



1212 New York Ave. N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
202-525-5717

*Free Markets. Real Solutions.*  
[www.rstreet.org](http://www.rstreet.org)

Testimony from:

Jesse Kelley, Government Affairs Manager, Criminal Justice & Civil Liberties, R Street Institute  
Emily Mooney, Policy Fellow, Criminal Justice & Civil Liberties, R Street Institute

In opposition to Senate Bill No. 248, “AN ACT concerning Juvenile Law – Jurisdiction – Attempted Carjacking and Attempted Armed Carjacking.”

February 5, 2020

Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee

My name is Jesse Kelley, and I am the government affairs manager for Criminal Justice policy at the R Street Institute, which is a nonprofit, center-right public policy research organization. Our mission is to engage in policy research and outreach to promote free markets and limited, effective government. As part of this mission, our Criminal Justice and Civil Liberties team focuses on evaluating policies related to criminal justice and the juvenile justice systems as well as ways of effectively reintegrating the formerly incarcerated into society. Therefore, SB 248 is of special interest to us.

By adding attempted carjacking and attempted armed carjacking to the list of crimes for which a child may be waived out of the juvenile system and placed in the adult system, SB 248 is at risk of undermining rather than promoting public safety.

While we acknowledge that serious offenses committed by young people can have significant consequences for victims and that the state has the duty to ensure accountability on their behalf, the state must also address its special responsibilities to protect young people by avoiding permanent harm to their development and their future.

These principles are reflected in the objectives laid out in the Maryland code regarding children in the justice system. The juvenile justice system is tasked with balancing “public safety and the protection of the community; accountability for the child to the victim and the community for offense committed; and competency and character development to assist children in becoming

responsible and productive members of society.”<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, SB 248 fails to strike that balance.

Primarily, youth charged as adults generally have less access to developmentally appropriate programming and services that promote rehabilitation when compared to youth who are detained in the juvenile justice system. For example, youth in Maryland’s juvenile detention centers still receive a standard week’s worth of education and are able to continue being served by juvenile justice services until age 21.<sup>2</sup> These are services that youth do not receive in the adult system.

Additionally, the relatively low number of youth in the adult system means that incarcerated youth are more likely to be isolated and, in some cases, placed in solitary confinement in order to comply with “sight and sound” separation requirements under federal law.<sup>3</sup> At the same time, when this separation does not occur, youth are at a high risk of sexual victimization.<sup>4</sup> This is the epitome of being placed between a rock and a hard place. The solution is clear: Place youth in the juvenile justice system, where they are more likely to benefit from an increased focus on building strong, pro-social family connections and individualized services—both of which contribute to decreased future delinquency.

Finally, youth in the adult system are saddled with an adult criminal record, which carries lasting penalties for employment, housing and education.<sup>5</sup> This can further impede their ability to rejoin society and can serve as the impetus for future criminal activity as opportunities for productive activities are restricted. Indeed, research suggests that youth transferred to the

---

<sup>1</sup> MD. Code Article Courts and Judicial Proceedings Section 3-8A-02.  
[http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2020RS/Statute\\_Web/gcj/3-8A-02.pdf](http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2020RS/Statute_Web/gcj/3-8A-02.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Youth held in the DOC-run Youth Detention Center are able to regularly access education. See, e.g., “More Baltimore youths charged as adults being sent to juvenile jails.” <https://cnsmaryland.org/2017/10/13/more-baltimore-youths-charged-as-adults-being-sent-to-juvenile-jails/>; Rachel Leber, “The Long-Awaited Baltimore City Youth Detention Center Opens its Doors,” *CorrectionalNews.com*, Oct. 2, 2017. <http://correctionalnews.com/2017/10/02/long-awaited-baltimore-city-youth-detention-center-open-doors>.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., “Youthful Inmate Implementation,” National PREA Resource Center, 2019.  
<https://www.prearesourcecenter.org/training-technical-assistance/prea-in-action/youthful-inmate-implementation>.

<sup>4</sup> “National Prison Rape Elimination Commission Report,” National Prison Rape Elimination Commission, June 2009, pp. 69-71. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdf-files1/226680.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Devah Pager, “The Mark of a Criminal Record,” *American Journal of Sociology* 108:5 (2003), pp. 937-75. [https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/pager/files/pager\\_ajs.pdf](https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/pager/files/pager_ajs.pdf); Devah Pager et al., “Sequencing Disadvantage: Barriers to Employment Facing Young Black and White Men with Criminal Records,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 623:1 (2009), pp. 195-213. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3583356>; Douglas Evans and Jeremy Porter, “Criminal history and landlord rental decisions: a New York quasi-experimental study,” *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 11:1 (2015), pp. 23-26, 35-40. [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jeremy\\_Porter2/publication/276838489\\_Criminal\\_history\\_and\\_landlord\\_rental\\_decisions\\_a\\_New\\_York\\_quasi-experimental\\_study/](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jeremy_Porter2/publication/276838489_Criminal_history_and_landlord_rental_decisions_a_New_York_quasi-experimental_study/)

adult system are, at best, no less likely to return to crime in the future and, at worst, may be more likely to commit crime than if they had remained in the juvenile justice system.<sup>6</sup>

Put simply, for those who are concerned with the prevalence of youth carjackings in areas such as Baltimore and throughout the state, changing this penalty will do little to promote safety in the long term. Indeed, by separating youth from the system that is better-equipped to serve their needs, it might actually lead them to commit more crime. This fails Maryland's goals of both competency and character development, not to mention its mandate to keep the community safe.

Certainly, children who commit violent acts may have different risk factors and need different, lengthier interventions than those who commit minor offenses. We believe that the best practice in these circumstances would be to allow juvenile court judges attuned to the individual circumstances and facts of each case to decide whether or not to waive youth into the adult system. SB 248 takes this power and discretion away from juvenile court judges and prosecutors and places it in the hands of legislators by creating a new automatic waiver of youth into the adult system.

Judges in Maryland have repeatedly sent youth automatically charged as adults for crimes such as carjacking and robbery back to the youth system. In fiscal year 2019 alone, more than 300 youth were transferred back to the youth system, with carjacking being one of the more common offenses among transferred youth.<sup>7</sup> If attempted carjacking and attempted armed carjacking are added to the list of crimes for which youth are automatically charged as adults, we can expect this trend to continue.

In the meantime, youth automatically charged as adults will spend an average of 108 days in youth detention centers (if eligible to be held there) while awaiting their transfer hearing.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, on the average day in FY 2019, over 100 youth charged as adults were held in juvenile detention facilities while awaiting transfer hearings.

Some legislators may want to place youth in the adult system simply because they feel a maximum sentence of several years in the juvenile system for an attempted armed carjacking

---

<sup>6</sup> Steven Zane et al., "Juvenile Transfer and the Specific Deterrence Hypothesis," *Criminology and Public Policy* 15:3 (August 2016), pp. 901-25. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1745-9133.12222>; Jason Ziedenberg, "You're an Adult Now: Youth in Adult Criminal Justice Systems," National Institute of Corrections, December 2011, p. 5. <http://biblioteca.cejamerica.org/bitstream/handle/2015/5434/025555.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.

<sup>7</sup> Maryland Department of Juvenile Services, "Data Resource Guide: Fiscal Year 2019," 2019, p. 116-117. [https://djs.maryland.gov/Documents/DRG/Data\\_Resource\\_Guide\\_FY2019\\_.pdf](https://djs.maryland.gov/Documents/DRG/Data_Resource_Guide_FY2019_.pdf).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 117.

(for example, a youth who is 17 when a carjacking occurs and could remain under juvenile jurisdiction until 21 at most) may not seem retributive enough. But those of us who care about conservative principles must balance this notion of retribution with principles of limited, effective government and subsidiarity. Long sentences in the adult system aren't more effective and may actually be worse for youth and public safety outcomes.

Ultimately, nearly all justice-involved youth will return to their communities, and the justice system needs to equip them with the skills they need to successfully reenter society. The R Street Institute believes that by allowing juvenile defendants to begin their case in the juvenile justice system, policymakers will best promote the youth justice system's aims to the overall benefit of public safety, court actors and society.

Thank you for your time.

Jesse Kelley, Esq.  
R Street Institute  
jkelly@rstreet.org

Emily Mooney  
R Street Institute  
emooney@rstreet.org