

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

March 17, 2003 LB 209

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...grant.

SENATOR BOURNE: Okay. So basically what we have, is we have a person whose license is revoked. They appeal, saying that there was a flaw, the police improperly pulled them over, or their breathalyzer machine was inaccurate, some...there's some basis for an appeal. And what you're saying is you're going to strike the language found on 27 or you're trying to reinstate the stricken language that says, "Such appeal shall suspend the order of revocation until the final judgment of a court finds against the person..."

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR BOURNE: ...so appealing." So what you're saying is that if a person appeals, they should keep their license until the final adjudication of that appeal.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That's my contention, yes.

SENATOR BOURNE: And Senator Bromm is saying that once there is a final order, even if it's appealable, they should have their license revoked.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR BOURNE: Okay. What...how long is...help me out here, because I've really no experience in this. Say that the license is revoked. How long is that period of time? Is that dependent on how many times they've been convicted of DUI?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, Senator Bromm might know more than that. It might be 90 days. Some people were talking about the number of days but I'm not...I cannot give you, with specificity, those periods.

SENATOR BOURNE: So I'll push my light again, I think I'm about out of time, and I'll ask Senator Bromm a question. But...so, Senator Chambers, what is your concern with why these individuals...why should they get their license back or why shouldn't they?