D3 3lr1669

By: Delegates Norman, Carr, Gilchrist, Jacobs, Niemann, S. Robinson, and Stein

Introduced and read first time: February 1, 2013

Assigned to: Judiciary

A BILL ENTITLED

1	AN ACT concerning
2 3	Courts – Garnishment of Joint Account – Burden of Proof (Bank Customer Protection Act)
4 5 6	FOR the purpose of establishing that an account holder has the burden of proving that a garnishment against property held in a certain joint account is not valid; and generally relating to the garnishment of joint accounts.
7 8 9 10 11	BY repealing and reenacting, with amendments, Article – Courts and Judicial Proceedings Section 11–603 Annotated Code of Maryland (2006 Replacement Volume and 2012 Supplement)
12 13	SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND, That the Laws of Maryland read as follows:
14	Article - Courts and Judicial Proceedings
15	11–603.
16 17 18 19 20	(a) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, a garnishment against property held jointly by husband and wife, in a bank, trust company, credit union, savings bank, or savings and loan association or any of their affiliates or subsidiaries is not valid unless both owners of the property are judgment debtors.
21 22 23	(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection does not apply unless the property is held in an account that was established as a joint account prior to the date of entry of judgment giving rise to the garnishment.



- (b) (1) A garnishment against property held in a bank, trust company, credit union, savings bank, or savings and loan association, or any of their affiliates or subsidiaries, by one person in trust for that person and another person or persons, is not valid unless all of the persons are judgment debtors.
- (2) A garnishment against property held in a bank, trust company, credit union, savings bank, or savings and loan association, or any of their affiliates or subsidiaries, by one or more persons in trust for another person or persons, is not valid unless all of the persons are judgment debtors.
- (3) A garnishment against property held in a bank, trust company, credit union, savings bank, or savings and loan association, or any of their affiliates or subsidiaries, to be payable on the death of one or more persons to another person or persons, is not valid unless all of the persons are judgment debtors.
- (c) (1) Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of this section and regardless of the relationship between or among the persons, if property held in an account in the name of 2 or more persons at a bank, trust company, credit union, savings bank, or savings and loan association or any of their affiliates or subsidiaries is garnished, and fewer than all of the persons named on the account are the judgment debtors, the garnishee may answer the writ of garnishment by stating:
- 19 (i) That the property is held in an account at the garnishee in 20 the name of 2 or more persons, 1 or more of whom but fewer than all of whom, are 21 judgment debtors; and
- 22 (ii) The amount held in the account at the time the writ of garnishment was served on the garnishee.
 - (2) If the garnishee answers as described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the garnishee shall hold the lesser of the amount of the judgment or the amount in the account subject to an entry of a court order releasing the property held by the garnishee or a final judgment in the garnishment proceeding.
 - (3) If the garnishee answers and holds property as provided under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, the garnishee may not be held liable to the judgment creditor or to any person named on the account for wrongful dishonor or for any other claim relating to the garnishment.
 - (D) AN ACCOUNT HOLDER HAS THE BURDEN OF PROVING THAT A GARNISHMENT AGAINST PROPERTY HELD IN AN ACCOUNT IN THE NAME OF THE ACCOUNT HOLDER AND ONE OR MORE PERSONS AT A BANK, TRUST COMPANY, CREDIT UNION, SAVINGS BANK, OR SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION, OR ANY OF THEIR AFFILIATES OR SUBSIDIARIES, IS NOT VALID.
 - SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect October 1, 2013.