THE IMPACT OF COURTROOM CAMERAS ON THE JUDICIAL PROCESS

SCOTT A. CAMPBELL*
THOMAS M. GREEN**
BRYAN S. HANCE***
JAMES G. LARSON****

ABSTRACT
The sensational trial of Richard Bruno Hauptmann for the kidnapping and murder of Charles Lindbergh’s young son in 1935 marked the starting point of the debate regarding the propriety of allowing cameras in courtrooms during judicial proceedings. This debate intensified during and following the 1994-1997 trial of O.J. Simpson. At issue is how a court must weigh the Sixth Amendment right of the accused to a public trial and the First Amendment right to a free press, as well as its own interest in preserving the dignity and decorum of the courtroom. This paper examines the history, Federal rules, seminal court cases, and California rules concerning cameras in the courtroom in the context of these important Constitutional issues. This research provides qualitative data from 208 California judges that help explain some of the thinking by those who are empowered to accept or reject requests to record court proceedings.
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INTRODUCTION
Though many people today attribute the 1994-1997 O.J. Simpson criminal and civil trials with bringing cameras into the courtroom, it was not the first time they were permitted in a public criminal trial. The Richard Bruno Hauptmann trial in 1935 (State v. Hauptmann, 115 N.J.L. 412, 180 A. 809 (1935), cert. denied, 296 U.S. 649 (1935)) arguably was the first time that restrictions on the use of cameras in the courtroom became an issue (Barber 1987). Hauptmann was accused of kidnapping and murdering Charles Lindbergh, Jr., son of the famous American aviator who made the first solo nonstop transatlantic flight. The trial judge, Thomas Trenchard, allowed still photographers and newsreel cameramen to record the proceedings; there was no
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objection by defense counsel. Media coverage of this case was so overwhelming, including a photo of Hauptmann’s face when the verdict was read in violation of the judge’s order, that it led to the American Bar Association House of Delegates to adopt Canon 35 in the Canons of Judicial Ethics in 1937 (Fulton 1981). Canon 35 read:

*Proceedings in court should be conducted with fitting dignity and decorum. The taking of photographs in the courtroom, during sessions of the court or recesses between sessions, and the broadcasting of court proceedings are calculated to detract from the essential dignity of the proceedings, degrade the court and create misconceptions with respect thereto in the mind of the public and should not be permitted.* 62 A.B.A. REP. 1134-35 (1937) (Fulton 1981: 1394).

With the rise of television, Canon 35 was amended in 1952 to prohibit recording by motion picture. In 1972, Canons were replaced by the Code of Judicial Conduct in 1972 (Fulton 1981; Patterson 1982). Canon 3 A(7) of the new Code updated the language in Canon 35 to “...prohibit broadcasting, televising, recording or photographing in courtrooms” except “…under rules prescribed by a supervising appellate court or other appropriate authority…” (American Bar Association n.d.: 515).

**Federal Rules, Judicial Council, and Pilot Projects**

In 1946, the U.S. Supreme Court adopted Rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which states that “…[e]xcept as otherwise provided by a statute or these rules, the court must not permit the taking of photographs in the courtroom during judicial proceedings or the broadcasting of judicial proceedings from the courtroom” (Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 2016: 64).

*At its September 1990 session, the Judicial Conference of the United States authorized a three-year experiment in courts of appeal and district courts that allowed for photographing, recording, and broadcasting of civil proceedings, in accordance with guidelines, also approved by the Conference, which participating courts would have to adopt and which give presiding judicial officers the discretion, at any time, to refuse, limit, or terminate media coverage for any reason “considered necessary or appropriate by the presiding judicial officer”* (The Judicial Conference of the United States 1990: 104).

The Conference also adopted the following policy on cameras that gave federal judges limited bases on which to authorize the use of courtroom cameras:

A judge may authorize broadcasting, televising, recording, or taking photographs in the courtroom and in adjacent areas during investitive, naturalization, or other ceremonial proceedings. A judge may authorize such activities in the courtroom or adjacent areas during other proceedings, or recesses between such other proceedings, only:

- a) for the presentation of evidence;
- b) for the perpetuation of the record of the proceedings;
- c) for security purposes;
- d) for other purposes of judicial administration; or
- e) in accordance with pilot programs approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States (United States Courts n.d.: 5).

At the conclusion of the three-year study conducted by the Federal Judicial Center, the Court Administration and Case Management Committee of the 1994 Judicial
Conference reported on the results of the pilot study. Based on the results, “a majority of the Conference concluded that the intimidating effect of cameras on some witnesses and jurors was cause for concern, and the Conference declined to approve the Committee’s recommendation to expand camera coverage in civil proceedings” (The Judicial Conference of the United States 1994: 47). The study was allowed to sunset on December 31, 1994.

The Judicial Conference again authorized a three-year pilot project at its September 2010 session (The Judicial Conference of the United States 2010). The purpose of the pilot project was “to evaluate the effect of cameras in district court courtrooms, video recordings of proceedings therein, and publication of such video recordings” (11). The project was to include up to 150 judges and was limited to civil cases only. The proceedings could be recorded only with the approval of the presiding judge, and all parties were required to consent to the recording. Recording of jury members was not permitted.

There was one important difference in this pilot program than the previous program: there was no media involvement (Singer 2015). Court employees or a private contractor hired by the court controlled the cameras and video recordings. Video recordings and a detailed summary of the case were linked to the case’s Public Access to Court Electronic Records (PACER) docket where they could be viewed. This process had several advantages over live broadcasting, including protecting the integrity of the proceedings and providing context for the proceedings (Singer 2015).

Moreover, this pilot program suggested several benefits to reviewing video recordings similar to the cognitive benefits of directly viewing court proceedings (Singer 2015). Lawyers, litigants, pro se litigants, law professors and students, and interested observers can all attain an educational benefit from viewing proceedings with different types of trials and judges. Access to video recordings also can mitigate the “thin slice” problem that results from media outlets presenting distorted, out-of-context segments of a proceeding, a reason cited by several Supreme Court Justices for barring cameras from the courtroom altogether (Singer 2015).

The Committee on Court Administration and Case Management reported on the results of the second pilot study at the Judicial Conference’s March 2016 meeting (The Judicial Conference of the United States 2016). The Committee concluded “that the findings of the report did not justify any change to the Judicial Conference’s current broadcasting policy” (12). At this same meeting, the Ninth Circuit Judicial Council authorized a continuation of the pilot project in the three districts that participated in the national study (Northern California, Western Washington, and Guam). The Ninth Circuit pilot project was designed to follow the same processes as the national project in an effort to provide additional data to the Judicial Conference.

Constitutional Implications of Courtroom Cameras

In deciding whether to allow a camera in a judicial proceeding, a court must balance certain rights under the United States Constitution that are guaranteed to the various stakeholders. It must weigh the Sixth Amendment right of the accused to a public trial and the First Amendment right to a free press, against the defendant’s Sixth Amendment right to a fair trial. A court also must consider its own interest in preserving the dignity and decorum of the courtroom, along with its duty to maintain control over the judicial proceedings to ensure the fair and impartial administration of justice (Annotated Law
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Review, 2017). Both federal and state courts across the country that have examined these issues generally have held that the specific circumstances in which a camera is to be used in the courtroom largely determines whether it should be allowed, prohibited, restricted, or terminated. Those circumstances also include criteria including the location of the camera inside the courtroom, how much of a distraction the camera may cause to the parties, witnesses, jurors, attorneys, the court, and others, and whether the camera may affect the defendant’s ability to present his or her case (See generally, Estes v. Texas, 381 U.S. 532 (1965), reh. den. 382 U.S. 875 (1965)).

Courts have routinely acknowledged the public’s right to be informed of trial proceedings. As the U.S. Supreme Court held in Richmond Newspapers v. Virginia, 448 U.S. 555 (1980), a criminal trial must be open to the public under both the First and Fourteenth Amendments absent an overriding interest specified in findings that support closure. The Court reasoned that the trial courtroom is a public place in which the presence of members of the community, including the media, and serves to preserve the integrity and openness of the proceedings.

Courts have further held that a defendant’s due process rights are not inherently denied by the presence of a courtroom camera. In Chandler v. Florida (1981) 449 U.S. 560, two Miami Beach police officers were charged with burglarizing a popular local restaurant. The officers argued that televising portions of their case would make a fair trial impossible. The trial court allowed local television stations to televise a small portion of the trial and the two officers were later convicted. The issue in the case was whether allowing radio, television, and still photographic coverage of a criminal trial for public broadcast violated the accused’s right to a fair trial guaranteed by the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments. The U.S. Supreme Court upheld the trial court’s decision, holding that the cameras did not deny the defendants a fair trial. The Court reasoned that the use of technology in the courtroom is consistent with the Constitution so long as it does not infringe on fundamental guarantees of the accused.

It is this potential infringement, though, that tempers the openness of the courts. Rights to a public trial and free press do not mean unfettered media access to the courtroom. The Sixth Amendment right to a public trial, applicable to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment, is guaranteed only to the accused, not the media, or anyone else for that matter. (See Gannett v. DePasquale, 443 U.S. 368 (1979)). The Gannett court concluded that, “There is not even the slightest suggestion ... that there is any correlative right in members of the public to insist upon a public trial” (Gannett v. DePasquale, 443 U.S. 368 (1979), p. 381).

Above all else, the Fourteenth Amendment right to due process dictates that the trial must be fair to the defendant. In Estes v. Texas (381 U.S. 532 14, reh. den. 382 U.S. 875 15 (1965)), the U.S. Supreme Court held that the defendant’s highly publicized and sensationalized trial deprived him of this right. The Court reasoned that, “A defendant on trial for a specific crime is entitled to his day in court, not in a stadium, or a city or nationwide arena” (Estes v. Texas, 381 U.S. 532 14, reh. den. 382 U.S. 875 15 (1965), p. 549). Moreover, a member of the media has no greater claim to be in the courtroom than the general public; both have the same rights.

Given that there is no automatic and unfettered media access to the courts, the federal judiciary and many states, like California, have imposed various restrictions on the use of cameras in the courtroom.
California Rules

The rules regarding cameras in California courts closely parallel those at the Federal level. The Judicial Council of California adopted Rule 980 in 1965 (Administrative Office of the Courts, 2007). The rule allowed for media coverage during ceremonial proceedings but prohibited any form of photography, audio recording, and broadcasting during sessions or recesses. The next year the Council adopted Rule 981, which allowed a limited number of experiments in courtroom photography (Administrative Office of the Courts, 2007, 2012). Following a study period, the Council revised Rule 980 in 1984 to permit media coverage of civil and criminal proceedings.

In 1995, the Task Force on Photographing, Recording, and Broadcasting in the Courtroom was charged with evaluating Rule 980 by then-Chief Justice Malcolm Lucas. Based on input from the judiciary, bar, public, and media, the Task Force recommended that the Judicial Council amend Rule 980 so that it:

- leaves to judges’ discretion the use of cameras in all areas, including all pretrial hearings in criminal cases;
- prohibits camera coverage of jury selection, jurors, and spectators in the courtroom;
- lists 18 factors a judge must consider in ruling on a request for camera coverage, including the importance of maintaining public access to the courtroom, preserving the privacy rights of the participants in the proceedings, and the effect of camera coverage on counsel’s ability to select an unbiased jury;
- continues to ban cameras at proceedings held in chambers or closed to the public; conferences between an attorney and a client, witness, or aide or between attorneys; and conferences between counsel and the judge at the bench; and
- since January 1, 2006, includes new digital technologies, such as camera cell phones, in the restrictions on the use of photographing, recording, and broadcasting in state courtrooms and makes these technologies subject to a judicial order permitting their use (Administrative Office of the Courts, 2012, p. 2-3).

Rule 980 was amended in 1996, and as of January 1, 2007, it was again amended and renumbered as Rule 1.150 as part of the reorganization of the California Rules of Court (Judicial Council of California, 2017). The current rule continues to leave the use of cameras to the discretion of judges in both civil and criminal proceedings...

...in accordance with established legal procedures in the calmness and solemnity of the courtroom. Photographing, recording, and broadcasting of courtroom proceedings may be permitted as circumscribed in this rule if executed in a manner that ensures that the fairness and dignity of the proceedings are not adversely affected (para.1, Introduction).

The media can submit a request to the court using form MC-510 at least five days before the start of the proceedings they wish to record, and the assigned judge must rule on the request based on a list of 18 factors (see Appendix 1). The Judge can permit, refuse, limit, or terminate recordings (including audio and/or video) at his or her discretion.
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DISCUSSION

As described, Rule 1.150 of the California Rules of Court (Judicial Council of California 2017) leaves the use of cameras to the discretion of judges in both civil and criminal proceedings based on 18 different factors. Representatives of the media can submit a request to the court at least five days prior to the start of the proceedings using form MC-510 (see Appendix 1). But how likely is it that judges will permit audio or video recordings?

To answer this question, the authors surveyed 1073 superior court judges in twelve California counties; of that number, 208 responded (a response rate of 19%). Because of the low response rate and lack of demographic data to evaluate the representativeness of the sample, the survey lacks external validity. However, the qualitative data are instructive and help explain the current state of thinking by California judges regarding cameras in their courtrooms.

Among those surveyed, 39% indicated that they had received 11 or more requests to allow a camera in the courtroom, 13% received 6-10 requests, 16% received 3-5 requests, 16% received 1-2 requests, and only 15% had received none. A total of 29% of judges approved 11 or more requests, 10% approved 6-10, 13% approved 3-5, 16% 1-2, and 17% approved 0 requests (15% did not respond). The rate of accepting media requests was highest among those judges who received the most requests: over 73% of those who received 11 or more requests indicated they approved 11 or more requests. For those who received fewer requests, the approval rate was 50-55%. Only 23% of the judges indicated that they had never allowed cameras in their courtroom.

For judges who have allowed cameras, 28% provided unrestricted access to the courtroom, 17% for witness testimony, 12% for communications from the bench, 19% for the presentation of evidence, and 17% for reading the verdict. Several judges commented that they allow filming except for the faces of the witnesses, in particular police officers, victims, or jurors. About having himself filmed, one judge commented:

"After having negative reaction from my children & neighbors who saw me on TV (and thought I looked distracted b/c I was taking notes during a murder prelim rather than staring into the camera) I have since restricted access to footage of me other than rulings. If they have nothing to show from counsel/witnesses then I don't want to be shown taking notes and having that mistaken for inattention!!"

A majority of judges (53%) stated that the main advantage to having cameras in the courtroom was to address the public’s right to know about the case; almost as many (47%) cited a benefit in educating the public on the court processes. Since video recordings and a detailed summary of the case are linked to the case’s Public Access to Court Electronic Records (PACER) docket, some judges (31%) believed that allowing cameras provided access to those who could not attend the proceedings. However, 35% of judges saw no advantage to having cameras in the courtroom. Some judges seem to be cynical about the issue:

- “The real advantage is that TV stations make money by having cameras in the courtroom.”
- “The reality is not about [the reasons listed]. The reality IS about ratings/business.”
- “For publicity seeking judges, it increases probability that the reporter's article will be published.”
Other comments reflected the majority opinion:
- “Reduce abuses by attorneys/parties/judges in the courtroom.”
- “Educates the public that judges typically don't act like the TV judges (such as Judge Judy etc.) who are actually used as examples for new judges of how not to act.”

A majority of judges who responded to the survey cited six specific disadvantages in allowing cameras in their courtroom:

a) The possibility of impacting jury selection, deliberations, or the jury’s verdict (64%);
b) Witnesses’ reluctance to testify (61%);
c) Different media interpretations (bias) that can influence public opinion (59%);
d) Witnesses changing their demeanor to be perceived as more or less sympathetic (57%);
e) Undermining the dignity of our judicial institutions by transforming a trial into entertainment (57%); and
f) Violation of privacy rights of participants in the proceeding, including witnesses, jurors, and victims (57%).

Many of the judges went on to explain their responses; the most common theme related to the integrity of the court processes and decorum:
- “Attorneys, parties and witnesses playing to the camera rather than testifying to the jury; use by the public and media of snippets of the trial rather than all the testimony heard by the jury which can undermine public confidence in jury decisions.”
- “Lawyers tend to grandstand when they know the camera is on.”
- “Pieces of the trial are shown to the public out of context suggesting a different interpretation of the evidence.”

When a member of the media submits a request to record a court proceeding, the form (MC-510; see Appendix 1) includes 18 specific factors a judge must consider before ruling on the request. There is also a 19th factor: Any other factor the judge deems relevant. The most frequently cited “other” factors include:
- “I consider the nature of the charges and the rights of the victims and witnesses in regard to the charges. I also consider the age of the witnesses and victims in determining the scope of coverage allowed. In at least one case, the media did not honor my order to ‘tile’ the face of a witness, so I take that into consideration as well.”
- “Jurors should never be shown. Child witnesses should not be shown.”
- “The right of the accused to a fair trial is sometimes implicated. Also, on rare occasions I consider the safety risk to the accused (e.g., at an arraignment--an early stage of the case--I might order the face of an accused sex offender who is being held in custody ‘tiled out’ to lessen the risk of jailhouse attacks).”
- “I usually discuss a media’s request with the parties and allow them to make a decision as to whether they have any objections to the cameras in the
courtroom and normally decide to grant or deny the media’s request based upon counsel’s opinions.”
- “Cost to the court and space taken up by media people.”
- “I certainly am open to what the parties/attorneys want. I’ve found they don’t always want coverage. I find it more taxing on me to have the cameras there as I do think certain witnesses, defendants, attorneys SHOW BOAT and play to the camera. Also, the videographers/story editors are truly ignorant about basic civics and many news stories do not provide the necessary context to explain what occurred. It is all about the SENSATIONALISM. That does not educate anyone nor does it improve the system of justice or citizens’ faith in their government institutions. As it is, jurors focus on what people were wearing or hair styles. How much more stupid and subjective can we make the court proceedings?? Total loss of dignity.”
- “My main concern is the legitimacy of claim of newsworthiness. If celebrity status is the primary motive for camera coverage request, I would almost certainly deny request.”
- “Whether the media has complied with the Rules of Court in making the request.”

**CONCLUSIONS**

Since the trial of Richard Bruno Hauptmann in 1935, courts have struggled to balance the Sixth Amendment right of the accused to a public trial and the defendant’s right to a fair trial, and the First Amendment right to a free press. Courts have also tried to consider their own interests in preserving the dignity and decorum of the courtroom. After years of debate and two pilot studies, the Federal judiciary, through The Judicial Conference of the United States, adopted a policy to allow judges the discretion to allow audio and/or video recordings and live transmissions of court proceedings within specific guidelines. The rules regarding cameras in California courts closely parallel those at the Federal level, also leaving the decision to the discretion of the judge.

This research contributes to the discussion on allowing recordings and live transmissions in court in two important areas. First, the authors have succinctly summarized the history, Federal rules, seminal court cases, and California rules concerning cameras in the courtroom in the context of the important Constitutional issues. Second, this research provides qualitative data from California judges that help explain some of the thinking by those who are empowered to accept or reject requests to record court proceedings. Based on the reactions of California judges, it is clear that the criteria described in California Rule 1.150 are being thoughtfully considered, especially those related to the integrity of the proceedings, the privacy rights of all participants, and the public’s right to know. At the same time, this research revealed genuine skepticism about the stated advantages to allowing cameras in court, including a tendency for some participants to behave differently when cameras are present and creating inaccurate impressions about the judicial system among the public as a result of not providing sufficient context for what is reported.

**Recommendations**

The issue of whether or not to allow recordings of court proceedings is far from settled. Even as technology has provided less obtrusive means by which recordings can be made, there is reluctance on the part of many judges to provide access. There are
at least three areas for future research that will shine more light on this issue. First, the authors were unable to obtain data from the State judiciary on how many requests were made to record court proceedings and the disposition of those requests. According to the judiciary, the request forms are not centralized but rather are a part of each individual case docket. These data would be useful in evaluating the process by which such requests are made and how discretion is exercised by judges. Second, the survey used in this research should be replicated to obtain a higher response rate and evidence of representativeness. Third, it would be interesting to conduct a similar type of survey among journalists who cover the courts. It is very likely that journalists will have a different perspective on both the Constitutional and practical implications of allowing greater access to court proceedings.
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Appendix 1

ORDER ON MEDIA REQUEST TO PERMIT COVERAGE

AGENCY MAKING REQUEST (name):

1. a. □ No hearing was held.
   b. □ Date of hearing:
      Time:       Dept./Div.:    Room:

The court considered all the relevant factors listed in subdivision (e)(3) of California Rules of Court, rule 1.150 (see reverse).

3. □ THE COURT FINDS (findings or a statement of decision are optional): □ Attached □ As follows:

THE COURT ORDERS

4. The request to photograph, record, or broadcast is
   a. □ denied.
   b. □ granted subject to the conditions in rule 1.150, California Rules of Court, AND the following:
      (1) □ The local rules of this court regulating media activity outside the courtroom (copy attached).
      (2) □ The order of the presiding or supervising judge regulating media activity outside the courtroom (copy attached).
      (3) □ Payment to the clerk of increased court-incurred costs of (specify): $     to be determined.
      (4) □ The media agency shall demonstrate to the court that the proposed personnel and equipment comply with California Rules of Court, rule 1.150, and any local rule or order:
      (5) □ Personnel and equipment shall be placed □ as directed □ as indicated in the attachment □ as follows (specify):

      (6) (i) □ The attached statement of agreed pooling arrangements is approved.
      (6) (ii) □ A statement of agreed pooling arrangements satisfactory to the court shall be filed before coverage begins.
      (7) □ This order
         (i) □ shall not apply to allow coverage of proceedings that are continued.
         (ii) □ shall apply to allow coverage of proceedings that are continued.
      (8) □ Other (specify):

5. Coverage granted in item 4b is permitted in the following proceedings:
   a. □ All proceedings, except those prohibited by California Rules of Court, rule 1.150, and those proceedings prohibited by further court order.
   b. □ Only the following proceedings (specify type or date or both):

6. □ The order made on (date): is □ terminated □ modified as follows (specify):

7. □ Number of pages attached:

Date:                     (See reverse for additional information)                     JUDGE

ORDER ON MEDIA REQUEST TO PERMIT COVERAGE

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use
Judicial Council of California
MC-510 [Rev. January 1, 2020]
FACTORS CONSIDERED BY THE JUDGE IN MAKING THIS ORDER (Rule 1.150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Name</th>
<th>Case Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Importance of maintaining public trust and confidence in the judicial system
2. Importance of promoting public access to the judicial system
3. Parties’ support or opposition to the request
4. Nature of the case
5. Privacy rights of all participants in the proceeding, including witnesses, jurors, and victims
6. Effect on any minor who is a party, prospective witness, victim, or other participant in the proceeding
7. Effect on the parties’ ability to select a fair and unbiased jury
8. Effect on any ongoing law enforcement activity in the case
9. Effect on any unresolved identification issues
10. Effect on any subsequent proceedings in the case
11. Effect of coverage on the willingness of witnesses to cooperate, including the risk that coverage will engender threats to the health or safety of any witness
12. Effect on excluded witnesses who would have access to the televised testimony of prior witnesses
13. Scope of the coverage and whether partial coverage might unfairly influence or distract the jury
14. Difficulty of jury selection if a mistrial is declared
15. Security and dignity of the court
16. Undue administrative or financial burden to the court or participants
17. Interference with neighboring courtrooms
18. Maintaining orderly conduct of the proceeding
19. Any other factor the judge deems relevant

PROHIBITED COVERAGE (Rule 1.150)

This order does not permit photographing, recording, or broadcasting of the following in the court:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prohibited Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The jury or the spectators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jury selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A conference between an attorney and a client, witness, or aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A conference between attorneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A conference between counsel and the judge at the bench (&quot;sidelines&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A proceeding closed to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A proceeding held in chambers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEDIA PERSONNEL AND EQUIPMENT (Rule 1.150)

NOTE: These requirements apply unless the judge orders otherwise. Refer to the order for additional requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No more than one television camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No more than one still photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No more than one microphone operator and no obtrusive microphones or wiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No operator entry or exit or other distraction when the court is in session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No moving equipment when the court is in session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No distracting sounds or lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. No visible signal light or device that shows when equipment is operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. No disruption of proceedings, nor public expense, to install, operate, or remove modifications to existing sound and lighting systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No media agency insignia or marking on equipment or clothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SANCTIONS FOR VIOLATING THIS ORDER (Rule 1.150)

Any violation of this order or rule 1.150 is an unlawful interference with the proceedings of the court. The violation may result in an order terminating media coverage, a citation for contempt of court, or an order imposing monetary or other sanctions.