

<b>LFC Requester:</b>	<b>Connor Jorgensen</b>
-----------------------	-------------------------

**AGENCY BILL ANALYSIS  
2015 REGULAR SESSION**

**WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BILL POSTING, EMAIL ANALYSIS TO:**

[LFC@NMLEGIS.GOV](mailto:LFC@NMLEGIS.GOV)

*and*

[DFA@STATE.NM.US](mailto:DFA@STATE.NM.US)

*{Include the bill no. in the email subject line, e.g., HB2, and only attach one bill analysis and related documentation per email message}*

**SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

*{Indicate if analysis is on an original bill, amendment, substitute or a correction of a previous bill}*

Check all that apply: Date 3/5/2015  
**Original**        **Amendment**        **Bill No:** SB 222  
**Correction**        **Substitute**   

**Sponsor:** Sen. Cliff R. Pirtle    **Agency Code:** Attorney General's Office  
**Short Title:** File Traffic Citations in County of Violation    **Person Writing:** James Torres, AAG  
**Phone:** 827-6064    **Email:** jtorres@nmag.gov

**SECTION II: FISCAL IMPACT**

**APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)**

Appropriation		Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY15	FY16		

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

**REVENUE (dollars in thousands)**

Estimated Revenue			Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY15	FY16	FY17		

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

**ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)**

	<b>FY15</b>	<b>FY16</b>	<b>FY17</b>	<b>3 Year Total Cost</b>	<b>Recurring or Nonrecurring</b>	<b>Fund Affected</b>
<b>Total</b>						

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates/Conflicts with/Companion to/Relates to:  
Duplicates/Relates to Appropriation in the General Appropriation Act:

**SECTION III: NARRATIVE**

This analysis is neither a formal Attorney General’s Opinion nor an Attorney General’s Advisory Letter. This is a staff analysis in response to an agency’s, committee’s, or legislator’s request.

**BILL SUMMARY**

**Synopsis:**

The Senate Judiciary Committee Substitute for SB 222 only amends §35-3-6, discarding amendments to §31-1-6, §66-8-122, and §66-8-123 contained in the original version of SB 222.

In its current form, §35-3-6 establishes magistrate court jurisdiction over motor vehicle criminal actions arising outside of that magistrate’s district, provided that magistrate’s district adjoins geographically at any point with the magistrate district in which the alleged traffic violation occurred. The Senate Judiciary Committee Substitute for SB 222 amends this language to require that a defendant consent to the change of venue from the district where the cause of action arose (as codified, the defendant need only be entitled to a change of venue to the district where the cause of action arose for a change of venue to occur).

**FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

N/A

**SIGNIFICANT ISSUES**

N/A

**PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS**

N/A

**ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS**

N/A

**CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP**

N/A

**TECHNICAL ISSUES**

Addressed above

**OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES**

N/A

**ALTERNATIVES**

N/A

**WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL**

Status Quo

**AMENDMENTS**