## 75th OREGON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY - 2009 Regular Session

STAFF MEASURE SUMMARY

Senate Committee on Judiciary

REVENUE: No revenue impact FISCAL: Fiscal statement issued

**Action:** Do Pass as Amended and Be Printed Engrossed

**Vote:** 5 - 0 - 0

Yeas: Bonamici, Boquist, Dingfelder, Whitsett, Prozanski

Nays: 0 Exc.: 0

**Prepared By:** Bill Taylor, Counsel **Meeting Dates:** 2/2, 2/5, 2/16

**WHAT THE MEASURE DOES:** Creates the statutory framework for victims to exercise their constitutional rights set forth in Section 42 and 43 of Article I of the Constitution of the State of Oregon. Grants the Attorney General the authority to adopt rules to establish a non-judicial process to determine if violations have occurred and to make nonbinding recommendations for achieving full compliance with victims' rights laws in the future. Clarifies when the district attorney and when the probation department will notify a victim of a probation hearing.

**MEASURE:** 

**CARRIER:** 

SB 233 A

Sen. Prozanski

## **ISSUES DISCUSSED:**

- Implements the recent amendments to the Oregon Constitution concerning the rights of victims
- Distinguishing the costs associated with the constitutional amendment and the costs associated with this bill

**EFFECT OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENT:** Clarifies when the district attorney and when the probation department will notify a victim of a probation hearing.

**BACKGROUND:** In the November 5, 1996 general election, the voters of Oregon adopted Measure 40, a comprehensive and far-reaching series of amendments to Oregon's Bill of Rights, particularly as it relates to victims and criminal defendants before the courts of Oregon. The Oregon Supreme Court found Measure 40 unconstitutional on the grounds that it contained two or more amendments to the Constitution in violation of Article XVIII, section 1, of the Oregon Constitution. *Armatta v. Kitzhaber*, 327 Or. 250 (1998). After *Armatta*, the Oregon Legislative Assembly referred seven individual amendments to the Oregon Constitution to the voters. The voters approved four amendments and rejected three. One of the approved proposals became Section 42, Article I of the Constitution of the State of Oregon. It grants to victims of crime the right to: (1) be present and informed in advance of all critical stages of the proceeding held in open court when the defendant is present; (2) obtain information about the conviction, sentence, imprisonment, criminal history and future release from custody of the defendant; (3) refuse a discovery request by the defendant; (4) receive restitution from the convicted defendant; (5) have a copy of the transcript of any court proceedings; (6) the right to be consulted regarding plea negotiations involving a violent felony; and, (7) be informed of these rights.

Another approved proposal became Section 43, Article I of the Constitution of the State of Oregon. It grants victims the right to: (1) be reasonably protected from the criminal defendant or convicted criminal throughout the criminal justice process; and, (2) have decisions by the court regarding pretrial release of a criminal defendant based on the principle of reasonable protection of the victim and the public, as well as the likelihood that the criminal defendant will appear for trial.

Although both of these constitutional amendments granted rights to victims, neither specified how a victim, in his or her individual capacity, could exercise these rights. To rectify this problem, during the 2007 Legislative Session, the legislature referred to the voters HJR 49 and 50. The voters adopted these proposals in May of 2008. Victims have now the constitutional authority to seek, in their individual capacities, redress for rights denied. SB 233 sets forth the process and procedure on how they can assert these rights.