

1	L.D. 1848
2	(Filing No. S- 334)
3	STATE OF MAINE
4	SENATE
5 6	111TH LEGISLATURE
6	SECOND REGULAR SESSION
7	COMMITTEE AMENDMENT " <sup>A</sup> " to S.P. 658,
8	L.D. 1848, Bill, "AN ACT Providing for Change of
9	Venue in Criminal Cases."
2	Venue in oriminar oubset.
10	Amend the bill in the first paragraph after the
11	amending clause, in the 5th line (page 1, line 28 in
12	L.D.) by striking out the underlined words "in this
13	section" and inserting in their place the underlined
14	words 'by statute'
15	STATEMENT OF FACT
12	STATEMENT OF FACT
16	This amendment corrects an error in the original
17	bill. The bill refers to locations for conducting
18	criminal proceedings provided by the section the bill
19	amends. That section does not, however, provide for
20	these locations. They are provided for in other
21	statutes.

5.04 R.

22 This amendment also offers an opportunity to 23 clarify the bill's statement of fact.

The bill addresses the matter of venue. Venue designates the particular county in which a court may exercise its authority to decide a given criminal case. <u>State v. True</u>, 330 A.2d 787, 789 (Me. 1975)

The purpose of the bill is to amend Title 15, section 1, last paragraph, to allow the Supreme Judicial Court by court rule to authorize the transfer of a criminal case from one county to another without the consent of the defendant so long as the transfer does not violate Article 1, section 6 of the Constitution of Maine. Maine Constitution, Article 1, section 6, in relevant part, provides as follows.



D.OFR.

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall
have a right...(to) have a speedy, public and im partial trial...by a jury of the vicinity."

4 The Maine Supreme Judical Court has held that the 5 word "vicinity" as used in this section of the Maine 6 Constitution does not mean "county;" rather, it means 7 "neighborhood." <u>State v. Baldwin</u>, 305 A.2d 555, 559 8 (Me. 1973) (citing <u>State v. Longley</u>, 119 Me. 535, 112 9 A. 260 (1921)).

10 It has been the practice in Maine to try every 11 defendant in the county where the crime is alleged to 12 have occurred absent his consent to a venue change. See, e.g., 3 Glassman, Maine Practice: Rules of Crim-inal Procedure Annotated Sections 18.1 - 18.4 and 13 14 21.1 - 21.5 (1967 & Supp. 1975) This practice, how-15 ever, to the extent not coextensive with Section 6 of 16 17 the Maine Constitution, causes some undesirable re-18 sults. First, in those counties where court backlog 19 exists, some defendants refuse to consent to a change 20 of venue so as to intentionally delay their upcoming 21 trial. Second, in those instances where the scene of 22 the alleged crime is much closer to a shire town in 23 an adjoining county than the shire town of the county 24 in which the alleged crime occurred, sound adminis-25 tration may militate for a venue change whether or 26 not the defendant is willing to agree.

27 By authorizing the Supreme Judicial Court to 28 promulgate a rule permitting transfers to exist with-29 in the neighborhood, the Legislature thereby strikes 30 the proper balance between the efficient administra-31 tion of criminal justice and the constitutional guar-32 antee respecting venue afforded every defendant.

6290031584

Reported by the Committee on JUDICIARY Reproduced and distributed pursuant to Senate Rule 11-A

March 22, 1984

33

(S-334)