

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 5357-05
Bill No.: CCS for SS for SCS for HB 1633
Subject: Courts; Crimes and Punishment; State Auditor; Evidence; Judges; Juries; Victims of Crime; Drugs and Controlled Substances; Alcohol; Public Officers
Type: Original
Date: May 16, 2018

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies certain provisions relating to criminal offenses.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)
General Revenue	(\$15,515)	(\$37,981)	(\$56,173)	(\$58,443)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	(\$15,515)	(\$37,981)	(\$56,173)	(\$58,443)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)
Crime Victims' Compensation Fund	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses. This fiscal note contains 16 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)
Total Estimated Net Effect on All Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0	0

Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$100,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Oversight was unable to receive some of the agency responses in a timely manner due to the short fiscal note request time. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best current information that we have or on prior year information regarding a similar bill. Upon the receipt of agency responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek the necessary approval of the chairperson of the Joint Committee on Legislative Research to publish a new fiscal note.

§§105.478, 531.070, 576.040, 576.042, 595.219

Officials at the **Missouri Ethics Commission** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal. However, should there be a significant increase in violations, the MEC may seek additional appropriations in future budget requests.

Officials at the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** assumed the proposed section 105.478, creates a new Class A misdemeanor if official misconduct involves more than \$750 in goods or services. Because misdemeanors are not under the jurisdiction of the (DOC), this section is expected to have no impact on the department.

Section 576.040 is significantly revised. The penalty for official misconduct is returned to a class A misdemeanor (as found in current law). The revision further removes the distinction of first and second degree misconduct. Because misdemeanors are not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections (DOC), this section is expected to have no impact on the department.

Section 595.219 proposes monetary restitution as a permissible penalty if found guilty of official misconduct. The revision further removes the distinction of first and second degree misconduct. No impact on DOC is expected from passage of this section.

Officials at **Clay County** estimates that the cost of a state audit will total approximately \$650,000 each time the County would undergo an audit. There is no limitation on the number of audits that may be requested by a Prosecutor or a Law Enforcement Agency. There is no language that these may or may not run concurrently. Therefore we can only make an estimate of the minimum cost to Clay County.

It is reported that the State Auditor has also estimated that the City of Columbia's budget (operating budget is \$142,000,000 annually) would cost \$750,000. Therefore, we believe to audit Clay County (operating budget is \$103,000,000), the true cost of a state audit of our county finances could exceed \$650,000 with each audit. This number is estimated using the assumed cost of the State Auditor, which will be billed to the county, at \$500,000. We must further add

ASSUMPTION (continued)

the internal labor that will go into producing the audit, which we anticipate around \$150,000.

We believe the true cost to Clay County is \$650,000 to even larger unknown annual costs, if multiple audits are allowed to run concurrently or consecutively.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SS #2 for SB 552, officials at the **Office of the Secretary of State** and the **Department of Public Safety's Missouri Highway Patrol** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

Officials at the **Kansas City Board of Election Commission** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SS #2 for SB 552, officials at **Boone County**, the **Boone County Sheriff's Department**, the **St. Louis County Police Department** and the **St. Louis County Board of Election Commissioners** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective entities from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SS #2 for SB 552, officials at the **Greene County Sheriff's Department** assumed an unknown impact for this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SS #2 for SB 552, officials at the **Callaway County Commission** assumed an unknown impact for this proposal.

Oversight inquired the Callaway County Commission to provide a further explanation to their response and it could not be provided at this time.

Oversight notes this proposal modifies the punishment for violating lobbying and conflict of interest provisions and the offense of official misconduct, which would have no fiscal impact. Oversight assumes this proposal allows law enforcement agencies and prosecutors to request an audit by the State Auditor. Since the requesting of the State Auditor is permissive, Oversight will not show a fiscal impact in the fiscal note.

§§303.025, 400.9-501, 488.029, 556.061, 570.095, 577.001, 577.010, 577.011 577.013, 577.014, 579.065, 579.068, 595.045

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** assume section 303.025 changes the penalty by deleting jail time/fines and replacing that penalty with a class C misdemeanor, which the department does not supervise. Therefore, no impact on DOC is expected from passage of this section.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Sections 556.061, 577.010, 577.013 and 577.014 add clarification to the dangerous felon definition as it applies to "habitual offender" or "habitual boating offender". No impact on DOC is expected from passage of these sections.

Section 570.095 repeals the current class E felony for filing false documents and establishes a class D felony for the first offense and in the conditions of aggravating circumstances a class C felony. The language in the newly created section is more specific than that in the current statute, and allows for a Class D felony for first time offenders, with an enhancement to class C for repeat offenders or offenses against certain government officials, police, fire fighters, etc. While this change makes the legislation more clear, it does not appear that any new actions would be considered a crime under these changes.

The current legislation found in RSMo 400.9-501 was modified in 2014 to introduce the criminal penalty. No charge code was ever created for this statute, and the legislation is still quite new, meaning that good data for the current impact is unknown. Thus, this will be treated as a new offense; further, as this offense is expected to be quite rare, only the D felony version will be considered. The standard response for a new non-violent D felony is found below. Under this situation, 3 individuals will be sentenced to prison and 5 to probation in each fiscal year. For incarcerated individuals, the average sentence is 4.8 years, with a total of 2.9 years in prison and 1.9 years on parole; the probationers serve a 3.0 year term.

Total Impact of a New Class D Non-Violent Offense										
	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027
New										
Admissions	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Probations	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Cumulative Populations										
Prison	3.0	6.0	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7
Parole			0.3	3.3	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7
Probation	5.0	10.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Impact										
Prison Population	3.0	6.0	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7
Field Population	5.0	10.0	15.3	18.3	20.7	20.7	20.7	20.7	20.7	20.7
Population Change	8.0	16.0	24.0	27.0	29.4	29.4	29.4	29.4	29.4	29.4

Thus, this legislation is estimated to increase the prison population by 8.7 individuals by FY2020, and increase the field population to 20.7 by FY2022.

Thus, this legislation is estimated to increase the prison population by 8.7 individuals by FY2020, and increase the field population to 20.7 by FY2022.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Below is the combined impact from all sections affecting the department's population:

	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028
Felony D Prison	3	6	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7
Felony D Probation	5	10	15.3	18.3	20.7	20.7	20.7	20.7	20.7	20.7

If this impact statement has changed from statements submitted in previous years, it is because the Department of Corrections has changed the way probation and parole daily costs are calculated to more accurately reflect the way the Division of Probation and Parole is staffed across the entire state.

In December 2017, the DOC reevaluated the calculation used for computing the Probation and Parole average daily cost of supervision and revised the cost calculation to be used for 2018 fiscal notes. The new calculation estimates the increase/decrease in caseloads at each Probation and Parole district due to the proposed legislative change. For the purposes of fiscal note calculations, the DOC averaged district caseloads across the state and came up with an average caseload of 51 offender cases per officer. The new calculation assumes that an increase/decrease of 51 cases in a district would result in a change in costs/cost avoidance equal to the cost of one FTE staff person in the district. Increases/decreases smaller than 51 offenders are assumed to be absorbable.

In instances where the proposed legislation would only affect a specific caseload, such as sex offenders, the DOC will use the average caseload figure for that specific type of offender to calculate cost increases/decreases.

The DOC cost of incarceration is \$17.003 per day or an annual cost of \$6,206 per offender. The DOC cost of probation or parole is determined by the number of P&P Officer II positions that would be needed to cover the new caseload.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

The DOC would assume this legislation will result in long term cost as indicated in the chart below.

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total Costs for prison	# to probation & parole	Fewer P&P officers from reduction	Total cost for probation and parole	Grand Total - Prison and Probation (includes and 2% inflation)
Year 1	3	(\$6,206)	(\$15,515)	5	none	\$0	(\$15,515)
Year 2	6.0	(\$6,206)	(\$37,981)	10	none	\$0	(\$37,981)
Year 3	8.7	(\$6,206)	(\$56,173)	15	none	\$0	(\$56,173)
Year 4	8.7	(\$6,206)	(\$57,297)	18	none	\$0	(\$57,297)
Year 5	8.7	(\$6,206)	(\$58,443)	20	none	\$0	(\$58,443)
Year 6	8.7	(\$6,206)	(\$59,612)	20	none	\$0	(\$59,612)
Year 7	8.7	(\$6,206)	(\$60,804)	20	none	\$0	(\$60,804)
Year 8	8.7	(\$6,206)	(\$62,020)	20	none	\$0	(\$62,020)
Year 9	8.7	(\$6,206)	(\$63,260)	20	none	\$0	(\$63,260)
Year 10	8.7	(\$6,206)	(\$64,526)	20	none	\$0	(\$64,526)

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** assume many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, SOS also recognizes that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what the office can sustain with our core budget. Therefore, SOS reserves the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

Oversight assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** assumed for the purpose of the proposed legislation, and as a result of excessive caseloads, the Office of the State Public Defender cannot assume existing staff will provide competent, effective representation for any new cases where indigent persons are charged with the proposed new crime of intentionally filing a fraudulent financing statement or any financing statement with

ASSUMPTION (continued)

the Secretary of State with the intent to harass or defraud any other person. This offense would be a new Class D Felony, unless the offense meets other circumstances, then it becomes a new Class C Felony. The Missouri State Public Defender System is currently providing legal representation in caseloads in excess of recognized standards.

In addition, this proposed legislation enhances penalties for failure to provide financial responsibility, escalating to a new Class C Misdemeanor.

While the number of new cases may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the Office of the State Public Defender will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide competent and effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Oversight assumes the SPD can absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SCS for HB 1769, officials from the **Department of Public Safety-Capitol Police** and the **Missouri State Highway Patrol** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SCS for HB 1769, officials from the **St. Louis County Election Board** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SCS for HB 1769, officials from the **Missouri State University** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SCS for HB 1769, officials from the **Summersville R2 School District** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight notes that in §595.045.8, delineates fees that are to be paid to the Crime Victims' Compensation Fund based on a finding of guilt. This proposal adds E felonies that would be required to pay a \$46 fee. Oversight is unable to determine how many E felonies would have to pay the fee. Oversight will show an Unknown positive impact to the Crime Victims' Compensation Fund.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§537.560 & 575.080

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB Nos. 2061 & 2219, officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** assumed the proposal would not create a fiscal impact.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** stated this bill makes filing a false emergency a crime, an E felony if it results in injury or a D felony if it results in a death. The offense is currently included in the offense of making a false report, a misdemeanor, and the Office of the State Courts Administrator reported 144 convictions in FY 2017. The department does not know how many of the convictions were related to false emergency calls or how many resulted in injuries. As charges for filing false reports are rare, a false report ending in injury or death is even less likely. Therefore, this section is expected to have no impact on the department.

If this impact statement has changed from statements submitted in previous years, it is because the Department of Corrections (DOC) has changed the way probation and parole daily costs are calculated to more accurately reflect the way the Division of Probation and Parole is staffed across the entire state.

In December 2017, the DOC reevaluated the calculation used for computing the Probation and Parole average daily cost of supervision and revised the cost calculation to be used for 2018 fiscal notes. The new calculation estimates the increase/decrease in caseloads at each Probation and Parole district due to the proposed legislative change. For the purposes of fiscal note calculations, the DOC averaged district caseloads across the state and came up with an average caseload of 51 offender cases per officer. The new calculation assumes that an increase/decrease of 51 cases in a district would result in a change in costs/cost avoidance equal to the cost of one FTE staff person in the district. Increases/decreases smaller than 51 offenders are assumed to be absorbable.

In instances where the proposed legislation would only affect a specific caseload, such as sex offenders, the DOC will use the average caseload figure for that specific type of offender to calculate cost increases/decreases.

The DOC cost of incarceration is \$17.003 per day or an annual cost of \$6,206 per offender. The DOC cost of probation or parole is determined by the number of P&P Officer II positions that would be needed to cover the new caseload.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DOC would assume this legislation will result in long term cost as indicated in the chart below.

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total Costs for prison		# to probation & parole	Cost per year	Total cost for probation and parole	Grand Total - Prison and Probation (includes and 2% inflation)
Year 1	1	(\$6,206)	(\$5,172)		2	absorbed	\$0	(\$5,172)
Year 2	2	(\$6,206)	(\$12,660)		4	absorbed	\$0	(\$12,660)
Year 3	2	(\$6,206)	(\$12,913)		7	absorbed	\$0	(\$12,913)
Year 4	2	(\$6,206)	(\$13,172)		7	absorbed	\$0	(\$13,172)
Year 5	2	(\$6,206)	(\$13,435)		7	absorbed	\$0	(\$13,435)
Year 6	2	(\$6,206)	(\$13,704)		7	absorbed	\$0	(\$13,704)
Year 7	2	(\$6,206)	(\$13,978)		7	absorbed	\$0	(\$13,978)
Year 8	2	(\$6,206)	(\$14,257)		7	absorbed	\$0	(\$14,257)
Year 9	2	(\$6,206)	(\$14,543)		7	absorbed	\$0	(\$14,543)
Year 10	2	(\$6,206)	(\$14,833)		7	absorbed	\$0	(\$14,833)

Oversight assumes the impact estimated by DOC to not be material and will not reflect it in the fiscal note.

Officials from the **Attorney General's Office (AGO)** assume that any potential costs arising from this proposal could be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO may seek additional appropriations if there is a significant increase in litigation.

In response to similar legislation from this year, HCS for HB Nos. 2061 & 2219, and for the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with the proposed new crime of causing a false emergency response - an escalating offense depending on the result of the false emergency.

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Oversight assumes the SPD can absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§556.037

Officials at the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** assume section 556.036 seeks to modify the existing statute by removing the statute of limitations for childhood sexual offenses. A thirty year limitation is removed for the prosecutions of unlawful sexual offenses and child abuse does not have any time limitations for prosecution. If evidence of the crime and successful prosecution has not occurred within the thirty year time period, unlimited time frames will not change those facts in many cases. No new criminal penalties are created in this bill, therefore, no impact on DOC is expected from passage of this section.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 655, officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their agency.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SB 655, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** stated while the number of new cases received due to removing the statute of limitations on abuse or neglect of a child may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Oversight assumes the SPD can absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal.

§556.046

In response to a previous version, officials at the **Office of the State Public Defender** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

§§563.011, 563.041, 569.010 & 569.140

Officials at the **Department of Corrections** assume there is no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SCS for HB 1797, officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** assumed the proposal would not have a fiscal impact.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SCS for HB 1797, and for the purpose of this proposed legislation, officials from the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent persons are charged with the proposed new crime of trespass on a nuclear power plant - a new class E felony.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

While the number of new cases (or cases with increased penalties) may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

Oversight assumes the SPD can absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, SCS for HB 1797, officials from **Callaway County** assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their agency

Officials from the Callaway County Sheriff's Office did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

Oversight assumes this proposal will not have a fiscal impact.

§567.050

Officials at the **Department of Corrections** assume this adds operating an interactive computer service to promote prostitution to the offense of Promoting Prostitution 1st degree. The offense is a class B felony, but the DOC has not received any offenders and there is no impact.

§610.140

Officials at the **Department of Corrections** assume there is no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from this year, Perfected SB 954, officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** and the **Springfield Police Department** each assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the **Attorney General's Office (AGO)** assume that any potential costs arising from this proposal could be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO states they may seek additional appropriations if there is a significant increase in litigation.

Bill as a Whole

Officials at the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** assume there may be some impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

Officials at the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration**, the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations**, the **Office of State**

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Auditor, the **Office of Administration's Division of General Services**, the **Department of Revenue**, the **Department of Social Services**, the **Missouri Department of Transportation** and the **Office of Prosecution Services** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to the previous version, the **Department of Public Safety's Office of the Director** assume there is no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the **City of Columbia** assume there is no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to the previous version, officials at the **City of Kansas City**, and the **University of Missouri System** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective entities from this proposal.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT -</u> <u>State Government</u>	FY 2019 (10 Mo.)	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)
GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
<u>Costs - DOC</u> increased prison costs from increased penalties (§§303.025, 400.9- 501, 488.029, 556.061, 570.095, 577.001, 577.010, 577.013, 577.014, 579.020, 579.065, 579.068, 595.045) p.8	<u>(\$15,515)</u>	<u>(\$37,981)</u>	<u>(\$56,173)</u>	<u>(\$58,443)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND	<u>(\$15,515)</u>	<u>(\$37,981)</u>	<u>(\$56,173)</u>	<u>(\$58,443)</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u> (continued)	FY 2019 (10 Mo.)	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)
--	---------------------	---------	---------	-----------------------------------

**CRIME VICTIMS'
 COMPENSATION
 FUND**

Revenue - \$46 fee
 paid for by those
 guilty of a class E
 felony \$595.045

<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>
----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

**ESTIMATED NET
 EFFECT ON
 CRIME VICTIMS'
 COMPENSATION
 FUND**

<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Unknown</u>
----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2019 (10 Mo.)	FY 2020	FY 2021	Fully Implemented (FY 2023)
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

§§303.025, 400.9-501, 488.029, 556.061, 570.095, 577.001, 577.010, 577.013, 577.014, 579.020, 579.065, 579.068, 595.045

This bill creates the offense of filing a false document, which is committed if, with intent to defraud, deceive, harass, alarm, or negatively impact financially, a person files, causes to be filed, or attempts to file, creates, uses as genuine, transfers or has transferred, presents, or prepares with knowledge or belief that it will be filed, presented, or transferred to the Secretary of State or his or her designee, any county recorder of deeds or his or her designee, any municipal, county, district, or state government entity or office, or any credit bureau or financial institution specified documents. For the first offense, filing a false document is a class D felony. Filing false

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

documents is a class C felony in certain specified instances. Any person who is found guilty of committing such offense will be ordered to make full restitution to any person or entity that has sustained any actual losses as a result of the commission of such offense.

The bill specifies that a system must be created, by January 1, 2019, in which suspicious filings are logged, and outlines the process for petitioning the court when a person has probable cause to believe a filing is fraudulent.

This bill specifies that a court shall be obligated to charge the jury with respect to an included offense only if it is established by proof of the same or less than all the elements required to establish the commission of the offense charged, there is a rational basis in the evidence for a verdict acquitting the person of the offense charged and convicting the person of the included offense, and either party requests the court to charge the jury with respect to a specific included offense.

Failure of the defendant or defendant's counsel to request the court to charge the jury with respect to a specific included offense shall not be a basis for plain-error review on direct appeal or post-conviction relief. It shall be the trial court's duty to determine if a rational basis in the evidence for a verdict exists.

Currently, the court shall be obligated to instruct the jury with respect to a particular included offense only if there is a basis in the evidence for acquitting the person of the immediately higher included offense and there is a basis in the evidence for convicting the person of that particular included offense, the bill repeals this language.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Corrections
Office of the Secretary of State
Office of the State Public Defender
Office of State Courts Administrator
Office of Prosecution Services
Attorney General's Office
Department of Public Safety
 Capitol Police
 Missouri Highway Patrol
 Office of the Director
Office of Administration
 Division of General Services

SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)

Department of Transportation
Department of Revenue
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Missouri Ethics Commission
Office of State Auditor
St. Louis County Election Board
City of Kansas City
Missouri State University
Summersville R2 School District
Springfield Police Department
University of Missouri System
Boone County
Boone County Sheriffs Department
St. Louis County Police Department
Greene County Sheriff's Department
Callaway County Commission
St. Louis County Board of Election Commission
Kansas City Board of Election Commission

Ross Strobe



Acting Director
May 16, 2018