

PRISONERS RIGHTS

- Ruffin v Commonwealth (1871): prisoners are “slaves” of the state; have no Constitutional rights
- Fulwood v Clemmer (1962): recognized Black Muslims as a legitimate religion and allowed them to hold worship services just like inmates of other faiths
- Cooper v Pate (1964): state prisoners have Constitutional rights; can sue state officials in federal court under Section 1983; end of “hands off doctrine”
- Johnson v Avery (1969): “jailhouse lawyers” can provide legal assistance to inmates
- Holt v Sarver (1970): “totality of conditions” in Arkansas prisons violated Eighth Amendment...cruel and unusual punishment
- U.S. v Hitchcock (1972): a cell is not a house so it is o.k. to conduct warrantless searches; any documentary evidence found can be used in court
- Gates v Collier (1972): “totality of conditions” at Mississippi State Penitentiary deprived inmates of basic Constitutional rights
- Estelle v Gamble (1976): corrections personnel cannot exhibit “deliberate indifference” to serious medical needs of prisoners
- Bounds v Smith (1977): prison authorities must provide adequate law libraries/legal assistance for inmates
- Bell v Wolfish (1979): may conduct body searches after contact visits if the need to do so outweighs the personal rights invaded
- Rhodes v Chapman (1981): O.K. to “double bunk” inmates
- Turner v Safley (1987): banned correspondence between inmates in different correctional institutions...”reasonableness test”, ie. reasonable because related to legitimate penological interest (security/safety)
- Helling v McKinney (1993): led to ban on tobacco in most prisons because secondary smoke constituted a health risk...Eighth Amendment

Pargo v Elliott (1995): differences in programs between male/female prisons do not necessarily violate the “equal protection” clause of the Constitution

Johnson v Johnson (2005): must provide equal protection for sexually abused gay inmates

Johnson v California (2005): O.K. to racially segregate new inmates in double cells for first sixty days if it served a “compelling interest” to promote prison safety