A bill to be entitled

An act relating to custodial interrogations in cases involving capital felonies; creating s. 901.241, F.S.; providing definitions; describing circumstances in which an oral, written, or sign language statement made by a capital interrogee during a custodial interrogation is presumed inadmissible as evidence against such person; describing circumstances in which the prosecution may rebut such presumption; describing circumstances in which law enforcement officers may have good cause not to electronically record all or part of an interrogation; providing for the admissibility of certain statements of a capital interrogee when made in certain proceedings or when obtained by federal officers or officers from other states; providing for the preservation of electronic recordings; providing for admissibility of certain statements of a capital interrogee; providing a finding of important state interest; providing application; providing an effective date.

19 20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

2223

24

25

26

Section 1. Section 901.241, Florida Statutes, is created to read:

901.241 Custodial interrogations in cases involving capital felonies.--

(1) This section shall apply to custodial interrogations in which the capital interrogee is suspected of involvement in a capital felony.

(2) As used in this section, the term:

- (a) "Capital interrogee" means a person who, at the time of the interrogation and concerning any topic of the interrogation, is:
 - 1. Charged with a capital felony; or
- 2. Suspected by those conducting the interrogation or investigating the capital felony of involvement in the capital felony.
- (b) "Custodial interrogation" means questioning of a capital interrogee in circumstances in which a reasonable person placed in the same position would believe that his or her freedom of action was curtailed to a degree associated with actual arrest.
- (c) "Electronic recording" means a true, complete, and accurate reproduction of a custodial interrogation. An electronic recording may be created by motion picture, videotape, audiotape, or digital or other media.
- (d) "Involvement" means participation in a crime as a principal or an accessory.
- (e) "Interrogation facility" means a law enforcement facility, correctional facility, community correctional center, detention facility, law enforcement vehicle, courthouse, or other secure environment.
- (3) An oral, written, or sign language statement made by a capital interrogee during a custodial interrogation shall be

presumed to be inadmissible as evidence against such person in a
criminal proceeding unless:

(a) The interrogation is reproduced in its entirety by means of an electronic recording.

- (b) Prior to the statement, but during the electronic recording, the capital interrogee is given all constitutionally required warnings and the capital interrogee knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily waives any rights set out in the warnings that would otherwise preclude the admission of the statement.
- (c) The electronic recording device was capable of making a true, complete, and accurate recording of the interrogation, the operator of such device was competent, and the electronic recording has not been altered.
- (d) All voices that are material to the custodial interrogation are identified on the electronic recording.
- (e) During discovery pursuant to Rule 3.220, Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure, but in no circumstances later than the 20th day before the date of the proceeding in which the prosecution intends to offer the statement, the attorney representing a criminal defendant is provided with true, complete, and accurate copies of all electronic recordings of the defendant made pursuant to this section.
- (4)(a) In the absence of a true, complete, and accurate electronic recording, the prosecution may rebut a presumption of inadmissibility through clear and convincing evidence that:
 - 1. The statement was both voluntary and reliable.
 - 2. Law enforcement officers had good cause not to

electronically record all or part of the interrogation.

- (b) For purposes of paragraph (a), "good cause" includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- 1. The interrogation occurred in a location other than an interrogation facility under exigent circumstances where the requisite recording equipment was not readily available, and there was no reasonable opportunity to move the capital interrogee to an interrogation facility or to another location at which the requisite recording equipment was readily available;
- 2. The capital interrogee refused to have the interrogation electronically recorded and such refusal was electronically recorded;
- 3. The failure to electronically record an entire interrogation was the result of equipment failure and obtaining replacement equipment was not feasible; or
- 4. The statement of the capital interrogee was obtained in the course of electronic eavesdropping that was being conducted pursuant to a properly obtained and issued warrant or that required no warrant.
- (5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a written, oral, or sign language statement of the capital interrogee made as a result of a custodial interrogation is admissible in a criminal proceeding against the capital interrogee in this state if:
- (a) The statement was obtained in another state by investigative personnel of such state, acting independently of law enforcement personnel of this state, in compliance with the

laws	of	such	state;	or

(b) The statement was obtained by a federal officer in this state or another state during a lawful federal investigation and was obtained in compliance with the laws of the United States.

- interrogation made pursuant to this section must be preserved until the capital interogee's conviction for any offense relating to the interrogation is final and all direct appeals and collateral challenges are exhausted, the prosecution of such offenses is barred by law, or the state irrevocably waives in writing any future prosecution of the capital interogee for any offense relating to the interrogation.
- (7) This section does not preclude the admission into evidence of a statement made by the capital interrogee:
- (a) At his or her trial or other hearing held in open court;
- (b) Before a grand jury;
- 129 <u>(c) That is the res gestae of the arrest or the offense;</u>
 130 or
 - (d) That does not arise from a custodial interrogation, as defined by this section.
 - Section 2. The Legislature finds that the reputations of countless hard-working law enforcement officers are needlessly attacked by criminal suspects who falsely claim the officers have violated the suspects' constitutional rights, that limited trial court resources are squandered in hearings on motions seeking to suppress statements made by criminal suspects who are

given the opportunity to make such claims because no recordings				
of their interrogations exist, and further that judicial				
resources are squandered when criminal suspects, after having				
been convicted of their crimes, file frivolous and unnecessary				
appeals. This process costs the taxpayers of this state untold				
dollars each year, dollars that could be better spent enhancing				
the administration of the criminal justice system. Low-cost				
technology is now available in every jurisdiction to record each				
and every custodial interrogation of a criminal suspect,				
eliminating this gross waste of resources and enhancing the				
reliability and reputation of law enforcement. Therefore, the				
Legislature determines and declares that this act fulfills an				
important state interest.				
Section 3. This act shall take effect July 1, 2005, and				

Section 3. This act shall take effect July 1, 2005, and shall apply to interrogations taking place on or after that date.