Approved 3-22-91
Date

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Judiciary.

The meeting was called to order by Representative John M. Solbach at
Chairperson

3:30 ~~a.m.~~/p.m. on February 14, 19 91 in room 519-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Representatives Douville, Gomez and Everhart who were excused

Committee staff present:

Jerry Donaldson, Legislative Research
Jill Wolters, Office of Revisor of Statutes
Gloria Leonhard, Secretary to the Committee

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Nancy Lindberg, representing the Attorney General's office
Representative Walter Hendrix
Jim Clark, Kansas County and District Attorney's Association
Representative Mark Parkinson
Paul Morrison, Johnson County District Attorney
Pat Lawless, representing the Appellate Defender's office

The Chairman called the meeting to order and called for bill requests.

Representative Heinemann requested legislation which would amend the code of civil procedure to allow the permissive joinder of parties in certain situations.

Representative Heineman made a motion that the proposed legislation be introduced. Representative Snowbarger seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Nancy Lindberg appeared representing the Attorney General's office and requested legislation regarding victim's rights, including (1) drunk driver sanctions, (2) vehicle forfeitures for habitual convicted drunk drivers (3) corrections-three issues a requirement of (a) victim's impact statement (b) notice of plea bargains to victims (c) victim's statement to the judge allowing the victim to talk to the judge in person prior to sentencing if the victim so desires.

Representative Allen made a motion that the proposed bills be introduced. Representative Snowbarger seconded the motion. The motion carried.

A committee member suggested including a 3-time conviction for DUI as a Class D Felony in the proposed legislation if not already included.

The Chairman called for hearing on HB's 2117, conditions of probation or suspended sentence and HB 2185, redefining probation and the conditions thereof.

Representative Walter Hendrix appeared in support of HB 2117. Representative Hendrix said the County Attorney of Franklin County and the local district court judge requested the bill; that HB 2117 makes detention in the county jail a condition of probation. (See Attachment # 1).

Representative Smith made motion that HB 2117 be passed. Representative Everhart seconded the motion.

Before a committee vote was taken, other conferees appeared.

Jim Clark, Kansas County and District Attorney's Association, appeared in support of HB 2117. (See Attachment # 2). Mr. Clark pointed out there is another similar bill by members of the Judiciary Committee and another in the Senate; that he urges the resolution, because the legislation is needed.

A committee member asked if this is permissive, that it allows this to be a condition not requires it to be a condition. Mr. Clark affirmed.

Unless specifically noted, the individual remarks recorded herein have not been transcribed verbatim. Individual remarks as reported herein have not been submitted to the individuals appearing before the committee for editing or corrections.

Pat Lawless, representing the Appellate Defender's Office, appeared to address several problems in connection with HB's 2117 and 2185. (See Attachment # 3).

A committee member asked if Mr. Lawless would recommend amending K.S.A. 21-4603 in lieu of K.S.A. 21-4602 as required in HB 2117.

Mr. Lawless said he would prefer the use of Senate Bill 183.

A committee member asked what would be more desirable for a misdemeanor where a person is put into the county jail and the maximum sentence is now a year; would 120 days maximum be appropriate.

Mr. Lawless said he would have no problem with 120 days; that a problem under the current statutory scheme is that someone just put under probation could actually serve longer in a jail cell than someone run through DOC.

Representative Hochhauser, a sponsor of HB 2185, appeared to testify in support of the bill. (See Attachment # 4.) Representative Hochhauser said she believes it would be appropriate to amend the bill to include a time limitation in the bill in the way it presently drawn.

A committee member asked if the incarceration is allowed to occur in the county jail, (1) Would they be under the control of the state parole officer of probation officer under the county? (2) If "parole" is violated or probation are we allowed to bring them into the system under DOC, CB or county community probation language?
Also on Page 1, Line 28 (4) of HB 2185, why is the court given authority normally held by the parole board?

Pat Lawless, Appellate Defender's Office commented that the practice is not widely used state-wide; that an interesting question arises if the practice is adopted and the definition in the bill is passed, can the district judge alter the condition of the probation and send the person back to jail for two or three months?

A committee member asked if the concept of SB 183 is cleaner. Mr. Lawless said probation should mean traditional probation throughout the statues.
A committee member asked if an amendment would be desirable allowing the judge an option of county jail up to 60 days beginning at the first term of probation and if he doesn't meet the terms of his probation then put him under the Department of Corrections. Mr. Lawless said he would see no problem with that approach.

A committee member asked Mr. Paul Morrison, D.A., Johnson County, if a suspended sentence approach rather than a probation approach would be desirable. Mr. Morrison said he would prefer the probation approach. A committee member noted the possibility of a judge having the right to incarcerate without ever having reached the point of sentencing which might cause a constitutional problem.

A committee member said when a suspended sentence is used, a sentence is given but the imposition of the sentence is suspended.

Representative Smith withdrew his original motion with the consent of his second.

A committee member said he believes it would be advisable to incorporate Senate Bill 183 into House Bill 2117, but that some specifics in SB 183 need to be addressed, e.g., how long a judge could impose confinement; that if a year is approved, coordination will be needed on whether or not the state should share cost with counties; that studies on shock incarcerations show they should be short.

Representative Heinemann made a motion to incorporate provisions of Senate Bill 183 into House Bill 2117. Representative Carmody seconded the motion.

A committee member requested that more time be allowed for consideration of amendments.

Representative Heinemann withdrew his motion with the consent of his second.

The hearings on House Bill 2117 and 2185 were closed.

The Chairman called for hearing on House Bill 2105, drug forfeiture money in special prosecutor's trust fund also spent on drug prevention programs in counties.

Paul Morrison, District Attorney, Johnson County Kansas, appeared to testify in favor of HB 2105. (See Attachment # 5).

A committee member asked if there is a problem with the county taking the money and using it for drug programs outside of the District Attorney's office. Mr. Morrison said in some counties of the state there might be a problem between the District Attorney or County Attorney and the Commission and for that reason--because it is prosecutors office proceeds, they should say the funds can go toward drug prevention; that the proposed amendment is good.

Jim Clark, Kansas County and District Attorney's Association, appeared and distributed balloon bill (Attachment # 6) with suggestions for amending HB 2105.
A committee member asked how common it is for DA offices and County Attorneys' offices to develop, implement and maintain drug prevention programs. Mr. Clark said it is not common at this time due to lack of resources and time but it is a trend; that in most places DA's are recognized as community leaders and activities by community leaders are recognized in the drug prevention area and drug education area; that HB 2105 gives funding for that.

A committee member asked if small offices would be mandated to have a program. Mr. Clark said he believes it is discretionary.

A committee member noted that in the final analysis the County Commissioners will have the control. Mr. Clark said he believes most Commissions will go along with the wishes of the DA or County Attorney; that the authority for the programs is the bill's intent, that it broadens a discretionary usage for the money.

A committee member noted it would not preclude the County Commission from developing their own program; that it would have to be developed by the prosecuting attorney only.

A committee member referred to Lines 37, 38, and 39 of the balloon bill and noted the fourth priority being listed in an awkward place in the language.

A committee member asked if there would be a problem with multi-county distribution. Mr. Clark said they could probably share a program but the actual expenditure of funds would have to be done by an individual prosecutor, that the counties couldn't come across county lines; that this is a county oriented trust fund; that an inter-local agreement might be used.

Representative Parkinson, sponsor of HB 2105, distributed written testimony in support of the bill. (See Attachment # 7.)

Representative Vancrum made a motion that HB 2105, be amended as per Mr. Clark's balloon bill. Representative Smith seconded the motion.

A committee member suggested changing the format of the bill. Revisor's staff made suggestions.

A committee member suggested adding the words "designee" following attorney in Line 34.

Representative Parkinson, sponsor of the bill, said he does not believe the bill precludes the fee arrangement between the county prosecuting attorney and law enforcement agency being discretionary so that a prosecuting attorney could decline the funds if that attorney could not administer a program.

Mr. Morrison, Johnson County District Attorney, noted that HB 2105 grants some options, that the intent is not to put additional burdens on anybody; that the check by the County Commission is needed; that the modification is requested to allow counties to best use the money as approved by the Commission; that the bill should not be construed to be a mandate on any county or district attorney.

A committee member asked why the original language leaves open who gets to develop, maintain and implement the programs, but now the amendment limits it to county or district attorneys.

Mr. Morrison noted that there is a danger in the language of the original bill in cases where the County Commission and prosecuting attorney are at odds; that the Commission could take the funds and use them for their programs; that there is no check and balance in the original language.

The Chairman called for a vote on the motion to amend House Bill 2105 as amended. The motion carried.
Representative Smith made a motion to pass House Bill 2105 as amended. Representative Snowbarger seconded the motion.

A committee member noted language would be clearer, if format were changed by Staff.

Representative Snowbarger withdrew his second and made a substitute motion that the bill be further amended by changing format to further clarify. Representative Smith seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Representative Smith made a motion that HB 2105 be passed as amended. Representative Snowbarger seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The Chairman called for action on HB 2102, child support through high school.

Staff briefly reviewed conferee's concerns with the bill, noting SRS had recomemnded changing the word "may" to "shall" on Page 1, Line 37. Also, on Page 3, Line 26, change "may" to "shall"; also, the "June 1" date, in the definition of a school year, be changed to "June 30".

Representative Sebelius made a motion to change "may" to "shall" as proposed. Representative Hochhauser seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Representative Macy made a motion to change the June 1 date to June 30, as proposed. Representative Garner seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Representative Vancrum made a motion that a technical amendment be inserted on Page 3, Line 24 which would change "high school" to "full time" and make the bill conform throughout. Representative Carmody seconded the motion. The motion failed.

Representative Smith made a motion that HB 2102 be passed as amended. Representative Lawrence seconded the motion.

Committee discussion followed.

Committee members noted the bill treats children of divorced marriages different than intact marriages; that there is a trend of creating more rights for children of divorced parents than for children of married parents and HB 2105 is one more bill in that direction.

A committee member said the bill might encourage a child to drop out of school at age 16 and return at age 18, or might encourage a parent to hold the child back a year in school.

The motion carried with Representative Snowbarger being recorded as voting "No".

The Chairman called for consideration of the minutes of the meetings of January 29, 30, and 31, 1991.

Representative Smith made a motion that the minutes be approved as submitted. Representative Macy seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 PM; the next meeting is scheduled for February 18, 1991, at 3:30 P.M. in room 313-S.

GUEST LIST

COMMITTEE: HOUSE JUDICIARY DATE: 2/14/91

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)	ADDRESS	COMPANY/ORGANIZATION
Lt. Bill Jacobs	Topeka	KHP
Pat Lawless	Topeka	Appellate Defender
Paul Shelby	Topeka	OJA
Laura Doole	Topeka	City of Topeka

STATE OF KANSAS

WALKER HENDRIX
REPRESENTATIVE, 10TH DISTRICT
FRANKLIN COUNTY
121 W. 3RD
P.O. BOX 787
OTTAWA, KANSAS 66067
(913) 242-8568

TOPEKA

HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
MEMBER: ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
LEGISLATIVE, JUDICIAL AND
CONGRESSIONAL APPORTIONMENT
LOCAL GOVERNMENT
PENSIONS, INVESTMENTS AND BENEFITS

This act is intended as a legislative reaction to the decision of the Kansas Supreme Court's holding in State v. Walbridge, no. 64,127 decided January 18, 1991. Although noting that it has been a common practice in the past, the Court held in Walbridge that courts may not require that defendants serve time in the county jail as a condition of a felony probation. The Court did state that requiring jail time as a probation condition could be appropriate and beneficial, and virtually invited the legislature to amend the statutes to permit continuation of the practice.

Since many district court judges believe in imposing "shock time" as a condition of probation from a felony conviction, enactment of this legislation will help prevent prison overcrowding and save the state money. Those judges who believe in requiring "shock time" now find in felony cases that the only permissible "shock time" is available through the Department of Corrections. Even if the judge imposes a sentence of incarceration which it later modifies by allowing probation, the "shock time" spent with the Department of Corrections is accompanied by an unnecessary, but expensive, evaluation at the state reception and diagnostic center.

With the current overcrowded prison conditions and the resultant increasing emphasis on probation and community-based corrections, it is clear that the courts of this state should have a local incarceration option available to them for use in appropriate felony cases in which probation is granted.

H/JUD
2-14-91
attachment #1

OFFICERS

Rod Symmonds, President
James Flory, Vice-President
Randy Hendershot, Sec.-Treasurer
Terry Gross, Past President

DIRECTORS

Wade Dixon
Nola Foulston
John Gillett
Dennis Jones

Kansas County & District Attorneys Association

827 S. Topeka Ave., 2nd Floor • Topeka, Kansas 66612
(913) 357-6351 • FAX # (913) 357-6352
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR • JAMES W. CLARK, CAE

Testimony in Support of

HOUSE BILL 2117

The Kansas County and District Attorneys Association appears in support of House Bill 2117, which simply allows courts to continue sentencing convicted felons to incarceration in the county jail as a condition of probation. The legislation is necessary because of the recent decision of the Kansas Supreme Court in State v. Walbridge, No. 64,127 (January 18, 1991). In that case, the Supreme Court reverses both the trial court and the Court of Appeals and construes confinement in the county jail as imprisonment and as such is prohibited by the definition of "probation" in K.S.A. 21-4602(3). The Court of Appeals had held that the language of K.S.A. 21-4610, as construed by prior decisions, gave the trial court broad powers to impose conditions of probation, which could include jail time. The Supreme Court recognizes that while its previous decisions may have implied that jail may be required as a condition of probation, and that the practice has been used in Kansas for many years, it had never given specific authorization or condonation of it. The Court also recognizes that jail may well have a beneficial effect on some defendants, however, "it is for the legislature to provide for such a procedure and not the courts."

While defendant Walbridge may have won the battle he (and those concerned about prison overcrowding) has most likely lost the war. The Supreme Court quotes extensively from the trial judge during the sentencing proceeding:

> "Gilbert Walbridge, Jr.... was pummeled in a manner that this court can find inconceivable. Not only that, you couldn't bother to do it yourself, you had to get a couple of buddies to help you beat your son to a pulp. There is nothing in God's world that can justify what you did to this child."

The Supreme Court declines to simply continue the probation without the jail time, but remands "for the trial court to determine whether this defendant, who brutally participated in the beating of his young son, should be placed on probation given the limitation imposed by this opinion."

HJUD
2-14-91
attachment #2

will serve eight months with D.O.C. before he is paroled with good time credit under K.S.A. 22-3725. This same defendant, if granted a one year term of "probation" in the county jail will be incarcerated four months longer than if he had not been granted "probation" and had been sent to D.O.C.

Under this bill a trial court that is dissatisfied with minimum sentences can simply circumvent parole eligibility factors by imposing a term of probation in the county jail which will be longer than the time he would be required to serve in D.O.C.

The practice of incarcerating a defendant for a short period of time to shock him or to give him a feel for what prison would be like is a beneficial practice. The best way to accomplish this is to amend K.S.A. 21-4603 so that this practice would be an authorized disposition. This could be done by suspending sentence and ordering a term of confinement in the county jail under K.S.A. 21-4603(2)(d). Senate Bill 183 appears to take this approach somewhat. Another possible approach would be to amend K.S.A. 21-4603 so that a trial court could order the defendant to serve a term of confinement much like the provision for assigning defendants to community corrections, conservation camps and house arrest programs. This approach would accomplish the goal of incarcerating the defendant and yet would call the practice exactly what it is - incarceration. A defendant sitting in a county jail is simply not on probation. He is simply incarcerated in the county jail.

It is also important to place some limit on the term of confinement. The period of confinement should correspond in some way to the provisions for good time credit. This will ensure that a defendant on "probation" will not be confined longer than his counterpart confined with D.O.C. It should also be noted that any therapeutic value from such a practice is lost when the confinement becomes long-term. Long periods of incarcertation will undoubtedly pose a financial burden on counties.

The logic and goals behind House Bill 2117 are sound. Some defendants will undoubtedly benefit from a short term stay in the county jail. However, tinkering with the definition of probation is not the best way to accomplish this. Incarceration in the county jail simply is incarceration in the county jail. It is not probation. The amending of K.S.A. 21-4603 to make this an authorized disposition will squarely address this issue, will call the practice exactly what it is, and will minimize potential problems and appeals.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Patrick Lawless, Jr.
Assistant Appellate Defender

HJUD
2-14-91

attach. # 2-2

STATE OF KANSAS

APPELLATE DEFENDER

Chief Appellate Defender
Jessica R. Kunen
Deputy Appellate Defender
Steven R. Zinn

Tel. 913-296-5484
1031 Kansas Ave.
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1326

Kansas Appellate Practice
Clinic
University of Kansas
School of Law
Green Hall
Lawrence, Kansas 66045-2380
(913) 864-4384

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE CONCERNING HOUSE BILLS 2117 & 2185 ON FEBRUARY 14, 1991.

At the outset it is important to note that I support a procedure whereby a sentencing court may order a convicted felon to serve a period of incarceration in order to give him a feel for what prison would be like. However, House Bill 2117 has a few problems that I feel must be addressed.

It is important that probation continue to mean a release from traditional incarceration. Under House Bill 2117, probation can mean anything from a release from custody to incarceration for several years. It is also important that probation continue to mean a release from traditional incarceration for other reasons.

It is very critical that both the state and the defendant know that probation will or will not include imprisonment when the two work out a plea agreement. Under this bill the state could agree not to oppose probation and then request a period of "probation" in the county jail. Any ambiguity concerning what probation means will most certainly result in fewer plea agreements. There would be little incentive for a defendant to plead to an E felony, where with good time credits, he would serve eight months with D.O.C. if he received a minimum sentence upon conviction, as opposed to plea whereby there was a high likelyhood of probation, but where probation could mean serving a longer term in the county jail. More D and E felonies simply would go to trial.

K.S.A. 21-4606a provides for a presumptive sentence of probation for certain D and E felonies. House Bill 2117 will enable sentencing courts to circumvent the statute by granting "probation" and then requiring confinement for up to five years in the county jail. Also under K.S.A. 21-4603(5) a sentencing court could ignore a recommendation for probation by SRDC by simply granting "probation" for a term in the county jail thereby effectively ignoring the requirement for modification.

Under this bill on D and E felonies, a sentencing court could grant probation and then order confinement in the county jail for a term of up to five years. This is because under K.S.A. 21-4611 a period of probation is limited to five years.

The current statutory scheme does not provide for good time credit for time served "on probation" in the county jail. Thus a defendant who receives a 1-5 sentence and who is denied probation

H-JUD
2-14-91
Attachment #3

STATE OF KANSAS

SHEILA HOCHHAUSER
REPRESENTATIVE, 66TH DISTRICT
1636 LEAVENWORTH
MANHATTAN, KANSAS 66502
(913) 539-6177 HOME
(913) 296-7657 TOPEKA OFFICE

TOPEKA

HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS
MEMBER: APPROPRIATIONS
JUDICIARY
LEGISLATIVE EDUCATIONAL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
RULES AND JOURNAL

February 14, 1991

TESTIMONY OF REP. SHEILA HOCHHAUSER
HOUSE BILL 2185
HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Judiciary Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to testify in favor of HB 2185.

Rep. Glasscock and I introduced HB2185 at the request of one of the judges in the 21st Judicial District, the Honorable Paul E. Miller. Judge Miller was responding to the Kansas Supreme Court's recent opinion in State v. Walbridge, which precludes a district judge from ordering confinement in a county jail as a condition of probation.

The Court's opinion is based on the language of K.S.A. 21-4602 (3) which currently defines probation as a procedure under which a defendant is released without imprisonment. The Court recognized that a term of confinement as a condition of probation may "have a substantial rehabilitative effect in certain cases." It further stated that "it is for the legislature to provide for such a procedure and not the courts."

HB 2185 would provide such a procedure merely by amending the definition of probation so as not to preclude imprisonment as condition of probation.

I would be pleased to answer questions.

H JUD
2-14-91
attachment #4

STATE OF KANSAS
Tenth Judicial District

OFFICE OF DISTRICT ATTORNEY

PAUL J. MORRISON
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

JOHNSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE
P.O. BOX 728, 6TH FLOOR TOWER
OLATHE, KANSAS 66061
913-782-5000, EXT. 5333

TO: MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

RE: HOUSE BILL NUMBER 2105

DATE: FEBRUARY 14, 1991

Good afternoon. I am here today to testify in favor of Representative Parkinson's amendment to 65-4173, which relates to the use of the prosecutor's share of forfeited drug proceeds. As I am sure you are aware, the current legislation requires that a trust fund for this money be set up and be overseen by the county commission. However, an amendment in the 1990 legislative session limited prosecutor's use of those funds to expenses incurred in forfeiture proceedings. I believe the legislature amended the law last year to prohibit the use of "slush funds" and/or salary enhancement by prosecutors. Obviously, I am in complete agreement with that thinking.

However, I believe there are other legitimate, structured uses for the prosecutor's share of drug forfeiture proceeds. This amendment allows for one of those uses. Drug prevention programs for youth. Over the years the Johnson County D.A.'s Office has used a substantial portion of its share of forfeited drug proceeds to help fund the start-up costs of programs, including the DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) program which is aimed at sixth graders. This money has been significant in helping spread this program throughout our county. Obviously, it has been done with the acquiescence of the county commission.

However, since July 1, 1990, we have been unable to use newly forfeited monies for this purpose. Frankly, I believe the legislation should be changed to allow this other worthy use of these funds. Thank you.

H JUD
2-14-91
attachment #5

Suggestions for Amending HB 2105, proposed by the Kansas County & District Attorneys Association

HJUD
2-14-91
Attachment #6

a Session of 1991

HOUSE BILL No. 2105

By Representative Parkinson

2-1

AN ACT concerning controlled substances; relating to forfeiture of property and moneys; concerning the expenditure of such property and moneys by the counties; amending K.S.A. 1990 Supp. 65-4173 and repealing the existing section.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:

Section 1. K.S.A. 1990 Supp. 65-4173 is hereby amended to read as follows: 65-4173. The proceeds of any sale pursuant to K.S.A. ~~1989~~ *1990* Supp. 65-4172, and amendments thereto, and any moneys forfeited pursuant to K.S.A. ~~1989~~ *1990* Supp. 65-4171, and amendments thereto, shall be applied: first, to payment of the balance due on any lien preserved by the court in the forfeiture proceedings; second, to payment of the cost incurred by the seizing agency in connection with the storage, maintenance, security and forfeiture of the property; third, to payment of the costs incurred by the county or district attorney or attorney for the law enforcement agency approved by the county and district attorney to which the property is forfeited, including reasonable attorney fees, but not to exceed 10% of the total proceeds. Any proceeds of any sale applied to the payment of reasonable attorney fees pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the county treasury and credited to the special prosecutor's trust fund in the county treasury. Moneys in the special prosecutor's trust fund in the county treasury shall be expended only upon appropriation to the county or district attorney's office, by the board of county commissioners, to aid the county or district attorney in proceedings against property sought to be forfeited pursuant to K.S.A. 65-4135 or 65-4156, and amendments thereto, ~~and~~ *to develop, implement, ~~and~~ or maintain drug prevention programs in the ~~county~~* and shall not be considered a source of revenue to meet normal operating expenditures including salary enhancement; and fourth, to payment of costs incurred by the court. The remaining proceeds or moneys shall be disposed of as follows: (a) If the law enforcement agency to which the property is forfeited is the Kansas bureau of investigation or the Kansas highway patrol, the entire amount shall be deposited in the state treasury and credited to the Kansas bureau of investigation and Kansas highway patrol special asset forfeiture

or for the county or district attorney
or enforcement
jurisdiction

clean up

OVERVIEW OF HOUSE BILL 2105

House Bill 2105 is a proposed alteration to a portion of the Kansas forfeiture law. It amends K.S.A. 65-4173, which is the statute that controls what law enforcement agencies and prosecutors can do with money and property seized as a result of enforcement efforts. It usually relates to money and property gained from drug cases.

Current law provides that when property is seized the money gained from its sale is first applied to pay off any liens on the property. The next priority for payment is for costs to the seizing agency for any storage expense. The third use of the funds is to pay the prosecuting attorney office a fee, not to exceed 10% of the money gained from the seizure. Finally, the remainder goes to the seizing agency. Frequently there is a significant remainder and prosecuting attorneys and law enforcement agencies have benefited.

The problem with current law is that prosecutors are too restricted in how they can use these funds. Currently they can only use them for costs, and costs in these actions are not very much. The result is that some prosecuting attorneys have these funds accumulating, they would like to put the funds to good use, but the law prevents that from taking place.

House Bill 2105 corrects this problem by allowing prosecutors more discretion in the use of the funds. In addition to costs, the money could be used to develop, implement, or maintain drug education programs. At the same time, the Bill contains an important safeguard against frivolous use of the money. The county governing body must approve any expenditure.

HJUD
2-14-91
attachment #7

This Bill is needed to allow important drug education programs to continue. Jim Clark and Paul Morrison are here today to discuss these programs and the importance of this Bill.

HJUD
2-14-97
Attachment #7-2