

SB

10

SFIN

FILE

SB 10

was referred to the
Senate Finance
Committee

Hearing(s) were held

The bill did not move
from Committee

Senate Bill 10 Related to Vandalism and Restitution (April 20, 2006)

- Introduction
- Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you to discuss Senate Bill 10. The Division appreciates any effort to assist it in its mission to hold juvenile offenders accountable for behaviors that cost Alaskans emotional and financial difficulty. We've appreciated the cosponsors willingness to consult and work with us to try and create a bill that enhances juvenile accountability.
- The mission of the Division of Juvenile Justice, as described in AS 47.12.010, is to promote a balanced juvenile justice system that imposes accountability of juvenile offenders, equips juvenile offenders with the skills needed to live responsibly and productively, and also affords protection and redress to victims.
- It is this third piece—promoting the safety and restoration of victims and communities—that we are concerned is jeopardized by this bill.
- The restitution payment structure set up by the bill (with the YOUTH ONLY is responsible for the first \$5,000 in damages, the parent for the next \$15,000, and the YOUTH ONLY responsible for any remainder) will likely slow down the speed with which victims are repaid for damages and will not encourage youth and their parents to work together to address the damages caused by delinquent acts.
- Whether a juvenile case is managed informally or formally, the provisions of the bill related to juvenile restitution removes the current joint and several liability system that encourages parents and youths to work together to see that restitutions to victims are repaid promptly and in full. While this conceivably may have the effect of holding juveniles more directly and individually accountable to their victims, in the end it will result in victims having to wait for the youth to gather, either through permanent fund dividend payments or through work, the money.
- Imagine a youth who has committed \$3,000 in damage. Under current statute, Juvenile Justice staff or the courts are able to order and collect that restitution directly from parents and the youth at once. Even if the youth and parent have no other source of cash income, they'd be able to repay most (if not all) of that restitution within a year by together using their permanent fund dividends. If you remove the requirement that parents participate, the victim would now have to wait three years for the youth to make annual payments of approximately \$1,000 each.
- So: while we support efforts to hold youth accountable, we are concerned about doing this at a cost to victims. AS 47.12.010, the statute describing the goals and purpose of the state's juvenile justice system, states that one of Alaska's goals is to "ensure that victims of crimes committed by juveniles are afforded the same

*Concerns
for
speed of
restitution
payment
for
victims
- removed
the
parent's
responsibility
to
repay
the
victim*

rights ^{and} victims of crimes committed by adults." This bill contradicts that statute by providing a restitution repayment scheme that will take longer for victims of juvenile crimes to be repaid than victims of crimes by adults, and as such, gives us serious concern.

- We also are concerned about elements of the bill related to state's liability for youth in our custody, and the possible impacts this may have on the state's ability to effectively recruit and retain foster parents. The bill repeals AS 34.50.020 (b), which currently and clearly states that a state agency or its agents, including those working in foster homes and other residential settings, are NOT responsible for the acts of unemancipated minors in its charge or custody; and ~~it~~ appears to conflict with regulation (7 AAC 53.110) that currently states that foster parents can be reimbursed by the state for damages and losses incurred by the juvenile in their care.
- An additional concern with the bill is that related to driver's license revocations. The bill states that a juvenile formally adjudicated for any delinquent offense shall have their driver's license revoked. (Currently, driver's licenses shall be revoked only for minor consuming violations, misconduct involving a controlled substance, and offenses involving the illegal use or possession of a firearm.)
- The Division is unaware of any evidence linking effectiveness of driver's license revocations with reducing offenses that have nothing to do with driving. The Division has spent the past few years focusing and investing heavily in research-based approaches to work with delinquent youth. Legislation that imposes far-reaching punitive measures without regard to whether the proposal has been linked to reduction in offenses is inconsistent with the mission of the Division and a data-driven approach.
- I want to re-emphasize that the Division takes its mission of holding juvenile offenders accountable seriously. We have worked to see that juvenile offenders managed through informal processes have repaid over 90% of the restitution payments owed to victims over the past several fiscal years; and we have worked closely with the Department of Law Collections Unit to ensure that restitutions ordered through the formal court system are repaid promptly and in full.
- The Division is eager to work with the Legislature to explore ways that further increase accountability for juvenile offenders in ways that are compatible with our obligation toward victims and the community. Thank you again, this concludes my testimony.



ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
SENATOR GRETCHEN GUESS
SENATOR FRED DYSON

Sponsor Statement

CS Senate Bill 10:

"An Act relating to civil liability for damage to or destruction of property by minors; relating to court revocation of a minor's privilege to drive; relating to restitution for certain acts of minors; and amending Rule 60, Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure."

Senate Bill (SB) 10 started out to lift the cap on civil liability for minor's vandalism, holding children and their parents accountable for the damage caused by minors.

In examining the current system, however, we found the juvenile system contains three processes for holding minors and their parents accountable for restitution: informal probation, criminal adjudication, and civil litigation. Each process approaches the crime of vandalism, non-vandalism crimes, the accountability of minors, and the accountability of parents differently.

The intent of Committee Substitute (CS) for SB 10 is to establish a consistent set of policies for all three processes to ensure full restitution, to hold minors and their parents appropriately accountable, and to improve the collection of restitution.

The key provisions of CS SB 10, applied to informal probation, criminal adjudication, and civil litigation processes, are as follows.

- All crimes against property are included except for shoplifting.
- All processes must result in full restitution being paid to the victim, unless the minor has no parents.
- Minors are accountable for the first \$5,000 of damages. Parents are accountable for the next \$15,000, and the minor pays the remaining amount. These allocations increase with the rate of inflation.
- The state is liable, to the same extent as parents, when the state has legal custody of the minor and has not placed the minor in his or her parents' physical care.
- The processes must develop payment plans based on ability to pay.
- Legal guardians, parents of runaway or missing minors, and adoptive parents of a hard-to-place child are exempt from liability.
- PFDs may be garnished and the court can order applying for a PFD.

Additionally, CS SB 10 revokes a minor's driver's license for any criminal adjudication.

Thank you for your consideration.



ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
SENATOR GRETCHEN GUESS
SENATOR FRED DYSON

Sectional Explanation

CS Senate Bill 10(JUD):

"An Act relating to civil liability for damage to or destruction of property by minors; relating to court revocation of a minor's privilege to drive, relating to restitution for certain acts of minors; and amending Rule 60, Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure."

Driver's License Provisions

Sections 1-3: Amends current statute on the revocation of a minor's driver's license to include all misdemeanor and felony offenses rather than just offenses involving misconduct with a controlled substance and illegal use or possession of a firearm.

Except for the existing statutes on repeat and habitual minor consumption or possession of alcohol, the court will revoke a minor's license for up to 90 days for a first misdemeanor, up to one year for subsequent misdemeanors, up to 180 days for a first felony, and up to two years or age 18 (whichever is longer) for subsequent felonies.

Section 4: Amends current statute allowing court issuance of a provisional driver's license to enable a person to earn a livelihood and satisfy conditions of probation.

Provisions on Civil Liability for a Minor's Destruction of Property

Section 5: Amends current statute on civil liability for the destruction of property by unemancipated minors with the following provisions.

- For any knowing or intentional act by a minor that damages or destroys property, the child is liable for the first \$5,000 of harm, parents are liable for the next \$15,000 of harm and the child is liable for any amount remaining. These specified monetary amounts will be adjusted to account for inflation.
- The amount of parental restitution will be apportioned between the parents without regard to legal custody but with due consideration for the actual care and custody of the minor provided by each parent.
- This section does not apply to shoplifting, which is covered in AS 09.68.110.

Section 6: Amends current statute on civil liability for the destruction of property by unemancipated minors to say the state is responsible for restitution, to the same extent as a parent (\$15,000), for acts of minors when the state has legal custody of the minor and has not placed the minor in his or her parents' physical care.

Section 7: Creates the following two new subsections on payment of civil liability for the destruction of property by unemancipated minors.

- The court will set a payment schedule for each individual liable for damages according to their ability to make payments. The payment schedule will separately address payments the minor may have to make after turning 18.
- The court may order an individual who is liable for damages to apply for a Permanent Fund Dividend.
- The court may modify these payment schedules if financial circumstances change.
- *Note exemptions from liability for legal guardians other than parents, persons other than parents with legal custody, parents of a runaway or missing minor, and adoptive parents of a hard-to-place children already exist in this statute.*

Permanent Fund Dividend Provisions

Section 8: Amends current statute to clarify that 100 percent of a parent's or minor's PFD can be taken to satisfy their required debt under this bill. *Note current law allows taking 100 percent of PFDs to satisfy restitution, but isn't clear whether it applies to minors as well as parents.*

Provisions on Informal Juvenile Justice Process for a Minor's Destruction of Property

Section 9: Amends current statute on the informal juvenile justice process to distinguish between crimes against a person and all other crimes (crimes against property), and to reference the driver's license provisions in sections three and four of this bill. For crimes against property, section nine creates the requirement for notice that an informal adjustment is not successfully completed until restitution is paid.

Section 10: Creates new subsections on informal adjustments for a minor's crimes against property, specifying the following

- Informal adjustment must include full restitution for damages resulting from the act of a minor, unless expressly waived by the victim.
- In determining the amount of restitution, the department may not consider the minor's or parent's ability to pay and must take into account the public policy that favors requiring compensation for damages and injury that results from criminal acts, the financial burden placed on the victim, and the amount and type of restitution that has already been made for the act.

- The child is liable for the first \$5,000 of harm, parents are liable for the next \$15,000 of harm, and the child is liable for any amount remaining. These specified monetary amounts will be adjusted to account for inflation.
- The amount of parental restitution will be apportioned between the parents without regard to legal custody but with due consideration for the actual care and custody of the minor provided by each parent.
- Parents are liable only if they have legal custody when the act was committed. This section exempts from liability legal guardians other than parents, persons other than parents with legal custody, parents of a runaway or missing minor, and adoptive parents of a hard-to-place children. *Note substantially similar exemptions currently exist in law regarding civil liability for a minor's destruction of property and in other areas of juvenile delinquency law.*
- The court will set a payment schedule for each individual liable for damages according to their ability to make payments and may modify these payment schedules if financial circumstances change. The payment schedule must provide for payments adequate to fulfill the total restitution amount by the time the minor turns 18. *Note enforcement of agreements made in the informal adjustment process relies on jurisdiction for criminal adjudication. In other words, failure to comply with the terms of an informal agreement results in criminal adjudication. Consequently, collection of restitution specified in an informal adjustment would be impossible after the offender's 18th birthday and payment schedules must provide for full payment by age 18. If this cannot be accomplished (e.g. offender is age 17.5 at the time of the vandalism), the informal adjustment process is not an option and the case will be handled through formal criminal adjudication, where the payment plan can continue long after the 18th birthday because the court retains jurisdiction to collect payments.*
- The court may order an individual who is liable for damages to apply for a Permanent Fund Dividend.
- The state is responsible for restitution, to the same extent as a parent (\$15,000), for acts of minors when the state has legal custody of the minor and has not placed the minor in his or her parents' physical care.

Provisions on Criminal Adjudication for a Minor's Destruction of Property

Section 11: Amends current statute on criminal adjudication of a minor to distinguish between crimes against a person and all other crimes (crimes against property). For crimes against property, section 11 creates subsections with the following provisions.

- The court will order the minor and the minor's parent to make suitable restitution (see section 13) and may not refuse to make an order of restitution.

- Exempts from liability legal guardians other than parents, persons other than parents with legal custody, parents of a runaway or missing minor, and adoptive parents of a hard-to-place children. *Note substantially similar exemptions currently exist in law regarding civil liability for a minor's destruction of property and in other areas of juvenile delinquency law.*
- The court may order the minor and the minor's parent to submit financial information for the purpose of establishing the amount of restitution payments and enforcing an order of restitution. *Note section 13 prohibits consideration of ability to pay in determining the total amount of restitution.*

Section 12: Amends current statute on criminal adjudication to include the driver's license provisions in sections three and four of this bill.

Section 13: Creates new subsection on criminal adjudication for a minor's crimes against property.

- Adjudication of a delinquent minor must include restitution for damages resulting from the act of a minor, unless expressly waived by the victim.
- In determining the amount of restitution, the court may not consider the minor's or parent's ability to pay and must take into account the public policy that favors requiring compensation for damages and injury that results from criminal acts, the financial burden placed on the victim, and the amount and type of restitution that has already been made for the act.
- The child is liable for the first \$5,000 of harm, parents are liable for the next \$15,000 of harm, and the child is liable for any amount remaining. These specified monetary amounts will be adjusted to account for inflation.
- Parents are liable only if they have legal custody when the act was committed. *Note the other exemptions for legal guardians other than parents, persons other than parents with legal custody, parents of a runaway or missing minor, and adoptive parents of hard-to-place children appear in section 11.*
- The amount of parental restitution will be apportioned between the parents without regard to legal custody but with due consideration for the actual care and custody of the minor provided by each parent.
- The court will set a payment schedule for each individual liable for damages according to their ability to make payments and may modify these payment schedules if financial circumstances change. The payment schedule will separately address payments the minor may have to make after turning 18.
- The court may order an individual who is liable for damages to apply for a Permanent Fund Dividend.

- The state is responsible for restitution, to the same extent as a parent (\$15,000), for acts of minors when the state has legal custody of the minor and has not placed the minor in his or her parents' physical care.

Miscellaneous Provisions

- Section 14:** Makes a conforming change to current statute on court dispositional orders.
- Section 15:** Amends current statute on court records to require the amount of unpaid restitution ordered during the criminal adjudication process and still owed by an individual age 18 or older to be public record.
- Section 16:** Makes a conforming change to current statute on court records.
- Section 17:** Makes a conforming change to current statute on court records.
- Section 18:** Makes a conforming change to current statute on community dispute resolution centers.
- Section 19:** Repeals existing statute on the civil liability of parents for the destruction of property by unemancipated minors. Language repealed reads as follows, "If a parent has an insurance policy that would compensate a claimant for civil damages described under (a) of this section, and the policy limits are in excess of \$15,000, civil damages may be recovered under (a) of this section in an amount not to exceed the policy limits or \$25,000, whichever amount is lower."
- Section 20:** The new subsection on civil actions created in section three of this bill amends Rule 60 of the Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure relating to modifications of payment schedules set in actions involving liability for the knowing or intentional acts of unemancipated minors.
- Section 21:** Severability. If any provision of this act is held invalid, the remainder of the act are not affected.

Summary of Damage Recovery by School District

	Anchorage School District	Fairbanks North Star Borough School District	Juneau School District	Kenai Peninsula Borough School District	Mat-Su Borough School District
Total Cost of Damages Annually	FY02/03 \$302,010 FY03/04 \$307,648 FY04/05 \$308,868 (FY04/05 figures are ytd)	FY03 \$70,000 FY04 \$60,000		FY00 \$77,000 FY01 \$29,000 FY02 \$126,000 FY03 \$82,000 FY04 \$76,000	FY03 \$42,334 FY04 \$14,999
Number of Vandalism Cases Annually	FY02/03 1278 FY03/04 791 FY04/05 374	No Data		200 (avg.)	FY03 31 FY04 29
Average Damage Per Case	\$376	No Data		\$390	\$956
Number/Percentage of Cases Where Vandals Are Identified	1.6% (40 vandals total identified in past 3 years)	Less than 50% (approximate)		5%	50% (approximate)
Number/Percentage of Cases Where Legal Action is Pursued	Cases with damages that exceed \$500 are pursued in civil court	Legal action is pursued in cases where damages is greater than \$500		Less than 1% of total cases go to court; 10% of cases where a vandal is identified go to court	90% + (when vandals identified)
Number/Percentage of Cases Where Damages Are Recovered	ASD has had \$918,528 in damage the past 3 years. Of that, \$21,080 has been recovered.	In 50% of cases, some portion of damages are recovered		Very low number of cases where full restitution is paid; Almost always, sole source of restitution is PFD	Some restitution is paid in most cases – usually in the form of the PFD.
Average Portion of Damages Recovered	2.3%; large portions of restitution outstanding	No Data		No Data	No Data
Attempt Direct Recovery Without Legal Action	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes

January 27, 2005

Senator Gretchen Guess requested the following information:

1. *The total number of vandalism cases your district suffered, the total cost of damages, the total number of cases pursued in court.*

Fiscal Year	Number of Incidents (approx)	Amount of Damages	Pursued Court Cases
FY 02/03	1278	\$302,010.53	
FY 03/04	791	\$307,648.75	See question #3
FY 04/05 ytd	374	\$308,868.72	

2. *Number/percentages of cases where vandals are actually identified.*

In the past 3 years there have been approximately 40 perpetrators identified. In most vandalism cases there have been several perpetrators caught for one incident.

3. *Number/percentages of cases where legal action (e.g. in civil court) is pursued.*

The majority of vandalism cases with damages that exceed \$500 are pursued in civil court.

4. *Number/percentages of cases where damages are recovered.*

In vandalism cases with a low dollar figure the school/facility will generally ask the parent/guardian to reimburse the monies spent. The parent/guardian will seldom pay for the damage caused by their child. No payment has been received on several cases but there are current restitution orders in place.

We have had approximately \$918,528.00 worth of vandalism damages in 3 years. In those 3 years the District has received approximately \$21,080.10 worth of restitution. This calculates out to approximately 2.3% of recovered damages.

5. *In those cases where damages are recovered, what portion of the District's damages are recovered?*

There are a large number of dollar cases still pending court action, making it difficult to estimate the possible return.

6. *Average amount of damages recovered as a percentage of total damages resulting from vandalism.*

Question asked and answered in #4 and #5.

7. *How does the school District make decisions about how to recover damages from vandals? Do they attempt to seek restitution one on one with the suspect/perpetrator before contacting law enforcement? Do they contact law enforcement, proceed with criminal investigation, and attempt to seek restitution in criminal court? Do they pursue any claims in civil court?*

Major vandalism, over approximately \$500, is reported immediately to the police and/or fire department. Authorities charge offenders as they are caught and then the court orders restitution.

January 27, 2005

Senator Dyson requested the following information:

1. *How much does the District spend each year in vandalism and, how much does it collect in restitution?*

Fiscal Year	Number of Incidents (approx)	Amount of Damages	Pursued Court Cases
FY 02/03	1278	\$302,010.53	
FY 03/04	791	\$307,648.75	See question #3
FY 04/05 ytd	374	\$308,868.72	

2. *The following questions relate to the District's property insurance coverage:*

- A. *What kind of insurance coverage for vandalism does the District have?*

The District insures \$1.3 billion dollars worth of property. The property insurance premium is \$961,974. The self-insured portion, deductible, per loss is \$100,000. The per incident deductible applies to virtually any type of loss; such as, fire, wind or vandalism. Property insurance with a lower deductible would not be economical for the District to purchase.

- B. *How much money has your insurance provider had to reimburse the District each year for vandalism since December 2001?*

There has been no money to date received from our property insurer; however, we have two large arson claims pending. Each claim exceeds \$100,000.

- C. *What is the cost of your property insurance and how has vandalism impacted the rates?*

The District's property insurance premium for FY 04/05 was \$961,974. The vast majority of the District's vandalism falls below the \$100,000 per incident deductible; therefore, our insurance premiums have not increased due to vandalism.

2. *Senator Dyson, in reviewing our chart of major incidents, said that it did not appear that the change to the statute in 2003 in the amount we are allowed to*

collect from parents, etc. has had any impact on our ability to collect. Current statute allows us to collect \$15,000 - \$25,000 per incident depending on whether parents are covered by insurance; yet, we have only collected \$1700.

A large amount of the court ordered restitution has not been received or is still in the hearing process before the judge.

A. *Is the current cap the problem; or are there other factors that need to be addressed?*

There are still a large number of cases pending in which the cap may play a role. Also, judges seem hesitant to seek restitution beyond a minor's 19th birthday.

B. *What is the process the District goes through for collecting restitution?*

The District relies on the juvenile/adult court system for most vandalism incidences, which exception of minor on site infractions.

Kenai Peninsula Borough and School District

Gary Lamb, Risk Manager, 907-714-2351

FY00 \$77,000

FY01 \$29,000

FY02 \$126,000

FY03 \$82,000

FY04 \$76,000

200 documented cases of vandalism per year; the average cost of each case is \$390.

The responsible party is identified in about five percent of cases every year. Of these cases where the vandal is identified, about ten percent go to criminal court (none go to civil court). These constitute less than one percent of total vandalism cases.

The district attempts to collect from both the minor and the parent(s) in cases of minor vandalism. The threat of legal action always helps in recovering damages. Uncooperative individuals are reported to the police.

Once the district's claim makes it through the criminal court system, they almost always receive a favorable judgment demanding restitution be paid to the district. However, in general, the ability of the responsible party to pay is "extremely low." Permanent Fund Dividend checks are typically the only source of restitution collected.

It is hard to say what portion of damages are actually recovered, even on a case by case basis. Prosecuting the vandal in court can take several years, and the payment of restitution can take several more.

More funds are recovered directly from the vandal than through the courts. Most cases constitute damages of less than \$500 a piece. The district recovers about \$3,000 to \$5,000. Precise figures are not readily available due to the long period of time it often takes to recover damages through the courts. However, the legal costs of prosecution are typically not a barrier to procuring restitution. But it is far more expedient and cost effective to recover damages directly from the responsible party. The largest problem the district faces is identifying responsible parties.

To the best of my memory, there has only been one case within the KPB (involving 3 kids) since 1996 that the cap on the amount of legal responsibility by the parents has been an issue. We are still attempting to collect on this case.

How does Kenai Peninsula Borough School District make decisions about how to recover damages from vandals? Do they attempt to seek restitution one on one with the suspect/perpetrator before contacting law enforcement? Do they contact law enforcement, proceed with a criminal investigation, and attempt to seek restitution in criminal court? Do they pursue any claims in civil court? Any reasonable explanations you can offer on these things would be helpful.

Contacting the suspect (and/or parents of minors) directly is the most successful method of procuring restitution. The threat of law enforcement intervention is sufficient to receive a confession of guilt and payment of damages. However, in cases where the district cannot obtain restitution directly, they turn the matter over to law enforcement. The district is almost always successful in receiving restitution through the criminal court by simply providing documentation – the District Attorney's Office takes care of the rest. At the very least, garnishment of the perpetrator's PFD is part of the court's judgment. Because criminal prosecution is relatively successful, there is little need to take civil action. The amount of staff time and legal expenses associated with civil action are not worth it. And generally, perpetrators tend to have "empty pockets," rendering civil action superfluous.

Fairbanks North Star Borough School District
Dave Ferree, Risk Manager, 907-452-4461 x224
FY03 \$70,000
FY04 \$60,000

For the majority of incidents, no suspect is ever identified. If a suspect is identified, and the damage totals more than \$500, Risk Management will go after them. They would consider any damage greater than \$2,000 to be large. They must weigh the benefits and costs of pursuing restitution in court. In about 50% of these cases, some portion of damages is recovered.

The largest incident the district has had in the past ten years occurred when an arsonist did \$50,000 worth of damage to a school. He was caught and prosecuted. The district collected some portion of the damages from his PFD, but not nearly all of it.

In spite of the fact that the district has not recently experienced highly expensive vandalism cases, Mr. Ferree acknowledges there is always the potential for one, in which case this bill would help.

How does the **Fairbanks North Star Borough School District** make decisions about how to recover damages from vandals? Do they attempt to seek restitution one on one with the suspect/perpetrator before contacting law enforcement? Do they contact law enforcement, proceed with a criminal investigation, and attempt to seek restitution in criminal court? Do they pursue any claims in civil court? Any reasonable explanations you can offer on these things would be helpful.

Use all three methods (One on one, criminal, civil).
Most successful method is one on one. Parents typically step up and take responsibility and pay. Small percentage of acts actually find out who the perpetrator is.

Do go through courts. Typically when police are interested (especially for repeat offenders) they will prosecute in criminal court. Have procured some amount of restitution. Don't typically go through civil court because it is rarely, if ever worth the cost because each vandalism case is typically small (in terms of cost), and not worth the legal fees to prosecute civilly.

Summary:

The district utilizes all three methods for recovering restitution. Contacting the suspect and attempting to procure restitution through one on one negotiation is generally most successful. Parents of minor suspects are usually willing to step up and pay damage costs. The district does not generally pursue claims in criminal court unless law enforcement authorities have an interest in prosecuting the perpetrator. When the perpetrator is prosecuted, it is typically because they are a repeat offender. Generally, the district does not pursue restitution in civil court. It is usually not worth the associated cost of legal fees because most cases of vandalism tend to be relatively small in terms of cost.

SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT

DATE: 4/12/05

FURTHER

Rules

DATE TURNED
IN TO OFFICE:

2/14/06

Judiciary Committee considered

SENATE BILL NO. 10

SB 10 PARENTAL LIABILITY FOR CHILD'S DAMAGE

"An Act relating to liability for destruction of property by unemancipated minors; and providing for an effective date."

and recommends:

- be replaced with _____ CS SB 10 (JUD)
- adopt previous _____ CS _____ (_____)
- attached amendment(s)
- adopt Letter of Intent by _____ Committee
- further referral to _____ Committee

CS Senate Bill:

- Same Title
- New Title

SCS House Bill:

- Same Title
- Technical Title Change
- New Title w/ SCR # _____

NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Fiscal	Indet.	Zero	FN#
HSS	1/18			✓	3
LAW	1/18	✓			4

PREVIOUS FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Fiscal	Indet.	Zero	FN#

APPROPRIATION - no fiscal note

SIGNATURES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

French
Huggins
Gress

	Do PASS	Do NOT PASS	NO REC	AMEND
			X	
	X			
	X			
CHAIR:	✓			

Seckens

SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT First Committee of Referral

DATE: 1/11/05

FURTHER: Judiciary

Date of 5-Day Notice: 1/13/05
(in accordance with Uniform Rule 23)

DATE TURNED
IN TO OFFICE: 4.11.05

Health, Education and Social Services Committee considered

SENATE BILL NO. 10

SB 10 PARENTAL LIABILITY FOR CHILD'S DAMAGE

"An Act relating to liability for destruction of property by unemancipated minors; and providing for an effective date."

and recommends:

- be replaced with _____ CS SB 10 (HES)
- adopt previous _____ CS _____ (_____)
- attached amendment(s)
- adopt Letter of Intent by _____ Committee
- further referral to _____ Committee

Senate Bill:

- Same Title
 New Title

House Bill:

- Same Title
 Technical Title Change
 New Title w/ SCR # _____

NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Fiscal	Indet.	Zero	FN#
LAW	1/11			X	1
ACS	1/12			X	2

PREVIOUS FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Fiscal	Indet.	Zero	FN#

APPROPRIATION - no fiscal note

SIGNATURES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:		DO PASS	DO NOT PASS	NO REC	AMEND
Wilken	<i>Garry Wilken</i>			X	
Ellon	<i>Ellon</i>			✓	
Olson	<i>Olson</i>	✓			
Green	<i>Lyla Green</i>			✓	
Dyson	CHAIR: <i>Jim Dyson</i>	✓			