

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

**Eightieth Session  
May 6, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Nicole J. Cannizzaro at 8:21 a.m. on Monday, May 6, 2019, in Room 2135 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 Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Chair  
Senator Dallas Harris, Vice Chair  
Senator James Ohrenschall  
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop  
Senator Melanie Scheible  
Senator Scott Hammond  
Senator Ira Hansen  
Senator Keith F. Pickard

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Assembly District No. 8  
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst  
Nicolas Anthony, Committee Counsel  
Jeanne Mortimer, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Sandy Anderson, Nevada State Board of Massage Therapy  
Bailey Bortolin, Washoe Legal Services  
Graham Galloway, Nevada Justice Association  
Alison Brasier, Nevada Justice Association

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 6, 2019  
Page 2

Christian Morris, Nevada Justice Association  
Brad Johnson, Las Vegas Defense Lawyers  
Marla McDade Williams, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony  
Connor Cain, Nevada Association of Realtors; Nevada Bankers Association  
Hawah Ahmad, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe  
Chris Ferrari, Nevada Credit Union League  
Robert Teuten  
Edward Coleman  
Christine Saunders, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada  
John J. Piro, Office of the Public Defender, Clark County; Office of the Public  
Defender, Washoe County

CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

The meeting is called to order and will begin with a presentation of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 248.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 248 (1st Reprint)**: Prohibits a settlement agreement from containing provisions that prohibit or restrict a party from disclosing certain information under certain circumstances. (BDR 2-1004)

ASSEMBLYMAN JASON FRIERSON (Assembly District No. 8):

I am here to present A.B. 248. This bill provides that under certain circumstances, settlement agreements are voidable. Settlement agreements are useful in civil litigation and help with timely settlement. Confidentiality provisions are often referred to as nondisclosure agreements (NDAs) within a NDAs settlement agreement.

Settlement agreements were created for reasonable business purposes; more recently, the NDA provision has been used by high-profile individuals accused of sexual assault to prevent the alleged victim from testifying in a criminal proceeding. The NDA provision protects serial abusers by preventing the details of a case from becoming public. This enables further abuse.

Most NDA provisions include a financial settlement between the accused and the accuser, barring the alleged victim from receiving a financial settlement and then talking about the allegations or revealing the amount of the settlement. The penalties for breaking the silence may be costly to an alleged victim, who may be forced to pay back monies he or she has received in a settlement agreement as well as legal fees for the adverse party.

Some advocates may be concerned that A.B. 248 would make it difficult for alleged victims to obtain settlements from their abusers and increase difficulty in criminally prosecuting sexual assault cases. In some instances, civil litigation may be the only recourse. This bill would create strong public policy to prohibit certain types of NDA provisions in settlement agreements; claims that involve vulnerable victims, felony behavior and other egregious conduct create an unfair justice system.

Assembly Bill 248 aims to create balance in the justice system. There needs to be balance for public disclosure and victim confidentiality. Settlement agreements that prohibit disclosure of sexual assault would be prohibited under this bill. Sex discrimination by an employer or landlord would be prohibited, as would retaliation by an employer or landlord concerning a person reporting sex discrimination. Under this bill, a court would be prohibited from entering an order that prohibits or restricts the disclosure of such factual information.

This bill prohibits the accused from shielding his or her identity. Settlement agreements would not prohibit the parties from disclosing the settlement amount. The Nevada Equal Rights Commission has the jurisdiction to investigate complaints of harassment against Nevada employers—these provisions do not apply to settlement agreements executed by the Commission. It is important to have options available to ensure that rights are protected and that sound public policy is adhered to. This bill provides that any settlement agreement entered into on or after July 1 that contains a provision prohibited by this bill would be void and unenforceable. It would be appropriate to send the message that this initiative is moving forward.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:  
Do other states have similar laws?

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:  
Yes, California does.

SENATOR HANSEN:  
Will this bill restrict a victim from receiving restitution or financial compensation?

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 6, 2019  
Page 4

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

No. This bill will not impact the ability of a victim receiving restitution or financial compensation. This bill presents many benefits. A serial perpetrator would be prohibited from entering into numerous illegal settlement agreements. This bill does not prohibit civil actions.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

Does this bill provide for protections for discrimination against a person based on sexual orientation?

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

Protection for sexual orientation is not the intent of the bill; however, this bill will cover discrimination against a person's sexual orientation.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

I agree. There are factual instances where it is difficult because of different factors based on discrimination. This bill is good public policy.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

This bill does cover protections for discrimination based on sexual orientation, as does existing Nevada law.

SANDY ANDERSON (Board of Massage Therapy):

We support A.B. 248. There are repeat offenders who negotiate settlement agreements with alleged victims. Subsequently, victims are prohibited from testifying before the Board of Massage Therapy that sexual assault occurred at the hands of a licensed massage therapist.

BAILEY BORTOLIN (Washoe Legal Services):

We support A.B. 248. This bill is an important step to balance inequities. More employers conduct sexual harassment training as a result of similar legislation in other states. There will be positive outcomes if this bill is passed.

CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

The hearing on A.B. 248 is closed. The hearing on A.B. 285 is open.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 285 (1st Reprint)**: Enacts provisions relating to a mental or physical examination of certain persons in a civil action. (BDR 4-1027)

ASSEMBLYMAN JASON FRIERSON (Assembly District No. 8):  
I am here to present A.B. 285 with the Nevada Justice Association.

GRAHAM GALLOWAY (Nevada Justice Association):

We have provided Article 35 Examinations Caselaw ([Exhibit C](#) contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request of the Research Library). In a personal injury lawsuit, the defendant is entitled to file a motion requesting or requiring that the alleged victim attend a medical examination arranged by the defense. This is called an independent medical evaluation or a *Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure* (NRCP) Rule 35 examination. The NRCP Rule 35 allows this process to move forward. I have practiced law for 33 years, and this area of law has been controversial.

The issue under NRCP Rule 35 is that the alleged victim is required to go to a medical examination and get questioned without any legal representation. This bill would provide and allow for alleged victims to have legal representation present during this medical examination. This bill would allow for an alleged victim to bring a friend or family member to the NRCP Rule 35 examination. This bill allows for the examination to be audio-recorded.

The Nevada Supreme Court rules allow an observer to be present but will not allow a recording of the examination unless certain elements of good cause have been met. We do not believe this bill addresses procedural rules; this bill addresses substantive law, dealing with fundamental rights such as liberty and to control your own body. Assembly Bill 285 will allow the medical examination to be audio-recorded; however, the Nevada Supreme Court rules prohibit it.

ALISON BRASIER (Nevada Justice Association):

Assembly Bill 285 protects injured victims. The NRCP Rule 35 examination governs some of the practices in place but not enough to protect an alleged victim's rights and intrusion. This bill protects persons from being forced to attend and participate in the NRCP Rule 35 examination. This bill allows the audio recordings and a witness present to have an objective record available. The current rule provides that an audio recording is only permissible upon a showing of good cause to the court. This bill addresses more than a procedural law, it is a substantive law. Some states permit video recordings of the medical examination; however, most states allow audio recording.

CHRISTIAN MORRIS (Nevada Justice Association):

Assembly Bill 285 allows for the alleged victim to have an observer present in the medical examination room. Doctors may not act in good faith. Perhaps the doctor may ask inappropriate questions that are outside the scope of the examination. Doctors may expose the alleged victim to intrusive questions.

SENATOR SCHIEBLE:

There is a presumption that the doctor is not biased. Does A.B. 285 undermine the goal that the doctor is unbiased?

MR. GALLOWAY:

Insurance companies want to win the lawsuit at all costs. Doctors will say what the insurance companies want them to say. Independence is no longer present.

MS. MORRIS:

The medical examination needs to be audio-recorded so that no one has to be a witness. The doctor knows that he or she will be creating a report and will be deposed about the medical examination. The attorneys agree on the parameters of the medical exam.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

In your testimony, you referenced how doctors may act inappropriately during a medical examination. There may be disputes on how a medical examination was conducted, so having a witness observe may alleviate disputed claims. Are you anticipating that plaintiff's counsel will be a witness in his or her own case?

MS. MORRIS:

No. That is why the medical examination must be recorded. Nobody needs to be a witness. An audio recording of the medical examination clarifies any disputes.

MR. GALLOWAY:

It is highly unlikely that the plaintiff's counsel would attend the medical examination, even if A.B. 285 allows the counsel to attend. If a lawyer attends the medical examination, this potentially could render the lawyer as a witness.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

What is the purpose of allowing attorneys in the medical examination room?

MS. MORRIS:

Most clients prefer that their attorney accompany them to the medical examination. This bill allows the attorney to attend and is an option. The reality is that most attorneys would not attend the medical examination. This bill allows the client to have a friend or family member present. This medical examination would be audio-recorded.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

There are legal practitioners who have medical backgrounds. Is there an issue with the difference in sophistication regarding attending medical examinations?

MR. GALLOWAY:

The issue derives from alleged victims who have never been through the process before. The alleged victim may not be a sophisticated individual and may not understand what is going on. Medical examiners are highly educated, and have completed many medical examinations. There is not a level playing field with this regard.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

The portion of the bill that deals with audio recording of the medical examination—is the medical examiner permitted to have such a recording?

MR. GALLOWAY:

It would go both ways. This bill allows either side to audio-record the medical examination.

SENATOR HANSEN:

If the plaintiff's attorney is present for the medical examination, is the attorney allowed to ask questions of the medical examiner during the exam?

MR. GALLOWAY:

The attorney is not permitted to ask questions or to interfere with the medical examination. The bill provides that if the observer interferes improperly, the medical examination can be stopped and sanctions can be leveled. If an attorney improperly conducted him or herself during the medical examination, the defense would bring a motion to impose sanctions on that attorney.

SENATOR HANSEN:

The idea clarifies a gray area of the law. This is why we want the audio recording of the medical examination. Would this provision apply when an injured party has been to his or her own medical examiner? Would the injured party then have to provide this audio recording to the defense?

MR. GALLOWAY:

No. This only happens during the litigation process. When an injured party goes to the doctor, there is no litigation at that point. There is no defense counsel at that point. These medical examinations are done for treatment purposes. The bill covers medical examinations during litigation for personal injury claims.

SENATOR HANSEN:

What if an injured party decides to go to dispute resolution? Can there be other doctors?

MR. GALLOWAY:

This occurs frequently.

SENATOR HANSEN:

This is standard operating procedure for the injured party to see both the plaintiff's doctor and the defense's doctor?

MR. GALLOWAY:

Yes; however, it is not common in smaller personal injury cases because it is not economically feasible. Any time there is a large case, the NRCP Rule 35 examination will occur.

SENATOR PICKARD:

Initially, the injured party is harmed, and he or she goes to see a doctor. Subsequently, the personal injury lawyer attempts to get compensation for the client's injuries. The insurance company then hires the doctor who is an expert witness to complete a medical examination under NRCP Rule 35?

MS. MORRIS:

Yes, that is correct. Most doctors are consistent. The doctors hired by the insurance company evaluate the injured victim for purposes of litigation. These medical examinations are typically outside the scope of most doctors' practices.



SENATOR PICKARD:

The insurance company hires the more experienced doctor for purposes of rebutting a claim. No provision disallows an injured party from bringing someone in; however, this bill allows the plaintiff's attorney to be in the room during the medical examination. The plaintiff's attorney can call an end to the exam, correct?

MS. MORRIS:

This bill helps injured victims. This is litigation-based deposition. The doctor anticipates that he or she will be called to the stand. Currently, there is no audio recording allowed, absent good cause. The doctors understand the process.

MS. BRASIER:

This bill does not have a chilling effect on the injured party's claim. The audio recording provides an objective record of what has occurred.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

I have concerns that A.B. 285 permits the observer to stop the medical examination. This is a legal inquiry—this raises the issue of whether the exam has exceeded the scope of the agreement made by the two attorneys? If the defense attorney exceeds the scope, this objection will lead the doctor to be the legal representative of the defense. This is what your testimony says that happens currently. Should both attorneys be present in the room during the examination?

MS. MORRIS:

These medical examinations are costly. Stopping a medical examination is unlikely. Either side of the litigation would have to deal with that. This bill will provide for accurate audio recordings from an objective standpoint. The boundaries of the medical examination have already been established by the attorneys and the court.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

My reading of the bill differs from the statements made during testimony.

MR. GALLOWAY:

If the doctor conducts an appropriate medical examination, this bill will prevent inappropriate behavior. The goal is to terminate an examination where a doctor is acting inappropriately.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 6, 2019  
Page 10

SENATOR PICKARD:

Is this already the law regarding workers compensation lawsuits?

MS. MORRIS:

Yes, the provision allowing an audio recording for purposes of a workers compensation claim is provided for in statute.

SENATOR PICKARD:

Have there been dilatory outcomes in those cases?

MR. GALLOWAY:

We have never experienced an issue attending a medical examination where the examination had to be terminated.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

Under the law, if the injured party feels that the examination is going wrong, is there any power for the injured party to stop the examination?

MR. GALLOWAY:

No. The law does not provide for the injured party to terminate the medical examination as it is occurring.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

Can the examination stop in the workers compensation claims if requested by the injured party?

MR. GALLOWAY:

Yes, that is correct.

BRAD JOHNSON (Las Vegas Defense Lawyers):

I have provided written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)). We oppose A.B. 285. The revised NRCP Rule 35 addresses the concerns that this bill brings forth. The current law permits that someone is allowed to attend the NRCP Rule 35 examination and that the exam can be audio-recorded, and the law is not one-sided with regard to the plaintiff.

It is not the Legislative Body that makes a procedural rule; however, this bill does not address a substantive law. This bill violates the separation of powers. The state of litigation is not a matter that should be before the Legislative Body.

Doctors do not conduct examinations of people for free, and the doctor must be hired. The workers compensation process is a different system. As provided on page 4 of [Exhibit D](#), doctors have one-stop-shops for patients where it can be determined if a patient has a claim.

SENATOR PICKARD:

With respect to the workers compensation, is there a panel of doctors paid independently by other people?

MR. JOHNSON:

No, there is not.

MR. GALLOWAY:

We want to emphasize that alleged victims are forced to undergo medical examinations to become whole again. The victims did not ask to be in this situation. This bill protects fundamental rights. This bill is a substantive law, not just procedural law.

CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

The hearing on [A.B. 285](#) is closed. The hearing on [A.B. 393](#) is open.

**[ASSEMBLY BILL 393 \(1st Reprint\)](#)**: Providing protections to certain governmental and tribal employees and certain other persons during a government shutdown. (BDR 3-1015)

ASSEMBLYMAN JASON FRIERSON (Assembly District No. 8):

This bill protects employees who are impacted by federal government shutdowns. Our Nation recently had a federal government shutdown and did not resume operations for many weeks. During that period, many federal employees did not receive paychecks. Federal law establishes an orderly process for a budget to be enacted by Congress and the U.S. President with outlined deadlines. If deadlines are not met, the budget will not be completed in time. Congress can pass a resolution to allow federal agencies to continue to spend money at current levels for a specified period of time. Sometimes, there is no resolution, resulting in a federal shutdown.

In Nevada, there are approximately 11,500 federal civilian employees. During the most recent shutdown, about 3,500 of these employees did not receive paychecks. Many other Nevadans were negatively impacted, some who had

contracts with federal agencies. When contractors are not paid, the contractors lay off employees. The federal shutdown impacts State employees who work in programs funded by the federal government. These families have ongoing financial obligations. Assembly Bill 393 provides a measure of relief for those who are directly affected during a federal government shutdown. This bill addresses mortgage holders, common-interest communities, landlords and holders of liens on motor vehicles. This bill prohibits evictions against persons who have been impacted by the federal government shutdown or repossessing vehicles. These families could be eligible for government assistance.

At the State level, we must take action to protect our citizens. This bill provides commonsense transition, and it is not indefinite. As a community, we need to help our members. This bill will provide protections for those impacted by federal government shutdowns.

SENATOR PICKARD:

There are many repercussions during a federal government shutdown. There is a domino effect. Can you explain limitations of A.B. 393?

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

This bill includes household members, and there is a proposed amendment to define who is a household member ([Exhibit E](#)). The bill requires that there be proof of financial hardship and proof of being subjected to a federal government shutdown. The parameters provide sufficient notice to lienholders and ability for adjustment for those who are subjected to the shutdown. There are federal employees who still need to work during a shutdown. This bill protects them.

SENATOR PICKARD:

As we discuss independent contractors, many in Nevada had no guarantee of getting paid during the federal shutdown.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

This bill includes persons who are contracted with the federal government. This bill does not relieve any debts accrued.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Can you explain the rationale including the term "landlord" in the bill?

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 6, 2019  
Page 13

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

With regard to evictions, this language is critical. This bill would prohibit evictions against tenants who are impacted by a federal government shutdown. This bill does not relieve a person of his or her debt.

MARLA MCDADE WILLIAMS (Reno-Sparks Indian Colony):

We support A.B. 393. The last federal government shutdown imposed hardships on the tribal communities.

CONNER CAIN (Nevada Association of Realtors; Nevada Bankers Association):

We support A.B. 393.

HAWAH AHMAD (Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe):

We support A.B. 393. However, we do not support section 2 of the amendment in [Exhibit E](#).

CHRIS FERRARI (Nevada Credit Union League):

We are neutral on A.B. 393 and submitted the proposed amendment, [Exhibit E](#). Credit unions are member-owned; credit unions do their best to assist their employees during the federal government shutdowns as well as recessions. The term "materially affected" is not enumerated. We want to include the definition of a "household member" in the bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

There needs to be proof that a person was materially impacted by the federal government shutdown. The person would need to provide proof that he or she was subject to a federal government shutdown.

CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

The hearing on A.B. 393 is closed. The hearing on A.B. 432 is open.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 432 (1st Reprint)**: Establishes provisions governing worker cooperative corporations. (BDR 7-1026)

ASSEMBLYMAN JASON FRIERSON (Assembly District No. 8):

Assembly Bill 432 aims to create quality jobs in Nevada. This bill will help the economy in Nevada. Jobs are vital to the economic health in Nevada. This bill sets up worker cooperatives as a type of cooperation in Nevada. This bill furthers making Nevada a welcoming environment for a variety of businesses.

Worker cooperatives are present in other states and are business entities. Worker cooperatives do not have a chief executive officer, and employees collectively own the business. Employees collectively decide important business decisions.

ROBERT TEUTEN:

This bill is important for setting up worker cooperatives in Nevada. This bill defines worker cooperatives and is a result of stakeholders input. Worker cooperatives are important to unite people during a crisis such as a recession. This bill is important for Nevada. There are many states that offer worker cooperatives as a form of business structure.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

If this bill were to pass, do you think the existing worker cooperatives would move to Nevada based on favorable tax structure?

MR. TEUTEN:

Yes, we believe worker cooperatives would come to Nevada if the State had favorable tax structure.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Are there entities that would be prohibited from being organized under the structure proposed in A.B. 432?

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON:

A worker cooperative is an attractive structure for certain types of businesses. This bill creates a new form of cooperation structure in Nevada.

MR. TEUTEN:

This bill does not prohibit any entity from forming under this bill. Small businesses favor worker cooperatives. There are more benefits to structuring as a worker cooperative.

CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

The hearing on A.B. 432 is closed. The hearing on A.B. 183 is open.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 183 (1st Reprint)**: Prohibits certain correctional services from being provided by private entities. (BDR 16-290)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DANIELE MONROE-MORENO (Assembly District No. 1):

This bill requires that State and local governments prohibit privately run prisons. Nevada does not currently have any private-operated prisons. We have provided a visual presentation ([Exhibit F](#)) of A.B. 183. Prisons will be provided by State and local governments. This bill will stop the movement of Nevada's prisoners to out-of-state facilities by 2022. Nevada has one federal facility. This bill will not impact the federal facility.

This bill was initially introduced as A.B. No. 303 of the 79th Session and passed in both Houses but was ultimately vetoed by the Governor. During that time, Nevada had a growing prison population; however, the prison population is decreasing in our State. During the last Session, there was testimony that situations in prisons were unsafe and amendments were proposed. We expect to return nearly 100 inmates back to Nevada by the end of the year. We are working to improve our prisons and to get our correction employees paid at competitive rates.

It costs Nevada more to send inmates out of state. Instead, we can use these funds to better fund our correction facility. We need to help our former inmates become the best people they can be. We have to be fiscally responsible with taxpayer dollars. It does not make sense to pay money to an out-of-state business when we can use that money to fund our own correctional facilities. This bill will send the message that this Legislature recognizes the needs of our taxpayers and that Legislators believe it is our duty to ensure anyone in our State is taken care of properly.

SENATOR DONDERO LOOP:

Most of our prisoners do not spend their whole lives in prison. In Nevada, we have shorter prison sentences. We have a responsibility to help defendants reenter society.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

I am hopeful A.B. 183 becomes law this Session.

EDWARD COLEMAN:

I support A.B. 183. The for-profit industry has been subject to many different lawsuits across the Country. Any changes to the law would reduce the demand for privately run correctional facilities. For-profit prisons appear to be focused on their bottom line. Medical care at for-profit correctional facilities may jeopardize

inmates' health. In one instance, a lawsuit was brought against a for-profit prison for failure to contain a widespread scabies outbreak. In other instances, for-profit correctional facilities have engaged in fraudulent activities and questionable lobbying.

CHRISTINE SAUNDERS (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada):

We support A.B. 183. Private prisons lead to mass incarceration and contribute to the billion-dollar industry. It is important that our taxpayer dollars never go to fund a highly paid chief executive officer of a privately run prison. Profit does not belong in Nevada's criminal justice system.

JOHN J. PIRO (Office of the Public Defender, Clark County; Office of the Public Defender, Washoe County):

We support A.B. 183.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO:

As a retired corrections officer, I can speak first-hand of reforms needed in our system. This bill will also provide protections for our corrections officers. It is fiscally responsible to spend our taxpayer dollars in Nevada. By outlawing for-profit prisons, our criminal justice system will be based on equity, integrity and fairness. Our prisoners are not profit margins. The service our corrections officers provide is valued. Our prisoners have complex needs. By outlawing for-profit systems, we are sending the message that prisoners are people. I urge the Committee to support passage of A.B. 183.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.



Senate Committee on Judiciary  
May 6, 2019  
Page 17

CHAIR CANNIZZARO:

The hearing on A.B. 183 is closed. The meeting is adjourned at 11:51 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Jeanne Mortimer,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Chair

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

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit / # of pages</b>		<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	1		Agenda
	B	6		Attendance Roster
A.B. 285	C	1	Nevada Justice Association	Article 35 Examinations Caselaw
A.B. 285	D	64	Brad Johnson / Las Vegas Defense Lawyers	Testimony and Letters of Opposition
A.B. 393	E	1	Nevada Credit Union League	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 183	F	20	Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno	Presentation