



Ohio Legislative Service Commission

Terry Steele

Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement

Bill: [H.B. 79 of the 128th G.A.](#)

Date: April 13, 2010

Status: As Introduced

Sponsor: Rep. Sears

Local Impact Statement Procedure Required: No — No local cost

Contents: Removes the term "pit bull" from the definition of a vicious dog

State Fiscal Highlights

- The bill removes the term "pit bull" from the definition of vicious dogs. By doing so, it is possible that violations of the law concerning certain requirements with respect to vicious dogs will decrease. If the number of violations decreases, there would be a negligible loss in the amount of state locally collected court cost revenue deposited into the Victims of Crime/Reparations Fund (Fund 4020) and the Indigent Drivers Alcohol Treatment Fund (Fund 7049).

Local Fiscal Highlights

- If the bill leads to fewer dog-related violations, counties and municipalities could incur lower costs for prosecuting and adjudicating such cases. There might also be a corresponding loss in court costs and fine revenue.

Detailed Fiscal Analysis

The bill removes the term "pit bull" from the definition of a vicious dog in current law. This means that, under certain circumstances, pit bull owners or keepers would no longer need to comply with requirements dealing with the transfer, confinement, restraint, and liability insurance coverage that apply to vicious dogs. Under current law, an owner or keeper who fails to comply with the confinement and restraint requirements is guilty of a fourth degree misdemeanor on a first offense and a third degree misdemeanor on each subsequent offense. Failing to obtain the liability coverage specified in law is a more serious first degree misdemeanor violation.

Eliminating these requirements as they apply specifically to pit bulls means that there will be fewer such violations and cases prosecuted and adjudicated in county and municipal courts. The Franklin County Municipal Court reported that, in calendar year (CY) 2008, there were 570 charges of "failure to confine a vicious dog" and 676 charges of not having liability insurance for vicious dogs. However, it is uncertain how many of these charges specifically involved pit bulls. Although reducing the volume of cases involving vicious dogs could lower expenses for the courts that hear these cases, it could also lower the amount of court costs and fine revenue collected by these courts. Since part of these court costs and fines are forwarded to the state and deposited into the Victims of Crime/Reparations Fund (Fund 4020) and Indigent Drivers Alcohol Treatment Fund (Fund 7049), the state might also incur a small loss in revenue from this source.