



LEGISLATIVE OFFICE FOR RESEARCH LIAISON

PA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

House Box 202218, Harrisburg, PA 17120-2218

Dr. Michael R. KING, *Executive Director*
Colette M. FAZZOLARI, *Admin. Assistant*

(717) 787-8948

FAX (717) 783-3485

TO

**Hon. Susan Laughlin, ATTN: Judy
Room 120, South Office Building**

FROM

**Sean Gimbel
Research Analyst**

**"Fingerprint Identification on
California Driver's License"**

LORL Inquiry #0683-96

May 21, 1996

LORL's Response

LORL is providing the following information concerning "*fingerprint identification on California driver's licenses.*"

In California, applicants for a driver's license are required to supply a fingerprint or thumbprint on their driver's license application. Section 12800(c) of the California Vehicle Code requires that "Every application for an original or a renewal of a driver's license shall contain a legible print of the thumb or finger of the applicant."

The California driver's license is designed to accommodate fingerprint identification, and most drivers permit their fingerprint or thumbprint to appear on their license. According to the California

Highway Patrol, fingerprint identification on driver's licenses is helpful in providing an additional element of identification of the licensee. However, fingerprint identification on the license itself is not mandatory. Section 12811 of the California Vehicle Code specifies what is required to appear on driver's licenses, and fingerprints or thumbprints are not mentioned. Therefore, a licensee may refuse without prejudice to have a fingerprint or thumbprint appear on the license.

Copies of the California Code mentioned above are included for your review. If you need anything further, please contact our office at 7-8948, or visit Room 223, South Office Building. Thank you.

June 12, 2001

To: Democratic Transportation Committee Members

From: Paul Parsells



Subject: Committee meeting today.

By now you should have been notified that Chairman Geist will be calling a meeting of the committee to consider SB237. The rationale is to move the annual permit changes included in the legislation which has remained in committee primarily because of the emission language added by Senator Lavalley in the Senate.

While I see no significant issues with that language, a commitment was made to Senator Lavalley by the Senate Republicans to protect his amendment. After consulting with leadership, *I would suggest that a negative vote on the Geist amendment to remove the Lavalley language might be appropriate. I do not see a problem with an affirmative vote on the vote to report the bill after the amendment.*

If you are not familiar with the Lavalley amendment, it requires the department to suspend the current emission inspection program if by October 5, 2001, the department has not issued a report or applied on board diagnostic system checks uniformly in all areas required to do so by EPA.

IF you have any questions, please see me. You may also call Marilyn in our office at 3-8338 if I am not around. She will find me.

**Cc: Mike Veon
Mike Edmiston**