

AUDIO RECORDINGS BY HOME SECURITY MONITORS

Phone: (517) 373-8080
<http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa>

House Bill 5421 as introduced
Sponsor: Rep. Graham Filler
Committee: Judiciary
Complete to 2-10-20

Analysis available at
<http://www.legislature.mi.gov>

SUMMARY:

House Bill 5421 would amend the Michigan Penal Code to exempt recordings made by a home security monitoring device from the ban on using a device to eavesdrop on a private conversation.

Currently, the Penal Code prohibits using a device to *eavesdrop* on a private conversation unless all the parties to the conversation consent. (*Eavesdrop*, as defined in the code, means to overhear, record, amplify, or transmit the conversation.) A violation is a felony punishable by imprisonment for up to two years or a fine of up to \$2,000, or both. However, section 539d of the Penal Code allows security monitoring in a residence if the monitoring is conducted by or at the direction of the owner or principal occupant of that residence and is not conducted for a lewd or lascivious purpose.

The bill would amend the Penal Code to exempt the use of a device for purposes of security monitoring in a residence, if conducted in conformity with section 539d, from the ban on using a device to eavesdrop on a conversation without the consent of all the parties.

MCL 750.539c

FISCAL IMPACT:

House Bill 5421 could result in a savings for the state and for local units of government, but it is not possible to know the extent of the savings, because it is not known how many convictions would be avoided because people are using devices for purposes of security monitoring in residences under provisions of section 539d. Fewer felony convictions would result in a savings for state prisons and state probation supervision. In fiscal year 2019, the average cost of prison incarceration in a state facility was roughly \$39,400 per prisoner, including various fixed administrative and operational costs. State costs for parole and felony probation supervision averaged about \$3,800 per supervised offender in the same year. Those costs are all financed with state general fund/general purpose revenue. Fewer cases going to court would result in a savings for local court systems. A reduction in the amount of penal fine revenue collected would mean less revenue for public and county law libraries, the constitutionally designated recipients of those revenues.

Legislative Analyst: Susan Stutzky
Fiscal Analyst: Robin Risko

■ This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House Fiscal Agency staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.