| By: | Whitmire |
|-----|------------------------|
| | (Turner of Harris, Wu) |

S.B. No. 344

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED

| 1 | AN ACT |
|----|---|
| 2 | relating to the procedure for an application for a writ of habeas |
| 3 | corpus based on relevant scientific evidence. |
| 4 | BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS: |
| 5 | SECTION 1. Chapter 11, Code of Criminal Procedure, is |
| 6 | amended by adding Article 11.073 to read as follows: |
| 7 | Art. 11.073. PROCEDURE RELATED TO CERTAIN SCIENTIFIC |
| 8 | EVIDENCE. (a) This article applies to relevant scientific |
| 9 | evidence that: |
| 10 | (1) was not available to be offered by a convicted |
| 11 | person at the convicted person's trial; or |
| 12 | (2) contradicts scientific evidence relied on by the |
| 13 | state at trial. |
| 14 | (b) A court may grant a convicted person relief on an |
| 15 | application for a writ of habeas corpus if: |
| 16 | (1) the convicted person files an application, in the |
| 17 | manner provided by Article 11.07, 11.071, or 11.072, containing |
| 18 | specific facts indicating that: |
| 19 | (A) relevant scientific evidence is currently |
| 20 | available and was not available at the time of the convicted |
| 21 | person's trial because the evidence was not ascertainable through |
| 22 | the exercise of reasonable diligence by the convicted person before |
| 23 | the date of or during the convicted person's trial; and |
| 24 | (B) the scientific evidence would be admissible |
| | |

S.B. No. 344

under the Texas Rules of Evidence at a trial held on the date of the 1 2 application; and 3 (2) the court makes the findings described by Subdivisions (1)(A) and (B) and also finds that, had the scientific 4 evidence been presented at trial, on the preponderance of the 5 evidence the person would not have been convicted. 6 7 (c) For purposes of Section 4(a)(1), Article 11.07, Section 5(a)(1), Article 11.071, and Section 9(a), Article 11.072, a claim 8 9 or issue could not have been presented previously in an original application or in a previously considered application if the claim 10 or issue is based on relevant scientific evidence that was not 11 ascertainable through the exercise of reasonable diligence by the 12 13 convicted person on or before the date on which the original application or a previously considered application, as applicable, 14 15 was filed. 16 (d) In making a finding as to whether relevant scientific evidence was not ascertainable through the exercise of reasonable 17 diligence on or before a specific date, the court shall consider 18 whether the scientific knowledge or method on which the relevant 19 20 scientific evidence is based has changed since: (1) the applicable trial date or dates, for a 21 determination made with respect to an original application; or 22 (2) the date on which the original application or a 23 previously considered application, as applicable, was filed, for a 24 25 determination made with respect to a subsequent application. SECTION 2. The change in law made by this Act applies only 26 27 to an application for a writ of habeas corpus filed on or after the

1 effective date of this Act. An application for a writ of habeas 2 corpus filed before the effective date of this Act is governed by 3 the law in effect at the time the application was filed, and the 4 former law is continued in effect for that purpose.

S.B. No. 344

5 SECTION 3. This Act takes effect September 1, 2013.