
The original instrument and the following digest, which constitutes no part of the legislative instrument, were prepared by Alden A. Clement Jr.

DIGEST

Dorsey-Colomb (SB 565)

Proposed law provides that before a defendant is tried for a capital offense in which the prosecution is seeking the death penalty, the prosecution must have either the Dept. of Public Safety and Corrections, office of state police, through one of its laboratories, or a laboratory that is accredited by the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors/Laboratory Accreditation Board (ASCLD/LAB) in forensic DNA analysis, perform DNA testing, in accordance with the laboratory's capabilities at the time the testing is performed, on any biological evidence that was collected as part of an investigation of the offense and that is in the possession of the prosecution. Proposed law further provides that the laboratory that performs the DNA testing is to pay for all DNA testing performed in accordance with proposed law.

Proposed law provides that, as soon as practicable after the defendant is charged with a capital offense, or on motion of the prosecution or the defendant, unless the prosecution has affirmatively waived the death penalty in writing, the court is to order the prosecution and the defendant to meet and confer about which biological materials collected as part of an investigation of the offense qualify as biological evidence that is required to be tested under proposed law.

Proposed law provides that if the prosecution and the defendant agree on which biological materials constitute biological evidence, the biological evidence is to be tested in accordance with proposed law. Proposed law further provides that if the prosecution and the defendant do not agree on which biological materials qualify as biological evidence, the prosecution or the defendant may request that the court hold a hearing to determine the issue. Proposed law further provides that on receipt of a request for a hearing, the court is to set a date for the hearing and provide written notice of the hearing date to the prosecution and the defendant. Proposed law further provides that at the hearing, there is a rebuttable presumption that the biological material that the defendant requests to be tested constitutes biological evidence that is required to be tested under proposed law. Proposed law does not prevent the prosecution from testing biological evidence in its possession.

Proposed law provides that if an item of biological evidence is destroyed or lost as a result of DNA testing, then the laboratory that tested the evidence must provide to the defendant any work product generated during DNA analysis by the laboratory that is related to the testing of the evidence and the results of that testing.

Proposed law provides that the defendant's exclusive remedy for testing that was not performed as required under proposed law is to seek a writ of mandamus from the court of appeal at any time on or before the date an appeal is due to be filed in the defendant's case under present law. Proposed law further provides that an application for a writ of mandamus under proposed law

does not toll or interrupt any time limitation applicable to an appeal under present law or to a habeas petition under federal law. Proposed law provides that the defendant is entitled to only one application for a writ of mandamus under proposed law.

Proposed law provides that at any time after an appeal is filed in the defendant's case, the defendant may file one additional motion for DNA testing under present law relative to DNA testing as part of post-conviction relief.

Proposed law provides that a defendant, at his expense, may have another laboratory accredited by the ASCLD/LAB in forensic DNA analysis perform additional testing of any biological evidence required to be tested under proposed law. Proposed law further provides that on an ex parte showing of good cause to the court, a defendant, at his expense, may have a laboratory accredited by the ASCLD/LAB in forensic DNA analysis perform testing of any biological material that is not required to be tested under proposed law.

Proposed law defines "biological evidence" as the contents of a sexual assault examination kit or any item that contains blood, semen, hair, saliva, skin tissue, fingerprints, or other identifiable human biological material that may reasonably be used to incriminate or exculpate any person in the criminal investigation, whether that material is catalogued separately on a slide or swab, in a test tube, or some other similar method, or is present on clothing, ligatures, bedding, other household materials, drinking cups, cigarettes, or any other item of evidence, including those that are alleged to have been touched or worn by the perpetrator of the offense. Proposed law further provides that any work product generated during DNA analysis is not considered "biological evidence", with the exception of the extracted DNA when the original biological evidence is consumed during analysis, in which event the extracted DNA must be retained.

Effective August 1, 2014.

(Adds C.Cr.P. Art. 501)