

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY**

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

The Senate Committee on Judiciary was called to order by Chair Melanie Scheible at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 26, 2023, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair  
Senator Dallas Harris, Vice Chair  
Senator James Ohrenschall  
Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop  
Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen  
Senator Ira Hansen  
Senator Lisa Krasner  
Senator Jeff Stone

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Shea Backus, Assembly District No. 37

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Patrick Guinan, Policy Analyst  
Karly O'Krent, Counsel  
Blain Jensen, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Patrick Cates, County Manager, Douglas County  
Vinson Guthreau, Nevada Association of Counties  
Mary Walker, Storey County; Douglas County; Lyon County  
Benjamin Orzeske, Chief Counsel, Uniform Law Commission  
Elyse Monroy-Marsala, Blockchains, Inc.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
April 26, 2023  
Page 2

Keith Rowley, Professor, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada,  
Las Vegas  
Tonja Brown, Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent  
Annemarie Grant, Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 68.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 68**: Revises provisions governing the assessment imposed on certain counties for the operation of a regional facility for the treatment and rehabilitation of children. (BDR 5-438)

PATRICK CATES (County Manager, Douglas County):

Assembly Bill 68 deals with funding formulas for counties to support a regional facility for the treatment and rehabilitation of children. This section of statute only applies to one facility in the State, China Spring Youth Camp, operated by Douglas County which serves all counties in the State except Clark County. It is a critical component of juvenile justice through continuum of care for youth who are sent there on court order. Other State facilities have similar programs, like Spring Mountain Youth Camp run by Clark County, and Summit View Youth Center, Caliente Youth Center and Nevada Youth Training Center run by the State.

China Spring is the highest-ranked State facility by several metrics. It is a good program and serves up to 56 youths at full capacity. The purpose of A.B. 68 is to address the funding formula because most of the funding comes from a combination of State appropriations and assessments from the participating counties based on student population of each county. The student population determines each county's assessment fees, and a spreadsheet shows the impact on all the counties under statute in the provisions of A.B. 68.

During the last Session, a working group was formed under Nevada Association of Counties (NACO). All counties participated and looked at various aspects of China Spring's programming and its funding formula. We worked in the Interim on something acceptable to all counties, and the result is A.B. 68. The bill was reviewed by the NACO working group, and all participants agreed on this funding formula. The formula continued to be based on student population but also evaluates each county's utilization of the facility.

Half of the rate would be assessed based on utilization and the other half would be based on student population. That is impactful primarily to the rural counties because some counties may go a few years without sending a child to China Spring Youth Camp even though they are still paying assessments. This new funding formula is population-based because counties are always going to pay something, but what they pay is based on their utilization.

The higher utilization of the camp, the more a county would have to pay. Douglas County would pay more under this formula, and we are good with that. The small rurals would benefit financially, and Washoe County's assessment would also go down. Of course, that could change from year to year depending on utilization. There was universal support from the 16 counties and no opposition in the State Assembly for A.B. 68 where it passed unanimously.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

I understand some contributions will increase and some will decrease.

MR. CATES:

That is correct. The overall contributions of the counties combined would not change under A.B. 68.

VINSON GUTHREAU (Nevada Association of Counties):

We represent all 17 of Nevada's counties and support A.B. 68. This is a collaborative agreement on the funding method for China Spring. The regional treatment and rehabilitation facility is available to 16 counties in the State. The new formula reflects an equitable assessment and usage of the facility.

MARY WALKER (Storey County; Douglas County; Lyon County):

We support A.B. 68. This is a fair and equitable funding formula. The previous formula has not been changed in decades. The China Spring Youth Camp is important to rural Nevada because, for many of those communities, this is the only appropriate facility for their juveniles.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

What is the capacity of the China Spring facility? Is it only boys or boys and girls?

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
April 26, 2023  
Page 4

MS. WALKER:

It is both boys and girls, but because of the COVID-19 pandemic as well as State funding reduction the last couple of years, those counts have gone down. However, we are planning on getting back to total capacity of about 60 kids.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

I close the hearing on A.B. 68 and open the hearing on A.B. 231.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 231 (1st Reprint)**: Revises various provisions of the Uniform Commercial Code. (BDR 8-604)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SHEA BACKUS (Assembly District No. 37):

I am a Nevada commissioner to the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, often referred to as the Uniform Law Commission (ULC). Prior to walking the Committee through the bill, I want to provide a brief history of the ULC which was established in 1892 to provide states with nonpartisan, well-conceived and well-drafted legislation. The Uniform Law Commission's deliberative and uniquely open drafting process draws on the expertise of commissioners but also utilizes input from legal experts, advisors and observers representing the views of other legal organizations and interests that will be subject to the proposed law. The Uniform Law Commission stays up to date by addressing important and timely legal issues such as the need for an amendment to the Uniform Commercial Code to address emerging technologies, including adding a new article.

The Uniform Commercial Code is commonly referred to as UCC. The UCC is a comprehensive set of laws governing all commercial transactions in the United States and has been universally adopted by all states. While parties to any particular transaction can agree to the terms of their contract, the UCC essentially offers default rules and provides legal certainty, giving strangers confidence to conduct business.

Nevada has enacted ten UCC articles, codified in chapters 104 and 104A of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). I will review the original articles so the Committee has an understanding as to what A.B. 231 is amending.

Article 1 provides general terms. Article 2 governs the sale of goods. Article 2A governs leases of personal property, such as construction equipment. Article 3 governs negotiable instruments, such as checks. Article 4 governs bank

deposits and collections. Article 4A provides a comprehensive body of law on the rights and obligations connected with fund transfers. Article 5 governs letters of credit typically issued by a bank or other financial institution to its business customers to facilitate trade.

Article 7 covers documents of title to personal property, such as bills of lading. Article 8 provides a modern legal structure for the system of holding securities through intermediaries. Article 9 provides a statutory framework that governs secured transactions involving personal property.

BENJAMIN ORZESKE (Chief Counsel, Uniform Law Commission):

Assembly Bill 231 is an update to the UCC law that has been in existence in the United States since the 1940s. It is one that we do not often think about but is a useful background law in the sense that when consumers order something from Amazon or eBay, people do not have to worry about what state the seller is in. It does not matter because the UCC has been enacted universally and will govern those transactions. Likewise, Nevada businesses benefit from being able to sell to customers in any state, knowing that those transactions are fully legal and enforceable because the State law governing them is the same.

This first major update to the UCC law in 12 years incorporates changes dealing with many technological advances. Some of the changes are mundane, such as changing the word “writing” to “record” in several places to account for electronic documents and signatures.

The most significant change is the addition of a new Article 12 pertaining to something called controllable electronic records. This is an umbrella term meant to encompass new types of property—virtual currency, nonfungible tokens, things that exist on a blockchain and can be controlled over a computer network. The old rules, unsurprisingly, did not apply well for transactions involving these new types of assets. The new Article 12 controllable electronic records will give legal backing to transactions involving these types of digital assets that did not exist before.

These are two major advantages. First is the concept of negotiability. If you pay for groceries with either cash or check, that is a negotiable instrument, and there is some safety for the merchant who sells those groceries. It does not matter if later it turns out that money was embezzled from the buyer's employers or borrowed from somebody else. The grocer is off the hook because

cash or check is a negotiable instrument. The merchant gave value in exchange, did not know of any other claim, and is an innocent party. It is the buyer who is on the hook for any loss for the person who lost the cash. If, for some reason, the grocer had accepted payment with a diamond ring, that is not negotiable. If later it is found the diamond ring was stolen, then the person from whom it was stolen can recover the ring not only from the grocer but from whoever the grocer may have sold it to.

This is just meant to illustrate the concept of negotiability. Under the law, digital assets like virtual currency are not negotiable, and that is a reason why businesses do not accept them as payment. After enacting the changes in A.B. 231 into the UCC, they will be negotiable under the same terms as other types of negotiable instruments. That is, if the person gives value in exchange and does not have knowledge of any other claim.

The second major advantage is using these types of assets as collateral. The rules in the UCC did not apply well if you wanted to borrow against your virtual currency. The rules for tangible currency dictate that if you default on the loan, the lender must be able to collect on the collateral. You as borrower must possess it—like a gold bar in a safe. The concept of possession as it has been interpreted by courts since the 1940s does not apply well to intangible things that a person cannot hold in his or her hand.

Under the existing rules, things like virtual currency fall into a catch-all category called general intangibles, and the loan rules did not work well for them. The new rules for controllable electronic records will legalize the practices already developing in the decentralized finance industry, where lenders that do loans against this type of asset have what is called control of it. Essentially, they take what is equivalent to possession of a tangible asset. If you can control a digital asset like this, then you are protected, safe in the event of default with collateral to collect on.

Assembly Bill 231 is the result of about three and a half years of work with leading thinkers from the decentralized finance blockchain community, as well as commercial lawyers, judges and members of the Uniform Law Commission and American Law Institute.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

The only reason I passed the Nevada Bar exam is because there was no question that year on the Uniform Commercial Code secured transactions and issues like that. I know great minds like Professor Keith Rowley from the Boyd School of Law at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and other folks on the drafting committee who worked hard to modernize the UCC.

The ULC made a difference almost a century ago in terms of making transactions and negotiable instruments work across state lines, even if a bank or financial institution was only in one state and not across the Country. When the UCC was first drafted, there was no Internet. Those attorneys got together to modernize the Code, and it was passed in all the states and territories.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We hear numerous bills from the Uniform Law Commission, and it is my understanding that it is always an opt-in situation. For a lot of what the Uniform Law Commission does, it is a kind of patchwork across the United States on which states adopt and those that do not. But A.B. 231 relates to the UCC, and I want to confirm that all 50 states have adopted the Uniform Commercial Code.

MR. ORZESKE:

That is correct. The UCC is one of our more successful projects and has been adopted across the United States. All 50 states plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and U.S. Virgin Islands have adopted it.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

There is not another body that would meet and discuss the language of the Uniform Commercial Code. It would only be the Uniform Law Commission.

MR. ORZESKE:

The Uniform Commercial Code is a joint project of the Uniform Law Commission and American Law Institute (ALI) with a joint drafting committee of appointees from both of those organizations. Other groups, academic groups and business groups, may need to discuss it, but they are not the official drafting committee that takes input and recommends the changes approved last summer by both the ULC and ALI.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
April 26, 2023  
Page 8

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS:

When we do the UCC Committee hearings, members of the American Bar Association's Business Law Section are sitting on the committee as well.

SENATOR KRASNER:

How many states have adopted these current amendments to the UCC?

MR. ORZESKE:

So far, two: North Dakota and New Mexico adopted these amendments. It has been introduced in 24 jurisdictions: 23 states and the District of Columbia. Those bills are advancing, and some are not going to pass this year. I do not know what the total count will be at the end of this year.

SENATOR KRASNER:

How many states decided not to adopt these current amendments to the UCC?

MR. ORZESKE:

I do not know that any states made that decision permanently but out of the bills that failed this year, I think in eight or nine states.

SENATOR KRASNER:

In eight or nine states, the bills did not pass legislatures to adopt these amendments?

MR. ORZESKE:

That is correct.

SENATOR KRASNER:

What would happen if a state does not choose to adopt the amendments this session?

MR. ORZESKE:

They can always come back and try again, but the downside is businesses in the states that do adopt these amendments would have an advantage over businesses in the states that do not adopt and implement these new rules of doing business with the new forms of assets.



ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS:

Early on when these bills were initially presented in certain states, there was a lot of misunderstanding as to what the bill could or could not do. The Uniform Law Commission has made a big effort to develop amendments to the UCC. In the Assembly, we enacted those amendments to address a lot of the concerns being raised in other states. This bill is the first reprint and incorporates the amendments to address those concerns.

SENATOR KRASNER:

My understanding is controlling law would first be federal law, then any state law and then third would be the Uniform Commercial Code. Is that correct, it is a backup law?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS:

It would depend on what we are looking at. As an example, in federal court with a transaction between two states, I had a UCC case on some construction equipment in a leasing situation. Lawyers still go to the choice of law aspects. In that situation, the choice of law I wanted was Idaho state law because that suited my needs for a statute of limitations argument; but in this situation, Nevada law applied and I lost the case. It is like your standard thing. I do not know if this could be considered as secondary authority, but it could be if this Body adopted A.B. 231 into Nevada law. Our NRS 104 and NRS 104A would be the applicable State law; if we were to adopt this bill, it would amend those statutes.

SENATOR KRASNER:

If we chose not to adopt A.B. 231 or be one of the states that did not adopt it this Session, the applicable NRS would apply still, and it would have no bearing?

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

Just to clarify: When we talk about amending the UCC, in the context of this discussion, we are talking about amending NRS. A separate body of laws does not exist. It is an NRS section that we call the UCC because it is the same as the revised statutes of Idaho, Washington, California or anywhere.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS:

If anyone opens up NRS to chapter 104, it only has all of the nonending "A" Articles which mirror the UCC, like Article 1, Article 2, Article 3 and

Article 4. I did get tested on Article 3 in the Nevada State Bar exam. I think it was the first and only year the UCC was ever tested on the bar exam.

I do want to get back to your question because the sad thing is if we do not adopt these updated UCC laws, then we are falling behind times. The UCC was established in the 1940s and 1950s, and it needs to stay with modern times. We are changing what should be secured interest, what could be protecting someone who has taken out a loan and needs a way to secure it. We want to make sure we are addressing current technology, staying ahead of the game and having up-to-date articles.

ELYSE MONROY-MARSALA (Blockchains, Inc):

Blockchains, Inc., supports policy that provides uniform rules for perfecting security interest when using certain digital assets, which A.B. 231 seeks to do. While we agree with the overall policy objectives of A.B. 231, we have to oppose the changes made to the definition of the term money which was added with the amendment that appear in this first reprint. Historically, government authorized or adopted money under the Uniform Commercial Code benefits from super-negotiability status. This status is critical because the business that accepts money as payment in commercial transactions must have confidence the money it accepts is not being used as collateral for an unknown loan. Imagine for a moment that a small Nevada business selling battery technology to a manufacturer in Arizona was unsure if the money offered as payment was subject to a lien in another state.

Performing a state-by-state lien search before accepting money as payment is just not practical. Commercial activity would be severely slowed if not halted altogether, and this is the primary reason why money enjoys super-negotiability status under the UCC. However, the change made to the definition of money turns this critical policy objective on its head. The proposed change expressly excludes any money in electronic form that otherwise meets the current definition of money in the UCC. This is problematic for traditional digital payments and emerging stablecoin payment ecosystems like bill pay, PayPal, Venmo and other forms of electronic money.

With the change, all forms of electronic money would no longer enjoy super-negotiability status in Nevada. Since Nevada would be the first or one of the first states to adopt this amendment, we are not sure what impact it would have on commercial transactions in Nevada. If businesses thought electronic

forms of money might serve as collateral for an unknown loan is a big question that we do not have an answer for. Certain stablecoins like USDC represent a digital token on a blockchain fully backed by \$1 U.S. deposited in a major U.S. bank or custody by fund managers such as BlackRock or highly liquid U.S. treasuries. These stablecoins allow U.S. dollars to become digitized and be moved efficiently and cost effectively across blockchain networks to the tune of billions of dollars a year in annual transactions. Stablecoins are used daily by millions of Americans and businesses, including those in Nevada.

The U.S. Congress House Financial Services Committee is working on bipartisan stablecoin legislation to firmly bless and appropriately regulate the electronic form of money. This type of electronic payment is here today, and we should think carefully about the changes to statutes that prohibit rather than enable the use of this technology. Nevada has benefited immensely from blockchain economic development because we have been thoughtful in the types of laws and regulations enacted in this area.

Emerging digital payment technologies are inclusive. They dramatically reduce costs for businesses and consumers, drive economic development and are used by a significant percentage of Nevadans. The policy objective of A.B. 231 can be fulfilled without amending the definition of money in the UCC. Blockchains, Inc., is eager and willing to work through our concerns with the bill sponsor or members of this Committee. We are open to bringing our technical experts to propose any amendments.

KEITH ROWLEY (Professor, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas):

I am professor of contracts and commercial law at the William S. Boyd School of Law and a Nevada Uniform Law Commissioner. I was an active participant in several years work of the drafting committee for the 2022 amendments to the UCC. I did not hear all the comments by the prior speaker from Blockchains or on behalf of Blockchains. I am not entirely sure the prior speaker was aware of the revision to A.B. 231 that eliminates references to electronic money from the 2022 amendments and treats what would be electronic money as well as things the UCC does not consider electronic money that other people might, for instance, either as a controllable electronic record—Bitcoin that may be passed and taken free by someone who in good faith and for value acquires them and does not have to worry about contending claims of ownership—or liens that might have applied previously. That security interest in them can be taken and

perfected by not just other on-chain lenders and participants but by traditional lenders as well that are looking for a way to perfect the security interest in an asset that now, at least in the form of Bitcoin, is imperfectible. There are several reasons to support the amendment.

The concern about affecting the ability to use stablecoin or other types of cryptocurrencies addresses the subject matter of a completely different bill, Senate Bill 333. The UCC does not try to regulate what is used for private payment purposes. It does not regulate the day-to-day operations of the payment system except to the extent that it has rules governing check collection and the negotiability of certain types of notes and other instruments. But even that negotiability is being opened up to include electronic equivalents to paper instruments and paper records not previously capable of being negotiated under UCC rules or being taken free of claims by competing parties, prior in the chain of title from the person from whom the person who acquired them in good faith and for value took them.

**SENATE BILL 333 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to virtual currency.  
(BDR 57-18)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BACKUS:

I would have loved not to have utilized the amendment. I would have been happy with it being the Uniform Law, but because of concerns over some of the original language, the amendment was necessary. I wanted to assure people Bitcoin is included. The terminology “controllable electronic record” carries throughout a lot of A.B. 231 which the updated UCC Articles would address.

MR. ORZESKE:

The representative from Blockchains is correct that money is super-negotiable and has a special status under the UCC. But A.B. 231 gives that same super-negotiability status to controllable electronic records. There are different categories subject to the same rules. The reason they are categorized differently is that the rules in existence for money since the 1940s did not work well for intangible assets. It was necessary to categorize them as this new blanket term came up with a controllable electronic record which builds on previous UCC definitions of record and electronic record, differentiating them by the type of control as defined in A.B. 231 as to how one person can have control of the electronic asset and transfer it to another and prevent others from using it.

I think we are all on the same page about the benefits for controllable electronic records.

The amendments introduced in the Assembly were to address a slightly different concern that arose in a few states about electronic money. Central bank digital currency—not a controllable electronic record—is something backed by a government. It will allow Nevada businesses or businesses in any state that adopts these UCC laws to do business with foreign countries that already have adopted these currencies. There is not one in the United States and a lot of political opposition to the idea of having one in this Country. The amendment was added in the Assembly to eliminate that concern by removing references to electronic money. But we have retained all the negotiability benefits, the same ones that apply to money for the benefit of controllable electronic records when used under UCC.

SENATOR NGUYEN:

Is controllable electronic record a common term used to describe cryptocurrency?

MR. ORZESKE:

It was coined by the drafting committee that developed these amendments to the UCC. Whenever we draft, we try not to use terms like blockchain or cryptocurrency because they can quickly become outdated by further advances in technology. We try to define things functionally by how they work and thus the definition of control and controllable electronic record came forth. Unlike money, they are not limited in their various uses. Beyond being a medium of exchange, someone can have controllable electronic records that embody property or payment rights and can be used as rights in art as in the case of a nonfungible token. We did not want to limit it to the rules for money which only apply to mediums of exchange. That was the reason for categorizing them separately, not in any way to disadvantage their use relative to money.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 231 and move to public comment.

TONJA BROWN (Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent):

We would like for the Committee to consider our proposed amendment to add an ombudsman to A.B. 452 that is coming up. We had every intention of putting our proposed amendment in the Assembly Judiciary Committee.

However, the Committee had an agendaless work session on A.B. 452 and I was unable to get it submitted in time. We are asking for the Committee to consider this proposed amendment and will provide a brief history as to why having an ombudsman is needed.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 452**: Revises provisions relating to visitation with offenders in a correctional institution or facility. (BDR 16-315)

When the Nevada offender tracking information tracking system was installed in 2007, a computer glitch happened and placed false felony charges in inmates' files. The Nevada Department of Corrections (NDOC) had hidden this information for years until I discovered it during the deposition of the former NDOC warden and assistant director because of the discovery in 2012. When asked about the false felony charges, NDOC established that 10 percent of the prison population has false felony charges in their notice files.

Everyone with a life sentence was affected by it. The Department did not know how to fix it, but when an inmate would come up for parole, NDOC would remove the false charges. The computer glitch would come back and reappear in the inmate's file after being removed. Former Assemblyman Al Kramer had received a letter from an inmate in Ely State Prison about the false charges in his file, and Mr. Kramer came to see me to discuss the problem.

I still get calls over the years from inmates and their families about the false charges. They do not understand why these charges are in their file. Some inmates while still incarcerated had expired their sentences and moved on to the next sentences. The glitch showed expired sentences as brand-new sentences. Some of those who had false felony charges had previously been incarcerated and their sentences expired were then paroled. If an offender returned to prison, that expired sentence would reappear in the notice file as a brand-new charge. These are the reasons why NDOC needs to have an ombudsman—to check for accuracy and correct the notice files as needed to make proper notifications to the Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners and Nevada Board of Pardons Commissioners.

ANNMARIE GRANT (Advocates for the Inmates and the Innocent):

I would like the Committee to support our amendment to A.B. 49 adding language for a petition to establish factual innocence posthumously. We are only aware of one case this may affect, but that does not mean others in the

future will not be identified. The Washoe County Conviction Integrity Committee exemplifies why a petition to establish factual innocence posthumously is needed. This is best if we are seeking to reform our criminal legal system.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 49 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to criminal procedure. (BDR 3-419)

I requested data from that committee in June 2020 and in 2022. Only two cases have been submitted since its inception in 2018; only one received a fair review, and the other case, of Nolan Klein, did not receive a fair review. The only difference between the two is one did not claim prosecutorial misconduct, while Mr. Klein's case claimed the prosecutor withheld exculpatory evidence.

In the first case, all document filings and pleadings were reviewed. It is clear from the 2019 letter from Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Noble to Ms. Tonja Brown regarding her so-called review of Mr. Klein's case, all she did was read previous court orders. What the committee should look for in the defendant's filing is newly discovered evidence submitted to them and not simply to rehash old court orders. Deputy District Attorney Noble stated the committee cannot offer a more thorough assessment of a claim than the 12 citizens who served on the jury. That jury did not get to see all the exculpatory evidence found in 2009, and that jury had been deadlocked for two days. If that is her assessment about Mr. Klein's case, will she maintain that position for every person convicted by a jury who maintained innocence and asked for a review?

There is no true remedy for someone who has died in prison and who was wrongfully convicted in Nevada. Your job as Legislators is to create those remedies. Our amendment to A.B. 49 adding language for a petition to establish factual innocence posthumously is that remedy.

MR. ROWLEY:

There was a question about the number of states that have enacted the 2022 amendments to the UCC. Two states have done so, North Dakota and New Mexico. In three other states, Colorado, Indiana and Washington, the bill has passed both chambers and is either sitting on the governor's desk or being delivered to the governor. Two or three additional states look like they are close to reconciling versions between the two chambers. If there was any concern that Nevada would be getting too far out ahead, be assuaged that other states are acting. Several additional states have bills pending.

Senate Committee on Judiciary  
April 26, 2023  
Page 16

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

I will adjourn the Senate Judiciary Committee at 2:53 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Blain Jensen,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair

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



<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit Letter</b>	<b>Introduced on Minute Report Page No.</b>	<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster