

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Seventy-Eighth Session
April 28, 2015**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Greg Brower at 1:02 p.m. on Tuesday, April 28, 2015, in Room 2134 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 Greg Brower, Chair
Senator Becky Harris, Vice Chair
Senator Michael Roberson
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Ruben J. Kihuen
Senator Aaron D. Ford

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Tick Segerblom (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Randy Kirner, Assembly District No. 26

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Policy Analyst
Nick Anthony, Counsel
Connie Westadt, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Kaye Shackford
Randi Thompson, National Federation of Independent Business
Tray Abney, The Chamber

Senate Committee on Judiciary
April 28, 2015
Page 2

Gene Brockman
Patricia Moser Morris, Incline Village/Crystal Bay Republican Women
Wes Henderson, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Wayne Carlson, Nevada Public Agency Insurance Pool
Tonja Brown
Kristy Oriol, Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence
Frank Wright
Sherry Powell, Ladies of Liberty
Judith Miller
Aaron Katz
Pam Del Porto, Inspector General, Department of Corrections
Eric Spratley, Sheriff's Office, Washoe County
Chuck Callaway, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Bob Roshak, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Steve Yeager, Public Defender's Office, Clark County
Sean B. Sullivan, Public Defender's Office, Washoe County
Melissa Saragosa, Las Vegas Township Justice Court, Department 4,
Clark County

Chair Brower:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 110.

ASSEMBLY BILL 110: Revises provisions governing court sanctions for certain conduct in civil actions. (BDR 2-648)

Assemblyman Randy Kirner (Assembly District No. 26):

Assembly District 26 includes Incline Village and Crystal Bay. I introduce A.B. 110 at the request one of my constituents, Kaye Shackford.

Kaye Shackford:

I have provided written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).

Chair Brower:

Why do you not think that Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure (NRCP) 11 is adequate to cover the sorts of abuses you are describing?

Ms. Shackford:

The Federal Rule of Civil Procedure (FRCP) 11 was weakened in 2005. I want to make two points. First, if I have been named in a frivolous lawsuit and I win or

the case is dismissed, then I need to file a motion for sanctions. I have just spent tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars defending myself, and then I must incur more legal expenses, costs and stress. At any time under the 21-day safe harbor rule, when the other party is notified of intent to file for sanctions, it can withdraw its pleading to avoid sanctions.

Second, Rule 11 provides that judges may impose sanctions; it does not require judges to impose sanctions. When judges may impose sanctions, they tend not to.

Chair Brower:

I would like to know more about the cases you referred to targeting Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID). How many lawsuits by this one pro se litigant are there?

Ms. Shackford:

There is one 51-page, multi-action lawsuit.

Chair Brower:

There is one lawsuit?

Ms. Shackford:

There is one lawsuit, and, in addition, there are a number of Commission on Ethics complaints and Open Meeting Law violation complaints.

Chair Brower:

What was the outcome of the one lawsuit?

Ms. Shackford:

Eleven of the 12 causes of action have been dismissed or found to be without merit. One is pending.

Chair Brower:

One cause of action is pending?

Ms. Shackford:

Yes.

Chair Brower:

Has IVGID filed a motion seeking sanctions?

Ms. Shackford:

I do not represent IVGID. I am a private party who believes there is something wrong. During the Assembly Committee on Judiciary meeting, IVGID's finance manager was asked whether there is any way to recover \$190,000 of costs incurred. He answered that he is not an attorney but has been told by IVGID's attorneys that there is no way to recover costs.

Chair Brower:

If the case had been dismissed by the judge, the defendant IVGID could make a Rule 11 motion arguing that the case was brought frivolously or in bad faith. If the judge agreed, sanctions could be awarded, including all of the attorney's fees that IVGID has expended on the case. It is premature for that to happen because the case is still pending.

Ms. Shackford:

Incline Village General Improvement District's finance manager was asked several times by members of the Assembly Committee on Judiciary if he is sure there is no way to recover costs. He said he discussed cost recovery with counsel and was told that there is no way to recover costs. I hope you are right.

Chair Brower:

In which court is this lawsuit pending?

Ms. Shackford:

It is pending before Patrick Flanagan, District Judge, Second Judicial District, Department 7.

Chair Brower:

I was under the impression this particular pro se litigant had filed several lawsuits against IVGID, and none of them had been successful. I was also under the impression that IVGID was unable to move successfully for sanctions. This is helpful clarification. There is one case, and it is still pending.

Senator Ford:

I am not enamored with A.B. 110. I think it will have a chilling effect on access to court. In addition to Rule 11, I have used *Nevada Revised Statute*

(NRS) 155.165, which allows a court to declare someone a vexatious litigant. That is another reason why this bill is unnecessary.

I understand your point about judges not exercising discretion. I appreciate judicial discretion, and judges determining under what circumstances to exercise it. I am not certain that, even if this bill passed, more sanctions would be awarded because the first line says, "If a court finds that an attorney or a party who is not represented by an attorney has" I imagine some judges would simply not find an attorney or a party who is not represented by an attorney has done one of the required findings. A countervailing consideration is whether this bill is going to deter people who cannot afford an attorney from accessing the courts to address their concerns.

I am not familiar with the IVGID case. If one claim is pending, then the case may not be vexatious litigation. We have Rule 11, but we also have a standard that people who are pro se are held to a lower standard in our courts. They are still bound by the rules, but there is a lower standard. In addition, we have NRS 155.165. Why are those not sufficient?

Ms. Shackford:

I would like to mention two things. First, Assemblyman David Gardner, who is a member of the Assembly Committee on Judiciary and an attorney, mentioned that in his experience judges bend over backwards for people who are out of their league in terms of what they are doing. He has seen judges stop proceedings, take the litigant into chambers, review caselaw and make suggestions.

Second, meritless lawsuits are a large problem affecting all aspects of our society. The people who will be testifying in support of A.B. 110 are able to speak to this problem better than I am. It is affecting businesses, schools, medicine, etc. Though this started in Incline Village for me, that is not the reason I am here.

Senator Ford:

I am not suggesting one case is your only reason for bringing A.B. 110. I have had my fair share of what I consider vexatious litigants in cases I have not won. I clerked for two federal judges, but I cannot recall if caselaw supports a constitutionally based requirement regarding access to courts. However, I would imagine judges bend over backward to help people who are not lawyers because

not everyone can afford a lawyer. I am not certain I can support this bill in view of the fact that we have statutes on the books—the NRCP and the NRS—that provide opportunities to address this concern.

Randi Thompson (National Federation of Independent Business):

We have over 2,000 members statewide. Ms. Shackford's testimony touched on incidents that show the damage frivolous lawsuits do to small businesses. We support A.B. 110. We hear about how a state's tax environment is important to attracting business, but so is its legal environment. Frivolous lawsuits create a climate of fear for America's small businesses. While some claims are legitimate, many of them are completely without merit. However, individuals and entities that are sued still have to defend themselves. This defense is costly to businesses and consumers. Individuals and attorneys who file claims against businesses and victimize innocent people should be held accountable for their actions.

I cannot respond to Senator Ford's question because I am not an attorney. However, the top legislative congressional priority for the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB) is helping pass a bill sponsored by U.S. Senator Chuck Grassley and Congressman Lamar Smith called the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, which would strengthen FRCP 11. Since 1993, FRCP 11, which previously helped prevent frivolous lawsuits, has been hamstrung by changes that reduce its effectiveness. Because of the changes, parties and their attorneys are allowed to avoid sanctions by withdrawing false claims within 21 days of notice of intent to file for sanctions. This change removed a real incentive for attorneys to avoid filing frivolous lawsuits. The Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act is intended to disincentivize pro se litigants from filing frivolous claims. It would go a long way in protecting small businesses from frivolous lawsuits and from the stress and costs that go along with defending against them. Until the U.S. Senate passes the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, A.B. 110 will help protect small businesses in Nevada from the type of abuses Ms. Shackford discussed.

Chair Brower:

Can you explain why NRCP 11 is inadequate?

Ms. Thompson:

I am not an attorney. I can only refer to the federal legislation that NFIB is working on in Congress on to strengthen FRCP 11.

Tray Abney (The Chamber):

We support A.B. 110. You will always see The Chamber at this table when it comes to protecting our members, especially our small business members, from unnecessary litigation. We agree with Ms. Thompson's testimony.

Chair Brower:

Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 11 allows a judge who finds a claim frivolous or brought in bad faith to award sanctions including all attorney's fees paid by the party seeking to have the case dismissed.

Mr. Abney:

It is my understanding that NRCP 11 applies to attorneys and not people who represent themselves.

Chair Brower:

That is incorrect.

Gene Brockman:

I am 26-year resident of Incline Village. I served terms on the town board, 3 years as chair. I was a vice president of the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities and on its executive board. Experience in those positions leads me to give strong support to A.B. 110. It has been particularly apparent during the last several years that legislation of this type is needed in Nevada. I agree with Ms. Shackford's testimony.

Patricia Moser Morris (Incline Village/Crystal Bay Republican Women):

The Incline Village/Crystal Bay Republican Women is a club of 110 politically active members. I am legislative chair. We support A.B. 110. We endorse the testimony of Ms. Shackford. It is important to close this loophole in the law, which has encouraged frivolous, vexatious and harassing lawsuits.

Wes Henderson (Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities):

We support A.B. 110. This is not a problem limited to IVGID. Other members have had experiences with people who like to file lawsuits.

Chair Brower:

Have your members also had experiences with judges who refuse to grant Rule 11 motions?

Mr. Henderson:

I do not know, but I do know that I have a file in my office regarding some of these particular lawsuits that I will copy and make available to the Committee.

Wayne Carlson (Nevada Public Agency Insurance Pool):

We have been involved in defending several of these cases, including the IVGID case and some ethics complaints against various IVGID employees. We have approximately 125 local government members, primarily in the smaller, rural communities throughout the State—cities, counties, towns, special districts and school districts. We see a variety of cases. I recall a complaint filed with the Commission on Ethics against two individuals who were concession stand employees with a tip jar. The ethics complaint was that the tip jar was compensation to which these employers were not entitled under the rules. However, the personnel policies of the employer allowed these employees to have tips in addition to their regular hourly wage. A simple review of the record determined there was no ethics violation. This is the type of case we assign attorneys to defend. These are unnecessary expenses in many cases. The particular claim I mentioned was dismissed. We have looked at the Commission on Ethics law regarding sanctions and there is no sanctions provision.

We are a quasi-governmental agency. In 1985, the risk pool was formed under NRS 277, the Interlocal Cooperation Act, which allowed risk-sharing pools. The risk pool is an expense directly to taxpayers via our members paying into our program. It is passed on as an assessment to our members. We support A.B. 110.

Tonja Brown:

I oppose A.B. 110. I had a wrongful death suit filed against the State. I had attorneys representing me. Due to the untimely death of my attorney, I breached a settlement agreement. I had to file pro se. Therefore, I am a pro se litigant with a breach of settlement agreement and a wrongful death lawsuit against the State. A trial date was set last year for a day in April 2015. The Office of the Attorney General was representing the State, and it filed a motion to dismiss. As a pro se litigant, I cited all the cases regarding pro se litigation. I provided my documentation during discovery. The Office of the Attorney General filed its reply. I lost on the grounds I was untimely. However, the Office of the Attorney General was also late—5 days late. An appeal is pending. The judge did not bend over backward for me. I was held to a higher standard than that of an attorney. I am not an attorney.

Kristy Oriol (Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence):

We are the statewide coalition of domestic violence programs in Nevada. We oppose A.B. 110 and the effect it could have on victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 11 and NRS 155.165 allow the appropriate amount of judicial discretion in determining whether a litigant is vexatious. Assembly Bill 110 is unnecessary and potentially harmful. Beyond just removing judicial discretion, it could have a chilling effect on victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. Roughly 70 percent of domestic violence victims pursue legal action against their abusers pro se. Assembly Bill 110 could deem some of these pro se litigants vexatious if they are not able to substantiate abuse.

Assembly Bill 110 is specific. The allegations have to be grounded in fact, which is often difficult to prove, especially in cases of emotional, physiological and sometimes financial abuse. Reporting abuse is one of the most challenging and dangerous decisions a victim of domestic violence can make. Violence commonly escalates after the report is made, and abusers can be adept at manipulating the justice system against victims. We must not make this process more difficult for victims. I have provided written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).

Frank Wright:

I live in Crystal Bay. I am one of the litigants suing IVGID. I spent \$86 filing a small claim to recover a fee, which is used for what IVGID says is recreation. My claim is in the Second Judicial District Court in Washoe County. We are trying to find a judge who does not live in Incline Village to rule on the case. My only recourse is to go to court because IVGID has not provided a method to administratively challenge the fee. The issue is whether I have a constitutional right to challenge a fee.

Assembly Bill 110 will have a chilling effect on people like me who go up against a governmental entity that has all kinds of money and an insurance pool to pay all its costs. I do not have that. As a citizen living in this Country, my constitutional right to due process would be violated by A.B. 110. Rule 11 is sufficient. I am against A.B. 110.

The information provided by Ms. Shackford is 90 percent false. I refer you to her statement that the trustees were charged with ethics violations for spending \$2 per month. She seems to say that Mr. Katz was responsible for the ethics complaint. It was not Mr. Katz. It was I. The complaint was against a board

member with a conflict of interest voting to get a discount on a meal. I have provided a letter ([Exhibit E](#)).

Sherry Powell (Ladies of Liberty):

I am a Republican from Washoe County. I am against A.B. 110. I am a paralegal. I help victims of domestic violence. I help people who cannot afford an attorney. Judges cannot practice law from the bench. I am a constitutionalist. I believe the Constitution is the Constitution. Assembly Bill 110 would violate the Fifth Amendment right to due process.

Judith Miller:

I am a resident of Incline Village. I have provided a letter ([Exhibit F](#)) and a presentation ([Exhibit G](#)). Assembly Bill 110 is about punishing and deterring those who challenge wrongdoing by a governmental agency whose employees skirt the laws of the State and disregard the basic tenet that public service is a public trust. It is not about frivolous lawsuits.

A comment was made to the Assembly Committee on Judiciary that an unrepresented party would not be sanctioned as long as the party filed the action in good faith. That is not what A.B. 110 says. Assembly Bill 110 makes sanctions mandatory for actions that are either frivolous or vexatious. Assemblyman Erven T. Nelson asked about actions filed in good faith and a licensed attorney assured him that, if the claims were filed in good faith, the court would not be required to order sanctions. The language of A.B. 110 in [Exhibit F](#) makes it clear that “made in good faith” applies to an argument for changing the existing law. It does not refer to any other part of the bill.

Chair Brower:

That is correct, and there is the “or” that follows that clause which requires sanctions for an action not well grounded in fact or law or for unreasonably and vexatiously extending a civil action or proceeding. I follow you and the Committee is tracking what you are saying.

Ms. Miller:

Ms. Shackford’s testimony suggesting that the phrase “appropriate situations” would excuse actions filed in good faith is incorrect. According to A.B. 110, if the court finds any action not well grounded or not warranted by existing law, even if made in good faith, the court shall require the party personally to pay costs, expenses and attorney’s fees. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 18 and FRCP 11

already provide ample means for deterring all parties whether or not represented from filing, maintaining or defending actions that are frivolous or vexatious and for sanctioning those who do. Please protect the ability of voters and taxpayers to stop not just public agencies that misuse public funds and violate our trust but also to seek justice through the courts whenever necessary. Our tradition of government, including our judicial system, of the people, by the people and for the people would be severely damaged by A.B. 110.

Aaron Katz:

I have submitted a written statement ([Exhibit H](#)). I am the person called the serial litigant who has filed one action against IVGID. Ms. Shackford talks about a loophole. There is no loophole. Rule 11 has been mentioned. Senator Ford referenced NRS 155.165. There is also the tort of abuse of process. If somebody has been wronged in this State, he or she is allowed to file an action and have the matter determined by the court. Abuse of process is the tort for bringing an action that is improper or without justification.

Neither Ms. Shackford nor any of the other proponents of A.B. 110 have proffered any evidence that my action was frivolous. I do not think she knows what the term means. You might ask her. Ask her about vexatious too. She has presented no evidence that frivolous civil lawsuits are out of control in Nevada. I am not saying they do not exist; of course they do, but they are not out of control. Incline Village General Improvement District has not suffered from frivolous lawsuits. Mr. Wright's action is not frivolous. My action is not frivolous. There have been two other lawsuits filed against IVGID over the beaches. One of them was published as a federal case. That was not frivolous.

Assembly Bill 110 is retaliation against Frank Wright and me. One of the problems with A.B. 110 is that it removes judicial discretion, which is an unwise thing to do. Our courts are there to exercise discretion. Assembly Bill 110 lacks mutuality. It seeks to give a protection to a defendant who prevails, but it fails to extend the same protection to a self-represented party who suffers the same wrong by a represented party. This defines what IVGID does.

Assembly Bill 110 has unintended consequences. It is not merely limited to unreasonable or vexatious behavior. It goes far beyond that. Assembly Bill 110 is a new remedy against both attorneys for represented parties and unrepresented parties. If you read the bill literally, you are opening the door to attorneys becoming personally liable. Assembly Bill 110 chills the

self-represented party's exercise of the right to seek redress of grievances in our courts. My lawsuit sought no money damages. I was not trying to shake down a government. The IVGID finance director who spoke before the Assembly Committee on Judiciary spoke without authority. He was chastised by the IVGID Board of Trustees. He came to the Legislature purporting to represent IVGID without authority to do so. That is why he is not here today.

Finally, my action and Mr. Wright's action are about a member of the public engaging in the right to petition the courts regarding issues of public concern. This is anti-Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation (SLAPP). People who bring anti-SLAPP actions are immune from any liability whatsoever. If you are going to go forward with A.B. 110, there should be an exception for actions attempting to redress issues of public concern. Otherwise, you are going to discourage people from challenging their government. It is unfortunate that we have to challenge our government through the court process. Please do not approve A.B. 110.

Assemblyman Kirner:

You have asked about Rule 11. I would turn that question around. How many times have you seen Rule 11 applied in Nevada? It is not. The intent of A. B. 110 is set forth in section 1, subsection 2 directing the court to liberally construe its provisions in favor of awarding sanctions. We want the court to understand the intent of the Legislature.

Chair Brower:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 110 and open the hearing on A.B. 16.

ASSEMBLY BILL 16 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions concerning sexual conduct between certain prisoners in lawful custody or confinement and other persons. (BDR 16-343)

Pam Del Porto (Inspector General, Department of Corrections):

The Department of Corrections is committed to compliance with the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (PREA). As the Inspector General, I am the PREA coordinator, and I am in charge of PREA compliance efforts. We have been tracking incidents, allegations and reports for quite a while. One of our concerns is that the Department of Justice (DOJ), while conducting blocks of instruction for a person to become a certified PREA auditor, makes it known that Nevada is the outlier in the Country because Nevada allows an inmate to be prosecuted

when he or she has been the victim of sex act with a staff member, contractor or volunteer. We are seeking to change that law so we are not the outlier while maintaining the authority to prosecute an inmate who engages in a consensual act of sexual contact with another person. We also seek to add language under NRS 212 allowing for the prosecution of staff members, contractors or volunteers for sexual abuse of an inmate as a Category D felony, which is equal to the charge for consensual sex.

I worked with the Clark and Washoe Counties Public Defender's Offices to amend the original bill with the language related to unauthorized physical conduct. These offenses are gross misdemeanors, and the attempt of these defined offenses is a misdemeanor.

Chair Brower:

I understand the need for the changes. How many people do you have on your staff?

Ms. Del Porto:

I have four administrative staff members. One is a program officer specifically for PREA who tracks the incidents and the initial review of reports. I have 19 investigators including two supervisors.

Chair Brower:

I know you have a big job in terms of investigating all allegations of inappropriate or improper conduct.

Ms. Del Porto:

I have one investigator in Ely, several in Las Vegas and seven investigators and one supervisor here Carson City. All of us respond when needed. We investigate more than just PREA. We investigate misconduct not rising to a crime. We have drug interdictions, escapes and batteries.

Chair Brower:

Does your office do audit activity?

Ms. Del Porto:

Our work is investigative except for PREA. Three of my staff members are certified as PREA auditors, but we cannot audit ourselves except for informal or interim audits when we are preparing for an audit. Staff members work with the

institutions and conduct training for outside law enforcement agencies because we are committed to law enforcement in this State.

Chair Brower:

Does your office engage in review activities that it initiates, or is it reactive in response to complaints that lead to investigations?

Ms. Del Porto:

We do both. We review processes and procedures, but we are also reactive.

Chair Brower:

Who hires you, who can fire you and who do you report to?

Ms. Del Porto:

I report to the Director and to the Board of State Prison Commissioners.

Chair Brower:

Are you appointed for a term or are you at will?

Ms. Del Porto:

My position is a permanent State employee position. I can be terminated for cause.

Eric Spratley (Sheriff's Office, Washoe County):

We support A.B. 16 and all that PREA does for the protection of inmates in our State but most importantly those in the Washoe County Detention facility.

Chuck Callaway (Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

We support A.B. 16. The Clark County Detention Center is in compliance with PREA.

Bob Roshak (Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):

We support A.B. 16.

Steve Yeager (Public Defender's Office, Clark County):

We are neutral on A.B. 16. We opposed the bill initially, but we were invited to collaborate with Ms. Del Porto and now we can live with it. The collaboration was a shining example of how this process is supposed to work.

Sean B. Sullivan (Public Defender's Office, Washoe County):

We are neutral on A.B. 16. It was a pleasure working with Ms. Del Porto.

Chair Brower:

We close the hearing on A.B. 16 and open the hearing A.B. 44.

ASSEMBLY BILL 44 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing judgments by confession. (BDR 6-491)

Melissa Saragosa (Las Vegas Township Justice Court, Department 4, Clark County):

Assembly Bill 44 adds structure to confessions of judgment that are filed in the justice courts. There are statutory provisions for confessions of judgment filed in the district courts. The law regarding confessions of judgment in justice court simply says a confession may be entered. Assembly Bill 44 incorporates the language from NRS 17 addressing confessions of judgment for the district courts into NRS 68.050.

The need for A.B. 44 is due to the volume of cases and types of cases at the justice court level. The Las Vegas Justice Court has 21,000 general civil cases, 28,000 eviction actions and 4,000 small claims actions each year. That is a lot of paperwork for our clerks to process. Part of the processing of a confession of judgment is making sure it is an appropriate case for a confession of judgment. There are statutes that prohibit a confession of judgment. For example, a confession of judgment is prohibited for deferred deposit loans—payday loans. Assembly Bill 44 requires a statement in writing signed by the defendant and a summary of the facts leading up to the confession of judgment. This will help the justice court accept confessions of judgment in the right cases.

Senate Committee on Judiciary
April 28, 2015
Page 16

Chair Brower:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 44. The hearing is adjourned at 2:01 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Connie Westadt,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Greg Brower, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
A.B. 110	C	5	Kaye Shackford	Written Testimony
A.B. 110	D	2	Kristy Oriol / Nevada Network Against Domestic Violence	Kristy Oriol Letter
A.B. 110	E	2	Frank Wright	Letter
A.B. 110	F	1	Judith Miller	Letter
A.B. 110	G	3	Judith Miller	Presentation
A.B. 110	H	4	Aaron Katz	Letter