



Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 145

Recorded 9-19-20

Andy 00:00

Registry Matters is an independent production. The opinions and ideas here are that of the hosts and do not reflect the opinions of any other organization. If you have a problem with these thoughts, fyp. Recording live from FYP Studios, east and west. Transmitting across the internet. This is Episode 145 of Registry Matters. Larry, I'm telling you, it feels like we've been doing this for like an hour already.

Larry 00:23

It does feel like that. I wonder why.

Andy 00:27

I have absolutely no idea. Let's kind of like just dive right in, that I will, I will start with this. That uh, there's some breaking news that happened last night. Ruth Bader Ginsburg passed away. If you haven't heard of this by now, I don't know where you're living. She was 87 years old. She was a pretty significant individual on the court. She's like, became something of a rockstar.

Larry 00:49

That's what they've been saying. I didn't realize it until the obituaries we started hearing from the news, but apparently that's the case.

Andy 00:59

Yeah, she she ended up becoming like t shirts, getting set up all kinds of stuff. She was very, very popular individual and an inspiration probably mostly for women to step up and be powerful and accomplished and just as a good role model in general.

Larry 01:17

Yes, it's it's sad. Anytime that that anybody who's served with distinction, which she has, and I kind of wish she would have stepped down sooner. But anyway, it's sad, her passing, and it opens up a whole bunch of stuff we're going to talk about in a patron extra today.

Andy 01:34

Yes, good. You want to give a quick synopsis of the 30 or so minute Patreon extra that we just recorded.

Larry 01:39

Well we're gonna, we actually did talk about the process of replacing the supreme court justice and what it might look like. And we bring out a lot of comparisons between the situation of '16 versus now and the hypocrisy of the Senate leadership compared to where they were in '16.

Andy 02:01

Very good. All right. I think we can we can shut down the ticker tape parade going on, and we can jump right into so there was the breaking news of Ruth Bader Ginsburg and we just talked about that. All right, then let's jump over to an article from the Guardian, which we have two articles, one from the guardian and another one from ABC Action News. That a man spat, Florida man cleared of rape and murder conviction after 37 years in prison. Larry, you're not telling me that someone was falsely accused and then convicted and spent almost four decades in prison?

Larry 02:35

Yep, that's what I'm telling you. And the funny thing is he's not gonna get any money.

Andy 02:39

Wait a minute, so why wouldn't you get any money after being in prison for that long wrongfully convicted?

Larry 02:47

Well, apparently they have a clean hands rule and it since he has other criminality in his past, you don't get any money but but that that's that's the sad thing about it.

Andy 02:58

You're saying you do felony jaywalking, and then you commit murder inaccurately, and because you did felony jaywalking, they won't give you any money for it? Because you already have a record?

Larry 03:09

That's the way I understood it. Yes.

Andy 03:10

That's ridiculous. 37 years in prison. That's not like you spent 300 days in the county jail or something. That's a long, long ass time.

Larry 03:22

It is we've got listeners that are not even 37 years old.

Andy 03:26

That is probably very true. Um, anything else besides this being like ridiculous?

Larry 03:32

That's the main reason I spotted it. I thought that it's one of those things where the nuance of the law was that since he had other criminality in his past, he can't, he can't receive any compensation.

Andy 03:45

That's crazy. So he was exonerated based on DNA evidence. See, we've like, there, there seems to be an ability for us to collect DNA and then even process DNA, but then getting the DA to use that to potentially overturn someone wrongfully convicted, often seems to be a roadblock.

Larry 04:04

It is and the sad thing is, it shouldn't be but it is. You've got finality as far as the victim is concerned. They've gotten their, they've gotten their justice. And, and and you you go back and reopen the case, you're revictimizing them again, to even doubt that that that this conviction is valid. And therefore, the people's attorneys just vehemently object to going back and first of all, they have to admit that they might have gotten something wrong, then they've got to revictimize the victim. And it's just it's just standard operating procedure that you try to preserve the conviction. You shouldn't, but that's what they do.

Andy 04:45

Yeah, it seems like I feel like we should be interested in justice and accuracy instead of convictions and numbers.

Larry 04:54

Well, what what's the dangerous thing is that the person, when you have a wrongful convicted person, it means the perpetrator is on the loose and (Andy: Correct.) That's the real danger. But But you should not never want an innocent person because of the morality of it. But that means that a guilty person is operating freely. And the guilty person may get your loved one next.

Andy 05:17

Right. Yes, I think we've talked about now you end up with three people that are in the wrong situation. You end up with the wrongfully convicted person is in the wrong place. The victim, if there was any sense of wholeness and getting justice, like now they don't have it, and the person is running around free and they should be getting justice.

Larry 05:37

Yep. And, unless the perpetrator may be dead in this case, but but you should never want an innocent person to be incarcerated, because that means the guilty person is still operating freely. And we we certainly wouldn't want that.

Andy 05:54

Gotcha. Well, all right, then let's move over to the Marshall project. And this is before election, Trump tries to stack prison sentencing agency with right wing allies. This, this seems complicated to me that he is like he is like the the saving grace of our criminal justice system by signing the First Step Act. What was that maybe even that was probably two years ago Larry. That was that was a while ago.

Larry 06:19

Yeah, he did. He did sign it. And, and he, he deserves credit. Not only did he sign it, he also, he also used the prestige of the White House with Kushner and himself to lean on McConnell, who did not even want to vote. Leader McConnell didn't want to vote. And so, we got a watered-down version of the First Step Act that had been neutered by a coalition of conservative senators led by Tom Cotton. But to his credit, he signed it. But this is one of those one of those things where you have to watch the totality of what they're doing. You give them credit for what they have done right. And you illuminate and call them out on what they haven't done, right because we want them to write those wrongs. And this is one of the things that that is not right along with the seek the maximum penalties with the with the DOJ with the prosecution arm. They have not rescinded their policies to stack charges and to seek the maximum enhancements and to go after people with with the full resources of the US government. And that also determines the length of sentences or whether or not a person is even federally prosecuted. So although he gets credit for that, he gets dinged for... he gets credit for the First Step Act. He gets dinged for not reversing course on the prosecution side. And he gets dinged for wanting to stack the Commission on his waning days of what what could be his waning days, he also could be reelected. But this is a little bit troubling to be on the Sentencing Commission, because the Sentencing Commission is the one who makes the recommendations for the sentencing guidelines, the US

sentencing guidelines we're talking about. And when people say, Well, my son only did this and he got sentenced to 11 years. Well, it's the sentencing guidelines that rendered that result. And these guidelines are written by people on this commission. They determine the severity level, they determine, they determine how many points you get on the scale. It's like It's like this maze of a grid, and they determine the severity level of the offense. They determine what mitigation factors that they'll award points for. The Sentencing Commission is extremely crucial in terms of the length of federal prison sentences. And you can't have it both ways. If you truly want reform, and which most of our people say that that they do, then you would need to hold the president accountable, where he's falling short. Give him credit where he's deserved, and call him out where he's fallen short. He also has executive clemency that he can use it, and it seems like his pattern has been to use it very sparingly. And only for people of a high-profile nature, and where they can put forward those people and say that we've done this for Blagojevich, we've done this for Joe Arpaio. But as far as the run of the mill clemency, I think his numbers are at an all-time low or close to it in terms of... that that's another thing, so he needs to be called out on that. But but he also gets credit for citing and helping push the First Step Act.

Andy 09:24

What is the big deal about like cramming these, like there's something significant here besides just I don't I there's some there seems to be something more here, then why is it being rushed? Wouldn't this be something that sort of just happens throughout the term of a president instead of just trying to push them all through and getting... Would the president try to find people that would be balanced? Or is he just like kowtowing to them, the people that have his attention the most, most donors? Something like that.

Larry 10:02

I don't really have any insight on who's getting on the Sentencing Commission and how that process is taking place. I know that that that there seems to be based on this article that there seems to be a rush to get to get more people on the Commission of his choice, of his choosing. It seems like some of these that have been mentioned are not particularly, they're all prosecution oriented. And I don't think you're going to get as much leniency on the sentencing guidelines if you only have people from the prosecution's side.

Andy 10:35

Okay, then we should probably move over to I think this is Yeah, this is your favorite Article of the night. So this is from The Appeal of Arizona. Man faces eight years in prison for not returning a rental car on time. Come on now, this can't be. This has got to be something like there's a whole lot of other stuff that went on also. But they just decided, hey, you missed your your check-in appointment by a couple hours, and they throw them in the slammer for 8 years.

Larry 11:03

I've read just the beginning of the week, and I have actually forgotten all the nuances. But you're right, there were a lot of nuances to what to what he... they spent a lot of resources, as I recall, basically targeting him to make sure that they found him. And they found him with a tiny little bit of drugs, and I don't know

their measurements. So when you when you talk about whether it's a significant amount, I don't know how to equate that because you know, what is 4.6 grams of heroin? I don't know what that means. I don't know.

Andy 11:32

I think that's actually a pretty considerable amount.

Larry 11:35

I don't know what .13 grams of crack and 4.6 grams of heroin, I don't know if that's a gallon, or if that's a little tiny speck on the end of an ink pen that doesn't mean anything to me. So you'll have to help me with that. What is .13 grams of crack?

Andy 11:49

Well, that one, I don't know. I just happen to know somebody that's into the heroin game. And he told me how much he gets and how much it lasts. And if you said four grams, that sounds like a mountain to me from what he says he uses. And he's a heavy user.

Larry 12:01

Haha, well, maybe we should have him on the show and we can have him do some explaining of what this stuff means.

Andy 12:09

that would be an amazing episode Larry. I'm telling you. He's an amazing human being and it would be very entertaining.

Larry 12:16

But yeah, the guy had had a had a criminal history. And apparently, they want to make sure that he goes to jail. And Arizona is notoriously tough. And then we've got one of our loyal supporters that's facing remainder of a 75-year term that had his conviction overturned in federal court, his state of Arizona conviction because the Arizona statute was unconstitutional. And then the circuit court reinstated the conviction. So I mean, they're tough over there.

Andy 12:48

And that happens to be in Arpaio's territory. That's Maricopa County. (Larry: Yep.) That sounds awful. Doesn't sound like they, like maybe they got rid of Arpaio. But they didn't replace him with a Krasner. Larry Krasner from, you know, Philadelphia, they didn't replace him with somebody like that.

Larry 13:05

Apparently not. But But the people, the people. That's not a particular liberal place. I mean, I'm supposing that that Maricopa County would probably be more liberal than other parts of Arizona, but Arizona is not a liberal state.

Andy 13:20

Yeah, I'm aware. And I guess then over at the New York Times police or prosecutor misconduct is at the root of half of exoneration cases study finds. Hmm, wrongly convicted black defendants are slightly more likely than whites to be victims of misconduct, especially in drug and murder investigations. Like the police are, like maybe not being honest, and maybe covering things up when they're dealing with citizens and arrests and all that. Is that what this is talking about?

Larry 13:51

Well, it runs the gamut of that of flat out perjury, concealing discovery from the defense side. And using confidential informants that have something to gain to get them to make untrue statements. I mean, it's bad. And the thing that's going to have to have happen to change this is the same thing that's going to happen with police misconduct. Police who engage in misconduct are going to have to be held accountable. Prosecutors who engage in misconduct are going to have to be held accountable. And when we start holding prosecutors accountable, rather than saying they're immune, for willful misconduct, now they have to be immune for their decisions in terms of their strategy. Whether they choose to prosecute, I mean we can't second guess that, but when you hide the ball, and you violate the rules of ethics, in particular, a prosecutor's heightened ethical responsibilities. We have to hold them accountable. It may mean disbarment. It may mean that they lose their law license and I think that that that Duke Lacrosse that's actually what happened to that that prosecutor. He lost his law license. And, and I think when we take away their livelihood, then they will be a little bit more accountable in terms of what they'll do to gain a conviction because they're just simply pandering to the voters. The voters want convictions.

Andy 15:19

Someone in chat just said, it makes me wonder whom really belongs behind bars. And I would then just say, well, we have chosen who is behind bars based on who we vote for.

Larry 15:29

That's a good analysis. That's exactly what we've done in terms of at least in terms of the state. And that's in the States, almost all prosecutors are elected. But in the federal system, they're appointed, but we do like the president who appoints the US Attorney's, once the Attorney General and then down the line through the, through the through the US Attorney's offices around the country. But we do choose that. But in the state system, they have to run for reelection, and you just don't, you don't generally win a lot of public support by talking about wanting to dismantle the system. Look, look how well that's playing right now by just reducing funding for the police.

Andy 16:05

Yeah, that's surely going really well.

Larry 16:07

Do you see the vilification that's happening?

Andy 16:10

I think we put a little clip on a program here about the phone ringing off the hook.

Larry 16:13

Yeah, and, and that's only going to get worse as we as these polls continue to tighten, which is what I predicted and it's happening. They're going to continue to try to peel off more and more, you would logically, now this is me telling the Republicans what they already know, you'd logically try to make inroads into suburbs, you're not going to get a whole lot of inroads in the inner cities in urban centers, you're not going to do that on the Republican side.

(Andy: Rural side.) But on the, Oh, you've already got that on the rural side, the Republican Party, but I'm talking about republicans trying to pick up votes. You would continue to try to scare the urban dwellers to death, about all this stuff that's in the urban centers that's coming out to you. And I'm all that stands between you and an anarchy. And that's what they're doing. They're calling them anarchists. They're saying that they're that the Democrat Party wants to defund the police. And it's amazing they use that term defund when you're talking about reducing funding. And I want to I want to jump on board with them. And every time conservatives want to cut funding, I want to say so you want to defund that right? Because they have set the rules. This is their standard. If anything is being reduced, it's defunding. So we need to say to them, okay, so you're wanting to defund Medicare. Okay, you wanted to defund the VA. You wanted to defund Headstart, you're wanting to defund school lunches, or whatever it is they want to reduce. You want to defund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which they actually have been trying to defund that for decades. They have they have tried multiple times to zero out that budget. So that would actually be a defunding.

Andy 17:46

Well, okay, I don't think there's anything else there that we need to hit on. And then we have another article from the appeal. I like this one Larry. This is how legislation meant to overhaul probation and parole in Pennsylvania strayed from its roots. The way that I read it is a particular party's politician introduced a plan to make I think it was like if you have a misdemeanor, you are on supervision for three years, and then it just ends. And if you have a felony, it's five years, and then it just ends, there's no, you don't have to go to court. And then another party went through and watered the whole thing down and took stuff out and made it much more better-er.

Larry 18:26

Well, yeah, and see now I want to try to qualify this. What we try to do is inform voters, and I know that everybody who listens to us, everyone can't vote, but a lot of people can because they're off supervision. And they don't have a felon disenfranchisement for life. And you have spouses, and you have family members. If you believe what you say you do, then I'm trying to help you to understand what's happening. Now, this is in Pennsylvania. And this is the Appeal, so I'm going off of them so don't vilify me. But the appeal has done an analysis of an attempt to reform Pennsylvania system, which has one of the highest ratio of people under supervision in the country. And the Democrat Party, a senator named Anthony Williams introduced a piece of legislation that went nowhere for nearly two years. And then, according to the appeal, this is not Larry and Andy. According to the appeal, the the legislation was was introduced in the House by Representative Cheryl Delozier and Jordan Harris, both are republicans and then the committee, House Judiciary Committee Chair Rob Kauffman, who is a republican, they gutted it. Where it actually, according to all the stakeholders who had been behind the democrat bill, oppose it now. That what what has replaced it and they say it actually makes it worse. And if the appeal is accurate, then this is an issue where when you go in that booth to make your decision. If you're for reform, you can't honestly vote for these people, if they actually did what was alleged in this article. And that's what I try to do is let people know that sometimes what you say you're for is being undermined by the people that you're voting for. So,

all the people in Pennsylvania, just remember that if you do want to cut down on your astronomically large number of people under supervision, then you probably need to change who you're voting for, because it's not going to happen under the current regime that you have there.

Andy 20:43
Alright.

Larry 20:45

I like the quote from Representative Delozier. She said that, that the changes were made to quote appease probation officers. Now what she means by that would be that under the system that had been proposed by the Democrat, that that there would be need for fewer probation officers, which would mean there would be a downsizing of the supervision caseload, which would mean there be downsize of the workforce. And anyone will tell you, they want less work, but no one will tell you they want fewer jobs. In particular if they hold that type of job. And so this was done to keep more probation officers employed. Now, but this is being done by the small government people who claim they want to eliminate wasteful spending.

Andy 21:31

I see. Okay. Yep. I understand. Well, Larry, joining us now is a gentleman named Justin, who posed a question to us maybe a month or so ago, and then I guess you got another one on the NARSOL side. And I think I'll just set this up by reading the question.

Listener Question

Are you people aware that the law regarding registration in Wisconsin that requires payment of a \$100 annual fee? Are we required to pay \$100 a year, even while in prison to register in Wisconsin? I'm wondering if I move back to Illinois, will I still have to pay Wisconsin the annual fee? I'm guessing that I would have to pay Illinois or whatever state I register in as well. That seems really absurd to me. Is NARSOL or anyone working on a national registry to replace all this confusion caused by us having to deal with this maze of state by state requirements?

Andy 22:23

Alright. Welcome. Justin, thank you so much for taking the time out of your schedule. And you're like, almost on a satellite phone in the middle of nowhere.

Justin 22:30

Yes, yes. I'm actually on top of a mountain in Colorado. Leadville, Colorado as a matter of fact,

Andy 22:36

God, I need to be there Larry. Can we make it so that I can record from there? I bet it's beautiful where you are.

Justin 22:42

Oh, it's it is absolutely beautiful. It's blue skies. And right now it's about 55, 60 degrees. And it'll be down in around in the 30s tonight.

Andy 22:52

Jeeppers. All right. All right. Before I start drooling, then. So what do we have going on?

Larry 22:58

Well, we we've got, we've got a great question. And that comes up from time to time. And so I thought we'd take a little bit of a deeper dive into it. The the answer to the second part, we can jettison that pretty quick. There is to my knowledge, no organization that's working on a national registry. And if there was such an organization doing that, it would be doubtful there would be jurisdiction to have a national registry. And the way I'm interpreting national would be that the federal government would run the registry. And I don't believe that there would be jurisdiction for the federal government to run a registry where the officers and all the administration and everything would be done by the federal government because these, the majority of people who have sexual offense convictions have been convicted under state law. And it's the states who determine if they're going to deal with with registration or not. That's the reason why we have the Adam Walsh Act to begin with. So the but no one that I'm aware of is pushing for a national registry and that would include NARSOL.

Justin 24:05

Actually, if I can jump in real quick, I was reading on Florida Action Committee, a post about the Attorney General had filed in the federal registry accepting comments for something along the lines of a national registry I believe, or something to that nature anyway. Which is also discouraging. And I will say that the Wisconsin requires you to fill out Annual Registration paperwork. And then in addition to that, there is a \$100 fee and being in Florida, I'm obligated to pay the hundred dollar fee. I've never paid it. They haven't pursued anything on the on that front of it. But I've always filled out and returned the verification letter that they mailed me. Because if I don't do that, there could be a criminal charge. Just like if I don't, you know, in Florida, I have to go and report in person twice a year. If I don't do that, I'm non-compliant. And I could, you know, face a charge.

Larry 25:16

Okay, so so the question the question has never been debated, about the hundred dollars. That Wisconsin request that they pay, the people living out of state, pay the hundred dollars. So we're gonna get into tonight is whether they can do that or not. And whether its constitutional, and but yes, that that that has been a repeated complaint we've heard and we acknowledge that \$100 is assessed and you will continue to receive your bill from Wisconsin. But But what I did is I looked at the case that was provided to me and I remembered it once I read it that I had read it back in 2015. The Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States said that that, that they that that fee was constitutional. And it probably is constitutional. But that's a separate issue. But the case we're talking about Mueller, the case from from the Seventh Circuit. I don't know how to how to pronounce the last word or the last name, but that's the case we're talking about. And that is an example of idiotic litigation. To begin with, the people who brought who brought the challenges, brought challenges they would have done them no good had they won, because they were living out of state. And they were subject because to those states' registration requirements. So the only thing that it would have

accomplished for them, would, and they challenged every aspect of registration, they claimed that it was unconstitutional in every way possible. They threw everything but the kitchen sink at it. And when you do litigation, contrary to popular belief, you want to focus on the issues that directly impact you. And the only thing that directly impacted them with Wisconsin's registry, they didn't have any proximity restrictions to deal with. They didn't have any compliance checks to deal with. All they had was an annual letter that said send us \$100. That's not particularly punishment. But they argued that that was punishment, because of costs due to the fine. And fines have always been punishment. Not necessarily. Now a fine generally is punishment. But the the hundred dollars is an administrative fee. And the Court of Appeals said, Well, this is not an exorbitant amount of a fee, compared to the cost of actually tracking the people who are no longer in the state. And that our state has an interest, Wisconsin has an interest, I shouldn't say our state, but Wisconsin has an interest in tracking people who are no longer in Wisconsin because of the of the satisfaction of knowing where people are. But what this decision does not do is that this does not give Wisconsin jurisdiction to prosecute anybody. If you read the decision, the state stipulated that they had never prosecuted anybody who had who had been non-compliant. And they even came close to stipulating that they didn't even think they could if they wanted to. Because the prosecutor person in Wisconsin, you have to have a crime that was committed within the boundaries of Wisconsin. And the registration that you're that you're doing in Florida has nothing to do with Wisconsin. Wisconsin no longer has jurisdiction over you. So we still don't have the answer to whether or not there's jurisdiction. But what I think we're going to have is we will never get the answer, because two things are going to keep us from getting the answer. First of all, the state is not going to be stupid enough to prosecute anybody who doesn't send in the form. They're not going to they're not going to try to extradite anybody back because the last thing you'd want would be to extradite a sex offender back. That would be as idiotic as anything you could do. What happens if they get stuck there and they start offending there? So, we'll never get to have an attempt to extradite. But before the person would be brought to trial, the first motion you would file would you would claim that they didn't break Wisconsin law. That you agreed that they didn't that they didn't return the form, but Wisconsin doesn't have jurisdiction. And contrary to popular belief, that's not a federal court decision. That's for the for the state of Wisconsin to determine whether they think they have jurisdiction or not to criminally prosecute someone, and when you're putting forth a criminal prosecution, you establish the grounding jurisdiction. So your affidavit of probable cause says that on or about this date, that a person did these things *within* the jurisdiction of this court, and therefore, there's probable cause to believe they should be prosecuted. And the first thing that any good defense attorney would argue if Wisconsin was stupid enough to try to extradite anybody for not paying the fee is they would say that that they didn't commit a crime in Wisconsin. That the regulatory fee that the Court of Appeals said is not punishment. Therefore, it can be applied to people retro actively, that still does not give them jurisdiction to prosecute. And only the state court can decide if it has jurisdiction. So, this case does not do what people think it does. It has not answered that question.

Justin 30:12

Can I jump in there real quick? (Larry: Sure.) The question I do have is the form the Annual Registration letter form that they send that I have to, you know, it's a verification letter that I have to complete sign and send back. It states on there, failure to return that form is a class H or class G or whatever, class felony. So, they're threatening me, because I'm convicted in Wisconsin, obviously, they're threatening me that if I fail to reply, or fail to report or send that form back, that I'm now facing a criminal charge. So, wouldn't that be grounds for filing a charge and extraditing me back to Wisconsin because I failed to report that form back or send that form back?

Larry 31:03

Well, first of all, I'm assuming I'm assuming that they use that form for everybody, including people who live in Wisconsin. And therefore, if you live within the borders of Wisconsin, you would be subject to prosecution, I don't think they have a special form for out of state residents. But just because the form says it doesn't make it so. For a prosecution to be successful, there would have to be a prosecutor willing to seek an arrest. And that process means an affidavit of probable cause, taken before a judicial official, a state judicial official, because this would be a state prosecution. And the state judicial official saying yes, I agree, there's probable cause. And then they put out an extradition. Whether they will pick this person up in their state or the surrounding states, they have levels of extradition. So they would put level one level two, or nationwide, or even outside the United States if they want you bad enough. But you'd have to find someone who could overcome the stupidity of why you wouldn't want to bring a sex offender back, number one, you'd have to get a judge to agree there's probable cause that a crime has occurred in Wisconsin where the court has jurisdiction, you would have to have willingness to extradite a person to expend those funds. And then you would face an immediate motion to dismiss because that would be the first motion that I would make is that there's been a law broken in Wisconsin. Wisconsin cannot continue to impose registration. Now, having said that, if you took your vehicle from one state and you move to another state, and the previous state continued to send you a bill and say you need to pay it, would you pay that? Of course not, you wouldn't pay that. But if they sent you the bill, and you paid it, and you continue to pay it, I'm sure they'd be happy to collect your money. And they would tell you, my goodness, why keep registering their car here? Our citizens would like to know, if we have some border cities that straddle each other, we'd like to know where that car is so we can keep track of it. But just because Wisconsin wants the money doesn't mean that they actually have the jurisdictional hook to get the money.

Justin 33:03

Correct. And then another valid point that I saw in that decision by the seventh district, that it spells out the fact that in Wisconsin's legislature in the statute for registration, it says if you live out of state, you're required to report and register with the state that you live in. So what they're doing, what they essentially are doing with me is redundancy. They're, you know, in that decision, they went in to say the judges or the judge panel or whatever, went in to say that they if a person or a registrant lives over the Wisconsin border in Illinois or Iowa or Minnesota or whatever, that they want to know that. Well, that isn't that the point that they're, the Wisconsin law says that I'm obligated to report to

Florida. So, I'm already on a registry. I'm already it's already public information where I live. So why do I have to have anything to do with Wisconsin?

Larry 34:16

Well, in my opinion, and my opinion alone, I don't think you have to have anything to Wisconsin. I think that you could ignore the letters and I don't think anything would happen. But that's just my personal opinion. But I'm sure they'll keep taking your hundred dollars as long as you're willing to send it. And what they would argue is that their registrants in Wisconsin, Wisconsinites don't go to Iowa and all these other state's registries, so they just want to look at the Wisconsin registry, and they won't know what happened to you. So therefore, we need to keep that up to date. But you could tell them in response to that, well, you can use the other states' registry, and you can you can track it that way. You can you can check with them, but but I ain't sending you nothing. And I can tell you unequivocally, if I had a conviction in Wisconsin, and I'm speaking for myself, I would not send any form to them nor would I pay them a dime. And I will almost guarantee, you could ever guarantee because there's always a nutty prosecutor somewhere, I can almost guarantee you that no one that resembles being in their right mind would want to go through the cost of extraditing a person that might be stuck in Wisconsin. You'd rather have them offending another state, wouldn't you?

Justin 35:22

Absolutely. Why bring them back?

Larry 35:22

And that's why they haven't. That's why they told the federal court that they haven't brought anyone back. And they're not likely to.

Justin 35:36

Yeah. Now, the dilemma, and I think I speak for everybody on the registry. Nobody wants to voluntarily violate a rule, or you know, and as we all know, how strict Florida is. Their, you can't keep up with their laws or their registration requirements, because they change them like every six months, it seems like, and they just get worse and worse. So I've watched it over 24 years, you know, just go from a one and done to, you know, I've got to donate my left kidney, you know, I mean, it's just ridiculous. But nobody wants to go, voluntarily get in trouble or violate a registration requirement, under the hopes and wishes that nothing might happen. And that's in my case, I'm, you know, now 45 years old, I don't want to, you know, run into legal issues, and get, you know, arrested and extradited and deal with any of those legal issues. I would like to, you know, I guess my question that I'm posing is, how would I go about dealing with this on a proactive level, so that I'm not facing, you know, criminal charges? I'd rather do it on my end. Not theirs.

Larry 36:50

And that's a great question. And, and sometimes there's no way to do what you'd like to do, because you have to have a justiciable controversy. And, meaning that there has to be a real, there has to be a real controversy, not an imaginary one. Could the fact that the letter says that you're subject to prosecution be enough to get you in a declaratory judgment action in the state of Wisconsin? Maybe. I'm not a legal professional in Wisconsin, but the best way this question is going to be answered is when someone has actually been extradited, and it has to go through a motion for

dismissal and waiting for the trial court to rule on it. And then it being appealed. And we have we have state court ruling on whether they think they have jurisdiction on people out of state, but I can assure you, the federal court cannot tell the state who it has jurisdiction over. And therefore, this is an unanswered question. And the only way to have it answered is to have someone either prosecuted, or we would have to be able to convince a court that you're within a zone of prosecution if you don't do this and see if they would entertain it. But if I'm the if I'm the, the the other side of this in Wisconsin, I'm going to argue, Your Honor, there's no justiciable controversy here. We've never prosecuted for this. We've never extradited anybody. This is just wishful thinking on this guy's part, we just want him to send \$100 in, we don't prosecute anybody. We never have. Now, there have been court decisions that said just the fact that you haven't done it doesn't mean that that that you couldn't do it. So, if you haven't renounced that that you won't prosecute a person, that might be enough. So the answer would be if you want to spend some money, and you want to try to do a declaratory judgment asking a Wisconsin trial court to declare that you're no longer subject to this requirement, and see what happens and then take that up on appeal. That would be the way we would find out proactively or tell them to take it and shove it and see what they do. That's two ways to find out.

Andy 38:43
Say fyp when you do it, too.

Larry 38:51
fyp would do it and I just about a bet nothing would happen. Because the last thing they want is the \$100 to stop coming. And they don't want an appellate decision saying that nobody has to pay out of state. And I don't even think that they would even get that decision, because I think about it here on the recording, because that's a separate issue. The hundred dollars is a separate issue about whether, if I'm the state, I'm gonna argue that that's an administrative cost for us to keep track of you. But whether or not there's jurisdiction to prosecute you, if you don't choose to be kept track of, that's a whole separate issue. So, the hundred dollars is a separate issue is what I'm going to argue. And if I can think of that, I tell people they can think of that. And that's what they would likely argue is that, you know, we need that to offset our cost. If he can keep a track of him, even if he doesn't turn the form in, we have to try to we have to try to keep track for our state citizens to know where this person is. And that's a fee and we're not going to prosecute him. That's a whole separate issue. So you may not ever get an answer on this until you tell them that you're not going to you're not going to participate with their little boogie show and see what happens.

Justin 40:00
Yeah.

Andy 40:00
How much would it cost them to actually like go and get him? I mean, that would be several, several thousands of dollars to like go extradite them.

Larry 40:09
probably not thousands. The way they do the extradition transport companies now it's a lot cheaper than it used to be when they

sent officers. But it would be money, but that that's only one component of it. The other component is you may have an offender that ends up staying and that would be the last thing you would want. If you bring 100 offenders back, I mean, I know that we believe the recidivism is zero. But it's not. If you're bringing 100 offenders back, and they're living out of state, and it's only 3%, you've got three offenses that happened in Wisconsin, that would have happened in other states. That's not something I'd want to explain to my constituents that I brought offenders back so they could commit crimes here. So that we get to pay the cost of both the extradition, the transportation, the incarceration, to release them in community under supervision so that they can't offend again. I mean, that's just nutty. And that's why they don't do it.

Andy 41:02
Wouldn't you end up with Wisconsin acting like Sheriff Long was *southern accent* "I'll take this all the way to the Supreme Court." So they go round them up?

Larry 41:12
Well, well, when you say go round them up around the country, I don't think so. I don't need to extradite people; I don't think that a single person would ever be extradited. The fact is, the proofs are there. They haven't extradited anybody.

Justin 41:25
So, Larry, this goes back to the question or the conversation we had a few weeks ago. I do have a question about, we didn't really get too much into detail on that on this. But my question a few weeks ago was if I moved to another state and petitioned the state that I move to, the local court, to be removed from registration, because it's been 24 years. And let's just say, in a perfect world, I'm granted that petition. It's approved, and I'm removed from the registration, the registration requirement for that state that I now live in, I would still be obligated under the what's going on with the Wisconsin and the requirement with the letter and the, you know, um, you know, if I'd fail to reply, blah, blah, I'm still required to be on registration. So, like, in this and my question, my question actually goes to as far as my passport. I'd received a letter from the Department of State that my passport was cancelled, because I don't have the identifying mark on the passport. So, there's no way for me to get you know, if I was removed from registration in, you know, the state that I moved to, I'm still going to be on a registration because of Wisconsin. And the state that I moved to has no jurisdiction to tell Wisconsin Oh, well, he's not required register anymore. So, I'm pretty much screwed, right?

Larry 43:06
It doesn't sound good for that. Now, being on a state registry website, it's not the same thing as being registered as far as being in an NCIC system. The NCIC is not the state website. But that's a topic for another show. But in terms of, if you're going to continue to send the form into Wisconsin, and there's no way to be removed, and you're still on their website, showing it your address that you're reporting to them through your mail in form. I would, I would say that that's, that's gonna be a major problem for you in terms of your passport. (Justin: Okay.)

Andy 43:40
All right. Are we, can we close that out?

Larry 43:44
I think we can.

Andy 43:46
Justin, appreciate it very much. And I hope you have a good rest of your weekend.

Justin 43:52
Thank you so much for everything you guys do. And I really appreciate the time and in the call and so on.

Andy 43:59
Fantastic. Thanks Justin. Take Care, good night.

Justin 44:04
Goodnight, thank you. Bye bye.

Andy 44:01
Ready to be a part of Registry matters? Get links at registrymatters.co If you need to be discreet about it, contact them by email at registrymatterscast@gmail.com You can call or text a ransom message to (747)227-4477. Wanna support Registry Matters on a monthly basis? Head to patreon.com/registrymatters Not ready to become a patron? Give a five-star review at Apple podcasts or Stitcher or tell your buddies at your treatment class about the podcast. We want to send out a big heartfelt support for those on the registry. Keep fighting without you, we can't succeed. You make it possible. Where should we go? Should we move over to I think we actually then done and we can move on to the second listener question is that where we're ready to go to?

Larry 45:04
Sure. And I was a little confused by this one, but I'm gonna do my best with it.

Andy 45:09
Alright, so I will read:

Listener Question

I am the wife of someone who is affected by the registry. And therefore, and I have listened to pretty much all of your episodes along with dear hubby. (Andy: Well, thank you very much for the both of you listening sounds like a nice time to like sit around by a fire and you get some popcorn, and you throw on the podcast and have a nice date night.) Thank you for your education and insight on all of these issues. Today I was reading through the proposed changes on the SORNA rules, (Andy: God, we're going to go back to that again?) And I came across the following in paragraph D, reporting of departure and termination concerning residents, employment, and school attendance regarding moving from one state to another. Certain pieces of this section sound to me like they are opening the door for a national registry. But then again, I work in accounting, so I know nothing about law speak, can you guys take a look and comment on it?

Andy 45:55
And for those that you happen to be watching on the YouTube side of things, you can read some of the text if you can read this little bit of like small font on the screen.

Larry 46:03
And and that's very insightful for an accountant. And that's exactly what they're doing. But they're doing it in a in a very sneaky way. As we said in the earlier segment, I don't whether it will be earlier or later when you play it. But there isn't really a national registry, there is a national looking resource that it looks into the state registries, but there's not a national registry. But the intent of the Adam Walsh Act was to get the registries as consistent, at least in terms of minimum standards, as possible. And that 14-year experiment has largely failed. That the states have done not so well at the key components of the Adam Walsh Act. So the small government Attorney General that that has put forth is proposed to modify it, what they're hoping to do, and this is my personal opinion, I I'm not authorized to render this on behalf of any other organization that I may be involved with. But they have given up on doing it through the legislative process. So what they've done is they're going to try to implement as much as they can administratively. And they will be, they will be handing forms to the states that they've already I'm sure produced. And they will be, the registrars and the states will be asking the offenders, and not just asking but demanding, that they sign these forms agreeing to these terms, because they're gonna say they're a federal law. And, and people are going to willingly do that, like they did in West Virginia when 99.8725% of them went running in to sign the required form that said, if you're going to travel internationally, you have to give 21 days' notice, which is not in Virginia, West Virginia law. But once they signed that acknowledgement, even though it's not in the state statute, it's a federal law, and the requisite notice has been given. And that's what I think they're going to do. So, we're going to have a de facto national, federal registry, and states are going to end up keeping people registries longer, and they're going to cite to, well it would be a violation of federal law. And you're registered, you're tier two, and although our state law is 10 years, I mean, the federal law actually takes control because you're a tier two, or the or you're a tier three, and you have to do lifetime. And so you're going to have those states having to to carry the cost of all these extra requirements, the shorter, the shorter turnarounds between changing, updating information. A lot of states don't have a three-day requirement in terms of that it's a longer period 7, 10, five days. And in order to be able to receive those updates, if you're not going to be electronically, you have to have more personnel allocated, which means that the effectively the small government people are imposing an unfunded mandate on the states.

Andy 48:50
unfunded mandates. We don't want those.

Larry 48:53
Well, normally those people don't want that, but amazingly on some things they do.

Andy 48:59
Can you describe how that actually then goes down? If there's an unfunded mandate? So like, I mean, I think at the state level, so the feds with the Byrne grant, like money goes into the states, and they collect it, but then the counties are often the ones that are administering the registry, but they don't get extra funding for it directly, do they?

Larry 49:19

Well, actually, they do for the compliance component of it. There's a compliance residency check where all the small government law enforcement agencies have their hands out to get as much federal funding as they can for the compliance check. And that's why you get these multi agency knocks at your door with people in SWAT regalia giving you a hard time but but also the the Byrne grants are available to local governments as well as state. So it's the state, the way I understand it, and a person who's more expert can come on in and correct us but my understanding is that the state is, they lose the state portion, the 10% comes off the state they don't penalize the local Funding because it's assumed that a county can't make its own rules. Now, there's exception to that. We've got a county in northwest Atlanta Metro, called Cobb. And Cobb County seems to feel like they can make their own rules. They consider themselves to be a jurisdiction. But they're actually not. You have to be a state or territory or tribe to be a jurisdiction under federal SORNA. But they've decided that since they would like to have more of Georgia's laws to look more like the fed's, they've decided that they can enforce federal requirements because they are a jurisdiction and they're dead wrong about that. They're not a jurisdiction.

Andy 50:36

Because it's not accounted for in the original drafting of the law?

Larry 50:42

Yeah, jurisdiction is defined and it's a state or a territory or a tribe. Cobb County is neither a state, nor is it a territory, nor is it a tribe.

Andy 50:53

It would be a Puerto Rico kind of thing. (Larry: Yes, because that's a territory.) I understand. I think so What was the confusing part? You said, when we started this, that you weren't necessarily even sure you understood the question? What's the, what is your confusion?

Larry 51:07

Well, I mean, she spotted the the part about we're moving towards a federal registry. But I don't know what the question is, per se. Like, what can we do about it? What can we do about it? Well, there's really not much we can do about it. Because the states are going to be more than willing to acquiesce to this power grab. And, of course, what you could do about it is you could vote the power grab out of office in November, but but you know, that that would be a lot to expect. This is, this is where you would say, look, I do believe in small government, I do believe in the concept of federalism, I do believe in states' rights. And I thought you did, but if you don't, I will register resentment against you at the polls. But amazingly, they get forgiven for that. And people say, Well, I'm going to vote for him anyway, despite that, because they're more important issues. And but that's one thing you could do. But the states are going to be more than willing, the local law enforcement units that administer registration, they're chomping at the bit to do more and to impose more requirements. That's what's so scary about this are people think that because their state is a compliant, that they've rejected AWA, they haven't. They just haven't substantially complied, there's a difference in rejecting it, and failing to substantially comply.

Andy 52:28

Take a state like Vermont that, you know, as we talk about, and I know, like the people in Vermont are like, Oh, my God, the registry sucks. And the people in Alabama are saying, Wow, that registry sucks. But they're not the same, they're not the same compliance requirements. And Vermont has just chosen to comply less than Alabama has decided to comply more.

Larry 52:47

Well think Alabama is designated as substantially compliant. Vermont is nowhere close, not even in the ballpark. But Vermont is one of those states that at this point has not really wanted to comply. But a lot of states who have not complied, they either already over compliant, or they just have failed in their implementation because they need legislative action. Like our state, we need to be compliant. We need to add more offences that are currently are not registered here. We can't do that by administrative action, it has to be put on the list or at least indirectly, we could pass a law that we talked about, that would say that the list of sex offenses will be determined by the designation from the sex offender management, apprehension, registration tracking, by the SMART Office. But other than that, the administrative bureaucracy cannot add to list. Also we need to register adjudicated juveniles who have been adjudicated of an aggravated sex offense if they're over 14. And we can't do that by executive action, by administrative action that has to be through the legislature. And so New Mexico, trust me, the bureaucracy, the law enforcement apparatus wants to comply. They are eager to comply. They're desperate to comply, but they have not been able to comply because the New Mexico opposition has been more successful than they've been in terms of attempting to pass compliant legislation. But everybody says well my State hasn't complied, they've rejected it. Nope. Your state hasn't complied not because they've rejected it. That may be the case. But but more likely, your state has just failed in all the parts that need to be achieved to be substantially compliant.

Andy 54:32

Alright. And we have another question. That is from Toby.

Listener Question

Is there anything I should know about living as a PFR in South Dakota? I was told that I would have to register? Is there any way I would not have to register? Am I not allowed to access the internet for three years? Everything is done on computers nowadays. How am I supposed to reintegrate into society? I thought that was the purpose of federal supervised release?

Andy 54:58

Yeah, like supervision in general is supposed to like quote unquote, help you reintegrate into Society, right?

Larry 55:01

Well, in particular federal supervised release because it follows a period of incarceration. And that's different than federal probation. It's the same people, the probation service does both but but actually, the intent and spirit of supervised release is to take that offender who has paid their debt to society, all except for the 15% potential good time that they they might have gotten off their sentence, and then they're supposed to be reintegrated. So he's correct. That is actually the stated purpose of supervised

release. But as with everything else, it has become blurry through the years that that, that that concept came about in 1984, under the Reagan administration with the sentencing reform act 1984. And they abolished parole in the federal system, and they put this Sentencing Commission in place, and they put these stringent requirements and, and diminished any behavior, any early release for good behavior to more than 15%, I think it's like 54 days a year. And so so the answer to the question is, that is the purpose, but it doesn't turn out to be that way. Now, in terms of the internet, we'll take that the the absolute ban, we're taking at face value. I'm not allowed to access the internet for three years. Now, it could be that the actual language, the language of his document may say without prior approval of the probation service. If it truly does, say, an all out ban, then he's got a potential cause of action, if they cannot articulate an individualized reason why he should have no access, because the case law is just a significant amount of it. You can't just ban someone from the internet. So therefore, I would ask him to consult with a legal professional, and find out if it is a total ban, that that they force the probation service to state a reason why that that they need to totally ban him because it would have to be significant. But in terms of registration, I'm afraid that if you're serving time and have served time in the federal system, anything that I can think of that the feds would convict you of in a way of a sex offense, it would be registerable, in any state that you would go to. I can't think of anything off the top of my head. Therefore, whatever state you choose to be released to and to begin live at, you will end up having to register in that state. And therefore, my suggestion to you would be that if you have options, you'd want to try to figure out the most favorable state that you could live in. And I think we have an episode not too far back where we said, Where should I go? If you have an option or where to go, then you would take that option. Now, sometimes you're stuck with going back to the jurisdiction where you were convicted. If you you may be at the time you were released, you may be in three states away, five states away from where you were because the feds can send you anywhere. And you may not be anywhere near, but my understanding is that more often than not, you end up back in a jurisdiction where you were where you were convicted.

Andy 58:05

I wanted to just clarify, something you said about anything that you could be convicted of at the federal level is most likely a registerable offense. I just wanted to provide the comparison back that you could be convicted of something super benign in a state that doesn't even really consider that to be a crime or it's a misdemeanor in another state and you move there and they don't get swept under the rug. But now you're not under a registration kind of environment. Did I describe that halfway well?

Larry 58:32

well, there'd be state offenses where that some states you'd have a registration obligation and the other state would say no, we don't register that offense, our registry, and I always bring up the Georgia thing with obscene phone calls to minor. To my recollection, nobody other than Georgia does that. And in fact, I think that there was a reform piece of legislation that that would have removed that from the list of Georgia registerable offences. But if you go to Vermont, chances are that would not translate to anything in Vermont, and they would terminate your duty to register. And but in the feds, since the universe of federal sex

offenses is not that large to begin with. It's not like the states where they have everything. The federal list is much smaller. And everything that constitutes the federal sex offense from possession of child porn to production distribution, to a sexual offense in and of itself, is probably going to be registerable in a state it's going to fit under and then the states may just have that any, any, any any obligation, they may have their law that says any obligation under another jurisdiction would automatically trigger a duty register under state law. I can't think of any way you're going to get out of registering. I'm sorry.

Andy 59:50

Can you circle back there's language in certain states, I guess it's almost similar to like the SORNA language of being substantially compliant. Isn't there language, when they do translations of the only one that I can think of is substantially similar. I think aren't there a couple other ways to word that of whether things get translated and how well they get translated?

Larry 1:00:11

Well, ours is equivalent here. It has to be, there's no substantial, it has to be equivalent.

Andy 1:00:17

Literally word for word equivalent?

Larry 1:00:20

Well, that's how they define it. It says these offences or their equivalents from another jurisdiction.

Andy 1:00:27

All right. And so going back to the obscene phone calls, so you make some naughty phone calls in Georgia, and you move to New Mexico and like, sorry, we don't have anything here. So kick rocks, have a nice day?

Larry 1:00:40

Well I don't know what you mean kick rocks and have a nice day. They would tell you that you don't have an obligation to register here.

Andy 1:00:45

That was the kick rocks part. Yeah, the registration office is gonna tell you to leave like you don't have any reason to be here.

Larry 1:00:52

Well, they would like to register you. But the law doesn't give them that prerogative. In fact, when we did our lawsuit here, which we ended up having to dismiss for, for reasons that I won't go into, but they wanted to change the law to eliminate the term equivalent, they wanted to insert in the law that if you have a registration obligation anywhere, that you have to register here. Now we've managed to defeat that in the last legislation session, it will come back, it will come back. And, and, but but right now, it says equivalent. Only problem is we don't have a process to determine that. So, we have, we have a form up in Santa Fe, and we have a lowly paid bureaucrat, who goes through that form and makes a few check marks on boxes. So yep, it's equivalent. And you don't have the opportunity to be heard, you don't have the opportunity to contest any information that they're using to make the determination, you don't have the opportunity for appeal. It's

just that if a bureaucrat says it's equivalent it is. and they find it as much equivalent as they can. Again, why would you want us to be a safe haven for people? So the apparatus wants to have no safe haven. So therefore, they try to find everything equivalent. To their credit, occasionally, they get it right, and they find something not equivalent, and they tell the person that they don't have to register, but it's very rare. Usually the person has to fight their way off the registry.

Andy 1:02:14

I think that, I don't think there's anything else for us to do tonight. I think that covers it all.

Larry 1:02:20

That's fantastic. We're gonna have a short one. Have we ever gotten done in an hour and 15 minutes before?

Andy 1:02:25

Yes, we have. We've actually we've had one that was maybe a hair like a tiny little hair over an hour.

Larry 1:02:32

That must have been in 1979.

Andy 1:02:36

Larry, should we should we announce our intent to expand our presence? What's not presence is the right word. Legitimacy, maybe that's the better way? Should we announce that

Larry 1:02:47

that? Yeah, we got a few minutes, we can do that what we're thinking of doing and this will be a good time to get listener participation, we, we realize that we're branching out in terms of reaching into the prisons where people desperately need information. And our intent is not to compete with anybody, we don't even think in those terms. Our intent is to augment what is lacking, which is information. And we undertook the transcript transmission service, which is in its infancy, but my prediction is that it will grow and it will grow significantly. And we don't want to not serve anyone, we want to be like NARSOL. NARSOL serves everybody on the newsletter. If if they're indigent, and they want the newsletter, NARSOL provides it to him. I'd like to be able to do the same thing for this, that we'd like to provide the transcripts. So what we're thinking about doing is incorporating and filing for 501(c)(3) for Registry Matters. And we would be this would be clearly education. What we do here is we walk through, explain things to people, this is an education podcast, and we would provide information and education. And I think that would be a nice umbrella to qualify under the 501(c)(3) status and we need a name for the entity. We would certainly do businesses Registry Matters but but we need to come up with some corporate name. I mean FYP is certainly on the table but we have name suggestions of what we would...

Andy 1:04:11

Duh, it's totally going to be FYP Studios. Duh.

Larry 1:04:15

well I don't I don't know so much about that. But but it would be it would be fun to see what kind of suggestions we can get for naming. We put a lot of effort into coming up with an NARSOL

name you know to replace the RSOL name which was Reform Sex Offender Laws and trying to keep the the RSOL in the name was a challenge because we didn't want to let go of that. Well, we certainly want Registry Matters to be prominent, but the corporate entity, we may not want to name it Registry Matters.

Andy 1:04:42

Right so I can just see one of us going to the bank and opening an account and like Well, what's the name of this? FYP Studios. Um, can we spell out FYP? and so you'd be like, Huh, you people.... haha that would be that It would be such an amazing day

Larry 1:05:02

well it's it's something that we're probably gonna try to get done by the end of the year in terms of least incorporation the (c)(3) status will take a while because you have to apply and the IRS to review what you do and and but the first step is to incorporate

Andy 1:05:17

fantastic that's amazing that'll be fun that'll be an exciting transition for us to move into and that opens up some avenues that it happened early in our infancy someone offered to contribute some money and they were going to do it from a trust and we had no no way to do that at the time.

Larry 1:05:33

well hopefully you kept their number and their name on file

Andy 1:05:37

probably could go find it somewhere along the way all right Larry Well, we can we can dispense with these things. so registrymatters.co is the website phone in at 747-227-4477 if you want to leave some voicemail. I don't ever answer any phone calls there. registrymatterscast@gmail.com is the email address and Larry we love all of our listeners but especially our patrons. How can people support the podcast?

Larry 1:06:01

By a lavish, lavish monthly gift?

Andy 1:06:06

As low as?

Larry 1:06:08

As low as \$1 all the way up to... didn't you create a \$1200 per month option or something like that?

Andy 1:06:15

You can adjust the number if you want to. You can come in at the highest level and then change the number and Oh yeah, sweet a Carnival Cruise for two someone says in chat. perfect Carnival Cruise for two. Even though you probably can't get on the boat or get off the boat on the other side.

Larry 1:06:30

Yeah, patreon.com/registrymatters.

Andy 1:06:33

Fantastic. Larry, I appreciate it always. And I hope that you have a wonderful evening and I will talk to you soon.

Larry 1:06:40
So Good night, everyone.

You've been listening to FYP

More show transcripts are available at <https://RegistryMatters.co> (that's right... just C O with no M)

In prison and can't get the podcast? Have a loved one "subscribe" at <https://patreon.com/registrymatters> at the **\$15 level**, and include your prison address information. Or send a check to cover at least 3 months.

REGISTRY MATTERS
MAIL-IN SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Sign me up for _____ months X \$10 = \$ _____
(Minimum 3 months) Note: **We do accept stamps for payment. No singles please.**

First Name

Last Name

Name of Institution

ID Number

Address

City

State

Zip Code

**Make check payable to Registry Matters and send to RM Podcast,
Post Office Box 36123, Albuquerque, NM 87176**