

House Bill No. 577—Private Detectives' Licenses

AN ACT to repeal Section 91 of Article 56 of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1957 Edition), title "Licenses", sub-title "Private Detectives", and to enact a new Section 91 in lieu thereof, to stand in the place of the section so repealed, providing for the rules and regulations which are to govern hearings before the Superintendent of the Department of State Police pertaining to the issuance, renewal, suspension or revocation of licenses and the manner in which appeals may be taken from the decision of the Superintendent after such hearings.

May 5, 1959.

Honorable Perry O. Wilkinson
Speaker of the House of Delegates
State House
Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. Speaker:

House Bill 577 is intended to alter the present practice and procedure before the Superintendent of Maryland State Police in conducting hearings for the issuance, suspension or revocation of private detective licenses. I do not believe that the modifications to existing procedure are desirable since the changes will involve additional expense in administering the law and will unduly restrict the ability of the Superintendent to conduct informal investigations and pre-hearing conferences. It is a most unusual requirement that an administrative official must give advanced detailed notice as a condition to discussing a complaint with a licensee. There is no justification for preventing the Superintendent from considering truths which may be revealed as a result of voluntary disclosure during an informal investigation. Investigations, conferences and hearings should have a goal of ascertaining truth with a minimum of technicalities. The requirement that all hearings, regardless of the probable outcome, must be stenographically reported, will substantially increase the cost of every hearing without any commensurate benefit. I am advised that this procedure is already employed in all formal hearings where revocation or suspension is even likely. I believe that the provision for automatic stay on the mere entry of a motion for re-hearing or of an appeal after an applicant or licensee has been given a full hearing without the necessity of showing a good and probable cause, is to encourage dilatory tactics and to delay prompt and final determinations. I further believe that this Bill would unduly complicate the established administrative procedure at additional expense to the State and thus impede prompt and final administrative determinations.

Accordingly, I have vetoed House Bill 577.

Respectfully,

(s) J. MILLARD TAWES,

Governor.

JMT:ss