





# **DPS TRAINING BULLETIN**

LEGAL BULLETIN NO. 198 March 6, 1996

SURREPTITIOUS USE OF VIDEO MONITORING IN PRIVATE RESIDENCE

<u>Reference:</u> State of Alaska v. Edward Page, Jr. Alaska Court of Appeals Opinion No. 1458 \_\_\_\_\_P.2d\_\_\_\_\_ February 9, 1996

#### FACTS:

Edward Page was suspected of selling cocaine. Police hid videotape equipment in a Fairbanks apartment and, through an informant, arranged for Page to come there to make a delivery of cocaine. Police had placed three video cameras in the apartment-one focused on the parking area and front door to the building, another on an amusement arcade across the street, with the third placed inside a non-functioning television set in the living room of the apartment. Page asked the Superior Court to suppress the videotapes of him taken by police.

#### ISSUE:

Were police required to obtain a <u>Glass</u> warrant before they recorded Page's activities?

HELD: Yes.

### **REASONING:**

1. If a person engages in a conversation that is protected from electronic monitoring under <u>Glass</u> and if this conversation occurs in a place where the person has a reasonable expectation of <u>visual</u> <u>privacy</u>, the police must secure a warrant before surreptitiously videotaping the conversation, <u>even if they turn the sound off</u>. (emphasis added)

2. Just as the Alaska Constitution, as construed in <u>Glass</u>, protected Page against surreptitious electronic monitoring or recording of his words to the undercover officer (informant), our State's Constitution also protected Page from surreptitious photography or videotaping of that meeting. LEGAL BULLETIN NO. 198 March 6, 1996

Page 2

<u>3.</u> Because of the value society places on individual privacy, we cannot give police unfettered discretion to decide when electronic monitoring of private conversations might be justified to detect or prevent illegal conduct. The same holds true for clandestine videtaping of <u>non-public</u> activities.

#### NOTES:

In this case, the court did not suppress the videotapes of the "public areas" outside the apartment. The court said, whereas he had no expectation of privacy outside the apartment, Page did have an expectation of privacy when he went inside the apartment.

## NOTE TO SUBSCRIBERS TO THE ALASKA LEGAL BRIEFS MANUAL:

Add this case to Section L, "Participant Monitoring," of your Contents and Text. File Legal Bulletin No. 198 numerically under Section R of the manual.