

Department of Legislative Services  
Maryland General Assembly  
2016 Session

FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE  
First Reader

House Bill 754  
Judiciary

(Delegates Carter and Glenn)

---

**Law Enforcement Officers - Disciplinary Actions - Written Policy**

---

This bill requires that, under the Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights (LEOBR), by January 1, 2017, each law enforcement agency must adopt a written policy and procedure to govern disciplinary actions that may be taken against a law enforcement officer in that agency. Each written policy must include a listing and description of potential violations and the mandatory and discretionary disciplinary action options for each potential violation. A law enforcement officer must be disciplined in accordance with the written policy and procedure of the law enforcement agency unless the hearing board or law enforcement agency states in detail the reasons for any departure from the written policy and procedure. A law enforcement agency that takes disciplinary action against a law enforcement officer in accordance with the bill's provisions must post a monthly summary of disciplinary actions on the Internet.

---

**Fiscal Summary**

**State Effect:** While the bill may cause some operational impacts for some State law enforcement agencies, its requirements can be handled with existing budgeted resources. Most State law enforcement agencies currently have written policies in some form.

**Local Effect:** While the bill may cause some operational impacts for some local law enforcement agencies, its requirements can be handled with existing budgeted resources. Most local law enforcement agencies currently have written policies in some form.

**Small Business Effect:** None.

---

## Analysis

**Current Law:** LEOBR was enacted in 1974 to guarantee police officers specified procedural safeguards in any investigation that could lead to disciplinary action. It extends to police officers of 26 specified State and local agencies. It does not grant collective bargaining rights. The investigation or interrogation by a law enforcement agency of a law enforcement officer for a reason that may lead to disciplinary action, demotion, or dismissal must be conducted in accordance with LEOBR.

The investigating officer or interrogating officer must be a sworn law enforcement officer or, if requested by the Governor, the Attorney General or a designee of the Attorney General. A complaint against a law enforcement officer alleging brutality in the execution of the officer's duties may not be investigated unless the complaint is sworn to, before an official authorized to administer oaths, by (1) the aggrieved individual; (2) a member of the aggrieved individual's immediate family; (3) an individual with firsthand knowledge obtained because the individual was present at and observed the alleged incident; or (4) if the alleged incident involves a minor child, the parent or guardian of the child.

Unless a complaint is filed within 90 days after the alleged brutality, an investigation that may lead to disciplinary action for brutality may not be initiated and an action may not be taken. The law enforcement officer under investigation must be informed of the name, rank, and command of the law enforcement officer in charge of the investigation, the interrogating officer, and each individual present during an interrogation. Before an interrogation, the law enforcement officer under investigation must be informed in writing of the nature of the investigation. If the officer is under arrest, or is likely to be placed under arrest as a result of the interrogation, the officer must be informed completely of all of the officer's rights before the interrogation begins.

Unless the seriousness of the investigation is of a degree that an immediate interrogation is required, the interrogation must be conducted at a reasonable hour, preferably when the officer is on duty. The interrogation is required to take place (1) at the office of the command of the investigating officer or at the office of the local precinct or police unit in which the incident allegedly occurred, as designated by the investigating officer or (2) at another reasonable and appropriate place. The officer under investigation may waive the right to have the interrogation take place at the office of the command of the investigating officer or at the office of the local precinct or police unit in which the incident allegedly occurred, as designated by the investigating officer.

All questions directed to the officer under interrogation must be asked by and through one interrogating officer during any one session of interrogation. This requirement must be consistent with a requirement that each interrogation session be for a reasonable period, allowing for personal necessities and rest periods as reasonably necessary.

The officer under interrogation may not be threatened with transfer, dismissal, or disciplinary action. On request, the officer under interrogation has the right to be represented by counsel or another responsible representative of the law enforcement officer's choice who must be present and available for consultation at all times during the interrogation. The interrogation must be suspended for a period of up to 10 days until representation is obtained. Within that 10-day period, the chief for good cause shown may extend the period for obtaining representation. The officer may waive this right to counsel. During the interrogation, the officer's counsel or representative may (1) request a recess at any time to consult with the officer; (2) object to any question posed; and (3) state on the record outside the presence of the law enforcement officer the reason for the objection.

A complete record must be kept of the entire interrogation, including all recess periods, of the law enforcement officer. The record may be written, taped, or transcribed. Upon completion of the investigation, and on request of the officer under investigation or the officer's counsel or representative, a copy of the record of the interrogation must be made available at least 10 days before a hearing.

The law enforcement agency may order the officer under investigation to submit to blood alcohol tests, blood, breath, or urine tests for controlled dangerous substances, polygraph examinations, or interrogations that specifically relate to the subject matter of the investigation. If the law enforcement agency orders the officer to submit to a test, examination, or interrogation, and the officer refuses to do so, the agency may commence an action that may lead to a punitive measure as a result of the refusal. If the law enforcement agency orders the officer to submit to a test, examination, or interrogation, the results are not admissible or discoverable in a criminal proceeding against the law enforcement officer.

If the law enforcement agency orders the officer to submit to a polygraph examination, the results of the examination may not be used as evidence in an administrative hearing unless the agency and the officer agree to the admission of the results. The officer's counsel or representative need not be present during the actual administration of a polygraph examination by a certified polygraph examiner if (1) the questions to be asked are reviewed with the law enforcement officer or the counsel or representative before the administration of the examination; (2) the counsel or representative is allowed to observe the administration of the examination; and (3) a copy of the final report of the examination by the examiner is made available to the officer or the counsel or representative within a reasonable time, up to 10 days, after completion of the examination.

Upon completion of an investigation and at least 10 days before a hearing, the officer under investigation must be (1) notified of the name of each witness and of each charge and specification against the officer and (2) provided with a copy of the investigatory file and any exculpatory information, if the law enforcement officer and the law enforcement

officer's representative agree to execute a confidentiality agreement with the law enforcement agency not to disclose any material contained in the investigatory file and exculpatory information for any purpose other than to defend the law enforcement officer and pay a reasonable charge for the cost of reproducing the material.

The law enforcement agency may exclude from the exculpatory information provided to a law enforcement officer (1) the identity of confidential sources; (2) nonexculpatory information; and (3) recommendations as to charges, disposition, or punishment. The agency may not insert adverse material into a file of the officer, except the file of the internal investigation or the intelligence division, unless the officer has an opportunity to review, sign, receive a copy of, and comment in writing on the adverse material. The law enforcement officer may waive this right.

When a LEOBR investigation or interrogation results in a recommendation of demotion, dismissal, transfer, loss of pay, reassignment, or similar action that is considered punitive, the law enforcement officer is entitled to a hearing on the issues prior to the imposition of the disciplinary action. An officer who has been convicted of a felony is not entitled to a hearing.

Evidence with probative value that is commonly accepted by reasonable and prudent individuals in the conduct of their affairs is admissible and must be given probative effect. The hearing board must give effect to the rules of privilege recognized by law and must exclude incompetent, irrelevant, immaterial, and unduly repetitious evidence. Each record or document that a party desires to use must be offered and made a part of the record. Documentary evidence may be received in the form of copies or excerpts, or by incorporation by reference.

The hearing board process is bifurcated. First, the board meets to determine guilt. If the officer is found guilty of the charges, a second hearing is held to determine the level of discipline. The decision of the hearing board as to finding of fact and any penalty is final if (1) a chief is an eyewitness to the incident or (2) a law enforcement agency or the agency's superior governmental authority has agreed with an exclusive collective bargaining representative that the decision is final. The decision of the hearing board may then be appealed. Within 30 days after receipt of the recommendations of the hearing board, the chief must review the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the hearing board and issue a final order. The final order may be appealed.

On written request, a law enforcement officer may have expunged from any file the record of a formal complaint under specified conditions.

If a law enforcement officer is charged with a felony, the chief may impose an emergency suspension of police powers without pay. A law enforcement officer who is suspended is entitled to a prompt hearing.

A law enforcement officer who is denied a right granted by LEOBR may apply to the circuit court of the county where the law enforcement officer is regularly employed for an order that directs the law enforcement agency to show cause why the right should not be granted. The officer may apply for the show cause order (1) either individually or through the officer's certified or recognized employee organization and (2) at any time prior to the beginning of a hearing by the hearing board. Chapter 165 of 2014 shifted primary responsibility for remedying investigative violations under LEOBR from the administrative hearing officer to the circuit court.

**Background:** Reports from across the nation on the use of excessive force by police officers against members of the public (some of which have been videotaped and seen publicly) have received much attention from news and social media outlets over the past year. Escalated tensions have spurred numerous protests and riots in the months since the deaths of African American men in Missouri, New York, and Baltimore City. Confrontations between law enforcement officers and citizens (some videotaped) have brought additional scrutiny to how allegations of excessive force by police officers are handled by State and local law enforcement.

When a complaint against a police officer is sustained by an internal investigation, LEOBR entitles the officer to a hearing before a board of sworn officers selected by the chief. (For minor offenses, the board may be a single officer.) Police agencies and officers may enter into collective bargaining agreements that allow an alternate method of forming the hearing board.

Citizen activists have long criticized internal reviews of law enforcement officer behavior in the State as ineffective, since citizens, at least in part due to the restrictions set forth in LEOBR, are only authorized to review cases after the law enforcement agency has already completed its own internal probe and rendered a decision on the merits of the charge as well as appropriate punishment, if any. The general charge is that these proceedings are invariably stacked in a police department's favor and against residents who lodge complaints.

**State Expenditures:** Several State agencies indicate that while the bill may have an operational impact and increase the workload of existing staff, the bill's requirements can be handled with existing resources.

The Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS) advises that it is currently in the process of developing a disciplinary matrix designed to list and describe

all potential violations and recommended penalties that will be used to provide disciplinary sanctions in a fair and consistent manner. However, DPSCS advises that it needs to hire one human resources staff person to review, compile, copy, and release disciplinary action information pursuant to the bill's requirements. The Department of Legislative Services disagrees and advises that DPSCS can likely implement the bill with existing budgeted resources.

---

### **Additional Information**

**Prior Introductions:** HB 731 of 2015 received an unfavorable report from the House Judiciary Committee. HB 1095 of 2013 received a hearing in the House Judiciary Committee but was subsequently withdrawn.

**Cross File:** None.

**Information Source(s):** Charles, Frederick, and Montgomery counties; cities of Frederick and Havre de Grace; Comptroller's Office; University System of Maryland; Department of General Services; Department of Natural Resources; Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services; Department of State Police; Maryland Department of Transportation; Department of Legislative Services

**Fiscal Note History:** First Reader - February 19, 2016  
md/lgc

---

Analysis by: Shirleen M. E. Pilgrim

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