

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

March 13, 2006 LB 786

it...and I would ask Senator Mines or Senator Schimek. I know this is a committee amendment, so perhaps I'd ask Senator Schimek the first question. Is it...is this hearing designed to have an appeal process? That is, if one side or the other decides that the determination is wrong, is there the possibility of appeal? Or is this some sort of preliminary indication which will not be subject to appeal? Obviously, if it's subject to appeal, there is a time sequence evolved here...involved here, which may or may not make a difference, but which should be considered. If it's meant not to be appealable, then perhaps we ought to say so. And maybe it's right that it shouldn't be appealable. But let me just ask that for a preliminary question, Senator Schimek. I would yield you my time.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. You are correct, the bill does not address the appealability. It is presumed that the ruling of the district court would be appealable.

SENATOR BEUTLER: It's assumed it would be appealable?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. So this process of recall may be dragged out for a considerable period of time if there's an appeal to the Appeals Court and eventually to the Supreme Court.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: It could be, yes. I think it would be a rare circumstance,...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...but it could be.

SENATOR BEUTLER: All right. If that's the case, then I'd recommend some language be put in there making clear that it's appealable. Secondly, with regard to this statement that's being filed, let's say a statement is filed, the court has its hearing, it goes as far as it's going to go, and it's determined that there is no case, there's not malfeasance, misfeasance, or nonfeasance. Now, is that intended, then, under Section