MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Eighty-Third Session
February 11, 2025

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Brittney M. Miller at 8 a.m. on Tuesday, February 11, 2025, 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/83rd2025.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Chair
Assemblymember Elaine H. Marzola, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Lisa K. Cole
Assemblymember Joe Dalia
Assemblymember Cecelia González
Assemblymember Ken Gray
Assemblymember Alexis M. Hansen
Assemblymember Melissa R. Hardy
Assemblymember Selena La Rue Hatch
Assemblymember Cinthia Zermeño Moore
Assemblymember Hanadi Nadeem
Assemblymember David Orentlicher
Assemblymember Erica P. Roth
Assemblymember Toby Yurek III

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cesar Melgarejo, Committee Policy Analyst
Karly O'Krent, Committee Counsel
Daniel Delap, Committee Counsel
Aaron Klatt, Committee Manager

Nicholas Fischer, Committee Secretary
Traci Dory, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Katherine Stocks, Director and State Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts
John R. McCormick, Assistant Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts
Kathleen M. Drakulich, Judge, Second Judicial District Court
Alicia Lerud, Court Administrator and Clerk of Court, Second Judicial District Court
Jerry A. Wiese II, Chief Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court
Andres Moses, Assistant Court Administrator, Civil/Criminal Division, Eighth Judicial District Court
Lidia S. Stiglich, Justice, Supreme Court of Nevada
Thomas L. Stockard, Judge, Tenth Judicial District Court
Steven D. Grierson, Court Executive Officer and Clerk of Court, Eighth Judicial District Court
Eva G. Segerblom, President, Nevada Justice Association
Jeff Rogan, Deputy District Attorney, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Clark County
Stewart Evans Handte, Private Citizen
Matthew Skarlatos, Private Citizen
Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts
Christine Middleton, Private Citizen
Roger Hillygus, Private Citizen
Hayden Flores, Private Citizen

Chair Miller:
[Roll was called. Committee protocol was explained.] We are having technical difficulties so we are not able to view those in Las Vegas. Our phone lines are still open and Zoom capacity is working. To anyone watching who is not in Carson City right now, you will still be able to make public comment or testify if you choose.

Today is a presentation of an overview of the Nevada Supreme Court. I will invite those up who will be presenting. We are ready whenever you are.

Katherine Stocks, Director and State Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts:
I am the state court administrator. I am here with my colleague, Mr. John McCormick.

John R. McCormick, Assistant Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts:
I am the assistant court administrator of the Nevada Supreme Court.

Katherine Stocks:
Thank you for letting us be here to provide a brief overview about the Nevada Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals, and the Administrative Office of the Courts. We serve the Judiciary as a whole, and it is our privilege to be able to represent the Judiciary for our state. We have been here a few times. This is my third session, and second in person. I am looking around the room and seeing some of you whom we worked with last session to accomplish significant improvements and to take steps to improve access to justice across our state. The slide here shows that our *2024 Annual Report* has been published [Exhibit C]. We are happy to meet with any member who would like to go over the accomplishments from 2024. We also have a 2023 report, since we have not seen you in two years. To speak about the specific programs or initiatives that we have related to the Nevada Judiciary strategic priorities, we are working this year to re-up our strategic priorities. We are already completing the 2022 to 2025 report and we will be making a 2026 to 2028 report in this next year.

John McCormick:
This next slide is just a representation of Nevada's counties and judicial districts. As you know, we have 11 judicial districts covering our 17 counties. We also have our limited jurisdiction courts with 17 municipal courts and 40 justice courts. This slide is a representation of Nevada's court model and structure, the right side of the slide showing the Nevada appellate courts, which are the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals. The left side of the slide shows the trial courts, those being the district court, justice court, and municipal court. We can go into the specific jurisdiction of those courts later in the presentation.

The Nevada judicial system is a separate and coequal branch of state government, along with the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch. That is found in the *Nevada Constitution*, Article 3, Section 1.

The responsibility of the Judiciary is to resolve legal disputes brought before it in a fair, timely, and impartial manner. As I indicated on the previous slide, our Judicial Branch consists of the Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, and the district, justice, and municipal courts. Nevada is a non-unified judiciary, meaning there is no one source of funding or administrative control.

The Nevada Supreme Court is the state's ultimate judicial authority. The Court's decisions become the precedential law in the state of Nevada. The Court is the state's final appellate court, hears all appeals from the district courts, and has discretionary review of appeals from the Court of Appeals. One thing to note is that all appeals of district court decisions come to the Supreme Court clerk's office, and they are screened based upon a Supreme Court rule to see if they go to the Court of Appeals or the Supreme Court. We will have a few details on that momentarily. The Court serves as both an error correction court and a court of last resort.

An error correction court examines the record from the case of the trial court and determines if the trial court made an error in the conduct of that case. The court of last resort means that if the matter pertains to Nevada law or a Nevada constitutional provision, then the Nevada Supreme Court is the final authority on that. The things that can be appealed from the Nevada Supreme Court, or at least petitioned, [unintelligible] the United States Supreme Court, are matters dealing with federal constitutional protections. There are seven justices on the court, and the chief justice administers the Nevada Judicial Branch pursuant to Article 6, Section 19, of the *Nevada Constitution*.

Katherine Stocks:
The Court of Appeals has three judges. The Court of Appeals is considered a "push-down" model, where all cases go to the Supreme Court. Then it is the Supreme Court that decides which cases go down to the Court of Appeals. This information is reviewed pursuant to the *Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure*, and the Supreme Court retains discretion to be able to accept any petitions for review from the Court of Appeals. Our Court of Appeals is quite successful and efficient in producing their decisions, and this model works well for Nevada.

Next, we have our district courts. Our district courts, or our limited jurisdiction courts, are where people are most likely to have interaction with our court system. We have the Second and the Eighth Judicial Districts here today. They will be presenting immediately after us about the overview of their courts, which are Washoe and Clark Counties. We have a total of 11 district courts in our 17 counties. Decisions from the limited jurisdiction courts that get appealed go to the district court before they could be appealed up to the Supreme Court. District courts hear all felony and gross misdemeanor criminal cases, as well as family, juvenile, and civil cases over $15,000.

John McCormick:
Civil cases under $15,000 happen in the justice courts. Those are considered a court of limited jurisdiction, where their jurisdiction is defined by statute. It is not a general jurisdiction court like the district court. Our justice courts handle misdemeanor criminal matters, criminal and civil traffic cases, and preliminary hearings for gross misdemeanors and felonies. The preliminary hearing is where the justice of the peace considers if there is enough evidence to believe a crime was committed, if the defendant possibly committed that, and bind them over to district court for further proceedings.

Justice court has two types of civil jurisdiction. First is small claims, which are up to $10,000. Small claims is designed to be a process with looser, less formal rules of evidence and other matters to allow people to decide these disputes without attorneys, et cetera. The idea is a more simplified procedure. Then, justice court has a general civil jurisdiction under $15,000. We will see a lot of credit card collection and those types of cases there. In Nevada we have 40 justice courts with 67 justices of the peace. Pursuant to the *Nevada Constitution*, there has to be one justice court for each township in the state. As we have mentioned, the district court has appellate jurisdiction over the justice courts.

The other type of limited jurisdiction courts we have in Nevada are municipal courts. Municipal courts handle misdemeanors and criminal and civil traffic cases in incorporated cities; that is the primary difference between municipal and justice court. The municipal court only covers incorporated cities like North Las Vegas, Fallon, Ely, or Wells, for example. One key difference between municipal courts and justice courts is that municipal courts do not have the same civil jurisdiction that justice courts have. They have limited civil jurisdiction, generally confined to things like city administrative decisions, city utility collections, and neighbor disputes. That is one of the primary differences between our two types of limited jurisdiction courts.

Katherine Stocks:
This slide is an overview of a sampling of what the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) provides for the state. Primarily, our role is to assist the chief justice with his or her duties in administrating the Judicial Branch of Nevada. These bullet point lists show quite a few different areas of what the AOC does. We do support the operations of the appellate courts, which is the entire area of the administrative side; payroll, human resources, case management systems, e-filing, and all that. We also optionally provide case management systems to trial courts in Nevada. With State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds we are rolling out e-file statewide. When we first started the strategic plan, over 80 percent of Nevada's courts did not provide e-file. That has been a project we have secured federal funds for and now seek one-shot funding to finish out that project. However, we are happy to meet with any of you to talk about the specific areas of support that we do. One of the highlights is our specialty courts. We help support the specialty courts across the state.

John McCormick:
Specialty courts are generally an area of interest. Specialty courts are therapeutic courts that use evidence-based practices, treatment, and case management to attempt to address underlying factors that contribute to criminal behavior. These include things like substance abuse, mental health disorders, developmental disabilities, veterans' issues, et cetera. The Specialty Court Funding and Policy Committee, which is our governing body over specialty courts, currently provides funding to 64 trial court specialty court programs in the amount of about $8.5 million. Much of that comes from the State General Fund for which we are very grateful.

In 2021, which is the most recent year we have data—because to track recidivism, you need a three-year window—2021 is the best numbers we have; 77 percent of Nevada specialty court program graduates did not recidivate within three years of graduating the program. That is a big number. It is significantly higher than folks who do not receive that therapeutic court experience. Also in 2021, unsuccessful participants recidivated at a 45 percent rate, meaning that even 55 percent of people who did not successfully complete a specialty court program did not have a new offense within three years. That is a better rate than we see with the general population. In fiscal year 2024, we had 1,320 participants graduate from our 64 specialty court programs throughout the state. Thirty-six babies were born without substance exposure due to the specialty court programs. That is all we have this morning, and we are happy to answer questions.

Chair Miller:
Thank you so much for your informative presentation. We do have some questions.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
Thank you for being here. My question is about some of those information technology (IT) upgrades that you mentioned last session. I know it is a big project. I think in your presentation you said that originally 80 percent of the courts did not have an e-file system. Can you give us the updated statistics of how many have e-file now and where we are in the process?

Katherine Stocks:
I can follow up with an email of the exact case management slide that shows the progress of that project. We have nine additional courts that came online in a nonintegrated fashion, and we already have e-file in other courts throughout the state. However, we have 34 courts that are on the AOC-supported case management system. Part of those federal funds are for upgrading to a modern cloud-based system. As part of the case management system upgrade, all 34 of those courts will have integrated e-file. With the progression of that, it is by the end of 2026.

Assemblymember Hansen:
You touched on it on your slide five, Mr. McCormick; I just wanted you to explain a little bit more about how Nevada has a non-unified judiciary so that we better understand that structure.

John McCormick:
When we say Nevada has a non-unified judiciary, that means there is no single unified funding source. For example, in some other states the state pays for the entire branch.

Here we have a funding mix where the appellate courts are paid for by the state. District court and judge salaries are paid by the state, but then all staff, facilities, et cetera, for the district courts are provided by the counties. Justice courts are exclusively paid for by the counties and municipal courts are exclusively paid for by the cities. All our judges, except for a very few—three or four appointed municipal court judges based on city charter—are elected officials with that level of independence. It is a careful balance between administrative directives from the Supreme Court and creating unfunded mandates and that kind of thing. That is what we mean when we say a non-unified judiciary; particularly there are multiple funding sources and there is no one central "you shall" type of administrative authority.

Assemblymember Cole:
Thank you for your presentation. I have a quick question that everybody in this room other than me probably knows the answer to. My question is on the definition of "recidivate." Does that mean the person does not commit the same type of crime they were in trouble for before, or is it any crime at all?

John McCormick:
On the recidivism numbers that I mentioned regarding specialty court, that is any other offense for which they are convicted within the three years after graduating. That would be any offense. It does not matter if it is another, say, possession of a controlled substance, or property, or whatever; they have not been convicted of another offense.

Chair Miller:
Just for clarity, is that following the national standards or definition of recidivism?

John McCormick:
The definition of recidivism is a hot topic amongst people who care about such things. We generally follow what the federal government uses, which is no new conviction within three years of graduation or whatever the precipitating event is.

Assemblymember Gray:
I started getting nervous when you were talking about the e-file system; then you said something that really scared me. You are not on a cloud-based system yet. Do you have a contingency plan if you become the victim of ransomware or something that wipes out the system?

Katherine Stocks:
Yes, we do. That is something we do not publish for our own protection. We are happy to meet with you to discuss it. We have participated in national cybersecurity tabletop exercises, and we also do internal tabletop exercises for those issues.

Assemblymember Gray:
That makes me feel much better.

Assemblymember Yurek:
I am fascinated by those numbers through the specialty courts. That is very encouraging and impressive. For comparison purposes, can you give us an indication of, for example, how that 77 percent recidivism rate compares to folks who go through the general criminal justice system here in Nevada? Do you have those numbers as well?

John McCormick:
I do not have those numbers handy. We will get back to you with the specifics on that, but it is almost a flip-flop, anecdotally. It is my understanding that while we have 77 percent in specialty court not recidivating, we basically have two and three people through the regular

system who do recidivate. That is general and anecdotal, and we will get back to you with the specifics.

Chair Miller:
We do not have any additional questions at this time, so I will close this presentation. The next presentation we have on the agenda this morning is an overview of the Second Judicial District Court of Nevada.

Kathleen M. Drakulich, Judge, Second Judicial District Court:
I am Judge Kathleen Drakulich. I preside over Department 1 of the Second Judicial District Court in Washoe County. Chief Judge Jones was to give this presentation this morning; you will see that as we move through the slides. She has unfortunately been plagued with one of the many bugs floating around this time of year and is home sick today. I am very happy to have been asked to give this presentation to you this morning.

Alicia Lerud, Court Administrator and Clerk of Court, Second Judicial District Court:
I am the court administrator and clerk of court for the Second Judicial District Court.

Judge Drakulich:
We will go to the first slide [Exhibit D]. You saw John McCormick present a slide similar to this. This is the Second Judicial District Court jurisdiction. We are honing in on Washoe County, which is the Second Judicial District. Our population is currently just over 508,000 people. The types of cases that we handle in the Second Judicial District Court are felony cases. That is anything that you can get more than a year in prison and for gross misdemeanor cases, up to 364 days in the Washoe County jail. We also handle all civil actions over $15,000; family law matters, probate and trust, guardianships, and juvenile matters that include dependency and delinquency.

Let us put some faces to these names, here are all 16 judges in the Second Judicial District Court. These are all of my colleagues whom I have the utmost amount of respect for. They are all hardworking. By the numbers, there are 16 of us, and we are all elected officials. Nine of us are general jurisdiction judges. Those are the judges who handle the civil actions over $15,000 cases, all criminal. Then we have seven family division judges. We also have six appointed judicial officers without whom our jobs would not be possible. They are our discovery commissioner, our probate commissioner, and our four family division court masters. In total, the Second Judicial District has 197 employees, 181 of whom are full-time. Our budget is at $47 million; $30 million of that is from the State General Fund and $17 million of that is in grant and restricted funding. In 2024, we took in over 19,000 new cases in Washoe County.

We are not just judges who preside over cases. We are judges who preside with a specific expertise and who have committee assignments, not one committee assignment—in some cases up to three or four committee assignments. To give you an example, here is a huge list of those cases. Let us just pick one: business court. This is a court where the more highly complex cases pursuant to Washoe District Court Rules are assigned to three of the district

court judges. They include things like shareholder derivative actions. You may also be assigned to a specialty court in Washoe County. That would include the adult drug court, the mental health court, or our felony driving under the influence (DUI) court. In addition to that, you see here, listed in amongst all these other specialties, the committees that we might be assigned to. These include things such as the budget committee, evidence, or courthouse security.

These are our case trends. We have an increasing number of complex cases across all case types. I will talk a little bit about population growth in just a minute. We have seen an increase in Washoe County of our population. With this have come a lot of new commercial and business interests, and with that a lot of new commercial and business cases of complexity. Our family law filings and our criminal filings continue to increase. In 2023 and 2024, our jury trials on the criminal side increased significantly. We have had over 14 percent increase in civil filings from 2023 to 2024. Probate and trust cases, including complex trust cases, have been rising. We had one case in particular that got a lot of press this year that was incredibly complex. The applications for domestic violence, temporary protective orders, and involuntary civil commitments remain high. Again, this is something that we see is endemic of our growing population.

This is our jury trials by calendar year. I have already indicated that we have this significant bump. It is unavoidably significant in our criminal jury trials in 2023 and 2024. One significant thing I want to point out to you is, if you look at the jurors reporting, look at what happened between 2021 and 2024. That is what comes with this increased number of trials. We have to bring in the requisite amount of jurors for that, and we now stagger the start of our jury trials on Monday and Tuesday mornings in order to accommodate this immense influx of jurors into our courthouse.

This is a slide regarding the mental competency court in the Second Judicial District Court. This is something we are incredibly proud of and is without a doubt revolutionizing the handling of our citizens who suffer from mental health issues. We started tracking the criminal mental competency cases in March of 2023, officially established the competency docket in September of 2023, and the jail-based treatment program. This means the inmates who suffer from mental health issues are not just languishing at the jail. The mental health treatment is now part of that stint in the jail before they can be transferred or have their mental health issues addressed.

Proudly, since March of 2023, the total number of cases is 246; defendants found competent after the initial valuation, 68. Of the 176 defendants found incompetent following the initial evaluation, discretionary mental health treatment as an alternative to prosecution was offered to over 49 percent of them. You really have to have the mental health defendants appear in front of you to understand how important this program is, and to understand how important mental health treatment is for them in lieu of prosecution. We have 40 defendants that have later been found competent.

Really important is this last bullet point. Look at that confluence of agencies; that is the reason for success. This program is led in the Second Judicial District Court by the general jurisdiction Judge Egan Walker and family court Judge Cynthia Lu. I want to inform all legislators that we have a tour tomorrow night starting at 5:30 p.m. It is for legislators and is at the Washoe County jail at 911 Parr Boulevard, Reno, Nevada. We want to have you tour the mental health unit. Judge Walker is going to be present to discuss the mental health competency court. I want to encourage all of you to take part in that if your schedules will accommodate it.

Changing topics, we have a Lawyer in the Library program. It is something we are very proud of. This is another way in which the Second Judicial District court serves our community. This is the 25th anniversary of this program. We provide brief lawyers in our community who provide brief, free-of-charge legal consultations. These are volunteer attorneys with expertise in family law, probate law, and general law. We have one of the oldest Lawyer in the Library programs in the United States, and we saw a record participation in this program in the calendar year 2024. Over 231 lawyers volunteered for this program. To me, that is very impressive. We had nearly 1,700 individuals who were assisted, and if you are wondering how popular this program is, we have 646 people on our waiting list. The consultations are held via Zoom, which allows for greater participation by both the lawyers and those seeking legal assistance. As Washoe County's population grows geographically, we are able to reach a greater number of people in need in our community doing this by Zoom.

Where do we live? We live in the Washoe County District Court complex. The general jurisdiction judges are housed at 75 Court Street. It is the oldest public building still in operation in Washoe County. The original structure is from 1873, and there have been subsequent additions patched together in 1911, 1946, and 1949. The most recent addition to the Second Judicial District Court was over 60 years ago in 1963. Our family court is housed across the street in a more modern building at 1 South Sierra Street.

Some of you who have tenure on this Committee and at the Legislature, have heard us talk about the fact that 75 Court Street is no longer suited for modern court operation. The layout really does put the public and the employees at risk. This is an old-style courthouse where the judges, in-and-out of custody defendants, civil case parties, families of all the people who have cases in the Second Judicial District Court, and court personnel all share a very narrow hallway every morning. It is not unusual to have inmates in belly chains and leg irons walking down one side of the hallway, while judges, court personnel, family, and civil litigants are coming the other way. Having the operation split between the two buildings, the family and the general jurisdiction courts, also creates a lot of inefficiencies. In 2023, the Washoe County Board of Commissioners identified a new court facility as a priority, and they have been actively participating with the judges in the Second Judicial District Court toward that effort. I want to thank you very much for your attention. That concludes the presentation on the Second Judicial District Court.

Chair Miller:
Thank you for your presentation. Our first question will come from Assemblymember Orentlicher.

Assemblymember Orentlicher:
Thank you for the presentation and for the work you do. It is a hard job. You mentioned the significant bump in criminal trials, and we have heard about the change in the district attorney (DA) plea policy. One would guess that those are related. Is that the case, and whatever the cause, should we be concerned about the bump, or is this a good or bad thing? What do you think?

Judge Drakulich:
I do not know if we can characterize it overall as a good or a bad thing. I will tell you that the Washoe County DA and his assistant DA met with every judge individually to explain the policy to us about a year and a half ago. I think that it has contributed to the number of trials we have. The bulk of judges are on the criminal side. The other thing we have to think about is, what happens after someone is tried? There are acquittals, so the more cases you have, the more acquittals you have. In other words, the more not guilty verdicts. That has been a function of having more jury trials on the criminal side. The Washoe County jail is not a large place for the rumor mill, and those defendants go back and talk about the fact that they have been acquitted; I am not kidding you. There are more requests by the defendant population for jury trials, notwithstanding the policy. I think there are a number of things that have contributed to it.

Assemblymember Roth:
This was not touched on in the presentation, but my question is in regard to that I heard the Second Judicial District Court was working on modernizing how they store evidence. I was wondering if we could get an update on that? I know that when I was a clerk in the court, which was a wonderful experience, there was a very old school way of storing evidence in the basement. I am wondering if we can get an update on any progress we are making in modernizing that system?

Judge Drakulich:
I love this question. It is true that we have a very antiquated way of storing evidence in the Second Judicial District Court. It is a function of the fact that our courthouse is aging. I am part of the evidence committee along with Judge Steinheimer, and we have started aggressively addressing the evidence issue. As you know, that is an area of our building that floods at times. We also spent a measurable amount of money on mold remediation in our evidence room.

What we are doing now is 500 cases at a time, starting on the civil side. We have started a process where we are taking those 500 cases that are aging, some of them are going to date back 20- or 30-plus years, and we are reaching out to counsel who last represented or who will identify as someone who is familiar with the case. We are telling all of them to come to do one of two things and that all of you need to come and review the material. The two things

are: take the information, the documents, the evidence, et cetera, with you, or authorize us to destroy them. We have documents that we require to be signed for each one of these cases where someone removes evidence that has been stored for a case that is now very old, or we are having them sign documents that authorize us to destroy them. We got through the first 500 cases not long ago and we are on the second 500 cases now. We just had a judge's meeting where we showed slides so that you can see what is happening with that very antiquated evidence room in a door that is in the basement of the courthouse. You can see what is happening in there, as the evidence off the shelves is noticeable in terms of what we are doing to get rid of it. Then, the idea is to digitize it all, and we are working on that as well with a new program. In response to your question, that is something that is aggressively underway.

Assemblymember Hansen:
I am a resident of Washoe County and very familiar—not because I have had to go to court—but I have served on two juries in that beautiful building. I am going to advocate very strongly. I know that you probably need other quarters, but I have hope we will preserve that beautiful DeLongchamps building. I am referring to slide seven, about your jury trials by calendar year and there is a precipitous drop in short trials. If you could define for us what a short trial is in comparison to the others, and then maybe an interpretation of why that precipitous drop?

Judge Drakulich:
Our short trial program (STP) is headed by Judge Steinheimer. It is a trial scheduled to take less than one day. We would like more of the trials to fall into the STP. We recently had a discussion among all of the judges why the number had dropped somewhat and what we are planning is to do a better job of advertising this program. Our goal is to try and get those numbers back up. We certainly find on the criminal side that the trials can be of short duration, and we want to funnel more of the civil trials into the STP. I think that the issue now in terms of getting those numbers back up is education to our Civil Bar about the fact that it continues to be available; and it is, for your clients, by the way, a less expensive alternative to the extent that you can fit the trial within the program.

Alicia Lerud:
For those who are not overly familiar with the STP, the STP was established for civil cases where maybe the issues or the amount in controversy is not as high as some of our other civil trials. What that allows litigants and attorneys to do is to come into the program. It is handled by a pro tempore volunteer judge who is not a member of our sitting judges. We seat four jurors, and it is guaranteed to be over in one day. It is a huge savings on the cost side for those litigants. In addition, our jurors really like it because they get to come in and we guarantee them that they are going to be walking out of that door at the end of the day and not rejoining us the following day. We are hoping that through advertising, this is something we will see an increase in. It is one of those things that has not really come back since we unfortunately had to put a temporary pause on trials in 2020.

Assemblymember Hansen:
Is there a monetary limit on the short court? I am familiar with a constituent with a civil trial whose scheduled date is two years out, but it involves millions of dollars, which was very distressing because they have had to close their business. In short court, is there a monetary limit?

Alicia Lerud:
There are certain requirements to get into that program, and I would love to follow up with you on what those requirements are. I do not know them off the top of my head.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
My question is similar to some of my colleagues. I am so glad to hear you are updating your evidence system because I have toured that basement and it is something. I echo my colleague's concern about digitizing and storing in just one place that can be hacked. I want to confirm that you are following the model of the other courts and working towards a more secure, cloud-based storage system for that evidence.

Alicia Lerud:
We are looking at all options right now with respect to how to modernize that evidence system and what that storage ultimately looks like.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
I want to confirm though, are we going to be in line with the other courts in the state as far as best practices, or is the Second Judicial doing their own thing?

Judge Drakulich:
It is best practices. We always look at best practices for bringing the evidence system up to date. We have the evidence committee that works on this on a weekly basis. We have a new evidence custodian, and with that new evidence custodian we have brought into play new software for the storage of evidence. We are always directed toward best practices and which option of best practices best suits the Second Judicial District.

Assemblymember Nadeem:
I respect the judges for doing such great work for the community. With the increase in population, there are more cases which leads to more waiting time. How can we help the community and the judges shorten that time?

Judge Drakulich:
This is something we do as a bench and as individual departments. As a bench, we always strive to get every case to court as quickly as we can. Some things that you need to bear in mind with regard to the civil cases are the extent that a defendant in a criminal case invokes. In other words, they have a constitutional right to a speedy trial and if that happens, they take precedent. When we are setting criminal trials we bear that in mind. When we are setting civil trials we do what counsel asks. In some of these cases, they ask to be set out a year or two. I am a business court judge. Those are the more complex cases that involve things like

shareholder derivative actions. They asked to be set out a couple of years. I have a class action lawsuit, same thing. Be mindful of the fact that the civil cases must always take a back seat to any criminal defendant who has invoked. That is a component of it, and I can tell you that with regard to my 15 colleagues, we are always trying to get every case that needs to go to trial as quickly as we can. Things happen; parties get added, discovery gets continued, a motion to dismiss gets filed. There is a heavy motion practice in complex civil cases. We are doing what we can, but there are some barriers and some impediments to that.

Alicia Lerud:
With respect to our criminal caseload, in particular in Washoe County, we are looking at doing some innovative things such as adopting a sequential intercept model that has been heavily used in Miami-Dade County, Florida, to really decrease the number of cases we have coming into the criminal system. If we can decrease those cases by providing appropriate social supports before people ever get into the criminal justice system, that also helps significantly with those caseload numbers.

Chair Miller:
Thank you for that and thank you for your presentation and response to our questions. The next item on our agenda is a presentation and overview of the Eighth Judicial District Court of Nevada.

Jerry A. Wiese II, Chief Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court:
I am the chief judge of the Eighth Judicial District Court.

Andres Moses, Assistant Court Administrator, Eighth Judicial District Court:
I am the assistant court administrator for the Eighth Judicial District Court.

Judge Wiese:
I am going to provide you an overview of the Eighth Judicial District. After hearing from the Supreme Court and the Second, a lot of this is going to be monotonous, so I am going to try to skip through these slides as quickly as I can. If you have questions about them, I am happy to talk to you afterwards.

This is just an organizational chart [Exhibit E]. You have already seen something similar, so I am going to skip that. Next is a history of the historical growth of our court over the years and shows the way the Legislature has helped us meet the growing needs of Clark County with judicial resources. We are going to have more to talk about on this when we talk about our Assembly Bill 66 in a little while. Currently, we have 58 district court judges in Clark County. We have 18 [*sic*] hearing masters who serve as quasi-judicial officers and 678 full-time and part-time employees. We are the busiest district court in the state. The high volume of cases and constant fiscal pressures require us to be efficient and innovative in managing our caseloads to serve the community of Clark County.

This slide talks about where we get our authority from—the *Nevada Constitution*, Article 6, Section 6. The kind of cases we hear, I am not going to spend a lot of time on that. You have

heard most of these things. Our General Jurisdiction Division is made up of 32 judicial departments. You will see the names of all my colleagues up there. I have not done this in the past, but I wanted to put what our case assignments were so you see that most of our departments are split into civil and criminal. We have a number that are all civil; they have specialty assignments consisting of things like medical malpractice, time comps, and business courts. You can see the different things. This focused, specialized approach allows us to develop a deeper understanding of complex legal issues resulting in more consistent rulings and expedited case resolution.

We have 32 that are general jurisdiction and we have 26 judicial departments in our Family Division, and you can see how they are divided as well. We have six departments dedicated to juvenile dependency, two for juvenile delinquency, four are half guardianship and half domestic, and the remaining 14 judges are all civil/domestic, which is divorce and child custody.

We are responsible for four different court facilities. The primary one is our Regional Justice Center. We had over 600,000 visitors in 2024. We have a Family Court Building that is separate, with over 223,000 visitors in 2024. Then we have the Phoenix Building, where we have two departments housed along with some other smaller departments, and the Greystone Building, where we have our child support facilities.

We are primarily funded through general fund dollars from Clark County. Last session we passed Senate Bill 63 of the 82nd Session, in which the Nevada Legislature modernized NRS 3.100, which had not been updated since 1865. This made it consistent with the Sparks case. These are more funding slides. You can see that the majority of our funding comes from the Clark County General Fund, but some of it comes from other fees and grants, and things like that. Our total budget is over $136 million for 2025. Our five-year funding history shows we are trying to be responsible with the money we are given, and we generally come up under budget.

Next are total pending cases over the last three years: 2022, 2023, and 2024 in the different areas. In criminal, our pending cases have gone down because we have started using a criminal settlement conference program that helps us resolve cases more speedily without the need for trial, which has helped us resolve a good number of cases alongside the efforts of our homicide departments. In civil, you can see that our total pending cases have increased over the years from 30,000 to 35,000. Family court went from 32,000 to 29,000 to 31,000. It is fluctuating back and forth.

Next is caseflow management. It shows the number of criminal cases filed in 2024. There were over 8,000 new cases filed and over 14,000 closed. You may wonder why we are closing more cases than are filed. That is actually the goal, because we always have cases left over from prior years. The goal is to close more this year than we have filed and that way we are eating into the backlog that we always have. There were over 73 criminal trials and 2 criminal bench trials last year.

The next slide shows our case flow trends of criminal cases being filed. I am not going to go through the numbers. This is end-of-year pending criminal cases; essentially showing our backlog reduction. We are trying to eat into that backlog as much as we can. Next slide shows case flow management alongside our civil case filing statistics. I wanted to address a question from earlier of the Second District Court dealing with the short trials. As you can see here, the green on the second graph up there is our short trials. Short trials are generally cases that are valued at under $50,000. Those are the cases that automatically go to the mandatory Court Annexed Arbitration Program, and those are the ones that funnel up into the STP. Unfortunately, we have seen a significant reduction in short trials similar to the Second [District Court]. You are going to be presented with Assembly Bill 3 later this session which seeks to increase the threshold from $50,000 to $100,000 for the arbitration program. That should double the number of cases that funnel up into the STP, which will increase our short trial numbers and hopefully decrease the number of trials that need to go up to a full-blown civil jury trial.

As we have already discussed, we have specialized judges here: complex business, construction defect, probate, and medical malpractice cases. You can see the numbers of those cases that we filed in 2024. The following slide shows our civil filing trends. This is just information in case you are interested in trends. As you can see, we have had a big increase over the last two years, which we will discuss more in the Assembly Bill 66 hearing.

The next slide shows our pending civil cases. You can see that they wax and wane depending on the year and what is going on. It depends on case filings as well as a number of trials and things like that. Following is a chart showing different types of cases in our civil division with a number of pending cases. You can see the majority of them are general civil cases or probate, with small numbers of medical malpractice, construction defect, and business courts.

The following slide shows our family filing statistics. Our family-domestic is the largest, and those are generally the divorces and child custody. There were over 19,000 filed last year. We disposed of 24,000. We also have child support cases, temporary protective orders, civil commitments, juvenile dependency which are abuse and neglect cases, and juvenile delinquency which are juvenile criminal cases. Family case filing statistics are provided for informational purposes as well.

Let us skip through some of these. On the next one we have a slide showing the domestic case trends of the Family Division. You can see those are pretty flat, but we had several years where we were at about 17,000 and the last four years we have been over 19,000, showing the increase over time.

This next slide is also pending end-of-year family domestic cases. This is just for informational purposes. Next slide, you can see there is a wide variety of cases in family court, with the pending case numbers and the different case types.

The next slide is specialty courts. We currently operate 17 specialty court programs. We have seven judges and four hearing masters that preside over those various specialty courts. You have heard some about that and recidivism rates. The next slide is the 2024 statistics for each of those specialty courts. Next slide shows recidivism rates, and we have already discussed that. We are very proud of the fact that the recidivism rates and specialty courts essentially mirror those that the Nevada Supreme Court was talking about. It helps people. Whether they graduate or not, the fact that they are provided treatment helps them so they are not committing crimes as much as those who do not receive that extra care.

Next slide is gender and demographic studies or statistics for our specialty courts from 2024. I am not going to go into detail on that. Next slide shows where we get the funding for our specialty courts. I know this is not the finance committee, so I am not going to talk about that.

The following slide is a Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) slide. The CASA volunteers are a big part of our Family Division and help individuals who are in foster care. We get reports from these individuals who are CASA volunteers, and they come and give us the best interests of the children. Over the years we have been able to get additional funding to advertise this program. You can see the numbers here from 2020 to 2021 to 2022. I think some of the more recent numbers show that, based on the advertising we are doing, we are getting more and more people interested in the CASA program. Our goal is to provide a CASA for every child. We are not there yet, but we are well on our way, and we appreciate everybody's help who assists us in that.

You are going to see bills about probate court reforms. We have worked with Commissioner [James] Fontano as one of our probate commissioners. He was appointed in 2022. Within the first few months, he implemented a bunch of changes so we can try to avoid some of the probate things that you may have seen in the news in Las Vegas, such as people taking houses and property from somebody who was not entitled to it. We are in the process of trying to resolve all of those little problems.

The next slide is our court orders and warrants. We have a program called "Order in the Court" that allows judges to sign orders from home, the office, or wherever we need to be. This is the same with the search warrants and pen registers and things like that, that assist our law enforcement. You will see that in 2024, we signed over 247,000 orders and over 10,000 warrants. The interesting thing about this is, a good percentage of these orders and warrants were signed either after hours or on weekends and holidays. I am very proud of the fact that our judges are working all hours of the day and night to help facilitate the resolution of issues and getting cases closed.

Judicial workload: people wonder what judges do. Everybody knows that we do trials. What you may not realize is that before any trial happens we have lots and lots of court hearings. People file motions and things like that. We are in court a lot of times for motion hearings, what we call "law and motion" calendars. The orders we have already talked about, warrants we have already talked about, and the last one is study, research, and review. A lot of the

time that judges spend to get ready for a trial or a motion hearing is in their office reading the pleadings that the parties file, doing legal research so that we know the right answers, and trying to come up with the best decisions we can on all the issues presented to us. That is our workload, and there is a picture of most of our judges. That concludes our presentation. I am happy to take any questions.

[Assemblymember Marzola assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair Marzola:
Thank you; we will start with questions.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
I was drawn to slide 11 where you talked about your budget. We are not the money committee, but I did notice that you are not spending your full budget every year, and I appreciate the fiscal responsibility. I wonder what happens to that extra money? Does it revert to the county or does it stay in a savings account? Where did those unspent funds go?

Judge Wiese:
As far as I know it does not stay with us.

Andres Moses:
A majority of the unused money comes from vacancy savings. We have over 700 employees, so we do have a vacancy rate that we work hard to try not to have, but it does happen. All of that money does revert back to Clark County, and I believe they use that for their capital funds.

Assemblymember Orentlicher:
I am curious. We talked a little bit with the Second Judicial District about the transition to cloud-based storage. What are you all doing with regard to cloud-based storage?

Judge Wiese:
As far as I know, we are not using cloud-based storage, but in Clark County we have two separate sites where our information is backed up that are completely independent from each other. If Las Vegas is destroyed, we may have a problem, but I do not think we have cloud-based storage. Do we?

Andres Moses:
I do know we use Switch at one of our facilities for storage of all of our case stuff. All of our case files are electronically stored. I will have to get back to the Committee to confirm that about the cloud question.

Assemblymember Hardy:
I had a couple questions regarding probate. On pages 17 and 20, I noticed you were discussing other caseloads, the disposed cases compared to the filings. I noticed you had more filings than were disposed. I was wondering if you could touch a little bit on if that is

the nature of probate and generally how long that takes? You also mentioned that you hired another judge to handle probate cases. Do you think that will help? Is that why that happened, you did not have enough staff hearing them?

Judge Wiese:
Our probate numbers are huge and it is a problem. We recognize that as a problem. Some of our probate cases will last 50 or 60 years because you have trusts in place and overseen by the court for many, many years. We hired a new probate commissioner, Commissioner Fontano, back in 2022. We just recently hired a second probate commissioner, who we are hoping will address the numbers and make it so that our resolution rate will go up and the red and blue lines will interchange. We are hopeful. We are doing what we can, and we know the numbers are too high.

Assemblymember Hansen:
I appreciate you elaborating more about the short trials and how that is working and about the bill that might be coming forward. That bill, I think you mentioned, was A.B. 3. We will look forward to that. When we talked earlier yesterday, you were talking about the caseloads. Could you remind us? The caseload has gotten higher in the civil cases and in family court. I remember as a freshman here in 2019, there was a big increase in the mental health space of court, and it seems like maybe that is because of some action that was taken here at the Legislature. We have seen a little bit better management of those caseloads, but now it seems like civil, and of course family, tend to—am I right? Am I remembering some of the details from yesterday that the growth has been where you are seeing a lot of growth or continued growth?

Judge Wiese:
We are seeing continued growth. I do not know that it had anything to do with mental health care or treatment back in 2019. Understand that as a court, we often do not know why there are trends up or down. Sometimes we can look at a policy of a district attorney or something like that, but other times our numbers will wax and wane and we are not sure why. Sometimes we do not know if it is a fluke or if it is a new trend. Our civil numbers were way up last year. We do not know why. I think we had four or five thousand more civil filings last year than we had the year prior. There is not a reason that we know of for that. We do not know if that is a new trend or if that is a new base or not. But yes, we have more cases than we can handle.

Assemblymember Moore:
My question is about CASA. I have seen the commercials and social media campaign around CASA. During your presentation, you mentioned that your goal is to have one CASA volunteer per child and that you are not there yet. How many more volunteers would you need?

Judge Wiese:
I look back at Steve Grierson because he is our CASA ambassador. He is our court executive and says we need an additional 500 volunteers in order to get one CASA for every child.

[Assemblymember Miller reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Miller:
Thank you so much for your presentation. I am not seeing any more questions. I will go ahead and close this agenda item on the presentation of the Eighth Judicial District Court and open the hearing on our next agenda item, which is a bill hearing on Assembly Bill 66. This measure revises provisions relating to district courts. When you are ready, introduce yourselves and proceed.

Assembly Bill 66: Revises provisions relating to district courts. (BDR 1-473)

Lidia S. Stiglich, Justice, Supreme Court of Nevada:
I am here representing the Nevada Supreme Court. Also presenting, at least on this portion of the bill, will be Judge Thomas Stockard.

Thomas L. Stockard, Judge, Tenth Judicial District Court:
I am the district court judge for the Tenth Judicial District Court in Fallon, Nevada.

Judge Stiglich:
Mr. John McCormick will be joining us at the table. Starting without him is like doing this without a net, but I am going to do my best.

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

Judge Stiglich:
Assembly Bill 66 is more of a judges' bill. It creates 25 new judgeships across the state. Those would be effective for election in 2026, and then would be on cycle with the rest of the judges every six years. With respect to coming to these numbers and how they break down, here is how our presentation will proceed. I want to discuss with you the need. In particular, I am here to address the rural situation and the rural asks. We have colleagues from the Second Judicial District Court and the Eighth Judicial District Court who are better able to present to you their needs and statistics in their larger districts and to field your questions.

With respect to that, why do we need more judges? Well, Nevada has experienced a lot of growth. The secret is out, and there are more people moving here. We are the sixth fastest growing state. In the ten-year period from 2010 to 2020, we grew 15 percent. We are up to 3.26 million now and we are still growing. We anticipate that as more people come here to live, work, play, and start businesses, the Judiciary is going to have to grow to meet those needs. Our bill here is one in which we try to make sure the Judiciary is of the right size to meet those incoming needs, both for litigants and lawyers as well as the judges.

With respect to the districts, other than the Second or the Eighth, why do we not want one-judge districts? It is an access to justice situation. First of all, judges need vacations; they get sick; and sometimes if it is not shared misery, it is just misery. They are out there by themselves serving the public, doing the best they can, but they are by themselves. It makes it difficult sometimes for litigants to have meaningful access. What do I mean by that? The Eighth Judicial District—it is kind of the goldilocks situation—is so large that they can specialize. They have civil and criminal general jurisdiction judges; they have a mix; they have specialization; and they have district courts and family courts. Washoe [County] in the Second Judicial District is, by contrast, big enough and small enough. It is small enough that it has general jurisdiction courts, but big enough that it has its own separate family court.

When we go to districts outside of those two, they do everything. Your one judge is the civil judge, the criminal judge, the probate judge, and the family judge. They wear a lot of hats in trying to give this service, in terms of providing specialty court service. Because there is just one judge out there, oftentimes those needs are met by a senior judge—not an elected official in the community serving as the judge in those specialty courts, but a senior judge, quite simply because they do not have enough bandwidth; and there is still that awkwardness of, Today I am your sentencer and tomorrow we are in our therapeutic court, and tell me how you are doing—just trying to provide service that makes sense to the litigants and perpetuates a feeling of fairness in that regard.

All of the judges I am asking for today would be here in support of this bill. I am here for them because if they are here, then they are not holding court, because there is just one of them. Part of this is keeping the doors open, keeping the access available, and making sure that we can meet the needs of these communities as they grow. Judge Stockard will be able to weigh in. To that end, what we did in developing this bill was to speak to our stakeholders, because these costs are split. The Supreme Court pays for district court judges' training, salary, and benefits, but the counties have to bear those other costs. That is why our judges have had to reach out and work with their counties and that is probably going to be an ongoing process.

We are asking for one additional judge in the First Judicial District. The First Judicial District is Carson City. Carson City has two judges. It is also the third busiest per-judge district in the state. The third judge would make sense here—it is one additional judge there—because in addition to their family, criminal, and civil needs, their proximity to the Capital means there are disruptive things that happen because they are important and they have to happen quickly. That additional judge allows them to be nimble when things like ballot questions come forward, or issues that emanate here uniquely in Carson City and uniquely to that courthouse. We are asking for one additional judge in that county, which on a per-judge basis is currently the third busiest district in the state.

We are respectfully asking to add an additional judge in the Sixth Judicial District. That is in Winnemucca, Humboldt County, and is served by Judge Montero.

We are asking in the Tenth Judicial District for one additional judge; that is served by Judge Stockard in Churchill County. Currently on a per-judge basis, Judge Stockard services five less cases than every judge in Clark County, which is the busiest district. He does not look tired, but I feel tired sitting next to him. Judge Stockard is amazing, and he has been servicing that county by himself for a long period of time.

The Eleventh Judicial District is served by Judge Shirley, and that is one of our throwbacks. He rides the circuit out in the Eleventh. That is Lander, Mineral, and Pershing, and they do not even all touch. Judge Shirley goes by himself to three different counties within that judicial district to provide access to justice. We are asking for one additional judge in that district to help him serve those three counties.

We have a similar situation in the Seventh Judicial District where we are not asking for judges. We have two judges that serve White Pine, and those two judges serve Eureka, White Pine, and Lincoln. The two judges are able to manage those three counties and move about. We are asking in the Eleventh to add an additional judicial officer to help serve them.

That is the quick overview of those districts, the what, why, and how many. I will turn it over to Judge Stockard.

Judge Stockard:
Judge Shirley and I, between the Tenth and the Eleventh, cover each other. We do settlement conferences for each other, and those types of things, and that would provide some relief there. I would like to speak on the Tenth in Fallon and what we have been doing to prepare for this. We have done it, and I think it will be able to address some of the questions that came up during the Administrative Office of the Courts' presentation.

We have looked at four things that we would need to do before we could feel good about coming to the Legislature and asking for this. One is to make sure we have the facilities. Our current courthouse, from before the Tenth was created, housed three judges who were shared between Churchill and Lyon County. In our existing facility, we could accommodate the additional judge. Fortunately, we are not going to have to because we are in the final stages of breaking ground on a new courthouse that we anticipate will carry us into the direction the county commissioners have given us for at least the next 50 to 60 years. We have the space where we are now, but our new courthouse will definitely do that.

We have also been able to upgrade our case management and our technology. With the help of the AOC we have implemented a statewide cloud-based, secure e-filing system. I used to lose a lot of sleep on how we previously stored our information, particularly when I was at the National Judicial College and I heard about the nightmares that some of our sister states have gone through. What that does, besides for the security issues, is to open up the ability to get counsel for the citizens of our community. They do not have the burden of having to come out just to file a document; now they can e-file. We can do routine hearings by Zoom and it has reduced the cost of retaining counsel for a lot of our local community members.

As statewide jurisdiction courts, we sometimes see some of our sister counties' litigants. If you live in Fernley, it might be more convenient to come to Fallon than to drive to Yerington. That has contributed to our caseload. We have implemented an e-filing system and also a cloud-based case management system that has really streamlined and made us much more efficient. We have developed a business plan on what personnel we will need if this bill becomes law. We have identified the exact cost to the county, and we have gotten buy-in from our county manager and county commissioners to fund those costs if this bill is approved.

Finally, we have engaged the stakeholders in our community. I have met with the mayor of Fallon, I have met with our county manager, and I have gone to our county commissioners who have come to our courthouse and we have talked about it there. I have met with the local state bar [State Bar of Nevada], and the support for adding an additional judge has been overwhelming. I think that, for our community, we have the things in place to transition successfully. I hope to be able to increase the access to justice and the timeliness for all the members of our community as they seek to come to court.

Judge Stiglich:
As to this portion, if there are any questions, then we are prepared to take them.

Assemblymember Dalia:
Referring to section 1, I see that the number of judicial postings is tied to population and a weighted caseload study. I see that we have been provided with a pretty detailed weighted caseload study for the Eighth District, but I am not seeing those for other districts. Have those weighted caseload studies been performed and, if so, can those be provided to the Committee?

John McCormick:
That is section 1 you are referring to, Assemblymember Dalia, it applies only to the Second and the Eighth in terms of that population trigger. We have not necessarily done the full-packet-level weighted caseload studies in the other districts.

Assemblymember Dalia:
Has there been a weighted caseload study performed for the Second District?

John McCormick:
I think so, but we should probably ask the Second to be sure, because I could very well be wrong.

Alicia Lerud:
In response to that question, the Second does not have a current weighted caseload study. We are in the process of working through that. We did try to initiate one last year through the National Center for State Courts, which is the primary vendor for those studies, and at that point in time they were booking out into 2027. We are trying to find a different avenue to get that caseload study completed.

Assemblymember Roth:
This question is specific to the Second Judicial District Court, and it piggy backs off of that. First, I want to say that I know and appreciate so much how hard judges across the state are working and how committed you all are to ensuring access to justice for everyone. While we are asking for more judges and there is not a weighted case study that has been done, I am wondering if there is some additional tracking or information that can be provided to the Committee, because I do not think the two larger jurisdictions, Washoe and Clark, are similarly situated in how cases are moving through the system. We have heard a lot about this new plea policy that was implemented in 2023, and the increase in cases that resulted from that. Is there any tracking that has been done in relation to that to help the Committee understand where the need for the new judges specific to jurisdictions comes from so we can ensure if we need that increase in trial, the cost, that it is being considered?

Kathleen M. Drakulich, Judge, Second Judicial District Court:
In the presentation that I went through with regard to the Second Judicial District earlier this morning, I am going to talk a little bit about some of those factors, with one of them being, as you pointed out, the additional jury work. Keep in mind that every day we are on the bench, we are not in the court. You know this, having previously worked in the Second Judicial District. When we are on the bench the orders mount, the pleadings mount, and then we are there at 8 or 9 p.m. or on the weekends. It is the complexity of the cases, and it is the number of court cases we are actually seeing go to trial. I cannot emphasize enough the complexity issue with regard to the cases we are now seeing as a result of the influx of so much new business throughout Washoe County.

In addition, the last time we added a family court judge was in 2019. The population growth since that time has been almost 50,000 additional souls in Washoe County. We are at 48,500 now and we expect that number to hit 50,000 shortly. We have not added a general jurisdiction judge in northern Nevada since 2009. I want you to think about what has happened to population growth and business growth in Washoe County since 2009. During that time, the population itself has increased by 85,000 people. All of those additional cases that come, as the matters become more complex, those are the things driving our request for additional judges.

Alicia Lerud:
I would add that we do have extensive data with respect to case filings that we can provide to the Committee. Some of the complexity of cases, as Judge Drakulich alluded to, comes in the form of more complex civil matters that are difficult to quantify using only numbers. In our Family Division we now estimate that we have between 70 to 80 percent of litigants who are self-represented. When you have a self-represented litigant who is prosecuting or litigating out a family matter, that puts increased pressure on the court. It requires increased court time because judges spend more time in court with those litigants because more explanation is actually provided in court proceedings. In addition, it puts additional staff pressures because instead of attorneys preparing orders, the court ends up preparing all orders.

Quantifying the number of self-represented cases to a precise amount is very difficult because some litigants come in with an attorney, they get through a certain portion of their case, and then their attorney withdraws for whatever reason. We often have litigants who move in and out of the status of being represented by counsel. We can certainly provide this Committee with some of those case filing numbers and additional data.

Judge Stiglich:
To Assemblymember Dalia and Assemblymember Roth, we do have some numbers that we rely on—they are not the weighted numbers necessarily or the depth—that we will provide to the Committee. With respect to outside the Second and the Eighth, however, it is not just the numbers, it is both geography and the access to these other courtrooms or the community, but we will provide that data to you.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
I am happy that Second Judicial is here because that is what my question is about. You mentioned a lot of the constraints of the current building—and I have toured that building—I know we have staff in broom closets. We have a judicial master that does not even have a courtroom right now. I wonder what your plan is to fit three additional judges and staff in a building that is already bursting at the seams?

Judge Drakulich:
It is bursting at the seams, but we will be able to accommodate that on the family court side. We do have judges who currently do not have courtrooms or very desirable accommodations, but we will continue that path with the more important objective being adding the judge, and we will make those accommodations the same with the Second Judicial District.

During COVID-19, in order to create a larger courtroom where we could keep jurors and court personnel away from each other, we completely did away with our general court clerk and filing area and created what is called the "complex litigation courtroom." We also have a much smaller courtroom that does not have its own jury, but we will work around that. It is called "courtroom A," and is a courtroom that could accommodate another district court judge. It is going to be tight, but the objective here is the additional judges, and we are going to make it work.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
I appreciate that because access to justice is obviously the most important thing. I understand we are going to adjust courtrooms, but the larger question, is where are you going to fit all of the staff?

Alicia Lerud:
With respect to our two general jurisdiction judges who would be added, as Judge Drakulich just mentioned, we do have the complex litigation courtroom, and courtroom A that are

currently used by visiting judges or for larger cases, and those both have adjoining staff areas. With respect to our request for an additional family judge, we do currently have two of our family dockets that we continue to run primarily via virtual means, mostly because it is better for the litigants. They are our child support docket and our domestic violence docket. That gives us additional courtroom space because we have been able to pull the equipment needed to keep the record for those dockets into office space rather than courtroom space.

We have done office sharing in that building with staff, so we do have some extra staff capacity within our family building, and we do continue to have some employees—not all—work on a hybrid basis, which has enabled us to really flex out some of the spaces that we do have available. It is a tight squeeze and does not eliminate the need for a new courthouse for other reasons, but we can accommodate this request in existing facilities.

Assemblymember Hardy:
My questions are specific to the Eighth Judicial District. If you could go through what you are specifically requesting and then follow up on what my colleague was asking about: if this passes, how would you plan to accommodate the new judges? Not to date myself, but I remember when we did not even have family court judges; we had one courthouse. I remember when they built the Reno Justice Court, et cetera. If you could elaborate on how many judges the Eighth Judicial is asking for, and then what your plans are to accommodate them and the staff in the overall effort to alleviate the caseloads and move the cases along?

Judge Wiese:
I had prepared remarks. Do you not want the remarks? Do you just want us to answer the questions?

Chair Miller:
Please respond to the question.

Judge Wiese:
I met with most of you yesterday and discussed the fact that we are working with the county as far as location is concerned. Currently, the Eighth is asking for 18 additional new judges, which our courthouses are full right now. Those 18 would need a new building. We have been working with Clark County, and Clark County has been working with us towards understanding the need for new judges and understanding that we need a new facility that will house them. We have worked with the county as far as whether we are going to expand the family court campus or if we are going to build a south tower. In my meeting last week with the county manager, it seemed that they were going to be fairly equivalent in cost, so it should not be an issue. There are plans in the works is all I can say for now.

Assemblymember Hardy:
Let us just say until, and if, those additional buildings are built, I assume you would have a way to take in the new judges with courtroom sharing, et cetera. Could you share that?

Judge Wiese:
We do have a plan. When I came on—I was elected in 2010 and started in 2011—there were seven or nine of us at the time, and we did courtroom sharing. At that time our chambers were housed in an adjacent building; we have plans to do something similar to that. We can do courtroom sharing or virtual appearances if necessary. COVID-19 has taught us that there are sometimes ways to handle our work without being present. It depends on the need, right? If we are going to do a trial, we need a courtroom; hearings need a courtroom. But there are other things we can do without necessarily being there, and there are ways that we can do telecommunicating administrative orders. We have plans to handle that in the interim while the building is being built so we can get the job done, but we will not be able to provide the same level of availability as a judge in a courtroom until those facilities are completed.

Assemblymember Orentlicher:
I am looking at the different provisions, and they are worded, For the X Judicial District, there must be Y district judges, and that is pretty standard from provision to provision. I could imagine it saying—looking at section 5—For the Sixth Judicial District there must be at least two district judges, rather than prescribing the exact amount, prescribing a minimum, and giving some authority to the counties if they want to go above the minimum and if they can fund it, they could. Is this typical? I know we are a Dillon's Rule state; I know a lot of states are. Across states, is it typical to prescribe specific amounts as opposed to a minimum, or is there variation from state to state in terms of staffing courts?

Judge Wiese:
We do not know the answer to that. To be honest, this is how it has always been done in Nevada as far as we are concerned and know. Neither Judge Drakulich nor I know what other states' statutes read as far as the number of judges. This is part of the reason we have proposed this statute to modify the language, so instead of having to come in and ask for 18 at a time, because we have not had any judges for so long, they would grow by population and caseload. If that happens, the number of judges would increase over time based on population and caseload, and that number would automatically modify.

Assemblymember Hansen:
When we talk about size—I guess I pick my poison—I would rather have a little problem with space than I would with not being able to have justice served more quickly. We know we might be in that position, although I think Judge Stockard addressed that in his jurisdiction they have addressed some of those needs. I think we have a really large new legislative building in southern Nevada, so perhaps we could lease some space out to the Eighth Judicial Court.

I am going to be here to advocate for the need for those judges in some of the counties that were mentioned. Four of my six counties are on that list for a need, and I have seen it up close and personal. Rurals have trouble with access to health care; the needs and the docket have grown on family court issues in the rurals; we have a real need in dealing with drug and mental health issues. The load of those judges is a lot; I have seen it myself. I am very

supportive of this effort put forth. My question would be to Judge Drakulich: you mentioned you had 19,000 cases just in 2024?

Judge Drakulich:
Yes, 19,000 new cases in Washoe County in 2024. That is the number.

Assemblymember Hansen:
I wanted to have you clarify it on the record and make sure I got it right, because we were talking about if we have some numbers showing some of the issues.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
My question has more to do with the rurals. I notice that in section 1, we have a metric by which we are accounting for population growth in Clark County and Washoe County, and they automatically get new judges when they grow by 40,000. My question is, why are we excluding the rurals from that specifically? Are we anticipating that they will never grow by 40,000? Could you talk to us about why they were left out of that growth metric?

John McCormick:
Assemblymember, in terms of the population growth, another 40,000 people in Churchill County is going to take forever; it is sort of an economies of scale thing. That number is more appropriate for the urban jurisdictions than the rural jurisdictions. Since we are talking access to justice—having multiple judges—that population trigger did not really fit.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:
I understand that. My question is why we have to say that in statute if we are not anticipating them to grow by 40,000; why are we putting a population cap in the first place; why not just leave it? If Churchill suddenly grows by 40,000 next year, then they are accounted for.

John McCormick:
I think that is a very good question. I do not necessarily know that I have an answer right now, but I think it certainly can be a topic for discussion moving forward.

Judge Drakulich:
By virtue of the fact that you are a district judge in the state of Nevada—there are 80 plus of us—you are a member of the Nevada District Judges Association (NDJA). This year, I am serving as the president of the NDJA, and you have heard from the Sixth, the Eighth, and Judge Stockard here on behalf of the Tenth. On behalf of the rest of the rural districts who are such an important part of our makeup of judges throughout the state, I have been authorized by their board to offer support for this bill. That would include those districts who are asking for more judges specific to the bill, and those who are not, who support the bill.

Assemblymember Cole:
I think my biggest question is here in section 1, subsection 3, where we talk about providing for the increase in the number of district judges in a judicial district and how that works if you do not actually need the judge. It is based on that population of the 40,000 increase, and

then there is work between you and the Clark County Commission—or whatever commission it is—and you actually work with the Legislative Counsel Bureau as to whether or not you actually need that. My question is on the logistics of that, and whether or not the county would want more control since they are funding it?

John McCormick:
This provision actually mirrors the provision for adding justices of the peace based on population that currently exists in *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 4, so we brought that model over. There is a relationship between the court and the county to discuss and make that work. Necessarily tipping the balance of power one way or the other is probably not a great solution in terms of adding judges, with the option the court has to say, yes, we have reached the trigger, but we do not need a judge. They can do that. The way this is constructed, it is incumbent upon the court to work with the county to make sure they are in concert.

Assemblymember Marzola:
My question is for the Eighth Judicial District Court. Thank you, Judge, for being here and for the updated study. On page 6 of your final report dated August 2024 [Exhibit F], I know a state's filings per judge in time to disposition were the leading indicators as a result to adding judges. Do you have a breakdown of where it shows the number of filings per judge and time to disposition per judge?

Judge Wiese:
This is a long study; it is a lot.

Steven D. Grierson, Court Executive Officer and Clerk of Court, Eighth Judicial District Court:
In this particular weighted caseload study, there is no indicator of the number of judges per filing, but we can certainly get those. We report on them every month; we report on time to disposition every month, so we can provide those to the Committee.

Assemblymember Marzola:
That was going to be my ask. Can you give the Committee a breakdown of each judge, the filings, and their time to disposition, broken down per department?

[Exhibit G and Exhibit H were submitted but not discussed during the hearing and will become part of the record.]

Chair Miller:
We have no further questions so I will open testimony. We still do not have access to Las Vegas so we will move to the phones. You may call in or submit your testimony in writing, specifically for those who are not able to access our office in Las Vegas right now. We will first start here in Carson City. Anyone wishing to make testimony in support of A.B. 66, please proceed.

Eva G. Segerblom, President, Nevada Justice Association:
We are here in support of A.B. 66. A tenet of our organization is access to justice. We feel that having more judges will increase access to justice for Nevadans and to the right to a jury trial. I practice primarily in the Second Judicial District Court, and I can tell you we are setting trials out to years—like Assemblymember Hansen stated—and it is really impacting victims. We are here in support of this bill.

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone else here in Carson City in support or anyone wishing to testify on the phone. [There was no one.]

I will move on to testimony in opposition to A.B. 66. If there is anyone here in Carson City, please proceed.

Jeff Rogan, Deputy District Attorney, Clark County District Attorney's Office; and representing Clark County
Clark County opposes A.B. 66 with regard to the Eighth Judicial District Court's request for 18 new judges, the single largest increase in the history of the court. We also oppose the parts of the bill that call for automatic increases of judges based upon population and caseload. The population of a county does not correspond to an increase in judicial workload. As Judge Wiese testified, we do not really know why filings go up and filings go down. An automatic increase also removes your authority to decide whether the number of judges should increase and obligates the Legislature and the county to provide for these new judges in the future. For perspective, the judges themselves provided a handout, and they anticipate in the next ten years anywhere in Clark County between 84 and 90 judges and thereafter between 94 and 98.

There is also not enough data to support an increase; the court's own study is unfinished, they admit this on page 3 [Exhibit F]. They say the methodology of their report is only a starting point for determining the number of judges. It needs to be utilized in conjunction with other data points, which we do not know yet. Their report calls for an additional study called the time study, which they have not completed, and which will not be completed until the summer after the session. Also missing from your consideration, as Assemblymember Marzola mentioned, are other factors on pages 5 and 6. I ask you to take a look at pages 5 and 6 to look at those factors that the court does not talk about in its report to you today.

In conclusion, we are willing to work with the court, but based upon the court's own report, the relevant data is not there and will not be completed before the end of session. We do not think that this report is accurate and comprehensive enough to justify the request for 18 new judges and thereafter 94 to 98.

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone else here in Carson City? [There was no one.] On the phone?

Stewart Evans Handte, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
I am a former 50-year resident of the state of Nevada and former retired law enforcement officer from the state of Nevada; 30 years, honorably retired. I want my comments permanently recorded for the record in this particular legislative committee meeting, and thank you very much for the opportunity to speak this morning.

First of all, I am opposed to this bill because the courts are so quagmired with bad case law. That is why they are asking for more judges. The problem exists with bad cops [unintelligible] bad case law, which is then turned into the district attorneys, which then goes in front of these judicial district courts. Having been in the legal system for 30 years myself, I have seen firsthand how the system is quagmired—again using that terminology—with bad case law. As should be noted, that under *Nevada Revised Statutes* 282.010, you have to be bonded, and any judge in any judicial district court in the state of Nevada has to have bonds and valid recorded oaths of the commission. Under a Freedom of Information Act request, I have learned that all the judges of the Second Judicial District Court are not bonded or do not have valid oath of office or commission. Therefore, they are invalid in their respective positions.

My statement to you this morning, legislative committee, is we have a problem that exists in the legal system of the State of Nevada. Having been a victim of a corrupt legal system perpetuated by a corrupt district attorney—by the name of Christopher Hicks—and judges in the Second District Court, this is why you have over 19,000 cases pending in that court because there is too much bad case law being perpetuated by lower members of the legal system and therefore put forth into the district courts. That is why you have an issue. I spent 50 years in the state of Nevada—30 of which were in the law enforcement profession—and I speak from firsthand experience. I significantly oppose this bill by form of being victimized by the Second Judicial District Court of Nevada.

Matthew Skarlatos, Private Citizen:
I am opposed to the bill. This is in line with the previous caller, Mr. Handte. I am speaking on behalf of a gentleman by the name of Robert Jason Ramirez, who was sentenced last February in Judge Drakulich’s court; CR 23-0249. He was criminally charged with very serious violations to the trial, was sentenced, and sent to the Northern Nevada Correctional Center. Less than six months later he was placed in the Desert Sands prison (sic) in Clark County, Nevada, for reasons that make absolutely no sense. His public defenders denied or delayed his appeal on numerous instances. This gentleman was brutally treated while incarcerated at the Washoe County Sheriff's Office, and the circumstances of his case make absolutely no sense based on the evidence and the information that was withheld.

Chair Miller:
Can you speak more directly to the bill, please?

Matthew Skarlatos:
I am speaking directly to the bill. You have a lot of people in the Washoe County Sheriff's Office, in the jails, and in the prisons who do not belong because they are being—as Mr.

Handte spoke to—unlawfully charged, incarcerated, and sentenced. [Written testimony was submitted Exhibit I.]

Chair Miller:
Are there any other callers? [There was no one.]

A reminder that we do not necessarily need to name individuals when we are opposing or supporting any proposed measure. I will open testimony in neutral.

Jonathan Norman, Statewide Advocacy, Outreach and Policy Director, Nevada Coalition of Legal Service Providers
Generally, we support the addition of more judges as it enables more access to justice. We appreciate the complexities of where to house judges, but generally we think it is good to have more judges on the bench to take time with pro se litigants. I apologize, I meant to come up in support.

Chair Miller:
We will consider your testimony as support, but first is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.]

Chair Miller:
Is there anyone here in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Any callers? [There was no one.] I will invite the presenters up to make any brief final remarks.

Judge Wiese:
I want to comment on a couple of the comments that have been made. As far as case filings are concerned, case filings are important and we will get that information to you, but they do not tell the whole story. That is why we did a weighted caseload study and why we did an update of our caseload study, because the different types of cases that judges hear require different time commitments. We tried to provide information that provided you with the best information we could. We will give you the other statistics, but I want to suggest to you that the statistics of case filings do not necessarily tell the full story.

The only other thing I want to say in conclusion is about the bill, A.B. 66. While it requests additional judges, we are not asking for additional judges so we have less work to do. All of us will continue to work 40-hour weeks or more. The ask is to give us additional judges so that we can provide better access to justice for the people in our communities, and so instead of waiting four or five years for a civil trial in Clark County, we can provide access to justice and people can get trial dates and get a trial resolved within a year or two. That is the ask; it is not to try to make it so we do less work.

Judge Stiglich:
We do not always anticipate all the questions you may have, and you may have more questions later. Please do not hesitate to reach out to us. We are happy to hunt and gather

whatever information or statistics are necessary to help you in this determination. Thank you for your time here today. We know you have a lot on your plate.

Judge Drakulich:
I want to thank you all very much for considering the bill and for all of your very thoughtful questions. We really do enjoy coming here and being asked about what we do, why we do it, and why it is so important.

Chair Miller:
I will go ahead and close the hearing on A.B. 66.

Next on our agenda is public comment. Public comment is not to make a comment about the bill that we just heard, but for other issues that are under the purview of this Committee. I will first start hearing Carson City. Is there anyone that would like to approach and make public comment? [There was no one.] Anyone on the phone?

Stewart Handte:
I would like to add an additional comment to what I just stated.

Chair Miller:
Sir, I am going to restate the policy. Public comment should not be on the bill. It should be on something else under the purview of the Committee, but it is not to make comment again on the bill.

Stewart Handte:
I am not commenting on the bill. I am requesting the Committee listen to me for just a second. Self-representation is the right afforded to us in the *United States Constitution*, and there were some comments earlier regarding self-representation. I hope the Committee would understand that there are those of us out there in the public world, arena, however you want to interpret it, that request self-representation through the court system. Having gone through the court system, there is a vaunted effort to not allow us to do so. I am requesting through the committee meeting today to please listen to me; there is a lot of criminal corruption taking place.

As a member of law enforcement and 50-year resident of the state of Nevada, I deserve to have my voice heard. I am requesting that the Committee listen to me and take note because I have emailed every one of the legislators of the state of Nevada on this very serious matter regarding our court systems, guardian probate fraud, and the multibillion-dollar-a-year racket. There are people's estates, trusts, and lives being taken on a daily basis, and Nevada is no exception. Case in point: April Parks, out of Las Vegas; Rebecca Schultz; and the most serious case—

Chair Miller:
Sir, I ask that we do not name names. Next caller.

Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincey, Massachusetts:
We have every right to name names, and you should want to know who they are. How about you let people start talking before you cut them off? This has been your M.O. [modus operandi] since you have been the Chair of this Committee. I would like to inform you of the corruption that you have all been on notice of—at least the folks who are return elected officials—and of the abuse of community members in Washoe County, Nevada, where my brother was murdered by Reno police in the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. He was hog-tied for over 40 minutes during a mental health crisis and asphyxiated to death.

I was outside protesting at the Second Judicial this past summer when Chief Deputy District Attorney Amos Stege, came outside and I said, "Hey, there is Amos Stege. Do you have any comment on your malicious prosecution of Stewart Handte and Roger Hillygus." Mr. Stege then gave me the middle finger, which is all on video obtained through a public record request.

Chair Miller:
Is this under the purview of this Committee?

Annemarie Grant:
This is public comment. You are the Judiciary Committee, are you not? None of the many elected judges in Washoe County have no oath of office. I personally have had several people reach out to me regarding malicious false prosecution in Washoe County. They are not about justice and truth in the Washoe County District Attorney's Office. My brother's case and his murder never even got a review by the district attorney. It is time for you all as elected officials to start making some laws to hold the corrupt judges, the corrupt district attorneys like Christopher Hicks, Jennifer Noble, and Amos Stege—

Chair Miller:
We are absolutely fine with hearing testimony, and we are absolutely willing, ready, and able to address corruption, but for the protection of everyone who works—regardless of which job or profession that people are in—naming names with accusations that may or may not be unfounded is not appropriate or safe for individuals. It is absolutely okay to make comments about situations, but when we start naming names, it becomes very challenging. Everyone is allowed to make any public comment they want. Believe it or not, we have very thick skin, including those sitting here who work in this service. The request and requirements are always that we are respectful and that we are not harassing or accusatory. Naming names for things that may or may not be well-founded is a challenge. I will take the next caller.

Christine Middleton, Private Citizen:
I do agree with the last couple of commenters, Annemarie and Stewart. Something needs to be done. The only thing I do not agree with Annemarie on is, there already are laws in place to handle judges and entities that work outside their duties and their authority, which seems to be happening. My father is missing. He was put in what you would call a guardianship. However, you are not allowed to move people around without keeping it on a docket. You also have to have due process. They have not given us these little things.

The whole thing is fraud, human trafficking, elder abuse, aggravated, and false imprisonment. They have taken all his property, which is what the whole thing was about. The laws are there, so I do not understand why, when we come to you and have a complaint to look into a situation—because guardians commit crimes every day in this country, and judges commit crimes every single day in this country. The reason that it keeps going on is because the elected and appointed people are supposed to do something, look into it. There has to be a place for us to go. I have been ignored by the police department, the sheriff, and every agency. I have gotten statewide investigations and I was validated; all my claims are substantiated. It is really hard to get these investigations, and the only place we seem to have is federal court to sue the counties and the people in charge. We put everybody on notice; we tell you ahead of time.

The *U.S. Constitution* protects all of our rights; it does not give us our rights. You cannot take our rights from us. We have the freedom of speech, and it is not to be censored. We can name names, places, dates, and times. There is no one with the authority to tell me what to say or what I cannot say, unless I am threatening somebody. I can understand that, but you cannot tell us how to comment.

Roger Hillygus, Private Citizen:
I would like to comment on what is going on with the Committee and the Legislature regarding the conviction rate. That is what we have to look at. Why is it so high for the district attorneys? That is troubling and problematic. It is in the high nineties—that is why things take so long to go to trial. There are no grand juries—which is a violation of the *U.S. Constitution*—there are no probable cause hearings signed by a magistrate, and there are false arrests made by law enforcement; these are Fourth Amendment constitutional violations. The district attorney overcharges and stacks charges on people. There are no proper trials, which is a violation of due process and speedy trials. I heard that it is taking up to five years to take somebody through a trial. There are anonymous juries, which are only supposed to be used for the extreme murderers, MS-13; I mean these people are mafioso types.

The problem is the Legislature needs to increase the representation of the people. You do not need to get more judges; you need to get more training and you need to increase the number of representatives for the people. If the population is growing, the number of representatives is not. There is the problem right there. You need to train law enforcement to make proper arrests because they are violating people's rights in these arrests, and then you move on to the prosecutors and the district attorneys that are making malicious prosecutions. I guarantee you if you look into a lot of these prosecutions, there are malicious prosecutions and false arrests. Start with nipping some of that in the bud and you will not have to hire 18 judges. There are too many prosecutions, and the percentage is way too high.

Chair Miller:
Sir, you are over your time. I am going to ask that you wrap up your comments.

Roger Hillygus:
What I am talking about is going to cost the state and the counties massive amounts of money until this Legislature starts making statutes that are going to protect the people and stop the malicious prosecution and false arrests. It is going to cost this state and these counties massive in civil rights complaints, human rights, and violations for false arrest.

Hayden Flores, Private Citizen:
I am calling in on behalf of my father, Jose Flores. I am calling to ask for your Committee to do a corruption probe or look into the Washoe County Sheriff's Department nondisclosure agreements, specifically with how they handle different types of accusations. Unfortunately, my father was a victim of a false accusation, and he is incarcerated for life. What I am hearing here is unfortunately all too common. I really hope that you listen to us and take the time to look into what is going on, specifically in Washoe County.

[Exhibit J was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Chair Miller:
Are there any other callers? [There was no one.]

Thank you, members, and everyone else, for a very successful morning. I will adjourn this meeting [at 10:15 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Nicholas Fischer
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	John McCormick, Assistant Court Administrator, Nevada Supreme Court	PowerPoint presentation titled "Overview of Nevada's Judiciary"
	D	Chief Judge Lynne K. Jones, Presented by Judge Drakulich Judge Kathleen Drakulich, Second Judicial District Court	PowerPoint presentation titled "Second Judicial Court Overview 2025"
	E	Jerry A. Wiese II, Chief District Judge, Eighth Judicial District Court	PowerPoint presentation titled "Eighth Judicial District Court Overview 2025"
A.B. 66	F	Andres Moses, Assistant Court Administrator, Eighth Judicial District Court	Document Titled "2024 Update to 2005 Weighted Caseload Study for Eighth Judicial District Court"
A.B. 66	G	Andres Moses, Assistant Court Administrator, Eighth Judicial District Court	Document Titled "Access to Justice – The Need for Additional Judges"
A.B. 66	H	Submitted by Andres Moses, Eighth Judicial District Court	Document Titled "Judicial Workload Assessment Report for Eighth Judicial Court dated August 2005"
A.B. 66	I	Matthew Skarlatos, Private Citizen	Email in opposition
	J	Letty Lanzerio, Private Citizen	Document regarding complaints made to the Judiciary Committee