



State of Wisconsin

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

1 EAST MAIN, SUITE 200
P. O. BOX 2037
MADISON, WI 53701-2037

LEGAL SECTION: (608) 266-3561
REFERENCE SECTION: (608) 266-0341
FAX: (608) 264-6948

STEPHEN R. MILLER
CHIEF

February 23, 2006

MEMORANDUM

To: Senator Roessler

From: Peggy J. Hurley, Legislative Attorney, (608) 266-8906

Subject: Technical Memorandum to **2005 SB-592** (LRB 05-4160/1)

We received the attached technical memorandum relating to your bill. This copy is for your information and your file. If you wish to discuss this memorandum or the necessity of revising your bill or preparing an amendment, please contact me.

CORRESPONDENCE MEMORANDUM

DT1175 97

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Date: February 20, 2006
To: DOA Fiscal Estimate
From: John J. Sobotik, Asst. General Counsel
Subject: Technical Memo

Section 3 of ~~AB 1023~~^{SB 592} proposes to create s. 125.14 (6) (b), Stats., to read:

125.14 (6) (b) *Discovery*. In a prosecution for a violation of this chapter that may result in the imposition of a forfeiture, neither party is entitled to pretrial discovery in any refusal hearing, except that, if the defendant moves within 30 days after the initial appearance in person or by an attorney and shows cause therefor, the court may order that the defendant be allowed to inspect documents, including lists of names and addresses of witnesses, if available, and to test under s. 804.09, under such conditions as the court prescribes, any devices used by the plaintiff to determine whether a violation has been committed.

If the basic aim of this provision is to eliminate discovery in underage alcohol cases, this amendment would not accomplish that aim. There is, in fact, no such thing as a "refusal" case in an underage alcohol context. Under current law, if a juvenile refuses chemical testing, no sanction could be applied to that individual. Accordingly, there is no need for legislation regarding underage alcohol refusal cases.

Peggy Hurley at LRB advised me that the purpose of this provision was to prohibit discovery in underage alcohol enforcement actions as it is prohibited in traffic cases. To that end, I suggest this provision be replaced with a proposed new provision modeled on s. 345.421, Stats.

For example, s. 345.421 could be copied and inserted into Ch. 125 along these lines:

Discovery. Neither party is entitled to pretrial discovery except that if the defendant moves within 10 days after the alleged violation and shows cause therefor, the court may order that the defendant be allowed to inspect and test under s. 804.09 and under such conditions as the court prescribes, any devices used by the plaintiff to determine whether a violation has been committed, including without limitation, devices used to determine presence of alcohol in breath or body fluid ~~or to measure speed~~, and may inspect under s. 804.09 the reports of experts relating to those devices. (The reference to speed devices is struck because the only devices at issue in underage alcohol cases are the alcohol measurement devices.)

Alternatively, the legislature could amend Ch. 345 to make its procedures apply in underage alcohol enforcement proceedings or amend s. 345.421 to prohibit discovery in those proceedings as well as in traffic proceedings generally.

In any event, the reference to refusal proceedings in section 3 of the bill appears to result in an unintended result.