

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO THE ADVISORY BOARD FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHILD CARE CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointments, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 2062, and the order of the House of January 3, 2025, of the following individuals to the Advisory Board for the House of Representatives Child Care Center:

Mr. Matthew Schlesinger, Mount Rainier, Maryland

Ms. Claudia Urrabazo-Beckelman, Washington, D.C.

Ms. Jo Stiles, Washington, D.C.

Ms. Emily Noriega-May, Washington, D.C.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 201(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431) and the order of the House on January 3, 2025, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Commission on International Religious Freedom for a term ending May 14, 2028:

Mr. Asif Mahmood, Bradbury, California

CASHLESS BAIL REPORTING ACT

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1275, I call up the bill (H.R. 5625) to direct the Attorney General to make publicly available a list of each State and unit of local government that permits cashless bail, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1275, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5625

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Cashless Bail Reporting Act".

SEC. 2. PUBLICATION OF CASHLESS BAIL JURISDICTIONS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall make publicly available a list of each State and unit of local government that permits the release pending trial of a person charged with a covered offense on personal recognizance or upon execution of an unsecured appearance bond.

(b) *COVERED OFFENSE DEFINED.*—In this section, the term "covered offense" means a criminal offense that the Attorney General determines poses a clear threat to public safety and order, including—

(1) *an offense involving a violent or sexual act, such as murder, rape, sexual assault, carjacking, robbery, burglary, and assault; and*

(2) *an offense that promotes public disorder, such as looting, vandalism, destruction of property, rioting or inciting to riot, or fleeing from a law enforcement officer.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HARRIS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 5625.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 5625, the Cashless Bail Reporting Act.

In August of 2025, the whole Nation watched in horror as we witnessed the brutal murder of Ukrainian refugee Iryna Zarutka on a Charlotte light rail.

This murder took place right outside my district in a city I have called home for many years. This tragic incident cannot be described as anything other than a cold-blooded murder carried out by a dangerous individual who should not have been out on the streets to begin with.

Iryna Zarutka's alleged killer, Decarlos Brown, Jr., had 14 prior arrests and had previously served a 5-year sentence for robbery with a dangerous weapon. Decarlos Brown, Jr., was out on a written promise to appear in court when he murdered Iryna Zarutka.

Decarlos Brown, Jr., should not have been released on a simple written promise to appear in court given his extensive history of crime and violence.

There are many aspects of public safety that must be addressed to keep our streets safer. One of the most pressing issues is bail reform.

As we celebrate National Police Week and welcome many brave members of our law enforcement to the Hill, I can't help but think about how some States and local governments choose to make law enforcement officers' jobs harder and more dangerous through the laws and policies they enact.

State legislatures, city councils, and rogue prosecutors have implemented radical bail laws and other policies that have worsened violent crime.

These laws and policies have eliminated cash bail, restricted judges from imposing constraints on dangerous criminals, and even mandated the immediate release of criminals back into the community.

Now more than ever it is important that we prioritize American citizens and support our law enforcement officers.

States like Illinois, California, Maryland, New Jersey, New York have modified their bail practices to eliminate or de-emphasize the use of monetary bail systems, which has resulted in increased property and violent crimes.

A March 2023 study by researchers at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice found that approximately 72 percent of violent felony offenders who were released without bail were later re-arrested.

State and local jurisdictions must take steps to address the problems that arise with irresponsible cashless bail policies.

I applaud my home State of North Carolina for passing Iryna's Law, which dealt with cashless bail, among other things. However, we cannot and should not sit and wait for more jurisdictions to experience tragedy to do something about these reckless bail policies.

To be clear, bail is not a criminal fine or a punishment. It is not a reflection of a defendant's guilt or innocence. It exists to ensure the defendant will appear at all required proceedings during their criminal case. Bail is imposed after an assessment of risk, the risk that a defendant may flee from a jurisdiction, and the risk that a defendant may harm witnesses or other members of the community if they are released before trial.

My bill, the Cashless Bail Reporting Act, will empower Americans with the information they need to advocate for much-needed changes. This bill simply requires the Attorney General to publish a list of each State and local jurisdiction that allows individuals charged with certain serious offenses to be released before trial either on personal recognizance or unsecured appearance bonds. This list will be made public and updated periodically to ensure Americans have accurate data on the extent of cashless bail across our country.

Americans should be able to see which jurisdictions have enacted dangerous and irresponsible policies related to bail when making decisions about where to live, to work, or to travel. It also shows Americans where change is needed most. The American people deserve transparency and accountability when it comes to policies that affect public safety.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HARRIS for his thoughtful remarks.

I rise to support and will vote for H.R. 5625, the Cashless Bail Reporting Act, because it would simply direct the Attorney General to publish a list of State and local jurisdictions that permit cashless bail.

This is already publicly available information. I just googled it. The answer seemed to come up, but it would be good to have some, perhaps, professional refinement and certification that these are actually the numbers.

Mr. Speaker, National Police Week is typically an opportunity for us to bring meaningful legislation forward that will support law enforcement and help them to perform their critical, lifesaving duties because Congress wants to support and honor their work. I am not quite sure that we are living up to this high calling in this National Police Week.

This bill, for example, is unobjectionable, but it doesn't do much work at all. It is hard to see how issuing a report advances community safety or justice.

Given the strangely hostile rhetoric that we are hearing from our colleagues about cashless bail, I thought I would take a moment to talk about what bail is and what it is not.

As the gentleman correctly states, bail is not a mechanism for punishment. In America, everybody is innocent until proven guilty. Whether you are the President, the Pope, or a pauper, you are considered to be innocent and presumed to be innocent until you have been proven guilty in a court of law, observing due process, by a jury of your peers, beyond a reasonable doubt, and with the prosecution satisfying every element of the burden of proof.

People have a right to their freedom while they are preparing to stand trial, among other reasons, to get ready for trial, unless they are a flight risk or unless they pose a danger to themselves or to other people.

That is basically the rule, as I understand it. In fact, that is the rule we have been using in the Federal system for more than 60 years. We have a cashless bail system under Congress in the Federal courts. There are 94 Federal district courts all across America, operating in red States, blue States, purple States, and everything in between. They all use a cashless bail system.

Mr. Speaker, when a person is brought forward on an arraignment before the court, those of us who have practiced law or have been prosecutors know this process in a very familiar way. The court asks one simple question, which is: Is this person a flight risk, or do they pose a danger to themselves?

They could be the richest person in the world, but if they are a flight risk, as, for example, some of the Epstein defendants clearly are—these are globe-trotting criminal defendants—it shouldn't make any difference how

much money you have to pay for bail. The money should be irrelevant to it.

Conversely, if you are not a flight risk, if you are not a danger to the community, but you are a pauper and have no money, you should not be held simply because you can't pay \$5,000, or whatever the bail is.

Somebody might be able to put up \$1 million or \$1 billion, but if they are going to abscond, if they are going to run away, they should be held. That is the Federal system. Money doesn't enter into it.

To my knowledge, I don't think there are any bills out there—my staff will correct me—that seek to overthrow the Federal bail system, which is a cashless system.

I don't know of a single candidate in America who is running for Congress on the premise that we need to overthrow the cashless Federal bail system, which is working great everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, cash bail is a billion-dollar, for-profit industry. Who makes money off of that? The bail bondsmen make money off of it, and they are very politically active. They don't want to see any change. They don't want to see the Federal system being adopted by States and jurisdictions around the country.

A cash bail system asks a different question. It doesn't focus on: Are you dangerous or a flight risk? It focuses on: Can you pay? Can you pay?

From the standpoint of the Federal system, that is an irrational, arbitrary issue that just confuses the question of why a person, who is presumed to be innocent but is now facing serious criminal charges, should be held in jail during the pendency of their trial or waiting for their trial to take place.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know why I am surprised that there are Members of Congress who are demonizing jurisdictions simply because they prefer to employ a policy that exactly mirrors Federal law. To say that that is somehow soft on crime strikes me as just bizarre, unless the entire Federal system is soft on crime because of the system that we have used.

I am not, in any way, afraid of or intolerant of this debate. I think we should have the debate. To the extent that this bill is just asking DOJ to compile information that is already publicly available, it is fine with me. I am going to vote for it.

Nothing currently prevents the Attorney General from compiling and publishing this information right now. Due to the miracles of artificial intelligence, it seems to be pretty quickly readily available. I think I got it in less than 1 second.

This bill could help to officially coordinate the collection of this information and ensure that it is reported accurately, so I plan to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support of this bill by the ranking member of our committee and what he has shared.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HARRIS for bringing this important legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, public safety should never take a back seat to politics. That is why I rise today in support of the Cashless Bail Reporting Act.

This legislation brings transparency and accountability to jurisdictions that release individuals who are charged with serious violent crimes without requiring bail.

The American people deserve to know where dangerous offenders who are accused of crimes like murder, rape, robbery, carjacking, rioting, and assault are being released back into communities before trial on unsecured bond or personal recognizance.

We have seen the devastating consequences of these failed policies. In Charlotte, Iryna Zarutka was tragically murdered by an individual who had been released on a cashless bail despite a violent criminal history.

I joined my colleagues for a hearing in Charlotte to meet with families who have lost loved ones at the hands of repeat offenders. Their stories are truly heartbreaking, and their message was clear: Enough is enough.

We must stand with victims, support law enforcement, and put public safety first.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), the very distinguished ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Crime and Federal Government Surveillance under the Judiciary Committee.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5625, the Cashless Bail Reporting Act. This bill directs the Attorney General to put together a public list of every State and local court that allows cashless bail.

While I think that this bill doesn't actually do very much, I hope that its passage will help to at least cut through some of the red tape, the partisan rhetoric, and the fear-mongering that we keep hearing about cashless bail, the system of bail that is used in our Federal courts and that this body actually has the jurisdiction over.

I want to reiterate over and over again that public safety is not a red or a blue issue. We need to stop making it that way. It is an American issue that affects everyone here.

We have to remember that the United States Constitution leaves it directly to the States. We talk all the time about States' rights. My colleagues across the aisle, Republican colleagues, talk about giving more responsibility to the States to make the decisions for their constituents. If we are talking about States' rights, the Constitution does leave it to the States to decide issues of public safety, including how the courts should operate.

States are grappling with these issues every single day. In my home State of Georgia, Republican politicians just reversed course on a whole slate of reforms that they ushered in by Republicans in the State legislature just a few years ago.

They didn't need Congress here. They didn't need our flip-flopping on that. They very well did it on their own.

□ 1240

Since this bill does nothing more than just tell the Attorney General to publish a list of information that already has been publicly made and available, I will support it. I just hope that the final product will be put to good use.

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week is Police Week, and I think our law enforcement officers would agree that public safety should not be a partisan issue.

What we have seen around the country are leftist judges and DAs who are pushing policies that put criminals back on the streets and take tools away from law enforcement. One of the ways that happens is through cashless bail.

I was an attorney for 30 years, and I practiced all levels of court, including criminal practice. I have seen, particularly in certain areas in my home State and other areas around the country, where violent criminals are released on either very low bail or sometimes cashless bail.

As Mr. HARRIS pointed out, you had the tragic situation of Iryna Zarutskya who was brutally murdered on the light rail in Charlotte. She would be alive today had that criminal been in jail. He had been released over and over and over again.

The Cashless Bail Reporting Act that we are debating today at least creates a list of jurisdictions that release individuals accused of serious offenses like murder, rape, and carjacking without requiring cash bail.

Now, I do think that the ranking member's assessment of bail—I would not disagree with the gentleman's assertion of how bail is set up. I would submit, and perhaps the gentleman would agree with me, that there are instances where the courts simply are getting it wrong. Someone with common sense should look and say: Why was this guy released on the street?

Look at the seriousness of the underlying crime, the criminal record. When you see someone who has been through the courts over and over again, and when the crimes get more serious every time, it starts off with maybe just stealing, then it goes to robbery, then it goes to assault, then it involves a weapon. Why in the world would that person be released on a cashless bail? Let alone, why would they not be held in jail awaiting trial?

Here is what happens. When you look at the statistics of the folks who commit crimes in my State and your State and other States, a lot of the crimes are committed by the same folks over and over again. The statistics are out there showing the folks who go out and commit crimes while they are awaiting trial on other charges. We have to rein this in, and we have seen situations around the country where that hasn't happened.

Look, I will tell you, in my home State of North Carolina, former Governor Roy Cooper actually released over 3,500 convicts, people who had already been convicted, he released them early from prison with lengthy criminal records, and the stats are showing of those folks released, most of them have reoffended since then.

The reality is there are some people who are dangerous. They are criminals. They are going to rob. They are going to murder. They are going to commit crimes, and they should be incarcerated. What this bill does at least, is this is going to shine a light—and I appreciate you doing this, Mr. HARRIS—this is going to shine a light on those jurisdictions where the judges are just letting these violent criminals back out again.

I hope a day will come when even folks who are on the left where some of this stuff is happening in these districts will realize it is not about left or right because when these criminals offend, they don't pick and choose who their victims are. They often terrorize those communities that can least afford to have that done to them.

So I appreciate this work, and we have other steps. There is a bill I am supporting that would actually create liability in the case of gross negligence when folks are released out on cashless bail.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this bill, and I hope we pass it.

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the gentleman for his thoughtful remarks there. We certainly don't want to see anybody being released without regard to whether or not they pose a danger to the community or whether they will abscond and disappear.

A good example of that happening recently was when President Trump en masse pardoned more than 1,500 convicted felons who were Proud Boys, Oath Keepers, rioters, and insurrectionists who assaulted 150 police officers right here on the Capitol campus. Departing from the traditional process of examining each case individually, which is what the Department of Justice has done in the pardon office, he just pardoned all of them. So he didn't look to see which ones had been convicted before of domestic violence, armed robbery, or other forms of felony crimes.

Some of them had no criminal record. Some of them had serious, violent criminal records. All of them were released. And what do you know, dozens of them have since reoffended since that terrible process took place.

One guy recently, Andrew Paul Johnson in Georgia, was released by Donald Trump, pardoned by him. He got out of jail and went and sexually assaulted two 12-year-olds. When they and their families were about to go to the police to report the crimes, he said: Well, I am about to get millions of dollars from Donald Trump because I am a J6er. I will split the money with you if you don't go in. Thankfully, they went and reported him to the police. He was prosecuted, and he was just sentenced to life in prison. Those two kids' lives are irrevocably altered because of the process that took place, which was no process, which is I am just going to go ahead and release everybody.

We have had other J6ers who were pardoned by Donald Trump who have since been convicted of offenses including domestic violence, violent assault, home invasion, and so on.

So I could not agree more with the point that people should not be getting out of jail or prison without any regard to the danger that they pose to the community.

Now, how does this all relate to bail? Well, I hope we agree that nobody should be getting out of jail without regard or without the court taking an analysis of whether they are a flight risk or whether they pose a danger to the community. That is what the focus should be.

So certain jurisdictions have said, including the Federal system, that is all we need to know. You could be the richest person in the world. You could be worth a billion dollars. It doesn't make any difference. If you are a flight risk, if you are a community danger, we are not going to let you out.

Conversely, you might be the poorest person in the world, but if you pose no flight risk, if you pose no danger, then you should be allowed to be released because that is the constitutional presumption, the presumption of innocence.

So the injection of a financial payment into the process just confuses the issue.

Now, I am not saying every State has to follow what the Federal courts do and what we have done for more than 60 years. That is up to them. That is a question of federalism.

That is why I am trying to prefigure where this whole inquiry leads. It looks like it is leading to an attack on the States who want to do it the way the Federal system has done it for more than a half century. I am just raising the point that I think we should look very carefully before we go down that road and we impose a different view on the States in some kind of straitjacket as to their criminal justice policies that we don't accept for ourselves because the current system is working great here.

So I agree with the prior speaker. We don't want people getting out of jail for any reason, whether it is bail or parole or a pardon from the President, without due consideration of what the effects are going to be on the community.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would say I want to thank the gentleman for his bill. I am going to vote for his bill. More information always better. I have got no problem with that.

The only thing I reject is the insinuation that the States that do it differently from the Federal system are somehow better than the States that do it in accord with the Federal system. We have had cashless bail at the Federal level for many decades, and our system zeros in on the critical criteria of whether or not this criminally charged suspect poses a flight risk or a danger to the community.

I hope that we can continue the conversation about what we can really do to advance and enhance community safety.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I do thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for his support of this bill and for his statements and I do hope that we will be able to continue conversations.

I would say in closing, Mr. Speaker, how many more victims must there be before we act? Cashless bail policies have proven to be a disaster. Soft-on-crime jurisdictions have released criminals on mere promises to reappear in court without adequately considering the flight or safety risk they pose to those around them.

□ 1250

I believe the American people believe enough is enough. The American people deserve to live in safety. The American people deserve safe public transportation. The American people should not have to live with the consequences of reckless bail policies, and it should not take brutal murders for these reforms to happen.

We must stop prioritizing ideology over safety. We must stop playing politics with bail policy. We must fight for a safer America, regardless of State or locality.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to stand for public safety and to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1275, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

KEEPING VIOLENT OFFENDERS OFF OUR STREETS ACT OF 2025

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1275, I call up the bill (H.R. 6260) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit fraud in connection with posting bail, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1275, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 6260

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH POSTING BAIL.

Section 1033(f)(1)(A) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the comma the following: "(including the posting of monetary bail, criminal bail bonds, and Federal immigration bail bonds)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 6260.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6260, the Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act of 2025.

The bill defines the posting of cash bail by a corporate, nonprofit, or for-profit entity as engaged in the business of insurance, subjecting them to Fed-

eral insurance laws and our criminal fraud statutes.

The use of crowdsourcing for posting bail has long been scrutinized by the courts, now as a way to disguise the true source of the funds. That is because if there is little or no relationship between the defendant and those supplying the money, the bail money provides no incentive to prevent the defendant from simply fleeing the jurisdiction. This is especially true if the money does not have to be paid back.

While crowdsourcing funds is generally illegal, the use of charitable bail funds remains legal in most States. Charitable bail funds generally flew under the radar until 2020, when the George Floyd riots caused revenues to balloon, thanks to solicitations from celebrities and some politicians.

What used to be a small, community-based organization that helped post bail for nonviolent misdemeanors has grown into a multimillion-dollar industry.

For example, the Minnesota Freedom Fund saw revenues increase by 18,000 percent between 2019 and 2020. In a similar situation, The Bail Project saw its contributions triple in 2020 to nearly \$42 million.

Perhaps more alarming, what was intended to help bail out low-level, non-violent protesters has instead been used to release violent felony offenders back into the streets with little or no oversight.

In 2021, for example, the Minnesota Freedom Fund released a domestic abuser back onto the street. Two weeks later, the man, George Howard, was charged with second-degree murder for a road rage incident.

Michael Dewitt of Louisville, Kentucky, was bailed out by The Bail Project in February 2021 after being arrested on multiple charges. Two months later, he was arrested for murder.

Shawn Michael Tillman, 3 weeks after having bail paid by the Minnesota Freedom Fund, murdered a man at a light rail station in Saint Paul and is now serving a life sentence for that crime.

Mr. Speaker, the list continues to go on and on. According to an investigation conducted by CNN, in Hennepin County, Minnesota, the Minnesota Freedom Fund has bailed out at least 65 defendants who were awaiting trial on felony charges involving violence, physical threats, or sex crimes.

Similarly, in Indiana, of the roughly 1,000 defendants released on bail supplied by The Bail Project between 2019 and 2021, 24 percent had previously been charged with a crime of violence, and 35 percent were accused of felony charges and had a previous charge of at least one crime of violence.

Because these funds are crowdsourced, there is no incentive for the defendants to show up for their court date. Guess what. Many of them don't.