

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

March 17, 2003 LB 209

further.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Bourne, did you wish to do so?

SENATOR BOURNE: Certainly.

SPEAKER BROMM: And let me try to respond to what I think I heard. At the ALR hearing, the initial hearing, the only two questions that...and the Supreme Court has ruled on this very recently, I think...that are relevant are whether there was probable cause to believe that this person was operating this vehicle or in control of the vehicle and, secondly, whether they were operating it in violation of the DUI laws by a test of their blood or...blood, breath, or urine. Those are the two questions. Now, whether it was an illegal stop or not wouldn't really be an issue at that point. However, when they appealed that to district court and the district court reviewed the matter, then that would become an issue or could become an issue if they raise it. And, of course, in the criminal side, I'm certain it would be an issue there. So they are somewhat limited in that ALR hearing as to what they're supposed to or what they're able to look at. And I would ask Senator Bourne if he had any other comments. He could use some of my time, if he did.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Bourne.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Senator Bromm, and I have my light on as well and I can yield you this time if you need it. So at the ALR hearing, is the individual represented by an attorney? Can he be, he or she be?

SPEAKER BROMM: He or she doesn't have to be. They have a right to be. At least in our area they usually are, but they don't have to be.

SENATOR BOURNE: Okay. But there's no prohibition that they are, or there's no prohibition that they have an attorney present. I mean they...

SPEAKER BROMM: No.