

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-fourth Session  
May 4, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Mark E. Amodei at 9:09 a.m. on Friday, May 4, 2007, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

23

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Mark E. Amodei, Chair  
Senator Maurice E. Washington, Vice Chair  
Senator Mike McGinness  
Senator Dennis Nolan  
Senator Valerie Wiener  
Senator Terry Care  
Senator Steven A. Horsford

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Marcus Conklin, Assembly District No. 37  
Assemblyman Ruben Kihuen, Assembly District No. 11

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Linda J. Eissmann, Committee Policy Analyst  
Brad Wilkinson, Chief Deputy Legislative Counsel  
Lora Nay, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Chris W. Collins, Las Vegas Police Protective Association; Southern Nevada  
Conference of Police and Sheriffs  
Darrell Wade, Henderson Police Officers' Association; Southern Nevada  
Conference of Police and Sheriffs  
Knight Allen  
Lea Lipscomb, Retail Association of Nevada

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 4, 2007  
Page 2

Robert J. Rojas, Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce  
Erin McMullen, Law Vegas Chamber of Commerce; Nevada Restaurant Association  
Robin L. Sweet, Deputy Director, Planning and Analysis and Court Services, Office of Court Administrator, Nevada Supreme Court  
James Jackson, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice  
Joseph A. Turco, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada; Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice  
Joshua Martinez, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association  
Ron Titus, Court Administrator and Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts, Office of Court Administrator, Nevada Supreme Court  
Arthur E. Mallory, District Attorney, Churchill County

CHAIR AMODEI:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 49.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 49 (1st Reprint)**: Revises certain provisions concerning jury service. (BDR 1-145)

ASSEMBLYMAN MARCUS CONKLIN (Assembly District No. 37):

I brought A.B. 49 on behalf of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Officers Association (LVMPOA) and Las Vegas Police Protective Association. It is a compromise seeking to exempt active-duty police officers from jury pools as officers are already often stricken from jury pools by the nature of their work, their job and job history. In Clark County, we have limited resources and an expanding response time for all the criminal activity and it does not make practical sense to remove officers from the streets for one to three days.

Our compromise narrowly defines police officer and puts a sunset provision in section 3. It is expected that within four years, software will be available to help deal with the issue effectively. In rare cases, police officers are selected into the jury pool on civil cases. There is no lack of desire to participate, there is only a lack of desire to sit for several days, never get chosen and be off the streets and off work because of their profession. The anticipated software will keep the jury pool random but allows for delineation between civil and criminal trials.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 4, 2007  
Page 3

CHRIS W. COLLINS (Las Vegas Police Protective Association; Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs):  
We urge your support for A.B. 49.

DARRELL WADE (Henderson Police Officers' Association; Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs):  
The men and women I represent are in support of A.B. 49.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:  
Where did the second portion of A.B. 49 come from concerning primary caregivers?

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:  
The Assembly Committee on Judiciary added an amendment not part of the original intent of the bill. It concerned constituents, who had been called to jury duty, whose primary responsibility was to provide care to a family member or a community member. The person receiving the care would not have anyone to care for them. The bill was amended for that reason.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:  
When we revised this section during the 73rd Legislative Session, did we remove trainmen on railroad cars including brakemen and conductors?

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:  
I do not recall. Several years ago, former Chief Justice Robert Rose, Nevada Supreme Court, brought a plan to put everyone into the jury pool. There were too many exceptions including teachers, doctors and all the people we would want included in a jury pool. There were numerous exclusion requests. Having a large jury pool is important for a good system of justice. Police officers, as a matter of practicality, never get selected for criminal trials, especially by defense attorneys.

KNIGHT ALLEN:  
I have come today to speak in favor of A.B. 49 and ask you give serious consideration to reinstating the exemption for judges. Judges and juries do not mix and for generations judges understood this. They hold an elevated place within our system of jurisprudence. They also understood the limits and constraints of their positions until this generation of judges who seem to have

thoroughly convinced themselves they can do just about anything they want, including sit on a jury.

Section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (d) of the original A.B. 49 said "any judge, justice of the peace or attorney at law." Please return the judges and the justices of the peace to the exemption list. We have a newbie judge who is having a difficult time, and she held an ex parte conversation with the jury. There was a quote in a newspaper story that is central to A.B. 49. It was from a professor at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, William S. Boyd School of Law, who said, "Juries can be too differential to a judge and her opinion." That is accurate. The professor continued:

It is not in the best interest to have judges shutting down their courts, hardly a fiscally responsible thing to do, and go sit in a jury pool for one or three days waiting to get into a jury room where they are obviously going to control the process. When you do that, you are not deepening the jury pool, you are polluting it.

After all, Senators, if you as Legislators on your own turf, in your own building and in charge of your own legislative process are going to defer to judges, what is going to happen to a cabdriver, bank teller, hotel maid, flight attendant or any citizen sitting in a jury room with the judges? Judges do not belong in a jury room and I am here to request you please return to the practice of exempting judges as was the procedure for many years before the 73rd Legislative Session.

SENATOR CARE:

The changes in the law stem from a bill requested by the Nevada Supreme Court in either the 70th Legislative Session or the 71st Legislative Session. The theory was that everyone has a civic duty to sit on a jury. I never sat on a jury. I have had jury trials. If you are going to exempt police and then judges and then you can just go down the list and we are back to where we were when there was a study leading to the legislation in the 71st Legislative Session.

MR. ALLEN:

The original law exempted locomotive engineers, firemen, conductors, brakemen, switchmen, engine foremen and any employee of the Legislature. Still in there are physicians, optometrists, dentists licensed to practice in the state and any county clerk, recorder, assessor, etc. These people are on the

frontline executing and adjudicating the law on a daily basis and should not be in a courtroom.

I have been in the jury pool several times. No one is suggesting we go back to having locomotive engineers on the exempt list again. We are talking about two vital and important segments to the execution and adjudication of our jury system. A judge trying to be an ordinary citizen is not going to work. I do not even have a problem with attorneys not being exempted; they can work that out among themselves.

SENATOR WIENER:

Section 3, subsection 2 of A.B. 49 has a 2011 sunset provision; do they believe they can separate civil and criminal jury pools by then?

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

Though it was not testimony, we believe by 2011 we will have something. If not, we will have to revisit the legislation.

SENATOR WIENER:

The benefit of the sunset provision is that we will have another chance for evaluation.

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

You have the positive opportunity to review it or it goes away.

SENATOR WIENER:

Mr. Allen, who is my constituent, takes a serious role in public comment and providing information to the panels I have sat on through the years. Based on his rationale, I could see the same argument. If you are talking about judges who participate daily in the process, it would also be appropriate to consider prosecutors and public defenders who might not be the best members of a jury pool. We may have to widen the exemption list if we are going to consider his testimony.

CHAIR AMODEI:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 49. We will open the hearing on A.B. 50.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 50 (1st Reprint)**: Amends the exceptions authorizing the release of the home address of a peace officer by a law enforcement agency in certain circumstances. (BDR 23-146)

ASSEMBLYMAN CONKLIN:

Assembly Bill 50 is a compromise piece of legislation. In the 73rd Legislative Session, we passed a police officer's bill of rights and in almost every iteration of that police officer's bill of rights, it addressed the privacy of an officer. Somehow the final bill did not include the officer's home address in cases where that police officer is not under arrest or indictment. The revision of A.B. 50 has been narrowed in scope on a compromise between the Nevada Press Association and the Las Vegas Police Protective Association. It authorizes the release to the public of a home address of a police officer if the officer has been arrested; the address is included in a report of 911 telephone calls, police report, witness statement or certain reports relating to the custody of a child.

MR. COLLINS:

I am fortunate to work for an agency that does not release the home addresses of the officers in our department. We believe it is vital to the families and safety of our officers. We ask for you to support the bill to help protect other officers in Nevada.

MR. WADE:

The Henderson Police Officers' Association and the Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs support A.B. 50 and ask for your support.

SENATOR CARE:

Information of the real property owned by a peace officer or a judge is not accessible through the county recorder's information on the Internet, but you could physically go down and find the microfiche and then get the home address. Am I right?

MR. COLLINS:

That is my understanding.

SENATOR CARE:

There was an incongruity because the information could be made available to a reporter who could put it in the newspaper and make it public information. If we pass A.B. 50, would you object to delivering a summons or complaint to the

substation or headquarters where a police officer works for purposes of service of process?

MR. COLLINS:

Our policy is all subpoenas involving an officer come through the risk management section of our police department. It does not prevent process servers from attempting to contact an officer at home. Everyone in Clark County is aware the processors deliver them to the police department so I do not think there would be a problem.

SENATOR CARE:

It is currently a voluntary policy; nobody in Las Vegas Metropolitan Officers Association is going to dispute effective service and say they were never served.

CHAIR AMODEI:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 50. We will open the hearing on A.B. 279.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 279 (1st Reprint)**: Requires the unused value of certain gift certificates to escheat to the State. (BDR 52-961)

ASSEMBLYMAN RUBEN KIHUEN (Assembly District No. 11):

I appreciate this opportunity to present this important piece of legislation on behalf of the generous consumers of Nevada. Assembly Bill 279 requires the unused portion of an expired gift card—purchased in Nevada—to become abandoned property and escheat to the state to be used specifically for education.

Unused portions of a gift card are already supposed to be handed over to the state where the issuer or corporation is incorporated, which most of the time is not Nevada. Even though a gift card was purchased in Nevada, if the company is incorporated in Delaware and if the card expires, the remaining balance escheats to Delaware. In 2006, out of \$80 billion spent on gift cards, roughly \$8 billion was never redeemed. An estimated 20 percent of the people who received gift cards in 2005 never used them.

The state where the card was sold can claim the unused portion only if the state has an escheat law. It makes sense if a card is purchased in Nevada that the money should stay in Nevada. Assembly Bill 279 would allow this money to

stay in the state and generate much-needed funds for education without raising taxes or fees.

LEA LIPSCOMB (Retail Association of Nevada):

We are speaking in support of A.B. 279. We have worked closely with Assemblyman Kihuen and he is aware of our proposed amendment ([Exhibit C](#)). The amendment would more closely align this bill's verbiage with the language in the Uniform Unclaimed Property Act and require 60 percent of the unredeemed or uncharged value of an expired gift certificate be deemed abandoned and escheated to the state while the other 40 percent of the value remain with the issuer of the gift certificate. The federal Financial Accounting Standards Board determined this reduction of value would accommodate the issuers of gift certificates for administrating the effort of obtaining and maintaining the purchaser's contact information as well as for holding that value on their accounts payable. After the abandoned amount has escheated to the state, the legislature determines where the money will go.

ASSEMBLYMAN KIHUEN:

I approve of the amendment.

CHAIR AMODEI:

The effort required to maintain records is a fixed cost regardless of the amount; therefore, 40 percent of a \$50 gift certificate versus 40 percent of a \$200 gift certificate is a profitable accommodation. Why is this?

SENATOR CARE:

The Senate passed Senate Bill 103 which is the revised Uniform Unclaimed Property Act. Gift certificates were exempted knowing A.B. 279 has been introduced in the Assembly. The amendment's language as to the 60 percent is consistent with the Treasurer's Office and what is contained in the Unclaimed Property Act.

**SENATE BILL 103 (1st Reprint)**: Adopts the Uniform Unclaimed Property Act.  
(BDR 10-718)

CHAIR AMODEI:

I do not dispute its consistency. I am wondering why. I guess the moral of the story is do not buy a big gift certificate because the 40 percent is a heck of a deal.



Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 4, 2007  
Page 9

ROBERT J. ROJAS (Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce):

On behalf of the Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce, we encourage your favorable consideration on A.B. 279 and the allocation of unused funds from gift certificates and cards going to Nevada. This bill, as well as the proposal and testimony shared by the previous speaker, represents a compromise between the sponsor of the legislation and representatives of the business community.

ERIN McMULLEN (Nevada Restaurant Association; Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce):

We want to go on record in support of this bill and thank Assemblyman Kihuen for working with us in crafting consumer-friendly legislation by addressing the needs of the business community. We have agreed to exempt gift certificates with no expiration date. This may provide incentives for those who are still putting expiration dates on their gift cards to stop doing so; and we applaud the creativity of finding funds for education through escheatments.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Is there a provision in your proposal concerning gift certificates with no expiration dates issued from a business that goes out of business?

ASSEMBLYMAN KIHUEN:

There is not, but we could include one. A person could go to the business or the person who owned the business and try to reclaim the money. If the business kept the money, they could return it to the unclaimed property of the state where it was incorporated.

CHAIR AMODEI:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 279.

SENATOR WIENER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
A.B. 279.

CHAIR AMODEI:

This is with the Retail Association's amendment.

SENATOR CARE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR NOLAN WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR AMODEI:

On A.B. 50, we have received a memorandum ([Exhibit D](#)) with proposed revisions on behalf of the Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice (NACJ) and also on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).

We will open the informational hearing on A.B. 190.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 190**: Makes various changes to provisions governing criminal procedure. (BDR 14-655)

ROBIN L. SWEET (Deputy Director, Planning and Analysis and Court Services, Office of Court Administrator, Nevada Supreme Court):

There are two sections to A.B. 190. The first section is a cleanup on bail bond reporting. This is one piece of information that would greatly help our efforts to manage that part of the reporting. The second section moves the reporting requirement of pre-adjudication information on murder, manslaughter and those kinds of cases from the Nevada Supreme Court to the Office of the Attorney General.

JAMES JACKSON (Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice):

The NACJ supports A.B. 190. Our only concern is that it be clear on the legislative record that these records, reports and submissions will be accessible to the public and can be obtained from the Attorney General's Office.

Ms. SWEET:

I have provided copies of our report ([Exhibit E](#), original is on file in the Research Library).

SENATOR CARE:

I had the same concern relayed to me by the "Nevada Support: Nevada Coalition Against Death Penalty."

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 4, 2007  
Page 11

CHAIR AMODEI:

Is the concern to amend the bill to indicate the report in the Office of the Attorney General is a public record?

MR. JACKSON:

That would be agreeable and appealing to the NACJ.

CHAIR AMODEI:

We will close the hearing in A.B. 190. We will reopen the hearing on A.B. 50.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 50 (1st Reprint)**: Amends the exceptions authorizing the release of the home address of a peace officer by a law enforcement agency in certain circumstances. (BDR 23-146)

JOSEPH A. TURCO (American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada; Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice):

The ACLU and NACJ had no particular problem with police officers keeping their addresses confidential. There is a public policy served by that. Police unions and police management know that when the chips are down, push comes to shove, when fundamental rights are at stake, we are there with them.

The problem with this proposal is that it may be intended or unintended, but service of process is going to be hindered. The attorneys explained in the offered amendments that oftentimes a desk sergeant will refuse to accept service. What is a litigant to do? I was ignored in the Assembly and so were the amendments. The proponent of the bill did not seem interested. I need your help for litigants. If you do not like a lawsuit, there are plenty of ways to get rid of it, but evading service is an improper way to do it.

SENATOR CARE:

Were you present when I raised that issue? I have not seen the amendment, but when I raised that issue, the response from LVMPOA is they have a policy that service is effected upon serving it to some entity within LVMPOA. It is a proposal not uniformly observed. If the address is not available, then litigants need to find some way to effect service upon police officers, either as parties or as witnesses.

MR. TURCO:

The NACJ lawyers, who practice in criminal defense on a daily basis, apparently had problems in certain locations in Clark County where service was refused. I am not aware it is a problem in Washoe County.

JOSHUA MARTINEZ (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):

When an officer is being sued or needs to be served papers regarding an issue arising out of his job, our risk management goes ahead and accepts service of the papers. If it is something outside the job, we direct them to the substation where they work and try to get them in contact with those people.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Have you had a chance to see the proposed amendment?

MR. MARTINEZ:

I have not. We can do it today.

CHAIR AMODEI:

I need you to speak with Assemblyman Conklin and your colleagues about the proposal of a centralized location and the appropriate specific times, hours and days and any concerns you may have.

SENATOR CARE:

For the record, I want to make it clear I am not suggesting officers evade service. I am simply saying it is obviously an issue we need to address concerning how do you effect service of process upon an active peace officer.

CHAIR AMODEI:

That context is accurate; no one is opposed to providing protection to those in public safety. If you have to serve them with something, here is where you go to do it.

We will close the hearing again on A.B. 50. We will open the informational hearing on A.B. 246, a bill still in the Assembly dealing with judges in the Eighth and Second Judicial Districts and the number of judges therein.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 246**: Increases the number of district judges in the Second and Eighth Judicial Districts. (BDR 1-654)

RON TITUS (Court Administrator and Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts, Office of Court Administrator, Nevada Supreme Court):

Assembly Bill 246 proposes adding ten judges to the Eighth Judicial District, in Clark County and two judges in the Second Judicial District in Washoe County. The two judges in Washoe County would be family court judges. In the Eighth Judicial District it is proposed six of the ten would be family court judges and four criminal and civil judges.

We received a suggestion and proposed an amendment to A.B. 246 creating a tenth judicial district by separating Churchill County and adding it to Mineral County. Lyon County and Churchill County create the Third Judicial District. Mineral County is in the Fifth Judicial District with Nye and Esmeralda Counties. There are three judges in the Third Judicial District. The proposal makes Lyon County its own Third Judicial District and Churchill and Mineral Counties will make the tenth judicial district. If a tenth judicial district is created, the proposal is to take one of the three judges and put them in the tenth district and add a new judge in the tenth district. There would then be two judges in Lyon County and two judges in Churchill and Mineral Counties.

The Assembly Committee on Judiciary felt this was a separate policy issue and did not want to compound it with the request for judges in the Second and Eighth Judicial Districts even though the Judicial Council and the Nevada Supreme Court are in support of creating a tenth judicial district.

SENATOR CARE:

How long have the current lines for the judicial districts been in existence?

MR. TITUS:

It has been longer than ten years, though I do not know when it was done.

ARTHUR E. MALLORY (District Attorney, Churchill County):

This proposal not only affects Churchill County but also Lyon County. Three of the Senators on this Committee have jurisdiction over part of these areas. It is projected that Nevada will grow about 40 percent in the next 5 years. Much of that growth will be in the north. We are the third largest judicial district in the state in population. Clark and Washoe Counties are larger. We are the largest rural-type county district in the state with Lyon and Churchill Counties projected to grow significantly in the next five to ten years.

We have three judges with two courtrooms in Lyon County and two courtrooms in Churchill County. We have faced situations where we have a judge doing work at a secretary's desk when all three judges are present. Now is the time to realign the districts for more effective distribution of judicial resources without a tremendous cost to the taxpayer.

We will be decreasing the travel between Yerington, the county seat, and Churchill County by making Lyon County its own separate judicial district, and leaving two judges there who would be able to devote all their time and resources to hearing cases. By combining Churchill County with Mineral County, a judge would be one hour away at the most. In the old Third Judicial District, the only related cost would be the cost of another judge, which is borne by the state and the county. There would be no fiscal costs for buildings or additional courtrooms and we would not need additional staff. This proposal is a good way to deal with growth without incurring tremendous costs.

We do not intend to effect the ability of Clark and Washoe Counties to get more judges. We have provided a packet with numbers and statistics ([Exhibit F](#), original is on file in the Research Library) showing this is one of the most cost-efficient proposals we could come up with. It increases access to justice for people in rural Nevada. It decreases travel time for judges. All of the numbers and figures came from the State Demographer, the Administrative Office of the Courts, the Nevada Supreme Court and the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) includes letters of support from all the county commissions. The mayor of Fallon supports this proposal as does all the various financial officers involved who say it would not have a significant financial impact on their counties. We respectfully ask it be given serious consideration in whatever manner you think appropriate.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

Your proposal is a good idea. You did not include a letter from Nye County. How do the Nye County commissioners feel about this?

MR. MALLORY:

I do not know how the Nye County commission feels about this. District Judge Robert W. Lane has spoken in favor. He is the judge in Pahrump handling the caseload of over 45,000 people. I do not know an objection they would have as this proposal would make more judicial time available at no cost.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 4, 2007  
Page 15

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

I spoke to District Judge Lane, who normally sits in Pahrump, and District Judge John P. Davis in Tonopah. This would make life easier for all of them.

SENATOR WIENER:

Can you give me additional history on why you do not have your own bill draft and why you are coming so late to the process so we can understand the measures to take if it is going to go forward?

MR. MALLORY:

I guess we could call it naivety or ineptitude on our part. When we presented the material, we assumed it would be included with the bill adding judges. We have been working on this for over a year and a half.

CHAIR AMODEI:

I am responsible for putting A.B. 246 on the agenda. The request to add a tenth judicial district was made prior to the beginning of Session. The request was denied and I am not sure what the exact basis of the denial was. I was approached probably a month ago with the issue. So that fills in part of the time line.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

Mr. Mallory presented this to me around the holidays, past the deadline for individual drafts. Since there was a bill addressing the issue of additional judges, I counseled him that there would be no problem adding an amendment. We took too much for granted and probably were not as timely as we could have been.

CHAIR AMODEI:

You indicated the counties pay for most of the infrastructure. The state would pay for the salary of a judge. Does the county pay for the salary of the secretary, the bailiffs and other stuff? Is the fiscal impact of A.B. 246 to the state the salary of one district judge?

MR. MALLORY:

Yes, sir.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Is it your testimony the fiscal impact to the counties is neutral in terms of the courtrooms and the staffs?

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 4, 2007  
Page 16

MR. MALLORY:

That is correct. There would be the potential for one additional law clerk in Churchill County. The comptroller in Churchill County assures us it would not be a problem. It would have no impact on Nye County and Goldfield because they would continue with two judges and the same staff they already have.

CHAIR AMODEI:

In your [Exhibit F](#), are there details in terms of the money end of it?

MR. MALLORY:

There are letters from the three different county commissions involved. We could get letters from the comptrollers.

CHAIR AMODEI:

Will you provide a one-page report talking about the fiscal impact to the state and the counties?

MR. MALLORY:

Yes, sir. We will have it on your desk by Monday morning.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

Under tab 11, [Exhibit F](#), there is a memo from the Churchill County Comptroller, Alan F. Kalt, concerning the costs.

SENATOR HORSFORD:

I want to be noted as voting in favor of Assemblyman Kihuen's bill on gift certificates, I had to be in the Senate Committee on Finance.

CHAIR AMODEI:

The record will so reflect for [A.B. 279](#); show Senator Horsford as a yes vote. If Committee members know of matters of concern in the Assembly money committees that have come through the Senate Committee on Judiciary and require a hearing, let me know.



Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 4, 2007  
Page 17

CHAIR AMODEI:  
We are adjourned at 10:29 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Lora Nay,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Mark E. Amodei, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_