

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Sixth Session
April 19, 2011**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman William C. Horne at 9:16 a.m. on Tuesday, April 19, 2011, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/76th2011/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman William C. Horne, Chairman
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Steven Brooks
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblyman Richard (Skip) Daly
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
Assemblyman Scott Hammond
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblyman Kelly Kite
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom
Assemblyman Mark Sherwood

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dave Ziegler, Committee Policy Analyst
Nick Anthony, Committee Counsel
Lenore Carfora-Nye, Committee Secretary
Michael Smith, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeff Wells, Assistant County Manager, Clark County
Natalie Tyrell, Chief Judge, North Las Vegas Township Justice Court
Karen Bennett, Chief Judge, Las Vegas Township Justice Court
John McCormick, Rural Courts Coordinator, Administrative Office
of the Courts
Bryan Nix, Coordinator, Victims of Crime Program, Department of
Administration

Chairman Horne:

[The roll was called.] Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the first day back after the first Committee deadline. To give everyone an idea of what took place, we referred 117 bills. We heard 98 of them, and processed 80. Everyone did a great job, and now we will begin hearing the Senate bills. First up today, we will hear Senate Bill 25 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 25 (1st Reprint): Revises the method used to determine the number of justices of the peace in a Township in certain counties. (BDR 1-342)

Jeff Wells, Assistant County Manager, Clark County:

I am here with Judge Karen Bennett from Las Vegas, and Judge Natalie Tyrell from North Las Vegas. Senate Bill 25 (R1) is designed to change the statutory population trigger for adding new judges to townships. I would like to begin with what it does not do. This bill only deals with Clark County and does not involve the rest of the state. It does not eliminate any departments. It does not eliminate any sitting judges, nor would it eliminate the department that any sitting judge is in. It is strictly a prospective bill only. Henderson and North Las Vegas each have three judges currently. The current population trigger of 100,000 stays in effect until they reach their fourth judge. Thereafter, for Henderson, North Las Vegas, and prospectively Las Vegas, the trigger moves from 100,000 to 125,000 in population. Mr. Chairman, that is the short version of the bill. We have worked cooperatively with all of the justice courts in our county. Two of the judges are here to support this.

Chairman Horne:

You mentioned that this was strictly prospective, and that there would be no elimination of departments. Does that include staff? We are not talking about any staff reductions in any of the existing departments, are we?

Jeff Wells:

The bill itself has no staff reductions whatsoever, because Clark County has statutory obligations to provide certain staff to each department. As all of the departments are maintained, we will be maintaining those staffing obligations to the departments.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

You mentioned the triggers based on population. Is that going to be just the population derived from the decennial census? Or, will there be any effort to take into account growth between the 2010 census and the 2020 census?

Jeff Wells:

It is based on the population determined by the Governor every two years. I believe the Governor signs off in March. Within the existing language for the current 100,000 population trigger, there is a provision that every two years the population is adjusted based upon what the demographers certify to the Governor. That is what is known as the trigger population. There is always a two-year delay. For example, if the population in North Las Vegas would go to 300,001, that 1 person would entitle them to the fourth judicial department. The election for that would not occur until the next even year thereafter. There is already a built-in delay, but it is not a 10-year delay, it is a 2-year delay.

Assemblyman McArthur:

I am wondering why the different triggers? You can have the same population and a different number of justices of the peace.

Jeff Wells:

The purpose is to assure that both North Las Vegas and Henderson get to move to the fourth judge, under the current rules. That is why the bill maintains that the 125,000 trigger does not come into place until Henderson and North Las Vegas make it to their fourth department. The Township of Las Vegas already has 14 departments. Two of the fourteen departments just started this past January. Because we just added the 2 there, we are able to move in the 125,000 figure immediately. In fact, there were some mathematical equations that Judge Melissa Saragosa and I worked on earlier. We actually start the equation at 1.1 million. Effectively, 125,000 is a trigger, but a trigger only goes backwards to the 1.1 million. It is a long mathematical formula which basically

means that the Township of Las Vegas would get its next judge with about another 90,000 people. Thereafter, it would be in 125,000 increments.

Assemblyman McArthur:

I believe I understand that; however, if you have 1.1 million, looking at section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a), you would have a total of nine justices. Now, if you go down to the second part, using 1.1 million you would wind up with 11 justices. It just does not look to me like this is being based on population. That is why I am curious about the trigger. Each of those two areas would have 1.1 million but you have a difference of two justices.

Jeff Wells:

You would be absolutely correct mathematically if the Las Vegas Township population was frozen today, and North Las Vegas moved up to 1.1 million. At that point, they would each be at 1.1 million. The Las Vegas Township would have more judges, based on that amount of population, than North Las Vegas would because the 125,000 trigger would apply to them. That is mathematically correct; however, we wanted to be sure that we protected all 14 departments that currently exist in the Las Vegas Township. It was written this way to make it clear that we are not reducing any of the current judges or their current departments.

Assemblyman Daly:

Going back to your example, using North Las Vegas going from 300,000 to 300,001 as the factor to get their fourth justice, do the districts get redrawn and receive an equal portion? Does it get completed by the County Commission or by the City Council? If they went to a fifth justice, but the population was still at 125,000, will the districts be equaled out? You should not have four justices at 100,000 and one justice at 125,000. It is just a mathematical calculation to determine when the county gets another justice, and then you balance them out. Is this correct?

Jeff Wells:

No. The Board of County Commissioners does in fact set the boundaries for the townships. The township boundaries are the same for the elected constables and the justices of the peace. There are 11 townships in Clark County. There are eight that we call the outlying townships. There are three larger townships which are Henderson, Las Vegas, and North Las Vegas. Both Henderson and North Las Vegas have populations in the range of 250,000 to 260,000, and they have three departments. The Las Vegas Township's population is at 1,380,000. As Las Vegas expanded, and brought more territory into the city, the population base grew during the development years. The Commission generally does not go through and balance the population, however they do try

to generally keep all of a city boundary within the same township. Each of the townships has unincorporated Clark County islands. North Las Vegas will include the City of Las Vegas, but will also have unincorporated Clark County portions as well.

Assemblyman Daly:

I will try my question again because I do not think you understood it. Let us say you get to the fourth or fifth justice of the peace. Using your example, moving from 300,000 people to 300,001 people, you receive a fourth justice. Two years later, you are going to elect that guy. You still have 300,001 people. Then, when the County Commission or township redraws the districts, there will be a new election. Who does it, and do they equal them out? Are there going to be three justices with 100,000 people, and one justice with 125,000? Or will it be balanced out?

Natalie Tyrell, Chief Judge, North Las Vegas Township Justice Court:

I think I understand your question. The township elects all the judges as a whole, so there are no lines drawn. When the cases are assigned, they are done so randomly so that each judge has the same amount of caseload. These figures will not affect the fourth judge when elected, having more of a caseload than the rest. Because of that random appointment of cases, we all have the same number. Does that answer your question?

Assemblyman Daly:

Yes.

Chairman Horne:

Judge Tyrell, do you have other comments you wish to put on the record?

Judge Tyrell:

Yes, thank you. We are able to live with the negotiations that we worked out with the County. We believe that by allowing us to receive our fourth judge as stated in the bill, based upon the slowdown in growth, it will probably be quite some time before we would add a fifth judge. We can live with this, and speaking as a member of the Nevada Judges of Limited Jurisdiction Association, we support the bill, with the amendment, as well. Thank you.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

It is my understanding that North Las Vegas Justice Court currently is not receiving the resources it needs as far as courtrooms and deputy district attorneys. Will this bill help that issue at all?

Judge Tyrell:

Unfortunately, it will not. You are correct, we do not have the district attorney staffing that we need. The Public Defender's Office and the County have been working with us as far as indigent defense, but this will not address that issue. We are hopeful that at some point, it will work out.

Karen Bennett, Chief Judge, Las Vegas Township Justice Court:

I would like to echo the sentiments of Judge Tyrell. On behalf of Las Vegas Justice Court, I am very pleased that we were able to cooperate and work diligently with county management. Judge Melissa Saragosa was tasked with that assignment, and I think she did an exemplary job in working with the County. I am sure Mr. Wells would echo my sentiments in that regard. We would like to see this bill passed with the amendments.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

Do you think the bill, how it is written, will adequately provide citizens in Las Vegas access to the courts?

Judge Bennett:

I believe that it will. Quite frankly, right now we are experiencing a slowdown. We are at a point where we are going to be looking at our own internal resources and coming up with some different innovative programming which I hope will provide even greater access. We definitely are mindful of the needs of the people whom we serve. We certainly do not want to hinder their access. The reality is, given the current budget restraints, we all have to pay our fair share. That is what the courts are trying to do in cooperating with the County on this bill.

Chairman Horne:

Are there any other questions for Mr. Wells or the judges? I see none. Thank you. Is there anyone here who wishes to testify in favor, in opposition or neutral on S.B. 25 (R1)? Seeing none, I will close the hearing on S.B. 25 (R1). We can move the bill now, if you would like.

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 25 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN DALY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Horne:

Let us now open the hearing on Senate Bill 6 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 6 (1st Reprint): Authorizes the electronic reproduction of the seal of a court. (BDR 1-324)

John McCormick, Rural Courts Coordinator, Administrative Office of the Courts:
I am here today on behalf of the Nevada Supreme Court. Senate Bill 6 (R1) is designed to do one thing. It allows for the electronic reproduction of a court seal. It allows the seal to be applied to the document electronically. Currently in statute, the seal must be applied through impression or on a substance attached to the document. Basically this will modernize our court seal statutes. In the bill, the security of an electronic court seal is contemplated. It will be governed by three sets of rules. Any electronic filing rules that will be adopted by the Supreme Court are intended to help safeguard a document from being changed after the seal is applied to reduce the likelihood of any unauthorized reproduction. Any court that decides to utilize the electronic seal will have to incorporate its own local rules of practice regarding the matter. That summarizes the substance of S.B. 6 (R1). There are a few other states that have allowed the use of electronic seals, including Iowa, Oklahoma, Michigan, Texas, and Virginia. In the research we have done, none of the states experienced a problem with this method. I am open to any questions. Thank you.

Assemblyman Kite:

You addressed the problem of security in reproducing the seal. You did not say how the security would be ensured. Is there some particular way that would keep someone from forging such a seal?

John McCormick:

The specifics involving the security aspect have not been determined yet. Hopefully, we will come up with an effective methodology to address that concern.

Assemblyman Frierson:

You touched on other states using this process. Can you elaborate on the specifics of that?

John McCormick:

The states that are utilizing the electronic seal currently are Iowa, Oklahoma, Michigan, Texas, and Virginia. Their statutory schemes all vary a little bit. We have not identified any problems with any of them. There is also some usage of electronic seals in federal courts, but I do not have specifics on that.

Chairman Horne:

Is it safe to assume they have security measures in place within the states that are utilizing the electronic seals?

John McCormick:

Yes, they do have security measures in place. I believe most of them have been processed through court rule and local procedure.

Assemblyman Daly:

For clarification purposes, which types of documents will utilize this type of seal? I am assuming this electronic seal will take the place of the standard raised seal or gold seal which would be attached to the document. I know that the birth certificates from Washoe County are not valid without that seal. Even a copy must have the impression on it certifying its validity. What kind of documents are they applied to? I realize there are all kinds of security measures which can be installed to be sure it is not easily duplicated.

John McCormick:

The documents would be any that are statutorily required to contain the seal, such as a court order, or documents filed with the court. I can do some research and come back with a complete list, if you would like me to. Basically, it would be for any official documents of the court. Currently, there is a stamp that can be applied to a substance which is attached to the document, as per the statute. It could be wax, a gold sticker, et cetera.

Chairman Horne:

Would it be just the Supreme Court seal, or is it for other courts?

John McCormick:

This would represent the seal of any court in Nevada, as long as the court opted to use the electronic seal and adopted their own local rules.

Chairman Horne:

You may have some problems with the security issue.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

I am having trouble understanding the driving motivation behind this bill. As far as I can tell, the current system is working well. Will there be great benefits from this?

John McCormick:

The primary motivation is the move toward allowing for e-filing. It will allow a document that is e-filed to have the seal affixed electronically so that a hard

copy does not have to be generated for the seal to be affixed to it. It is a matter of efficiencies and reducing resource usage.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

You mentioned other states. Was that their motivation as well?

John McCormick:

That is my understanding. It would take better advantage of the technology that we are implementing, as a court system.

Assemblyman Hammond:

It seems rather simple, but I think there are some unanswered questions. You say there are five states utilizing the method now. I would like to know more about the specifics of those states' methods. I am also concerned with the security, and whether there is an economical benefit to this method. If the five states have not been utilizing the method for very long, we do not know what the ramifications may be in the long run. There may be problems such as someone faking the seals, or other problems with documents that were never actually produced by the court. I would ask you to provide us with more about the security.

John McCormick:

Iowa authorized the electronic seals in 2009. Oklahoma authorized usage in 2004. Michigan authorized usage in 2010. Texas authorized usage in 2007. I am not sure about Virginia's startup. As far as the security matter, I am not aware of the specifics of the technology, and what electronic measures can be taken. I realize that my answer was less than sufficient; however, the rules would be adopted by the local courts. I can do some more research on what specific security measure may be employed by the courts.

Assemblyman Hansen:

What is the penalty for document forgery? Can you provide me with an example of why someone would want to forge a seal? Is this even an issue?

John McCormick:

I do not know what the current penalties are. The court seal is addressed generally in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 1. I would have to look at the penalties. Regarding unauthorized production, I do not believe it is a big problem currently. I imagine someone could want to reproduce a document to fake that he had filed something with the court.

Chairman Horne:

What about an order garnishing your bank account?

John McCormick:

The order of garnishment would also require a signature of the justice of the peace.

Chairman Horne:

Yes, but we are talking about a seal here. A financial institution is not going to necessarily know whether or not the signature of the justice of the peace is authentic. They will look for a seal to indicate it is a true and accurate document. That is an example of why there are some concerns here from the Committee regarding the lack of information on the security measures. I believe that Mr. Anthony is looking up the penalties for forgery, but has not located it yet. Are there any other questions or concerns that have not been addressed? I see none. Is there anyone wishing to testify? With no further testimony, we will close the hearing on Senate Bill 6 (R1). We will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 67 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 67 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the disbursement of money from the Fund for the Compensation of Victims of Crime. (BDR 16-431)

Bryan Nix, Coordinator, Victims of Crime Program, Department of Administration:

I am here to testify in support of Senate Bill 67 (R1). This bill essentially deletes one sentence from *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 217.260, which currently requires the program to pay claims in a manner based on the percentage difference between revenues that come into the program, and the estimated claims against the program. The language that I highlighted in my written testimony can cause quite a problem if we apply it literally. You can see from my submitted testimony ([Exhibit C](#)) that last year, we had about \$38 million in victim claims. We had just about \$8 million to pay those claims. Based on last year's claims, of the \$36 million in claims, \$28 million represented hospital claims. We end up paying a disproportionate amount of claims just to hospitals, in relationship to all the other victims' needs. We have been managing for several years now to pay all of the victims' needs, with our limited resources.

The Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) recently reviewed the program in an audit, and felt the language required a stricter interpretation than we were applying. We are asking the Legislature to delete the referenced sentence. The claims would be paid under policies adopted by the State Board of Examiners, rather than proportionate to the revenue and the expenses. Currently, all of our policies are online. I believe there are approximately 90 pages of policies which discuss all aspects of how the claims are paid. I am available for any questions.

Chairman Horne:

Are there any questions on S.B. 67 (R1)?

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

Can you work out an example under the current laws versus the laws under this bill? Let us say someone applied who had a very large need that may take a substantial amount of the fund's money. How would it work differently under current law versus this bill?

Bryan Nix:

I can provide you with many examples but we see many cases. I think you all understand the cost of a hospital emergency room visit. If someone stays two or three days in a hospital emergency room, or in intensive care, the cost may add up to thousands of dollars. The bills will sometimes accumulate to over \$1 million. Typically, when someone is injured that gravely, they have additional problems such as being out of work, or requiring additional reconstructive surgery. They may need counseling to deal with the trauma. In that type of case, under strict reading of the statute, virtually all of the money in that claim would have to go to the hospital bill. Our claims are limited by statute or by policy. The Board of Examiners policy limits a claim to \$35,000. There are exceptions, and we can go to \$150,000 in some cases. The general rule would be that the hospitals will get the bulk of the money and there will be little left. The victim, who incurred a \$1 million hospital bill, or an \$800,000 hospital bill, would not receive the reconstructive jaw surgery. They may not receive lost wage benefits, whereas they were covered for their injuries.

Let us look at the way we pay claims pursuant to the Board of Examiners' policies. The hospitals are paid according to fee schedules, primarily based on the state workers' compensation fee schedules. They are then reduced further in these types of cases because of the limits on the claim. At the beginning of that claim, we try to determine what the spectrum of the victim's needs are going to be, before we commit to paying off the hospital bill. In fact, if it were a priority three bill, it would get paid after the other bills are addressed. The big difference is the victims would have more of their hospital bills paid, but it would not be much more. For instance, a \$1 million hospital bill might get \$35,000 instead of \$20,000, allowing the rest of the money to be available for other victim needs. I hope that addresses your question.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

I believe that it does. If I understand correctly, under your proposed bill, the extra cost for things like reconstructive surgery might be available for the

person. Whereas, beforehand, it might be more limited in what would be available.

Bryan Nix:

Yes, primarily because the victim's claim would have been exhausted by payment of the hospital bill. Each claim is only allowed a certain amount based on policy. If there is a claim with serious injuries, we may be looking at a claim of \$50,000 to \$100,000. Although it varies, because the bill may be only \$35,000. It depends on the policy. The bottom line is the hospital bill would have eliminated virtually all of the available funds to pay on that particular claim. It would not affect other claims, because each claim has an individual policy limit, and that one claim would be exhausted under this current statutory language. As it is now, if we can eliminate this one sentence, we would be able to work with the hospital in regard to our cost containment policies by applying cuts to fee schedules, et cetera, and still have enough money left over in the claim to pay some of the victim's other bills. For instance, last week I approved surgery to rebuild a victim's jaw after he had been released from the hospital. The emergency room will not provide that sort of surgery. They will patch you up, save your life, and send you home. In that kind of claim, there would not have been any money left to pay for that sort of surgery. The money would have been eaten up by the initial hospital bill. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to have the ability to testify from Las Vegas.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

As I understand it, the way we are structured currently, for all injuries and accidents, the hospitals have a priority lien on all disbursements. The reason for that is because they have to treat people, and cannot turn anyone away. That is part of the reason that we have put the hospitals in the first position. It is difficult to change a precedent, because once this is done, the insurance companies and secondary health insurers would want this change as well. The attorneys representing the people in the accident would also request this change. I wonder whether there may be another remedy to contain costs, perhaps by negotiating with the hospitals. To take the hospital's first priority away and still burden them with the responsibility of treating everyone does not seem equitable. What other remedies would be available to contain costs, besides taking away the precedent that we have established?

Bryan Nix:

Under the policies adopted by the Board of Examiners, and under long practice of the Victims of Crime Program, we have been paying the hospitals reduced fees, as per our fee schedules, for 17 years. I have not heard from any hospital that opposes this bill, or that has ever opposed our policies. Because of the policies that we have adopted, we are able to pay fast, and pay by a scientific

method, according to fee schedules first. They are only reduced based on the claim limit. The hospitals know that we are going to pay in every case. This is unusual for victims of crime programs throughout the country because none of the other states have adopted the kind of policies and approach as successfully as we have. We have the ability to take \$8 million in funding provided and satisfy \$36 million of victim claims in one year. We have never had a complaint from a hospital. Last year we paid nearly 13,000 bills and every single bill that we have paid was accepted by the provider in full satisfaction of the victim's obligation. I do not think we need to change what we are doing. We need to change the language, which has been interpreted only recently as requiring a stricter approach. Personally, I think the policies of the Board of Examiners already take care of this problem, but there is an interpretation problem between us and the LCB auditors. Although I think what we do is completely appropriate and legal within the intent of the statutes, the problem is between us, LCB, and the application of this particular language. Having to pay claims proportionally to our estimated revenue and expenses would decimate the Victims of Crime Program. Nobody does it that way.

The language was put into the bill by Bill Bible, while he was Budget Director. When this program was implemented by the Legislature, there was very little funding to pay claims. It was quickly discovered that the amount of bills overwhelmed the amount of funding. It has never been anything except that. We have never had enough money to pay claims. Mr. Bible asked the Legislature to adopt this language so they could take all of their claims, divide up all of the medical bills, and pay them out a prorated share. It disposed of the claim and got rid of the file. It paid some of the victim's bills, but it did not really address the victim's needs like we do now. We no longer need to just get rid of the files. We need to utilize the best approach in order to apply some type of reasonable scientific approach to paying claims while knowing there is never enough money to pay all of the claims.

There is one final point I would like to make. In order to qualify for this program, none of the victims will have any money to pay bills of this nature. The hospitals know that if it were not for this program, they would not receive any money for these bills. What the hospitals receive will allow them to close their file, or seek other sources of compensation. The Victims of Crime Program is a last-resort payer. We pay what we pay, and the hospitals have other resources such as Medicare, Medicaid, or something else. They often have other resources to turn to. Thank you.

Chairman Horne:

Are there any more questions for Mr. Nix? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Nix. Is there anyone else wishing to testify? I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 67 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 67 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

We heard testimony that the hospitals were okay with this. Before I vote, I would like to hear from the hospitals saying they are okay. This could serve as precedent for a whole array of hospitals being charged to treat people. If we can obtain some additional background before voting on this, I would feel more comfortable.

Assemblyman Frierson:

With regard to the notion that this bill is charging the hospitals, I am not sure that I understood it that way. It seems like it is addressing the process of reimbursing and paying out funds, while prioritizing it proportionately. If we are dealing with charging hospitals, it is likely a different issue. I support the measure, as I think it gives them some structure to deal with how to distribute funds when there may not be enough to cover everything. Instead of paying one person, and leaving everyone else with nothing, this allows the program to provide it proportionately.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

As I understood the testimony, I agree with Assemblyman Frierson. I think that this bill will allow for more providers to get paid, and allow them to be able to provide services required by these victims. This will actually expand the pie to be sure that more people are actually getting reimbursed for treating victims. I support the measure.

Assemblyman Hammond:

While it seems like my two colleagues are correct, I am hesitant since it is so quick. I would like to reserve my right to change my mind. I will probably vote no and then change my mind to yes, depending on the concerns from the other stakeholders.

Chairman Horne:

We may have moved too fast. We may need a work session on it. Is there anything else you would like to add, Mr. Sherwood? Okay, I will open the vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN BROOKS WAS
EXCUSED FROM THE VOTE.)

Chairman Horne:

Please mark Assemblyman Brooks excused from the vote. Senate Bill 67 (R1) will go to Mr. Hansen. Senate Bill 25 (R1) will go to Ms. Diaz. Is there any other business to come before the Committee today? We are adjourned [at 10:08 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lenore Carfora-Nye
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman William C. Horne, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Judiciary

Date: April 19, 2011

Time of Meeting: 9:16 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 67	C	Bryan Nix, Coordinator, Victims of Crime Program	Written Testimony