

What does SB 60 do?

- SB 60 reintroduces Policing Reform Legislation first presented during the Special Session in 2020. It aims to reform policing in this state so that trust is rebuilt between communities and police as well as establish standards for law enforcement to treat all the communities with dignity and limited use of force against those communities.
- This bill presents a menu of items that have been discussed and passed around the country in the wake of national protests to address policing, including a ban on chokeholds, explicitly prohibiting sex by officers while on duty, and clarifying the definition of law enforcement.

SB 60 is rooted in the need for law enforcement to implement transformative reforms that build public trust and lead to humane and equitable policing across communities. These reforms will keep both officers and communities safer.

What's in the Bill

- Definition of Law Enforcement Officer: Police officers are meant to protect and serve the community—not abuse or intimidate it. Part of that call requires that peace officers be clearly defined. This bill looks to remove security guards from the definition of law enforcement officers who are licensed, trained, assessed, and reprimanded through state agencies.
- No Sex on Duty: As of 2019, 30 states and the feds allow police officers to engage in a sexual act with people in their custody if they claim it was consensual.
 - o There is **NO** consent to sexual acts when an officer is exercising their law enforcement powers over another person, particularly when on duty with the ability to handcuff and control the individual.
 - o This bill would make it a class E felony for officers to abuse their duty and the power of their uniform to sexually assault those detained or imprisoned.
 - o Eliminates “consent” as a defense to having sex with a detainee while on duty.
 - o Explicitly closes law enforcement officers’ loophole in officer-detainee sexual contact and bans sexual contact in the same manner as corrections officers and inmate.
 - o We need this piece of legislation to protect detainees who have not yet been convicted of a crime from those who may abuse their power and authority.
- Chokeholds: It is necessary for officers to be held accountable when they use excessive force or violence, starting with the ban of chokeholds by all law enforcement agencies across the state.
 - o Chokeholds must not be used against citizens detained for questioning and/or during arrests. Chokeholds are an abuse of power by police that have resulted in the unnecessary death of too many citizens.
 - o The language for these chokehold bans echoes suggested policing reforms from a [2020 Executive Order on Safe Policing for Safe Communities](#).
 - o This bill creates the offense of aggravated strangulation in the first degree by a peace officer or security guard. Specifically, it prevents any peace officer or security guard, while in the performance of their official duties, from using a chokehold that restricts a person’s breathing.
 - o Should an officer use a chokehold and cause death or serious physical injury to another person in circumstances in which the use of deadly force, according to a reasonable person, is not justified shall be guilty of aggravated strangulation, a felony.

The bill also does the following:

- Bans no knock warrants: No knocks are a relic from the 1980's war on drugs.
 - o St Louis officers shared that in 2019, ~10% of warrants issued in STL were no-knocks.
 - o To prevent stories like that of Angela Zorich in STL County, who had SWAT execute a no-knock for an unpaid light bill. The SWAT team killed her dog in that interaction.
 - o This can prevent senseless deaths like that of Breonna Taylor, which inspired the Louisville legislation, which inspired this language.
 - o This legislation restricts their use so that they can ONLY be used in instances of violent crime. It mandates that officers announce themselves in all other situations.
- Defines Use of Force by Private Citizens: After the shooting death of Ahmaud Arbery in Georgia at the hand of former police investigator and his son, the danger of citizen-based use of force came back to the forefront.
 - o This bill attempts to restrain when citizen arrest or interference during the commission of a crime may involve use of force.
- Defines use of force by law enforcement officers: It is a fact that officers are almost never prosecuted and convicted after a finding of excessive use of force. To combat this injustice, we should aim our focus on the reasonableness of an officer's actions, not the reasonableness of their beliefs.
 - o This bill raises the standard for the use of deadly force so that officers can only use deadly force if the suspect poses a threat of imminent harm and committed or attempted to commit a violent crime.
 - o This language mirrors suggestions from the [Ferguson Consent Decree](#), a document that Senator Roy Blunt has encouraged the state to review and use.
- Demilitarizing Law Enforcement Agencies: Militarization of the law enforcement agencies has been an issue highlighted in the wake of peaceful protests across the country being met with military-style and grade weapons.
 - o Between 2006 and 2018, our 3 largest counties (Jackson, STL, St. Charles) received nearly \$7 million in acquisition from the DOD.
 - o These military acquisitions include several tactical, combat vehicles (tanks costing nearly \$400,000 each) and over 25 mine resistant vehicles (over \$700,000 each) scattered across the state.
 - o This bill would follow a similar [law passed by Montana](#) in 2015, stopping Missouri law enforcement from taking military leftovers and further militarizing their police force.
- Certification of out of state officers: Similar to the decertification that takes place in other professions, such as with lawyers, doctors and accountants, we must hold bad actors on the force accountable.
 - o As of 2018, 46 states allow for the revocation of police officer license or certification after the officer has engaged in serious misconduct.
 - o This language makes it clear that officers who move to MO will not be recertified if they were fired for misconduct from their previous department and makes the certification and loss of certification easier to track.
 - o This would mirror a similar law our neighbors to the north, [Iowa](#), passed in 2020.
 - o This language is crucial in address bad officers hopping from one municipality to the next when they should be off our streets.