

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

January 14, 2004 LB 353

district, she was charged with a...obviously, a misdemeanor, but under the statute that we passed a few years ago, her license was revoked. And it appears that there was not an intent to be quite that severe with a youngster who's made a minor infraction of the law. It cost her \$125 to get her license back, and then she was put on a high-risk insurance plan for three years, which cost a great deal more than a regular insurance policy would cost. In visiting with the judge, he indicated to me he didn't think it was the intent of the Legislature to make that severe a penalty on that small an infraction of the law, and I agree. And so, in order to somehow give some leeway to the judges to make a judgment on these kind of offenses, we decided that if we could change the word from "revoke" to "suspend," and then I think there's a committee amendment on to change it to "impound" the license, then the license could be returned to her without having to pay...go to the Motor Vehicle Department and get her license restored, and then end up, by the insurance company, being on a high-risk insurance plan. I understand it, from what I've learned in dealing with this issue, that it's a policy of insurance companies to place an automatic high-risk insurance on people who have their licenses revoked. And it's my understanding, in talking to some of my colleagues, that they never intended for that to happen when we passed this law. So it was my intent then to make this so there would be some leeway for the judge to address this issue, and not leave such a tremendous burden on a young person who didn't feel...and I don't feel did this...committed this serious a crime. Now, we understand that there are laws, and certainly driving two or three blocks out of the route rather than a direct route from their home to the school is a violation of the law. The question is, is it that serious? And I think that the person understood that they had to pay a fine, plus all the other costs that were incurred because of this slight offense of the law. So what we've done is change the word...under the amendment that's put in there, we change it to revoke the license, and I think that this will indeed make the person who does this understand that they have committed a violation of a state law, but certainly they won't be penalized to the extent. There are other laws that are more serious than this that they don't receive quite this serious a fine, or it's so costly. Well, that's my purpose of the bill. I'd be willing to answer any