House Study Bill 567 - Introduced

HOUSE FILE	
ВУ	(PROPOSED COMMITTEE
	ON JUDICIARY BILL BY
	CHAIRPERSON HOLT)

A BILL FOR

- 1 An Act relating to forensic scientific evidence and
- postconviction relief.
- 3 BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF IOWA:

H.F. ____

- 1 Section 1. Section 822.2, subsection 1, Code 2020, is
- 2 amended by adding the following new paragraph:
- 3 NEW PARAGRAPH. i. There exists forensic scientific evidence
- 4 pursuant to section 822.2A.
- 5 Sec. 2. NEW SECTION. 822.2A Forensic scientific evidence.
- 6 l. As used in this section:
- 7 a. "Applied validity" means the reliability of a scientific
- 8 method or technique in practice.
- 9 b. "Forensic science" means the application of scientific or
- 10 technical practices to the recognition, collection, analysis,
- 11 and interpretation of evidence for criminal and civil law or
- 12 regulatory issues.
- 13 c. "Forensic scientific evidence" includes scientific or
- 14 technical knowledge including a forensic analyst's or expert's
- 15 scientific or technical knowledge or opinion and reports
- 16 offered by forensic analysts and experts; scientific standards,
- 17 and a scientific method or technique upon which forensic
- 18 scientific evidence is based.
- 19 d. "Foundational validity" means the reliability of a
- 20 scientific method that is repeatable, reproducible, and
- 21 accurate in a scientific setting.
- 22 e. "Scientific knowledge" includes knowledge of the general
- 23 scientific community and all fields of scientific knowledge
- 24 upon which those fields are based.
- 25 2. A person seeking relief under section 822.2, subsection
- 26 l, paragraph i'', shall prove all of the following:
- 27 a. There is evidence of any of the following:
- 28 (1) Forensic scientific evidence that was not discoverable
- 29 through the exercise of reasonable diligence by the person
- 30 on the date of the person's conviction or guilty plea. In
- 31 determining whether forensic scientific evidence was not
- 32 discoverable through the exercise of reasonable diligence prior
- 33 to the date of a person's conviction or guilty plea, the court
- 34 shall consider whether a claim or issue could not have been
- 35 presented previously in the person's original application or in

H.F. ____

- 1 any previously considered application if the claim or issue is
- 2 based on forensic scientific evidence that was not available
- 3 through the exercise of reasonable diligence by the person
- 4 on or before the date on which the original application or a
- 5 previously considered application, as applicable, was filed.
- 6 (2) Forensic scientific evidence that undermines the
- 7 forensic scientific evidence used to convict the person.
- 8 Forensic scientific evidence is considered to be undermined
- 9 if new research or information exists that repudiates the
- 10 foundational validity of scientific evidence or expert
- 11 testimony or the applied validity of a scientific method or
- 12 technique.
- 13 b. The person proves by a preponderance of the evidence
- 14 that had the forensic scientific evidence been presented at the
- 15 time of the person's conviction or guilty plea, it would have
- 16 probably changed the result of the trial or voided the factual
- 17 basis of the guilty plea.
- 18 c. The forensic scientific evidence would have been
- 19 admissible under the Iowa rules of evidence in existence at the
- 20 time of the person's conviction or guilty plea.
- 21 3. Claims brought pursuant to section 822.2, subsection
- 22 1, paragraph "i", are not subject to the limitation periods
- 23 provided in section 822.3.
- 4. This section does not create a cause of action against
- 25 an expert who repudiates the expert's opinion during any
- 26 proceeding that resulted in a conviction or whose opinion
- 27 has been undermined by subsequent scientific research or
- 28 technological advancements.
- 29 EXPLANATION
- The inclusion of this explanation does not constitute agreement with the explanation's substance by the members of the general assembly.
- 32 This bill allows a court to grant postconviction relief
- 33 if a person who files an application for postconviction
- 34 relief proves all of the following: 1) there is forensic
- 35 scientific evidence that was not discoverable at the time of

hf/rh

- 1 the person's conviction or guilty plea or that undermines
- 2 forensic scientific evidence used to convict the person, 2)
- 3 the person proves by a preponderance of the evidence that the
- 4 forensic scientific evidence would have probably changed the
- 5 result of the trial or voided the factual basis of the guilty
- 6 plea, and 3) the forensic scientific evidence would have been
- 7 admissible under the Iowa rules of evidence in existence at the
- 8 time of the person's conviction or guilty plea.
- 9 The bill provides that in determining whether forensic
- 10 scientific evidence was not discoverable through the exercise
- 11 of reasonable diligence, a court shall consider whether the
- 12 claim or issue could not have been presented previously in the
- 13 person's original application or in any previously considered
- 14 application.
- Under the bill, a claim for postconviction relief based
- 16 upon forensic scientific evidence is not subject to the time
- 17 limitations in Code section 822.3. The bill does not create a
- 18 cause of action against an expert who repudiates the expert's
- 19 original opinion during any proceeding that resulted in a
- 20 conviction or whose opinion is undermined by any subsequent
- 21 scientific research or technological advancement.
- The bill provides definitions of "forensic science",
- 23 "forensic scientific evidence", "scientific knowledge",
- 24 "applied validity", and "foundational validity".