

SESSION OF 2015

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE ON HOUSE BILL NO. 2198

As Amended by House Committee on Judiciary

Brief*

HB 2198 would amend the crime of possessing, consuming, obtaining, purchasing, or attempting to obtain or purchase alcohol by a person under 21 to include immunity from prosecution if a person and, if applicable, one or two other persons acting in concert with such person, if the person initiated contact with law enforcement or emergency medical services; requested medical assistance on their own behalf because such person reasonably believed they were in need of medical assistance; and cooperated with emergency medical services personnel and law enforcement officers on the scene.

The bill also would extend immunity from prosecution when a person and, if applicable, one or two other persons acting in concert with such person, initiated contact with law enforcement or emergency medical services or was one of one or two other persons who acted in concert with such person; requested medical assistance for another person who reasonably appeared to be in need of medical assistance; provided their full name, the name of one or two other persons acting in concert with such person, if applicable, and any other relevant information requested by law enforcement or emergency medical services; remained at the scene with the person who reasonably appeared to be in need of medical assistance until emergency medical services personnel and law enforcement officers arrived; and cooperated with emergency medical services personnel and law enforcement officers on the scene.

*Supplemental notes are prepared by the Legislative Research Department and do not express legislative intent. The supplemental note and fiscal note for this bill may be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.kslegislature.org>

Immunity also would be extended to a person who reasonably appeared to be in need of medical assistance but did not initiate contact with law enforcement or emergency medical services and cooperated with emergency medical services personnel and law enforcement at the scene.

The bill would state a person shall not be allowed to initiate or maintain an action against a law enforcement officer or such officer's employer based on the officer's compliance or failure to comply with these new provisions.

Background

In the House Judiciary Committee, Representative Phillips, the student body presidents of Kansas State University and the University of Kansas, and a representative of the Kansas Association of Chiefs of Police, Kansas Peace Officers Association, and Kansas Sheriffs Associations appeared in support of the bill. There were no opponents.

The House Committee amended the bill to add one or two other persons acting in concert with the person; clarify that the person must have initiated contact with law enforcement or emergency medical services to have immunity; clarify in paragraph (A) that the person requested medical assistance on their own behalf because the person reasonably believed they were in need of medical assistance; clarify in paragraph (B) that it would apply to a person who was one of one or two other persons who acted in concert with such other person and requested medical assistance for another person; require the other persons acting in concert with the person who contacted law enforcement or emergency medical services to provide their names when requested; change "medical assistance personnel" to "medical services personnel"; add a paragraph to extend immunity to a person who reasonably appeared to be in need of medical assistance due to alcohol consumption but did not initiate contact with law enforcement or emergency medical services; and delete language that would have allowed the

court to order a person with immunity to perform no more than 40 hours of community service.

The fiscal note prepared by the Division of the Budget indicates the bill, as introduced, could reduce the amount of fine revenue credited to the Board of Emergency Medical Services by providing immunity to underage persons who otherwise would have paid a fine. The precise fiscal impact is unknown, however. The Board notes local governments that own or operate ambulance services could incur cost increases if the bill results in increased usage of those services.

The League of Municipalities concurs that there could be an effect for local governments but is unable to estimate the specific effect on counties.

The Office of Judicial Administration indicates there would be no fiscal effect on district or appellate courts.