

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

January 28, 2000 LB 175

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Brashear, you're recognized to open.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Mr. President, members of the body, at this time now we're dealing with the second division of the committee amendment, which is Sections 2 and 3 of the bill. Now at this point we turn our attention to personal property left by a tenant in the rental property after the tenant has vacated the rental property and the rental premises, and where the tenant is not contesting their having...the tenants having vacated the rental premises. I'm framing the picture here. So we have personal property on the premises. The tenant has vacated the premises and is not contesting that vacation. The issue becomes, what do you do with the, what we will call or denominate, abandoned personal property remaining in the rental premises? And that's what Sections 2 and 3 deal with. Now, as originally proposed in the green copy, it was suggested that if the property was worth...we would be changing the law so that if the property was worth less than \$1,000 it could be sold. The committee thought that was too great an increase from \$250 to \$1,000 and so the committee amendment reduces that increase so it is not \$250 to \$1,000; it is now \$250 increased to \$500, sort of out of respect for the passage of time and the wear and tear of inflation in our economy. The provision as originally written, the law says as at present, it says: If the personal property is not released pursuant to Section 69-2307, it shall be sold at public sale by competitive bidding, except that if the landlord reasonably believes that the total resale value of the property not released is less than, and under the committee amendment it would be less than \$500, he or she may retain such property for his or her own use or dispose of it in any manner that he or she chooses. This issue of abandoned personal property by tenants who are not contesting their having vacated the property is what's at the core of Sections 2 and 3. That's what the bill seeks to deal with. By increasing the amount, what the proponents, I'm sure Senator Hilgert, will say, to a realistic level, to a commercially reasonable level, and the committee has modified that back from \$1,000 max and, remember, there is a judgment call to be made by the landlord, it has to