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- New Jersey AIDS Assistance Act
- Skate Park Act
- Uniform Electronic Recordation of Custodial Interrogations Act
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When does the Commission decline work in a particular area?

- Legislature already working in the area
- Policy considerations
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Generally, project declined if Legislature is already working in a particular area, unless:

- Specifically requested by a legislator, or
- Commission work could be of assistance to the Legislature
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Generally, project declined if it involves making policy determinations, *e.g.*:

- Commission conducts extensive research and outreach, *but*
- Still no basis on which to make a recommendation, *so*
- Legislature must first make policy determinations
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Generally, project declined if it involves making policy determinations, *unless*:

- Specifically requested by a legislator, or
- Commission can gather and provide info useful to Legislature’s policy determination
Case Study: Three Potential Projects

- New Jersey AIDS Assistance Act
  - Origin: case law search (1/3*)

- Skate Park Act
  - Origin: member of the public (1/3*)

- Uniform Electronic Recordation of Custodial Interrogations Act
  - Origin: Uniform Law Commission (1/3*)

* Division of project sources for past several years
Case Study: Potential Project No. 1

New Jersey AIDS Assistance Act

*N.J.S. 26:5C-1 et seq.*
New Jersey AIDS Assistance Act

Background

NJAAA enacted to:

• Educate the public and promote testing for HIV/AIDS
• Provide early detection, counseling, social services, & referrals
Both HIPAA (federal) and NJAAA protect patient privacy, with exceptions.
State of New Jersey v. C.M.

- HIV-positive defendant fails to disclose his status to two women with whom he had sexual relationships.
- Charged with two counts of “third-degree diseased person committing an act of sexual penetration” N.J.S. 2C:34–5(b).
- Trial judge denies prosecutor’s application to obtain medical records under NJAAA.
- Appellate Division affirms.
State argues: both HIPAA and NJAAA authorize disclosure.
New Jersey AIDS Assistance Act

Background

State relied on *N.J.S. 26:5C-9(a)*:

“The record of a person who has or is suspected of having AIDS or HIV infection may be disclosed by the order of a court of competent jurisdiction which is granted pursuant to an application showing good cause…”
But the next section, *N.J.S. 26:5C-9(b)*, applies to **criminal prosecution**:

“A court may authorize disclosure of a person's record for the purpose of conducting an investigation of or a **prosecution** for a crime of which the person is suspected, **only if the crime is a first degree crime**…”
New Jersey AIDS Assistance Act
Preliminary Research

- Some citing references to NJAAA
- Possible remedy of adding statutory language
- Request for approval to conduct additional research (including legislative history/intent) and outreach
New Jersey AIDS Assistance Act

Subsequent Developments

- Introduction of A-4380 by Assemblyman Jack Ciattarelli
- Introduction of S-2979 by Senator Christopher Bateman (with language identical to A-4380)
Assembly Bill 4380 & Senate Bill 2979:
b. A court may authorize disclosure of a person's record for the purpose of conducting an investigation of or a prosecution for a crime of which the person is suspected, only if the crime is a first degree crime or
the crime of a diseased person committing an act of sexual penetration set forth under subsection b. of N.J.S.2C:34-5, and there is a reasonable likelihood that the record in question will disclose material information or evidence of substantial value in connection with the investigation or prosecution.
New Jersey AIDS Assistance Act

Disposition

• No action recommended
• Status: completed
• 215th Legislative Session: each bill referred to its respective Judiciary Committee with no recorded votes
• 216th Legislative Session: On 1/16/2014, Assemblyman Jack Ciattarelli and others introduce A-1163, referred to Judiciary
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Skate Park Act
Skate Park Act

Background

Comparison of Ski, Roller Skate, & Equine Acts during a Commission meeting.
Ski Act – N.J.S. 5:13-6:
The assumption of risk set forth in section 5 shall be a complete bar of suit and shall serve as…

Roller Skating Act – 5:14-7:
The assumption of risk set forth in section 6 of this act shall be a complete bar of suit and shall serve as…

Equine Act – 5:15-5:
The assumption of risk set forth in section 3 of this act shall be a complete bar of suit and shall serve as…
Skate Park Act

Background

Questions raised during Commission meeting:

✓ “Is there a Skate Park Act?”
✓ “If not, should the Commission take up the project?”
Skateboarding addressed in Title 39, **not** Title 5
N.J. law silent re skate park duties & obligations
No legal definition of “skate park” in N.J.
39:4-10.10. Rights and duties of roller skaters and skateboarders

Every person operating any roller skates or skateboard upon a roadway shall be granted all of the rights and shall be subject to all of the duties applicable to the driver of a vehicle by chapter four of Title 39 of the Revised Statutes and all supplements thereto, except as to those provisions thereof which by their nature can have no application.

***
Skate Park Act
Preliminary Research

Threshold questions:
- What is the law in New Jersey?
- What are other states doing?
At least 58 operational N.J. skate parks
Mix of public and private operation
Rules vary widely re protective gear, fees, & signed waiver requirements
At least 9 other states have enacted laws

- Policy of government immunity over liability
- Liability a major deterrent to private park operation
The majority of N.J. parks are publicly operated and fall under Title 59, Claims against public entities.
59:2-1. Immunity of public entity generally

a. Except as otherwise provided by this act, a public entity is not liable for an injury, whether such injury arises out of an act or omission of the public entity or a public employee or any other person.

b. Any liability of a public entity established by this act is subject to any immunity of the public entity and is subject to any defenses that would be available to the public entity if it were a private person.
Tort and contract law already address this area

- N.J. courts enforce liability waivers at skate parks and other recreational activities if they do not violate public policy.

- *Hojnowski v. Vans Skate Park* (2005) – waiver enforced as to arbitration clause, but invalid as to right of the child to sue in tort.
Public Policy considerations:

- Designating public skate parks to draw skateboarders away from inappropriate areas
- No known economic policy to protect skateboard industry (as with Ski, Equine, etc.)
“No action required at this time, in light of Title 59 and existing contract law protections.”
Case Study: Potential Project No. 3

Uniform Electronic Recordation of Custodial Interrogations Act
Commission has a statutory obligation to consider the work of the ULC:

“Receive and consider suggestions and recommendations from the American Law Institute, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, and other learned bodies and from judges, public officials, bar associations, members of the bar and from the public generally…” N.J.S. 1:12A-8c
The Commission examines ULC proposals to:

- Determine state of existing NJ law
- Determine what other states are doing
- Determine NJ law’s date of enactment or modification
- Assess whether existing law is a better fit for the State of NJ
- Determine whether NJ law is enhanced by including ULC’s provisions
UNIFORM ELECTRONIC RECORDATION OF CUSTODIAL INTERROGATIONS ACT

Drafted by the

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

and by it

APPROVED AND RECOMMENDED FOR ENACTMENT IN ALL THE STATES

at its

ANNUAL CONFERENCE MEETING IN ITS ONE-HUNDRED-AND-NINETEENTH YEAR IN CHICAGO, ILLINOIS JULY 9-16, 2010

* * *
Uniform Electronic Recordation of Custodial Interrogations Act

Preliminary Research

Purpose of the UEROCIA:

- Address use of audio and video to record law enforcement interviews of criminal suspects in custody
- Mandate electronic recording; defer to states’ discretion re video and specific exceptions
- Improve investigations, accuracy, fairness
- Protect constitutional rights (avoid false confessions)
Law in New Jersey:

- NJ “at the forefront of advancing the cause sought to be served by the UEROCIA”
- Criminal Practice Rule 3:17 (2005) mandates electronic recording of specific crimes in “places of detention” with exceptions
What other states are doing:
- Enacted in 1 state
- Introduced for adoption in 3 states
Uniform Electronic Recordation of Custodial Interrogations Act
Consideration and Discussion

**Issues re UEROCIA:**

- At odds with *Winberry v. Salisbury* determination re: separation of powers in NJ
- NJ’s existing law successfully covers the matters in the Uniform Act with Rule 3:17
- Not likely to accomplish uniformity due to high degree of variation in each state
Enactment of the UEROCIA *not* recommended by the Commission.
NEW JERSEY LAW REVISION COMMISSION

Final Report

Relating to

Uniform Electronic Recordation of Custodial Interrogations Act

July 18, 2013

* * *
NJAAA References

- New Jersey AIDS Assistance Act (NJAAA), N.J.S. 26:5C-1 et seq.
- State of New Jersey v. C.M., 2013 WL 3582074
Skate Park Act References

- Roller Skating Rink Act, *N.J.S.* 5:14-1 et seq.
- Equestrian Activities Liability Act, *N.J.S.* 5:15-1 et seq.
- *N.J.S.* 39:4-10.10. Rights and duties of roller skaters and skateboarders
- *N.J.S.* 59:2-1. Immunity of public entity generally
Uniform Electronic Recordation of Custodial Interrogations Act

References

• N.J.S. 1:12A-8. Powers and duties
• Uniform Electronic Recordation of Custodial Interrogations Act (www.uniformlaws.org)
• N.J. Court Rules 3:17. Electronic Recordation
• Winberry v. Salisbury, 5 N.J. 240 (1950)
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