Fiscal impact reports (FIRs) are prepared by the Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) for standing finance committees of the NM Legislature. The LFC does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of these reports if they are used for other purposes.

Current FIRs (in HTML & Adobe PDF formats) are available on the NM Legislative Website (legis.state.nm.us). Adobe PDF versions include all attachments, whereas HTML versions may 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 Ing | ORIGINAL DATE LAST UPDATED              | 02/24/09 <b>HB</b> |       |
|-------------|---|--------------------|-------|
| SHORT TITLE | Multiple Voyeurism Offenses as Felonies | SB                 | 689   |
|             |   | ANALYST            | Weber |

# ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)

|       | FY09 | FY10    | FY11    | 3 Year<br>Total Cost | Recurring or Non-Rec | Fund<br>Affected |
|-------|------|---------|---------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Total |      | Minimal | Minimal | Minimal              | Recurring            | General          |

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

# **SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

LFC Files

Responses Received From

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)

Administrative Office of the District Attorney (AODA)

Attorney General (AGO)

New Mexico Sentencing Commission (NMSC)

#### **SUMMARY**

# Synopsis of Bill

Senate Bill 689 amends Section 30-9-20 NMSA 1978 to provide that an offender who commits a second or subsequent offense of voyeurism is guilty of a fourth degree felony. The result is an enhanced penalty for "serial" voyeurism offenders.

Under the current terms of Section 30-9-20 NMSA 1978, whoever commits voyeurism is guilty of a misdemeanor. When the victim is less than 18 years of age, the penalty is a fourth degree felony.

#### FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

Any fiscal impact should be minimal or negligible, however, it must be expected that an enhanced penalty should result in additional or more severe sentences with some associated cost increase. Both the AOC and AODA mention more required court time to dispose of cases with higher penalties.

# **SIGNIFICANT ISSUES**

The AGO notes the following primarily relating to the original statute.

The bill amends the Voyeurism Criminal Statute Section 30-9-20 N.M.S.A. enacted in 2007. It maintains the original misdemeanor penalty when an adult victim is involved and makes second and subsequent offenses 4<sup>th</sup> degree felonies. It leaves the original penalty for cases with juvenile victims at the 4<sup>th</sup> degree felony level. The original statute appears to have arisen out of concern for prosecuting what has been called "upskirting" that was unsuccessfully litigated in State vs. Myers 2008-NMCA-047 under the Sexual Exploitation of Children Act. Certiorari is pending in the State Supreme Court on that case. The original statute was enacted after the Myers case was tried.

The constitutionality of the original statute has not been litigated. Certain elements of the news media may challenge the statute on First Amendment grounds. The statute as it exists requires a lack of knowledge or consent by the person being viewed. This would appear to protect legitimate artistic concerns where someone poses for viewing. Store security surveillance cameras and the use of long-range cameras by law enforcement and private investigators could run afoul of the statute. The new phenomenon of "sexting", the sending of explicit photos via camera phones, may be a problem under the statute revolving around issues reasonable expectations of privacy versus consent. The modern technique of paparazzi taking surreptitious photos may violate the Act.

The statute as written runs close to the edge of the First Amendment. It is relatively narrowly drawn and serves the legitimate purpose of protecting persons from gross invasions of privacy. The balancing of competing constitutional rights is always difficult. Since the bill itself merely changes penalties, it does not directly raise the constitutional issues of the original statute. There are no reported New Mexico cases interpreting the statute.

MW/mt