

SANCTUARY POLICY PROHIBITION ACTS

Phone: (517) 373-8080
<http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa>

House Bill 4197 as introduced
Sponsor: Rep. Pamela Hornberger

Analysis available at
<http://www.legislature.mi.gov>

House Bill 4539 as introduced
Sponsor: Rep. Beau Matthew LaFave

Committee: Military, Veterans and Homeland Security
Complete to 6-14-21

SUMMARY:

House Bills 4197 and 4539 would create two new acts called, respectively, the Local Government Sanctuary Policy Prohibition Act and the County Law Enforcement Protection Act. The new acts would prohibit local laws that prevent local officials from cooperating with federal authorities regarding an individual's immigration status.

House Bill 4197 would apply to *local units of government*, defined as: cities, villages, townships, and charter townships; officers and officials of those entities; and boards, departments, commissions, councils, agencies, or other bodies created or primarily funded by those entities.

House Bill 4539 would apply to *counties*, defined as: county boards of commissioners; county officers or officials; and boards, departments, commissions, councils, agencies, or other bodies created or primarily funded by a county.

The new acts would prohibit local units of government and counties from enacting or enforcing a law, ordinance, policy, or rule that limits or prohibits a peace officer or local official, officer, or employee from communicating or cooperating with appropriate federal officials concerning the immigration status of an individual in Michigan. Any law that violated the applicable act would be void and unenforceable. A local unit of government or county with an existing law that violated the applicable act would have 60 days after that act took effect to bring the law into compliance with the act.

Beginning 61 days after the applicable act took effect, a resident of a local unit of government or a county that had, enacted, or enforced a law violating the act could either file a complaint with the attorney general or bring an action to enforce the act in the circuit court where the local unit or county is located.

The attorney general could receive and investigate complaints regarding violations of the new acts. A local unit of government or county would have to cooperate with such an investigation.

Beginning 61 days after the applicable act took effect, if a local unit of government or county had, enacted, or enforced a law violating the act, the attorney general would have to bring an action to enforce the act in the circuit court where the local unit or county is located.

In an action brought by a resident or the attorney general as described above, if the court determined that the law violated the act, the court would have to do all of the following:

- Issue an injunction restraining enforcement of the law.
- Order the local unit of government or county to amend or repeal the law.
- Award actual damages, costs, and reasonable attorney fees to the party challenging the law.

Under House Bill 4197 (local units), but not under House Bill 4539 (counties), the court would also have to assess a civil fine of between \$2,500 and \$7,500 against any elected or appointed official who the court determined knowingly and willfully enacted or enforced a law in violation of the act. The civil fine would be in addition to any other penalty provided by law.

BACKGROUND:

House Bills 4197 and 4539 are reintroductions of House Bills 4083 and 4090, respectively, of the 2019-20 legislative session. Those bills were referred by the House Committee on Military, Veterans and Homeland Security to the House Committee on Ways and Means.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Local units of government: The bills would create minimal administrative costs for those local units of government not in compliance with the provisions of the bill upon enactment. Any administrative actions taken to bring the local unit of government into compliance would likely be absorbed under its current appropriation levels and in the normal course of business. Local units of government already in compliance with the provisions of the bills would realize no fiscal impact. Local units of government deemed to be in violation of the provisions of the bills could face increased costs if actions were brought against them for noncompliance. Costs could include legal costs, damages, and fines. Cities, villages, townships, and charter townships would be the only local units of government subject to fines.

Local law enforcement: The bills would not have a significant fiscal impact on any law enforcement agency in this state.

Attorney General: The bills' fiscal impact on the Department of the Attorney General would depend on the number of complaints submitted to the attorney general and the number of investigations initiated as a result. If the number of investigations exceeds the case load capacity of the investigators currently staffed by the attorney general and additional investigators are needed, the attorney general would incur costs of additional hires. The full-time equivalent cost of an investigator is \$110,000 a year.

Judiciary: The bills would have an indeterminate fiscal impact on local court systems. The fiscal impact would depend on how provisions of the bill affect court caseloads and related administrative costs. Any increase in civil fine revenue would increase funding for public and county law libraries, which are the constitutionally designated recipients of those revenues.

Legislative Analysts: Emily S. Smith
Edith Best

Fiscal Analysts: Ben Gielczyk
Michael Cnossen
Marcus Coffin
Robin Risko

■ This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House Fiscal Agency staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.