

MCPA-MSA SB 536 - Home Detention Monitoring - SUPP

Uploaded by: Samira Jackson

Position: FAV



Maryland Chiefs of Police Association

Maryland Sheriffs' Association



MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable William C. Smith, Jr., Chair and
Members of the Judicial Proceedings Committee

FROM: Darren Popkin, Executive Director, MCPA-MSA Joint Legislative Committee
Andrea Mansfield, Representative, MCPA-MSA Joint Legislative Committee
Samira Jackson, Representative, MCPA-MSA Joint Legislative Committee

DATE: February 19, 2026

RE: **SB 536 - Private Home Detention Monitoring Agencies - Notification of Violation**

POSITION: **SUPPORT**

The Maryland Chiefs of Police Association (MCPA) and the Maryland Sheriffs' Association (MSA) **SUPPORT SB 536**. This legislation makes a necessary and commonsense adjustment to current law governing notifications to law enforcement regarding home detention monitoring violations.

Under existing statute, law enforcement agencies are required to receive notice for virtually any violation of a home detention monitor, regardless of severity or whether the conduct presents any public safety concern. This can include minor or technical deviations such as a defendant going to the grocery store, seeking medical treatment at a hospital, or other non-emergency movements. These notifications do not serve a worthwhile purpose and instead create an unnecessary administrative burden on law enforcement agencies that have no actionable role in responding to routine monitoring violations.

Importantly, law enforcement does not have independent authority to intervene or take enforcement action based solely on these generic notifications. The court is the only entity empowered to determine whether a violation warrants further consequences, including the issuance of an arrest warrant. Without such a warrant, law enforcement cannot step in absent an emergency circumstance, which would require police response regardless of whether the notification statute exists. As a result, these mandated notices consume time and resources through review, cataloging, and documentation, without any meaningful end goal or ability to act.

SB 536 ensures that law enforcement resources remain focused on situations where action is appropriate and authorized, while preserving the court's proper role in determining when violations rise to the level requiring enforcement intervention. For these reasons, MCPA and MSA **SUPPORT SB 536** and urge a **FAVORABLE** committee report.

sb536.pdf

Uploaded by: Will Vormelker

Position: UNF

HON. STACY A. MAYER
CIRCUIT COURT
JUDGE
BALTIMORE COUNTY
CHAIR

HON. RICHARD SANDY
CIRCUIT COURT
JUDGE
FREDERICK COUNTY
VICE-CHAIR



KELLEY O'CONNOR
ASSISTANT STATE COURT
ADMINISTRATOR
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS
AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
P: (410) 260-1560

SUZANNE PELZ, ESQ.
SNR. GOVT. RELATIONS AND
PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICER
P: (410)260-1523

MARYLAND JUDICIAL COUNCIL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee
FROM: Legislative Committee
Suzanne D. Pelz, Esq.
410-260-1523
RE: Senate Bill 536
Private Home Detention Monitoring Agencies – Notification of
Violation
DATE: February 11, 2026
(2/19)
POSITION: Oppose

The Judiciary opposes Senate Bill 536.

The Judiciary supported Chapter 893 from 2024 which altered notification requirements for private home detention monitoring agencies (PHDMAs) when monitored individuals violate certain conditions of pretrial release or probation. This legislation was important, as it clearly defined the scope and timing of the notifications to be most effective, and ensured that the court and law enforcement would be notified of all violations.

This bill removes the notification to law enforcement from the PHDMAs for violations of conditions of home detention monitoring and provides only notification to the court for those violations. Removing the requirement for private home detention agencies to notify law enforcement of court ordered home detention violations, even minor violations, risks weakening accountability and delaying critical responses necessary for public safety. The Judiciary depends on these notifications to law enforcement to foster collaboration and maintain a balanced approach to compliance and enforcement. Eliminating this safeguard could undermine public confidence and reduce deterrence for individuals under

supervision. The Justice Reinvestment Act Oversight Board is currently examining this issue and will offer collaborative, well-informed recommendations in future legislative sessions to ensure both efficiency and public safety are preserved.

cc. Hon. William Folden
Judicial Council
Legislative Committee
Kelley O'Connor