

HOUSE BILL 808

R3

0lr2038
CF SB 309

By: **Delegates Valentino-Smith, M. Jackson, Bartlett, and P. Young**

Introduced and read first time: February 3, 2020

Assigned to: Judiciary

A BILL ENTITLED

1 AN ACT concerning

2 **Drugged Driving – Oral Fluid Tests – Pilot Program**

3 FOR the purpose of establishing a pilot program to examine the testing of oral fluid samples
4 by certain police officers to assist in determining whether an individual is operating
5 a motor vehicle while impaired by a controlled dangerous substance; requiring the
6 pilot program to take place in local jurisdictions in the State that volunteer to
7 participate; establishing certain standards for oral screening instruments used
8 under the pilot program; authorizing a police officer in a participating jurisdiction
9 who has reasonable grounds to believe that an individual is or has been driving or
10 attempting to drive a motor vehicle while impaired by a controlled dangerous
11 substance to request the individual to provide a certain oral fluid sample; requiring
12 a police officer who requests an oral fluid sample to advise the individual of certain
13 matters related to subsequent blood tests; prohibiting a police officer from using the
14 results of an oral fluid test for certain purposes; prohibiting the use of the results of
15 an oral fluid test as evidence in any court action; providing that the provision of or
16 refusal to provide an oral fluid sample is not admissible as evidence in any court
17 action; prohibiting the use of any evidence pertaining to an oral fluid test in a civil
18 action; establishing that refusal to provide an oral fluid sample does not constitute a
19 certain violation; establishing that submission to an oral fluid test does not relieve
20 the individual of certain obligations; requiring the State Coordinator for the Drug
21 Recognition Expert Program to submit certain reports to the General Assembly by a
22 certain date; defining the term “oral fluid test”; providing for the termination of
23 certain provisions of this Act; making stylistic changes; and generally relating to the
24 pilot program to examine the testing of oral fluid samples by police officers to detect
25 the presence of a controlled dangerous substance.

26 BY repealing and reenacting, with amendments,
27 Article – Transportation
28 Section 16–205.2
29 Annotated Code of Maryland
30 (2012 Replacement Volume and 2019 Supplement)

EXPLANATION: CAPITALS INDICATE MATTER ADDED TO EXISTING LAW.

[Brackets] indicate matter deleted from existing law.



BY adding to
Article – Transportation
Section 16–205.3
Annotated Code of Maryland
(2012 Replacement Volume and 2019 Supplement)

SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND,
That the Laws of Maryland read as follows:

Article – Transportation

16–205.2.

(a) A police officer who has reasonable grounds to believe that an individual is or has been driving or attempting to drive a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol or while impaired by alcohol may, without making an arrest and prior to the issuance of a citation, request the individual to submit to a preliminary breath test to be administered by the officer using a device approved by the State Toxicologist.

(b) The police officer requesting the preliminary breath test shall advise the person to be tested that neither a refusal to take the test nor the taking of the test shall prevent or require a subsequent chemical test pursuant to § 16–205.1 of this subtitle.

(c) **(1)** The results of the preliminary breath test [shall]:

(I) **SHALL** be used as a guide for the police officer in deciding whether an arrest should be made [and may];

(II) **MAY** not be used as evidence by the State in any court action[. The results of the preliminary breath test may]; **AND**

(III) **MAY** be used as evidence by a defendant in a court action.

(2) The taking of or refusal to submit to a preliminary breath test is not admissible in evidence in any court action.

(3) Any evidence pertaining to a preliminary breath test may not be used in a civil action.

(d) Refusal to submit to a preliminary breath test [shall] **DOES** not constitute a violation of § 16–205.1 of this subtitle and the taking of a preliminary breath test [shall] **DOES** not relieve the individual of the obligation to take the test required under § 16–205.1 of this subtitle if requested to do so by the police officer.

SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That the Laws of Maryland read

1 as follows:

2 **Article – Transportation**

3 **16–205.3.**

4 (A) IN THIS SECTION, “ORAL FLUID TEST” MEANS THE TESTING ON AN
5 AUTHORIZED DEVICE OF THE ORAL FLUID OF A DRIVER WHO IS THE SUBJECT OF A
6 TRAFFIC STOP FOR THE PURPOSE OF DETECTING THE PRESENCE OF A CONTROLLED
7 DANGEROUS SUBSTANCE.

8 (B) THERE IS A PILOT PROGRAM TO EXAMINE THE TESTING OF ORAL FLUID
9 SAMPLES BY POLICE OFFICERS WHO ARE CERTIFIED AS DRUG RECOGNITION
10 EXPERTS TO ASSIST IN DETERMINING WHETHER AN INDIVIDUAL IS OPERATING A
11 MOTOR VEHICLE WHILE IMPAIRED BY A CONTROLLED DANGEROUS SUBSTANCE.

12 (C) THE PILOT PROGRAM SHALL TAKE PLACE IN LOCAL JURISDICTIONS IN
13 THE STATE THAT VOLUNTEER TO PARTICIPATE.

14 (D) A PILOT PROGRAM SHALL USE ORAL SCREENING INSTRUMENTS THAT:

15 (1) USE AN INSTRUMENTED ANALYZER IN WHICH THE SAMPLE AND
16 REAGENTS ARE MIXED, ASSAYS PERFORMED, AND RESULTS INTERPRETED WITHIN
17 THE INSTRUMENT;

18 (2) HAVE THE CAPACITY TO RECORD AND STORE THE RESULTS
19 INTERNALLY;

20 (3) ARE CAPABLE OF ACCURATELY RECORDING EACH CONTROLLED
21 DANGEROUS SUBSTANCE BEING TESTED; AND

22 (4) COMPLETE THE TESTING PROCESS WITHIN 15 MINUTES OF THE
23 SAMPLE BEING COLLECTED.

24 (E) A POLICE OFFICER IN A PARTICIPATING JURISDICTION WHO HAS
25 REASONABLE GROUNDS TO BELIEVE THAT AN INDIVIDUAL IS OR HAS BEEN DRIVING
26 OR ATTEMPTING TO DRIVE A MOTOR VEHICLE WHILE THE INDIVIDUAL IS IMPAIRED
27 BY A CONTROLLED DANGEROUS SUBSTANCE MAY REQUEST THE INDIVIDUAL TO
28 PROVIDE AN ORAL FLUID SAMPLE TO BE TESTED BY A POLICE OFFICER CERTIFIED
29 AS A DRUG RECOGNITION EXPERT.

30 (F) THE POLICE OFFICER REQUESTING THE ORAL FLUID SAMPLE SHALL
31 ADVISE THE INDIVIDUAL TO BE TESTED THAT NEITHER PROVIDING THE SAMPLE
32 NOR REFUSING TO PROVIDE THE SAMPLE SHALL PREVENT OR REQUIRE A

SUBSEQUENT BLOOD TEST UNDER § 16–205.1 OF THIS SUBTITLE.

(G) (1) THE RESULTS OF THE ORAL FLUID TEST MAY NOT BE USED AS:

(I) A GUIDE FOR A POLICE OFFICER IN DECIDING WHETHER CHARGES SHOULD BE FILED; OR

(II) EVIDENCE IN ANY COURT ACTION.

(2) PROVIDING OR REFUSING TO PROVIDE AN ORAL FLUID SAMPLE IS NOT ADMISSIBLE IN EVIDENCE IN ANY COURT ACTION.

(3) NO EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO AN ORAL FLUID TEST MAY BE USED IN A CIVIL ACTION.

(H) REFUSAL TO PROVIDE AN ORAL FLUID SAMPLE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A VIOLATION OF § 16–205.1 OF THIS SUBTITLE AND PROVIDING AN ORAL FLUID SAMPLE DOES NOT RELIEVE THE INDIVIDUAL OF THE OBLIGATION TO TAKE THE TEST REQUIRED UNDER § 16–205.1 OF THIS SUBTITLE IF REQUESTED TO DO SO BY THE POLICE OFFICER.

SECTION 3. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That, on or before December 1, 2022, the State Coordinator for the Drug Recognition Expert Program shall submit, in accordance with § 2–1257 of the State Government Article, a report to the General Assembly for the period from October 1, 2020, through September 30, 2022, stating:

(1) the local jurisdictions that participated in the pilot program;

(2) the number of traffic stops that later resulted in a police officer requesting an oral fluid sample from an individual and the number of oral fluid tests performed;

(3) the types of devices used to conduct an oral fluid test;

(4) (i) the number of individuals charged after a positive oral fluid test who subsequently received a positive blood test for the presence of a controlled dangerous substance; and

(ii) the number of individuals charged after a positive oral fluid test who subsequently received a positive oral fluid laboratory confirmation test for the presence of a controlled dangerous substance;

(5) (i) the number of individuals charged after a negative oral fluid test who subsequently received a positive blood test for the presence of a controlled dangerous substance; and

1 (ii) the number of individuals charged after a negative oral fluid test
2 who subsequently received a positive oral fluid laboratory confirmation test for the presence
3 of a controlled dangerous substance;

4 (6) the number of individuals charged after a negative oral fluid test who
5 subsequently received a negative blood or oral fluid laboratory confirmation test for the
6 presence of a controlled dangerous substance; and

7 (7) the final disposition of matters, and the number of pending matters, for
8 which an individual was charged with driving while impaired by a controlled dangerous
9 substance after an oral fluid test was used on the individual.

10 SECTION 4. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect
11 October 1, 2020. Section 2 of this Act shall remain effective for a period of 2 years and, at
12 the end of September 30, 2022, Section 2 of this Act, with no further action required by the
13 General Assembly, shall be abrogated and of no further force and effect.