

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. DOES THE BILL:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 1. Reduce government? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Lower taxes? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Expand individual freedom? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Increase personal responsibility? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Empower families? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

For any principle that received a "no" above, please explain:

B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Currently, officers who are the subject of internal investigations are allowed access to the complaint against them and copies of witness statements immediately prior to the investigative interview. The officer's legal counsel or other representative are also allowed access to these statements. Public employees, including law enforcement officers, are currently required to answer questions during an investigative interview by their agency or face discipline. The U.S. Supreme Court case of *Garrity v. State* excludes such compelled information from being considered in a criminal setting.¹ If the officer is facing criminal charges, investigators must notify the officer of that fact and read them their Miranda Warnings. If the officer does not waive his Miranda rights, the Internal Affairs investigators usually cease the administrative interview and allow the criminal case to run its course. If, on the other hand, the officer waives his rights, the internal investigation interview may proceed. It is a common practice, however, to avoid such *Garrity* issues altogether by simply delaying the internal investigative interview pending the outcome of probable criminal prosecution.

HB 431 would require that all identifiable witnesses be interviewed prior to the interview of the accused officer. This change would allow the officer to be made aware of all statements by all identified witnesses before being required to testify in an interview of an internal investigation against him. Nothing in this bill prevents investigators from going back and re-interviewing the officer, any witnesses, or the complainant. This bill does remove some of the discretionary authority of agency investigators on when to interview the accused officer, however.

C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1: Amends S. 112.533 (2)(a) relating to law enforcement officer complaint interviews.

Section 2: Provides an effective date.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

None

2. Expenditures:

¹ *Garrity v. New Jersey*, 385 U.S. 493 (1967)

None

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

None

2. Expenditures:

None

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

There does not appear to be any fiscal impact to this bill.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

None

2. Other:

None

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None

IV. AMENDMENTS/COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

A strike all amendment was adopted by the Criminal Justice subcommittee that placed the language of the bill into a new subsection of the statute.

A second amendment was adopted by the Criminal Justice subcommittee that added the language, "whenever possible" to the part of the bill requiring all witnesses to be interviewed prior to the investigative interview of the officer. This removes the absolute language that was previously in the bill which would have prevented an officer from ever being interviewed if a known witness was unavailable for whatever reason.