COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HEARING

STATE CAPITOL
IRVIS OFFICE BUILDING
ROOM G-50
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2009 10:05 A.M.

PRESENTATION ON CONSTABLES

BEFORE:

HONORABLE THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN

HONORABLE JOSEPH F. BRENNAN

HONORABLE JAMES E. CASORIO, JR.

HONORABLE PAUL J. DRUCKER

HONORABLE DEBERAH KULA

HONORABLE JOHN E. PALLONE

HONORABLE JOSH SHAPIRO

HONORABLE GLEN R. GRELL

HONORABLE TIM KRIEGER

HONORABLE RICHARD R. STEVENSON

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

HONORABLE DANTE SANTONI, JR. DISTRICT JUDGE GAIL M. GRETH

DEBRA B. MILLER REPORTING (717)439-3785 dbmreporting@msn.com

* * * * *

1	ALSO PRESENT:
2	DAVID D. TYLER MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
3	WILLIAM H. ANDRING MAJORITY SENIOR LEGAL COUNSEL
4	V. KURT BELLMAN MAJORITY LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT
5	DAVID M. McGLAUGHLIN MAJORITY SENIOR RESEARCH ANALYST KAREN S. COATES
6	MINORITY SENIOR LEGAL COUNSEL KAREN L. DALTON
7	MINORITY SENIOR LEGAL COUNSEL
8	MICHELLE R. MOORE MINORITY LEGISLATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
9	
10	DEBRA B. MILLER
11	REPORTER
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX
	I N D E Y
2	TESTIFIERS
3	NAME
4	<u>NAME</u> <u>PAGE</u>
5	THOMAS IMPINK PRESIDENT, PENNSYLVANIA STATE CONSTABLES ASSOCIATION (PSCA)
6	
7	EMIL J. MINNAR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PENNSYLVANIA STATE CONSTABLES ASSOCIATION (PSCA)11
8	MICHAEL J. KANE, ESQ.
9	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PA COMMISSION ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY (PCCD)44
10	LARRY MAGGI
11	WASHINGTON COUNTY COMMISSIONER;
12	CHAIR, COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ASSOCIATION OF PENNSYLVANIA (CCAP) COURTS AND CORRECTIONS COMMITTEE66
13	SANDY GRAFFIUS
14	BERKS COUNTY CONTROLLER72
15	RICHARD L. MILLER INTERNAL AUDITOR, OFFICE OF
16	THE CONTROLLER, COUNTY OF BERKS87
17	SHELLEY WHITCOMB
18	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY CONTROLLERS (PSACC)99
19	TERRI CLARK
20	SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBER, CHESTER COUNTY CONSTABLE HANDBOOK100
21	TROY RICE PRESIDENT,
22	FAYETTE COUNTY CONSTABLES' ASSOCIATION107
23	RICHARD G. OPIELA MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE,
24	ALLEGHENY COUNTY111
25	

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 3 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We'll get started with the House Judiciary Committee hearing on 4 constables. 5 6 I would like the members of the panel that 7 are here with us -- there will be others joining us, I'm sure -- if they wouldn't mind introducing 8 themselves. We'll start to my right and work over. 10 11 Debbie. 12 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Deberah Kula from 13 Fayette and Westmoreland Counties. 14 MR. ANDRING: Bill Andring, Chief Counsel to 15 the committee. 16 DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Good morning. I'm Magisterial District Judge Gail Greth from Berks 17 18 County. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I am Chairman 19 20 Tom Caltagirone, Reading, Berks County. 21 MS. DALTON: Karen Dalton, Senior Counsel to 22 the House Judiciary Committee. REPRESENTATIVE KRIEGER: Tim Krieger from 23 24 Westmoreland County. 25 MR. McGLAUGHLIN: Good morning.

```
David McGlaughlin, Counsel to the Judiciary
1
    Committee.
2
 3
            REPRESENTATIVE SANTONI: I'm Dante Santoni.
    I'm a member from Berks County.
 4
            REPRESENTATIVE CASORIO: Representative
 5
 6
    Jim Casorio, Westmoreland County.
7
            REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Good morning.
    Representative Glen Grell, 87th District, Cumberland
8
    County.
            REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: And I'm
10
11
    Paul Drucker. I'm the 157th, which is basically
12
    Chester County.
1.3
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We will have other
    members joining us, I'm sure.
14
15
            Go ahead.
            REPRESENTATIVE STEVENSON: Representative
16
    Dick Stevenson, Mercer and Butler Counties.
17
18
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Let me just open up
19
    by saying that in the years that I have served, one
2.0
    of the things that I was most proud of in the early
    years of the accomplishments was the fee bill that I
21
22
    was able to get through, and my very, very dear
23
    friend, whom I have known for over 30 years, Emil,
24
    who will be testifying, we worked on that together
2.5
    and we were able to get that through.
```

That was the first major breakthrough for an increase in quite a number of years. And then we did the education and training part, which helped, I think, increase the skills and the training and education for the constables.

1.3

2.0

What we are going to be attempting to do, hopefully in this session, is to consolidate. One of the things that I think Emil will be talking about is the consolidation of the statutes, which are spread out over 13 or more different codes. We would like to put them into one code. That is one piece of this puzzle.

The second piece is that we would like to take a look at the training and education standards, and I am a member -- I have been reappointed to the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. So that board, of course, oversees the training and education, and we would like to take a second look at that to see what upgrades we could institute.

And with that, I would like to ask

Tom Impink, who is the President of the Pennsylvania

State Constables Association -- and yes, please,

Emil, if you would come up also, who is the Executive

Director -- to start with the testimony.

Tom is from Berks County, so I know your

President quite well. He's a good friend.

1.3

2.0

2 MR. IMPINK: Good morning, Chairman
3 Caltagirone and members of the House Judiciary
4 Committee.

It's a pleasure and honor to be able to participate in these hearings and to have an opportunity to inform you, the committee, relative to constables.

Very briefly about myself, I have been a constable in Wernersville Borough, Berks County, for 30 years. I will be running for reelection, and I have been on the Board of Directors of the Pennsylvania State Constables Association for nearly 8 years.

In December, I took office as President of the association. So I am really a rookie at that, but we are trying hard. I do have some past experience, and I do have a good coach over here taking care of me here.

All right. As the current President of the PSCA, it is important that those in attendance here today are aware of PSCA's activities.

PSCA is a nonprofit statewide organization with a primary mission to promote certain educational goals as one of its services to membership.

The association has been in existence since early 1972. The association is the result of joining several smaller constable groups, all sharing the common desire to improve the efficiency and performance of constables and the constable system of Pennsylvania.

Historically, the association has offered training programs, seminars, and ongoing annual conferences -- it will be our 35th this year -- as a means to improve the constables' service in the Commonwealth Court system.

The aforementioned programs have focused on the primary functions performed by constables -- that of serving the civil and criminal process, courtroom security as needed, and the transportation of prisoners.

The aforementioned services are generally associated with the Magisterial District Court system. However, in some instances, counties/districts utilize constables for specific functions for the Common Pleas and Domestic Relations Courts.

With the constable being deemed the "independent contractor," his services are dictated by statutory fees. These related services are

sometimes dictated by the lack of availability of court-related personnel and sufficient funding.

It is for activities of this nature that the PSCA provides ancillary training and information to assist the constable perform his requested services properly in other areas of court-related work.

Most notably, the PSCA's residential training program evolved by the association to fill the void created by Act 147, an intended training bill which was struck down as being unconstitutional in 1994 by the Supreme Court.

PSCA filled the breach by scheduling weekend classes at nine locations around the State to prepare new and minimally working constables for the Magisterial District Court system.

This PSCA training program has produced in excess of 500 trained constables who were accepted by the courts to perform the service of process. Many of these graduates still actively serve the courts today.

Just for those who aren't familiar, this was before Act 44 went into the PCCD training, okay?

The success of this effort was acknowledged by the Minor Judiciary Education Board, an advisory

board appointed by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court to set training standards for the Magisterial District Judges.

1.3

I relate these activities and accomplishments by PSCA to exemplify our mission and sincerity for the preparation of the best cadre of constables for court service. We recognize that recently, actions of certain constables have been detrimental to the Office of Constable.

PSCA stands ready to work cooperatively with the Legislature and the Judiciary in any capacity to eliminate the possibilities for further public concern and to improve and solidify the constable system in the Commonwealth.

At this point, I would like to turn the last portion of the presentation over to Emil Minnar, Executive Director of the Pennsylvania State Constables Association, who will address specific concerns and recommendations for consideration by the Judiciary Committee.

Before so, I want to thank Chairman

Caltagirone and the committee for inviting us to

testify here today, and with that said, I would like

to introduce Mr. Emil Minnar, the Executive Director

of the Pennsylvania State Constables Association.

MR. MINNAR: Thank you, Tom.

1.3

2.0

I, too, want to thank Chairman Caltagirone for affording the opportunity for me to address the committee today.

I might point out that our thrust in the presentation today is focused on the purpose, the mission of the association, past history, and also the activities or cooperation that we are involved in to get to the stage that we are in today.

Now, the stage that we're in today is not all perfect; we understand that, but I would like to make some comments about it.

As I previously mentioned, PSCA has programmed a series of training opportunities to better serve the constable when he or she is working for the courts.

Beyond this, we have had a concerted effort that has been exercised to monitor and promote legislation favorable to the Office of Constable.

The first counteracting, knock-out punch to constables was delivered in 1983 when Rule 17 of the Pennsylvania Rules of Court removed the responsibility of constables from the President Judge of each district.

At that time, originally the rule stated

that the rule permitted the presence of each judicial district to have supervision over District Justices and constables.

Obviously, two words were removed from that rule, the "and constables," which really resulted from the very famous case in 1983-84, which was the case in which the constable was sued for performing a sale.

And there's a lot of detail on that case,
but it went up and down through the court system, and
ultimately, at the Supreme Court level, it was no
longer challenged. But it did remove the
responsibility for the constable from the judicial
branch at that point.

We were sort of a group that, as quoted, "rotated" around the Judiciary but really wasn't an employee or related staff as such.

Okay. Shortly after that, this rule change, PSCA pursued legislation in the eighties to offset the lack of supervision and formalized training, but it didn't materialize.

Further efforts were attempted to craft legislation, and that failed again in the early 1990s. At that point, Act 147 was in the hopper, and Act 147 basically addressed training, fees, advisory

committees, and also it suggested that we be under the judicial branch of government.

1.3

There was one hook in the act that the Supreme Court decided would make it unconstitutional. That was the fact that the right or the ability to perform political duties was reserved for the constable, and therefore, the separation of judicial versus Executive branch was then entertained and made very clear to us.

However, when that Act 147 was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1992, it also designated us as "independent contractors." That was the second knock-out blow that we faced then.

As an elected officer, we were independent contractors who had to abide by legislative requirements, statutory requirements, but we had no home, and this was quite a problem. And we are the first ones to own up to it. However, we didn't decide that; that decision was made by the Supreme Court.

This decision also placed the constable in the Executive branch of government, since we certainly didn't belong in the legislative or judicial at that point.

Truly, the constables at that point were and still are in a boat without a paddle or a rudder.

This obviously has been a concern with us for a number of years.

1.3

2.0

Since then, the single biggest concern shared by all of us is the lack of supervision and discipline over the constable system and the constables in it.

These concerns have been exemplified by illegal and questionable actions by a small number of constables, further giving the media the opportunity to create dramatic headlines at the expense of the office and the system.

True, while some of these certain illegal acts have been committed by constables, the prosecution for these acts -- and I might say that there is a legal method for follow-through. But I will repeat that the illegal acts have been committed by constables, but the prosecution for these actions have been minimal for whatever reasons.

Most recently, in the last year or so, I have seen a couple of actions filed by D.A.s in particular counties.

The resultant of it is the direct reflection of a void that still continues to permit the

occurrence of these problems, and this is where our concern lies as well.

1.3

2.0

Training alone can't eliminate these problems. Supervision and disciplinary actions are necessary to assure a functional and noteworthy system.

Now, as we'll find out a little later, the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, or PCCD as we refer to it, is the commission responsible for constable training.

It provides all the information regarding the training necessary for service to the Judiciary. However, they can't guarantee daily acceptable actions by constables. There must be some type of supervision.

It is not a responsibility, I don't believe, of a training function to supervise day-to-day activity of the constable, and it would certainly overload their responsibilities.

In practice, some constables tend to believe that they can function as police officers, that being the single biggest problem, and that is where I see a lot of the incidents occur, because they are overstepping their bounds of authority, and therefore, they get into gray areas, which are the

areas that usually cause the problems.

1.3

And likewise, I have to say it is not all the constable's problem. In defense of that I have to say that in some communities, their leaders expect constables to perform unrelated duties, which would expose the constable to a host of liability issues.

Further, the badge of the office is being misused in that some constables are performing duties unrelated to court service while in uniform, yet holding themselves out as constables.

Now, I have to revert back and say that my comment about communities that use constables perhaps in a less than proper fashion, I have known instances where constables have been called out at 3, 4 o'clock in the morning to go out and direct traffic on a highway because there was no local police force.

Well, first of all, constables aren't trained to direct traffic. Number two, their liability insurance that they must have under Act 44 doesn't cover things that are illegal or unrelated to their work.

So I'm not throwing stones or casting stones at any one group, but there are a lot of activities out there that are sort of assigned to them or expected of them as constables. Why? Because the

leaders in some communities as well as constables themselves are not aware of what their authority is or their responsibilities.

1.3

The authority, in a way, is directed by the training function, and it identifies those areas that the constable will be involved in, and therefore, the training is offered to satisfy that requirement. And I am sure PCCD will reiterate that.

However, in looking at the big picture, the association understands that if we are going to get something done that is going to help the system and the constable, the first thing that we feel has to be done is the codification of laws that relate to constables.

The current laws are scattered all over.

They are in codes, they are in any number of statutory, and also common law.

And as you know, common law, obviously based on prior decisions and so on, may be fine, but when the laws are challenged and they progress through the court system, common law is the least one with substantiation for determining what is right and what is wrong. Certainly statutory law is the most accurate, and that is left up to the courts to decide or define it.

Also, once we know or once we have a handle on the codification of laws, necessary training could then address the identified responsibilities.

2.0

Further, certain questionable gray areas of activity by constables would be qualified, thereby determining whether or not those actions are justifiable and acceptable or not.

Thirdly, there appears to be a wide variance in the method of clearly reporting income that constables produce for the counties and for the State as well as related expenses.

Also, the interpretation of constable fees vary by county, yet they are statutory in nature.

There must also be some standardization in these areas as well.

At present, there are 1,160 certified constables who are serving the courts today. These are the active constables who are out there serving process, knocking on doors, making arrests, and so on.

Now, this 1,160 serve 560 district courts around the State. So I think you can see, if you start making a comparison there, say roughly 1,200 for discussion's sake for 560 courts, they are doing a job. They are doing a job in more ways than one.

They are also earning money for the counties and the State.

1.3

In 2008, warrant service alone by constables accounted for 100,690 warrants being served, which produced an income for the counties of \$7,143,604 for fines collected.

It is important to know that constables absorb their out-of-pocket expenses, and I'm not going to get into the details there, but everything from their vehicle to their uniforms to their insurance to their weapon. Anything needed to perform the job is borne by out-of-pocket expenses. And this can rise to a reasonable number, particularly if you equipped a car correctly for transportation of prisoners.

Realistically, the constable is one who absorbs all of their expenses but gets no perks or benefits comparable to salaried court employees. I point to that only because regardless of the amount of the gross figure that a constable earns, the ballpark figure is that approximately one-half of it goes for overhead, so that any of these numbers that come up, I can assure you, and I don't have to tell you the cost of gas, the cost of operations of a vehicle today, the cost of insurance.

In fact, now we are facing the possibility, will insurance exist and will it cover us for certain areas of activity?

A recent action that was filed and was decided in the hallway rather than go to trial directly affects prisoner transportation. And we believe we have it resolved, but I point this out only because it could become a major problem. I have confidence that it will not right now, but like anything else, it can change on a day-to-day basis.

And by the way, in that particular case, it resulted from a constable who was doing a transport in which he killed, accidently, a flagman on the highway who was directing traffic. It was a very nebulous situation; quite a few organizations and groups involved in that one. It wasn't as clearcut as just a bad homicide by vehicle.

Realistically, the constable system is a cost-free system of service to the judicial branch and equally important to the taxpaying public.

The constable system provides a major service to the courts with little or no financial burden for its service. From an economic standpoint, it's a wise investment with little financial risk.

In an effort to ensure this continued service, it is necessary that various interest groups cooperatively work together to develop favorable adjustments to the constable system to assure continued service to the judicial system and the public.

2.0

In this regard, PSCA offers its knowledge and experience to those who might consider the crafting of legislation for the improvement of the constable system.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman

Caltagirone and the committee for the opportunity to

address you today. Should you have any specific

questions or comments, we are open to them.

And I believe that based on what Tom said here of 30 years of experience, I have 31 years of experience as a constable, so we are talking about in excess of 60 years between the two of us, both actively working as a constable on a day-to-day basis.

I also have a background in law enforcement, being a police officer and former detective. So with the combination of this, I think I can bring something to the job and to the table here today that will focus on making it a better system and a more

```
1
    competent constable.
2
            I want to thank everyone here for the
3
    opportunity to speak with you today.
 4
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Emil.
                                                      Τf
5
    you would just hold for questions.
6
            We had a couple of members join us. Please
7
    introduce yourselves for the record.
8
            REPRESENTATIVE BRENNAN: Representative
    Brennan, Lehigh and Northampton Counties.
9
10
            REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Good morning, and
11
    thank you. John Pallone, the 54th Legislative
12
    District, representing northern Westmoreland County
1.3
    and southern Armstrong County.
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay.
1 4
15
            Ouestions from the committee? Bill;
    Counsel.
16
            MR. ANDRING: Emil, as far as the unrelated
17
18
    duties you referred to, if you look at the statutes,
19
    they basically give constables the authority to
20
    provide security on Election Day, and if they are
21
    certified, to serve process. And the law, the
22
    statutory law, really doesn't say much more than
23
    that.
24
            MR. MINNAR: Correct.
25
            MR. ANDRING: In some counties, it is my
```

understanding that constables are used extensively to transport prisoners, but not all counties.

MR. MINNAR: Yes.

1.3

MR. ANDRING: Is that basically incorrect?

MR. MINNAR: Actually what happens is, and it is affected by the size of the sheriff's agency in many cases, also the police departments. However, there is a problem there.

First of all, any type of prisoner transport that is resulting from any action that deals with the Magisterial District Courts, certainly the judge is issuing the commitment order or the order to remove the defendant from prison, which is a direct relationship with the responsibilities.

However, constables sometimes are asked to perform transports, for instance, for police departments and so on. Now, there is nothing in the budget, you might say, of a police department for buying transportation services, and therefore, the constable has to bill the county to get paid for that action or function.

These are expenses which perhaps are unidentified but sooner or later build up and they are charged against constable activity, when realistically they should be charged against the

police department in that particular township or borough or whatever.

1.3

There are other areas where constables are asked to perform, or you might say encouraged to perform.

In addition to prisoner transports, you have transports of mental patients. You have transports from Children and Youth. These are separate additional activities for different agencies.

It is not the courts that we are working for. They may be the result of the courts, and it may be that it is a legal action on our part that we can do it, but this has not been identified, and it becomes a function of contracting the work out.

Well, now if the work is contracted out and the constable is performing for them, this isn't a bad idea. However, are they being trained for it? This is something we have to consider.

If we agree that they can do it, then what are we doing to make sure they do the job right? And this is not a responsibility of PCCD at this point, because they are addressing service to the courts.

If it is decided that these are services that are court related, fine, then include it; otherwise, let's look at additional training in some

other area.

1.3

There is also something else to be considered there -- transporting children. There have to be clearances. There have to be clearances on every individual who is involved in a transport who is transporting children. This isn't done right now. It may be done on a selective or elective basis by a particular county.

I teach around the State quite a bit for both Temple and Lackawanna. These schools expect us to get cleared, because somewhere along the way there are children under 18 on the premises. These are the kinds of things that we have to consider.

MR. ANDRING: In your experience, are there many constables who provide security guard or these types of services?

MR. MINNAR: Yes, more than I would like to see, to be very honest with you.

There are two forms of security, and I would like to break them out that way. One is for the courts. That's a justifiable form of security right there, and there is even a fee involved with that so that it pays for their effort and time.

However, the area that concerns me the most is the security that is performed for the

Burger Kings, the McDonalds, private operations that are not municipal or township related.

1.3

Now, in the past -- and I don't know if this will still hold true, but I know that it has not been changed at this point in time -- we asked the State Police to give us a position statement on security work which might be outside the realm of constable work. And the position that the State Police took, because they are responsible for Act 235, which, as you know, is the security act, it was said or decided or determined that if the constable was performing this work for a municipality or a leg of the government and being paid by the government agency, then that was acceptable.

If he was working for the ABC Security

Company guarding McDonalds, then he was being paid by

ABC and he was nothing more than a private individual

who should be 235 certified and should not be

functioning in a constable's uniform. I didn't mean

to go into that much detail, but that's a fine line

right there.

MR. ANDRING: Well, what you describe as the State Police position is my understanding of what the law requires.

MR. MINNAR: Right.

```
1
            MR. ANDRING: Are you saying that is a
2
    problem, though, statewide, people performing private
    services?
3
 4
            MR. MINNAR: Well, it's a problem in that it
    goes on, that it goes on. And, of course, as I
5
6
    mentioned before, is it misuse of the badge?
7
    Probably. Is it misuse of the constable in an area
8
    where he maybe is not trained? He is not certified
    in 235.
            MR. ANDRING: And my final question:
10
                                                  Do you
11
    find that there are a substantial number of
12
    constables who believe that they do have some sort of
1.3
    police powers?
            MR. MINNAR: Too many. I'll answer it that
14
15
    way -- too many.
            As an instructor in Act 44, I can tell you,
16
    I don't know how many times I have said with new
17
18
    students and in con ed, you are not a policeman; you
19
    can't do this, you can't do that. I quess they don't
2.0
    hear me.
21
            MR. ANDRING: Thank you.
22
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Gail.
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: I do have a question.
24
25
            I am a Magisterial District Judge. I have
```

served in the Judiciary for over 30 years, and I really feel that it is very important that the constables are accountable to the courts. And you certainly have made that statement this morning and you referenced the constables working for the courts.

2.0

It is very important to the Magisterial District Judges that constables are professional; they treat people with dignity and respect. And it is very important that constables are not free to move around from office to office.

If there is a problem in an office with a constable, it should be addressed. They have the ability to just move around from office to office, and the courts do not seem to have any control over them.

They engage in political activity, and within the judicial system, the Judges are not allowed to engage in political activity nor are the staff of the Magisterial District Judges.

So to have individuals who are working for the courts and, you know, allowed to engage in political activity and to move around and to not really have any control over them is -- it is a problem that we are faced with and it is a problem

that needs to be resolved, because they do work for the courts and they should fall under the judicial branch of government, but there has to be some accountability.

Also, I am concerned about the comment that you made that the constable system is a cost-free system.

MR. MINNAR: Relatively.

1.3

2.0

DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Back in the nineties, the constable system was a cost-free system, because when fees were collected, constables were paid based on fees that were collected.

I believe that the constables appealed that system and were successful and that was changed, that constables must be paid their fees within a short time frame, 15 or 20 days from the date of service.

So we aren't always able to collect fees on cases, if people are found not guilty or, you know, a case is dismissed. So I would be interested in meeting with you and having a discussion about your theory that this is a cost-free system.

And I definitely feel we need the constable system in Pennsylvania. The Magisterial District Courts need process servers. Our courts must be

served.

1.3

And in accordance with the Pennsylvania
Rules of Civil and Criminal Procedure, many of our
processes require hand service. We cannot tender
service by mail. Warrants cannot be served by mail.
Civil processes, landlord-tenant processes, and many
criminal processes cannot be instituted through the
mail.

So I definitely would be interested in meeting with you and going over some of these issues with you and attempting to professionalize our system, and hopefully eventually bring the constables under the judicial branch of government.

MR. MINNAR: I welcome your offer.

And I might say that in some of your references -- and I don't want to address them all right now. Certainly we can do that in some type of meeting that you would like to set up or call.

There is one right there that really hits me home, and that is the fact that if you have a constable who isn't performing correctly, don't give him any work. Don't give him any work. You cut off his money.

DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: No, you don't; he moves to another office.

MR. MINNAR: Well, that's fine; that's fine. 1 2 If he performs in the other office, okay, but if he doesn't perform in another office, he is going to 3 wear out very quickly. I base it on past experience. 4 I know constables who work out of county 6 because they will not get work in county because of 7 their performance factor. It's a shame, but this is where discipline should kick in. There should be 8 some form of discipline there. 10 DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: I agree. 11 MR. MINNAR: And I have seen President 12 Judges in the past issue orders saying that those within his Magisterial District should not issue work 1.3 to John Jones, Constable. 14 15 But I would; I would love to spend time, 16 because as I mentioned earlier, we are looking for a 17 cooperative effort that we can pursue so that we can work it out so it is mutually acceptable to 18 19 everyone. 2.0 And I concur with your comment about the fact that the courts need us and we need them. 21 22 DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Thank you. 23 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. 24 We have been joined by Representative

Josh Shapiro, a member of the committee.

25

And Representative Kula, do you have a question?

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Yes.

1.3

As a former Magisterial District Judge for 14 years, obviously I worked with constables each and every day, and they were an important function of our office in order to clear cases.

And I can tell you that it is the Supreme

Court that is after every Magisterial District Judge
to make sure that those cases are closed, that the
fines and costs are collected. And I can tell you
the Department of Transportation wants it even more
than anyone else, in most instances.

But I could never understand when a constable is certified, and 9 times out of 10, in a lot of areas, it is not the elected constable that is the certified constable in those areas. Am I correct?

MR. MINNAR: In many cases, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: That there are deputies that that elected constable has appointed, because technically, he is just an elected -- he or she -- is just an elected official and doesn't function as a certified constable.

MR. MINNAR: Can I speak from a very

practical and historical standpoint?

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Yes.

MR. MINNAR: There are an awful lot of constables out there, percentage-wise, who really didn't know what the job entailed when they were asked to run or chose to run for election.

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Yeah, but they are elected constables and can perform the duties of a constable, but for the performing services for the courts, because you have to be certified in order to perform those services.

MR. MINNAR: Well, I guess I am speaking heresy here, but as I said, I wanted to address the point.

You have a percentage of constables that are encouraged to run as candidates for constable who, first of all, have no idea what the job entails or what it might include in terms of training and so on.

You will also have those at the municipal level who say, that is an open slot; we better have a candidate for it. And Joe may never want to be a constable, but he is a nice guy, so he puts his name on the ballot.

He certainly doesn't -- he gets elected. He

certainly doesn't want to get involved; he is happy doing whatever he does. And therefore, in many cases, he will appoint a deputy, and it's the deputy who performs.

However, I have to make this point clear:
Working or not, the constable is responsible for the actions of the deputy. Therefore, if he has deputies out there who are working and are not conforming to acceptable practice, he is still responsible. It doesn't release him from it at all.

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: So in that instance, constables or deputy constables are somewhat supervised, or they do have someone, at least the deputy constables then would have someone that is supervisory.

MR. MINNAR: That would be a weak "yes."

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Okay. All right. But
we have established at least something.

But the part I could never understand in all of this certifying and working in order to perform services for the courts, that does not entail any supervisory capacity as to whether they retain their certification?

MR. MINNAR: Well, let's put it this way: Certification, at best, can only exist for 1 year,

1 and I think PCCD will point this out. 2 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: And---MR. MINNAR: But you must understand, you 3 not only have to be -- you take 80 hours of basic, 4 40 hours of firearms, and 20 hours per year for 5 6 con ed updates. 7 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Okay. MR. MINNAR: And also, one must have a 8 minimum of an insurance policy of \$250,000 per 9 incident, \$500,000 aggregate, and this occurs on an 10 11 annual basis. 12 So at best, if a person or a constable 13 doesn't pursue annual certification, he is out of business. 14 15 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Right. But what I am 16 saying is, say they do not -- say they are or maybe 17 do not perform their duties that are prescribed by 18 their training and the certification and what that 19 certification entails. There is no way that that 2.0 certification can be revoked because of that? 21 MR. MINNAR: No. No, it cannot be. 22 The only thing that can happen, as I alluded 23 to here, is that if they are not performing properly 24 or they are not treating the individuals in our

community or whoever they are serving---

25

```
1
            REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Okay.
2
            MR. MINNAR: I have always said, you get a
3
    lot more with honey than you do taking the world on,
    and in 31 years I never had to pull a weapon.
4
5
    blame that on salesmanship, not being---
 6
            REPRESENTATIVE KULA: A smooth talker.
7
            MR. MINNAR: Right; right. I like that.
            It is; it is salesmanship and psychology,
8
9
    believe me.
            REPRESENTATIVE KULA:
10
11
            MR. MINNAR: However---
12
            REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Being a District
13
    Judge, probably a question I was often asked was,
    were you ever in fear or were you ever afraid?
14
15
    Obviously I'm not the largest person in the world,
    but I quarantee you, if you treat people the way
16
    you want to be treated, you usually get that in
17
18
    response.
19
            MR. MINNAR: I agree with you.
20
            REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Other than at
    3 o'clock in the morning when they are highly
21
22
    intoxicated, but.
23
            MR. MINNAR: Right. And there is one other
24
    time, too.
25
            You know, many times -- I'm not a big person
```

myself, but sometimes you do have to serve some people that are from the wide world of wrestling or something.

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Sure.

1.3

MR. MINNAR: And under those conditions I have found out that sometimes it is really being candid and using a little bit of psychology: Look guy, the Judge sent me here; I am only the messenger on this.

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Right.

MR. MINNAR: And I also fill in by saying, you know, you must have had a hearing; there must have been a resolution at that hearing; you must have a judgment, and I guess you just ignored it. That's why I'm here.

And if you spell this out to them, they might not like the fact that you're there, but they don't become aggressive or uncooperative.

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Is that something, what I alluded to as far as the certification and if there is some type of unacceptable behavior during that certification period that is in force, is there some mechanism that could be established to remove someone or take away that certification if they do not perform to the standards that have been set up

```
by PCCD?
1
2
            MR. MINNAR: Okay. Well, Title 13 does have
3
    a couple instances in there for removal.
            If it is a criminal act or something
 4
5
    criminal in nature, they certainly can be removed by
6
    petitioning the courts or filing an action with the
7
    D.A. And in most cases, if it is substantial and has
    substance, then it should be considered.
8
            As I mentioned a little bit earlier, I have
10
    not seen as many filings as perhaps maybe there
11
    should have been for actions by some constables --
12
    for whatever reason. I see more now in the last year
1.3
    or so, and rightfully so. In my own mind, I have to
    say, what took them so long?
14
15
            REPRESENTATIVE KULA: But in some instances,
    I don't believe that every maybe violation rises---
16
17
            MR. MINNAR:
                         No; no.
18
            REPRESENTATIVE KULA: --- to the level---
19
            MR. MINNAR:
                         No.
20
            REPRESENTATIVE KULA: --- of a criminal
    charge.
21
22
            MR. MINNAR:
                         No.
            REPRESENTATIVE KULA: But does it rise to
23
24
    the level of being outside the scope of their duties
25
    and creating a problem for maybe the other constables
```

1 in their area or the District Judges? 2 And as I said many times, when that warrant is served, the only name anybody is going to remember 3 when that warrant is served is my name on that 4 warrant that issued it, or whatever Judge. And that 5 is why it is so important for the perception to be 6 7 there of being aboveboard, being honorable, and 8 performing those duties in a mannerly, courteous judicial way. MR. MINNAR: This is, I guess, the thrust of 10 11 our whole concern. We want them to be as 12 professional as possible in their performance. 1.3 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: And in most instances, 14 they are. 15 MR. MINNAR: Yes. REPRESENTATIVE KULA: And I can attest to 16 that. 17 18

MR. MINNAR: Yes.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: And they have a tough job, and I think a lot of the discrepancies among the district courts as to how they are paid, what services they are paid for, and how they account for those services, whether you have 10 warrants on someone and that constable gets all 10 warrants, and then it is paid for each and every one of all of the

```
1
    fees that go along with that, but you might go to
2
    another District Judge where that doesn't occur.
            So then I think you see where it is
 3
    selective as to what court you perform the services
 4
    for, because it is more financially lucrative to
5
 6
    perform in certain areas.
7
            MR. MINNAR: I would say that's a good
    motivation.
8
            REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Yes; it is.
10
            But it seems that there are a lot of issues.
11
    I am glad that this was brought to this committee's
    attention, and we look forward to looking into this
12
    further.
1.3
            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14
15
            MR. MINNAR: Thank you.
16
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.
17
            Members, any other questions?
18
            Counsel.
19
            MR. McGLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20
            Director Minnar, in your experience, do you
    feel that the current criminal system and civil
21
22
    system adequately address instances of constable
23
    misconduct?
24
            In other words, if it is criminal, the D.A.
25
    gets involved; if it is civil, the aggrieved person
```

could sue. Do you think that that is an adequate system for the present constable functions?

1.3

2.0

MR. MINNAR: As I said, I certainly see more of it today than I had 5 years ago.

Within the last year, there are a number of actions that have been filed that do hover on criminal actions, and certainly the courts are going to make that decision.

There is also a third way -- by petition. Any citizen can petition a court for removal of a constable for whatever reason. Obviously it is a substantial reason, but it is the court who makes that decision.

And more than once in my actions, I have told someone -- I get a call; someone is complaining about Constable Jones. I talk to the D.A. If the D.A. feels there isn't enough substance there, file a petition with the court, and obviously the court has the right to remove that constable.

MR. McGLAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you, sir. And one other question.

Do you think that as a representative of the organization, that we should consider or at least examine a system of distributing the work on an objective basis to all certified constables? Do you

think that is something we should look at?

MR. MINNAR: Well---

1.3

MR. McGLAUGHLIN: Rather than just, you know, if somebody is not performing to a personal standard that is set by, say, a Judge, not to give them work.

In other words, if they are certified, should they get a certain amount of work simply because they are certified and elected, or is the present system adequate?

MR. MINNAR: I will answer it this way: If you take a look at the geography of the State, there are areas in the State where the population is more dense than others, and there obviously are greater filings made, whether they be civil or some type of criminal action taken resulting in a fine, something of that nature.

With those high-density areas, you are obviously going to have a greater number of constables than you will out in Podunk. So under those conditions -- and if you look at the spread, we have some counties where a constable has served one, there was only one warrant issued for the year, and that warrant was served. Well, is it an area where obviously there are more deer and trees than there

1 are people? Or they are all good citizens -- one of 2 the two. Yet, you get near the bigger cities and so on or the adjacent areas -- I am out in Montgomery 3 County. We get all the overflow and the spill from 4 Philadelphia -- not that I'm picking on Philadelphia 5 -- plus we get our own. 6 7 So if there are more actions filed, there is 8 more work, there is more to get done, and it takes more constables to do it adequately. 10 MR. McGLAUGHLIN: That's what I am talking 11 In other words, in Montgomery County, 12 shouldn't the work be spread out equally over the certified constables ---1.3 MR. MINNAR: Well---14 MR. McGLAUGHLIN: ---rather than play 15 16 favoritism perhaps or ---17 MR. MINNAR: You can't bring a constable in from out of county. I won't say you can't. 18 19 I will; you can't bring a constable in from 20 out of county unless there is no constable in that 21 county who is certified and not willing to work. 22 So in plain words, as a Judge, I would have 23 that opportunity to request someone from Berks, 24 someone from Delaware County, to come in because I

don't have a constable available to perform my work

25

```
1
    in that area.
2
            And that was an amendment made, oh gosh, at
    least 5 years ago, and it was the result of a
3
    landlord-tenant action. But we found out later that
 4
    there was only one landlord-tenant action in that
5
 6
    county also which could have well been handled by the
7
    sheriff. But it does exist.
            MR. McGLAUGHLIN: Thank you, sir.
8
            MR. MINNAR: My pleasure.
9
10
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Are there any other
11
    questions?
            If not, gentlemen, thank you for your
12
13
    testimony. We certainly appreciate it.
            MR. MINNAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14
15
            MR. IMPINK: Thank you.
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We will next hear
16
    from the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and
17
18
    Delinquency, Michael Kane, Esq., Executive Director;
    and John Pfau, the Director of the Constables'
19
20
    Training Board.
21
            MR. KANE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22
            Good morning, and good morning to members of
23
    the committee.
            As you said, I'm Michael Kane. I'm the
24
    Executive Director at the Commission on Crime and
25
```

Delinquency. And next to me is Mr. John Pfau, who is the Director of our Bureau of Training Services. He oversees constables as well as sheriffs and deputy sheriffs' training.

2.0

We do appreciate the opportunity to participate in this hearing. I have submitted written remarks. I will just summarize those to kind of speed up the time a bit.

As you know, Act 44 of 1994 created the Constables' Education and Training Act and the Training Board that is housed within PCCD.

The act requires the board to provide curriculum development and delivery as well as timely and accurate constable certification and recertification.

PCCD staff coordinates the services of six training contractors and maintains fiscal responsibility over the funds that are generated through a surcharge on Minor Judiciary cases and which are maintained in a restricted account.

The act requires that all newly elected constables or appointed deputy constables attend and successfully complete a basic training program that is 80 hours in length in order to perform judicial duties.

If I could go off of script here, I think that we've heard testimony earlier today about whether there are duties that are not related to judicial functions, and just to make it clear that the board's focus and requirement is to focus on creating a curriculum that trains constables to take care of their judicial functions, not for any other functions that may be based on common law or some other theory.

1.3

In order to successfully complete the training program, an individual has to attend and participate in all the training that is scheduled and achieve passing scores on each of the modules that are presented to them, and there are 10 modules.

We provided a copy in the appendix of each of those modules for the committee.

An individual who receives less than

70 percent on the written test can take a retest, and if they don't complete that, then they have to start over and take the course over again. You can only do that twice in a calendar year, although I don't think we have ever had a situation where someone has not completed it after giving them opportunities to do that.

The Constables' Act also provides for a waiver for those constables going back to the initial date of the act who were essentially grandfathered in. But now more importantly, it pertains to constables who also serve as police officers or who have undergone the deputy sheriff's training.

1.3

And there's a waiver test that is given.

Listed in our remarks here are the areas that are covered by that. And to date, there are

652 constables who receive certification from the commission by successfully passing that waiver training.

Since the creation and certification process began, a total of 3,117 individuals have successfully completed either the basic training or the waiver examination.

The act also requires an annual continuing education program to maintain that certification.

Under the commission's present rules that we access, it can be up to 40 hours. The commission's present rules require a 20-hour continuing education program, and it has to be completed within a year in order to be certified in the coming year.

So a constable who does not take the training loses certification to perform judicial

duties, and I have listed the areas that are covered in that continuing education program.

We also started to provide in 2008 a voluntary optional training for those constables who wanted additional training in certain types of courses.

It is offered on a first come-first serve basis, but to date, there have only been approximately 15 percent of constables who have taken advantage of the opportunity to have this additional optional training. And I provided an appendix that includes a detail of what is available to the constables in an optional training.

Just a final statistic. There are currently maintained on the rolls within PCCD, there are 4,830 constables and deputy constables that are registered. However, of these, there are 1,277 who are currently active as constables and maintain their certification with the board.

Through the curriculum delivery, the board has contracted with Penn State University to develop, to refine, and to enhance that 80-hour basic training program.

Having a single training curriculum developer ensures a standardized approach to

instruction, course presentation, and content among the board's five regional training contractors. The curriculum includes the topical outlines, the instructors' outlines, et cetera.

1.3

2.0

I have listed in the written materials the contractors that we have that actually deliver the training. There are five separate contractors, and they represent universities and community colleges across the State.

You have also heard testimony about the firearms training. Act 44 gives PCCD and the board the responsibility for the establishment of firearms qualification criteria in order for constables to carry or use firearms in the performance of their judicial duties.

Actually, the act says in the performance of "any" duties, but the board has long focused, once again, on the judicial duties. And so the qualification goes to their ability to carry a firearm in the performance of those.

The board has structured the firearms qualification as an annual requirement similar to the continuing education. Constables take firearms training in one calendar year in order to be certified to carry in the subsequent calendar year.

Firearms training consists of initial training of 40-hours Basic Force Options, and then after that there is a 20-hour continuing firearms training program, of which 4 hours is classroom and the rest is on the firing range.

1.3

In order for the board to certify constables to carry firearms, it must also ensure they are legally eligible to possess, use, control, and transfer those firearms. So as a result of that, we do a background check just if they are making application to use a firearm to make sure that they don't have a disability or a previous conviction or something like that.

The 20-hour firearms course is, as I said, made up of both the classroom and the practical firing range, and there are passing scores that must be maintained in order to qualify.

Also, the board provides for an advanced firearms course. There are some constables that are very good, so the basic training course really doesn't give them the opportunity to hone some really additional skills, so we offer an advanced course that they can opt to take if they scored at a high score on the basic course, and some constables opt to take that advanced course.

To date, or during 2008, we had a total of 904 of the 1,200-some constables that are certified, 904 of them were certified to carry firearms under the act.

1.3

You all know about the financial support.

It is based on fees that are attached to the filing of a criminal docket or a defendant in a civil case.

There's a \$5 fee, and that goes into a restricted fund that is used by the board to provide this training.

The account at the end of last year had approximately \$1 million, a few thousand over that, in the balance of the account. And that is used for, obviously, training; it is used to provide additional training.

But beginning in 2004 with Act 233, the

Legislature provided that we can, because constables
only make their money off of receiving fees -
obviously, going to training is on their own time -
and so it allows the board to grant some

reimbursement for some of the costs of doing that

training, travel, and what have you.

As a practical matter, the commission just doesn't have the staff to go through every constable who might submit an \$8 bill for a lunch or a \$60 bill

for a hotel room, so the board just decided to give a flat-fee reimbursement to constables, and that's the way we do it.

1.3

We contracted in 2005 for a job task analysis, and we contracted with a firm called CALIBER to take a look at what are all the duties of a constable and how those duties may be translated into a training program.

CALIBER completed that job task analysis and presented its findings to the Constables' Board on September 10, 2007. And for the most part the evaluation determined that the program as it was provided, the curriculum as it was provided, was solid, but it recommended that there be some increased hours beyond the statutory maximum of 80 hours.

They recommended that the training itself should be during the course of 96 to 110 hours for the basic training, but the firearms course be extended from 40 hours to perhaps 44 hours.

That is, in a nutshell, what PCCD's involvement is. We thank you, obviously, as I said, for the opportunity to come here and present on the work of the Training Board, and we would certainly welcome the opportunity to answer questions that you

1 may have relating to that. 2 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: No questions? 3 comments? Members? 4 REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: May I ask a couple 5 of questions? 6 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Sure. 7 REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: Is there somewhere where I can go to find a basic explanation of the 8 duties and responsibilities of a constable? 10 MR. KANE: When you say "someplace," if you 11 are using the singular, I think the answer is no, that as we've heard earlier from the Constables 12 1.3 Association, there are some statutory functions, but there are also court cases and there is -- let me put 14 15 it this way. I think that there is confusion on the 16 answer. REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: That is why I am 17 asking that question, because I'm certainly confused. 18 19 MR. KANE: Well, yes. And I don't think 20 that anybody has a definitive answer as to what exactly are the duties of a constable to the extent 21 22 that a constable has been treated as a law 23 enforcement officer, going back to the common law duties of the law enforcement officers. The Supreme 24 2.5 Court has talked about, particularly in the area of

the sheriffs, what law enforcement means versus the police powers. I think that that is part of the problem that the board, the Training Board, faces.

The training, Act 44, focuses on the judicial functions of a constable, and the training is all geared towards those judicial functions, and they are fairly well laid out. But as to any other duties, or even not duties but rights that a constable would have by purpose of being elected to a law enforcement office, that is not clearly defined.

So as a result, there are constables, as has been referenced earlier today -- if you do a Google search for Pennsylvania constables, you will find instances where constables are doing bail-bond jumping, contracting with bail bondsmen to perform that work, doing other types of work like that.

REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: If it is not defined anywhere, shouldn't it be? Shouldn't we be able to go someplace to answer that question?

I mean, we have people out there who are carrying guns and may not even have the power to arrest and sorts of other things, and we don't know what their obligations and duties are.

1 MR. KANE: Right. I think in fairness to 2 citizens as well as in fairness to constables that 3 there is a need to have a single codified explanation of what the duties are of a constable. That would 4 assist PCCD to develop training, to make sure that 5 6 they were well trained to carry out those duties, and 7 that there were no functions that went beyond that that were permissible. 8 I think that everybody would agree that that 10 would be a good thing. 11 REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: I have a couple of 12 other things. 1.3 In just looking at the material I have here -- I think it is the third page -- there are 4,830 14 15 constables and deputy constables registered with PCCD. 16 17 MR. KANE: Yes. 18 REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: And of these, 1,277 19 are currently active. 2.0 Now, are there constables and deputy constables that are not registered with PCCD? 21 MR. KANE: Yes. I don't know the number of 22 23 them, but clearly there are some, as we have heard 24 earlier, who are elected and then choose, for 25 whatever reason, not to take the training and become

certified.

There are other constables, I believe, that are elected and choose not to take the training because they don't have a desire to perform the judicial work but maybe are earning a living doing other things, like working for bail bondsmen, working for other -- as I say, if you go on the Internet, you will find examples of some constables in Pennsylvania who have a grocery list of things that they hold themselves out as available to do on a contract basis.

So I think that of the 1,200 that are certified, they are certified to do those judicial functions, but there are certainly other elected constables and appointed deputy constables who choose not to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: What is the result, if any, of not being registered?

MR. KANE: Well, not being registered means that you can't perform work for the Judiciary.

The registration database is provided to AOPC, and if work is going to be given to a constable, that constable's name has to appear as a certified constable in that database.

REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: Well, let me ask it

```
1
    the other way around then.
2
            MR. KANE: Yes.
            REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: What can you do if
 3
    you are not registered?
4
            MR. KANE: Well, I think that that's the
5
    real question, what can you do? If you are a
6
    law---
7
            REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: That is one of the
8
    things I'm trying to ask you.
9
            MR. KANE: Sure. If you are an elected
10
11
    official who has law enforcement powers, does that
12
    give you the authority to, for example, work for a
    bail bondsman to effect an arrest? As a law
1.3
    enforcement officer, you have arrest powers. Can you
14
15
    work for a bail bondsman on a percentage basis or a
    fee basis? Can you work---
16
17
            REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: Can they make an
18
    arrest?
19
            MR. KANE: Certainly, as a law enforcement
2.0
    officer.
21
            REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: If you are working
22
    on a fee basis, aren't you therefore working as a
23
    private citizen?
24
           MR. KANE: Well, that's the real question
25
    that---
```

REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: I mean, I'm not trying to argue here, even though that is what I'm doing.

1.3

I am trying to get a grasp on, what is it that constables do?

MR. KANE: I think you are asking the question exactly what the issue is, is that there isn't a definitive answer to that.

What are the duties and responsibilities of a law enforcement officer in Pennsylvania versus a police officer? Obviously the duty or the power to make an arrest if there is an outstanding warrant I believe will come with that.

If that arrest warrant is issued as a result of jumping bail and the bail bondsman is on the hook for the amount of the bail, the bail bondsman has an interest and often does go out and make the arrest for the failure to appear. But there is nothing probably that would prohibit the bail bondsman from hiring the constable to go out and do that.

And when I say there is nothing to prohibit,

I'm not talking about the Ethics Act and using your

elected office and things like that. But I think

your question points out some of the, from the

commission's perspective, some of the issues that we

1 deal with, and that is that there are things that 2 perhaps are within the powers of a constable that don't necessarily tie into a judicial function, yet 3 we are expected to train constables but solely within 4 the confines of those judicial functions. 5 6 having that kind of clarity in legislation I think 7 would benefit everybody. REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: This will be, 8 hopefully, my last question, at least at this 9 10 point.

Two pages down you say "...a total of 904 constables achieved or maintained their firearms certification under the mandates of Act 44."

MR. KANE: Yes, sir.

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: Does that mean that there are constables who are carrying guns that are not licensed?

MR. KANE: Well, that's a good question. Let me put it this way.

Under the act, you cannot carry a gun in the performance of your judicial duties without being certified, and so the 900-and-some who seek that certification can carry a gun when they go out to serve process as requested by the court.

On the other hand, the statutes in general,

the criminal code, the Crimes Code, Title 18, has a provision that allows a law enforcement officer to carry a weapon.

1.3

So in the conduct of nonjudicial duties, that certification doesn't apply. It only applies in connection with performing judicial duties. So if a constable has powers beyond that and carries a gun, that is a criminal law question.

REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: All right.

I mean, I just think that there is a relatively recent Supreme Court case on the issue of whether a sheriff is a law enforcement officer, and that is a sheriff as opposed to a constable, and I just think that this is an issue that we have got to get our hands around.

I don't know that anybody knows the answer to the question.

MR. KANE: And I---

REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: I mean, there are people out there carrying guns and making arrests, and we don't know if they're allowed -- I mean, they are -- or where the lines are drawn.

MR. KANE: Well, you know, as I say, it is a criminal law issue under Title 18, what constitutes a violation of carrying a concealed weapon, carrying a

1 prohibitive offensive weapon. 2 There's an issue involving Tasers. Can a 3 constable carry a Taser? There is a specific provision about possession of Tasers. It actually, I 4 think, is fairly unclear that, can a private citizen 5 6 possess a Taser? can a constable possess? 7 The problem is that in the county, the District Attorney as the chief law enforcement 8 officer makes that decision, and there are certain counties that we have been advised of where the 10 11 District Attorney has felt that that is not something 12 that a constable can carry as part of doing his 1.3 official duties. In other counties, that's not a problem. 14 15 REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: All right. Thank 16 you. 17 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. 18 19 Counsel Andring. 2.0 MR. ANDRING: Just to clarify something. 21 You mentioned several times the arrest 22 authority of constables, and I would hope you are 23 talking about their authority to arrest in terms of 24 executing a warrant issued by a court or a District

Justice. I hope you are not suggesting that

25

```
1
    constables have general police powers.
2
            MR. KANE: No; no, not at all.
            MR. ANDRING: I just want to make that clear
 3
    for anybody who might be watching this.
4
            MR. KANE: No, not at all. What I am saying
 5
    is that if there is a warrant, who the constable is
 6
7
    working for. If it is executing as part of the court
    function, that is one thing. If he is executing as
8
    part of a contract with a bail bondsman, that is
10
    something completely different. But certainly I am
11
    not suggesting that they have police powers.
12
            MR. ANDRING: Okay. Thank you.
1.3
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Mr. Krieger.
14
            REPRESENTATIVE KRIEGER:
                                      Thank you,
15
    Mr. Chairman.
            In previous testimony, there was a reference
16
    to a case in 1983, and my understanding from that
17
    case is that at that point, the President Judge's
18
19
    authority to supervise constables was removed. Is
20
    that your understanding as well?
21
            MR. KANE: Yes. And right now Title 13,
22
    as was mentioned earlier, has a provision for
23
    removal.
24
            But I think that the difference, it is one
25
    thing to have the authority to remove; it is another
```

```
1
    thing to have the authority to supervise, and
2
    certainly you get into all kinds of constitutional
    issues whenever one branch of government is
3
    supervising a member of another branch of
 4
    government.
5
            That is different from, obviously you have
 6
7
    the authority to impeach a member of the Executive.
    So the Judiciary has, on petition for malfeasance or
8
    commission of a crime, the authority to remove, but
10
    the issue is, who has the authority to discipline?
11
    And there really isn't anybody out there that has the
12
    power to do something short of, you know, essentially
    the death penalty for a constable.
1.3
            REPRESENTATIVE KRIEGER: Now, some of the
14
15
    problems we have been addressing here today, were
    those problems present before 1983 when the
16
17
    constables were under the supervision of the
18
    President Judge?
19
            MR. KANE: I really have to pass on that,
20
    because I wasn't around then, at least in
    Pennsylvania, and so I don't know historically.
21
22
    I'm sure that there are people in the room here who
23
    could answer your question. I'm sorry.
24
            REPRESENTATIVE KRIEGER:
                                      Thank you.
```

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Certainly.

Any other questions?

Let me just say this as an appointed member to the board. I would hope that we would take a close look at raising the bar on the education. And I know some of the recommendations that I read previously, and they are also included here about increasing some of the basic training and some of the other areas on the recommendations, and I would like to take it to heart that the board would absolutely consider making those changes.

In addition to that, as previously mentioned, one of the things that we definitely want to do when we do the compilation is possibly give some clarity and definition as to what those duties specifically are and what is expected.

I think that would help everybody so that they would know exactly what they can and can't do, and if you step outside that area, then you are acting as a private citizen or you have to go through some other mechanism to get licensed, if it is going to be a bounty hunter or something else.

We have legislation, of course, that we are doing with that very issue, by the way, on that licensing. That is Representative Walko's

legislation. But I definitely want to work very closely with you on trying to establish the standards and additional education and training.

2.0

I mean, one, oftentimes I have looked at this and I say, you know, on the physical and the mental issues, I don't know how you address that.

You know, anybody can run for office, anybody can get elected, but if there are problems that are there, how do you deal with them? And I'm not just singling out the constables. People think that I'm a little crazy.

MR. KANE: If I could comment on that,

Mr. Chairman.

That is something that the board -- and I should mention that Judge Richard Opiela, who is the Chairman of the Constables' Education Board, is present here today, and I know that he struggles with that with the members of the board, that you are dealing with an elected official---

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Right.

MR. KANE: ---and then telling an elected official, well, you know, you are not in shape to carry a gun, and how do you do that? You can't. So that also, I think, needs to be clarified.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay. I look forward

```
1
    to working with you, and we will be facing these
2
    issues certainly on the board and legislation will be
3
    developed.
 4
            MR. KANE:
                        Thank you.
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    Thank you, sir.
 5
 6
            We will next hear from Larry Maggi, a
7
    Washington County Commissioner, Chair of the County
    Commissioners Association, the Courts and Corrections
8
    Committee; and also Sandy Graffius from the Berks
    County Controller's Office.
10
11
            You can come up, Karen, if you would like
12
    to.
1.3
            MS. COATES:
                         That's okay.
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: She is Republican
14
15
    Counsel to the committee. We work very closely
    together.
16
            If you would like to start.
17
18
            MR. MAGGI: Good morning, Chairman
19
    Caltagirone and members and staff of the House
20
    Judiciary Committee.
21
            My name is Larry Maggi, and I'm a retired
    State Trooper after 25 years, and also I served as a
22
23
    Washington County sheriff for 6 years. And right now
24
    I'm the current Washington County Commissioner.
25
            Where the State Trooper people respected me,
```

the sheriff people liked me, as County Commissioner, everybody hates me. So with that, I will get started onto my testimony.

I am here speaking on behalf of the association and as a member of the Board of Directors and as the Chair of the CCAP Courts and Corrections Committee.

As you know, CCAP is a nonprofit, nonpartisan association providing legislative, training, insurance, technology, research, and similar services for all of the Commonwealth's 67 counties. And I would like to thank you for the opportunity to offer our perspective on the issue of constable reform.

There are a number of areas where in the CCAP Platform, which includes all of our members' policy positions, in that platform it contains a plank supporting the change in the statute to allow the option for county governments to abolish the Office of Constable, and the following policy was adopted into our Pennsylvania Counties Platform:

"The Association supports legislation authorizing the county governing body to abolish the office of constable," and that was added in 1993 and amended in 2002.

Now, in the absence of legislation as mentioned above, CCAP members have adopted additional positions with regard to constables, including the creation of an oversight structure to assure accountability to some entity that has authority.

While several of these commenting today are likely to mention this issue, I want to convey that CCAP members share that view, although we do not believe that the county commissioners should be the entity to provide oversight.

An entity with which constables have a close working relationship may be the most viable, and we urge the committee to develop legislation to establish a supervisory structure.

And another concern relates to the need for refinement to the recent fee-increase legislation. In 2006, Act 59 made significant changes to the constable fee structure in nearly every area, including mileage, allowances for constables to operate in pairs for certain operations, and other matters.

And one particular change now permits a constable to collect fees on the basis of docket numbers served as opposed to a per-warrant charge. But the change has been very disturbing to the

counties and has led to costly situations where a constable makes one single trip to a single location to serve a warrant with numerous docket numbers included, and the constable can now bill a separate fee for every docket number included in that warrant at a rate of \$25 per docket while making only one trip to one location.

CCAP supports a change in the fee structure, one again, allowing only one charge per warrant and regardless of the number of dockets listed on the warrant.

While it is true that the constable fees are to be borne by the defendants, the reality is, the defendants are frequently unable to pay the whole array of fines, costs, and fees.

And the process of constable payments requires that counties pay the constable based upon his or her submitted claim within 30 days of it being submitted. I think that answers one of your questions, Madam.

DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Thank you.

MR. MAGGI: The county must then collect the reimbursement of those fees from the responsible party, which in many cases is impossible. If a defendant is found innocent, is determined by a Judge

to be indigent, or is unable to pay fees, costs, and other charges, the counties have no way to recover the fees already paid to the constable.

If a defendant makes a partial payment of fees and costs, the established priority of how the payments are disbursed sets constable fees near to the last priority, and counties would only receive payment after other priorities are met, if they ever are.

And in the 6 months following the passage of Act 59, counties across the Commonwealth realize increases of more than 50 percent of their constable billings and their constable fee budgets.

For example, in Armstrong County, the constable fee budget was \$82,000 in 2006 and then \$124,000 in 2007, an increase of almost 51 percent. And in Berks County, the constable fee budget increased \$600,000, and that went from \$2,050,000 to \$2,650,000.

And the third plank in our position related to constables supports the elimination of the requirement that they be present at polling places on Election Day. The association believes that constables should no longer be required to be present at each polling place in every election district, and

the decision to eliminate or maintain their presence should be at the option of the local election board.

1.3

But this provision requires counties to pay wage costs to fund this position, which is unnecessary given that there is rarely a task to be performed. And by allowing the county the option to determine whether to employ constables at the polls, commissioners can also take into account local circumstances and make the decisions that are best for their communities.

And for 2009, CCAP members developed a list of mandates that create costs for counties which we support modifying or eliminating. We have published a Mandate Relief List seeking legislative change in a number of areas. Given the economic climate, it would help counties control costs and produce savings for taxpayers.

And the list includes two of the provisions discussed above, as I just mentioned, including a revision to Act 59 of 2006 on constable fees, as well as the provisions relating to county determinations on constables at polling places.

In closing, CCAP urges the committee to study ways to create a system of oversight for the

Office of Constable. 1 2 CCAP also urges the committee to support the 3 legislation that would lessen the burden of mandates 4 on county governments in this trying budgetary time. A change in the language in the constable fee 5 structure from docket number to warrant served and 6 7 eliminating the requirements for constables at polling places would do just that. 8 We look forward to working with this 10 committee in the development of legislation to revise 11 and reform the operation of constables in the Commonwealth. 12 1.3 Once again, I would like to offer my thanks to this committee, and we will be able to take any of 14 15 your questions. 16 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. 17 If we could hear from Sandy next, and then 18 we'll open it up. 19 MS. GRAFFIUS: Do you want to do that? 20 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Sure. 21 MS. GRAFFIUS: Okay. I also brought my 22 experts, but they're sitting in the second row. 23 don't want to get pushy, but ---24 I'm Sandy Graffius, and I'm the Controller 25 of the County of Berks.

And before I go any further, you were able to mention that we are \$2,600,000. When I came into office in 2004, we were \$1,500,000. So in 5 years, that is how much we jumped. Scary, isn't it? MR. MAGGI: Yes, it is. MS. GRAFFIUS: Okay. I'm Sandy Graffius, Controller for the County of Berks. I want to thank Representative Tom Caltagirone and the committee for inviting us here today to express our issues with current statute governing the constables. With me today is Rick Miller, who is part of our internal auditing staff from the Controller's Office, and Barb Crossley, who is our number cruncher. She is a collections manager with the Court Administration in Berks County. We spent hundreds of hours last year reviewing fees billed by the constables serving in the County of Berks' 18 Magisterial District Courts. We conducted our review based on concerns of inappropriate billings brought to our attention in January of 2008. The County of Berks established a hotline, and it goes to the HR Department, and we were able to

get some of these concerns to us through the hotline.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

That is when we started our investigation.

1.3

In addition, in September of 2008, a committee was established to review and update the constable manual used in the County of Berks.

Members of the committee attended seven meetings and had made revisions to the constable procedures manual as of February 1. We changed our individual manual for the county.

Sitting on that committee was the President Judge and the sheriff and a commissioner and two constables and two Magisterial District Judges and the Controller.

The Controller's Office has compiled our issues and proposed recommendations, and we presented them to Representative Caltagirone in his Berks County office on Monday, January 12.

We indicated that many sections in the current statute are vague. Thus, they are open for different interpretations in all 67 counties.

Clarification and simplification of the fee bill would result in uniformity for all the counties in Pennsylvania.

Constable costs paid by the counties and never collected due to nonpayment of defendants or dispositions such as not guilty or dismissed are the

burden at the government level. As defendants are attempting to pay the constable costs, State and county funds are not being paid.

2.0

Counties are prepaying the constable fees, and defendants are being incarcerated in lieu of those fines and costs, thus creating counties to not only pay the fees for the defendant to be incarcerated but also having to reimburse the constable fees. So we get a double hit. We have to pay for their incarceration as well as the constables.

The following is a position of the Controller and not necessarily the position of the President Judge of Berks County. Let us all listen to that disclaimer.

Our issues are primarily concentrated on 42 Pa.C.S.A. Section 2950, and we started with the statute so that we could give you our ideas on how some of this stuff can be nailed down.

42 Pa.C.S.A. Section 2950(c): "Additional persons: A constable or deputy constable when he is transporting a prisoner, serving a felony or misdemeanor warrant or serving a warrant on a juvenile or a defendant of the opposite sex may at his discretion, be accompanied by a second constable

or deputy constable who is certified under section 2947...." What does that mean? It means they can make the choice to take a second constable or deputy constable if they choose to.

If it would say "shall," it would mean they have to. If it says "may," it means at their discretion.

"In such cases, each officer shall receive
the fee set out in this section. In all other civil,
landlord-tenant and summary criminal cases, the
issuing authority may authorize payment to a second
officer." So what that does is it gives the choice
to the constable to take along a second person, which
immediately doubles the fees.

In such cases, each officer shall receive the fee set out in this section. We understand the concern for constable safety, which is why we always get the idea that they have to have a second person. But in the County of Berks, almost all the prison transports are performed and billed by two constables.

Based on this scenario, the defendants will be changed \$86 in server fees -- \$43 for each person -- in addition to the fines and other court-related costs. And we will get later to some scenarios on

how this all works out.

1.3

Our issue: Should the constables determine if a second constable is necessary or should the Judge or issuing authority that requested the constable service? Since it is the constables who would both be receiving payment for the service, it is in their financial interest to always work as a pair.

Our recommended options would be to set a limit to the number of services to be paid per constable; i.e., three warrants each, as they do in Chester County. Split the warrants between the constables. Pay the constables for the warrants only issued to them.

What happens is, there are warrants that go out to the same defendant and they are given to different constables. When the constable brings the person in to the M.D.J., they get all the warrants in the system. It doesn't matter who else has them. Anybody else that is carrying them around in the trunk of their car, they just lose it. It all goes to the person who takes the defendant in.

Pay the constables for the warrants only issued to them. Two constables may charge for transportation of a defendant such as conveyance, if

they are both there, custody, and commitment. We think that if they are there helping to serve each other, they should be paid for transporting. They should be paid for the commitment. They should not be paid for all the warrants. That is Berks County's Controller, not the President Judge's opinion.

1.3

Implemented February 1, 2009, from the recommendations of some on our constable manual committee: a new process with the Berks County Prison that requires all constables transporting prisoners to sign a form that is sent to the Controller's Office. If this form is not signed by the constables, they are not paid.

What we did was we set up a partnership with the correctional officers at the County of Berks, and they have a time-stamp machine there. And what the form does is it asks the two correctional officers to sign saying that both constables are there doing work, and then they go ahead and time-stamp it. We found that we were getting charged for two constables and there weren't always two constables inside the prison. So it was very hard to prove that there were two constables transporting.

With this time-stamp effort, what is happening is there is no loss in the chain of

command. And the sheets stay with the correctional officers and they are sent down to our office twice a week, so that when we get billed from the constables for doing prison runs, we can tell immediately by looking at those sheets that are coming from the prison whether or not both people were there. It is helping to keep honest people honest.

2.0

Pa.C.S.A. Section 2950(g): "Criminal cases -- Fees in criminal cases shall be as follows," and this is from the statue as it now exists:

"For executing each warrant of arrest, or for effectuating the payment of fines and costs by attempting to execute each warrant of arrest, \$25 for each docket number and \$2.50 for each return of service, plus mileage."

What does "effectuating payment" mean? How many counties allow mailing a warrant card as effectuating payment for a defendant that comes into court by themselves to make the payment?

When our constables mail out their warrant cards and the person comes in voluntarily to pay for that card that was mailed out, that is effectuating payment the way it is set up now because of the fuzziness of the statute. Does mailing the warrant card or having the person come in and pay it

voluntarily mean that the constable gets paid for the warrant? So effectuating payment, that's a toughy.

Should the payment be only for that warrant card and not all outstanding warrants for that individual?

"For taking custody of a defendant,..."

which is \$5 per defendant. "Custody" means being

physically with the defendant at all times. We

suggest this should be restated as "for taking and

maintaining custody," because what happens is, when

they are dropped off at the sheriff's central

processing to get fingerprinting and stuff like that,

the constables, the way it is set up now, they can

charge holding and they are in the possession of

another body of officers, with the sheriff's people.

But the constables are allowed to charge holding

time, because it is fuzzy.

"For attendance at arraignment or hearing, \$13." Issue/recommendation: "attendance" means both the defendant and the constable are in the same room or location. The constable attendance may be needed to protect the Judge from the defendant. An option would be a video conference where the defendant is incarcerated at another location away from the Judge and the constable. The constable attendance becomes

```
1
    unnecessary, and therefore, no payment would need to
2
    be made.
            "For executing discharge, $5 per defendant."
 3
    Issue/recommendation: rewording as executing
 4
    discharge "from court by judge."
5
            "For executing commitment, $5 per
 6
7
    defendant." Issue/recommendation: commitment charge
    is appropriate only when the constable physically
8
    commits or recommits a defendant to jail on a case
9
10
    before the M.D.J. and executes the appropriate forms
11
    with the prison.
            "For executing release, $5 per defendant."
12
    Reword it as executing release "by" a law enforcement
13
    agency into the "custody of" a constable.
14
                                                This is
    not for release from the court; this is a discharge.
15
            "Transporting each nonincarcerated defendant
16
    to jail, $17, plus mileage; transporting an
17
18
    incarcerated prisoner, $38 per prisoner, plus an
19
    hourly rate of $13 per hour, plus mileage.
20
    Computation of hourly rate applies after the
    expiration of the first hour per prisoner per hour,
21
22
    not to exceed $26 per hour per prisoner."
23
            When we were looking at this holding time,
    if there's a lag time in the M.D.J. offices, we felt
24
25
    that it was important for the constable to get some
```

kind of remuneration for this holding time, because it was not their fault that they were not able to get into the M.D.J. So in our new manual, we have a half an hour, and then after that they get paid holding time.

If they go back to the jail and the jail can't accept them right away and they are outside with their prisoner in their custody, we will pay them holding time after a half an hour for that also.

Issue/recommendation: redefine a transport of an incarcerated prisoner as a two-way trip from the prison to the courts and back to the prison.

A transport is not a one-way trip to court and/or a handoff to another set of constables for an additional partial trip to another court. Remember, the constable who signed out that prisoner has the responsibility for custody and the return of the individual.

What we are finding is that the constables are taking defendants to a court in Berks, and they have a hearing at another court, and they will hand them off to two more constables to go to the other court and then take them back to the prison. What happens is, the chain of custody is broken, and the

prison has no idea where that defendant is.

There are several ways to solve this, which we can talk about later. But that is very dangerous precedent to set for the prison, because that means that the constable who picks them up does not continue to have them in custody until they go back to the prison.

"Receipt of the fees for transporting a nonincarcerated defendant under paragraph (9) shall not exclude receipt of the fees under paragraphs (6) and (8) for that transport.

Don't you love the way this jumps around?

"Receipt of the fees for transporting an incarcerated prisoner under paragraph (9) shall exclude receipt of the fees under paragraphs (2),

(3), (4), and (7) for that transport."

Issue/recommendation: explain that those fees are included in the \$38 fee. Sections 9, 10, and 11 are very unclear and clarification and simplicity is needed.

"For conveying defendants for fingerprinting..." The same as paragraph (9): responsibility for defendants is not to be handed off to another law enforcement agency that completes fingerprinting. Remember, the task is not complete

until the defendant arrives at their final and intended destination.

1.3

2.5

In looking at the overall fee bill, we think it is important to see in black and white exactly what the ramifications are. For this reason, examples are attached with exactly what can be charged for service of warrants with two constables when they are working together.

The attachment represents a few examples, and fees can vary depending on the situation.

Additional fees, such as holding time, could apply in some cases as well as fingerprinting and so forth.

In considering revisions, also please consider the time and staff it takes to monitor and review constable cost sheets for processing payments with multiple charges.

For example, our sheriff, who is mandated by statute, charges a simple arrest fee and a fee for each warrant. Additional fees would be a commitment or a discharge. Section (g) particularly is confusing by adding \$5 fees for custody conveyance and so forth. The sheriff fee schedule is easy to understand and calculate fees to defendants.

I don't know how many of the cost sheets you have seen from the different counties, but ours has

about 10 boxes that have to be checked going down through, and our girls who do the payment have to sit there and go down through all those boxes to make sure that they are being charged correctly. This takes a lot of staff time.

On your attachment, you will see there is a warrant, custody, conveyance to court, arraignment, conveyance to jail, transport non-incarcerated, commitment, and mileage if assessed. When you are done figuring all that out, the total comes to \$77.50 for each constable. That is without mileage.

If you bundle some of the costs so that we don't have to go through all this, I checked with our sheriff to see by statute what they have to charge. They charge \$30 for an arrest and \$9 for each warrant. Bang; that is it -- \$30 for an arrest, \$9 for each warrant. We don't go through all this transport, commitment, mileage, conveyance, arraignments, and all the rest of that stuff.

When you look down at the second piece where they are not taken to prison, it is \$55.50 for each constable, or \$111 obviously, and then you have mileage.

One of the things I wanted to talk about, because some of the folks spoke to you earlier, we do

have in Berks County the revenue for the year that we get from the M.D.J. offices, and we also have the server piece paid by the defendant and we also know what we paid out to our constables. I don't have that here, but we do have that if you folks want to see it.

1.3

The way we handle deputies in Berks County, which is another suggestion I would like to make to you, we decided several years ago, since there were constables that were paying to be elected and campaigning and putting out their own money to do so, that deputy constables being brought into the system was going to take work away from our regular elected constables. So as a Controller's Office, we took the stand that deputy constables were going to be few and far between, because that does take work away from the elected officials.

In order to encourage the constables not to have deputies, in order to encourage the deputies to have to report to someone, we make all the constables bill their deputy fees under their name. So at the end of the year when there are 1099s and all that stuff, this has to all be done through the regular constable and not through the deputy. That then helps the deputy at least report to the constable for

```
1
    their money, because unless it is signed by a
2
    constable, we won't pay.
            I will entertain any questions, and if they
 3
    are really, really significant, I'm going to ask
4
    Rick and Barb to answer you.
5
 6
            Yes?
7
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: I have a question.
            As part of your audit, do you ever contact
8
    defendants and talk with defendants?
9
            MR. MILLER: Yes, we do.
10
11
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Do you want to come up
    here?
12
1.3
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: You do spot audits?
            MR. MILLER: Yes. We actually have the
14
15
    D.A.'s office go out and talk to the defendants.
            What we find out a lot of times, though, is
16
17
    that the defendant has been compromised by the
18
    constable, because the constable has talked to them
19
    already.
2.0
            And they don't understand what they are
21
    being billed for, so they say, oh, this guy, he was
22
    such a nice guy, and then the guy says, well, he
23
    billed you for conveyance even though he didn't put
24
    you in the car.
25
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH:
                                    Okay.
```

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Do you want to just identify yourself for the record.

1.3

MR. MILLER: Yes. I'm Rick Miller. I'm with the internal auditing with Berks County.

DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: And you made the comment, let's help keep honest people honest and we have extra controls in place in Berks County in order to do that.

Do you really feel that we should have to have extra controls in place to keep people honest?

Either they are honest or they aren't, and once they demonstrate they are not honest, they do not deserve to be working for the courts.

MS. GRAFFIUS: Let me get back to the problem of who supervises them and how you take their work away.

You know, because you are from Berks also, that we are in the process right now of prosecuting two constables because they were -- it was proven that they were not billing correctly. And the only way I can control that situation is not to pay them, because there is no oversight.

I don't know who to put in the place of the oversight. If I had that answer, I would be sitting up with you guys.

1 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: One day maybe. 2 MS. GRAFFIUS: No thank you. I'll stay in 3 Berks. But that's the problem, that we don't -- do 4 I think everybody should be honest? 5 Yes. 6 perfect world, would they be? Yes. But when you 7 have latitude, sometimes things slip through the cracks and it just spreads to all of them, and then 8 we start seeing it happen and we start cracking down 10 on payments. 11 DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Well, perhaps the 12 Magisterial District Judges need to take more responsibility in reviewing some of those invoices 13 that are being submitted. Because I feel as an 14 15 elected official that I have a duty in not running 16 unnecessary costs up on a case, and I know that not 17 every District Judge feels that way, and maybe it is 18 time we all sit down and look into that very 19 issue. 20 MS. GRAFFIUS: Could I be invited to that, please? 21 22 DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Certainly. 23 I actually requested to serve on the 24 committee that looked into the issues in Berks 25 County. I was not appointed to that committee, and

1 unfortunately, there wasn't a lot of feedback from 2 the District Judges who were on that committee to the other Magisterial District Judges, until the end of 3 the process. So we didn't really have a lot of 4 5 input. MS. GRAFFIUS: We got a lot of tightening 6 7 done in the manual. We really did, and it is much better. Inch by inch, everything's a cinch. 8 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: If I may just jump in 10 here. 11 I did meet with the Chief Justice, and we 12 did share some concerns about several counties having 13 different manuals. And there is no uniformity with these manuals, and that is one of the things that we 14 are going to have to take a look at, because in this 15 16 particular situation, there should be some uniformity 17 statewide. I think it just makes some good sense. 18 MS. GRAFFIUS: I think Berks is really one 19 of the most lenient, and I don't quite know how we 20 got there. We are tightening up as we go. 21 Yes? 22 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Counsel? Sure. 23 MR. ANDRING: You know, I read the stories 24 in the newspapers up in Berks County about the 25 constable fees and the totals being paid out, and the

problem I have is, I see those numbers in the paper, some of which seem incredibly excessive. Then I look at your attachment here, at the amounts that are actually paid.

1.3

2.0

I mean, when you look at these charges, for somebody to go out, execute a warrant, arrest a defendant, put them in a car, drive them to court, sit through the hearing, after the hearing drive him to prison, and do that all entirely on his own dime in terms of equipment, benefits, everything, you know, these charges are certainly not outrageous. I don't even know that---

MS. GRAFFIUS: Do you want the reality of it? Yes.

MR. ANDRING: And what I don't understand is how we get these costs that you are looking at here -- \$77.50 or even \$150 if you are talking two constables -- and those numbers that I see in the paper, and somewhere there is a disconnect there.

MS. GRAFFIUS: Okay. Under---

MR. ANDRING: And then I think you mentioned that you have a lot of data, and I think maybe if you would give us some of that and we could see where the disconnect is coming from.

```
MS. GRAFFIUS: Well, your $155 is your one
1
2
    defendant, one warrant.
 3
            MR. ANDRING: Right.
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Let me tell you something:
 4
5
    The one warrants get left behind for the ones that
    are 20 warrants and 30 warrants.
 6
7
            MR. ANDRING: 20 and 30?
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Yeah.
8
            MR. ANDRING: And they are billing for all
9
    20 and 30 at one time?
10
11
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Correct. That's correct.
12
    That pushes the numbers up. They are huge.
            MR. ANDRING: And the counties are doing
1.3
    nothing administratively to address that?
14
                                                I mean,
15
    you referenced Bucks County---
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Well, the person has a
16
    warrant, and so they go ahead and serve the warrant.
17
18
            MR. ANDRING: But you referenced in your
19
    testimony Bucks County---
2.0
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Chester---
21
            MR. ANDRING: Chester?
22
            MS. GRAFFIUS: ---pays nothing over 3.
            MR. ANDRING: So Chester has taken action
23
24
    and Berks County at this point has.
25
            I mean, I am just asking---
```

```
1
            MS. GRAFFIUS: No. I know; that is
2
    correct.
3
            MR. ANDRING: ---because it seems like some
    counties are aggressively tackling this issue and
 4
    some counties are realizing that they need to
5
 6
    aggressively attack the issue.
7
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Yeah. What we did with our
    new manual, we changed the process of being
8
    transferred from a police officer to a constable, and
10
    when they go from one officer to a constable, they no
11
    longer get all the warrants like they used to.
12
    each get paid one, and after that they have to split
1.3
    it, which cuts everything down to one warrant and it
    has to go to both constables.
14
15
            In this new manual, we tried to tighten up
    some of this stuff.
16
            MR. ANDRING: Yeah. You raised the issue of
17
    transporting prisoners from prison to a hearing and
18
19
    back, and in a lot of counties, constables don't even
2.0
    do that.
21
            MS. GRAFFIUS: That's correct.
22
            MR. ANDRING: That's the sheriff.
23
            MS. GRAFFIUS: That's correct.
24
            MR. ANDRING: So it seems to me that that is
25
    something within the control of the county to
```

```
1
    either---
2
            MS. GRAFFIUS: But then you have ---
            MR. ANDRING: ---use the constables or stop
 3
    using the constables and use the sheriffs.
4
 5
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Well, see, then you have to
6
    decide whether or not you want to start to strangle
7
    off the constable system, and I'm not sure I want to
    do that.
8
                                 And frankly, I don't
            MR. ANDRING: Yeah.
    know whether it would be more cost effective to use
10
11
    sheriffs. Personally, I doubt it.
12
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Well, what happens is, when
13
    you use the sheriff's deputies, the cost and fees
    that are paid to the sheriff's deputy comes back to
14
15
    the general fund of the county, because they are
    already being paid wages and benefits and that
16
    stuff.
17
18
            So your cost, instead of going to the
19
    constable, which is an independent contractor, comes
20
    back to the county in their revenue. So that is what
21
    happens.
22
            MR. ANDRING: So you also have the cost for
23
    the sheriffs.
24
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Absolutely. Absolutely.
25
            The other thing we change in the new manual,
```

```
1
    there was much going back and forth to the prison
2
    during night court, which we have in Berks.
    time do they start, 7 o'clock? and then they go all
3
    night?
 4
            Those defendants are now being held in the
 5
 6
    basement in a holding area for central processing,
7
    and the sheriff is taking a whole bunch back at one
    time during the night, so those are no longer being
8
    transported by constables.
            That is what we said, we tightened it up,
10
11
    but you have to go slowly.
            MR. ANDRING: Yeah; I understand that.
12
13
    Thank you.
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Oh, you're welcome.
14
15
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH:
                                    If I can comment.
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
16
                                    Go ahead.
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: I don't think the
17
18
    fees are out of line if a constable is actually
19
    performing all of those services.
2.0
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Absolutely.
21
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: But I don't think
22
    everyone is seeing the full picture here.
23
            In a lot of those cases, the police
24
    departments have already made the arrests, and then
25
    the constable goes to the police station, or if it is
```

```
1
    night court, and then sits through the arraignment
2
    and is paid a full bill of costs, and they haven't
    technically served the warrant. They haven't---
3
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Gone and picked up the
 4
5
    defendant.
6
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: So if you look at the
7
    fee bill, if a constable is performing all of those
    services, certainly the fees are fair.
8
            MS. GRAFFIUS: If they are working the
10
    warrant, I have no problem with that.
11
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: They are out on the
12
    street working the warrants.
1.3
            MS. GRAFFIUS: But if they are sitting at
    night court and a policeman comes in and hands
14
    somebody over and then they get all the fees, that,
15
    to me, that is really unfortunate.
16
17
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Right, or if they are
18
    called into a situation where the arrest has already
19
    been made, and that is where a lot of the fees are
    escalating.
20
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Please feel free to ask Barb
21
22
    and Rick questions. That's why they are here.
23
            MR. MILLER: What I was going to add, the
24
    incentive that you have here with the people with
25
    multiple warrants, what was happening was, they were
```

```
1
    fabricating the conveyance. They said they were
2
    putting them in the car and taking them, which would
    allow both constables to bill everything.
3
            So if a person had 20 warrants, they put
 4
    them in the car, supposedly take them to court, and
5
6
    then both of them could bill everything. That is
7
    where the incentive was, you know, to do some of the
    dishonest things that were happening within Berks
8
    County.
10
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: And why are those
11
    constables still working?
            MR. MILLER: Well, two of them aren't.
12
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Two of them.
1.3
            MS. GRAFFIUS: You have to prove it.
14
15
            MR. MILLER: And we are not done with the
16
    work going forward. We are still looking.
17
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Because the majority
18
    of constables are honest---
19
            MR. MILLER: Yes, absolutely.
2.0
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: --- and hardworking.
21
            MS. GRAFFIUS: That's what bothers me.
22
            MR. MILLER: Unfortunately, a few bad eggs
23
    give the rest of them a bad name.
24
            MS. GRAFFIUS: We were finding that the
    trips to the prison, one was supposedly out in the
25
```

```
1
    car, and it's just that I can't prove that they were
2
    or were not. And that is why we started this
    time-stamping, that they both have to come in,
3
 4
    because we were getting billed for trips to the
    prison that we don't think that two of them were both
5
 6
    there, but you have to prove it.
7
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Any other questions?
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Anything else?
8
            MR. McGLAUGHLIN:
                             Mr. Chairman?
9
10
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes; Counsel.
11
            MR. McGLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
12
            Ma'am, I wanted to ask you, after an
    election---
1.3
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Yes.
14
15
            MR. McGLAUGHLIN: ---a general election,
    does the Controller get like a grand bill totaling
16
    all the constables who participated in the election
17
18
    polling place? Their activity?
19
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Actually, it comes through
20
    the elections department.
21
            MR. McGLAUGHLIN: But there is a fee for
22
    every constable that participates.
23
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.
24
            MR. McGLAUGHLIN: Is that one reason why you
    recommended elimination of that?
25
```

```
1
            MR. MAGGI: Right. That is correct.
2
    Because some of these are rural country settings and
3
    some of them are counties, and they are required,
    mandated by law, to have an elected constable
 4
    there.
5
6
            MR. McGLAUGHLIN: Well, I understand it is
7
    statutory.
8
            MR. MAGGI: It is statutory.
9
            Mr. McGLAUGHLIN: Thank you.
10
            Thank you.
11
            MS. GRAFFIUS: Oh, no problem.
12
            MR. McGLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.
    appreciate your testimony.
14
15
            MR. MAGGI: Thank you.
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Batter up.
16
                                                The
    Pennsylvania State Association of County Controllers.
17
18
            Thank you, Sandy.
            Shelley Whitcomb is the Executive Director,
19
    and Terri Clark is the author of the handbook.
20
21
            MS. WHITCOMB: Good morning. Thank you for
22
    inviting us to speak today.
23
            My name is Shelley Whitcomb. I am the
24
    Executive Director of the Pennsylvania State
25
    Association of County Controllers.
```

I want to start off by saying that our association believes that the constables serve a valuable and essential role in the county judicial system. But as the fiscal watchdogs of the county, we also believe that there are areas of the fee bill that could be more specifically defined, and we believe that there are other ways to cut money without adversely affecting the livelihood of the constables.

1.3

2.0

I have to respectfully disagree with the statement that it is basically a cost-free service, but I believe that they do serve an excellent purpose.

We have 37 counties that belong to the association. There are 37 ways to pay constables, 37 cost sheets, so we definitely agree that having a supervised structure is an excellent idea. And we also agree that further certification and training is very important.

Essentially, I am going to turn it over to

Terri now, because as a member of the Chester County

Constable Handbook, she lives, eats, breathes the fee

bill on constables, so Terri.

MS. CLARK: Good morning. Thank you.

I am going to talk a little bit about our

handbook, which we started working on back in 2003, and the first time of the original publication was in 2005. And it is going to involve a lot of discussion that you have already heard, so I'm only going to touch base on a few things.

When we decided that it would be beneficial to Chester County to have a handbook, we looked at it through a multi-pronged approach to the fee bill -- safety, professionalism, training, and expectations as far as what we consider to be subcontractors of the county. They are vendors; we pay them. Even though they do work for the courts, the money is coming out of county funds.

We require -- and in this handbook, we had certain expectations. We require criminal background checks, child abuse history checks, proof of liability and car insurance, and we also require for them to attend a training that we, Chester County, put on, not with the State associations.

They carry a signed contract with us. Every constable that works out of any of our district courts in Chester County has a contract that is approved by our county commissioners.

The fee bill, I wanted to touch base on that. I think Sandy did a pretty good job, because

we feel it is open to interpretation in several areas, which I gave you copies and highlighted in red what our concerns are.

1.3

2.0

And we felt that way back in 2003-2004 when we initiated this handbook. And by the way, we just finished the first, I guess, printing in 2005, and then the vehicle had changed in 2006 and we went back to square one.

And actually, before I go on, I want to correct something. I am not the author of this handbook. This has been -- as a matter of fact, another gentleman that has been on the subcommittee with me, Glenn Markley, is in the audience. He is one of our constables.

When we first decided to do this, the President Judge at the time formed a committee, and it had representatives and department heads of every department in the county that uses constables -- CYF, Domestic Relations, the prison. We wanted everything to be consistent across the board. Consistency is a very important thing when you are dealing with a lot of varied issues.

And then from that committee there was a subcommittee, and that was the Handbook Subcommittee which serves on that. It is a representative from

the sheriff's department; myself from the Controller's Office; someone from D.J. Admin; two constables; a District Judge; an M.D.J., actually two of them.

So we have continually, since 2003, met to update or tweak the handbook, which we are in the process of doing for probably the umpteenth time.

But I want to touch base on some of the things that were brought up that we in Chester County do.

There was discussion about the police departments calling the constables and saying the county is going to pay it. When we were in the process of doing the handbook, we decided that the county was not going to pay for things that the police department wanted our constables to do.

It seemed like over the years, it had evolved into constables were basically the assistants to a lot of the police departments. They could just pick up the phone, call in, and say come do this, and then the county would pay.

We met with all of our police chiefs in Chester County and said, you know, these certain things we are no longer going to pay for; that is your responsibility in your municipality. If you

choose to call a constable for him to do that service for you, the financial responsibility will be yours.

So I wanted to touch on that.

1.3

I think a lot of times it is very difficult

-- I have been doing this for about 9 or 10 years. I
have dealt with 19 district courts and I don't know
how many constables, and it seems like, it's
difficult, you've got 19 district courts and District
Judges and you've got 19 different fiefdoms.

Everything is run differently; everybody has their
own ways of doing things and their philosophies and
their thoughts.

The other thing I wanted to talk about as far as our handbook is we have a CRB. It's called the Constable Review Board. And what that consists of is if for any reason cost sheets or payment is rejected by the Controller's Office, the constable has an avenue of, you know, getting their case heard. Or if the Controller's Office feels that, you know, a constable has fraudulently turned in false sheets, they can file a complaint.

It has been a good process. I tell you, it is very time-consuming, but I think for the most part it has worked out pretty well. And the person or the people that sit on that committee are an M.D.J., a

constable, and a representative from the Controller's Office.

1.3

And I don't know if all of you have a copy of our handbook. We have tried to be very, very specific. We have tried to tweak it and make it as tight as we can, although we are finding that that is not possible.

I would like to warn or give a caution as far as uniformity to handbooks. As Shelley said, there are 37 counties and they pay constables 37 ways. So you have got counties that are paying up front, as Chester County is. You have counties that are paying only when the defendants' pay. And the Controller's Office, only civil goes through the Controller's Office.

I mean, there are a lot of different ways that constables are being paid in every county, and I think in order for a handbook to work, at least from our perspective, is that it has to be unique to the way things are running in the county. So I just would like that to be thought of, you know, as we move forward on that.

And I will take any questions. I mean, I don't want to go through all of our handbook, but it is pretty tight.

```
CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Counsel.
1
2
            MS. DALTON: Good morning. Thanks so much
3
    for coming.
            MS. CLARK: Sure.
 4
            MS. DALTON: You alluded to the fact that
5
6
    police departments pick up the phone and call
7
    constables and ask them to do certain things.
    you give us examples of what those things are,
8
    please?
            MS. CLARK: Well, they'll have someone in
10
11
    custody at their police department and they'll say,
12
    you know, hey, come get this person and take them to
1.3
    the prison, you know, or take them for
    fingerprinting, which should be done before they
14
15
    release them -- things like that.
16
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Is that addressed in
    your handbook?
17
18
            MS. CLARK:
                       No.
19
            MS. DALTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20
            Thank you.
21
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Ouestions?
22
            All right. I want to thank you for your
23
    testimony. We appreciate it.
24
            MS. CLARK: Thank you.
25
            MS. WHITCOMB:
                            Thank you.
```

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We have the Fayette County Constables' Association, Troy Rice.

MR. RICE: Good morning, Chairman

Caltagirone and esteemed members of the House

Judiciary Committee.

My name is Troy Rice. I'm from Jefferson

Township, Fayette County. I served as a constable

for approximately 12 years.

On behalf of the Fayette County Constables' Association, I offer you the following points for your consideration.

We submit that statewide standards of conduct should be in place with a corresponding disciplinary board akin to that in place for attorneys and the Minor Judiciary with similar enforcement authorities.

An elected constable, similar to a

Magisterial District Judge, should have a limited

amount of time to pass a certification test and an

approved course of study.

Currently, one who fails to meet these requirements can still remain in office without performing the duties of the office. If the requirements are not met, the office should be vacated and then filled in accordance with the law.

A standardized or approved badge should be adopted for use throughout the State for the safety of the public and for admission into State and county prisons.

With respect to liability for errors and omissions, a good-faith standard should be imposed to provide immunity for constables. Barring malice, no liability should be imposed for a good-faith act. A standardized policy for insurance should be made available statewide through reduced rates and simplified coverage issues.

Fayette County spent a total of \$111,000 for constable services last year. This does not provide the kind of income to an individual constable reportedly earning in excess of \$300,000 per year. That is certainly not the case in Fayette County at least.

Consideration should be given to access, however limited, to JNET to obtain address and warrant information on individuals, which would likely result in more effective service, reduced costs, and a higher success rate.

JNET access could also improve safety to the officer who may be attempting to serve a warrant on a traffic case on an individual who is wanted for a

violent crime in another jurisdiction.

2.0

We stand ready to offer our service and input to the committee at any time called upon us, as we realize the significance and importance of the task which you are charged.

Again, thank you again for this opportunity to speak with you on behalf of the Fayette County Constables' Association. I am available for any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Troy.

Questions? Gail.

DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: I would just like to comment on the JNET access.

I absolutely agree with you. I can access JNET; the police departments can access JNET. I'm not permitted to print a defendant's photo off and give it to the constable or give the constable that information with the warrant. The photo does not print onto the warrant---

MR. RICE: Right.

DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: ---so my constables have to hope that they have a good rapport with the police department and can go over there and at least view that on the screen through the agency that the warrant originated from.

1 MR. RICE: Right. 2 DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: So I think it is very 3 important that that change, that the Magisterial District Judges should be permitted to attach that 4 5 information with a warrant. That is very valuable information. 6 7 We have constables that are knocking on doors, looking face to face---8 MR. RICE: Right. 10 DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: ---at someone you are 11 holding a warrant on, and they say, it's not me; they're not here. 12 1.3 MR. RICE: Right. In a perfect world, everybody would be honest. 14 15 DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Something needs to 16 change. 17 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Sandy, and then the 18 gentleman. 19 Sandy. 20 MS. GRAFFIUS: As long as we are asking for access, the Controllers in the County of Berks as 21 22 well as across Pennsylvania would like to have access 23 to AOPC. That sure would help us a lot when they are 24 working warrants and that stuff for us. 25 Oh, you are shaking your head. You know,

```
1
    I see you.
2
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I didn't shake my
3
    head no.
 4
            MS. GRAFFIUS: No; right here.
            Let me know when that hearing is scheduled.
 5
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                    All right.
 6
7
            Yes, sir?
            DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: Judge Opiela from
8
    Allegheny County, also Chair of the Constables'
9
10
    Education and Training Board.
11
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes.
            DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: To somewhat correct
12
13
    that one, when I first came on board with the office,
    I was concerned about the photos and the fact that
14
    the MDJS system wouldn't allow that to transpond over
15
16
    because of software. It wasn't acceptable to me that
17
    constables couldn't have access to photos.
18
            And I actually went to JNET, and I have a
19
    memo from their Director that permits us to
2.0
    disseminate that to our constables so long as there
    is a warrant. But that has to come from each
21
    individual M.D.J. office.
22
23
            And since that has been implemented in my
24
    office, I would say on average I might get a request
25
    or two per month from a constable for that, but
```

```
1
    typically they don't. That was a big complaint, that
2
    how can you identify somebody if you don't have a
    photo?
3
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
 4
            DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: JNET does authorize
 5
    us as M.D.J.s to disseminate that to our constables,
6
7
    but we have to do that. We cannot just say, here is
8
    our system; go to it.
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Great. That's great.
10
            DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: So that is probably
11
    a little bit incorrect.
12
            And that did go out statewide to our
13
    constables. And it went out, I thought, to the
14
    M.D.J.s. I know it did here in Allegheny County.
15
            But I can provide that for you. But that
16
    was something I worked on my first year with
    Constables' Education and Training, even though that
17
18
    really wasn't our perfunctory duties on the board.
19
    But I felt compelled that, you know, if somebody is
20
    going to make a good-faith effort of service and not
    know who Sam Jones is, they ought to have a
21
22
    photograph.
23
            DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Absolutely.
            DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: And so that is
24
25
    permissible.
```

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Okay. 1 2 DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: Mr. Naisby has 3 permitted that, and I can get you that information. DISTRICT JUDGE GRETH: Great. Thank you. 4 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Mr. Chairman, if I 5 6 could offer a suggestion here. 7 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Sure. REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Maybe you could 8 send under your pen or the committee's pen a letter 9 to the District Justice Association ---10 11 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Certainly. 12 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: ---requesting that 13 they inform all of the D.J.s, because I do represent a number of rural communities that clearly aren't 14 aware of that authorization of availability. 15 And I have had a number of my D.J.s as well 16 as my constables contact me relative to access to the 17 18 JNET for that reason, you know, that they are looking 19 at a guy saying, "Are you Sam Jones?" and he says no, 2.0 and he really can't do anything. 21 Or the vice-versa of it is the JNET also contains other information relative to criminal 22 23 histories, which certainly would give the constable 24 the opportunity to know whether or not he needs to

take a second constable with him because that

2.5

```
1
    individual may have an extensive record versus a
2
    first-time offender who maybe did something silly and
    he is just serving a paper for civil or criminal
3
    purposes.
 4
            So if that is not a problem, maybe we could
5
 6
    ask the---
7
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Counsels to craft a
    letter?
8
            REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: --- the Magisterial
10
    District Justice Administrator or somebody from the
11
    AOPC to let the other D.J.s know that, because I
12
    don't believe they do, and I certainly know that a
1.3
    couple of them in my district do not know that.
14
            Thank you.
15
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We will follow up on
16
    that, certainly.
            All right. Troy, thank you very much for
17
18
    your testimony.
19
            MR. RICE: Thank you.
20
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Oh; I'm sorry. Emil?
21
            MR. MINNAR: Yeah; I would like to concur
22
    with what you are saying there.
23
            And frankly, I think there's a lack of
24
    communication or a breakdown somewhere along the way,
25
    because the last time I got involved with the
```

concerns about JNET, we received a letter from the individual responsible, and he said it was limited to police and the courts and that the constables could not have access to those photos.

2.0

Now, if that has been a change and there is some official letter or orders to that effect and it was sent to the D.J.s, I'm not aware of it and most of us are not also. So it may well be true---

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Right.

MR. MINNAR: ---but the communication factor isn't there.

DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: Just so it is clear, it was sent to me because I made the inquiries. I tried to make the inquiries for our board, and my board said and PCCD said, well, look, you know, that really isn't our duties. And I said, well, that's not acceptable to me. You know, I'm an M.D.J., and I want to make sure that Sam Jones on paper matches Same Jones on photograph.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yeah.

DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: You know, they put date of birth, they put all this information on this warrant, but they don't put a photograph. And they said, well, the problem is, Judge, we just can't get the software to update to make it work on the current

system, and I said, well, why can't we disseminate that?

e-mail from Mr. Naisby on that point directly. So, I mean -- and he cited the section under JNET. But it is not a system in which we can just let our constables come in and say, okay, you know, I'm going to do some searching here because I want to find out, because there are constables out there that will do that.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes.

DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: So the system has to work under our review, our supervision, and it has to be a legitimate warrant. It just can't be, you know, something that somebody wants to check on their old girlfriend to see what they look like.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Yeah; I'm not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that everyone have access. Clearly either the M.D.J. and/or law enforcement, but at least disseminate the knowledge that that information is permitted to be shared without any kind of repercussion from it, that it would create any kind of a problem for either the M.D.J. and/or the law enforcement agent who would provide that information.

My oldest brother serves as the local M.D.J. in my home community as well, and they are heavily regulated and a very highly qualified group.

At the same time, we do have a situation that while we may not always agree with the 67 different methodologies that are being used by the 67 different counties as they relate to constables, in the rural areas and in some of the suburban communities, the constables provide a valuable service to help supplement what either the local sheriff's office is doing and/or what the local police departments are doing.

We want to be able to at least augment their use with safety if we can provide them a photo or some type of an image of the individual they are trying to serve a warrant on.

So while we want to regulate and control, we shouldn't be derelict in how we do it. So we have to tread cautiously there.

Thank you.

1.3

2.0

DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: And if I could just make one more comment.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Sure.

DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: It wasn't for me, even so much for the constable; it is also for the

```
safety of the individual, Joe Citizen---
1
2
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yeah.
            DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: ---who knows that,
3
    you know, hey, this person is legit.
4
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Right.
5
            DISTRICT JUDGE OPIELA: They got my photo;
 6
7
    they got it attached to a piece of paper; that is me.
    I mean, I don't know how many cases I have where a
8
    brother uses his brother's name and, you know, it's
    the wrong individual.
10
11
            CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We will certainly
12
    cooperate with you and get that information off.
            Emil.
1.3
            MR. MINNAR: I would like to expand on that
14
15
    a bit.
            The JNET photo is extremely important. We
16
17
    have always asked how come and why not? It goes
18
    further than that.
19
            Whenever you get a warrant, and I'm not
20
    saying this happens all the time, but you can get a
21
    warrant and not have an attachment -- if it were a
22
    traffic, as an example. There is not a copy of the
23
    traffic citation attached to it, so when you go
24
    there, "I have a warrant for Mr. Jones." "Well, what
25
    do you need me for?" "I can only tell you it is
```

Section 3242(a)(1). Unless you have had law enforcement experience, you don't know what that is.

1.3

even attach a copy of the citation with the warrant. The ideal situation is the name, the photo, the citation, and the warrant, particularly where -- and it was pointed out -- you are the person knocking on the door and Joe is either a felony criminal or the fact that he has jumped bail already and he is wanted. You have no way of knowing this whatsoever, and therefore, you are reverting back to something even more important.

Officer safety is a priority, and I think everyone has the responsibility to ensure that individual that when he is out there working, that he has all the tools he needs to do the job properly.

And I have to say we are all delinquent on that; we are all very delinquent on that.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We will be addressing these issues. And let me reassure the constables that are here today and those that will be watching this, I am not of a mind to eliminate the constables, even though that has been suggested, I might tell you. I think they serve a very useful purpose in our society. I think their role can be expanded and

defined. That is what we are going to be about with this session.

1.3

So let me reassure you, I am not here to eliminate you, and one of the things that I would like to be able to do is to work with your association and the other groups -- you have heard the testimony here today -- to try to fix it and try to make it better.

We had done this a number of years ago.

Emil and I have worked together to make a lot of the reforms. I think the issues, we know what they are.

We are going to address them, we are going to try to get some clarity, and we are going to, I think, help to make this system function a lot better.

There is a useful purpose that is served by the constables, and I don't think it suits anybody's purpose to be talking about eliminating them, because I think they are there, and it would be a tremendous expense to add additional burdens to the county.

Because if you would say to my deputy sheriffs, well, who is going to pay for it? how many more do you need? where are they going to come from? Do you know what I mean? You know, you go on and on, and I think with what we have heard here today, we have a starting reference point to work to make the system

1 better.

And knowing that, I just want to leave you with one last note. We did cancel the hearing, for those that are viewing this at home, for tomorrow in Philadelphia out of respect to the fallen officer that had been slain. That hearing has been canceled for tomorrow, and we will be posting that hearing later on in Philadelphia dealing with the violent repeat offenders, which is something, you know, I think many of you have to deal with when you go out there and do your service.

But as far as this JNET, we are going to get to the bottom of that and let you all know about that.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Mr. Chairman, just one additional thought?

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Relative to, it may seem like we are picking on the AOPC. Let me say that they do a fine job and they have a great staff, and the Pennsylvania Supreme Court does a good job as well.

In fact, while the JNET regulations need to be massaged somewhat, the AOPC does have a public Web site. It is available for access to anybody who

has access to a computer.

1.3

It is a wealth of knowledge and information. It provides probably more information than the average person needs to know. And there is in fact a docket entry system where you can actually do a search online at the AOPC's Web site to find out on any individual defendant and/or what his or her charges are and what the disposition of that case is or has been.

So, you know, while we have issues concerning JNET, which is a system contained within the system, the Supreme Court and the AOPC have been very responsive to the public as well as the legal community in making that information available, and we need the public to know that we do have a lot of proactive approach relative to information sharing at our level as well as the court level.

So I just wanted to make that known that we are not picking on the AOPC or JNET. It is just we need to massage it some.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We do have a partnership with the AOPC. We work very closely with them, and I think some of the people that are here know that.

```
Thank you, and we will adjourn the hearing
 1
    for today.
 2
 3
             (The hearing concluded at 12:25 p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same. Debra B. Miller, Reporter