NOTE: As provided in LFC policy, this report is intended only for use by the standing finance committees of the legislature. The Legislative Finance Committee does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of the information in this report when used for other purposes.

The most recent FIR version (in HTML & Adobe PDF formats) is available on the Legislative Website. The Adobe PDF version includes all attachments, whereas the HTML version does not. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

SPONSOR:	Martinez	DATE TYPED:	2/05/03	HB	243
SHORT TITLE: <u>Mandatory Sentencir</u>		g of Habitual Offe	nders	SB	

ANALYST: Ch

Chavez

APPROPRIATION

Appropriation Contained		Estimated Add	litional Impact	Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY03	FY04	FY03	FY04		
			See Narrative	Recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Conflicts with <u>HB 117</u> and <u>SB 16</u>

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Administrative Office of the District Attorneys (AODA) Adult Parole Board (APB) New Mexico Corrections Department (CD) Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) LFC Files

SUMMARY

Synopsis of Bill

House Bill 243 amends Section 31-18-17 NMSA 1978 providing for a suspension or deferment of an otherwise mandatory sentence upon a finding by the court that justice will not be served by imposing a mandatory sentence of imprisonment and that there are substantial and compelling reasons, stated on the record, for departing from the sentence imposed. The bill allows for the suspension or deferment of a violent felony. Additionally, the bill allows the use of prior convictions regardless of their age. The effective date of the provisions of this act is July 1, 2003.

Significant Issues

Significant issues addressed by the Corrections Department (CD) include:

1. The bill could result in a reduction in the number of persons sentenced to department prisons

which would translate into a reduction in costs to the department because of the lesser number of prison commitments and smaller prison population.

2. If a significant number of persons with prior felony convictions are not sentenced to prison the result may be a lack of deterrence and a continuance of additional crimes against the general public. Consequently, this could lead to longer prison sentences and result in increased cost to various other criminal justice agencies, including the police, prosecuting agencies, the public defender and the courts. It is possible that mandatory prison terms for habitual felony offenders have contributed to the recent reduction of crime rates.

3. Of particular concern to the CD is that the bill could be interpreted to allow inmates who are convicted of committing certain felonies while in prison to receive a sentence that would not involve additional prison time.

The bill creates more judicial discretion by providing flexibility to suspend or defer what would otherwise be mandatory sentences.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The bill contains no appropriation. There will be minimal administrative cost for statewide update, distribution, and documentation of statutory changes.

The CD indicates costs could be reduced if the court suspends or defers the imposed sentence.

The Administrative Office of the Courts states the fiscal implications on the judiciary will directly follow the amount of hearings generated by this amendment.

The Administrative Office of the District Attorney (AODA) feels the fiscal impact will be significant on the criminal justice system. If a repeat offender is no longer facing mandatory time under the Habitual Offender Statute, there will be fewer reasons for that person to enter a plea, thus forcing more cases to go to trial. This would increase the needs of the prosecutors, public defenders and courts for more personnel to handle an increased trial load. As the number of cases set for trial increase, it will take longer for cases to be resolved, possibly resulting in longer pre-trial confinement, thus impacting jails throughout the state. Even if a defendant were to enter a plea, under this bill, there would be the need to have a sentencing hearing so that both sides can present evidence and/or argument to the court about the types of æntence the defendant should receive. Under the current statute, such a hearing is not necessary as the sentence is mandatory. However, the removal of the ten year requirement for prior felonies would help reduce the costs of determining when a sentence was completed.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

The administrative implications on the CD depends on the frequency of judicial discretion providing for the suspension or deferment of sentences. The AODA indicates it would need additional FTE's to handle an increasing caseload of offenders with prior convictions. If crime continues to rise, the number of FTEs will need to increase over time.

CONFLICT

House Bill 117 and Senate Bill 16 conflict with this bill because they amend different language within Section 31-18-17 NMSA 1978.

POSSIBLE QUESTIONS

- 1. Should a habitual offender receive a mandatory sentence or should it be left to the court's discretion?
- 2. Should a person convicted of a violent felony be eligible for receiving a suspended or deferred sentence ?
- 3. Does the removal of mandatory penalties for being a repeat offender increase the liklihood of increased crime ?

FC/ls