## HB1155 L.004

## HOUSE COMMITTEE OF REFERENCE AMENDMENT Committee on Judiciary.

<u>HB23-1155</u> be amended as follows:

Amend printed bill, page 2, strike lines 4 and 5 and subs
---

"16-3-406. Custodial interrogation - admissibility - legislative
declaration - definition. (1) The General assembly finds and
DECLARES THAT:
(a) THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THE STATE
CONSTITUTION DECLARE A PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION AND
A RIGHT TO COUNSEL TO BE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS;
(b) WITHOUT PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS, CUSTODIAL
INTERROGATION BY LAW ENFORCEMENT CAN LEAD TO INHERENTLY
COMPELLING PRESSURES THAT WORK TO UNDERMINE THE WILL OF THE
INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTED TO THE INTERROGATION;
(c) Prior to custodial interrogation, an individual must be
CLEARLY AND UNEQUIVOCALLY APPRISED OF THE INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHTS;
(d) The exercise of these rights prior to or during
CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION MUST BE FULLY HONORED;
(e) In <i>Miranda v. Arizona</i> , 384 U.S. 436 (1966), the United
STATES SUPREME COURT RECOGNIZED PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS AND
THAT AN ADVISEMENT MUST BY GIVEN PRIOR TO ANY CUSTODIAL
INTERROGATION IN ORDER FOR STATEMENTS FROM THAT CUSTODIAL
INTERROGATION TO BE ADMITTED AT TRIAL BY THE PROSECUTION;
(f) The court further stated in $Miranda$ that states are
Free to develop their own safeguards consistent with $\it Miranda$ ;
(g) In the decades that have followed Miranda v. Arizona,
EXPERIENCE HAS DEMONSTRATED THAT PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS TO
INFORM INDIVIDUALS OF THEIR RIGHTS AND TO HONOR EXERCISE OF THEIR
RIGHTS ARE BENEFICIAL AND JUST;
(h) COLORADO SHOULD JOIN OTHER STATES THAT HAVE CODIFIED
SUCH PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS; AND
(j) It is the intent of general assembly that Colorado
SHOULD THEREFORE PROVIDE INDEPENDENT STATUTORY PROTECTION
Consistent with $Miranda$ in no greater or lesser degree.
(2) As used in this section, "custodial interrogation" has
THE".

- 34 Renumber succeeding subsections accordingly.
- Page 2, line 25, strike "(2)" and substitute "(3)".

\*\* \*\*\* \*\* \*\*\*