



April 5, 2021

Rep. Jamie Becker-Finn, Chair  
House Judiciary Finance and Civil Law  
Minnesota House of Representatives  
559 State Office Building  
St. Paul, MN 55155

Rep. Peggy Scott, Republican Lead  
House Judiciary Finance and Civil Law  
Minnesota House of Representatives  
335 State Office Building  
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Reps. Becker-Finn and Scott:

We write to express our appreciation for including language from HF75 (Moller) in HF1030 (Becker-Finn), the House Judiciary Finance bill. As you know, the coalition of undersigned organizations strongly supports this reform of civil asset forfeiture in Minnesota.

This language reflects extensive negotiations between defense attorneys and justice reform advocates and prosecutors and law enforcement stakeholders in Minnesota. The negotiations took place over several months in 2019 and 2020.

Stakeholders on both sides started negotiations in 2019 and devoted a significant amount of time and effort to reach this agreement. This was a lengthy and arduous process that wasn't easy to reach. But we believe the agreed-to language will focus law enforcement's use of civil asset forfeiture on individuals who pose a legitimate threat to public safety and will better safeguard civil liberties of Minnesotans.

Civil asset forfeiture allows the government to seize money, vehicles, and other property suspected of being connected to criminal activity. Even if an individual is never charged with a crime, their property can be seized and ultimately forfeited. Under current law, people wishing to reclaim seized property must engage in expensive litigation to get their property back which often costs much more than the value of the seized currency or property itself. This is a separate, civil process that is completely unrelated to any criminal process.

The established system burdens property owners and creates administrative burdens for law enforcement agencies. Law enforcement agencies must go through various steps in the forfeiture process, including the storage and sale of vehicles, at a cost to taxpayers.

The agreed upon forfeiture language implements reforms by changing the following:

- Reforms the DWI forfeiture statute to expand the use of ignition interlock, requires entrance into treatment courts, and focuses seizure and forfeitures on repeat offenders;
- Provides additional protections for innocent owners and aligns with a recent Minnesota Supreme Court case that requires a prompt hearing;
- Prevents law enforcement from circumventing state forfeiture laws by accessing and utilizing the federal sharing program;
- Establishes a \$1,500 threshold for money and property that can be subject to forfeiture unless the currency or property was used in the direct commission of certain crimes;
- Creates transparent reporting requirements for forfeited property and the use of forfeiture revenue by local municipalities;
- Waives storage fees and some filing fees for individuals and innocent owners; and
- Requires a recidivism study to track efficacy of forfeiture and ignition interlock as strategies to reduce the number of repeat DWI offenders.

Again, thank you for including the legislation as part of HF1030, the House Judiciary Finance bill.

Sincerely,

William Ward, State Public Defender  
Minnesota Board of Public Defense

Holly Harris, Executive Director  
Justice Action Network

John Gordon, Executive Director  
American Civil Liberties Union of Minnesota

Drew Schaffer, Executive Director  
Mid-Minnesota Legal Aid

Andy Birrell, President  
Minnesota Association of Criminal Defense Attorneys (MACDL)

Jason Flohrs, State Director  
Americans for Prosperity – Minnesota

CC: Members of the House Judiciary and Civil Law Committee