Department of Planning and Budget 2013 Fiscal Impact Statement

| 1. | Bill Number: | SB 82 | 28 | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---------|--------------|-----|------------|-------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| | House of Origin | 1 🗌 | Introduced | | Substitute | | Engrossed | | | | |
| | Second House | | In Committee | | Substitute | \boxtimes | Enrolled | | | | |
| 2. | Patron: | Blevins | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Committee: 1 | Passed | both houses | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | Title: | Control | of dogs | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | Summary: | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Currently, there is a single statute in the Code of Virginia that defines "dangerous" and "vicious" dogs and prescribes the procedures to be used in dealing with dogs that have been deemed by courts to be "dangerous" or "vicious". The statute sets out criminal penalties for dog owners who do not comply with the provisions of the statute. The proposed legislation provides a clearer distinction between "dangerous" and "vicious" dogs by using different statutes to define them and set out procedures for the court to use in handling complaints dealing alleged "dangerous" or "vicious" dogs brought by an law-enforcement officer or animal control officer. The bill does not propose any changes in criminal penalties. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Budget Amer | ndment | Necessary: N | lo. | | | | | | | |
| 7. | No Fiscal Imp | oact: F | inal. | | | | | | | | |
| 8. | Fiscal Implic | ations: | | | | | | | | | |

The bill does not change any criminal penalties nor does it impose any additional duties

9. Specific Agency or Political Subdivisions Affected:

All counties, cities, and towns.

or requirements on state agencies.

General district courts

Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

10. Technical Amendment Necessary: None.

11. Other Comments: None.

Date: 2/8/2013

Document: G:\LEGIS\fis-13\sb828er.docx Dick Hall-Sizemore