



**Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police  
House Bill 42 – Interested Party Testimony  
House Government Oversight Committee**

Chair Hall, Vice Chair Ferguson, Ranking Member Humphrey, and members of the House Government Oversight Committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide interested-party testimony on House Bill 42.

My name is Heinz von Eckartsberg. I am the retired Chief of Police for the City of Dublin and formerly served as Assistant Superintendent of the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Today I am appearing on behalf of the membership of the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police, where I serve as chair of the Legislative Committee.

At the outset, I want to be clear that the OACP does not oppose the underlying goals of HB 42, and we appreciate the sponsor's willingness to amend the original bill so that its requirements apply only to *arrestees* rather than all detainees.

That said, we do have concerns that the mechanism proposed in the bill may not be the most efficient or practical way for state government to track the immigration status of arrestees in Ohio.

Local, county, and state law enforcement agencies do not possess the ability to independently determine a person's immigration status. The only accurate and reliable method is the existing process already in place:

- Agencies submit fingerprints to BCI and the FBI as part of standard booking procedure;
- Those fingerprints are then routinely shared with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, which is the federal entity responsible for making any immigration-status determination.

If DHS does not notify the submitting agency of a result, HB 42 appears to require agencies to then seek updates from multiple other entities — including the local prosecutor, the clerk of courts, and, where applicable, the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. For every arrest, this could create a significant volume of follow-up queries, placing substantial administrative burden on all involved agencies without guaranteeing more accurate or timely information.

We do not believe this represents an efficient use of government resources.

The OACP would welcome the opportunity to work with the sponsor to explore alternative approaches that achieve the bill's objective without creating unnecessary workload for law enforcement, prosecutors, clerks, or corrections officials.

At a minimum, we respectfully suggest one additional refinement: limiting the bill's requirements to only those arrestees who must be fingerprinted under the Ohio Revised Code. This would align the legislation with existing statutory practice and reduce needless inquiries for cases in which immigration-status information would never be generated in the first place.

Chair Hall and members of the committee, thank you again for the opportunity to offer interested-party testimony on behalf of the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police. I am happy to answer any questions you may have.