

**HB 2328 STAFF MEASURE SUMMARY**

**Carrier:** Sen. Manning Jr

**Joint Committee On Ways and Means**

---

**Action Date:** 06/07/19

**Action:** Do pass.

**Senate Vote**

**Yeas:** 9 - Beyer, Frederick, Girod, Heard, Johnson, Manning Jr, Roblan, Steiner Hayward, Wagner

**Exc:** 2 - Hansell, Thomsen

**House Vote**

**Yeas:** 9 - Gomberg, Holvey, McLain, McLane, Nosse, Piluso, Rayfield, Smith G, Stark

**Fiscal:** Fiscal impact issued

**Revenue:** No revenue impact

**Prepared By:** Gregory Jolivette, Budget Analyst

**Meeting Dates:** 5/30, 6/7

---

**WHAT THE MEASURE DOES:**

Modifies mental state necessary to prove a person has committed the crime of Unlawful Use of a Vehicle. Requires state to prove that defendant knowingly took control of another's vehicle and was aware of and consciously disregarded a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the owner of a vehicle did not consent to the defendant's use of the vehicle. Provides that a person who knowingly rides in another's vehicle without the consent of the owner or authorized user is also guilty of unlawful use of a vehicle if the person knew, at the time, that the owner or authorized user did not consent to the use.

**ISSUES DISCUSSED:**

- Potential costs associated with the bill for the 2019-21 biennium
- Need for the bill given high auto theft rates

**EFFECT OF AMENDMENT:**

No amendment.

**BACKGROUND:**

In prosecutions for the unlawful use of a vehicle, which frequently involve allegations of a stolen car, the state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant knows the vehicle is being operated without the owner's consent. While a judge or jury may base a conviction on reasonable inferences drawn from circumstantial evidence, the Court of Appeals has concluded that certain fact patterns "require[] the stacking of inferences to the point of speculation." *State v. Shipe*, 264 Or. App. 391 (2014); *State v. Korth*, 269 Or. App. 238, 243 (2015).

House Bill 2328 reduces the required mental state and allows a conviction for the unlawful use of a vehicle if the state proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant "is aware of and consciously disregards a substantial and unjustifiable risk" that the owner does not consent to the use of the vehicle. Additionally, the measure refines the mental state required with respect to a passenger in a vehicle. If a passenger knew that the owner of the vehicle did not consent to its use and rode in the vehicle, the passenger may also be subject to unlawful use of a vehicle.