



**Testimony for the House Judiciary Committee
February 9, 2021**

YANET AMANUEL
PUBLIC POLICY ADVOCATE

**HB 120- Public Information Act - Personnel Records- Investigations
of Law Enforcement Officers (Anton's Law)**

Favorable

AMERICAN CIVIL
LIBERTIES UNION
OF MARYLAND

3600 CLIPPER MILL ROAD
SUITE 350
BALTIMORE, MD 21211
T/410-889-8555
or 240-274-5295
F/410-366-7838

WWW.ACLU-MD.ORG

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS
JOHN HENDERSON
PRESIDENT

DANA VICKERS SHELLEY
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

ANDREW FREEMAN
GENERAL COUNSEL

The ACLU of Maryland supports HB 120, which would change the Maryland Public Information Act to ensure that members of the public who lodge complaints against law enforcement are not categorically barred from learning how the agency investigated their complaint. The legislation is necessary because the Court of Appeals concluded in *Md. Dep't of State Police v. Dashiell*, 443 Md. 435 (2015) that records of internal investigations into alleged police misconduct are “personnel records” which cannot be released under the Maryland Public Information Act (MPIA). Md. Code, Gen. Prov. § 4-311(a).

Under the 2016 reform to the Law Enforcement Officers’ Bill of Rights, complainants are now entitled to learn the disposition of the complaint and the discipline imposed, if any. While that was a progressive step in the right direction, it is far from adequate, especially for complainants whose allegations are found un-sustained and have no way of knowing whether the department conducted a meaningful and diligent investigation into the alleged wrongdoing.

Statutory background

The MPIA begins with a legislative declaration,

“[a]ll persons are entitled to have access to information about the affairs of government and the official acts of public officials and employees. To carry out the right [of access] . . . , unless an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy of a person in interest would result, this Act shall be construed in favor of permitting inspection of a public record.” Md. Code, Gen. Prov. § 4-103.

The general presumption of disclosure is withdrawn for specific categories of records or information, some of which *must be* withheld or redacted, and some of which *may be*, but are not required to be, redacted. “Personnel records,” which are not defined in the statute, are among the category of records that must not be disclosed.

As a result of the Court of Appeals decision, all records of police investigations into alleged misconduct or citizen complaints are prohibited from disclosure,

drawing a veil of secrecy around the one of the most important issues our society, and especially communities of color, face today. As the MPIA itself recognizes, transparency in government is essential to trust in government. And that wisdom is particularly true in the context of law enforcement, as the police wield unique power in their authority to initiate criminal investigations, detain, search, arrest, and use force.

Case Background (*Md. Dep't of State Police v. Dashiell*)

In 2009, Maryland State Police Sergeant John Maiello telephoned Ms. Taleta Dashiell, a potential witness in a case he was investigating. When she didn't answer her phone, Sgt. Maiello left a message identifying himself and asking her to call back. He then continued speaking, thinking he had hung up, in an apparent conversation with another State Trooper, disparaging Ms. Dashiell as "some God dang n***ger. His statements were recorded on Ms. Dashiell's voice mail.

Understandably distraught at the message, Ms. Dashiell swore out an official complaint against Sgt. Maiello. It took no small amount of courage for her to do so, as a young African American who lives in a county with a long history of racial violence and oppression. Several months later, the MSP sent Ms. Dashiell a letter telling her that the department had sustained her complaint and taken "appropriate" action.

Ms. Dashiell, however, wanted to know more than mere platitudes from the MSP about how it had handled her case. She wanted to see if the complaint had been sustained only because the Trooper's words were captured on tape. She wanted to know if the investigation accounted for the fact that a trooper used slurs freely in conversation with other troopers. And she wanted to know what action had been taken. In short, she wanted to know whether the MSP had taken her complaint seriously. So, she requested the documents relating to her complaint under Maryland Public Information Act ("MPIA"). The MSP refused to provide *any* information, claiming that *all* of the records about their investigation and discipline of the officer were confidential, including her own statement to investigators. In June, 2015, the Maryland Court of Appeals upheld the refusal to provide records, concluding that records of police investigations into alleged officer misconduct were "personnel records" and therefore could not be disclosed under the Maryland Public Information Act.

The result of *Dashiell*

The Court of Appeals' decision in *Dashiell* case adopted the categorical position that the public may never see for itself how government agencies police one of their own, even in instances of substantiated, official, on-the-job misconduct—even misconduct that is not itself secret because it is *directly involves* members of the public.

Take these examples, among many other possibilities:

- An internal local law enforcement agency investigation concludes that an officer fabricated evidence to obtain a criminal conviction;

- An internal state agency investigation determines that an agency official improperly steered agency contracts to a favored contractor;
- An internal county agency investigation concludes that an agency supervisor was engaging in a pattern and practice of sexually harassing subordinate female employees; or
- Or the case in *Dashiell* itself: an internal investigation finds that a public official directed racial epithets at a potential witness in a criminal investigation.

Because of *Dashiell*, in each and every one of these cases, the public never gets to see what the government employee's agency did to investigate the matter.

And the *Dashiell* opinion has already metastasized in other ways. In July, 2015, a Baltimore Circuit Court judge kicked a Baltimore Sun reporter out of the courtroom during a murder trial because the court was going to be hearing testimony about findings of misconduct against one of the officers who was going to testify. The judge relied explicitly on the *Dashiell* decision as a basis for concluding that the information could not be discussed in open court.¹

Department of Justice Investigation of the Baltimore City Police Department

In its investigation of the Baltimore City Police Department, the Department of Justice recognized,

“The [MPIA] further limits BPD’s transparency to the public [...]. We heard from numerous sources that *this provision has repeatedly blocked attempts to access information* about the resolution of complaints and other issues of public concern related to BPD’s policing activities.”²

In one of several egregious examples, the DOJ uncovered a complainant, who alleged that two BPD officers fondled her when conducting a search and called her a “junkie, whore b*tch.” The woman’s complaint went uninvestigated for so long that by the time the investigator contacted the first witness, the complainant had died. As a result, that complaint was found not sustained.³ Under our current law, the public would only learn that the complaint was unsustained; not that the department’s own failure to investigate is the reason for the outcome.

¹ J. Fenton, “Judge says state secrecy on police records extends to courtroom,” Baltimore Sun, July 25, 2015. <http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/maryland/investigations/bs-md-ci-judge-ruling-police-misconduct-20150725-story.html>

² U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, Investigation of the Baltimore Police Department (Aug. 10, 2016).

³ U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, Investigation of the Baltimore Police Department (Aug. 10, 2016).

Conclusion

As a result of the *Dashiell* decision, no one outside of law enforcement, or any other government agency, has a right to see how the agency investigates, or fails to adequately investigate, allegations of misconduct. By flouting the public's interest in obtaining assurance that official misconduct is properly addressed, this level of official secrecy profoundly undermines the public's trust in law enforcement, and government in general, that must exist for government to function effectively. "Trust us" is simply not an adequate response.

This bill restores the necessary balance by rejecting the categorical denial of access to such records and information. It provides access to basic information about the most important functions of government, namely addressing abuses of power while preserving the legitimate privacy and other interests of law enforcement officers.

For the foregoing reasons, the ACLU of Maryland supports HB 120.

