# **SENATE BILL 193**

E2

7lr1295 CF HB 67

## By: Senators Conway, Britt, Currie, Della, Exum, Gladden, Jones, Kelley, McFadden, Pugh, and Raskin Introduced and read first time: January 26, 2007

Assigned to: Judicial Proceedings

#### A BILL ENTITLED

#### 1 AN ACT concerning

### 2 **Criminal Procedure – Custodial Interrogation – Electronic Recordation**

3 FOR the purpose of establishing that, in a prosecution for a crime of violence, 4 statements of a defendant made during a certain custodial interrogation are 5 presumed involuntary unless a certain electronic recording is made of the 6 interrogation; establishing that, if a court finds by a preponderance of evidence 7 that a defendant was subjected to a custodial interrogation in violation of this 8 Act, a statement made by the defendant following the custodial interrogation is 9 presumed involuntary in a prosecution for a crime of violence; establishing that a presumption of involuntariness established by this Act may be overcome by 10 certain clear and convincing evidence; providing that this Act does not preclude 11 the admission in a criminal proceeding of certain statements by a defendant; 12 13 prohibiting the State from destroying or altering certain electronic recordings made of certain custodial interrogations until certain circumstances exist; 14 15 defining certain terms; providing for the application of this Act; and generally 16 relating to custodial interrogations of certain individuals.

- 17 BY adding to
- 18 Article Criminal Procedure
- Section 2–401 through 2–403 to be under the new subtitle "Subtitle 4. Custodial
  Interrogation"
- 21 Annotated Code of Maryland
- 22 (2001 Volume and 2006 Supplement)

EXPLANATION: CAPITALS INDICATE MATTER ADDED TO EXISTING LAW. [Brackets] indicate matter deleted from existing law.



**SENATE BILL 193** 

SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1 2 MARYLAND, That the Laws of Maryland read as follows: **Article – Criminal Procedure** 3 SUBTITLE 4. CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION. 4 2-401. 5 6 (A) IN THIS SUBTITLE THE FOLLOWING WORDS HAVE THE MEANINGS 7 INDICATED. "CRIME OF VIOLENCE" HAS THE MEANING STATED IN § 14-101 OF 8 **(B)** 9 THE CRIMINAL LAW ARTICLE. 10 (C) "CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION" MEANS AN INTERROGATION BY A POLICE OFFICER IN WHICH THE INDIVIDUAL BEING INTERROGATED IS NOT 11 FREE TO LEAVE. 12 (D) "ELECTRONIC RECORDING" MEANS A VIDEOTAPE OR DIGITAL 13 RECORDING THAT INCLUDES BOTH AUDIO AND VISUAL REPRESENTATIONS OF 14 15 ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THE CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION. 2-402. 16 17 THIS SUBTITLE APPLIES TO A PROSECUTION FOR A CRIME OF VIOLENCE. 2-403. 18 19 (A) AN ORAL, WRITTEN, OR SIGN LANGUAGE STATEMENT OF A 20 DEFENDANT MADE DURING A CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION SHALL BE 21 PRESUMED INVOLUNTARY UNLESS AN ELECTRONIC RECORDING IS MADE OF 22 THE ENTIRE CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION THAT: 23 (1) **IS SUBSTANTIALLY ACCURATE;** 24 (2) IS NOT INTENTIONALLY ALTERED; AND

 $\mathbf{2}$ 

(3) INCLUDES AN ADVISEMENT OF, AND WAIVER BY, THE
 DEFENDANT OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE DEFENDANT REGARDING
 SELF-INCRIMINATION AND THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL.

4 (B) IF THE COURT FINDS, BY A PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE, THAT A 5 DEFENDANT WAS SUBJECTED TO A CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION IN VIOLATION 6 OF SUBSECTION (A) OF THIS SECTION, A STATEMENT MADE BY THE DEFENDANT 7 FOLLOWING THE CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION, EVEN IF OTHERWISE IN 8 COMPLIANCE WITH THIS SECTION, IS PRESUMED INVOLUNTARY.

9 (C) A PRESUMPTION OF INVOLUNTARINESS UNDER THIS SECTION MAY 10 BE OVERCOME BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT:

11

(1) A STATEMENT WAS VOLUNTARY AND RELIABLE; AND

12 (2) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS HAD GOOD CAUSE FOR 13 FAILURE TO RECORD THE ENTIRE INTERROGATION, INCLUDING EVIDENCE 14 THAT THE FAILURE TO ELECTRONICALLY RECORD THE ENTIRE INTERROGATION 15 WAS THE RESULT OF EQUIPMENT FAILURE AND OBTAINING REPLACEMENT 16 EQUIPMENT WAS NOT FEASIBLE.

17(D) THIS SECTION DOES NOT PRECLUDE THE ADMISSION OF A18STATEMENT BY A DEFENDANT THAT IS:

19(1) MADE IN OPEN COURT AT TRIAL, BEFORE A GRAND JURY, OR20AT A PRELIMINARY HEARING;

21 (2) MADE SPONTANEOUSLY AND NOT IN RESPONSE TO A 22 QUESTION;

23 (3) MADE AFTER QUESTIONING THAT IS ROUTINELY ASKED
 24 DURING THE PROCESSING OF AN ARREST;

(4) MADE DURING A CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION CONDUCTED
 OUT-OF-STATE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE LAW OF THAT JURISDICTION AND
 NOT CONDUCTED IN CONJUNCTION WITH STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENTS;

28(5)OBTAINED BY A FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER IN A29FEDERAL PLACE OF DETENTION ACTING IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL LAW

1 AND NOT CONDUCTED IN CONJUNCTION WITH STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT 2 AGENTS; OR

3 (6) GIVEN AT A TIME WHEN THE INTERROGATORS ARE UNAWARE
 4 THAT THE DEFENDANT IS SUSPECTED OF A CRIME OF VIOLENCE.

5 (E) THE STATE MAY NOT DESTROY OR ALTER AN ELECTRONIC 6 RECORDING MADE OF A CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION UNDER THIS SECTION 7 UNTIL:

8 (1) THE CONVICTION OF THE DEFENDANT FOR AN OFFENSE 9 RELATING TO THE INTERROGATION IS FINAL AND ALL DIRECT AND HABEAS 10 CORPUS APPEALS ARE EXHAUSTED; OR

11(2) PROSECUTION FOR AN OFFENSE RELATING TO THE12INTERROGATION IS BARRED BY LAW.

13 SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall be 14 construed to apply only prospectively and may not be applied or interpreted to have 15 any effect on or application to any statement obtained from a defendant before the 16 effective date of this Act.

SECTION 3. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effectOctober 1, 2007.