

**CAROLYN A. QUATTROCKI**  
*Chief Deputy Attorney General*

**LEONARD J. HOWIE III**  
*Deputy Attorney General*

**CARRIE J. WILLIAMS**  
*Deputy Attorney General*

**ZENITA WICKHAM HURLEY**  
*Chief, Equity, Policy, and Engagement*



**STATE OF MARYLAND**  
**OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL**

**ANTHONY G. BROWN**  
*Attorney General*

**PETER V. BERNS**  
*General Counsel*

**CHRISTIAN E. BARRERA**  
*Chief Operating Officer*

February 6, 2025

**TO:** The Honorable Luke Clippinger  
Chair, Judiciary Committee

**FROM:** Adam Spangler  
Legislative Aide, Legislative Affairs, Office of the Attorney General

**RE:** House Bill 293 – Criminal Procedure - Child Victims - Testimony in Child Abuse Cases– **Favorable**

---

The Office of the Attorney General urges the Judiciary Committee to give **House Bill 293** - Criminal Procedure - Child Victims - Testimony in Child Abuse Cases a favorable report.

Courtroom testimony, including speaking about abuse in front of one’s abuser, can be traumatizing for any victim-survivor, especially for a child. **House Bill 293** creates a rebuttable presumption that a child victim under the age of 13 shall be taken outside of court, unless there is “clear and convincing evidence” that the testimony “will not result in the child victim suffering severe emotional distress.” **House Bill 293** properly balances the defendant’s right to confrontation with the technological advances that allow for physical distance between the victim-survivor and the defendant.

Ordinarily, witnesses in criminal cases, including victims, must appear in-person on the witness stand in order to fulfill the constitutional obligation that a criminal defendant be “confronted” by the witnesses against them. However, under Section 11-303 of the Criminal Procedure Article, in the case of a victim in a case of child abuse or sexual abuse of a minor, a judge may permit the victim to remain outside of the courtroom, and have their testimony live-streamed in the courtroom via CCTV, if the judge determines that the child being physically in the courtroom will cause the child to “suffer such emotional distress that the child cannot reasonably communicate.”

An earlier version of § 11-303 of the Criminal Procedure Article was upheld, against a challenge that it violated defendants’ constitutional right to confrontation, in *Maryland v. Craig*,

497 U.S. 836 (1990). In *Craig*, the U.S. Supreme Court held: “if the State makes an adequate showing of necessity, the state interest in protecting child witnesses from the trauma of testifying in a child abuse case is sufficiently important to justify the use of a special procedure that permits a child witness in such cases to testify at trial against a defendant in the absence of face-to-face confrontation with the defendant.” Id. at 855.

The Office of the Attorney General would like to alert the Committee, however, that by alleviating the State’s burden to make an “adequate showing of necessity”, as required in *Craig*, **House Bill 293** could invite a constitutional challenge in a criminal appeal.

For the foregoing reasons, the Office of the Attorney General urges the Committee to vote favorably on **House Bill 293**.

CC: The Honorable Delegate Jesse T. Pippy  
Judiciary Committee Members