practice constitutes such agreement); *United States v. Sababu*, 891 F.2d 1308, 1329 (7th Cir. 1989) (outsider who telephones inmate has no reasonable expectation that conversation will be private because "[i]n prison, official surveillance has traditionally been the order of the day"); *United States v. Wiloughby*, 860 F.2d 15, 20-21 (2d Cir. 1988); *United States v. Amen*, 831 F.2d 373, 379-80 (2d Cir. 1987), cert. denied sub nom, *Abbamonte v. United States*, 485 U.S. 1021, 108 S.Ct. 1573, 99 L.Ed.2d 889 (1988); *United States v. Paul*, 614 F.2d 115 (6th Cir. 1980); *United States v. Clark*, 651 F.Supp. 76, 81 (M.D. Pa. 1986) (distinguishing monitoring of public telephone booth from monitoring of jailhouse telephone on grounds that there is no reasonable expectation of privacy in jailhouse conversation); *Teat v. State*, 636 So.2d 697, 699 (Ala. Crim. App. 1993) ("there is no reasonable expectation of privacy in the telephone conversations of inmates at penal institutions"); *State v. Fox*, 493 N.W.2d 829, 832 (Iowa 1992) (no fourth amendment violation even though inmate not specifically notified of monitoring).

In cases in which other state courts have applied the independent provisions of their state constitutions to privacy claims pertaining specifically to prison telephone conversations, those courts unanimously have found that the monitoring or taping of such conversations does not violate the implicit or explicit privacy protections of their respective state constitutions. *People v. Myles*, 62 Ill.App.3d 931, 936, 20 Ill.Dec. 64, 379 N.E.2d 897 (1978) (no reasonable expectation of privacy in jailhouse conversations, despite explicit privacy provision in state constitution, because "[a] phone maintained in a jail for prisoner use shares none of the attributes of privacy of a home or automobile or even a public phone booth"); *State v. Fischer*, 270 N.W.2d 345, 354 (N. Dak. 1978) ("parties to a jailhouse conversation usually have no reasonable expectation of privacy due to the security needs of maintaining order and of limiting the introduction of contraband, such as drugs, into the jail" unless deceptive actions of law enforcement officials provide such reasonable expectation).

Id. at 276. See also *United States v. Balon*, 384 F.3d 38, 44 (2d Cir. 2004) ("[M]onitoring of telephone communications does not offend the Fourth Amendment because prisoners have 'no reasonable expectation of privacy.'" (citations omitted); *United States v. Gangi*, 57 Fed.Appx. 809, 815 (10th Cir. 2003) ("We agree with the Ninth Circuit that 'any expectation of privacy in outbound calls from prison is not objectively reasonable and that the Fourth Amendment is therefore not triggered by the routine taping of such calls.'" (citations omitted); *United States v. Workman*, 80 F.3d 688, 694 (2d Cir. 1996) ("[T]he interception of calls from inmates to noninmates does not violate the privacy rights of the noninmates.") (citations omitted).

Monitoring and recording inmate telephone conversations does not, generally, violate the provisions of Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-22. Title III generally forbids the intentional interception of telephone calls when done without court-ordered authorization. Under the "consent" exception, 18 U.S.C. § 2511(2)(c), law enforcement personnel may lawfully intercept telephone calls where one of the parties to the communication has given prior consent to such interception. Courts have held that consent may be either express or implied. Additionally, courts have held that

under certain circumstances, prisoners are deemed to have given their consent for purposes of Title III to the interception of their calls on institutional telephones.

In *United States v. Amen*, 831 F.2d 373 (2d Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 485 U.S. 1021, 108 S.Ct. 1573, 99 L.Ed.2d 889 (1988), the Second Circuit Court of Appeals held that inmates impliedly consented to have their telephone conversations monitored where they had received notice of the surveillance and nevertheless used the prison telephones. *Id.* at 378-379. In *Amen*, the notice consisted of federal prison regulations clearly indicating that inmate telephone calls were subject to monitoring, an orientation lecture in which the monitoring and taping system was discussed, an informational handbook received by every inmate describing the system, and signs near the telephones notifying inmates of the monitoring.

In *United States v. Workman*, 80 F.3d 688 (2d Cir. 1996), prior to trial, the defendants moved to suppress recordings made by prison officials of defendant Green's incriminating conversations on the prison telephone system. The defendants contended that these recordings were made in violation of Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-22 ("Title III"). *Id.* at 692. The court held that the combination of signs, written in English and Spanish, near each telephone in the prison notifying inmates of the monitoring program, an orientation handbook that provided further notice of the telephone monitoring program, and state regulations that provided public notice that prisoner calls were subject to monitoring and recording were sufficient to find that Green impliedly consented to the surveillance. *Id.* at 693-694. *See also United States v. Corona-Chavez*, 328 F.3d 974, 978 (8th Cir. 2003) (finding implied consent where an inmate chose to proceed with a phone call after receiving notice of recording); *United States v. Hammond*, 286 F.3d 189, 192 (4th Cir. 2002) (same); *United States v. Footman*, 215 F.3d 145, 155 (1st Cir. 2000) (same); *United States v. Van Poyck*, 77 F.3d 285, 292 (9th Cir. 1996) (same).

Under the "law enforcement" exception, 18 U.S.C. § 2510(5)(a), oral communications may be intercepted by investigative and law enforcement officers acting in the ordinary course of their duties. *United States v. Van Poyck*, 77 F.3d 285, 291-292 (9th Cir. 1996). Finding that the law enforcement exception applied to the Los Angeles Metropolitan Detention Center's routine taping policy, the court noted that the "MDC is a law enforcement agency whose employees tape all outbound inmate telephone calls; interception of these calls would appear to be in the ordinary course of their duties." *Id.* *See also United States v. Hammond*, 286 F.3d 189, 192 (4th Cir. 2002) (The law enforcement exception rendered the recording of prisoner's telephone conversations permissible where the facility was acting pursuant to its well-known policies in the ordinary course of its duties in taping the calls.); *United States v. Feekes*, 879 F.2d 1562, 1565-1566 (7th Cir. 1989) (finding law enforcement exception was clearly satisfied where federal prison regulations authorized the tape recording of all prisoner calls, except to prisoners' lawyers, and inmate's calls were recorded in accordance with routine practice, which was the "ordinary course" for the officers who supervised the monitoring system); *United States v. Paul*, 614 F.2d 115, 117 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 446 U.S. 941, 100 S.Ct. 2165, 64 L.Ed.2d 796 (1980) (finding that the law enforcement exception applied where the monitoring took place within the ordinary course of the correctional officers' duties).

Source URL: <http://ctas-eli.ctas.tennessee.edu/reference/telephone-use>

