

Bill as
Introduced

HB 491 - AS AMENDED BY THE HOUSE

28Feb2019... 0295h

2019 SESSION

19-0520
08/04

HOUSE BILL **491**

AN ACT relative to questioning and detaining suspects.

SPONSORS: Rep. Rodd, Merr. 6; Rep. Keans, Straf. 23; Rep. Opderbecke, Straf. 15; Rep. Almy,
Graf. 13

COMMITTEE: Criminal Justice and Public Safety

AMENDED ANALYSIS

This bill provides that refusing to provide a name and address, upon request by a peace officer, shall not, by itself, constitute grounds for arrest.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics***.
Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

HB 491 - AS AMENDED BY THE HOUSE

28Feb2019... 0295h

19-0520
08/04

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Nineteen

AN ACT relative to questioning and detaining suspects.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

- 1 1 Questioning and Detaining Suspects. Amend RSA 594:2 to read as follows:
- 2 594:2 Questioning and Detaining Suspects. A peace officer may stop any person [~~abroad~~] whom
- 3 [~~he~~] ***the officer*** has reason to suspect is committing, has committed, or is about to commit a crime[~~,~~
- 4 ~~and may demand of him his name, address, business abroad and where he is going~~]. ***An officer***
- 5 ~~may request the person's name and address, but the officer shall not arrest the person~~
- 6 ***based solely on the person's refusal to provide such information.***
- 7 2 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

CHAPTER 171
HB 491 - FINAL VERSION

28Feb2019... 0295h

2019 SESSION

19-0520
08/04

HOUSE BILL **491**

AN ACT relative to questioning and detaining suspects.

SPONSORS: Rep. Rodd, Merr. 6; Rep. Keans, Straf. 23; Rep. Opperbecke, Straf. 15; Rep. Almy,
Graf. 13

COMMITTEE: Criminal Justice and Public Safety

AMENDED ANALYSIS

This bill provides that refusing to provide a name and address, upon request by a peace officer, shall not, by itself, constitute grounds for arrest.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in *bold italics*.
 Matter removed from current law appears ~~[in brackets and struckthrough]~~
 Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

CHAPTER 171
HB 491 - FINAL VERSION

28Feb2019... 0295h

19-0520
08/04

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Nineteen

AN ACT relative to questioning and detaining suspects.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

- 1 171:1 Questioning and Detaining Suspects. Amend RSA 594:2 to read as follows:
- 2 594:2 Questioning and Detaining Suspects. A peace officer may stop any person [abroad] whom
- 3 [he] *the officer* has reason to suspect is committing, has committed, or is about to commit a crime[;
- 4 ~~and may demand of him his name, address, business abroad and where he is going].~~ *An officer*
- 5 *may request the person's name and address, but the officer shall not arrest the person*
- 6 *based solely on the person's refusal to provide such information.*

171:2 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

Approved: July 10, 2019

Effective Date: September 08, 2019

Amendments

Amendment to HB 491

1 Amend RSA 594:2 as inserted by section 1 of the bill by replacing it with the following:

2

3 594:2 Questioning and Detaining Suspects. A peace officer may stop any person abroad whom
4 [he] **the officer** has reason to suspect is committing, has committed, or is about to commit a crime;
5 ~~and may demand of him his name, address, business abroad and where he is going]. An officer~~
6 **may request the person's name and address, but the officer shall not arrest the person**
7 **based solely on the person's refusal to provide such information, or otherwise without**
8 **probable cause. Nothing herein shall be construed to limit the provisions of RSA 265:4,**

people being stopped
stress based solely
on refusal

2148

Levesque → Hennessy
withdrawn

Committee

Chandler → Levesque

3-2 (Carson/French)

UNAPPROVED
OTPA

Levesque → Hennessy
3-2 (Carson/French)

Levesque

Senate Judiciary
May 21, 2019
2019-2181s
08/10

Amendment to HB 491

1 Amend RSA 594:2 as inserted by section 1 of the bill by replacing it with the following:

2

3 594:2 Questioning and Detaining Suspects. A peace officer may stop any person abroad whom
4 ~~[he]~~ ***the officer*** has reason to suspect is committing, has committed, or is about to commit a crime,
5 ~~and may demand of him his name, address, business abroad and where he is going].~~ ***An officer***
6 ***may request the person's name and address, but the officer shall not arrest the person***
7 ***based solely on the person's refusal to provide such information, or otherwise without***
8 ***probable cause. Nothing herein shall be construed to limit the provisions of RSA 265:4.***

Committee Minutes

SENATE CALENDAR NOTICE

Judiciary

Sen Martha Hennessey, Chair
 Sen Shannon Chandley, Vice Chair
 Sen Melanie Levesque, Member
 Sen Sharon Carson, Member
 Sen Harold French, Member

Date: April 5, 2019

HEARINGS

Thursday	04/11/2019
(Day)	(Date)
Judiciary	SH 103
(Name of Committee)	(Place)
	1:00 p.m.
	(Time)

Note: The Committee will meet at 1:00pm or 30 minutes following the end of Session.

1:00 p.m.	HB 491	relative to questioning and detaining suspects.
1:20 p.m.	HB 153	relative to circumstances under which police officer disciplinary records shall be public documents.
2:00 p.m.	HB 155	relative to procedures for determining and disclosing exculpatory evidence in a police officer's personnel file.
2:40 p.m.	HB 486	relative to department of corrections procedures concerning the requirement for restoration of the voting rights of felons.
3:10 p.m.	HB 349	relative to a second opinion on health care matters for state and county prisoners.

EXECUTIVE SESSION MAY FOLLOW

Sponsors:

HB 491	Rep. Rodd	Rep. Keans	Rep. Opderbecke	Rep. Almy
HB 153	Rep. Berch	Rep. K. Murray		
HB 155	Rep. Berch	Rep. Bordenet	Rep. Conley	Rep. Keans
	Rep. Abbott	Rep. K. Murray	Rep. Janvrin	Rep. Sylvia
	Rep. McLean	Rep. Gagne		
HB 486	Rep. Klein-Knight	Rep. Bouchard	Rep. Kenney	Rep. Espitia
	Rep. Amanda Bouldin	Rep. Query		
HB 349	Rep. Amanda Bouldin	Rep. Berch	Rep. Butler	Rep. J. Schmidt
	Rep. Almy	Rep. K. Murray	Rep. Riel	Sen. Reagan
	Sen. Hennessey	Sen. Watters		

Jennifer Horgan 271-2609

Martha S. Hennessey
Chairman

Senate Judiciary Committee

Jennifer Horgan 271-2609

HB 491, relative to questioning and detaining suspects.

Hearing Date: April 11, 2019

Time Opened: 1:05 p.m.

Time Closed: 2:06 p.m.

Members of the Committee Present: Senators Hennessey, Chandley, Levesque, Carson and French

Members of the Committee Absent : None

Bill Analysis: This bill provides that refusing to provide a name and address, upon request by a peace officer, shall not, by itself, constitute grounds for arrest.

Sponsors:

Rep. Rodd

Rep. Keans

Rep. Opderbecke

Rep. Almy

Who supports the bill: Representative Rodd; Representative Gathwright; Representative Keans; Gilles Bissonnette, ACLU-NH; Katherine Cooper, NHACDL

Who opposes the bill: Sgt. Patrick Cheethan, NHPA; Kenneth A. Chamberlin, Manchester Police Patrolman's Association/NH Police Association; Bob Blaisdell, NH Police Association/NH Troopers Association

Summary of testimony presented in support:

Representative Rodd

- This bill came from the ACLU.
- It is not a big change, it is simply clarifying.
- Currently, the law as it appears, says that if a person does not stop and give their information to a law enforcement officer they can be arrested.
- However, people have a constitutional right to remain silent.
- The officer can ask for information, but they cannot demand it.

Representative Keans

- This bill is about whether or not just because an individual refuses to give their name and address to an officer, can they be arrested.
- Senator Levesque asked if an officer pulls someone over for speeding and asks for their license, is that appropriate.
 - Thinks that is appropriate because he has proof that that person has been speeding. Flew into Manchester at 2am and was driving on 101. An officer stopped her and asked for her information even though she was doing

nothing wrong. It was not a big burden, but the question is if that was appropriate.

- Senator Levesque asked if it is appropriate to be required to give your license if you are told why you are being stopped.
 - Thinks that is appropriate if you are subject to arrest or a fine. If there is no reason given, they should not be stopping you.

Gilles Bissonette (ACLU) (provided written testimony)

- This bill does not deal with motor vehicle stops, which is governed under RSA265:4.
- RSA265:4 is a disobeying an officer statute that deals exclusively with motor vehicle stops when an individual refuses to give their identification.
- This bill deals with stops outside of the motor vehicle context.
- Would be completely comfortable amending the bill to say 'nothing herein shall impact the provisions of RSA265:4'.
- If someone is walking down the street and an officer stops them that person has the right to be silent and not be arrested simply for that.
- If there is probable cause, even if that person invokes the right to remain silent, that person can be arrested under probable cause.
- Knows this issue is not pervasive but it does happen.
- In Manchester in 2018 a person was arrested for walking away from an officer. There was a concern the person was stepping in the roadways. However that person was not arrested for stepping in the roadway, but was detained for disorderly conduct under disobeying an officer for not providing their information.
- If there is probable cause that the person has committed a crime, they should be arrested.
- Nothing in this bill will prevent officers from approaching people and requesting information, which is perfectly appropriate law enforcement behavior.
- Does not think that under the current law arresting people for not providing this information is even legal.
- Senator Levesque asked if officers have a good reason to stop someone, should they state so.
 - Does not know whether officers are required to explain what they are doing or not. This bill is just clarifying the right to remain silent.
- Senator Hennessey asked about the word 'abroad' in the statute.
 - Thinks it is in the original stop and ID statute. Is not sure why it was taken out. Has no real attachment to it.
- Senator Hennessey asked if this bill is coming forward due to individuals who may not look as though they are citizens being stopped and asked for identification.
 - Does not think that is the intent. This is simply a codification of a constitutional principle.
- Senator Carson stated that 'abroad' may mean walking while patrolling. If an officer sees someone walking around her house she wants them to stop that individual and find out who it is. Asked how an officer is supposed to do their job if they do not know who they are talking to.

- The police can still stop individuals if there is reasonable suspicion. Does not think this limits their ability to ask questions. This deals with after that inquiry for information, has a crime occurred. That person at her home is trespassing. This bill is meant to get at a situation where there isn't probable cause that a crime has been committed.
- Senator Carson pointed out that in order to be on the safe side officers are going to assume something wrong is going on. Asked about situations where an officer stops someone and is unable to get their information and then that person goes on to do something wrong. Even Fed-Ex requires that you provide identification.
 - The key distinction is that law enforcement officers have the ability to deprive people of their freedom. With things like Fed-Ex people can elect to not use that service. Concerned that officers are stating that they want the ability to arrest someone simply because they do not provide identification even if they are not doing anything wrong.
- Senator French asked if the right to remain silent comes in after someone identifies themselves.
 - Does not believe that to be true. Views that right as much broader. Thinks this bill is the current law right now but, law enforcement seems to disagree.
- Senator Levesque asked if this has been happening in NH.
 - Is aware of the one incident in Manchester.
- Senator Levesque asked if that person was arrested simply because they did not obey to officer's instruction to provide identification.
 - Yes.
- Senator Levesque expressed that that does not seem like a valid reason for arrest.
 - Agrees. This bill is meant to clarify what already exists. If there are enough facts to show a crime has been committed there can and should be an arrest.

Representative Gathwright

- Lives in Nashua and has had a series of difficulties with Nashua PD.
- Through the years, if someone did not respond to an officer then they were arrested.
- Spoke to a woman in Nashua, whose grandson was arrested because they thought he had committed a crime even though he was just waiting for the bus. He was arrested and fingerprinted even though nothing happened.
- Everyone has the right to not give their name and this clarifies the current law.
- If no crime has been committed and a person is just walking down the street, officers do not have a right to arrest them.
- If an officer was not summoned to an area and does not have probable cause that a crime has occurred, they should not be stopping someone or intimidating them into giving their name.
- Senator Levesque asked if it would appropriate for the officer to state why they were approaching or stopping someone.

- They can, but if they did not get a call, people should be free to walk down the street without being stopped and asked for their name.

Katherine Cooper (NH Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers)

- This statute was declared unconstitutional in 1979.
- It is illegal for the police to arrest someone simply because they do not give their name.
- It is a constitutional right for someone to not give their name.
- This is simply cleaning up an old unconstitutional statute, clarifying it for officers.
- Terry v Ohio, Sibron v New York, and Florida v Royer all delineate how the search and seizure rights can play out.
- If the police violate those rights, they are subject to having evidence suppressed.
- It is important for this to be clear.
- “Abroad” is just an old legal language that means being out there.
- Senator Levesque asked about the process for an officer stopping someone if they have probable cause.
 - There is no requirement for officers to state why they are stopping someone.
- Senator Levesque asked what happens if an officer stops someone for probable cause but the individual refuses to give information.
 - If the police stop someone because they have probable cause that a crime has been committed or is about to be committed, case law says that they can stop and question them. If they develop further information and believe someone has committed a crime, they are allowed to arrest that person. However, if they randomly stop someone on the street that officer is welcome to talk to that person, but the person is allowed to refuse and not be arrested.
- Senator Levesque asked how you prove an officer is stopping someone for probable cause or not randomly.
 - The officer should be able to reasonably articulate the reasonable suspicion for why they stopped someone. Lawyers can argue in court that someone was unreasonably arrested. That is a fact-based scenario that gets litigated in court.

Summary of testimony presented in opposition:

Patrick Cheetham (NH Police Association)

- This bill does drastically change procedures for officers and it will seriously affect the law regarding disobeying a police officer, which is a motor vehicle offense.
- If an officer has articulable suspicion or probable cause to pull someone over, they then have a duty ask for the person’s driver’s license. If they refuse they can be arrested for disobeying an officer.
- This bill would change that law so that that person would not have to provide their driver’s license.

- If a person was involved in a traffic accident and the other driver were to flee, if the police found that driver they would be able to refuse to provide their identification.
- This will drastically impact public safety.
- Senator Chandley asked if there is a situation outside of one related to a motor vehicle, like when someone is walking on the street, where passing this bill would be problematic.
 - If an officer were to stop someone for a violation level offense, like prowling, he believes that the Supreme Court has said that officers have the right to ask for their information. Cannot think of a situation where an officer would arrest someone for not providing their information, it would be for prowling or criminal trespass. Has not seen or heard of an increase in NH officers arresting individuals for not identifying themselves.
- Senator Levesque asked if when officers stop someone do they have to state why they stopped them.
 - Yes.
- Senator Levesque asked if they ask for identification before or after telling them why they stopped them.
 - During his patrol days, he would identify himself as an officer and then say, 'this is why I stopped you' and then ask for their license. With a prowling situation they would first identify themselves as an officer and then request their identification in order to dispel any concerns that the officer has. If officers don't explain their actions it usually leads to confrontation.
- Senator Hennessey asked about the process of Miranda Rights.
 - Someone has to be in custody and they have to be interrogated in order for Miranda to apply. The Supreme Court has said you don't need to read Miranda rights if an officer is simply detaining them.

Kenneth Chamberlin (NH Patrolman's Association, NH Police Association)

- If an officer is responding to a domestic violence situation, where there has been criminal threatening with the suspect threatening to kill the victim if they call the police, then that officer needs to be able to question people in close proximity to the residence.
- If one of those individuals was the offender, under this bill, that person would be able to leave and then could come back and kill the person.
- This bill would prevent the officer from doing anything.
- Senator French stated that he went on a ride along with the Manchester Police this past weekend and went to a domestic. There was someone outside of the residence who they detained and got his information. They were able to determine that that individual had multiple outstanding warrants.
- Senator Carson stated that she is concerned that this hamstring the police from doing their job. Asked if more people would refuse to say anything to an officer if this passed.
 - Runs into this issue now. There are some individuals that feel that officers don't have the right to ask them for identification. The tool they

have now to address that is disobeying an officer. Under this bill, if a person says they are not going to identify themselves there is nothing he can do about that.

Bob Blaisdell (NH Police Association & NH Troopers Association)

- Went on a ride along with Senator French this past weekend and saw a situation like this first-hand.
- There was a call about a potential domestic violence situation and a couple was coming out of the house; the guy's face went white and was visibly nervous when he saw the officers.
- The officer stopped the couple to ask them if they heard anything.
- The man was asked for his name and address which he gave.
- Under this bill if that person decided not to give his name that would have been the end of it.
- Instead that person was arrested and found out to be involved in the domestic situation.
- There is this negative perspective of law enforcement nationwide, but in NH we don't really have that.
- Do you think it reasonable for law enforcement to know who they are dealing with?
- Giving your information can be a good thing where it can help someone in a bad situation if an officer has follow-up questions.
- There has only been one case cited regarding this.
- Why was this introduced if it is already unconstitutional?
- Senator Levesque asked if there is a difference between a case where officers are called in versus someone simply walking down the street with no reason to stop them.
 - Everything is different. When someone is just walking down the street and is 30 ft from a potential crime scene, if they give their name and the officer thinks of a follow up question they will be able to reach out.
- Senator French asked if during their ride along were the people outside that the officers asked questions of demanded to give their identification.
 - Just the people coming out of the building they were called to.
- Senator Carson asked how this will affect juveniles.
 - Not qualified to answer that.
- Senator Carson raised the concern about juveniles running away or living on the street or being trafficked. Asked if officers are not allowed to ask what their name is, how are they supposed to help these kids.
 - Would agree it could create a situation. Does not know if juveniles would be treated differently under this. It is not always about arresting someone, sometimes it is about helping someone.
- Senator Hennessey asked if this bill does not prohibit officers from asking, it is more about a person not having to reply.
 - That is correct. However, under the scenario on Saturday if that person refused to answer what could the officers do?

- Senator Hennessey asked if a person is in a place where there was probable cause a crime occurred, officers have the right to detain people and ask for information.
 - At that time these people were being detained because the officers need to figure out the situation. They weren't under suspicion at that time.
- Senator Hennessey asked if individuals on parole who are afraid of being falsely accused of something have the right not to say anything.
 - No one is asking people to have name tags or asking for a police state. The only reason a parolee is going to be worried is if they did something wrong.

jch

Date Hearing Report completed: April 15, 2019

Speakers

Senate Judiciary Committee SIGN-IN SHEET

Date: 04/11/2019 Time: 1:00 p.m.

HB 491 AN ACT relative to questioning and detaining suspects.

Name/Representing (please print neatly)

Name/Representing (please print neatly)	Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
✓ PATRICK CHEETHAM NHPA <i>Manchester Police Patrolman's Assn</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
✓ Kenneth A. Chamberlain New Hampshire Police Assn	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
✓ Gilles Bissonnette ACLU-NH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
✓ Katherine Cooper NHACPL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
✓ P/Rep. Rodd	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
✓ Bob Blaisdell Rep. Troopers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking? <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Testimony



AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FOUNDATION

New Hampshire

Statement by Gilles Bissonnette, ACLU-NH Legal Director
Senate Judiciary Committee
House Bill 491
April 11, 2019

I submit this testimony on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union of New Hampshire (“ACLU-NH”)—a non-partisan, non-profit organization working to protect civil liberties throughout the state for over 50 years. House Bill 491 (HB 491) makes a narrow clarification to the law to make clear that if a person stopped on the street by the police does not answer questions, they cannot be arrested simply for not answering those questions. We respectfully urge the Committee to vote HB 491 *Ought to Pass*.

Current law provides that a police officer may stop a person and “demand” his name, address, business address and where he is going. This bill would change “demand” to request,¹ and would make clear that declining to respond to an officer’s request for information pursuant to this section shall not be grounds for arrest. The bill removes ambiguity by making clear that a person has a right to remain silent, which is a bedrock right within our Constitution and is consistent with our “Live Free or Die” values. This bill does not change an officer’s ability to arrest someone when the person has probable cause to believe a crime has been committed. Nor does it change the requirement in RSA 265:4 which requires a person driving a vehicle to give a police officer his name, address, date of birth and the name and address of the owner of the vehicle.

We know that this law has been used. The Union Leader reported in May of 2018 that a woman was charged with resisting arrest for repeatedly walking away and being uncooperative from police. This bill would ensure that simply refusing to cooperate with the police is not grounds for arrest.

The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and Part I, Article 19 of the New Hampshire Constitution protect people from unreasonable seizures. This bill would further promote those values.

¹ A Montana stop-and-identify statute uses the word “request.” See Mont. Code Ann. §46-5-401 (“A peace officer who has lawfully stopped a person or vehicle under this section may . . . request the person's name and present address and an explanation of the person's actions and, if the person is the driver of a vehicle, demand the person's driver's license and the vehicle's registration and proof of insurance.”)

Voting Sheets

Senate Judiciary Committee

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Bill # H 349

Hearing date: _____

Executive session date: _____

Motion of: 2148

VOTE: Withdrawn

<u>Made by</u> Hennessey <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Seconded</u> Hennessey <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Reported</u> Hennessey <input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Senator:</u> Chandley <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>by Senator:</u> Chandley <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>by Senator:</u> Chandley <input type="checkbox"/>
Carson <input type="checkbox"/>	Carson <input type="checkbox"/>	Carson <input type="checkbox"/>
Levesque <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Levesque <input type="checkbox"/>	Levesque <input type="checkbox"/>
French <input type="checkbox"/>	French <input type="checkbox"/>	French <input type="checkbox"/>

Motion of: Comm

VOTE: 3-2 (Carson/French)

<u>Made by</u> Hennessey <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Seconded</u> Hennessey <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Reported</u> Hennessey <input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Senator:</u> Chandley <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>by Senator:</u> Chandley <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>by Senator:</u> Chandley <input type="checkbox"/>
Carson <input type="checkbox"/>	Carson <input type="checkbox"/>	Carson <input type="checkbox"/>
Levesque <input type="checkbox"/>	Levesque <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Levesque <input type="checkbox"/>
French <input type="checkbox"/>	French <input type="checkbox"/>	French <input type="checkbox"/>

OTPA Levesque - Hennessey 3-2

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Reported out by</u>
Senator Hennessey, Chairman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator Chandley, Vice-Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator Carson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senator Levesque	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Senator French	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Amendments: _____

Notes: _____

Committee Report

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
SENATE
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Tuesday, May 21, 2019

THE COMMITTEE ON Judiciary

to which was referred **HB 491**

AN ACT relative to questioning and detaining suspects.

Having considered the same, the committee recommends that the Bill

OUGHT TO PASS WITH AMENDMENT

BY A VOTE OF: 3-2

AMENDMENT # 2019-2181s

Senator Melanie Levesque
For the Committee

Jennifer Horgan 271-2609

JUDICIARY

HB 491, relative to questioning and detaining suspects.

Ought to Pass with Amendment, Vote 3-2.

Senator Melanie Levesque for the committee.

Docket of HB491

Docket Abbreviations

Bill Title: relative to questioning and detaining suspects.**Official Docket of HB491.:**

Date	Body	Description
1/15/2019	H	Introduced 01/03/2019 and referred to Criminal Justice and Public Safety HJ 3 P. 17
1/16/2019	H	Public Hearing: 01/24/2019 10:00 am LOB 204
1/23/2019	H	==CANCELLED== Executive Session: 01/30/2019 10:00 am LOB 204
1/29/2019	H	==RESCHEDULED== Executive Session: 02/07/2019 10:00 am LOB 204
2/14/2019	H	Majority Committee Report: Ought to Pass with Amendment #2019-0295h for 02/27/2019 (Vote 19-1; RC) HC 13 P. 27
2/14/2019	H	Minority Committee Report: Inexpedient to Legislate
2/28/2019	H	Amendment #2019-0295h : AA VV 02/28/2019 HJ 7 P. 51
2/28/2019	H	Ought to Pass with Amendment 2019-0295h: MA VV 02/28/2019 HJ 7 P. 51
3/18/2019	S	Introduced 03/14/2019 and Referred to Judiciary; SJ 9
4/5/2019	S	Hearing: 04/11/2019, Room 103, SH, 01:00 pm; the committee will meet at 1:00 p.m. or 30 minutes following the end of session; SC 17A
5/21/2019	S	Committee Report: Ought to Pass with Amendment #2019-2181s , 05/30/2019; SC 24
5/30/2019	S	Committee Amendment #2019-2181s , AF, VV; 05/30/2019; SJ 18
5/30/2019	S	Ought to Pass: MA, VV; OT3rdg; 05/30/2019; SJ 18
6/18/2019	S	Enrolled (In recess 06/13/2019); SJ 21
6/18/2019	H	Enrolled 06/13/2019 HJ 19 P. 18
7/15/2019	H	Signed by Governor Sununu 07/10/2019; Chapter 171; Eff: 09/08/2019

NH House

NH Senate

Other Referrals

Senate Inventory Checklist for Archives

Bill Number: HB 491

Senate Committee: Judiciary

Please include all documents in the order listed below and indicate the documents which have been included with an "X" beside

Final docket found on Bill Status

Bill Hearing Documents: {Legislative Aides}

Bill version as it came to the committee

All Calendar Notices

Hearing Sign-up sheet(s)

Prepared testimony, presentations, & other submissions handed in at the public hearing

Hearing Report

Revised/Amended Fiscal Notes provided by the Senate Clerk's Office

Committee Action Documents: {Legislative Aides}

All amendments considered in committee (including those not adopted):

- amendment # 2146

- amendment # 2181

- amendment # _____

- amendment # _____

Executive Session Sheet

Committee Report

Floor Action Documents: {Clerk's Office}

All floor amendments considered by the body during session (only if they are offered to the senate):

- amendment # _____

- amendment # _____

- amendment # _____

- amendment # _____

Post Floor Action: (if applicable) {Clerk's Office}

Committee of Conference Report (if signed off by all members. Include any new language proposed by the committee of conference):

Enrolled Bill Amendment(s)

Governor's Veto Message

All available versions of the bill: {Clerk's Office}

as amended by the senate

as amended by the house

final version

Completed Committee Report File Delivered to the Senate Clerk's Office By:

Committee Aide

Date

Senate Clerk's Office JM