

**2017-2018 Fiscal Year Summary Act 45 of 2010**  
**Restraining Pregnant Females**  
**Pennsylvania Department of Corrections**

Correctional institutions in Pennsylvania are required to ensure the safety of pregnant prisoners or detainees in their custody within the facility and during transport outside of the facility. The restraint of a pregnant prisoner is considered an extraordinary occurrence and is permissible only when the prisoner or detainee presents a substantial flight risk or if there are extraordinary medical or security risks to the prisoner, the staff of the correctional institution or medical facility, other prisoners or the public.

When the use of restraints is deemed necessary it is the responsibility of the correctional institution to provide adequate personnel to monitor a pregnant prisoner or detainee for the duration of her stay at a medical facility, in addition to her transport to and from the medical facility. If a restraint is used, the prisoner or detainee must always be accompanied by correctional institution staff with the ability to release the restraint, shall it become medically necessary. If a doctor, nurse or other health professional requests it, correctional institution staff must remove all restraints.

If there is knowledge that the prisoner is in the second or third trimester of pregnancy, the least restrictive restraint necessary should be used. Restraints shall not be used during any stage of labor, any pregnancy-related medical distress, any period of delivery, any period of postpartum, or for transport to a medical facility after the beginning of the second trimester of pregnancy without a determination that the prisoner presents a substantial flight risk or the existence of an extraordinary medical or security risk.

Act 45 of 2010 (SB 1074) establishes the documentation requirements for county jails and state correctional institutions that must be met in reporting incidents of restraint applied to pregnant prisoners or detainees. Initial reports are submitted in writing through a Monthly Extraordinary Occurrence Report to Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (DOC). Should a use of restraint occur, individual and separate written findings for each incident must accompany the report and must note the type of restraints utilized and the trimester of pregnancy.

Act 45 also requires the Pennsylvania DOC to provide a written report to the Governor's Office summarizing the use of restraints on pregnant prisoners or detainees incarcerated in State Correctional Facilities or County Jails. This document is the 7th annual report completed under Act 45 and covers the 2017-2018 fiscal year.

Between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018, the DOC received reports of pregnant inmates being restrained from 7 of the 58 county jails that house females in Pennsylvania. Fifty-one counties did not submit any Extraordinary Occurrence Reports of pregnant inmates being restrained during FY 2017-18. During this time, there were zero incidents of restraining pregnant inmates within the DOC's State Correctional Institutions.

A total of 15 separate incidents, involving eleven different inmates were reported from county jails. The reported age of the pregnant inmates ranged from 22 to 40.

Data on trimester of pregnancy was documented for six out of eleven the inmates involved. Of those reported, two inmates were in the 2<sup>nd</sup> trimester of pregnancy, two inmates were in the 3<sup>rd</sup> trimester of pregnancy and two inmates were postpartum. Of the reported incidents, two occurred during transport to a medical facility, three occurred in a medical facility and ten within the correctional facility.

Restraints were administered as follows:

- Handcuffs only were used in four incidents.
- Handcuffs and ankle restraints were used in four incidents.
- Handcuffs, ankle restraints and oleoresin capsicum were used in one incident.
- Restraint chairs were used in four incident
- Restraint chair and a taser were used in one incident
- One incident did not detail the type of restraint used.

“Self and/or staff harm” is cited as the reason for the use of restraints on pregnant females in seven incidents. Additionally, two incidents cited “transportation”, four incidents cited aggressive behavior or failure to cooperate” and two incidents cited “escape or flight risk/history” as the reason for the use of restraints.

A breakdown of the incidents by county is shown below, followed by a three-year overview of the use of restraints by type.

**Summary of Restraints Used on Pregnant Inmates, by County Jail**  
July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018

<b>County Jail / Institution</b>	<b>Number of Incidents</b>	<b>Types of Restraints</b>	<b>Incidents by Trimester</b>	<b>Number of Inmates</b>
Berks	4	Handcuffs(1), Taser(1), Restraint Chair (3)	4 – 2 <sup>nd</sup> Trimester	3
Dauphin	1	Restraint Chair	1 – Unknown	1
Lancaster	1	Handcuffs Ankle shackles	1- Postpartum	1
Lebanon	1	Unknown	1- Postpartum	1
Luzerne	4	Handcuffs (3) Restraint Chair (1) Ankle shackles (3)	3 – Unknown 1 – 3 <sup>rd</sup> Trimester	2
Lycoming	1	Handcuffs Only	1 – Unknown	1
Montgomery	3	Handcuffs Only(3) Ankle shackles(1) Oleoresin capsicum(1)	2 – Unknown 1 – 3 <sup>rd</sup> Trimester	2
<b>Total</b>	15			11

## Restraint of Pregnant Inmates 3-Year Overview

County Jail/Institution	2017-2018									2016-2017									2015-2016								
	Number of Pregnant Inmates Restrained	Total Number of Incidents	Handcuffs	Taser	Waist Belt	Restraint Chair	Ankle Shackles	Oleoresin capicum	Unknown	Number of Pregnant Inmates Restrained	Total Number of Incidents	Handcuffs	Leg Shackles	Waist Belt	Restraint Chair	Ankle Shackles	Oleoresin capicum	Unknown	Number of Pregnant Inmates Restrained	Total Number of Incidents	Handcuffs	Leg Shackles	Waist Belt	Restraint Chair	Ankle Shackles	Oleoresin capicum	Unknown
Armstrong	N/S									N/S									1	11	11	-	-	-	-	-	-
Beaver	N/S									N/S									1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Berks	3	4	1	1	-	3	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	N/S								
Blair	N/S									N/S									1	4	3	-	-	-	1	-	-
Columbia	N/S									1	1	1							N/S								
Dauphin	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	2	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	-
Franklin	N/S									N/S									2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lancaster	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/S								
Lebanon	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1										N/S								
Luzerne	2	4	3	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	2	2	-	1	2	1	-	-	N/S								
Lycoming	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/S									1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Montgomery	2	3	3	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Philadelphia	N/S									N/S									1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somerset	N/S									1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
SCI-Muncy	N/S									1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/S								
<b>Total:</b>	11	15	9			5	5	1	1	8	10	9	2	4	2	1			13	27	24	0	0	1	1	0	1

N/S - Nothing submitted

An overview of the last three years reveals that 14 of the 58 county jails and 1 State Corrections Institution that house females have reported incidents involving the use of restraints on pregnant prisoners or detainees. It is not known whether outside agencies who transport pregnant prisoners were without incident, or failed to report. Additionally, some Extraordinary Occurrence Reports received lack critical information, such as trimester of pregnancy, type of restraint and the required separate written findings describing the circumstances that led to the determination that the prisoner or detainee represented a substantial flight risk or a safety threat.