



**TESTIMONY OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
TWENTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURE, 2011**

**LATE
Testimony**

ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURE:

H.C.R. NO. 5, REQUESTING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO CONDUCT A STUDY ON WHETHER THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF HAWAII'S SEX OFFENDER LAWS ARE BEING MET AND WHETHER SEX OFFENDER LAWS ARE BEING IMPLEMENTED IN THE WAY THEY WERE INTENDED..

BEFORE THE:

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES

DATE: Thursday, March 19, 2011 **TIME:** 10:45 a.m.

LOCATION: State Capitol, Room 329

TESTIFIER(S): David M. Louie, Attorney General, or
Liane M. Moriyama, Administrator, Hawaii Criminal
Justice Data Center

Chair Mizuno and Members of the Committee:

The Department of the Attorney General does not support this concurrent resolution.

The purpose of this concurrent resolution is to request a study to determine whether the goals and objectives of the state sex offender registration laws are being met and whether the state sex offender registration laws are being implemented in the way they were intended.

We do not believe that there is a need for a study, because based on current resources for the sex offender registration program, responsibilities to register, verify, locate, and prosecute sex offenders are being addressed. If, however, it is determined that a study by the Department of the Attorney General is still desired, we request additional resources to conduct the study.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this resolution.

National Association of Reformed Criminals
1765 Ala Moana Blvd. #1388
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96815
March 10, 2011

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES

Rep. John M. Mizuno, Chair

Rep. Jo Jordan, Vice Chair

Thursday March 10, 2011

10:45 AM

Room 329

BILL # HCR 5

Support

Our stance is in regards to the objectives of the sex-offender Laws, which is to keep track of offenders who have committed crimes of a sexual nature. Our concern is in regards to an actual case, among many, where the offender didn't commit a sexual offense, but was an accomplice to robbery. In that specific case, his co-defendant fondled someone in the course of the robbery. The co-defendant was charged and convicted for the sex-offense in addition to the robbery, while the prosecution dropped the sex offense against the defendant as 'nolo prosecution'. After serving 15 years for the robbery, he was told that he has to register as a sex-offender even though he wasn't even charged, much less convicted for any type of sexual offense in his life.

Mahalo,

Andy Botts