H-1853.1		

SUBSTITUTE HOUSE BILL 1874

By House Public Safety & Emergency Preparedness (originally sponsored by Representatives Dickerson, Hurst, Klippert, Pearson, Parker, Shea,

62nd Legislature

2011 Regular Session

Kenney, Angel, Kristiansen, Stanford, McCune, and Ormsby)

READ FIRST TIME 02/17/11.

State of Washington

AN ACT Relating to police investigations of commercial sexual exploitation of children and human trafficking; amending RCW 9.73.230 and 9.73.210; reenacting and amending RCW 9.68A.110; creating a new section; and providing an effective date.

5 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

The legislature finds increasing incidents 6 NEW SECTION. Sec. 1. 7 of commercial sexual exploitation of children in our state, and further protection of victims require giving law enforcement agencies the tool 8 9 to have a unified victim-centered police investigation approach to 10 further protect victims by ensuring their safety by prosecuting The one-party consent provision permitted for drug 11 traffickers. in the comprehensive bill 12 trafficking investigation passed 13 facilitate police investigation and prosecution of drug trafficking 14 crimes is a helpful tool to this end. The legislature also finds that 15 exceptions should be allowed for minors employed for investigation when 16 the minor is a victim and involves only electronic communication with the defendant. 17

p. 1 SHB 1874

1 **Sec. 2.** RCW 9.73.230 and 2005 c 282 s 17 are each amended to read 2 as follows:

3

5

6 7

8

10

11

17

18

19

20

2324

25

2627

28

29

30

31

- (1) As part of a bona fide criminal investigation, the chief law enforcement officer of a law enforcement agency or his or her designee above the rank of first line supervisor may authorize the interception, transmission, or recording of a conversation or communication by officers under the following circumstances:
- (a) At least one party to the conversation or communication has consented to the interception, transmission, or recording;
- (b) Probable cause exists to believe that the conversation or communication involves:
- (i) The unlawful manufacture, delivery, sale, or possession with intent to manufacture, deliver, or sell, controlled substances as defined in chapter 69.50 RCW, or legend drugs as defined in chapter 69.41 RCW, or imitation controlled substances as defined in chapter 69.52 RCW;
 - (ii) A party engaging in the commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW 9.68A.100, or promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW 9.68A.101, or promoting travel for commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW 9.68A.102; and
- (c) A written report has been completed as required by subsection (2) of this section.
 - (2) The agency's chief officer or designee authorizing an interception, transmission, or recording under subsection (1) of this section, shall prepare and sign a written report at the time of authorization indicating:
 - (a) The circumstances that meet the requirements of subsection (1) of this section;
 - (b) The names of the authorizing and consenting parties, except that in those cases where the consenting party is a confidential informant, the name of the confidential informant need not be divulged;
- 32 (c) The names of the officers authorized to intercept, transmit, 33 and record the conversation or communication;
- 34 (d) The identity of the particular person or persons, if known, who 35 may have committed or may commit the offense;
- 36 (e) The details of the particular offense or offenses that may have 37 been or may be committed and the expected date, location, and 38 approximate time of the conversation or communication; and

SHB 1874 p. 2

(f) Whether there was an attempt to obtain authorization pursuant to RCW 9.73.090(2) and, if there was such an attempt, the outcome of the attempt.

- (3) An authorization under this section is valid in all jurisdictions within Washington state and for the interception of communications from additional persons if the persons are brought into the conversation or transaction by the nonconsenting party or if the nonconsenting party or such additional persons cause or invite the consenting party to enter another jurisdiction.
- (4) The recording of any conversation or communication under this section shall be done in such a manner that protects the recording from editing or other alterations.
- (5) An authorization made under this section is valid for no more than twenty-four hours from the time it is signed by the authorizing officer, and each authorization shall independently meet all of the requirements of this section. The authorizing officer shall sign the written report required under subsection (2) of this section, certifying the exact date and time of his or her signature. An authorization under this section may be extended not more than twice for an additional consecutive twenty-four hour period based upon the same probable cause regarding the same suspected transaction. Each such extension shall be signed by the authorizing officer.
- (6) Within fifteen days after the signing of an authorization that results in any interception, transmission, or recording of a conversation or communication pursuant to this section, the law enforcement agency which made the interception, transmission, or recording shall submit a report including the original authorization under subsection (2) of this section to a judge of a court having jurisdiction which report shall identify (a) the persons, including the consenting party, who participated in the conversation, and (b) the date, location, and approximate time of the conversation.

In those cases where the consenting party is a confidential informant, the name of the confidential informant need not be divulged.

A monthly report shall be filed by the law enforcement agency with the administrator for the courts indicating the number of authorizations granted, the date and time of each authorization, interceptions made, arrests resulting from an interception, and subsequent invalidations.

p. 3 SHB 1874

(7)(a) Within two judicial days of receipt of a report under subsection (6) of this section, the court shall make an exparte review of the authorization, but not of the evidence, and shall make a determination whether the requirements of subsection (1) of this section were met. If the court determines that any of the requirements of subsection (1) of this section were not met, the court shall order that any recording and any copies or transcriptions of the conversation or communication be destroyed. Destruction of recordings, copies, or transcriptions shall be stayed pending any appeal of a finding that the requirements of subsection (1) of this section were not met.

- (b) Absent a continuation under (c) of this subsection, six months following a determination under (a) of this subsection that probable cause did not exist, the court shall cause a notice to be mailed to the last known address of any nonconsenting party to the conversation or communication that was the subject of the authorization. The notice shall indicate the date, time, and place of any interception, transmission, or recording made pursuant to the authorization. The notice shall also identify the agency that sought the authorization and shall indicate that a review under (a) of this subsection resulted in a determination that the authorization was made in violation of this section.
- (c) An authorizing agency may obtain six-month extensions to the notice requirement of (b) of this subsection in cases of active, ongoing criminal investigations that might be jeopardized by sending the notice.
- (8) In any subsequent judicial proceeding, evidence obtained through the interception or recording of a conversation or communication pursuant to this section shall be admissible only if:
- (a) The court finds that the requirements of subsection (1) of this section were met and the evidence is used in prosecuting an offense listed in subsection (1)(b) of this section; or
- (b) The evidence is admitted with the permission of the person whose communication or conversation was intercepted, transmitted, or recorded; or
- (c) The evidence is admitted in a prosecution for a "serious violent offense" as defined in RCW 9.94A.030 in which a party who consented to the interception, transmission, or recording was a victim of the offense; or

SHB 1874 p. 4

(d) The evidence is admitted in a civil suit for personal injury or wrongful death arising out of the same incident, in which a party who consented to the interception, transmission, or recording was a victim of a serious violent offense as defined in RCW 9.94A.030.

Nothing in this subsection bars the admission of testimony of a party or eyewitness to the intercepted, transmitted, or recorded conversation or communication when that testimony is unaided by information obtained solely by violation of RCW 9.73.030.

- (9) Any determination of invalidity of an authorization under this section shall be reported by the court to the administrative office of the courts.
- (10) Any person who intentionally intercepts, transmits, or records or who intentionally authorizes the interception, transmission, or recording of a conversation or communication in violation of this section, is guilty of a class C felony punishable according to chapter 9A.20 RCW.
- (11) An authorizing agency is liable for twenty-five thousand dollars in exemplary damages, in addition to any other damages authorized by this chapter or by other law, to a person whose conversation or communication was intercepted, transmitted, or recorded pursuant to an authorization under this section if:
- (a) In a review under subsection (7) of this section, or in a suppression of evidence proceeding, it has been determined that the authorization was made without the probable cause required by subsection (1)(b) of this section; and
- 26 (b) The authorization was also made without a reasonable suspicion 27 that the conversation or communication would involve the unlawful acts 28 identified in subsection (1)(b) of this section.
- **Sec. 3.** RCW 9.73.210 and 1989 c 271 s 202 are each amended to read 30 as follows:
 - (1) If a police commander or officer above the rank of first line supervisor has reasonable suspicion that the safety of the consenting party is in danger, law enforcement personnel may, for the sole purpose of protecting the safety of the consenting party, intercept, transmit, or record a private conversation or communication concerning:
- 36 <u>(a) The unlawful manufacture, delivery, sale, or possession with</u>
 37 intent to manufacture, deliver, or sell, controlled substances as

p. 5 SHB 1874

defined in chapter 69.50 RCW, or legend drugs as defined in chapter 69.41 RCW, or imitation controlled substances as defined in chapter 69.52 RCW; or

- (b) Person(s) engaging in the commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW 9.68A.100, or promoting commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW 9.68A.101, or promoting travel for commercial sexual abuse of a minor under RCW 9.68A.102.
- (2) Before any interception, transmission, or recording of a private conversation or communication pursuant to this section, the police commander or officer making the determination required by subsection (1) of this section shall complete a written authorization which shall include (a) the date and time the authorization is given; (b) the persons, including the consenting party, expected to participate in the conversation or communication, to the extent known; (c) the expected date, location, and approximate time of the conversation or communication; and (d) the reasons for believing the consenting party's safety will be in danger.
- (3) A monthly report shall be filed by the law enforcement agency with the administrator for the courts indicating the number of authorizations made under this section, the date and time of each authorization, and whether an interception, transmission, or recording was made with respect to each authorization.
- (4) Any information obtained pursuant to this section is inadmissible in any civil or criminal case in all courts of general or limited jurisdiction in this state, except:
- (a) With the permission of the person whose communication or conversation was intercepted, transmitted, or recorded without his or her knowledge;
- (b) In a civil action for personal injury or wrongful death arising out of the same incident, where the cause of action is based upon an act of physical violence against the consenting party; or
- (c) In a criminal prosecution, arising out of the same incident for a serious violent offense as defined in RCW 9.94A.030 in which a party who consented to the interception, transmission, or recording was a victim of the offense.
- 36 (5) Nothing in this section bars the admission of testimony of a 37 participant in the communication or conversation unaided by information 38 obtained pursuant to this section.

SHB 1874 p. 6

(6) The authorizing agency shall immediately destroy any written, transcribed, or recorded information obtained from an interception, transmission, or recording authorized under this section unless the agency determines there has been a personal injury or death or a serious violent offense which may give rise to a civil action or criminal prosecution in which the information may be admissible under subsection (4)(b) or (c) of this section.

- (7) Nothing in this section authorizes the interception, recording, or transmission of a telephonic communication or conversation.
- Sec. 4. RCW 9.68A.110 and 2010 c 289 s 17 and 2010 c 227 s 8 are each reenacted and amended to read as follows:
- (1) In a prosecution under RCW 9.68A.040, it is not a defense that the defendant was involved in activities of law enforcement and prosecution agencies in the investigation and prosecution of criminal offenses. Law enforcement and prosecution agencies shall not employ minors to aid in the investigation of a violation of RCW 9.68A.090 or 9.68A.100 through 9.68A.102, except for the purpose of facilitating an investigation where the minor is also the alleged victim, the minor is advised of the risk that the alleged perpetrator may learn of his or her participation in the investigation, and the:
- 21 (a) Investigation is authorized pursuant to RCW 9.73.230(1)(b)(ii)
 22 or 9.73.210(2)(b); or
 - (b) Minor's aid in the investigation involves only telephone or electronic communication with the defendant.
 - (2) In a prosecution under RCW 9.68A.050, 9.68A.060, 9.68A.070, or 9.68A.080, it is not a defense that the defendant did not know the age of the child depicted in the visual or printed matter. It is a defense, which the defendant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence, that at the time of the offense the defendant was not in possession of any facts on the basis of which he or she should reasonably have known that the person depicted was a minor.
 - (3) In a prosecution under RCW 9.68A.040, 9.68A.090, 9.68A.100, 9.68A.101, or 9.68A.102, it is not a defense that the defendant did not know the alleged victim's age. It is a defense, which the defendant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence, that at the time of the offense, the defendant made a reasonable bona fide attempt to ascertain the true age of the minor by requiring production of a driver's

p. 7 SHB 1874

license, marriage license, birth certificate, or other governmental or educational identification card or paper and did not rely solely on the oral allegations or apparent age of the minor.

- 4 (4) In a prosecution under RCW 9.68A.050, 9.68A.060, 9.68A.070, or 9.68A.075, it shall be an affirmative defense that the defendant was a 5 law enforcement officer or a person specifically authorized, 6 7 writing, to assist a law enforcement officer and acting at the 8 direction of a law enforcement officer in the process of conducting an official investigation of a sex-related crime against a minor, or that 9 10 the defendant was providing individual case treatment as a recognized medical facility or as a psychiatrist or psychologist licensed under 11 12 Title 18 RCW. Nothing in chapter 227, Laws of 2010 is intended to in 13 any way affect or diminish the immunity afforded an electronic 14 communication service provider, remote computing service provider, or domain name registrar acting in the performance of its reporting or 15 preservation responsibilities under 18 U.S.C. Secs. 2258a, 2258b, or 16 17 2258c.
- 18 (5) In a prosecution under RCW 9.68A.050, 9.68A.060, 9.68A.070, or 9.68A.075, the state is not required to establish the identity of the alleged victim.
- 21 (6) In a prosecution under RCW 9.68A.070 or 9.68A.075, it shall be 22 an affirmative defense that:
 - (a) The defendant was employed at or conducting research in partnership or in cooperation with any institution of higher education as defined in RCW 28B.07.020 or 28B.10.016, and:
 - (i) He or she was engaged in a research activity;
 - (ii) The research activity was specifically approved prior to the possession or viewing activity being conducted in writing by a person, or other such entity vested with the authority to grant such approval by the institution of higher ((learning)) education; and
- 31 (iii) Viewing or possessing the visual or printed matter is an 32 essential component of the authorized research; or
 - (b) The defendant was an employee of the Washington state legislature engaged in research at the request of a member of the legislature and:
- 36 (i) The request for research is made prior to the possession or 37 viewing activity being conducted in writing by a member of the 38 legislature;

SHB 1874 p. 8

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

33

3435

1	(ii) The research is directly related to a legislative activity;
2	and
3	(iii) Viewing or possessing the visual or printed matter is an
4	essential component of the requested research and legislative activity.
5	$((\frac{c}{c}))$ Mothing in this section authorizes otherwise unlawful
6	viewing or possession of visual or printed matter depicting a minor
7	engaged in sexually explicit conduct.

8 <u>NEW SECTION.</u> **Sec. 5.** This act takes effect August 1, 2011.

--- END ---

p. 9 SHB 1874