# COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

### FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 3626-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: SB 857

Subject: Consumer Protection; Merchandising Practices

<u>Type</u>: Original

Date: January 8, 2002

# **FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS							
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005				
None							
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0				

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS							
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005				
None							
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0				

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS						
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005			
<b>Local Government</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0			

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 3 pages.

#### FISCAL ANALYSIS

#### **ASSUMPTION**

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on the courts.

Officials from the **Office of Attorney General** assume the costs of the proposed legislation could be absorbed within existing resources.

Officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services (OPS)** assume the proposal could increase the caseloads of prosecutors because it creates a new remedy. OPS assumes the increase should be less than \$100,000. However, passage of numerous bills creating new crimes could have a greater fiscal impact on the prosecutors.

**Oversight** assumes assume the OPS could absorb the cost of the proposed legislation within existing resources.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2003 (10 Mo.)	FY 2004	FY 2005
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2003 (10 Mo.)	FY 2004	FY 2005
	<u><b>\$0</b></u>	<u><b>\$0</b></u>	<u>\$0</u>

## FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

The proposal could have a fiscal impact on small businesses found guilty of price gouging during a state of emergency.

#### **DESCRIPTION**

The proposed legislation would create a price gouging law. During a declared state of emergency, a person would commit price gouging if he or she advertises or charges an excessive

BLG:LR:OD (12/01)

L.R. No. 3626-01 Bill No. SB 857 Page 3 of 3 January 8, 2002

### **DESCRIPTION** (continued)

price for necessities. A person suspected of price gouging would have an affirmative defense if he or she can provide written documentation that the price of the necessity was increased due to an increase in the cost to obtain the necessity and the price increase was beyond the person's control.

A person engaging in price gouging would be liable for three times the amount unfairly received in each transaction.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

#### **SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

Office of Attorney General
Office of State Courts Administrator
Office of Prosecution Services

Mickey Wilson, CPA Acting Director

January 8, 2002