



J. CHARLES SMITH, III
STATE'S ATTORNEY

KIRSTEN N. BROWN
DEPUTY STATE'S ATTORNEY

STATE'S ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

County Courthouse
100 West Patrick Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701

www.statesattorney.us

CIRCUIT COURT DIVISION
301-600-1523

DISTRICT COURT DIVISION
301-600-2573

CHILD SUPPORT DIVISION
301-600-1538

JUVENILE DIVISION
301-600-2980

The Honorable William Smith & Members of the Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee
Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee
11 Bladen Street, Annapolis, MD 21401

Dear Chairperson Smith and Judicial Proceedings Committee,

The Frederick County State's Attorney's Office writes in support of Senate Bill 142: Marriage—Confidential Communication—Criminal Charge.

Currently, Maryland is one of only a *few* states that *does not* have an exception to the marital communications privilege for crimes committed against a spouse. In practice, this means that an offending spouse can *prohibit* their victim from testifying to apologies, acknowledgements, or other statements relevant to crimes they committed against their partner, even after the marriage is over, if the communication happened during the marriage.

In crimes such as marital rape and domestic assault, these communications are critical pieces of evidence of brutal crimes that most often occur behind closed doors--with no witnesses other than the perpetrator and victim. This was the exact issue in *State v. Enriquez*, 327. Md. 365 (1992). The Defendant was convicted of second-degree sexual offense against his wife. The Victim testified about the crime and testified that the Defendant apologized to her later—a critical piece of evidence. The Defendant argued that the apology--a marital communication--was inadmissible because it was statutorily privileged, while he maintained that the act was consensual.

The Courts ruled that the apology should have been excluded under § 9-105 of Courts and Judicial Proceedings, commenting: “. . . the legislature has taken no action to add any express exceptions to the statute. Since the legislature is presumed to know the law . . . and it did not amend the statute, we conclude that it intended that our interpretation of the statute . . . should obtain.” (internal citations omitted). His conviction was *reversed* and remanded. There has been no action by the Legislature on martial communications since *Enriquez*, and it is still good law in this State.

As said by the Frederick County DVCC, to continue to allow an offender to silence a victim and prohibit them from sharing their attacker's confessions and relevant communications to a judge or jury is unjust. A martial communications privilege without a crime exception is archaic and the privilege statute must be modernized to reflect the reality of martial violence.

We urge a favorable report on SB 142.


Chief, Domestic Violence Unit,

Frederick County State's Attorney's Office