NOTE: As provided in LFC policy, this report is intended 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 in any other situation.

Only the most recent FIR version, excluding attachments, is available on the Intranet. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC office in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

#### FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

SPONSOR:	Silva	DATE TYPED:	01/21/02	HB	75	
SHORT TITLE:	Criminal Offence of	f Inducing Panic		SB		
			ANAL	YST:	Wilson	

#### APPROPRIATION

Appropriation	n Contained		ditional Im- ct	Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY02	FY03	FY02	FY03		
NFI					

### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

State Department of Education (SDE) Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)

#### SUMMARY

#### Synopsis of Bill

HB75 creates a new criminal offense of inducing panic which is described as causing the evacuation of a public place or otherwise causing serious public inconvenience or alarm by a host of intentional acts such as circulating false reports or warnings of various catastrophes, pretending to commit a violent offense or committing a criminal offense with reckless disregard to the serious public inconvenience it will cause.

#### Significant Issues

The SDE believes that HB75 is too broad and, therefore, subject to court attack as being unconstitutional. HB 75 criminalizes certain behavior in a "public place" without narrowly defining what that means. Also, "causing serious public inconvenience" is so broad as to be almost meaningless. For example, a person who drives recklessly on a public highway and causes an accident that shuts down that highway would arguably be subject to this bill. Likewise, a person stopped for suspected DWI or anyone being pursued by police where a police officer is struck by a motor vehicle while making an arrest or issuing a citation could give rise to a charge under this bill. A homeless person relieving himself in the park could also be prosecuted under this bill. Political activists who circulate handbills with false information to draw attention to a political issue could arguably also be prosecuted under this bill. This last observation would raise First Amendment issues. A person who stands up in a municipal bus and continually warns the passengers that the world will end tomorrow is arguably subject to this bill. What seems to be missing in the "intent" part of the bill is language that a person know or should know that his behavior could cause serious inconvenience. The fact that there are already criminal laws that address many prohibited behaviors covered by this bill could result in a person being needlessly overcharged and thus raise double jeopardy issues.

The portions of HB 75 that apply to school premises could have far-reaching and possibly unintended consequences. This is a felony offense and children engaging in pranks or horse play on school property could find themselves being charged with a felony under the bill. The causeand-effect language in this bill is unclear; "causing serious inconvenience" is not defined. A child could say something in jest where the school policy in every case might be to evacuate the school. This could result in the child being charged with a felony. Therefore, there might be very broad school emergency policies, however reasonable, that in effect dictated what constituted "serious public inconvenience."

# FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The AOC states that there will be a minimal administrative cost for statewide update, distribution, and documentation of statutory changes. Any additional fiscal impact on the judiciary would be proportional to the enforcement of this law and commenced prosecutions. New laws, amendments to existing laws, and new hearings have the potential to increase caseloads in the courts, thus requiring additional resources to handle the increase.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE IMPACT**

HB 75 has no immediate administrative impact for SDE, but would require that public schools review and possibly amend their policies and student handbooks to ensure adequate notice to parents and school children that they could be criminalized for certain types of behavior including pranks. The only possible impact on the department would be that it may affect the way in which the school district must report acts of vandalism to it pursuant to Section 22-1-7, NMSA 1978.

## **TECHNICAL ISSUES**

The definition of "school premises" in the bill omits mention of teacher housing which is part of the definition of "school building" contained in the Public School Code at 22-1-2W, NMSA 1978.

DW/njw