By Senator Bracy

11-00089-20 2020258

A bill to be entitled

An act relating to statements made by a criminal defendant; amending s. 90.803, F.S.; requiring that hearsay statements made during certain custodial interrogations comply with specified requirements in order to be admissible; defining terms; specifying that an oral, written, or sign-language statement made by an interrogee during a custodial interrogation is inadmissible as evidence against such person unless certain requirements are met; authorizing the prosecution to rebut a presumption of inadmissibility under certain circumstances; defining the term "good cause"; providing for the admissibility of certain statements of an interrogee when obtained by federal officers or investigative personnel from other jurisdictions; requiring the preservation of electronic recordings until certain requirements are met; providing that admissibility is not precluded for certain statements of an interrogee; amending s. 90.804, F.S.; requiring that any statements made during a custodial interrogation comply with certain requirements in order for the statement to be admissible; providing a legislative finding of important state interest; specifying the purpose of the act; providing an effective date.

2627

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

1617

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

2829

Section 1. Subsection (18) of section 90.803, Florida

11-00089-20 2020258

Statutes, is amended to read:

30

31

32

3334

35

36

37

38

39

40

4142

43

44

4546

47

48 49

5051

52

53

5455

56

57

58

90.803 Hearsay exceptions; availability of declarant immaterial.—The provision of s. 90.802 to the contrary notwithstanding, the following are not inadmissible as evidence, even though the declarant is available as a witness:

- (18) ADMISSIONS.—A statement that is offered against a party and is:
- (a) The party's own statement in either an individual or a representative capacity;
- (b) A statement of which the party has manifested an adoption or belief in its truth;
- (c) A statement by a person specifically authorized by the party to make a statement concerning the subject;
- (d) A statement by the party's agent or servant concerning a matter within the scope of the agency or employment thereof, made during the existence of the relationship; or
- (e) A statement by a person who was a coconspirator of the party during the course, and in furtherance, of the conspiracy. Upon request of counsel, the court shall instruct the jury that the conspiracy itself and each member's participation in it must be established by independent evidence, either before the introduction of any evidence or before evidence is admitted under this paragraph; or
- (f) The party's own statement that is the result of a custodial interrogation conducted in compliance with this paragraph.
 - 1. As used in this paragraph, the term:
- <u>a. "Custodial interrogation" or "interrogation" means</u> questioning of an interrogee in circumstances in which a

11-00089-20 2020258

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.

- b. "Electronic recording" means a true, complete, and accurate reproduction of a custodial interrogation created through the use of videotape, audiotape, or digital or other media.
- <u>c. "Interrogation facility" means a law enforcement</u>
 <u>facility, correctional facility, community correctional center,</u>
 <u>detention facility, law enforcement vehicle, courthouse, or</u>
 other secure environment.
- d. "Interrogee" means a person who, at the time of the interrogation and concerning any topic of the interrogation, is:
 - (I) Charged with a felony; or
- (II) Suspected by those conducting the interrogation of involvement in a felony.
- e. "Involvement" means participation in a crime as a principal or an accessory.
- 2. An oral, written, or sign-language statement made by an interrogee during a custodial interrogation is inadmissible as evidence against such person in a criminal proceeding unless all of the following requirements are met:
- <u>a. The interrogation is reproduced in its entirety by means</u> <u>of an electronic recording.</u>
- b. Immediately before the interrogation begins, and as part of the electronic recording, the interrogee is given all constitutionally required warnings and the interrogee knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily waives any rights set out in the warnings that would, absent such waiver, otherwise preclude the

11-00089-20 2020258

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 persons recorded on the electronic recording who 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 under 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 an interrogee is provided with true, complete, and accurate copies of all electronic recordings of the interrogee made pursuant to this paragraph.
- 3.a. In the absence of a true, complete, and accurate electronic recording, the prosecution may rebut a presumption of inadmissibility only by offering clear and convincing evidence that:
- (I) The statement was both voluntary and reliable, made after the interrogee was fully advised of all constitutionally required warnings; and
- (II) Law enforcement officers had good cause not to electronically record all or part of the interrogation.
- b. For purposes of sub-subparagraph a., the term "good cause" includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- (I) The interrogation occurred in a location other than an interrogation facility under exigent circumstances where the requisite recording equipment was not readily available and

11-00089-20 2020258

there was no reasonable opportunity to move the interrogee to an interrogation facility or to another location where the requisite recording equipment was readily available;

- (II) The interrogee refused to have the interrogation electronically recorded, and such refusal was electronically recorded;
- (III) The failure to electronically record an entire interrogation was the result of equipment failure, and obtaining replacement equipment was not feasible; or
- (IV) The statement of the interrogee was obtained in the course of intercepting wire, oral, or electronic communication which was being conducted pursuant to a properly obtained and issued warrant or which required no warrant and was otherwise legally conducted.
- 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, a written, oral, or sign-language statement of the interrogee which was made as a result of a custodial interrogation is admissible in a criminal proceeding against the interrogee in this state if:
- a. The statement was obtained in another jurisdiction by investigative personnel of that jurisdiction, acting independently of law enforcement personnel of this state, in compliance with the laws of that jurisdiction; or
- b. The statement was obtained by a federal officer in this state or another jurisdiction during a lawful federal investigation and was obtained in compliance with the laws of the United States.
- 5. Every electronic recording of a custodial interrogation made pursuant to this paragraph must be preserved until the

11-00089-20 2020258

interrogee'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 interrogee for any offense relating to
the interrogation.

- 6. This paragraph does not preclude the admission into evidence of a statement made by the interrogee:
 - a. At his or her trial or other hearing held in open court;b. Before a grand jury;
 - c. Which is the res gestae of the arrest or the offense; or
- d. Which does not arise from a custodial interrogation or which is a spontaneous statement.

Section 2. Paragraph (c) of subsection (2) of section 90.804, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

- 90.804 Hearsay exceptions; declarant unavailable.-
- (2) HEARSAY EXCEPTIONS.—The following are not excluded under s. 90.802, provided that the declarant is unavailable as a witness:
- (c) Statement against interest.—A statement which, at the time of its making, was so far contrary to the declarant's pecuniary or proprietary interest or tended to subject the declarant to liability or to render invalid a claim by the declarant against another, so that a person in the declarant's position would not have made the statement unless he or she believed it to be true. A statement tending to expose the declarant to criminal liability and offered to exculpate the accused is inadmissible, unless corroborating circumstances show the trustworthiness of the statement. However, any statement

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199200

201

202

203

11-00089-20 2020258

made during a custodial interrogation of an interrogee as defined in s. 90.803(18)(f) must comply with that paragraph when required in order for the statement to be admissible under this paragraph.

Section 3. (1) The Legislature finds that the reputations of countless hard-working law enforcement officers are needlessly attacked by criminal suspects who falsely claim the officers violated the suspects' constitutional rights, that limited trial court resources are squandered in hearings on motions to suppress statements made by criminal suspects who are able 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 custodial interrogation of a criminal suspect, eliminating this gross waste of resources and enhancing the reliability and reputation of law enforcement officers. Therefore, the Legislature determines and declares that this act fulfills an important state interest.

(2) The purpose of this act is to require the creation of an electronic record of an entire custodial interrogation in order to eliminate disputes about interrogations, thereby improving prosecution of the guilty while affording protection to the innocent and increasing court efficiency.

Section 4. This act shall take effect July 1, 2020.