

Department of Legislative Services
Maryland General Assembly
2004 Session

FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE

Senate Bill 718 (Senators Forehand and Jimeno)
Judicial Proceedings

Evidence - Separate Act of Sexual Misconduct Involving a Minor - Admissibility

This bill allows evidence of prior acts of sexual misconduct involving a minor to be admitted into evidence in the trial of a defendant charged with an act of sexual misconduct involving a minor, if the court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant committed the separate act and certain other conditions are met.

Fiscal Summary

State Effect: None. The bill is not expected to result in new prosecutions and thus is not expected to have a significant impact on the District Court's workload or finances.

Local Effect: None. The bill is not expected to result in new prosecutions and thus is not expected to have a significant impact on the circuit courts' workload or finances.

Small Business Effect: None.

Analysis

Bill Summary: The State's Attorney must disclose the evidence sought to be admitted to the defendant at least 15 days prior to trial, unless the court makes an exception for good cause. The evidence may not be referred to in a statement to a jury or introduced in a trial unless the court has held a closed hearing and found it to be admissible.

"Act of sexual misconduct involving a minor" means sexual abuse of a minor and any other sexual offense in which the victim is a minor, including first and second degree rape; a first, second, third, or fourth degree sexual offense; attempted first or second degree rape or an attempted first or second degree sexual offense; sexual conduct

between a correctional or Department of Juvenile Justice employee and an inmate or confined child; continuing course of conduct with a child; unnatural or perverted sexual practice; sodomy; and incest.

Current Law: The Maryland Rules generally follow the Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE). Maryland Rule 5-404(b), which is identical to FRE 404(b), excludes from trial evidence of a defendant's prior crimes, wrongs, or acts, where this evidence is offered to show action that conforms to these prior actions. Such evidence is admissible only for the limited purpose of showing motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, common scheme or plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident.

Background: The common law "propensity rule," which dates back to the seventeenth century, prohibits the use of character evidence to show a person's propensity to act in accordance with their character traits or prior acts. Its proponents reason that the rule is necessary to ensure that a defendant receives a fair trial because, if the evidence is admitted, juries may overvalue the probative force of the prior conduct or may punish for a prior act rather than for the charged crime. There is substantial support in Maryland case law for the propensity rule. See, e.g., *Behrel v. State*, 151 Md.App. 64 (2003); *Weiland v. State*, 101 Md. App. 1 (1994); *Acuna v. Maryland*, 332 Md. 65 (1993).

This bill is based on FRE 413 and 414, which were included in the federal Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. Rule 413 admits evidence of similar crimes in sexual assault cases, while Rule 414 covers child molestation actions.

Additional Information

Prior Introductions: None.

Cross File: HB 401 (Delegate Menes, *et al.*) – Judiciary.

Information Source(s): State's Attorneys' Association, Judiciary (Administrative Office of the Courts), Department of Legislative Services

Fiscal Note History: First Reader - February 16, 2004
ncs/jr

Analysis by: Rita A. Reimer

Direct Inquiries to:
(410) 946-5510
(301) 970-5510

