

July 2017
MPT-1 Library:
Peek et al. v. Doris Stern
and Allied Behavioral
Health Services

EXCERPTS FROM FRANKLIN CRIMINAL CODE**§ 35-210 Misdemeanor Sentencing; Probation**

For a person convicted of a misdemeanor, the court may impose a jail sentence not to exceed 12 months. The court may suspend the jail sentence and place the person on probation for a term not to exceed three years. When placing a person on probation, the court shall determine the conditions of probation.

§ 35-211 Probation Services

- (a) Each county shall appoint a County Probation Officer who shall be an employee of the county and shall provide probation services to the county as required by the Criminal Code, either directly or through other entities as provided by law.
- (b) Any county may elect to provide probation services for those convicted of misdemeanors by contracting with a private entity, provided that the private entity:
 - 1. Shall be a nonprofit entity.
 - 2. Shall receive approval from the County Probation Officer of an annual Plan of Services which must include
 - (i) oversight of those on probation;
 - (ii) monthly meetings with those on probation unless otherwise ordered;
 - (iii) drug and alcohol testing; and
 - (iv) drug and alcohol counseling, anger management counseling, vocational and mental health counseling, and referral to educational programs.
 - 3. Shall require that each individual providing such services possess at least a bachelor's degree in the relevant professional field or its equivalent as determined by the County Probation Officer.
 - 4. Shall submit to the County Probation Officer quarterly reports listing the names of probationers served during that quarter, the services provided to those probationers, and any other information required by the County Probation Officer, and shall receive approval of those reports from the County Probation Officer.
 - 5. Shall submit to the County Probation Office an annual report of services provided and all expenses incurred and receive approval of that report from the County.

Lake v. Mega Lottery Group
United States Court of Appeals (15th Cir. 2009)

Olivia Lake sued the Mega Lottery Group pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, claiming that it fired her without due process. Mega moved to dismiss the complaint, arguing that as a private actor, it cannot be sued under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The district court dismissed the complaint. Lake appealed. The sole issue on appeal is whether Mega acted as a state actor when it fired Lake. We affirm.

42 U.S.C. § 1983 provides for a cause of action against persons acting under color of state law who have violated rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution. *Buckley v. City of Redding*, 66 F.3d 190 (9th Cir. 1995). The Constitution's due process clause applies to states but not to private actors. However, private actors are not always free from suit for violating the Constitution. Constitutional standards protect those harmed by private actors when it is fair to say that the state is responsible for the offending conduct. To succeed on a § 1983 civil rights claim against a private actor, a claimant must prove that the private actor was a state actor.

To determine if an apparently private actor may still be a state actor, no one set of circumstances or criteria is sufficient. Rather, courts typically consider the range of circumstances when characterizing a private actor as a state actor for § 1983 purposes. Each set of factual circumstances must be examined in light of the critical question: whether "the State is responsible for the specific conduct of which the plaintiff complains." *Brentwood Acad. v. Tennessee Secondary Sch. Athletic Ass'n*, 531 U.S. 288 (2001).

There are two tests of those circumstances creating state action that are pertinent to Lake's claims. First, state action exists where the private actor was engaged in a public function delegated by the state. If the private actor exercises a function that has traditionally been a public or sovereign function, the private actor is not free from constitutional limits when performing that function. Second, a private actor engages in state action when the state exercises its coercive or influential power over the private actor or when there are pervasive entanglements between the private actor and the state. Under this test, "a state normally can be held responsible for a private decision only when it has exercised coercive power or has provided such significant encouragement . . . that the choice must in law be deemed to be that of the state." *Rendell-Baker v. Kohn*, 457 U.S. 830 (1982).

Under either of these two tests, there is a further requirement to find state action: there must be such a “close nexus between the State and the challenged action that seemingly private behavior may be fairly treated as that of the state itself.” *Brentwood*.

Public function

Lake claims that Mega is engaged in a public function, relying on *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42 (1988), and on *Camp v. Airport Festival* (15th Cir. 2001). In *West*, a privately employed doctor was a state actor when he was employed to provide medical care to inmates in a state prison. The state is required to provide medical care to those it imprisons, and when the doctor contracted with the state to provide that care, he became a state actor.

In *Camp*, the plaintiff sued Airport Festival, a private nonprofit entity created to organize an aviation festival, for violating his First Amendment rights when he was arrested for leafleting during the festival. The city’s police department had been directed to follow the instructions of festival organizers regarding security and arrests. Only the state has the power to deprive persons of their freedom by arresting them. When festival organizers accepted the authority to instruct the police regarding arrests, festival organizers became state actors.

Other examples of activities found to be public functions constituting state action include operating a local primary election, operating a post office, and providing for public safety through fire protection and animal control. Courts have narrowly construed the public function test to require that the action be one that is exclusively within the state’s powers. Thus, courts have rejected claims that those who operate hospitals, privately owned public utilities, or schools, or provide foster care are performing public functions. While the state sometimes performs these functions, they are not traditionally the *exclusive* prerogative of the state. Over the years, private organizations have often initiated and performed these functions.

Here, the State of Franklin established a state-operated lottery in 1985. In 2005, due to the financial costs of operating a lottery, Franklin entered into a contract with Mega to operate the lottery, with the profits reverting to the state. Operating a lottery is not a traditional function of state government. Many private entities operate similar activities through racetracks, casinos, sweepstakes, and other activities. Thus, Mega is not engaged in a public function.

State coercion or influence, or pervasive entanglement

Lake next argues that there is state action because the state has coerced or influenced Mega to act. Lake argues that because Franklin contracts with Mega to operate the lottery, with the profits from the lottery becoming state proceeds, its influence over Mega is significant, if not coercive. She also argues that Franklin coerces Mega through its extensive regulation of the lottery, making Mega an agent of the state.

Lake's argument fails in light of the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in *Rendell-Baker*. That case involved employees who claimed that their First Amendment rights were violated when they were discharged by a private school. The plaintiffs argued that the state's extensive regulation of education made the school a state actor. The Court rejected this argument because the state did not regulate, encourage, or compel the private board of trustees to fire the employees. Any government regulation was directed to education of the children, and did not compel the board to follow any particular personnel policies.

The state's exercise of its coercive power or influence must be such that the private choice can be said to be that of the state. Lake has failed to show any evidence that the State of Franklin required, recommended, or even knew about this, or any, personnel action. What the state regulates is the operation of the lottery, not the hiring and firing of Mega's employees.

Lake also argues that even if the state did not coerce Mega, there are additional pervasive state-private entanglements. She relies on *Brentwood*, 531 U.S. at 288. There, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the "nominally private character of the Association" could not overcome the pervasive entanglement with public institutions. Lake maintains that Franklin and Mega are entangled because of Franklin's heavy regulation of the lottery.

In *Brentwood*, the defendant Association regulated interscholastic athletic competition among public and private high schools in Tennessee. The Association's board found that Brentwood, one of the Association's member schools, had violated a rule prohibiting "undue influence" in recruiting athletes and, among other things, declared Brentwood's teams ineligible to compete in playoffs for two years. Brentwood sued the Association, alleging violation of its First and Fourteenth Amendment rights when the school was penalized for violating Association rules. The Association argued that it was not a state actor. The Court found that the Association's board of directors was composed primarily of representatives of public schools. The board effectively operated the sports program for the state's public high schools. The State Department

of Education formally adopted the Association's rules as the rules for public school sports programs. Based on these findings, the Court rejected the Association's claim, concluding that the relationship of the public schools and the Association constituted a pervasive entanglement that made the Association a state actor.

Lake also points to the pervasive entanglements in *Camp* as analogous to the State's control here over the lottery. In *Camp*, although the festival was organized by a nonprofit entity, the city permitted the festival to use the airport grounds at no cost; the city's personnel were extensively involved in planning for the festival while on city time and at city expense; the city promoted the festival through its tourism bureau; and the city's airport personnel controlled access of airplanes during the festival's air show. As noted *supra*, the city's police and first responders were effectively turned over to the festival organizers for the duration of the festival. These entanglements were extensive.

In contrast, the primary relationship between the State of Franklin and Mega is a contract, no different from that between the state and any other contractor. The State of Franklin contracts with private entities to build its buildings, deliver food for its prisoners, and furnish office supplies to state legislators, to name but a few contracts. These contracts do not constitute the sort of pervasive entanglement necessary to constitute state action. When the state enters into a contract to build a state building, the contract demands compliance with many regulations, yet it is left to the contractor to execute the contract. Franklin does not involve itself in the governance of Mega. It does not endorse Mega's personnel policies as the state had in *Brentwood* when the state Department of Education approved the Association's rules. Nor does Franklin involve itself directly in the operation of Mega as the city did in running the airport festival at issue in *Camp*.

Connection to offending conduct: nexus

Even if Lake had met one or both of the tests discussed above, Lake has failed to meet the further requirement of *Rendell-Baker* that there be a nexus, meaning a connection, between the state and the challenged action. That is, Lake has not shown that the offending conduct—her being discharged without due process—was somehow connected to the state's influence over Mega. Lake was discharged by Mega in the same way that any private corporation fires any employee. The state played no role in the discharge, so Lake cannot show the required nexus. Lake offers no facts that rise to the level of the circumstances where the state and private parties

MPT-1 Library

have acted in concert to engage in denial of a party's civil rights. Mega's only participation with the state is to contract with the state to operate the lottery. Mega did not involve the state in any way in its decision to fire Lake.

Affirmed.

