

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

**Eighty-First Session  
February 17, 2021**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Steve Yeager at 9:03 a.m. on Wednesday, February 17, 2021, Online. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman  
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen, Vice Chairwoman  
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen  
Assemblywoman Cecelia González  
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen  
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy  
Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama  
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner  
Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola  
Assemblyman C.H. Miller  
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill  
Assemblyman David Orentlicher  
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst  
Ashlee Kalina, Assistant Committee Policy Analyst  
Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel  
Bonnie Borda Hoffecker, Committee Manager  
Kalin Ingstad, Committee Secretary  
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Elizabeth Neighbors, Statewide Forensic Program Director, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services  
John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office  
Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office  
Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada  
Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Daniel Purdy, Private Citizen, Rockland, Massachusetts

**Chairman Yeager:**

[Roll was called, and Committee rules were explained.] We will move to our agenda. We have two bills on the agenda today. We have the same presenter for both bills. I am going to open the hearing on Assembly Bill 23.

Assembly Bill 23 revises provisions regarding the procedure to commit an incompetent criminal defendant. We have Dr. Elizabeth Neighbors with us today to present the bill and Ms. JoAnn Malay from the Division of Public and Behavioral Health with the Department of Health and Human Services. I want to welcome you two to the Committee hearing. We will give you a chance to present the bill, then we will take questions from the members before opening up for additional testimony.

**Assembly Bill 23: Revises provisions regarding the procedure to commit an incompetent criminal defendant. (BDR 14-291)**

**Elizabeth Neighbors, Statewide Forensic Program Director, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:**

We would like to thank you for giving us the opportunity this morning to present in support of Assembly Bill 23. I would like to talk about what we are asking in the bill, the comprehensive risk assessment that this bill affects, what is entailed in doing a risk assessment, and then sum up about why we are asking for an expansion of time to present those comprehensive risk assessments to the court.

Assembly Bill 23 proposes changes in the time frame for submitting the comprehensive risk assessment that is required when a petition is filed to commit an incompetent defendant under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 178.461. These are individuals whom we have had at the forensic facilities for restoration of competency to stand trial, and whom we have been unable to restore after considerable effort to competency. These individuals are charged with very serious crimes and for whom there is considerable doubt that they are appropriate for commitment to a civil hospital or for discharge to the community.

Presently, when there is a petition filed, the evaluators at the facility are notified by the prosecutor, and there is a request that they read completely the comprehensive risk assessment answering the question about whether the person is in need of the level of care and security of a forensic facility. That commitment can be up to 10 years or more. An issue here is that when we are notified to complete the comprehensive risk assessment, we have about seven days to assign an individual, gather the data, and complete the assessment to provide to the court. The hearing is within ten days, and the risk assessment has to be there three days before; that limits the time to a seven-day period. If we get the notice on a weekend, then that shrinks the time frame even more. We have been working with this for a number of years now. It is very difficult, and, almost uniformly, we have to ask for extensions in order to do this in an appropriate and responsible manner to deliver the recommendation that is appropriate to the court.

Another issue involved in this is the limited pool of evaluators that are available to perform these evaluations. They need to be performed by doctors who are credentialed and trained to do this particular type of risk assessment. These doctors are the same individuals who perform the competency to stand trial assessments in the state. They have many clinical duties. They do other evaluations, other types of risk assessments, mental health assessments, and criminal responsibility assessments. They sit on treatment teams. They are officers of the day, and they facilitate admissions and a myriad of other clinical duties. When we receive a request to complete a risk assessment, that assessment must be accommodated within the caseload of the other duties that these evaluators have before them, which can be daunting. We operate at full capacity at both of our forensic facilities. Certainly, there is no shortage of work.

The goal is to balance all this with a reasonable time frame to complete the evaluations. They are high stakes. These evaluations have an outcome that may result in an individual being committed for up to 10 years—which for certain offenses can be extended by 5-year increments—to a forensic facility, which is a psychiatric hospital where they receive appropriate treatment and care. This is a significant intervention upon their personal liberty. If an adequate physician has not done an evaluation, someone who is dangerous could possibly be allowed into the community. We have concern about protecting the community, as well. It is extremely important that these be done carefully and with deliberation.

The evaluators certainly need to invest a great deal of time and care with the evaluations. In all cases, except murder and sexual assault, the court is obligated to find in concurrence with the recommendation of the evaluator. Should the evaluator recommend that the petition be

denied and the person should not be committed to a forensic facility, the judge is obligated to dismiss the petition. The evaluator carries a very large burden of responsibility in completing these evaluations appropriately and needs adequate time to do that.

The risk assessment is not just a checklist. It is an extremely time-consuming and labor-intensive collection of data, which includes external records from past hospitalizations, prison or jail, incarcerations, and collateral interviews with individuals who have known the person, in order to complete the standardized risk assessments that we require in the protocol that is used to come to the conclusions that the evaluator presents to the court. This includes internal records and an extensive interview with the client who is being evaluated. Peer review is also part of this; that adds to the time. These evaluations probably consume at least 30 to 40 hours of professional time by the time the data is collected, the tests are administered, and the report is produced. They are extensive reports, 15 to 20 pages long. There is a great deal of time invested in these.

As I was pointing out, seven days or less to complete this, in the context of one's regular caseload, is a very limited time frame. That is why we are asking to expand this time frame in the statute. We have asked for a reasonable time to complete the evaluation, and that the hearing that happens after the evaluation is completed to make the decision about the person's commitment would then be docketed within 10 judicial days of the time the report is received. We have been having some discussions about this. I do not know about the appropriateness of addressing this here; we are aware of and sensitive to the concern about the possible subjectivity of the language, "reasonable period." Our interpretation of that would be an estimate of 30 judicial days with the potential to extend that if it was necessary to, for example, collect more data than what we have available to us, or if we do not receive it in a timely manner. We would be open to that consideration. We feel that under the circumstances, it is imperative that we have available to us a more expansive time frame in order to do these evaluations in an appropriate and professional manner.

With that, I will thank you for your time and am happy to answer any questions.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I want to ask a couple of questions. If someone is deemed to be incompetent to stand trial, then they are transported to the state forensic facility. Is the only facility in the state that does competency restoration Lakes Crossing Center in Sparks, Nevada?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

No. We opened a new facility in Las Vegas late in 2015, which has been performing the same services that Lakes Crossing Center performs. We now have two facilities that operate and perform that function.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is that Stein Hospital in Las Vegas?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

Yes.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Section 1 of the bill references NRS 178.425, which indicates what happens if a defendant is deemed to be incompetent without probability of becoming competent. That person will be in state custody at Lakes Crossing Center or Stein Hospital. Under NRS 178.425, once the court receives notice that the person is incompetent without probability, that statute indicates that the court has to dismiss the case. The statute, as it exists today, allows the district attorney to file a petition to tell them not to release the defendant because they could be dangerous. Once the court orders dismissal of the case, that defendant is going to stay in custody for some period of time because we have to wait and see if the district attorney is actually going to file that motion. Is that how it works in real life?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

Yes. When a person is deemed incompetent without probability, the statute reads that we have 10 days. We get an order to civilly commit or release the person, unless there is a petition filed for the long-term commitment. If the person does not qualify under NRS 178.461, and they are incompetent without probability, then their charges would be dismissed. We have a window in which we can petition, and the facility does that for civil commitment if we believe they meet the criteria for civil commitment. If they do not, then there are other discharge plans arranged, and they are discharged to services in the community. If the long-term petition is filed, then the person remains with us while we complete that process, and the court makes a decision about whether they are going to be committed under NRS 178.461.

**Chairman Yeager:**

When someone is incompetent without probability, how often do district attorneys file these types of petitions that are referenced in the bill? Does that happen a lot? Do you have any general sense of how often they file?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

The numbers are not huge. We have been getting about one petition a month, which may seem like a lot to us in the grand scheme of things. Those are not big numbers, but for an evaluator, that is a fairly large chunk out of their monthly schedule to complete an evaluation. We have about 23 individuals committed statewide. The petitions began in 2007 and obviously they accumulate. We are seeing more petitions within the last year. Prior to that, and I am just estimating, it was about three or four a year. The actual number of petitions has increased.

**Chairman Yeager:**

With COVID-19, options are limited, but I did have an opportunity to tour Lakes Crossing Center in Sparks back in 2013. When they are back open and ready for visitation, either at Lakes Crossing Center or Stein Hospital, I would commend that to members, if you are

interested, to take a tour of the facility and see what is happening there. I think it helps inform the context of this bill. Obviously, we cannot do that right now, but hopefully soon.

**Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:**

I was looking at Lakes Crossing Center's website last night when I was reading the bill, and it does not mention Stein Hospital. It says that Clark County uses a private company, so you might want to update that.

You mentioned earlier that you often ask for additional time. Can you walk me through what the process in asking for additional time looks like? How long do you typically ask for?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

It varies from venue to venue. Sometimes it is relatively simple by just contacting the court. We have a specialty competency court in Clark County, which helps to facilitate and expedite matters. All these proceedings in Clark County are carried out in that court. In the rest of the state, these petitions would remain in the criminal court where the charges were originally filed. We would have to ask each one individually. In Clark County it is a little easier. We simply contact the competency court and the court approves the extension. We have generally been asking to extend the 7 days up to 30 judicial days. I do not recall a time that has not been granted, but it means we have to go back and request. In other courts, they have requested that a hearing occur in order to grant the extension. That does include when we have to do an additional hearing and the process that goes along with that. Generally, it is about 30 days. Sometimes it has been more depending on the situation and how complicated the case is. I would say rarely more than 30 days.

**Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:**

You used the term 30 judicial days. I believe you are familiar with the amendment offered by the public defenders [[Exhibit C](#)]. I think most of the Committee was a little taken aback with the term "reasonable." The definition of reasonable can be very different for different people. For example, my daughter has a very different definition of reasonable than I do. Are we just a stickler on judicial or calendar days with the amendment? Is that correct?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

Yes, for some very particular reasons. If it was chronological days, the number of workdays that fall out in varying windows are considerable. We also have furloughs right now. We have people who cannot work on their furlough days and are limited. Some of the staff that do this are part-time staff and they cannot do additional work. Sometimes they help us out by doing paid, additional regular time to complete these, but they cannot do that in a week in which they have a furlough. Holidays are also workdays that fall out. It helps if they are judicial days to give us an absolute number of hours of actual work that we have available to complete this, as opposed to a chronological calendar.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I certainly understand that you need time to do the report. If you can make any conclusions when you are doing these reports, how long on a typical basis has the defendant already been

in state custody, either at Stein Hospital or Lakes Crossing Center? Are we talking months or years? I think that will help us process what might be the appropriate time frame for the report.

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

They are serious crimes. There is a tendency for those folks to have an investment in restoration. I can think of two cases where they were not at Lakes Crossing Center at all, and there was an expedited process that had a petition filed and a subsequent effort at conditional release. That gave us very little past record for us to review. Most of the time, the time frame is between 6 months to 2 years that they are here, and with an effort at restoration before the decision is made to say they cannot be restored.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

I have a question about the hearings that are referenced in the bill. I think you already answered one; when you file for an extension, sometimes the court asks you to come in for an actual hearing. In section 1, subsections 8 and 9, there are other hearings addressed. Are those court hearings or are those done in chambers?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

Those are the annual hearings that are required by NRS 178.461. Once the person is committed for up to 10 years, the individual has the ability to petition once a year for conditional release. We are also required to do an annual report that shows if the person is eligible for conditional release, and if they have improved and recovered to the extent that they could be safe in the community on a conditional release program. The Division can do that at any time. The individual can only do it once per year, and then there is the required annual hearing, either in competency court in Clark County or the original criminal court of the charge.

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

Is that an actual hearing in court with the person having counsel and that type of thing, not an in-chambers hearing?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

Yes.

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

From your presentation, I certainly understand and see the need for you to have more time for the comprehensive risk assessment. In the changes here, it says in a "reasonable period," which you have talked about. I think you said you could get it done in 30 days. I am just wondering if there should be, instead of a minimum time, a cap on the time, within a reasonable period of time, not more than 60 days or 90 days or 120 days. I am just wondering if there is a time frame that you feel comfortable with that could always be met to get the risk assessment done.

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

These individuals are each unique. It depends on what the absolute maximum time frame is. I think 120 days would be a lot. Sixty days would probably work. I would be a little hesitant to make the cap 30 days, in case there was an unforeseen event or issue that arose that made it extremely difficult to do that, and we could not ask for an extension.

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

I can certainly sense your hesitation. You just want the flexibility. I guess as long as the process is moving along, and someone would not linger for three years. I am sure you have the process and you move it forward. I guess that was the thought I had.

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

I would agree with that. We are sensitive to the person's constitutional rights not to be held longer than is appropriate and at a more restrictive setting without the appropriate due process. I recently had at least two occasions where the staff member got it done sooner than the extension we had asked for. There is a considerable effort to meet those needs and parameters.

**Assemblywoman Kasama:**

I certainly agree with the flexibility. You do not want to be hampered by that so you can do a good job. I was just curious about that. Thank you for your response and your overview.

**Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

When you request an extension, is it generally for 30 days?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

Yes, that is a typical time frame that we have found comfortable for us to work within, in order to complete these.

**Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

When does therapy for those who are in your care begin? During this assessment program, do you begin any assessment to get them along their way? Are they just held in stasis during the time you are conducting your review?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

Therapy begins when they arrive at our facility. We have a very comprehensive program to restore individuals, which addresses their psychiatric needs and their medical needs; although we do have medical clearance because there are some things that, as a psychiatric hospital, we cannot address. Our focus is on working to restore the individual's competency. We have regular classes. In legal process we have four treatment teams that the clients are assigned to. They have a sponsor; a forensics specialist, who is there daily; a psychologist; psychiatrist; nursing staff; and a very active and comprehensive recreational therapy program, which is very important with this population in helping them to recover from their various mental health diagnoses and issues they may bring when they come to the facility. They can focus on their criminal case, become competent, and move forward and resolve



their legal entanglements. The program is a little different for individuals who are committed long-term. In that case, the goal is not to go back to court, but to recover to the point that they can function in the community and hopefully be discharged from our supervision eventually. It includes comprehensive milieu therapy, recreational therapy, psychiatric and psychological interventions, and a very comprehensive program of daily living that we provide for them.

**Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

Is the Stein Hospital facility strictly for criminal commitment, or is it for the public?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

We strictly receive individuals who are ordered to the facility by the court; even the long-term clients, who stay here after their charges are dismissed without prejudice. The path into a forensic facility is always through the courts. There is a provision, if there is someone who is in a civil hospital and they cannot be appropriately managed because of violent behavior, they can be administratively transferred to our facility for treatment until they are appropriate to return to the former setting. That is a rare occurrence.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any further questions from Committee members? [There were none.]

Thank you, Dr. Neighbors, for presenting. We ask you to stick around to do any follow-up or concluding remarks after we take testimony on the bill.

At this time, I am going to go to testimony in support of the bill. [There was none.] I am going to close testimony in support. I will open testimony in opposition to A.B. 23.

**John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office:**

Since the proposed amendment is unfriendly, we are currently in the opposition position. We agree with Dr. Neighbors that the previous deadline of seven days was far too short, and frankly, we always ask too much of our state workers who bear the brunt of a lot of things in this state without a lot of support. We agree with Dr. Neighbors that we are not trying to release dangerous folks into the community without a full evaluation; however, we were originally opposed to the "reasonable" language. "Reasonable," as a legal term, has been around since 1835. It has provided numerous arguments between courts, lawyers, and parties since 1835. We are glad they have taken some of our suggestions to put a 30-day cap on it; however, we are still having discussions regarding judicial days or 30 calendar days. We believe that our amendment [[Exhibit C](#)], "30 calendar days" with the ability to ask for an extension if needed, provides a little more certainty to the courts, the person awaiting evaluation, the person doing the evaluation, and the public. To be clear, we do not want this bill to die. We just think our version is better, and we thank Dr. Neighbors and her staff working on this bill for discussing it with us at this time.

**Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office:**

First, I want to thank Dr. Neighbors, as well as the other sponsors of this bill, for spending so much time speaking with Mr. Piro and myself to go over our concerns. Our main concern is the issue of the language "reasonable." "Reasonable" is a slippery standard, especially when there is a chance that a community member can be released safely. Specific dates are necessary to monitor the case to ensure that the proceeding continues and does not get lost in the system. We agree that seven days is not enough time for the Division to complete this very important, comprehensive risk assessment after someone has been found to be incompetent and not likely able to regain competency. We believe that 30 calendar days is necessary in order to balance the constitutional rights that our clients have, address the safety concerns, and ensure that the risk assessment is done completely.

We are dealing with almost a quasi-civil issue, because at this point, the legal criminal case is going to be dismissed. The concern is if that person is to remain at Lakes Crossing Center or Stein Hospital, or if they can be safely released into our community. I believe it is important to look at the rules of civil procedure that discuss computing and extending time. In 2019, Nevada adopted the federal time-computation standard, which includes calendar days [Supreme Court of Nevada Rule No. 6]. That is one of the reasons why we wanted to request calendar days, to ensure that there are very specific time frames so that everyone knows what the next step in the process is going to be like. I appreciate that Dr. Neighbors is still willing to speak with us in order to figure out how we can come to an agreement to ensure that all individuals are handled in the same manner by having a definite time for their next hearing, they are fully aware of what that is, and there are also balances to safety interests.

**Tonja Brown, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

I concur with Ms. Bertschy and Mr. Piro. We are in opposition.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there anyone else in opposition? [There was no one.]

I will now close opposition testimony. I will open testimony in the neutral position.

**Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I want to highlight the story of Matthew Rushin from Virginia as an example of why mental health concerns should be decriminalized before folks unfairly enter the criminal justice system. Mr. Rushin was sentenced for a car crash. Ultimately, once his mental health concerns were noted, he received a conditional pardon from the Governor of Virginia. Unfortunately, because of COVID-19 restrictions, despite that conditional pardon, he has not yet been released from the correctional facility. Unfortunately, he caught COVID-19 in the process. In summary, I think we should take a broad-stroke look at the mental health system intersection with criminal justice. I am happy to work with the agency and the Committee on language that is reflective of that.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there anyone else who would like to give testimony in the neutral position? [There was no one.] I will close neutral testimony.

Dr. Neighbors, would you like to give any concluding remarks on A.B. 23?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

I appreciate that the public defender's offices in the north and south have been very open to talking with us, and I assume we will have some more conversation about this. We are looking at their concerns as well.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Please keep me updated on the progress of those conversations. Certainly, we would appreciate it if you are able to come to some kind of agreement, but if not, that is what we are here for. We will make the best decision we think makes sense for the state.

I am going to close the hearing on A.B. 23.

We will now move to our second bill on the agenda. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 24. Assembly Bill 24 revises provisions relating to a forensic facility to which certain offenders and defendants with a mental illness may be committed.

Welcome back to the Committee, Dr. Neighbors.

**Assembly Bill 24: Revises provisions relating to a forensic facility to which certain offenders and defendants with a mental illness may be committed. (BDR 14-292)**

**Elizabeth Neighbors, Statewide Forensic Program Director, Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services:**

Assembly Bill 24 is very straightforward. We are asking to update the definition of a forensic facility in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 175.539. This bill indirectly connects with Assembly Bill 23, because we must have a definition for a forensic facility in the comprehensive risk assessments that we do. We are finding that we have increasingly more statutes that refer to where people go, and we need to be clear about what facilities constitute a forensic facility.

There have been some changes. It used to be that Lakes Crossing Center was the only forensic facility in the state, but that is no longer true. The statute refers, without limitation, to Lakes Crossing Center, and we would like to add Stein Hospital forensic facility, which is part of the Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (SNAMHS) facility in the south, to that definition. The additional language we are asking to add in the bill indicates that the Division of Public and Behavioral Health can designate which units or facilities they oversee would qualify as a forensic facility. In the process of making those changes, we have discussed that we would also do policy that would detail more clearly the exact attributes and

requirements of a forensic facility. Those are the changes that we are asking for in A.B. 24. I am happy to answer any questions about that.

**Chairman Yeager:**

You mentioned SNAMHS, which I believe is Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services. The change here is just intended to give the Division flexibility, as additional facilities come online. This definition gives you a little more flexibility of where you can place people when they need to be placed in a forensic facility.

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

Yes, that is correct. Over the last decade, we have doubled the number of beds in the state. We anticipate, going forward, that expansion is probably not going to change. We have retrofitted a couple of units that were civil facilities. It is helpful to be clear that those are what is defined in the statute.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Are there any questions from Committee members for Dr. Neighbors on A.B. 24? [There were none.]

We will open up for testimony in support.

**John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender:**

We are testifying in support of this bill. We thank Dr. Neighbors for bringing it forward to modernize our statutes and recognize that we may have more facilities in the future. We have had a facility that has not been recognized in statute since 2015. We are grateful for her bringing this legislation forward to start updating our statutes.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there anybody else in support of A.B. 24? [There was no one.] We will close testimony in support. I will open up testimony in opposition. Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] I will close opposition testimony. I will open neutral testimony. Is there anyone who would like to offer neutral testimony?

**Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Ditto my remarks previously entered as to Assembly Bill 23.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there anyone else on the line in neutral position? [There was no one.] I will close neutral testimony. Dr. Neighbors, any concluding remarks on A.B. 24?

**Elizabeth Neighbors:**

No. I want to thank everyone on the support of that bill, and I think it would be very helpful in our process going forward.

**Chairman Yeager:**

I will close the hearing on A.B. 24. That was our simple bill. We will now move on to public comment.

**Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I have already concluded my remarks. I will be submitting more thorough remarks to the committee manager.

**Daniel Purdy, Private Citizen, Rockland, Massachusetts:**

I am the brother of Thomas Purdy, who was murdered at Washoe County jail. I was out there about a year ago. I was surrounded with my 12-year-old son by six deputies, none of them wearing body cameras. One of them stepped behind me and my 12-year-old son and placed his hand on his gun for approximately five minutes. I am sure he was trying to intimidate myself, my son, and my sister. We were there protesting. My brother had been murdered at the jail, due to asphyxiation. They told us lies. They were not going to give us the video. We had to go out on our own, obtain it from the casino that my brother was a guest at, and the casino said my brother was trespassing. Meanwhile he was comped a \$500 per night suite. Washoe County officers show up and next thing you know, my brother is dead. There is no accountability in the whole state of Nevada. There are several police officers within Washoe County who have killed two people each, unarmed, and out of those four deaths, all four were justified. That blows my mind. I do not know if any of you could actually believe that all four of those would be justified. Where I am from, that would never happen. I appreciate your time.

**Chairman Yeager:**

Is there anyone else for public comment? [There was no one.] We will close public comment.

This meeting is adjourned [at 10:13 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Kalin Ingstad  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Chairman

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

## **EXHIBITS**

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 23, submitted by John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office; and Kendra G. Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office.