February 2014 MPT

► *FILE*

MPT-2: *In re Peterson Engineering Consultants*

Lennon, Means, and Brown LLC
Attorneys at Law
249 S. Oak Street
Franklin City, Franklin 33409

TO: Examinee
FROM: Brenda Brown
DATE: February 25, 2014
RE: Peterson Engineering Consultants

Our client, Peterson Engineering Consultants (PEC), seeks our advice regarding issues related to its employees' use of technology. PEC is a privately owned, non-union engineering consulting firm. Most of its employees work outside the office for over half of each workday. Employees need to be able to communicate with one another, the home office, and clients while they are working outside the office, and to access various information, documents, and reports available on the Internet. PEC issues its employees Internet-connected computers and other devices (such as smartphones and tablets), all for business purposes and not for personal use.

After reading the results of a national survey about computer use in the workplace, the president of PEC became concerned regarding the risk of liability for misuse of company-owned technology and loss of productivity. While the president knows that, despite PEC's policies, its employees use the company's equipment for personal purposes, the survey alerted her to problems that she had not considered.

The president wants to know what revisions to the company's employee manual will provide the greatest possible protection for the company. After discussing the issue with the president, I understand that her goals in revising the manual are (1) to clarify ownership and monitoring of technology, (2) to ensure that the company's technology is used only for business purposes, and (3) to make the policies reflected in the manual effective and enforceable.

I attach relevant excerpts of PEC's current employee manual and a summary of the survey. I also attach three cases that raise significant legal issues about PEC's policies. Please prepare a memorandum addressing these issues that I can use when meeting with the president.

Your memorandum should do the following:

(1) Explain the legal bases under which PEC could be held liable for its employees' use or misuse of Internet-connected (or any similar) technology.

(2) Recommend changes and additions to the employee manual to minimize liability exposure. Base your recommendations on the attached materials and the president's stated goals. Explain the reasons for your recommendations but do not redraft the manual's language.

PETERSON ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS

EMPLOYEE MANUAL
Issued April 13, 2003

Phone Use

Whether in the office or out of the office, and whether using office phones or company-owned phones given to employees, employees are not to incur costs for incoming or outgoing calls unless these calls are for business purposes. Employees may make calls for incidental personal use as long as they do not incur costs.

Computer Use

PEC employees given equipment for use outside the office should understand that the equipment is the property of PEC and must be returned if the employee leaves the employ of PEC, whether voluntarily or involuntarily.

Employees may not use the Internet for any of the following:

- engaging in any conduct that is illegal
- revealing non-public information about PEC
- engaging in conduct that is obscene, sexually explicit, or pornographic in nature

PEC may review any employee's use of any company-owned equipment with access to the Internet.

Email Use

PEC views electronic communication systems as an efficient and effective means of communication with colleagues and clients. Therefore, PEC encourages the use of email for business purposes. PEC also permits incidental personal use of its email system.

* * *

NATIONAL PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

RESULTS OF 2013 SURVEY CONCERNING COMPUTER USE AT WORK

Executive Summary of the Survey Findings

1. Ninety percent of employees spend at least 20 minutes of each workday using some form of social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn), personal email, and/or texting. Over 50 percent spend two or more of their working hours on social media every day.

2. Twenty-eight percent of employers have fired employees for email misuse, usually for violations of company policy, inappropriate or offensive language, or excessive personal use, as well as for misconduct aimed at coworkers or the public. Employees have challenged the firings based on various theories. The results of these challenges vary, depending on the specific facts of each case.

3. Over 50 percent of all employees surveyed reported that they spend some part of the workday on websites related to sports, shopping, adult entertainment, games, or other entertainment.

4. Employers are also concerned about lost productivity due to employee use of the Internet, chat rooms, personal email, blogs, and social networking sites. Employers have begun to block access to websites as a means of controlling lost productivity and risks of other losses.

5. More than half of all employers monitor content, keystrokes, time spent at the keyboard, email, electronic usage data, transcripts of phone and pager use, and other information.

While a number of employers have developed policies concerning ownership of computers and other technology, the use thereof during work time, and the monitoring of computer use, many employers fail to revise their policies regularly to stay abreast of technological developments. Few employers have policies about the ways employees communicate with one another electronically.

February 2014 MPT

▶ *LIBRARY*

MPT-2: *In re Peterson Engineering Consultants*

Hogan v. East Shore School

Franklin Court of Appeal (2013)

East Shore School, a private nonprofit entity, discharged Tucker Hogan, a teacher, for misuse of a computer provided to him by the school. Hogan sued, claiming that East Shore had invaded his privacy and that both the contents of the computer and any electronic records of its contents were private. The trial court granted summary judgment for East Shore on the ground that, as a matter of law, Hogan had no expectation of privacy in the computer. Hogan appeals. We affirm.

Hogan relies in great part on the United States Supreme Court opinion in *City of Ontario v. Quon*, 560 U.S. 746 (2010), which Hogan claims recognized a reasonable expectation of privacy in computer records.

We note with approval Justice Kennedy's observation in *Quon* that "rapid changes in the dynamics of communication and information transmission are evident not just in the technology itself but in what society accepts as proper behavior. As one *amici* brief notes, many employers expect or at least tolerate personal use of such equipment because it often increases worker efficiency." We also bear in mind Justice Kennedy's apt aside that "[t]he judiciary risk error by elaborating too fully on the . . . implications of emerging technology before its role in society has become clear." *Quon*.

The *Quon* case dealt with a government employer and a claim that arose under the Fourth Amendment. But the Fourth Amendment applies only to public employers. Here, the employer is a private entity, and Hogan's claim rests on the tort of invasion of privacy, not on the Fourth Amendment.

In this case, the school provided a computer to each teacher, including Hogan. A fellow teacher reported to the principal that he had entered Hogan's classroom after school hours when no children were present and had seen what he believed to be an online gambling site on Hogan's computer screen. He noticed that Hogan immediately closed the browser. The day following the teacher's report, the principal arranged for an outside computer forensic company to inspect the computer assigned to Hogan and determine

whether Hogan had been visiting online gambling sites. The computer forensic company determined that someone using the computer and Hogan's password had visited such sites on at least six occasions in the past two weeks, but that those sites had been deleted from the computer's browser history. Based on this report, East Shore discharged Hogan.

Hogan claimed that East Shore invaded his privacy when it searched the computer and when it searched records of past computer use. The tort of invasion of privacy occurs when a party intentionally intrudes, physically or otherwise, upon the solitude or seclusion of another or his private affairs or concerns, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.

East Shore argued that there can be no invasion of privacy unless the matter being intruded upon is private. East Shore argued that there is no expectation of privacy in the use of a computer when the computer is owned by East Shore and is issued to the employee for school use only. East Shore pointed to its policy in its employee handbook, one issued annually to all employees, that states:

> East Shore School provides computers to teachers for use in the classroom for the purpose of enhancing the educational mission of the school. The computer, the computer software, and the computer account are the property of East Shore and are to be used solely for academic purposes. Teachers and other employees may not use the computer for personal purposes at any time, before, after, or during school hours. East Shore reserves the right to monitor the use of such equipment at any time.

Hogan did not dispute that the employee policy handbook contained this provision, but he argued that it was buried on page 37 of a 45-page handbook and that he had not read it. Further, he argued that the policy regarding computer monitoring was unclear because it failed to warn the employee that East Shore might search for information that had been deleted or might use an outside entity to conduct the monitoring. Next, he argued that because he was told to choose a password known only to him, he was led to believe that websites accessed by him using that password were private. Finally, he argued that because East Shore had not

conducted any monitoring to date, it had waived its right to monitor computer use and had established a practice of respect for privacy. These facts, taken together, Hogan claimed, created an expectation of privacy.

Perhaps East Shore could have written a clearer policy or could have had employees sign a statement acknowledging their understanding of school policies related to technology, but the existing policy is clear. Hogan's failure to read the entire employee handbook does not lessen the clarity of the message. Perhaps East Shore could have defined what it meant by "monitoring" or could have warned employees that deleted computer files may be searched, but Hogan's failure to appreciate that the school might search deleted files is his own failure. East Shore drafted and published to its employees a policy that clearly stated that the computer, the computer software, and the computer account were the property of East Shore, and that East Shore reserved the right to monitor the use of the computer at any time.

Hogan should not have been surprised that East Shore searched for deleted files. While past practice might create a waiver of the right to monitor, there is no reason to believe that a waiver was created here, when the handbook was re-issued annually with the same warning that East Shore reserved the right to monitor use of the computer equipment. Finally, a reasonable person would not believe that the password would create a privacy interest, when the school's policy, read as a whole, offers no reason to believe that computer use is private.

In short, Hogan's claim for invasion of privacy fails because he had no reasonable expectation of privacy in the computer equipment belonging to his employer.

Affirmed.

Fines v. Heartland, Inc.

Franklin Court of Appeal (2011)

Ann Fines sued her fellow employee, John Parr, and her employer, Heartland, Inc., for defamation and sexual harassment. Each cause of action related to electronic mail messages (emails) that Parr sent to Fines while Parr, a Heartland sales representative, used Heartland's computers and email system. After the employer learned of these messages and investigated them, it discharged Parr. At trial, the jury found for Fines and against defendants Parr and Heartland and awarded damages to Fines. Heartland appeals.

In considering Heartland's appeal, we must first review the bases of Fines's successful claims against Parr.

In emails sent to Fines, Parr stated that he knew she was promiscuous. At trial Fines testified that after receiving the second such email from Parr, she confronted him, denied that she was promiscuous, told him she had been happily married for years, and told him to stop sending her emails. She introduced copies of the emails that Parr sent to coworkers after her confrontation with him, in which Parr repeated on three more occasions the statement that she was promiscuous. He also sent Fines emails of a sexual nature, not once but at least eight times, even after she confronted him and told him to stop, and Fines found those emails highly offensive. There was sufficient evidence for the jury to find that Parr both defamed and sexually harassed Fines.

We now turn to Heartland's arguments on appeal that it did not ratify Parr's actions and that it should not be held vicariously liable for his actions.

An employer may be liable for an employee's willful and malicious actions under the principle of ratification. An employee's actions may be ratified after the fact by the employer's voluntary election to adopt the employee's conduct by, in essence, treating the conduct as its own. The failure to discharge an employee after knowledge of his or her wrongful acts may be evidence supporting ratification. Fines claims that because Heartland delayed in discharging Parr after learning of his misconduct, Heartland in effect ratified Parr's behavior.

The facts as presented to the jury were that Fines did not complain to her supervisor or any Heartland representative until the end of the fifth day of Parr's offensive behavior, when Parr sent the emails to coworkers. When her supervisor learned of Fines's complaints, he confronted Parr. Parr denied the charges, saying that someone else must have sent the emails from his account. The supervisor reported the problem to a Heartland vice president, who consulted the company's information technology (IT) department. By day eight, the IT department confirmed that the emails had been sent from Parr's computer using the password assigned to Parr during the time Parr was in the office. Heartland fired Parr.

Such conduct by Heartland does not constitute ratification. Immediately upon learning of the complaint, a Heartland supervisor confronted the alleged sender of the emails, and when the employee denied the charges, the company investigated further, coming to a decision and taking action, all within four business days.

Next, Fines asserted that Heartland should be held liable for Parr's tortious conduct under the doctrine of respondeat superior. Under this doctrine, an employer is vicariously liable for its employee's torts committed within the scope of the employment. To hold an employer vicariously liable, the plaintiff must establish that the employee's acts were committed within the scope of the employment. An employer's vicarious liability may extend to willful and malicious torts. An employee's tortious act may be within the scope of employment even if it contravenes an express company rule.

But the scope of vicarious liability is not boundless. An employer will not be held vicariously liable for an employee's malicious or tortious conduct if the employee *substantially* deviates from the employment duties for personal purposes. Thus, if the employee "inflicts an injury out of personal malice, not engendered by the employment" or acts out of "personal malice unconnected with the employment," the employee is not acting within the scope of employment. *White v. Mascoutah Printing Co.* (Fr. Ct. App. 2010); RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 2.04.

Heartland relied at trial on statements in its employee handbook that office computers were to be used only for business and not for personal purposes. The Heartland handbook

also stated that use of office equipment for personal purposes during office hours constituted misconduct for which the employee would be disciplined. Heartland thus argued that this provision put employees on notice that certain behavior was not only outside the scope of their employment but was an offense that could lead to being discharged, as happened here.

Parr's purpose in sending these emails was purely personal. Nothing in Parr's job description as a sales representative for Heartland would suggest that he should send such emails to coworkers. For whatever reason, Parr seemed determined to offend Fines. The mere fact that they were coworkers is insufficient to hold Heartland responsible for Parr's malicious conduct. Under either the doctrine of ratification or that of respondeat superior, we find no basis for the judgment against Heartland.

Reversed.

Lucas v. Sumner Group, Inc.

Franklin Court of Appeal (2012)

After Sumner Group, Inc., discharged Valerie Lucas for violating Sumner's policy on employee computer use, Lucas sued for wrongful termination. The trial court granted summary judgment in favor of Sumner Group. Lucas appeals. For the reasons stated below, we reverse and remand.

Sumner Group's computer-use policy stated:

> Computers are a vital part of our business, and misuse of computers, the email systems, software, hardware, and all related technology can create disruptions in the work flow. All employees should know that telephones, email systems, computers, and all related technologies are company property and may be monitored 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to ensure appropriate business use. The employee has no expectation of privacy at any time when using company property.
>
> Unauthorized Use: Although employees have access to email and the Internet, these software applications should be viewed as company property. The employee has no expectation of privacy, meaning that these types of software should not be used to transmit, receive, or download any material or information of a personal, frivolous, sexual, or similar nature. Employees found to be in violation of this policy are subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination, and may also be subject to civil and/or criminal penalties.

Sumner Group discovered that over a four-month period, Lucas used the company Internet connection to find stories of interest to her book club and, using the company computer, composed a monthly newsletter for the club, including summaries of the articles she had found on the Internet. She then used the company's email system to distribute the newsletter to the club members. Lucas engaged in some but not all of these activities during work time, the remainder during her lunch break. Lucas admitted engaging in these activities.

She first claimed a First Amendment right of freedom of speech to engage in these

activities. The First Amendment prohibits Congress, and by extension, federal, state, and local governments, from restricting the speech of employees. However, Lucas has failed to demonstrate any way in which the Sumner Group is a public employer. This argument fails.

Lucas also argued that the Sumner Group had abandoned whatever policy it had posted because it was common practice at Sumner Group for employees to engage in personal use of email and the Internet. In previous employment matters, this court has stated that an employer may be assumed to have abandoned or changed even a clearly written company policy if it is not enforced or if, through custom and practice, it has been effectively changed to permit the conduct forbidden in writing but permitted in practice. Whether Sumner Group has effectively abandoned its written policy by custom and practice is a matter of fact to be determined at trial.

Lucas next argued that the company policy was ambiguous. She claimed that the language of the computer-use policy did not clearly prohibit personal use. The policy said that the activities "should not" be conducted, as opposed to "shall not."[1] Therefore, she argued that the policy did not ban personal use of the Internet and email; rather, it merely recommended that those activities not occur. She argued that "should" conveys a moral goal while "shall" refers to a legal obligation or mandate.

In *Catts v. Unemployment Compensation Board* (Fr. Ct. App. 2011), the court held unclear an employee policy that read: "Madison Company has issued employees working from home laptops and mobile phones that should be used for the business of Madison Company." Catts, who had been denied unemployment benefits because she was discharged for personal use of the company-issued computer, argued that the policy was ambiguous. She argued that the policy could mean that employees were to use only Madison Company–issued laptops and phones for Madison Company business, as easily as it could mean that the employees were to use the Madison Company equipment only for business reasons. She argued that the company could

[1] This court has previously viewed with approval the suggestion from PLAIN ENGLISH FOR LAWYERS that questions about the meanings of "should," "shall," and other words can be avoided by pure use of "must" to mean "is required" and "must not" to mean "is disallowed."

prefer that employees use company equipment, rather than personal equipment, for company business because the company equipment had anti-virus software and other protections against "hacking." The key to the *Catts* conclusion was not merely the use of the word "should" but rather the fact that the entire sentence was unclear.

Thus the question here is whether Sumner Group's policy was unclear. When employees are to be terminated for misconduct, employers must be as unambiguous as possible in stating what is prohibited. Nevertheless, employers are not expected to state their policies with the precision of criminal law. Because this matter will be remanded to the trial court, the trial court must further consider whether the employee policy was clear enough that Lucas should have known that her conduct was prohibited.

Finally, Lucas argued that even if she did violate the policy, she was entitled to progressive discipline because the policy stated, "Employees found to be in violation of this policy are subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination . . . ." She argued that this language meant that she should be reprimanded or counseled or even suspended *before* being terminated. Lucas misread the policy. The policy was clear. It put the employee on notice that there would be penalties. It specified a variety of penalties, but there was no commitment or promise that there would be progressive discipline. The employer was free to determine the penalty.

Reversed and remanded for proceedings consistent with this opinion.