

<b>LFC Requester:</b>	<b>Sanchez</b>
-----------------------	----------------

**AGENCY BILL ANALYSIS - 2025 REGULAR SESSION**

**WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BILL POSTING, UPLOAD ANALYSIS TO**  
[AgencyAnalysis.nmlegis.gov](http://AgencyAnalysis.nmlegis.gov) and email to [billanalysis@dfa.nm.gov](mailto:billanalysis@dfa.nm.gov)  
*(Analysis must be uploaded as a PDF)*

**SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

*{Indicate if analysis is on an original bill, amendment, substitute or a correction of a previous bill}*

**Date Prepared:** 11 Feb 2025 *Check all that apply:*  
**Bill Number:** HB 316 Original  Correction   
 Amendment  Substitute

**Sponsor:** Block/Lord **Agency Name and Code** 218 AOC  
**Short Title:** INTERFERENCE WITH FEDERAL IMMIGRATION LAW **Number:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Person Writing** Aaron Holloman  
**Phone:** 505-487-6140 **Email** aocash@nmcourts.gov

**SECTION II: FISCAL IMPACT**

**APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)**

Appropriation		Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY25	FY26		

(Parenthesis ( ) indicate expenditure decreases)

**REVENUE (dollars in thousands)**

Estimated Revenue			Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY25	FY26	FY27		

(Parenthesis ( ) indicate revenue decreases)

**ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)**

	FY25	FY26	FY27	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
<b>Total</b>						

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates/Conflicts with/Companion to/Relates to:  
Duplicates/Relates to Appropriation in the General Appropriation Act

### **SECTION III: NARRATIVE**

#### **BILL SUMMARY**

Synopsis: The bill prohibits the state or political subdivision by passing or enforcing any policy that would impact the enforcement of federal immigration laws.

#### **FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

#### **SIGNIFICANT ISSUES**

- 1) Impact to Court Participation. The bill, as drafted, could arguably be read to apply to the judiciary in its management of courthouses and other judicial programs. In previous years, when immigration enforcement actions increases or where the perception that enforcement actions could occur at courthouses, participation in all court activity has declined. See Douglas Keith, *States Push Back Against ICE Courthouse Arrests*, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/states-push-back-against-ice-courthouse-arrests>. The impact is felt in the appearance rate of witnesses, victims, and a decline in orders of protection from domestic violence. This bill would strip the judiciary's ability to address these concerns through any policies.
- 2) Court Management. The judiciary as a separate branch of government is entitled to administer its personnel and facilities as it sees fit, within reason. The bill prohibits any rule that would "interfere with the enforcement of federal immigration law." This blanket prohibition precludes the judiciary from managing courthouses, thereby infringing on the role of administration of the branch of government.
- 3) Vague. The bill does not clearly define what actions would be violative of this order, as many decisions could have collateral impacts that affect immigration enforcement.

#### **PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS**

As noted above, greater perception of immigration activity at courthouses decreases participation in court functions generally. This could result in more cases being dismissed for failure of witnesses and victims to appear.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

#### **CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP**

#### **TECHNICAL ISSUES**

#### **OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES**

#### **ALTERNATIVES**

#### **WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL**

#### **AMENDMENTS**