

January 23, 1996 LB 592

section, it says that the license would be reinstated without any fee. It also says that if a fee had been paid the fee would be returned. It also says the department, county attorney, or authorized attorney is liable to the license holder for damages resulting from the erroneous revocation of a license. So is the primary change the language about damages, that would be the primary change...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: ...from the original bill?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yes, Senator, and just the focusing on the fact that an actual erroneous revocation has to take place.

SENATOR BROMM: Now would the erroneous revocation...would that be for just any reason, or would there have to be...is there language in here that I haven't caught yet dealing with any negligence requirement, or just if it's erroneous, it's erroneous and damages could result? Is it a strict liability situation?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator, it was intended by me to be a negligence situation.

SENATOR BROMM: And I've been looking for that, and I haven't been able. Maybe it's in a different section, I'll continue to look. But we had discussed, I think, there being some standard, such as negligence, that would need to be applied. Otherwise we've got a strict liability situation here, I think.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Janssen, to speak to the Beutler amendment to the Witek amendment.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Madam President, members, if Senator Beutler would yield to a question.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yes.