

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-sixth Session  
April 12, 2011**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Valerie Wiener at 8:10 a.m. on Tuesday, April 12, 2011, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412E, 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.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Valerie Wiener, Chair  
Senator Allison Copening, Vice Chair  
Senator Shirley A. Breeden  
Senator Ruben J. Kihuen  
Senator Mike McGinness  
Senator Don Gustavson  
Senator Michael Roberson

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Moises (Mo) Denis, Clark County Senatorial District No. 2  
Senator David R. Parks, Clark County Senatorial District No. 7

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Linda J. Eissmann, Policy Analyst  
Bradley A. Wilkinson, Counsel  
Kathleen Swain, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Norma Taylor  
Brett Kandt, Special Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General  
Connie S. Bisbee, Chairman, State Board of Parole Commissioners  
Orrin J. H. Johnson, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office

CHAIR WIENER:

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 201.

SENATE BILL 201: Revises provisions relating to correctional institutions.  
(BDR 16-827)

NORMA TAYLOR:

My husband was an inmate at Nevada State Prison (NSP). While there, he went into kidney failure and needed dialysis to survive. He and I were told that he could not have that treatment because the doctor was on vacation, and we had to wait until she got back. My husband was held for two weeks. During that time, he was given no medication to ease his suffering or pain. Some of the staff made fun of him and laughed at him. When the doctor returned, she examined him and told him he was dying and there was nothing she could do.

I had been desperately calling everyone I could think of—the warden, the prison medical staff, the doctor, the Governor's Office—and no one would listen to me. The doctors decided to send my husband for dialysis, even though they knew it was too late and would not do any good. I got his medical records, and one of the doctors had written that she thought dialysis might kill him. The first doctor responded that my husband should have dialysis even if it did kill him.

I was most grateful that they sent him for dialysis. He was treated well in the hospital and was immediately given medication to ease his suffering. He died two days later. He had to be resuscitated and was on full life support. This man who had been so passionate about doing things that made him feel free—he was a pilot and a scuba diver and had served in World War II—died chained to his bed with a guard standing over him, even though he was on full life support.

I took his medical records and tried for two years to get an attorney to take my case without success. The laws state there are limits on the amount of money that can be awarded in a case about an inmate, and lawyers would not take the case unless I could come up with \$30,000 to pay for doctors who would testify on his behalf. I tried until the statute of limitations ran out. I tried to talk to the Assembly in 2005; they did not think a measure establishing an ombudsman should come to the Senate. I had a friend who had worked at NSP who offered to act in my husband's behalf, but the Department of Corrections (DOC) would not allow that to happen. I had been calling people to beg that my husband either be sent for dialysis or released to me. I had paid for his Medicare all the

time he was in prison, and I had filed for a compassionate release so he could come home to die. We were refused all the way around.

The upshot of my trying to go to the Legislature in 2005 was that ex-Senator Maurice Washington had his office call the office of the Director of the Department of Corrections and set up a meeting in April 2005 to investigate the situation. Someone from the Office of the Attorney General came over and promised to investigate. The week before the meeting, the nurse who had talked to my husband and me retired. The man from the Office of the Attorney General submitted a report stating that my husband refused treatment, and that was not true. His only desire and need was to return home to die.

There is no appeal for inmates. They cannot go to the law. Their rights under the Eighth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution have been done away with because they cannot get an attorney to represent them. Only those who are independently wealthy and can throw money at the case, or those who have the ability to study and present their own case, can get some satisfaction. If we had an advocate in the form of an ombudsman, these kinds of abuses would never occur. The people who work in the DOC would know that they cannot get away with anything, that the inmate has an appeal.

I know you want to believe that perhaps my husband was insane and raving, and that these things never happened to him. But in fact, he was not. He was perfectly calm. None of you were there; none of you were able to see how he bore all that with great courage. He was a man who was strong. When he was 14, he was fighting forest fires. When he was 16, he was running a 60-man fire crew. He was a man of great strength, and he was not raving or crazy. These things did happen, and they do happen. You need to have an advocate for those who are mistreated in the prison system.

CHAIR WIENER:

We will close the hearing and open the work session on S.B. 201.

LINDA J. EISSMANN (Policy Analyst):

I have a work session document for this bill ([Exhibit C](#)). [Exhibit C](#) includes two amendments to the bill: one from Rebecca Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada, and one from Brett Kandt, Special Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
April 12, 2011  
Page 4

CHAIR WIENER:

If you recall, the sponsor of the bill reviewed Mr. Kandt's amendment and requested two further changes to the amendment, which are also noted in [Exhibit C](#).

SENATOR COPENING:

There are two versions of Mr. Kandt's amendment in [Exhibit C](#). Which one are we referring to?

MS. EISSMANN:

The second one is the latest version of the amendment; that is on page 5 of [Exhibit C](#). One difference between the two versions is that the later amendment establishes a program for mediating litigation as opposed to mediating programs.

CHAIR WIENER:

Mr. Kandt, can you confirm that the amendment on page 5 of [Exhibit C](#) is the one you want to submit?

BRETT KANDT (Special Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General):  
Yes. That amendment reflects my understanding of the revisions the Committee requested during the last work session on this bill. It references mediating litigation because with that change, we can pay for the program out of our litigation fund. That fund was established to pay for unanticipated expenses associated with pending litigation. That means we do not have to put any sort of fiscal note on the bill.

CHAIR WIENER:

With that change of language, can you absorb the costs of this program?

MR. KANDT:

Yes.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

Mr. Kandt, the program will still cost money that must come from somewhere. Did you put some numbers to that?

MR. KANDT:

There would still be costs associated with implementing a mediation program. The distinction is that we could pay for those costs out of our litigation fund.

BRADLEY A. WILKINSON (Counsel):

In your amendment, the change refers to mediating litigation based upon complaints. In subsection 2, paragraphs (a) and (b), there are references to establishing procedures for mediating complaints. Is that an intended distinction, or should it refer to mediating litigation?

MR. KANDT:

That refers to the complaints that were filed to initiate the litigation that we would seek to mediate.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

Just for the record, I would like to oppose this bill as amended. Although there is no fiscal note, it is still going to cost money, and I would prefer the Attorney General's Office were fighting crime and enforcing our laws.

SENATOR COPENING MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
S.B. 201 WITH THE AMENDMENT FROM MS. GASCA AND THE  
REVISED AMENDMENT FROM MR. KANDT.

MS. EISSMANN:

The amendment from Ms. Gasca is to the original bill. Mr. Kandt's amendment replaces the bill.

SENATOR COPENING:

Senator Parks, did you have discussions with Ms. Gasca about her amendment?

SENATOR DAVID R. PARKS (Clark County Senatorial District No. 7):

The bill as initially proposed included a fairly substantial fiscal impact. Mr. Kandt's amendment minimizes that impact. We have seen a number of cases that have proceeded to litigation and resulted in a substantial cost to the State, and the intent of the measure was to reduce the severity of any settlements made in this area. While I would like to have seen major legislation moving us forward, I am satisfied that given the tough fiscal times we have, this bill will have minimal to no fiscal impact on the State. The litigation fund is a reserve fund intended to pay litigation whenever cases are decided. This is a

good move forward. I would like to have seen a whole lot more, but this is a good first step and goes a long way to reducing court judgments that can be costly to the State.

SENATOR COPENING WITHDREW THE MOTION.

SENATOR COPENING MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 201 WITH THE REVISED AMENDMENT FROM MR. KANDT.

SENATOR BREEDEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS GUSTAVSON, MCGINNESS AND ROBERSON VOTED NO.)

\*\*\*\*\*

CHAIR WIENER:

I will open the hearing on S.B. 221.

SENATE BILL 221: Makes various changes relating to trusts, estates and probate. (BDR 2-78)

Ms. EISSMANN:

I have a work session document on this bill ([Exhibit D](#)). Two proposed amendments are included in [Exhibit D](#): one from Charles Duarte, Administrator, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, and one from Mark Solomon, State Bar of Nevada.

CHAIR WIENER:

The amendment from Mr. Solomon, which is on pages 4 through 7 of [Exhibit D](#), is one we discussed in concept at the last work session on this bill. I have two further changes to recommend to this amendment.

First, in section 182, subsection 6, paragraph (a), I would like to change the language to read, "... by certified or registered mail ..." with no reference to first-class mail. I would like to be sure the beneficiaries get the notice. Second, in section 182, subsection 6, paragraph (b), I would like the portion of the notice starting with "NOTICE OF ELECTION UNDER NRS 164.900(4)" to be in

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
April 12, 2011  
Page 7

boldface and 16-point type. We need to be sure beneficiaries know what is at stake.

As the bill is written, beneficiaries will get this notice three times. I would like to see them get it six times, but I am comfortable with three.

SENATOR COPENING:

Do you have any objections to the amendment from Mr. Duarte?

CHAIR WIENER:

No. His amendment is necessary for Medicaid.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

I am comfortable with the amendments.

SENATOR ROBERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
S.B. 221 WITH THE AMENDMENT FROM MR. DUARTE AND THE  
AMENDMENT FROM MR. SOLOMON AS REVISED BY  
SENATOR WIENER.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR WIENER:

I will open the work session on S.B. 265.

SENATE BILL 265: Revises provisions governing sentencing of criminal offenders and determining eligibility of prisoners for parole. (BDR 14-311)

MS. EISSMANN:

I have a work session document for this bill ([Exhibit E](#)). We received three proposed amendments to the bill from Connie S. Bisbee, Chairman, State Board of Parole Commissioners, which are included in [Exhibit E](#). In addition, Tonja Brown suggested an amendment, the gist of which was to add several factors to the decision to grant parole; they are listed on page 2 of [Exhibit E](#).

CHAIR WIENER:

Ms. Bisbee, could you review Ms. Brown's proposed changes?

CONNIE S. BISBEE (Chair, State Board of Parole Commissioners):

We use a validated risk assessment. We also use what is required under *Nevada Revised Statute* (NRS) 213. We look at everything: criminal history, institutional behavior, release planning and risk to reoffend. When someone has been determined to be a risk to public safety, we are required by statute to explain that risk. I do not see anything in Ms. Brown's amendment that we are not already doing.

I would object to her provision that if inmates have satisfied certain criteria, we must parole them. There are always other factors that must be considered when you decide whether to grant or deny parole.

CHAIR WIENER:

What about the requirement that you define "threat to society"?

MS. BISBEE:

Under the mandatory parole release law, we are required to respond as to why we have denied or granted parole. The concept of "threat to society" or "threat to community" is subjective. It may be the fact that the last time the inmate was on parole he or she committed a violent offense, or that there is a history of violence, or that the inmate has stated he or she would not comply with the conditions of parole.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

At the last hearing on this bill, I asked what other states have been doing with regard to aggregate sentencing. That information would be helpful.

MS. BISBEE:

I have a handout showing the responses we have gotten from 16 states and 1 Canadian province ([Exhibit F](#)). As you can see, most of them do aggregate sentencing.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

I am still opposed to this bill. I am concerned that there are unintended consequences, such as the example given at an earlier hearing. The result will



be that prisoners will end up spending less time in jail than they currently are, and that is not good policy.

SENATOR COPENING MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
S.B. 265 WITH THE AMENDMENT FROM MS. BISBEE.

SENATOR BREEDEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS GUSTAVSON, MCGINNESS AND  
ROBERSON VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR WIENER:  
I will open the work session on S.B. 277.

SENATE BILL 277: Revises provisions governing certain acts by juveniles relating to the possession, transmission and distribution of certain sexual images. (BDR 15-10)

Ms. EISSMANN:  
I have a work session document on this bill ([Exhibit G](#)). [Exhibit G](#) includes two amendments, one from Ms. Gasca and one from Chair Wiener.

CHAIR WIENER:  
There was considerable concern over possession of sexual images being a delinquent act, even though we have affirmative defenses built into the bill, and we talked about removing that provision. In talking with Mr. Wilkinson, I was reminded that unless we address possession, our alternatives are to do nothing or admit the minor into sex offender status. My amendment provides an alternative for the juvenile justice court.

Remember that this bill still leaves room for prosecutorial discretion if the facts are such that we need to do more. This is something in between doing nothing and doing something substantial that could affect the person's life forever because of one bad choice. This is something to allow officials to redirect behavior. The amendment states that a minor in possession of a sexual image of another minor is considered a child in need of supervision to give the court a chance to redirect those behaviors.

Bart Mangino from the Clark County School District asked if "school official" could be added as an authority to whom a minor may report such an image because often this happens at school when minors do not have access to law enforcement. The amendment defines "school official" in section 1, subsection 7, paragraph (c) as "... a principal, vice principal or school police officer." Mr. Wilkinson, did we get that language from elsewhere in statute?

MR. WILKINSON:

No. We can expand that as the Committee wishes.

CHAIR WIENER:

I would like to add "school counselor" to that list.

SENATOR COPENING:

Is there a conflict between your amendment and that from Ms. Gasca?

CHAIR WIENER:

There is no conflict with regard to Ms. Gasca's provision about treating recipients as minors in need of supervision. With regard to the deletion of the term "simulating," is that not in statute?

MR. WILKINSON:

Simulation of sex acts is included within the scope of the prohibition against child pornography.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

My understanding is that your amendment addresses the concerns raised by Ms. Gasca. Is that right?

CHAIR WIENER:

Not specifically. With regard to the issue of possession, my thought was that recipients of sexual images might be passive recipients, and we needed to give juvenile justice court the flexibility to decide that in individual cases.

SENATOR ROBERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
S.B. 277 WITH SENATOR WIENER'S AMENDMENT.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR WIENER:

I will open the work session on S.B. 307.

SENATE BILL 307: Revises provisions relating to the exercise of the power of sale under a deed of trust concerning owner-occupied property. (BDR 9-958)

Ms. EISSMANN:

I have a work session document for this bill ([Exhibit H](#)). Senator Copening offered a conceptual amendment to the bill that is on page 2 of [Exhibit H](#).

SENATOR COPENING:

A concern was expressed that the mediation program is currently overwhelmed, and one more piece of paper, one more responsibility, would likely be a hardship for them. The intent of the bill is to say that banks need to give homeowners a chance to either modify their loans or begin some sort of loss mitigation program before they serve notice of default. This stemmed from banks that have a record of deliberately not giving homeowners a chance to try to work things out.

The amendment indicates that a letter would be sent 30 days prior to the notice of default that would include a loss mitigation application. That can be as simple as the banks would like to make it, or they can send out what they would normally use as a loss mitigation application.

Provision No. 3 of my amendment is a wording change. We were using the word "trustee" in some cases where it should have been "beneficiary," and this corrects that.

If you recall, at the earlier hearing on S.B. 307, a former Washoe County Commissioner came forward with a page of suggestions. If any of those amendments are needed, they can be added when the bill goes to the Assembly. We are currently researching active bills to see where the changes might best fit.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

I respectfully submit that this bill is not good public policy. We heard testimony from Bill Uffelman, President and CEO, Nevada Bankers Association, that on average it takes 12 to 18 months to foreclose on a home in Nevada right now. That is not healthy for a housing market. Homeowners already receive plenty of notice from lenders as to ways to work with them if they cannot pay their mortgage. But 12 to 18 months is simply too long of a period. We have too many houses tied up in foreclosure; they are not getting back out on the market, and property taxes are not being paid. That affects all of us. I will oppose this bill.

SENATOR COPENING:

The intent of the bill is to avoid foreclosure. As I recall, the sample 30-day letter given to us by Mr. Uffelman is a negative, threatening letter. When you get to the end, it simply says, "If you would like to discuss the present condition of your loan ... " There is no invitation to try to create some sort of loss mitigation program. It says to the homeowner, "We're not interested in working this out, but you can try if you want."

SENATOR BREEDEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
S.B. 307 WITH THE CONCEPTUAL AMENDMENT FROM  
SENATOR COPENING.

SENATOR KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATORS GUSTAVSON, MCGINNESS AND  
ROBERSON VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR WIENER:

I will open the work session on S.B. 347.

SENATE BILL 347: Authorizes the issuance of a subpoena to compel the production of certain financial records as part of an investigation of the exploitation of an older person. (BDR 15-1075)

MS. EISSMANN:

I have a work session document for this bill ([Exhibit I](#)). [Exhibit I](#) includes an amendment from Senator Moises (Mo) Denis that limits the subpoena power provided to only the Administrator of the Aging and Disability Services Division of the Department of Health and Human Services or the executive head of the office of Elder Protective Services in that Division.

CHAIR WIENER:

Mr. Wilkinson, as I recall, if there are egregious circumstances, a warrant can be obtained within an hour. What is the distinction between a subpoena and a warrant, and what is the impact of this amendment?

MR. WILKINSON:

Senator Denis testified that it was not his intent to include references to law enforcement agencies in this bill. Presumably, a law enforcement agency would go through the ordinary warrant process, which would be based on probable cause of a criminal act. This would typically be referred to as an administrative subpoena.

CHAIR WIENER:

We will put this bill aside to the end of today's meeting to allow time for the sponsor to meet with us. I will close the work session on [S.B. 347](#) and open the work session on [S.B. 381](#).

[SENATE BILL 381](#): Revises provisions regarding who may issue a marriage license. (BDR 11-227)

MS. EISSMANN:

I have a work session document on this bill ([Exhibit J](#)). [Exhibit J](#) includes Senator Manendo's amendment to the original bill, pages 3 and 4; an amendment offered by Amy Harvey, Washoe County Clerk, pages 5 through 11; and a verbal amendment offered by George Flint at the hearing, page 2.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

I will defer to the opinions of Ms. Harvey, who states that she still has a strong opposition to this bill, and vote no.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

The amendment from Ms. Harvey does not appear to be trying to find any common ground. It specifies that if you issue the license, you cannot perform or be a witness to the marriage. That clearly goes against the point of the bill.

SENATOR MCGINNESS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 381 WITH THE AMENDMENT FROM SENATOR MANENDO.

SENATOR BREEDEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

CHAIR WIENER:

I have two questions. First, in much of the discussion, there was a suggestion that licenses could be issued in chapels only when they were not available at the clerk's office. Would you agree to that?

Second, we heard from a rural county, I believe it was Winnemucca, that an existing chapel/flower shop has a long-standing agreement with the county clerk that when the clerk's office is not open, the shop can issue licenses and perform weddings. They do perhaps 50 weddings a year out of about 250 done in that county. If we only do this for Washoe County, this rural county would be excluded.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

I do not see a problem including the rural counties. I think Humboldt is the only one in the State that actually does this, so it will not have an effect. The other change is also fine.

SENATOR MCGINNESS AMENDED HIS MOTION TO INCLUDE THE TWO ADDITIONAL CHANGES.

SENATOR BREEDEN SECONDED THE AMENDED MOTION.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I have not had a chance to digest this whole thing completely. I represent quite a bit of Washoe County, and the Washoe County Clerk has been opposed to it. I am not sold on the concept, though it might be a good idea. I am undecided, so I will abstain from the vote now and reserve the right to vote on the Floor of the Senate.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
April 12, 2011  
Page 15

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATOR GUSTAVSON ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTE. SENATOR ROBERSON VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR WIENER:  
I will open the work session on S.B. 405.

SENATE BILL 405: Revises provisions governing business entities. (BDR 7-528)

Ms. EISSMANN:  
I have a work session document on this bill ([Exhibit K](#)). There was no opposition to the bill. However, there was some discussion with others who requested an amendment. Rob Kim, Executive Committee of the Business Law Section, State Bar of Nevada, met with those parties and has submitted an amendment to the bill, which starts on page 3 of [Exhibit K](#).

SENATOR COPENING MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 405 WITH THE AMENDMENT FROM MR. KIM.

SENATOR ROBERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR WIENER:  
I will reopen the work session on S.B. 347, referring to [Exhibit I](#).

SENATE BILL 347: Authorizes the issuance of a subpoena to compel the production of certain financial records as part of an investigation of the exploitation of an older person. (BDR 15-1075)

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:  
I am concerned about giving subpoena powers to administrative department heads. This is something we need to be really careful about. For that reason, I am not in support of the bill.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

My concern with this bill is that it is on its face unconstitutional.

CHAIR WIENER:

Mr. Wilkinson, can you expound on that?

MR. WILKINSON:

I have not investigated this in depth. I would respectfully disagree with the statement that it is on its face unconstitutional, though it could certainly be unconstitutional as applied. There are other circumstances in the NRS where different entities are given the power to issue administrative subpoenas for investigatory purposes, and those have either not been challenged or been upheld.

SENATOR ROBERSON:

I remind the Committee of the testimony of Orrin J. H. Johnson, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender.

ORRIN J. H. JOHNSON (Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office):

The reason we feel this bill is facially unconstitutional and not just as applied is that the Fourth Amendment protects us from State action. It does not matter if it is an administrative agency bureaucrat, a law enforcement agency or a sheriff's deputy. If it is State action, we are protected from unreasonable search and seizure, and any warrantless search is presumptively unreasonable unless there is some exigent circumstance that requires speed. Those circumstances do not exist here because there is enough time to get these warrants. It is not like you are flushing a bank record down the toilet, which would necessitate a search or seizure before a warrant could be obtained. Even though it is an administrative agency that would be issuing the subpoena for an investigation, it could still potentially lead to criminal charges. There is no reason at this point that a warrant cannot be obtained.

At the last hearing, the argument was made that the officers could not get a warrant because they did not have probable cause, and to get probable cause they needed the information they would have used the warrant to find. That is exactly the opposite of how the system works. You have to have probable cause first, or you have to leave people alone. You have to leave them to be secure in their persons and their papers. That is what the Fourth Amendment



Senate Committee on Judiciary  
April 12, 2011  
Page 17

says. That is why we believe this bill, even with the amendment, is unconstitutional on its face.

CHAIR WIENER:

I will move this bill to the work session on Friday, April 15. In the meantime, I will meet with the sponsor and Mr. Johnson to see what we can work out.

SENATOR MOISES (Mo) DENIS (Clark County Senatorial District No. 2):

I am not a lawyer. All I know is people are being defrauded financially, and investigators have not been able to get the records they need to be able to prosecute the frauds. These individuals who prey on elderly people are allowed to continue to do it. What we are saying is go ahead and take advantage of our elderly because we will not prosecute.

CHAIR WIENER:

Is there any public comment or further business to come before the Committee? Hearing none, I am adjourning this meeting at 9:28 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Lynn Hendricks,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Valerie Wiener, Chair

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

<b><u>EXHIBITS</u></b>			
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 201	C	Linda Eissmann	Work session document
S.B. 221	D	Linda Eissmann	Work session document
S.B. 265	E	Linda Eissmann	Work session document
S.B. 265	F	Connie S. Bisbee	Chart titled "Aggregated Sentencing Practices"
S.B. 277	G	Linda Eissmann	Work session document
S.B. 307	H	Linda Eissmann	Work session document
S.B. 347	I	Linda Eissmann	Work session document
S.B. 381	J	Linda Eissmann	Work session document
S.B. 405	K	Linda Eissmann	Work session document