

Department of Legislative Services
Maryland General Assembly
2002 Session

FISCAL NOTE

Senate Bill 80

(Senator Green)

Judicial Proceedings

Judiciary

False, Fictitious, or Fraudulent Representations to Legislative Branch Units

This bill provides that it is a misdemeanor to make a false statement, conceal a material fact, or make false representations in a recorded proceeding to a unit of the legislative branch of the State government. The bill applies only to a hearing or other proceeding that is required to be recorded by the rules of the House or Senate. Violators are subject to maximum penalties of a fine of \$1,000 and/or imprisonment for one year.

Fiscal Summary

State Effect: Potential minimal increase in general fund revenues and expenditures due to the bill's penalty provisions.

Local Effect: Potential minimal increase in revenues and expenditures due to the bill's penalty provisions.

Small Business Effect: None.

Analysis

Bill Summary: Specifically, the bill prohibits a person, in any matter within the jurisdiction of a legislative unit, from knowingly and willfully: (1) falsifying or concealing a material fact; (2) making a false, fictitious, or fraudulent representation; or (3) making or using a document that contains a false, fictitious, or fraudulent representation.

“Unit” is defined to include: (1) all standing committees and their subcommittees; (2) all legislative committees created by statute and their subcommittees; (3) the Legislative Policy Committee and any special committee appointed by it; and (4) any other task force or committee appointed by the Legislative Policy Committee or the presiding officer of the House or Senate.

Current Law: There is no specific offense of making a false representation to a unit of the legislative branch. However, a similar restriction applicable to lobbyists was enacted by Chapter 631 of 2001. Under that provision, it is a violation of the ethics law for a lobbyist to knowingly make a statement of material fact relating to lobbying activity to an official or government employee that the lobbyist knows to be false. Violators are guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to maximum penalties of a fine of \$1,000 and/or imprisonment for one year (State Government Article, § 15-903).

State Revenues: General fund revenues could increase minimally as a result of the bill’s monetary penalty provision from cases heard in the District Court.

State Expenditures: General fund expenditures could increase minimally as a result of the bill’s incarceration penalty due to increased payments to counties for reimbursement of inmate costs and more people being committed to Division of Correction (DOC) facilities. The number of people convicted of this proposed crime is expected to be minimal.

Persons serving a sentence of one year or less in a jurisdiction other than Baltimore City are sentenced to a local detention facility. The State reimburses counties for part of their incarceration costs, on a per diem basis, after a person has served 90 days. State per diem reimbursements for fiscal 2003 are estimated to range from \$10 to \$61 per inmate depending upon the jurisdiction. Persons sentenced to such a term in Baltimore City are generally incarcerated in a DOC facility. Currently, the DOC average total cost per inmate, including overhead, is estimated at \$1,850 per month. This bill alone, however, should not create the need for additional beds, personnel, or facilities. The average variable cost of housing a new DOC inmate (food, medical care, etc.), excluding overhead, is \$300 per month.

Local Revenues: Revenues could increase minimally as a result of the bill’s monetary penalty provision from cases heard in the circuit courts.

Local Expenditures: Expenditures could increase as a result of the bill’s incarceration penalty. Counties pay the full cost of incarceration for the first 90 days of the sentence, plus part of the per diem cost after 90 days. Per diem operating costs of local detention facilities are expected to range from \$20 to \$84 per inmate in fiscal 2003.

Additional Information

Prior Introductions: Similar bills were introduced in 2000 and 2001. In 2001, SB 40 passed the Senate and was referred to the House Rules and Executive Nominations Committee with no further action taken on it. HB 873 was referred to the House Rules and Executive Nominations Committee and had no further action taken on it. In 2000, SB 294 was withdrawn and HB 88 received an unfavorable report from the Commerce and Government Matters Committee.

Cross File: None.

Information Source(s): Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Department of Legislative Services

Fiscal Note History: First Reader - January 15, 2002
lsc/cer

Analysis by: Guy G. Cherry

Direct Inquires to:
John Rixey, Coordinating Analyst
(410) 946-5510
(301) 970-5510