

## STATE OF MARYLAND

CHARLTON T. HOWARD III  
State Prosecutor

SARAH R. DAVID  
Deputy State Prosecutor

ABIGAIL E. TICSE - MARY W. SETZER  
JOYCE K. McDONALD - BRITTANY DUNKLOW  
Senior Assistant State Prosecutors

STEPHANIE HADDAD  
Assistant State Prosecutor



## OFFICE OF THE STATE PROSECUTOR

40 W. Chesapeake Avenue  
Suite 300  
Towson, MD 21204  
Telephone (410) 321-4067  
1 (800) 695-4058  
Fax (410) 321-3851

### **RE: Support for HB 802, Maryland Office of the State Prosecutor**

Dear Madam Chair and Members of the Judiciary Committee:

We are writing to express the Office of the State Prosecutor's support for House Bill 802, Intercepted Communications – Penalties and Admissibility of Evidence, which would allow a judge to decide whether or not to admit recordings by one party if it would serve the interests of justice. This would allow the evidence to be used by victims who use recording as a mechanism to obtain evidence in situations where they are concerned for their safety and concerned about a power disparity between them and their attacker.

Under current Maryland law, any unconsented to recording would not be admissible in court for any reason, including impeachment. This means a person could testify that they never said words that were recorded by a victim, whether those words were threats, words that showed lack of consent, etc., and the recording would not be admissible as evidence to contradict the testimony. This bill would change that. The State should have every tool available to prosecute perpetrators of criminal behavior and allow victims the opportunity to present evidence of a crime against them.

### **The Office of the State Prosecutor**

The Office of the State Prosecutor is an independent agency within the Executive Branch of government. The Office is tasked with ensuring the honesty and integrity of state government and elections by conducting thorough, independent investigations and, when appropriate, prosecutions of criminal conduct affecting the integrity of our state and local government institutions, officials, employees and elections.

### **Exclusionary Rule**

Under current Maryland law, any person who intercepts and/or discloses communications without the consent of all parties in the recording is guilty of a felony and can be sentenced up to five years in prison. When the wiretap statute was drafted, the only entities that were envisioned to have the capacity to violate the statute were law enforcement or very sophisticated operational entities. But now, with the advent of personalized cell phones, recording a conversation without the knowledge of another party is literally just a click away, and can be used by nearly everyone, including victims of violent crimes.

Currently all illegal wiretaps, or recordings without the consent of both parties, are inadmissible in court. This bill would amend that exclusionary rule, so that a judge may decide to admit evidence obtained from a surreptitious recording if it met certain criteria, similar to provisions in Maryland law allowing the admission of certain hearsay evidence.

The language for this part of the bill, borrowed as noted from existing Maryland law, places the decision to admit such evidence in the hands of a judge, in the same way a judge would determine admissibility on a hearsay issue. The language for the bill mirrors that of Maryland's "residual hearsay" rule. Hearsay is defined as an out-of-court statement that is offered for its truth. Normally, hearsay is inadmissible in court. There are, however, a litany of exceptions. One exception, outlined in Rule 5-803(b)(24), directs judges to evaluate and admit evidence that does not fit into one of the enumerated hearsay exceptions, but which has equivalent guarantees of trustworthiness. The rationale for the language from the "residual hearsay" rule coincides with the interests of admitting illegal recordings because recordings are inherently more trustworthy and reliable than other forms of hearsay. While we want to continue to dissuade their general admissibility, we want to make sure there is a mechanism for them to be admitted in special contexts.

It is important to note that this bill does not allow for all recordings to automatically be admitted. Pursuant to the bill, the recording can only be admitted once a judge makes a determination based on a showing by the moving party that: (1) the evidence is offered as evidence of a material fact in the criminal proceeding; (2) the contents of the recording are more probative than other available evidence; (3) the interests of justice will be best served by the recording being entered into evidence; and (4) the recording must be disclosed to the opposing party sufficiently in advance of the trial date. And of course, all evidence, including recordings, are subject to the other rules of evidence.

This is an important step in ensuring recordings that reflect the truth in critical matters, including alleged sexual violence and domestic abuse, especially when potential power dynamics are at play, can be admitted. This is a time when actions and emotions are heightened, and a person's first line of defense is often to record an uncomfortable or threatening interaction on their cell phone. Right now, if a public official recorded a person threatening to blackmail them or hurt their family, the recording could not be used in a hearing for threatening or blackmailing that public official. If a woman is being sexually assaulted and records her own rape, her assailant can argue she consented even while she holds a recording showing she did not. If an elderly person's caretaker threatens and abuses them when they are alone in a medical facility and the elderly person records the interaction, it is not admissible in court for any reason. The examples are endless of how important these recordings are in achieving justice and discovering truth.

## **Conclusion**

The most significant impact of this bill would be to allow the ability to admit into evidence a victim's recording of a violent crime yet still dissuade individuals generally from engaging in illegal recordings of private communications.

To that end, we would encourage a favorable report from the Judiciary Committee on House Bill 802.

Sincerely,

Charlton T. Howard, III  
Maryland State Prosecutor