

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: SB 1220

INTRODUCER: Senator Brandes

SUBJECT: Custodial Interrogations

DATE: January 12, 2018

REVISED: _____

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Cellon	Jones	CJ	Pre-meeting
2.			JU	
3.			RC	

I. Summary:

SB 1220 requires a law enforcement officer to electronically record the entire custodial interrogation if it:

- Takes place at a place of detention; and
- Relates to a covered offense.

Place of detention is defined as:

- A fixed location under the control of a law enforcement agency where persons may be questioned in connection with suspected criminal offenses; or
- Where persons are detained temporarily in connection with criminal charges pending a potential arrest or citation, including, but not limited to, a police department or sheriff's office, a correctional facility, or a detention facility.

The bill specifies covered offenses which include: arson, sexual battery, robbery, kidnapping, aggravated child abuse, aggravated abuse of an elderly person or disabled adult, aggravated assault with a deadly weapon, murder, manslaughter, aggravated manslaughter of an elderly person or disabled adult; aggravated manslaughter of a child, the unlawful throwing, placing, or discharging of a destructive device or bomb, armed burglary, aggravated battery, aggravated stalking, home invasion robbery, and carjacking.

The bill also:

- Defines other terms;
- Provides exceptions to the recording requirement;
- Requires a court to consider an officer's failure to record all or part of the custodial interrogation as a factor in determining the admissibility of a statement;
- Requires a law enforcement officer to write a report explaining why he or she did not record the custodial interrogation;

- Requires a law enforcement officer to write a report explaining why when he or she conducts a custodial interrogation at a place *other than a place of detention*;
- Allows a defendant to request, and receive a cautionary jury instruction when a statement is admitted into evidence and the statement was not recorded;
- Exempts a law enforcement agency that has adopted rules regarding the recording of custodial interrogations in a place of detention from civil liability; and
- Specifies that no cause of action is created against a law enforcement officer.

There is no reported fiscal impact resulting from the bill.

The bill is effective July 1, 2018.

II. Present Situation:

Constitutional Protections and Court Decisions Interpreting and Applying Those Protections

The Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution states that “No person...shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.”¹ Likewise, the Florida Constitution extends the same protection.² The voluntariness of a defendant’s statement and the admissibility of the statement against him or her in court is a creature of both case law and statutory law in Florida.

Custodial Interrogation

Whether a person is in custody and under interrogation is the threshold question that determines the need for a law enforcement officer to advise the person of his or her *Miranda* rights.³ In *Traylor v. State*, the Supreme Court of Florida found that “[T]o ensure the voluntariness of confessions, the Self-Incrimination Clause of Article I, Section 9, Florida Constitution, requires that prior to custodial interrogation in Florida suspects must be told that they have a right to remain silent, that anything they say will be used against them in court.”⁴

The test to determine if a person is in custody for the purposes of one’s *Miranda* rights, is whether “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.”⁵

An interrogation occurs “when a person is subjected to express questions, or other words or actions, by a state agent that a reasonable person would conclude are designed to lead to an incriminating response.”⁶

¹ U.S. Const. amend. V.

² No person shall be . . . compelled in any criminal matter to be a witness against himself. Article I, s. 9, Fla. Const.;

³ In *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, (1966), the Court established procedural safeguards to ensure the voluntariness of statements rendered during custodial interrogation.

⁴ 596 So.2d 957, 965-966 (Fla. 1992).

⁵ *Traylor*, 596 So.2d 957, 966 at n. 16.

⁶ *Id.* at 966 at n. 17.

Waiver of the Right to Remain Silent

A person subjected to a custodial interrogation is entitled to the protections of *Miranda*.⁷ The warning must include the right to remain silent as well as the explanation that anything a person says can be used against them in court. The warning includes both parts because it is important for a person to be aware of his or her right and the consequences of waving such a right.⁸

Admissibility of a Defendant's Statement as Evidence

The admissibility of a defendant's statement is a mixed question of fact and law decided by the court during a pretrial hearing or during the trial outside the presence of the jury.⁹ For a defendant's statement to become evidence in a criminal case, the judge must first determine whether the statement was freely and voluntarily given where the statement was obtained by law enforcement during the custodial interrogation of the defendant. The court looks to the totality of the circumstances of the statement to determine if it was voluntarily given.¹⁰

The facts considered by the court come from testimony by the defendant and by the law enforcement officers involved, their reports, and any additional evidence such as audio or video recordings of the custodial interrogation.

As discussed above, the courts use a "reasonable person" standard in making the determination of whether the defendant was in custody at the time he or she made a statement.¹¹ The court considers, given the totality of the circumstances, whether a reasonable person in the defendant's position would have believed he or she was free to terminate the encounter with law enforcement and, therefore, was not in custody.¹² Among the circumstances or factors the courts have considered are:

- The manner in which the police summon the suspect for questioning;
- The purpose, place, and manner of the interrogation;
- The extent to which the suspect is confronted with evidence of his or her guilt; and
- Whether the suspect is informed that he or she is free to leave the place of questioning.¹³

The court will also determine whether the defendant was made aware of his or her *Miranda* rights, and he or she knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently elected to waive those rights and give a statement.¹⁴

Even when the court deems the statement admissible and the jury hears the evidence, defense counsel will be able to cross-examine any witnesses who testify and who have knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the defendant's statement. Additionally, counsel may argue to the jury in closing argument, that the statement was coerced in some way by law enforcement.

⁷ See *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 444 (1966).

⁸ *Sliney v. State*, 699 So.2d 662, 669 (Fla. 1997), cert. denied, 522 U.S. 1129 (1998).

⁹ *Nickels v. State*, 90 Fla. 659, 668 (1925).

¹⁰ *Supra* n. 8 at 667.

¹¹ *Supra* n. 5.

¹² *Voorhees v. State*, 699 So.2d 602, 608 (Fla. 1997).

¹³ *Ramirez v. State*, 739 So.2d 568, 574 (Fla. 1999).

¹⁴ *Supra* n. 8 at 668.

Interrogation Recording in Florida

Law enforcement agencies in Florida are not currently required to record the custodial interrogation of a crime suspect, neither by audio, video, or a combination of means. Fifty-seven agencies in Florida are reported to voluntarily record custodial interrogations, at least to some extent.¹⁵

Other States

Currently twenty-three states and the District of Columbia record custodial interrogations statewide.¹⁶ These states have statutes, court rules, or court cases that require law enforcement to make the recordings or allow the court to consider the failure to record a statement in determining the admissibility of a statement.¹⁷

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

The bill creates a statutory requirement, and exceptions to the requirement, that a law enforcement officer conducting a custodial interrogation must record the interrogation in its entirety.

The bill provides definitions for terms used in the bill. These are:

- “Custodial interrogation” which means questioning or other conduct by a law enforcement officer which is reasonably likely to elicit an incriminating response from an individual and which occurs under circumstances in which a reasonable individual in the same circumstances would consider himself or herself to be in the custody of a law enforcement agency;
- “Electronic recording” which means an audio recording or an audio and video recording that accurately records a custodial interrogation;
- “Covered offense” which lists the following criminal offenses:
 - Arson.

¹⁵ *Compendium: Electronic Recording of Custodial Interrogations*, Thomas P. Sullivan, pp. 36-37, August 2016, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, available at <https://www.nacdl.org/electronicrecordingproject> (last visited January 8, 2018). See also *Electronic Recording of Suspect Interrogations*, Interim Report 2004-123, Florida Senate Committee on Criminal Justice, available at http://archive.flsenate.gov/data/Publications/2004/Senate/reports/interim_reports/pdf/2004-123cj.pdf (last visited January 11, 2018).

¹⁶ *Compendium: Electronic Recording of Custodial Interrogations*, Thomas P. Sullivan, pp. 7-8, August 2016, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, available at <https://www.nacdl.org/electronicrecordingproject> (last visited January 8, 2018).

¹⁷ See *Stephan v. State*, 711 P.2d 1156 (AK 1985); Ark. R. Crim. P. Rule 4.7 (2012); Cal Pen Code s. 859.5 (2016) and Cal Wel & Inst Code s. 626.8 (2014); C.R.S. 16-3-601 (2016); CT Gen. Stat. s. 54-10 (2011); D.C. Code s. 5-116.01 (2005); Hawaii was verified by the four departments that govern law enforcement in the state; 705 ILCS 405/5-401.5 (2016), 725 ILCS 5/103-2.1 (2017); Ind. R. Evid. 617 (2014); 25 M.R.S. s. 2803-B(1)(K) (2015); Md. CRIMINAL PROCEDURE Code Ann. ss. 2-401 – 2-402 (2008); MCLS ss. 763.7 – 763.9 (2013); *State v. Scales*, 518 N.W.2d 587 (MN 1994); MO Rev. Stat. s. 590.700 (2017); MT Code Ann. ss. 46-4-406 – 46-4-411 (2009); NE Rev. Stat. Ann. ss. 29-4501 – 29-4508 (2008); NJ Court Rules, R. 3:17 (2006); N.M. Stat. Ann. s. 29-1-16 (2006); N.C. Gen. Stat. s. 15A-211 (2011); OR Rev. Stat. s. 133.400 (2009); RIPAC, Accreditation Standards Manual, ch. 8, s. 8.10 (Rev. 2015); Utah R. Evid. Rule 616 (2016); 13 V.S.A. s. 5585 (2015); *State v. Jerrell C.J.*, 699 N.W.2d 110 (WI 2005); Wis. Stat. ss. 968.073 and 972.115 (2005); *Compendium: Electronic Recording of Custodial Interrogations*, Thomas P. Sullivan, August, 2016, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, available at <https://www.nacdl.org/electronicrecordingproject> (last visited January 8, 2018).

- Sexual battery.
- Robbery.
- Kidnapping.
- Aggravated child abuse.
- Aggravated abuse of an elderly person or disabled adult.
- Aggravated assault with a deadly weapon.
- Murder.
- Manslaughter.
- Aggravated manslaughter of an elderly person or disabled adult.
- Aggravated manslaughter of a child.
- The unlawful throwing, placing, or discharging of a destructive device or bomb.
- Armed burglary.
- Aggravated battery.
- Aggravated stalking.
- Home invasion or robbery.
- Carjacking.
- “Place of detention” which means a fixed location under the control of a law enforcement agency where persons may be questioned in connection with suspected criminal offenses or where persons are detained temporarily in connection with criminal charges pending a potential arrest or citation, including, but not limited to, a police department or sheriff’s office, a correctional facility, or a detention facility. The term does not include a police vehicle; and
- “Statement” which means a communication that is oral, written, electronic, nonverbal, or in sign language.

The bill requires that a custodial interrogation related to a covered offense and conducted at a place of detention must be electronically recorded in its entirety. The recording must include:

- The giving of a required warning;
- The advisement of rights; and
- The waiver of rights by the individual being questioned.

If the custodial interrogation at the place of detention is not recorded by the law enforcement officer, he or she must prepare a written report explaining the reason for the noncompliance. Additionally, the report must summarize the custodial interrogation process and the individual’s statements.

When a law enforcement officer conducts a custodial interrogation at a place other than a place of detention the officer must prepare a written report as soon as practicable. The report must explain the officer’s decision to conduct the interrogation in that place and the report must summarize the custodial interrogation process and the individual’s statements made at that place.

The general recording requirement does not apply under the following circumstances:

- If there is an unforeseen equipment malfunction that prevents recording the custodial interrogation in its entirety;
- If a suspect refuses to participate in a custodial interrogation if his or her statements are electronically recorded;

- Due to equipment operator error;
- If the statement is made spontaneously and not in response to a custodial interrogation question;
- If a statement is made after questioning that is routinely asked during the processing of the arrest of a suspect;
- If the custodial interrogation occurs when no law enforcement officer participating in the interrogation has knowledge of facts and circumstances that would lead an officer to reasonably believe that the individual being interrogated may have committed a covered offense;
- If the law enforcement officer conducting the custodial interrogation reasonably believes that electronic recording would jeopardize the safety of the officer, individual being interrogated, or others; or
- If the custodial interrogation is conducted outside of the state.

Unless a court finds that one or more of the enumerated exceptions applies, the court must consider the officer's failure to record all or part of the custodial interrogation as a factor in determining the admissibility of a defendant's statement made during the interrogation. If the court decides to admit the statement, the defendant may request and the court must give a cautionary jury instruction regarding the officer's failure to comply with the recording requirement.

Finally, if a law enforcement agency has enforced rules that are adopted pursuant to the bill and that are reasonably designed to comply with the bill's requirements, the agency is not subject to civil liability for damages arising from a violation of the bill's requirements. The bill does not create a cause of action against a law enforcement officer.

The bill is effective July 1, 2018.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

It is possible that the requirements of the bill related to electronic recording could result in local fund expenditures for equipment, maintenance, and operation. However, because any such local funding resulting from the requirements of the bill will directly relate to the defense and prosecution of criminal offenses, under subsection (d) of Article VII, Section 18 of the Florida Constitution, it appears there is no unfunded mandate.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

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

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

None.

C. Government Sector Impact:

Although local law enforcement agencies may incur costs related to the electronic recording requirement in the bill, that cost is indeterminate.

The Florida Department of Law Enforcement anticipates no fiscal impact to the department resulting from the bill.¹⁸

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

On line 58 of the bill, the offense listed as “Home invasion *or* robbery” likely refers to the crime of “home-invasion robbery.”¹⁹

The list of offenses in the bill, beginning on line 41 and ending on line 59, appear to have been adopted from the list in s. 775.084(1)(c)1., F.S. The offense listed in s. 775.084(1)(c)1., F.S., as “Home invasion/robbery” is a somewhat more accurate representation of the actual crime than the term “Home invasion *or* robbery.” For better accuracy the scrivener’s error in the bill could be corrected to reflect the name of the actual crime, “home-invasion robbery.”

VII. Related Issues:

None.

VIII. Statutes Affected:

This bill creates section 900.05 of the Florida Statutes.

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

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

None.

¹⁸ Florida Department of Law Enforcement, *2018 Legislative Bill Analysis, SB 1220* (December 14, 2017) (on file with the Senate Committee on Criminal Justice).

¹⁹ Section 812.135(1), F.S., defines “home-invasion robbery” to mean any robbery that occurs when the offender enters a dwelling with the intent to commit a robbery, and does commit a robbery of the occupants therein.

B. Amendments:

None.

This Senate Bill Analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill's introducer or the Florida Senate.
