Bill as Introduced

HB 214 – AS INTRODUCED

2003 SESSION

03-0567
09/01

HOUSE BILL ***214***

AN ACT relative to discovery deposition of minors in criminal cases.

SPONSORS: Rep. Dumaine, Rock 75; Rep. Fish, Ches 25; Rep. P. Smith, Rock 75; Rep. Introne, Rock 75

COMMITTEE: Children and Family Law

ANALYSIS

This bill lowers the minimum age at which a minor may be deposed during discovery in a criminal case.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics.***
Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

HB 214 – AS INTRODUCED

03-0567
09/01

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Three

AN ACT relative to discovery deposition of minors in criminal cases.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 Discovery Deposition of Minors. Amend RSA 517:13, V to read as follows:

V. Notwithstanding this section, no party in a criminal case shall take the discovery deposition of a victim who was [~~16~~] ***13*** years of age or under at the time of the alleged offense or of any witness who was [~~16~~] ***13*** years of age or under at the time of the alleged offense.

2 Effective Date. This act shall take effect January 1, 2004.

HB 214 – AS AMENDED BY THE HOUSE

06mar03... 0180h

2003 SESSION

03-0567
09/01

HOUSE BILL ***214***

AN ACT relative to discovery deposition of minors in criminal cases.

SPONSORS: Rep. Dumaine, Rock 75; Rep. Fish, Ches 25; Rep. P. Smith, Rock 75; Rep. Introne, Rock 75

COMMITTEE: Children and Family Law

ANALYSIS

This bill lowers the minimum age at which a minor may be deposed during discovery in a criminal case.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics.***
Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

HB 214 – AS AMENDED BY THE HOUSE

06mar03... 0180h

03-0567
09/01

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Three

AN ACT relative to discovery deposition of minors in criminal cases.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 Discovery Deposition of Minors. Amend RSA 517:13, V to read as follows:

V. Notwithstanding this section, no party in a criminal case shall take the discovery deposition of a victim [~~who was 16 years of age or under at the time of the alleged offense or of any witness who was 16 years of age or under at the time of the alleged offense~~] ***or witness who has not achieved the age of 17 years at the time of the deposition***.

2 Effective Date. This act shall take effect January 1, 2004.

Amendments

Senate Judiciary
April 18, 2003
2003-1331s
09/01

Amendment to HB 214

Amend RSA 517:13, V as inserted by section 1 of the bill by replacing it with the following:

V. Notwithstanding this section, no party in a criminal case shall take the discovery deposition of a victim [~~who was 16 years of age or under at the time of the alleged offense or of any witness who was 16 years of age or under at the time of the alleged offense~~] ***or witness who has not achieved the age of 16 years at the time of the deposition***.

2003-1331s

AMENDED ANALYSIS

This bill prohibits discovery depositions in criminal cases of victims and witnesses who are under 16 years of age at the time of the deposition.

Committee Minutes

Gail

Judiciary Committee

Hearing Report

To: Members of the Senate

From: Susan Duncan
Senior Legislative Aide

Re: **HB 214** – *AN ACT relative to discovery deposition of minors in criminal cases.*

Hearing date: April 17, 2003

Members present: Senators Peterson, Foster, Clegg, Roberge and Sapareto

Members absent: None

Sponsor(s): Representatives Dumaine, Fish, P. Smith and Introne

What the bill does: This bill lowers the minimum age at which a minor may be deposed during discovery in a criminal case.

Who supports the bill: Sandra Matheson, Victim Advocate in the Attorney General's office
Representative David Bickford for the Children & Family Law Comm.

Who opposes the bill: Attorney Mike Iacopino representing the NH Assoc. of Criminal Defense Lawyers

Summary of testimony received:

- This legislation was changed in the House. The bill as filed lowered the age to 13 and many spoke in opposition. The amended bill now clarifies the original intent regarding the age at which a victim may be deposed.
- The intent of the lengthy study establishing this protection for children/victims was to clarify the age at which a deposition may be taken, not the age at which the crime occurred.
- This legislation is for children who have been victimized only.
- The age of consent in New Hampshire is 16 years.

- Attorney Lehmann clarified that under New Hampshire statute, at the age of 17, one can be charged as an adult.
- Ms. Matheson noted that in a violent crime, one can be certified as a child down to age 13.
- This legislation is not intended to prohibit a child from being called as a witness in a trial. This is to only limit the depositions that may be taken so that the child is not traumatized.
- A child at a deposition may or may not be represented by legal counsel; they may have a Guardian Ad Litem present, however.
- Currently, if a victim is over the age of 16, with the court's permission, a deposition may be taken.
- Testimony was received that the way the bill is currently written, the status quo will be changed and more people would be excluded from being deposed.
- Attorney Iacopino requested that the bill be amended to change the age from 17 to 16 years.

Funding: No financial impact

Action: Senator Clegg moved "Ought to Pass" with an amendment changing the age from 17 to 16 years old. Senator Sapareto seconded the motion. The committee voted 5 to 0 in support of AA,OTP. Senator Clegg will report the bill out of committee.

sfd
[file: HB 214 report]
Date: April 18, 2003

HB

Date: April 17, 2003
Time: 1:05 p.m.
Room: State House, Room 105-A

The Senate Committee on Judiciary held a hearing on the following:

HB 214 relative to discovery deposition of minors in criminal cases.

Members of Committee present:

Senator Peterson
Senator Foster
Senator Clegg
Senator Roberge
Senator Sapareto

The Chair, Senator Andrew R. Peterson, opened the hearing on HB 214. There being no sponsor present, Senator Peterson put the bill into play at this time and called Sandra Matheson of the Attorney General's Office to speak on the bill. Thank you.

Sandra Matheson: I don't really know now if I do need to speak and I will explain. The way this bill was when it came out, it was to lower the deposition age for children to the age of thirteen. What I testified in the House on was the dangerousness of lowering that age to under the age of sixteen. I brought with me the history of it going back to Senator Podles' child abuse committee back in 1985.

Now it has been changed and the House decided that they did not want to do that, they did not want to lower the age. So, one of the things that they did in this bill is they are basically just clarifying the language. When it first passed in 1984, it said who was sixteen years of age or under at the time of the alleged offense. The intent of that legislation was at the time of the deposition. In other words, if I was abused at six and I am not thirty, the defense should be able to take my deposition. So, what they have done here is clarify that it means at the time of the deposition, not at the time of the offense.

So, my testimony that I copied for you, unless you would like the history of it, I would support this and the Attorney General's Office supports this the way it is written, clarifying the language, in other words.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Are there questions from the Committee? Senator Sapareto?

Senator Frank V. Sapareto, D. 19: Thank you. Do you remember the difference between...why this change is more important?

Ms. Matheson: Sure. In the discussions on the original bill, it was made, the Committee was made aware that the intent of the legislation back in 1984 was to insure that children sixteen years old and under would not go through a deposition. The way they wrote it up, the way the law was written, it makes it so that, if the child was sixteen or under at the time of the offense. Well, many, many child abuse cases, as you know, they are not disclosed until people are much older. So, the way this was originally written, it was if I disclosed at thirty that I was abused at six, you could not take the deposition of me. So, it is basically protecting child victims and witnesses. If I am thirty years old or I am over the age of sixteen, the defense should be able to take a deposition as I am no longer a child.

Senator Frank V. Sapareto, D. 19: That's the only difference?

Ms. Matheson: Yes. It is exactly the same, not changing the age. It is changing the language to make it more clear.

Senator Frank V. Sapareto, D. 19: Thank you.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Further questions from the Committee? I just wonder, although, are the sponsors here to speak to this bill?

Ms. Matheson: The sponsor of the original bill was there because he wanted to lower the age that defense attorneys could depose children and quite a big group of us testified as to the harm that that would do to children. And, so, the committee unanimously said we are not going to do that, but we are adding, while we have this bill in front of us, we will change the language to make it more clear to people. That's the original intent.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Thank you. Would you object to the seventeen being changed to sixteen years to modify?

Ms. Matheson: Well, Attorney Iacopino and I were just talking about that. The intent of the original language was that anyone sixteen years old or under. Attorney Iacopino interprets that as the minute I turn sixteen, you can depose me. The intent of it was sixteen years old and under. In other words, I am sixteen until I turn seventeen. The deposition, the age for people to be able to depose a child does not begin at age sixteen, but at age seventeen. So that is why the committee wrote it up like this because what we were looking for is that no one at the age of sixteen or under would be entitled to be deposed or be mandated to be deposed.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Senator Clegg?

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: Now that Senator Peterson brought that up, you're telling me that someone who is sixteen years of age who commits a crime with a motor vehicle isn't subject to deposition?

Ms. Matheson: No, this is for victims only. This is children who have been victimized. It is the victim in the case. It is to protect children from being deposed who are victims, not defendants.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: It says deposition of a victim.

Ms. Matheson: Right.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: Originally it said no party in a criminal case should take discovery deposition of a victim.

Ms. Matheson: Right.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: But, it's not limited to...

Ms. Matheson: They added witness.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: The deposition of the victim is not limited to anything in particular. It's not child abuse.

Ms. Matheson: No. It's a victim of any crime.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: Okay.

Ms. Matheson: Should not be deposed. I'd love to just leave this history which shows some of the reasoning behind that, if I could.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: So, it's your testimony that this language, in essence, preserves the current law, preserves the intent as you divide it over current law?

Ms. Matheson: Yes.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: What's the age of consent in New Hampshire?

Ms. Matheson: Sixteen.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Do you see any conflict in that?

Ms. Matheson: Well, I think the whole intent was that the age of consent is sixteen, but we are not just talking about sexual assault cases. You are talking about sixteen year old children. At sixteen, we still consider them children. They are adults at seventeen. So, the actual age of certification, not certification, is seventeen. They are an adult at seventeen. So, they are a child under the age of seventeen under our law.

Attorney Lehmann: They can be charged as an adult at seventeen.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: Didn't we change that?

Attorney Lehmann: I'm sorry.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: Didn't we change that in some cases for some crimes?

Attorney Lehmann: I don't think so.

Senator Frank V. Sapareto, D. 19: I remember something about that.

Ms. Matheson: No, I believe it was...

Attorney Lehmann: You might have touched up the juvenile certification.

Ms. Matheson: In a violent crime, you can certify a child over the age of thirteen. But, as far as being recognized as an adult in our state, it is the age of seventeen.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: This bill relates to being able to depose a victim as a witness. What are the circumstances relative to being able to call as a witness a person who is age sixteen in a criminal trial?

Ms. Matheson: They have the absolute right to confront, the accuser has an absolute right to confront the victim and would certainly be called as a witness. This has no bearing on whether they are actually testifying at trial or not.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: So, in other words, the issue that I parenthetically raised a moment ago through questioning you about the age of consent, the prosecutor or whomever would have the modality of calling the victim as a witness.

Ms. Matheson: Absolutely. Would also have all the discovery, the original investigation, the original interview with the child, any videotape that would have been done. The defense has access to all of those interviews and that was the premise, that they already had that information and to subject a child to a deposition would just revictimize them again. That was sort of the premise behind changing it in the beginning.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: And, could you just give us your encapsulization for the Committee on why deposing a sixteen year old is more of a revictimization than putting them on the stand in a trial?

Ms. Matheson: Well, they have to go on the stand anyway. So, if you depose a child, they still have to take the stand at trial, if it went to trial. So, you basically force them to testify twice.

In a deposition, there are no rules and regulations. There is no judge to prevent certain questions from being asked. So, there is the prosecutor, the defense attorney, and the witness or the victim in a deposition and the testimony, when we changed this law, whether children age sixteen, fifteen, thirteen, ten or seven at the time, could be subjected to depositions as long as an hour and a half to two hours long, with no parameters. The prosecutor can object to a question, but it is still often that the child is forced to answer that question. So, there are no parameters in a deposition to protect a child from certain things. In a courtroom, there are parameters; there is a judge and a prosecutor that can object.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Thank you for providing those insights for the record. Senator Roberge?

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: But, the child would have, would be represented by counsel at a deposition.

Ms. Matheson: No.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Not necessarily.

Ms. Matheson: Not necessarily. If there was a Guardian ad Litem, but in most of the cases that I know of, that I have worked with child abuse cases, they may have an advocate with them, but they are not a party. The prosecutor is basically the attorney for the child.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: So, there is nobody to object if an improper question is asked?

Ms. Matheson: The prosecutor can object. It is between the defense and the prosecutor to figure out whether or not the question should be asked. There is no one really to object to. In other words, there are three people in a room and it depends on...

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: And, one of those people isn't an advocate for the child?

Ms. Matheson: No. The prosecutor represents the State, not necessarily the victim. If you are prosecuting a case, you represent the State. So, unless there is a Guardian ad Litem who might be there. We haven't deposed children since 1983, so before that there were sometimes Guardian ad Litems when we deposed children, sometimes the child would be there with just the prosecutor and the defense attorney.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Further questions from the Committee? Seeing none, thank you for being here today on HB 214. Are there any sponsors of the bill or others who were involved in the House action that wish to speak? Yes, I see Representative David Bickford. Welcome.

Representative David Bickford: Thank you. My name is Representative David Bickford and we just found out two minutes ago about the bill up in my Committee and the Chair asked me if I would run, seeing I was the only person to grab, and tell you about it.

The bill, as it is right now, that you have, was amended just prior to make the language clearer. It is not doing the job that the sponsor intended to do. Okay? I was the only person that voted with the bill itself. The rest of the Committee was not interested in changing the age. So, it would effectively, if you pass it the way it is, leaves everything in place but simplifies the language. That's the intent.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Thank you, Representative. I'm sorry people weren't properly notified. We did have this hearing in the calendar. My understanding was that people were notified in the normal course. So, if there is a problem there, I would be glad to take it up with you.

Representative Bickford: It wasn't me. It was the secretary over at Judiciary, who just hollered over while Representative Moran and myself were talking about another bill which we are going to do some voting on at 1:30. She said, "You know, you've got a bill over in the Senate right now being heard" and asked me if I would run over and try to weigh in on. That's all I know.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Well, I believe Representative Dumaine would have been informed as it has been in the calendar as well that we were having the hearings this afternoon. So, I certainly didn't mean to short shrift your members on notice. If that occurred, we would want to address it. Are there other questions for Representative Bickford? Hearing none, thank you and call Mike Iacopino. Welcome.

Attorney Michael Iacopino: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Senators of the Committee. My name is Michael Iacopino and I have the privilege of serving as the President of the New Hampshire Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers and I am here in that capacity today to provide information with respect to this bill regarding discovery depositions of minors.

Let me just start off with the way that the law has presently been working in criminal cases. This bill, although I think it may be the intent of people to keep the law the way it is, I don't think that it does that. The way that depositions of minors have been occurring in criminal cases since a case that came down in 1986 or '87, shortly after this law was passed is that, if the witness or victim is over the age of sixteen, in other words, having attained the age of sixteen, then, with the court's permission, you can take that person's deposition. That's the way that the law is presently being interpreted or that's how RSA 517:13 is now operating in the courts.

I came here because I perceived this bill... I came here unaware of the history of this particular bill because I am not adept enough at this legislative stuff yet to look at other committees and the Criminal Justice Committee in the House. This one apparently came out of a different committee. But, in any event, when I saw it on your calendar, I did notice it and figure I better come up here to provide some information.

What I believe that this bill will do is change the status quo and make a certain class of victims and witnesses not subject to discovery depositions,

and that would be those who have reached their sixteenth birthday, but not yet their seventeenth birthday. So, I think that it does in fact exclude more people from being deposed.

Now, one of the things that hasn't been mentioned here and I think that it should be pointed out is that the Legislature changed the whole deposition law after the change for minors in 1985 and there are no... We used to have, as defense lawyers, discovery depositions as a matter of right, the same way that you had them in civil cases. I personally, and I believe that most members of my organization would believe, that that's still the way that it should be, but it's not.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: When was that done?

Attorney Iacopino: I don't know exactly when that was passed. My guess is it was in the early '90s.

However, now under the present law, we have to file a motion with the court unless it is for the deposition of an expert witness. We have to file a motion with the court and satisfy the court that there are no other alternatives available to us not to take a deposition, but to obtain the discovery information that we are looking for. We also have to prove that there is just cause for the taking of the particular depositions that we are seeking. Of course, this issue, because the police do all the investigation and pretty much the preparation work for a prosecutor, this issue falls disproportionately on the defense lawyers because one of the only ways that we have to get this information is, in some cases, by taking depositions.

So, we have to go to the judge and get approval for any depositions, whether it is a deposition of an adult or a child. So, much of what the initial intent of RSA 517:13 V was, has sort of been made moot by the subsequent changes that you have made in this law. Now, for any deposition, we need to get judicial approval and I would suggest that that in fact protects all witnesses, not just minors, but all witnesses, from unnecessary deposition and depositions which may be brought with the intent to harass or somehow otherwise cause some kind of harm to the deponent.

So, with that said, I would point out that, although my experience and the experience of other criminal defense lawyers that I have spoken to, is that once somebody, under the present rule, once somebody reaches their sixteenth birthday, they can be deposed with the permission of the court. This law seems to extend that now to seventeen. We would oppose that part of it. We have no problem with the change in the law which makes it at the time of the deposition. I think that is the important time in any event. So, I

would suggest to this Committee that if you are inclined to pass a bill such as this, that you amend it to change seventeen to sixteen.

I would point out that there are rules at depositions. There is not a judge sitting there, but there are rules and oftentimes a victim is in fact, under Superior Court Rule 93, represented by a Guardian ad Litem who most of the time is a lawyer and most of the time is a litigating lawyer so that they are in fact protected at depositions when those depositions are in fact allowed.

So, that is our position with respect to this bill and we would ask that, if you are inclined to pass this bill out of your Committee, that you amend it to reflect that achieved the age of sixteen at the time of deposition.

If there are any questions, I would be more than happy to answer them.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Senator Roberge for a question.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Do you have any record of how many depositions are actually, requested depositions are refused by the court?

Attorney Iacopino: More and more.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Like how much of a percentage are actually refused?

Attorney Iacopino: I don't know. I couldn't give you an actual percentage.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: You don't think it is just a rubber stamp one way or the other, they just refuse or allow?

Attorney Iacopino: I think that they were allowed more liberally right after you changed the law when we first had to go to get judicial approval. Then what happened was that several judges denied the deposition. Those denials made their way to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court affirmed those denials. In other words, said the judge was right to deny the depositions in those cases. In my experience, what has happened is that the Superior Court judges have been more emboldened by those decisions to deny discovery depositions. Of course, we are not just talking about minors or victims here. We are talking about depositions overall.

I have found in my personal practice and I think most defense lawyers that come before you will tell you that over the years, it gets harder and harder to get the court to approve you taking a discovery deposition, not just the victim, but of any witness in criminal cases.

Quite frankly, in my opinion, that is somewhat unfair. If there is money on the table and that is what the case is about, we allow people to take depositions until next Tuesday. But, when somebody's liberty is on the line, we are permitted less and less that very important discovery. From our perspective, that seems to be an unfair situation.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: And, although the point is taken, you're certainly not recommending an amendment to this bill today to address that situation, are you?

Attorney Iacopino: No. I am simply here to speak to this bill and to provide information on it. I was told by Sandra that the bill only intended to sort of codify the law as it is presently interpreted. I don't read it that way. What I am saying is that, if you do pass this bill, we would suggest that you make it fifteen.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Well, very honestly, I have trouble reading the existing law any other way. First of all, the law that is in front of us, on lines 3 and 4, strikes me, makes it so crystal clear as to the problem if someone was twenty years old and the offense had occurred when they were sixteen, you still could not depose them. I also understand that this law was changed in 1988 by the Legislature. The cite was just provided to me so, rather than saying under sixteen years old, it went to sixteen years old or under. So how the court could interpret it any other way is one of the mysteries that I will no doubt struggle with in my spare time.

Attorney Iacopino: I am here to report the way it has been interpreted in practice.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Thank you. Are there other questions? Hearing none, thank you for appearing today.

Attorney Iacopino: Thank you.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: I have no one else who wishes to testify or who signed up to testify on 214. Are there others who wish to speak? If I could ask Ms. Matheson again. Would you respond to a question please?

Ms. Matheson: Sure. I apologize. I did not introduce myself. My name is Sandra Matheson and I am not an attorney with the Attorney General's Office. I am the Director of the State Office of the Victim Witness Assistance,

a position I have held since the office was created legislatively in '87. I am a victim advocate; I am not an attorney.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Well, thank you. That was my oversight in not asking you to identify yourself for the record. Is what the previous witness has told us accurate with regard to the way the court has interpreted this law, to your knowledge?

Ms. Matheson: I really am probably not the one to answer that because I have been in the Attorney General's Office doing homicide cases for sixteen years. I am not doing child sexual abuse cases. So, I would rather defer that. At the last hearing, Cheshire County Attorney Heed and Peter Odum from Strafford County that were answering the legal questions and are in the courts every day. They would be able to answer that question. I do not want to say yes or no on that. I'm really not sure.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Thank you. Senator Clegg:

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: I'm confused. You said that when this bill they testified on the House side?

Ms. Matheson: Yes.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: It was Cheshire County Attorney Peter Heed?

Ms. Matheson: Yes. It was before...

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: He wasn't the AG then?

Ms. Matheson: No, he wasn't. He testified as the County Attorney.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Further questions from the Committee? My only one and frankly, it was for the previous witness, if you would be so willing. Were you party to the conversation in the House when they had the hearing in the House? Did you appear there with these issues?

Attorney Iacopino: No, I did not. I understand that the bill initially actually lowered the age to thirteen at the time of the deposition and was then amended. In fact, if you look at the analysis on the backside of the page, it actually analyzes the bill as lowering the minimum age.

We weren't, neither I nor anybody from my organization, were a party to that at the time. As I alluded to before, we are all volunteers and we basically

look at two committees. That's your Committee in the Senate and the Criminal Justice Committee in the House and this came out of a committee called the Child & Family Committee, which is one that I suppose we should be looking at from now on. No, I did not learn of this until it appeared on the calendar as before this Committee.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: There are three judiciary related committees in the House, as well as this Committee. It is perfectly understandable that you wouldn't be available to comment on an amendment to a bill that you were unaware of, but I thank you for clarifying it and thank you for being here today.

Are there others who wish to testify on HB 214? Seeing none, I will close the hearing on HB 214.

Hearing concluded at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

L. Gail Brown
Senate Secretary
4/22/03

Speakers

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Date 4/17/03 Time 1:00 p.m. Public Hearing on HB 214

HB 214 – relative to discovery deposition of minors in criminal cases.

Please check box(es) that apply.

SPEAKING	FAVOR	OPPOSED	NAME (Please print)	REPRESENTING
☒	☐	☐	Sandra Matheson	Attorney General's office
☒	☐	☐	Mike Ingram	NHACDL
☐	☐	☐	Rep. David Bickford	Children + Family Law
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		

Committee Report

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SENATE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Date:

THE COMMITTEE ON Judiciary

to which was referred House Bill 214

AN ACT relative to discovery deposition of minors in criminal cases.

VOTE: 5-0

2003-1331s

Having considered the same, report the same with the following amendment and recommend that the bill: **AS AMENDED OUGHT TO PASS.**

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr.
For the Committee

HB214 Docket

Next|Prev|Results List|Main|Bill Status

Bill Title: relative to discovery deposition of minors in criminal cases.

Date	Body	Description
1/9/2003	H	Introduced and ref to Child & Fam Law; HJ8, p111
1/14/2003	H	Copy to Chairman on 1/14/2003
1/29/2003	H	Hearing Feb 4 2:30 RM206,LOB
2/19/2003	H	Maj Report OTP/AM for Mar 6 (Vote 12-0;CC)
2/19/2003	H	Prop Comm Am{0180}; HC 17, p383
3/6/2003	H	Passed with Am; HJ 21, p493 + 513
4/3/2003	S	Introduced and Ref. to Judiciary; SJ 11, Pg.268
4/11/2003	S	Hearing; April 17, 2003, Room 105-A, SH, 1:00 p.m.; SC18
4/28/2003	S	Committee Report; Ought to Pass With Amendment{1331}, [05/08/03]; SC21, Pg.10
5/8/2003	S	Committee Amendment{1331}, AA, VV; SJ 15, Pg.360-361
5/8/2003	S	Ought to Pass With Amendment{1331}, MA, VV; OT3rdg; SJ 15, Pg.361
5/8/2003	S	Passed by 3rd Reading Resolution; SJ 15, Pg.369
5/29/2003	H	House Conc with Sen Am, Rep Moran MA VV; HJ 45, p1439
6/5/2003	S	Enrolled; SJ 19, Pg.681
6/5/2003	H	Enrolled;
6/17/2003	H	Signed by the Governor on 6/17/2003 Eff: 1/1/2004 Chap: 0141

Next|Prev|Results List|Main|Bill Status

Docket Abbreviations