

Ohio Legislative Service Commission

Office of Research and Drafting

Legislative Budget Office

Substitute Bill Comparative Synopsis

Sub. H.B. 247

136th General Assembly

House Public Safety

Amanda Goodman, Attorney

This table summarizes how the latest substitute version of the bill differs from the immediately preceding version. It addresses only the topics on which the two versions differ substantively. It does not list topics on which the two bills are substantively the same.

Previous Version (l_136_0758-3)	Latest Version (I_136_0758-5)	
Dangerous and vicious dogs prohibited from hunting		
Prohibits a dog owner from using a dangerous or vicious dog while hunting by removing the current law exemption from the secure confinement requirements that apply to a dangerous or vicious dog if the dog is lawfully engaged in hunting or training (R.C. 955.24(A)).	Adds an additional prohibition against a dog owner from using a dangerous or vicious dog while hunting by narrowing the exemption to the running-at-large prohibition that currently applies to all dogs (R.C. 955.21(A) and (F)).	
Field trial exemption		
No provision.	Exempts a dog that is not a dangerous or vicious dog and that is engaged in a field trial (which is a competitive event for hunting dogs) from the prohibition against a dog owner allowing their dog to run-at-large (R.C. 955.21(F)).	
Dog warden criminal prohibition		
Retains current law's prohibition against a dog warden from failing to perform the dog warden's	Removes the criminal prohibition against a dog warden who knowingly fails to perform "other legal duties" required of dog wardens (R.C. 955.12(H)).	

Previous Version	Latest Version
(I_136_0758-3)	(I_136_0758-5)
duties under Ohio law or other legal duties required of dog wardens (R.C. 955.12(H)).1	

Dangerous dog act

Specifies that a dog has committed a dangerous dog act when the dog, without provocation, commits one of the following actions:

- Causes injury by physical contact, other than killing or serious injury, to any person in either a menacing fashion or an apparent attitude of attack;
- Kills another dog or livestock; or
- Causes serious injury to another dog or livestock that results in euthanasia of the animal (R.C. 955.22(A)(2)).

Adds that a dog has committed a dangerous dog act when that dog, without provocation, causes serious injury to a person without making physical contact, and does so in either a menacing fashion or an apparent attitude of attack (R.C. 955.22(A)(2)).

Nuisance, dangerous, and vicious dog designation process

Requires the dog warden, in any case involving an alleged dangerous or vicious dog act, or allows the dog warden, in any case involving an alleged nuisance dog act, to petition the court that has territorial jurisdiction over the location where an alleged act occurred to hold a dog designation hearing regarding the dog and requires the court to conduct the hearing within ten days after receiving the petition (R.C. 955.23).

Requires a court to conduct a dog designation hearing concurrently with a criminal proceeding if the dog that is the subject of a hearing is also the subject of a criminal proceeding for a dog attack (R.C. 955.23).

Retains current law's specification that any appeal requested by the dog owner (or any petition filed by the dog warden under the bill) to hear a dog designation hearing to determine the dog's designation and disposition must be held

Instead, in cases where a dog did not cause serious injury to a person or kill a person and the dog warden determines that the dog may safely remain with the dog's owner, restores the current law's designation process under which a dog warden designates the dog and the dog owner may appeal the designation (R.C. 955.23).

No provision.

Clarifies that the hearing must be held within ten calendar days (R.C. 955.23).

¹ See R.C. 955.23 in current law, recodified to R.C. 955.12(H) in the bill.

Don't a ve Veni	Lohosh Mousius
Previous Version (l_136_0758-3)	Latest Version (I_136_0758-5)
within ten days of the request or petition (R.C. 955.23).	
Animal shelters	
Retains current law's provision that exempts a nonprofit animal shelter from paying any dog registration fees (R.C. 955.02).	Exempts a nonprofit animal shelter <i>from any</i> registration requirement, including registering any dog or a dangerous or vicious dog, instead of just exempting them from paying registration fees (R.C. 955.02).
No provision.	Exempts a nonprofit animal shelter, with respect to a dog that it keeps or harbors, from complying with certain requirements governing dangerous or vicious dogs, including notice upon transfer requirements, obtaining liability insurance, and securely confining the dog, if all of the following apply:
	The animal shelter did not have knowledge and could not have reasonably ascertained that the dog is a dangerous or vicious dog;
	The animal shelter checks any microchip implanted in the dog to ascertain the dog's designation status; and
	The animal shelter asks the following questions to the dog's previous owner, if such person is known:
	"Has the dog ever chased or attempted to attack or bite a person? If yes, describe the incident(s) in which the behavior occurred."
	"Has the dog ever bitten a person? If yes, describe the incident(s) in which the behavior occurred."
	"Has the dog ever seriously injured or killed a person? If yes, describe the incident(s) in which the behavior occurred" (R.C. 955.11 and 955.24).