

Department of Legislative Services  
Maryland General Assembly  
2022 Session

**FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE**  
**Third Reader - Revised**

Senate Bill 33

(Senator Lee)

Judicial Proceedings

Judiciary

---

**Criminal Law - Sexual Crimes - Fourth-Degree Sexual Offense and Spousal Defense**

---

This bill repeals an exemption from prosecution for specified sexual crimes if, at the time of the alleged rape or sexual offense, the person was the victim's legal spouse. The bill also establishes that for the purposes of § 3-308(b)(1) of the Criminal Law Article (sexual offense in the fourth degree), in the case of two individuals engaged in an ongoing consensual sexual relationship, "sexual contact" does not include physical contact commonly engaged in by two individuals in a sexual relationship, unless one of the individuals has reasonably indicated to the other that further physical contact is unwanted.

---

**Fiscal Summary**

**State Effect:** Minimal increase in general fund expenditures due to the bill's expanded application of existing penalty provisions. The bill does not materially affect State revenues.

**Local Effect:** Potential minimal decrease in local incarceration expenditures. Revenues are not materially affected.

**Small Business Effect:** None.

---

## Analysis

### Current Law:

#### *Spousal Exemption*

In general, a person may not be prosecuted under § 3-303 (rape in the first degree), § 3-304 (rape in the second degree), § 3-307 (sexual offense in the third degree), or § 3-308 (sexual offense in the fourth degree) of the Criminal Law Article for a crime against a victim who was the person's legal spouse at the time of the alleged rape or sexual offense.

However, a person may be prosecuted under § 3-303 (a) (rape in the first degree – in general), § 3-304 (a)(1) (rape in the second degree – vaginal intercourse or sexual act with another by force or threat of force without the consent of the other), or § 3-307 (a)(1) (sexual offense in the third degree – engaging in nonconsensual sexual contact while meeting other specified criteria related to weapons, infliction of serious physical injury, threats, and being aided or abetted by another) if:

- at the time of the alleged crime, the person and the person's legal spouse have lived apart, without cohabitation and without interruption (1) under a written separation agreement executed by the person and the spouse or (2) for at least three months immediately before the alleged rape or sexual offense; or
- the person, in committing the crime, uses force or threat of force and the act is without the consent of the spouse.

A person may be prosecuted for the commission of first-degree rape, second-degree rape, third-degree sexual offense, or fourth-degree sexual offense against the person's legal spouse if at the time of the alleged crime the person and the spouse lived apart, without cohabitation and without interruption, under a decree of limited divorce.

The applicable penalties for the sexual crimes mentioned above are:

- § 3-303 (rape in the first degree): felony, imprisonment not exceeding life (imprisonment for life without the possibility of parole applies to violations involving a child younger than age 16 and subsequent offenders);
- § 3-304 (rape in the second degree): felony, imprisonment for up to 20 years;
- § 3-307 (sexual offense in the third degree): felony, imprisonment for up to 10 years; and
- § 3-308 (sexual offense in the fourth degree): misdemeanor, imprisonment for up to 1 year and/or \$1,000 maximum fine (3 years and/or \$1,000 for subsequent offenders).

### *Definition of Sexual Contact*

Under § 3-301 of the Criminal Law Article, “sexual contact,” as used in §§ 3-307, 3-308, and 3-314 (sexual conduct between a correctional employee and an inmate, *etc.*) of the Criminal Law Article means an intentional touching of the victim’s or actor’s genital, anal, or other intimate area for sexual arousal or gratification, or for the abuse of other party. ”Sexual contact” does not include (1) a common expression of familial or friendly affection or (2) an act for an accepted medical purpose.

### *Section 3-308(b)(1) of the Criminal Law Article*

Section 3-308(b)(1) of the Criminal Law Article prohibits a person from engaging in “sexual contact” with another without the consent of the other.

**State/Local Fiscal Effect:** Repeal of the spousal exemption is likely to result in an increase in prosecutions for specified sexual offenses; the bill’s “sexual contact” provisions may reduce the number of fourth-degree sexual offense cases.

Information is not available on the number of cases that were not prosecuted as a result of the spousal exemption provisions repealed by the bill and the number of cases that would no longer be considered fourth-degree sexual offenses due to the bill’s “sexual contact” provisions. However, given the penalties for the offenses to which the spousal exemption applies and the likely circumstances in which the spousal exemption applies, and assuming that the bill’s provisions apply to a small number of cases, this analysis assumes that the overall effect of the bill is a (1) minimal increase in State general fund incarceration expenditures from the repeal of the spousal exemption and (2) a potential minimal decrease in local incarceration expenditures from the bill’s “sexual contact” provisions. While fourth-degree sexual offense carries a monetary penalty, the bill is not expected to materially affect State or local revenues.

Persons serving a sentence longer than 18 months are incarcerated in State correctional facilities. Currently, the average total cost per inmate, including overhead, is estimated at \$4,700 per month. Persons serving a sentence of one year or less in a jurisdiction other than Baltimore City are sentenced to local detention facilities. For persons sentenced to a term of between 12 and 18 months, the sentencing judge has the discretion to order that the sentence be served at a local facility or a State correctional facility. The State provides assistance to the counties for locally sentenced inmates and for (1) inmates who are sentenced to and awaiting transfer to the State correctional system; (2) sentenced inmates confined in a local detention center between 12 and 18 months; and (3) inmates who have been sentenced to the custody of the State but are confined in or who receive reentry or other prerelease programming and services from a local facility.

The State does not pay for pretrial detention time in a local correctional facility. Persons sentenced in Baltimore City are generally incarcerated in State correctional facilities. The Baltimore Pretrial Complex, a State-operated facility, is used primarily for pretrial detentions.

Counties pay the full cost of incarceration for people in their facilities for the first 12 months of the sentence. Per diem operating costs of local detention facilities have ranged from approximately \$90 to \$300 per inmate in recent years.

The Office of the Public Defender (OPD) advises that the bill increases agency caseloads and that it may need to hire additional staff to manage its caseloads. However, OPD provided no information on the bill's anticipated effect on the agency's caseloads and noted that it cannot calculate the bill's impact on its expenditures. The Department of Legislative Services advises that the bill is unlikely to generate enough additional cases to warrant the hiring of additional staff.

The Maryland State's Attorneys' Association advises that the bill has no fiscal or operational effect on prosecutors.

---

### **Additional Information**

**Prior Introductions:** SB 250 of 2021, as amended and passed by the Senate, passed the House with amendments. A conference committee was appointed, but no further action was taken. Its cross file, HB 147, a similar bill, passed the House and was referred to the Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee, but no further action was taken. HB 590 of 2020, a similar bill, passed the House and was referred to the Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee, but no further action was taken. Its cross file, SB 230, received a hearing in the Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee, but no further action was taken. HB 958 of 2019, a similar bill, received a hearing in the House Judiciary Committee, but no further action was taken.

**Designated Cross File:** HB 153 (Delegate Crutchfield) - Judiciary.

**Information Source(s):** Baltimore City; Caroline, Montgomery, and Prince George's counties; Maryland State Commission on Criminal Sentencing Policy; Judiciary (Administrative Office of the Courts); Office of the Public Defender; Maryland State's Attorneys' Association; Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services; Department of Legislative Services

**Fiscal Note History:** First Reader - January 20, 2022  
fnu2/aad Third Reader - March 21, 2022  
Revised - Amendment(s) - March 21, 2022

---

Analysis by: Amber R. Gundlach

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