Table of Contents

Volume One

List of Contributors *v*
About the Editor *vii*
Foreword *ix* *Norval Morris*
Foreword to the Original Edition *xi* *Morris E. Lasker*
Preface *xv*

SECTION I
An Overview of Prison Law

CHAPTER 1
Introduction

Reflections of a Federal Judge *Frank A. Kaufman* *1-3*
Notes *1-8*

Resolving Prisoners' Grievances Out of Court: 42 U.S.C. § 1997e
Harvard Law Review
Introduction *1-11*
Recommendations of the Federal Courts Study Committee *1-12*
Elements of a Fair and Effective Prisoner Grievance System *1-17*
Conclusion *1-21*
Notes *1-22*
Appendix *1-31*

The Prisoners' Mail Box and the Evolution of Federal Inmate Rights *Ira P. Robbins*
Introduction *1-33*
Federal Prisoners Before the Federal Prison System: 1789-1891 *1-34*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

The Three Prisons Act and Its Immediate Aftermath *1-35*
The Early Days of the Federal Prison System *1-36*
Early Procedures for Prisoner Complaints *1-38*
The Prisoners' Mail Box and the Evolution of Inmate Rights *1-40*
Expanding Scope/Expanding Concerns *1-45*
Transition to the Future *1-53*
Conclusion *1-54*
Notes *1-56*

The Trauma of the Incarceration Experience *Mika'il DeVeaux*
Introduction *1-80*
I. Psychological Effects of Incarceration *1-81*
A. Trauma *1-84*
B. A Concern Related to Public Safety *1-86*
II. The Incarceration Experience *1-88*
A. Sing Sing Prison *1-91*
B. Clinton Dannamora *1-94*
C. Special Housing Units *1-95*
D. Happy Nap *1-97*
III. Conclusion *1-99*

CHAPTER 1A
Correctional Developments

The State of Corrections Today: A Triumph of Pluralistic Ignorance *Allen F. Breed*
Introduction *1A-3*
Public Attitudes Over Time *1A-4*
The Emergence of Crime and Corrections as Major Issues *1A-6*
The Politicization of Crime and Corrections *1A-8*
The Public Attitude Today *1A-9*
The Lessons Learned *1A-10*

The Use of Incarceration in the United States: A Look at the Present and the Future *Lynn Sanders Branham*
Preface and Summary of Recommendations *1A-13*
General Recommendations *1A-14*
Recommendations to State and Local Bar Associations *1A-16*
Introduction *1A-16*
The Use of Incarceration—Where We Are Today *1A-18*
How Many People Are Incarcerated in Prisons and Jails? *1A-18*
Who Is Incarcerated in Prisons and Jails? *1A-20*
How Long Are People Incarcerated in Prisons and Jails? *1A-26*

What Happens During Incarceration in Prison or Jail? *1A-29*
Why Are So Many More People Incarcerated in Prisons and Jails? *1A-32*
More Prison and Jail Sentences *1A-36*
Longer Sentences *1A-37*
More Restrictive Parole and Other Release Policies *1A-37*
Increased Probation and Parole Revocations *1A-38*
Demographic Factors *1A-38*
What Are the Costs, Benefits, and Efficacy of Present Incarceration Policies? *1A-39*
Financial Costs *1A-39*
Opportunity Costs *1A-40*
Other Costs of Incarceration *1A-41*
Crime-Control Benefits and Efficacy *1A-41*
Recommendations for the Future *1A-46*
The Role of State and Local Bar Associations in Sentencing and Corrections Reform *1A-66*
Corrections and Sentencing Committees in Each State Bar Association *1A-67*
Appointment of a Liaison to the American Bar Association Criminal Justice Section's Corrections and Sentencing Committee *1A-67*
Working with Other Organizations *1A-67*
Training *1A-68*
Public Education *1A-69*
Monitoring *1A-70*
Conclusion *1A-71*
Notes *1A-72*
Appendix: Model Adult Community Corrections Act *1A-82*

The Return of the Chain Gang *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *1A-101*
Problems with the Concept *1A-101*
Conclusion *1A-104*
Notes *1A-104*

Designing a Prisoner Reentry System Hardwired to Manage Disputes *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction: The Reentry Problem *1A-110*
I. Three Principles for an Effective Reentry System *1A-111*
II. Past Solutions: Parole and the Rehabilitative Ideal *1A-113*
A. The Rehabilitative Ideal Failed to Follow Three Principles of DSD *1A-114*
B. Resulting Critiques of the Rehabilitative Ideal *1A-115*
C. The Fall of the Rehabilitative Ideal *1A-118*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

III. The Status Quo: Supervised Release and the Rise of the Reentry Court Model *1A-120*
A. Supervised Release *1A-120*
B. The Rise of Reentry Courts *1A-121*
IV. Improving on the Status Quo: Designing a Sustainable System to Manage Reentry Disputes *1A-124*
A. Involving Stakeholders in the Design and Implementation of the System *1A-124*
B. Timing: Approaching a Mutually Hurting Stalemate *1A-128*
C. Sustainability: Revisiting and Reevaluating the System *1A-130*
Conclusion *1A-131*

Second Looks & Second Chances *Shon Hopwood*
Introduction *1A-134*
I. Second Looks Have a Long Historical Pedigree and are a Worthwhile Policy Goal *1A-139*
A. There is a Long History of Second Look Provisions in the Federal Justice System *1A-139*
B. Providing a Second Chance to Those Who are Deserving Comes with a Number of Benefits *1A-141*
II. Federal Judges Can Reduce Sentences for People Whose Cases Present "Extraordinary or Compelling Reasons" Under the Compassionate Release Statute in 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(I) *1A-147*
A. The History of Second Look Compassionate Release and Its Expanding Development *1A-147*
C. Circumstances Presenting "Extraordinary and Compelling Reasons" for a Sentence Reduction *1A-155*
III. Congress Should Create a True Second Look Provision, Requiring a Federal Judge to Reevaluate a Sentence after a Prisoner has Served Ten Years *1A-157*
IV. U.S. Attorneys Can Dismiss Charges Under Holloway Relief for Deserving Prisoners who were Over-Sentenced *1A-158*
V. The President Should Commute the Sentences of Those Who Were Unable to Seek Relief Through the Judicial System, But Who Have a Demonstrated Record of Rehabilitation and Who Have Been Sentenced Too Harshly *1A-161*
Conclusion *1A-164*

The Prisoner Trade *Emma Kaufman*
Introduction *1A-166*
I. Building the American Penal Estate *1A-171*
A. The Rise of Regional Prison Governance *1A-171*
B. The Law of Prison Transfers *1A-179*
II. The Prison Network *1A-187*
A. State Sunshine Statutes *1A-188*
B. Interstate Prison Pathways *1A-191*

C. Rationales for Prisoner Transportation *1A-197*
III. Regulating the Prisoner Trade *1A-204*
A. The Harms *1A-205*
B. The Benefits *1A-215*
C. Outsourcing the Power to Punish *1A-218*
D. Consent as a Cure *1A-222*
Conclusion *1A-227*
Appendix *1A-228*

But Who Oversees the Overseers?: The Status of Prison and Jail Oversight in the United States *Michele Deitch*
Introduction *1A-234*
I. The Value of Independent Correctional Oversight *1A-240*
A. What is Oversight? *1A-240*
B. Why is Oversight Important *1A-242*
1. Benefits to Incarcerated People *1A-243*
2. Benefits to Correctional Administrators *1A-243*
3. Benefits to Judges, Prosecutors, Defense Lawyers, and Policymakers *1A-245*
4. Benefits to the Media and the General Public *1A-246*
C. The United States is an Anomaly on the World Stage *1A-247*
II. America'S Overreliance on Court Oversight and its Now-Diminished Role *1A-250*
III. Increasing Calls for Independent Oversight *1A-254*
IV. The Current Research Project: Assessing the State of Prison and Jail Oversight in the United States *1A-265*
A. Project Purpose *1A-265*
B. Research Methodology *1A-266*
C. Defining the Criteria for Inclusion *1A-267*
1. Independence *1A-267*
2. Function *1A-268*
3. Acess *1A-269*
D. Research Findings *1A-270*
(a) Prison Oversight *1A-282*
(b) Statewide Jail Oversight *1A-285*
(c) Local Jail Oversight *1A-289*
(1) Insufficient staffing and funding *1A-289*
(2) Political pressures *1A-293*
(3) Lack of unfettered access to correctional facilities *1A-294*
Conclusion: Two Steps Forward, One Step Back *1A-295*

Climate Change and the Threat to U.S. Jails and Prisons *1A-299*
Laurie Levinson
I. Introduction *1A-300*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

II. The Tragedy in Surfside *1A-304*
III. Climate Change and Its Impact on Correctional Facilities *1A-308*
A. Step #1: Recognize There Is a Problem with U.S. Jails and Prisons *1A-313*
B. Step #2: Conduct a Comprehensive Study of the Physical Condition of U.S. Jails and Prisons *1A-314*
C. Step #3: Prepare a Climate Change Impact Report for Vulnerable Institutions *1A-315*
D. Step #4: Assess and Allocate Money for Rebuilding Prisons *1A-316*
E. Step #5: Address Political Resistance to Rebuilding Prisons *1A-317*
F. Step #6: Create a Transparent Process for Groups to Monitor Prison Conditions *1A-317*
G. Step #7: Let Science Guide the Design *1A-318*
H. Step #8: Collaborate with International Efforts *1A-319*
I. Step #9: Engage Detainees in Efforts to Protect Prisons and Prisoners *1A-321*
J. Step #10: Address How Mass Incarceration Contributes to Climate Change *1A-322*
IV. Ten Steps for Coping with Climate Change and Its Impact on Correctional Institutions *1A-311*
V. Add Repair and Reconstruction of Correctional Facilities to Subsequent Infrastructure Bills *1A-324*
VI. Conclusion *1A-326*
Appendix *1A-329*

CHAPTER 1B
Overview of the Law of Prisoners' Rights and Remedies

Prisoners' Rights and Procedural Means of Enforcement Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 *Georgetown Law Journal*
Introduction *1B-4*
Prisoners' Rights *1B-4*
Right of Access to Courts *1B-7*
Freedoms of Speech, Association, and Religion *1B-16*
Rights Related to Searches, Seizures, and Personal Privacy *1B-23*
Rights Related to Conditions of Confinement and The Use of Force Against Prisoners *1B-27*
Rights to Procedural Due Process *1B-39*
Right to Equal Treatment *1B-49*
Right to Assistance of Counsel *1B-54*
Rights of Pretrial Detainees *1B-55*
Procedural Means of Enforcement Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 *1B-63*
Scope of § 1983 *1B-63*

Available Remedies Under § 1983 *1B-76*
Filing a § 1983 Action Pro Se and Proceeding In Forma Pauperis *1B-84*
Other Restrictions Imposed by the PLRA *1B-89*
Persons Liable Under § 1983 *1B-94*
Absolute and Qualified Immunity from Suit Under § 1983 *1B-100*
Other Affirmative Defenses *1B-111*
Appointment of Counsel *1B-115*
Other Procedural Issues Governing § 1983 Actions *1B-116*

CHAPTER 2
Legal Developments

The Legacy of *Wolfish* and *Chapman*: Some Thoughts About "Big Prison Case" Litigation in the 1980s *David J. Gottlieb*
Introduction *2-3*
Conditions Litigation Prior to *Wolfish* *2-4*
The Rise and Fall of the "Hands Off" Doctrine *2-4*
Early Prison-Conditions Litigation *2-5*
Early Jail-Conditions Litigation *2-6*
The Road to *Wolfish* *2-8*
Bell v. Wolfish *2-9*
Post-*Wolfish* Litigation *2-11*
Rhodes v. Chapman *2-15*
Post-*Chapman* Litigation *2-17*
Totality of Conditions vs. Core Conditions *2-17*
Experts and Proof *2-19*
Equitable Relief *2-21*
Conclusion *2-24*
Notes *2-25*

***Wilson v. Seiter:* Less Than Meets the Eye** *David J. Gottlieb*
Introduction *2-33*
Wilson v. Seiter *2-34*
The Relevance of Intent *2-36*
The Meaning of Deliberate Indifference *2-39*
Estelle v. Gamble *2-39*
Deliberate Indifference in Class-Action Cases *2-41*
Deliberate Indifference in Prison-Conditions Cases *2-42*
The Question of Cost *2-42*
Litigation After *Wilson* *2-44*
Conclusion *2-46*
Notes *2-47*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Modification of Consent Decrees *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *2-53*
Rufo v. Inmates of Suffolk County Jail *2-53*
Analysis *2-55*
Conclusion *2-58*
Notes *2-59*

***Farmer v. Brennan:* A Subjective Standard for Deliberate Indifference** *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *2-63*
Farmer v. Brennan *2-63*
Analysis *2-66*
Conclusion *2-68*
Notes *2-69*

Symbolic Statutes and Real Laws: The Pathologies of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act and the Prison Litigation Reform Act *Mark Tushnet and Larry Yackle*
Introduction *2-75*
The AEDPA and the PLRA: Studies in Interpretation *2-76*
General Background *2-77*
Habeas Corpus: Reform Proposals *2-77*
Prisoner Litigation: Developments and Reform Proposals *2-82*
Limiting Relief to Identifiable Violations *2-83*
Limiting "Micromanagement" *2-84*
Easing Standards for Modifying and Lifting Decrees *2-84*
Adoption of the Proposals *2-87*
The Habeas Corpus Revisions in the AEDPA *2-87*
Felker v. Turpin *2-87*
Revising Habeas Corpus: Some Case Studies *2-89*
Delays and Timetables *2-90*
Filing Deadlines for Prisoners *2-90*
Timetables for Federal Court Action *2-94*
Procedural Bar Rules *2-95*
Default in Successive Petition Cases *2-95*
Default with Respect to Fact Development *2-96*
Default in Death Penalty Cases *2-99*
Previous State Court Judgments on the Merits *2-99*
The Prison Litigation Reform Act *2-102*
Restricting Institutional Litigation: The Statute *2-103*
Introduction *2-103*
General Considerations *2-103*
Prospective Relief Generally, Including Modification *2-105*
Modifying Decrees Now in Force *2-109*

Limiting Frivolous Litigation *2-111*
The AEDPA and the PLRA as Case Studies in Legislative and Judicial Process *2-115*
Accounting for the Judicial Responses *2-115*
Two Positive Accounts *2-115*
Methods of Interpreting the Statutes as Stabilizers of the Law *2-116*
The "Constitutional" Lens *2-116*
The "Administrative" Lens *2-116*
The "Policy" Lens *2-117*
The "Realistic" Lens *2-117*
Instrumental, Expressive, and Symbolic Statutes *2-117*
First-Order Instrumental Statutes *2-118*
Direct Effects on Incentives *2-118*
Indirect Effects on Incentives: Reconstitutive Law *2-119*
Expressive or Second-Order Instrumental Statutes *2-120*
Searching for "Loopholes" in the Details *2-121*
Obscuring the Message Through the Details *2-121*
Symbolic Statutes *2-122*
Conclusion *2-122*
Notes *2-123*

The PLRA and AEDPA: Implications for Federal District Judges
Harvard Law Review *2-149*
Introduction *2-149*
Historical Background *2-150*
The Warren Court *2-150*
The Expansion of Rights for Prisoners and Criminal Defendants *2-151*
The Rehnquist Court *2-152*
The Statutes *2-153*
The Prison Litigation Reform Act *2-153*
Legislative History *2-153*
Provisions *2-155*
Prospective Relief Restrictions *2-155*
Three-Judge Court Requirement for Population Caps *2-155*
Termination of Prospective Relief *2-156*
The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act *2-157*
Legislative History *2-157*
Provisions *2-158*
"Clearly established law" *2-158*
Circuit Court Certification Requirement *2-159*
The Importance of Federal District Judges *2-159*
The Impact of the PLRA's and AEDPA's Procedural Changes on Prisoners' Rights *2-160*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

The Virtues of Federal, Rather Than State, Courts *2-160*
The Virtues of Trial, Rather Than Appellate, Federal Courts *2-160*
Implications That Should Concern Even Those Who Do Not Support Prisoners' Rights *2-161*
Conclusion *2-162*
Notes *2-162*

The Essential but Inherently Limited Role of the Courts in Prison Reform *Erwin Chemerinsky* *2-173*
Introduction *2-174*
I. The Crisis *2-175*
II. The Causes of the Crisis *2-176*
III. The Courts' Essential but Limited Role *2-178*
Conclusion *2-183*

Prisoners' Rights Strategies for Preserving the Role of the Courts *Margo Schlanger* *2-185*
I. Introduction *2-186*
II. Trends in Prisoner Litigation *2-188*
III. Entry of Relief, Including Settlment *2-192*
A. What the PLRA Requires *2-192*
B. How Parties Continue to Settle Cases *2-194*
1. Acceptable Stipulations *2-194*
2. Conditional Dismissal *2-200*
3. State-Court Enforcement *2-205*
IV. Termination of Prospective Relief *2-207*
A. What the PLRA Requires *2-207*
B. How the Prisoners' Rights Bar has Responded, and Should Respond *2-209*
1. Lengthening the Remedial Period *2-210*
2. Gathering Information *2-212*
V. Conclusion *2-216*
Appendix *2-218*
A. Federal Court Filings (Table 1 & Figure A) *2-218*
B. Prison Population (Table 1 & Figure A) *2-219*
C. Jail Population (Table 1 & Figure A) *2-220*
D. Prison Censuses (Table 2) *2-222*
E. Jail Censuses (Table 2) *2-222*

"When Mercy Seasons Justice": Interstate Recognition of Ex-Offender Rights *Wayne A. Logan* *2-225*
Introduction *2-226*
I. Restoration and Recognition *2-232*
A. Restoration *2-233*

B. Recognition *2-238*
1. Statute or Regulation *2-238*
2. Caselaw *2-240*
II. Potential Constitutional Arguments *2-244*
A. Full Faith and Credit *2-244*
B. Privileges and Immunities *2-251*
C. Right to Travel *2-255*
D. Equal Protection *2-258*
III. Legislative Options *2-262*
A. States *2-262*
1. The Case for Recognition *2-262*
2. The Case Against Recognition *2-265*
3. The Case for a More Conditional Approach *2-267*
B. Congress *2-271*
1. Interstate Compact *2-271*
2. Spending Clause *2-273*
3. Commerce Clause *2-275*
4. Effects Clause *2-277*

Wayne A. Logan *2-225*
Conclusion *2-279*

The Constitutional Law of Incarceration, Reconfigured *Margo Schlanger* *2-281*
Introduction *2-282*
I. Constitutional Regulation of Jail and Prison Conditions: Doctrinal Developments *2-286*
A. Stage 1: Before the 1970s *2-289*
B. Stage 2: *Estelle* Through *Rhodes*, 1976-1981 *2-293*
C. Stage 3: *Whitley* Through *Farmer*, 1986-1994 *2-301*
D. The Problem with "Punishment" *2-309*
II. The Normative Case for a Constitutional Ban on Objectively Unreasonable Force *2-312*
A. Officers Sometimes Inflict Obvious Summary Corporal Punishment *2-313*
B. Officers Sometimes Escalate a Situation that Could Reasonably Be Managed with Minor Force, to Cover Summary Corporal Punishment *2-316*
C. Officers Sometimes Use Excessive Force to Accomplish Legitimate Purposes, Indifferent to the Pain or Injury the Force Inflicts *2-317*
D. Officers Sometimes Use Force that Is Unreasonable Under the Circumstances *2-323*
III. *Kingsley v. Hendrickson* *2-326*
A. The *Kingsley* Majority *2-327*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

B. The *Kingsley* Dissent *2-333*
C. *Kingsley* Requires an Objective Reasonableness Conditions-of-Confinement Standard, Too *2-334*
IV. The Organizational Normative Case for a Constitutional Ban on Objectively Unreasonable Force or Conditions *2-341*
A. Solving the Problem of Culpable Ignorance *2-342*
B. Solving the Problem of a Cost Defense *2-346*
V. The Eighth Amendment "Malicious and Sadistic" and Deliberate Indifference Standards are Wrong, Too *2-349*
Conclusion *2-357*

150% Wrong: The Prison Litigation Reform Act and Attorney's Fees *Eleanor Umphres* *2-361*
Introduction *2-362*
A. Attorney's Fees in America *2-363*
B. The Prison Litigation Reform Act: 42 U.S.C. § 1997e *2-365*
I. The Statute: 42 U.S.C. § 1997e *2-366*
A. Legislative Purpose and History *2-366*
B. The Text in Question: 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(d)—Attorney's Fees *2-369*
II. How 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(d)(2) Has Been Interpreted *2-371*
A. The Prevailing Interpretation *2-371*
B. The Problem with the Prevailing Interpretation *2-374*
1. Fallacy of the Inverse *2-374*
2. Unnecessarily Absurd Results That Deter Meritorious Litigation *2-375*
C. Why Such a Bad Interpretation Has Persisted *2-377*
D. "The Reminder Theory" *2-380*
III. How 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(d) Should Be Interpreted *2-381*
A. Section 1988-Authorized Attorney's Fees in Non-Prisoner Suits *2-381*
B. Section 1988-Authorized Attorney' s Fees Under the PLRA: A Reasonable Interpretation *2-382*
C. "Proportionately Related" *2-384*
IV. Benefits of a Correct Reading *2-388*
Conclusion *2-393*

Completely Exhausted: Evaluating the Impact of *Woodford v. Ngo* on Prisoner Litigation in Federal Courts *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*
Introduction *2-396*
I. *Woodford v. Ngo*: A Primer *2-397*
A. The Administrative Law Exhaustion Doctrine *2-397*
B. The PLRA: The End of Prisoner Litigation in Federal Court? *2-398*

C. *Woodford v. Ngo*: Parsing the Opinion *2-401*
D. Post-*Woodford* Developments *2-405*
II. "Proper" Exhaustion and Prisoner Litigation: What Result? *2-405*
A. Methodology *2-406*
B. Summary: Key Findings *2-412*
III. Analyzing Trends: *Woodford*'s Failure to Block Prisoners' Unexhausted Civil Claims from Entering Federal Court *2-413*
A. Explaining the Outliers *2-413*
B. Outliers vs. The Median *2-417*
C. Knowledge Gaps: Setting Prisoners up to Fail *2-418*
D. Longer Sentences, More Time to File *2-420*
E. *Woodford*'s Impact on the Courts and on Court Proceedings *2-421*
IV. Recommendations *2-422*
Conclusion *2-425*
Appendix *2-426*

SECTION II
Litigating and Enforcing the Rights of Prisoners

CHAPTER 3
The First Amendment

Prisons as Censors *Clair A. Cripe and Ira Kirschbaum*
Introduction *3-3*
The Constitutional Context *3-4*
The Need for Professional Decisionmaking Deference *3-6*
Publications That Pose a Definite Threat *3-9*
To Reject or Not to Reject Other Publications: It Depends on the Particular Situation *3-10*
Sexually Explicit Material *3-13*
What Process Is Due? *3-15*
Conclusion *3-19*
Notes *3-19*

Prisoners' Religious Free Exercise Rights *American University Law Review*
Introduction *3-25*
Background *3-26*
Prisoners' First Amendment Rights *3-26*
Federal Appellate Court Decisions *3-29*
Shabazz v. O'Lone: Facts and Procedural History *3-31*
The District Court's Analysis *3-31*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

The Third Circuit's Analysis *3-32*
The Supreme Court's Analysis *3-32*
Analysis *3-33*
Conclusion *3-37*
Notes *3-37*

Restrictions on Prisoners' Rights to Receive Publications
Harvard Law Review
Introduction *3-59*
Thornburgh v. Abbott *3-59*
Analysis *3-62*
Conclusion *3-65*
Notes *3-65*

In the Belly of the Whale: Religious Practice in Prison
Harvard Law Review
Introduction *3-71*
The Legal Standard for Inmate Religious Claims *3-72*
Correctional Approaches to Religious Accommodation *3-73*
Religious Accommodations in Practice *3-75*
Classification *3-75*
Worship and Pastoral Services *3-77*
Diet *3-78*
Grooming *3-80*
Personal Property *3-81*
Conclusion *3-82*
Notes *3-83*

The Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000
Harvard Law Review *3-95*

Inmate Access to Print Media
Harvard Law Review *3-107*

Gods Behind Bars: Prison Gangs, Due Process, and the First Amendment
Brooklyn Law Review
Introduction *3-120*
I. Due Process: Prisoners' Claims of Deprivation of Constitutional Rights *3-125*
A. The Turner Test *3-125*
B. Turner and Security Threat Group Designation *3-128*
C. Other Legal Approaches to STGs *3-130*
II. First Amendment *3-132*

A. Five Percenters *3-132*
1. Background *3-132*
2. Legal Analysis *3-134*
B. Black Guerilla Family *3-139*
1. Background *3-139*
2. Legal Analysis *3-142*
III. Consequences of STG Designation *3-145*
A. Lost Privileges *3-147*
B. Segregation *3-148*
C. Reporting to Local Law Enforcement on Release *3-150*
D. "Debriefing" *3-150*
IV. Proposals for Change *3-152*
A. The Future of Turner *3-152*
B. Proposed Approaches *3-155*
Conclusion *3-157*

Ineffective Assistance of Library: The Failings and the Future of Prison Law Libraries

Jonathan Abel
Introduction *3-160*
I. The History of Prison Law Libraries *3-166*
A. Prison Law Libraries: 1900 to 1960 *3-166*
1. General-Interest Libraries in Prisons *3-166*
2. Law Libraries in Prisons: The Early History *3-168*
3. Propagating the Prison Law Library Myth *3-171*
B. Prison Law Libraries in the 1960s *3-172*
1. The Courts' Views on Prison Law Libraries *3-173*
2. Prison Officials' Views on Prison Law Libraries *3-174*
II. The Wobbly Path to a Law Library Doctine *3-178*
A. Nonlibrary Access-to-Courts Cases: *Ex Parte Hull and Johnson v. Avery* *3-179*
B. *Younger v. Gilmore*: The First Law Library Case *3-180*
C. *Bounds v. Smith*: The Second Law Library Case *3-183*
D. The Law Library Debate Flipped on its Head *3-185*
1. Inmate Advocates Opposed Law Libraries Insofar as Libraries Became an Impediment to a Postconviction Right to Counsel *3-185*
2. The States' Noninterference Principle *3-190*
III. The Internal Contradictions of the Law Library Doctrine *3-193*
A. *Lewis v. Casey*: The Standing Paradox and the Absence of a Right to "Discover" Claims or to "Litigate Effectively" *3-193*
B. The Mysterious Origins of the Constitutional Right *3-194*
C. The Correct Amount of Access: Which Claims? What Resources? How Effective? *3-196*
D. Circuit Split: Do Pretrial, Pro Se Inmates have a Law Library Right? *3-197*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

A Concluding Note: Technological Changes to the Prison Law Library *3-198*

Holding Federal Prison Officials Accountable: The Case for Recognizing a Damages Remedy for Federal Prisoners' Free Exercise Claims
Nicole B. Godfrey
I. Introduction *3-204*
II. Development of Damages Remedy Against Government Officials for Constitutional Violations *3-209*
A. Damages Against State and Local Officials Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 *3-210*
B. Damages Against Federal Officials Under *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics* *3-211*
C. The Future of *Bivens* *3-218*
III. Extending *Bivens* to Free Exercise Claims Brought by Federal Prisoners *3-226*
A. Is a *Bivens* Remedy for Free Exercise Claims Truly an Extension of *Bivens*? *3-227*
B. Do Special Factors Exist that Would Counsel Hesitation in Expanding the Availability of a *Bivens* Remedy for Free Exercise Claims Brought by Federal Prisoners? *3-231*
C. Has Congress Created an Adequate Alternative Remedy to Address the Violation of Federal Prisoners' Free Exercise Rights? *3-235*
IV. Importance of a Damages Remedy for Substantial Burdens on the Free Exercise of Religion in Prisons *3-244*
A. The Stanford Prison Experiment and the "Lucifer Effect": How Prisons Create an Environment Ripe for Abuse *3-245*
B. The Importance of Religious Rights in Prison *3-248*
C. The Historical Purpose of Punitive Damages *3-250*
V. Conclusion *3-251*

Reading the Prisoner's Letter: Attorney-Client Confidentiality in Inmate Correspondence *Gregory Sisk, Michelle King, Joy Nissen Beitzel, Bridget Duffus, and Katherine Koehler*
Introduction *3-258*
I. Confidentiality in Attorney-Client Correspondence with Prisoners *3-262*
A. Attorney-Client Confidentiality in General *3-263*
B. Attorney-Client Confidentiality and the Inmate *3-265*
1. The Prisoner's Need for Confidentiality in Legal Communications *3-265*
2. The Impact of Invasive Prison Legal Mail Rules on the Availability of Legal Counsel for Prisoners *3-269*
C. The Vital Importance of Legal Mail to the Attorney-Client Relationship *3-271*

II. A Survey of Prison Policies on Legal Mail *3-274*
A. Prison Regulations on Incoming Attorney Mail to Prisoners *3-275*
B. Prison Regulations on Outgoing Prisoner Mail to Attorneys *3-276*
III. Constitutional Protection for Prisoner-Attorney Correspondence *3-277*
A. Prisoner Free Speech and Access to Court Rights to Confidentiality in Attorney Correspondence *3-280*
1. Supreme Court Precedent *3-280*
2. Circuit Precedent (Majority) *3-281*
3. Circuit Precedent (Minority) *3-283*
4. Whether Prison Intrusion Occurs Inside or Outside Presence of Prisoner as Being Irrelevant to Prohibition on Reading *3-284*
B. Prisoner Right to Assistance of Counsel in Criminal Matters and Confidentiality in Attorney Correspondence *3-286*
C. Protecting a Prison's Legitimate Penological Interests *3-288*
1. Protecting Against Introduction of Contraband *3-289*
2. Interrupting Illegal Communications *3-290*
3. Upholding the Critical Need for Attorney-Client Confidentiality *3-292*
D. Reading Versus Inspection Versus Scanning *3-293*
1. Impermissibility of Reading Attorney-Client Letters *3-293*
2. The Danger of Allowing Even Limited Access to the Substantive Contents of Attorney-Client Mail *3-296*
a. Skimming of Legal Mail is a Form of Reading That Would Eviscerate Confidentiality *3-297*
b. The Rare Prospect of the Rogue Lawyer Engaging in Criminal Misconduct *3-298*
c. Nordstrom v. Ryan: Rejecting Skimming and Highlighting Absence of Evidence of Lawyer Abuse of Legal Mail *3-301*
IV. Procedures for Asserting Right to Confidentiality in Prisoner Legal Mail *3-306*
A. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies: The Prison Grievance Process and Legal Mail Cases *3-307*
B. Liberal Construction of Pro Se Prisoner Complaints in Legal Mail Cases *3-311*
C. Standing for Legal Mail Claims *3-313*
1. Proving a Practice or a Policy of Reading or Opening Attorney-Client Mail *3-313*
2. Standing for First Amendment Free Speech Claim *3-314*
3. Standing for Sixth Amendment Right to Counsel Claim *3-316*
a. Showing of Prejudice When Seeking Retrospective Relief *3-316*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

b. No Need to Show Past Prejudice When Seeking Prospective Relief *3-318*
c. The Potential Problem of Mootness *3-320*
4. Standing for Right-of-Access-to-the-Courts Claim *3-322*
D. Retrospective and Prospective Relief in Legal Mail Cases *3-324*
E. Qualified Immunity for Prison Officers in Legal Mail Cases *3-327*
Conclusion *3-329*

CHAPTER 4
Fourth Amendment, Privacy, and Possessory Rights

Fourth Amendment, Privacy and Possessory Rights of Detainees and Prisoners: Recent Supreme Court Decisions *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *4-3*
Block v. Rutherford *4-3*
Hudson v. Palmer *4-5*
Analysis of the Decisions *4-7*
Conclusion *4-10*
Notes *4-10*

CHAPTER 5
Procedural Due Process Rights

Prisoners and Due Process Litigation: An Invitation to the State Courts *Susan N. Herman*
Introduction *5-3*
Due Process Claims *5-4*
Federal Due Process Claims *5-4*
State Constitutions: The New Frontier *5-6*
Perceived Flaws or Eccentricities in the Federal Doctrine *5-7*
Institutional Differences Between State and Federal Courts *5-9*
Distinctive State-Specific Factors *5-10*
Alternative Approaches *5-11*
Conclusion *5-12*
Notes *5-13*

The Supreme Court's Due Process Cases of the 1985 Term *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *5-19*
Daniels v. Williams and *Davidson v. Cannon* *5-19*
Analysis of the Decisions *5-21*

Conclusion *5-24*
Notes *5-25*

Procedural Due Process of Incarcerated Parents in Termination of Parental Rights Proceedings: A Fifty State Analysis *Philip M. Genty*
Introduction *5-29*
Constitutional Requirements in the Determination of Parental Fitness *5-33*
When a Hearing Is Something Less: Streamlined Hearing Procedures *5-37*
Physical Presence at Hearings *5-38*
Disposition of Proceeding Through Summary Judgment *5-39*
Right to Counsel *5-40*
Conclusion *5-40*
Termination of Parental Rights on the Basis of Past Unfitness: "Backward-Looking" Statutes and Cases *5-41*
Rehabilitation of Parents *5-42*
Repeated Criminal Activity or Other Detrimental Conduct *5-43*
Nature of the Parent's Crime *5-44*
Conclusions *5-46*
Termination of Parental Rights on the Basis of Length of Prison Sentence: "Forward-Looking" Statutes and Cases *5-47*
Statutes *5-48*
Cases *5-49*
Conclusions *5-52*
Protecting the Procedural Due Process Rights of Incarcerated Parents: Toward a Constitutionally Acceptable Framework for Termination of Parental Rights *5-53*
Illustrative State Systems *5-54*
Model for Termination of Parental Rights Proceedings Involving Incarcerated Parents *5-61*
Hearing Procedures *5-61*
Duties of Childcare Agency *5-61*
Requirements for Judicial Inquiry Into Parental Fitness *5-62*
Conclusions *5-63*
Notes *5-64*

Due Process and Punishments Imposed by Administrative Proceedings *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *5-109*
Sandin v. Conner *5-110*
Analysis *5-112*
Conclusion *5-114*
Notes *5-115*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

CHAPTER 6
Overcrowding

Prison Overcrowding: The Threat of the 1980s *Robert B. McKay*
Introduction *6-3*
Extent of Prison Overcrowding *6-5*
Prison Population Trends from 1960 to 1983 *6-6*
Jail Inmates *6-6*
Probation and Parole *6-7*
Rates of Crime *6-7*
Causes of Prison Overcrowding *6-9*
Demographic Factors *6-9*
Legislative Responsibility *6-9*
Judicial Responsibility *6-9*
Parole Officials' Responsibility *6-10*
Consequences of Prison Overcrowding *6-10*
Remedies for Prison Overcrowding *6-12*
New Construction or Conversion of Facilities *6-13*
Decriminalization *6-14*
Reducing Mandatory Sentences *6-14*
Alternative Sanctions *6-15*
Restitution *6-15*
Fines *6-15*
Community Service *6-16*
Presumptive Parole *6-16*
Emergency Standby Release Power *6-16*
Conclusion *6-17*
Notes *6-17*

Table of Contents

Volume Two

SECTION II
Litigating and Enforcing the Rights of Prisoners (continued)

CHAPTER 7
The Eighth Amendment

The Defense Perspective on Prison-Conditions Cases
William C. Collins
Introduction *7-3*
The Role of the Judiciary *7-4*
The Status of the Totality-of-Conditions Standard *7-5*
The Impact of *Bell v. Wolfish* and *Rhodes v. Chapman* *7-5*
The Lower Federal Cases *7-6*
Effects of the *Chapman* Trend *7-7*
Relief as a Separate Issue *7-7*
Development of the Law *7-7*
The Relevance of Cost *7-9*
The Precedents Reconsidered *7-10*
Continuing Jurisdiction *7-11*
Relief and the Contempt Power: An Old Idea Revisited *7-12*
Conclusion *7-14*
Notes *7-15*

Excessive Force Against Prisoners *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *7-19*
Hudson v. McMillian *7-19*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Analysis *7-22*
Conclusion *7-24*
Notes *7-25*

Secondhand Smoke Signals from Prison
Michigan Law Review
Introduction *7-29*
The Serious Risk Posed By Secondhand Smoke *7-33*
Secondhand Smoke and the Eighth Amendment *7-36*
The *Helling v. McKinney* Standard *7-36*
Societal Intolerance Toward Significant Exposure *7-38*
The Deliberate Indifference Inquiry *7-42*
Remedying the Eighth Amendment Violation *7-46*
Conclusion *7-52*

Confronting the Helms Amendment *Elizabeth R. Alexander*
Introduction *7-73*
The Helms Amendment Does Not Require Proof of Any Element Not Previously Required to Show an Eighth Amendment Violation Regarding Overcrowding *7-74*
The Helms Amendment Should Not Be Construed as an Attempt to Alter the Eighth Amendment Standard Applicable to Overcrowding *7-76*
The Helms Amendment Does Not Restrict the Equitable Discretion of the Federal Courts to Issue an Injunction Against Overcrowding *7-78*
The Amendment Does Not Preclude Class Action Certification for Prison Overcrowding Cases *7-79*
Section 2 Places No New Restrictions on Federal Court Remedial Powers in Overcrowding Cases *7-81*
Section (b)(1) Does Not Interfere with the Ability of a Federal Court to Place a Ceiling on Overcrowding by Approving a Consent Decree *7-81*
Application of the Helms Amendment to Require Modification of Existing Consent Decrees May Violate the Principles of Separation of Powers and Due Process *7-84*
Section (c) of the Helms Amendment Does Not Change the Standard for Modification *7-85*
Conclusion: What Was Congress Doing in Enacting the Helms Amendment? *7-85*
Notes *7-86*
Appendix *7-91*

Restrictions on Prisoners' Religious Freedom as Unconstitutional Conditions of Confinement: An Eighth Amendment Argument
Duke Law Journal
Introduction *7-93*
The Importance of Protecting the Religious Freedom of Prisoners *7-94*

The Religious Freedom of Prisoners is Poorly Protected *7-95*
The Eighth Amendment May Protect the Religious Freedom of Prisoners *7-96*
Background *7-97*
Applying the *Wilson* Test to Religious Deprivations *7-98*
The Subjective Prong *7-98*
The Objective Prong *7-98*
Objections and Replies *7-102*
Religious Freedom and (Physical?) Pain *7-102*
Pain and the Eighth Amendment *7-102*
The Prison Litigation Reform Act *7-103*
Isn't the First Amendment the Right Way to Protect Free Exercise? *7-104*
Conclusion *7-104*
Notes *7-105*

Managed Health Care in Prisons as Cruel and Unusual Punishment
Ira P. Robbins
Introduction *7-117*
Managed Health Care in Prisons *7-118*
Managed Care *7-118*
Managed Health Care in Prisons *7-119*
The Different Companies *7-120*
Contracts for Services *7-120*
Accreditation Standards *7-120*
The "Deliberate Indifference" Standard *7-121*
History of the Standard *7-121*
Liability of Institutional Defendants *7-123*
Liability of Private Health Care Providers *7-123*
Municipal Liability Based on Acquiescence in Acts of Private Health Care Providers *7-124*
Financial Considerations as Deliberate Indifference *7-125*
Institutional Liability of Private Health Care Providers *7-126*
Challenges Under the Standard *7-126*
Can the Use of Managed Care Constitute "Deliberate Indifference"? *7-128*
Per Se Deliberate Indifference *7-129*
Rebuttable Presumptions of Deliberate Indifference *7-129*
Treatment-Based Controversies *7-131*
Treatment Denied *7-132*
Inefficacious Treatment *7-132*
Treatment Delayed *7-132*
Inadequate Staffing *7-133*
Conclusion *7-134*
Notes *7-134*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Racial Segregation in Prisons *Harvard Law Review* *7-151*

The Deaths in Custody Reporting Act: Status and Recommendations *Ira P. Robbins*

Introduction *7-163*
The Unmet Goals of DICRA *7-165*
The Effectiveness of Reporting Acts *7-167*
The Utility and Limitations of Reporting Statutes Generally *7-167*
California as a Microcosm: The Need for More than Data Collection *7-168*
Why Congress Should Enact Additional Legislation to Supplement DICRA *7-170*
Blueprint for Complementary DICRA Legislation *7-171*
Legislative Tools for Creating Accountability *7-171*
Reporting *7-171*
Investigations and Inspection *7-172*
National Standards *7-173*
Training *7-176*
Conclusion *7-180*
Notes *7-180*

Lessons From Hurricane Katrina: Prison Emergency Preparedness as a Constitutional Imperative *Ira P. Robbins*

Introduction *7-200*
I. Preparing for Hurricane Katrina *7-205*
A. "There was No Plan for this Situation" *7-205*
B. Point of Comparison: The Nebraska Emergency System *7-210*
II. Emergency Preparation and Response in Prisons Generally *7-211*
A. Emergency Training *7-212*
B. Emergency Drills and Exercises *7-214*
C. Planning for Terrorism *7-216*
III. Legal and Moral Issues in Prison Emergency Preparedness *7-218*
A. Emergency Preparedness and the Eighth Amendment *7-218*
1. The Components of an Eighth Amendment Claim *7-220*
2. Applying the Deliberate Indifference Standard to the Orleans Parish Prison *7-223*
a. Officials' Awareness of Serious Risks to Inmates *7-226*
b. OPP Officials Were Deliberately Indifferent by Failing to Take Reasonable Steps to Abate the Risks to Prisoners *7-231*
3. The Defense of Qualified Immunity *7-236*
B. Emergency Preparedness and the Sixth Amendment *7-238*
1. The Rights to Speedy Trial and Counsel: Legal Background *7-239*

2. Hurricane Katrina, the Rights to Speedy Trial and Counsel, and Emergency Planning *7-243*
a. The Right to Speedy Trial *7-243*
b. The Right to Counsel *7-248*
3. What Could Have Been Done Differently? *7-249*
C. Emergency Preparedness and Human Rights Concerns *7-250*
IV. Recommendations *7-255*
A. Reform Through Prisoners' Rights Litigation *7-256*
B. Reform Through Legislation *7-258*
C. Comparing Litigation with Legislation *7-262*
1. Advantages of Litigation *7-262*
2. Advantages of Legislation *7-263*
D. Speedy Trial Recommendations *7-264*
Conclusion *7-266*

Qualified Immunity: Order of Analysis
Harvard Law Review *7-269*

The Psychology of Cruelty Recognizing Grave Mental Harm in American Prisons *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *7-282*
I. Applying Psychological and Neuroscientific Research to the Eighth Amendment Inquiries *7-285*
A. Unconstitutional Punishments: The Proportionality Inquiry *7-285*
B. Unconstitutional Conditions of Confinement *7-289*
II. Using Psychological and Neuroscientific Research as a Basis for Recognizing Grave Mental Harm *7-295*
A. Juvenile Brain Research and the Proportionality Inquiry *7-296*
B. Social Isolation Research and the Conditions of Confinement Inquiry *7-297*
III. Justifying Judicial Action *7-299*
A. Overcoming Institutional Biases: Why the Courts are the Correct Entity to Identify Mental Needs *7-299*
B. Why Courts are Capable of Identifying Grave Mental Harm *7-302*
IV. Conclusion *7-302*

Cruel and Unusual Construction: The Eighth Amendment as a Limit on Building Prisons on Toxic Waste Sites *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*
Introduction *7-306*
I. The Problem: Prisons in Unsafe Locations *7-309*
A. The State Correctional Instiution at Fayette (SCI Fayette), LaBelle, Pennsylvania) *7-311*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

B. Forthcoming: United States Penitentiary Letcher (USP Letcher), (Roxana, Kentucky) *7-311*
II. Cruel and Unusual Prison Conditions: The Case Law *7-313*
A. Development of the Objective and Subjective Requirements *7-315*
B. Future Harm and Deliberate Indifference *7-318*
1. *Helling*: Exposure to Unsafe Conditions *7-318*
2. *Farmer*: Reconciling *Wilson* with *Hutto* and *Rhodes* *7-319*
C. *Brown v. Plata*: System-Wide Violations *7-321*
III. Applying the Legal Framework *7-325*
A. Objective Requirement: The Evidence *7-327*
1. SCI Fayette *7-327*
2. Letcher County *7-330*
B. Subjective Test: Deliberately Indifferent Design *7-332*
1. SCI Fayette *7-332*
2. Letcher County *7-333*
3. Subjectivity and Prospective Relief: An Uneasy Fit *7-334*
IV. Limitations and Solutions *7-336*
A. Federal Courts: The PLRA and Justiciability *7-336*
1. Standing and Ripeness: Limits on Entry *7-336*
2. The PLRA: Limits on Remedies *7-340*
B. State Courts: A Solution Through Subsidiarity *7-342*
Conclusion *7-345*

Promise Amid Peril: PREA's Efforts to Regulate An End to Prison Rape *Brenda V. Smith*

Introduction *7-348*
Background *7-349*
I. The Development of PREA Provided Greater Discover Tools for Prisoners and Their Counsel *7-352*
A. Shining a Light on Agency Practices in the Standards Development Process *7-353*
B. PREA Discovery in Litigation *7-354*
C. Notice and Comment as Admissions *7-357*
II. New Articulations for the Standard of Care in Preventing, Investigating, and Punishing Sexual Abuse in Custody *7-359*
III. Lowering Barriers and Giving New Life to Existing Constitutional and State Law Claims *7-364*
A. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies *7-366*
B. Frivolous Claims *7-367*
C. Physical Injury *7-369*
IV. Litigation Interpreting PREA *7-371*
A. Cases Attempting to Use PREA as a Separate Cause of Action Have Not Succeeded *7-371*
B. PREA's Contribution to the Eighth Amendment Analysis *7-372*

V. Extending Civil Rights and Services to Incarcerated Persons *7-374*
A. Sexual Assault Services for People in Custody *7-374*
B. Limits on Cross-Gender Supervision *7-377*
C. Providing Protections for LGBTQI Persons in Custody *7-380*
Conclusion *7-383*

Excessive Force in Prison *Sharon Dolovich*
Introduction *7-386*
I. Institutional Realities *7-394*
A. Mechanisms of Moral Diengagement in the Modern American Prison *7-394*
B. The Moral Psychology of Excessive Force *7-404*
C. The Psychology of Excessive Force in Action: The Case of *Kingsley* *7-408*
D. Why Individual Liability *7-413*
II. Constitutional Standards *7-420*
A. Governing Doctrine *7-420*
B. The Problem with *Whitley* *7-432*
C. *Kingsley v. Hendrickson*: A Step in the Right Direction *7-432*
D. Objectively Unreasonable Physical Force: Cruel and Unusual Punishment? *7-436*
E. Reasonableness as a Moral Concept *7-436*
F. *Kingsley* and the Limits of Reasonableness *7-453*
G. Reasonableness Force and the Police *7-460*
III. Normative Limits *7-464*
A. The State's Carceral Burden and Cos' Duty to Protect *7-464*
B. Necessity and Governing Values *7-471*
C. *Whitley*, *Kingsley*, and the (Flawed) Grounds for Force *7-482*
D. Putting It All Together *7-487*
Conclusion *7-491*

CHAPTER 8
Death-Row Conditions

Litigating Death-Row Conditions: The Case for Reform
Robert Johnson and John L. Carroll
Introduction *8-3*
Death-Row Confinement Conditions *8-4*
Nature of Conditions *8-4*
Psychological Harms Produced by Death-Row Conditions *8-7*
Attacking Death-Row Conditions: A Litigational History *8-8*
The Nineteenth-Century Experience *8-8*
Death-Row Litigation Before *Gregg* and *Furman* *8-9*
Modern Theories for Enforcing the Rights of Death-Row Inmates *8-10*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Cruel and Unusual Punishment: Totality of Conditions *8-11*
The Due Process Clause: Arbitrary and Capricious Treatment and the Substantive Right Not to Be Confined to Death Row *8-13*
Death Row as Punishment Without Penological Justification: Another Eighth Amendment Approach *8-16*
Core Issues: Out-of-Cell Time and Contact Visitation *8-17*
Out-of-Cell Time *8-17*
Contact Visitation *8-19*
The Texas Success *8-21*
Conclusion *8-22*
Notes *8-23*
Appendix: Stipulations and Orders Regarding Death-Row Conditions, *Ruiz v. McKaskle* *8-27*

CHAPTER 9
Supervisory Liability

Legal Liabilities and Responsibilities of Corrections Agency Supervisors *Rolando v. del Carmen*
Introduction *9-3*
Supervisor Lawsuits Categorized *9-4*
Direct Liability *9-5*
To Clients *9-5*
State Law *9-5*
Federal Law *9-6*
To Subordinates *9-6*
State Law *9-6*
Federal Law *9-8*
Vicarious Liability *9-8*
To Clients *9-9*
State Law *9-9*
Respondeat Superior *9-9*
Policy or Custom *9-9*
Negligence of Supervisors *9-10*
Federal Law *9-17*
To Subordinates *9-20*
Agency Representation and Liability for Acts of Supervisors *9-20*
Conclusion *9-22*
Notes *9-23*

CHAPTER 9A
Overview of the Law of Probation, Supervised Release, Restitution, and Parole

Probation, Supervised Release, Restitution, and Parole
Georgetown Law Journal
Probation *9A-4*
Imposition of Probation *9A-5*
Duration of Probation *9A-8*
Conditions of Probation *9A-9*
Revocation *9A-16*
Supervised Release *9A-25*
Restitution *9A-34*
Parole *9A-42*
Parole Release from Incarceration *9A-42*
Parole Revocation *9A-47*

CHAPTER 10
Parole

The Rights of Parolees *Oliver J. Keller, Jr.*
Introduction *10-3*
The Federal Parole System *10-4*
A Brief History of Parole *10-5*
Parole Becomes a Target *10-5*
Judicial Intervention *10-6*
Morrissey v. Brewer: Revoking Parole *10-6*
Gagnon v. Scarpelli: Legal Assistance *10-8*
Moody v. Daggett: No Immediate Hearing Required for Parole Violators *10-8*
Wolff v. McDonnell: Loss of Good Time Requires a Prison Hearing *10-10*
Jago v. Van Curen: Rescission Proceedings *10-11*
Greenholtz v. Nebraska Penal Inmates: No Constitutional Right to Parole *10-12*
Birth of Parole Guidelines *10-14*
The Presentence-Investigation Report: A Crucial Document *10-15*
Important Improvements to Presentence-Investigation Reports Under Rule 32 *10-17*
Youth Corrections Act vs. Parole Commission and Reorganization Act *10-19*
The Guidelines and the Salient-Factor Score *10-20*
Criticisms of the Guidelines *10-21*
Nonadjudicated Offenses *10-22*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Resentencing *10-23*
Judicial Expectations *10-24*
Inadequate Reasons *10-26*
Double-Counting *10-26*
Failure to Consider Rehabilitation *10-27*
Mechanical Use of Guidelines *10-27*
Ex Post Facto Violation *10-28*
Separation of Powers *10-30*
Prisoners Not Adequately Informed *10-31*
Final Observations *10-31*
Notes *10-34*
Appendix A: Guidelines for Decision-Making *10-43*
Appendix B: Salient Factor Score *10-44*

The Fourth Amendment Exclusionary Rule in Parole Revocation Hearings *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *10-45*
Pennsylvania Board of Probation & Parole v. Scott *10-45*
Analysis *10-48*
Conclusion *10-49*
Notes *10-51*

CHAPTER 10A
Pardon and Clemency

The Quality of Mercy Strained: Wresting the Pardoning Power from the King *Daniel T. Kobil*
Introduction *10A-3*
The Nature and Origins of Clemency: What's Justice Got to Do With It? *10A-6*
Defining Clemency, and Its Relationship to Notions of Justice *10A-6*
Early Origins of the Clemency Power *10A-10*
The Development of the Clemency Power in England *10A-11*
The Clemency Power in the United States *10A-13*
Federal Clemency Power *10A-13*
The Clemency Power in the States *10A-21*
A Proposal for Bifurcation of the Clemency Power: Replacing Politics with Justice *10A-25*
Limitations on the Exercise of Executive Clemency Power *10A-27*
The Legislature *10A-27*
The Judiciary *10A-27*
The People *10A-31*
The Executive *10A-31*

Proposed Clemency Commission *10A-32*
Proposed Clemency Standards *10A-33*
Substantial Doubt of Guilt *10A-33*
Diminished Mental Capacity, Retardation, Intoxication, or Minority *10A-34*
Disparate Sentencing: Proportionality *10A-34*
Disparate Sentencing: Special Circumstances *10A-35*
Sentencing That Is Unrelated to Deserts *10A-36*
Crimes Committed Out of Necessity, Coercion, or Adherence to Moral Principles *10A-36*
Crimes in Which the Offender Has Suffered Enough *10A-37*
Proposed Clemency Procedures *10A-38*
Justice-Neutral Exercise of the Clemency Power by the Executive: What Remains? *10A-39*
Conclusion *10A-41*
Notes *10A-42*
Appendix *10A-70*

Clemency and Presidential Administration of Criminal Law
Rachel E. Barkow
Introduction *10A-72*
I. The Constitutional Pardon Power *10A-78*
A. The Use of the Clemency Power *10A-82*
B. Analyzing the Decline *10A-87*
1. Politics *10A-88*
2. Structural Bias at DOJ *10A-93*
II. Clemency, the Unitary Executive, and Presidential Administration *10A-98*
A. Clemency's Structural Function *10A-98*
B. Clemency's Relationship to Unitary Executive and Presidential Administration Theories *10A-109*
III. The Modern Relevance of Clemency *10A-120*
A. Fewer Mechanisms for Controlling Prosecutors *10A-120*
B. Increasing Danger of Overreach *10A-125*
C. The Need for Relief from Collateral Consequences *10A-135*
Conclusion *10A-138*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

SECTION III
Procedural Aspects of Prisoner Litigation

CHAPTER 11
Magistrate Judges

The Role of the United States Magistrate Judge in Prisoner Litigation *Frederic N. Smalkin and Nancy K. Oliver*
Introduction *11-3*
The Office of United States Magistrate Judge *11-3*
Jurisdiction of Magistrate Judges *11-4*
Nonconsensual References *11-4*
Consent Trials *11-8*
Additional Duties *11-10*
Conclusion *11-11*
Notes *11-11*
Appendix: 28 U.S.C. § 636(a)-(c) (1988 & Supp. IV 1992) *11-19*

CHAPTER 11A
The Provision of Counsel

Rethinking Prisoner Civil Rights Cases and the Provision of Counsel *Howard B. Eisenberg*
Introduction *11A-3*
The History of Prisoner Civil Rights Litigation *11A-4*
Stemming the Tide of Prisoner Litigation *11A-6*
Medical Care *11A-7*
Prisoner Overcrowding, Conditions of Confinement, and Protection of Inmates *11A-8*
Failure to Protect *11A-9*
First Amendment Rights *11A-10*
Privacy and Fourth Amendment Rights *11A-11*
Use of Force *11A-11*
Right to Due Process *11A-11*
The Issues to Be Litigated Under Present Prison Cases *11A-12*
Volume and Frivolity—The Twin Devils of Prisoner Civil Rights Litigation *11A-12*
Volume of Prisoner Cases *11A-12*
Frivolity of Prisoner Cases *11A-13*
Defining "Frivolous" *11A-14*
The Therapeutic Value of Prisoner Litigation *11A-15*
Prisoners' Ability to Draft a Viable Complaint *11A-16*
Frivolity and the "Jailhouse Lawyer" *11A-18*

Remedies for High Volume and Perceived Frivolity *11A-19*
The Provision of Counsel in Prisoner Civil Rights Cases *11A-19*
Legal Authority for the Provision of Counsel in Prisoner Civil Rights Cases *11A-19*
Constitutional Right *11A-19*
Statutory Right *11A-20*
Inherent Authority of the Court *11A-20*
Criteria for Provision of Counsel in Prisoner Civil Rights Cases *11A-21*
Factors Relating to the Nature of the Claim *11A-22*
Factors Relating to the Nature of the Plaintiff *11A-22*
Factors Relating to the Plaintiff's Efforts to Obtain Counsel *11A-23*
Providing Reasons for Denying the Appointment of Counsel *11A-23*
Results of File Review in Three Federal Districts *11A-24*
Who Provides Legal Representation to Prisoners in Civil Cases? *11A-26*
Reducing the Volume of Prison Civil Rights Litigation *11A-30*
Requiring Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies *11A-31*
Expediting Department of Justice Certification of State Grievance Systems *11A-31*
Requiring Partial Payment of Filing Fees *11A-32*
Modification of Existing Form Complaints *11A-33*
Mandatory Post-Filing Review *11A-33*
Mandatory Document Submission *11A-34*
Second Screening by the Court *11A-34*
The Need for Counsel *11A-35*
Leave to Appeal *11A-35*
Providing Counsel in Prisoner Cases *11A-36*
Amending 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) to Cure *Mallard* Problem *11A-36*
Paying for Counsel *11A-36*
The Most Obvious Ways of Providing Counsel Are Politically Unrealistic *11A-37*
The Judiciary Could Simply Order the Funding of Attorneys to Represent Prisoners *11A-37*
Using Segregated Funds (Filing Fees, Court Costs, and Attorneys' Fees) to Fund Counsel in Prisoner Cases *11A-38*
Interest on Prisoner Trust Accounts *11A-39*
Selecting Counsel *11A-40*
The Role of Counsel *11A-43*
Establishing Rapport with the Client *11A-43*
Amending the Complaint, Discovery, and Settlement *11A-44*
Conclusion *11A-44*
Notes *11A-45*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

CHAPTER 11B
Pro Se Litigation

Ghostwriting: Filling in the Gaps of Pro Se Prisoners' Access to the Courts
Ira P. Robbins
Introduction *11B-4*
I. Background *11B-6*
A. The Need in Prisons *11B-8*
B. Trends in the Response to Ghostwriting *11B-16*
II. The Important Role of Ghostwriting *11B-22*
III. Do Attorneys Have an Ethical or Legal Duty to Disclose Drafting Assistance? *11B-27*
A. Ethical Duty to Disclose *11B-27*
B. Legal Duty to Disclose *11B-30*
IV. Does Undisclosed Ghostwriting Implicate the Attorney's Duty to Provide Competent Representation? *11B-34*
A. Competent Representation *11B-35*
B. Benevolent Reading *11B-38*
V. Does Undisclosed Ghostwriting Encourage the Unauthorized Practice of Law? *11B-44*
A. Does Ghostwriting Constitute the "Practice of Law"? *11B-44*
B. Does Ghostwriting by Non-Lawyers Constitute the *Unauthorized* Practice of Law? *11B-46*
C. Should Non-Lawyer Ghostwriting be Authorized in Certain Circumstances? *11B-47*
Conclusion *11B-51*

CHAPTER 12
Obtaining Witnesses

Obtaining Witnesses in Prisoner Cases *Kent Sinclair, Jr. and Debra Ruth Wolin*
Introduction *12-3*
Attendance of Witnesses *12-3*
Plaintiff's Own Presence at Trial *12-3*
Subpoena Power for Witnesses *12-5*
Transportation *12-6*
Use of Depositions *12-7*
Waiver of Witness Fees *12-7*
Relevant Caselaw *12-7*
Statutory Analysis and Legislative History *12-11*
Can the Government Be Required to Bear the Expense? *12-14*
Conclusion *12-16*

Notes *12-16*
Appendix: Sample Orders Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Testificandum *12-23*
Order for Service of Subpoena, with Government to Advance Fees *12-24*
Order for Service of Subpoena, Without Prepayment of Fees *12-25*

CHAPTER 13
Challenges to the Duration of Confinement

Habeas Corpus and the Burger Court *Theodore McMillian*
Introduction *13-3*
Background *13-3*
Recent Cases *13-4*
Conclusion *13-6*
Notes *13-7*

The Habeas Corpus Certificate of Probable Cause *Ira P. Robbins*
Introduction *13-9*
The Stevens-Rehnquist Debate *13-10*
Congressional Intent and the History of the Certificate *13-12*
Problems with Certificate Practice *13-14*
The Standard for Issuance of the Certificate *13-14*
Limited Certificates *13-16*
The State and the Certificate *13-18*
Procedure *13-20*
Current Legislative Reform of the Certificate Requirement *13-22*
Conclusion and Recommendations *13-24*
Notes *13-26*

The Jurisprudence of Detention: An Analysis of the Politics of Federal Habeas Corpus Relitigation *Gary Peller*
Introduction *13-43*
The Classical Liberal Justification of the Substantive Criminal Law *13-44*
The Instrumentalist and Process-Oriented Approaches to Legitimizing Detention *13-47*
The Burger Court Restrictions *13-48*
An Evaluation of the Restriction of Collateral Habeas Corpus Review *13-51*
Interpretation of the Habeas Corpus Act of 1867: Reconsidering the Relevant History *13-52*
Habeas Law Prior to the Habeas Corpus Act of 1867 *13-52*
Passage of the Habeas Corpus Act of 1867 *13-54*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Federal Habeas Corpus Review Prior to 1915 *13-54*
Federal Habeas Corpus Review Between 1867 and 1886 *13-55*
Supreme Court Habeas Cases Involving Due Process Claims: 1886–1915 *13-56*
Exhaustion and Habeas Review: 1886–1915 *13-58*
Federal Habeas Corpus Review for State Prisoners from *Frank v. Mangum* to *Brown v. Allen* *13-59*
The Contraction and Expansion of Due Process Requirements Under the Fourteenth Amendment *13-60*
Exhaustion, Relitigation, and the Adequacy of the State's Corrective Process *13-61*
Effect of the Denial of Certiorari Review *13-62*
Summary *13-62*
A Critique of Process Orientation in the Habeas Corpus Relitigation Debate *13-63*
The External Critique *13-65*
The Internal Critique *13-68*
Conclusion *13-71*
Notes *13-73*

Whither (or Wither) Habeas Corpus?: Observations on the Supreme Court's 1985 Term *Ira P. Robbins*
Introduction *13-83*
Statistics *13-84*
Supreme Court Cases of the 1985 Term *13-84*
Vasquez v. Hillery and *Kuhlmann v. Wilson* *13-84*
Miller v. Fenton *13-87*
Murray v. Carrier and *Smith v. Murray* *13-90*
Kimmelman v. Morrison *13-95*
The Next Generation of Habeas Corpus Analysis *13-100*
Conclusion *13-103*
Notes *13-104*

Habeas Corpus and Retroactivity *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13-119*
Teague v. Lane *13-119*
Analysis *13-122*
Conclusion *13-125*
Notes *13-125*

Habeas Corpus and Retroactivity: The Supreme Court's 1989 Term *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13-131*
Butler v. McKellar, Saffle v. Parks, and *Sawyer v. Smith* *13-132*

Analysis *13-135*
Conclusion *13-138*
Notes *13-139*

Habeas Corpus and State Procedural Default *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13-143*
Coleman v. Thompson *13-143*
Analysis *13-146*
Conclusion *13-147*
Notes *13-149*

Habeas Corpus and Abuse of the Writ *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13-155*
McCleskey v. Zant *13-155*
Analysis *13-158*
Conclusion *13-160*
Notes *13-161*

Habeas Corpus and Evidentiary Hearings *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13-167*
Keeney v. Tamayo-Reyes *13-167*
Analysis *13-169*
Conclusion *13-171*
Notes *13-172*

Habeas Corpus and Actual Innocence *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13-177*
Herrera v. Collins *13-177*
Analysis *13-180*
Conclusion *13-182*
Notes *13-183*

Habeas Corpus and *Miranda* Claims *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13-187*
Withrow v. Williams *13-187*
Analysis *13-190*
Conclusion *13-193*
Notes *13-193*

Harmless Error in Federal Habeas Corpus After *Brecht v. Abrahamson* *John H. Blume and Stephen P. Garvey*
Introduction *13-197*
The Structure of the *Brecht-Kotteakos* Rule *13-198*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Allocation of the Burden of Proof *13-199*
Burden of Proof *13-200*
Standard of Prejudice *13-201*
Burden on the State *13-201*
Burden on the Defendant *13-202*
Approach of the Reviewing Court *13-204*
Exceptions to the *Brecht-Kotteakos* Rule *13-206*
The *Orndorff* Exception *13-207*
Trial Error and Structural Error *13-208*
Prosecutorial Misconduct and Cumulative Error *13-209*
The *Richmond* Principle *13-210*
Conclusion *13-213*
Notes *13-214*

Habeas Corpus, Death Penalty, and Actual Innocence Claims
Harvard Law Review
Introduction *13-223*
Schlup v. Delo *13-223*
Analysis *13-225*
Conclusion *13-228*
Notes *13-228*

Habeas Corpus and Retroactivity: *Schriro v. Summerlin* *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13-235*
Schriro v. Summerlin *13-235*
Analysis *13-238*
Conclusion *13-240*
Notes *13-240*

Habeas Corpus and Military Detention: Alien Detainees *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13-245*
Rasul v. Bush *13-245*
Analysis *13-248*
Conclusion *13-251*
Notes *13-251*

Habeas Corpus and Military Detention: Enemy Combatants
Harvard Law Review
Introduction *13-257*
Hamdi v. Rumsfeld *13-257*
Analysis *13-261*
Conclusion *13-263*

Notes *13-264*

Habeas Corpus Jurisdiction and Venue: *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*
Harvard Law Review
Introduction *13-269*
Rumsfeld v. Padilla *13-269*
Analysis *13-272*
Conclusion *13-274*
Notes *13-275*

The Vienna Convention and Procedural Default *Harvard Law Review* *13-281*

Postconviction Access to DNA Evidence *Harvard Law Review* *13-291*

Excuse of State Procedural Default: *Martinez v. Ryan* *Harvard Law Review* *13-303*

Habeas Corpus Petitions in Federal and Tribal Court: A Search for Individualized Justice *Carrie E. Garrow*
Introduction *13-316*
I. The Indian Civil Rights Act and Federal Indian Law's Limitations on Tribal Criminal Jurisdiction *13-320*
II. Habeas Corpus *13-324*
III. Federal Courts and ICRA Habeas Corpus Petitions *13-326*
A. The Exhaustion Requirement *13-327*
B. Non-Indian Defendants—No Exhaustion Required *13-329*
C. Tribal Court Remedies Exhausted and Habeas Corpus Granted *13-332*
D. Tribal Court Remedies Exhausted and Habeas Corpus Denied *13-336*
E. Federal Habeas Petitions by State Detainees *13-337*
F. Implications from the Survey *13-338*
IV. Individualized Justice and a Case Study of the Navajo Nation Supreme Court and Habeas Corpus *13-339*
A. Individualized Justice *13-339*
B. The Navajo Nation Courts *13-341*
C. The Navajo Nation Habeas Corpus Process *13-342*
D. Individualized Justice—A Balancing of Rights *13-348*
E. Exhaustion of Tribal Remedies *13-349*
F. Navajo Due Process *13-350*
G. Mr. Haungooah's Quest for Individualized Justice *13-354*
H. Implications from the Navajo Nation Case Study *13-356*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Conclusion *13-357*

Habeas Corpus Retroactivity in Florida *Harvard Law Review* *13-359*

Procedural Default: A Structural Approach to Adequacy Doctrine *Eve Brensike Primus*

Introduction *13-371*
I. State Procedural Rules as Obstacles to the Adjudication of Criminal Defendants' Federal Claims *13-379*
II. Structural Adequacy Doctrine as a Potential Solution *13-390*
A. The Origin and Purpose of Procedural Adequacy Doctrine *13-391*
B. A Structural Approach to Procedural Adequacy *13-398*
III. Structural Adequacy Doctrine Falls Dormant: How the Federal Courts Shifted to a Cause and Prejudice Analysis *13-400*
IV. Why Structural Adequacy is Better Than Cause and Prejudice *13-406*
A. Different Orientations: The Prisoner Versus the System *13-406*
B. Different Relief *13-407*
C. Different Obstacles to Review *13-411*
D. Doctrinal Coherence and Original Purposes *13-413*
Conclusion *13-416*

Equitable Gateways: Toward Expanded Federal Habeas Corpus Review of State-Court Criminal Convictions *Eve Brensike Primus*

Introduction *13-420*
I. An Overview of the Obstacles to Federal Habeas Review *13-425*
A. Procedural Obstacles to Review *13-426*
1. Statute of Limitations *13-427*
2. Exhaustion Requirement *13-428*
3. Procedural Default Doctrine *13-428*
4. Successive Petition Barrier *13-429*
B. Substantive Obstacles to Review *13-429*
1. Limits on Cognizable Claims *13-430*
2. Evidentiary Hearings *13-430*
3. Presumption of Correctness with Respect to State Factual Findings *13-431*
4. Deferential Standards of Review *13-431*
II. Fair Consideration Doctrine's Equitable Gateways *13-432*
A. Bypassing Procedural Obstacles to Review *13-433*
1. Statute of Limitations *13-433*
2. Exhaustion Requirement *13-435*
3. Procedural Default Doctrine *13-437*
4. Successive Petition Barrier *13-438*

B. Obtaining More Rigorous and Less Deferential Merits Review *13-440*
1. Expansion in Cognizable Claims *13-440*
2. Evidentiary Hearings *13-441*
3. Deferential Standards of Review and the Presumption of Correctness *13-442*
III. Expanding Equitable Gateways *13-445*
Conclusion *13-450*

Habeas Corpus and Retroactivity: *Edwards v. Vannoy* *Harvard Law Review* *13-453*

CHAPTER 13A
Death Penalty Review

Toward a More Just and Effective System of Review in State Death Penalty Cases: Report and Recommendations of the American Bar Association Task Force on Death Penalty Habeas Corpus
Ira P. Robbins
Task Force Members *13A-5*
Executive Summary *13A-6*
Introduction *13A-11*
The Provision of Competent Counsel *13A-15*
Special Demands of Representation in a Capital Case *13A-16*
The Problem at Trial and on Appeal *13A-16*
Post-Conviction Representation *13A-19*
The Causes of the Problem *13A-20*
Compensation for Counsel and Other Services *13A-21*
The Right to Post-Conviction Counsel *13A-22*
Task Force Recommendations *13A-28*
Commentary *13A-30*
State Procedural Default Rules *13A-37*
Background *13A-37*
Does *Wainwright v. Sykes* Overrule *Fay v. Noia?* *13A-39*
Miscarriages of Justice and Innocence *13A-40*
Role of Procedural Default Rules in Death Penalty Cases *13A-42*
Task Force Recommendations *13A-48*
Commentary *13A-49*
Exhaustion of State Judicial Remedies *13A-52*
Background *13A-52*
The Mixed-Petition Issue *13A-53*
Application to Death Penalty Cases *13A-55*
Task Force Recommendations *13A-56*
Commentary *13A-57*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Stays of Execution, Certificates of Probable Cause, and "Chaotic" Litigation *13A-59*
Background *13A-59*
28 U.S.C. §§ 2251 and 2253 *13A-62*
Barefoot v. Estelle *13A-63*
The Aftermath of *Barefoot v. Estelle* *13A-67*
Task Force Recommendations *13A-68*
Commentary *13A-70*
Delay, Time Limitations, Successive Petitions, and Abuse of the Writ *13A-72*
Delay *13A-72*
Time Limitations *13A-77*
Successive Petitions and Abuse of the Writ *13A-80*
Teague v. Lane *13A-86*
Task Force Recommendations *13A-89*
Commentary *13A-92*
Notes *13A-98*
Selected Bibliography *13A-184*
List of Witnesses *13A-188*
Separate Statements of Task Force Members *13A-197*

Table of Contents

Volume Three

SECTION III: PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF PRISONER LITIGATION
(Continued)

CHAPTER 13B
Challenges to the Duration of Confinement for Federal Prisoners

Habeas Corpus Relief for Federal Prisoners *Georgetown Law Journal*
28 U.S.C. § 2255 Relief for Federal Prisoners *13B-4*
Cognizable Claims *13B-4*
§ 2255 Motions Distinguished from § 2241 Petitions *13B-9*
Custody Requirements and Venue *13B-11*
Filing Deadlines *13B-13*
Procedural Bar *13B-15*
Right to Legal Assistance *13B-21*
Disposition of Motions *13B-22*
Successive Motions *13B-28*
Remedies and Appeals *13B-30*

CHAPTER 13C
The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996

Supreme Court Jurisdiction to Review Second or Successive Habeas Corpus Petitions *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13C-3*
Felker v. Turpin *13C-4*
Analysis *13C-6*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Conclusion *13C-9*
Notes *13C-9*

Rewriting the Great Writ: Standards of Review for Habeas Corpus Under the New 28 U.S.C. § 2254 *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13C-15*
Federal Habeas Corpus Review Prior to the AEDPA *13C-16*
Standards of Review *13C-16*
Nonretroactivity and "New Law" *13C-16*
Interpretive Approaches to the Amendments to § 2254 *13C-17*
Approaches to Review of Legal and Mixed Question Determinations *13C-18*
Approaches to Review of Factual Determinations *13C-19*
Policy, Precedent, and Their Implications for the Interpretation of the New § 2254 *13C-20*
Consonance with the Objectives of Habeas and Deferential Review *13C-21*
Interaction with Pre-AEDPA Case Law *13C-24*
Conclusion *13C-26*
Notes *13C-27*

Standard of Review for the Recall of Mandates by Courts of Appeals *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13C-35*
Calderon v. Thompson *13C-35*
Analysis *13C-38*
Conclusion *13C-40*
Notes *13C-41*

Deference to State Court Determinations of Law *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13C-47*
Williams v. Taylor *13C-47*
Analysis *13C-50*
Conclusion *13C-52*
Notes *13C-53*

Habeas Corpus and the Suspension Clause *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13C-59*
INS v. St. Cyr *13C-60*
Analysis *13C-62*
Conclusion *13C-64*
Notes *13C-65*

Standard for Obtaining Certificates of Appealability *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13C-69*
Miller-El v. Cockrell *13C-69*
Analysis *13C-72*
Conclusion *13C-74*
Notes *13C-75*

"Clearly Established Law" in Habeas Review *Harvard Law Review* *13C-81*

Actual Innocence Gateway: *McQuiggin v. Perkins*
Harvard Law Review *13C-93*

The Demise of Habeas Corpus and the Rise of Qualified Immunity
Stephen R. Reinhardt
Introduction *13C-106*
I. The Demise of Habeas Corpus *13C-110*
A. The Evolution from Independent Review to Near-Total Deference to State Courts *13C-111*
B. Respect for State Courts at the Expense of Constitutional Rights *13C-116*
C. The Lack of "Clearly Established Federal Law" *13C-119*
D. Pinholster and the Court's Barriers to Establishing Factual Cause for Relief *13C-124*
E. The Court's Exceptional Treatment of Habeas Law *13C-127*
F. How Far We Have Strayed *13C-130*
II. The Rise of Qualified Immunity *13C-131*
III. Particularly Unfortunate Consequences *13C-137*
Conclusion *13C-140*
CODA *13C-141*

Certificates of Appealability, Rule 60(b) Motions, and Race: *Buck v. Davis* *Harvard Law Review* *13C-143*

AEDPA as Forum Allocation: The Textual and Structural Case for Overruling *Williams v. Taylor* *Carlos M. Vázquez*
Introduction *13C-156*
I. The Historical Forum-Allocation Function of Habeas *13C-160*
A. The 1789-1916 Period *13C-161*
B. The 1916-1953 Period *13C-162*
C. The 1953-1996 Period *13C-164*
II. *Williams* and the Standard of Review *13C-166*
A. The *Williams* Majority's Basis for its Interpretation *13C-166*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

1. AEDPA's Text *13C-167*
2. AEDPA's Purpose *13C-172*
B. Congress's Actual Intent *13C-174*
III. AEDPA's Forum-Allocation Function *13C-184*
A. The Constitutionality of the *Williams* Construction of § 2254(d)(1) *13C-184*
B. The Dysfunctional Nature of AEDPA's Allocation of Jurisdiction *13C-187*
C. Alternative Interpretations? *13C-191*
D. Implementing the Forum-Allocation Interpretation *13C-195*
IV. Reconsidering *Williams* *13C-201*
A. The Court's Freer Hand in Interpreting Jurisdictional Statutes *13C-202*
1. The Court's Common Law Approach to the Interpretation of Jurisdictional Statutes *13C-202*
2. Supreme Court Resistance of Severe Misallocations of Jurisdiction *13C-206*
a. *Martin v. Hunter*'s Lesee *13C-207*
b. *Murdock v. City of Memphis* *13C-209*
B. In Defense of Resistance of Jurisdictional Misallocations *13C-212*
1. The Complexity of the Law of Federal Jurisdiction *13C-213*
2. The Propriety of Resistance *13C-214*
Conclusion *13C-216*

Ineffective Assistance of Counsel and Procedural Default: *Shinn v. Ramirez* *13C-219* *Harvard Law Review*

AEDPA Repeal *Cornell Law Review*
Introduction *13C-233*
I. AEDPA and Federal Habeas Corpus *13C-240*
A. Statutory Background *13C-242*
B. Pre-AEDPA Caselaw Regulating Federal Habeas Corpus *13C-245*
C. The Impact of AEDPA *13C-249*
1. AEDPA Statute of Limitations *13C-250*
2. AEDPA and State Court Fact Finding *13C-252*
3. AEDPA's Limitation on Merits Relief *13C-249*
II. AEDPA Amendment and Repeal *13C-257*
A. Remove or Amend the 28 U.S.C. Section 2254(d) Relitigation Bar *13C-258*
B. Codify Teague to Preseve Mixed Question Review *13C-260*
1. 28 U.S.C. Section 2254(b): Second or Successive Petitions *13C-261*

2. 28 U.S.C. Section 2254(d): Statute of Limitations *13C-263*
3. 28 U.S.C. Section 2254(b)-(c): Exhaustion *13C-265*
4. 28 U.S.C. Section 2254(e): Evidenty Hearings *13C-266*
5. Include Adequate Funding for Federal Representation *13C-268*
C. Revise AEDPA's Procedureal Restrictions *13C-270*
B. Civil Rights Models *13C-271*
C. A Consequentialist Case for Federal Habeas Reform *13C-272*
Conclusion *13C-274*

The Interplay Between 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and 28 U.S.C. § 2255: *Jones v. Hendrix* *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13C-292*

General Principles as "Clearly Established Law": *Andrew v. White* *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *13C-303*

SECTION IV
Special Issues and Problems

CHAPTER 14
The Rights of Gay Prisoners

Prisons Within Prisons: Gay Prisoners and Protective Custody
Joan W. Howarth
Introduction *14-3*
Segregation in Prisons *14-4*
Segregation: A Method of Control *14-4*
Segregation of Gay Prisoners *14-5*
The Judicial Response: Confused *14-8*
Reform of Criteria and Procedures for Protective-Custody Assignment *14-11*
Staying Out: Procedural Due Process *14-11*
Staying Out: Substantive Due Process *14-14*
Getting In: The Right to Reasonable Protection *14-14*
Getting In: Procedural Due Process *14-15*
Reform of Conditions in Protective Custody *14-16*
Protective-Punitive Distinction *14-16*
Nonwaiver of Constitutional Rights *14-17*
Equal Protection *14-18*
Cruel and Unusual Punishment *14-19*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Penal-Policy Considerations *14-21*
Conclusion *14-22*
Notes *14-23*

CHAPTER 14A
AIDS

AIDS in Prisons and Jails: Issues and Options *National Institute of Justice, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *14A-3*
Cause and Transmission of AIDS *14A-4*
AIDS in the Correctional Population *14A-5*
Correctional Policy Issues and Options *14A-5*
Education and Training *14A-6*
HTLV-III Antibody Testing *14A-6*
Correctional Policies on HTLV-III Antibody Testing *14A-6*
Mass Screening: The Debate *14A-7*
Implementation Issues *14A-9*
Medical, Correctional Management, and Legal Issues *14A-9*
Medical Issues *14A-9*
Correctional Management Issues *14A-10*
Housing Policies *14A-10*
Precautionary Measures *14-11*
Notification and Confidentiality *14A-11*
Costs of Care and Associated Services *14A-13*
Legal Issues *14A-13*
Conclusion *14A-14*
Notes *14A-19*

Opening the Bloodgates: The Blood Testing of Prisoners for the AIDS Virus *Lynn Sanders Branham*
Introduction *14A-21*
Mandatory Blood Testing of Prisoners for the AIDS Virus—Constitutionally Permissible? *14A-22*
The Fourth Amendment: An Unreasonable Search or Seizure? *14A-22*
Hudson v. Palmer and *Bell v. Wolfish:* A Framework for Analysis *14A-22*
Involuntary Blood Taking: A Search or Seizure? *14A-24*
The Reasonableness of AIDS-Virus Blood Testing *14A-28*
The Intrusiveness of AIDS-Virus Blood Testing *14A-28*
The Need for AIDS-Virus Blood Testing *14A-30*
The Latency of AIDS *14A-31*
Intravenous Drug Users and Sex in Prisons *14A-31*

Lack of Behavior-Monitoring Resources *14A-32*
Negative Effects of Intense Supervision *14A-32*
Disadvantages of Increased Confinement of Prisoners in Cells *14A-33*
Limits on the Efficaciousness of Education *14A-33*
Seropositivity Rates in Prisons *14A-34*
The Failure to Adopt Testing in "Other" Jurisdictions *14A-35*
Protection of the Public *14A-36*
Preservation of Life: A Fundamental Interest *14A-37*
Case Law on the Constitutionality of Public Health Measures *14A-37*
The Right to Privacy *14A-38*
The Requirement of a Rational Relationship *14A-40*
Other Means of Exercising the Right to Privacy *14A-41*
Less Restrictive Means *14A-42*
Adverse Effects of Accommodation *14A-42*
Due Process *14A-43*
Blood Testing of Prisoners for the AIDS Virus—Constitutionally Required? *14A-46*
Requiring Blood Testing to Prevent the Spread of AIDS *14A-47*
Due Process *14A-47*
Cruel and Unusual Punishment *14A-48*
Requiring Blood Testing for Medical Treatment Purposes *14A-50*
Conclusion *14A-51*
Notes *14A-52*

Update on AIDS in Prisons and Jails *National Institute of Justice, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *14A-61*
Essential Medical Information *14A-62*
HIV Infection and AIDS in the Correctional Population *14A-63*
Correctional Policy Issues and Options *14A-65*
Education and Training *14A-65*
HIV-Antibody Screening and Testing *14A-66*
Correctional Policies on HIV-Antibody Testing *14A-67*
Medical Care, Psychosocial Services, Housing, and Correctional Management Issues *14A-68*
Medical Care *14A-68*
Psychosocial Services *14A-68*
Housing and Programming Policies *14A-69*
Precautionary and Preventive Measures *14A-70*
Legal Issues *14A-71*
Notes *14A-79*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Prisons, Law and Public Health: The Case for a Coordinated Response to Epidemic Disease Behind Bars *Scott Burris*
Introduction *14A-81*
Prisoners and Epidemic Disease *14A-83*
The Demographics of HIV, TB, Drug Use, and Incarceration *14A-83*
Who Is Ill? *14A-83*
Who Is Ill in Prison? *14A-84*
The Public Health Responses *14A-86*
A Model Response *14A-87*
HIV *14A-87*
TB *14A-88*
Prison Practices *14A-90*
The Role of Litigation *14A-91*
Court Decisions *14A-91*
Basic Medical Care for HIV *14A-91*
HIV Testing and Counseling *14A-91*
Medical Care After Identification *14A-92*
HIV Prevention Education *14A-94*
Social Conditions for People with HIV *14A-95*
TB Prevention and Treatment *14A-98*
Barriers to Effective Litigation *14A-99*
The Constitutional Right to Medical Treatment Is Narrowly Applied *14A-99*
Poor Facts *14A-102*
Poor Lawyering *14A-102*
Wrong Parties, Wrong Place *14A-104*
Prison Organization, Change, and the Courts *14A-104*
The Coordinated Public Health Strategy *14A-106*
Conclusion *14A-109*
Notes *14A-110*

1998 AIDS in Prison Bibliography *National Prison Project*
Preface *14A-121*
Introduction *14A-121*
Legal Articles *14A-122*
Law Review Articles *14A-122*
Clinical Trials *14A-122*
Confidentiality *14A-122*
Conjugal Vists *14A-122*
HIV/AIDS Policy *14A-122*
Segregation *14A-124*
Sentencing *14A-124*
HIV Seroprevalence Rates & HIV Testing *14A-124*

Transmission in Prison *14A-125*
Women Prisoners *14A-125*
Legal News Articles *14A-125*
Compassionate Release *14A-125*
Confidentiality *14A-126*
HIV/AIDS Policy *14A-126*
HIV Seroprevalence Rates & HIV Testing *14A-128*
HIV Transmission in Prison *14A-129*
Legislation & Jurisprudence *14A-130*
Segregation *14A-130*
Sentencing *14A-130*
Articles and Abstracts on AIDS/HIV in Corrections *14A-130*
Criminal Justice Articles *14A-130*
Articles *14A-130*
Clinical Trials *14A-130*
Conjugal Visits *14A-130*
HIV/AIDS Education & Prevention *14A-131*
HIV/AIDS Epidemiology & Medical Care *14A-132*
HIV/AIDS Policy *14A-133*
HIV Seroprevalence Rates & HIV Testing *14A-136*
Legislation & Jurisprudence *14A-136*
Probation & Parole *14A-138*
Substance Abuse Prevention & Control *14A-138*
Women Prisoners *14A-138*
Reports & Books *14A-139*
Surveys on HIV/AIDS in Prisons and Jails *14A-139*
Books on HIV/AIDS in Prisons and Jails *14A-140*
Manuals & Handbooks *14A-140*
Training Manuals & Guidelines for Correctional & Probation Staff *14A-140*
Training Manuals & Guidelines for Criminal Justice Staff *14A-141*
HIV/AIDS Policies in Corrections *14A-141*
HIV/AIDS Policies in Criminal Justice Agencies *14A-142*
International Conference on HIV/AIDS Abstracts *14A-142*
Clinical Trials *14A-142*
Compassionate Release *14A-143*
Discharge Planning *14A-143*
Incarcerated Youth *14A-143*
HIV/AIDS Education & Prevention *14A-144*
HIV/AIDS Epidemiology & Medical Care *14A-148*
HIV/AIDS Policy & Legal Issues *14A-149*
HIV/AIDS Preventive Measures *14A-151*
HIV/AIDS Psychology *14A-151*
HIV Seroprevalence Rates & HIV Testing *14A-152*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

HIV Transmission in Prison *14A-154*
Substance Abuse Prevention & Control *14A-155*
Tuberculosis Epidemiology *14A-156*
Women Prisoners *14A-157*
Medical Articles *14A-158*
Clinical Trials *14A-158*
Discharge Planning *14A-158*
Incarcerated Youth *14A-158*
HIV/AIDS Education & Prevention *14A-160*
HIV/AIDS Epidemiology & Medical Care *14A-162*
HIV/AIDS Psychology *14A-164*
HIV/AIDS Policy *14A-166*
HIV Seroprevalence Rates & HIV Testing *14A-168*
HIV Transmission in Prison *14A-173*
Substance Abuse Prevention & Control *14A-175*
Tuberculosis Epidemiology *14A-177*
Women Prisoners *14A-179*
National Prison Project Journal Articles *14A-180*
Policies on AIDS/HIV & Corrections *14A-183*
Federal Policies *14A-183*
Federal Bureau of Prisons *14A-183*
Department of the Army *14A-183*
State Correctional Policies *14A-183*
Organizational Policies on AIDS/HIV in Prison *14A-190*
AIDS/HIV Educational Materials *14A-191*
Correctional Education Materials *14A-191*
Canadian Publications *14A-192*
General Educational Materials *14A-192*
Local & National Organizations *14A-192*
African-American Community *14A-192*
Asian Community *14A-194*
Latino Community *14A-195*
Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender Community *14A-196*
Native American Community *14A-198*
People of Color Communities *14A-199*
Women *14A-199*
People Living with HIV/AIDS *14A-201*
Commercial Organizations *14A-202*
Federal Government Agencies *14A-203*
Audiovisual Materials *14A-204*
Resource Listings *14A-208*
Publications *14A-208*
Legal/Correctional Newsletters *14A-209*
Service Providers and Advocacy Organizations *14A-211*
Canadian Organizations *14A-222*

CHAPTER 14B
Compassionate Release

Compassionate Release of Terminally Ill Prisoners *Working Group on Compassionate Release*
Introduction *14B-3*
Justifications and Compatibility with Sentencing Laws *14B-5*
Compassionate Release Programs in the Federal System and the States *14B-7*
An Overview of Compassionate Release Programs *14B-8*
Types of Programs *14B-8*
Eligibility and Release Criteria *14B-8*
Application Process and Review *14B-9*
Release Conditions; Revocation *14B-10*
Data on Compassionate Release *14B-10*
Issues in Implementing Compassionate Release *14B-11*
Eligibility and Standard for Release *14B-11*
Release Procedure *14B-13*
A Special Mechanism for Terminally Ill Prisoners? *14B-13*
Paradigms for Special Mechanisms *14B-13*
Administrative Agency as Decisionmaker *14B-13*
Court as Decisionmaker *14B-14*
Hybrid System *14B-14*
General Considerations *14B-15*
Procedural Issues *14B-15*
The Application *14B-15*
Time Frames for Decisionmaking *14B-16*
Hearing Requirement *14B-16*
Legal Representation *14B-16*
Evidentiary Issues *14B-16*
Administrative or Judicial Review *14B-16*
Revocation of Release *14B-17*
Reporting of Data *14B-18*
Relationship Between the Department of Corrections and the Maker of the Release Decision *14B-18*
Need for Uniform System? *14B-18*
Conclusion *14B-19*
Notes *14B-20*
Appendix: Draft Language for Compassionate Release Legislation—Administrative Model *14B-24*
Draft Language for Compassionate Release Legislation—Judicial Model *14B-27*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Quelling the Silver Tsunami: Compassionate Release of Elderly Offenders *Jalila Jefferson-Bullock*
I. Introduction *14B-30*
II. Which Elderly Offenders Should Be Compassionately Released? *14B-35*
III. Aging in America *14B-39*
A. Physical Deterioration of the Elderly *14B-40*
B. Mental Decline of the Elderly *14B-42*
C. The Elderly Population Requires "Tender Loving Care" *14B-45*
IV. The Undignified Prisoner *14B-46*
A. Prison Life, Generally *14B-50*
B. Prison Life for the Elderly *14B-53*
V. The Problem with Compassionate Release *14B-59*
VI. Incarceration of Category Four Elderly Offenders Does Not Fulfill Any Goal of Criminal Punishment *14B-63*
A. The Problem with Deterrence *14B-63*
B. Aging Out of Crime *14B-64*
C. The Problem with Retribution *14B-67*
D. Retribution and Quantitative Proportionality *14B-69*
E. Retribution, the Eighth Amendment, and Qualitative Proportionality *14B-70*
VII. Incarceration of the Elderly is Cost-Prohibitive *14B-72*
VIII. Remedies *14B-74*
A. Compassionate Release Procedures Must Clearly Define and Reform Eligibility Criteria *14B-78*
B. Eligibility Determination Should Be Placed Squarely in the Hands of Judges *14B-79*
IX. Conclusion *14B-80*

CHAPTER 15
Prison Riots

Legal Aspects of Prison Riots *Ira P. Robbins*
Introduction *15-3*
Prison Riots and the Attorney *15-4*
Practical Limitations on the Attorney's Involvement in a Prison Riot *15-5*
Ethical and Legal Limitations on the Attorney's Involvement in a Prison Riot *15-6*
Illegal or Improper Conduct *15-6*
Withdrawal of the Attorney-Client Privilege and the Duty to Disclose *15-7*
Potential Conflicts of Interest *15-8*
Summary *15-9*

Prison Riots and the Inmates *15-9*
Tort Recovery *15-10*
State Law *15-10*
Federal Law *15-12*
Constitutional Causes of Action *15-13*
Criminal Sanctions for Prison Riots *15-15*
Federal Law *15-15*
State Law *15-16*
Issues Common to Federal and State Criminal Cases *15-16*
Amnesty and Negotiations *15-17*
First Amendment Implications *15-19*
Prison Riots and the Guards *15-21*
Recovery Under Federal Law *15-21*
Recovery Under State Law *15-22*
Conclusion *15-22*
Notes *15-23*

How Can We Sleep When the Beds Are Burning? The Tumultuous Prison Culture of Attica Flourishes in American Prisons Twenty-Five Years Later *Justin Brooks*
Introduction *15-35*
What Is a Prison Culture? What Makes Prison Cultures Unique? *15-37*
The Cultures of Attica and Lucasville *15-38*
Attica: The Punitive Culture *15-38*
Lucasville: The Custodial Culture *15-40*
Reforming Prison Cultures Over the Last Twenty-Five Years *15-41*
Shortcomings of Reforming Prison Cultures Through Litigation *15-41*
Reforming Prison Cultures Has Been Contrary to Political Agendas *15-43*
Other Factors Aggravating Cultural Reform *15-45*
Overcrowding *15-45*
Health Issues *15-46*
The Changing Characteristics of Inmates *15-47*
How Do We Change Prison Cultures? *15-47*
Alter Our Correctional Philosophy *15-47*
Change the Relationship Between Staff and Inmates *15-48*
Break Down Total Institutions *15-48*
Decrease the Number of Prisoners *15-49*
Improve Prisoner Health Care *15-50*
Conclusion *15-50*
Notes *15-51*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

CHAPTER 16
Inmate Welfare Funds

Inmate Welfare Funds: Reassessing Prisoner Assessments *Eric Neisser*
Introduction *16-3*
Nature and Operation of Inmate Welfare Funds *16-6*
Overview *16-6*
California *16-6*
Survey of Other States *16-10*
Legal Authority *16-10*
Administration *16-10*
Methods of Assessment *16-11*
Expenditures *16-11*
Constitutional Limitations on Financial Assessments of Inmates *16-12*
The Constitutional Framework for Punishment *16-12*
Involuntary Servitude *16-13*
Fines *16-14*
Liberty vs. Property Punishments *16-17*
Other Sources and Limits *16-17*
The Eighth Amendment Perspective *16-18*
The Fiscal Implications of Constitutional Imperatives *16-19*
The Meaning of Cruel and Unusual Punishment *16-20*
The Application to Monetary Impositions *16-21*
The Equal Protection Perspective *16-23*
Indigency *16-23*
Public vs. Individual Benefit: Who Pays When All Gain? *16-25*
The Federal Approach *16-26*
The California Analysis *16-27*
Applying the California Analysis *16-30*
Limits on Particular Methods of Assessment *16-35*
Assessment of Interest on Inmate Savings *16-35*
Surcharges on Inmate Purchases *16-36*
Surcharges on Inmate Sales *16-37*
Disclosure Requirements *16-38*
The Correctional Perspective: The Purposes of Punishment *16-39*
Retribution *16-39*
Incapacitation *16-40*
Deterrence *16-40*
Rehabilitation *16-42*
The Economic Perspective: User Fees in Prison *16-43*
Conclusion *16-50*
Notes *16-51*
Appendix: San Quentin Inmate Welfare Fund Statement of Operations, 1980 & 1981 *16-85*

CHAPTER 17
Jail Litigation

A Primer for Jail Litigators: Some Practical Suggestions for Surviving and Prevailing in Your Lawsuit *Edward I. Koren, John Boston, Elizabeth R. Alexander, and Daniel E. Manville*
Introduction *17-4*
The Legal Context *17-4*
The Importance of Remedy *17-6*
Political Realities *17-6*
Your Clients *17-8*
Threshold Decisions *17-9*
Choice of Forum *17-9*
Factors That Influence the Choice of Forum *17-10*
Choosing the Appropriate Judge *17-10*
The Substantive Law *17-10*
State Procedural Law *17-11*
State Remedial Options *17-11*
Enforcing State Law in Federal Court and Vice Versa *17-11*
Remedial Options: Injunctions and Damages *17-12*
Injunctive Relief *17-13*
Damages *17-13*
Preliminary Relief *17-15*
Naming the Proper Defendants *17-17*
Respondeat Superior vs. Personal Responsibility *17-17*
Monell Actions: Direct Liability of Local Government *17-18*
Individual and Official Capacity *17-18*
Non-Jail Defendants *17-19*
Preliminary Planning and Research *17-20*
Initial Contact with Plaintiffs *17-20*
Gathering Documents *17-21*
Other Sources of Information and Assistance *17-21*
Preliminary Tour *17-21*
Resources and Money *17-22*
Experts *17-23*
Types of Experts *17-23*
Corrections and Security *17-23*
Medical Care *17-23*
Mental Health *17-23*
Environmental Health *17-24*
Structure *17-24*
Use of Experts *17-24*
Legal Limitations *17-24*
What to Do with Your Expert *17-25*
The Expert Tour *17-25*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Finding and Selecting Experts *17-26*
Drafting the Complaint *17-27*
Class Actions *17-28*
Preparation for Filing *17-29*
Requirements for Certification *17-29*
Numerosity and Impracticability of Joinder *17-30*
Commonality *17-30*
Typicality *17-31*
Adequate Representation *17-32*
Injunctive Relief *17-32*
The "Lack of Necessity" Argument *17-33*
If Certification Is Denied *17-33*
Notice *17-35*
Settlement or Dismissal *17-36*
Discovery *17-37*
Defenses in Jail Cases *17-40*
Lack-of-Funding Defense *17-41*
Improved-Conditions Defense *17-41*
Future-Improvements Defense *17-41*
Damage-Case Defenses *17-43*
Proving the Case *17-44*
Making It Real *17-44*
Making Sense Out of It *17-46*
Fitting the Facts to the Law *17-49*
Deference *17-49*
Length of Stay *17-50*
Medical Care *17-50*
Protection from Inmate Assault *17-51*
Access to the Courts *17-52*
Enforcing and Defending a Judgment *17-53*
Writing an Enforceable Judgment *17-53*
Enforcing an Injunction *17-56*
Modification of Judgments *17-57*
Attorneys' Fees *17-58*
Recordkeeping *17-58*
Prevailing-Party Status *17-59*
Interim Awards *17-59*
Awards to Public-Interest Lawyers *17-59*
Prevailing Under a Consent Decree *17-60*
Prevailing as a Catalyst for Relief *17-60*
Prevailing on Non-Section 1983 Claims *17-61*
Recovering Experts' Costs and Other Litigation Expenses *17-61*
Recovering Fees Against the Governmental Unit *17-61*
Compliance Work *17-61*
Getting Paid *17-62*

Conclusion *17-62*
Notes *17-62*
Appendix A: Leading Post-*Wolfish* and Post-*Chapman* Federal Decisions *17-89*
Appendix B: List of Correctional and Other Relevant Standards (and Where to Obtain Them) *17-92*

CHAPTER 17A
Disenfranchisement

The Disenfranchisement of Ex-Felons: Citizenship, Criminality, and "The Purity of the Ballot Box" *Harvard Law Review*
Introduction *17A-3*
Policy Justifications *17A-4*
Theoretical Justification *17A-5*
The Social Contract *17A-5*
Moral Competence *17A-7*
Building Fences *17A-8*
Disenfranchisement as Symbolic Action *17A-8*
Building an Inclusive Community *17A-11*
Conclusion *17A-12*
Notes *17A-12*

CHAPTER 17B
The Rights of Deaf Prisoners

Deaf Prison Inmates: Time to Be Heard *Bonnie P. Tucker*
Introduction *17B-3*
Anti-Discrimination and Equal Protection Principles *17B-10*
Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act *17B-12*
Requirement That the Prison Be a Recipient of Federal Financial Assistance *17B-12*
Requirement That the Deaf Prisoner Be an Otherwise Qualified Handicapped Individual *17B-14*
The "Program or Activity" Requirement *17B-14*
Discrimination Under Section 504 *17B-18*
Reasonable Accommodations *17B-19*
Constitutional Rights *17B-20*
Equal Protection *17B-21*
The Eighth Amendment *17B-26*
Rights of Convicted Deaf Prisoners *17B-26*
Due Process Rights of Pretrial Detainees *17B-31*
Summary *17B-33*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Broadening State Interpreter Statutes: A Partial Solution *17B-33*
Conclusion *17B-36*
Appendix *17B-37*
Notes *17B-42*

CHAPTER 17C
The Rights of Women Prisoners

Pregnant Prisoners *Ellen M. Barry*
Preface *17C-3*
Pregnant Prisoners: The Overall Picture *17C-3*
The Development of an Adequate Medical Care Standard in Correctional Institutions *17C-4*
Pregnancy Medical Care Litigation in California State Prisons and County Jails *17C-6*
Harris v. McCarthy *17C-6*
Jones v. Dyer *17C-8*
Yeager v. Smith *17C-9*
Analysis of Litigation for Pregnant Prisoners *17C-9*
Conclusion *17C-11*
Notes *17C-12*

Women in Prison Bibliography
Introduction *17C-17*
Amnesty International/International Human Rights *17C-17*
Battered Women: Abuse, Domestic Violence, and Crime *17C-19*
Bibliographies About Women in the Criminal Justice System *17C-21*
Book Reviews/Book Notes *17C-22*
Capital Punishment *17C-24*
Education/Programs/Training *17C-28*
Employment/Labor *17C-29*
Health Care/Mental Illness *17C-29*
HIV/AIDS *17C-31*
HIV+ Women *17C-35*
Juvenile Girls in the Criminal Justice System *17C-39*
Motherhood/Family in Prison: Children of Incarcerated Mothers *17C-40*
Pregnancy/Reproductive Rights/Prenatal Care *17C-44*
Pregnancy and Substance Abuse *17C-48*
Race and the Criminal Justice System *17C-53*
Rape, Sexual Assault, Cross-Gender Searches *17C-55*
Sex/Gender Issues In Constitutional Law and Criminal Sentencing *17C-60*
Statistics About Women in Jail/Prison *17C-68*

Substance Abuse and Women *17C-69*
Additional Resources *17C-71*

Gender and Sexuality in the ABA Standards on the Treatment of Prisoners *Margaret Colgate Love and Giovanna Shay*
I. Development of the ABA Standards on the Treatment of Prisoners *17C-76*
II. Updated Provisions Affecting Women Prisoners *17C-80*
A. Screening and Classification *17C-81*
B. Pregnancy and Childbirth *17C-83*
C. Co-Corrections and Equal Protection *17C-85*
III. New Provisions Addressing Sexual Abuse, Privacy, and LGBT Prisoners *17C-86*
A. Custodial Sexual Abuse and Prison Sexual Violence *17C-86*
B. Searches and Cross-Gender Supervision *17C-88*
C. Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Prisoners *17C-92*
D. Provisions Affecting Transgender Prisoners *17C-94*
IV. Conclusion *17C-97*

Parental Prisoners: The Incarcerated Mother's Constitutional Right to Parent *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*
Introduction *17C-100*
I. Why and How Women End Up Incarcerated *17C-106*
II. Existing Programs *17C-109*
A. Prison Nurseries *17C-109*
B. Community-Based Residential Parenting Programs *17C-110*
III.Parental Rights Upon Incarceration *17C-111*
IV. Fourteenth Amendment Right to Parent *17C-113*
V. The Logic of *Turner* Grants Incarcerated Mothers the Right to Parent *17C-117*
VI. Policy Justifications *17C-121*
A. Well-Being of the Children *17C-121*
B. Benefits for the Mothers *17C-123*
C. Common Arguments Against Parental Rights for Incarcerated Mothers *17C-124*
D. Contested Methods *17C-125*
VII. Additional Barrier: Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 *17C-125*
Conclusion *17C-126*

CHAPTER 17D
The Rights of Native American Prisoners

Sweat Lodges and Headbands: An Introduction to the Rights of Native American Prisoners *Louis M. Holscher*
Introduction *17D-3*
A Brief History of Prison Litigation *17D-4*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Long Hair and Headbands *17D-7*
Medicine Men and Sweat Lodges *17D-12*
Recommendations and Conclusion *17D-16*
Notes *17D-18*

CHAPTER 17E
The Rights of Disabled Prisoners

George Bush's America Meets Dante's Inferno: The Americans with Disabilities Act in Prison *Ira P. Robbins*
Introduction *17E-3*
Specific Disabled Prison Populations *17E-7*
Disabled Prisoners *17E-7*
Elderly *17E-7*
Mentally Disabled *17E-8*
HIV- and AIDS-Infected *17E-9*
Hearing Impaired *17E-10*
Disabled Pretrial Detainees *17E-10*
Disabled Death-Row Inmates *17E-11*
Status of Disabled Prisoners Prior to the ADA *17E-12*
Constitutional Standards for Prison Litigation *17E-13*
Statutory Civil Rights for the Disabled: The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 *17E-14*
The Americans with Disabilities Act *17E-15*
Background: The Interrelationship of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the ADA *17E-15*
Summary of ADA Requirements *17E-16*
Title II: Public Services—Prohibition Against Discrimination and Other Generally Applicable Provisions *17E-17*
Other Relevant Provisions *17E-18*
Accessibility Guidelines and Their Limitations *17E-20*
General Applicability to Prisoners *17E-21*
Legal Aspects and Implications of ADA's Title II *17E-22*
Liability of State Governments and Individual Officials *17E-23*
Remedies *17E-23*
Diminished or Disappearing Intent Requirement *17E-24*
Objective Standards *17E-25*
Judicial Constraints *17E-26*
The Class: Disabled Individuals and Levels of Judicial Review *17E-26*
The Context: Prisons and Appropriate Levels of Judicial Deference *17E-26*
ADA-Based Prisoner Litigation to Date *17E-28*
Strategic Possibilities *17E-33*

Conclusion *17E-35*
Postscript *17E-37*
Notes *17E-38*

CHAPTER 17F
Experimentation on Prisoners

Prisoners as Human Subjects: A Closer Look at the Institute of Medicine's Recommendations to Loosen Current Restrictions on Using Prisoners in Scientific Research *Osagie K. Obasogie*
Introduction *17F-4*
I. The Institute of Medicine: Organization, Structure, and Influence *17F-7*
II. The Institute of Medicine and its Recommendation to Loosen Current Restrictions on Prison Research *17F-10*
A. Background to the Current Regulatory Restrictions: Past Abuses with Using Prisoners as Human Subjects *17F-11*
B. Mounting Concerns and Current Regulatory Framework *17F-15*
C. The 2006 IOM Report and Its "Evolved" Ethical Framework for Evaluating Prison Research *17F-19*
III. Beyond Consequences: A Critique of the Institute of Medicine's Recommendations *17F-22*
A. Existing Commentaries on the IOM Report *17F-22*
B. Three Critiques of the IOM's Updated Ethical Framework *17F-24*
1. Methodological Critique *17F-24*
2. Contextual Critique *17F-33*
3. Substantive Critique *17F-39*
Conclusion *17F-43*

CHAPTER 17G
Children of Incarcerated Parents

Children of Incarcerated Parents: The Child's Constitutional Right to the Family Relationship *Chesa Boudin*
I. Introduction *17G-4*
II. The Population Impacted by Parental Incarceration and the Issues at Stake *17G-8*
III. The Rights of the Child: Lessons from International Law *17G-10*
A. The Convention on the Rights of the Child *17G-10*
B. The African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child *17G-13*
C. European Law *17G-15*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

D. Other International Law *17G-17*
IV. Sentencing and Visiting: Is There a Role for the Child? *17G-18*
A. Sentencing Procedures Fail to Recognize Children's Rights *17G-19*
B. Visitation Policies and Children with Incarcerated Parents *17G-25*
V. Constitutional Rights of Children with Incarcerated Parents *17G-31*
A. First Amendment *17G-32*
B. Due Process *17G-36*
C. Engaging Counter-Arguments *17G-39*
D. Prudential Considerations *17G-41*
VI. Conclusion *17G-44*

CHAPTER 17H
Prison Visitation

Prison Visitation Policies: A Fifty-State Survey *Chesa Boudin, Trevor Stutz, and Aaron Littman*
Introduction *17H-4*
I. Methodology *17H-10*
A. Background *17H-10*
B. Sources of Data *17H-11*
II. Key Findings *17H-14*
A. Overview of Key Findings *17H-14*
1. Institutional Authority over Visitation *17H-14*
2. Number and Duration of Visits *17H-14*
3. Inmate Eligibility for Visits *17H-15*
4. Approval of Visitors *17H-17*
5. Exclusion of Visitors *17H-19*
6. Searches of Visitors *17H-20*
7. Dress and Behavior of Visitors *17H-21*
8. Children Visiting *17H-22*
9. Extended Visits *17H-23*
10. Virtual Visits *17H-25*
B. Similarities and Differences Across the Fifty States *17H-26*
C. Recent Policy Reforms *17H-27*
III. Overnight Family Visits and Virtual Visitation *17H-28*
A. Overnight Family Visits *17H-29*
B. Virtual Visitation *17H-33*
Conclusion *17H-41*

CHAPTER 17I
Prison Banking

Prison Banking *Anna VanCleave*
Introduction *17I-4*
I. What are Inmate Trust Accounts *17I-11*
A. How Inmate Trust Accounts Operate *17I-11*
B. Descriptions, Justifications, and Purposes of Inmate Trust Accounts *17I-16*
1. Prison Accounts as Ledgers to Track Wages and Debts *17I-16*
2. Prison Accounts as Simple Government Budget Line Items to Track Property *17I-18*
3. Prison Accounts for Purposes of Setting up an Efficient and Well-monitored Commissary System *17I-19*
4. Prison Accounts as a Means of Maintaining Security and Control *17I-21*
5. Prison Accounts as Pooled Assets for the General Welfare *17I-24*
6. Prison Accounts as Tools for Teaching Financial Responsibility *17I-26*
C. The Legal Status of Inmate Trust Accounts *17I-28*
D. Statutory and Regulatory Frameworks and Failures *17I-34*
II. Problems with the Current System: Legal and Illegal Abuses *17I-42*
A. Prison Banking and Its Historical Contexts *17I-42*
B. Inmate Trust Accounts Today: Forms of Asset Seizure *17I-49*
1. Unilaterally Establishing Prison Costs for Goods and Services and Deducting These Costs from Individual Accounts *17I-50*
2. Collecting Interest *17I-54*
3. Charging Money for Prison Disciplinary Infractions and Restitution *17I-55*
4. Diverting Funds to Pay Court Fines and Fees *17I-56*
5. Imposing Per Diem Costs of Incarceration *17I-58*
6. Embezzlement and Error *17I-61*
C. Impacts of Asset Seizures *17I-62*
D. Problematic Features of Prison Banking Systems *17I-64*
1. Conflicts of Interest *17I-64*
2. Low Transparency and Oversight *17I-65*
3. Minimal Regulation *17I-66*
4. Lack of Judicial Recourse *17I-67*
5. Low Transaction Costs *17I-72*
E. Change Resistance *17I-73*
III. The Paths Forward *17I-74*
A. Increasing Regulation, Oversight, and Transparency *17I-74*
B. Abolition *17I-79*
Conclusion *17I-82*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

CHAPTER 18
The Accreditation Debate

The Case Against Correctional Accreditation *David L. Bazelon*
Introduction *18-3*
The Promise of Accreditation *18-4*
The Reality of the Accreditation Process *18-5*
The Commission Has Repeatedly Refused to Open Up the Accreditation Process to Public Scrutiny and Participation *18-5*
The Commission's Audit Techniques and Deliberative Procedures Are Inherently Unreliable *18-8*
The Commission Is Unwilling to Accommodate Constructive Criticism and the Possibility of Meaningful Change *18-10*
The Commission's Priorities Are Fundamentally Flawed *18-10*
The Commission Has Pervasive Conflicts of Interest with the Facilities It Is Charged with Monitoring *18-11*
The Commission Has Permitted the Accreditation Movement to Be Transformed into a Propaganda Vehicle for Corrections Authorities *18-12*
Conclusion *18-13*
Notes *18-13*

The Case for Correctional Accreditation *B. James George, Jr.*
Introduction *18-19*
Standards Development *18-20*
Accreditation Procedures *18-21*
Statistics on Accreditation *18-21*
Correspondent Status *18-21*
Candidate Status *18-22*
Accreditation Hearing *18-23*
Accredited Status *18-24*
Reaccreditation *18-26*
Criticisms of the Accreditation Process *18-27*
The Benefits of Accreditation *18-35*
Conclusion *18-36*
Notes *18-37*

Accreditation: Making a Good Process Better
Lynn Sanders Branham
Introduction *18-41*
Ensuring That Accredited Facilities Meet Constitutional Standards *18-42*
Ensuring That the Information Provided by the Auditors to the Commission Is Accurate and Complete *18-46*

Ensuring That the Decisions of the Commission Are Accurate and Reliable *18-48*
Establishing a Multitiered Accreditation System *18-50*
Conclusion *18-50*
Notes *18-51*

CHAPTER 19
The Future of Prisons

Let's Nationalize the State Prisons *David Fogel* *19-3*
Notes *19-7*

CHAPTER 20
Restitution

A Proposal for a New Correctional System: Correction by Restitution *Don J. Young*
Prologue *20-3*
Introduction *20-4*
The Proposal *20-5*
Problems to Be Considered *20-5*
How This Proposal Would Work in Practice *20-7*
The Mechanics of Translating the Program into Reality *20-9*
The First Stage *20-9*
The Second Stage *20-10*
Conclusion *20-10*
Epilogue *20-10*
Notes *20-13*

CHAPTER 21
Prison Industries

Factories with Fences: The Prison-Industries Approach to Correctional Dilemmas *Warren E. Burger* *21-3*
Notes *21-8*

Freeing Prisoners' Labor *Stephen P. Garvey* *21-9*
Introduction *21-9*
Closing the Market *21-11*
Organizational Forms of Prison Labor *21-11*
The Rise of Prison Labor, 1790–1870 *21-12*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Prison Labor in the North *21-12*
Labor in the "Cradle of the Penitentiary" *21-12*
Labor in the Auburn-Cherry Hill Rivalry *21-13*
Prison Labor in the South *21-15*
The Fall of Prison Labor, 1870–1935 *21-17*
The Fall of the Contract *21-17*
The Fall of the Lease *21-20*
Federal Intervention *21-22*
Prison Labor Today *21-24*
Reopening the Market *21-26*
The Morality of the Market *21-27*
Potential Benefits *21-27*
Social Welfare *21-27*
Prison Order *21-28*
Inmate Reform and Rehabilitation *21-29*
Risks *21-31*
Abuse, Coercion, and Exploitation *21-31*
Racial Stereotyping *21-33*
Less Eligibility *21-34*
The Politics of the Market *21-35*
Three Ways to Open the Market *21-36*
Unions *21-36*
The State *21-36*
Victims *21-37*
Punishment and Profit *21-38*
Conclusion *21-40*
Notes *21-40*

Table of Contents

Volume Four

SECTION V
The Future of Prison Reform

CHAPTER 22
Privatization of Corrections

Privatization of Corrections: Defining the Issues *Ira P. Robbins*
Introduction *22-3*
Advantages and Criticisms *22-4*
Constitutional Issues *22-6*
State Action *22-6*
Public-Function Test *22-7*
Close-Nexus Test *22-8*
State-Compulsion Test *22-9*
Delegation *22-10*
Other Important Questions *22-11*
Symbolism: The Hidden Issue *22-12*
Conclusion *22-13*
Notes *22-13*

Contracting for the Operation of Prisons and Jails *National Institute of Justice, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *22-17*
Legal Issues *22-18*
Labor Relations *22-18*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Liability *22-19*
Use of Force *22-19*
Inmate Rights *22-19*
Before Deciding to Contract *22-20*
Public Relations *22-20*
What Kind of Facility? *22-20*
Selection of Inmates *22-20*
Inmate Discipline *22-21*
RFP and Contract Issues *22-21*
Appraisal Criteria *22-21*
Contract Pricing *22-22*
Interruptions in Service *22-23*
Performance Standards *22-23*
Duration and Renewal *22-23*
Provisions for Monitoring *22-23*
Present Employees *22-24*
Monitoring and Evaluation *22-24*
How to Monitor and How Much *22-24*
Evaluation Issues *22-25*
What Results to Expect *22-27*
Official Perceptions *22-27*
Speed and Quality *22-27*
Cost Considerations *22-27*
Public Perceptions *22-28*
Avoiding Future Problems *22-28*
Prison Contracting: The Issues *22-29*
Legal Issues *22-29*
Policy and Program Issues Before Deciding to Contract *22-29*
RFP and Contract Issues *22-29*
Monitoring and Evaluation *22-30*
Trends in Private Operation of Correctional Facilities *22-30*

The Legal Dimensions of Private Incarceration *Ira P. Robbins*
Preface *22-36*
Advisory Board *22-39*
Executive Summary *22-40*
I. Introduction *22-40*
II. Constitutional Dimensions *22-43*
A. The Delegation Doctrine *22-43*
1. Introduction *22-43*
2. Federal Delegation *22-44*
a. Brief History *22-44*
(1) Delegation to Public Bodies *22-45*
(2) Delegation to Private Parties *22-46*
b. Current Federal Law *22-47*

(1) The *Todd* Test *22-48*
(2) Possible Inapplicability of the *Todd* Test *22-49*
c. Possible Trend to Revive the Delegation Doctrine *22-49*
3. State Delegation *22-51*
a. Delegation of Management Functions *22-52*
b. Delegation of Rule-Making Authority *22-54*
c. Delegation of Adjudicative Powers *22-57*
d. Application of State Law to Private Incarceration *22-60*
4. Conclusion *22-60*
B. The State-Action Requirement of the Fourteenth Amendment and 42 U.S.C. § 1983 *22-62*
1. Introduction *22-62*
2. Overview of State-Action Doctrine *22-63*
a. Historical Approaches to State Action: Four Traditional Tests *22-64*
b. The 1982 Trilogy: An Attempt at Clarification *22-64*
3. Development of the State-Action Doctrine: The Application to Prison and Jail Privatization *22-65*
a. Public-Function Test *22-65*
b. Close-Nexus Test *22-69*
c. State-Compulsion Test *22-72*
d. Multi-Characterization Analysis *22-73*
4. The Latest Word: *West v. Atkins* *22-75*
5. Conclusion *22-76*
C. The Thirteenth Amendment *22-77*
1. Introduction *22-77*
2. Analysis *22-77*
3. Conclusion *22-79*
III. Contractual Dimensions *22-80*
A. Model Contract and Commentary *22-82*
Section 1: Policy Statement—Goals and Responsibilities of the Parties *22-82*
Section 2: Private Financing and Physical Plant *22-86*
Section 2(A): Private Financing *22-86*
(1) Private Financing Generally *22-86*
(a) Advantages and Disadvantages *22-86*
(b) Tax Aspects *22-87*
(2) Types of Private Financing *22-87*
(a) Straight Lease *22-88*
(b) Leasing as Part of Contract for Operation and Management of a Correctional or Detention Facility *22-89*
(c) Sale/Leaseback *22-90*
(3) Other Types of Financing for Incarceration Facilities *22-91*
(4) Conclusion *22-93*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Section 2(B): Physical Plant *22-94*
Section 3: General Contract Terms *22-95*
Section 3(A): Term *22-95*
Section 3(B): Renewal *22-97*
Section 3(C): Compensation *22-99*
Section 3(D): Performance Bond *22-101*
Section 3(E): Indemnification, Immunity, and Insurance *22-102*
(1) Indemnification and Immunity *22-102*
(a) The Eleventh Amendment, Sovereign Immunity, and Federal/State Tort-Claims Acts *22-103*
(b) 42 U.S.C. § 1983 *22-104*
(c) Available Immunities *22-105*
(d) Immunity for Private-Incarceration Contractors *22-105*
(2) Insurance *22-112*
Section 3(F): Operating Standards and Accreditation *22-119*
(1) Operating Standards *22-119*
(2) Accreditation *22-121*
Section 3(G): Subcontracts and Assignments *22-122*
Section 3(H): Independent-Contractor Status *22-124*
Section 4: Employee Issues *22-124*
Section 4(A): Hiring Criteria *22-124*
(1) Employment Discrimination *22-124*
(2) Employment Options for Correctional and Detention Employees at Existing Facilities *22-126*
(3) Employee Background Investigations *22-127*
Section 4(B): Employee Training Requirements *22-128*
Section 4(C): Personnel Policy *22-130*
Section 4(D): Staff Ratio *22-131*
Section 4(E): Labor Disputes/Right to Strike *22-132*
(1) Federal Facilities *22-132*
(2) State Facilities *22-133*
(3) Private Facilities *22-134*
(a) The National Labor Relations Act *22-134*
(b) The Applicability of the National Labor Relations Act to Private Prison and Jail Employees *22-134*
(4) Recommendations *22-137*
Section 5: Inmate Issues *22-138*
Section 5(A): Inmate Management *22-138*
(1) Classification *22-138*
(2) Transfer *22-139*
(3) Discipline *22-139*
(4) Parole *22-141*
Section 5(B): Use of Force *22-142*
Section 5(C): Inmate Transportation *22-145*

Section 5(D): Inmate Labor *22-146*
Section 6: Monitoring *22-147*
Section 7: Termination *22-150*
Section 8: Miscellaneous Provisions *22-154*
Section 8(A): Entire Agreement *22-154*
Section 8(B): Amendment *22-154*
Section 8(C): Severability *22-155*
Section 8(D): Venue and Choice of Law *22-155*
Section 8(E): Alternative Dispute Resolution *22-156*
B. Summary of Model Contract Provisions *22-157*
IV. Statutory Dimensions *22-176*
A. Federal Statutory Authorization to Designate Privately Operated Places of Confinement *22-176*
1. Introduction *22-176*
2. 18 U.S.C. § 4082(b) *22-177*
a. Legislative Intent of 18 U.S.C. § 4082(b) *22-178*
b. 18 U.S.C. § 4002's Restrictions on 18 U.S.C. § 4082(b) *22-179*
c. 1965 Amendment to Section 4082(b) Expanding Scope of Attorney General's Authority to Designate Places of Confinement *22-180*
3. Conclusion *22-180*
B. Model Statute and Commentary *22-181*
Section 1: Enabling Legislation *22-183*
Section 2: Site Selection *22-185*
Section 3: Contract Term and Renewal *22-187*
Section 4: Standards of Operation *22-188*
Section 5: Use of Force *22-189*
Section 6: Employee Training Requirements *22-190*
Section 7: Monitoring *22-191*
Section 8: Liability and Sovereign Immunity *22-192*
Section 9: Insurance *22-193*
Section 10: Termination of Contract and Resumption of Government Control *22-194*
Section 11: Nondelegability of Contracting Agency's Authority *22-195*
Section 12: Conflict of Interest *22-195*
C. Summary of Model Statutory Provisions *22-197*
V. Conclusion *22-202*
VI. Notes *22-203*
VII. Selected Bibliography *22-282*

No Qualified Immunity for Private Prison Guards
Harvard Law Review
Introduction *22-335*
Richardson v. McKnight *22-336*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Analysis *22-338*
Conclusion *22-340*
Notes *22-341*

Prison Accountability and Performance Measures
Alexander Volokh

Introduction *22-349*
I. The Failure of Comparative Effectiveness Studies *22-354*
A. Which Sector Costs Less? *22-354*
1. Difficulties in Calculating Costs *22-354*
2. Competing Cost Estimates *22-357*
a. Texas *22-357*
b. Florida *22-358*
c. Taft *22-358*
B. Which Sector Provides Higher Quality? *22-360*
1. Difficulties in Figuring Out Quality *22-360*
2. Which Sector Leads to Less Recidivism? *22-364*
C. The Limits of Comparative Effectiveness *22-368*
II. Why Use Performance Measures? *22-371*
A. The Puzzle of Prisons? *22-371*
B. Accountability, Neutrality, and Goal Setting *22-376*
1. To Know What Works *22-376*
2. To Implement Competitive Neutrality *22-377*
3. To Express What We Want *22-380*
C. For Performance-Based Contracting *22-380*
1. Limited Current Efforts *22-380*
2. The Range of Possible Contracts *22-382*
a. General Considerations *22-382*
b. Rewards or Penalities *22-384*
c. Controlling for Baselines *22-385*
d. Discrete vs. Continuous Measures *22-389*
3. The Feasibility of Merit Pay in the Public Sector *22-391*
D. What Measures to Choose *22-392*
III. Concerns and Critiques *22-400*
A. What Prices to Set *22-400*
B. Effects on Market Structure *22-403*
1. Public-Interestedness *22-403*
2. Risk and Capital Requirements *22-404*
a. The Risk Is in the Slope *22-404*
b. Financing Nonprofits: Social Impact Bonds *22-408*
C. Undesirable Strategic Behavior *22-410*
1. Manipulating the Goals *22-410*
2. Distortion Across Dimensions of Performance *22-413*
3. Distortion Across Types of Inmates *22-417*
4. Falsifying Performance Measures *22-419*

Conclusion *22-422*

APPENDIX A
Prisoners' Assistance Directory

Introduction *App. A-3*
National and Regional Organizations *App. A-4*
Corrections/Criminal Justice/Legal *App. A-4*
AIDS/Hepatitis *App. A-13*
Book Programs/Pen Pals *App. A-15*
Death Penalty *App. A-17*
Drug Law Reform *App. A-18*
Families/Visitation *App. A-18*
Gays/Lesbians *App. A-21*
Immigrants Rights *App. A-23*
Juveniles *App. A-23*
Mental Health *App. A-24*
Religious *App. A-25*
Technology *App. A-26*
Veterans/Military *App. A-27*
Voting Rights *App. A-27*
Women *App. A-28*
State and Local Organizations *App. A-29*
International Organizations *App. A-132*
Publications *App. A-135*
Books, Reports, Etc. *App. A-135*
Newsletters *App. A-143*
Miscellaneous *App. A-147*
Duplicating Services *App. A-147*
Educational Opportunities *App. A-147*

APPENDIX B
American Bar Association Criminal Justice Standards

ABA Criminal Justice Standards on the Treatment of Prisoners (Approved by the ABA House of Delegates, February 2010)

Definitions *App. B-7*
General Principles *App. B-9*
Intake and Classification *App. B-11*
Conditions of Confinement *App. B-18*
Rules of Conduct and Discipline *App. B-24*
Personal Security *App. B-27*
Health Care *App. B-36*
Personal Dignity *App. B-46*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Rehabilitation and Reintegration *App. B-54*
Grievances and Access to Courts *App. B-62*
Administration and Staffing *App. B-68*
Accountability and Oversight *App. B-73*

APPENDIX C
Prisoner Statistics

Time Served in Prison and on Parole 1984 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-87*
Prison Releases, 1984 *App. C-88*
Offender Characteristics *App. C-88*
Type of Prison Release *App. C-89*
Time Served in Prison *App. C-89*
Time Served in Local Jails *App. C-90*
Sex *App. C-90*
Race *App. C-91*
Prior Felony Incarceration *App. C-91*
Minimum Time to Be Served *App. C-92*
Parolees Discharged in 1984 *App. C-92*
Total Time Under Supervision *App. C-93*
Time to Failure *App. C-93*
Methodology *App. C-94*
Reporting Criteria *App. C-94*
Offenses *App. C-94*
Sentences *App. C-95*
Time Served *App. C-95*
Median and Mean *App. C-96*
Year-to-Year Comparisons *App. C-96*

Historical Statistics on Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions, Yearend 1925-86 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-153*
National Trends, 1925-86 *App. C-154*
Record High Number of Prisoners *App. C-154*
Record Year-to-Year Numerical Increase *App. C-154*
Record Year-to-Year Percentage Increase *App. C-154*
Record Year-to-Year Percentage Decrease *App. C-154*
Regional Trends, 1925-86 *App. C-154*
Record Year-to-Year Percentage Increase *App. C-154*
Individual State Trends, 1925-86 *App. C-155*
Record Year-to-Year Percentage Increase *App. C-155*

Trends in the Size of the Federal Prison Population as a Percentage of the Total Prison Population *App. C-156*
Record High Percentage of Federal Prisoners *App. C-156*
Record Low Percentage of Federal Prisoners *App. C-156*
Methodology *App. C-156*
Tables *App. C-157*
Sources *App. C-170*

Prison Rule Violators *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-175*
Rule Violators: Definition, Classification, and Disposition *App. C-176*
Rule Violations in State Prisons *App. C-177*
Demographic Characteristics of Rule Violators *App. C-177*
Drug-Use History of Rule Violators *App. C-178*
Frequency of Violations *App. C-178*
Average Annual Number of Violations *App. C-179*
Facility Characteristics Relating to Rule Violators *App. C-179*
Punishments for Rule Violations *App. C-180*
Methodology *App. C-181*
Questions Asked State Prison Inmates About Their Prison Rule Infractions *App. C-182*
Notes *App. C-196*

Women in Prison *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-241*
Surveys of State Prison Inmates *App. C-242*
Female Prisoner Characteristics *App. C-243*
Commitment Offense *App. C-243*
Violent Female Offenders and Their Victims *App. C-243*
Criminal History *App. C-244*
Sentence Length and Time Served *App. C-244*
Drugs and Crime *App. C-245*
Drug Use by Women Prior to Imprisonment *App.C-246*
Physical and Sexual Abuse *App. C-246*
Mothers in Prison *App. C-247*
Recent Growth in the Female Offender Population *App. C-248*
Methodology *App. C-249*
Notes *App. C-258*

Race of Prisoners Admitted to State and Federal Institutions, 1926-86 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-259*
National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-259*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Statistics on Race from the Admission Series *App. C-260*
Definitions Used in the Admission Series *App. C-261*
Gaps in the Admission Series *App. C-262*
Number of States Submitting Admission Records *App. C-263*
Relative Number of Admission Records Submitted *App. C-263*
Long-Term Growth of the Black Prison Population in the United States *App. C-264*
Growth in Per Capita Rates of Black Imprisonment *App. C-265*
Increase in the Number of Blacks in State Versus Federal Prisons *App. C-265*
Comparing the Growth in the Prison Population of Blacks and of Asians, Alaska Natives, American Indians, and Pacific Islanders *App. C-265*
Regional Variation in the Growth of the Black Prison Population *App. C-266*
Recent Trends in the Racial Composition of Persons Admitted to State Prisons *App. C-266*
State-by-State Statistics and Federal Statistics on Prison Admissions, by Race, 1926-86 *App. C-266*
Methodology *App. C-267*
Estimation Procedures *App. C-267*
Missing States, 1926 *App. C-267*
Missing States, 1986 *App. C-267*
Missing Records, 1926 and 1986 *App. C-268*
Incomplete Records, 1926 and 1986 *App. C-268*
Tables *App. C-268*
Appendix: Sources on Table 1 *App. C-309*
Sources for Total Admissions from Courts *App. C-309*
Sources for State and Federal Prison Admissions *App. C-310*
Notes *App. C-315*

Drug Enforcement and Treatment in Prisons, 1990 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Overview *App. C-341*
Introduction *App. C-342*
Interdiction Activities *App. C-343*
Most Prison Facilities Patted Down Inmates and Required Them to Exchange Clothes upon Admission or Any Reentry *App. C-343*
Most Facilities Searched the Belongings of Visitors *App. C-343*
Staff Were Also Subject to Drug Interdiction Activities *App. C-344*
Maximum Security Facilities Took More Stringent Drug Interdiction Measures Than Other Facilities *App. C-344*
Testing Urine for Drug Use *App. C-344*
Most Correctional Facilities Tested Some Inmates for Illegal Drug Use *App. C-344*
Most Large State Confinement Facilities Tested for Drugs *App. C-345*

Almost All Work Release Facilities Tested for Drugs *App. C-346*
For All Inmates Tested, State Prisons Reported Higher Positive Rates Than Federal Prisons *App. C-346*
Same Percentage of State and Federal Facilities Reported Positive Drug Tests *App. C-346*
Community-Based Facilities Found Higher Rates of Drug Use Than Confinement Facilities *App. C-346*
Among State Confinement Facilities, Positive Test Results Were Highest in Those Testing on Suspicion Only *App. C-347*
The Percentages of Positive Tests Were Higher in Large Facilities *App. C-347*
Positive Results from Drug Tests Varied Among Facilities Performing Different Functions *App. C-347*
Positive Drug Tests Were Linked to Interdiction Activities *App. C-348*
Drug Testing of Staff Was Highest in Federal Facilities *App. C-348*
A Positive Test Was Grounds for Dismissal in over a Third of Facilities That Tested Staff for Drugs *App. C-349*
Drug Treatment/Intervention on June 29, 1990 *App. C-349*
Prisons Could Treat an Estimated 131,900 Inmates for Drug Addiction *App. C-350*
Prisons Were Treating Approximately 100,200 Inmates *App. C-350*
Enrollment in Drug Treatment Was Below Capacity *App. C-351*
Prisons Offered a Variety of Programs *App. C-351*
Interpreting Measures of Drug Testing *App. C-352*
Methodology *App. C-353*
Census Universe *App. C-353*
Questionnaire Administration *App. C-353*
Definitions of Community-Based and Confinement Facilities *App. C-354*
Drug Addendum *App. C-354*
Estimation Procedures *App. C-354*
Notes *App. C-369*

HIV in U.S. Prisons and Jails *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-391*
Data Sources *App. C-392*
Prevalence of HIV Infection in U.S. Prisons *App. C-392*
Prison Policies for Testing for HIV *App. C-393*
Deaths in Prison *App. C-393*
AIDS-Related Deaths *App. C-393*
Extent of HIV Testing of State Prison Inmates *App. C-394*
HIV Test Results, By Inmate Characteristics *App. C-394*
HIV Test Results, By Drug and Needle Use *App. C-395*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

HIV Test Results, By Type of Prison *App. C-395*
HIV Testing Policies in the Largest Jail Jurisdictions *App. C-395*
Deaths in 503 Large Jail Jurisdictions *App.C-396*
Methodology *App. C-396*
Data Sources *App. C-396*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. C-397*

Women in Prison, 1994 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-433*
Current Offenses *App. C-433*
Criminal Histories *App. C-433*
Victims of Violent Inmates *App. C-434*
Family Characteristics *App. C-434*
Drug and Alcohol Use *App. C-434*
Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities, 1991 *App. C-434*
Increase in Number of Women in Prison *App. C-435*
Characteristics of Women in Prison *App. C-435*
Current Offense *App. C-436*
Violent Female Inmates and Their Victims *App. C-436*
Criminal History *App. C-437*
Sentence Length *App. C-437*
Family Background *App. C-438*
Physical and Sexual Abuse of Prisoners *App. C-439*
Mothers in Prison *App. C-441*
Drug Use History *App. C-442*
HIV and AIDS *App. C-444*
Alcohol Use *App. C-445*
Prison Health Care for Women *App. C-445*
Methodology *App. C-445*
Sample Design *App. C-446*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. C-446*

Comparing Federal and State Prison Inmates, 1991 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Foreword *App. C-463*
Summary *App. C-464*
Current Offense *App. C-464*
Sentence Length and Time to Be Served *App. C-464*
Criminal History *App. C-465*
Drug and Alcohol Use *App. C-465*
Weapons *App. C-465*
Personal and Family Characteristics *App. C-465*
HIV *App. C-466*

Activities Since Admission *App. C-466*
Inmate Characteristics *App. C-466*
The Data *App. C-466*
Characteristics of Sentenced Federal and State Prison Inmates *App. C-467*
Current Offenses *App. C-467*
Current Offenses of Men and Women *App. C-468*
Current Offenses of Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics *App. C-468*
Current Offenses of Citizens and Noncitizens *App. C-469*
Sentence Length and Time to Be Served *App. C-469*
Recidivism *App. C-470*
Prior Sentences to Probation and Incarceration *App. C-470*
Criminal Histories *App. C-471*
Characteristics of Prior Sentences *App. C-471*
Criminal Histories of Men and Women *App. C-471*
Criminal Histories of White, Black, and Hispanic Inmates *App. C-471*
Criminal History and Current Offense *App. C-472*
Drug Use *App. C-472*
Drug Use of Men and Women *App. C-473*
Drug Use of White, Black, and Hispanic Inmates *App. C-473*
Drug Use of Age Groups *App. C-473*
Drug Use of Citizens and Noncitizens *App. C-474*
Drug Use, by Current Offense *App. C-474*
Drug Treatment Programs *App. C-474*
Type of Drug Treatment Program *App. C-474*
Status of Drug Treatment *App. C-475*
Characteristics of Drug Treatment Participants *App. C-475*
Alcohol and Drug Use at the Time of the Offense *App. C-475*
Federal Inmates Serving Time for a Drug Offense—Other Than Possession Only—Organizations and Activities *App. C-476*
Amount of Drugs Involved in the Current Offense for Federal Inmates *App. C-477*
Firearms *App. C-478*
Firearm Use by Violent and Nonviolent Offenders *App. C-478*
Type of Firearm *App. C-479*
Firearm Use, by Offense *App. C-479*
Stealing and Selling Firearms *App. C-479*
Family Background *App. C-479*
Parental Drug and Alcohol Abuse *App. C-480*
Family Members Incarcerated *App. C-480*
Physical or Sexual Abuse *App. C-480*
Prisoners with Children *App. C-481*
Women in Federal and State Prisons *App. C-481*
Highlighting Women in Federal and State Prisons: An Index to Tables *App. C-482*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Activities in Prison *App. C-483*
Furloughs *App. C-483*
HIV Infection *App. C-484*
Conditions of Confinement in Federal Prisons *App. C-486*
Federal Inmates' Opinions of Confinement Conditions *App. C-486*
Methodology *App. C-487*
Sample Design *App. C-487*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. C-488*

Lifetime Likelihood of Going to State or Federal Prison *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-659*
Highlights *App. C-659*
The Chances of Going to Prison, by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin *App. C-660*
The Likelihood of Going to Prison, by Age *App. C-661*
The Chances of Going to Prison Decline with Advancing Age *App. C-661*
The Number of First Admissions by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin *App. C-662*
Characteristics of First Admissions *App. C-663*
Steady Chances of Going to Prison Since 1991 *App. C-664*
Comparing Lifetime Rates to Other Types of Incarceration Rates *App. C-665*
Methodology *App. C-666*
Life Table Techniques *App. C-666*
Age-Specific Mortality Rates *App. C-667*
Estimating the Number of Persons at Risk to First Incarceration *App. C-667*
Estimating the Number of First Admissions to Prison *App. C-667*
Calculating the Lifetime Chances of Going to Prison *App. C-669*
Limitations of the Life Table Estimates *App. C-670*

Prisoner Petitions in the Federal Courts, 1980-96 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Highlights *App. C-741*
Petitions by State Inmates *App. C-741*
Petitions by Federal Inmates *App. C-741*
Introduction *App. C-742*
Overview *App. C-742*
Tracking Prisoner Petitions Through the Federal Courts *App. C-742*
Petitions Dismissed *App. C-743*
Petitions Adjudicated *App. C-743*
Petitions Pending *App. C-743*

Legal Representation of Federal and State Inmates *App. C-743*
Prisoner Petitions in U.S. District Courts *App. C-744*
Prisoner Petitions Filed *App. C-744*
Trends in Prisoner Petitions Filed *App. C-745*
Cases Filed *App. C-745*
Filing Rate *App. C-746*
Prisoner Petitions Adjudicated in U.S. District Court *App. C-747*
Mode of Disposition *App. C-747*
Disposition *App. C-747*
Case Processing Time *App. C-748*
Habeas Corpus Petitions by Death Row Inmates in State Prisons *App. C-749*
Mode of Adjudication *App. C-750*
Case Processing Time *App. C-750*
Appeals *App. C-750*
Prisoner Petitions in U.S. Courts of Appeal *App. C-751*
Prisoner Petitions Filed *App. C-751*
Trends, 1980-1995 *App. C-752*
Appeals Filed *App. C-752*
Filing Rate *App. C-752*
Prisoner Petitions Adjudicated in U.S. Courts of Appeal *App. C-753*
Mode of Disposition *App. C-753*
Disposition *App. C-753*
Case Processing Time *App. C-754*
Methodology *App. C-754*
Notes *App. C-754.1*

Truth in Sentencing in State Prisons *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-859*
Highlights *App. C-860*
Three Decades of Sentencing Reform—1970's Through 1990's *App. C-860*
Discrepancy Between Sentence and Time Served *App. C-860*
Data Were Compiled From Multiple Sources *App. C-860*
Sentencing Reforms Parallel "Get Tough on Crime" Attitude *App. C-861*
Washington State Enacted the First Truth-in-Sentencing Law in 1984 *App. C-862*
Most Truth-in-Sentencing States Require Offenders to Serve 85% of the Prison Sentence *App. C-862*
14 States Have Abolished Parole Board Release for All Offenders *App. C-863*
Between 1990 and 1997 the Number of Offenders in State Prison Increased 7% Annually *App. C-864*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

State Prison Admission Rates Have Dropped *App. C-864*
Over a Third of Prison Admissions in 1997 Were Parole Violators *App. C-864*
The Commitment Rate for Murder Rose From 460 per 1,000 Arrests in 1990 to 613 per 1,000 in 1996 *App. C-866*
Nearly 40% of All Female, Black, and Hispanic Prison Admissions Were Drug Offenders *App. C-867*
Nearly 7 in 10 Violent Offenders Are in a State that Requires 85% of the Sentence Be Served *App. C-868*
Offenders Admitted to Prison in 1996 for Robbery Were Expected to Serve 7 Months Longer Than in 1990 *App. C-869*
Violent Offenders Admitted to Prison in 1996 Were Expected to Serve About Half of Their Sentence *App. C-870*
Truth-in-Sentencing Laws Would Increase the Minimum Prison Term by 15 Months for Violent Offenders *App. C-870*
Violent Offenders Would Serve About 10 Months Less Under a 75%-Requirement Than an 85%-Requirement *App. C-871*
For Releases, Average Time Served in Prison Increased From 22 Months in 1990 to 25 Months in 1996 *App. C-871*
Time Served by Released Part 1 Violent Offenders Increased in 38 States Between 1993 and 1997 *App. C-872*
Part 1 Violent Offenders Released in 1997 Served Between 25% and 87% of Their Sentence *App. C-872*
Black Offenders Released in 1996 Served 2 Months Longer Than White Offenders *App. C-873*
Prisoners Released in 4 States Served Over 70% of the Sentence *App. C-874*
Nearly 18% of Released Offenders Served Their Entire Prison Sentence *App. C-875*
Time Served Increased for Parole Board Releases Between 1990 and 1996 *App. C-875*
Violent Offenders Released by Parole Boards Served 4 Months Longer Than Other Conditional Releases *App. C-875*
Parole Board Releases Served 29% of the Sentence, and Other Conditional Releases, 47% *App. C-876*
Prisoners Are Serving More Time Than Release Data Indicate *App. C-876*
State Prison Population Growth Is Linked to Increasing Time Served *App. C-876*
The Sentences of Released Offenders Decreased Between 1990 and 1996 *App. C-877*
The Release Rate for Rape Offenders Dropped From 24 per 100 to 15 per 100 State Prison Inmates *App. C-877*
Few Offenders Admitted Under Truth-in-Sentencing Laws Are Being Released From Prison *App. C-878*
Six States Projected an Average 10-Year Prison Term Under Truth in Sentencing *App. C-878*

Seven States Reported an Average Percent of Sentence Served Above 85% *App. C-878*
Methodology *App. C-879*
NCRP Participating States *App. C-879*
Estimating the Admission and Release Rates by Offense *App. C-880*
Truth-in-Sentencing Reform *App. C-880*
Definition of Terms *App. C-880*

Prior Abuse Reported by Inmates and Probationers *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-897*
Highlights *App.C-898*
For Women, Abuse as Children More Likely in Correctional Than General Population *App. C-899*
Abused Males Reported Being Mistreated as Children, But Females, as Both Children and Adults *App.C-899*
Abuse of Men Was by Family Members, But Abuse of Women by Family Members and Intimates *App. C-899*
Prisoners' Prior Abuse Related to Their Family Background *App. C-899*
Reported Past Abuse Associated With Violent Crime *App. C-900*
The Reported Use of Illegal Drugs and Alcohol Higher Among Abused *App. C-901*
Inmates and Probationers Answered Surveys About Their Abuse *App. C-901*
Question Wording and Respondent Sensitivity Affect Level of Reported Abuse *App. C-902*

Substance Abuse and Treatment, State and Federal Prisoners, 1997 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-907*
Highlights *App. C-908*
Half of State Inmates and a Third of Federal Prisoners Reported Committing Their Current Offense Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs *App. C-908*
Since Admission 1 in 8 State Prisoners Were Treated for Substance Abuse, and 1 in 4 Had Participated in Other Alcohol or Drug Abuse Programs *App. C-909*
Drug Offenders Accounted for Over 250,000 Prisoners; 21% of State, Over 60% of Federal Prisoners in 1997 *App. C-910*
Half of All Prisoners Were Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs at the Time of Their Offense *App. C-911*
Assault, Murder, and Sexual Assault Most Closely Tied to Alcohol Use at the Time of Offense *App. C-912*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

A Third of State and a Fifth of Federal Prisoners Said They Used Drugs at the Time of Offense *App. C-912*
Prior Drug Use by State Prisoners Remained Stable Since 1991, Except for Marijuana Use *App. C-912*
Nearly Three-Quarters of Federal Prisoners Had Used Drugs in the Past—Up From 60% in 1991 *App. C-913*
Over 40% of Federal Prisoners Used Drugs in the Month Before the Offense; 20% Used Cocaine or Crack *App. C-913*
Past Experiences of Alcohol Abuse, by Number of Positive CAGE Responses of State Prisoners, 1997 *App. C-914*
About 1 in 6 Prisoners Said They Committed Their Offense to Get Money for Drugs *App. C-915*
Responses From a Quarter of State, a Sixth of Federal Prisoners Indicated Past Alcohol Abuse or Dependence *App. C-915*
Over 60% of All Prisoners Had Driven While Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs *App. C-916*
Prisoners Were as Likely to Experience Problems With Alcohol as With Drugs *App. C-916*
Female State Prisoners Reported Higher Levels of Past Drug Use; Levels Higher for Male Federal Prisoners *App. C-916*
Prior Drug Use of State Prisoners Varies Little by Race; Hispanics Report Lowest Levels in Federal Prisons *App. C-917*
Prisoners Aged 44 and Younger Report More Prior Drug Abuse Than Older Prisoners *App. C-917*
Alcohol Abuse More Prevalent Among Whites, Male Prisoners *App. C-917*
Three-Quarters of All Prisoners Can Be Characterized as Alcohol- or Drug-Involved Offenders *App. C-918*
A Third of State, a Quarter of Federal Prisoners Said They Had Ever Been Treated for Substance Abuse *App. C-919*
Treatment Tied to Past Use, Time Remaining Until Expected Release *App. C-919*
Prisoners' Participation in Drug Treatment Dropped Since 1991; Other Drug Programs Grew *App. C-920*
1 in 4 Prisoners Participated in Either Drug Treatment or Other Drug Abuse Programs Since Admission *App. C-921*
Among Prisoners With Past Drug Abuse, Treatment Provided Less Commonly Than Other Programs *App. C-921*
A Quarter of State and a Fifth of Federal Prisoners Received Alcohol Treatment Since Admission *App. C-922*
Less Than a Fifth of Alcohol-Abusing Prisoners Received Treatment; About a Third Enrolled in Other Programs *App. C-923*
Women, Whites More Likely to Receive Substance Abuse Treatment Since Admission to State Prison *App. C-923*
Substance Abuse Treatment of Federal Prisoners Shows Little Variation by Sex or Age *App. C-924*
Methodology *App. C-924*

Sample Design *App. C-924*
Estimates of Prisoner Counts *App. C-926*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. C-926*

Time Served in Prison by Federal Offenders, 1986-97 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-947*
Highlights *App. C-948*
Sentences Imposed *App. C-948*
Time to Be Served, 1986 and 1997 *App. C-948*
Time Served to First Release *App. C-949*
Differences Between Entry and Release Cohorts *App. C-949*
Measuring Length of Stay for Entering Cohorts of Federal Prisoners *App. C-950*
Time to Be Served by Federal Offenders, 1986-97 *App. C-950*
Offenders Entering Federal Prison *App. C-950*
Offense of Conviction *App. C-951*
Offenders Released from Federal Prison *App. C-952*
Offense of Conviction *App. C-953*
Time to Be Served *App. C-953*
Prison Population *App. C-954*
Methodology *App. C-955*
Data Sources *App. C-955*
Measuring Time Served and Time to Be Served *App. C-956*
Prison Term in Effect *App. C-956*
Time Served *App. C-956*
Proportion of Time Served *App. C-957*
Estimated Number of Suspects in Criminal Matters in 1986 *App. C-958*

Mental Health and Treatment of Inmates and Probationers *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1017*
Highlights *App. C-1018*
Over a Quarter Million Mentally Ill Incarcerated in Prison or Jail *App. C-1018*
Mentally Ill Inmates Were More Likely Than Others to Be in Prison for a Violent Offense *App. C-1018*
Nearly 6 in 10 Mentally Ill Offenders Reported They Were Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs at the Time of Their Current Offense *App. C-1019*
Prevalence of Mental Illness Among Correctional Populations Based on Offender Self Reports *App. C-1019*
16% of State Prisoners Identified As Mentally Ill *App. C-1020*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

283,800 Mentally Ill in Prison or Jail; 547,800 on Probation *App. C-1020*
White Inmates More Likely Than Blacks or Hispanics to Report a Mental Illness *App. C-1021*
Offender Mental Illness Highest Among the Middle-Aged *App. C-1021*
Mentally Ill More Likely Than Other Offenders to Have Committed a Violent Offense *App. C-1022*
6 in 10 Violent Mentally Ill State Prisoners Knew Their Victim *App. C-1022*
Half of Mentally Ill Inmates Reported 3 or More Prior Sentences *App. C-1023*
Mentally Ill More Likely Than Other Inmates to Be Violent Recidivists *App. C-1024*
Homelessness More Prevalent Among Mentally Ill Offenders *App. C-1024*
About 4 in 10 Inmates with a Mental Condition Unemployed Before Arrest *App. C-1025*
Family History of Incarceration and Alcohol or Drug Use Prevalent Among Mentally Ill *App. C-1025*
Mentally Ill Report High Rates of Past Physical and Sexual Abuse *App. C-1026*
6 in 10 Mentally Ill State Inmates Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs at Time of Offense *App. C-1026*
A Third of Mentally Ill Offenders Alcohol Dependent *App. C-1027*
Mentally Ill Offenders Report Negative Life Experiences Related to Drinking *App. C-1027*
Mentally Ill Expected to Serve 15 Months Longer Than Other Inmates in Prison *App. C-1028*
Disciplinary Problems Common Among Mentally Ill Inmates *App. C-1028*
6 in 10 Mentally Ill Received Treatment While Incarcerated *App. C-1029*
Female Mentally Ill More Likely Than Males to Report Treatment *App. C-1029*
Methodology *App. C-1030*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. C-1031*
Estimating the Number of Mentally Ill Offenders Under Correctional Supervision *App. C-1031*

Women Offenders *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1073*
Highlights *App. C-1074*
Violent Victimizers *App. C-1075*
Characteristics of Violent Female Offenders *App. C-1075*

Characteristics of Victims of Female Violent Offenders *App. C-1076*
Where Offenders Committed Violence and Use of Drugs or Alcohol *App. C-1076*
Consequences of Female Violence *App. C-1077*
Women Who Murder *App. C-1077*
Parents Who Kill *App. C-1079*
Arrests *App. C-1079*
Female Defendants in State Courts *App. C-1080*
Female Corrections Populations *App. C-1081*
Characteristics of Women Serving a Sentence *App. C-1081*
Race and Hispanic Origin *App. C-1081*
Age *App. C-1082*
Marital Status *App. C-1082*
Education *App. C-1082*
Inmates' Children *App. C-1082*
Economic Circumstances *App. C-1083*
Health Issues *App. C-1083*
Alcohol and Drug Use *App. C-1083*
Criminal History *App. C-1084*
State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-1085*
Sentences to Prison *App. C-1085*
Prison Admissions *App. C-1085*
Prison Releases *App. C-1086*
Death Sentences *App. C-1086*
Recidivism *App. C-1087*
The Prevalence of Imprisonment Among Women *App. C-1087*
Basic Sources for Statistics Describing Women Offenders *App. C-1088*
National Crime Victimization Survey *App. C-1088*
Uniform Crime Reporting Program *App. C-1089*
Supplementary Homicide Reports *App. C-1089*
State Court Processing Statistics *App. C-1089*
National Judicial Reporting Program *App. C-1090*
National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-1090*
National Corrections Reporting Program *App. C-1090*
Surveys of Probationers and Jail and Prison Inmates *App. C-1091*

Profile of State Prisoners Under Age 18, 1985-97 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1139*
Highlights *App. C-1140*
States Utilize Three General Types of Transfer Mechanisms *App. C-1141*
States Using Blended Sentences Link Adult and Juvenile Systems *App. C-1142*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

States Vary in Their Correctional Responses for Persons Under 18 Sentenced as Adults *App. C-1142*
Half of 1% of State Inmates Were Under Age 18 at Yearend 1997 *App. C-1142*
Prison Admissions Rose 7% Per Year Among Persons Under Age 18 *App. C-1143*
The Number of Persons Under Age 18 Admitted for Violent Offenses Nearly Tripled in 13 Years *App. C-1143*
In 1996, 9,160 Persons Under 18 Were Convicted of Violent Felonies; Nearly 4,200 Were Sent to Prison *App. C-1144*
State Prison Admissions Grew Faster Than Arrests *App. C-1144*
Prison Admissions More Than Doubled Among Male Offenders Under Age 18 *App. C-1145*
Nearly 6 Out of 10 Offenders Admitted to State Prison Under Age 18 Were Black *App. C-1145*
Maximum Sentences for Violent Offenders Under Age 18 Were Shorter on Average in 1997 *App. C-1146*
A Growing Number of Inmates Released From Prison Had Been Admitted Under Age 18 *App. C-1147*
Among Persons Admitted Under 18, An Increasing Percentage Are Released From Prison Unconditionally *App. C-1147*
Nearly Half of Prisoners Released in 1997 Were Sentenced to Prison for a Violent Crime *App. C-1147*
Released Violent Offenders Admitted Under 18 Had Served 53% of Their Sentences in 1997 and 46% in 1985 *App. C-1148*
Methodology *App. C-1148*
Data Sources *App. C-1148*
National Corrections Reporting Program *App. C-1148*
National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-1149*
Survey of Inmates in State Correctional Facilities *App. C-1149*
Annual Survey of Jails *App. C-1149*
National Judicial Reporting Program *App. C-1149*
Estimation Procedures *App. C-1149*
Estimating State Prison Admissions and Releases *App. C-1149*
Estimating Persons Under 18 in State Prison *App. C-1150*
Estimating Arrests of Persons Ages 13 to 17 From the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports *App. C-1150*
Estimating State Court Conviction Offenses for Persons Under Age 18 *App. C-1150*

Veterans in Prison or Jail *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1169*
Highlights *App. C-1170*
Nearly 60% of Incarcerated Veterans Had Served in the Army *App. C-1171*

1 in 5 Incarcerated Veterans Saw Combat Duty During Their Service *App. C-1172*
A Majority of Veterans in State Prison, But Less Than a Third of Nonveteran Inmates, Were White *App. C-1172*
Among State Prisoners, the Median Age of Veterans Was 10 Years Higher Than That of Nonveterans *App. C-1173*
Veteran Inmates Were More Likely to be Violent Offenders, Less Likely to be Drug Offenders *App. C-1174*
Among Violent State Prisoners, Over Two-Thirds of Veterans Knew Their Victims *App. C-1174*
Combat Veterans in Prison Were No More Likely to be Violent Offenders Than Other Veterans *App. C-1175*
Among State Prisoners, Veterans Had Less Extensive Criminal Histories Than Nonveterans *App. C-1175*
Criminal Histories of Combat Veterans Were Less Serious Than Other Veterans in Prison *App. C-1176*
Veterans' Sentences Averaged 3 Years Longer Than Other State Prisoners *App. C-1176*
Veterans Were Less Likely Than Other Inmates to Report Using Drugs in the Month Before Their Current Offense *App. C-1177*
Less Than a Third of Incarcerated Combat Veterans Used Drugs in the Month Before Their Offense *App. C-1178*
Reports of Prior Alcohol Abuse and Dependence Were Higher Among Veteran Inmates *App. C-1179*
Incarcerated Veterans and Nonveterans Reported Equal Participation in Substance Abuse Treatment *App. C-1180*
Incarcerated Veterans Were More Likely to Report a Mental Illness *App. C-1180*
Reported Levels of Employment and Income Were Higher Among Veteran Inmates *App. C-1181*
Incarcerated Veterans Were as Likely as Nonveterans to Have Been Homeless When Arrested *App. C-1181*
Methodology *App. C-1182*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. C-1182*
Estimates of the Veteran Population *App. C-1183*
Historical Statistics on Active Duty Military Personnel *App. C-1183*
Military Prison Statistics *App. C-1183*
CAGE Diagnostic Instrument for Alcohol Dependence *App. C-1183*

Offenders Returning to Federal Prison, 1986-97 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1247*
Highlights *App. C-1248*
Violent Offenders Returned to Federal Prison at Higher Rates Than Other Offenders *App. C-1249*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Men, Blacks, and Younger Adults Returned to Federal Prison at Higher Rates Than Other Offenders; Hispanics at Lower Rates *App. C-1249*
Noncitizens, More Than a Third of Offenders Released From Federal Prison, Returned to Prison at a Lower Rate Than Citizens *App. C-1250*
Several Factors Account for Noncitizens' Lower Rate of Return *App. C-1250*
Return Rates for Technical Violations of Post-Release Supervision Exceeded the Return Rates for New Crimes *App. C-1251*
As Length of Time Served in Prison Increased, So Did the Rate of Return to Prison *App. C-1251*
Offenders Released to Supervision Remained Free Longer Than Other Offenders *App. C-1252*
Offenders Returning to Prison Following Revocation Served an Additional 16 Months in Federal Prison *App. C-1252*
Methodology *App. C-1254*
Data Sources *App. C-1254*
Scope of the Analysis *App. C-1254*
Identifying and Counting "First Returns" to Prison *App. C-1254*
Unit of Analysis *App. C-1255*
Measuring Time Served Upon Return *App. C-1255*
Comparing Returns to Prisons With Unsuccessful Terminations of Supervision *App. C-1256*
Definitions of Concepts *App. C-1257*

Incarcerated Parents and Their Children *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1271*
Highlights *App. C-1272*
In 1999 an Estimated 721,500 State and Federal Prisoners Were Parents to 1,498,800 Children Under Age 18 *App. C-1272*
Prior to Admission, Less Than Half of the Parents in State Prison Reported Living With Their Children—44% of Fathers, 64% of Mothers *App. C-1272*
Nearly 2 in 3 State Prisoners Reported at Least Monthly Contact With Their Children by Phone, Mail, or Personal Visits *App. C-1273*
Over Half of Both State and Federal Prisoners Reported Having a Child Under Age 18 *App. C-1273*
State and Federal Prisons Held an Estimated 721,500 Parents of Minor Children in 1999 *App. C-1274*
1.5 Million Children in the U.S. Had a Parent in Prison in 1999—Up by More than 500,000 Since 1991 *App. C-1274*
Nearly Half of All Imprisoned Parents Were Black; About a Quarter Were White *App. C-1275*
Half of the Parents in State Prison Were Never Married *App. C-1276*
Fewer Than Half of the Parents in State Prison Lived With Their Minor Children Prior to Incarceration *App. C-1276*

Fathers Cite Child's Mother as the Current Caregiver; Mothers Cite Child's Grandparents, Other Relatives *App. C-1277*
One-Third of Mothers in Prison Had Been Living Alone With Their Children in the Month Before Arrest *App. C-1278*
40% of Fathers and 60% of Mothers in State Prison Had at Least Weekly Contact With Their Children *App. C-1278*
Over 60% of Parents in State Prison Were Held More Than 100 Miles From Their Last Place of Residence *App. C-1279*
A Majority of Parents in Prison Were Violent Offenders or Drug Traffickers *App. C-1279*
On Average, Parents Expected to Serve 80 Months in State Prison and 103 Months in Federal Prison *App. C-1280*
Over 75% of Parents in State Prison Reported a Prior Conviction; 56% Had Been Incarcerated *App. C-1281*
A Majority of Parents in State Prison Used Drugs in the Month Before Their Offense *App. C-1282*
1 in 3 Mothers in State Prison Committed Their Crime to Get Drugs or Money for Drugs *App. C-1282*
Over a Third of Parents in State Prison Committed Their Offense While Under the Influence of Alcohol *App. C-1283*
About 1 in 7 Parents in State Prison Reported Indications of a Mental Illness *App. C-1284*
Nearly 20% of Mothers in State Prison Had Been Homeless in the Year Prior to Admission *App. C-1284*
Methodology *App. C-1285*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. C-1285*
CAGE Diagnostic Instrument for Alcohol Dependence *App. C-1286*

Medical Problems of Inmates, 1997 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1333*
Highlights *App. C-1334*
Nearly a Third of State Inmates and a Quarter of Federal Inmates Reported Having Some Physical Impairment or Mental Condition *App. C-1334*
More Than 1 in 4 State and Federal Inmates Had Been Injured After Admission to Prison *App. C-1334*
Injuries and Other Medical Problems Increase With Time in Prison *App. C-1335*
Medical Problems and Other Conditions More Common Among Older Inmates *App. C-1335*
State and Federal Inmates Asked to Report on Physical Impairments, Injuries, and Other Medical Problems *App. C-1335*
Nearly a Third of State Inmates and a Quarter of Federal Inmates Reported a Physical Impairment or Mental Condition *App. C-1336*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Rates of Speech and Vision Impairment Higher Among Inmates Than in the General Population *App. C-1337*
Older Inmates More Likely to Report Physical Impairments or a Mental Condition *App. C-1338*
More Than 1 in 10 State Inmates Reported Multiple Impairments *App. C-1338*
Over a Quarter of State and Federal Inmates Reported Being Injured Since Admission to Prison *App. C-1339*
Likelihood of Injury Increases With Time Served in Prison *App. C-1339*
Inmates With a Physical Impairment or Mental Condition Were Also More Likely to Report an Injury *App. C-1340*
Violent Offenders More Commonly Reported Being Injured in a Fight Since Admission *App. C-1341*
About 22% of State Inmates Will Be Injured While in Prison *App. C-1341*
More Than 1 in 5 Inmates in State and Federal Prisons Reported a Medical Problem Excluding Injury Since Admission *App. C-1342*
Reported Medical Problems Highest Among Older, Female Inmates *App. C-1343*
About 1 in 6 State and Federal Inmates Reported a Medical Problem Other Than a Cold, Injury, or Surgery *App. C-1343*
Medical Problems More Prevalent Among Inmates Who Had Been Homeless or Unemployed *App. C-1344*
Medical Problems More Common Among Inmates Who Had Used a Needle to Inject Drugs and Those Who Were Alcohol Dependent *App. C-1344*
Methodology *App. C-1345*
Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 1997 *App. C-1345*
Accuracy of the survey estimates *App. C-1345*
National Adult Literacy Survey, 1992 *App. C-1346*
National Health Interview Survey, 1996 *App. C-1346*
Estimating the Likelihood That an Inmate Will Be Injured or Will Require Surgery at Some Time While in Prison *App. C-1347*

Prisoners in 2000 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1369*
More Than 1.9 Million in Prisons and Local Jails *App. C-1370*
U.S. Prison Population Rose 1.3% During 2000—The Smallest Annual Growth Rate Since 1972 *App. C-1370*
In the Last 6 Months of 2000, the State Prison Population Declined About 6,200 Inmates *App. C-1370*
Sentenced Federal Inmate Population Rose 9.4% During the Last 12 Months *App. C-1371*

Prison Incarceration Rates Have Risen Sharply Since 1990 *App. C-1371*
Five States Reported Increases of at Least 10% During 2000; 13 States Reported Decreases *App. C-1372*
Among States, Louisiana had the Highest Incarceration Rate; Minnesota, the Lowest *App. C-1372*
Female Prisoner Population More Than Doubled Since 1990 *App. C-1372*
Privately Operated Prisons Held Over 87,000 State and Federal Inmates in 2000 *App. C-1373*
Local Jails Held More Than 63,000 State Prisoners *App. C-1374*
Prison Capacity Measures Vary *App. C-1374*
Twenty-Two States and Federal System Operating at or Above Capacity *App. C-1375*
States Added 351 Adult Correctional Facilities and More Than 528,000 Prison Beds During the Decade *App. C-1375*
At Yearend 2000 U.S. Military Authorities Held 2,420 Prisoners in 62 Facilities *App. C-1376*
U.S. Territories Held 16,130 Inmates in 2000 *App. C-1376*
More Black Males Than White Males Among State and Federal Inmates at Yearend 2000 *App. C-1377*
Nearly 10% of Black Males, Age 25-29, in Prison in 2000 *App. C-1377*
Growth Linked to Increasing Number of Inmates in State Prison for Violent and Drug Offenses *App. C-1378*
Sources of Growth Differ Among Men and Women and Among White, Black, and Hispanic Inmates *App. C-1378*
Changing Federal Prison Population Related to Drugs, Weapons, and Immigration Violations *App. C-1379*
Methodology *App. C-1379*
National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-1379*
2000 Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities *App. C-1380*
Military Corrections Statistics *App. C-1380*
Estimating Age-Specific Incarceration Rates *App. C-1380*
NPS Jurisdiction Notes *App. C-1381*

Mental Health Treatment in State Prisons, 2000 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1407*
Inmates Screened at Admission and Placed in General Confinement or Specialized Facilities *App. C-1407*
Mental Health Services Most Commonly Provided in Maximum/High-Security Confinement Facilities *App. C-1408*
Based on Inmate Self-Reports, at Midyear 2000 State Prisons Held 191,000 Mentally Ill Inmates *App. C-1409*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

13% of State Inmates Were Receiving Mental Health Therapy; 10% Were Receiving Psychotropic Medications *App. C-1409*
General Confinement Facilities Provided Most Mental Health Treatment *App. C-1409*
In 5 States Nearly 20% of Inmates Receiving Pyschotropic Medications *App. C-1410*
Methodology *App. C-1410*

Firearm Use by Offenders *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1443*
Almost a Fifth of Prison Inmates Carried a Gun During Their Crime *App. C-1444*
Less Than 2% of Prison Inmates Reported Carrying an Assault Gun *App. C-1444*
Of Inmates Who Carried a Firearm During Their Offense, 8 in 10 Had a Handgun *App. C-1445*
Firearm Use During Crimes Increased From 1991 to 1997 *App. C-1445*
8% of Drug Offenders and 3% of Property Offenders Armed While Committing Their Crimes *App. C-1446*
Male Inmates and Young Inmates Carried Firearms *App. C-1446*
Background Characteristics Account for Relatively Small Differences in Firearm Use *App. C-1446*
Violent Recidivists Were as Likely as First Time Violent Offenders to Have Carried a Gun *App. C-1447*
Inmates' Retail Purchase of Firearms Fell Between 1991 and 1997 *App. C-1448*
Recidivists Less Likely Than First Timers to Buy Their Gun From a Retail Establishment *App. C-1448*
1 in 5 Assault Guns Bought From Retail Store *App. C-1449*
Young Offenders Less Likely Than Older Ones to Have Bought a Firearm From a Retail Source *App. C-1449*
Federal Law May Have Disqualified Over 8 in 10 Inmates From Buying a Firearm *App. C-1449*
9% of All State Prison Inmates and 2% of All Federal Inmates Shot a Gun While Committing Their Current Offense *App. C-1450*
About Half of Inmates Carrying a Gun During Their Offense Fired it and Half of Those Injured or Killed Someone *App. C-1450*
Possession of a Firearm During an Offense Increased Sentences and Expected Time Served of Inmates *App. C-1451*
Methodology *App. C-1451*
Sample Design *App. C-1452*
Estimates of Prisoner Counts *App. C-1453*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. C-1453*
Definitions *App. C-1454*

Prisoner Petitions Filed in U.S. District Courts, 2000, with Trends 1980-2000 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1519*
Petitions Filed During 2000 *App. C-1519*
Petitions by State Inmates *App. C-1520*
Petitions by Federal Inmates *App. C-1520*
Legislative Initiatives to Reduce Prisoner Litigation *App. C-1521*
Civil Rights Petitions *App. C-1522*
Habeas Corpus Petitions *App. C-1522*
Measuring the Impact of Legislation *App. C-1523*
Civil Rights Petitions *App. C-1524*
Habeas Corpus Petitions *App. C-1524*
Methodology *App. C-1525*
Data Sources *App. C-1525*

HIV in Prisons, 2000 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1579*
Number of HIV-Infected Prison Inmates at Yearend 2000 Down From 1999 *App. C-1579*
Inmates in the Northeast Had the Highest Rates of HIV Infection *App. C-1580*
A Greater Percent of Females Than Males With HIV Infection *App. C-1580*
Number of HIV-Positive Female Inmates Rose During 2000 *App. C-1581*
The Number of Confirmed AIDS Cases in U.S. Prisons Decreased During 2000 *App. C-1582*
Rate of Confirmed AIDS Higher Among Prison Inmates Than U.S. General Population *App. C-1583*
About a Third of Prisoners With Confirmed AIDS Were Held in 25 Facilities *App. C-1584*
Nearly a Quarter of HIV-Positive Prisoners Were Housed in Medical Treatment Facilities *App. C-1584*
AIDS-Related Deaths in State Prisons Have Dropped by More Than 80% Since 1995 *App. C-1585*
Fewer Deaths Reported in All Jurisdictions in 2000 Compared to 1995 *App. C-1586*
AIDS Deaths as a Percent of All Deaths in State Prison More Than Two and a Half That in the General Population *App. C-1586*
AIDS Death Rate Lower for State Prisoners Than for Comparable General Population *App. C-1587*
20 States and the Federal Bureau of Prisons Test All Inmates for HIV at Admission or While in Prison *App. C-1587*
Methodology *App. C-1588*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-1588*
Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities *App. C-1588*
AIDS in the U.S. Resident Population *App. C-1589*
AIDS-Related Deaths in the United States *App. C-1589*

Immigration Offenders in the Federal Criminal Justice System, 2000 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1643*
Nationality of Persons Investigated *App. C-1644*
Geographical Distribution of Immigration Suspects *App. C-1644*
Suspects in Matters Concluded by U.S. Attorneys *App. C-1645*
Characteristics of Defendants Charged *App. C-1645*
Demographic Characteristics *App. C-1645*
Criminal History *App. C-1645*
Trends in Prosecution of Immigration Offenses, 1985-2000 *App. C-1646*
Defendants Adjudicated in the Federal Courts *App. C-1648*
Offenders Under Federal Correctional Supervision *App. C-1648*
Incarcerated *App. C-1648*
Community Supervision *App. C-1648*
Immigration Offenders Returning to Federal Prison *App. C-1648*

Education and Correctional Populations *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1713*
Correctional Populations Less Educated Than the General Population *App. C-1714*
Numbers of Prison Inmates Without a High School Education Increased From 1991 to 1997 *App. C-1715*
Three-Quarters of State Prison Inmates Did Not Earn a High School Diploma *App. C-1715*
Jail Inmates and the General Population Reported Why They Dropped Out of School *App. C-1715*
9 in 10 State Prisons Offer Educational Programs *App. C-1716*
Over Half of Inmates Reported Taking an Educational Program Since Their Most Recent Prison Admission *App. C-1717*
State Prisoners Without a High School Diploma Were More Likely to Have Taken Classes Since Admission *App. C-1717*
Women in State Prison Were Better Educated Than Men *App. C-1718*
Minority State Prison Inmates Were Less Likely Than Whites to Have a High School Diploma or GED *App. C-1718*
Young Inmates Were Less Well Educated Than Older Inmates *App. C-1718*

Inmates With Military Service Were Better Educated Than Those Who Had Not Served *App. C-1719*
61% of Noncitizens Had Not Completed High School or a GED *App. C-1719*
Inmates Raised Without Two Parents Less Likely to Have a High School Diploma or a GED *App. C-1720*
66% of State Prison Inmates With Learning Disabilities Did Not Complete High School or a GED *App. C-1720*
47% of Drug Offenders Did Not Have a High School Diploma or a GED *App. C-1721*
Inmate Unemployment Before Admission Varied With Education *App. C-1721*
Less Educated Inmates More Likely Than More Educated to Be Recidivists *App. C-1721*
Methodology *App. C-1723*
Bureau of Justice Statistics Surveys *App. C-1723*

Prevalence of Imprisonment in the U.S. Population, 1974-2001
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-1777*
4.3 Million U.S. Residents in 2001 Were Former Prisoners *App. C-1778*
More Than Two-Thirds of Former Prisoners No Longer Under Correctional Supervision *App. C-1778*
1 in 37 Adult U.S. Residents in 2001 Had Ever Served Time in Prison *App. C-1779*
Two-Thirds of the Increase in Number Ever Incarcerated Due to Rise in First Incarceration Rates *App. C-1779*
In 2001, 3 Out of 10 Adults Ever Incarcerated Were Age 35 to 44 *App. C-1780*
Prevalence Rates Up Sharply Among Persons Under Age 50 *App. C-1780*
More Males Than Females and More Blacks and Hispanics Than Whites Had Ever Served Time in Prison *App. C-1781*
Nearly 17% of Adult Black Males Had Ever Served Time in Prison *App. C-1781*
Regardless of Gender, Race or Hispanic Origin, Prevalence Rates Highest Among Persons Age 35 to 44 *App. C-1782*
Impact of Rising First Incarceration Rate Varies by Birth Cohort *App. C-1782*
3.4% of Adults Projected to Have Served Time in Prison by 2010 *App. C-1783*
6.6% of Persons Born in 2001 Will Go to Prison, If Current Rates of First Incarceration Remain Unchanged *App. C-1784*
6 Times Higher Lifetime Chance of Going to Prison in 2001 for Men Than for Women *App. C-1784*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Methodology *App. C-1785*
Life Table Techniques *App. C-1785*
Estimating Prevalence of Imprisonment in the United States *App. C-1786*
Limitations *App. C-1787*

Hepatitis Testing and Treatment in State Prisons *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1861*
Nearly 8 in 10 State Prison Facilities Reported Testing Inmates for Hepatitis C *App. C-1861*
Nearly a Third of Hepatitis C Tests Confirmed Positive *App. C-1862*
Hepatitis C Tests Concentrated in 23 States *App. C-1862*
More Than 6,000 Inmates in State Prisons Treated for Hepatitis C in the 12-Month Period Before the Census *App. C-1863*
Two-Thirds of Facilities Had a Policy to Vaccinate Inmates for Hepatitis B *App. C-1863*
In the 12 Months Before the Census, 13,655 Inmates Completed a 3-Dose Series Vaccination for Hepatitis B *App. C-1863*
Methodology *App. C-1864*

Profile of Nonviolent Offenders Exiting State Prisons *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-1901*
Offense Characteristics of Nonviolent Prison Releasees *App. C-1901*
Demographic Characteristics of Nonviolent Prison Releasees *App. C-1902*
Criminal History Characteristics of Nonviolent Prison Releasees *App. C-1902*
Recidivism of Nonviolent Prison Releasees *App. C-1903*

Table of Contents

Volume Five

APPENDIX C
Prisoner Statistics (continued)

Suicide and Homicide in State Prisons and Local Jails *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-2027*
Nationwide, 337 State Prisoners Committed Suicide During 2001-02 *App. C-2028*
87 State Prisoners Became Victims of Homicide Over 2 Years *App. C-2028*
Suicide Rate in the Nation's 50 Largest Jail Jurisdictions Half That of All Other Jails *App. C-2028*
During 2002 The Nation's Smallest Jails Had a Suicide Rate 5 Times That of the Largest Jails *App. C-2029*
Jail Suicide Rates Drop by Over 90% When Based on "At-Risk" Population *App. C-2030*
Males and White Inmates Had the Highest Rates of Suicide in Jails *App. C-2030*
White Jail Inmates 6 Times More Likely to Commit Suicide Than Black Inmates and 3 Times More Likely Than Hispanic Inmates *App. C-2031*
State Prisoners Age 45 or Older Made Up 17% of Inmates but 66% of Deaths *App. C-2031*
Black Inmates Had the Lowest Suicide and Homicide Rates in State Prisons *App. C-2032*
Violent Offenders Committed Suicide At Nearly Triple the Rate of Nonviolent Offenders in Jails *App. C-2033*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Local Jails Had An Average of Fewer Than 20 Inmate Homicides Each Year *App. C-2033*
Drug Offenders Had the Lowest Suicide and Homicide Rates of All State Prisoners *App. C-2034*
Nearly Half of Jail Suicides Occurred in the First Week of Custody *App. C-2034*
7% of State Prison Suicides Took Place During the First Month *App. C-2035*
At Least 80% of Suicides in Prison and Jail Occurred in the Inmate's Cell; Time of Day Not a Factor *App. C-2036*
Most Jail Homicides Occurred At Least 2 Weeks After Admission *App. C-2037*
Two-Thirds of Homicide Victims in State Prison Had Served At Least 2 Years in Prison; Nearly 40% Had Served 5 Years or More *App. C-2037*
Homicide Rate of U.S. Residents, When Standardized, 10 Times the Rate of Jail Inmates in 2002 *App. C-2038*
Methodology *App. C-2039*
Standardized U.S. Resident Death Rates *App. C-2040*
Population Bases for Mortality Rates *App. C-2040*

Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2004
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-2053*
BJS Conducts the First Annual Administrative Records Collection *App. C-2053*
Survey Covers More Than 2,700 Adult and Juvenile Correctional Facilities *App. C-2054*
Two-Thirds or More of Systems and Facilities Able to Fully Report the Most Serious Forms of Sexual Violence *App. C-2055*
Caution Needed When Interpreting the 2004 Survey Results *App. C-2056*
More Than 5,500 Allegations of Sexual Violence Reported In Survey *App. C-2056*
Juvenile Facilities Reported the Highest Rates of Alleged Sexual Violence *App. C-2057*
External Authorities Often Involved in Investigating Allegations *App. C-2058*
In State Prisons Fewer Than 20% of Allegations Of Nonconsensual Sexual Acts Were Substantiated *App. C-2058*
In Juvenile Facilities a Third of the Alleged Nonconsensual Sexual Acts Were Substantiated *App. C-2059*
During 2004 Correctional Authorities Substantiated Nearly 2,100 Incidents of Sexual Violence *App. C-2059*
Males Comprised 90% of Victims and Perpetrators of Nonconsensual Sexual Acts in Prison And Jail *App. C-2060*

Female Staff Implicated in Staff Sexual Misconduct in Prisons; Male Staff in Local Jails *App. C-2061*
Most Prisons and Jails Imposed Legal Sanctions on Perpetrators of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Violence *App. C-2061*
90% of Perpetrators of Staff Sexual Misconduct Discharged or Referred for Prosecution *App. C-2062*
Methodology *App. C-2062*
Sampling Design *App. C-2062*
Comparing Systems and Facilities *App. C-2064*

Mental Health Problems of Prison and Jail Inmates *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-2167*
A Quarter of State Prisoners had a History of Mental Health Problems *App. C-2168*
Symptoms of Mental Disorder Highest Among Jail Inmates *App. C-2168*
High Proportion of Inmates had Symptoms of a Mental Health Disorder Without a History *App. C-2169*
Mental Health Problems More Common Among Female, White, and Young Inmates *App. C-2169*
Homelessness, Foster Care More Common Among Inmates Who had Mental Health Problems *App. C-2170*
Low Rates of Employment, High Rates of Illegal Income Among Inmates Who had Mental Problems *App. C-2170*
Past Physical or Sexual Abuse More Prevalent Among Inmates Who had Mental Health Problems *App. C-2171*
Family Members of Inmates with Mental Problems had High Rates of Substance Use and Incarceration *App. C-2171*
Inmates Who had Mental Health Problems had High Rates of Substance Dependence or Abuse *App. C-2172*
Over a Third of Inmates Who had Mental Health Problems had Used Drugs at the Time of the Offense *App. C-2173*
Binge Drinking Prevalent Among Inmates Who had Mental Problems *App. C-2173*
Violent Offenses Common Among State Prisoners Who had a Mental Health Problem *App. C-2173*
Use of a Weapon Did Not Vary by Mental Health Status *App. C-2174*
Violent Criminal Record More Prevalent Among Inmates Who had a Mental Health Problem *App. C-2174*
State Prisoners Who had Mental Health Problems had Longer Sentences Than Prisoners Without *App. C-2175*
State Prisoners Who had a Mental Health Problem Expected to Serve 4 Months Longer Than Those Without *App. C-2175*
A Third of State Prisoners Who had Mental Health Problems had Received Treatment Since Admission *App. C-2176*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Use of Medication for a Mental Health Problem By State Prisoners Rose Between 1997 and 2004 *App. C-2176*
Rule Violations and Injuries from a Fight More Common Among Inmates Who had a Mental Health Problem *App. C-2177*
Methodology *App. C-2178*
Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2004 *App. C-2178*
Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, 2002 *App. C-2178*
Accuracy of Survey Estimates *App. C-2178*
Measures of Mental Health Problems in the General Population *App. C-2179*

Drug Use and Dependence, State and Federal Prisoners, 2004
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-2201*
Overall Drug Use By State Prisoners Unchanged from 1997; Methamphetamine Use Rose *App. C-2201*
Overall Drug Use By Federal Prisoners Rose; Cocaine/Crack Use Declined *App. C-2202*
Women in Federal Prison Report Sharp Increase in Prior Drug Use *App. C-2202*
Prior Drug Use Grew Most Quickly Among Middle-Aged Inmates *App. C-2203*
1 in 4 Violent Offenders in Prison Committed Their Offenses Under the Influence of Drugs *App. C-2203*
1 in 3 Property Offenders in State Prisons Report Drug Money As a Motive in Their Crimes *App. C-2204*
53% of State and 45% of Federal Prisoners Met Criteria for Drug Dependence or Abuse *App. C-2205*
In State Prisons, Violent Offenders were Least Likely to Meet Criteria for Drug Dependence or Abuse *App. C-2205*
Half of Drug Dependent or Abusing Inmates in State Prisons Reported Three or More Prior Sentences *App. C-2206*
1 in 7 Drug Dependent or Abusing Inmates in State Prison Were Homeless in Year Before Admission *App. C-2206*
Participation in Drug Abuse Programs Rose in Both State and Federal Prison Since 1997 *App. C-2207*
Number of Federal Prisoners Taking Part in Drug Abuse Programs Up 90% Between 1997 and 2004 *App. C-2207*
Over 250,000 Dependent/Abusing State Inmates Took Part in Drug Abuse Programs Since Admission *App. C-2208*
Methodology *App. C-2208*
Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2004 *App. C-2209*
Accuracy of Survey Estimates *App. C-2209*
Measures of Drug Dependence and Abuse in the General Population *App. C-2210*

Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2005
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-2229*
Second Administrative Records Collection Conducted for 2005 *App. C-2229*
2005 Survey Covered 1,866 Adult Correctional Facilities *App. C-2230*
State Prison Reporting Capabilities Improve During 2005 *App. C-2231*
Sexual Violence Allegations Increased *App. C-2232*
Approximately 15% of Allegations of Nonconsensual Sexual Acts in 2005 were Substantiated *App. C-2233*
During 2005 Correctional Authorities Substantiated 885 Incidents of Sexual Violence *App. C-2234*
Correctional Authorities Provided Detail on 82% of Substantiated Incidents *App. C-2234*
Physical Force or Threat of Force was Used in 51% of Inmate-On-Inmate Sexual Violence *App. C-2235*
Victims Received Physical Injuries in 15% of Substantiated Incidents of Inmate-On-Inmate Sexual Violence *App. C-2236*
Half of Victims of Nonconsensual Sexual Acts were Placed in Protective Custody or Administrative Segregation *App. C-2236*
Most Inmate Perpetrators Received Legal Sanctions or Solitary Confinement *App. C-2237*
Two-Thirds of Incidents of Staff Sexual Misconduct with Inmates were Reported to Be Romantic *App. C-2237*
Female Staff Implicated in Staff Sexual Misconduct in Prisons; Males in Local Jails *App. C-2238*
Over Two-Thirds of Perpetrators of Staff Sexual Misconduct or Harassment were Correctional Officers *App. C-2238*
Inmates Involved in Staff Sexual Misconduct Often Transferred or Placed in Segregation *App. C-2239*
Nearly 90% of Perpetrators of Staff Misconduct Arrested, Referred for Prosecution, or Discharged *App. C-2239*
Methodology *App. C-2239*

Prisoners in 2005 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-2279*
Nearly 2.2 Million Persons in Prison or Jail at Yearend 2005 *App. C-2280*
U.S. Prison Population Rose 1.9% During 2005 *App. C-2280*
14 States Reported Increases of at Least 5% During 2005; 11 States Had Decreases *App. C-2280*
Prison Incarceration Rate Reached 491 Per 100,000 Residents in 2005, Up from 411 in 1995 *App. C-2281*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Female Prisoners Increased 2.6% During 2005; Male Prisoners, 1.9% *App. C-2281*
Over a Third of Female Prisoners Held in the 3 Largest Jurisdictions *App. C-2281*
Privately Operated Prisons Held 7.0% of State and Federal Inmates in 2005 *App. C-2282*
In 2005 Local Jails Held almost 5% of State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-2282*
23 States and the Federal System Operated at or Above Highest Capacity *App. C-2283*
60% of State and Federal Inmates Black or Hispanic at Yearend 2005 *App. C-2284*
An Estimated 8% of Black Males, Age 25 to 29 in Prison in 2005 *App. C-2284*
Half of State Prisoners Were Violent Offenders *App. C-2285*
Offenses of State Prisoners Varied by Gender, Race, and Hispanic Origin *App. C-2285*
Changing Federal Prison Population Related to Drug and Immigration Offenses *App. C-2286*
Methodology *App. C-2286*
National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-2286*
Military Corrections Statistics *App. C-2287*
Other Inmate Counts *App. C-2287*
Estimating Age-Specific Incarceration Rates *App. C-2287*
NPS Jurisdiction Notes *App. C-2287*

Medical Causes of Death in State Prisons, 2001-2004 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-2309*
Heart Diseases and Cancer Accounted for Half of All State Prison Deaths *App. C-2310*
Death Rates Higher Among Men Than Women in 9 of the 10 Leading Causes of Death *App. C-2310*
Black and Hispanic Inmate Mortality Rates Identical; White Inmates 67% Higher *App. C-2310*
Two-Thirds of State Prison Deaths Involved Inmates Age 45 or Older *App. C-2310*
Among Deaths of Elderly State Prisoners, 85% Were 45 or Older When Admitted *App. C-2311*
Death from Illness Increased with Time Served in Prison *App. C-2311*
Time Served in Prison Played Little Role in the Death Rate Due to Communicable Diseases *App. C-2312*
Two-Thirds of Illness Deaths Resulted from Pre-Existing Conditions—Including 94% of AIDS Deaths *App. C-2312*
In 93% of Deaths from Illness, Medical Staff Had Provided Medications for the Fatal Condition *App. C-2312*

Over 40% of Prisoner Deaths Took Place in 5 States; Mortality Rates Varied Widely Across States *App. C-2313*
Mortality Rate in State Prisons Nearly 20% Lower Than in U.S. Resident Population *App. C-2313*
Methodology *App. C-2313*

Veterans in State and Federal Prison, 2004 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-2331*
After Rising for Two Decades, Number of Veterans Dropped Since 2000 *App. C-2332*
Male Veterans Were Half as Likely as Other Men to be Held in Prison; the Gap Increasing Since the 1980s *App. C-2333*
U.S. Army Accounted for 46% of Veterans Living in the U.S., But 56% of Veterans in State Prison in 2004 *App. C-2334*
Half of Incarcerated Veterans Performed Wartime Military Service; 1 in 5 Reported Combat Duty *App. C-2334*
Veterans Were Older, Better Educated Than Other State and Federal Prison Inmates *App. C-2335*
Nearly 1 in 4 Veterans in State Prison Were Sex Offenders, Compared to 1 in 10 Nonveterans *App. C-2335*
Veterans Were More Likely Than Other Violent Offenders in State Prison to Have Victimized Females and Minors *App. C-2336*
Veterans Had Shorter Criminal Histories Than Nonveterans In State Prison *App. C-2336*
More Than a Third of Veterans in State Prison Had Maximum Sentences of at Least 20 Years, Life, or Death *App. C-2337*
Veterans Reported Longer Average Sentences Than Nonveterans, Regardless of Offense Type *App. C-2337*
Veterans Were Less Likely Than Nonveteran Prisoners to Have Used Drugs *App. C-2338*
No Relationship Between Veteran Status and Alcohol Dependence or Abuse *App. C-2338*
Veteran Status Unrelated to Inmate Reports of Mental Health Problems *App. C-2339*
Combat Service Not Related to Prevalence of Recent Mental Health Problems *App. C-2339*
Methodology *App. C-2340*
Estimates of the Veteran Population in the United States *App. C-2340*
Military Prison Statistics *App. C-2341*

HIV in Prisons, 2005 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-2407*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

HIV/AIDS Cases in State and Federal Prisons Steadily Declining Since 1999 *App. C-2408*
New York Accounted for More Than Three-Quarters of the Decline in HIV/AIDS Cases Between 1999 and 2005 *App. C-2408*
Number of Confirmed AIDS Cases Fluctuated Between 1999 and 2005 *App. C-2409*
Difference Between the Rate of Confirmed AIDS Cases in Prisons and the General Population Shrinking *App. C-2409*
HIV/AIDS Cases Among Both Male and Female State Inmates Declining, But at a Faster Rate for Females *App. C-2409*
Number of AIDS-Related Deaths Declined Dramatically Between 1995 and 2000 *App. C-2410*
Almost All of the Decrease in AIDS-Related Deaths Attributed to Male Inmates *App. C-2410*
AIDS-Related Deaths As a Percent of All Deaths Decreasing More Rapidly in State Prison Than in the General Population *App. C-2411*
Rate of AIDS-Relate Deaths Declining in Prisons, Stabilizing in the General Population *App. C-2411*
Older Persons in State Prisons Had a Higher Rate of AIDS-Related Deaths Than Those in the General Population *App. C-2411*
Methodology *App. C-2411*
National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-2411*
Surveys of Inmates in State Correctional Facilities *App. C-2412*
Accuracy of the Survey Estimates *App. C-2412*
Deaths in Custody Reporting Program *App. C-2412*
Estimation of HIV/AIDS Cases in New York State *App. C-2413*
AIDS in the U.S. Resident Population *App. C-2413*
AIDS-Related Deaths in the United States *App. C-2413*

Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2006
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-2435*
Allegations of Sexual Violence Rose During 2006 *App. C-2436*
Upon Investigation, Most Allegations Were Unsubstantiated or Unfounded *App. C-2437*
Surveys Reveal Consistent Patterns of Sexual Violence in Correctional Facilities *App. C-2438*
Most Incidents of Sexual Violence Among Inmates Involve Force or Threat of Force and Occur in the Victim's Cell, in the Evening *App. C-2439*
Most Victims Experienced a Change in Their Housing; Most Inmate Perpetrators Received Solitary Confinement *App. C-2439*
The Sexual Relationship "Appeared to Be Willing" in 57% of Incidents of Staff Sexual Misconduct and Harassment *App. C-2440*
Female Staff More Frequently Implicated in Sexual Misconduct in Prisons; Male Staff in Local Jails *App. C-2441*

Three-Quarters of Staff Perpetrators in 2006 Lost Their Jobs; 56% Were Arrested or Referred for Prosecution *App. C-2442*
Half of Inmates Involved in Staff Sexual Misconduct Were Transferred or Placed in Segregation *App. C-2442*
Methodology *App. C-2443*
Measures of Sexual Violence *App. C-2443*
Sampling Procedures *App. C-2444*
National Estimates and Accuracy *App. C-2445*
Detail on Substantiated Incidents *App. C-2446*

Sexual Victimization in State and Federal Prisoners Reported by Inmates, 2007 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-2537*
Inmate Self-Reports Provide a Basis for Comparing and Ranking Facilities *App. C-2538*
An Estimated 60,500 Inmates Experienced One or More Incidents of Sexual Victimization *App. C-2538*
10 Facilities Had Prevalence Rates of 9.3% or Greater; 6 Facilities Had No Reported Incidents *App. C-2539*
Identification of the 3 Facilities With the Highest Rates of Sexual Victimization Depends on Non-Statistical Judgments *App. C-2540*
Inmates Reported an Estimated 165,400 Incidents of Nonconsensual Sexual Acts With Other Inmates or Staff *App. C-2541*
11 Facilities had Nonconsensual Sex Rates of 300 or More Incidents Per 1,000 Inmates *App. C-2542*
Further Analyses of Sexual Victimization and Facility Variations Underway *App. C-2542*
Methodology *App. C-2543*
Selection of State and Federal Prisons *App. C-2543*
Selection of Inmates *App. C-2545*
Weighting and Non-Response Adjustments *App. C-2545*
Survey Estimates and Accuracy *App. C-2546*
Exposure Period *App. C-2546*
Measuring Sexual Victimization *App. C-2547*
Definition of Terms *App. C-2548*

Prison Inmates at Midyear 2007 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-2595*
Growth in the Prison Population Slowed Slightly During the First Six Months of 2007 *App. C-2595*
Growth During the First Half of the Year Generally Outpaced Growth During the Second Half *App. C-2596*
Growth During the First Half of 2007 Slowed in States With the Largest Prison Populations *App. C-2596*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Six-Month Growth Rates in States Ranged From Increases of More Than 8% to Decreases of 3% *App. C-2597*
Growth in Sentenced Prisoners Mirrored Growth in All Prisoners Under Jurisdiction *App. C-2597*
Prison Admissions Growth Outpaced Growth in Releases *App. C-2598*
State Admissions for Parole Violations Grew More Rapidly Than New Court Commitments *App. C-2598*
Use of Private Facilities and Local Jails By Federal Correctional Authorities Increased 12% *App. C-2598*
Inmates Held in State or Federal Prison or in Local Jails Increased to Nearly 2.3 Million *App. C-2599*
Black Males Ages 30 to 34 Had the Highest Custody Incarceration Rate of Any Race, Age, or Gender Group *App. C-2599*
Hispanic and White Men Accounted for More Than Half of the Increase to the Custody Population *App. C-2600*
Estimated Number of Non-U.S. Citizens and Juveniles in State Custody Increased *App. C-2601*
Methodology *App. C-2601*
National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-2601*
Other Inmate Counts *App. C-2602*
Estimating Age-Specific Incarceration Rates *App. C-2603*
NPS Jurisdiction Notes *App. C-2604*

Parents in Prison and Their Children *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-2637*
Parents of Minor Children Held in the Nation's Prisons Increased by 79% Between 1991 and Midyear 2007 *App. C-2638*
The Number of Children Under Age 18 with a Mother in Prison More Than Doubled Since 1991 *App. C-2638*
More Than 4 in 10 Fathers in State or Federal Prisons Were Black; Almost 5 in 10 Mothers Were White *App. C-2638*
The Majority of Prisoners Reported Having a Minor Child, a Quarter of Which Were Age 4 or Younger *App. C-2639*
More Than a Third of Minor Children Will Reach Age 18 While Their Parent is Incarcerated *App. C-2639*
Incarcerated Parents of Minor Children Most Likely to be Age 25 to 34 *App. C-2640*
Drug and Public-Order Offenders in State and Federal Prisons Were More Likely Than Violent Offenders to Have Children *App. C-2640*
Inmates in State and Federal Prisons With a Criminal History Were More Likely to be Parents of Minor Children Than Those With No Criminal History *App. C-2641*
Fewer Than Half of Parents in State Prison Lived With Their Minor Children Either in the Month Before Arrest or Just Prior to Incarceration *App. C-2641*

More Than 4 in 10 Mothers in State Prison Who Had Minor Children Were Living in Single-Parent Households in the Month Before Arrest *App. C-2642*
Fathers Living With Their Minor Child Relied Heavily on Someone to Provide Daily Care *App. C-2642*
Fathers Most Commonly Reported the Child's Mother as Current Caregiver of Their Children, While Mothers Most Commonly Reported the Child's Grandparents *App. C-2642*
About Half of Parents in State Prison Provided the Primary Financial Support for Their Minor Children *App. C-2643*
More Than Three-Quarters of State Prison Inmates Who Were Parents of Minor Children Reported That They Had Some Contact With Their Children Since Admission *App. C-2644*
Half of Parents in State Prison Reported That They Had a Family Member Who Had Been Incarcerated *App. C-2644*
Mothers in State Prison More Likely Than Fathers to Report Homelessness, Past Physical or Sexual Abuse, and Medical and Mental Health Problems *App. C-2645*
More Than 4 in 10 Parents in the Nation's Prisons Who Met the Criteria for Substance Dependence or Abuse Had Received Treatment Since Admission *App. C-2646*
Among Parents in State Prison, Two-Thirds Reported They Had a Work Assignment; Over Half Had Attended Self-Help or Improvement Classes Since Admissions *App. C-2646*
Mothers in Prison Had Served Less Time at Time of Interview and Expected to Be Released in a Shorter Amount of Time Than Fathers *App. C-2647*
Methodology *App. C-2648*
Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities *App. C-2648*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. C-2648*
Number of Parents in Prison Who Had Minor Children *App. C-2649*
Number of Minor Children of Parents in Prison *App. C-2649*

Prison Inmates at Midyear 2008 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Methodology *App. C-2729*
National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-2729*
Other Inmate Counts *App. C-2730*
Estimating Age-Specific Incarceration Rates *App. C-2730*
NPS Jurisdiction Notes *App. C-2731*

Prison Inmates at Midyear 2009 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Highlights *App. C-2847*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Selected Characteristics of Prisoners Under State or Federal Jurisdiction *App. C-2847*
Selected Characteristics of Inmates Held in Custody in State or Federal Prisons or in Local Jails *App. C-2848*
Methodology *App. C-2848*
National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-2848*
Other Inmate Counts *App. C-2849*
Estimating Age–Specific Incarceration Rates *App. C-2850*
Definitions *App. C-2850*
NPS Jurisdiction Notes *App. C-2851*

Sexual Victimization in Prisons and Jails Reported by Inmates, 2008-09 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-2879*
Incidents of Sexual Victimization *App. C-2880*
4.4% of Prison Inmates and 3.1% of Jail Inmates Reported One or More Incidents of Sexual Victimization *App. C-2880*
Facility Level Rates *App. C-2881*
NIS-2 Provides a Basis for Identifying High Rate and Low Rate Facilities *App. C-2881*
Eight Male Prisons, 2 Female Prisons, and 6 Jails Were Identified as Having High Rates of Inmate-On-Inmate Sexual Victimization *App. C-2882*
Four Male Prisons, 2 Female Prisons, and 5 Jails Were Identified as Having High Rates of Staff Sexual Misconduct *App. C-2883*
Seven Male Prisons, 4 Female Prisons, and 9 Jails Were Identified as ''Low Rate'' for Sexual Victimization Overall *App. C-2883*
Low Rates of Sexual Victimization Were Reported in Military, Indian Country, and ICE Facilities *App. C-2884*
Demographic Characteristics *App. C-2885*
Rates of Reported Sexual Victimization Varied Across Demographic Categories of Prison and Jail Inmates *App. C-2885*
Sexual History and Orientation *App. C-2886*
Large Differences in Sexual Victimization Were Found Among Inmates Based on Their Sexual Orientation and Past Sexual Experiences *App. C-2886*
Criminal Justice Status *App. C-2887*
Inmates Held for a Violent Sexual Offense Reported Higher Rates of Inmate-On-Inmate Sexual Victimization Than Inmates Held for Other Offenses *App. C-2887*
Rates of Staff Sexual Misconduct Also Varied Among Inmates Based on Their Criminal Justice Status and History *App. C-2887*
Predicted Victimization Rates *App. C-2888*
Sexual Victimization Among High Rate Facilities Only Partially Explained by Variations in Risk Among Inmates Held *App. C-2888*

Inmate-On-Inmate Victimization *App. C-2890*
Reports of Inmate-On-Inmate Sexual Victimization Differed Among Males and Females by Type of Facility *App. C-2890*
Inmate-On-Inmate Victimization Occurred Most Often in the Victim's Cell Between 6 pm and Midnight *App. C-2890*
Staff Sexual Misconduct *App. C-2891*
Most Victims of Staff Sexual Misconduct in Prisons and Jails Reported at Least One Incident That Involved Pressure, Force, or Threat of Force *App. C-2891*
Most Victims and Perpetrators of Staff Sexual Misconduct Were of the Opposite Sex *App. C-2892*
Reports of Staff Sexual Misconduct Were Linked to Strip Searches and Pat Downs *App. C-2892*
Methodology *App. C-2892*
Selection of State and Federal Prisons *App. C-2893*
Selection of Inmates Within Prisons *App. C-2894*
Selection of Jail Facilities *App. C-2895*
Selection of Inmates Within Jails *App. C-2896*
Selection of Special Confinement Facilities *App. C-2897*
Selection of Inmates in Special Confinement Facilities *App. C-2898*
Weighting and Non-Response Adjustments *App. C-2898*
Standard Errors and Tests of Significance *App. C-2899*
Exposure Period *App. C-2900*
Measurement of Sexual Victimization *App. C-2900*
Interviews Checked for Inconsistent Response Patterns *App. C-2901*
Definition of Terms *App. C-2902*
Logistic Regression Models *App. C-2902*
Predicting Facility-Level Rates of Sexual Victimization *App. C-2903*

Sexual Victimization Reported by Adult Correctional Authorities, 2007-2008 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-3045*
Detail on Substantiated Incidents *App. C-3046*
Summary Findings *App. C-3047*
Allegations of Sexual Victimization *App. C-3047*
The Rate of Sexual Victimization Reported by Correctional Administrators Increased from 3.33 Incidents Per 1,000 Inmates in 2005 to 3.82 in 2008. *App. C-3047*
Allegations of Inmate-on-Inmate Abusive Sexual Contacts Account for Two-Thirds of the Total Increase in Reported Allegations of Sexual Victimization Between 2005 and 2008. *App. C-3047*
Substantiated Incidents of Sexual Victimization *App. C-3047*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

State Prison Administrators Reported an Increase of 130 Substantiated Incidents Between 2005 and 2008. *App. C-3047*
Substantiated Incidents of Inmate-on-Inmate Abusive Sexual Contacts and Staff Sexual Harassment Increased Significantly Between 2005 and 2008. *App. C-3048*
A Greater Percentage of Allegations of Abusive Sexual Contacts and Incidents of Staff Sexual Misconduct were Substantiated in Local Jails than in Prisons. *App. C-3048*
Incident-Level Findings *App. C-3048*
Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization *App. C-3049*
Females were Disproportionately Victimized by Inmates in State and Federal Prisons and Local Jails. *App. C-3049*
Victims and Perpetrators of Nonconsensual Acts were More Likely to be Younger than 25, Compared to Victims and Perpetrators of Abusive Sexual Contacts. *App. C-3049*
About 1 in 9 Substantiated Incidents of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization were Committed by More than one Perpetrator. *App. C-3049*
About 1 in 5 Incidents of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization Resulted in a Victim Injury. *App. C-3049*
Nonconsensual Sexual Acts were More Likely than Abusive Sexual Contacts to Occur in the Early Morning Hours (Midnight to 6 A.M.). Abusive Sexual Contacts Occurred More Often During the Day (6 A.M. to 6 P.M.) than Nonconsensual Sexual Acts. *App. C-3050*
Solitary Confinement was Used Most Often as a Sanction Against Perpetrators of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization. *App. C-3050*
Sanctions were More Severe for Nonconsensual Sexual Acts than for Abusive Sexual Contacts. *App. C-3050*
Staff-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization *App. C-3051*
Females were Disproportionately Victimized by Staff in State and Federal Prisons and Local Jails. *App. C-3051*
Females Perpetrated the Majority of Incidents of Staff Sexual Misconduct, While Males Perpetrated the Majority of Incidents of Staff Sexual Harassment. *App. C-3051*
Over Half of Incidents of Staff Sexual Harassment were Reported by the Victim. *App. C-3051*
About 2 in 5 Incidents of Staff-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization Occurred in a Program Service Area. *App. C-3051*
More Incidents of Staff Sexual Victimization Occurred During Daytime Hours (6 A.M. to 6 P.M.) in Federal and State Prisons than in Jails. *App. C-3052*
Methodology *App. C-3052*

Prisoners in 2010 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-3137*
The Imprisonment Rate Declined in 2010 *App. C-3138*

Releases from Prison Exceeded Admissions; However, Both Declined During 2010 *App. C-3139*
Decline in State Prison Admissions was led by a Decrease in Parole Violators Admitted in California *App. C-3139*
The Decrease in Releases from State Prisons was Divided Between Conditional and Unconditional Releases *App. C-3140*
Decline in Admissions Accounted for Decrease in State Prison Population, as Time Served by State Prisoners Remained Relatively Unchanged *App. C-3140*
Other Selected Findings *App. C-3141*
Methodology *App. C-3142*
Definition of Terms *App. C-3145*
NPS Jurisdiction Notes *App. C-3147*

Correctional Populations in the United States, 2010 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-3193*
Community Supervision and Incarcerated Populations Declined for the Second Consecutive Year *App. C-3194*
Probation Population Accounted for Three-Quarters of the Decline in the Correctional Population During 2010 *App. C-3194*
Methodology *App. C-3194*

Prison and Jail Deaths in Custody, 2000-2009 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-3211*
Summary Findings: Jails *App. C-3212*
Cause of Death *App. C-3212*
Decedent Characteristics *App. C-3212*
State-Level Jail Populations *App. C-3213*
Cause of Death by Decedent Characteristics *App. C-3213*
Summary Findings: Prisons *App. C-3213*
Cause of Death *App. C-3213*
Decedent Characteristics *App. C-3214*
State-Level Prison Populations *App. C-3214*
Cause of Death by Decedent Characteristics *App. C-3214*
Methodology *App. C-3215*

Sexual Victimization Reported by Former State Prisoners, 2008 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-3253*
Highlights *App. C-3254*
Prevalence of Sexual Victimization *App. C-3254*
Coercion and Physical Injury *App. C-3254*
Individual Risk Factors *App. C-3255*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Facility Characteristics *App. C-3255*
Sexual Victimization and Its Consequences *App. C-3256*
Incidents of Sexual Victimization *App. C-3257*
9.6% of Former State Prisoners Reported One or More Incidents of Sexual Victimization During the Most Recent Period of Incarceration in Jail, Prison, or a Post-Release Community-Treatment Facility *App. C-3257*
5.4% of Former Inmates Reported an Incident with Another Inmate; 5.3% Reported an Incident with Staff *App. C-3257*
Few Former Inmates Reported Experiencing Sexual Victimization While in a Community-Based Correctional Facility *App. C-3258*
Sexual Victimization Rates Differed from Those Previously Reported in the NIS-1 and NIS-2 *App. C-3259*
Criminal History and Supervision Profile of Former Inmates *App. C-3259*
Type of Coercion and Physical Injury *App. C-3260*
Among Victims of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Violence, a Quarter Had Been Physically Held Down or Restrained and a Quarter Had Been Physically Harmed or Injured *App. C-3260*
Half of Victims of Staff Sexual Misconduct Said They Had Been Offered Favors or Special Privileges; A Third Had Been Persuaded or Talked Into It; A Quarter Had Been Bribed or Blackmailed *App. C-3261*
Four Percent of Victims of Staff Sexual Misconduct Reported that They Were Physically Injured *App. C-3261*
Circumstances Surrounding Victimization *App. C-3262*
Inmate-on-Inmate Victimization Occurred Most Often in the Victim's Cell; Staff-on-Inmate Victimization Occurred Most Often in a Closet, Office, or Other Locked Room *App. C-3262*
Most Victims (86%) of Staff Sexual Misconduct Reported More than One Incident; 47% Reported More than One Perpetrator *App. C-3262*
Variations by Sex of Former Inmates *App. C-3263*
The Rate of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization Among Former State Prisoners Was 3 Times Higher Among Females (13.7%) than Males (4.2%) *App. C-3263*
The Rate of "Willing" Sexual Activity with Staff Was Higher Among Males (4.8%) than Females (2.6%), and the Rate of Unwilling Sexual Activity Was Higher Among Females (2.5%) than Males (1.1%) *App. C-3263*
Variations by Other Individual-Level Characteristics *App. C-3263*
Large Differences in Sexual Victimization Were Found Among Former Inmates Based on Their Sexual Orientation *App. C-3263*
Violent, Male Sex Offenders Reported High Rates of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization (13.7%) *App. C-3264*
Rates of Sexual Victimization Increased with the Length of Time that Former Inmates Had Served *App. C-3265*

Former State Prisoners Who Had Served Time in 5 or More Facilities During Their Most Recent Confinement Reported the Highest Rates of Staff Sexual Misconduct *App. C-3265*
Difference in Findings After BJS Performed Multivariate Logistic Regressions *App. C-3266*
Variations By Selected Facility-Level Characteristics *App. C-3266*
Three-Quarters of Former Inmates Had Served Time in More than One Prison Facility; Nearly 1 in 8 Had Served Time in 5 or More Prison Facilities Before Their Release *App. C-3267*
Nearly 44% of Male Victims and 74% of Female Victims Reported that Sexual Victimization Had Occurred in the First Prison Facility They Had Entered *App. C-3267*
Reports of Sexual Violence Did Not Vary by Size of Facility, Facility Age, Crowding, Inmate-to-Staff Ratios, or Sex Composition of Staff *App. C-3268*
Sexual Victimization Rates Varied by Type and Primary Function of the Facility and by Indicators of Facility Disorder *App. C-3268*
Prison Placements and Individual-Level Risk Factors *App. C-3269*
An Incident of Sexual Victimization Was Reported in 4.0% of Prison Placements *App. C-3270*
Independent Contributions of Individual-Level and Facility-Level Factors to Victimization *App. C-3271*
Variations in Sexual Victimization Rates Were Strongly Related to Sexual Orientation After Controlling for Other Factors *App. C-3271*
Facility-Level Factors Remained Significant After Controlling for Inmate Characteristics *App. C-3272*
Reporting Of Sexual Victimization *App. C-3273*
Two-Thirds of Victims of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization Said They Reported at least One Incident to Facility Staff or Someone Else *App. C-3273*
22% of Unwilling Victims of Sexual Activity with Staff, Compared to 3% of "Willing" Victims, Said They Had Reported an Incident to Facility Staff or Someone Else *App. C-3273*
Most Common Reasons for Not Reporting Sexual Victimization by Other Inmates Linked to Embarrassment, Shame, and Not Wanting Others to Know *App. C-3274*
37% of Victims Who Reported Being Victimized by Other Inmates Said Facility Staff Did Not Respond *App. C-3274*
Post-Release Responses To Victimization *App. C-3274*
HIV Testing and Results *App. C-3275*
Current Employment, Housing, and Living Arrangements of Former Inmates *App. C-3276*
Following Their Release from Prison, Victims and Nonvictims Did Not Differ in Their Employment and Housing Arrangements, but Victims Were More Likely than Nonvictims to Be Living Alone *App. C-3276*
Methodology *App. C-3276*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

HIV in Prisons, 2001-2010 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-3323*
Rates of HIV/AIDS and AIDS-Related Deaths in Prisons have Declined Steadily Since 2001 *App. C-3324*
Rates of HIV/AIDS Cases and AIDS-Related Deaths Declined Across all Sizes of Prison Populations *App. C-3324*
The Rate of AIDS-Related Deaths for State Prison Inmates Dropped Below the Rate for the U.S. General Population *App. C-3325*
Methodology *App. C-3325*

Sexual Victimization in Prisons and Jails Reported by Inmates, 2011-12 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-3455*
Highlights *App. C-3456*
Prevalence of Sexual Victimization *App. C-3456*
Facility Rankings *App. C-3456*
Variations in Victimization Rates *App. C-3457*
Special Inmate Populations *App. C-3457*
Incidents of Sexual Victimization *App. C-3459*
In 2011-12, 4.0% of Prison Inmates and 3.2% of Jail Inmates Reported Experiencing One or More Incidents of Sexual Victimization *App. C-3459*
Facility-Level Rates *App. C-3460*
The NIS-3 Provides a Basis for Identifying High Rate and Low Rate Facilities *App. C-3460*
11 Male Prisons, 1 Female Prison, and 9 Jails Were Identified as Having High Rates of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization in 2011-12 *App. C-3461*
8 Male Prisons, 4 Female Prisons, and 12 Jails Were Identified as Having High Rates of Staff Sexual Misconduct *App. C-3462*
7 Male Prisons, 6 Female Prisons, and 4 Jails Were Identified as Low-Rate Facilities for Sexual Victimization Overall *App. C-3463*
In 2011-12, Two Military Facilities and One Indian Country Jail Had High Rates of Staff Sexual Misconduct *App. C-3463*
Demographic and Other Characteristics *App. C-3464*
Overweight and Obese Prison Inmates Had Lower Rates of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization and Staff Misconduct Than Inmates Who Were at or Below a Normal Weight *App. C-3464*
Large Differences in Sexual Victimization Were Found Among Inmates Based on Their Sexual Orientation and Past Sexual Experiences *App. C-3465*
In 2011-12, Inmates Held for a Violent Sexual Offense Reported Higher Rates of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization Than Inmates Held for Other Offenses *App. C-3466*

Rates of Staff Sexual Misconduct Varied Among Inmates Based on Their Criminal Justice Status and History *App. C-3467*
Special Inmate Populations—Inmates Ages 16 to 17 *App. C-3467*
In 2011-12, Juvenile Inmates Ages 16 to 17 Held in Adult Facilities Reported Rates of Sexual Victimization Similar to Those of Adult Inmates *App. C-3467*
Among Juveniles and Young Adult Inmates in 2011-12, Patterns of Sexual Victimization Across Demographic Subgroups Showed Little Variation *App. C-3468*
Among Juveniles Victimized by Other Inmates in 2011-12, More Than Three-Quarters Experienced Force or Threat of Force, and a Quarter Were Injured *App. C-3469*
Special Inmate Populations—Inmates with Mental Health Problems *App. C-3469*
A High Percentage of Inmates Had a History of Problems with Their Emotions, Nerves, or Mental Health *App. C-3470*
Inmates with a History of Mental Health Problems Had Higher Rates of Sexual Victimization Than Other Inmates *App. C-3470*
In 2011-12, Nearly 15% of State and Federal Prisoners and 26% of Jail Inmates Had Symptoms of Serious Psychological Distress *App. C-3471*
Inmates with SPD or Anxiety-Mood Disorders Reported High Overall Rates of Sexual Victimization in 2011-12 *App. C-3472*
Inmates with Mental Illness Reported Higher Rates of Sexual Victimization Than Inmates Without Mental Health Problems Across Subgroups *App. C-3473*
Reports of Sexual Victimization Differed Among Inmates with SPD and Other Inmates *App. C-3473*
Special Inmate Populations—Inmates with a Non-Heterosexual Sexual Orientation *App. C-3474*
Across Subgroups, Inmate-on-Inmate Victimization Rates Were Higher for Non-Heterosexual Inmates Than Heterosexual Inmates *App. C-3474*
Methodology *App. C-3475*

Prisoners in 2012: Trends in Admissions and Releases, 1991-2012
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-3647*
The Drop in State Prison Admissions Drove the Overall Decline in U.S. Prison Admissions in 2012 *App. C-3648*
Releases from State Prison in 2012 Exceeded Admissions for the Fourth Consecutive Year, Contributing to the Decline in the Total Prison Population *App. C-3649*
Violent Offenders Accounted for a Larger Proportion of the State Prison Population Between 1991 and 2011 *App. C-3649*
Between 1991 and 2011, Changes in State Prison Admission Types Were Associated with Changes in the Offense Distributions *App. C-3650*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

The Number of Females Admitted on New Court Commitments for Violent Offenses in 2011 Increased by 2% from 2006 and by 83% from 1991 *App. C-3651*
Among New Court Commitments to State Prison, More than a Third Each of Black and Hispanic Offenders, and a Quarter of White Offenders Were Convicted of a Violent Offense *App. C-3651*
Since 1991, the Proportion of Newly Admitted Violent Offenders Receiving Prison Sentences of Less than 5 Years has Increased *App. C-3652*
Violent Offenders' Longer Sentences Contribute to Their Increased Proportion in the Yearend Prison Population *App. C-3653*
State Prisons Released Almost 24,900 More Inmates than They Admitted in 2011 *App. C-3654*
The 2012 Yearend U.S. Sentenced Prison Population Declined 1.8%, Driven by a Decrease in the Number of State Prisoners *App. C-3654*
Imprisonment Rates Continued to Decline for Most Race, Ethnicity, Sex, and Age Groups *App. C-3654*
Other Select Findings *App. C-3655*
National Prisoner Statistics Program Jurisdiction Notes *App. C-3656*
Terms and Definitions *App. C-3664*
Methodology *App. C-3665*

Medical Problems of State and Federal Prisoners and Jail Inmates, 2011-12

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-3979*
Prisoners and Jail Inmates were More Likely than the General Population to Report Ever Having a Chronic Condition or an Infectious Disease *App. C-3980*
High Blood Pressure was the Most Commonly Reported Chronic Condition Among Prisoners and Jail Inmates *App. C-3980*
Chronic Conditions were more Commonly Reported by Female Inmates Both in Prisons and Jails *App. C-3981*
Older Prisoners were About 3 Times more Likely than Younger Persons to Report Ever Having a Chronic Condition or Infectious Disease *App. C-3981*
24% of Prisoners and Jail Inmates Reported at Least Two Chronic Conditions *App. C-3981*
Most Prisoners and Jail Inmates Received Medical Assessments or Exams Since Admission *App. C-3982*
Among Prisoners and Jail Inmates Who Reported Ever Having a Chronic Condition, About Three-Quarters Reported Having a Chronic Condition at Admission *App. C-3982*
66% of Prisoners and 40% of Jail Inmates with a Current Chronic Condition Reported Taking Prescription Medication *App. C-3983*
More than Half of Prisoners and Jail Inmates Reported Being Somewhat or Very Satisfied with Health Care Services Received Since Admission *App. C-3983*

Methodology *App. C-3984*

Multistate Criminal History Patterns of Prisoners Released in 30 States *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. C-4129*
Older Inmates Were More Likely Than Younger Inmates to Have Prior Out-of-State Arrests *App. C-4130*
Prior to Release, the Majority of Multistate Offenders Had Arrest Records in Two States *App. C-4131*
Inmates with Prior Out-of-State Arrests Were More Likely Than Other Inmates to Have an Out-of-State Arrest Following Release *App. C-4131*
Recidivism Patterns Based on National Criminal History Records Differed from Those Limited to Criminal History Records Within the State of Release *App. C-4132*
For Most States, Their Released Prisoners Had Arrest Histories in About 50 States *App. C-4133*
Methodology *App. C-4134*

Use of Restrictive Housing in U.S. Prisons and Jails, 2011-12 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. C-4163*
Individual-Level Rates *App. C-4164*
On an Average Day in 2011-12, Up to 4.4% of State and Federal Prisoners and 2.7% of Jail Inmates Were Held in Administrative Segregation or Solitary Confinement *App. C-4164*
Nearly 20% of Prison Inmates and 18% of Jail Inmates Had Spent Time in Restrictive Housing in the Past 12 Months or Since Coming to the Facility, If Shorter *App. C-4164*
Time in Restrictive Housing Varied Among Inmate Demographic Groups *App. C-4165*
Time in Restrictive Housing Units Linked to Current Offense and Past Criminal Justice Contacts *App. C-4166*
Use of Restrictive Housing Linked to Inmate Mental Health Problems *App. C-4166*
A High Percentage of Inmates with Current Symptoms of Serious Psychological Distress Had Spent Time in Restrictive Housing Units *App. C-4167*
More than Three-Quarters of Inmates Written Up for Assaulting Other Inmates or Staff Had Spent Time in Restrictive Housing *App. C-4168*
Facility-Level Rates *App. C-4169*
Use of Restrictive Housing Associated with Indicators of Facility Disorder *App. C-4169*
Facility-Level Rates of Restrictive Housing Associated with Characteristics of Inmates Housed *App. C-4170*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Lack of Inmate Trust and Confidence in Staff Linked to Greater Use of Restrictive Housing *App. C-4171*
Methodology *App. C-4173*

Veterans in Prison and Jail, 2011-12 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-4201*
Veterans in Prison and Jail Have Decreased Since 1998 *App. C-4202*
On Average, Veterans in Prison and Jail Were Older Than Nonveterans *App. C-4202*
Incarcerated Veterans Were More Likely to be Convicted On a Violent Sexual Offense and Have Fewer Priors Than Nonveterans *App. C-4203*
The Majority of Incarcerated Veterans Did Not Experience Combat During Their Military Service *App. C-4204*
Veterans in Prison and Jail Were Likely to Report Having Been Told They Had Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder *App. C-4205*
Veterans in Prison and Jail Were More Likely Than Nonveterans to Report a Hearing or Vision Disability *App. C-4205*
Methodology *App. C-4205*

Disabilities Among Prison and Jail Inmates, 2011-12 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-4263*
Inmates Were More Likely than Persons in the General Population to Report Having a Disability *App. C-4264*
Cognitive Disability was the Most Commonly Reported Disability Among Inmates *App. C-4264*
About 13% of Prisoners and 16% of Jail Inmates Reported Having Multiple Disabilities *App. C-4264*
Female Inmates Were More Likely than Male Inmates to Report Having a Disability *App. C-4264*
Non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic Inmates Were Less Likely than Non-Hispanic Whites to Report a Disability *App. C-4265*
Older Inmates Were More Likely to Report *App. C-4265*
More than Half of Inmates with a Disability Reported a Chronic Condition *App. C-4265*
Methodology *App. C-4266*

Prisoners in 2015 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-4291*
Total Prison Population *App. C-4291*
Sentenced Prison Population *App. C-4292*
State and Federal Prisoners Sentenced to More than 1 Year Declined for the Second Consecutive Year *App. C-4293*

Blacks and Hispanics Sentenced to More than 1 Year in State or Federal Prison Declined in 2015 *App. C-4293*
Imprisonment Rate *App. C-4293*
At Yearend 2015, the Imprisonment Rate for Sentenced Prisoners of All Ages Was the Lowest Since 1997 *App. C-4293*
The Imprisonment Rates Decreased for All Races from 2014 to 2015 *App. C-4294*
Prison Admissions And Releases *App. C-4294*
State and Federal Correctional Authorities Admitted 17,800 Fewer Prisoners in 2015 than in 2014 *App. C-4294*
Correctional Authorities Released 4,700 More Prisoners from State and Federal Prisons in 2015 than in 2014 *App. C-4295*
Demographic and Offense Characteristics of State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-4295*
A Tenth (11%) of Prisoners Sentenced to More than 1 Year in State or Federal Prison at Yearend 2015 Were Age 55 or Older *App. C-4295*
Fifty-Three Percent of State Prisoners Were Serving Time for Violent Offenses *App. C-4296*
Nearly Half of Federal Prisoners in 2015 Were Serving Sentences for Drug Offenses *App. C-4296*
Other Selected Findings *App. C-4297*
Prison Capacity *App. C-4297*
Private Prisons *App. C-4297*
Prisoners Held in Local Jails *App. C-4297*
U.S. Military and Territories *App. C-4298*
Methodology *App. C-4298*
National Prisoner Statistics (NPS) Program Jurisdiction Notes *App. C-4302*

Correctional Populations in the United States, 2015 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-4341*
Community Supervision and Incarcerated Populations Declined to Lowest Levels in More than a Decade *App. C-4341*
Drop in the Number of Probationers Accounted for Most of the Decrease in the Correctional Population During 2015 *App. C-4342*
By Yearend 2015, the Correctional Supervision Rate Dropped to the Lowest Rate Since 1994 *App. C-4343*
Terms and Definitions *App. C-4343*
Methodology *App. C-4345*

Aging of the State Prison Population,1993-2013 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-4403*
Growth of the State Prison Population *App. C-4404*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

The Number of State Prisoners Age 55 or Older Doubled Each Decade Between 1993 and 2013 *App. C-4404*
Persons Age 55 or Older Made Up a Larger Percentage of the U.S. Resident Population than the State Prison Population *App. C-4404*
Characteristics of the Aging State Prison Population *App. C-4405*
Between 1993 and 2003, Both Males and Females Ages 40 to 54 Increased by More than 100% *App. C-4405*
Black State Prisoners Age 55 or Older Increased More than 150% Between 2003 and 2013 *App. C-4406*
State Prison Inmates Age 55 or Older Had a Higher Percentage of Violent Offenders than All Other Age Groups *App. C-4406*
Sources of Growth in the Older Prison Population *App. C-4407*
Admissions of State Prisoners Increased Most Among 45 to 49 Years Old Between 1993 and 2003, and Among Ages 55 or Older After 2003 *App. C-4407*
Type of admission *App. C-4408*
Rate of admission *App. C-4408*
Admitting offense *App. C-4408*
Likelihood of admission to prison after an arrest *App. C-4409*
Inmates Age 55 or Older Admitted to State Prison Were Sentenced to—and Were Expected to Serve—More Time on Average than Younger Inmates *App. C-4410*
Sentence length *App. C-4410*
Time served in prison *App. C-4411*
The Percentage of Older Prisoners Released After Serving at Least 10 Years More than Doubled Between 1993 and 2013 *App. C-4412*
By 2013, 40% of Persons Age 55 or Older in Prison at Yearend Had Served 10 Years or More, Compared to 9% in 1993 *App. C-4413*
Over Time, Admissions Contributed a Smaller Proportion of State Prison Inmates Age 55 or Older Relative to Prisoners Who Turned 55 While in Prison *App. C-4413*
Conclusion *App. C-4414*
Longer Sentences, More Time Served, and Increased Admissions Among Older Offenders Led to Aging in the State Prison Population *App. C-4414*
Methodology *App. C-4415*

HIV in Prisons, 2015
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-4473*
HIV Among State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-4474*
HIV Among State and Federal Prisoners by Sex *App. C-4474*

AIDS-Related Deaths Among State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-4475*
AIDS-Related Deaths of State Prisoners by Sex, Race, Hispanic Origin, and Age *App. C-4475*
Sex *App. C-4475*
Race and Hispanic Origin *App. C-4475*
Age *App. C-4476*
HIV Testing Practices in State and Federal Prison Systems *App. C-4476*
During Intake Process *App. C-4476*
While in Custody *App. C-4476*
During Discharge Process *App. C-4477*
Methodology *App. C-4477*

Indicators of Mental Health Problems Reported by Prisoners and Jail Inmates, 2011-12
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-4499*
Prisoners and Jail Inmates Were More Likely to Have Ever Been Told They Had a Major Depressive Disorder than Other Mental Disorders *App. C-4500*
Prisoners and Jail Inmates Were Three to Five Times as Likely to Have Met the Threshold for SPD as Adults in the General U.S. Population *App. C-4500*
Female Prisoners and Jail Inmates Were More Likely to Have Met the Threshold for SPD than Males *App. C-4501*
Prisoners Age 65 or Older Were Less Likely to Have a Mental Health Indicator, Compared to Other Age Groups *App. C-4501*
Prisoners Who Were Married Were Less Likely to Have Met the Threshold for SPD than Prisoners with Other Marital Statuses *App. C-4502*
Prisoners and Jail Inmates with a College Degree Were More Likely than High School Graduates to Have a History of a Mental Health Problem *App. C-4502*
The Percentage of Prisoners Incarcerated for a Violent Offense Who Met the Threshold for SPD was Similar to Those Incarcerated for a Property Offense Who Met the Threshold for SPD *App. C-4502*
The Percentage of Prisoners Who Met the Threshold for SPD Did Not Differ by Sentence Length *App. C-4503*
The Percentage of Inmates Who Had Ever Been Told They Had a Mental Disorder Did Not Differ by Time Served Since Admission *App. C-4503*
A Larger Percentage of Prisoners and Jail Inmates with More than One Arrest than Those with One Arrest Had Been Told They Had a Mental Disorder *App. C-4504*
Prisoners Who Spent 5 Years or More Previously Incarcerated Were More Likely to Have Met the Threshold for SPD than Those with No Prior Time Served *App. C-4504*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Almost Three-Quarters of Inmates Who Met the Threshold for SPD Had Received Mental Health Treatment in Their Lifetime *App. C-4505*
Prisoners Who Had a Mental Health Indicator Were More Likely than Similar Jail Inmates to Have Received Treatment Since Admission to Their Current Facility *App. C-4505*
About a Third of Inmates With a Mental Health Indicator Were Currently Receiving Treatment *App. C-4505*
Prisoners and Jail Inmates Who Met the Threshold for SPD Were More Likely than Those Without SPD to be Written Up or Charged with an Assault While Incarcerated *App. C-4506*
Methodology *App. C-4506*

Drug Use, Dependence, and Abuse Among State Prisoners and Jail Inmates, 2007-2009
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-4535*
Drug Dependence and Abuse *App. C-4536*
During 2007-09, More than Half of State Prisoners and Two-Thirds of Sentenced Jail Inmates Met the DSM-IV Criteria for Drug Dependence or Abuse *App. C-4536*
Female Inmates Were More Likely than Male Inmates to Have Met the DSM-IV Criteria for Drug Dependence or Abuse *App. C-4536*
Inmates Incarcerated for a Property Offense Were More Likely to Have Met the Criteria for Dependence or Abuse than Inmates Incarcerated for Other Offenses *App. C-4536*
State Prisoners Were 12 Times More Likely than Adults in the General Population to Have Met the Criteria for Dependence or Abuse *App. C-4537*
Jail Inmates Were More Likely to Have Met the Criteria for Dependence or Abuse than Those in the General Population Who Had Been Arrested *App. C-4537*
Trends in Lifetime and Regular Use of Drugs by State Prisoners and Jail Inmates *App. C-4538*
Overall Drug Use Reported by Inmates was Unchanged from Past Surveys *App. C-4538*
More State Prisoners and Jail Inmates Reported They Had Ever Used Marijuana/Hashish than Any Other Drug *App. C-4538*
Patterns of Drug Use at Time of the Offense *App. C-4539*
4 in 10 Prisoners and Jail Inmates Used Drugs at the Time of the Offense for Which They Were Currently Incarcerated *App. C-4539*
About 4 in 10 State Prisoners and Sentenced Jail Inmates Who Were Incarcerated for Property Offenses Committed the Crime to Get Money for Drugs or to Obtain Drugs *App. C-4539*
Drug Use by Demographics and Offense *App. C-4539*
Among State Prisoners, Females, Whites, and Those Age 54 or Younger Were More Likely than Other Persons to Have Used Drugs in the Month Before the Offense *App. C-4539*

State Prisoners Incarcerated for Property or Drug Offenses Were More Likely to Have Used Drugs than Those Who Committed Violent Offenses *App. C-4540*
Female Jail Inmates Were More Likely than Male Inmates to Have Used Drugs in the Month Before the Offense or at the Time of the Offense *App. C-4540*
More than Half of Sentenced Jail Inmates Incarcerated for a Drug Crime Used Drugs at the Time of the Offense *App. C-4540*
Regular Use of Cocaine/Crack, Methamphetamine, or Heroin/Opiates by Demographics *App. C-4541*
Cocaine/Crack *App. C-4541*
During 2007-09, Regular Use of Cocaine/Crack was Highest Among Females, Whites, Inmates Ages 35 to 44, and Property Offenders *App. C-4541*
Methamphetamine *App. C-4541*
Female Inmates Were More Likely than Male Inmates to Have Regularly Used Methamphetamine During 2007-09 *App. C-4541*
Heroin/Opiates *App. C-4542*
Regular Use of Heroin/Opiates was Lowest Among Black Prisoners and Jail Inmates During 2007-09 *App. C-4542*
Estimates of Lifetime and Regular Use of Drugs Among Adults in the General Population *App. C-4542*
Little to No Change Occurred in the Percentage of Adults in the General Population Who Had Ever Used or Regularly Used Drugs Between 2002-04 and 2007-09 *App. C-4542*
Month-Before Drug Use Among Prisoners was Three Times Higher than the General Population *App. C-4543*
Among Prisoners and Adults in the General Population, Marijuana/Hashish was Reported as the Most Used Drug in the Month Before the Arrest or Interview *App. C-4543*
Sentenced Jail Inmates Were More Likely than the General Population to Have Used Drugs in the Prior Month *App. C-4543*
Participation in Drug Treatment Programs *App. C-4544*
Fewer than a Third of Inmates Who Met the Criteria for Drug Dependence or Abuse Received Drug Treatment or Participated in a Program *App. C-4544*
Prisoner and Jail Inmate Participation in a Drug Treatment Program Did Not Differ by Time Since Arrival to the Current Facility or Time Until Release *App. C-4544*
More Inmates Who Met the Criteria for Dependence or Abuse Participated in a Drug Treatment Program than Adults in the General Population *App. C-4544*
Methodology *App. C-4545*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Table of Contents

Volume Six

APPENDIX C
Prisoner Statistics (continued)

2018 Update on Prisoner Recidivism: a 9-Year Follow-up Period (2005-2014)
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-4675*
About 1 in 4 State Prisoners Released in the 30 States in 2005 Were in Prison for a Violent Offense *App. C-4676*
Extending the Follow-up Period from 3 to 9 Years Increased Recidivism of Prisoners by 15 Percentage Points *App. C-4676*
Longer Follow-up Periods Show Substantial Declines in Apparent Desistance *App. C-4677*
After Year-1 the Annual Percentages of Males and Females Arrested for the First Time were Similar *App. C-4677*
Prisoners Released in 30 States in 2005 were Arrested Nearly 2 Million Times During the 9 Years Following Release *App. C-4678*
Male and Younger Prisoners were More Likely to be Arrested Each Year than Female and Older Prisoners *App. C-4678*
During the 9 Years After Release, Prisoners Released for a Property Offense were Most Likely to be Arrested *App. C-4678*
By the Sixth Year After Release, Prisoners Released for a Violent or Property Crime were Similarly Likely to be Arrested for a Violent Crime *App. C-4679*
Among Prisoners Arrested Following Release, the Percentage of Arrests in Another State Increased Each Year After Release *App. C-4679*
Five Percent of Prisoners Were Arrested During Year-1 Following Release and Not Arrested Again During Years 2 Through 9 *App. C-4680*

Forty-Four Percent of Released Prisoners were Not Arrested After Year-5 *App. C-4680*
Methodology *App. C-4680*

Time Served in State Prison, 2016
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-4757*
Violent Offenders Served 4.7 Years in State Prison on Average, Compared to Less than 2 Years for Other Offenders *App. C-4758*
More than 7 in 10 Violent Offenders Released in 2016 Served Less than Five Years in State Prison *App. C-4758*
Persons Released After Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault (62%) Served the Highest Percentage of Their Sentence *App. C-4758*
Persons Sentenced for Murder or Rape/SexualAssault Made Up About Half (49%) of All Deaths in State Prisons in 2016 *App. C-4759*
Methodology *App. C-4759*

Source and Use of Firearms Involved in Crimes: Survey of Prison Inmates, 2016
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-4827*
Controlling-Offense Characteristics *App. C-4828*
Extent of Firearm Use Among Prisoners During the Crime *App. C-4828*
Type of Firearm Possessed By Prisoners During Offense *App. C-4829*
Demographic Characteristics *App. C-4829*
Method, Source, and Process Used to Obtain the Firearm *App. C-4830*
Use and Source of Firearms Among All State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-4830*
Methodology *App. C-4830*

Recidivism of Sex Offenders Released from State Prison: a 9-Year Follow-Up (2005-14)
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-4855*
Sex Offenders were more Likely than Other Released Prisoners to Receive Longer Sentences and to be Granted Unconditional Releases *App. C-4856*
The Median Age at Release for Sex Offenders was 38 *App. C-4857*
About Half of Sex Offenders had 5 or more Prior Arrests and about a Third had at Least 1 Prior Drug Arrest *App. C-4857*
Sex Offenders were Less Likely than Other Released Prisoners to be Arrested During the 9 Years Following Release *App. C-4857*
Sex Offenders were Three Times as Likely as Other Offenders to be Arrested

for Rape or Sexual Assault During the 9 Years Following Release *App. C-4858*
18% of Sex Offenders were Arrested for the First Time During Years 4 Through 9 After Release *App. C-4858*
Half of Prisoners Released After Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault had an Arrest Within 9 Years that Led to a Conviction *App. C-4859*
Younger Sex Offenders were more Likely than Older Sex Offenders to be Arrested for Another Sex Offense Post-Release *App. C-4859*
11% of Prisoners Released After Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault were Arrested at Least Once Outside the State that Released Them *App. C-4860*
Annual Arrest Percentages Among Sex Offenders Declined During the 9 Years Following Their Release *App. C-4860*
Prisoners Released after Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault Accounted for 16% of Arrests for Rape or Sexual Assault During the Follow-Up Period *App. C-4861*
Almost 6% of Male Prisoners Released in 30 States in 2005 were Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault *App. C-4861*
Fewer than 1% of Female Prisoners Released in 30 States in 2005 were Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault *App. C-4862*
67% of Male Prisoners Released After Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault were Arrested Within 9 Years *App. C-4862*
Methodology *App. C-4862*

Time Served in State Prison, 2018 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-5161*
Violent Offenders Served More than Twice as Long in State Prison on Average as Other Offenders *App. C-5161*
More than 75% of Offenders Released in 2018 Served Less than 3 Years in State Prison *App. C-5162*
Offenders Released After Serving Time for Rape Served the Highest Percentage of Their Sentence *App. C-5162*
Violent Offenders Made Up More than 70% of All Deaths in State Prisons in 2018 *App. C-5163*
Methodology *App. C-5163*

Parents in Prison and Their Minor Children, 2016 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-5173*
Highlights *App. C-5173*
Other Key Findings *App. C-5174*
Methodology *App. C-5174*

Veterans in Prison, 2016 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-5185*
Highlights *App. C-5185*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Other Key Findings *App. C-5186*
Methodology *App. C-5187*

Disabilities Reported by Prisoners, 2016 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-5197*
Highlights *App. C-5197*
Other Key Findings *App. C-5198*
Methodology *App. C-5198*

Federal Prisoner Statistics Collected Under the First Step Act, 2020
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-5213*
Key Findings *App. C-5213*
Methodology *App. C-5214*

Medical Problems Reported by Prisoners, 2016
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-5309*
Other Key Findings *App. C-5309*
Methodology *App. C-5310*

Alcohol and Drug Use and Treatment Reported by Prisoners, 2016
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-5325*
Other Key Findings *App. C-5325*
Alcohol and Drug Use *App. C-5325*
Alcohol and Drug Use, by Prisoner Characteristics *App. C-5326*
Alcohol, Drug, and Substance Use Disorder *App. C-5327*
Alcohol or Drug Use Treatment *App. C-5327*
Methodology *App. C-5327*

Indicators of Mental Health Problems Reported by Prisoners, 2016
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-5349*
Other Key Findings *App. C-5349*
Methodology *App. C-5350*

Indicators of Mental Health Problems Reported by Prisoners, 2016
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-5365*
Allegations of Sexual Victimization *App. C-5366*
Over Half of All Fully Investigated Allegations of Sexual Victimization in 2018 were Unsubstantiated *App. C-5366*

Outcomes of Sexual Victimization Investigations *App. C-5366*
8% of Inmate-on-Inmate and 5% of Staff-on-Inmate Allegations were Substantiated During 2016-18 *App. C-5367*
In 2018, There Were 1,673 Substantiated Incidents of Sexual Victimization in Adult Correctional Facilities *App. C-5367*
Methodology *App. C-5367*

Suicide in Local Jails and Federal Prisons, 2000-2019
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-5407*
Suicides in Local Jails *App. C-5408*
Demographic Characteristics of Local Jail Inmates Who Died by Suicide *App. C-5408*
Criminal Justice Characteristics of Local Jail Inmates Who Died by Suicide *App. C-5409*
Circumstances of Suicide Deaths in Local Jails *App. C-5409*
Characteristics of Jail Facilities with Suicides in 2019 *App. C-5409*
Suicides in State Prisons *App. C-5410*
Demographic Characteristics of State Prisoners who Died by Suicide *App. C-5410*
Circumstances of Suicide Deaths in State Prisons *App. C-5411*
Suicides in Federal Prisons *App. C-5411*
Demographic and criminal Justice Characteristics of Federal Prisoners who Died by Suicide *App. C-5411*
Characteristics of State and Federal Prison Facilities with Suicides in 2019 *App. C-5412*
Methodology *App. C-5412*

Prisoners in 2020 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-5453*
Total Prison Population *App. C-5454*
State-Level Total Prison Populations *App. C-5454*
Population of Sentenced Prisoners *App. C-5454*
State-Specific Sentenced Prison Populations *App. C-5455*
Imprisonment Rates *App. C-5455*
State-Specific Imprisonment Rates *App. C-5456*
Prison Admissions *App. C-5456*
Prison Releases *App. C-5456*
Age, Sex, and Race or Ethnicity of Sentenced Prisoners *App. C-5457*
Imprisonment Rates of Sentenced Males By Age and Race or Ethnicity *App. C-5457*
Imprisonment Rates of Sentenced Females By Age and Race or Ethnicity *App. C-5457*
Prisoners Held in Privately Operated Prisons *App. C-5458*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Prisoners Held in Local Jails *App. C-5458*
Prisoners Age 17 or Younger *App. C-5458*
Offense Characteristics of State Prisoners *App. C-5459*
State-Specific Offense Distributions *App. C-5459*
Offense Characteristics of Federal Prisoners *App. C-5459*
Prison Capacity *App. C-5460*
Non-U.S. Citizens in State and Federal Prisons *App. C-5460*
Persons Held Under U.S. Military Jurisdiction *App. C-5460*
Offense Characteristics of Persons Held Under U.S. Military Jurisdiction *App. C-5461*
Persons Held in the Custody of U.S. Territories *App. C-5461*
Methodology *App. C-5461*

Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 24 States in 2008: a 10-Year Follow-Up Period (2008-2018) *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-5533*
The Median Age of State Prisoners Released in 2008 was 34 *App. C-5533*
About 1 in 4 State Prisoners Released in 2008 Were Serving Time for a Violent Offense *App. C-5534*
82% of Released State Prisoners Were Arrested Within 10 Years *App. C-5534*
Nearly 8 in 10 Violent Offenders Were Arrested for any Crime Within 10 Years of Release From State Prison *App. C-5535*
Nearly 9 in 10 State Prisoners With 10 or More Prior Arrests Were Arrested Within 10 Years of Release *App. C-5535*
Nearly 7 in 10 State Prisoners Released Across 22 States Had an Arrest Within 10 Years That Led to a Conviction *App. C-5536*
About 6 in 10 Released Prisoners Across 18 States Returned to Prison Within 10 Years *App. C-5536*
The Total Number of Arrests Among Former Prisoners Released in 2008 Declined From Year 1 to Year 10 *App. C-5536*
Nearly Half of State Prisoners Released in 2008 Were Arrested for a Drug Offense Within 10 Years *App. C-5537*
More Than 4 in 10 Prisoners Released After Serving Time For a Violent Offense Were Arrested For a Violent Offense Within 10 Years *App. C-5537*
Prisoners Released After Serving Time For a Violent Offense Were More Likely to Be Arrested For a Public Order Offense Than Other Offenses *App. C-5537*
About 3 in 4 Prisoners Released After Serving Time For a Drug Offense Were Arrested For a Nondrug Offense Within 10 Years *App. C-5537*
More Than 8 in 10 Prisoners Released After Serving Time For a Property Offense Were Arrested For a Crime Other Than a Property Offense Within 10 Years *App. C-5538*

Persons in Prison For a Violent Offense Served Longer Sentences Than Other Released Prisoners *App. C-5538*
Released Prisoners Who Served Less Time Had Higher Arrest Rates Than Those Who Served More *App. C-5538*
About 1 in 6 Released State Prisoners Were Arrested in Another State Within 10 Years *App. C-5539*
About Half as Many State Prisoners Were Arrested in Year 10 as in Year 1 *App. C-5539*
Methodology *App. C-5539*

Profile of Prison Inmates, 2016 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-5609*
Demographic Characteristics *App. C-5609*
Sex and Age *App. C-5609*
Race and Ethnicity *App. C-5610*
Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity *App. C-5610*
Education *App. C-5610*
Marital Status, Military Service, and Citizenship *App. C-5611*
Offense Characteristics of State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-5611*
Criminal Histories of State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-5612*
Criminal Justice Status *App. C-5612*
Lifetime Arrests *App. C-5613*
Prior Incarcerations *App. C-5612*
Sentence Length and Time Served *App. C-5614*
Sentence Length *App. C-5614*
Time Served Since Admission *App. C-5614*
Total Time Expected to Serve *App. C-5614*
Special Conditions of Sentences *App. C-5615*
Time to Expected Release *App. C-5615*
Housing Characteristics Prior to Arrest *App. C-5615*
Family Background While Growing Up *App. C-5616*
Methodology *App. C-5617*

Mortality in State and Federal Prisons, 2001-2019 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-5653*
Total Prison Deaths, 2001-2019 *App. C-5654*
Cause of Deaths in State Prison *App. C-5654*
State Prison Mortality Rates in 2019 *App. C-5654*
Comparing Mortality in State Prisons and the U.S. Population *App. C-5655*
Demographic Characteristics of State Prison Decedents *App. C-5655*
Deaths in Federal Prisons *App. C-5655*
Jurisdiction-Level Prison Mortality *App. C-5656*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Methodology *App. C-5656*

Employment of Persons Released from Federal Prison in 2010
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-5701*
Persons Released From Federal Prison in 2010 *App. C-5702*
Pre-Prison Employment *App. C-5702*
Percent of Persons Employed Prior to Imprisonment *App. C-5702*
Quarterly Earnings Prior to Imprisonment *App. C-5703*
Post-Prison Employment *App. C-5704*
Overall Employment Measures for Persons Released From Federal Prison *App. C-5704*
Quarterly Employment After Release From Federal Prison *App. C-5705*
Quarterly Earnings After Release From Federal Prison *App. C-5706*
Sectors of Employment *App. C-5707*
Methodology *App. C-5708*

Correctional Populations in the United States, 2020 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-5741*
Methodology *App. C-5741*

HIV in Prisons, 2020 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-5757*
Key Findings *App. C-5758*
HIV Among State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-5758*
AIDS-Related Deaths Among State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-5758*
AIDS-Related Deaths Among State and Federal Prisoners by Demographic Characteristics *App. C-*
HIV Testing Practices in State and Federal Prison Systems *App. C-5759*
Methodology *App. C-5760*

Federal Deaths in Custody and During Arrest, 2020 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-5795*
Methodology *App. C-5795*

Impact of COVID-19 on State and Federal Prisons, March 2020-February 2021 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-5815*
The Number of Prisoners in Custody Declined in All States During the Study Period *App. C-5816*

Admissions to Prison Decreased 66% During the Pandemic from March 2020 to April 2020 *App. C-5816*
Fewer than 10% of Releases from Prison During the COVID-19 Study Period were Earlier than Originally Scheduled *App. C-5817*
State and Federal Prisons Administered 4.8 Million Viral COVID-19 Tests to Prisoners Over the Study Period *App. C-5818*
The Majority of States Suspended Prisoners' Family Visitation and Educational Programming at Some Point in the COVID-19 Study Period to Mitigate Transmission *App. C-5819*
The Infection Rate for State Prisoners was 219 Per 1,000 Prisoners at Risk of Exposure to COVID-19 *App. C-5819*
White and Black Prisoners Accounted for Two-Thirds of all COVID-19 Infections *App. C-5820*
The Crude Mortality Rate for COVID-19 was 1.5 Deaths Per 1,000 Prisoners *App. C-5820*
Less than 10% of COVID-19-Related Deaths Occurred in Prisoners Less than 44 Years of Age *App. C-5821*
Jurisdictions Vaccinated 119,000 Staff and 126,000 Prisoners from December 2020 to February 2021 *App. C-5821*
Almost 200 Prison Staff Died as a Result of Covid-19 Over the Study Period *App. C-5822*
Jurisdiction Notes *App. C-5822*

Work Assignments Reported by Prisoners, 2016 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-6071*
Methodology *App. C-6072*

Recidivism of Females Released from State Prison, 2012-2017
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-6083*
Key Findings *App. C-6083*
Methodology *App. C-6084*

Arrest History of Persons Admitted to State Prison in 2009 and 2014 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-6165*
Characteristics of Persons Admitted to State Prison *App. C-6166*
About Half of All Persons Entering Prison in 2014 Were Ages 25 to 39 *App. C-6166*
About 4 in 5 Persons Admitted to Prison in 2014 Entered on A New Court Commitment *App. C-6166*
Persons Age 24 or Younger Made Up 1 in 4 of Those Admitted in 2014 on A New Court Commitment *App. C-6167*
Arrest History of Persons Admitted to State Prison *App. C-6167*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

About 9 in 10 Persons Admitted in 2014 Were First Arrested at Age 24 or Younger *App. C-6167*
2% of persons admitted in 2009 or 2014 were first arrested at age 40 or older *App. C-6167*
Persons Admitted to Prison in 2009 or 2014 Had a Median of Nine Prior Arrests *App. C-6168*
For 5% of Persons Admitted in 2014, the Arrest that Led to Their Imprisonment Was Their Only Arrest *App. C-6168*
About 3 in 10 Persons Admitted to Prison in 2014 Had Prior Arrests in More Than One State *App. C-6169*
The Percentage of Persons Admitted to Prison with an Out-of-State Arrest Increased from 2009 to 2014 *App. C-6169*
About 8 in 10 Persons Admitted to Prison in 2014 Had a Prior Arrest for a Property Offense *App. C-6169*
Methodology *App. C-6170*

Sexual Victimization Reported by Adult Correctional Authorities, 2019-2020 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-6301*
BJS Changes to Reporting of Sexual Victimization *App. C-6302*
Section 1: Summary of Allegations and Substantiated Incidents in Adult Correctional Facilities, 2013-2020 *App. C-6302*
Key Findings *App. C-6302*
Section 2. Characteristics of Substantiated Incidents of Sexual Victimization, 2019-20 *App. C-6303*
Key Findings *App. C-6303*
Inmate-on-Inmate Incidents *App. C-6303*
Victim and Perpetrator Characteristics *App. C-6303*
Outcomes *App. C-6303*
Staff-on-Inmate Incidents *App. C-6304*
Victim and Perpetrator Characteristics *App. C-6304*
Outcomes *App. C-6304*
Section 3. Allegations and Substantiated Incidents in Federal and State Prisons, 2019 and 2020 *App. C-6304*
Key Findings *App. C-6305*
Methodology *App. C-6305*

Maternal Healthcare and Pregnancy Prevalence and Outcomes in Prisons, 2023 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-6385*
Pregnancy Testing and Positive Tests Among Female Admissions *App. C-6385*
Pregnancy Prevalence in Custody and Outcomes of Pregnancies by Type *App. C-6386*
Pregnancy-Related Training for Staff, Emergency Transportation Protocols, and Medical Services *App. C-6386*

Accommodations and Support Services for Pregnant and Postpartum Women in Custody *App. C-6386*
Residential Units for Mothers and Babies *App. C-6387*
Methodology *App. C-6387*

HIV in Prisons, 2023 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-6399*
Highlights *App. C-6399*
About this Report *App. C-6400*
HIV Among Persons in State and Federal Prison *App. C-6400*
HIV Testing During Intake Process *App. C-6400*
HIV Testing While in Custody *App. C-6400*
HIV Testing During Discharge Planning *App. C-6401*
Data Tables *App. C-6401*
Methodology *App. C-6401*

Prisoners in 2023 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-6417*
Total Prison Population *App. C-6417*
Jurisdiction-Level Total Prison Populations *App. C-6418*
Population of Sentenced Prisoners *App. C-6418*
Jurisdiction-Specific Sentenced Prison Populations *App. C-6419*
Imprisonment rates based on sentenced prisoners *App. C-6419*
Jurisdiction-Specific Imprisonment Rates Based on Sentenced Prisoners *App. C-6420*
Admissions of Sentenced Prisoners *App. C-6420*
Releases of Sentenced Prisoners *App. C-6420*
Age, Sex, and Race or Hispanic Origin of Sentenced Prisoners *App. C-6421*
Imprisonment Rates of U.S. Residents, Based on Sentenced Prisoners, by Sex, Age, and Race or Hispanic Origin *App. C-6421*
Prisoners Held in Privately Operated Prison Facilities and Local Jails *App. C-6422*
Prisoners Age 17 or Younger *App. C-6422*
Offense Characteristics of Sentenced State Prisoners *App. C-6422*
Offense Characteristics of Sentenced Federal Prisoners *App. C-6422*
Prison Capacity *App. C-6423*
Non-U.S. Citizens in State and Federal Prisons *App. C-6423*
Persons Held Under U.S. Military Jurisdiction *App. C-6423*
Persons Held in the Custody of U.S. Territories *App. C-6423*
Methodology *App. C-6424*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Correctional Populations in the United States, 2023 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-6473*
Total Correctional Population *App. C-6473*
Composition of the Correctional Population *App. C-6474*
Correctional Supervision Rates *App. C-6474*
Males and Females Under Correctional Supervision *App. C-6475*
Correctional Supervision by Race or Hispanic Origin *App. C-6475*
Incarcerated Persons *App. C-6476*
Methodology *App. C-6476*

Federal Deaths in Custody and During Arrest, 2023 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-6503*
Highlights *App. C-6503*
Methodology *App. C-6503*

Sexual Victimization in Prisons Reported by Inmates, 2023-24 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-6519*
Reports of Sexual Victimization *App. C-6520*
Facility-level Rates *App. C-6521*
Methodology *App. C-6522*

Federal Prisoner Statistics Collected Under the First Step Act, 2025 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. C-6549*
Key Findings *App. C-6549*
Methodology *App. C-6551*

APPENDIX D
Jail Inmate Statistics

Census of Local Jails 1988 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-57*
The 1988 Census of Local Jails *App. D-58*
Jails Require a Greater Reserve of Bed Space Than Prisons *App. D-59*
The South Led the Increase in Local Jail Population *App. D-59*
Percentage of Women in Jail Increased *App. D-59*
Percentage of Juveniles in Adult Jails Declined *App. D-60*
Average Daily Jail Population Rose Markedly *App. D-60*
White Inmates Outnumbered Blacks by a Small Margin *App. D-60*

Percentages of Unconvicted and Convicted Inmates Were Unchanged *App. D-60*
Admissions and Releases Increased *App. D-61*
Most Jail Detentions Lasted a Few Days *App. D-61*
The Number of Jail Deaths Relative to Releases Was Unchanged from 1983 *App. D-61*
The Number of Facilities Decreased Slightly *App. D-62*
Most Jails Were Small *App. D-62*
A Majority of Inmates Were Held in Medium or Large Capacity Jails *App. D-62*
Nearly Two of Every Five Bed Spaces Were Added Between 1978 and 1988 *App. D-63*
Occupancy Exceeded Rated Capacity *App. D-63*
One in Every Eight Inmates Were Being Held for Other Correctional Authorities *App. D-63*
Most Jails Charged Fees to Hold Inmates for Other Authorities *App. D-64*
Courts Had Ordered One of Every Eight Jails to Limit Population or Improve Conditions *App. D-64*
Staff Growth Kept Pace with Inmate Increase *App. D-64*
Sex and Race/Ethnicity Representation of Staff Differed from That of Inmates *App. D-65*
Inmate-to-Staff Ratio Rose Among All Occupational Groups Except Correctional Officers *App. D-65*
Annual Jail Spending Exceeded $4.5 Billion in 1988 *App. D-65*
Methodology *App. D-66*
Notes *App. D-85*

Population Density in Local Jails, 1988 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-87*
The 1988 Census of Local Jails *App. D-88*
Inmates, Housing, and Staff in Local Jails *App. D-89*
Population Density in Local Jails *App. D-90*
Spatial and Social Density in Local Jails *App. D-92*
Spatial Density Categories *App. D-93*
Social Density Categories *App. D-93*
Jail Size and Density Measures *App. D-93*
Spatial Density and Occupancy *App. D-94*
Jail Suicides and Population Density *App. D-94*
Spatial Density and Jail Size *App. D-94*
Social Density and Jail Size *App. D-94*
Methodology *App. D-95*
Notes *App. D-108*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Profile of Jail Inmates, 1989 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-123*
Local Jails *App. D-125*
Detention Status *App. D-125*
Characteristics of Jail Inmates *App. D-125*
Current Offenses *App. D-126*
Criminal Justice Status at Arrest *App. D-127*
Prior Sentences and Criminal Histories *App. D-128*
Sentence Length *App. D-129*
Time Served *App. D-129*
Drug and Alcohol Use *App. D-130*
Treatment for Drug and Alcohol Abuse *App. D-131*
Family Background *App. D-131*
Physical and Sexual Abuse *App. D-132*
Mental Health Problems *App. D-132*
Methodology *App. D-132*
Sample Design *App. D-132*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. D-133*
Self-Reported Information *App. D-134*

Jail Inmates 1990 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-151*
One-Day Counts *App. D-152*
Average Daily Population *App. D-152*
Adult Conviction Status *App. D-152*
Demographic Characteristics *App. D-153*
Population Movement *App. D-153*
Occupancy *App. D-153*
Characteristics of Jurisdictions with Large Jail Populations *App. D-153*
Twenty-Five Largest Jail Jurisdictions *App. D-154*
Inmate Deaths *App. D-154*
Methodology *App. D-155*
Sampling Error *App. D-156*
Measures of Population *App. D-156*
Juveniles *App. D-156*

Drugs and Jail Inmates, 1989 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-165*
The 1989 Survey of Inmates in Local Jails *App. D-166*
Inmates in Jail with Drug Charges *App. D-166*
Characteristics of Inmates Charged with Drug Offenses *App. D-167*

Sentences *App. D-168*
Criminal Histories *App. D-169*
Prior Drug Use by Jail Inmates *App. D-169*
Characteristics of Drug Users *App. D-170*
Parental Abuse of Drugs and Alcohol *App. D-171*
First Use of Drugs and First Arrest *App. D-171*
Drug Use and Family Background *App. D-172*
Drug Use by Inmates Who Had Been Physically or Sexually Abused *App. D-172*
Drug-Related Crime *App. D-172*
Drug Use at the Time of the Offense *App. D-173*
Alcohol and Drugs *App. D-173*
Current Offense and Drug Use *App. D-173*
Participation in Drug Treatment Programs *App. D-174*
Jail Inmates Who Had Used Cocaine or Crack, 1989 *App. D-174*
How Many Jail Inmates Used Cocaine or Crack in the Month Before Their Arrest? *App. D-174*
What Are the Characteristics of Inmates Who Used Cocaine or Crack in the Month Before Their Offense? *App. D-175*
Methodology *App. D-177*
Sample Design *App. D-177*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. D-177*
Self-Reported Information *App. D-178*
Notes *App. D-193*

Women in Jail 1989 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-211*
Growth in the Female Jail Population *App. D-212*
Characteristics of Female Inmates *App. D-213*
Current Offense *App. D-214*
Detention Status *App. D-215*
Sentence Length *App. D-215*
Criminal Justice Status at Arrest *App. D-216*
Criminal History *App. D-216*
Violent Female Inmates and Their Victims *App. D-217*
Drug Use *App. D-217*
Alcohol Abuse and Treatment *App. D-218*
Mothers in Jail *App. D-219*
Family Background *App. D-219*
Physical and Sexual Abuse *App. D-220*
How Sentenced Jail Inmates Used Their Time, 1989 *App. D-220*
Characteristics of Jails Holding Female Inmates, 1988 Census of Local Jails *App. D-222*
Methodology *App. D-224*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Sample Design *App. D-225*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. D-225*
Self-Reported Information *App. D-226*

Profile of Jail Inmates 1996 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-305*
Highlights *App. D-305*
The Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, 1996 *App. D-306*
Two-Thirds of Jail Inmates Were Convicted on Their Arrest Offense or Still Serving a Prior Sentence *App. D-307*
Jails Held 12% of Inmates for Other Authorities *App. D-307*
An Increasing Percentage of the Jail Population Was Female *App. D-307*
6 in 10 Jail Inmates Were Racial or Ethnic Minorities *App. D-307*
Middle-Aged Inmates Comprised a Growing Part of the Jail Population *App. D-307*
1 in 3 Jail Inmates Were Not Working Before Their Arrest *App. D-308*
1 in 5 Jail Inmates Received Government Payments *App. D-309*
Unchanged From 1989, 22% Were in Jail for Drug Offense *App. D-309*
Unconvicted Inmates Were More Likely Than Convicted Inmates to be in Jail for Serious Offenses *App. D-310*
Offenses Vary Among Men and Women; Blacks, Whites, and Hispanics; and by Age Group *App. D-310*
54% of Jail Inmates Already Had a Criminal Justice Status When Arrested *App. D-311*
Three-Quarters of Jail Inmates Had Served Prior Sentences *App. D-311*
44% of Inmates Had Current or Past Violent Offenses; 14% Had Only Drug Offenses *App. D-312*
Criminal Histories Differ Among Inmate Groups *App. D-312*
Among Sentenced Jail Inmates—Half Would Serve Less Than 6 Months From Admission *App. D-313*
Reported Drug Use Rose Between 1989 and 1996 *App. D-313*
62% of Convicted Jail Inmates Reported They Consumed Alcohol Regularly *App. D-314*
6 in 10 Convicted Jail Inmates Were Using Alcohol or Drugs at the Time of the Offense *App. D-315*
Nearly Two-Thirds of Jail Inmates Said They Had Driven After Consuming Alcohol or Drugs *App. D-316*
After Entering Jail, 1 in 6 of the Active Drug Users Had Participated in Treatment or Self-Help Program *App. D-316*
6 in 10 Inmates Grew Up Living in Homes Without Both Parents *App. D-317*

Nearly Half of all Female Inmates Reported Past Physical or Sexual Abuse *App. D-317*
Over a Third of Jail Inmates Reported a Physical or Mental Disability *App. D-318*
Almost Half of Jail Inmates Had Received a Medical Examination After Admission *App. D-318*
A Quarter of Inmates Had Received Treatment for a Mental or Emotional Problem *App. D-318*
1 in 4 Jail Inmates Had a Work Assignment *App. D-319*
14% of Inmates Had Been in a Fight, Hit, or Punched Since Entering Jail *App. D-319*
Methodology *App.D-319*
Sample Design *App. D-320*
Accuracy of the Survey Estimates *App. D-320*
Information From Inmate Interviews *App. D-321*
Measurement *App. D-322*
Blood Alcohol Concentration *App. D-322*

Federal Pretrial Release and Detention, 1996 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Highlights *App. D-347*
Introduction *App. D-348*
Recommendations to the Court *App. D-348*
Federal Pretrial Release and Detention Practices *App. D-349*
Decisions to Release or Detain Pending Trial *App. D-349*
Pretrial Practices Across Federal Judicial Districts *App. D-350*
Characteristics of Defendants Detained Following a Federal Detention Hearing *App. D-350*
Statutorily Prescribed Factors *App. D-351*
Offense Charged *App. D-351*
Defendant Characteristics *App. D-352*
Criminal History *App. D-352*
History of Pretrial Misconduct *App. D-353*
Community Ties *App. D-353*
Threat to the Community *App. D-354*
Demographic Characteristics *App. D-355*
Methodology *App. D-356*
Data Sources *App. D-356*
Notes *App. D-357*

DWI Offenders Under Correctional Supervision *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-385*
Highlights *App. D-386*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Arrests for Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs (DUI) Have Been Generally Declining Since 1986 *App. D-387*
Most States Report a Decline in DUI Arrest Rates *App. D-388*
Average DUI Arrest Rate Higher in States with a .08 g/dl Legal Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Limit Than in States with a .10 g/dl Limit *App. D-389*
The Number of DWI Offenders Under Correctional Supervision Nearly Doubled Between 1986 and 1997 *App. D-389*
DWI Offenders Serving Time in Jail Had an Average Sentence of 11 Months *App. D-390*
Nearly a Third of DWI Offenders on Probation Had Served Time in Jail or in Prison for Their Current DWI Offense *App. D-390*
All DWI Offenders on Probation Had at Least One Condition to Their Sentence *App. D-391*
A Third of DWI Offenders on Probation and Nearly Two-Thirds of Those Incarcerated Reported Prior DWI Sentences *App. D-391*
Over Half of DWI Offenders in Jail Were on Probation, Parole, or Pretrial Release at Time of New Offense *App. D-392*
DWI Offenders Were Older, Better Educated, and More Commonly White and Male *App. D-393*
Females Account for a Growing Number of DWI Offenders in Jails *App. D-393*
Over a Third of Convicted DWI Offenders in Jail Consumed 7 or More Ounces of Ethanol Prior to Their Arrest *App. D-394*
About Half of the DWI Offenders Who Reported Drinking Prior to Arrest Consumed Beer Only *App. D-395*
DWI Offenders on Probation Drank for Fewer Hours and Consumed Less Ethanol Than Those in Jail *App. D-395*
BAC Levels Were Higher Among DWI Offenders in Jail Than Among Those on Probation *App. D-396*
Nearly 1 in 3 DWI Offenders on Probation and 2 in 5 in Jail Reported Drinking Daily *App. D-396*
Over a Third of DWI Offenders on Probation and Nearly Half in Jail Exhibited Signs of Past Alcohol Dependence *App. D-397*
DWI Offenders Reported More Alcohol-Related Troubles Than Other Offenders *App. D-397*
DWI Offenders Who Consumed Greater Amounts of Ethanol Reported More Signs of Alcohol Dependence *App. D-397*
High Levels of Past Drug Use Reported by DWI Offenders *App. D-398*
About Two-Thirds of DWI Probationers and Jail Inmates Had Ever Received Any Alcohol/Drug Treatment *App. D-398*
DWI Offenders Who Exhibited the Greatest Need More Frequently Reported Receiving Treatment *App. D-399*
About 1 in 7 DWI Offenders on Probation and 1 in 5 in Jail Reported Ever Receiving Mental Health Treatment *App. D-400*
Methodology *App. D-401*

Data Sources *App. D-401*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. D-401*
Estimating the Number of DWI Offenders Under Correctional Supervision *App. D-402*
Measuring Sentence Length *App. D-402*
Estimating Ounces of Ethanol Consumed *App. D-402*
Calculating BAC Levels *App. D-403*

Drug Use, Testing and Treatment in Jails *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-429*
Highlights *App. D-431*
Jail Inmates Reported High Levels of Drug Involvement *App. D-432*
Actively Drug-Involved Jail Inmates Younger and More Likely to Be Black Than Other Inmates *App. D-432*
Jails Emphasized Testing to Control Drug Use *App. D-433*
Half of All Inmates Were in Jails That Tested for Drug Use *App. D-433*
69% of Jurisdictions Test Inmates Mainly on Indication of Use *App. D-434*
Over Two-Thirds of the Jails That Tested Inmates Had at Least One Positive Test *App. D-434*
10% of Tests Conducted in June 1998 Were Positive for One or More Drugs *App. D-434*
Most Jurisdictions Take Away Inmate Privileges for a Positive Test Result *App. D-435*
70% of Jail Jurisdictions Tested All Staff; 20%, New Employees Only *App. D-436*
Most Jail Employees Are Tested at Random *App. D-437*
In 7 in 10 Jail Jurisdictions a Positive Test Was Grounds for Dismissal *App. D-437*
Self-Help Programs Like Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous Common in Jails *App. D-438*
Large Jails Had Three-Quarters of the Total Capacity for Substance Abuse Treatment *App. D-438*
92,600 Inmates Participated in Drug or Alcohol Programs or Treatment *App. D-438*
61% of Inmates Who Had Used Drugs at the Time of the Offense Had Received Treatment in the Past *App. D-439*
Methodology *App. D-439*
Survey of Inmates in Local Jails *App. D-439*
Annual Survey of Jails *App. D-440*

Jails in Indian Country, 2000 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-483*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Tribes Retain Jurisdiction Over Many Crimes by American Indians and Alaska Natives in Indian Country *App. D-483*
On June 30, 2000, Jails in Indian Country Supervised 1,799 Persons *App. D-485*
Juveniles Accounted for Nearly 16% of Inmates in Custody *App. D-485*
90% of Confined Inmates Held For Misdemeanors; 15% for DWI/DUI *App. D-485*
From 1999 to 2000, Admissions Declined 12%, and Discharges, 7% *App. D-485*
On June 30, 2000, 24 Persons Under Community Supervision, Down From 72 the Previous Year *App. D-486*
The 10 Largest Jails Housed 45% of Inmates in Indian Country *App. D-486*
Indian Country Jails Operated at 118% of Capacity on Peak Day in June 2000, Up From 111% in 1999 *App. D-487*
Medium-Sized Facilities Reported the Highest Occupancy Rates on Their Peak Day in June 2000 *App. D-487*
11 Jail Facilities in Indian Country Under a Court Order or Consent Decree on June 30, 2000 *App. D-488*
Methodology *App. D-488*

Substance Dependence, Abuse, and Treatment of Jail Inmates, 2002 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-587*
68% of Jail Inmates Met Substance Dependence or Abuse Criteria *App. D-587*
Over Half of All Female Jail Inmates Reported Substance Dependence *App. D-588*
White and Middle Age Inmates Had Relatively Higher Rates of Substance Dependence or Abuse *App. D-588*
Substance Dependence or Abuse More Prevalent Among Drug or Property Offenders *App. D-589*
Half of Inmates Who Met Criteria of Dependence or Abuse Had a Family Member Who Had Served Time *App. D-589*
Prior Criminal Record Linked to Substance Dependence or Abuse *App. D-590*
Alcohol Use at Offense Declined Between 1996 and 2002 *App. D-590*
Regular Drug Use Rose Between 1996 and 2002; Use at Offense Declined *App. D-591*
Women and White Inmates More Likely to Have Used Drugs at Offense *App. D-591*
Younger Inmates Had Higher Rates of Dependence or Abuse of Drugs; Middle-Age Inmates, of Alcohol *App. D-592*
Over Half of Inmates Convicted of Robbery, Burglary, or Drug Offenses Were Under the Influence At Offense *App. D-593*

16% of Convicted Jail Inmates Committed the Offense to Get Money for Drugs *App. D-593*
Three-Quarters of Inmates in Jail For Drug Or Property Offenses Met Dependence or Abuse Criteria *App. D-594*
6 in 10 Substance Dependent or Abusing Inmates Had Participated in Substance Treatment or Programs *App. D-594*
Participation in Substance Treatment or Programs Linked to Dependence *App. D-595*
Participation in Treatment or Other Programs While Under Correctional Supervision Rose Between 1996 and 2002 *App. D-595*
1 in 6 Inmates Using Alcohol at the Time of the Offense Participated in Treatment/Programs After Admission *App. D-596*
1 in 5 Inmates Who Used Drugs at Time of the Offense Participated in Treatment or Programs After Admission *App. D-596*
Substance Dependent or Abusing Women, Whites More Likely to Participate in Treatment or Programs *App. D-597*
Methodology *App. D-597*

Medical Problems of Jail Inmates *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-617*
22% of Jail Inmates Reported One Medical Problem; 14%, Two or More *App. D-618*
Medical Problems were Highest Among Female and Older Inmates *App. D-618*
About 1 in 8 Jail Inmates Reported Currently Having Arthritis *App. D-618*
Women Most Likely to Report Cervical Cancer, Men Skin Cancer *App. D-618*
Heart Valve Damage was the Most Commonly Reported Heart Problem *App. D-619*
Prevalence of a Medical Problem Did Not Change with Time Served *App. D-620*
More Than a Third of Jail Inmates Reported an Impairment *App. D-620*
Females Most Likely to Report a Physical or Mental Impairment, Males a Learning Impairment *App. D-620*
More Than 40% of Inmates Age 45 or Older Reported an Impairment *App. D-621*
15% of Jail Inmates had 2 or More Impairments *App. D-621*
Around 1 in 8 Jail Inmates Reported Being Injured Since Admission to Jail *App. D-621*
Injuries Highest Among Male and Younger Inmates *App. D-621*
Violent Offenders had Higher Rates of Fight-Related Injuries *App. D-622*
Inmates with an Impairment had Higher Rates of Injuries *App. D-622*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Likelihood of Injury Increased with Time Served in Jail *App. D-623*
Health-Related Problems More Common Among Homeless or Unemployed Inmates *App. D-624*
Medical Problems Common Among Inmates with a History of Drug Use or Dependence *App. D-624*
Methodology *App. D-625*

Jail Inmates at Midyear 2010 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-915*
Population Decline was Mostly Concentrated in Large Jails *App. D-915*
Six Jail Jurisdictions Account for Nearly Half of the Decline in Jail Population *App. D-916*
Capacity to Hold Inmates Continues to Increase at Slower Rate *App. D-916*
Local Jails Admitted Almost 13 Million Persons During the 12 Months Ending June 30, 2010 *App. D-917*
Methodology *App. D-917*

Jails in Indian Country, 2010 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-937*
The Number of Operating Jails in Indian Country Increased Between 2004 and 2010 *App. D-937*
On an Average Day in June, the Percentage of Occupied Bed Space Decreased from 71% to 67% *App. D-938*
Fourteen Jails Held More than Half of all Inmates *App. D-938*
Jails Holding 50 or More Inmates Reported Stability in Their Use of Jail Space in June 2010 *App. D-939*
Fifteen Jails were Operating at More than 50% Over Capacity on Their Most Crowded Day in June 2010 *App. D-940*
Jail Admissions Increased in Indian Country Jails *App. D-940*
Attempted Suicides in Indian Country Jails Declined *App. D-941*
The Share of Inmates Held for a Violent Offense Declined *App. D-941*
The Number of Jail Operations Staff Increased *App. D-942*
Methodology *App. D-942*

Table of Contents

Volume Seven

APPENDIX D
Jail Inmate Statistics (continued)

Jails in Indian Country, 2015 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-1157*
Jails Operating in Indian Country Increased from 68 Facilities in 2004 to 76 in 2015 *App. D-1157*
Occupied Bed Space Declined from 86% of Rated Capacity in 2000 to 66% in 2015 *App. D-1158*
The Largest Jails Accounted for 26% of All Facilities and Held Nearly 60% of All Inmates in Indian Country Jails *App. D-1158*
The Expected Average Length of Stay in Indian Country Jails Increased By a Day *App. D-1158*
An Estimated 30% of Inmates Were Held for a Violent Offense Each Year in the Previous 5 Years *App. D-1159*
The Number of Correctional Staff Increased Since 2010 *App. D-1159*
Two Reported Deaths Occurred in Indian Country Jails in the 12-Month Period Ending June 30, 2015 *App. D-1160*
Methodology *App. D-1160*

Jail Inmates in 2015 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-1187*
Juvenile Population in Adult Jails Continued to Decline *App. D-1187*
Nearly 7 in 10 Inmates Were Held in Jail for a Felony Offense *App. D-1188*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Jail Jurisdictions with 2,500 or more Inmates Held 21% of the Population in 2015, Down from 25% in 2014 *App. D-1188*
Bed Space Increased Between 2008 and 2015, While Jail Population Decreased *App. D-1188*
The Smallest Jail Jurisdictions Turn Over Inmates Three Times Faster Than the Largest Jails *App. D-1189*
Jail Staff Supervised an Additional 57,100 Persons in Various Community Programs Outside of Jail *App. D-1189*
Methodology *App. D-1190*

American Indian and Alaska Natives in Local Jails, 1999-2014
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. D-1255*
The Number of AIANs Held in Local Jails Nearly Doubled from 1999 to 2014 *App. D-1255*
The Majority of AIAN Jail Inmates Were Held in the Midwest and West *App. D-1256*
About 22% of Jails Held at Least One AIAN Inmate *App. D-1256*
A Small Number of Inmates Were Held for Tribal Authorities *App. D-1257*
The AIAN Jail Incarceration Rate Continued to Increase *App. D-1257*
An Estimated 71% of Adult AIAN Jail Inmates Were Age 39 or Younger in 2011 *App. D-1258*
The Number of Jail Inmates Reporting Partial AIAN Race was Six Times Greater than Persons Reporting Sole AIAN Race *App. D-1258*
Methodology *App. D-1259*

Mortality in Local Jails, 2000-2019 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-1541*
Cause of Death in Jail Inmates in 2019 *App. D-1542*
Mortality Rates in 2019 *App. D-1542*
Demographic and Criminal Justice Characteristics of Jail Decedents *App. D-1543*
Local Jail Mortality Rates by Demographic and Criminal Justice Characteristics *App. D-1543*
Total Deaths in Local Jails, 2000-19 *App. D-1543*
Average Annual Mortality Rates, 2000-19 *App. D-1543*
Time Between Jail Admission and Death *App. D-1544*
Location of Jail Deaths *App. D-1544*
Jail Deaths by Hold-Status and Jurisdiction Size *App. D-1544*
Jurisdictions With and Without Jail Deaths *App. D-1545*
Methodology *App. D-1545*

Census of Jails, 2005-2019 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-1625*
Key Findings *App. D-1626*

Distribution of Local Jail Populations *App. D-1626*
Demographic Characteristics of Local Jail Inmates *App. D-1626*
Conviction Status and Offense Seriousness of Local Jail Inmates *App. D-1626*
Probation and Parole Violations of Local Jail Inmates *App. D-1627*
Jail Inmates Held for Federal, State, and Tribal Correctional Authorities *App. D-1627*
Admissions and Average Time in Jail *App. D-1627*
Capacity of Local Jails *App. D-1628*
Functions of Local Jails *App. D-1628*
Correctional Officers Employed in Local Jails *App. D-1628*
Characteristics of the Federal Bureau of Prisons' Detention Facilities and Inmates *App. D-1628*
Methodology *App. D-1629*

Jails in Indian Country, 2021, and the Impact of COVID-19, July-December 2020
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. D-1677*
The Largest Facilities Experienced the Greatest Increase in Their Midyear Populations from 2020 to 2021 *App. D-1677*
Admissions to Indian Country Jails Increased 8% from June 2020 to June 2021 *App. D-1678*
About Half of Jail Beds in Indian Country were Occupied at Midyear 2021 *App. D-1678*
More Inmates were Held for Violent (up 6%) and Nonviolent (up 10%) Offenses at Midyear 2021 than at Midyear 2020 *App. D-1678*
Indian Country Jails Reported One Death During the 12 Months Ending June 30, 2021 *App. D-1679*
About 6% of COVID-19 Tests Conducted on Inmates from July to December 2020 Were Positive *App. D-1680*
From July to December 2020, About 1 in 5 Inmates Received Expedited Release in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic *App. D-1680*
The Number of Staff in Indian Country Jails Continued to Decline *App. D-1680*
Nearly 1 in 5 Jail Staff Tested Positive for COVID-19 from July To December 2020 *App. D-1680*
Methodology *App. D-1681*

Jail Inmates in 2023
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. D-1821*
Highlights *App. D-1821*
About this Report *App. D-1822*
Demographic Characteristics of Inmates *App. D-1822*
Jail Incarceration Rates *App. D-1822*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Conviction Status and Offense Characteristics *App. D-1823*
Persons Held for Federal, State, or Tribal Authorities *App. D-1823*
Average Daily Population, Admissions, and Average Time in Jail *App. D-1823*
Capacity and Staffing *App. D-1824*
Persons Supervised Outside Jail and Those Serving Weekend Sentences *App. D-1824*
Data Tables *App. D-1824*
Terms and Definitions *App. D-1825*
Methodology *App. D-1826*

Sexual Victimization in Local Jails Reported by Inmates, 2023-24
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. D-1853*
Reports of Sexual Victimization *App. D-1854*
Facility-level Rates *App. D-1855*
Methodology *App. D-1856*

Jails in Indian Country, 2024 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. D-1891*
The Monthly Jail Population Fluctuated Between June 2023 and June 2024 *App. D-1891*
The Largest Jails Accounted for 3 in 10 Jails and 7 in 10 Incarcerated Persons *App. D-1892*
June Admissions to Indian Country Jails Increased by 12% From 2023 to 2024 *App. D-1892*
The Largest Jails Accounted for Over Half of All Admissions in June 2024 *App. D-1892*
Nearly 6 in 10 Jail Beds in Indian Country Were Occupied at Midyear 2024 *App. D-1892*
Persons Held for Violent Offenses Decreased 6% From Midyear 2023 to Midyear 2024 *App. D-1893*
One-Third of Individuals Were Held for Violent Offenses at Midyear 2024 *App. D-1893*
The Share of Unconvicted Individuals Remained Stable From Midyear 2023 to Midyear 2024 *App. D-1894*
Females Accounted for a Quarter of All Persons Held in Indian Country Jails *App. D-1894*
Indian Country Jails Reported Seven Deaths in Custody During yhe 12 Months Ending on June 30, 2024 *App. D-1895*
The Number of Staff in Indian Country Jails Continued to Decline *App. D-1895*
Methodology *App. D-1895*

APPENDIX E
Probation and Parole Statistics

Probation and Parole 1985 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. E-17*
Probation *App. E-17*
Parole *App. E-18*
Adults Under Correctional Supervision *App. E-18*
Probation Notes *App. E-18*
Parole Notes *App. E-19*

Recidivism of Felons on Probation, 1986-89 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Preface *App. E-83*
Introduction *App. E-84*
Probation Defined *App. E-84*
Types of Probation Sentences *App.E-85*
Eligibility for Probation *App. E-86*
State Probation Sentences Nationwide, 1986 *App. E-86*
The Probation Department's Role in Deciding Who Gets Probation *App. E-87*
Probation Conditions Imposed *App. E-88*
Financial Penalties Imposed *App. E-88*
Felony Arrests and Disciplinary Hearings for Probationers *App. E-89*
Felony Arrest Offenses *App. E-91*
Compliance with the Conditions of Supervision *App. E-92*
The Effect of Drug Testing and Treatment in Reducing New Arrests *App. E-93*
The Effect of Intensive Supervision in Reducing New Arrests *App. E-94*
What Happened to Probationers After Felony Arrest *App. E-95*
Probation Status 3 Years Later *App. E-95*
Methodology *App. E-96*
Data Sources *App. E-96*
Sampling Design *App. E-97*
Sampling Error *App. E-97*
Period of Follow-up *App. E-97*
Missing Data *App. E-98*
Notes *App. E-106*

Probation and Parole Violators in State Prison, 1991 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. E-107*
Highlights *App. E-107*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Criminal Justice Status Defined *App. E-108*
Reason for Imprisonment: New Conviction or Technical Violation *App. E-110*
Trends in Probation and Parole Violators in State Prisons *App. E-111*
Reasons for Imprisoning Technical Violators *App. E-111*
Current Commitment Offense *App. E-113*
Demographic Characteristics *App. E-113*
Criminal History *App. E-114*
Time Periods Served Defined *App. E-115*
Prior Conviction Offense That Resulted in Probation or Parole *App. E-115*
Time on Probation or Parole Prior to Being Sent to Prison *App. E-115*
Expected Time to Serve in Prison *App. E-116*
Current Conviction Offense Versus Prior Conviction Offense That Resulted in Probation or Parole *App. E-116*
Criminal Justice Status at Time of Offense *App. E-117*
Characteristics of Offenses Committed While on Probation or Parole *App. E-119*
Drug and Alcohol Use *App. E-120*
Weapons *App. E-121*
Methodology *App. E-121*
Sample Design *App. E-122*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. E-122*
Self-Reported Information *App. E-123*
Notes *App. E-142*

Characteristics of Adults on Probation, 1995 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. E-143*
Highlights *App. E-143*
Survey of Adults on Probation, 1995 *App. E-145*
Nearly 2 of 5 Probationers Convicted of a Violent or Drug Offense *App. E-146*
Felons More Than Half of All Adults on Probation *App. E-146*
Women and Non-Hispanic Whites Make Up Comparatively High Percentages of Adult Probationers *App. E-147*
Types of Offenses Vary Among Men and Women and Blacks, Whites, and Hispanics on Probation *App. E-147*
DWI Accounts for More Than a Quarter of Probationers Over Age 44 *App. E-148*
Half of All Probationers Have at Least One Prior Sentence *App. E-148*
Violent Offenders On Probation the Least Likely To Have a Prior Sentence *App. E-148*
Presentence Investigations Focus on the Most Serious Offenders *App. E-149*

4 Out of 5 Probationers with a PSI Recommended for Probation *App. E-149*
Half of Sentences Split Between Incarceration and Supervision *App. E-149*
Repeat Offenders More Likely To Be Incarcerated *App. E-150*
More Than a Third of Probationers Also Serve Jail or Prison Time *App. E-150*
82% of Probationers Given 3 or More Conditions on Sentence *App. E-151*
Majority Pay Supervision Fees *App. E-151*
More Than 2 of 5 Adults on Probation Required To Receive Treatment for Alcohol or Drug Abuse *App. E-151*
Nearly Three-Quarters Contacted by a Probation Officer in Last 30 Days *App. E-152*
More Than a Third of Probationers in Alcohol/Drug Treatment Program *App. E-152*
18% Faced a Disciplinary Hearing After Entering Probation *App. E-153*
Disciplinary Hearings More Common Among Unemployed and Those With Prior sentences *App. E-154*
Failure To Maintain Contact the Most Frequent Reason for Hearing *App. E-155*
Over 40% Receive New Conditions of Supervision; 29% Incarcerated *App. E-155*
Methodology *App. E-156*
Sample Design *App. E-156*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. E-157*
Data on Prior Sentences *App. E-157*
Sentence Lengths *App. E-159*

Substances Abuse and Treatment of Adults on Probation, 1995
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. E-177*
Highlights *App. E-178*
Half of Probationers Were Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs at the Time of the Offense for Which They Were Convicted *App. E-178*
While on Probation, 32% Were Treated for Alcohol, 17% for Drugs *App. E-178*
Probationers Over Half of the Nation's Correctional Population *App. E-178*
The Survey of Adults on Probation, 1995, the First of Its Kind *App. E-179*
Almost Half of Probationers Were Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs at the Time of Their Offense *App. E-180*
Over Two-Thirds of Probationers Said They Used Drugs in the Past *App. E-181*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Responses From a Quarter of Adults on Probation Indicated Past Alcohol Abuse or Dependence *App. E-182*
Nearly Two-Thirds of Probationers Said They Had Driven While Under the Influence of Drugs or Alcohol *App. E-182*
Hispanic Probationers Reported the Lowest Levels of Prior Drug Use *App. E-183*
Prior Drug Use Dropped Dramatically Among Probationers Over Age 45 *App. E-183*
Over 80% of Probationers with a GED Reported Past Drug Use *App. E-184*
Two-Thirds of Probationers Can Be Characterized as Alcohol- or Drug-Involved Offenders *App. E-184*
While on Probation, Half of Probationers Tested—But Less Than a Fifth Treated—for Drug Abuse *App. E-185*
Types of Drug Treatment Varied Little Among Probationers with Differing Severity of Past Drug Use *App. E-186*
A Third of All Probationers Received Alcohol Treatment During Probation *App. E-187*
Over 80% of Current Drug Users Had Personal Contact with Their Probation Officer in the Past 30 Days *App. E-188*
Fewer Than 1 in 7 Current Drug Users on Probation Reported a Prior Drug Offense Sentence *App. E-188*
Half of Alcohol- or Drug-Involved Probationers Received Treatment on Their Current Probation Sentence *App. E-189*
Methodology *App. E-189*

Federal Offenders Under Community Supervision, 1987-96
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. E-215*
Highlights *App. E-216*
Offenders Supervised *App. E-216*
Probation *App. E-217*
Post-Incarceration Supervision *App. E-218*
Parole *App. E-218*
Supervised Release *App. E-218*
Special Conditions of Supervision Imposed by the Courts *App. E-218*
Community Confinement *App. E-219*
Drug Abuse Treatment and Monitoring *App. E-219*
Termination of Supervision *App. E-220*
Successful Completion of Supervision *App. E-220*
Reasons for Unsuccessful Termination of Active Supervision *App. E-220*
Length of Revocation Period *App. E-221*
Revocation Sentences Imposed *App. E-221*
Time Served *App. E-221*
Methodology *App. E-222*

Data Sources *App. E-222*
Notes *App. E-223*

Trends in State Parole, 1990-2000 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. E-257*
States Have Reduced the Discretion of Parole Boards in Determining Prison Release *App. E-258*
Four States Accounted for Nearly Two-Thirds of the Growth in Parole During the 1990's *App. E-260*
Since 1990 Discretionary Releases Have Declined; Mandatory Parole and Expiration of Sentence Releases Have Increased *App. E-260*
Growth in Prison Releases Linked to Drug Offenders *App. E-260*
Prison Releases Have Served More Time and a Greater Portion of Their Sentence Before Release *App. E-261*
Time Served by Released Part 1 Violent Offenders Increased in 33 States Between 1993 and 1999 *App. E-262*
Inmates Released by Parole Boards Served Longer Than Those Released by Mandatory Parole *App. E-262*
Among Discretionary and Mandatory Parole Releases, Black Offenders Served Longer Than Whites *App. E-263*
Over Half of Prison Releases had a Prior Incarceration; More Than a Quarter Were Parole Violators *App. E-263*
State Parole Entries and Discharges Rose During the 1990's *App. E-264*
Re-Releases an Increasing Portion of State Parole Entries *App. E-264*
State Parole Entries Older in 1999 Than in 1990 *App. E-264*
Female Entries to Parole Increased During the 1990's *App. E-265*
Parole Success Rates Unchanged Since 1990 *App. E-265*
Success Rates Highest Among First Releases and Discretionary Parole Releases *App. E-266*
Among Parole Discharges, Success Rates Rose for Blacks and Hispanics; Dropped for Whites *App. E-266*
Success Rates Highest Among First Releases Serving Less Than 12 Months in Prison *App. E-267*
In 1999 Parole Discharges Served an Average of 26 Months Under Supervision, Up From 23 Months in 1990 *App. E-267*
Number of Parole Violators Returned to Prison Continued to Rise During the 1990's *App. E-267*
Nearly a Quarter of State Prisoners in 1997 Were Parole Violators *App. E-268*
70% of Parole Violators in Prison in 1997 Returned for a New Offense *App. E-268*
Half of Parole Violators Incarcerated in 3 States *App. E-269*
Characteristics of Parole Violators Varied Among the 3 Largest States *App. E-269*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Methodology *App. E-269*
National Corrections Reporting Program *App. E-269*
Annual Parole Survey *App. E-270*
National Prisoners Statistics *App. E-270*
Surveys of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 1991 and 1997 *App. E-271*

Probation and Parole in the United States, 2000 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Summary *App. E-301*
National Correctional Population Reaches New High—Grows by 126,400 During 2000 to Total 6.5 Million Adults *App. E-301*

Probation and Parole in the United States, 2005 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. E-391*
Nearly 5 Million Persons on Probation or Parole *App. E-391*
Probationers Accounted for Half the Growth in the Correctional Population Since 1990 *App. E-392*
Community Supervision Declined as a Percentage of the Correctional Population *App. E-392*
Correctional Supervision Rate Rose Sharply from 1980 to 2005 *App. E-393*
6 of the 10 States with Largest Probation Populations Also Had Large Parole Populations *App. E-393*
9 States Reported an Increase of 5% or More in Their Probation Population *App. E-394*
19,070 Probationers Added in 2005 *App. E-394*
Small Growth in Probation Population During 2005 *App. E-394*
Growth in Probation Since 1990 Linked to Entries *App. E-395*
5 States Accounted for Nearly a Third of the Growth in Probation from 1995 to 2005 *App. E-395*
At Yearend 2005 Almost 1 in 4 Probationers Were Female; More Than 1 in 2 Were White *App. E-396*
Direct Sentences More Common in 2005 Than 1995 *App. E-396*
Half of All Probationers Convicted of a Felony *App. E-396*
Success Rates Have Remained Stable Since 1995 *App. E-397*
Parole Population Grew by 12,556 During 2005 *App. E-397*
Parole Populations Increased in 33 States *App. E-397*
State Parole Population Increasing After Stability During the 1990s *App. E-397*
Growth in State Parole Linked to Entries *App. E-398*
Discretionary Releases to Parole Supervision Continued to Decline *App. E-398*
Proportion of Females on Parole Increased Between 1995 and 2005 *App. E-399*

More Than 8 in 10 Parolees Were Under Active Supervision *App. E-399*
About 4 in 10 Parolees Served a Sentence for a Drug Offense *App. E-399*
Rates of Success for Parolees Have Remained Stable Since 1995 *App. E-400*
Methodology *App. E-401*
Probation *App. E-401*
Parole *App. E-401*

Characteristics of State Parole Supervising Agencies, 2006 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Overview *App. E-437*
Combined Parole and Probation Agencies Supervised 4 Times as Many Offenders on Probation as on Parole *App. E-437*
Five Agencies Supervised Half of the Parole Population *App. E-438*
State Parole Supervising Agencies Employed Nearly 65,000 Full-Time and 2,900 Part-Time Workers *App. E-438*
Average Caseload Was 38 Active Parolees for Each FTE Devoted to Supervision *App. E-439*
Two-Thirds of Paroled Offenders Were Required to Meet With a Parole Officer at Least Once a Month *App. E-439*
Half of Parole Supervising Agencies Had a Role in Releasing Prisoners to Parole, Setting the Conditions of Supervision, or Conducting Revocation Hearings *App. E-440*
Up to 16% of At-Risk Parolees in Some Agencies Were Re-Incarcerated for a Failed Drug Test *App. E-441*
Nearly All Agencies Report Use of Drug, Sex Offender, or Mental Health Treatment Programs *App. E-441*
2 in 5 Parole Supervising Agencies Operated or Contracted a Housing Service For Paroled Offenders *App. E-442*
Half of Parole Supervising Agencies Offered Some Type of Formal Employment Assistance *App. E-442*
Methodology *App. E-442*

Probation and Parole in the United States, 2010 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. E-627*
Community Supervision Population Dropped to the 2004 Level *App. E-628*
Rate of Offenders Under Community Supervision at Yearend 2010 Dropped Below the 2000 Level *App. E-629*
Five States Accounted for more than Half of the Decline in the Probation Population *App. E-629*
Entries onto Probation Were Down for the Third Consecutive Year; Exits Declined for the First Time Since 2006 *App. E-630*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Offenders on Probation Completed Their Supervision Terms at About the Same Rate in 2010 as in 2009 *App. E-630*
Rate of Incarceration Among Probationers Remained Steady During the Last Year *App. E-631*
Most Characteristics of Probationers Were Unchanged During 2010 *App. E-631*
U.S. Parole Population Rose During 2010; State Parole Population Dropped for the Second Consecutive Year *App. E-632*
Entries to Parole Exceeded Exits During 2010 as Exits Dropped at a Greater Rate Than Entries *App. E-632*
Mandatory Releases from Prison Were a Smaller Portion of Entries to Parole in 2010 Compared to 2009 *App. E-632*
Parole Completion Rate Increased During 2010, Continuing a Trend Observed Since 2006 *App. E-633*
Rate of Reincarceration Among Parolees Declined During 2010 *App. E-633*
Most Characteristics of Parolees Were Unchanged During 2010 *App. E-634*
Methodology *App. E-634*
Probation: Explanatory Notes *App. E-645*
Parole: Explanatory Notes *App. E-653*

Probation and Parole in the United States, 2015 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. E-745*
The Decline in Community Supervision was Primarily Due to a Decline in the Probation Population *App. E-745*
The Rate of Adults Under Community Supervision Fell to 1,886 Per 100,000 U.S. Adult Residents *App. E-746*
Probation Entries and Exits Each Decreased by More Than 4% in 2015 *App. E-746*
The Exit Rate for Probationers was Consistent with Rates Observed in 2005 *App. E-746*
Probation Population Characteristics Remained Relatively Unchanged During the Last Decade *App. E-747*
U.S. Parole Population Increased 1.5% in 2015 *App. E-747*
The Parole Exit Rate Increased After Five Consecutive Annual Decreases *App. E-747*
Parolees Being Supervised for Drug Offenses Decreased 6 Percentage Points Since 2005 *App. E-747*
Methodology *App. E-748*
Probation: Explanatory Notes *App. E-753*
Parole: Explanatory Notes *App. E-755*

Probation and Parole in the United States, 2024 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. E-1029*
Population of Adults on Parole Declined for Fourth Consecutive Year *App. E-1030*
Rate of Adults Under Probation Supervision Dropped in 2024 *App. E-1030*
Entries to Probation Exceed Exits for Third Consecutive Year *App. E-1030*
Entries to Parole Increased for the First Time Since 2018 *App. E-1031*
Known Race/Hispanic Origin Percentages Similar Across Felony and Misdemeanor Probation Populations *App. E-1031*
Maximum Sentence to Incarceration Was More Than 1 Year For Most Adults on Parole Supervision *App. E-1031*
Methodology *App. E-1032*

APPENDIX F
Correctional and Detention Facility Statistics

1984 Census of State Adult Correctional Facilities *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Preface *App. F-3*
Overview *App. F-4*
Confinement Facilities (Prisons) *App. F-4*
Security Level *App. F-4*
Size of Facility *App. F-5*
Sex of Inmates Housed *App. F-5*
Facilities and Inmates by Region and State *App. F-6*
Occupancy *App. F-6*
Court Orders or Consent Decrees *App. F-6*
Years Since Original Construction *App. F-6*
Inmates *App. F-7*
Employees *App. F-7*
Expenditures *App. F-8*
Methodology *App. F-8*
Tables *App. F-9*

Census of Local Jails, 1983 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Preface *App. F-63*
Selected Findings *App. F-64*
Number of Jails and Number of Jail Inmates *App. F-64*
Jails Under Court Order *App. F-64*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Inmate Deaths *App. F-65*
Confinement Unit Use *App. F-65*
Planned Changes in Jails *App. F-65*
Expenditures *App. F-66*
Jail Employees *App. F-66*
Inmate Programs *App. F-66*
Juveniles *App. F-67*
Methodology *App. F-67*
Text Tables *App. F-68*
Summary Tables by Region and State *App. F-68*
Text Tables *App. F-70*
Summary Tables *App. F-76*

Census of Local Jails, 1988 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Preface *App. F-115*
Selected Findings *App. F-116*
Number of Jails and Jail Inmates *App. F-116*
Jail Capacity and Court Orders *App. F-117*
Inmate Deaths *App. F-118*
Confinement Unit Use *App. F-118*
Planned Changes in Jails *App. F-119*
Expenditures *App. F-119*
Jail Employees *App. F-120*
Inmate Programs *App. F-120*
Juveniles *App. F-121*
Methodology *App. F-121*
Contents of Text Tables *App. F-122*
Contents of Summary Tables *App. F-123*
Text Tables *App. F-125*
Summary Tables *App. F-132*

State Prison Expenditures, 1996 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Highlights *App. F-259*
Introduction *App. F-261*
Total Expenditure, 1985-96 *App. F-263*
State Correctional Costs More Than Doubled Between 1985 and 1996 *App. F-263*
State Costs Per Resident for Corrections Increased Faster Than Costs for Education, Health, and Natural Resources *App. F-263*
Expenditures, Fiscal Year 1996 *App. F-264*
States Spent $22.0 Billion on Prisons in FY 1996 *App. F-264*
States Spent Approximately $94 of Every $100 on Current Operations *App. F-264*

Capital Expenditures *App. F-265*
Most States Spent About $6 Out of Every $100 on Prison Capital Projects *App. F-265*
Operating Expenditures *App. F-266*
About Two-Thirds of Operating Costs Went for Prison Employee Salaries, Wages, and Benefits *App. F-266*
Five Core Expenditures *App. F-267*
Five Core Expenditures Provide a Prison Cost Profile *App. F-267*
Medical Care *App. F-267*
Food Service *App. F-267*
Inmate Programs *App. F-268*
Utilities *App. F-268*
Transportation *App. F-268*
Differences in Prison Costs *App. F-269*
Numerous Factors Associated With State-by-State Differences in Prison Costs *App. F-269*
Inmate-to-Staff Ratios *App. F-269*
Average Number of Inmates Per Facility *App. F-270*
Transfer Payments *App. F-271*
Facility Security Level *App. F-272*
Community Corrections *App. F-272*
Methodology *App. F-273*
Data Limitations *App. F-274*
Adjusting for Inflation *App. F-274*
Underreporting *App. F-275*
Estimating Average Daily Population *App. F-275*
U.S. Resident Population *App. F-275*

Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2000 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Highlights *App. F-363*
Number of Facilities *App. F-363*
Capacity *App. F-364*
Facility Characteristics *App. F-364*
Characteristics of Inmates *App. F-365*
Number of Correctional Employees *App. F-365*
Characteristics of Correctional Staff *App. F-366*
Prisoner Assaults *App. F-366*
The 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities Counted 1,668
Facilities in Operation on June 30, 2000 *App. F-366*
Number of Facilities *App. F-366*
Population *App. F-367*
Type of Facility *App. F-367*
More Than Three-Quarters of Facilities Operated by State Authorities *App. F-367*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Facilities *App. F-367*
Prisoners *App. F-367*
Facility and Inmate Growth Highest Among Private Facilities *App. F-367*
Jurisdictions *App. F-367*
Regions *App. F-368*
Black and Hispanic Inmates in the Majority *App. F-368*
Federal *App. F-368*
State *App. F-368*
Private *App. F-368*
Average Daily Population in Prison Reached Nearly 1.3 Million—Up 30% From 5 Years Earlier *App. F-368*
Jurisdiction *App. F-368*
Region *App. F-369*
Prison Facilities Operated at 2% Above Rated Capacity in 2000 *App. F-369*
Federal Facilities *App. F-369*
State Facilties *App. F-369*
Private Facilities *App. F-369*
A Quarter of All Prison Facilities Held Between 750 and 1,499 Inmates *App. F-369*
Jurisdiction *App. F-370*
Region *App. F-370*
Confinement Facilities *App. F-370*
Community-Based Facilities *App. F-370*
More Than a Quarter of Correctional Facilities Less Than 10 Years Old *App. F-371*
Facilities *App. F-371*
Inmates *App. F-371*
More Than a Quarter of All Confinement Facilities Maximum Security Prisons *App. F-371*
Gender of Inmates Housed *App. F-371*
Function *App. F-371*
Age *App. F-372*
Size *App. F-372*
More Than a Third of Confined Inmates in Maximum Security Facilities *App. F-372*
Gender of Inmates Housed *App. F-372*
Age of Facility *App. F-372*
Size of Facility *App. F-372*
State Inmates Nearly Twice as Likely as Federal Inmates to Be Rated at the Maximum Custody Level *App. F-372*
Confinement *App. F-373*
Community *App. F-373*
3,175 Inmates Died in Federal, State, and Private Prisons Between July 1, 1999, and June 30, 2000 *App. F-373*

The Number of Noncitizen Inmates Nearly Doubled From 1995 to 2000 *App. F-373*
4,095 Prisoners Under Age 18 in 2000, Down From 5,309 in 1995 *App. F-374*
About 1 in 5 Correctional Facilities Operated Under a Court Order or Consent Decree *App. F-374*
State *App. F-374*
Private *App. F-374*
More Inmate Assaults on Other Inmates and Staff in 2000 Than in 1995 *App. F-375*
More Than 90% of Facilities Had Work Programs *App. F-375*
Work Programs *App. F-375*
Education Programs *App. F-376*
Counseling *App. F-376*
Work Release Programs *App. F-376*
95 Facilities Operated Boot Camps in 2000, Up From 65 in 1995 *App. F-377*
Correctional Staff Exceeded 430,000 in 2000, an Increase of 24% Since 1995 *App. F-377*
Correctional Officers Comprised 63% of Facility Employees in 2000 *App. F-378*
Growing Percentages of Facility Staff Female, Black, or Hispanic *App. F-378*
Community-Based Facilities Had the Highest Number of Inmates Per Employee in 2000 *App. F-379*
The Number of Inmates Per Employee Highest in Private Confinement Facilities *App. F-379*
Private Facilities Increased in Number and in Size of Their Inmate Population During the 1990's *App. F-380*
Facilities *App. F-380*
Inmates *App. F-380*
Less Than Half of 1% of Inmates in State and Private Facilities Under Age 18 *App. F-380*
Rated Capacity of Prisons Operating Under State Authority Expanded Nearly 84% From 1990 to 2000 *App. F-381*
Methodology *App. F-381*

State Prison Expenditures, 2001 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. F-415*
The Increase in Cost of Corrections Outpaced the Cost of Health, Education, or Natural Resources *App. F-415*
States Spent $29.5 Billion on Prisons in Fiscal 2001 *App. F-416*
Operating Costs Averaged $22,650 Per Inmate in Fiscal Year 2001 *App. F-417*
Compared to 1996, Prison Spending in 2001 Revealed a Greater Emphasis on Facility Operation *App. F-418*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

A Majority of States Spent 4% or Less of Prison Expenditures on Capital Projects *App. F-418*
Spending on State Prison Capital Projects Decreased 25% From 1996 to 2001 *App. F-419*
Over a Quarter of Prison Operating Costs for Basic Living Expenses *App. F-419*
40 State Correctional Systems Paid Others to House Some Prisoners *App. F-420*
Methodology *App. F-421*
Underreporting *App. F-421*
Data Limitations *App. F-422*
Adjusting for Inflation *App. F-422*

Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2005 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. F-431*
Selected Findings from the Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2005 *App. F-432*
Facility Characteristics *App. F-433*
Facility Size and Rated Capacity *App. F-433*
Facility Security Level *App. F-434*
Court Orders and Consent Decrees *App. F-434*
Private Facilities *App. F-435*
Inmates *App. F-435*
Facility Security Level *App. F-436*
Staff *App. F-436*
Inmate-To-Staff Ratios *App. F-437*
Facility Programs *App. F-437*
Institutional Work Programs and Work Release *App. F-438*
Educational Programs *App. F-438*
Counseling Programs *App. F-439*
Methodology *App. F-439*
Scope *App. F-439*
Data Reporting and Estimation *App. F-440*
Definitions *App. F-441*

State Corrections Expenditures, FY 1982-2010 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. F-497*
States Spent About Three-Quarters of the Corrections Budget on Correctional Institutions *App. F-497*
Direct Expenditures on Institutions Were Divided Between Capital Outlay and Operations *App. F-498*
Operational Expenditures, as a Share of Total Expenditures, Grew From 1982 to 2010 *App. F-498*

Changes in State Operations Expenditures From 1999 to 2010 *App. F-499*
Medical Care Expenditures Increased for Correctional Institutions in Most States *App. F-500*
Methodology *App. F-500*

Local Government Corrections Expenditures, FY 2005-2011
Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. F-519*
Local Governments Spent 1.6% of Total Expenditures on Corrections *App. F-519*
Local Governments Spent More than 80% of Total Corrections Expenditures on Correctional Institutions *App. F-520*
Methodology *App. F-520*

Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2019 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. F-531*
Key Findings *App. F-532*
Adult Correctional Facilities by Type and Operator *App. F-532*
Characteristics of Adult Correctional Facilities *App. F-5880*
Prisoners by Characteristic of Adult Correctional Facilities *App. F-532*
Demographic Characteristics of Prisoners in Adult Corrections Facilities *App. F-532*
Selected Characteristics of Prisoners in Adult Correctional Facilities *App. F-533*
Prisoners Held in State and Private Facilities for Federal, State, and Local Authorities *App. F-533*
Security Incidents in Adult Correctional Facilities *App. F-5882*
Security Staff Employed in Adult Correctional Facilities *App. F-534*
Work Programs in Adult Correctional Facilities *App. F-534*
Education Programs in Adult Correctional Facilities *App. F-534*
Special Programs in Adult Correctional Facilities *App. F-535*
Methodology *App. F-535*

APPENDIX G
International Statistics

Imprisonment in Four Countries *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Introduction *App. G-3*
Findings *App. G-3*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

Background *App. G-5*
Using Arrest Data *App. G-5*
Selection of Crimes *App. G-6*
Assumptions and Adjustments to the Data *App. G-6*
Excluding Juveniles *App. G-7*
The Jail Correction *App. G-7*
The Charge Reduction Correction *App. G-8*
Limitations in Comparing Imprisonment Rates *App. G-8*
Notes *App. G-11*

Profile of Inmates in the United States and in England and Wales, 1991 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*
Overview *App. G-13*
The United States and England and Wales Administer Corrections in Distinctive Types of Systems *App. G-15*
In Both the United States and England and Wales About Four-Fifths of the Inmates Were Serving a Sentence *App. G-16*
For Certain Offense Categories, the Distributions of Inmates in the Two Countries Were Similar *App. G-16*
A Majority of Convicted Inmates in Both Populations Had Served a Prior Sentence to Adult Custody *App. G-18*
About 1 in 3 Convicted Inmates in Both Countries Had Family Members Who Had Also Served a Sentence to Incarceration *App. G-18*
U.S. Inmates, on Average, Received Longer Sentences for Comparable Offenses Than Inmates in England and Wales *App. G-19*
Inmates in England and Wales and in the United States Differ from Their General Population *App. G-20*
Men Formed the Overwhelming Majority of Inmates in Both Systems *App. G-20*
Inmates on the Whole in England and Wales Were Younger Than Those in the United States *App. G-20*
Racial or Ethnic Minorities Were Overrepresented in the Incarcerated Populations in Both Countries *App. G-21*
A Larger Percentage of U.S. Inmates, Compared to Their British Counterparts, Had Married at Some Time *App. G-21*
From a Third to a Half of Inmates, Depending on the Country, Were Unemployed Around the Time of Their Arrest *App. G-22*
About the Same Proportion of Inmates in Both Systems Reported Having Prison Jobs *App. G-22*
The Educational Level of Inmates in Each Country Was Generally Lower Than That of the Respective General Adult Population *App. G-23*
In Both Countries About a Third of the Inmates Were Living with Dependent Children Before Incarceration *App. G-23*
Growing Up in a One-Parent Family Was More Than Twice As Likely for U.S. as for British Inmates *App. G-24*
Methodology *App. G-25*

Sample Design *App. G-25*
Comparability of Survey Methods *App. G-27*
Accuracy of the Estimates *App. G-27*
Comparability Issues *App. G-28*
Appendix *App. G-29*
Notes *App. G-48*

World Prison Population List *International Centre For Prison Studies*
Introduction *App. G-49*
Key Points *App. G-50*

World Female Imprisonment List *International Centre For Prison Studies*
Introduction *App. G-57*
Key Points *App. G-58*

World Prison Population List *International Centre for Prison Studies*
Introduction *App. G-65*
Key Points *App. G-66*

World Pre-Trial Remand Imprisonment List *International Centre For Prison Studies*
Introduction *App. G-73*
Key Points *App. G-74*

World Prison Population List *International Centre for Prison Studies*
Introduction *App. G-81*
Key Points *App. G-82*

World Prison Population List *International Centre for Prison Studies*
Introduction *App. G-89*
Key Points *App. G-90*

World Female Imprisonment List *International Centre for Prison Studies*
Introduction *App. G-97*
Key Points *App. G-98*

World Prison Population List *International Centre for Prison Studies*
Introduction *App. G-105*
Key Points *App. G-106*

World Pre-Trial Remand Imprisonment List *International Centre For Prison Studies*
Introduction *App. G-113*
Key Points *App. G-114*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026

World Female Imprisonment List *Institute for Criminal Policy Research*
Introduction *App. G-121*
Key Points *App. G-122*

World Prison Population List *Institute for Criminal Policy Research*
Introduction *App. G-135*
Key Points *App. G-136*

World Female Imprisonment List *Institute for Criminal Policy Research*
Introduction *App. G-151*
Key Points *App. G-152*

World Pre-trial/Remand Imprisonment List *Institute for Criminal Policy Research*
Introduction *App. G-167*
Key Points *App. G-168*

World Prison Population List *Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research*
Introduction *App. G-183*
Key Points *App. G-184*

World Pre-trial/Remand Imprisonment List *Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research*
Introduction *App. G-205*
Key Points *App. G-206*

World Female Imprisonment List *Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research*
Introduction *App. G-225*
Key Points *App. G-226*

World Prison Population List *Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research*
Introduction *App. G-245*
Key Points *App. G-246*

World Female Imprisonment List *Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research*
Introduction *App. G-265*
Key Points *App. G-266*

World Pre-trial/Remand Imprisomnent List *Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research*
Introduction *App. G-281*
Key Points *App. G-282*

Index *Ind.-1*

© 2026 Thomson Reuters, 11/2026