

**STORAGE NAME:** h0389s1z.cp  
**DATE:** June 14, 1999

**\*\*FINAL ACTION\*\***  
**\*\*SEE FINAL ACTION STATUS SECTION\*\***

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE ON  
CRIME AND PUNISHMENT  
FINAL ANALYSIS**

**BILL #:** CS/HB 389 (Passed as CS/SB 748)

**RELATING TO:** Pretrial Detention

**SPONSOR(S):** Committee on Judiciary, Rep. Cantens & others

**COMPANION BILL(S):** SB 748(c)

**ORIGINATING COMMITTEE(S)/COMMITTEE(S) OF REFERENCE:**

- (1) CRIME AND PUNISHMENT YEAS 7 NAYS 0
- (2) JUDICIARY YEAS 9 NAYS 0
- (3) CRIMINAL JUSTICE APPROPRIATIONS
- (4)
- (5)

---

I. FINAL ACTION STATUS:

CS/SB 748 was vetoed by the Governor on June 5, 1999. The veto message strongly approved of the original bill, however, approval of the bill was withheld because of a last minute amendment which provided that public funds may not be used to subsidize release of persons charged with violent offenses. The veto message noted that the amendment would allow every defendant who posts bond to "walk the streets without supervision."

II. SUMMARY:

The bill creates the "Trooper Robert Smith Act."

The bill amends s. 907.041 to broaden court authority to order pretrial detention without bond, particularly for DUI manslaughter, violations of supervision and for persons who may not appear for trial or for persons who pose a risk of physical harm to the community.

The bill eliminates the 90-day cap placed on pretrial detention for defendants who pose a danger to the community.

The bill eliminates the requirement that pretrial detention orders may be issued, only, pursuant to motion by the state attorney. Consequently, pretrial detention orders may issue after any bail hearing, so long as the court makes the required findings of fact.

The bill repeals Rule 3.131 & 3.132 of the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure relating to pretrial release and pretrial detention to the extent that they are inconsistent with the bill.

III. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

A. PRESENT SITUATION:

**Constitutional Right To Bail**

Article I, Section 14 of the Florida Constitution provides for two exceptions to the right to bail. The first exception applies to persons charged with a capital offense or an offense punishable by life imprisonment and the proof of guilt is evident or the presumption is great. State v. Arthur, 390 So. 2d 717 (Fla. 1980). The second exception applies where no "conditions of release can reasonably protect the community from risk of physical harm to persons, assure the presence of the accused at trial, or assure the integrity of the judicial process . . ." Article I, Section 14, Fla. Const. This constitutional provision is implemented by ss. 903.046 and 907.041, F.S.

**Statutory Right To Bail**

Section 907.041, F.S. (Pretrial Detention and Release), provides for denial of bail to defendants when the court finds that:

1. The defendant has previously violated conditions of release and that no further conditions of release are reasonably likely to assure the defendant's appearance at subsequent proceedings; **(or)**
2. The defendant, with the intent to obstruct the judicial process, has threatened, intimidated, or injured any victim, potential witness, juror, or judicial officer, or has attempted or conspired to do so, and that no condition of release will reasonably prevent the obstruction of the judicial process; **(or)**
3. The defendant is charged with trafficking in controlled substances as defined by s. 893.135, that there is a substantial probability that the defendant has committed the offense, and that no conditions of release will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance at subsequent criminal proceedings; **(or)**
4. The defendant poses the threat of harm to the community. The court may so conclude if it finds that the defendant is presently charged with a **dangerous crime**, that there is a substantial probability that the defendant committed such crime, that the factual circumstances of the crime indicate a disregard for the safety of the community, and that there are no conditions of release reasonably sufficient to protect the community from the risk of physical harm to persons. In addition, the court must find that at least one of the following conditions is present:
  - a. The defendant has previously been convicted of a crime punishable by death or life imprisonment.
  - b. The defendant has been convicted of a dangerous crime within the 10 years immediately preceding the date of his or her arrest for the crime presently charged.
  - c. The defendant is on probation, parole, or other release pending completion of sentence or on pretrial release for a dangerous crime at the time of the current arrest.

### **Dangerous Crimes Enumerated**

To deny bail on the basis that the defendant poses a threat of physical harm to persons in the community (4., above), the defendant must be charged with a “**dangerous crime**,” as defined by s. 907.04, F.S. These crimes include:

1. Arson;
2. Aggravated assault;
3. Aggravated battery;
4. Illegal use of explosives;
5. Child abuse or aggravated child abuse;
6. Abuse of an elderly person or disabled adult, or aggravated abuse of an elderly person or disabled adult;
7. Hijacking;
8. Kidnaping;
9. Homicide;
10. Manslaughter;
11. Sexual battery;
12. Robbery;
13. Carjacking;
14. Lewd, lascivious, or indecent assault or act upon or in presence of a child under the age of 16 years;
15. Sexual activity with a child, who is 12 years of age or older but less than 18 years of age, by or at solicitation of person in familial or custodial authority;
16. Burglary of a dwelling;
17. Stalking and aggravated stalking;
18. Act of domestic violence as defined in s. 741.28; and
19. Attempting or conspiring to commit any such crime; and home-invasion robbery.

### **Procedural Requirements of 907.046, F.S.**

In addition to establishing criteria for denying bail, s. 907.041 includes several procedural requirements, as follows:

- ▶ Arresting agency must notify state attorney of arrest of qualified defendants.
- ▶ Arresting agency may hold the defendant up to 24 hours pending the filing of a motion for pretrial detention by the state attorney.
- ▶ A hearing on the motion for pretrial detention must be held within 5 days, but a state attorney is allowed one continuance for good cause. A defendant may be held in jail until the hearing.
- ▶ The state attorney has the burden of showing the need for pretrial detention.
- ▶ The defendant may present witnesses and evidence and may cross-examine the state’s witnesses.
- ▶ The court may admit relevant evidence, but the Florida Evidence Code does not apply, except that no evidence will be admitted which was procured in violation of the state or federal constitutions.
- ▶ The defendant’s testimony may not be used as evidence of guilt at any other proceeding, other than a perjury proceeding, or for impeachment.
- ▶ The court will prepare a pretrial detention order based on the evidence produced at the hearing within 24 hours of the hearing.
- ▶ If bail is denied, any failure to bring the defendant to trial within 90 days results in the defendant’s release.

### **Legislative Intent Regarding Bail**

Section 903.046, F.S., sets forth the Legislature’s “**purpose of and criteria for bail determination**”:

- (1) The purpose of a bail determination in criminal proceedings is to ensure the appearance of the criminal defendant at subsequent proceedings and **to protect the community against unreasonable danger from the criminal defendant.**

- (2) When determining whether to release a defendant on bail or other conditions, and what that bail or those conditions may be, the court shall consider:
- (a) The nature and circumstances of the offense charged.
  - (b) The weight of the evidence against the defendant.
  - (c) The defendant's family ties, length of residence in the community, employment history, financial resources, and mental condition.
  - (d) The defendant's past and present conduct, including any record of convictions, previous flight to avoid prosecution, or failure to appear at court proceedings. However, any defendant who previously had willfully and knowingly failed to appear and breached a bond as specified in s. 903.26, but who had voluntarily appeared or surrendered, shall not be eligible for a recognizance bond; and any defendant who willfully and knowingly failed to appear and breached a bond as specified in s. 903.26 and who was arrested at any time following forfeiture shall not be eligible for a recognizance bond or for any form of bond which does not require a monetary undertaking or commitment equal to or greater than \$2,000 or twice the value of the monetary commitment or undertaking of the original bond, whichever is greater.
  - (e) The nature and probability of danger which the defendant's release poses to the community.
  - (f) The source of funds used to post bail.
  - (g) Whether the defendant is already on release pending resolution of another criminal proceeding or on probation, parole, or other release pending completion of a sentence.
  - (h) The street value of any drug or controlled substance connected to or involved in the criminal charge. It is the finding and intent of the Legislature that crimes involving drugs and other controlled substances are of serious social concern, that the flight of defendants to avoid prosecution is of similar serious social concern, and that frequently such defendants are able to post monetary bail using the proceeds of their unlawful enterprises to defeat the social utility of pretrial bail. Therefore, the courts should carefully consider the utility and necessity of substantial bail in relation to the street value of the drugs or controlled substances involved.

B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

**Pretrial Detention for DUI Manslaughter**

The bill would have created a new subsection in section 907.041, F.S., that authorizing the pretrial detention (without bond) of a person charged with DUI manslaughter if there is a substantial probability that the defendant committed the crime and that the defendant poses a threat of harm to the community. The bill provided that the following conditions that would support a finding by the court that the defendant poses a threat of harm to the community:

- a. The defendant has previously been convicted of a DUI.
- b. The defendant was driving with a suspended license when the offense was committed.
- c. The defendant has been found guilty of, or has had adjudication of guilt withheld for driving with a suspended or revoked license in violation of s. 322.24, F.S.

These conditions do not exclude the consideration of any other factors that demonstrate a threat of harm to the community.

**Elimination Of Certain Statutory Requirements For Pretrial Detention**

Presently, s. 907.041, F.S., restricts a court's authority to deny bail unless the court determines that no condition of release can reasonably protect the community from risk of physical harm and:

- 1) the defendant is presently accused of a dangerous crime;
- 2) there is a substantial probability the defendant committed the crime; and
- 3) the circumstances of the crime indicate a disregard for safety of the community.

Pretrial Detention pursuant to s. 907.041 also requires a showing that the defendant:

- a) has previously been convicted of a crime punishable by death or life imprisonment, **OR**
- b) has been convicted of an enumerated dangerous crime within 10-years, **OR**
- c) is on probation, parole, or other release pending completion of sentence or on pretrial release for a "dangerous crime" at the time of the current arrest.

**The bill would have eliminated the latter three restrictions** ((a) through (c)) and expands a court's ability to deny bail for dangerous crimes by requiring only that the court find the existence of the first three enumerated requirements ((1) through (3)).

#### **Pretrial Detention for Violating Supervision or Pretrial Release**

##### Violation of Supervision and Pretrial Release for a "Violent Crime"

The bill would have authorized pretrial detention when it is determined that the defendant was on supervision or pretrial release for one of the enumerated "dangerous crimes" (See list of enumerated "dangerous crimes" in Present Situation) at the time the current offense was committed. The similar present law authorizes pretrial detention if both the new offense and the offense for which the defendant is on supervision or pretrial release both be a "dangerous crime." Under this new criteria, a person qualifies for pretrial detention without bail for any offense if the person was on supervision or pretrial release for a "violent crime."

##### Violation of Supervision or Pretrial Release for Any Crime

The bill would have authorized pretrial detention without bond for any offense if a defendant has violated one or more conditions of pretrial release or bond for the offense currently before the court which, in the discretion of the court, support the finding that no conditions of release can reasonably protect the community from risk of physical harm to persons, assure the presence of the accused at trial, or assure the integrity of the judicial process.

#### **Elimination Of Need For Motion For Pretrial Detention**

Under current law, bail may not be denied (for offenses other than capital or life felonies) except pursuant to a motion for pretrial detention, filed by the state attorney. The bill would have allowed the court to deny bail at any bail hearing, without motion from the state attorney.

#### **Elimination Of the Ninety Day Cap**

Under current law, any pretrial detention based upon a defendant's potential harm to the community is limited to 90-days. If the defendant is not brought to trial in that time, he must be released on bail.

**The bill repealed the 90-day cap placed on pretrial detention.** However, defendants are still protected by the right to speedy trial. That is, every defendant has the right to trial in 60-days, upon demand. Otherwise, the state must bring misdemeanor defendants to trial in 90 days, and felony defendants within 175 days, unless the offender waives his or her right to have a speedy trial. See, Rule 3.191, Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure.

#### **Repeal Of Florida Rules Of Criminal Procedure**

The bill would have repealed Rule 3.131 & 3.132 of the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure relating to pretrial release and pretrial detention to the extent that the rules are inconsistent with the bill. The

repeal of the rules of criminal procedure takes effect only if the bill is passed by two-thirds of the Legislature. Article V, Section 2(a), Florida Constitution.

C. APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES:

1. Less Government:

a. Does the bill create, increase or reduce, either directly or indirectly:

(1) any authority to make rules or adjudicate disputes?

No.

(2) any new responsibilities, obligations or work for other governmental or private organizations or individuals?

No.

(3) any entitlement to a government service or benefit?

No.

b. If an agency or program is eliminated or reduced:

(1) what responsibilities, costs and powers are passed on to another program, agency, level of government, or private entity?

The bill does not eliminate or reduce any agency or government program.

(2) what is the cost of such responsibility at the new level/agency?

N/A

(3) how is the new agency accountable to the people governed?

N/A

2. Lower Taxes:

a. Does the bill increase anyone's taxes?

No.

b. Does the bill require or authorize an increase in any fees?

No.

c. Does the bill reduce total taxes, both rates and revenues?

No.

d. Does the bill reduce total fees, both rates and revenues?

No.

- e. Does the bill authorize any fee or tax increase by any local government?

No.

3. Personal Responsibility:

- a. Does the bill reduce or eliminate an entitlement to government services or subsidy?

No.

- b. Do the beneficiaries of the legislation directly pay any portion of the cost of implementation and operation?

No.

4. Individual Freedom:

- a. Does the bill increase the allowable options of individuals or private organizations/ associations to conduct their own affairs?

No.

- b. Does the bill prohibit, or create new government interference with, any presently lawful activity?

The bill would have eliminated a defendant's right to 90 day release from pretrial detention, and may also increase the number of persons who are detained under the new relaxed standard for such detention.

5. Family Empowerment:

- a. If the bill purports to provide services to families or children:

- (1) Who evaluates the family's needs?

The bill does not purport to provide services to families or children.

- (2) Who makes the decisions?

N/A

- (3) Are private alternatives permitted?

N/A

- (4) Are families required to participate in a program?

N/A

- (5) Are families penalized for not participating in a program?

N/A

- b. Does the bill directly affect the legal rights and obligations between family members?

N/A

- c. If the bill creates or changes a program providing services to families or children, in which of the following does the bill vest control of the program, either through direct participation or appointment authority:

- (1) parents and guardians?

The bill does not create or change any program providing services to families or children.

- (2) service providers?

N/A

- (3) government employees/agencies?

N/A

D. STATUTE(S) AFFECTED:

ss. 903.046 & 907.041, F.S., and Rules 3.132 and 3.131, Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure.

E. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:

**Section 1:** Creates the "Trooper Robert Smith Act."

**Section 2:** Amends s. 907.041 to broaden court authority to order pretrial detention without bond, particularly for DUI manslaughter, violations of supervision and for persons who may not appear for trial or for persons who pose a risk of physical harm to the community.

**Section 3:** Reenacts Florida Law.

**Section 4:** Repeals Rules 3.131 & 3.132 of the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure to the extent they are inconsistent with the bill.

**Section 5:** Provides an effective date.

IV. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE AGENCIES/STATE FUNDS:

1. Non-recurring Effects:

Not estimated.

2. Recurring Effects:

Not estimated.

3. Long Run Effects Other Than Normal Growth:

Not estimated.

4. Total Revenues and Expenditures:

Not estimated.



B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AS A WHOLE:

1. Non-recurring Effects:

Not estimated.

2. Recurring Effects:

Not estimated.

3. Long Run Effects Other Than Normal Growth:

Not estimated.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

1. Direct Private Sector Costs:

None.

2. Direct Private Sector Benefits:

None.

3. Effects on Competition, Private Enterprise and Employment Markets:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

The Criminal Justice Estimating Committee has determined that the bill would not impact the state prison population. The bill could have caused more detainees in county jails, and thus there could have been some expense to the counties.

V. CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:

A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

Because the committee substitute affects a criminal statute, it is exempt from Article VII, Section 18.

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

N/A

C. REDUCTION OF STATE TAX SHARED WITH COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES:

N/A

VI. COMMENTS:

**Constitutional Right To Bail**

Prior to January 1, 1983, courts could deny bail only for offenses which were punishable by death or by life in prison. Article 1, Section 14 of the Constitution guaranteed the right to bail for all other offenses. See, *State v. Arthur*, 390 So. 2d 717 (Fla. 1980). However, Article I, Section 14 was amended by the citizens of Florida in the election of November 2, 1982 (effective January 1, 1983). That amendment, proposed by the Legislature, gave Florida courts constitutional authority to deny bail for any offense, if no

condition of release could ensure the presence of the defendant at future proceedings, protect the community from harm or ensure the integrity of the judicial process. See, Art. I, Sec. 14.

The effect of the amendment to the Florida Constitution was to "allow courts to deny bail, in certain situations, to persons accused of offenses other than capital offenses or offenses punishable by life imprisonment." Gomez v. Hinckley, 473 So. 2d 809, 810 (Fla. 4th DCA 1985). Section 907.041, Florida Statutes (1983), implements Article I, section 14, as amended.

**VII. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:**

On February 17, 1999, Rep. Cantens offered an amendment in the Committee on Crime and Punishment to change the word "the" on page 5, lines 10 and 12 to the word "a".

The Committee on Judiciary adopted one amendment and made the bill a Committee Substitute. The amendment amends s. 907.041(4)(b)4.c., F.S., adding as a factor in the determination of whether a defendant is a threat to community previous convictions or adjudications withheld for driving with a suspended or revoked driver's license in violation of s. 322.24, F.S. Prior to the amendment, the bill [section 907.041(4)(b)4.c.] provided that the fact that a person has had his or her license suspended on two or more prior occasions is a factor that the court must consider in determining whether a defendant charged with DUI manslaughter poses a threat of harm to the community.

On the floor of the Senate an amendment was adopted providing that public funds may not be used to subsidize release of persons charged with the enumerated violent crimes. This amendment subsequently caused the Governor to veto the bill. The amendment was ambiguous as to whether a judge would have been able to require conditions of bond such as electronic monitoring unless the defendant paid the state's costs.

**VIII. SIGNATURES:**

**COMMITTEE ON CRIME AND PUNISHMENT:**

Prepared by:

J. Willis Renuart

Staff Director:

J. Willis Renuart

**AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY:**

Prepared by:

Michael W. Carlson

Staff Director:

Don Rubottom

**FINAL ANALYSIS PREPARED BY THE COMMITTEE ON CRIME AND PUNISHMENT:**

Prepared by:

J. Willis Renuart

Staff Director:

J. Willis Renuart