

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

April 4, 2002            LB 874, 875, 876

she would then have one more day in which to file the appeal. Under current law, such party will lose a day, and they may miss a deadline, and be irreparably damaged in not being able to pursue an appeal. And that's just one of many examples we could make of record, where time lines are absolutely critical and deadlines are...and the failure to meet them is irreversible. LB 874 would align the court's holiday schedule with that of other government entities, removing inconsistency and avoiding the potential for harm. The committee advanced that bill unanimously also. LB 875, at Section 3 page 2 of the committee amendment; under current law, the Supreme Court is required to furnish one copy of Nebraska reports, which are bound volumes of published Nebraska Supreme Court decisions, and one copy of the Nebraska appellate reports, to lower courts, public law libraries, and specified state offices. Additionally, under current law, the Supreme Court is required to furnish copies of advance sheets to the lower courts, public law libraries, and specified state offices. Advance sheets are copies, printed in pamphlet form, of recent decisions by the Nebraska Supreme Court and the Nebraska Court of Appeals. LB 875, as we've amended it, eliminates the statutory references to state offices as recipients of copies of Nebraska reports...Nebraska appellate reports and advance sheets, but would allow the State Court Administrator to furnish as many copies as he or she deems necessary for the operation of the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals. The bill is a cost saving measure for the court administrator and for the court, and for the people. The court currently sells copies of reports and advance sheets to private recipients, such as law firms, and uses the money received to subsidize the cost of free distribution to public recipients. Private sales have decreased because of on-line computer research, and the court can no longer cover the cost of the free...or the cost of free distribution. This is a fiscal issue, which the Court Administrator must either reduce the number of free copies; increase the fee for private sales, which will likely result in fewer sales; or seek General Fund support. We all know that this is not the time to be seeking an increase in General Fund support. This does not necessarily mean that free recipients, or those who have received copies free in the past, will go without. Opinions are now posted on the court's web site. Many state offices and libraries have on-line