

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
March 12, 2013**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Tick Segerblom at 9:07 a.m. on Tuesday, March 12, 2013, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 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 Tick Segerblom, Chair
Senator Ruben J. Kihuen, Vice Chair
Senator Aaron D. Ford
Senator Justin C. Jones
Senator Greg Brower
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Mark Hutchison

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mindy Martini, Policy Analyst
Nick Anthony, Counsel
Marshellah D. Lyons, Supervising Principal Research Analyst, Research Division
Lindsay Wheeler, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Brett Kandt, Special Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
Frankie Sue Del Papa, Chair, Ad Hoc Unlicensed Health Care Task Force
John T. Jones, Jr., Nevada District Attorneys Association
Marc DiGiacomo, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Office of the District Attorney,
Clark County
Chuck Callaway, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Keith L. Lee, Board of Medical Examiners
Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Lawrence P. Matheis, Executive Director, Nevada State Medical Association

Senate Committee on Judiciary
March 12, 2013
Page 2

Paul Edwards, General Counsel, State Board of Pharmacy
Eric Spratley, Lieutenant, Washoe County Sheriff's Department
Robert Talley, DDS, Executive Director, Nevada Dental Association
Spencer Armuth, School of Dental Medicine, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Melissa Piasecki, MD, Senior Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, University of Nevada School of Medicine
Kristina Coger, School of Medicine, University of Nevada, Reno
Shari Peterson, Program Director, Dental Hygiene, College of Southern Nevada
Layne Rushforth, Cochair, Legislative Committee, Probate and Trust Law Section, State Bar of Nevada
John Dawson, State Bar of Nevada
Pat Cashill, Nevada Justice Association
Jeff Burr

Chair Segerblom:

We will open the hearing today with Senate Bill (S.B.) 199.

SENATE BILL 199: Makes it a felony to perform certain medical procedures without a license. (BDR 15-504)

Marsheilah D. Lyons (Supervising Principal Research Analyst, Research Division):

I work for the Legislative Counsel Bureau, which is a nonpartisan agency. I may not advocate or oppose any type of legislation. I served as a Committee Policy Analyst for the Legislative Committee on Health Care which brings S.B. 199 for hearing today.

Representatives from the Department of Health and Human Services testified before the Senate Committee on Health and Human Services that Nevada has seen a sharp rise in services provided by medically unlicensed persons. The testifiers gave specific examples in which people died or became ill because of unlicensed procedures. The deaths or illnesses occurred through the use of unsterilized and illegal equipment. The Health Division of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Office of the Attorney General, along with community members, created a task force—Ad Hoc Unlicensed Health Care Task Force—to produce a strategic plan to increase enforcement and education regarding unlicensed providers. In Nevada, a significant number of illegal surgeries, unlicensed health care and incidents reports, including reports of

deaths, occur primarily in the Hispanic community. Education in the Hispanic community would be the initial focus of the action plan.

The plan for action was provided and is available through the Office of the Attorney General Website. A representative from the Office of the Attorney General indicated that various criminal justice agencies across the State collaborated to review ways to improve the criminal justice response to unlicensed health care providers. This includes improving lines of communication between the various local and State agencies that may have jurisdiction over unlicensed activities. A recommendation from the Office of the Attorney General was presented to stiffen criminal penalties for unlicensed activities resulting in serious injury or death.

Chair Segerblom:

Is it not already illegal to perform illegal health care procedures? Is there not already a penalty?

Brett Kandt (Special Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General):

Yes. The criminal penalties for unlicensed practice depend upon the type of practice performed, how it is licensed and whether the procedure falls outside the scope of that particular practice. The regulatory boards for the various types of practices are contained in Title 54 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS)*. Each chapter within the statutes provides its own penalty, such as a misdemeanor, a gross misdemeanor or a Category D felony. When someone dies or suffers substantial bodily harm, those facts may warrant a murder charge. If the result is something short of death, that act could result in an assault or battery charge. There is an issue with the battery statute in that the victims are possibly consenting to the treatment, and that becomes problematic.

Chair Segerblom:

Does S.B. 199 make the penalty the same across the board for the unlicensed practice of medicine?

Mr. Kandt:

Senate Bill 199 is intended to address those instances when someone has suffered death or substantial harm.

Chair Segerblom:

This does not change the law where there is not substantial harm to the victim?

Mr. Kandt:

No. Senate Bill 199 would create felony penalties for performing certain health care or surgical procedures without an appropriate license. Senate Bill 199 was developed by the Ad Hoc Unlicensed Health Care Task Force to examine unlicensed health care providers and to formulate solutions. The Task Force was developed in response to significant illegal surgeries and health care procedures that resulted in substantial injury or death in our State. The Task Force's recommendations and findings are set forth in an action plan ([Exhibit C](#)). I served as the Attorney General's representative on the Task Force, and the representative for southern Nevada was Frankie Sue Del Papa. She served as the chair and leader of the Task Force.

Frankie Sue Del Papa (Chair, Ad Hoc Unlicensed Health Care Task Force):

I am here to support this work in regard to this substantial public policy problem.

Mr. Kandt:

A subcommittee made up of criminal justice agencies conducted an analysis and overview of the criminal justice system's response to unlicensed health care. The subcommittee assessed how unlawful activity enters into the criminal justice system, given the various State and local agencies that may have jurisdiction. The flow chart ([Exhibit D](#)) shows the three ways in which unlicensed activity may come into the criminal justice system.

First, there may be a report of unlicensed activity made directly to a law enforcement agency. Second, there may be a report of death or substantial bodily harm or a sex offense made through a 911 call or hospital. Third, a report of unlicensed activity may be made directly to a regulatory board or administrative agency. A report may be made to a licensing board, but the activity may fall under the purview of another board or agency. There is an issue as to how the various boards and agencies communicate with one another regarding such reports.

The first question asked by criminal law agencies is whether someone died, was seriously injured or suffered a sexual assault. That is when law enforcement will handle it as a crime and investigate it as such. If applicable, those agencies will

turn it over to the district attorney for prosecution. If the incident does not involve those apparent crimes, the agencies will investigate as to whether the offense involves fraud with Medicare, insurance or workers' compensation insurance. If so, those cases would be under the jurisdiction of the Office of the Attorney General and turned over to the appropriate unit for investigation and prosecution. If a person has not been physically harmed, generally it would be referred to a regulatory board for investigation and action. Civil or administrative remedies may apply in such actions. The case could still come back to the district attorney for criminal charges.

The subcommittee also noted that the penalties are set forth within the NRS chapters regulating each profession. Those penalties range from a misdemeanor to a Category D felony. Other statutes may come into play in regard to battery or murder charges if the facts support those types of charges. Senate Bill 199 provides appropriate criminal penalties when this unlicensed activity results in serious injury or death. Senate Bill 199 creates two new crimes. Section 5 addresses a person who performs a health care procedure on another person without a license which results in substantial bodily harm or death. A guilty decision on a first offense is a Category C felony. A second or subsequent offense would result in a Category B felony; if death results, it would be a Category B felony. Senate Bill 199 would not preclude a murder charge if the facts warranted it.

Section 6 would create a new crime if a person performs a surgical procedure on another person without a license. Regardless of whether that procedure resulted in substantial bodily harm, it would be a Category C for a first offense. Second or subsequent offenses would result in Category B felonies. Substantial bodily harm other than death would be a Category C felony. I have submitted an amendment ([Exhibit E](#)) to reflect the recommendation of the Task Force. Surgical procedures resulting in substantial bodily harm to the victim should be a Category B felony. If death results, it would be a Category B felony and would not preclude a murder charge if the facts warrant.

Chair Segerblom:

If a person performs a medical procedure that results in substantial bodily harm, it is a Category C felony, but if that person performs surgery which results in substantial bodily harm, it will be a Category B felony?

Mr. Kandt:

We distinguish between a surgical and a health care procedure. We felt that if a person is cutting into another person, the harm to the victim could be greater and so should the penalty. The penalties proposed in this legislation are endorsed by the Nevada District Attorneys Association and the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association.

Senator Kihuen:

Why do you think it is a very prominent problem in the Hispanic community?

Mr. Kandt:

As a member of the Task Force, I came to understand that there are immigrants who are not familiar with our health care system. Additionally, other individuals who are licensed in another country come to our Country but do not become licensed here. Yet those unlicensed individuals provide medical services to those in that immigrant community. It may be an awareness issue.

Senator Kihuen:

How prominent is this problem? There was a situation where a person went to a location in my district for a procedure, and that person died. Thankfully, the place was shut down. We want to make it possible to go after those people who run these illegal practices. Is it a problem only in Las Vegas, or is it a problem statewide?

Mr. Kandt:

This unreported problem is more prevalent than the actual reports made to law enforcement. We are not aware of the problem until someone dies or suffers substantial bodily harm. I think the problem is much greater than what we have been able to identify because of the failure to report.

Senator Kihuen:

Many victims are most likely undocumented and are afraid to make a report for fear of deportation.

Mr. Kandt:

I think that is true. A lot of immigrants are afraid to come forward because of a fear of subsequent consequences.

Senator Kihuen:

Thank you for the work you and the subcommittee have done on this issue. It has been a prominent issue.

Senator Brower:

A representative of the Mexican Consulate was a member on the Task Force. Was there a member of the Legislature on the Task Force?

Ms. Lyons:

I am not sure. I do not recall any member of the Legislature on the Task Force. I did attend several meetings at the direction of the Chair of the Legislative Committee on Health Care.

Senator Brower:

Looking at the report, it does not address the prevalence of the problem in the Latino community. Did the State pay for this report?

Ms. Del Papa:

This report was in response to a significant number of complaints or incidents which resulted in great harm and even deaths to individuals. A small grant paid for a portion of this report which was issued by the Nevada Public Health Foundation. A portion of that grant went to the University of Nevada, Reno Latino Research Center. Public service announcements were produced as well. The total grant was approximately \$24,000. There was no State money involved. Funding came through the Nevada Public Health Foundation.

Senator Brower:

What is the Nevada Public Health Foundation?

Ms. Del Papa:

The Nevada Public Health Foundation was founded originally to address the teen pregnancy issue and has expanded to address additional areas. There is a lot of information on the Foundation's Website. It assists if there is an additional need for research as a supportive arm of the Health Division.

Senator Brower:

How is that foundation funded?

Ms. Del Papa:

Primarily through grants and fundraising through outreach in relation to public health. That information should be on the Website.

Senator Brower:

It is not taxpayer-funded?

Ms. Del Papa:

I am not completely sure how the funding is comprised. I do not think it is taxpayer-supported. I know the Foundation gets a lot of money through grants.

Mr. Kandt:

A portion of the cost for putting together the Task Force was covered by a grant from the Office of the Attorney General, which came from the United Healthcare Settlement.

Senator Brower:

So it was public money?

Mr. Kandt:

To some extent. I can get you additional information regarding that grant.

Chair Segerblom:

Is that a problem?

Senator Brower:

It depends on who made the decision to give that money. We usually appropriate funds.

Chair Segerblom:

Do other states have similar legislation?

Ms. Del Papa:

This is a national problem. For several years, Florida has had an unlicensed health care entity within the state's health division which deals primarily with these issues. California deals with unlicensed health care through the state's medical board. As our research developed, we determined that we are not the only state that has this issue. A related issue of unlicensed immigration services was beyond the scope of this project. I have other states inform me of similar

issues throughout the Country. It is often an unreported issue, but many incidents have been reported in Nevada and throughout the Nation.

Mr. Kandt:

We looked at other states and did extensive research on what they are doing.

John T. Jones, Jr. (Nevada District Attorneys Association):

We support S.B. 199.

Marc DiGiacomo (Chief Deputy District Attorney, Office of the District Attorney, Clark County):

In 2011, I investigated the case of a woman who went to whom she believed to be a licensed doctor. He was a Colombian national, a Mr. Galvas. He and his wife, who was an attorney for the government of Colombia in the consumer protection division, represented that they were doctors. The woman went to see Mr. Galvas to have the wrinkles in her eyes reduced. The woman went back for a second procedure. She had a reaction to the anesthesia and died. The doctor called a friend, and they dumped her body in a parking lot. The Galvases then attempted to flee to Colombia.

The laws in Nevada do not provide a lot of protection for the victims. Many other states also lack effective laws for this type of offense. The Galvases pled to Category D felonies and received sentences of 1 to 4 years. With good time credits in prison, the Galvases will do very little time for being con artists who killed a woman. They had no remorse and collected money from people who did not know they were unlicensed. They received referrals from places that had unlawful pharmacies or from places such as nail shops. Nevada lacks a law that protects people.

Chair Segerblom:

Do you believe this bill will correct this problem?

Mr. DiGiacomo:

Yes. This bill increases the penalties and provides a deterrent to those who commit these crimes. Those individuals who engage in this type of behavior will be facing substantial prison time.

Chuck Callaway (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

I was the law enforcement representative on the Task Force. The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department's Violent Crimes Section generally handles these types of cases when they rise to the level of a person suffering death or substantial bodily harm. I was hoping to have Detective Jay Roberts here today to discuss these issues since he helped draft some of this bill's language.

Chair Segerblom:

Does S.B. 199 make it easier for law enforcement to go after individuals who commit these types of crimes?

Mr. Callaway:

Yes.

Keith L. Lee (Board of Medical Examiners):

We support S.B. 199. Senator Jones is chairing a subcommittee regarding a few bills in which we hope to address this issue. Under NRS 630.388, the Board of Medical Examiners does have limited jurisdictional ability over unlicensed practitioners. The jurisdiction is of no great effect. The Board can get an injunction against unlicensed people, but that remedy has little effect. A civil penalty and an injunction do not deter these people; for them, that is the cost of doing business. We need to get these people off the street, prosecute them and send them to prison. That sends the message to the community. With S.B. 199, we can send unlicensed practitioners to prison. We have been working on how we deal with this increasing problem. We have been working with Latino outreach programs in both Clark and Washoe Counties, charities and other public outreach programs to educate the immigrant communities. Nevada requires individuals to be licensed in order to practice medicine and to have certain standards of care.

Senator Kihuen:

Education is key in this issue. A lot of people in these communities do not know they are able to go to licensed doctors.

Robert Roshak (Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):

We support S.B. 199. We participated in the meetings regarding this bill.

Lawrence P. Matheis (Executive Director, Nevada State Medical Association):

We participated with the Task Force and the Legislative Committee on Health Care. It is a serious subject. The two bills introduced in the Senate Committee on Commerce and Labor give the Board more effective tools to deal with these cases. Horrible situations develop in the immigration communities. One event that occurs during high immigration is an alternative medical system that develops over time. This alternative system exists in relation to the comfort level of the immigrant community with the new country. Before those communities can become comfortable with our health care system, there is huge public risk. We support this bill and feel it will become a model for other states to follow.

Paul Edwards (General Counsel, State Board of Pharmacy):

We support this bill. The State Board of Pharmacy has inspectors who are on the streets and encounter the unlicensed practice of medicine. Oftentimes, there is unlicensed dispensing of drugs.

Eric Spratley (Lieutenant, Washoe County Sheriff's Department):

We support this bill.

Ms. Del Papa:

This is an important ongoing issue. I really appreciate the support and coordination.

Chair Segerblom:

Hopefully, this will get the public educated on this serious issue. We will close the hearing on S.B. 199. We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 189.

SENATE BILL 189: Revises provisions governing assault and battery. (BDR 15-917)

Senator Justin C. Jones (Senatorial District No. 9):

I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)) regarding S.B. 189 which I sponsor. This bill was brought to my attention by a dental student who faces the same issues as any other student faces. I urge you to pass this bill.

Mr. Matheis:

We supported the original legislation regarding this issue. At the time, there were violent incidents in emergency departments at various hospitals in

southern Nevada and at other health care settings throughout the Nation. We worried about risk of violence to health care professionals who were doing the jobs we needed them to do. Over time, several versions of this bill were passed which inadvertently excluded these groups. Health care students are placed into settings during training in which they could be subjected to violence. It makes sense to include these students.

Robert Talley, DDS (Executive Director, Nevada Dental Association):

The Nevada Dental Association is asking for your support of this bill since it will afford the same deterrent against crime to dental professional students as to licensed dentists and hygienists. Dental student Spencer Armuth brought this bill to our attention.

Spencer Armuth (School of Dental Medicine, University of Nevada, Las Vegas):

I am a third-year dental student and will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)) in support of S.B. 189.

Melissa Piasecki, MD (Senior Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, University of Nevada School of Medicine):

We support this bill.

Kristina Coger (School of Medicine, University of Nevada, Reno):

I am a fourth-year student at the University of Nevada, Reno, School of Medicine. I support this bill.

Shari Peterson (Program Director, Dental Hygiene, College of Southern Nevada):

I support this bill.

Chair Segerblom:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 189.

SENATOR KIHUEN MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 189.

SENATOR FORD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Chair Segerblom:

We will now open the hearing on S.B. 138.

SENATE BILL 138: Authorizes irrevocable trusts and certain other entities to hold ownership interests in professional entities. (BDR 7-848)

Senator Mark Hutchison (Senatorial District No. 6):

Professional corporations and entities cannot hold ownership or interest through irrevocable trusts. Those entities and corporations are only able to do so through revocable trusts. Other businesses may hold interest via irrevocable trusts.

Chair Segerblom:

Why is that?

Senator Hutchison:

Professional corporations and entities were probably overlooked. This bill allows professional corporations, such as doctors, dentists and lawyers, to hold their professional corporations and limited-liability companies (LLCs) and their interest in irrevocable trusts as opposed to revocable trusts.

Layne Rushforth (Cochair, Legislative Committee, Probate and Trust Law Section, State Bar of Nevada):

The allowance of professional entities to hold interest through revocable trusts was a good idea, but once a person dies, a trust becomes irrevocable. The trust becomes ineligible to own the professional entity. There are other reasons to have irrevocable trusts, including spendthrift trusts or gift trusts. This bill will assist in estate planning for professionals such as accountants, attorneys and doctors, that is, all professionals who require licenses. This is a minor extension of what exists.

Chair Segerblom:

For example, if a lawyer or a person who owns a professional corporation dies, the person who owned the corporation at that time would not be a lawyer anymore. Is that an issue?

Mr. Rushforth:

The trustee who manages that trust will be required to be a licensed person to run that entity. There will still be a licensed person running that entity.

Chair Segerblom:

What is the advantage to the professional?

Mr. Rushforth:

There does not have to be an immediate liquidation of that entity at death because the trust is an ineligible owner. There does not have to be an immediate divestiture of the trust of the professional corporation. The trustee can continue to administer the assets, pay the taxes and continue with the business without having to have a problem with a disqualified owner.

Chair Segerblom:

What if the professional corporation was facing a malpractice case. Would this bill affect that pending case?

Mr. Rushforth:

No.

Chair Segerblom:

It would continue with the trustee, and the complainant would still be able to go after the professional corporation?

Mr. Rushforth:

Yes. It changes who benefits from that asset, assuming the corporation does not lose everything in the lawsuit. Any benefit goes to the beneficiaries of the trust. It simplifies administration. It does not shield assets from creditors.

John Dawson (State Bar of Nevada):

I am the former Chair of the Probate and Trust Law Section of the State Bar and I would like to reiterate this bill provides that someone who is not licensed cannot participate in any decisions in regard to the rendering of services.

Pat Cashill (Nevada Justice Association):

We are in opposition to this bill. It is not good public policy. This is a mechanism to insulate assets and will frustrate the ability of the public to seek redress, in the form of liability, against a professional. This bill does in fact shield the professional entity. No protections are built into this bill as provided for by common law, for example, NRS 78.747 which is the piercing-of-the-veil concept. I have provided a copy ([Exhibit H](#)) of *LFC Marketing Group v. Loomis*, 116 Nev. 896, 8 P.3d 841 (2000) and NRS 78.747 ([Exhibit I](#)) relating to the

liability of stockholder, director or officer for debt or liability of a corporation. These originated in caselaw to ensure the statute carried forward the common law of protecting one who seeks redress against a wrongdoer. This bill relates only to professional entities, but the effect is to erect another barrier of an irrevocable trust to entities. These entities are already addressed by the common law and statutes, which provide that a professional wrongdoer may not be insulated. With this bill, assets would be transferred into an irrevocable trust and could not be pierced for purposes of those who seek to enforce a judgment.

Chair Segerblom:

An example is: a lawyer is driving and is involved in an accident, and several people are killed. The accident was the fault of the lawyer, but the lawyer is also killed in the accident. Are you saying the victims of the accident, if that lawyer's firm was an LLC, would not be able to go after that firm?

Mr. Cashill:

The victim of that crash would be able to seek redress against the lawyer, his law firm and the owner of the car. However, if the lawyer or the LLC failed to have any insurance but had other assets held by an irrevocable trust, the existence of the trust creates a barrier for the victims to reach assets previously held outside the trust. Those assets are now held within the walls of the trust. That is our concern.

Chair Segerblom:

Can an LLC or professional corporation hold other assets such as property?

Mr. Cashill:

Yes. Property and any other assets may be held by a professional corporation.

Mr. Rushforth:

Our position is that we do not have any intent to destroy the piercing-the-veil arguments. If a series of facts would allow for piercing, that would go to the shareholder, which would include the assets of the irrevocable trust. If the trust had those assets, those would be available to satisfy the lawsuit. There is no shielding of the assets of the trust if it may be pierced. This makes the entire trust vulnerable to the judgment and does not impede on the collection of the lawsuit. A professional can never make an entity that protects an individual from his or her own malpractice. If I have committed malpractice as an attorney

and whether I am a professional limited liability company or a corporation, I am personally liable as well as my LLC or corporation. The purpose is not to shield or destroy the ability to pierce the corporate veil and get justifiable compensation for malpractice. This bill states that when a trust becomes irrevocable, either at inception or upon death, it does not become a disqualified owner of a professional entity. This bill applies to professional entities only because only licensed professionals require licensing. Only licensed persons can participate in the management of that entity.

Mr. Dawson:

The assets of the LLC or corporation would be available. This bill does not shield those assets from liability.

Chair Segerblom:

Can you make an amendment which provides that this bill does not intend to get rid of the right to pursue judgment under chapter 78 of NRS?

Mr. Rushforth:

It would be appropriate to include that nothing within this bill is intended to negate the pierce-the-veil concept and to include a specific reference to NRS 78.

Jeff Burr:

The intent of this bill is to extend the same protections to professionals that all other business owners already have under NRS 166. Only professionals are not allowed to take advantage of those protections.

Chair Segerblom:

Why were professional corporations left out?

Mr. Burr:

It was an oversight. The statute allows for a living trust to be an owner of a professional corporation. I do not think Legislators thought about the fact that a professional corporation cannot be owned by an irrevocable trust because it was precluded by the professional corporation statute. We come across this issue a lot in practice where professionals seek protection from frivolous lawsuits outside the corporation and are unable to do so because they are only allowed to own the corporation individually or through a revocable living trust. We want to fill that gap and extend that protection to professionals.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
March 12, 2013
Page 17

Mr. Cashill:

I am happy to work on an amendment to clarify language and ensure it does not affect the common law ability to pierce the veil and reverse piercing of the veil.

Senator Hutchison:

We can work on the appropriate language to make it clear as to what happens to professional entities when we die. We want them to be transferred in an orderly fashion. We do not want to have any piercing-the-corporate-veil issues.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
March 12, 2013
Page 18

Chair Segerblom:

We will now close the hearing on S.B. 138.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lindsay Wheeler,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Tick Segerblom, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness / Agency	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
S.B. 199	C	10	Frankie Sue Del Papa	Responding to Unlicensed Health Care in Nevada
S.B. 199	D	1	Brett Kandt	Flow Chart
S.B. 199	E	1	Brett Kandt	Proposed Amendment to S.B. 199
S.B. 189	F	2	Senator Justin C. Jones	Written Testimony
S.B. 189	G	2	Spencer Armuth	Written Testimony
S.B. 138	H	7	Pat Cashill	Caselaw
S.B. 138	I	2	Pat Cashill	N.R.S. 78.747