

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

**Eighty-Second Session
April 26, 2023**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Brittney Miller at 9:01 a.m. on Wednesday, April 26, 2023, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. 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/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair
Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine
Assemblywoman Danielle Gallant
Assemblyman Ken Gray
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen
Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy
Assemblywoman Selena La Rue Hatch
Assemblywoman Erica Mosca
Assemblywoman Sabra Newby
Assemblyman David Orentlicher
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong
Assemblyman Toby Yurek

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Diane C. Thornton, Committee Policy Analyst
Bradley A. Wilkinson, Committee Counsel
Devon Kajatt, Committee Manager
Traci Dory, Committee Secretary
Ashley Torres, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Nathan Holland, Deputy Attorney General, Government and Natural Resources
Division, Office of the Attorney General
Harold Albright, Chair, Neighborhood Mediation Center
Leslie Nino Piro, General Counsel, Office of the Attorney General
John R. McCormick, Assistant Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the
Courts

Chair Miller:

[Roll was called. Committee protocol was explained.] We have two bills on the agenda this morning and we will be taking them out of order. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 37, presented by Nathan Holland, Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General. Please proceed when you are ready.

Senate Bill 37: Authorizes governmental attorneys to volunteer as third-party neutral mediators under certain circumstances. (BDR 1-428)

**Nathan Holland, Deputy Attorney General, Government and Natural Resources
Division, Office of the Attorney General**

Senate Bill 37 proposes to revise *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 7, which would expand access to voluntary mediation services and provide additional avenues for attorneys in public service to volunteer their time to benefit their communities. Before I explain the bill, I would like to briefly explain how the idea for this statutory change came about. Attorney General Ford frequently reminds the Office of the Attorney General that our job is justice. He describes his office priorities as the five Cs, one of which is community engagement. The other four are constitutional rights, criminal justice reform, consumer protection, and client services.

As a deputy attorney general in the office, my practice includes representation of the labor relations unit, which engages in collective bargaining with designated representatives of state employees. I have experienced an interest resolving disputes through cooperative mediation and negotiations. My passion for negotiation and Attorney General Ford's commitment to community engagement invoked me to consider ways I could use my skills and my free time to benefit the community. Sometime last year, I began looking into volunteering my time with local community organizations that assist people in resolving their differences amicably. Unfortunately, I learned that the existing law that allowed public attorneys to

volunteer to represent indigent persons and pro bono services, NRS 7.065, did not allow for us to serve as neutral mediators. Thankfully, Attorney General Ford encourages his attorneys to bring forward ideas for bill drafts. The office approved my request to amend this section to allow public sector employees to serve as volunteer mediators.

Existing law allows any attorney employed by the State of Nevada or any agency or a political subdivision of the State to volunteer their time to represent indigent persons in court but does not allow them to volunteer their time as third-party neutral mediators. Senate Bill 37 would add subsection 2 to NRS 7.065 to allow service as a third-party neutral mediator as long as certain conditions are met. These five conditions mirror the existing four conditions currently placed on attorneys who volunteer to represent indigent persons and adds a requirement to both sections that the attorney's efforts must comply with the Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct at all times. The five commonsense restrictions on volunteering are as follows:

- First, the employer of the attorneys must be aware of and have the opportunity to object to the representation. The bill requires the attorney seeking to volunteer as a mediator to first receive permission from his or her supervisor, if any, to serve as a third-party neutral mediator in each dispute or matter.
- Second, the employer and the mediating parties must be confident that the attorney is free from any bias or outside interests in both their day job and their volunteer work. The interests of the mediating parties must not conflict with the interests of the attorney's employer.
- Third, this must be true community service to assist those unable to pay for mediation services. The services and mediators are provided through, or in association with, an organization that provides free mediation services to individuals.
- Fourth, this must be a true volunteer opportunity and not a way to supplement the attorney's income. The attorney must not receive any compensation for the service.
- Fifth and finally, the service as a mediator must meet all the existing ethical obligations contained in the Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct. The attorney assures they will confine themselves to the ethical rules that govern every lawyer's conduct.

This bill also proposes to add the requirement that his or her professional conduct comply with the provisions of the Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct to the ability to volunteer their time as a pro bono attorney for indigent persons in subsection 1 of NRS 7.065. However, attorneys volunteering to serve as pro bono attorneys were already required to conform to the Nevada Rules of Professional Conduct, so this addition is only adding consistency with the new subsection 2.

This concludes the proposed changes contained in S.B. 37. In closing, S.B. 37 makes one small, but important, change with many community benefits. This bill allows attorneys employed by public employers to serve as third-party neutral mediators in certain circumstances. This expands the pool of volunteer mediators available to assist organizations providing no-cost mediation services, which increases access to volunteer mediators for individuals seeking to resolve their differences amicably. This also assists our communities in developing skills to resolve their differences outside the court of law which should decrease the number of cases that are needed to be resolved by judges and justices across the state.

I am thankful that the Attorney General has brought this bill forward and allowed me to present it to you today. I am excited to be the first to volunteer my time once it becomes law. I am even more excited to start recruiting other public service employees to help our communities resolve their differences cooperatively, whenever possible. Thank you for your time and listening to my presentation today. I welcome any questions you may have.

Chair Miller:

We are excited for you too, but I understand you have to get permission first from your boss. Hopefully, he grants that to you. Are there any questions from Committee members?

Assemblyman Yurek:

I think it is great to see somebody with a heart to serve like that. I love the fact that the Attorney General is encouraging people to bring bill draft requests, and this is a great idea. My question actually ties into what Chair just said, that you have to get permission from your supervisor, which I think is a great idea, but it says, "if any." Are there people who work in the Attorney General's Office who do not have supervisors, and if so, what happens in that case?

Nathan Holland:

That provision was basically just for Mr. Ford so that he could volunteer as a mediator if he would like to. Yes, pretty much all of us have someone up the chain until you get to Attorney General Ford.

Assemblyman Orentlicher:

I really appreciate what this will accomplish. I just want to be sure about the provision that it has to be provided through an organization that provides free mediation services, which is not exactly the same as saying with the defense to indigent defendants. Are there now or might there be organizations that provide free mediation services that are not tied to the participant's income so that we might be providing your services to nonindigent people who need mediation?

Nathan Holland:

That is a very good question. Yes, the indigency clause is only applied to subsection 1 and it is not applied to subsection 2. The thought behind that was we did not want to put an additional burden on the organizations that provide free mediation services to have to qualify

the people seeking free mediation as indigent. They already go through a process. We do have somebody from one of the neighborhood mediation programs here to speak on behalf of the bill and can answer questions on that behalf. But, yes, it is possible that we could volunteer our time to somebody who was not indigent and was just seeking free mediation services. It is my understanding the vast majority of people who are seeking free mediation services through these organizations are not affluent.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

This sounds like a fabulous idea. Could you give us a real-life anecdote so we can see how this looks? What would be a mediation scenario that this would apply to that maybe you would be involved in?

Nathan Holland:

A lot of the people seeking free mediation services are dealing with neighbor disputes, barking dogs, loud neighbors, people parking in their parking spot, or things along those lines. I actually just attended a mediation training put on by the National Judicial College. There were multiple judges there, some from small claims courts, and they actually said that they worry most about getting shot in the parking lot from a barking dog case just because those get so heated. The Neighborhood Mediation Center and the other mediation centers do work with those issues in addition to foreclosures, evictions, mechanic's liens, things along those lines—mostly small claims court issues.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

My question is about the conflicts check. I know it is the same as the existing statute, but can you tell us a little bit about that? As we know, the Attorney General's Office is really large and there are a lot of state agencies, so how is the conflicts check accomplished?

Nathan Holland:

Whenever we request from our supervisor to mediate, we have to inform the supervisor what the issues are that are going to be mediated, and then the supervisor would be checking up the chain to see if there is any conflict. For instance, one of the mediation programs that the Attorney General's Office is involved in is actually mediating disputes for inmate civil rights cases. They are always seeking mediators in those cases. Unfortunately, the Attorney General's Office could not volunteer to mediate any of those cases because we are involved as one of the parties in that. That is one where there would be a conflict. I am sure that there are dozens of different conflicts that I am not able to pull off the top of my head. It would go up the chain whenever you request from your supervisor to mediate. The supervisor would be made aware of what the issues are that are being mediated and then they will see if there is any conflict within the office.

Chair Miller:

I have a question in the other direction with this. I see the parameters that protect the agency and protect your license to practice, to make sure there is no conflict and that we are getting permission from our employer. Is there any support for you as the attorney? For instance,

what if your employer just simply says, No, I do not want you to do it; you do not have the time; I do not like them. Can it be that arbitrary where they just make the decision, no, just based on being your supervisor?

Nathan Holland:

This is a volunteer opportunity that will be taken on our own time. It will not be taking time away from our employers. It is just pro bono work, the hours that we put in on our free time. That would not be an issue if they said that we do not have time to take the mediation because it would not be taking time away from our normal 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. duties.

Chair Miller:

You have normal 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. duties?

Nathan Holland:

No, we do not. To be honest with you, every supervisor that I have had at the Attorney General's Office has just been absolutely fantastic to work with. My current team chief, Greg Ott, is the best boss I have ever had, and I could not imagine that he would ever have any objections.

Chair Miller:

Sir, you just have to get us to vote for it.

Nathan Holland:

That is not necessarily a concern. Also, if you think about it, being able to mediate a dispute is a very limited amount of time. It is not like where you are volunteering to represent somebody in a case where you have to do a bunch of work to try to familiarize yourself with everything. Do not get me wrong, you still need to in order to mediate a case, but then you are not taking every step along the way; you are just setting aside a window of your time on a weekend, three or four hours, to sit down with a couple of people who are having a disagreement and try to help them work something out, and then whenever you are done, you are done. You do not have to worry about it anymore. As a public service employee, I think that is a pretty easy way to give back to the community without signing yourself up to an indefinite litigation.

Chair Miller:

I appreciate that. I just want to make sure that flexibility is there and that for the person who wants to do this, that it is there, and it is not arbitrary, because this attorney general is all about it, but again, he is not always going to be in office. We want to make sure that the parameters that we put in place are there regardless of who the attorney general happens to be, to make sure that there is not someone else who comes in and says, Well no, I do not want you to do it just because I do not support this, believe it, want it, and I have the ability to say no. That is what I was getting at.

I do not see any additional questions. Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of Senate Bill 37?

Harold Albright, Chair, Neighborhood Mediation Center:

We are the entity that provides free mediation services for people. I was on the Rose Commission of the Nevada Supreme Court many years ago and we tried to determine alternative methods of dispute resolution and whether that would be appropriate for Nevada. We developed a procedure that has been codified and used since 1999. When I was elected justice of the peace, I put it into our court in Reno.

I am here to ask for your help. We are currently handling about 600 cases with the Reno Justice Court. We have a resolution of about 50 percent, and most of those never come back to the court. Once the resolution is made, the parties are satisfied and happy and very few come back to the court. We provide a 40-hour training service that trains mediators, and the importance of that is it takes the person and makes them neutral. They do not come as advocates and they do not come as judges; they come to help two people who are having a dispute. Our mission is to solely resolve disputes in northern Nevada. It is a broad concept where we help anybody—rich man, poor man, beggarman, fools all have disputes, and we help everybody. In today's climate, if we can reduce some of the acrimony between people getting along and not getting along, we do that. They come to us, and a trained mediator helps them explore avenues to resolve this conflict themselves, and they reach their own resolution.

In court, we have restrictions of hearsay, restrictions of evidence, limitations on what we can do—we can generally find the damages, liability, or whatever. Here, they can do anything the parties will agree to and that is reduced in Reno Justice Court to a written agreement. We enter an order ordering them to comply with that agreement. The few that have come back, our punitive sanction is to enter the judgment that was originally paid for by the complaint. There is a penalty there, but it has been very, very seldom used. This is a great process. We are going to approach the Sparks Justice Court. They are going to add about 100 cases to our caseload. We currently have 600. We provide training to the City of Reno, Reno Police Department, and University of Nevada, Reno. We are just a great organization, but we need help and to free up this pool of competent people to help us would be a real gift. I urge you to do that, and I thank you for your time.

Chair Miller:

Is there anyone else in support of Senate Bill 37? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] With that, Mr. Holland, would you like to make any final remarks? Would you like to praise anyone else on the record?

Nathan Holland:

I would like to praise the entire Attorney General's Office. No, but seriously, I really do appreciate them giving me the opportunity to present this bill and I appreciate you taking the time to listen to me and appreciate all of your questions. They were all fantastic, and Madam Chair, thank you for looking out for us. I did not even consider that at all. Thank you for that. I am really passionate about this, and I hope that the Committee thinks it is as good of an idea as I did.

Chair Miller:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 37. Our next hearing will be Senate Bill 34 (1st Reprint), presented by Leslie Nino Piro, General Counsel for the Attorney General's Office. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 34 (1st Reprint), and you can proceed when you are ready.

Senate Bill 34 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to legal representation in certain actions or proceedings. (BDR 3-422)

Leslie Nino Piro, General Counsel, Office of the Attorney General:

Senate Bill 34 (1st Reprint) would make two needed changes to existing law by first explicitly authorizing an official attorney, either the Attorney General for the state or a chief legal officer of a political subdivision, to provide legal services to government employees when they are not a named defendant in a lawsuit. Second, conforming with related statutes, allowing the Attorney General to determine that it is impracticable, uneconomical, or could constitute a conflict of interest for the Office of the Attorney General to serve as a legal advisor on a particular matter. Nevada law defines an official attorney as the Attorney General or chief legal officers of political subdivisions, such as a county district attorney or a city attorney. I will use the term official attorney in explaining section 1.

Section 1 does a few things. First, it would authorize the official attorney to provide legal services to a government employee who is summoned or subpoenaed to appear in a legal action or proceeding and then promptly request the official attorney's assistance. This section addresses a current statutory deficiency for situations when a government employee is not a named party in an action, but he or she receives a summons or subpoena for their testimony. I will give an example. The Attorney General's Office has encountered this scenario when a highway patrol officer is subpoenaed for deposition testimony in a lawsuit between two private parties based on an accident report the trooper authored. The Attorney General's Office seeks statutory authority to prepare the trooper to testify and then represent the trooper at the deposition, which will codify existing practice.

Second, section 1 will allow the official attorney to authorize legal services if they determine that representation is in the best interest of the state or the political subdivision. I will provide a general example. A plaintiff in a civil lawsuit can amend their complaint to name a government employee who provided deposition testimony. If the government employee seeks legal services before the deposition, the official attorney may examine the nature of the case and allegations and determine that providing legal advice before the deposition is in the best interest of the state or political subdivision.

Finally, section 1 provides a path for the official attorney to withdraw from the representation if the government employee employs their own counsel or the court authorizes the withdrawal. Section 1 also models existing law for defending government employees once they become defendants in a lawsuit by authorizing employment of special counsel under limited circumstances. Further, section 1 makes clear that it does not change or diminish any existing immunity for legal protection.

The Attorney General's Office has one minor conceptual amendment [[Exhibit C](#)] to section 1, which we will submit after the hearing. It will amend section 1, subsection 1, to reinstate the term "State Legislator" at the request of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

Section 2 makes conforming changes to align with section 1. We submitted an amendment [[Exhibit C](#)] to reinstate section 3 and remove the phrase "at any time prior to trial" from *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 41.03435. This change is necessary because the Attorney General may need to employ special counsel for a range of civil matters that do not culminate in a trial including the scenarios such as those described in section 1. For example, the Attorney General's office has previously employed a collective bargaining attorney as special counsel to assist in negotiations when no deputy attorney general had experience in that highly specialized practice area. A collective bargaining negotiation is not a civil lawsuit, and it does not result in a trial, but special counsel was needed for a brief time following the 2019 enactment of collective bargaining statutes for state employees. A second example is the Attorney General's Office may identify a conflict of interest after a trial in the appellate stage. Removing the phrase "any time prior to trial" will give the Attorney General's Office the flexibility required to meet the demands of modern law practice. We ask that the phrase "at any time prior to trial" be removed from NRS 41.03435.

Section 4 harmonizes NRS 228.110 with other provisions of Nevada law regarding the Attorney General's decision to employ special counsel. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 228.110 designates the Attorney General's Office as legal counsel for all "state matters arising in the Executive Department of State Government." The statute provides a single exception for when the Attorney General and his deputies are "disqualified to act in such matter." Disqualification is a specific finding of fact and conclusion of law by a court. However, the Attorney General's Office routinely provides legal advice to state agencies when no judicial proceeding exists. When there is no lawsuit, no judge is available to determine that the Attorney General's Office is disqualified to act. This presents a problem. The only exception in the statute is unavailable when the Attorney General's Office advises an agency outside the judicial proceeding. However, other parts of Nevada law have demonstrated the appropriate solution. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 41.0339, 41.03435, and 228.091 authorize the Attorney General to independently decide when legal services are "impracticable, uneconomical or could constitute a conflict of interest" and then employ special counsel. Each special counsel contract is subject to the Board of Examiners' approval process. These procedures ensure that state agencies receive timely, high quality legal services. Section 4 seeks to add the same option to NRS 228.110, which will harmonize the statute with related Nevada law.

I want to pause for a second to explain the terms "impracticable" and "uneconomical." These terms were originally added to Nevada law in 1979. Adding this language to NRS 228.110 would not increase the Attorney General's authority. The terms do not address contracts for contingency counsel. Instead, this language facilitates the most efficient and effective client services to state agencies. As I noted, the Attorney General's Office has employed special counsel in limited circumstances where no deputy attorney general has experience in highly specialized practice areas. Providing legal services under those circumstances is impracticable and uneconomical because learning an entirely new area of law would

consume a substantial amount of time to the detriment of other state agency clients. Further, some state boards and commissions are billed at an hourly rate. That means they would rack up pretty sizable legal bills before the real work even began. Even if our deputy attorneys general could devote substantial time to learning that new area of law, that time might not be available due to pending litigation deadlines.

The Attorney General's Office has also employed special counsel when the state has active litigation in another state or a regulatory matter in Washington D.C., because requiring a deputy attorney general to travel out of state to practice in a foreign jurisdiction is generally impracticable and uneconomical. Only a small number of deputy attorneys general have bar licenses in other states, and even if the deputy attorney general has an active bar license in the right jurisdiction, having a deputy undertake out-of-state practice could be detrimental to the state's interest because the deputy would not be a regular practitioner in that jurisdiction and might be unfamiliar with local rules and customs. Court rules may even require a local attorney to appear in the case despite that deputy's local licensure. To meet state agency needs, the Attorney General's Office negotiates favorable rates with special counsels and closely monitors the billing to ensure economical legal services. These contracts also provide long-term benefits to the state because deputy attorneys general work in partnership with special counsel. They acquire new knowledge and experience at a sustainable pace which may eliminate the need to retain special counsel for future matters without negatively impacting other state agencies. Section 4 would conform NRS 228.110 to expressly authorize the Attorney General's Office to employ special counsel in limited situations. These changes are in the best interest of the state.

Section 5 speaks to effective date. Lastly, a friendly amendment will be presented by John McCormick [[Exhibit D](#)] from the Nevada Supreme Court's Administrative Office of the Courts. I want to thank you for your time and consideration on Senate Bill 34 (1st Reprint). I am available to answer any questions you may have.

Chair Miller:

I appreciate your thorough explanation of "impracticable" and "uneconomical" because you knew those would have been very specific questions. I think you gave us some real-world examples and reasons for it. I appreciate that.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

Thank you for your thorough explanation because I think it was very helpful. My question is similar to one that our Chair asked on the last bill. We will not always have the current Attorney General, and in section 1, it leaves this determination up to the official attorney and that could be a county or city attorney. What are some protections to ensure if they decide not to represent someone because of a political reason or a personality conflict or some other issue?

Leslie Nino Piro:

With section 1, this is a little bit of a different consideration for either the state or a political subdivision because this really is a legal determination on whether or not it makes sense for

the government entity to provide representation at that stage. I would like to think that this is made with an eye to whether or not there may be any potential liability for the government entity down the line. Another example is the Attorney General's Office had an investigator subpoenaed because there was a civil lawsuit in which we did not end up filing criminal charges in one of her investigations. The gentleman who was investigated filed a lawsuit against the complainants and they tried to use our investigator as a tool, as a weapon against the complainant. That was one in which we had one of our deputy attorneys general represent the investigator because we needed to protect investigative methods and law enforcement sources. It was a little bit of a different consideration than liability for a government entity. These are things I would like to think are not political considerations. These are truly either protections of law enforcement considerations or potential liability. I do not think that they would be, but I would like to hope that they are not politicized even though there is no guarantee.

Chair Miller:

I do not see any additional questions at this time. I am going to open it up for testimony in support of Senate Bill 34 (1st Reprint).

John R. McCormick, Assistant Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts:

I am here to do two things today: First of all, to support the bill. We particularly appreciate the codification of representation provided in section 1. For example, one of the units I supervise at the court is our Guardianship Compliance Unit, and oftentimes our investigators will get subpoenaed in sort of a related matter and this just confirms the Attorney General's current practice that we greatly appreciate providing our staff that assistance.

Secondly, I am here to propose an amendment [[Exhibit D](#)].

Chair Miller:

Mr. McCormick, according to the rules of our Committee, if you are offering an amendment or any change to it, I would have to move your testimony to something else. Because the bill presenter has already mentioned that she is accepting a friendly amendment from you, I think we are good.

John McCormick:

For the amendment, I would like everybody to step into the way back machine with me and go back to 2013, way back when this body passed Senate Joint Resolution 14 of the 77th Session for a second time to put creation of the Court of Appeals on the ballot. There was enabling legislation for that, and it was sort of a ship passing in the night with another piece of legislation that put a number of these changes originally in NRS Chapter 41, allowing the Attorney General's Office to provide representation. Those ships passing in the night resulted in the judges of the Court of Appeals not being included in the definition of a "state judicial officer" in NRS 41.03385. This amendment just includes those judges.

Chair Miller:

Thank you for some background information. You are in support?

John McCormick:

Yes.

Chair Miller:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] I would invite the presenter back to the table for any concluding remarks. [There were none.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 34 (1st Reprint).

I will open it for public comment. [There was none.] We are scheduled to start at 9 a.m. tomorrow; however, we have some other Assembly business tomorrow morning so it may be a little bit after 9 a.m. I will you see you all tomorrow morning. This meeting is adjourned [at 9:46 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Traci Dory
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to [Senate Bill 34 \(1st Reprint\)](#), submitted and presented by Leslie Nino Piro, General Counsel, Office of the Attorney General.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to [Senate Bill 34 \(1st Reprint\)](#), submitted and presented by John R. McCormick, Assistant Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts.