

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 7, 2000 LB 74

discussion of the term "infraction". The provision of statute that the bill would amend is the definitional section in the statute. What the Legislature attempted to do was to declare an infraction to be a civil offense. The Supreme Court, in analyzing all of the statutes that relate to infractions, came to the conclusion that, regardless of what the Legislature said about it being a civil offense, it is not a civil offense, it is a criminal offense, and as such all of the requirements in terms of the rights of a person accused attach when he or she is charged with a traffic infraction. So that court decision, it was State vs. Knoles, K-n-o-l-e-s, mentioned this definitional section and discounted it saying, despite the fact that the Legislature calls it a civil offense, it is not. So the way I was going to bring the definition in line with what the Supreme Court said was to call it what the Supreme Court called it, namely, a crime. What the committee decided to do was to amend the statute by simply removing the words that described it as a civil offense. It would leave the law, in terms of the definition, as it is now, but it would put a period before you got to the words about it being a civil offense. And I do think that is a kinder, gentler way of saying the same thing. So I am in favor of the committee amendment and it's adoption will bring that definition in line with the definition given by the Nebraska Supreme Court. What would happen if this bill is not advanced, if it's not enacted into law? We would just have a dead letter in the law. It would not mean that an infraction is a civil offense. Why, then, do I want to amend the law? It is simple. A person should be able to look in the statutes of this state and know what the law is. The statutes should not express wishing and hoping and singing and praying. The statutes should specify precisely what the law is, and when the Supreme Court has spoken we know precisely what the law is. So whether we leave this language in or take it out, a traffic infraction or any other kind of infraction remains a criminal offense, very minor, almost insignificant, but it still is a criminal offense. And that designation carries very important ramifications. I mentioned some of them, but every right that a person accused of any other crime would have a person accused of an infraction would have the same rights. The main one is the presumption of innocence. The second in importance, the state must prove every element of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt. And the third, the one accused need not say anything in his or her