

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

**Seventy-Fifth Session
April 9, 2009**

The Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chairman Bernie Anderson at 10:09 a.m. on Thursday, April 9, 2009, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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/75th2009/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Bernie Anderson, Chairman
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom, Vice Chair
Assemblyman John C. Carpenter
Assemblyman Ty Cobb
Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop
Assemblyman Don Gustavson
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblyman William C. Horne
Assemblyman Ruben J. Kihuen
Assemblyman Mark A. Manendo
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman Harry Mortenson
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall
Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer M. Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst
Nicolas Anthony, Committee Counsel
Katherine Malzahn-Bass, Committee Manager
Emilie Reafs, Committee Secretary
Steve Sisneros, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Captain P.K. O'Neill, Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department
of Public Safety

[Call to order. Roll call]

Chairman Anderson:

[Opening remarks.]

We looked at Assembly Bill 500 yesterday. The Legal Division has provided a mock-up.

Assembly Bill 500: Revises provisions relating to domestic relations.
(BDR 11-1156)

Nicolas Anthony, Committee Counsel:

The mock-up ([Exhibit C](#)) is defined as proposed amendment 4141 to A.B. 500 to help the Committee visualize the bill, as there were some questions yesterday.

Starting on page 2 of the mock-up, you will see that sections 4 through 10 of the bill are deleted by amendment. This would keep existing law, which is the third degree of consanguinity.

Page 5 of the mock-up was language requested by the Committee to clarify and remove the double negative in section 11, subsection 3 of the bill. We are not changing the substance; it just is reorganized a little bit.

Section 12 was asked to be deleted. Section 13, subsections 6 and 7 were asked to be deleted by the Committee. In what is the new subsection 7, you will see the deletion of "or statutory sexual seduction" as requested by Assemblyman Carpenter. Also, there is the change to "A court may issue an order of support for the child."

Assemblywoman Parnell:

I am much more comfortable with the bill. Section 12 particularly concerned me yesterday. I am also glad that the language was changed from "shall" to "may."

Chairman Anderson:

I would entertain a motion to amend and do pass with the amendments suggested in the mock-up.

Assemblyman Horne:

I have an additional proposed amendment dealing with the last page of the mock-up. We talked about child support in the phrasing "A court may issue an order of support...." In addition, if the court does issue such an order, there should be clarification that such an order does not give rise to the child having inheritance rights, nor does the parent then have visitation rights. It was expressed yesterday that this might be a risk.

Chairman Anderson:

That support payments do not give rise to either visitation rights or inheritance rights, unless established by court order?

Assemblyman Horne:

This section deals particularly with the court having the authority and discretion to order support.

Chairman Anderson:

Is that a problem, Mr. Anthony?

Nicolas Anthony:

No, that is fine, we can add that statement.

Assemblyman Cobb:

I was wondering why section 13, subsection 7, refers only to men.

Chairman Anderson:

I guess a woman could be convicted of sexual assault from which she becomes pregnant. Mr. Anthony, with the new gender-neutral language can we fit that in?

Nicolas Anthony:

We can research that issue. The rest of the statute refers to just an "unfit parent." So if it is true that a woman could be convicted of sexual assault, we can certainly amend the language to refer to either parent.

Assemblyman Hambrick:

While we have to worry about paternity issues with the father, I do not think we have to worry about that with the mother. So, we will have to work around that.

Nicolas Anthony:

We can take a look at it, and if it needs to be changed to reflect either parent as unfit, we can make that change.

Chairman Anderson:

Assemblyman Cobb, are you okay with leaving the language dilemma but voting today?

Assemblyman Cobb:

That is fine, as long as the Legal Division takes a look at it. I think it could be solved if it just read "conviction of the parent or putative father."

Chairman Anderson:

Good point. So again I would entertain a motion to amend and do pass with the amendments in the mock-up and the possibility of additional language clarifications as raised by Assemblyman Horne and Assemblyman Cobb.

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 500 AS STATED.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Let us take a look at Assembly Bill 320.

[Assembly Bill 320](#): Revises provisions relating to guardianships. (BDR 13-906)

Jennifer Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reviewed the work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).] Assembly Bill 320 makes various changes to the guardianship laws. The Committee has four issues to consider in the attached compromise amendment, submitted by Ernie Nielsen, who worked with the interested parties.

The first amendment is found in section 1, page 3 of the amendment and provides the court with the discretion to create assessment forms in guardianship cases, rather than any kind of mandatory creation of forms.

The second amendment establishes a process for when a proposed ward cannot appear in court in person or by videoconference to ensure that the person is asked whether he wants counsel and that the court is notified of the response. Sections 2 and 3 contain this procedure for both the initial hearing and for subsequent hearings.

The third amendment is on page 7. It removes the provisions for an emergency transfer and, instead, has the provisions apply to transferring the ward to a long-term residential-care secured unit. It further specifies which health care professionals may authorize such transfers.

The fourth amendment is on pages 7 and 8 and provides for a reporting procedure when a ward is transferred to a long-term residential-care secured unit.

Chairman Anderson:

All of these were amendments that were suggested at the time of the hearing.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 320.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I want to thank the Subcommittee for dealing with common-interest communities. I would like to review the mock-up of Assembly Bill 350.

Assembly Bill 350: Makes various changes relating to common-interest communities. (BDR 10-620)

One of the suggestions was on page 22, line 45 of the mock-up about the removal of punitive damages from the bill [page 25 of [Exhibit E](#)].

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Yes, I thought that was a valid point. Since insurance cannot be purchased for punitive damages, and because, for the most part, these are volunteer boards, I think it is inappropriate at this time to have a director subject to punitive damages.

Chairman Anderson:

There were also issues brought forth by Mr. Gordon, representing the Olympia Group. I would suggest that, if he wants, he can raise them again in the Senate. We will probably see this bill again in conference.

I would entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 350 with the amendments suggested in mock-up number 3895, which Legal carefully reviewed yesterday and the deletion of the provision for punitive damages.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 350 AS STATED.

ASSEMBLYMAN KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

We will not have to consider Assembly Bill 108. [The bill was incorporated into Assembly Bill 350.]

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Assembly Bill 204, Assembly Bill 207, Assembly Bill 251, Assembly Bill 311, and Assembly Bill 361 were all unanimously approved as amended by the Subcommittee.

Chairman Anderson:

Do they each have an amendment?

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Yes.

Chairman Anderson:

We will take up Assembly Bill 204. We were briefed on all of these yesterday.

Assembly Bill 204: Revises provisions relating to the priority of certain liens against units in common-interest communities. (BDR 10-920)

Nicolas Anthony, Committee Counsel:

Assembly Bill 204 has two amendments attached. One is to address a potential conflict with Fannie Mae lending provisions and the other is about collection policies [pages 48-49 of [Exhibit E](#)].

Chairman Anderson:

I will entertain an amend and do pass motion on the recommendation of the Subcommittee.

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 204.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Cobb:

I think that two years is an extraordinary amount of time to have a look-back, especially when we are trying to clear these houses out of inventory and drop as many barriers as possible to getting them into the hands of new owners. What concerned me about some of the testimony we heard on this bill was that some homeowners' associations said that they cannot extract any kind of dues, fines, fees, or assessments from banks; they cannot even get them to mow the lawns.

We heard testimony on a separate bill that the bank is in the same position as any other owner. There is a process to move against them to collect, so there does not need to be all the lawyers' fees and everything else that will be piled on. One of my constituents said he was trying to buy homes to reduce the inventory and get the economy going again, and he was handed an invoice for \$4,000 from a homeowners' association with \$16-a-month dues. So it was not the dues, it was the attorney's fees and everything else that was added on. I think six months should be enough.

Chairman Anderson:

Homeowners' associations have been dealing with the problem for some time, and they would like to abrogate it so that the expenses they have been carrying are passed to the new owner as part of closing.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

Another issue was that this bill was supposed to put a fire under the banks' feet because, right now, they just let the property go knowing that after six months they are no longer obligated for these fees. This will hopefully encourage the banks to get the properties up and running and try to sell them.

Assemblyman McArthur:

I do think 24 months is far too long, but I will vote yes to get this bill out of Committee. I reserve my right to change my vote later.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN COBB VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMAN McARTHUR RESERVED THE RIGHT TO CHANGE HIS VOTE ON THE FLOOR.)

Let us turn to Assembly Bill 207, Assemblyman Carpenter's bill. The recommendation from the subcommittee was an amend and do pass.

Assembly Bill 207: Makes various changes concerning common-interest communities. (BDR 10-694)

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 207.

ASSEMBLYMAN KIHUEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Let us turn to Assembly Bill 251. Again, the Subcommittee voted unanimously to recommend an amend and do pass to the full Committee.

Assembly Bill 251: Revises provisions relating to common-interest communities. (BDR 10-555)

Nicolas Anthony, Committee Counsel:

There is a mock-up prepared [page 52 of [Exhibit E](#)], which clarifies that if an election is held and there is a member running without opposition, then the board does not have to send out ballots. It can just elect the person.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 251.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Let us turn to Assembly Bill 311, Assemblyman Settlemeyer's bill.

Assembly Bill 311: Revises provisions governing the financial statements of common-interest communities. (BDR 10-389)

This also has an amend and do pass recommendation from the Subcommittee.

Nicolas Anthony, Committee Counsel:

In the mock-up prepared by the Legal Division in your work session binder from yesterday [page 57 of [Exhibit E](#)], is language that allows the financial review to be conducted in the year prior to which any study of the reserves is conducted. That amendment was proposed by the bill's sponsor, and the bill was unanimously recommended for an amend do pass by the Subcommittee.

Chairman Anderson:

We have seen additional discussions via email about this bill. I do not see any problems.

Assemblyman Segerblom:

This bill simplifies things for the smaller associations and saves them a great deal of money as far as the types of financial reviews they have to do.

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 311.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Finally, Assembly Bill 361.

Assembly Bill 361: Makes changes relating to the destruction or deterioration of foreclosed or vacant units in common-interest communities. (BDR 10-940)

Nicolas Anthony, Committee Counsel:

In the work session binder from yesterday, beside each change is an explanation on the mock-up [page 59 of [Exhibit E](#)]. Largely, these amendments were technical and made at the request of Mr. Michael Buckley, Chairman for the Commission of Common-Interest Communities and Condominium Hotels.

Chairman Anderson:

Assemblyman McArthur, have your questions been answered?

Assemblyman McArthur:

Yes, they are mostly technical or clarifying in nature and are all good.

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 361 AS PRESENTED IN THE MOCK-UP.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSTAVSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Anderson:

Again, my thanks to the Subcommittee.

Let us take a look at Assembly Bill 471.

Assembly Bill 471: Revises provisions relating to the award of deficiency judgments after a sale of real property. (BDR 3-1138)

Jennifer Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reviewed the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).] Assembly Bill 471 relates to deficiency judgments that are currently allowed under statute in cases of foreclosure. This bill would prohibit those deficiency judgments for homeowners.

The Committee has four amendments to consider. The first was proposed at the hearing by Assemblyman Conklin and deletes the provision requiring that the debtor did not occupy the property before securing the loan. This is at paragraph (c) of subsection 3, on page 2 of the bill. The primary sponsor believes this language is unnecessary.

The second amendment relates to the effective date of the bill. The Committee has two alternative choices and may only adopt one of the two. Amendment 2(a) was proposed by Assemblyman Conklin to have the bill apply only to loans secured after the October 1, 2009, effective date. Alternatively, amendment 2(b) was proposed by Vice Chairman Segerblom to have the provisions of the bill apply retroactively.

The third amendment was a suggestion by Assemblyman Carpenter to allow a debtor to cure a default from nonpayment at any time before foreclosure sale in order to retain the property. Alaska has such a provision that could be adopted in Nevada, and you will see the language in the attachment.

The fourth amendment was suggested by Assemblyman Cobb and would limit the prohibition on deficiency judgments only to cases concerning low-income residents. New Mexico has a similar provision, and that language is also attached for review.

Chairman Anderson:

The Chair is going to recommend that we adopt proposed amendments 1, 2(a), and 3.

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 471 AS STATED.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Let us look at Assemblyman Ohrenschall's bill, Assembly Bill 462 and the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).

Assembly Bill 462: Revises the provisions governing sureties. (BDR 14-838)

Chairman Anderson:

There was some question whether this bill was needed. There still seems to be some confusion as to the intent. The bill clarifies things so there is no ambiguity even if the judge who originally issued the surety is no longer serving.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

This bill would establish uniformity in all of the courts and require that all sureties are approved by the Commissioner of Insurance.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 462.

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Anderson:

Let us take up Assembly Bill 335.

Assembly Bill 335: Makes various changes relating to criminal gangs. (BDR 15-85)

Jennifer Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Reviewed the work session document ([Exhibit H](#)).] Assembly Bill 335 provides for an enhanced penalty for a person who commits misdemeanor or gross misdemeanor offenses to promote criminal gang activity. There are two amendments for the Committee to consider.

The first amendment is in section 1 of the bill and amends the number of previous convictions from one to three before the enhancement may apply.

The second amendment retains existing law regarding juvenile certifications. The bill proposed to add this enhanced gang penalty to the qualifications for a juvenile to be certified as an adult, however this amendment removes that provision and leaves the law as it currently exists.

Assemblywoman Parnell:

Everyone worked so hard on this bill from the beginning, and there is agreement on the two proposed amendments. I think there was special concern about the juvenile certification, and we have the other bill that will address it, so for the bill to go forward it was best to leave that section out. That is all of section 4. I felt strongly that we needed to tighten the language in section 1, referencing the three or more offenses, rather than just one prior offense.

Chairman Anderson:

The Chair will entertain a motion to amend and do pass with both amendments.

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 335 AS STATED.

ASSEMBLYMAN COBB SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Let us address Assembly Bill 64 and Assembly Bill 65.

Assembly Bill 64: Increases the number of judges in the Second and Eighth Judicial Districts. (BDR 1-371)

I am going to recommend that the Committee rerefer this bill without recommendation to Ways and Means ([Exhibit I](#)).

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER MOVED TO REREFER WITHOUT
RECOMMENDATION ASSEMBLY BILL 64 TO WAYS AND MEANS.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP
ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTE.)

Assembly Bill 65: Provides for the collection and disposition of additional court fees. (BDR 2-372)

I asked Assemblyman Segerblom to look at the issue, and you can see it in front of you ([Exhibit J](#)).

Assemblyman Segerblom:

We have added a couple of fees for legal aid when the complaint and answer are filed and we have eliminated some of the fees that were associated with certain motions. There were some questions about business courts. The Supreme Court confirmed that it is committed to providing extra resources for the business courts in Washoe and Clark Counties so they could have written, published opinions which could be used as precedent.

Chairman Anderson:

The Chair is going to suggest an amend, without recommendation, and rerefer to Ways and Means motion with proposed amendments by Assemblyman Segerblom.

ASSEMBLYMAN SEGERBLOM MOVED TO AMEND, WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION, AND REREFER ASSEMBLY BILL 65 TO WAYS AND MEANS.

ASSEMBLYMAN HORNE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN COBB, GUSTAVSON, HAMBRICK AND McARTHUR VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYWOMAN DONDERO LOOP ABSTAINED FROM THE VOTE.)

We will now turn to Assembly Bill 8.

Assembly Bill 8: Establishes the Statewide Central Registry for the Collection of Information Concerning the Abuse, Neglect, Exploitation or Isolation of Older Persons. (BDR 38-98)

Assemblywoman Parnell:

I would like to move to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 8.

Chairman Anderson:

There are five recommendations in the work session document ([Exhibit K](#)). Would you please review those Ms. Chisel?

Jennifer Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 8 establishes an elder abuse registry. Based on concerns raised at the hearing, the first four amendments were prepared by Sally Ramm with the Aging Services Division of the Department of Health and Human Services. She also prepared a memorandum discussing these issues. The fifth amendment was presented at the hearing by the Records and Technology Division of the Department of Public Safety.

The first amendment would require Aging Services to adopt regulations to provide an appeal process for individuals in the registry. Another process is to carry out the registry, and these regulations would be similar to those that have been adopted by the Division of Child and Family Services for the child abuse registry.

The second amendment incorporates the standard used in elder abuse investigations that there is "reasonable cause to believe" that the abuse has occurred.

The third amendment limits the scope of employers who may access the elder abuse registry to those who provide services to the elderly and removes the reference to children that was in the original bill.

The fourth amendment ensures the confidentiality of the victim.

The fifth amendment, proposed by Captain P.K. O'Neill, transfers responsibility for employment suitability determinations away from the central repository to the agencies that actually regulate those industries. In this case it would be the Office of Disability Services and the Health Division.

Chairman Anderson:

Obviously, amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 are agreed upon by the groups that are going to have the responsibility for carrying out this program. The recommendation by Captain O'Neill is based upon the concerns he raised that the original bill places an inappropriate level of responsibility on his agency.

I am going to recommend amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

Would the Division of Aging Services have to set up a new registry? How is this going to work?

Jennifer Chisel:

This bill would consolidate existing investigative reports already generated. It would put the information into an electronic database for employers who may be hiring in the elder-services industries. This would give them the ability to check on people looking to be hired.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

Maybe Captain O'Neill could explain it. I would like to know what is happening now, what would be different with this bill, and if the Division of Aging Services is going to have to create a new registry.

Chairman Anderson:

Could you explain what currently takes place when there are inquiries from elder care facilities about potential employees?

Captain P.K. O'Neill, Chief, Records and Technology Division, Department of Public Safety:

It is my understanding that yes, it would create a new registry that would be accessible by various individuals so they could see if potential employees were involved in prior elder-abuse crimes.

I am not actively involved in that part of A.B. 8. It was developed by a committee. I can say right now for licensing and criminal fingerprint background checks that we run on individuals for licensing, there are criteria set in statute that my staff use to make determinations as to whether the person is employable.

Our amendment transfers that responsibility to Aging Services and the Health Division because they regulate these areas and would be best at making the determinations. This would help them write better bills and make better determinations.

So, Assemblyman Carpenter, the answer is yes. There would be a registry established by Aging Services.

Chairman Anderson:

On the face of the bill, it does say that there is an effect on the state, so I would imagine it will be taken by Ways and Means. I would imagine this is what Assemblywoman McClain is anticipating.

Captain P.K. O'Neill:

In consultation with Aging Services, they are in favor of these amendments.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

During the hearing I think Ms. Lee Rowland of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) expressed some concerns about the word "belief." I notice that it is being amended to "a reasonable cause to believe." I will vote in the affirmative now, but I would like to reserve my right to change my vote on the Floor.

I would feel more comfortable if this registry were based on actual convictions.

Jennifer Chisel:

For your information, there is a memorandum attached from Sally Ramm from the Division of Aging Services that provides some explanation as to why the elder abuse registry is a little different from the child abuse registry. It also touches on some of the processes and procedures that go into the investigations. I know it is brand-new information, but it may help explain the purpose of the registry.

Assemblyman Gustavson:

A quick look at this memorandum at number 1, it says that the registry would violate due process....

Jennifer Chisel:

This memorandum is organized to address some of the concerns raised by the ACLU during the hearing. One of the concerns was that the registry would violate due process.

The response from Aging Services is beneath that heading. They would be required to adopt regulations to provide an appeals process for having one's name removed from the registry if there are issues about why it is on the list. Also, it would provide some other processes that the Division of Child and Family Services currently have. They have adopted regulations in the *Nevada Administrative Code*—and I have reviewed them—which provide an extensive process for determining which reports actually get into the registry, substantiated versus unsubstantiated. It establishes the appeals process and some other procedures that provide due process rights. These processes are in regulation now rather than in statute.

Assemblyman Gustavson:

I appreciate that, but I still have a concern about the fiscal note.

Assemblyman Horne:

Along the lines of Assemblyman Ohrenschall's and others' points, I too, still have some concerns about the bill.

Chairman Anderson:

There is a comfort level that has to be reached, so I will hold the bill over until tomorrow.

We are adjourned [at 11:28 a.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Emilie Reafs
Committee Secretary

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karyn Werner
Editing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Bernie Anderson, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Judiciary

Date: April 9, 2009

Time of Meeting: 10:09 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 500	C	Nicolas Anthony, Committee Counsel	Mock-up for A.B. 500
A.B. 320	D	Jennifer Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document and mock-up
	E	Nicolas Anthony, Committee Counsel	Subcommittee report on HOA bills
A.B. 471	F	Jennifer Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document
A.B. 462	G	Jennifer Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document
A.B. 335	H	Jennifer Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document
A.B. 64	I	Jennifer Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document
A.B. 65	J	Jennifer Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document
A.B. 8	K	Jennifer Chisel, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document