

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

January 15, 2004 LB 155

to, in other words, sell the farm but assure that the present renter would continue to have that for five years, which obviously binds the new purchaser wanting to farm it himself? What covers there? Would that be notification by registered letter? Or could that be hidden? Or could they have to be recorded? I'd just like a little more broadening of that, because I think that's what Senator Louden is getting at, and I want to be...understand for sure how this affects farm leases.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Is that a question, Senator? Senator Quandahl, will you...was that a question, Senator Wehrbein?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Quandahl,...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I'd like to have Senator...

SENATOR CUDABACK: ...would you answer?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: ...Quandahl, please.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Quandahl.

SENATOR QUANDAHL: Yes. And I guess I would respond to that. The bill as it's written right now just deals with those leases of less than a year, and so it wouldn't affect the leases that you're talking about. But when you talk about a lease that would be in excess of one year, in order for it to have effect as to subsequent purchasers or any subsequent lien holders or mortgagors, mortgage holders, or anything like that, it would have to be recorded before that subsequent deed or mortgage was recorded. So it kind of clarifies the race to the courthouse, or the Register of Deeds filings. And so when you talk about a five-year lease that could be within those people that would be within the second degree of consanguinity, if you wanted that to have effect against any sort of a third-party buyer or a bank or whomever, in order for that to be effective or to go past that one-year period, it would have to be recorded. The secured party or the subsequent buyer would have to have notice of that.