



A Practical Guide to Taping Phone Calls and In-Person Conversations in the 38 "one-party consent" States.

Introduction

At first, the question of whether or not to tape record a phone call seems like a matter of personal preference. Some journalists see taping as an indispensable tool, while others don't like the formality it may impose during an interview. Some would not consider taping a call without the subject's consent, others do it routinely.

However, there are important questions of law that must be addressed first. There are both federal and state statutes governing the use of electronic recording equipment. The unlawful use of such equipment can give rise not only to a civil suit by the "injured" party, but also criminal prosecution.

Accordingly, it is critical that journalists know the statutes that apply and what their rights and responsibilities are when recording and disclosing communications.

Although most of these statutes address wiretapping and eavesdropping -- listening in on conversations of others without their knowledge -- they usually apply to electronic recording of any conversations, including phone calls and in-person interviews.

Federal law allows recording of phone calls and other electronic communications with the consent of at least one party to the call. A majority of the states and territories have adopted wiretapping statutes based on the federal law, although most have also extended the law to cover in-person conversations. Thirty-eight states and the District of Columbia permit individuals to record conversations to which they are a party without informing the other parties that they are doing so. These laws are referred to as "one-party consent" statutes, and as long as you are a party to the conversation, it is legal for you to record it. (Nevada also has a one-party consent statute, but the state Supreme Court has interpreted it as an all-party rule.)

It shouldn't need to be said, but it is illegal in all states to record a conversation to which you are not a party, do not have consent to tape, and could not naturally overhear.

Federal law and most state laws also make it illegal to disclose the contents of an illegally intercepted call or communication.

At least fifteen states have laws outlawing the use of hidden cameras in private places. Be warned, however, that the audio portion of a videotape will be treated under the regular wiretapping laws in any state. Also, many of the statutes

concern unattended hidden cameras, not cameras hidden on a person engaged in a conversation. And regardless of whether a state has a criminal law regarding cameras, undercover recording in a private place can prompt civil lawsuits for invasion of privacy.

This guide provides a quick reference to the specific provisions of each jurisdiction's wiretap law. It outlines whether one-party or all-party consent is required to permit recording of a conversation, and provides the legal citations for wiretap statutes. Some references to case law have been provided in instances where courts have provided further guidance on the law. Penalties for violations of the law are described, including criminal penalties (jail and fines) and civil damages (money that a court may order the violator to pay to the subject of the taping). Instances where the law specifically includes cellular calls and the wireless portion of cordless phone calls are also noted, but many laws are purposely broad enough to encompass such calls without specifically mentioning them.

Note that these are general discussions, and you will have to consult the state entries to see how these issues apply in particular states.

Tape-recording laws at a glance

	Is consent of all parties required?	Are there criminal penalties?	Does the statute allow for civil suits?	Is there a specific hidden camera law?	Are there additional penalties for disclosing or publishing information?
<i>Federal</i>		✓	✓		✓
Alabama		✓		✓	✓
Alaska		✓		✓	✓
Arizona		✓			
Arkansas		✓		✓	
Colorado		✓			✓
Delaware		✓	✓	✓	✓
D.C.		✓	✓		✓
Georgia		✓		✓	
Hawaii		✓	✓		✓
Idaho		✓	✓		✓
Indiana		✓	✓		✓
Iowa		✓			✓
Kansas		✓			✓

Kentucky		✓			✓
Louisiana		✓	✓	✓	✓
Maine		✓	✓	✓	✓
Minnesota		✓	✓		✓
Mississippi		✓	✓		✓
Missouri		✓	✓	✓	✓
Nebraska		✓	✓		✓
New Jersey		✓	✓		✓
New Mexico		✓	✓		✓
New York		✓			✓
North Carolina		✓	✓		✓
North Dakota		✓			✓
Ohio		✓	✓		✓
Oklahoma		✓			✓
Oregon		✓		✓	
Rhode Island		✓	✓		✓
South Carolina					
South Dakota		✓		✓	
Tennessee		✓	✓	✓	✓
Texas		✓	✓		✓
Utah		✓	✓	✓	✓
Vermont					
Virginia		✓	✓		✓
West Virginia		✓	✓		✓
Wisconsin		✓	✓		✓
Wyoming		✓	✓		✓

Interstate phone calls

In light of the differing state laws governing electronic recording of conversations between private parties, journalists are advised to err on the side of caution when recording or disclosing an interstate telephone call. The safest strategy is to assume that the stricter state law will apply.

For example, a reporter located in the District of Columbia who records a telephone conversation without the consent of a party located in Maryland would not violate District of Columbia law, but could be liable under Maryland law. A court located in the District of Columbia may apply Maryland law, depending on its "conflict of laws" rules. Therefore, an aggrieved party may choose to file suit in either jurisdiction, depending on which law is more favorable to the party's claim.

Federal law may apply when the conversation is between parties who are in different states, although it is unsettled whether a court will hold in a given case that federal law "pre-empts" state law.

Papillon Technology
Langdale Silver Birch Avenue Epping Essex CM16 6LB United Kingdom
Website: <http://www.papillontechnology.com/>
Email: support@papillontechnology.com
Tel +44 (0)1992 560487 Fax +44 (0)1992 560489

The texts of Papillon Technology documents (including website pages, in any medium, electronic or otherwise) are strictly for information purposes only. Whilst every effort is made to ensure that the information provided in any such format is accurate, no guarantees for the currency or accuracy of information are made or implied. We strongly recommend that independent legal advice is sought in all circumstances relating to any of the above issues.