

BILL ANALYSIS

Senate Research Center
78R16965 GWK-F

C.S.H.B. 1634
By: Hilderbran (Staples)
Criminal Justice
5/21/2003
Committee Report (Substituted)

DIGEST AND PURPOSE

Current case law requires the state to "exercise due diligence" to apprehend a defendant for violating probation including for absconding. The state is penalized if it does not continually, until the defendant is apprehended, make efforts to locate the absconder. Some feel that the defendant, who has been given a second chance by being placed on probation, should have the responsibility to comply with all terms and conditions of probation and not have as a possible result the dismissal of the state's motion to revoke probation. C.S.H.B. 1634 ensures the ability of a court to maintain jurisdiction over a person who absconds while on probation.

RULEMAKING AUTHORITY

This bill does not expressly grant any additional rulemaking authority to a state officer, institution, or agency.

SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1. Amends Section 5, Article 42.12, Code of Criminal Procedure, by adding Subsection (h), as follows:

(h) Provides that a court retains jurisdiction to hold a hearing under Subsection (b) and to proceed with an adjudication of guilt, regardless of whether the period of community supervision imposed on the defendant has expired, if before the expiration the attorney representing the state files a motion to proceed with the adjudication and a *capias* is issued for the arrest of the defendant.

SECTION 2. Amends Section 21, Article 42.12, Code of Criminal Procedure, by adding Subsection (e), to provide that a court retains jurisdiction to hold a hearing under Subsection (b) and to revoke, continue, or modify community supervision, regardless of whether the period of community supervision imposed on the defendant has expired, if before the expiration the attorney representing the state files a motion to revoke, continue, or modify community supervision and a *capias* is issued for the arrest of the defendant.

SECTION 3. Amends Article 42.12, Code of Criminal Procedure, by adding Section 24, as follows:

Sec. 24. DUE DILIGENCE DEFENSE. Provides that for the purposes of a hearing under Section 5(b) or 21(b), it is an affirmative defense to revocation for an alleged failure to report to a supervision officer as directed or to remain within a specified place that a supervision officer, peace officer, or other officer with the power of arrest under a warrant issued by a judge for that alleged violation failed to contact or attempted to contact the defendant in person at the defendant's last known residence address or last known employment address, as reflected in the files of the department serving the county in which the order of community supervision was entered.

SECTION 4. Provides that the change in law made by this Act applies to a hearing under Article 42.12, Code of Criminal Procedure, as amended by this Act, that commences on or after the effective date of this Act, regardless of whether the defendant was placed on community supervision before, on, or after the effective date of this Act.

SECTION 5. Effective date: upon passage or September 1, 2003.