



2026 MSBA Advocacy Program

Preface	2
Executive Summary	3
MSBA Advocacy Overview	4
Legislative Advocacy	7
Position Categories	10
Program Organization	11
SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION	12
JUDICIARY	26
ACCESS TO JUSTICE	44
PUBLIC INTEREST AND CONSUMER	50
CRIMINAL LAW	59
CIVIL LAW	64
DORMANT ISSUES	78

Preface

The MSBA's Advocacy Program is an important part of the association's overall advocacy. The purpose of the Program is to provide the Board of Governors of the Maryland State Bar Association with an opportunity to establish and regularly update the MSBA's advocacy priorities related to the Maryland General Assembly's legislative sessions, federal legislation, proposed court rule and regulation changes, and member-wide campaigns.

Executive Summary

For more than 125 years, the MSBA has been the voice of lawyers across the state, from nearly every practice area, career stage, and demographic. The MSBA's nationally-recognized advocacy protects the legal profession, preserves the integrity of the judicial system, and ensures access to justice for Marylanders. The association conducts the most effective advocacy with the support and input of legal practitioners, convening attorneys with diverse perspectives and specialized expertise to educate and inform representatives from all branches of government.

By coordinating the efforts of MSBA committees, sections, and individuals through its Advocacy Program, the MSBA continues to lead efforts on critical initiatives such as successfully defeating a proposed tax on legal services, prioritizing judicial and attorney security, and consistently funding access to justice programs. The association also provides input and informational perspective on issues that directly affect the legal profession or significant practice areas, promote substantive law reform, raise novel issues for litigation, or propose systemic changes to the legal system or the operation of courts.

MSBA Advocacy Overview

The MSBA is a powerful advocate for our priorities on behalf of over 42,000 Maryland attorneys, judges, paralegals, law students, and other legal professionals.

Core Objectives and Achievements

The MSBA's core advocacy objectives include:

- Developing policies and programs that uphold the MSBA's role as an effective voice in legal developments that have a broad impact on the legal profession;
- Ensuring positive and effective relations between the State Bar and representatives from the Executive, Judicial, and Legislative branch, and advocacy partners and stakeholders, and supporting MSBA's membership growth of this population;
- Following proceedings and developing comments and providing input on court rules and regulations that impact the legal profession and court systems, at the full committee and subcommittee levels;
- Monitoring and reporting on legislation relevant to the profession and on behalf of over two dozen legal practice areas;
- Testifying, providing informational letters, and drafting bill language and amendments for legislative committees;
- Monitoring appellate issues and filing high-impact *amicus curiae* briefs when MSBA can provide a unique perspective of the state's legal practitioners, in cases that broadly impact the legal system or MSBA membership and relate to MSBA's core advocacy principles;
- Mobilizing member-wide advocacy campaigns on issues that impact the majority of the profession;
- Raising the visibility of the MSBA as an important advocate and go-to partner on behalf of the legal profession and Marylanders through coalition-building, brand awareness, public education, and external engagement.

Recent legislative successes include:

- Successfully stopped a broad business-to-business services tax that would have financially harmed Maryland attorneys, firms, and those seeking legal services.
- Defeated an unreasonable fee to access Maryland land records online that would raise attorney and firm overhead costs and increase client fees.
- Defeating a proposed tax on legal services that would decrease attorney and firm competitiveness and reduce access to justice;
- Enhancing judicial and attorney security through the protection of personal information of judicial officers and their families, related penalties, address

confidentiality program, and a Task Force to study and recommend security measures;

- Securing civil legal aid funding to allow high-quality legal services reach the state's low-income and vulnerable populations;
- Improving the probation before judgment process in criminal cases to no longer negatively impact a Marylander's immigration matters or professional opportunities and licenses;
- Making Maryland a no-fault divorce state through new grounds of "irreconcilable differences," thereby offering a simpler path to divorce and lowering the financial burden on parties;
- Updating Maryland corporation code to better support and retain Maryland business entities, clients, and lawyers;
- Modernizing estates and trusts law permitting e-filing of documents, and updating intestacy law to secure rights for surviving domestic partners;
- Providing testimony and advice on hundreds of bills that impact the profession and specific practice areas.

Coordinated Advocacy Through Sections and Committees

To ensure the MSBA speaks with a consistent and effective voice, all MSBA advocacy efforts are coordinated through the MSBA's Advocacy Program. Some issues impact one or more practice areas while others have a broader impact on the profession.

Bill Positions

Each MSBA section designates a legislative liaison who communicates with MSBA's Advocacy Program in advance of taking bill positions to make sure there is no conflict with the MSBA's position and for the MSBA to identify potential collaboration with other sections. The MSBA Advocacy Team also solicits section input as the team reviews all bills throughout the legislative session.

The MSBA Laws Committee reviews proposed state legislation, considers which issues may be of interest to the broader profession, and refers legislation to appropriate Sections or Committees for additional advocacy. For legislative positions that are consistent with MSBA's Legislative Program, the Laws Committee has delegated authority from the Board of Governors to proceed with advocacy efforts. For issues or positions outside of the scope of the Legislative Program, the Committee may propose a position for consideration by the Board of Governors (or Executive Committee, if time-sensitive) before taking any further action.

Drafting Legislation and Filing Amicus Briefs

MSBA's Board of Governors must approve of the drafting and initiation of any legislation or amicus brief filed on behalf of the association as a whole. Upon approval, the Board may delegate further authority to an MSBA section or committee. Unless otherwise directed, no other MSBA section, committee, or individual is authorized to submit legislation on behalf of the entire association. When an immediate response is required, the Executive Director shall consult with the Executive Committee for approval.

Unless otherwise directed, no other MSBA section, committee, or individual is authorized to submit legislation or an amicus brief on behalf of the entire association. MSBA sections may draft and file legislation relevant to their practice area through their councils, as long as there is no conflict with MSBA's position, core values, or the position(s) of other sections, and with notice to MSBA's Advocacy Program. MSBA sections must request approval from MSBA's Board of Governors before filing any amicus brief, whether on behalf of the entire association or the section, with a goal to file briefs only in matters that have a broad impact on membership.

Sections are also encouraged to consult with MSBA's Laws Committee or the Board on emerging advocacy issues before making a formal request.

Grassroots Advocacy

Grassroots advocacy tools provide a direct, digital opportunity for MSBA members and the public to directly share their opinions on pending legislation and issues with elected officials through a targeted messaging campaign (via email, phone, or social media). MSBA has successfully used grassroots tools to mobilize membership, relevant stakeholders, and the public on critical issues such as the taxation of legal services and civil legal aid funding.

Interested sections can reach out to the MSBA Advocacy team (advocacy@msba.org) at any time to directly engage in these efforts.

Legislative Advocacy

Section VIII. Advocacy/Legislative Activity/Political Activity

1. It is important for the MSBA to take an active role and participate in the formulation of legislation of concern to the membership and to the general legal community. It is equally important to establish guidelines that will enable the MSBA to participate in the legislative process in the most effective manner possible.

The Board of Governors shall pursue these two objectives in the following manner:

(a) With input from the sections and committees through the Laws Committee and its liaison, determine issues of concern that may be appropriate for inclusion in a preliminary legislative program that contains general issue areas and general legislative goals;

(b) Review the preliminary legislative program and provide direction to the Laws Committee and its liaison for inclusion in a final legislative program;

(c) Approve a final legislative program in advance of the legislative session, which authorizes the Association to take action on general issue areas with specific legislative goals;

(d) Approve additional issues for inclusion in the final legislative program during the legislative session.

2. When the membership of the Association or the Board of Governors takes action on a legislative matter in anticipation of, or during, a Legislative Session, the action shall be deemed to apply specifically to the terms of the legislative matter on which action is expressed and to expire upon the date of the Governor's deadline for signing or vetoing legislation enacted by the General Assembly, unless the action of the membership or the Board of Governors expressly provides otherwise.

3. The Executive Committee is authorized and empowered to adopt positions on behalf of the Board of Governors with respect to legislation pending before the Maryland General Assembly during the legislative session, provided that:

(a) the position receives the affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Executive Committee; and

(b) a copy of the bill and the position taken by the Executive Committee is promptly transmitted to each member of the Board of Governors.

(c) If time constraints make polling the Executive Committee impracticable, the President is authorized to adopt positions on behalf of the Executive Committee. The President-Elect is authorized to act, if the President is unavailable.

*ARTICLE IX
OPINIONS SUBJECT TO ASSOCIATION'S LEGISLATIVE POLICY
MSBA Bylaws Adopted 6/30/2020*

A section or committee may, within its area of responsibility, express its opinion on any matter before the executive branch of the federal or any state government, United States Congress, the General Assembly of Maryland or other legislative or regulatory body, and may appear before the executive branch of the federal or any state government or any legislative or regulatory body concerning the matter, provided that (i) the Section or Committee states that its opinion is the opinion of the Section or Committee only and (ii) its opinion does not conflict with a position of the Association. A Section or Committee shall advise the Board or the Association's senior staff member in charge of regulatory affairs, in writing, of its intention to express an opinion and of its position prior to the expression of its opinion. In any areas of concern to the Association in which it may wish to express an opinion, take a position, or present proposed legislation, a Section or Committee may confer with other Committees, with Sections and with legislators as it deems appropriate, and provide the Board with recommendations for legislative activity by the Association.

*Laws Committee
from MSBA Policies & Procedures Manual
Adopted 6/30/2020
Section V. – Committees*

V. Committees

B. Standing Committees

f) Laws Committee shall consist of not less than eleven (11) members, inclusive of the Chair, and may include one (1) non attorney member with relevant legislative experience. The Director of Legislative Relations shall serve as ex-officio member of the committee. The Laws Committee shall act in accordance with its role as outlined in Appendix A of this Policy Manual. Members of the Laws Committee shall serve two (2) year terms.

Appendix A. Laws Committee

The Laws Committee shall review proposed legislation before the General Assembly of Maryland in which the Association or its Sections may be interested and shall endeavor to refer such legislation to appropriate Sections or Committees of the Association. In addition, the Laws Committee shall prepare the MSBA Legislative Program, which sets forth the Association's positions on such legislative issues as the regulation of the legal profession, the administration of justice, and the independence of the judiciary, for consideration by the Board of Governors.

Position Categories

The MSBA uses three categories of involvement with State legislative issues:

Category 1 – Support – Full MSBA support for an issue. Activities include, but are not limited to, testimony, membership and/or specialty bar association alerts, press activities, and direct contact with individual members of the General Assembly.

Category 2 – Oppose – Full MSBA opposition to an issue. Normal activities include testimony and participation in coalition efforts with other interested groups.

Category 3 – Neutral – Informational letter (or no activity) recommended by the Laws Committee.

MSBA may file testimony or take further actions based on any position the Laws Committee takes, through the direction of MSBA's Board of Directors or Executive Committee. The Board or Executive Committee will inform the Laws Committee of these actions in a timely manner.

Informational Letters and Meetings

For some issues, the MSBA may propose amendments to a bill, refer a bill to a Section or Committee for further action, or submit an **Informational Letter** or hold an informational meeting to provide expertise to legislators studying an issue. This informational perspective is particularly important for issues where a section or committee-wide consensus cannot be reached, but the Legislature would greatly benefit from the diverse viewpoints and practical information provided by practitioners.

Section Positions – When to File Informational Testimony Only

If MSBA takes a position supporting or opposing a bill or on any aspect of a bill, MSBA sections may only file informational testimony on the bill. This helps to avoid confusion on the part of legislators and promotes uniformity in the association's advocacy.

Program Organization

Legislative issues are divided into the following categories:

SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION: Core issues include proposed taxation on legal services, regulation of the legal profession and attorney discipline, unauthorized practice of law, and fees.

JUDICIARY: Core issues include judicial selection, separation of powers, and judicial integrity.

ACCESS TO JUSTICE: Core issues include support for funding the justice system, including civil legal aid funding through MLSC and other initiatives.

PUBLIC INTEREST AND CONSUMER: Issues include cameras in the courtroom, public access to court records, Client Protection Fund, victim's rights, and ADR.

CRIMINAL LAW: Issues include sentencing guidelines and systemic reforms (expungements and juvenile justice).

CIVIL LAW: Controversial issues include employment discrimination, tort reform, and liability/damages.

DORMANT ISSUES: Issues that arise from time to time, but are not necessarily active during the Legislative Session. Includes some tort reform, insurance, criminal procedure, and property issues.

**Bills that concern core, non-controversial issues within the MSBA membership are further designated within a category by (*Core Issue) following the issue name.*

**Bills that involve topics of interest to the legal profession but affect groups of attorneys with different view of what the law should be are further designated within a category by (*Controversial Issue) following the issue name.*

SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION

SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION

1) ISSUE: RAPID RESPONSE TO EMERGENCY SITUATIONS AND CURRENT EVENTS (*Core Issue)

MSBA monitors emergency situations and current events that may have an immediate impact on the legal profession, the practice of law, the administration of justice, and access to courts. The association may choose to communicate with members and/or the public about these matters, at times to simply acknowledge the event or comment from the perspective of the legal profession, without taking a definitive stance, and in other instances, to share a specific position on behalf of the Bar. The association's organizational response will be guided by MSBA's mission statement and internal policies, under the direction of the association's Board of Governors. *See September 2024 Rapid Response Policy (approved by Board of Governors).*

MSBA's Lawyer Assistance Program will also be publicized as a resource for members to mitigate their stress or anxiety and support their wellbeing during difficult times.

When an immediate response is required regarding a particular piece of legislation, the Executive Director shall consult with the Executive Committee to consider action consistent with the Association's overall mission and advocacy goals, recommendations from the Laws Committee or other relevant committee, or recommendations from a Section. If time permits, the Executive Director shall consult with the Board of Directors for additional guidance. Any actions taken shall be reported at the next Board meeting.

SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION

2) ISSUE: LEGISLATION THAT IMPACTS THE LEGAL PROFESSION (*Core Issue)

As the collective voice of over 40,000 members of Maryland's legal profession, MSBA may file testimony, comment, meet with legislators, or take other actions on legislation that:

- Promotes substantive law reform;
- Directly affects the legal profession, significant practice area(s), and/or clients;
- Raises novel issues for litigation;
- Proposes systemic changes to the legal system; or
- Materially affects the administration of justice or operation of the Maryland courts.

For these issues, MSBA membership may be split, but MSBA will prioritize providing testimony and input from member experts, even if MSBA remains neutral on the topic.

POSITION: Varies

Reason: MSBA's goal in providing testimony and information on these types of bills is to inform and educate legislators and the public on the details and likely impact of significant legal issues.

SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION

3) ISSUE: PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT AND COMPETITIVE COMPENSATION (*Core Issue)

According to the U.S. Bureau for Labor Statistics, employment of lawyers is projected to grow eight (8) percent from 2022 to 2032, faster than the average for all occupations. The Washington D.C. metro area has the highest demand for lawyers in all metro areas, yet lawyers in the region face extraordinary challenges related to compensation, recruitment, and mentorship. Exemplary attorneys may leave their desired field to pursue an alternate path within the profession, move to another jurisdiction with more competitive salaries, or leave the practice of law entirely due to these factors. Maryland clients and businesses are negatively impacted by the departure of these experienced practitioners. The Judiciary, government agencies, and public interest organizations report declining applicant pools in recent years, and often have to readvertise vacancies due to advertised salaries. Comprehensive professional support for legal professionals is needed to maintain a high caliber of attorneys in the state.

POSITION: SUPPORT

REASON: MSBA supports reasonable and equitable compensation for the profession, in line with attorney and judicial salaries in other states, as well as broader recruitment, mentorship, and other financial incentives, to attract a capable, diverse, and inclusive group of legal practitioners to Maryland.

MSBA encourages deeper engagement with partner communities, including law schools, public and private entities and corporations, government agencies, the Judiciary, and the Legislature, to expand legal recruitment, training, resources, and mentorships for the legal profession. Increased financial assistance for law school, generous and flexible repayment options and loan forgiveness programs, and other incentives from public interest organizations and agencies, including commitments to fair salaries, are necessary to support indebted graduates and keep qualified attorneys in Maryland.

SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION - TAXATION

4) ISSUE: TAXING LEGAL SERVICES, PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, OR BUSINESSES (*Core Issue)

State government presently relies on two taxes—the personal income tax and the retail sales and use tax—to raise most General Fund revenues. Other sources of state income include franchise and insurance taxes, alcohol and tobacco taxes, estate taxes, and the State lottery. In addition, dedicated taxes (revenue sources levied to fund specific purposes defined by law) include transportation taxes (motor vehicle fuel tax, title tax and registration revenues), a percentage of corporate income tax receipts, and the State property tax. Maryland also receives revenue from the federal government, although the percentage of the state budget funded by this source has been decreasing in recent years. Finally, the receipt of billions of dollars from the lawsuit against tobacco companies will be used over the next 25 years to fund specified programs.

Periodically, the Legislature explores imposing a tax on legal services, professional services, or businesses as part of the revenue-raising measures associated with other taxes.

See HB 755 (1997), HB 1 (2002), HB 448 (2007), HB 1628 (2020), HB 1515 (2024), HB 1554/SB 1045 (2025).

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: General negative impact on access to the courts.

A legal services tax is a disincentive for citizens to seek legal advice and falls on the clients—not the lawyers. The MSBA places a high value upon access to justice for all citizens. A levy on legal services would hit low- and moderate-income taxpayers hardest, especially those who do not qualify for public assistance, yet cannot afford to devote a significant percentage of their income to pay for legal advice. Many legal transactions, such as property transfers and administration of estates, require payment of taxes. A legal services tax would impose an additional tax on the same transaction. In addition, clients seeking legal advice on dissolution of marriage, bankruptcy, child support, debt collection, and similar matters would pay the tax, but are those who can least afford to pay an additional charge. Moreover, an audit of client fund accounts in order to administer the tax may violate the attorney/client privilege. In some instances, a legal services tax could be a tax on tax advice. And taxing a person's ability to defend himself or herself in a criminal proceeding could be challenged as unconstitutional. A

legal services tax broadly impacts the competitiveness of Maryland law firms that compete with firms in other states for both in-state and out-of-state clients, as clients may look to firms outside of Maryland for lower fees.

SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION - TAXATION

5) ISSUE: ATTORNEY ADMISSION AND OTHER FEES (*Core Issue)

Maryland's fiscal crisis in the early 1990's prompted some lawmakers to propose new revenue-generating ideas as a means of chipping away at budget shortfalls. One of these proposals appeared in a bill, and later a budget amendment, to establish an admission and biennial renewal fee for all Maryland lawyers.

Maryland lawyers already pay substantial amounts to provide for regulation and maintenance of professional standards. Applicants to the bar exam must pay a fee to take the test. Once admitted, each attorney must pay an annual fee for the Attorney Grievance Commission and the Client Protection Fund of the Bar of Maryland to support the disciplinary and public protection infrastructure of the State's legal profession. The MSBA, although a voluntary bar, provides many of the services supplied by government agencies and unified bars in other states. MSBA annual dues range from \$95-195/year, based on membership type. The Continuing Legal Education Committee of the MSBA includes additional fees and costs for programs, materials, and webinars.

See SB 544 (1992), HB 16 (1999), HB 56 (2003), HB 523 (2011)

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: Professional service fees should apply to all professions.

Additional professional service fees, if enacted, must include all professions, not just the legal profession. Consideration also must be given to the impact of the additional fee on efforts to encourage attorneys to devote more time to pro bono activities.

In 2025, ongoing revenue concerns led to the state proposing unreasonable fees to access online land records, without proper notice and feedback from users. MSBA opposes prohibitive fees that significantly impact the profession and supports regulatory safeguards to prevent unreasonable fees in the future.

SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION - REGULATION OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION

6) ISSUE: GENERALLY – REGULATION OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION (*Core Issue)

The Legislature regulates the legal profession through the Business Occupations and Professions Article of the Maryland Annotated Code. Within that Article are sections regulating admission to the Bar, misconduct of attorneys, unauthorized practice of law, the state prosecutor, state's attorneys, attorney escrow funds, and attorney liens, as well as authorizations for the Client Protection Fund and the Maryland Legal Services Corporation.

Judicial oversight of the legal profession is much more extensive, consisting of a variety of offices and agencies including the Attorney Grievance Commission, the Client Protection Fund, the Maryland Judicial Conference, the Maryland Professionalism Center, the Supreme Court of Maryland's Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure, and the State Board of Law Examiners. The Judicial Branch has primary responsibility for regulating the practice of law, admitting new members to the Bar, and disciplining attorneys who fail to meet the standards of professional conduct.

See HB 1292 (1993), HB 2 (1994), HB 165 (1995), HB 184 (1995), HB 16 (1999), HB 1398 (2002), HB 426 (2003), HB 1108 (2004), HB 792 (2007), SB 493 (2008), SB 389 (2008)

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: The Judicial Branch has primary responsibility for regulating the practice of law.

To the extent the Legislature has the ability to regulate the legal profession, it should do so consistently with its regulation of other professions.

**SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION - REGULATION OF
THE LEGAL PROFESSION**

7) ISSUE: ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE (*Core Issue)

It is the policy of the MSBA that attorney discipline is within the sole jurisdiction of the Judiciary, and that the Legislature should not dilute the authority of the Judiciary in this area.

See SB 466 (1994), SB 76 (1996), HB 792 (2007), HB 949 (2018)

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: The Judiciary has the primary responsibility for regulating the practice of law.

SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION - CLIENT PROTECTION

8) ISSUE: UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW (*Core Issue)

Challenges to the exclusive privilege of attorneys to practice law have been an ongoing concern that raises two conflicting ideals: preservation of high-quality legal services (professionalism) versus provision of affordable legal advice (consumerism).

The legal community has criticized the use of non-lawyers in this manner by focusing on the poorer quality of the services and the lack of protection of the public when the services are inadequate. Consumers are protected by receiving services from, or under the supervision of, attorneys, for the following reasons:

1. Attorneys, through their education and training, have a better understanding of the ramifications of the decisions that clients are making when executing documents, on their financial well-being and their personal rights.
2. Non-attorney providers are not held to the same level of supervision and accountability as attorneys, through the Attorney Grievance Commission and other discipline structures created by the Supreme Court.
3. Clients generally have greater recourse against attorneys who commit wrongdoing than non-attorneys, who are typically either unregulated (or lightly regulated) and have very limited (if any) professional liability insurance.

Many non-lawyer professionals have sought and obtained permission to perform legal transactions. For example, insurance companies, banks, real estate brokers, financial services, and title companies have competed with attorneys for the right to serve the public in specific areas of the law. The issue has grown to include paralegals and legal assistants. Undergraduate training and new computer software packages enable paralegals to provide legal assistance to consumers at reduced prices, including document preparation and representation before administrative agencies or boards.

The MSBA has viewed immigration consultants as an acceptable service that does not amount to the practice of law.

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: Non-lawyers, without the supervision of an attorney, should not be permitted to provide legal services.

Legislation that would expand the rights of non-lawyers to perform those services that have been provided by attorneys in the past weakens the legal system and fails to protect the clients from malpractice and misfeasance. The MSBA will monitor specific instances where non-attorneys, under the supervision of an attorney, wish to provide increased legal services.

SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION - CLIENT PROTECTION

9) ISSUE: LAWYER/CLIENT CONFIDENTIALITY (*Core Issue)

One of the key elements in a lawyer's effective representation of a client's interests is the confidentiality of client information. A lawyer may reveal information without the client's consent only in limited circumstances:

- to prevent fraudulent or criminal acts by the client;
- to rectify the consequences of criminal and fraudulent acts by a client with the lawyer's assistance;
- to protect a lawyer's rights in a controversy or disciplinary proceeding; or
- to comply with other rules, court orders, or statutes.

See Rules of Professional Responsibility, Rule 1.6, Confidentiality of Information. The movement toward multi-professional practices creates a challenge to the attorney confidentiality principle.

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: Protect attorney/client privilege.

Any change to the confidentiality of information exchanged between lawyers and clients should be accomplished by amending the Maryland Rules, not through legislation. This would be consistent with the oversight of the legal profession by the Judiciary.

SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION – FEES

10) ISSUE: LIMITS ON CONTINGENCY FEES

Some tort reform advocates have suggested that one of the ways to curb the filing of non-meritorious lawsuits is to place percentage limits on lawyer contingency fees. This idea is based on the concern that an open-ended contingency fee method encourages plaintiffs' attorneys to inflate the size of settlements and awards in order to collect higher fees. Critics of the present system also contend that allowing contingency fees in the punitive damages context creates a windfall for both the plaintiffs and the plaintiffs' attorneys and should be handled differently than the fees for compensatory awards.

See HB 1215 (2005), HB 673 (2011)

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: The reasonableness of fees is governed by the Maryland Rules of Professional Conduct, and Maryland's Supreme Court—not the Legislature—should discipline attorneys who charge excessive fees.

Many injured parties cannot afford to pay legal expenses prior to a settlement, making contingency fees useful to enable poorer clients to receive competent legal assistance on complicated cases that involve months of preparation and research. A flexible contingency fee system allows attorneys to assume responsibility and take the risks in deserving cases. Imposing strict percentage formulas to limit lawyer fees would not recognize that some cases require enormous amounts of research and preparation, while others need only minimal effort.

SUPPORTING AND IMPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION – EDUCATION

11) ISSUE: MINIMUM CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION (*Core Issue)

The issue of a minimum continuing legal education requirement (MCLE) has been discussed in Maryland for many years, and in fall 2022, the Maryland Judiciary formed a Workgroup to consider whether Maryland should adopt MCLE (minimum continuing legal education). The Workgroup, which included two representatives of the MSBA, released its findings in a comprehensive report in September 2023, recommending that the Supreme Court of Maryland should adopt a minimum MCLE requirement of 12 hours per year (with some exceptions), with at least one hour each of CLE concerning 1) ethics and professional responsibility, 2) diversity, equity, and inclusion, and 3) mental health and substance abuse. The Report recommends an “inclusive and flexible approach” to providing credit for CLE activities to ease the burden of compliance.

MSBA’s Board of Governors created an MCLE Rapid Response Task Force that collected and shared member feedback with the Judiciary through written and oral comments over several weeks in 2023. Many MSBA attorneys report that they regularly take CLE courses offered by MSBA and other providers to stay current on areas of practice, ethics, and professionalism. Member feedback was mixed on whether to implement a mandatory scheme in the state. Positive themes include improved public perception, maintaining standards of practice, avoiding misconduct, and the potential for increased participation in pro bono work. Members describe positive professional benefits from a variety of existing MSBA and local bar association educational programs, and request that these activities receive accreditation. Member concerns included time constraints and costs for taking, tracking, and reporting CLE credits, flexible reciprocity with other states and/or legal-adjacent practice areas, and penalties for lack of compliance.

In March 2024, the Supreme Court of Maryland held an Open Meeting where it voted in favor of further meetings to evaluate and consider mandatory CLE requirements and implementation. The vote did not result in a final decision about whether to adopt MCLE in Maryland. MSBA provided Supplemental Comments to the Court in July 2024.

Maryland is one of five jurisdictions that does not require continuing legal education (CLE) for lawyers.

POSITION: NEUTRAL

REASON: MSBA remains neutral as to whether the Maryland Judiciary should proceed with the adoption of MCLE in Maryland. If the Maryland Judiciary moves forward with the adoption of MCLE, MSBA strongly advocates for an innovative, attorney-friendly model.

MSBA recommends that any MCLE program adopted in Maryland should include:

1. Flexible and inclusive reciprocity and accreditation standards that include both traditional CLE, and other high-quality programs and activities, including pro bono, valued by Maryland attorneys, to address the time and affordability concerns of practitioners;
2. No limits on distance learning, allowing all MCLE credits to be completed digitally;
3. Easy self-reporting and compliance measures that coincide with the current IOLTA and pro bono reporting deadline to encourage participation;
4. A reasonable exemption, waiver, and reactivation policy;
5. Acknowledgement of MSBA as a presumptive provider, and immediate accreditation of MSBA's CLE programs already accredited with the surrounding MCLE states; and
6. MSBA representation on any governing MCLE Commission or Board.

MSBA will continue to provide widely accredited, affordable CLE programs to attorneys through in-person and online offerings, regardless of whether a minimum CLE requirement begins in Maryland, in its role to support and educate the profession.

JUDICIARY

JUDICIARY – JUDICIAL SELECTION

1) ISSUE: ELIMINATION OF CONTESTED ELECTIONS (*Core Issue)

In Maryland, only circuit court judges are appointed by the Governor and then must run in a contested election within two years following the first year of service. Judges of the appellate courts are appointed by the Governor, confirmed by the Senate, and subject to retention elections. District court judges are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate, but do not have to stand for election at all (contested or retention).

Several reasons justify an end to contested elections for circuit court judges:

- Many of the best-qualified candidates for the circuit court do not apply, because they must leave their practices with the risk of losing their judicial seat in a contested election.
- The appearance of sitting judges accepting campaign donations from contributors, including those who have cases before them, undermines public trust in an independent judiciary.
- The Code of Judicial Conduct prohibits a sitting judge from taking positions as to how he or she would decide certain cases. As a consequence, a key element of the contested election process—debating the issues—is removed and the judicial campaign process becomes an inherently unfair process, because a challenger to a sitting judge does not have to comply with these restrictions.
- The contested election threatens the independence, integrity, and competence of the circuit court.

See HB 450 (2004), SB 647 (2004), HB 271 (2005), SB 206 (2006), SB 647 (2006), HB 1363 (2007), HB 1275 (2008), SB 367 (2015), HB 548 (2015), HB 582, HB 1071 (2015), HB 513 (2018), SB 236, HB 487 (2019), HB 11, HB 518, HB 1039, HB 1402, SB 415, SB 703, and SB 1042 (2020), HB35 (2021), HB75 (2021), SB101 (2022), HB 1255 (2023), HB 48 (2024).

POSITION: SUPPORT

REASON: The contested election for sitting circuit court judges creates an unfair system and reduces the incentive for qualified individuals to apply.

For over thirty years, the MSBA has opposed the contested election of Maryland's circuit court judges. The MSBA has supported sitting judges every election season, as

those individuals have been properly vetted and gone through a rigorous process based on their judicial qualities and merits.

In 2022, the MSBA began serving on the Judiciary's Judicial Selection Workgroup that is studying the judicial selection process. The MSBA appreciates the Workgroup's comprehensive, holistic approach. It is anticipated that the Workgroup will submit recommendations on whether or not changes should be made to the current process within the next year. The MSBA will continue to monitor this issue, review any proposed legislation, participate in ongoing advocacy efforts, and consider further refining its position as proposed solutions come to light.

JUDICIARY - JUDICIAL SELECTION

2) ISSUE: JUDICIAL NOMINATING COMMISSIONS

The Maryland Constitution empowers the Governor to appoint appellate court judges (subject to Senate confirmation and retention elections), Circuit Court judges (subject to a contested election), and District Court judges (subject to Senate confirmation only). Judicial Nominating Commissions were established by Executive Order in 1970 to propose nominees for appointment to the judiciary by the Governor. In 1995, the Executive Order was revised by the Governor with the intention of adding greater diversity in the composition of the Commissions. The composition of the Commissions changes periodically based on updated Executive Orders by the Governor.

Between 1989 and 1995 there were several unsuccessful legislative attempts to alter the judicial nominating process by either codifying the commissions into statute, or by giving the State Senate the right to confirm appointments to the Commissions. The Office of the Attorney General issued opinions on these proposals that declared them to be unconstitutional violations of the separation of powers, even though the State Senate generally supported the bills. Since 1995, there have been no legislative efforts to change the Commission process.

POSITION: SUPPORT

REASON: The MSBA supports the use of Judicial Nominating Commissions along with significant attorney participation to ensure that qualified individuals are appointed to the Maryland courts.

The best method of selecting judicial candidates uses a system where power is shared within a constitutional framework and minimizes political pressure inherent in the appointment process by limiting the influence of any one power center. By specifying the respective roles of the Governor, the Legislature, lay and lawyer members of the Commissions, and the lawyers within each judicial district, adequate safeguards have been created to discourage abuse of the judicial appointment process and to ensure racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of Maryland's judiciary. Any attempt to alter this balance by legislation should be opposed.

In its 2022 and 2023 meetings, the Judiciary's Judicial Selection Workgroup has discussed the importance of diversity and inclusion in the Judicial Nominating Commission process and commission composition. The MSBA will remain engaged in

these conversations and consider further refining its position on the Judicial Nominating Commission system.

JUDICIARY – JUDICIAL SELECTION

3) ISSUE: JUDICIAL APPOINTMENT/CONFIRMATION

The method of appointing and confirming judges periodically receives scrutiny from the General Assembly. When a vacancy occurs in Maryland courts, the Administrative Office of the Courts notifies the appropriate Judicial Nominating Commission (a statewide Appellate or regional Trial Court) of the opening, which in turn advertises the vacancy and solicits applications from members of the bar. Applications for the position are distributed to Commission members in advance of a meeting at which the filings are reviewed along with recommendations of bar associations and other interested parties. Each candidate for the opening is interviewed by the full Commission or by panels of the Commission. Once these interviews are completed, the Commission prepares a list of the candidates whose legal and professional qualifications make them suitable for judicial appointment. This list contains the names of those candidates who have received a favorable vote from a majority of the Commission present at a voting session. Votes are taken by secret written ballot. The approved list is then sent to the Governor, who must select the appointment from the names on the list or from a previous list submitted within the 24 months prior to the vacancy.

Once the Governor appoints a judge, he or she may serve on the bench immediately. Appellate and District Court judges are subject to Senate confirmation, while Circuit Court judges must run in contested elections. If an Appellate or District Court judge is not confirmed by the Senate during the regular session of the General Assembly, he or she may continue to sit until the end of the session and then leave the Bench.

See SB 150 (2002), SB24 (2002)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA supports the Commission system for appointing judges.

In its 2022 and 2023 meetings, the Judiciary's Judicial Selection Workgroup has discussed the importance of diversity and inclusion in the Judicial Nominating Commission process and commission composition. The MSBA will remain engaged in these conversations and consider further refining its position on the Judicial Appointment/Confirmation process.

JUDICIARY - JUDICIAL SELECTION

4) JUDICIAL RETIREMENT AGE

Thirty-one states and Washington D.C. have set mandatory retirement ages for judges, most between 70-75 years. Maryland is one of eighteen states that sets the mandatory retirement age at 70. As people work later into life and longer-serving judges bring experience to the bench, some states have recently tried to raise or repeal the mandatory retirement age. Recent attempts to repeal the retirement age have failed (Oregon in 2016 and Louisiana in 2014), while initiatives to raise the age have had mixed results, both through the Legislature and Constitutional amendment.

Considerations for this issue include MSBA member and public response, legislative interest, Maryland Judiciary initiatives, public perception of judges, institutional knowledge and judgment, compensation expenses, recruiting and retaining judges, and promoting diversity on the bench.

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA is committed to supporting an efficient, fair, and impartial Judiciary, representative of the profession, and will carefully monitor and consider any proposed changes to the retirement age.

JUDICIARY - LEGISLATURE AND JUDICIARY

5) ISSUE: JUDICIAL DISABILITIES (*Core Issue)

The Maryland Constitution requires judges to retire when they reach 70 years of age. Prior to retirement, a judge may be removed by a vote of two-thirds of the General Assembly, with the approval of the Governor, if the judge is unable to discharge his or her duties with efficiency because of physical or mental illness. The Constitution requires the Governor to remove judges when convicted by a court or jury, of incompetency, willful neglect of duty, misbehavior in office, or any other crime. Elected judges also may be suspended from office upon conviction or entering a nolo contendere plea for a felony or a misdemeanor related to his or her public duties.

A less extreme method of disciplining and removing Maryland judges is exercised by the Commission on Judicial Disabilities. The Commission was established in 1966 by constitutional amendment to investigate complaints against judges. The Commission conducts hearings and exerts substantial informal influence to modify inappropriate judicial behavior. As a means of determining whether to initiate formal proceedings against a member of the Judiciary, the Commission may undertake an investigation, which may involve hearings regarding the alleged disability or misconduct. If a majority of the Commission determines that a judge should be retired, removed, censured, or publicly reprimanded, a recommendation for action is sent to the Supreme Court of Maryland. The Commission also has the power to issue private reprimands.

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: Changes should be made only through Court Rule.

The Judicial Disabilities Commission was established in the Maryland Constitution as a judicial agency. Any changes to the scope or responsibilities of the Commission should be achieved by Court Rule, not by legislation.

JUDICIARY - LEGISLATURE AND JUDICIARY

6) ISSUE: THREATS TO JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE (*Core Issue)

Periodically, the Legislature files bills to overturn or nullify court decisions through retroactive application. When that is the sole goal of a bill, it reflects a dramatic disconnect in the legislative/judicial relationship. A certain level of conflict often exists between these branches of government and is expected during most General Assembly sessions where legislators file bills in response to court rulings on specific public policy issues. When the Legislature has passed laws and the courts then interpret these statutes in the constitutional context, some friction often has developed. As long as the focus remains on the issues, they can avoid usurping each other's authority.

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: The roles of the Legislature and the Judiciary must remain separate under the Constitution.

The MSBA opposes any bill that threatens judicial independence or weakens the Judiciary's status as a co-equal branch of government with the Legislature.

JUDICIARY - LEGISLATURE AND JUDICIARY

7) ISSUE: RETROACTIVE LEGISLATION (*Core Issue)

Up until the 2000 General Assembly, it had been generally accepted that legislation should have prospective effect, and not apply retroactively. Constitutionally, the Legislature must begin its session on the second Wednesday of January and conclude on the second Monday in April. In most circumstances, bills that are passed during the Legislative Session take effect on one of three future dates:

- June 1st (constitutional date),
- July 1st (customary date for budget items), or
- October 1st (customary date for all other legislation).

Exceptions to these effective dates include:

- vetoed bills (which do not go into effect unless the General Assembly overrides the veto),
- emergency legislation (which take effect upon the Governor's signature), and
- constitutional amendments (which are effective upon approval by registered voters on Election Day and certification of the results).

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: Retroactive effective dates of legislation are unfair and may deny due process.

JUDICIARY - LEGISLATURE AND JUDICIARY

8) ISSUE: JUDICIAL AND ATTORNEY SECURITY (*Core Issue)

Enhancing judicial and attorney security and preserving the rule of law is critical to the Maryland State Bar Association (MSBA) and the entire legal profession, in light of rising attacks and threats against all levels of the Judiciary. Most recently in 2023, we mourned the killing of Judge Andrew Wilkinson, Circuit Court Judge for Washington County and longtime MSBA member. As a profession, our members and support staff who walk in and out of courthouses every day – judges, magistrates, law clerks, attorneys, and court personnel - must be able to present cases and issue decisions without fear.

The Judiciary serves a vital function of upholding the rule of law and serving as a pillar of our democracy and freedom. We must preserve judicial integrity and independence, allowing judges to make impartial decisions without fear of violent threats and harmful physical recourse. Attacks on the Judiciary can have a chilling effect on the recruitment and retention of judges, as attorneys must weigh their calling to the highest level of professional service with their personal safety.

Attorneys who regularly engage in high-conflict matters, including family and criminal law practitioners, are also at great risk of physical harm and threats, as well as emotional safety risks, including vicarious trauma, stress, and anxiety, given the emotional nature of their cases. The plethora of personal information available to anyone online, including home and email addresses, creates an even greater risk of harm to attorneys and judges. Judicial and attorney security requires the cooperation of all branches of government to modernize court structures, protect personal data, and prevent future harm.

See SB 221 (2023), HB 536 (2023), HB 664/SB 575 (2024).

POSITION: SUPPORT

Reason: Increased safety and security of judges, attorneys, and other court personnel throughout Maryland is essential to protect the profession and the public and to allow members to work without fear.

MSBA supports legislation and state and local funding to address both immediate and long-term judicial and attorney security needs, including:

- Courthouse construction projects, improved infrastructure, and technology modernization;
- Additional security measures in courthouses, surrounding outdoor areas, commissioners' offices, and judicial offices and homes;
- Increased security staff and related trainings;
- Protecting personally identifiable information of judges and their immediate families;
- Threat assessment and response funds; and
- Ongoing assessments and reporting of the current and future security needs of the judiciary.

Mental health support for judges and attorneys is also critical to support wellbeing. These resources, including MSBA's Lawyer Assistance Program (available to all lawyers), should be promoted widely to the profession.

MSBA's commitment to judicial and attorney security continues through representation on the legislatively-created Task Force to Ensure the Safety of Judicial Facilities. MSBA will continue to monitor and prioritize security legislation and initiatives.

JUDICIARY - LEGISLATURE AND JUDICIARY

9) ISSUE: THE INITIATIVE (*Core Issue)

The initiative is a method of lawmaking by which citizens circumvent the legislative process to place proposals directly before the voters. The initiative and the referendum were enacted in an era when political corruption was rampant and when few methods existed by which to expose and effectively prosecute misdeeds by public officials. The initiative served a means of limiting the abuse of power by elected leaders.

During the 20th century, greater citizen participation in the legislative and electoral process, along with more extensive coverage by the mass media, diminished the value of the initiative. Although some special interests that have been thwarted by the legislature still advocate the initiative as the only available means of enacting their programs into law, most of those familiar with the lawmaking process oppose it. These critics recognize that most public policy issues are too complicated to be condensed into ballot questions requiring yes or no votes.

Proposals to place the initiative on the ballot have been filed in the Maryland General Assembly many times and have been unsuccessful. The Constitution of Maryland provides for the Referendum (Article XVI), but it has been used infrequently at the State level.

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: The initiative is no longer needed to address abuse, and the issues are more complex than ever before.

The MSBA supports pursuing legislative change through the legislative process and not based on the initiative process, which may not evaluate the issues properly.

JUDICIARY - COURT SYSTEM

10) INCREASED NUMBER OF JUDGESHIPS (*Core Issue)

Among the methods suggested for reducing clogged court dockets is to increase the number of judgeships in some jurisdictions. The decision of which jurisdictions require additional judgeships relies on a statistical analysis that takes into account several variables, including actual and projected filings; the number of pending cases per judge; the ratio of attorneys to judges; the time required from the filing of the case through its disposition (divided by criminal, civil and juvenile); and the population per judge for each jurisdiction. In addition, each circuit administrative judge, along with others in the jurisdiction familiar with the courts, are consulted. Once the Chief Judge has considered all of the responses and statistics, a decision is made regarding which jurisdictions require new judges.

Due to the costs associated with additional judgeships, a variety of steps are taken on an administrative level prior to the request for a new position. These interim steps include: temporary recall of retired judges; the assignment of active judges from other areas and other courts of the State; and, procedural management adjustments, if necessary. If it is clear that these measures will not result in a permanent decrease in the caseloads, then a new judgeship is requested.

The past few years have seen a number of new judgeships at the district, circuit, and appellate levels of the court system.

See HB 111 (2015), HB 83 (2013), HB 513 (2018), SB 205 (2019), HB 592/SB 668 (2024).

POSITION: SUPPORT

REASON: Additional judges may be necessary to handle overwhelming workloads.

The MSBA is committed to finding immediate and long-range solutions to the problem of overburdened court dockets where they exist. The MSBA will support legislation that will add judges in jurisdictions identified by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

JUDICIARY – COURT SYSTEM

11) CHANGES IN THE JURY TRIAL SYSTEM

Critics of the present system claim that requests for jury trials often are used to obtain delays, to inconvenience unfavorable witnesses, to wait until a more lenient judge is available, or to improve the defendant's plea bargaining position. Several jurisdictions have used "instant jury trials" to reduce the number of jury trials in their courts. The "Settlement Week" concept also has been implemented with a high success rate in those cases considered. Changes to the dollar thresholds for the amount in controversy within the jurisdiction of the circuit and district courts also have been made.

See HB 614 (2004), SB 796 (2006), HB 1108 (2007), HB899 (2021), HB902 (2021), SB30 (HB74) (2022)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA has an interest in protecting the integrity of the jury trial system without overburdening either the district or circuit court systems.

JUDICIARY – COURT SYSTEM

12) JURISDICTIONAL AMOUNTS

Dollar thresholds and ceilings for determining the jurisdiction for hearing cases and the right to demand a jury trial are a topic of discussion in many sessions of the Maryland General Assembly.

Currently, the claim must exceed \$25,000 to establish jurisdiction for a jury trial. Maryland voters approved this limit in 2022. The last change was in 2010, when voters approved an increase from more than \$10,000 to more than \$15,000.

See HB 413 (2006), HB 427 (2006), HB 1109 (2007), SB 403 (2008), SB 404 (2008), SB 474 (2015), SB 475 (2015), SB 669 (2021)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA has an interest in the jurisdictional thresholds that apply to district court and circuit court matters, especially when they affect the constitutional right to a jury trial.

JUDICIARY – COURT SYSTEM

13) JURY SELECTION PROCESS

In early 2024, the Legislature considered expanding the scope of the jury selection process to reduce the effects of bias, by expanding questioning 1) to identify and remove prospective jurors who are unable to serve fairly and impartially and 2) to allow the parties to obtain information that may provide guidance for the use of peremptory challenges and challenges for cause. Proponents of the bill testified that allowing a broader range of questions during voir dire would lead to fairer juries and reveal implicit bias, and would bring Maryland in line with the majority of states that permit expanded voir dire. Others raised concerns about the operational impact of expanded voir dire on length of time allotted for jury selection and the lack of clarity regarding implementation. The Judiciary noted that the issue has been raised by the Court's Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (hereinafter "Court's Rules Committee") in previous years as well as by the Equal Justice Committee, but all recommendations had not yet been fully considered by the court. The bill did not move forward in the 2024 session.

In April 2024, the Court's Rules Committee reconsidered the issue of whether to expand the current scope of voir dire and recommended changes to Rule 2-512 and Rule 4-312 consistent with the proposed 2024 legislation. In September 2024, the Supreme Court of Maryland held an Open Meeting, and after hearing from practitioners and judges, voted to immediately implement a Pilot Program in Maryland courts through January 1, 2026, to consider and pursue the effects of expanded voir dire, in anticipation of potential changes to the scope of voir dire and consideration of whether amendments to Rule 2-512 and 4-312 are appropriate.

The Pilot Program will provide feedback to the court on the effects of expanded voir dire on the efficiency of jury selection, case management, juror satisfaction, public perception of the trial process, and court operations; develop guidance and education to assist stakeholders in introducing the update to assist courts, attorneys, and litigants, and inform the Court's Rules Committee and the Supreme Court of Maryland to consider what the process should look like and any additional rule amendments.

The court may also consider other rule changes related to addressing bias in jury selection, including: changing the number of peremptory challenges, new rules to address objections to peremptory challenges, other recommendations from the Equal Justice Committee, and model rules from other jurisdictions. MSBA will monitor and comment on further proposals.

MSBA will continue to work with the Court's Rules Committee, Special Voir Dire Subcommittee, and participate in the Judiciary's Advisory Group for the Pilot Program and will provide practitioner feedback on proposed amendments and implementation concerns, to develop and update relevant resources for the profession and the public, and inform and educate membership.

See HB 1079/SB 827 (2024), Rule 2-512 (2024), Rule 4-312 (2024).

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: MSBA supports the holistic process outlined and approved by the Supreme Court of Maryland in addressing implicit bias in jury selection, through 1) the newly created 2024 Pilot Program to consider the effects of expanded voir dire, and 2) the Court's Rules Committee's ongoing work to draft and finalize related rule changes by 2026, inclusive of feedback from the Pilot Program, practitioners, and judges. MSBA will oppose any legislation that interferes with the court's process of implementing and reviewing a Pilot Program and authorizing any updates to the jury selection process.

The proposal is an important step in ensuring fairness and transparency in the judicial process, an integral part of MSBA's mission, through equality in jury service, access to justice, diversity, and improved public perception of the courts.

ACCESS TO JUSTICE

ACCESS TO JUSTICE - FUNDING THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

1) ISSUE: THE JUSTICE SYSTEM MUST HAVE ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR ITS PROGRAMS AND SERVICES (*Core Issue)

Cuts in funding some programs within the justice system during recent years have prompted state and local officials to look at ways to reduce costs without sacrificing the quality of services or changing public policy.

The justice system in Maryland is financed by a combination of State and local funds. In general, the State pays for the courts and indigent defense while the subdivisions support the police and prosecutorial functions. There are exceptions; for example, local governments pay for the support staff for the circuit courts, and the Maryland State Police Department does not receive any local expenditures. The correctional systems are financed by a blend of State and local funds. The legislation requiring legal counsel for bail hearings compounded this issue. Similar issues arise with the new electronic case management and establishment of the Family Courts.

See SB 197 (1995), SB 133 (1999), HB 913 (2000), SB 66 (2014), HB 51 (2015), HB 54 (2015), HJ 3 (2018), SB106 (2022), HB 693 (2024).

POSITION: SUPPORT

REASON: The MSBA has an interest in ensuring that Maryland's courts are adequately funded, and that other components of the justice system are not subject to unfunded mandates.

The Legislature often enacts laws that promote services or require infrastructure that it does not fund either at the State or local levels. These initiatives impact the justice system when the program either is delayed in implementation due to the cost or requires elimination of other valid programs to fund the initiative.

ACCESS TO JUSTICE - FUNDING THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

2) ISSUE: MARYLAND LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION, INC. (*Core Issue)

The Maryland Legal Services Corporation (MLSC) was established by statute in 1982 as a means of expanding the availability of legal services to those Maryland citizens who were unable to afford adequate legal counsel. The primary function of the MLSC has been to fund providers of legal services to the poor in non-criminal proceedings. While the MLSC is not an agency of the State, its governing board is appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate, it is required to submit an annual report and audit to the Executive and Legislative branches of government, and it must have statutory approval of its funding sources. Also specified within the MLSC's enabling statute are restrictions on spending MLSC funds for use in fee-generating cases, criminal proceedings or civil cases arising out of criminal convictions, lobbying or political activities, and class action suits. MLSC funding is provided primarily by a \$2,000,000 annual appropriation from the State Abandoned Property Fund, from proceeds of the Interest on Lawyer Trust Accounts (IOLTA) program, and from surcharges on circuit and district court filing fees.

See SB 280 (2012), HB 265 (2012), SB 640 (2013), HB 1303 (2013), SB 262 (2013), HB 1291 (2017)

POSITION: SUPPORT

REASON: The MSBA supports legal services for all Maryland residents.

The MSBA has been a strong advocate for the MLSC in the Maryland General Assembly, supporting its goals and fighting for passage of both the voluntary and comprehensive IOLTA statutes. The MLSC provides a significant resource for legal services in Maryland.

ACCESS TO JUSTICE - FUNDING THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

3) ISSUE: Civil Right to Counsel (*Core Issue)

In 2008, the Maryland Access to Justice Commission (A2JC) was created to develop, consolidate, coordinate, and implement policy initiatives to expand access to and enhance the quality of justice in civil legal matters for persons who encounter barriers in gaining access to the State's civil justice system. In 2011, the Commission published a report entitled *Implementing a Civil Right to Counsel in Maryland*, which made recommendations on implementation strategies, including specifying the types of cases for which the right to civil counsel should attach, particularly those where basic human needs are at stake, "such as those involving shelter, sustenance, safety, health, or child custody."

During the Covid-19 pandemic, the need for civil legal aid skyrocketed in many areas of the civil justice system, including housing, consumer debt, public benefits, domestic violence, and immigration. A2JC provided distinctive leadership with the MSBA to confront the crisis. A2JC partnered with the Attorney General's Office to lead the Covid-19 Access to Justice Task Force, delivering substantive recommendations, many of which were transformed into bills and then law. In 2021, the General Assembly passed HB18, creating a statewide access to counsel in evictions program. While the MSBA and A2JC have secured over \$40 million in funding for the program since 2020, additional funds are needed to fully implement the program beyond 2024.

See HB18 (2021)

POSITION: SUPPORT

REASON: Increasing access to counsel in civil proceedings is a beneficial, cost-effective access to justice solution.

The MSBA has been a strong advocate for civil legal aid and will continue to consider and support such initiatives affecting basic human needs.

ACCESS TO JUSTICE - FUNDING THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

4) PUBLIC DEFENDERS AT BAIL REVIEW HEARINGS (*Core Issue)

One of the chronic problems in detention facilities is the number of inmates who have been incarcerated for relatively minor offenses because they were unable to pay bail. In many of the cases, the defendants are released with no punishment other than time served, but their incarceration has deprived the jurisdiction of valuable jail space that could have been used to house those accused of more serious crimes. Often defendants lose jobs and suffer significant personal difficulties during and after even a brief detention, consequences that may increase the likelihood of lawbreaking by these individuals in the future. The Commission on the Future of Maryland Courts (CFMC) reviewed this situation during its tenure (1995-1996) and recommended involvement in criminal cases by defense counsel soon after arrest as a means of resolving many of these cases earlier in the process. The most significant hurdle in implementing the recommendation has been funding.

In 2013 and 2014, a series of reviews by the Supreme Court of Maryland resulted in a requirement that a defendant have legal counsel at an initial appearance before a District Court Commissioner. See *DeWolfe v. Richmond and Clyburn v. Richmond*. Recognizing the economic impact on the Office of the Public Defender, the Court issued several stays of the decision's implementation. As of July 1, 2014, no further stays exist. The Chief Judge of the District Court and the local bar associations have collaborated on establishing supplemental services to ensure the representation, because the OPD continues to have insufficient funding to perform these new responsibilities.

During the 2014 legislative session the General Assembly considered measures to either provide representation at initial appearances, or to replace those appearances with a computerized risk-assessment tool. Each of the bills failed.

See HB 1186, HB 1232, SB 973, SB 170 – The Budget Bill (2014), HB 494 (2015), HB 596 (2015)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA has an interest in avoiding conscription of attorneys while supporting that the Office of the Public Defender has the funding and resources to comply with the requirement.

ACCESS TO JUSTICE - FUNDING THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

5) ISSUE: INCREASED LANGUAGE AND DISABILITY INTERPRETER ACCESS

Increased language and disability access services are needed in Maryland courts to enable litigants with limited English ability to fully participate in court proceedings and related matters. As courts continue to update their protocols and consider strategies to best handle cases and matters involving parties and witnesses with limited English proficiency, consideration of the following priorities is essential:

- Recruiting, training, and certifying additional interpreter candidates;
- Translating court documents, forms, and online information;
- Access to appropriate interpreter services at all court hearings, including emergency hearings, trials, and motions, as well as related matters outside the courtroom, including intake offices, mediation, and clerks' and sheriffs' offices;
- Training and technology upgrades including IT, phone, and web-based tools to receive and process requests.

MSBA will work with established partners including legal services organizations, the Judiciary, law firms, and local and specialty bar associations to support this initiative.

POSITION: SUPPORT

Reason: MSBA supports increased language and disability access services to promote equal access to the courts and to maintain fairness in the legal system.

PUBLIC INTEREST AND CONSUMER

PUBLIC INTEREST AND CONSUMER – COURT RECORDS AND TECHNOLOGY

1) ISSUE: CAMERAS IN THE COURTROOM

In 1980, the Supreme Court of Maryland adopted a Rule to permit extended media coverage of court proceedings on an experimental basis. A few months later, however, the General Assembly passed legislation prohibiting extended coverage of criminal proceedings in trial courts (Criminal Procedure Article, Section 1-201). Over the next two years, experiments were conducted with greater media coverage of civil cases in the Circuit Courts and a permanent rule permitting this type of access was approved in 1984. This Rule was expanded to allow coverage of the appellate courts in 1992.

Requests from the broadcast media for access must be filed on a timely basis, written consent must be obtained from all parties involved in the case, and the coverage may not place a burden on courtroom equipment or personnel. See Rule 16-109. The Supreme Court of Maryland has video-streamed oral arguments since 2006 and maintains an archive of past arguments for viewing.

The Covid-19 pandemic accelerated remote technology and video capability for virtual court proceedings as well as public access to virtual dockets. Both the Supreme Court of Maryland and the legislature are dealing with many novel issues related to these leaps in remote technology since 2020. As technology improves, the ability to record court proceedings could expand, but the judicial branch should be given appropriate consideration and deference regarding the broadcast and regulation of court proceedings, particularly for sensitive criminal proceedings. Analysis of the fiscal impact of implementing and maintaining A/V equipment and systems must also be reviewed. The MSBA will continue to monitor this issue and refine its position upon review of any proposed legislation and/or rules.

See HB 207 (2007), HB 77 (2008), HB 8 (2016), HB 756 (2019), HB 1376 (2020), HB 810 (2022)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA will monitor the opportunities to implement new technology, while also giving appropriate discretion to the Court to regulate broadcasting and recording of court proceedings.

PUBLIC INTEREST AND CONSUMER – COURT RECORDS AND TECHNOLOGY

2) ISSUE: ACCESS TO COURT RECORDS

The burgeoning growth in the amount of information received and stored in the judicial system, and calls for greater public access to this data, has prompted the Courts and the Maryland General Assembly to review policies on how these records are disseminated. The pivotal issue in the debate over the openness of court records pits the right of the public to obtain access to information against the right of individuals to privacy. Courts in Maryland acquire and maintain extensive files on individuals and entities involved in the judicial system—extremely personal information may be collected for criminal investigations, civil cases gather details about individual lives that the general public does not need to see, and corporations need to protect confidential financial information and proprietary information.

Some situations may appear reasonable, such as releasing criminal records to employers who are hiring applicants for positions of trust, but they present questions concerning the range of information actually necessary for distribution or review. Increasing electronic storage of information brings with it unauthorized access issues. Protecting against security breaches compounds the difficulty of balancing access to public information with protection of individuals from identity theft. The ability to seal court records provides some relief but is not a routine practice except in matters involving minors.

Changes to the Maryland Rules and State laws have tried to address these concerns. See Md. Rules 16-1001 through 16-1011, which prohibit certain personal information from being included in documents filed with the court. The Maryland Public Information Act identifies specific personal proprietary information that must not be disclosed when that information is held by a government entity, and the State Gov't Article protects certain combinations of personal information when held by a government or a contractor working for the government as a means of reducing the threat of identity theft.

More recently, the use and broadcast of legally obtained recordings of Maryland criminal proceedings has emerged as an important issue for the press, attorneys, and the public. See *Soderberg v. Carrion*, Civ. No. RDB 19-1559 (D. Md.), writing that the State may not sanction the press for broadcasting “lawfully obtained, truthful information that the State itself has disclosed to the public.” The Supreme Court of Maryland’s Rules Committee is considering proposed rule changes to address the process of public access to court recordings.

The MSBA will continue to monitor this dynamic issue and its impact on the profession, with relevant feedback from its affected members.

See HB 134 (2022)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA will monitor the potential impact of public access and distribution of court records and also consider the interests of legal practitioners and any separation of power issues.

PUBLIC INTEREST AND CONSUMER - GENERAL

3) ISSUE: CLIENT PROTECTION FUND

The Clients' Security Trust Fund was created in 1965 to protect the integrity of the legal profession by reimbursing losses caused by attorney misconduct. Legislation passed in the 2002 session changed the name of the Clients' Security Trust Fund to the Client Protection Fund (CPF). Attorneys pay an annual fee to support the fund.

See SB 118 (2000), SB 493 (2008)

POSITION: SUPPORT

REASON: The MSBA has an interest in ensuring the protection of clients and agrees that insurers should notify third-party claimants that payment has been delivered to their attorneys.

PUBLIC INTEREST AND CONSUMER - GENERAL

4) ISSUE: VICTIM'S RIGHTS

The approval by Maryland voters of a constitutional amendment regarding victim's rights in 1994 was the culmination of a lengthy campaign by supporters of the proposal. It also set the stage for refinements in applicable statutes to ensure that victims will have a role in a variety of criminal justice proceedings.

In 1995, the General Assembly enacted two laws concerning the rights of victims. The first required the registration of sex offenders, both those who were convicted of sex crimes and those who received probation before judgment, if registration was a condition of probation. The second measure added mechanisms for increasing state funds to the Maryland Victims of Crime Fund, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund, and the Victim and Witness Protection and Relocation Program.

Since then, advocates have shifted their attention to the courts, enforcement agencies, and Congress for additional relief, rather than the State Legislature.

See HB 624 (1995), SB 508 (2006),

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA will review all legislation concerning the rights of victims to ensure that the rights of defendants are protected and that the proposals do not violate constitutional principles.

PUBLIC INTEREST AND CONSUMER - GENERAL

5) ISSUE: ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR)

The frustration over the perceived litigiousness of American society has resulted in a variety of proposals to move some of these disputes out of the courts and into alternative forums for settling differences. During many sessions of the General Assembly, suggestions for other avenues of dispute resolution are reflected in specific bills designed to enact these ideas into law. Many levels of court now implement a mediation system to encourage settlement prior to trial or further judicial action.

See HB 1043 (1997), SB 792 (2013), HB 456 (2017)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA supports voluntary alternatives to litigation for dispute resolution.

The MSBA supports unrestricted access to the judicial system, including legislation that would make ADR available to the parties, but does not necessarily agree that legislation should require ADR as a condition for filing lawsuits. The success of ADR depends upon flexibility and innovation. Simply entrenching a particular method or program into a statute will not achieve the goals of ADR.

PUBLIC INTEREST AND CONSUMER - GENERAL

6) ISSUE: LAWYER-LEGISLATORS REPRESENTING CLIENTS

The Maryland General Assembly is a part-time legislature, with a membership from a broad array of professions. Most legislators must have another source of income to supplement their salary. It is the second source of income that has aroused concerns that special interest groups may be hiring legislators and paying their salaries in return for favors from these elected officials.

Lawyer-legislators also have been subjected to criticism from groups who charge that their votes have been affected by clients who compensate them for their legal services. Some critics have sought to curb the ability of these attorneys to practice law before Executive Branch agencies and the Judiciary. Because legislators must vote on bills that impact virtually every economic activity in the State, and lawyers often represent clients from many of these same concerns, it leaves the lawyer-legislators open to criticism that the competing interests have an adverse effect on their performance in both professions.

Public concern over potential conflicts of interest of members of the General Assembly prompted calls for restrictions on the activities of lawmakers. Restrictions now exist on a legislator's representation of clients for compensation before State agencies in any matter involving procurement or the adoption of regulations. This law excludes judicial, quasi-judicial, or administrative hearings (contested cases) from coverage. An ongoing issue involves the propriety of lawyer-legislators voting on bills that would benefit their law practices. Members of the General Assembly who practice law must have a clear understanding of their legislative role and their legal role and avoid the appearance of impropriety.

See HB 1198 (1995)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA includes members who serve as lawyers and legislators.

To preserve the integrity of both groups, the MSBA has an interest in monitoring legislation that might unduly affect the legal profession.

PUBLIC INTEREST AND CONSUMER - GENERAL

7) ISSUE: LICENSURE OF PRIVATE PROCESS SERVERS

Process servers have an important role in the legal system by providing a reliable method of delivering papers and documents from one party to another party in civil actions. Service of process may be made in person by sheriffs or by any other competent adult, or by registered mail. Regulations on service of process are specified in the Maryland Rules, Title 2. The amount of fees charged for service of process varies across the state. Some process servers charge a fee, plus expenses, while other providers have a flat schedule of costs.

See SB 554 (2013), SB 838 (2014)

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: The current system of private process service functions adequately.

CRIMINAL LAW

CRIMINAL LAW - SENTENCING

1) ISSUE: SENTENCING GUIDELINES

Maryland relies upon recommended guidelines that have a range of sentences depending upon the severity of the offense and the offender's criminal history. This method of using voluntary guidelines was approved by the General Assembly in 1983 (Criminal Procedure Article, § 6-216), and applies the Maryland Sentencing Guidelines as developed by the Sentencing Guidelines Advisory Board, which consists of circuit court judges, criminal justice agency officials, and members of the Bar.

The key elements of Maryland's policy with regard to sentencing are:

- training for judges, court personnel, public defenders, state's attorneys, and parole and probation officers in the application of the guidelines;
- a Maryland Sentencing Guidelines Manual with matrices to aid judges in the application of appropriate sentences; and
- a data collection unit within the Administrative Office of the Courts that maintains statistics to track sentencing patterns, inconsistent sentencing, and compliance rates.

These elements are intended to be flexible to accommodate changing circumstances.

See SB 222 (1996), HB 1143 (2002), HB 918 (2004), SB21 (2022)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: Sentencing guidelines should remain references, but should not become mandatory requirements.

CRIMINAL LAW – SENTENCING

2) MANDATORY SENTENCING (*Controversial Issue)

Advocates of mandatory sentencing provisions for various crimes contend that criminal activity will decline if potential offenders are convinced that they will serve time in jail if they break the law. Support for this concept was strong in the Maryland General Assembly during the 1970's and 1980's when statutes were approved containing provisions for mandatory sentencing for a number of criminal offenses.

The types of crimes in Maryland that require a minimum mandatory sentence, with no provisions for suspended sentences, fall within five general categories:

- violent crimes involving use of a handgun (Criminal Law, § 4-204);
- use of a firearm in relation to drug trafficking (Criminal Law, § 5-621);
- drug "kingpin" offenders (Criminal Law, § 5-613 and § 5-905);
- drug distribution offenders in the vicinity of schools (Criminal Law, § 5-627); and
- third conviction for a violent crime (Criminal Law, § 14-101 and § 14-102).

The American Bar Association has opposed mandatory minimum prison sentences not subject to parole or probation since 1974. The Maryland State Bar Association for the first time opposed all mandatory sentencing provisions in any legislation introduced in the 1993 General Assembly.

See HB 2 SB 1005 (2016), HB 1312 & HB 1313 - Justice Reinvestment (2016)

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: Mandatory sentences should apply to some crimes, but not all of them.

The MSBA believes that mandatory sentences should exist for those offenses where adequate diversion or rehabilitation programs are available, and the MSBA opposes mandatory sentencing for other crimes based on several key points:

- Mandatory sentencing does not deter crime, because offenders either do not know of the mandatory sentence or are confident that they will elude capture.
- The prospect of a mandatory sentence may lead a jury to find a defendant innocent to avoid a mandatory sentence.
- Mandatory sentences remove and interfere with judicial discretion in sentencing.
- Mandatory sentences exacerbate the overcrowding in correctional institutions.

CRIMINAL LAW – SYSTEMIC REFORMS

3) Juvenile Justice

A number of juvenile justice reforms came into effect in June 2022, consistent with policies from Maryland’s Juvenile Justice Reform Council (2019). The recent reforms include:

- Raising the minimum age of juvenile court jurisdiction to 13 (with some exceptions for the most serious violent offenses);
- Removing barriers to diversion, including allowing nonviolent felony cases to be diverted without approval from prosecution;
- Prohibiting the use of confinement for violations of probation and misdemeanors (other than firearm offenses);
- Placing developmentally-appropriate timeframes for probation

As jurisdictions have begun to implement these reforms, further legislation may be needed to clarify and improve the reforms, including consideration of the following:

- Process for intake, arrest, and release of a juvenile for an alleged crime;
- Repeat juvenile offenders;
- Legal process for Children In Need of Supervision (CINS), including application and oversight

Given the association’s expertise from its criminal and juvenile justice practitioners and judges, the MSBA will continue to monitor these issues and provide information and strategies to legislators to improve upon these efforts.

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: Further juvenile justice improvements may be needed. The MSBA may provide unique insight and expertise to legislators.

CRIMINAL LAW – SYSTEMIC REFORMS

4) Expungements

Several expungement bills have been introduced and passed in recent sessions, as opportunities to destroy or shield old criminal records can immensely impact Marylanders' access to housing, jobs, and other resources and benefits. Automatic expungement of certain cases through recent laws have helped many citizens move forward with their lives.

Advocates continue to push for shorter waiting periods for misdemeanors and certain felonies, and cannabis legalization in July 2023 will offer even more opportunities for expungement reforms.

While the societal impact of expungements is powerful, consideration must also be given to the fiscal impact of implementing such changes, a reasonable time frame for courts to review and grant petitions, and the digital and analog case management systems that vary across the state. Maryland also lacks a comprehensive classification of crimes that would help to streamline and clarify expungement procedures, both for unrepresented citizens trying to expunge their records and to clarify the types of convictions for which early expungement is appropriate as opposed to those serious breaches of trust for which continued information may be necessary to protect the public.

The MSBA remains committed to providing subject-matter expertise to the General Assembly related to expungement reform. The State Bar's unique perspective and the knowledge of our legal practitioners, ranging from prosecutors, defense attorneys, those working in juvenile justice, and more, will allow the MSBA to lead efforts for a comprehensive approach to Maryland's expungement policies.

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: Comprehensive expungement reform is required to balance the need to help those with criminal records progress in their lives, with the need to permit the public to research the background of people with whom they might hire or contract. The MSBA may provide unique insight and expertise to legislators.

CIVIL LAW

CIVIL LAW – TORT REFORM

1) ISSUE: TORT REFORM – GENERAL (*Controversial Issue)

Since the early 1980's, Congress and state legislatures throughout the United States have struggled to change tort law in a way that would satisfy the concerns of some that the system had become too concerned with compensating plaintiffs at the expense of the larger societal goals, and at the same time provide a forum for deserving plaintiffs to obtain adequate compensation. Most of the attention with regard to torts focused on the following topics: collateral source; comparative negligence; immunity for some categories of defendants; joint and several liability; limits on awards (especially punitive damage awards); "loser pays"; and standards of proof.

The 1987 General Assembly devoted considerable time and effort to discussion of torts and ways to deal with the dramatic increase in liability insurance rates in the 1980's. Unlike other states, Maryland legislators did not respond to the "crisis" by passing a complete overhaul of the tort system, but instead, chose to pass some limits on awards while examining the underlying factors that led to the rapid rise in insurance premiums.

Although the General Assembly has not adopted a general comparative negligence provision, nor any of the other modified systems, it has made some modest adjustments in immunities for particular groups. In particular, liability issues have been modified for medical malpractice and patients' access to quality health care.

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The tort system should not unduly restrict individual rights or unreasonably disrupt traditional common law concepts of tort law.

To the extent change is needed, the MSBA encourages expansion of the alternate dispute resolution programs, rather than decreasing access to the court system.

CIVIL LAW – TORT REFORM

2) ISSUE: COMPARATIVE NEGLIGENCE (*Controversial Issue)

The comparative negligence theory of law provides that a plaintiff may recover damages in a tort action even if the plaintiff shared the blame with the defendant. This differs from contributory negligence, which completely bars recovery by a plaintiff who did not exercise reasonable care and contributed to the harm suffered.

Maryland remains one of a few states that has not adopted some form of comparative negligence. The types of comparative negligence range from the pure type, in which a plaintiff may recover damages regardless of the amount of negligence, to those with tighter standards (requiring 50% or 49% negligence). Maryland adheres to a contributory negligence standard, which may preclude recovery by a plaintiff except when the defendant's conduct is willful or wanton. The most recent affirmation of the principle by the Court of Appeals occurred in 2013, when the Court applied contributory negligence to preclude recovery by a plaintiff who suffered serious injuries when he grabbed a soccer goal that was not secure. In *Coleman v. Soccer Association of Maryland*, the Court emphasized that the change in this principle needs to occur through the Legislature, and not through the courts. Although the General Assembly has proposed a legislative change, many details have not been resolved, so the law remains unaltered.

See HB 110 (2007), HB 1156 (2013), SB 465 (2018)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The change from contributory negligence to comparative negligence affects the parties in ways that do not yield a single answer to a decision to support or oppose.

Supporters of adopting comparative negligence in Maryland explain that contributory negligence unjustly bars a plaintiff from recovery of any kind even when his or her responsibility for the damage was minimal. Opponents of comparative negligence contend that the change would unnecessarily disrupt a common law concept (contributory negligence) that has evolved over centuries and would lead to greater uncertainty as courts sorted out the new method. The change also would affect the related legal doctrines of joint and several liability, assumption of the risk, and strict liability.

CIVIL LAW – TORT REFORM

3) FEE SHIFTING (*Controversial Issue)

Maryland follows the American Rule for recovery of attorney's fees, which requires a statute or written agreement for a prevailing party to obtain attorney's fees from the non-prevailing party. Some Maryland statutes and court decisions define when attorneys' fees and costs are available, and Maryland Rule 1-341 provides sanctions that may include an award of attorney's fees when actions are brought or pursued in bad faith.

Chapter 700 of Title 2 of the Maryland Rules was adopted effective 2014 to address the recovery of attorneys fees, either by law or by contract.

See SB 188 (1995), SB 362 (2016), HB 902 (2017)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: MSBA opposes provisions that would deter people from bringing meritorious cases for fear of losing and having to pay the other party's legal fees.

Measures that would permit the prevailing party in all cases to obtain an attorney's fees award would favor wealthy parties who can afford to pay legal costs and large businesses who can hire in-house counsel, while discouraging access to justice for poor and middle-class parties who often cannot pay for their own attorneys, much less those court costs and fees incurred by the other side.

CIVIL LAW – TORT REFORM

4) ISSUE: HEALTH CLAIMS ARBITRATION (*Controversial Issue)

The Health Claims Arbitration Office (HCAO) was established in 1976 and provides a means of arbitrating claims against health care providers for damages exceeding \$30,000. Filing in the office is mandatory, but once a certificate of qualified expert is filed, the arbitration process may be waived. In 2005, the Office was renamed the Health Care Alternative Dispute Resolution Office, as part of medical malpractice reform.

See HB 1263 (1995), HB 2 (2004), HB 547 (2015), HB 992 (2016)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: Medical malpractice issues involve varying positions within the bar association and often do not lead to a unified position.

CIVIL LAW – TORT REFORM

5) STRUCTURED PAYMENTS (*Controversial Issue)

Legislation designed to expand current law to provide for structured payments that would itemize verdicts and annuities for life care and future loss of earnings were considered by the Maryland General Assembly in the mid-1980's. Section 11-109 of the Courts Article authorizes a court in its discretion to order periodic or other payments equal when paid to the amount of the future economic damages award.

Proponents of the structured payments approach argue that awards for future care expenses and loss of future earnings are intended to care for plaintiffs on a long-term basis, and that lump-sum payments do not encourage the injured individuals to protect their future well-being. Supporters also argue that structuring payments for future expenses permits fairness and greater certainty in addressing actual damages. Advocates of structured payments believe that their solution to this problem would provide a stream of income to injured parties, while stabilizing the liability insurance market.

Opponents of structured payments contend that, while structured payments may be useful in certain cases, a mandatory approach would be an improper restriction on judgments where flexibility for investment or income tax purposes may be useful. Opponents also contend that mandatory structured payments deprive injured parties of the interest payments that may accrue as a result of a lump-sum payment.
HB 832 (2003), HB 734 (2016)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: Structured payments involve varying positions and any relevant bills will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

CIVIL LAW – LIABILITY/DAMAGES

6) IMMUNITY FOR SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS (*Controversial Issue)

Over the years the General Assembly and the Courts have provided immunities from civil liability for torts to a wide variety of specific interest groups. During the interim between the 1988 and 1989 sessions of the Maryland General Assembly, the Judiciary Committee staff concluded that no fewer than 75 special interest groups enjoyed some form of immunity from civil liability. In 1990, the array of immunity provisions concerning immunity from liability, limitations on liability, and prohibited actions were consolidated into the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article.

See HB 113 (2005), HB 700 (2006), SB 664 (2006), SB210 (2021), HB508 (2021), HB212 (2021) HB25 (2021), HB1106 (2021), HB 1084 (1084), HB48 (2022), HB 190 (2022)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA opposes any law that would decrease access to justice in civil matters.

Whenever a bill is proposed that expands or adds immunity, the MSBA participates in narrowing the scope and refining the language of the new statutes.

CIVIL LAW – LIABILITY/DAMAGES

7) JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY (*Controversial Issue)

The doctrine of joint and several liability, developed over centuries by English and American courts, provides that, when a person suffers an injury as a result of the negligence of two or more defendants, each defendant becomes liable for the entire injury and the total amount of damages. Thus, a defendant whose wrongful conduct has injured the plaintiff cannot avoid liability for the total damage award by showing that some other wrongdoer also was responsible for causing the injury.

Supporters of continuing joint and several liability argue that, without it, plaintiffs would be required to identify every potential wrongdoer, prove the misconduct of each that caused the injury, provide a reasonable basis for apportioning the damages against the defendants, and recover a separate judgment against each defendant. The retention of joint and several liability increases the probability that injured parties will receive adequate compensation for their damages, thereby ensuring one of the primary goals of tort law.

Proponents of abolishing joint and several liability contend that it is unfair to require defendants who may be liable for a small part of an injury to pay, in some cases, the entire amount of the award. As a consequence, impecunious defendants, or those beyond the jurisdiction of the court where the action is filed, may escape responsibility, while those who are able and available to pay may be disproportionately affected.

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA recognizes the validity of both sides of the issue and has remained neutral regarding this legislation.

CIVIL LAW – LIABILITY/DAMAGES

8) LIMITS ON AWARDS — GENERALLY (*Controversial Issue)

In liability cases, damages ordinarily are awarded to compensate a victim or surviving family member for medical expenses, lost wages, pain and suffering, and the mental anguish caused by needless death or injury. Punitive damages, designed to punish a defendant and to deter others from similar conduct, may be imposed as well.

There is little disagreement within the General Assembly that victims should be compensated for economic losses (wage loss, medical expenses), which can be documented and quantified. Non- economic losses (pain and suffering, mental anguish) are more difficult to determine because of the subjective nature of those damages. Current law provides escalating limits on the non-economic damages. Punitive damages are highly controversial and have been the subject of extensive debate in the courts, state legislatures throughout the country, and in Congress.

Current law provides limits on the amount of damages for certain State and local governments. Usually, they do not include a limit on punitive damages. While the purpose of those limits often is to protect entities that rely on public funds to pay judgments, along with protections available through qualified and public official immunity, the laws result in lower compensation for victims of negligence in circumstances where the actual damages may be much higher.

See HB 2 (Sp. Sess. 2004), HB 606 (2008)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA promotes justice for all individuals.

CIVIL LAW – LIABILITY/DAMAGES

9) LOCAL GOVERNMENT TORT CLAIMS ACT (*Controversial Issue)

In 1987, the Local Government Tort Claims Act was enacted to address the insurance and liability issues that were facing local governments. The definition of "local government" under the Act includes all counties and Baltimore City, municipal corporations, community colleges, county libraries, special taxing districts, nonprofit community service corporations, and local housing authorities. The Act retains the immunity otherwise enjoyed by local governments but requires the local government to provide a legal defense for its employees who act within the scope of their employment and to pay any judgment entered against their employees. The law also requires a claimant to comply with a notice provision, so that the local government may investigate the claim promptly and set appropriate reserves.

The Local Government Tort Claims Act differs from the Maryland Tort Claims Act in two significant ways. First, the LGTCA does not waive governmental immunity, while the MTCA waives the State's sovereign immunity. Second, in light of the immunity status, a local government employee remains a necessary party to the lawsuit but is entitled to a defense and payment of any judgment by the government employer. Under the MTCA, however, a State employee has immunity and is not a necessary party to the suit—only the State need be named. Both laws set limits on the liability of the government for damages.

See SB18 (HB199) (2022)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: Any expansion of the Act that would limit access to civil justice conflicts with the MSBA's protection of access to the courts.

CIVIL LAW – LIABILITY/DAMAGES

10) MARYLAND TORT CLAIMS ACT (*Controversial Issue)

The Maryland Tort Claims Act was enacted in 1981, and amended several times thereafter, to provide citizens injured by the State with a remedy for compensation, while at the same time protecting State employees from the threat of a multitude of lawsuits. Prior to enactment of this legislation, a tort victim could not sue the State, because of its sovereign immunity, leaving no recourse but to sue the State employee responsible for the tortious act.

The Act waives the State's sovereign immunity when a claimant provides notice within one year of an injury and limits awards up to a specific monetary ceiling. State employees are specifically protected from suit when they act within the scope of their employment.

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA promotes access to justice and opposes laws that would limit a person's ability to sue.

CIVIL LAW – LIABILITY/DAMAGES

11) PRODUCT LIABILITY (*Controversial Issue)

The expansion of manufacturers' and suppliers' liability for harm caused by unreasonably dangerous products has been one of the most dramatic developments in tort law. The debate illustrates the irreconcilable interests of consumers and businesses.

Supporters of legislation to restrict the liability of the makers and sellers of dangerous products have sought to limit the ability of the courts to favor plaintiffs by:

- Abolishing or severely limiting punitive damages;
- Adopting a "state of the art defense" that would not hold manufacturers liable if they could not have known of potential dangers, or if there was not a practical or technically feasible alternative design that would have prevented harm;
- Requiring victims to discover and prove what was "knowable" and "feasible" about a product's design;
- Barring recovery to victims over a specific age;
- Establishing a less stringent standard of negligence; and
- Reducing awards by any benefits paid through workers' compensation.

Because Maryland products liability law has been established primarily in the courts, supporters of limits have indicated that legislation may be appropriate to specify the rights of consumers and manufacturers. Proponents of this approach believe that, once legislation has been passed, the number of product liability lawsuits will decrease, because both plaintiffs and defendants will have a clear understanding of what to expect from litigation, and that competition and product innovation will be encouraged. Most legislative changes to products liability have occurred at the federal level.

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: Any change to the common law regarding product liability should be made uniformly.

CIVIL LAW – LIABILITY/DAMAGES

12) PUNITIVE DAMAGES (*Controversial Issue)

Punitive or exemplary damages are designed to punish a defendant and to deter others from similar conduct. In 1991, the United States Supreme Court focused attention on punitive damages when it announced that punitive damage awards must be based upon articulated standards, and a reasonable relationship must exist between the amount of compensatory and punitive damage awards, so that punitive damages are "reasonable in amount and rational in light of their purpose." See *Pacific Mutual v. Haslip*, 499 U.S. 1 (1991).

Following the directives of the Court, supporters of changes in the law of punitive damages proposed legislation during the 1992 Session of the General Assembly in an effort to bring Maryland law into line with the principles espoused in the decision. Others argued that changes were unnecessary, because Maryland already conformed to the points made by the Supreme Court. In 1992, the Court of Appeals established the standard in Maryland as requiring clear and convincing evidence of actual malice for an award of punitive damages. See *Owens-Illinois, Inc. v. Zenobia*, 325 Md. 665 (1992).

HB 459 (2001), SB 836 (2017), SB 5 (2018)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA has remained neutral on this issue.

CIVIL LAW

13) ISSUE: EMPLOYMENT AND BUSINESS LAW – GENERAL (*Controversial Issue)

The General Assembly recently passed a variety of bills related to employment and business law, including paid family leave, medical leave, and other benefits, minimum wage considerations, non-compete agreements, protections for low-wage workers, pay transparency, and employee privacy. While Maryland currently regulates the use of some artificial intelligence during the hiring process, additional legislation regarding AI and data privacy will likely be introduced as digital capabilities and HR tools expand.

POSITION: MONITOR

Reason: MSBA can offer diverse perspectives from employment and business law practitioners to inform legislators about the impact on corporations, employers, and employees of proposed legislation, as well as best practices from other states, without taking a position on a particular bill. Legislators place a high value on this information, particularly as emerging issues related to AI and data privacy move into these practice areas.

DORMANT ISSUES

DORMANT ISSUES

1) ISSUE: CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS - ELIMINATION OF DE NOVO APPEALS

In criminal cases, a defendant who is dissatisfied with the verdict in district court may automatically have a new trial in circuit court. Advocates of abolishing this privilege believe the system demeans the district court, because defendants know that the outcome can be reversed at the next level. In some respects, it harkens back to an era when the magistrates that presided over the cases were not all lawyers. The system can be expensive, inefficient, and redundant.

See HB 615 (2004)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA supports the rights of individuals to due process.

DORMANT ISSUES

2) ISSUE: LEGISLATURE AND JUDICIARY – SINGLE-SUBJECT RULE

The Maryland Constitution requires that all bills passed by the General Assembly embrace only one subject. (Article III, Section 29) Over the years, there have been numerous court challenges to various statutes that have resulted in a significant amount of case law on the Single-Subject Rule. In general, these opinions have held that this constitutional provision was designed to be interpreted liberally so as not to thwart the will of the Legislative Branch.

The United States Constitution and a few state constitutions do not have a Single-Subject Rule. As a consequence, certain legislative tactics, such as the use of “riders” to attach amendments unrelated to, or only marginally associated with, the primary purpose of particular bills are employed frequently in Congress and the legislatures of these other states. Conversely, efforts to employ these same techniques are rare in Maryland and, up until the 2000 Legislative Session, there was little interest in abolishing the Single-Subject Rule in the Maryland Constitution.

The move to repeal the Single-Subject Rule was prompted by a Court of Appeals decision that was issued in the middle of the 2000 Legislative Session, which invalidated a bill from the 1998 Legislative Session on the basis that it violated the one-subject constitutional provision. (*Migdal v. State*, 358 Md. 308 (2000)) The issue involved the attempt to add provisions from a bill that was defeated earlier in the 1998 Session (addressing the independence of directors of some investment companies) to another piece of legislation (concerning the process for designating resident agents). The Court reaffirmed the single-subject rule and chastised the Legislature for its attempt to circumvent the requirement.

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: The single-subject rule for State legislation is appropriate.

Although the MSBA opposes a repeal of the single-subject rule, no activity has occurred since the 2000 Legislative Session.

DORMANT ISSUES

3) ISSUE: LEGISLATURE AND JUDICIARY - JUDICIAL POWER TO REVISE CRIMINAL SENTENCES

In 2004, the Court of Appeals amended Maryland Rule 4-345, Sentencing - Revisory Power of Court, to provide that the court has revisory power over a sentence, except that the court may not revise the sentence more than five years after the date the sentence originally was imposed on the defendant and the court cannot increase the sentence. The revised Rule applied to violent and non-violent crimes.

Legislation to place a time limit on the court's revisory power arises periodically. It has generally been unnecessary, because most judges consider the revisory power as a tool to ensure rehabilitation of those convicted of crimes, and that motions of this sort should be filed within the one- to two-year range.

See HB 495 (2005), HB 464 (2004), SB 333 (2004)

POSITION: SUPPORT

REASON: The MSBA respects the Court's rulemaking authority regarding a judge's ability to revise a criminal sentence and opposes any change that does not occur through a Court Rule.

DORMANT ISSUES

4) ISSUE: REGULATION OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION - STATE BOARD OF LAW EXAMINERS SUNSET REVIEW

The Board of Law Examiners was created by law and includes a sunset provision to evaluate the law from time to time. The MSBA follows the evaluation process to ensure that responsibility for the Board remains with the Judiciary and that funding is adequate to maintain high standards.

See SB142 (2003)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA has an interest in the manner of continuing the Board of Law Examiners that evaluates applicants to the Maryland Bar.

DORMANT ISSUES

5) ISSUE: CIVIL LAW TORT REFORM - STRATEGIC LAWSUITS AIMED AT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (SLAPP)

Proposals to grant immunity from civil liability to defendants in an action described as a strategic lawsuit aimed at public participation (SLAPP) were filed in the 1992 General Assembly. The stated purpose of these bills was to protect citizens who exercise their First Amendment right of free speech from suits by developers, waste disposal companies, landlords, and other organized special interests who often seek to intimidate critics into silence. Under the provisions of these measures, citizens subjected to a SLAPP suit would be permitted to petition the court to dismiss a "suit brought for the purpose of intimidation or harassment."

A SLAPP suit has the following characteristics:

- a civil complaint or counterclaim for monetary damages and/or an injunction;
- filed against non-governmental individuals or groups;
- results from communications to a government body or official, or to the public; and
- addresses an issue of some public interest or concern.

Alternatives to a legislative ban on SLAPP suits include strengthening court rules pertaining to bad faith litigation or legislation that would allow defendants in SLAPP suits to file a countersuit against plaintiffs (i.e., they could SLAPP back).

Statutes have been enacted providing protection to those who raise complaints regarding false claims and other matters that encourage whistleblowers to voice their concerns.

See HB 930 (2004), HB 134 (1997), HB 113 (2003), SB 221 (2012), SB162 (2021), HB70 (2022)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA supports free speech, but opposes bad faith litigation.

DORMANT ISSUES

6) ISSUE: CIVIL JUSTICE TORT REFORM - CERTIFICATE OF MERIT—LICENSED PROFESSIONALS

Legislation was filed in the 1996 Legislative Session to require a certificate of a qualified expert to be filed in any malpractice claim against a licensed professional. The professional groups specified in the bill included architects, interior designers, landscape architects, engineers, and land surveyors.

Current law requires filing a certificate of a qualified expert with the court for malpractice claims against licensed professionals (Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article, § 3-2C-02) and filing a certificate of a qualified expert for health care malpractice claims (Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article, § 3-2A-04). In addition, Maryland Rule 5-702 allows the court to admit expert testimony to assist the trier of fact to understand evidence or determine a fact in issue. This Rule allows the court to decide whether a witness is a qualified expert, whether the expert's testimony is appropriate, and whether a sufficient factual basis exists to support the testimony.

POSITION: NO POSITION

REASON: When legislation is proposed, the MSBA will review it.

DORMANT ISSUES

7) ISSUE: CIVIL JUSTICE TORT REFORM - CHANGES IN THE COLLATERAL SOURCE RULE (* Controversial issue)

The collateral source rule permits an injured person to recover the full amount of provable damages, regardless of the amount of compensation which the person has received for injuries from sources unrelated to the tortfeasor, and prohibits the introduction of evidence that an injured plaintiff has received benefits from other sources. Proponents of the principle usually argue that a person injured by the wrongful or unlawful acts of another is entitled to the full value of that injury from those who perpetrated the wrong and that to enable a wrongdoer to avoid payment by demonstrating that the injured party has already received benefits for the injury would allow some of those responsible for the injury to avoid paying for their actions. Opponents of the collateral source rule contend that, except where subrogated interests exist by law, a flat prohibition on introduction of collateral sources means that an injured party may be “overcompensated” for the injury by receiving benefits for the same injury from two different sources: the collateral source and the defendant in a tort action. Opponents also argue that the collateral source law does not account for the current health care services market (in which the amount actually paid or owed for a medical service is typically far lower than the “sticker price”), and results in a windfall for plaintiffs to ‘recover’ costs that were never actually incurred.

Current law reflects two modifications to the collateral source rule In medical malpractice cases. First, the law permits modification or remittitur of damages in medical malpractice awards if modification is supported by evidence, although it excludes workers’ compensation, life insurance policies, and employee benefits from consideration in the calculations. A similar effort sought to reduce automobile insurance rates in Baltimore City in 1996. Second, recovery for past medical expenses is limited to the total amount of past medical expenses paid or owed.

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA will consider each bill on a case-by-case basis.

DORMANT ISSUES

8) ISSUE: INSURANCE - NO-FAULT AUTOMOBILE NEGLIGENCE

No-fault automobile insurance is the type of coverage in which a driver's own insurance company pays for the injuries or damages of the insured party, regardless of fault. The critical provision in some no-fault insurance laws is the "verbal threshold"—a concept in which lawsuits are permitted only for drivers who die or suffer serious injuries. By limiting the number of categories within the "verbal threshold," proponents of no-fault insurance seek to deprive large numbers of injured parties of their right to sue. Other states with no-fault insurance laws use a "monetary threshold," under which claimants are required to submit medical expenses over a certain amount prior to initiating litigation.

Proponents and opponents of no-fault insurance have basic disagreements over issues involving individual responsibility, the relative importance of a driver's right to sue, the impact of litigation on insurance premiums, and the experience of states that have enacted no-fault statutes.

Supporters of no-fault insurance seek to lower automobile insurance costs, to obtain faster payment of benefits to accident victims, and to set up a more efficient insurance system by lessening the amount of litigation. In addition, they consider increased litigation to be the primary cause of increased auto insurance premiums, and cite estimates prepared by the Insurance Information Institute that legal fees add up to approximately 11% of all premium dollars.

Critics of no-fault insurance argue that the statistical evidence prepared by the insurance industry is spurious, and cite examples where no-fault insurance has failed to decrease premium costs. They also emphasize the importance of maintaining a person's right to seek compensation for injuries, and the necessity of making drivers responsible for their actions. Requiring drivers to have insurance that pays for damages to others serves as a deterrent, while no-fault insurance blames the victim, whose premiums will increase as a consequence of payment for damages arising out of accidents that were caused by reckless drivers.

POSITION: OPPOSE

REASON: No-fault insurance legislation alters victims' rights, without correcting abuses and fraud within the tort system.

DORMANT ISSUES

9) ISSUE: INSURANCE - PERSONAL INJURY PROTECTION COVERAGE (PIP)

Personal Injury Protection (PIP) insurance for Maryland drivers was created in 1976 as a limited form of "no-fault" insurance. Prior to the 1989 Legislative Session, this law mandated that every driver in the State buy a minimum of \$2500 worth of PIP insurance to cover medical costs, lost wages, and funeral expenses for the policyholder and others in the driver's car, regardless of blame. In 1989, the Legislature passed a measure allowing policyholders to select an optional form of PIP that excludes adult residents in the household. Under the provisions of the law, drivers are still required to purchase PIP for all of those living in the household under the age of 16, and for all pedestrians.

No additional proposals to restrict PIP have been introduced since 1989, as proponents and foes of the optional approach have been content to monitor premium rates of both those who selected options and those who continued to maintain full PIP coverage.

See SB 637 (1988), HB 841 (2000), SB 139 (2002), SB 784 (2016)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: Changes that impact victims' rights or access to justice may trigger a need for an MSBA position.

DORMANT ISSUES

10) ISSUE: INSURANCE - PEOPLE'S COUNSEL FOR INSURANCE

The Office of the People's Counsel was established in 1922 as a representative of the interests of residential consumers of gas, electric, telephone, sewer and water services, and non-commercial users of regulated transportation industries. The primary duty of the People's Counsel is to appear before the Public Service Commission, courts, and federal and state agencies, to protect the interests of residential and non-commercial utility users. The People's Counsel must be an attorney licensed to practice law in Maryland, and the Governor appoints the People's Counsel with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Efforts to expand the duties of the People's Counsel (or to establish a public advocate within the Insurance Division of the Department of Licensing and Regulation) to include insurance matters have failed. While the insurance industry has opposed the effort based on its position that self-regulation is adequate, the MSBA supported the People's Counsel on Insurance late in the 1989 session, because the industry had failed to provide adequate safeguards for consumer interests and the threat of litigation could help lower insurance rates.

See HB 542 (1989), SB 546 (2004), HB 144 (2010)

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA encourages adequate safeguards for consumers.

DORMANT ISSUES

11) ISSUE: JUDICIAL PROCESS - SUBSTITUTED SERVICE OF PROCESS

In 1998, the MSBA opposed legislation that would have authorized substituted service of process in civil actions upon resident agents of insurance companies when defendants could not be located. The problem arises when plaintiffs cannot locate a party for service of process. If passed, the bill would have placed resident agents of insurers in the place of defendants in order to allow litigation to move forward.

The MSBA opposed the measure, because it would have unfairly burdened the counsel for the defense without providing compensation to deserving plaintiffs. Lawyers who are unable to find their clients face significant handicaps in defense of any matter, and insurance carriers likely would refuse to pay in these cases, leaving plaintiffs no better off than before the substituted service of process.

In 1999, legislation was approved to require a defendant's insurer to provide plaintiffs with information about the defendant's last known home address when previous efforts to locate the defendants have failed.

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: The MSBA supports meaningful substitution of process, but not options that impose a significant burden on one party without providing a noticeable benefit to anyone.

DORMANT ISSUES

12) ISSUE: PROPERTY - EMINENT DOMAIN

Both the federal and state constitutions expressly limit condemnation authority of government entities by establishing two requirements for taking property through the power of eminent domain. First, the property taken must be for a “public use,” which Maryland courts have broadly interpreted. Second, the party whose property is taken must receive “just compensation,” which often requires payment of the land’s “fair market value,” as defined by statute.

Historically, State and local governments have used the condemnation authority primarily for the construction of roads and highways. Recently, however, its condemnation authority has been used for commercial redevelopment, including the construction of sports stadiums and theaters. The United States Supreme Court acknowledged the ability of the State to establish the reach of the condemnation power, when it ruled that New London, Connecticut, did not violate the United States Constitution when the town relied on State law allowing use of the condemnation authority to require several homeowners in an economically depressed area to vacate their properties to make way for mixed-use development. See *Kelo v. City of New London*, 545 U.S. 469 (2005).

In Maryland, bills were introduced in 2006 that tried to nullify the effect of the *Kelo* decision or to clarify its holding. Several concerns arose from the proposals:

- A constitutional amendment eliminating eminent domain for economic development might prove to be unwise, because eminent domain may be appropriate in some instances.
- There should not be any special rules governing just one county.
- Any bill providing for legal fee shifting must be carefully examined.
- Any bill should require a clearer computation of damages than is provided under the present law.

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: While some revisions may be appropriate, they must promote uniformity and consistency throughout the State.

DORMANT ISSUES

13) ISSUE: CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - FORFEITURE

Developments in the United States Supreme Court, the Maryland Court of Appeals, and the Maryland General Assembly led the MSBA to call for a review of forfeiture statutes in 1994. Drug forfeiture laws were enacted as a means of punishing and deterring illegal narcotics activity (Criminal Procedure Article, Title 12). Maryland also permits forfeiture of cash seized for illegal gambling activities (Criminal Procedure Article, Title 13, Subtitle 1), as well as many seizures of property that are established in common law.

Although the seizure of personal property and assets are authorized when obtained through certain arrests, it remains a fundamental principle of due process that the owner of the seized property has a right to notice and the opportunity to be heard. Current statutes and the Maryland Rules include adequate due process protections

POSITION: MONITOR

REASON: All forfeitures must include adequate judicial review and protect due process rights.