

TEXAS PUBLIC POLICY FOUNDATION

2019-20  
**LEGISLATOR'S  
GUIDE**  
to the issues



**TEXAS PUBLIC POLICY**  
FOUNDATION

Copyright ©2018 by the Texas Public Policy Foundation

Permission to reprint in whole or in part is hereby granted, provided the Texas Public Policy Foundation and the author are properly cited.

The Texas Public Policy Foundation is a 501(c)3 non-profit, non-partisan research institute.

The Foundation's mission is to promote and defend liberty, personal responsibility, and free enterprise in Texas and the nation by educating and affecting policymakers and the Texas public policy debate with academically sound research and outreach.

Funded by thousands of individuals, foundations, and corporations, the Foundation does not accept government funds or contributions to influence the outcomes of its research.

The public is demanding a different direction for their government, and the Texas Public Policy Foundation is providing the ideas that enable policymakers to chart that new course.

TEXAS PUBLIC POLICY FOUNDATION  
901 Congress Ave., Austin, TX 78701  
(512) 472-2700 Phone (512) 472-2728 Fax  
[www.TexasPolicy.com](http://www.TexasPolicy.com)

# Procedural Liberty and Asset Forfeiture

## The Issue

Our western criminal justice system is at its core one of laws, not of men. The supremacy of law is deliberate. Man's passions are fickle, prone to capricious reaction, and oftentimes unmeasured during times of stress and uncertainty. Steadfastness in the rule of law allows society to weather such perilous times rather than careen from one crisis to another.

The rule of law—and by proxy the legitimacy of the criminal justice system—is rooted firmly in unflinching adherence to the formal procedure as a manifestation of our founding principles. The presumption of innocence, entitlement to a jury of one's peers, the state bearing the high burden of proof, and the sanctity of property rights are representative of our revolutionary inheritance, direct responses to the atrocities endured at the orders of George III and Santa Anna. These procedural elements ensure that the end result of the criminal process is just.

Today, this legitimacy is threatened. Whether by laziness, fear, or emphasis on clearance over correctness, procedural “shortcuts” have cropped up in routine practice, divesting the system of the requisite safeguards to be considered a neutral arbiter of guilt.

One example of this is civil asset forfeiture. Under this practice, police and prosecutors can take your property without ever charging you with a crime. Further, the protections you would have if you are accused of a crime (such as a lawyer or a jury of your peers, just to name a few) are not due during forfeiture proceedings, because it is *the property itself* that is alleged to be guilty of the criminal offense.

Texans are not even made aware of how much civil forfeiture is being conducted in the state, as there are no requirements to post such numbers, only to inform the attorney general of the aggregate amount of property forfeited.

Further, the original intent of the Fourth Amendment was to allow for police officers to conduct reasonable detentions and searches, and to seize evidence to be later used in a criminal prosecution without a warrant. What it is not intended for is to, after a failure to produce any evidence of wrongdoing, allow the detention to be extended indefinitely until more invasive warrantless measures can be employed, such as a canine search. Such detention is permissible only if there is a reasonable suspicion of wrongdoing, said six of the U.S. Supreme Court justices in *Rodriguez vs. United States*, including the late Antonin Scalia.

Procedural soundness is not about helping the guilty go free. Those that would do harm to our families and communities must be duly punished under the law, and we must be certain that the punishment is delivered to the correct person. By ensuring that criminal procedure adheres to the intent of our founding documents, we can buttress the legitimacy of our criminal justice system.

## The Facts

- Texas law is amongst the most permissive of civil asset forfeiture, requiring only a preponderance of the evidence standard be met before the government can take property.

- Civil forfeiture is, more often than not, done without any representation of the interests of the property owner.
- In 2017 alone, over \$50 million was forfeited by agencies in Texas.
- Texas has a track record of enshrining procedural protections, such as with the codification of *Riley v. California* during the 84th Legislature.

### Recommendations

- Wholly eliminate civil asset forfeiture by requiring a conviction before property can be forfeited.
- Empower police and prosecutors by strengthening criminal forfeiture, allowing judges to declare property abandoned if the appropriate government entity has undertaken its due diligence in trying to locate the owner and if no one has come forward to claim the property, thereby bypassing the conviction requirement.
- Bolster the “innocent owner defense” for property owners, requiring the state to prove via clear and convincing evidence that the owner knew their property was being used for illegal activities.
- Divert forfeited cash and property to the purview of the jurisdiction’s elected body, e.g., the city council or commissioners court—those with the authority to appropriate.
- Failing meaningful procedural reform, require forfeiting agencies to publicly report information on individual forfeiture proceedings including value of the property and whether a criminal conviction was obtained.
- Codify the standards established in *Rodriguez v. United States*, allowing Texas appellate courts to determine the legality of certain traffic stops under Texas law.

---

### Resources

[Rebutting Common Myths of Civil Asset Forfeiture](#) by Derek Cohen, Texas Public Policy Foundation (Dec. 2016).

[Asset Forfeiture by Texas Law Enforcement](#) by Derek Cohen, Texas Public Policy Foundation (April 2016).

[Without Due Process of Law: The Conservative Case for Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform](#) by Derek Cohen, Texas Public Policy Foundation (Sept. 2015).

[Taking Contraband Without Taking Our Liberties: Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform in Texas](#) by Derek Cohen, Texas Public Policy Foundation (March 2014).

## Experts

**Kara Belew**, *Senior Education Policy Advisor, Center for Innovation in Education*  
kbelew@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: State Budget, Taxes, Public Education Finance and Policy, Public Education Accountability

**Derek Cohen, Ph.D.**, *Director, Center for Effective Justice and Right on Crime*  
dcohen@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Juvenile Justice Reform, Victims' Rights, Overcriminalization, Constitutional Limitations on Corrections

**The Hon. Chuck DeVore**, *VP of National Initiatives; Senior Fellow for Fiscal Policy*  
cdevore@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Tax and Fiscal Policy, Elections, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, Energy and Environmental Policy

**Vance Ginn, Ph.D.**, *Director, Center for Economic Prosperity; Senior Economist*  
vginn@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: State Budget and Tax Reform, National and State Labor Market Trends, Tax and Expenditure Limits, Energy Markets and Policy

**Michael Haugen**, *Policy Analyst, Center for Effective Justice and Right on Crime*  
mhaugen@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Civil Forfeiture, Overcriminalization, Substance Abuse Policy

**The Hon. Talmadge Heflin**, *Director, Center for Fiscal Policy*  
theflin@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: State Budget and Taxation, Economic Stabilization Fund, Local Government Spending, Pension Reform, Federal Funds

**Haley Holik**, *Attorney, Center for Effective Justice and Right on Crime*  
hholik@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Juvenile Justice, Grand Jury Reform, Constitutional Limitations on Search and Seizure, Overcriminalization

**Marc Levin, Esq.**, *VP of Criminal Justice and Right on Crime*  
mlevin@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Adult Corrections, Juvenile Justice, Overcriminalization, Victim Empowerment and Restitution, Law Enforcement, School Discipline

**Thomas Lindsay, Ph.D.**, *Director, Center for Innovation in Education*  
tlindsay@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Higher Education, Culture Wars (Political correctness, cultural decline, etc.), America's Founding Principles, Online Learning, Federalism, Tenth Amendment, Interstate Compacts

**Brandon J. Logan, Ph. D.**, *Director, Center for Families & Children*  
blogan@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Child Welfare Policy, Foster Care, Adoption, Family Law, Parental Rights

**Bryan Mathew**, *Policy Analyst, Center for Local Governance*  
bmathew@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Local Economic Regulation, Local Economic Development, Municipal Annexation, Housing Affordability, Property Rights, Special Districts

**Stephanie Matthews**, *VP of Public Affairs*

smatthews@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Workforce Development, Charter Schools, School Choice, Virtual Learning

**Jennifer Minjarez**, *Policy Analyst, Center for Health Care Policy*

jminjarez@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Medicaid Reform, Mid-Level Providers, Medical and Dental Licensure Reform

**Bill Peacock**, *VP of Research*

bpeacock@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Electricity Markets and Renewable Energy, Insurance, Technology and Telecommunications, Tort Reform, Property Rights, Economic Development, Consumer Issues

**Randy Petersen**, *Senior Researcher, Center for Effective Justice and Right on Crime*

rpetersen@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Policing Policy, Diversion Programs, Civil Asset Forfeiture

**James Quintero**, *Director, Center for Local Governance*

jquintero@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Budgets, State and Local Spending, Debt, Taxes, Transparency, Pensions

**Kevin D. Roberts, Ph.D.**, *Executive Director*

kroberts@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: K-12 Education Growth, Increasing Public School Efficiency, Education Choice, Higher Education, Tenth Amendment

**Emily Sass**, *Policy Analyst, Center for Innovation in Education*

esass@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: K-12 Education, Education Choice, School Finance, Civic Education, Charter Schools

**Deane Waldman, Ph.D.**, *Director, Center for Health Care Policy*

dwaldman@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: Health Care, Medicaid, Telemedicine, Scope of Practice, Regulatory Issues

**The Hon. Kathleen Hartnett White**, *Distinguished Senior Fellow-in-Residence; Director, Center for Energy & the Environment*

khwhite@texaspolicy.com AREAS OF EXPERTISE: EPA Regulation, Energy and Environmental Policy, Free Market Environmental Policies, Endangered Species Act, Water Rights

The Texas Public Policy Foundation is a 501(c)3 non-profit,  
non-partisan research institute.

The Foundation's mission is to promote and defend liberty,  
personal responsibility, and free enterprise in Texas and  
the nation by educating and affecting policymakers and  
the Texas public policy debate with academically  
sound research and outreach.

Funded by thousands of individuals, foundations, and  
corporations, the Foundation does not accept government  
funds or contributions to influence the  
outcomes of its research.

The public is demanding a different direction for their  
government, and the Texas Public Policy Foundation is  
providing the ideas that enable policymakers  
to chart that new course.



901 Congress Ave., Austin, Texas 78701 | 512.472.2700 phone 512.472.2728 fax  
[www.TexasPolicy.com](http://www.TexasPolicy.com)