

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Stewart  
Vice Chairman Sader  
Mr. Thompson  
Ms. Foley  
Mr. Beyer  
Mr. Price  
Mr. Chaney  
Mr. Malone  
Mrs. Cafferata  
Ms. Ham  
Mr. Banner

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

GUESTS PRESENT: Robert E. Heaney, NV Trial Lawyers Association  
Roger Detweiler, State Bar of Nevada  
Kent Robinson, State Bar of Nevada/NV Trial  
Lawyers Association  
Bob Shriver, NV Trial Lawyers Association  
Jim Joyce, NV District Judges' Association

Chairman Stewart called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m. and asked for testimony on SB 79 first.

SB 79: Amends act adding two judges to second judicial district.

Mr. Kent Robinson, appearing on behalf of the Board of Governors of the State Bar Association and also representing the NV Trial Lawyers Association, testified in favor of this bill.

Mr. Robinson said the current situation regarding judges in Washoe County is desperate, and there is an extreme need for two additional judges. He then outlined the workload of those judges now serving in Washoe County, stressing the problems this creates for both the court system and for the civil litigants, who must take second place to the criminal cases. He urged the Committee to pass this bill as quickly as possible, in order to help all those involved as well as to further advance the administration of justice.

In reply to Mr. Sader, Mr. Robinson explained that this bill is the result of a bill which was passed by the 1979 Legislature, and which gave Washoe County two additional judges. This bill, however, required the addition of the judges only upon the expiration of a term or upon a vacancy. As neither of these has occurred since 1979, and as there is no indication either of these will occur in the near future, the 1979 legislation is, in actuality, ineffectual. He added that since the decision to add these two judges was made, there has

been over a 50% increase in the number of cases filed in Washoe County; thus the current situation is twice as bad as that in 1979.

Mr. Robinson said there are already two additional courtrooms available to accommodate the new judges; these rooms are equipped with jury boxes and all the necessary facilities and are currently being used by Justices of the Peace. New accommodations would be provided for the Justices.

In reply to Ms. Ham it was stated that the county has already budgeted for these two judges, since the county expected to get them back in 1979.

Mr. Sader noted that the bill would also have to go before the Ways and Means Committee for a budget hearing, since although the support for the judges comes out of the county's budget, the judge's salary comes out of the state budget.

Mr. Robinson also noted that the County Commissioners support the passage of SB 79.

Next to testify on this bill was Mr. Bob Heaney, of the Nevada Trial Lawyers Association. He noted he wished to go on record as supporting Mr. Robinson's remarks.

Mr. Heaney said that in 1978 there were 8,775 total cases filed in Washoe County; in 1980 there were 13,435 cases filed in Washoe County. In that two year period, there was a 53% increase in the number of cases; i.e., since the 1979 Legislature agreed there was need for two additional judges there has been a 53% increase in the caseload in that county.

Mr. Heaney then reiterated what Mr. Robinson said concerning civil cases being "bumped" by criminal cases, explaining there often occurs a two year delay in getting a trial date. He said this is not efficient administration of the system of justice, especially since, as a result of such a time lag, witnesses sometimes disappear, memories fade, etc, making for a difficult trial.

He further noted that through 1 April 1981, there is already a total case filing in Washoe County of 1,278 compared to 1,072 for the same period last year. He said that since it is likely the number of cases filed will pick up as the year progresses, he felt the increase would eventually reach the 50% level as it did last year. He went on to note that it is his feeling that the two judges currently being requested will not be sufficient, and that in the near future another request for additional judges will be forthcoming. However, at present, the request is only for those two judges who were allocated to Washoe County in 1979 but never appointed.

Mr. Heaney continued by pointing out that even if this bill is passed and approved immediately, it will take several months for the machinery to be carried out in order to actually get these judges on the bench. This is because they must go through the appointment system, the selection and nomination system, etc. Thus, early passage of this bill is highly advisable.

An additional factor involved in SB 79, according to Mr. Heaney, is the length of time it takes for a judge to issue a decision. He said this could sometimes be as long as a year and if there were more judges on the bench, each judge would have more time for such things as issuing decisions, thus speeding up this process.

Another consideration is the physical toll on the judges because of the extra workload. This is something which should not be overlooked by the Legislature. This can also affect the morale of the judges, and possibly their decision-making processes.

He ended his testimony by urging the Committee to pass this bill as soon as possible.

Mr. Beyer noted that in the first quarter of 1981 only about 1,200 cases were filed, whereas in all of 1980 circa 13,000 cases were filed; if the first quarter of 1981 is multiplied by four, this is a decrease over the cases filed in 1980, not an increase. Mr. Heaney was not certain why this discrepancy existed, but noted that a) there is usually an increase in the monthly number of cases filed as the year progresses, and b) his figures for 1981 may only indicate the number of civil cases filed whereas the 1980 figures include criminal as well as civil cases.

Mrs. Cafferata moved DO PASS SB 79, seconded by Ms. Foley and passed unanimously, with Mr. Banner, Mr. Price and Mr. Thompson absent at the time of the vote.

Chairman Stewart then noted that this bill would have to be rereferred to the Ways and Means Committee after it is reported out of the Judiciary Committee.

SB 118: Prohibits use of list of registered voters for selection of jurors and increases fees for jurors.

Senator Mel Close testified on this bill. He explained that Section 1 eliminates a problem found in Carson City and in most small counties: they could only select their potential jurors once a year, and these would have to suffice until the next annual selection date. This bill would allow these counties the same power as Clark and Washoe Counties currently have; i.e., to select potential jurors as required. The reason these smaller counties could select jurors only once a year is because they did not have a jury commissioner.

1488

Section 2 of this bill increases the amount of money paid to a juror. The method for doing this as cited in the original bill would have proven to be very costly. In this version, if a juror serves more than 5 days, after the fifth day the entitlement becomes \$30 per day. Senator Close noted that most jury trials last, on an average, 2½ days; however, there are those extraordinary trials that last several weeks, and \$30 a day, while not full compensation, was felt to be more fair than the \$15 per day which is currently paid. He added that the cost of this change is minimal.

Mr. Sader noted that these fees, in civil cases, are paid by the litigants, thus further reducing the fiscal impact on the counties.

It was explained that the fiscal note attached to the bill is based upon the original version, and is not in the least applicable to the second reprint. It was again reiterated that the fiscal impact of this latter version is minimal.

In reply to Ms. Ham it was explained that Clark County has found the Motor Vehicle Department's drivers license list is more reliable than the voters list--there is a 46% rejection rate using the voters list (letters returned for incorrect address, etc.), but using the DMV list the rejection rate is only 25%. It was suggested that this might be because people are reluctant to register to vote because it increases the possibility they will be chosen for jury duty.

Senator Close explained to Mrs. Cafferata that, if a juror is summoned but does not serve (is not chosen for the jury), he receives \$9; if he serves, he gets \$15 per day. The \$30 per day is only if the trial goes longer than 5 days, and only starts on the 6th day.

Senator Close said testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee indicated that people are no more willing to serve on a jury for \$25 per day than they are for \$15; that this is a public duty which one should do willingly; and that many people continue to be paid by their employers while serving jury duty anyway, and simply pocket the extra money. However, in some cases there would be hardship, especially after the first 5 days, and in those cases the \$30 would be much more useful than \$15.

It was pointed out to Mr. Beyer that this bill already contains a clause preventing an employer from firing an employee for having been absent due to jury duty, and that it was this wording which was used by the Assembly Judiciary Committee in amending the witness bill.

Mr. Sader was told that for some reason the summaries are never changed after the original bill is printed and that the summary 489

to SB 118 is incorrect: this bill no longer prohibits the use of the list of registered voters for the selection of jurors, this is at the discretion of the counties.

Mr. Malone moved DO PASS SB 118, seconded by Mr. Sader and passed unanimously, with Mr. Banner, Mr. Price and Mr. Thompson absent at the time of the vote.

SB 185: Requires notaries public to maintain record of official acts.

Senator Close also testified on this bill, noting that its primary significance is that the notary must give the bond to the clerk in the county where he resides. He explained that under current law, the notary can give this bond to any clerk in any county in this state; this causes problems in verifying that the bond has actually been given. SB 185 simply says that if you reside in such and such a county, then your bond must be given in that same county, although the notary powers are statewide.

Another change is the removal of language dealing with small county notaries and large county notaries, making the fees identical statewide.

It was noted that in this case, also, the summary no longer matches the bill.

Chairman Stewart noted that Secretary of State Swackhamer, who originally requested this bill, has asked for further amendments to the current language: delete "in which the notary resides" and replace it with "in which he intends to enter upon his notarial duties". ((Section 1, subsection 1(c)))

Senator Close pointed out that this adds to rather than simplifies the problem because the notary's stamp lists where that person resides, whereas if the person resides in one county but intends to start their duties in another county, then again tracing of the bond would be difficult.

Chairman Stewart replied that Mr. Swackhamer felt that when documents are taken out of the state, other jurisdictions assume that if it has the place where the notary resides, he can only execute notary documents in that county. He went on to say he was not certain Mr. Swackhamer's suggestion was an improvement over the current wording. Senator Close pointed out that it states in the bill itself that the notary powers are statewide.

Chairman Stewart then said that Mr. Swackhamer also suggests the Committee amend NRS 240.040, which has to do with the notary's rubber stamp, and add the clause that this rubber stamp is of the State of Nevada, the date the notary's commission expires, and also the county wherein the notary's bond is filed. Senator Close then suggested the bill require

the bond be posted in the same county indicated on the notarial seal. This necessitates, however, that if the notary moves he must also move his bond, since the notarial seal indicates where the notary resides.

Mr. Stewart suggested the stamp simply indicate where the bond is filed. Senator Close said he had no preference in the matter, as long as the bond and the stamp correspond.

Mr. Beyer suggested that, since the powers can be exercised throughout the state, the bond be filed with the Secretary of State.

Chairman Stewart suggested the Committee do pass the bill, and then he would discuss with the bill drafter the suggested language of Mr. Swackhamer to see if he thinks it appropriate.

Senator Close suggested changing subsection 1(c) in section one to read "...to be approved and filed with the clerk of the county in which the notary resides." He would then delete subsection 2 of this section. When it was pointed out that this eliminated the section dealing with the oath of office, Senator Close said he just felt the bond and the filing should take place in the same county.

Ms. Foley moved DO PASS SB 185, seconded by Mrs. Cafferata and passed unanimously, with Mr. Banner, Mr. Price and Mr. Thompson absent at the time of the vote.

SB 190: Alters population classification relating to impaneling grand juries.

Senator Close explained that the original law did not provide for there being only one judge in an area containing a population of over 15,000. This bill simply increases the population figure for the selection of grand jurors by one district judge from 15,000 to 30,000 in order to accommodate the growth of the state.

In reply to a question from Ms. Ham, Mr. Stewart explained that this bill would affect Elko and Douglas Counties, which have 15,000 or more population, but only one judge. It was further noted that Carson City has over 30,000 population.

Mr. Beyer asked why a cut-off number was necessary in the first place. Senator Close said this is because there are two methods for selecting grand jurors: 1) the district court judge himself selects grand jurors, and 2) a group of prospective jurors is chosen, and each district court judge in order selects one grand juror. Mr. Beyer noted that if a county only has one district judge, then it doesn't matter what the population of the county is. Thus, the process used should depend upon the number of judges in a county, rather than on the population.

1191

Senator Close said this method could create problems, because many statutes are based upon the 15,000 and/or 30,000 population figures; thus, several different laws would have to be amended in order to eliminate the use of these population figures as categories. He went on to explain that it is unconstitutional to pass special legislation for one specific county or another; however, by basing certain statutes upon population, this technicality can be circumvented, thus allowing the Legislature to deal with each area as appropriate.

Mr. Sader moved DO PASS SB 190, seconded by Mr. Beyer and passed unanimously, with Mr. Banner, Mr. Price and Mr. Thompson absent at the time of the vote.

SB 225: Specifies number of jurors in civil actions.

Senator Close explained that this bill simply provides that a jury can consist of less than eight people--i.e., down to four--if the parties consent, in a civil action. The current minimum is eight people.

Senator Close told the Committee members that, if both parties agree, then there can be a four man jury rather than eight or twelve; this is not compulsory. He pointed out that the reason many people opt for the smaller jury is because it is less expensive, since the jurors are paid by the litigants. He further said that in an uncomplicated case, four people can usually decide just as well as twelve. Additionally, this saves the county money, since not as many prospective jurors must be called in; the litigants do not begin paying the jurors until they are actually selected, and the county must pay them \$9 for each day they are in until dismissed or selected. Thus, this is a money-saving proposition all around.

Mr. Sader moved DO PASS SB 225, seconded by Mr. Beyer and passed unanimously, with Mr. Banner, Mr. Price and Mr. Thompson absent at the time of the vote.

SB 250: Repeals provision regarding change of judge.

Senator Mel Close testified on this bill. He explained that 2 years ago the Legislature passed a new method for disqualifying and getting a new judge at a trial. The Supreme Court ruled this method to be unconstitutional. In addition, the Court stated that the Legislators would not intentionally pass a law that both was unconstitutional and replaced and repealed a law that was constitutional. The Court therefore struck down the new law and reinstated the one which had been repealed.

Senator Close went on to explain that this bill is an attempt to conform the statutes to the Supreme Court decision. Thus, the new law (NRS 1.240), which was passed 2 years ago and which was declared unconstitutional by the Court, must now be

officially repealed since it cannot be used. He further noted that by repealing NRS 1.240 (which apparently replaced and repealed the original disqualification law), the original disqualification law which was reinstated by the Supreme Court is reaffirmed as the current valid law on this subject; in other words, the law replacing the original law has been repealed, hence, the original law returns.

Basically, the result is that there are 2 ways to disqualify one judge and get a new one:

1. Prove bias on the part of the judge. This hearing is presided over by the accused judge himself, and seldom results in the removal of the judge. It is the method contained in SB 250.
2. Simply request a new judge. This is called a preemptory challenge and can only be invoked once. The request must be granted. Under this method it is forbidden to allege bias or prejudice on the part of the judge.

It was further noted that both these methods are recognized in the Supreme Court ruling on this matter, but only the first one is covered by statute.

Senator Close also noted that this bill extends the time frame from 3 to 10 days for filing an affidavit to disqualify a judge in cases where a new judge has already been assigned.

Mrs. Cafferata moved DO PASS SB 250, seconded by Mr. Malone, and passed unanimously, with Mr. Banner, Mr. Price and Mr. Thompson absent at the time of the vote.

SB 249: Permits admonishment of jury by officer of court other than judge.

Senator Close explained that under current law, whenever the jury leaves the courtroom, or the jury room, or retires for the day, the judge must always remind them that they are not to discuss this matter with anyone, nor read any newspaper articles about it, or watch TV, etc. This bill would allow those types of admonishments to be made by the bailiff, or some other officer of the court, rather than the judge. This prevents having the judge come down to the courthouse at all hours in order to accomplish this task; the bailiff is always present as long as the jury is in deliberation anyway.

Mr. Beyer moved DO PASS SB 249, seconded by Mr. Malone and passed unanimously, with Mr. Banner, Mr. Price and Mr. Thompson absent at the time of the vote.



SB 321: Clarifies certain provisions of law relating to estates of decedents.

Mrs. Cafferata asked if the Committee could consider SB 321. She said that following discussions with several of the people concerned with this bill, the following amendment has been drafted: delete, from line 4, page 1, "upon the expiration of 10 days".

Chairman Stewart explained that the result of this change is it does put a definite time period within which a person has to file an appeal. It was further explained that this change is necessary because at present a suit can be brought against an estate several years after it has been settled. This is the only change to the bill.

Mrs. Cafferata moved AMEND AS NOTED ABOVE AND DO PASS SB 321, seconded by Mr. Stewart and passed unanimously, with Mr. Banner, Mr. Price and Mr. Thompson absent at the time of the vote.

AB 346: Authorizes state and local agencies to obtain background checks of Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Ms. Foley said that, while she did not have the actual amendment with her, she would like to explain to the Committee what the subcommittee has decided to do with this bill. Basically, the change simply involves changing lines 4 and 5 to say that the cited political entities may "request and receive from the Federal Bureau of Investigation information..." It was explained that it was felt this strengthened the bill by indicating that not only can these entities request the information, they are also authorized to receive it.

Since Ms. Foley did not have the exact wording in front of her, the Committee decided to postpone taking a vote on this matter.

AJR 24: Proposes to amend Nevada constitution to allow raffles for charity.

Mr. Sader said he has been working very closely with the Gaming Industry in an attempt to come up with an amendment to this resolution which would be acceptable to them, because otherwise the industry will actively lobby against it. He said they have agreed in principle, and he is currently awaiting precise language from them. He said basically the agreement is that the bill will permit raffles to be conducted only by persons engaged in charitable or non-profit activities, on their own behalf, if the proceeds are used within the state of Nevada for charitable or non-profit purposes. Additionally, it notes that neither the state nor any political subdivision shall run a lottery. Finally, the industry would like to see an additional sentence indicating that any lottery may have as proceeds only merchandise or an amount of money equal to (some figure based upon gaming revenues).

1494

Mr. Sader said this last section is the one for which he is awaiting language from the industry. The reason for this requested change is that the industry does not want to have a situation where, for example, the YMCA of Reno can run a year-round lottery. What the industry is trying to avoid is money lotteries.

Mr. Sader further said the industry wanted to insert the fixed sum of \$500 in this section, but he did not feel it right to put dollar amounts into the constitution when inflation, etc. would require constant changing of that amount via a constitutional amendment. However, if the industry wants to tie it in some way to their profits, thus permitting fluctuation without requiring a constitutional amendment, then Mr. Sader felt this to be acceptable.

Ms. Foley said one of the aspects of the amendment which she liked was that it allows charitable organizations, like the Lions Club, to raise funds for another charitable organization.

In reply to Ms. Foley, Mr. Sader explained that the gaming industry would like to tie this bill into their net proceeds, not gross.

It was stressed that this amendment to the constitution would allow any club--if it is a non-profit organization--churches, political clubs, etc. to hold raffles for their own benefit.

A question was raised as to whether or not it is advisable to include non-profit organizations in this resolution, but it was pointed out that if not included, then such groups as Little League teams could not sell their raffle tickets to raise money for uniforms, since they are not a charitable organization. It was added that exclusion of non-profit groups and/or clubs would involve a huge number of organizations.

Mrs. Cafferata wondered why money prizes couldn't be eliminated altogether. Mr. Sader replied this could be done, but by simply adding one sentence they could be retained.

Several Committee members commented that they would not agree to placing a dollar amount in the constitution.

It was further noted that there is no way of hurrying this along nor of permitting such raffles prior to the formal amendment being added to the constitution.

Mr. Stewart stressed that the Gaming Industry must be encouraged to permit the setting of dollar limits by statute, rather than by putting them in the constitution. Mr. Sader again pointed out that the industry is afraid that this would result, in the future, in the Legislature removing such limitations. That is why they want it in the constitution itself, and that is why Mr. Sader feels tying it into the net proceeds of the industry,

and thus into a fluctuating amount, to be the best compromise. He asked for the Committee's desires on this.

In the ensuing discussion it was determined that the amendment cited by Mr. Sader is the best possible compromise.

AB 52: Provides punishment for participation in a criminal syndicate.

Mr. Stewart noted that the Senate also has a bill on this matter, and that following discussions with several Senators, it was agreed to let the Senate carry this one. Thus, the Senate can pass their bill and send it over to the Assembly. The Committee decided not to indefinitely postpone AB 52 until they had seen the Senate's bill, however.

As there was no further business Chairman Stewart adjourned the meeting at 9:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Pamela B. Sleeper*

Pamela B. Sleeper  
Assembly Attache

61st NEVADA LEGISLATURE  
ASSEMBLY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
LEGISLATION ACTION

DATE: Wednesday, 22 April 1981

SUBJECT: SB 79: Amends act adding two judges to second judicial district.

MOTION:

DO PASS XX AMEND \_\_\_ INDEFINITELY POSTPONE \_\_\_  
RECONSIDER \_\_\_

MOVED BY: MRS. CAFFERATA SECONDED BY: MS. FOLEY

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

	MOTION		AMEND		AMEND	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Thompson	ABSENT	___	___	___	___	___
Foley	X	___	___	___	___	___
Beyer	X	___	___	___	___	___
Price	ABSENT	___	___	___	___	___
Sader	X	___	___	___	___	___
Stewart	X	___	___	___	___	___
Chaney	X	___	___	___	___	___
Malone	X	___	___	___	___	___
Cafferata	X	___	___	___	___	___
Ham	X	___	___	___	___	___
Banner	ABSENT	___	___	___	___	___
TALLY:	8	0	___	___	___	___

ORIGINAL MOTION: Passed XX Defeated \_\_\_\_\_ Withdrawn \_\_\_\_\_  
 AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_ AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_  
 AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_ AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_

ATTACHED TO MINUTES OF Assembly Judiciary Committee  
Wednesday, 22 April 1981

61st NEVADA LEGISLATURE  
ASSEMBLY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
LEGISLATION ACTION

DATE: Wednesday, 22 April 1981

SUBJECT: SB 118: Prohibits use of list of registered voters for selection of jurors and increases fees for jurors.

MOTION:

DO PASS XX AMEND \_\_\_\_\_ INDEFINITELY POSTPONE \_\_\_\_\_  
RECONSIDER \_\_\_\_\_

MOVED BY: MR. MALONE SECONDED BY: MR. SADER

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

VOTE:	MOTION		AMEND		AMEND	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Thompson	ABSENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Foley	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Beyer	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Price	ABSENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sader	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Stewart	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Chaney	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Malone	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Cafferata	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ham	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Banner	ABSENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
TALLY:	8	0	_____	_____	_____	_____

ORIGINAL MOTION: Passed XX Defeated \_\_\_\_\_ Withdrawn \_\_\_\_\_  
 AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_ AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_  
 AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_ AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_

ATTACHED TO MINUTES OF Assembly Judiciary Committee  
Wednesday, 22 April 1981

61st NEVADA LEGISLATURE  
ASSEMBLY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
LEGISLATION ACTION

DATE: Wednesday, 22 April 1981  
SUBJECT: SB 185: Requires notaries public to maintain record of official acts.

MOTION:  
DO PASS XX AMEND \_\_\_\_ INDEFINITELY POSTPONE \_\_\_\_  
RECONSIDER \_\_\_\_  
MOVED BY: MS. FOLEY SECONDED BY: MRS. CAFFERATA

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

VOTE:	MOTION		AMEND		AMEND	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Thompson	<u>ABSENT</u>	____	____	____	____	____
Foley	<u>X</u>	____	____	____	____	____
Beyer	<u>X</u>	____	____	____	____	____
Price	<u>ABSENT</u>	____	____	____	____	____
Sader	<u>X</u>	____	____	____	____	____
Stewart	<u>X</u>	____	____	____	____	____
Chaney	<u>X</u>	____	____	____	____	____
Malone	<u>X</u>	____	____	____	____	____
Cafferata	<u>X</u>	____	____	____	____	____
Ham	<u>X</u>	____	____	____	____	____
Banner	<u>ABSENT</u>	____	____	____	____	____
TALLY:	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	____	____	____	____

ORIGINAL MOTION: Passed XX Defeated \_\_\_\_ Withdrawn \_\_\_\_  
AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_ AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_  
AMENDED & PASSED. \_\_\_\_\_ AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_

ATTACHED TO MINUTES OF Assembly Judiciary Committee  
Wednesday, 22 April 1981

61st NEVADA LEGISLATURE  
ASSEMBLY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
LEGISLATION ACTION

DATE: Wednesday, 22 April 1981  
SUBJECT: SB 190: Alters population classification relating  
to impaneling grand juries.

MOTION:  
DO PASS XX AMEND  INDEFINITELY POSTPONE   
RECONSIDER   
MOVED BY: MR. SADER      SECONDED BY: MR. BEYER

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

	MOTION		AMEND		AMEND	
VOTE:	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
Thompson	<u>ABSENT</u>		<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>
Foley	<u>X</u>		<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>
Beyer	<u>X</u>		<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>
Price	<u>ABSENT</u>		<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>
Sader	<u>X</u>		<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>
Stewart	<u>X</u>		<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>
Chaney	<u>X</u>		<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>
Malone	<u>X</u>		<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>
Cafferata	<u>X</u>		<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>
Ham	<u>X</u>		<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>
Banner	<u>ABSENT</u>		<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>
TALLY:	<u>  8  </u>	<u>  0  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>	<u>  </u>

ORIGINAL MOTION:      Passed XX      Defeated       Withdrawn   
AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_      AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_  
AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_      AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_

ATTACHED TO MINUTES OF Assembly Judiciary Committee  
Wednesday, 22 April 1981

61st NEVADA LEGISLATURE  
ASSEMBLY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
LEGISLATION ACTION

DATE: Wednesday, 22 April 1981  
SUBJECT: SB 225: Specifies number of jurors in civil actions.

---

MOTION:  
DO PASS XX AMEND \_\_\_\_\_ INDEFINITELY POSTPONE \_\_\_\_\_  
RECONSIDER \_\_\_\_\_  
MOVED BY: MR. SADER SECONDED BY: MR. BEYER

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

---

VOTE:	MOTION		AMEND		AMEND	
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
Thompson	ABSENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Foley	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Beyer	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Price	ABSENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sader	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Stewart	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Chaney	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Malone	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Cafferata	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ham	X	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Banner	ABSENT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
TALLY:	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____

---

ORIGINAL MOTION: Passed XX Defeated \_\_\_\_\_ Withdrawn \_\_\_\_\_  
AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_ AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_  
AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_ AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_

---

ATTACHED TO MINUTES OF Assembly Judiciary Committee  
Wednesday, 22 April 1981



61st NEVADA LEGISLATURE  
ASSEMBLY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
LEGISLATION ACTION

DATE: Wednesday, 22 April 1981  
SUBJECT: SB 250: Repeals provision regarding change of judge.

MOTION:

DO PASS XX AMEND      INDEFINITELY POSTPONE       
RECONSIDER     

MOVED BY: MRS. CAFFERATA      SECONDED BY: MR. MALONE

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY:                                       SECONDED BY:                                 

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY:                                       SECONDED BY:                                 

VOTE:	MOTION		AMEND		AMEND	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Thompson	<u>ABSENT</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>
Foley	<u>X</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>
Beyer	<u>X</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>
Price	<u>ABSENT</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>
Sader	<u>X</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>
Stewart	<u>X</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>
Chaney	<u>X</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>
Malone	<u>X</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>
Cafferata	<u>X</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>
Ham	<u>X</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>
Banner	<u>ABSENT</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>
TALLY:	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>

ORIGINAL MOTION:      Passed XX      Defeated           Withdrawn       
AMENDED & PASSED                                       AMENDED & DEFEATED                                   
AMENDED & PASSED                                       AMENDED & DEFEATED                                 

ATTACHED TO MINUTES OF Assembly Judiciary Committee  
Wednesday, 22 April 1981

61st NEVADA LEGISLATURE  
ASSEMBLY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
LEGISLATION ACTION

DATE: Wednesday, 22 April 1981  
 SUBJECT: SB 249: Permits admonishment of jury by officer  
 of court other than judge.

MOTION:

DO PASS XX AMEND \_\_\_\_\_ INDEFINITELY POSTPONE \_\_\_\_\_  
 RECONSIDER \_\_\_\_\_

MOVED BY: MR. BEYER SECONDED BY: MR. MALONE

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

VOTE:	MOTION		AMEND		AMEND	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Thompson	<u>ABSENT</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Foley	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Beyer	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Price	<u>ABSENT</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sader	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Stewart	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Chaney	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Malone	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Cafferata	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ham	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Banner	<u>ABSENT</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
TALLY:	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____

ORIGINAL MOTION: Passed XX Defeated \_\_\_\_\_ Withdrawn \_\_\_\_\_  
 AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_ AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_  
 AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_ AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_

ATTACHED TO MINUTES OF Assembly Judiciary Committee  
 Wednesday, 22 April 1981

61st NEVADA LEGISLATURE  
 ASSEMBLY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
LEGISLATION ACTION

DATE: Wednesday, 22 April 1981  
 SUBJECT: SB 321: Clarifies certain provisions of law  
 relating to estates of decedents.

MOTION:

DO PASS \_\_\_\_\_ AMEND \_\_\_\_\_ INDEFINITELY POSTPONE \_\_\_\_\_  
 RECONSIDER \_\_\_\_\_ AMEND AND DO PASS XX

MOVED BY: MRS. CAFFERATA      SECONDED BY: MR. STEWART

AMENDMENT:

Page 1, lines 4-5: Delete "upon the expiration of  
 10 days".

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_      SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

AMENDMENT:

MOVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_      SECONDED BY: \_\_\_\_\_

VOTE:	MOTION		AMEND		AMEND	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Thompson	<u>ABSENT</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Foley	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Beyer	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Price	<u>ABSENT</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sader	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Stewart	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Chaney	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Malone	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Cafferata	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ham	<u>X</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Banner	<u>ABSENT</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
TALLY:	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____

ORIGINAL MOTION:      Passed XX      Defeated \_\_\_\_\_      Withdrawn \_\_\_\_\_

AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_      AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_

AMENDED & PASSED \_\_\_\_\_      AMENDED & DEFEATED \_\_\_\_\_

ATTACHED TO MINUTES OF Assembly Judiciary Committee  
 Wednesday, 22 April 1981