

STORAGE NAME: h1123z.sa.doc
DATE: May 30, 2002

****AS PASSED BY THE LEGISLATURE****
CHAPTER #: 2002-284, Laws of Florida

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON
STATE ADMINISTRATION
FINAL ANALYSIS**

BILL #: HB 1123 (IDENTICAL PROVISIONS PASSED IN SB 140)

RELATING TO: Public Records/Criminal Use

SPONSOR(S): Representative(s) Wishner and others

TIED BILL(S):

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

- (1) STATE ADMINISTRATION YEAS 5 NAYS 0
- (2) CRIME PREVENTION, CORRECTIONS & SAFETY (W/D)
- (3) COUNCIL FOR SMARTER GOVERNMENT (W/D)
- (4)
- (5)

I. SUMMARY:

House Bill 1123 died on the House calendar on March 22, 2002. Its Senate companion, Senate Bill 140, passed the Senate on March 7, 2002, and passed the House of Representatives and was then enrolled on March 22, 2002. The effective date of Senate Bill 140 is July 1, 2002. The bills are identical. This analysis is of chapter 2002-284, L.O.F.

The Florida Criminal Code does not currently impose punishment for the use of public records or information obtained from public records in the commission of a misdemeanor or a felony.

This act creates criminal offenses for the knowing use of a public record or public information obtained from a public record. When the record or information is used in the commission of a misdemeanor of the first degree, the person commits a misdemeanor of the first degree. When the record or information is used in the commission of a felony, the person commits a felony of the third degree. This act provides for fines and imprisonment commensurate with the severity of the crime. This act also amends the Criminal Punishment Code to include the felony crime in the offense severity ranking chart.

This act does not appear to have a significant fiscal impact on the state or local governments.

This act takes effect July 1, 2002.

THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT INTENDED TO BE USED FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUING STATUTES, OR TO BE CONSTRUED AS AFFECTING, DEFINING, LIMITING, CONTROLLING, SPECIFYING, CLARIFYING, OR MODIFYING ANY LEGISLATION OR STATUTE.

II. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

A. DOES THE BILL SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES:

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 1. <u>Less Government</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. <u>Lower Taxes</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. <u>Individual Freedom</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. <u>Personal Responsibility</u> | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. <u>Family Empowerment</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

This act creates criminal offenses for the knowing use of a public record or public information obtained from a public record used in the commission of a misdemeanor or a felony.

B. PRESENT SITUATION:

Chapter 119, F.S., relating to public records, prescribes the criminal penalties for the violation of its provisions. Section 119.10(1), F.S., provides that a public officer who violates the chapter's provisions is guilty of a noncriminal infraction, punishable by a fine not exceeding \$500. Section 119.10(2), F.S., provides that any person (includes public officers) who willingly and knowingly violates the provisions of the chapter is guilty of a misdemeanor in the first degree, punishable under s. 775.082, F.S. (imprisonment not to exceed one year) or s. 775.083, F.S. (a fine not to exceed \$1,000). Additionally, s. 119.10(3), F.S., provides that a person who violates s. 119.105, F.S., relating to the protection of victims of crimes or accidents, commits a felony of the 3rd degree and is punishable as provided under 775.082, F.S. (imprisonment not to exceed 5 years), s. 775.083, F.S. (a fine not to exceed \$1,000), or s. 775.084, F.S. (enhanced criminal penalties for conviction as a habitual felony offender).

The Florida Criminal Code does not currently impose punishment for the use of public records or information obtained from public records in the commission of a misdemeanor or a felony.

C. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

This act creates two criminal offenses for the knowing use of a public record or public information obtainable from a public record used in the commission of a crime. When the record or information is used in the commission of a misdemeanor of the first degree, the person commits a misdemeanor of the first degree. When the record or information is used in the commission of a felony, the person commits a felony of the third degree. This act also amends the Criminal Punishment Code to include the felony crime in the offense severity ranking chart.

D. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:

Section One. Creates s. 875.569, F.S., to provide that a person who knowingly uses any public record or information obtainable only through public records to further the commission of a:

- Misdemeanor of the first degree, commits a misdemeanor of the first degree which is punishable as provided for in ss. 775.082 or 775.083, F.S.; and

- Felony, commits a felony of the third degree which is punishable as provided for in ss. 775.082 or 775.083, F.S.

Section Two. Amends s. 921.0022(3), F.S., the Criminal Punishment Code, to include the use of public records or public records information to facilitate the commission of a felony as a crime in the offense severity ranking chart.

Section Three. Provides that the act takes effect July 1, 2002.

III. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

See Fiscal Comments, below.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

See Fiscal Comments, below.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

If a person is convicted under the provisions of this act, there will be costs associated with that prosecution and the imprisonment of that person. However, it is unlikely that the volume of prosecutions under these two criminal provisions will result in a significant fiscal impact on judicial or executive branch expenditures.

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

A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

This act requires counties or municipalities to spend funds or to take action requiring the expenditure of funds. However, this act is exempted from the provisions of the mandate requirement because it affects criminal laws.

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

This act does not reduce the authority that counties or municipalities have to raise revenues in the aggregate.

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

This act does not reduce the percentage of a state tax shared with counties or municipalities.

V. COMMENTS:

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

The staff of the Senate Committee on Criminal Justice, in its analysis of this act's companion (Senate Bill 140), discusses the issue of double jeopardy. That discussion is set out below in its entirety.

There should be no double jeopardy issue with regard to convictions for the new offense and somewhat interrelated crimes such as identity theft. Under double jeopardy analysis, a court is required to examine each of a defendant's convictions arising out of the same incident to determine whether each offense requires proof of an element that the other does not, without regard to the accusatory pleading or the proof adduced at trial. *Blockburger v. United States*, 284 U.S. 299 (1932). The test is referred to as the "*Blockburger* test" or "same-elements" test. One statutory exception to the "same-elements" test is when the offense is a lesser-included offense. s. 775.021, F.S. However, the "same-elements" test distinguishes between offenses that are necessarily lesser included offenses and offenses that are not. If two statutory offenses are found to be separate under the "same-elements" test than the lesser offense is not subsumed by the greater offense.

The elements of the public records offense are not the same as, for example, the elements of identity theft. An identity theft offense could be committed by the use of personal identification information from a public record but need not be. The use of a public record is not an element of the offense.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None.

C. OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

VI. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:

None.

STORAGE NAME: h1123z.sa.doc

DATE: May 30, 2002

PAGE: 5

VII. SIGNATURES:

COMMITTEE ON STATE ADMINISTRATION:

Prepared by:

David M. Greenbaum

Staff Director:

J. Marleen Ahearn, Ph.D., J.D.

FINAL ANALYSIS PREPARED BY THE COMMITTEE ON STATE ADMINISTRATION:

Prepared by:

David Greenbaum

Staff Director:

J. Marleen Ahearn, Ph.D., J.D.
