TEXT OF BILL AS PASSED

SENATE BILL 53

E3 2lr0658
SB 136/21 – JPR (PRE–FILED) CF HB 269

By: ~~Senator Carter~~ **Senators Carter, Hettleman, Lee, Smith, Sydnor, Waldstreicher, and Watson**

Requested: October 6, 2021
Introduced and read first time: January 12, 2022
Assigned to: Judicial Proceedings

Committee Report: Favorable with amendments
Senate action: Adopted
Read second time: March 4, 2022

CHAPTER _____

AN ACT concerning

Juvenile Law – ~~Juvenile~~ Child Interrogation Protection Act

FOR the purpose of establishing certain requirements for taking a child into custody, interrogating a child, or charging a child with a criminal violation, including notice requirements, requirements for consultation with an attorney, and requirements for the maintenance of certain records; authorizing the Court of Appeals to adopt certain rules relating to the advisement of a child of certain rights; establishing a certain rebuttable presumption that a statement made by a child during an interrogation is inadmissible under certain circumstances; requiring the Office of the Public Defender to develop and implement certain policies and to publish on its website or make available to law enforcement certain information; and generally relating to juvenile law and the interrogation of children by law enforcement.

BY repealing and reenacting, with amendments,
Article – Courts and Judicial Proceedings
Section 3–8A–14
Annotated Code of Maryland
(2020 Replacement Volume and 2021 Supplement)

BY adding to
Article – Courts and Judicial Proceedings
Section 3–8A–14.2
Annotated Code of Maryland

EXPLANATION: **CAPITALS INDICATE MATTER ADDED TO EXISTING LAW.**
[Brackets**]** indicate matter deleted from existing law.
Underlining indicates amendments to bill.
~~Strike out~~ indicates matter stricken from the bill by amendment or deleted from the law by amendment.

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True

(2020 Replacement Volume and 2021 Supplement)

BY repealing and reenacting, with amendments,
Article – Criminal Procedure
Section 2–108
Annotated Code of Maryland
(2018 Replacement Volume and 2021 Supplement)

BY adding to
Article – Criminal Procedure
Section 2–405
Annotated Code of Maryland
(2018 Replacement Volume and 2021 Supplement)

SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND, That the Laws of Maryland read as follows:

Article – Courts and Judicial Proceedings

3–8A–14.

(a) A child may be taken into custody under this subtitle by any of the following methods:

(1) Pursuant to an order of the court;

(2) By a law enforcement officer pursuant to the law of arrest;

(3) By a law enforcement officer or other person authorized by the court if the officer or other person has reasonable grounds to believe that the child is in immediate danger from the child's surroundings and that the child's removal is necessary for the child's protection;

(4) By a law enforcement officer or other person authorized by the court if the officer or other person has reasonable grounds to believe that the child has run away from the child's parents, guardian, or legal custodian; or

(5) In accordance with § 3–8A–14.1 of this subtitle.

(b) **(1) (I)** If a law enforcement officer takes a child into custody, the officer shall immediately notify, or cause to be notified, the child's parents, guardian, or custodian **IN A MANNER REASONABLY CALCULATED TO GIVE ACTUAL NOTICE** of the action.

(II) THE NOTICE REQUIRED UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (I) OF THIS PARAGRAPH SHALL:

1. INCLUDE THE CHILD'S LOCATION;

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True

2. PROVIDE THE REASON FOR THE CHILD BEING TAKEN INTO CUSTODY; AND

3. INSTRUCT THE PARENT, GUARDIAN, OR CUSTODIAN ON HOW TO MAKE IMMEDIATE IN–PERSON CONTACT WITH THE CHILD.

(2) After making every reasonable effort to give **ACTUAL** notice **TO A CHILD'S PARENT, GUARDIAN, OR CUSTODIAN**, the law enforcement officer shall with all reasonable speed:

[(1)**]** **(I)** Release the child to the child's parents, guardian, or custodian or to any other person designated by the court, upon their written promise to bring the child before the court when requested by the court, and such security for the child's appearance as the court may reasonably require, unless the child's placement in detention or shelter care is permitted and appears required by § 3–8A–15 of this subtitle; or

[(2)**]** **(II)** Deliver the child to the court or a place of detention or shelter care designated by the court.

(c) If a parent, guardian, or custodian fails to bring the child before the court when requested, the court may **[**issue**]:**

(1) ISSUE a writ of attachment directing that the child be taken into custody and brought before the court**[**. The court may proceed**]; AND**

(2) PROCEED against the parent, guardian, or custodian for contempt.

(d) In addition to the requirements for reporting child abuse and neglect under § 5–704 of the Family Law Article, if a law enforcement officer has reason to believe that a child who has been detained is a victim of sex trafficking, as defined in § 5–701 of the Family Law Article, the law enforcement officer shall notify any appropriate regional navigator, as defined in § 5–704.4 of the Family Law Article, for the jurisdiction where the child was taken into custody or where the child is a resident that the child is a suspected victim of sex trafficking.

(E) THE COURT OF APPEALS MAY ADOPT RULES CONCERNING AGE–APPROPRIATE LANGUAGE TO BE USED TO ADVISE A CHILD WHO IS TAKEN INTO CUSTODY OF THE CHILD'S RIGHTS.

3–8A–14.2.

(A) (1) IN THIS SECTION THE FOLLOWING WORDS HAVE THE MEANINGS INDICATED.

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True

(2) "CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION" RETAINS ITS JUDICIALLY DETERMINED MEANING.

(3) (I) "LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER" HAS THE MEANING STATED IN § 3–101 OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY ARTICLE.

(II) "LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER" INCLUDES A SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER, AS DEFINED IN § 7–1501 OF THE EDUCATION ARTICLE.

(B) A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER MAY NOT CONDUCT A CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION OF A CHILD UNTIL:

(1) THE CHILD HAS CONSULTED WITH AN ATTORNEY WHO IS:

(I) RETAINED BY THE PARENT, GUARDIAN, OR CUSTODIAN OF THE CHILD; OR

(II) PROVIDED BY THE OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER; AND

(2) THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER HAS MADE AN EFFORT REASONABLY CALCULATED TO GIVE ACTUAL NOTICE TO THE PARENT, GUARDIAN, OR CUSTODIAN OF THE CHILD THAT THE CHILD WILL BE INTERROGATED.

(C) A CONSULTATION WITH AN ATTORNEY UNDER THIS SECTION:

(1) SHALL BE:

(I) CONDUCTED IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE MARYLAND RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT; AND

(II) CONFIDENTIAL; AND

(2) MAY BE:

(I) IN PERSON; OR

(II) BY TELEPHONE OR VIDEO CONFERENCE.

(D) TO THE EXTENT PRACTICABLE AND CONSISTENT WITH THE MARYLAND RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, AN ATTORNEY PROVIDING CONSULTATION UNDER THIS SECTION SHALL COMMUNICATE AND COORDINATE WITH THE PARENT, GUARDIAN, OR CUSTODIAN OF THE CHILD IN CUSTODY.

(E) THE REQUIREMENT OF CONSULTATION WITH AN ATTORNEY UNDER THIS SECTION:

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True

(1) MAY NOT BE WAIVED; AND

(2) APPLIES REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THE CHILD IS PROCEEDED AGAINST AS A CHILD UNDER THIS SUBTITLE OR IS CHARGED AS AN ADULT.

(F) (1) A LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY CONDUCTING AN INTERROGATION UNDER THIS SECTION SHALL MAINTAIN A RECORD OF THE NOTIFICATION OR ATTEMPTED NOTIFICATION OF A PARENT, GUARDIAN, OR CUSTODIAN UNDER THIS SECTION, INCLUDING:

(I) A SIGNED STATEMENT BY A DULY AUTHORIZED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER EMPLOYED BY THE AGENCY THAT AN ATTEMPT TO NOTIFY A PARENT, GUARDIAN, OR CUSTODIAN WAS MADE;

(II) THE NAME OF THE PERSON SOUGHT TO BE NOTIFIED; AND

(III) THE METHOD OF ATTEMPTED NOTIFICATION.

(2) (I) A LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY CONDUCTING AN INTERROGATION UNDER THIS SECTION SHALL MAINTAIN A RECORD OF THE NAME OF THE ATTORNEY CONTACTED AND THE COUNTY OR COUNTIES IN WHICH THE ATTORNEY PROVIDED THE CONSULTATION.

(II) AN ATTORNEY CONTACTED TO PROVIDE LEGAL CONSULTATION TO A CHILD UNDER THIS SUBTITLE SHALL PROVIDE TO A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER THE INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR THE RECORD REQUIRED TO BE MAINTAINED UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (I) OF THIS PARAGRAPH.

(G) (1) NOTWITHSTANDING THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS SECTION, A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER MAY CONDUCT AN OTHERWISE LAWFUL CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION OF A CHILD IF:

(I) THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER REASONABLY BELIEVES THAT THE INFORMATION SOUGHT IS NECESSARY TO PROTECT ~~AN INDIVIDUAL FROM AN IMMINENT THREAT TO THE LIFE OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND A REASONABLE DELAY TO ALLOW THE CHILD TO HAVE LEGAL CONSULTATION WOULD IMPEDE THE ABILITY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT TO SAFEGUARD THE LIFE OF THE THREATENED INDIVIDUAL~~ AGAINST A THREAT TO PUBLIC SAFETY; AND

(II) THE QUESTIONS POSED TO THE CHILD BY THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER ARE LIMITED TO THOSE QUESTIONS REASONABLY NECESSARY TO OBTAIN THE INFORMATION NECESSARY TO PROTECT ~~THE~~

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True

~~INDIVIDUAL FROM AN IMMINENT THREAT TO THE LIFE OF THE INDIVIDUAL~~ AGAINST THE THREAT TO PUBLIC SAFETY.

(2) (I) UNLESS IT IS IMPOSSIBLE, IMPRACTICABLE, OR UNSAFE TO DO SO, AN INTERROGATION CONDUCTED UNDER PARAGRAPH (1) OF THIS SUBSECTION SHALL BE RECORDED.

(II) IN A JURISDICTION THAT HAS ADOPTED THE USE OF BODY–WORN DIGITAL RECORDING DEVICES BY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, THE INTERROGATION OF A CHILD MAY BE RECORDED USING A BODY–WORN DIGITAL RECORDING DEVICE IN A MANNER THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES REGARDING THE USE OF BODY–WORN DIGITAL RECORDING DEVICES.

(III) IN A JURISDICTION THAT HAS NOT ADOPTED THE USE OF BODY–WORN DIGITAL RECORDING DEVICES, THE INTERROGATION OF A CHILD MAY BE RECORDED USING OTHER VIDEO AND AUDIO RECORDING TECHNOLOGY IN A MANNER THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH ANY POLICIES OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY REGARDING THE USE OF VIDEO AND AUDIO RECORDING TECHNOLOGY.

(IV) A CHILD BEING INTERROGATED UNDER THIS SUBSECTION SHALL BE INFORMED IF THE INTERROGATION IS BEING RECORDED.

(H) (1) THERE IS A REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION THAT A STATEMENT MADE BY A CHILD DURING A CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION IS INADMISSIBLE IN A DELINQUENCY PROCEEDING OR A CRIMINAL PROSECUTION AGAINST ~~THE~~ THAT CHILD IF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER WILLFULLY FAILED TO COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS SECTION.

(2) THE STATE MAY OVERCOME THE PRESUMPTION BY SHOWING, BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE, THAT THE STATEMENT WAS MADE KNOWINGLY, INTELLIGENTLY, AND VOLUNTARILY.

(3) THIS SUBSECTION MAY NOT BE CONSTRUED TO RENDER A STATEMENT BY THAT CHILD INADMISSIBLE IN A PROCEEDING AGAINST ANOTHER INDIVIDUAL.

(I) THE OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER SHALL:

(1) DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT POLICIES TO PROVIDE GUIDANCE AND INSTRUCTION TO ATTORNEYS TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS SECTION; AND

(2) ON OR BEFORE OCTOBER 1, 2022, PUBLISH ON ITS WEBSITE, OR PROVIDE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT ON REQUEST, INFORMATION ON ATTORNEYS AVAILABLE TO ACT AS COUNSEL TO A CHILD IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS SECTION.

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True

Article – Criminal Procedure

2–108.

(a) A law enforcement officer who charges a minor with a criminal offense shall make a reasonable attempt to **[**notify**]** **PROVIDE ACTUAL NOTICE TO** the parent or guardian of the minor of the charge.

(b) If a law enforcement officer takes a minor into custody, the law enforcement officer or the officer's designee shall make a reasonable attempt to notify the parent or guardian of the minor **[**within 48 hours of the arrest of the minor**]** **IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF § 3–8A–14 OF THE COURTS ARTICLE**.

2–405.

A CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION OF A MINOR SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF § 3–8A–14.2 OF THE COURTS ARTICLE.

SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That it is the intent of the General Assembly that the term "threat to public safety", as used in this Act be construed in a manner consistent with the judicially recognized exception to the requirements of Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).

SECTION ~~2.~~ 3. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect October 1, 2022.

Approved:

_____

Governor.

_____

President of the Senate.

_____

Speaker of the House of Delegates.

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True

SEQ NO. 515
Presiding: Mr. President

Calendar Date: Mar 17, 2022 8:23 (PM)
Legislative Date: Mar 5, 2022

Senate of Maryland
2022 Regular Session

SB 53 Third Reading (SB) Calendar No.43
Senator Carter et al (JPR)
Juvenile Law - Child Interrogation Protection Act

On Third Reading

31 Yeas **15 Nays** **0 Not Voting** **0 Excused** **1 Absent**

Voting Yea - 31

Mr. President	Feldman	Hough	Lee	Sydnor
Augustine	Griffith	Jackson	McCray	Waldstreicher
Beidle	Guzzone	Kagan	Patterson	Washington
Benson	Hayes	Kelley	Pinsky	Watson
Carter	Hester	Kramer	Rosapepe	Young
Elfreth	Hettleman	Lam	Smith	Zucker
Ellis				

Voting Nay - 15

Bailey	Corderman	Gallion	Klausmeier	Salling
Carozza	Eckardt	Hershey	Ready	Simonaire
Cassilly	Edwards	Jennings	Reilly	West

Not Voting - 0

Excused from Voting - 0

Excused (Absent) - 1

King

SENATE FLOOR VOTE

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True

SEQ NO. 864
Presiding: Speaker

Calendar Date: Mar 31, 2022 10:36 (AM)
Legislative Date: Mar 24, 2022

Maryland House of Delegates
General Assembly of Maryland 2022 Regular Session

SB 53 Third Reading (SB) Calendar No.8
Senator Carter et al (JUD)
Juvenile Law - Child Interrogation Protection Act

On Third Reading

91 Yeas **42 Nays** **2 Not Voting** **0 Excused** **6 Absent**

Voting Yea - 91

Speaker	Chang	Healey	Love	Smith
Acevero	Charkoudian	Henson	Luedtke	Solomon
Amprey	Charles	Hill	McIntosh	Stein
Anderson	Clippinger	Holmes	Moon	Stewart
Atterbeary	Crosby	Howell	Palakovich Carr	Terrasa
Bagnall	Crutchfield	Ivey	Patterson	Toles
Barnes, B.	Cullison	Jalisi	Pena-Melnyk	Turner
Barnes, D.	Davis	Jones, D.	Pendergrass	Valderrama
Bartlett	Ebersole	Jones, R.	Prettyman	Valentino-Smith
Barve	Feldmark	Kaiser	Proctor	Walker
Belcastro	Fennell	Kelly	Qi	Washington
Boyce	Fisher, W.	Kerr	Queen	Watson
Branch, C.	Foley	Korman	Reznik	Wells
Branch, T.	Forbes	Landis	Rogers	Wilkins
Bridges	Fraser-Hidalgo	Lehman	Rosenberg	Williams
Brooks	Gilchrist	Lewis, J.	Ruth	Wilson
Cardin	Guyton	Lewis, R.	Sample-Hughes	Young, K.
Carey	Harrison	Lierman	Shetty	Young, P.
Carr				

Voting Nay - 42

Adams	Ciliberti	Impallaria	Mangione	Otto
Anderton	Clark	Jackson	Mautz	Parrott
Arentz	Cox	Jacobs	McComas	Pippy
Arikan	Fisher, M.	Johnson	McKay	Reilly
Beitzel	Ghrist	Kipke	Metzgar	Rose
Bhandari	Griffith	Kittleman	Morgan	Saab
Boteler	Hartman	Krebs	Munoz	Szeliga
Buckel	Hornberger	Lisanti	Novotny	Wivell
Chisholm	Howard			

Not Voting - 2

Attar Shoemaker

Excused from Voting - 0

Excused (Absent) - 6

Conaway	Krimm	Long	Lopez	Thiam
Grammer				

HOUSE FLOOR VOTE

* Indicates Vote Change

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True

April 8, 2022

The Honorable Bill Ferguson
President of the Maryland Senate
H–107 State House
Annapolis, MD 21401

Dear President Ferguson:

In accordance with Article II, Section 17 of the Maryland Constitution, I have vetoed Senate Bill 53 – *Juvenile Law – Child Interrogation Protection Act*.

We share the common goal of protecting the youth in the state's custody, and balancing the safety of our communities and the rehabilitation of youth involved in delinquency proceedings; however, Senate Bill 53, while it has good intentions, is a flawed bill that will hamper criminal investigations, and, in turn, potentially jeopardize public safety. Many of the provisions in the bill meant to protect youth were concepts that I could support, such as requiring the recording of interrogations, notification to parents/guardians, and developing age–appropriate language to explain Miranda rights to a youth. The hurdles created by this bill, most notably requiring consultation with an attorney prior to questioning, will effectively eliminate the ability for law enforcement to interrogate a youth. At a time where the public is concerned about increases in juvenile crime, this bill removes a crucial tool from the toolbox in the investigation of criminal activity and the administration of justice.

Recent studies suggest that youth are more vulnerable and culpable than adults, and may be more likely to submit to pressure from police to proceed with questioning instead of exercising their constitutional right against self–incrimination. Nonetheless, adult and youth suspects alike often choose to waive their Miranda rights and speak to police. These interactions, which are typically consensual, frequently provide crucial information that may lead to the identification of additional suspects and victims; evidence, such as firearms and other dangerous and deadly weapons, stolen property, and drug stashes; and facts that could assist in the investigation of alleged criminal activity as well as bringing criminals to justice. Despite the fact that some youth may choose to speak freely and voluntarily, this legislation bars a youth from waiving the requirement to speak with a defense attorney or public defender.

Additionally, law enforcement officers undergo routine training on best practices that are to be utilized when taking a youth into custody and questioning them. Law

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True

enforcement officials understand the inherent difference and special care that is needed when a youth is in custody, so they take extra precautions to ensure that any statement that a youth provides is voluntary and in accordance with the Constitution and precedent established by the judicial branch. Under current practices, it is rare for a custodial interrogation of a youth to not be recorded by audio and video. The recordings of the interrogation are then meticulously reviewed by prosecutors, challenged in court by the defense, and the court will ultimately decide if the youth's rights were violated or if the evidence is admissible.

After careful consideration of the dueling priorities of protecting both youth constitutional rights as well as public safety and criminal investigations, it is clear that Senate Bill 53 fails to strike an appropriate balance that protects the youth and public safety of the state.

For these reasons, I have vetoed Senate Bill 53.

Sincerely,

Lawrence J. Hogan, Jr.
Governor

HOGAN'S VETO LETTER PAGE 2 OF 2

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True

SEQ NO. 1174
Presiding: Mr. President

Calendar Date: Apr 9, 2022 10:53 (AM)
Legislative Date: Mar 29, 2022

Senate of Maryland
2022 Regular Session

SB 53 Vetoed Senate Bills No. 2
Senator Carter et al
Juvenile Law - Child Interrogation Protection Act

Shall the bill(s) pass notwithstanding the objections of the Chief Executive?

30 Yeas **16 Nays** **0 Not Voting** **0 Excused** **1 Absent**

Voting Yea - 30

Mr. President	Ellis	Hettleman	Lam	Sydnor
Augustine	Feldman	Jackson	Lee	Waldstreicher
Beidle	Griffith	Kagan	Patterson	Washington
Benson	Guzzone	Kelley	Pinsky	Watson
Carter	Hayes	King	Rosapepe	Young
Elfreth	Hester	Kramer	Smith	Zucker

Voting Nay - 16

Bailey	Eckardt	Hershey	Klausmeier	Salling
Carozza	Edwards	Hough	Ready	Simonaire
Cassilly	Gallion	Jennings	Reilly	West
Corderman				

Not Voting - 0

Excused from Voting - 0

Excused (Absent) - 1

McCray

SENATE FLOOR VOTE - VETO OVERRIDE

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True

SEQ NO. 1193
Presiding: Speaker

Calendar Date: Apr 9, 2022 1:15 (PM)
Legislative Date: Apr 1, 2022

Maryland House of Delegates
General Assembly of Maryland 2022 Regular Session

SB 53 VETOED SENATE BILL
Senator Carter et al
Juvenile Law - Child Interrogation Protection Act

Shall the bill pass notwithstanding the objections of the Chief Executive?

93 Yeas **44 Nays** **1 Not Voting** **0 Excused** **3 Absent**

Voting Yea - 93

Speaker	Chang	Henson	Love	Smith
Acevero	Charkoudian	Hill	Luedtke	Solomon
Amprey	Charles	Holmes	McIntosh	Stein
Anderson	Clippinger	Howell	Moon	Stewart
Atterbeary	Crosby	Ivey	Palakovich Carr	Terrasa
Bagnall	Crutchfield	Jalisi	Patterson	Toles
Barnes, B.	Cullison	Johnson	Pena-Melnyk	Turner
Barnes, D.	Davis	Jones, D.	Pendergrass	Valderrama
Bartlett	Ebersole	Jones, R.	Prettyman	Valentino-Smith
Barve	Feldmark	Kaiser	Proctor	Walker
Belcastro	Fennell	Kelly	Qi	Washington
Boyce	Fisher, W.	Kerr	Queen	Watson
Branch, C.	Foley	Korman	Reznik	Wells
Branch, T.	Forbes	Landis	Rogers	Wilkins
Bridges	Fraser-Hidalgo	Lehman	Rosenberg	Williams
Brooks	Gilchrist	Lewis, J.	Ruth	Wilson
Cardin	Guyton	Lewis, R.	Sample-Hughes	Young, K.
Carey	Harrison	Lierman	Shetty	Young, P.
Carr	Healey	Lopez		

Voting Nay - 44

Adams	Clark	Impallaria	Mautz	Pippy
Anderton	Cox	Jackson	McComas	Reilly
Arentz	Fisher, M.	Jacobs	McKay	Rose
Arikan	Ghrist	Kipke	Metzgar	Saab
Beitzel	Grammer	Kittleman	Morgan	Shoemaker
Bhandari	Griffith	Krebs	Munoz	Szeliga
Buckel	Hartman	Lisanti	Novotny	Thiam
Chisholm	Hornberger	Long	Otto	Wivell
Ciliberti	Howard	Mangione	Parrott	

Not Voting - 1

Attar

Excused from Voting - 0

Excused (Absent) - 3

Boteler	Conaway	Krimm

HOUSE FLOOR VOTE - VETO OVERRIDE

* Indicates Vote Change

Courtesy of 2A Maryland www.2amaryland.org 2a@2amaryland.org
Source: https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/SB0053?ys=2022RS&search=True