

JEN TERRASA
Legislative District 13
Howard County

Environment and Transportation
Committee

House Chair

Joint Committee on Children,
Youth, and Families



Annapolis Office
The Maryland House of Delegates
6 Bladen Street, Room 217
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
410-841-3246 · 301-858-3246
800-492-7122 Ext. 3246
Jen.Terrasa@house.state.md.us

THE MARYLAND HOUSE OF DELEGATES
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

February 7, 2023

To: The Honorable Luke Clippinger
Chair, Judiciary Committee

From: Delegate Jen Terrasa
District 13, Howard County

Re: Sponsor Testimony in Support of HB336: Courts - Expert Witnesses -
Letter of Exception

Dear Chairman Clippinger, Vice Chair Moon, and Members of the Judiciary Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to once again present HB336, which clarifies the ability of forensic experts, testifying for defendants, to provide analysis of lab results in criminal proceedings.

Your committee voted favorably on this legislation last year and it passed the House. It got through the Senate by being amended into another bill on Sine Die, but unfortunately ran out of time to cross the finish line.

The Problem:

Because of a series of regulations and departmental guidance stemming from Health General § 17-2A-04, criminal defendants are being denied the right to a fair trial because they are unable to question the results of the state forensic lab, and in some cases are unable to have expert witnesses testify at trial.

Background:

Maryland law provides for the licensing of forensic labs by Maryland Department of Health (MDH). Health General § 17-2A-04 (“a forensic laboratory shall hold a license issued by the Secretary before the forensic laboratory may offer or perform forensic analysis in the State.”) An unlicensed lab may be granted a letter of exception by the Secretary of MDH to perform limited forensic analysis if it “[m]eets the exception requirements in regulations adopted by the Secretary.”

MDH through its Office of Health Care Quality (OHCQ) has interpreted this law to include the regulation of individuals who perform forensic analyses. Based on this, MDH promulgated regulations that require that individuals who perform forensic analysis, but are not affiliated with a licensed laboratory, must obtain a Letter of Permit Exception from the OHCQ in a specific discipline. Not only is such a letter required for an individual to enter a state lab and perform original forensic analysis, but MDH also requires a Letter of Permit Exception for individuals who are reviewing results or conclusions of an original analysis. COMAR 10.51.01.03.54:

“Letter of permit exception means a letter granting limited authority to an individual not associated with a public or commercial laboratory, **who reviews results or conclusions of the original forensic analysis performed by a licensed forensic laboratory solely for the purpose of assessing the original opinion, interpretation, or conclusion of the licensed forensic laboratory.**” (emphasis added)

This essentially means those who work for the state lab can perform analyses on forensic evidence, while those who do not work for a state lab must seek a Letter of Permit Exception to even just review the work of someone who works for the state lab. So, a forensic expert would need to go to the state to get permission to question work performed by the state. Thus, creating a problem for defendants seeking to have an expert review analyses performed by the state lab in preparation for trial.

However, this problem goes even further. Some trial courts have interpreted the regulations to mean that in order to testify as a forensic expert witness in court on behalf of a defendant, the expert has to obtain a Letter of Permit Exception. In other words, these judges are interpreting the law and regulations to mean that whether an expert has a Letter of Permit Exception is a threshold question. Rather than follow the Daubert standard for admissibility of experts and scientific evidence which, as you probably know, makes the trial judge the gatekeeper who determines whether an expert's evidence is deemed reputable and relevant, some judges feel their hands are tied and they cannot move forward in deciding if the witnesses is qualified from their perspective.

This may, in part, stem from a 2012, OQHC letter which stated, “Failure to obtain a Letter of Permit Exception may effect the criminal courts’ decision when considering the admission of forensic expert’s opinions, interpretations and conclusions.”

The bottom line is that MDH should not have control over whether or not an expert can testify against them. It might make sense for the Department to have a say in who comes into their labs and does original forensic analyses on items in MDH custody and control. It has an interest in and an obligation to protect those items. However, it does not have a legitimate interest, and in fact, has a conflict of interest with respect to whether the defendants’ experts can review and question their conclusions. It, therefore, does not make sense to require defendants’ experts to have to request permission from OQHC to review reports and to testify in court. Significantly, it is my understanding that these Letters of Permit Exception are rarely, if ever granted.

Ultimately, the effect of the current law and set of regulations is that there are no individual chemists currently permitted to review drug test data from crime labs in the state of MD. Therefore, no one may independently challenge the drug evidence presented against them in court. Should a criminal defendant wish to seek outside expertise from a qualified individual (e.g. chemistry professors from Johns Hopkins, UMD, other universities in the state, or consultants from many of the world-class STEM contracting and consulting companies in the area) they will not be able to.

What HB336 Does:

HB336 fixes this simply by prohibiting the Court from requiring an MDH Letter of Exception for an individual to testify in a criminal proceeding who is reviewing the data, opinion, interpretation, or conclusion of another expert witness or forensic laboratory and is not handling any physical evidence.

Last year, the bill was originally drafted to prevent MDH from requiring this letter of exception for an expert who was merely reviewing a report. However, working with the State's Attorneys Association, we amended the bill to prohibit the Court from requiring this in order for a non-state lab affiliated expert to testify in Court. And then the State's Attorneys Association withdrew their opposition to the legislation.

I respectfully urge a favorable report.