

The Florida Senate
BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

Prepared By: The Professional Staff of the Committee on Criminal Justice

BILL: CS/CS/SB's 130 & 122

INTRODUCER: Criminal Justice Committee; Judiciary Committee; and Senators Simmons, Smith, and Thompson

SUBJECT: Use of Deadly Force

DATE: March 19, 2014

REVISED: _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	<u>Brown</u>	<u>Cibula</u>	<u>JU</u>	Fav/CS Combined
2.	<u>Cellon</u>	<u>Cannon</u>	<u>CJ</u>	Fav/CS
3.	_____	_____	<u>CA</u>	_____
4.	_____	_____	<u>RC</u>	_____

Please see Section IX. for Additional Information:

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE - Substantial Changes

I. Summary:

CS/CS/SB's 130 & 122 require the county sheriff or municipal police department to issue reasonable guidelines for participants in neighborhood crime watch programs.

The bill specifies that the guidelines must include a prohibition against the program participant, while on patrol, confronting or attempting to apprehend a person suspected of improper or unlawful activity. The bill carves out an exception in the guidelines for program participants to act under circumstances in which a reasonable person would be permitted, authorized, or expected to assist another person. The guidelines may include any additional content the sheriff or municipal police department deem appropriate.

The bill amends the Stand Your Ground law to:

- No longer preclude lawsuits from third parties who are injured by negligent conduct used in self-defense. The bill clarifies that a person who uses justifiable force is immune from civil lawsuits filed by the person against whom force was used and his or her personal representative or heirs.
- Clarify that a law enforcement agency maintains the authority and duty to fully investigate whether a person claiming self-defense has lawfully used force. The bill further clarifies that law enforcement is not precluded from detaining an individual during the course of an

investigation under potential Stand Your Ground circumstances so long as the officer may otherwise lawfully do so.

- Clarify that an aggressor who unjustifiably uses force does not have the benefit of immunity from criminal prosecution or civil actions.
- Adopt the procedure under which the immunity hearing will be conducted.

Generally under s. 776.041, F.S., the self-defense and immunity provisions are not available to a person who provokes the use of force against him or herself. The bill clarifies that in order to provoke aggression against oneself, one must use force or threat of force. This should clarify that more than mere words or offensive behavior, for example, are required to constitute provocation.

The bill creates a new section of law that contains legislative findings.

The bill becomes effective October 1, 2014.

II. Present Situation:

Neighborhood Crime Watch Programs

County sheriffs and municipal police departments may establish neighborhood crime watch programs. The only statutory limit on crime watch programs is that the programs include city or county residents or business owners.¹

Self-defense

The "Castle" Concept

Section 776.012, F.S., absolves a person of a duty to retreat before using deadly force if the person knows or reasonably believes that an unlawful and forcible entry or act of a dwelling, residence, or occupied vehicle was occurring or had occurred.² This provision appears to codify and expand what constitutes a "castle" under the common law. Under the common law "Castle Doctrine," a "castle" was limited to a person's home.

Section 776.013(4), F.S., creates a presumption that a person intends to commit an unlawful act using force or violence when that person unlawfully and forcibly enters another person's dwelling, residence, or occupied vehicle. Similarly, s. 776.013(1), F.S., creates a presumption that the person using deadly, defensive force has a reasonable fear of imminent peril of death or great bodily harm.

¹ Sections 30.60 and 166.0485, F.S.

² A dwelling is defined as: "a building or conveyance of any kind, including any attached porch, whether the building or conveyance is temporary or permanent, mobile or immobile, which has a roof over it, including a tent, and is designed to be occupied by people lodging therein at night." Section 776.013(5)(a), F.S. A residence is defined as "a dwelling in which a person resides, even temporarily, or visits as an invited guest." Section 776.013(5)(b), F.S. A vehicle is defined as "a motorized or non-motorized conveyance intended to transport people or property." Section 776.013(5)(c), F.S. In addition to extending the concept of a home to other places of shelter, s. 776.013(3), F.S., extends the right to "stand your ground" beyond a place of habitation altogether provided that a person is attacked while he or she is in a place where he or she has a right to be and is not engaged in unlawful activity.

The presumption that a person intends to commit an unlawful act does not apply if the person against whom force is used:

- Has the right to enter the place, including as an owner or lessee, and if he or she is not subject to a court-ordered injunction or “no contact” order.
- Has custody of and is in the process of legally removing a child or grandchild.
- The person who uses defensive force is engaged in an unlawful activity or is using the dwelling, residence, or occupied vehicle for that purpose.
- Is a law enforcement officer acting pursuant to his or her official duties.

Self-defense and Defense of Others (Outside the “Castle”)

Section 776.012, F.S., relieves a person of a duty to retreat in using non-deadly force when the person reasonably believes that the force is needed for defense against a person’s imminent use of unlawful force. Deadly force is permitted when the person defends himself or herself or another person under a reasonable belief that deadly force is needed to prevent imminent great bodily harm or death or to prevent the perpetrator from committing a forcible felony.³

Self-defense and Defense of Property

Section 776.031, F.S., authorizes a person to use non-deadly force to protect personal property and real property other than a dwelling. Additionally, the provision absolves a person of a duty to retreat and justifies the use of deadly force if the person reasonably believes deadly force is necessary to prevent the commission of a forcible felony.⁴

Limitations on Self-defense Claims by Aggressors

A person who is in the process of committing or escaping after committing a forcible felony is precluded from claiming a justifiable use of force.⁵

The defense is also not available to a person who otherwise qualifies but initially provokes the use of force against himself or herself, unless:

- The force is so great that the person reasonably believes that he or she is in imminent danger of death or great bodily harm and has exhausted every reasonable means other than the use of force which is likely to result in death or great bodily harm; or
- The person physically withdraws in good faith and clearly indicates the desire to withdraw, but the assailant continues or resumes the use of force.⁶

Immunities and Defenses to Legal Actions

A person who uses force as authorized under the Stand Your Ground law is immune from criminal prosecution and any civil action based on the use of force. Immunity from criminal prosecution includes immunity from being arrested, detained in custody, and charged or

³ Section 776.012, F.S.

⁴ A forcible felony is defined to include the following offenses: “treason; murder; manslaughter; sexual battery; carjacking; home-invasion robbery; robbery; burglary; arson; kidnapping; aggravated assault; aggravated battery; aggravated stalking; aircraft piracy; unlawful throwing, placing, or discharging of a destructive device or bomb; and any other felony which involves the use or threat of physical force or violence against any individual.” Section 776.08, F.S.

⁵ Section 776.041(1), F.S.

⁶ Section 776.041(2)(a) and (b), F.S.

prosecuted.⁷ A defendant to a civil action based on a use of force is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees, court costs, lost income and all expenses related to the defense of the action if the defendant is immune from criminal prosecution for the use of force.⁸

Case Law

Self-defense and Common Law Duty to Retreat

Before the Florida Legislature adopted the Stand Your Ground law in 2005, the state followed the Florida common law that imposed a duty to retreat in self-defense situations. Under Florida common law, a person acting in self-defense outside his or her home or workplace had a "duty to use every reasonable means to avoid the danger, including retreat, prior to using deadly force."⁹ This duty is also referred to as a duty to retreat "to the wall."¹⁰ The duty to retreat also applied to both parties in mutual combat and to an initial aggressor.¹¹ Before using non-deadly force, however, a defender had no duty to retreat.¹²

The duty to retreat had not always been a part of the common law. Centuries ago, "any man who was feloniously attacked without provocation could stand his ground *anywhere*, not retreat, and use deadly force if necessary to repel the attacker."¹³ The common law predating the Stand Your Ground law placed a "greater emphasis on the sanctity of life as opposed to chivalry."¹⁴ Similarly, the duty to retreat appeared to stem from the policy that "[h]uman life is precious, and deadly combat should be avoided if at all possible when imminent danger to oneself can be avoided."¹⁵

Immunity Determination

When the Legislature declared in the 2005 Stand Your Ground law that a person who uses force as permitted in ss. 776.012, 776.013, and 776.031, F.S., is justified in doing so and is immune from prosecution, no procedure was put in place by which immunity could be determined.

The question of whether a person is using justifiable force turns on questions of fact and circumstance. The facts to be resolved are related to the reasonable belief that force is necessary to defend persons or property and what level of force is justifiable under the circumstances. In order to decide these factual matters, the trial courts had to decide how to evaluate the facts and settle the claims of immunity created in 2005.

⁷ Section 776.032(1), F.S.

⁸ Section 776.032(3), F.S.

⁹ *State v. James*, 867 So. 2d 414, 416 (Fla. 3d DCA 2003). According to *Weiland v. State*, 732 So. 2d 1044, note 4 (Fla. 1999), "a majority of jurisdictions do not impose a duty to retreat before a defendant may resort to deadly force when threatened with death or great bodily harm."

¹⁰ *Weiland v. State*, 732 So. 2d 1044, 1049 (Fla. 1999).

¹¹ *Pell v. State*, 122 So. 110, 116 (Fla. 1929) and s. 776.041, F.S.

¹² *Weiland*, 732 So. 2d at note 4.

¹³ *Cannon v. State*, 464 So. 2d 149, 150 (Fla. 5th DCA 1985) (emphasis original).

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *State v. James*, 867 So. 2d 414, 417 (Fla. 3d DCA 2003) (quoting *State v. Bobbitt*, 415 So. 2d 724, 728 (Fla. 1982)).

In 2008, in *Peterson v. State*, the First District Court of Appeal reviewed a first-degree murder case involving a claim of immunity under the Stand Your Ground law.¹⁶ The court rejected the State's endorsement of the commonly used Motion to Dismiss under Florida Rule of Criminal Procedure 3.190(c)(4) where immunity would be denied when there were "disputed material facts."

The *Peterson* court decided that trial courts must determine factual disputes by actually confronting and weighing them. The court approved the use of a pretrial, adversarial hearing to determine immunity.¹⁷

The court also endorsed the trial court's review of the defendant's motion to dismiss under a showing of a preponderance of the evidence standard, a similar burden for motions challenging the voluntariness of a confession.¹⁸

In *Dennis v. State*, the Florida Supreme Court upheld the *Peterson* process of determining immunity through a pretrial evidentiary hearing.¹⁹

The *Dennis* court also recognized that upon denial of a defense motion to dismiss, the defendant still has available the claim of self-defense or Stand Your Ground as an affirmative defense at trial.²⁰ The Task Force on Citizen Safety and Protection determined that the *Peterson* hearing is an appropriate mechanism to resolve immunity claims.

Arrest and Detention

The Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution provides, in part, "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated."

Fourth Amendment protections are triggered for most stops by law enforcement officers, and law enforcement officers must have a reasonable suspicion that a person has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a crime. The U.S. Supreme Court has long authorized law enforcement officers to effect a temporary detention or investigatory stop, also known as a *Terry* Stop-and-Frisk, for the purpose of briefly ascertaining information about criminal activity. The seminal case of *Terry v. Ohio* established limits on law enforcement officers in making temporary stops.²¹ In so doing, the Court strictly limits the scope of a search and generally disfavors moving a defendant to multiple places for questioning.²²

¹⁶ *Peterson v. State*, 983 So. 2d 27 (Fla. 1st DCA 2008).

¹⁷ *Id.* at 29.

¹⁸ *Id.* at 29-30.

¹⁹ *Dennis v. State*, 51 So. 3d 456, 464 (Fla. 2010).

²⁰ *Id.* at 459.

²¹ *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (88 S.Ct. 1868).

²² *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (88 S.Ct. 1868), involved a discovery of unlawfully concealed firearms during a pat down by a law enforcement officer. In this case, the Court ruled the search permissible where the law enforcement officer had a reasonable suspicion of criminal activity. In this case, the officers observed defendants engage in a pattern of unusual activity, possibly indicative of preparing to commit a burglary or robbery. The Court also found that the officers conducted a reasonable scope of search by limiting the search to a pat down of outer pockets of clothing. *Id.* at 7 and 29. "The sole justification of the search in the present situation is the protection of the police officer and others nearby, and it must

Florida codified the *Terry* holding as s. 901.151, F.S., which is known as the “Florida Stop and Frisk Law.”²³ The Florida Stop and Frisk Law imposes a reasonableness standard for law enforcement officers to temporarily detain a person. The questions a law enforcement officer may ask are limited to identifying a person’s identity and questions designed to elicit information about the suspected criminal activity. Likewise, Florida law prohibits law enforcement officers from moving the person detained as part of a “Stop and Frisk,” investigatory stop.

The U.S. Supreme Court makes sharp distinctions between a temporary detention and an arrest for which an officer must have probable cause. Probable cause is a much higher level of suspicion than reasonable suspicion. Probable cause requires that the facts and circumstances known to the officer warrant a prudent man in believing that an offense has been committed.²⁴

Taking a person into custody generally rises to the level of an arrest.²⁵ Custody does not always mean arrest, however. Regardless, the courts do not typically recognize a cursory, temporary detention as being as restrictive as taking someone into custody.

Task Force

Florida Governor Rick Scott convened the Task Force on Citizen Safety and Protection to thoroughly review the state’s Stand Your Ground law. The task force held seven public hearings around the state, took testimony, and issued recommendations, detailed in a report dated February 21, 2013.²⁶ The task force provided the report to the Governor, President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Although the task force issued a number of recommendations, members concurred in the belief that all persons who are conducting themselves in a lawful manner have the right to defend themselves and to stand their ground when attacked.²⁷

therefore be confined in scope to an intrusion reasonably designed to discover guns, knives, clubs, or other hidden instruments for the assault of the police officer.” *Id.* at 29.

²³ Section 901.151(2), F.S., provides: “Whenever any law enforcement officer of this state encounters any person under circumstances which reasonably indicate that such person has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a violation of the criminal laws in this state . . . the officer may temporarily detain such person for the purpose of ascertaining the identity of the person temporarily detained and the circumstances surrounding the person’s presence abroad which led the officer to believe that the person had committed, was committing, or was about to commit a criminal offense.” The section precludes an officer from temporarily detaining a person longer than is reasonably necessary or from moving the person to another location during the detention. Section 901.151 (3), F.S.

²⁴ *Henry v. United States*, 361 U.S. 98, 102 (1959).

²⁵ See *Caldwell v. State*, 41 So. 3d 188 (Fla. 2010). In this case, the Florida Supreme Court reviewed the requirement for law enforcement officers to issue *Miranda* warnings in the context of arrest and custody. The Court emphasized that “*Miranda* warnings are not required in any police encounter in which the suspect is not placed under arrest or otherwise in custody” *Id.* at 198. “[B]ecause of the very cursory and limited nature of a *Terry* stop, a suspect is not free to leave, yet is not entitled to full custody *Miranda* rights.” *Id.* at 199, quoting *United States v. Salvo*, 133 F.3d 943, 949 (6th Cir. 1998).

²⁶ Governor’s Task Force on Citizen Safety and Protection, Final Report (Feb. 21, 2013). The task force developed its mission as follows: “The Task Force on Citizen Safety and Protection will review ch. 776, F.S., and its implementation, listen to the concerns and ideas from Floridians, and make recommendations to the Governor and Florida Legislature to ensure the rights of all Floridians and visitors, including the right to feel safe and secure in our state.”

²⁷ *Id.* at 5. “The Task Force concurs with the core belief that all persons . . . have a right to feel safe and secure in our state. To that end, all persons who are conducting themselves in a lawful manner have a fundamental right to stand their ground and defend themselves from attack with proportionate force in every place they have a lawful right to be.”

Task force members recommended that:

- The Stand Your Ground law apply to all persons, regardless of citizenship status.
- The term “unlawful activity” be defined. Suggested definitions would exclude noncriminal or certain county and municipal ordinance violations or require a temporal nexus between the unlawful activity and the use of force.
- Law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and the judiciary have additional training and education to facilitate the uniform and fair application of the self-defense law.
- The role of neighborhood crime watch participants be limited to observing, watching, and reporting potential criminal activity.
- Any ambiguity be removed from the definition of the term “criminal prosecution” to enable law enforcement officers to fully investigate cases involving the use of force.
- The Legislature consider whether the immunity provisions of the Stand Your Ground law should preclude innocent, third-party bystanders from filing legal actions.
- The Legislature consider funding further study of the relationship between race, ethnicity, gender, and expanded self-defense laws, as a follow-up to the informal report provided by the University of Florida, Levin College of Law.
- The Legislature review the state’s 10-20-Life law to eliminate unintended consequences.²⁸

Stand Your Ground Law in other States

At least 22 states adopted some version of the Stand your Ground law. These laws provide that there is no duty to retreat from an attacker in any place in which a person is lawfully present.²⁹ These states include Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and West Virginia.³⁰ Nine of these states adopted laws with specific language providing that a person may stand his or her ground.³¹

Civil immunity is available to persons who use self-defense in certain circumstances in at least 22 states. These states include Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

²⁸ The final report of the task force is available at: <http://www.flgov.com/citizensafety/>.

²⁹ *Self-defense and “Stand Your Ground,”* National Conference of State Legislatures (Aug. 30, 2013).

<http://www.ncsl.org/issues-research/justice/self-defense-and-stand-your-ground.aspx> (last visited Oct. 2, 2013).

³⁰ Alabama (s. 13A-3-20, 23); Arizona (s. 13-405); Florida (ch. 776, F.S.); Georgia (ss. 16-3-23, 16-3-23-1, 16-3-24); Indiana (s. 35-41-3-2); Kansas (ss. 21-5222, 21-5223, 21-5224, 21-5225, 21-5230); Kentucky (ss. 503.050, 503.055, 503.080); Louisiana (ss. 14:19, 14:20); Michigan (s. 780.972); Mississippi (s. 97-3-15); Montana (s. 45-3-110); Nevada (ss. 200.120, 200.160); New Hampshire (s. 627:4); North Carolina (ss. 14-51.2, 14-51.3); Oklahoma (s. 1289.25); Pennsylvania (title 18, s. 505); South Carolina (ss. 16-11-440, 16-11-450); South Dakota (s. 22-18-4); Tennessee (s. 39-11-614); Texas (ss. 9.31, 9.32, 9.41, 9.42, 9.43); Utah (ss. 76-2-402, 76-2-405, 76-2-407); West Virginia (s. 55-7-22).

³¹ States with self-defense laws with specific stand your ground language are: Alabama (s. 13A-3-23(b)), Florida (s. 776.013, F.S.), Georgia (s. 16-3-23.1), Kansas (s. 21-5320), Kentucky (s. 503.055), Louisiana (s. 14:19), Oklahoma (s. 1289.25), Pennsylvania (title 18, s. 505), and South Carolina (s. 16-11-440(C)).

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

Neighborhood Crime Watch Program Law

The bill requires the sheriff or municipal police department to issue guidelines for the operation of neighborhood crime watch programs within the county or municipality.

The content of the guidelines are only limited by the bill in two respects. The bill requires that the guidelines include:

- a prohibition against a program participant, while on patrol, confronting or attempting to apprehend a person suspected of improper or unlawful activity subject to
- an exception in the guidelines for program participants to act under circumstances in which a reasonable person would be permitted, authorized, or expected to assist another person.

Immunity from Civil Actions

The bill provides that a person who is immune from civil lawsuits is only immune from lawsuits by the person against whom force is used and his or her personal representative or heirs. Therefore, an injured third party is not expressly precluded from filing a civil action against a person who is otherwise immune under the Stand Your Ground law.

Immunity from Criminal Prosecution

The Stand Your Ground law provides that a person who justifiably uses force is immune from criminal prosecution. The term "criminal prosecution" is further defined by the law to include "arresting, detaining in custody, and charging or prosecuting the defendant." The bill redefines "criminal prosecution" for purposes of the application of the Stand Your Ground law as arresting, taking into custody, or charging or prosecuting the defendant."

The bill also states that the immunity language in the Stand Your Ground law does not negate or lessen a law enforcement agency's authority and duty to fully investigate whether a person lawfully used force.

As such, the bill should remove ambiguities which may have been interpreted by some to require law enforcement officers to have probable cause to make an investigatory detention during the course of an investigation under potential Stand Your Ground circumstances.

The bill clarifies that an aggressor who is not justified in using force will not benefit from immunity from criminal prosecution or civil actions.

Immunity Hearing Procedure

The bill creates a procedure by which immunity claims may be raised by defendants facing criminal prosecution. The defendant is entitled to an evidentiary hearing on a pretrial Motion to

Dismiss by making a prima facie showing of the justifiable use of force.³² The bill does not specify whether the motion must be a sworn motion.

At the hearing the State bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant's use of force was not lawful. Presumably the defendant will not testify at the hearing, and cannot be compelled to do so. If, however, the defendant testifies, the bill provides that his or her testimony is only admissible for impeachment purposes in a subsequent hearing or trial. Likewise, any factual determinations made are not considered to be established for trial purposes.

The judge will decide all factual disputes at the hearing. If the court denies the defendant's Motion to Dismiss, any factual findings the court makes at the hearing does not preclude the defendant from raising any defense or presenting any evidence at trial.

Additional Provisions in the Bill

The bill refines current law related to the availability of the Stand Your Ground self-defense and immunity provisions. Generally, under s. 776.041, F.S., the self-defense and immunity provisions are not available to a person who provokes the use of force against him or herself. The bill clarifies that in order to provoke aggression against oneself, one must use force or threat of force. This should clarify that more than mere words or offensive behavior, for example, is required to constitute provocation.

The bill creates a new section of law containing legislative findings that state: The use of force authorized by this chapter is not intended to encourage vigilantism or acts of revenge, authorize the initiation of a confrontation as a pretext to respond with deadly force, or negate a duty to retreat for persons engaged in unlawful mutual combat.

The bill takes effect October 1, 2014.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

³² "Evidence good and sufficient on its face; such evidence as, in the judgment of the law, is sufficient to establish a given fact, or the group or chain of facts constituting the party's claim or defense, and which if not rebutted or contradicted, will remain sufficient." *Black's Law Dictionary*, Fifth Ed., 1979, West Publishing.

V. Fiscal Impact Statement:**A. Tax/Fee Issues:**

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

None.

C. Government Sector Impact:

The local sheriffs and municipal police departments may incur some costs related to creating and distributing the guidelines for local neighborhood crime watch programs.

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

None.

VII. Related Issues:

None.

VIII. Statutes Affected:

This bill substantially amends the following sections of the Florida Statutes: 30.60, 166.0485, 776.032, and 776.041.

The bill creates section 776.09, of the Florida Statutes.

IX. Additional Information:**A. Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes:**

(Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

CS/CS by Criminal Justice on March 17, 2014:

The committee substitute:

- Requires the county sheriff or municipal police department to issue reasonable guidelines for participants in neighborhood crime watch programs and eliminates the requirement that FDLE develop curriculum for the programs.
- Amends the Stand Your Ground law to no longer preclude lawsuits from third parties who are injured by negligent conduct used in self-defense.
- Clarifies that a law enforcement agency maintains the authority and duty to fully investigate whether a person claiming self-defense has lawfully used force.
- Clarifies that an aggressor who unjustifiably uses force does not have the benefit of immunity from criminal prosecution or civil actions.
- Clarifies that in order to provoke aggression against oneself, one must use force or threat of force. This should clarify that more than mere words or offensive behavior, for example, are required to constitute provocation.

- Adopts the procedure under which the Stand Your Ground immunity hearing will be conducted.
- Creates a new section of law, s. 776.09, F.S., that contains legislative findings.

CS by Judiciary on October 8, 2013:

The committee substitute:

- Requires FDLE to develop a training curriculum for neighborhood crime watch participants, rather than requiring local law enforcement agencies to establish guidelines for crime watch programs, and specifies subject matter to be addressed in the curriculum.
- Revises the definition of “criminal prosecution” used in the section on immunity for justifiable use of force to clarify the distinction between an officer effecting a detention and a custody.

B. Amendments:

None.