



Senate Fiscal Agency
P. O. Box 30036
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536



BILL ANALYSIS

Telephone: (517) 373-5383
Fax: (517) 373-1986
TDD: (517) 373-0543

House Bill 4465 (Substitute S-1 as reported by the Committee of the Whole)
Sponsor: Representative Glenn Steil
House Committee: Conservation, Forestry and Outdoor Recreation
Senate Committee: Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs

CONTENT

The bill would amend the Michigan Penal Code to prohibit a person in this State from doing any of the following:

- Engaging in computer-assisted shooting.
- Providing or operating, with or without remuneration, facilities for computer-assisted shooting.
- Providing or offering to provide, with or without remuneration, equipment specially adapted for computer-assisted shooting.
- Providing or offering to provide, with or without remuneration, an animal for computer-assisted shooting.

The prohibition regarding specially adapted equipment would not apply to general-purpose equipment, including a computer, a camera, fencing, building materials, or a bow or crossbow; general-purpose computer software, including an operating system and communications programs; or general telecommunications hardware or networking services for computers.

"Computer-assisted shooting" would mean the use of a computer or any other device, equipment, or software to control remotely the aiming and discharge of a firearm to kill any animal, whether or not the animal was located in Michigan.

The bill is tie-barred to Senate Bills 373 and 620. Senate Bill 373 (S-3) would prohibit computer-assisted shooting involving a bow or crossbow, and Senate Bill 620 (S-1) would prescribe criminal penalties for computer-assisted shooting violations.

Proposed MCL 750.236a

Legislative Analyst: Julie Koval

FISCAL IMPACT

The bills would have an indeterminate fiscal impact on State and local government. There are no data to indicate how many offenders would be convicted of violations. Local units would incur the additional costs of misdemeanor probation and incarceration in local facilities, both of which vary by county. Public libraries would benefit from additional penal fine revenue.

If property were seized and forfeited for repeat violations, the State and local units of government could receive proceeds from the sale of the property, after other obligations were satisfied.

Date Completed: 6-29-05

Fiscal Analyst: Bethany Wicksall

[floor\hb4465](#)

Analysis available @ <http://www.michiganlegislature.org>

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan Senate staff for use by the Senate in its deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.