



## Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 153

Recorded 11-14-20

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 probation savings time, FYP Studios, east and west, transmitting across the internet. This is Episode 153 of Registry Matters. Larry it's another Saturday night, I'm happy to be here, I hope you are too.

Larry 00:26

I'm always happy to be here. And I'm surprised you keep inviting me back.

Andy 00:31

I do keep inviting you back. And that's probably against my better judgment and counsel from other people.

Larry 00:37

So well, maybe they'll come to their senses one of these days.

Andy 00:40

we could just say, look, if nobody shows up, if nobody would download the show and all that, then we could just shut it down and have a nice quiet Saturday night. And I wouldn't have to talk to your kind.

Larry 00:51

So, what kind is that anyway?

Andy 00:53

The kind that actually... let me let me just preface this whole thing. I was having, this is gonna come up here in a little bit, but so I was speaking to someone that if they were to be released from their supervision requirements from the registry, they would be done with the movement. And I said, Larry doesn't have anything to like, you don't have any direct involvement anymore. You're not on supervision, you're not in the registry. So, you're helping us out of the kindness of your heart.

Larry 01:19

Well, that would be, that would be tragic if people take that attitude. We try to encourage the ones in this state not to do that because since it is a civil regulatory scheme, and we know that the ex post facto prohibition only alters the change in criminal statutes. It's possible that a person who's gotten off the registry could be invited back and you could just look around Wyoming, that'd be a good example of that when they went for their 10-year registration to their 15-25-life, when they passed their version of AWA. They invited people back, so never assume just because you're off something that you're not impacted, you can't be impacted by going forward. If you have this conviction, you can be impacted by it. So, I would encourage you... (Andy: And you said invited back, huh?) Well, that was a nice way to put it.

Andy 02:10

I love that you put it that way. That's awesome. Um, let's dive right in. Can you describe that you received a small little package in the mail this weekend, and it did not contain anything that was uh, oh,

anyway, let's be nice. You received a package, I was gonna say something kind of snarky.

Larry 02:26

I did I received a package from one of our really faithful, generous patrons. And it was a package that I was expecting containing fudge. And I didn't go down to the box till late yesterday to pick it out. And I said, Well, I'm not going to open it this late because I try to watch my diet eating rich foods at night. And I said, I'll just open it the next day or two when I'm craving something sweet. But I decided that I better open it because you never take for granted what's in a package. And not only was there the fudge I expected, there was a nice card, and there was also a card within the card. That was something that I can redeem at Outback Steak House.

Andy 03:05

Fantastic.

Larry 03:07

So, Justin, that was so kind. And I'm so moved by that. I mean, we already have people that are making more generous contributions than I could ever have imagined when we started this. I didn't even understand the concept that somebody would pay to listen to someone ramble. Because all the rambling I listened to, I listened to it for free, on commercial broadcasting.

Andy 03:29

That's definitely not true but yes, it's just a different business model. You're paying for it with commercials that you may or may not ever go buy a product.

Larry 03:35

Well, yeah, it's built into the products like the NFL. If you stop and think about it, you know, those \$30 million salaries, you're helping pay for those because it's built into the TV contract, which is built into the cable and satellite package, which is built into the advertising cost of the sponsors. But I'm not making an individualized payment for anything that I'm listening to. That's just something I couldn't fathom that people are doing.

Andy 04:00

Oh, see, here's a good point. So, someone in chat is asking, are those special brownies? Are they like happy brownies? Maybe? Do you even know? You might have consumed some pot brownies Larry.

Larry 04:11

I would not expect that we would have received anything like that.

Andy 04:17

That's funny. All right. Let's move right along there. Thank you again, Justin. And now I'm upset because I don't really care for fudge. So, I declined the gift. And this is the second package of fudge that you have received. (Larry: It's the second one.) It's sad to me. But Alright, so enjoy your Outback. And again, thank you very much Justin. Justin is our super all-time winner on Patreon. Anyway, it'll take anybody a very long time to catch up to be mister number one patron.

Larry 04:43

It is, well it's, like I say it's, I can't imagine that. I've been subscribed to the newspaper, you might pay 12, 15 bucks a month, maybe 20 depending on your market. And we've got people that are paying more than 20 bucks a month and the newspaper comes every day.

Andy 05:01

We received a question over on YouTube from Episode 151, which was a couple weeks ago, and it says:

#### *Listener Question*

Somehow, I missed the last 10 or so minutes of this on the podcast and wound up wrapping back around to this in the car over the weekend. The comments Larry made starting at around 74 minutes in with the *Smith v. Doe* in Alaska case. Larry said they went that route due to the recidivism rate being frighteningly high. I'm wondering if that is where the legal challenge would reside. Is that, is that such a thing as to challenge a specific ruling based on the Alaska case with the actual evidence to define what high is and if it is unfounded when compared to other criminal cases? It just seems to me that we keep trying cases on an individual versus going after the ruling that the Supreme Court was advised based on incorrect information. Can we go after just that information?

Andy 5:55

I really liked this question, Larry, because I think that a lot of people would have some level of confusion about if the facts were wrong, can't we just go thump them on the forehead and tell them no Dum Dum, the facts were wrong. Can we try this again?

Larry 06:06

Not that case, no, you can't try that case again. And it's my position that it wouldn't have made any difference in that case, because the case didn't turn on recidivism. It consternates people to no end that they think that because the recidivism that was mentioned was the deciding factor of what was the deciding factor. What was the deciding factor was the Supreme Court had ruled in 1963, in a case called *Kennedy v. Mendoza Martinez*, that if you change a law, as long as it's not a criminal law, that you can change it retroactively. And what determines you can label something civil. But if it, if it those seven factors in the Kennedy Mendoza Martinez test, if those factors weigh in favor of finding it's punitive, you can call it civil all you want to. The factors that they weighed, when they weighed the seven factors did not weigh in favor of the Alaska scheme being found punitive. They didn't decide it on recidivism, they decided it largely on it did not impose any disabilities or restraints. It was merely a regulatory scheme at the time. And so therefore, I encourage people not to spend all the energy they spend on the recidivism. But the deeper question that he's asking, I think is, could they go back and prove that. I wouldn't want to waste my time doing that, because it wasn't the deciding thing. But if you wanted to do that, you'd have to launch a new case. And that's exactly what he did. The challenging party in that case filed in state court, and he argued that it violated the Alaska constitution, and he won. And he put his case together differently, and he won. But "Can we go after the after the court?" If I'm understanding that part of the question, if that's what he means? No, we can't go after the court. The court is immune. They're not a party. But beyond that, the litigants themselves agreed to these facts. When you file for summary judgment, and

I've said this so many times, when you decide to resolve a case by summary judgment, the party to whom is opposed to the summary judgment, everything that they would have used as a defense is presumed true, because they don't get the opportunity to put that defense on at trial. So, everything that Alaska would have said about finding high recidivism had to be assumed true, because we told the court and I say "we", our side, we tell the court that there was nothing factually needed be further developed. We all agree on the facts. So that was a fact that the parties agreed to, that recidivism was high. But that wasn't the deciding factor in the case.

Andy 08:57

ARaidersfan in chat says it's like that that's like going after the referees in a football game after the game is over. Is that a fair analogy?

Larry 09:07

I think that is somewhat fair, the court was handed those facts that recidivism was frightening and high, but it didn't decide the case. if you read the decision, what decided the case was it was a very modest imposition. Not much different than other civil regulatory schemes that are not considered punitive. They, they equated it to a driver's license. And of course, every driver's license, everybody looks at what they're required to do now and they say, of course, it's not like that. But that wasn't what they were looking at. They weren't looking at a crystal ball of what the registry might look 20, 30, 40 years out. They were looking at what was being challenged. And what was being challenged didn't impose much of anything.

Andy 09:48

And that that is one of the pieces that keeps coming back to haunt us now is that they, you know, they constantly cite it says well, if the recidivism rate is frighteningly high, why would we ever let them off the registry?

Larry 10:01

It does come up to haunt in the public discourse, because that is assumed to be true. The more bad political decisions that are made, because everybody knows, as far as they think I'm not saying everybody knows this, because it's not true. But everybody who doesn't know the issue inside out, they have heard this so much about recidivism being frighteningly high, it's assumed to be true. And therefore, the law, the law makers are scared to death to do anything other than to be harsh, because the recidivism is frighteningly high, some lawmakers don't even know that the recidivism rate is very low.

Andy 10:36

Which I constantly come back to that. That is why we need to be present when these laws are being drafted and so forth, so that we can tell them that this information is not accurate and hand them the stack of papers to refute that specific piece of it. I know that you're going to go in like we don't want to fight this on a recidivism basis. But when that piece of evidence comes up, when that conversation comes up here all the studies after, after, after that say that this is not accurate.

Larry 11:00

You absolutely do want to fight that when it's formulation of public policy. You don't want to fight that as your legal, as your chief legal strategy. But in terms of public policy formulation, you absolutely want to talk about recidivism, you want to tell people that, that you're formulating public policy based on a misguided belief that recidivism is off the charts when it isn't. And that comes into sentencing. Why do you think the sentences are so harsh? Well, because the public is outraged about these people that just keep doing this over and over again. And they get a slap on the wrist. So absolutely. You want to talk about recidivism, but you want to talk about it in the right form. And the right form is in the legislature. It's not in the courtroom because the recidivism did not decide *Smith v. Doe*.

Andy 11:46

Gotcha. Is there anything else you want to...?

Larry 11:48

I know I'm gonna get a lot of eggs and hate mail, because everybody... but I claim to my belief that when I read that case, that wasn't the deciding factor. I don't spend all that time worried about it.

Andy 12:02

To address that for just a minute, you are in a position that you are doing this. I don't want to say professionally but you were there in the fight daily or multiple times per week that you know how this process works. Many of us are just sort of like part time kind of hang out and do it maybe during the legislative week if any of us are even there at all. We're very much Monday morning quarterbacks at best.

Larry 12:28

Correct. And there there is no, there's no challenge that will bring the registry down. Because the registry is a collection of 50 registries among the states plus the territories and the Indian tribes. They have their registries, so they're all different. And each registry has to be analyzed on its, what it does and whether it can be constitutional or not. There's no challenge against the registry.

Andy 12:54

Yeah. Anything else before we move on to, I don't know if I want to call it the featured event, but we can call it that for a minute?

Larry 13:01

Oh, sure. Let's move on to, I like this one.

Andy 13:04

All right. Well, let's cover the back one first, that just we can briefly touch on what happened in Spalding County, Georgia. This is I think, related to the Halloween signs.

Larry 13:14

This is there were two lawsuits filed last September 2019, early October, I think it's like late September, simultaneously, one was filed against Butts, one was filed against Spalding and their adjoining counties who happened to be two different judicial districts. The Spalding county officials decided to settle, and the attorney Mark Yurachek the lead attorney on the case will be in the NARSOL Live, hh, what do we call that? The legal...

Andy 13:48

Litigation Summit. So he's speaking what at 7pm next Thursday, and that's Eastern time.

Larry 13:52

And he will be in a position to give you far more information than I can. I know that there's been a settlement. I know that there was some attorney's fees as part of the settlement. And I know that there was a stipulation in terms of prohibition going forward. And I don't know anything beyond that. If it's a permanent injunction against the office or against this sheriff but that's the great kind of questions you can ask Mr. Yurachek.

Andy 14:16

Excellent. Cool. So I mean, that I mean, you know, so we lost in the Butts county side, that seems to be very, very split, that we would settle on one side, and then we would be handed a defeat on the other side.

Larry 14:30

Well, and and we initially won. We got the injunction in Butts County in 2019. And then when the case was decided by summary judgment, we lost and then there be appeal options. You can talk to Mr. Yurachek, and I'm sure he'll be addressing those in the litigation summit. He'll be talking about what they're going to do in terms of appeal of that. But But yes, that case that case is not completely over.

Andy 14:54

Okay, interesting. Well, then, moving on Larry, I guess I first want to preface by saying that I don't really ever want this podcast to be about me, because it is about trying to make things better for all of you people out there. And but as coincidence, or irony would have it, this episode has a significant amount that goes to me because I petitioned the court to terminate my sentence. And it was about a two-month long process. And I went to court on Thursday, and I was victorious. And I, as soon as the judge will sign the paperwork in the next couple days, I will have the rest of my, my sentence terminated, which is like seven years.

Larry 15:34

Well, seven years, getting off seven years early is fantastic. And that is something that happens across the country where people can be released pre-termination date on being compliant. And my recommendation is usually a recommendation or at least a tacit non opposition to the petition. So did you did you have a recommendation? Or did you have a non-opposition? What was the what was the DA's position on this?

Andy 16:04

The DA's position, I think you used the word at some point along the way you said it was they just they tacitly, they didn't come, they came with just Well, here's what happened. The case was so old, nobody here in the office was even here, when this happened. They did not bring forth any level of resistance, but they were just they're putting up some sort of like fake opposition to it. I guess you don't want to say fake, but they were not in any level of serious opposition to it.

Larry 16:30

And the and the probation officer, they generally hear from the probation officer, what did your probation officers tell the court?

Andy 16:37

They the so I guess my attorney had said, you know, off, my officer was there and, and she could speak for herself. But he said, I don't think she has an opposition. And then the judge asked for her statement testimony, there was no oath or swearing in, or anything like that. But he asked her what she thought, and she just said, he's been completely compliant, never gives us any problems, he follows the rules. And even like, they'll give me travel permits, and I'm one of the only ones that will like, tell them I'm back when I do get back. Some people get a travel permit and never come back, I guess, is what she said. And that I was just hyper compliant, and they don't have any issues with me, and they did not oppose having this action go forward.

Larry 17:21

So well, that would be a lesson for people to try to do your best to be compliant. And, and it may seem like some of the requirements like call in and let us know when you're back and go by and check in with local people, when you when you're given a travel permit to do all those things. And you've done those religiously correct? (Andy: Mhm. Always.) And, and, and then in terms of finding an attorney, people are gonna want to know, how you, how you identified attorney, I guess I would question did this attorney come recommended to you or did you just go out and start flipping through the virtual Yellow Pages? Did you did you get a recommendation for this attorney?

Andy 18:02

It was definitely a recommendation. It was definitely recommendation. And I called the individual. And after some wrangling back and forth, I ended up in his office and speaking to him. And he agreed to take the case, obviously.

Larry 18:16

So, did you feel like he was honest with you in terms of what your chances were based on your type of conviction and is that one of the factors that made you hire the attorney because of because I want to have a good feeling about who I'm working with. How did you feel in terms of what the attorney was telling you, when you said what you're wanting to do?

Andy 18:35

Originally he was not in favor of it. But one of the first things that he did was even while I was in the office with him the first time was talk to the DA and tried to just gauge their feeling. This was even before I laid any money down, he wanted to see what their level of opposition was. And then he got who my probation officer was. And after speaking with her, he agreed to go forward with it because she was not going to resist it either.

Larry 18:59

So now that, taking the temperature of the DA that sounds familiar, like what I've been saying on this podcast the last three years doesn't it?

Andy 19:07

It is and you know it's funny. So you know I have a certain level of quote unquote, expertise now because I'm constantly every week listening to you give us all the tips and tricks of the trade. And you've said, I can't, me, Andy, I can't call the DA and go, hey, how do you feel about me in this case? I need to have an attorney go do that. I told him that I said, I can't do this, I need you to go do this.

Larry 19:31

So, well that would have been the first thing I would have told him, told you. But when I assessed your odds, I would say look, let me talk with the DA'S office and see what they recollected by your case and how they feel about you and how what a battle this is going to be or whether it's going to have a reasonable chance. That would be what, what I would say. If I can't do that, I can't realistically tell you what your chances are. If they still hate you as much as they did at the time that conviction happened and if the person is still politically connected if they originally were, if you were high profile, they're going to come after you. And you need to know, you need to be told as the person look, this case was high profile back in 2006. They haven't forgotten that the family still here, the community, they're still well connected. And they are going to come in, and they're going to go after you again, because they don't even think you should be out to this very day. You need to know that. Right? (Andy: Totally.) And I tell people that. You need to know what the DA's office will have to say about you.

Andy 20:33

I did find it interesting that the DA brought up who the prosecuting ADA was the assistant district attorney at the time, and he was going gangbusters. And if you came up on the radar, he was going to just nail you to the wall as hard as he could. And they brought that up. And I'm not, I'm not sure, just my feeling of the individual was that he was just going after everybody just guns blazing for whatever it was. And that seemed to almost be like, "oh, that guy."

Larry 21:05

We've got some prosecutors like that. That, that it doesn't matter who it is. That's just, that's just their method of operation.

Andy 21:16

But another thing that I wanted to bring up was the former governor of Georgia was mentioned by the judge as far as that he was very big, the guy was named Nathan Deal. And so he was the former governor, and he was very pro, figuring out how to get fewer people in prison and get some of them out sooner. And he referenced that along the way. That that that was his sort of mantra. That was his theory that people can be rehabilitated and give them a second chance. And he referenced that. And I think that had a, some level of decent influence on whether he granted this motion or not.

Larry 21:54

And I don't want to take this off into a political direction. But I just want to put forth observation that Nathan Deal is a Republican. Now, he led the charge to criminal justice reform. You've been in Georgia for a number of years and there's currently a different administration. Have you heard, have you heard any Democrat, vilifying governor Deal for his leadership on criminal justice

reform? Have you heard any vilification saying he's turned loose a tidal wave of crime on Georgia? That he's letting the thugs and the rapist and the pillagers and the plunderers out of prison? Have you heard anybody do that?

Andy 22:37

To be fair, I don't follow a lot that I would have. But no, I have not. But I haven't, you know, I just I'm not in a space that I would have heard it, but I certainly have not.

Larry 22:46

Well, my point is they don't do that. (Andy: Yeah, I'm with you. I know where you're going with that.) That's what that's what happens the other way around. You know, we had Will here a couple weeks ago saying that maybe a month ago saying that, that the democratic house slowed down some consideration on criminal justice reform before the election. I said they did because they didn't want to be vilified in the election cycle. And, but you don't have the same vilification on that issue. Now, to be fair, you do get vilified as a Republican for other things. That just doesn't happen to be one of them. So, you don't if anybody has a Democrat vilifying a Republican for criminal justice reform, please send it to me, and we'll put it on the podcast and we'll be just as critical of that democrat as we are of anyone else who does that.

Andy 23:41

I also want to point out the level of stress. So I have a Fitbit and I'm kind of like you know I watch it fairly regularly and it'll pop up on the screen here in a second that during the morning hours so from you know, the time I woke up whatever till noon, you can see that my heart rate was at a pretty smallish level, you know, some kind of normal 60, 70 kind of heart rate. And then court was around two o'clock and then my heart rate spikes. It goes through the flippin' roof. Larry, I was stressed out in court, I was sitting that I was having to like, consciously go \*breathes deeply\*. I was trying so hard. Like it was incredibly stressful for me to go in here.

Larry 24:26

I can see that.

Andy 24:27

It was brutal. It was uncomfortable as I'll get out. I'm watching them leading up to my hearing of them bringing people in there and charging them and sentencing to 15 years for stealing some meth or something, some pills from somebody at a hotel room. And like, I am stressed out. There's bailiffs running around, there's people with guns. I really thought that there was a thing in Georgia in the mid aughts of somebody like stealing the weapon from the officer and shooting a bunch of people in the in the courtroom (Larry: There was.) and then I see a police officer in the courtroom with a gun.

Larry 25:02

In Atlanta, Fulton County, yep.

Andy 25:03

Okay. I was like, man, they're not supposed to have guns in here. But sure, enough they do now. Anything else, man before you want to go on like, I'm super happy, I couldn't be happier. Oh, let me let me cover the one other thing is, I'm probably going to get removed from the registry too. That that was a part of the deal

was that I hired the attorney to do is like, if I can do this, I would like to go after it, obviously. And he, I needed to have one other little T-cross and i-dotted it of being leveled in Georgia and I haven't been and that is required to get off the registry. But that was like presented in court. And I think it's just a clerical thing at this point. And then I'll be off the registry, too, which is amazing.

Larry 25:48

So yeah, I think that once you once you have a judicial request, e probably should ask Brendan to clarify this but once you have a judicial request for leveling, they manage to get it done. But there's like 70% of the people in Georgia that have never been leveled through that risk assessment process they have.

Andy 26:05

Yeah. Which is in the statute that you will have, you will be leveled before you exit the walls, you know, once you get out of prison, before you get out of prison, you're supposed to be levels. That's in the code, which I find really funny.

Larry 26:19

But you have to have funding to do these things. See, that's the thing that people don't understand that when you're when you're trying to get funding to do certain things that are not as popular. Can you imagine when you go to a civic group, and "I'll tell you what I'm gonna do, you vote for me, I'm gonna make sure that we have ample money to evaluate and risk-base these sex offenders before they leave prison." You'd have so many eggs thrown in your face, you'd never get out of that group alive.

Andy 26:46

I can't not ask you to do this. And how did they end up in that position? What do they do before they took the position?

Larry 26:53

What are you getting at? (Andy: Where they put their hand?) Oh, that's not the same thing there.

Andy 27:00

They've been asking for it in chat. Are you gonna figure out a way to slip that in to the conversation?

Larry 27:06

Hahaha, oh.

Andy 27:07

And that was also brought up that someone had said in the courtroom that, look, if he was anything of a threat, then he would have been leveled. By him not being leveled, you could make the assumption that he doesn't he had, you know, he'll be a level one. And if I have the level one, then I'm off of probation. And what I didn't even realize Larry it just didn't click that. Since my probation, my sentence has been terminated, that I can go vote.

Larry 27:34

You can, you've got an election coming up in January, and the books close usually close about a month before that January date. So, you need to register by early December.

Andy 27:43

I will get that done. I will get that done. It is roughly about time for us to move on to the first question then I suppose. Are we ready for that?

Larry 27:54

Let's do it. This one's from Bernard.

Andy 27:58

Bernard says, and I'm not gonna read the whole thing. So this is just a little highlighted section:

*Listener Question*

On another issue, in Episode 150, Larry addressed a question from an inmate about purchasing a home prior to his release. While I understand and appreciate Larry's stance where he does not recommend buying a home prior to release in fear of a community creating something to make the residents non-compliant, does this hold true if looking to secure rural property with acreage attached? Plus, the first part of the listener's question was not addressed at what point is at one point is one's address one's residence? Is that when you purchase the home or when you sleep there? This could be important if trying to relocate.

Larry 28:39

Well, Bernard, and thank you for your letter and for your support of the podcast. And we are happy that we resolved all the distribution issues with the, with the institution there. But hopefully I didn't communicate that the way it came across. The issue of a residence of someone buying and acquiring one in advance, if you had acreage attached, clearly the more acreage you have attached, the more buffer you can put between that residence and anything that would constitute an exclusion zone. So, that would that would increase the odds of that residence being approved. But where I think Bernard is going with that question is it seems to suggest that there's some entitlement to return to a residence or because he says At what point does this come become one's residence as if somehow that entitles you can live in that residence. While you're being punished, it does not entitle you to live there. People have lived in places 20, 30 years and they plead out to a crime. And they don't have the best of representation who understands that like, say an attorney doesn't do very many of these cases related to sexual offences and they don't know all the supervision prohibitions that are built in for a supervised offender. And they don't know that the minute they walk that client over to probation, they're going to tell them you've got 48 hours, you've got a week to find another place. So, there's no inherent right to live in a particular residence while you're under supervision. It's going to vary from supervising authority to supervising authority, and what their policies are. In this state, for example, it's 1000 feet from a school, park, playground, and then any place where children congregate, which is very, very vague. They could be, they could construe that to be anything and then they don't say how they measure the 1000 feet. Is it a measurement as the crow flies from the property, outermost boundary, to the property outermost boundary? Or is it 1000 feet as the crow flies from the nearest structure that anybody occupies on the property? They don't, they don't go into all that. So it's very risky for you to acquire any real estate, with the intention of living in it, because you cannot assert a right to live in that property

while you're under supervision. And that's what I was trying to communicate.

Andy 31:03

Right. I understand that. And actually, someone reached out to me on Twitter and I suggested a realtor for them to work with. That sounds like a kind of neat idea is that you go by, pick a number, let's just say it's 10 acres, and you segment that 10 acres so that you can put your property in the middle of it and then sequester that to be its own property, and then you own the surrounding property so that you can fit the 1000 foot zones. And then I don't know that anybody could do anything to you if you own that extra property out there.

Larry 31:33

Well, that is, that is true. And then where I think that I can sharpen a little further, there's registration prohibitions, in addition to supervision. An example would be Georgia. Depending on when your crime occurred, there's an increasing amount of restrictions on where you can live in Georgia. And if you can show for example, that you owned the property, that your name was on the deed, you can you can assert your right to live there as far as not being prohibited by the registry because you had... and that may be where he's trying to go with it. At what point is that a person's residence? Well, in Georgia, it would be that if you could show that you had a deeded interest in that property prior to the prohibition kicking in. So, you may have been away from the property, but they would still let you live there as far as the way I understand it in Georgia, but that is not the same thing as applying to supervision as far as what conditions. They can tell you, we don't care if you've owned this for 35 years, we're not gonna let you live here. There's a daycare right across the street within 25 feet of you, we're not going to let you live here, you've got a week to leave. And I've actually seen a case where they gave a person a few hours to leave, not even a week.

Andy 32:47

Paul says in Wyoming, it's from the edge of the school property to your front door. I had always heard that it was like to from property line to property line, which could be better or worse, if they're going to your front door, that could be better or worse?

Larry 33:01

I think it'd be better if they define the measurement as your door if that's defined, that would give you a more of a buffer because, you know, if they do it out of property you may have, if you have a long contiguous piece of property that it may it may screw you because of the configuration if they do it from boundary to boundary.

Andy 33:23

Okay. And then we're going to move on to a question from Jason. And I have to find the question from Jason. Is that Jason? That's Jason. How much of this you want me to read? The whole thing?

Larry 33:36

Oh, Jason, question number two. Oh, no, not the whole thing.

Andy 33:41

Alright, Is there a particular splott?

Larry 33:41

I, really don't like to read because I'm such a horrible reader. But what he's trying to the essence of his question is that he's not permitted to loiter within 500 feet of any real property comprising any public park or playground equipment or a public swimming pool. And he cites the Missouri statute that applies. Then he says that, that he doesn't understand why he's taxed to pay for these things that he's not allowed to use. He says 68% of his 2019 property taxes went to support the local school district.

Andy 34:21

So I pay federal taxes, so I should be able to go knock on the Pentagon's door and go inside and say hi, I pay for this. Can I have a tour?

Larry 34:28

I don't think it works that way. But on a serious note, I share his frustration Jason. I share that completely. The fact of the matter is the litigation has not been successful. Adele Nicholas and Mark Weinberg have done litigation on this in Illinois. And it has not been successful. And I'm not saying it can't be successful, but we've got to figure out how to succeed in this litigation because it's not only prohibiting you from going as the convicted person, but for the practical reality is it's prohibiting your family because you have to disassociate from your family, to be able to use these facilities that you're paying for. And, and I don't like that, that the litigation hasn't been successful. And I think that we'll eventually figure out how to perfect the complaint and put forth a cogent argument in the right venue, with the right plaintiff. And I think that we're going to eventually gain some traction on this. But it's, it's really, really sad that you can't take your kid to the park, you can't... But look, you can't take your kid to the school play. You can't be in the audience. You can't go to the PTA meetings or whatever they call those meetings these days that we used to call PTA. Do they still call it PTA as a matter of fact?

Andy 35:49

You would have to translate, just like I say, DMV, and you say MVD and whatnot. I think PTA is is kind of local.

Larry 35:56

You know, Parent Teacher Association, or whatever it stood for, but you can't participate. You can't go to athletic events. This is all a part of the debilitation of the registry. The disabilities and restraints that did not exist in 2003. In the early segment, we were talking about that. There were no such restriction back in 2003. Very few restrictions existed at the time, and certainly not in the state of Alaska. As wide open as it is that there's so much open space, you could do anything you want to in Alaska, nobody will know you're doing it.

Andy 36:32

Because your nearest neighbor is seven miles, 15 miles away.

Larry 36:35

If you're not in Fairbanks or Anchorage, you don't have anyone anywhere near you.

Andy 36:40

My parents live on an island in Alaska, there's 15,000 people on the island, and most of it is a Native American reservation.

Larry 36:47

So yeah, well, I've actually never visited but there's a lot of open space. I mean, they have a difficulty moving, moving commerce around. In particularly with the frigid horrible winters. And, and they have to, it's very expensive to live or do business in Alaska.

Andy 37:04

Yeah, gas is significantly more expensive out there, even though they have the big pipeline, at least where my parents are. Then the next question... what?

Larry 37:13

But they do get that big permanent fund distribution that the state pays out as a royalty.

Andy 37:19

Yep. And when they move there forever, 1000 years ago, it was around 1,000 bucks. The last number I knew was two grand. I don't know what it is these days.

Larry 37:27

So and then I want to apologize to Jason that I think that question had pondered around for a while. Until we started doing these on the podcast. We just got so many for the legal corner. We couldn't answer them all. But it now goes up because we're doing we're doing questions on the podcasts at least two, maybe three or four a week depending on how many good ones we find that we like.

Andy 37:49

Guess we could actually like run out and then we'll just sit here and twiddle our thumbs and breathe at each other.

Larry 37:55

I don't think we're gonna run out. People as they hear the answers to questions. Like for example, one question from from Bernard comes in, he's sharpening the answer, and drilling down on an answer we've given previously, so I don't think we're ever run out of questions.

Andy 38:08

Probably not, I was being silly. Ready to be a part of Registry Matters? Get links at [registrymatters.co](http://registrymatters.co). If you need to be all discreet about it, contact them by email at [registrymatterscast@gmail.com](mailto: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](https://patreon.com/registrymatters). Not ready to become a patron? Give a five-star review at Apple podcasts or Stitcher or tell your buddies that 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. Let's move over to one from Dan-o-matic. Dan says to whom it may concern, I'm pretty sure that this is Dan, says:

#### *Listener Question*

My special conditions of supervised release states the defendant will abide by all rules of the minor protection and restriction program of the US pretrial services and probation. That's a mouthful, Larry. I don't recall this being mentioned during sentencing. These rules were never read at sentence and they are not defined in my judgment and commitment. I contacted the

probation office and they sent me the current list of rules. But of course, it says they are subject to change at any time. Many of the rules have nothing to do with sexual offenses. Some examples are I can't consume alcohol at all. I shall not enter establishments that sell alcohol. My crime had nothing to do with alcohol. Is this legal? if so, how can they subject me to conditions that were not explicitly outlined during sentencing and are left wide open to change at any time? Do you have any recommendations on what I should do? Thank you, sincerely. What do you think? So how is it that they can just willy nilly change all these things on the fly without, without any recourse, without any notification, like all of a sudden, it just makes it hell on earth tougher?

Larry 40:18

Well, what he's describing are referred to as standard conditions of supervision. And very few people, very few courts go through the standard, the standard normal conditions, they'll just say, the person will have a period of five years' probation subject to the standard conditions and the following special conditions and the court will go through the special conditions that they are imposing that are in addition to the standard conditions. So, what he's talking about, those are standard conditions that the probation service of the US government have developed, that they think are prudent. I don't agree with them. I agree with Dan about like, for the alcohol, since it's a legal product, it seems, it seems quite a stretch to tell people that they can't do it. But remember, again, you're being supervised for a criminal act, and the full plethora of rights that you enjoy normally can be restricted. So, the courts tend to defer to the agency that has expertise in supervising offenders, very few people report directly to the judge to monitor their probation. I mean, can you think of any judges that are actively supervising offenders themselves?

Andy 41:33

I don't imagine maybe in a super teeny, small county where the judge is also the coroner and the ME and then also probation, maybe there.

Larry 41:40

But that would be an anomaly I've never seen in my life. But so we've got these agencies that are charged with developing supervision models that work and they do it based on statistical numbers of what tends to derail success. And I think you'd have to admit that a probation service would have to deal with the complications of alcohol of what happens when people use alcohol. Statistically, everyone who uses alcohol is not gonna have a problem. But I think that within the zone of what they do, they can show a correlation between alcohol use and failure to be a success on your job, failure to be responsible and certainly, certainly, it can cause people to do very weird things that.... Domestic violence, a lot of that stuff would never happen if the person wasn't consuming alcohol. (Andy: Likely.) But his point is beyond that. His point is, why don't they wait until that is a problem and impose that condition on me? That's what he's indirectly asking. I I can't find any fault with that logic. It makes sense. And like, why do they, why do they paint everybody with that same brush with all those standard conditions, particularly on legal things? I would make the same comparison with adult theater entertainment. It could be that your offense had, we're talking about sexual offenses, now it could be that your particular sexual offense had nothing to do with adult entertainment. I

mean, you but all of a sudden, when you're being supervised, you're not allowed to have any provocative material. And they take it out beyond just the what's clearly adult magazines that you need to be over 18 to purchase.

Andy 43:31

Which are legal for you to have.

Larry 43:32

Yeah, for sure legal, but they take it out to the to the swimsuit edition of Sports Illustrated, you'll get pinged for that. Yeah. But that's, that's provocative. Really?

Andy 43:43

I bet you we could get like our local therapist person to concur that, in that particular case, at least, if you had it, maybe you're getting some, this kind of going off a little bit, but you could get some kind of satisfaction so that maybe you don't have to go find it somewhere else? Maybe you would be a better person at home, handling your business on your own.

Larry 44:03

So, I don't think I want to go there.

Andy 44:09

I didn't think you would.

Larry 44:12

But in terms of the rest of this question that they were not explicitly explained and outlined, that is a legitimate concern, because very few attorneys do what should have been done. We do it. Ashley does it. We pull off of the website, what the supervision model looks like for people who have a sexual offense and they're going to be in the sex offender supervision regime, we pull those conditions off, we pull off what they call the behavioral contract, and we tell them, this is what you're going to be up against. If you do not believe you can comply with these conditions, you may as well go to trial. Because if you don't comply with these, they're going to be able to send you to prison a whole lot easier. So, you need to make them work for sending you to prison because these things are taken seriously. They will violate you for these things. This is what they're going to put on you. And although we disagree with some of them, we think some of them are unconstitutional, we have not been able to prevail on most of our challenges. So therefore, this is what they're going to tell you. I think it's really, really, significantly an imposition on person's constitutional rights, even with the diminished constitutional rights if you can't look at anything that's a legal magazine because they deem that it's provocative.

Andy 45:24

Right? And then there's the one in Georgia that we've talked about recently, of you shall never drive alone, especially with children and other congregates. Where did something, how are you like never to drive alone? This isn't some major city where you have public transportation, you shall never drive alone. If you live out in the boonies, which is kind of like the only place many of our people can live. How in the flip, are you supposed to move about get to work, get to your handler's office, etc. if you can't drive alone?

Larry 45:51

Well, that one needs to be challenged as being facially invalid. Rather than a person just going and trying to get it relieved, they need to file a challenge saying that that's facially... you can't have a, that can't be constitutional, that you could tell a person to never drive alone. That you could tell a person under certain circumstances, I might conceive of some where the person wouldn't be allowed to drive alone, but as a blanket condition though, you can't do that.

Andy 46:16

Yeah, if somebody was like constantly picking up hitchhikers and doing whatever goes on next for them to end up in trouble that, yeah, you should not drive alone. That seems legit. So, anything else with Dan before we move on to Adam?

Larry 46:33

I hope that helps, Dan. Thank you, Dan.

Andy 46:37

And it says:

#### *Listener Question*

Dear Andy, I'm about to complete this almost like a like a one of those a nighttime love programs. Dear Andy, I'm about to complete the paralegal studies program through Blackstone Career Institute. I recently wrote NALA National Association of Legal Assistants and got a form letter back from them stating that while on court supervision, you cannot sit for the certified paralegal exam. Can an SO, a PFR become a certified paralegal through NALA? What options would be open for someone that obtains a paralegal certification as a PFR? How can a PFR make a career in the fields of advocacy, lobbying and/or politics? Sincerely, Adam. Larry, I am under the opinion that if you have a marketable, I'm trying to think of the right way, the most effective way to word that, but marketable skill set that an employer, something that is in demand, you know, particularly by an employer, and then one that is, at least not hostile, but friendly to people with some kind of conviction, that you will be able to get a job doing that kind of work. But I don't see, I don't see why NALA would have any kind of prohibition on them sitting for an exam to become a paralegal. Why would that be?

Larry 48:06

I don't know anything about the, I don't know anything about the National Association of Legal Assistants, so therefore, I don't, I can't speak for them and their policy, but I can tell you this, that if you possess the skills... now most of these paralegal certificates really don't train you to what, what you really need to know. They, they train you in terms of how to set up a pleading. They train, they train you in what pleadings are, what the names of them are. They train you, they train you in terms of what the margins are supposed to look like, and how you're supposed to find the rules for and what font size and all those things are important. The pleading is supposed to be in conformity with the courts requirements. And those are good skills to have. But they don't they don't teach you how to compose a pleading in terms of what to put in it. And if you possess the skills to do the research and writing, and you don't want to work for a big firm, because some of the firms, you know, we have some good-sized law firms here in my town, and we they won't hire people with criminal convictions.

They're reluctant. Yeah, for whatever the reasons are, their partners have, maybe it's insurance, but the smaller firms, you know, five or fewer attorneys, where the bulk of their practices in criminal defense. If you can do these things, you will get hired. Now I can't attest to what type of barriers probation may put up because no, no law firm is going to intrude, allow probation to intrude and come in and say I'm searching this computer. They they're not going to tolerate that. If a probation says they have to have unfettered access to your computer, they're not going to tolerate that. But the opportunity for working in the legal profession, even without their certificate, which I can appreciate wanting, the opportunity is there, you're going to need to demonstrate some knowledge and writing. And you're going to need to demonstrate some knowledge in research. And, and then you're going to have to knock on some doors and hopefully have some lucky breaks where you actually get in the door. And I don't know how you get into virtual door now with the pandemic. How you how you go about applying for jobs, but, but like in my state, we have the paralegal section of the of the state bar, and you would you would you would join, you would join that section, or you can become without any certificate at all with seven years of an attorney's supervision. They could qualify you as a paralegal without you having to sit for anything, you know, I believe it's seven years I've been doing it for so long, I don't even think about that anymore. But there's a period of time for for on the job training, kind of like what Tim told us in Vermont, you know, you can with a certain amount of working at doing substantive law work, they'll let you sit for the bar exam in Vermont without going to law school without having a law school degree. (Andy: So many reasons to move to Vermont. Paul. Just saying.) Just a bunch liberal pointy heads up there, if you ask me.

Andy 51:18

Um, I remember a particular person in Kentucky that had finished his law degree and had to run around and run around and run around trying to get to sit for the bar exam. And he recently did maybe in the last year? But they fought him kind of tooth and nail in letting him sit for the bar exam. This is not an uncommon practice.

Larry 51:38

I do remember that in terms of in terms of the advocacy, lobbying and politics, that's going to be state specific in terms of whether you can run for public office, some states will allow you to some won't. And lobbying, again, gonna be state specific. Some will require you to register and you'll fill out a registrant lobbyist registration form. And that question will be on there if you have any, if you have any of that, but it's not a universal thing. You may be able to be whether you're a paid lobbyist, you can lobby on behalf of yourself and you don't need anything other than you showing up. So you could you could advocate in the public policy arena without being an officially registered lobbyist.

Andy 52:22

Interesting. I don't know that we have... what was the comment from Brian on getting RM into prisons? I don't see that anywhere. Can you cover that real quick?

Larry 52:31

Yeah. Adam, thank you for your support, and I really appreciate the clarity that he writes was you say how nice and clear and easy to read that letter is?

Andy 52:42

I do excellent. And there's even little bullets towards the towards the bottom of it.

Larry 52:47

I mean, wouldn't it be nice if they all came in that way? Some of them...

Andy 52:52

Now you may be asking for too much.

Larry 52:54

Some of them are so difficult to read. And I passed on one to Brenda here a few weeks ago, couple weeks ago when I said nobody alive can read this. And she wrote back after she read it and translated it. She says I guess I'm not alive. But she did read it. And so, I don't, I don't, I guess I don't possess those skills.

Andy 53:14

Okay, this is it looks like it's gonna be fun Larry. This is from courthouse news. It says name change for transgender sex offender debated at Seventh Circuit. I got to agree, Larry, that if you try to change your name, that you have a First Amendment right, to express yourself however you wish. And if you want to be called whatever you want to be called whether you make up some crazy name, or you just make a modification or your name ever so slightly to change how the gender presents itself. That seems like that would be a fundamental first amendment right to me.

Larry 53:45

You think so do you?

Andy 53:47

I do. That's how I feel about it just at first glance.

Larry 53:52

So well, why don't we take a look at the decision. It's called the Krebs Order.

Andy 53:57

I got it.

Larry 53:58

So on page two, the facts of the case are largely just undisputed. And the parties have filed cross motions for summary judgment...

Andy 54:10

Oh, God, we're back to that.

Larry 54:12

Asking the court to decide the legal questions of whether or how the name change statute may violate the plaintiff's constitutional rights. So we were doing a summary judgment, so we didn't do a trial. And then if you flip down to page three, plaintiff forgets who bears the burden of proof and persuasion on her claim. It is she not defendant who must establish that regulating a person's name

implicates the First Amendment and then they cite the circuit precedent from 2004, *Doe v. City of Lafayette*. And so that appears to be the first thing and then when you go down to page four, the court must therefore find that plaintiff has not met her burden to demonstrate that a name change statute implicates her speech rights. Without this foundation, plaintiff cannot present a viable first amendment claim et al, irrespective of the level of scrutiny that they were having at the debate about what level there was. Whether it was strict scrutiny or, or intermediate scrutiny, or whether it was the most lax standard of rational basis. But it says the court takes well the instruction from the Court of Appeals that it should not conduct a party's legal research and invent arguments on the party's behalf. If you guys have ever heard me say anything on this podcast it's that the court is a neutral party. They're not there to advocate for you. And so, this is the court saying this case was not very well put together. Neither District Court nor this court are obligated to research and construct legal arguments for parties, especially when they're represented by counsel.

Andy 55:54

All right, well, then can you pontificate for me if you thought that if the case was put together well, do you think that this could be claimed?

Larry 56:02

I think it could. I think it could. And there's an amazing appellate brief that I didn't read that that the same attorneys put forward. And they had oral argument at the circuit court, and we'll see how it comes out. But on page five, the final quote that I highlighted. In plainer terms, citizens cannot file lawsuits requesting a certain enactment be subject to rational basis review without an allegation that the enactment has harmed them. So apparently, they weren't convinced that there had been sufficient harm pled by this. So what I would like to see happen would be that that the Court of Appeals would, would remand it for further development. Let's use summary judgment just a tad bit more sparingly. And let's try to develop our cases. That's what I keep saying that this is our biggest enemy is everybody moves for summary judgment.

Andy 56:55

I think, I need you to do me a favor. When is summary judgment a good thing? It always seems like we've brought examples of bad stuff.

Larry 57:04

When there's absolutely nothing that needs to be developed factually. And that is very rarely when there's absolutely nothing that needs to be developed factually. And, and in the case of this, the the court has, has not been has not been provided proof that there's been any harm by not being able to change the name. If the court wants to, to award it based on emotion, well, clearly, if you've got a gender, if you're being forced to, to, to use what is presumably a male name, and that's not your gender, there would be... But I need to see the proof. Remember, the burden is on you. You're making the allegation that the government is hurting you. Show me how that harm is occurring to you. What have you not been allowed to do?

Andy 58:00

Yeah, I'm thinking, you, you, you being in public, you could say your name is whatever you want it to be. And you can even have business cards printed as whatever you want them to be. So, you could hand out your name saying that your name is you know, somebody entirely different I could present myself as Larry, if I really wanted to, nobody would know the difference. But then you may end up with troubles with the whole PFR situation of now you're known as aliases. And that might cause you grief, there might be even states that have statutes that say that you can't present yourself as something other than your legal name.

Larry 58:35

I think there are, I think there are such statutes, but again, if you're going to try to tear down the people's work, and the people enacted this statute in Wisconsin, if you're going to try to tear down the people's work, you bear the burden of showing that it's not an emotional expedition. These judges are supposed to interpret the law. That's what we want, right? We want them to interpret the law, not legislate from the bench. And what we tend to want to ask judges to do is to legislate from the bench because they can't, obviously it's gonna be very politically challenging to repeal this law that says you can't do a name change. So therefore, since they can't legislate this through the Wisconsin legislative process, they're trying to go through the courts to do it, which is your last resort when you can't win something through legislative process. But this court is saying, wait, we're not, the trial court said sorry, you didn't prove that you are harmed and you didn't prove that this implicates the First Amendment.

Andy 59:36

That sucks. They should try harder. Do it again. Do it again.

Larry 59:41

Well, I think that if look and remember, we have hindsight now. At the time you file the motion for summary judgment, you believe that you don't have any facts in dispute. But in hindsight, we can sit here and say, Well, apparently there was enough proof offered as to how this person's being harmed by forcing, by being forced to use a name that's not that who they are now. Try to be politically sensitive. But that harm has to be proven.

Andy 1:00:15

Very well. And then getting close to the end here. Police unions are losing the war on criminal justice reform. This is from The Appeal. Law enforcement organizations have long treated mass incarceration as a job creation program. In 2020, the tide began turning against them. What do you have for us here from The Appeal, Larry?

Larry 1:00:35

I thought it was a good read. It goes into the to the, particular in California, but the the law enforcement unions put an awful lot of money into public policy, influencing public policy. And it's amazing to me and boy, I'm gonna get hate mail for this. It's amazing to me that, that most conservatively-leaning individuals despise unions, but they amazingly love law enforcement unions. And I would like for them to explain to me the difference. The law enforcement union does the same thing that our private sector union does, whether it be the airline pilots Association, that that lobbies for, for better working conditions, better compensation,

better health insurance, better flight employment rules, all this stuff that they lobby for. That's exactly what a police union does. They try to get the maximum amount of leave they can as short of retirement they can. The best salaries they can, the best equipment that they can for their members. They do all the same things. And somehow or another we hate the private sector unions, but we love the police. You just, but that's a pontification for another day. They put a whole lot of money the police do into trying to prop up the criminal industrial complex. And they show that in the article, it's 10s of millions of dollars that we're talking about. No small amount of money. One recent study found that law enforcement groups have spent about \$87 million dollars in local and state elections over the last 20 years. I mean, that's not chump change. And including almost 65 million in Los Angeles alone. At the federal level, the recent campaign contributions a lobbying expenditures approach \$50 million, according to The Guardian. But on election day in 2020, California voters deliver police unions a series of resounding defeats, even though they use all the scare tactics that they do about how that that the tidal wave of crime is coming. It didn't work this time, and that's the essence of this article is that perhaps maybe the people are wising up. And they're seeing through this, the police don't always tell you the truth. I'm sorry to burst your bubble, but they scare you a lot with stuff that they tried to undo the 20, that the voter approved 2014, They tried to undo that with a with a proposition 20 that would have reclassified several misdemeanor offenses as felonies. And the voter saw through that, and they voted no. They didn't vote with the police. So but that that, that that's the main reason I put that in there is that the people that you admire the most, they are doing the significant amount of the heavy lifting to keep you from achieving what you say you want, which is criminal justice reform.

Andy 1:03:35

Yeah, I just I can't see how them being unionized... I could see them lobbying and trying to get more pay and more benefits. I can totally see, you know, that being in their interest. I don't know that, that all of their interests are being mirrored with what we need for better public safety, though. I don't know that those two things coincide.

Larry 1:03:57

Well, it's about preserving the status quo. As I was telling you, as crime has declined, if we were cutting back on law enforcement commensurate with that decline, we would have far fewer police than we had 25 years ago. But how many how many cities do you know that have far fewer police than they had 25 years ago?

Andy 1:04:19

I'm willing to bet that all we do have is more.

Larry 1:04:23

Well there'll be some cities where it's been, ours has been relatively flat. But we've been trying to increase we've got some magic number they're trying to get to I think it's like 1300 or something but but they have, but the police are not ever going to be, not likely, shouldn't say ever, they're not likely to going to be with us on reforming because they make their living off of arresting people and showing up in court and testifying. And if you tear that system down, there's need for fewer of them. I mean, duh, nobody wants to eliminate their job.

Andy 1:05:01

We have a couple articles over at the, how do you refer to it Larry the The Washington What?

Larry 1:05:08

That would be the Washington Compost.

Andy 1:05:10

Okay, so she is a former addict and prisoner. She was just elected to the State House in Washington. That's pretty fun. I think I heard about this one. Winning an election was the furthest thing from Tara Simmons mind in 2013, when she was working at a BK worried about how she was going to pay her rent. She had recently been released after a 30-month prison sentence for drug and theft convictions. Now she is a state level representative in the house in Washington State. Well, that's kind of neat. That sounds like an inspiring story for people that are tangentially related to us.

Larry 1:05:40

But that's in one of those liberal left wing leaning states. And we can't have that kind of thing across this country. Lefties putting people that have that kind of conviction, that's that's, can you imagine somebody? I mean, what are they gonna think of next?

Andy 1:05:59

We probably shouldn't stick around here long before you before you run off all of our listeners for you and your lefty ways, right?

Larry 1:06:04

Well, that's a bunch of left... I mean, everybody knows that the West Coast is as bunch of leftists.

Andy 1:06:11

They call it the left coast for a reason. Right?

Larry 1:06:13

That's right. So that I mean, everybody knows that there's nothing but lawlessness and defunding the police and that there's nothing but crime and you the minute you set foot in Washington, you're in grave danger of being attacked.

Andy 1:06:28

And then another article that you put in here, voters made clear the war on drugs isn't working. I don't know that, how many people do you think actually would say the war on drugs is actually effective and working? I haven't heard anybody say that it's working. Though, well, I wouldn't say that anybody's necessarily trying to stop it. But I don't know that anybody says it's working.

Larry 1:06:44

That was the reason I put it in there, even despite that we have as a society recognized that the war on drugs has been largely a failure. It's difficult to defund that war on drugs. And I put it in only for the comparison of what we're trying to get is some defunding of the effort that they do on registering folks and all the money they're spending on that, on that process, and monitoring and tracking and doing what they do. If we can't defund the war on drugs with the recognition that we have about how unsuccessful it's been. Just be aware that we have a struggle.

That's the only comparison that I was trying to make sure. Everybody knows the war on drugs has been a failure.

Andy 1:07:29

And that was what like five states voted to legalize recreational, so New Jersey, Arizona, South Dakota and Montana voted to legalize recreational use and Mississippi voted to legalize medicinal. I, they're pretty close to last on that one. It's almost legalized for medicinal, almost nationwide. So Mississippi good job at being at last again.

Larry 1:07:49

Well, they typically run last in many measurements. But it's a step. It's a step in the right direction when you can take a state like that and they I mean, the next the next I mean, all we have is medicinal in my state. I mean, we think we've got a good shot at moving further this year because we've got, here's the factors in play: We've got a more liberal legislature that's been elected. We've got a governor who's already announced that she's receptive to it. Our previous governor Martinez said absolutely no way would she ever sign anything. so so that was a doubt no matter how liberal the legislature was, it wasn't going to happen. So we've got the ingredients. And we've also got one final ingredient. And that is the need for money, the the cratering of revenues, our revenues was a significant amount of its energy which the energy sector has been down. And, and the the broad economy is down because of the high unemployment. So, we're down on sales taxes, we're down, we're down on every component of every revenue stream. So, this is going to be a tempting, tempting thing to do. So, it may happen for us, but right now, we're just medicinal.

Andy 1:08:56

Cool. We did get a couple new patrons this week, and I want to send out many many, many, many, many thanks to Kevin and Andreas. Andreas joined as soon as we started recording this evening, and I thank you both very much for joining the Patreon crew of PFRs. Thanks all very much.

Larry 1:09:14

Well, that's fantastic.

Andy 1:09:16

anything else?

Larry 1:09:17

We picked up two and a week. We're gonna make we're gonna we're gonna make that hundred by the end of the year.

Andy 1:09:23

We very well might. Um, that's all I got Larry, I if you have anything else you want to make any announcement, plug anything before we head out.

Larry 1:09:32

I want to plug the the transcripts. We are getting more and more inquiries from prisons and and people people are finding exciting that they can hear, not hear, but they can read what we talk about. And so if you want a transcript, all you have to do is write and we'll send you a sample and someone can become a patron on the outside at 15 a month or more and it's automatic if they tell us. It comes with the as one of the perks of being a patron, and

you can subscribe directly. And our goal in 2021 is to actually bring that price down. We're working on on a on a 501 c three designation and if the IRS accepts that designate grants and the designation, we feel like the contributions will actually improve and our goal will be to cut that at least in half. Or even probably do something similar, Like they do the NARSOL newsletter and make it where people that are eligible have to pay. So so exciting things coming in 2021, Hopefully,

Andy 1:10:40  
awesome. Fantastic. Yeah. So join on Patreon at \$15 a month, and then you shoot me a text email, something like that, shoot me the address of the person that if you want one, if you want one set into prison, then we will get that added to the roster of the hundreds of people that are receiving those in prison already.

Larry 1:11:01  
I hope it gets to that level.

Larry 1:11:04  
How do people contact us if they have any questions or comments?

Andy 1:11:08  
Smoke signals are best I think, find a hut and start a little fire and you can start sending smoke signals. That's really the best way I found.

Larry 1:11:17  
Okay, and if we don't do that, then what do I do?

Andy 1:11:22  
browse your way over to registrymatters.co. How do people find us on a telephone call Larry?

Larry 1:11:30  
Well, that phone has quit ringing. But if you were so inclined to call it would be 747-227-4477.

Andy 1:11:43  
Excellent. And then we also have an email address that is registry matterscast@gmail.com. And lastly, Larry, the best way our favorite way for people to support the program is to do what?

Larry 1:11:56  
Go to patreon.com/registrymatters and give us your 2020 tax refund in its entirety.

Andy 1:12:07  
You are a mess Larry. Yeah, I mean, people just filed it actually was what the middle of October, very late this year.

Larry 1:12:13  
I was thinking about this this year, which hasn't ended yet but in January when people start getting their W2s can they can file their 2020. But there might even be another stimulus. We don't know yet. But it could be.

Andy 1:12:30  
You promised us one like three months ago, man, you said it was gonna happen. I was like I already spent the money.

Larry 1:12:35  
Yeah. Unfortunately, it didn't happen. And now that we have different political makeup, it may not happen at that level. I'll explain why on the next podcast if you want me to.

Andy 1:12:46  
We may have to do an extra for that one. Larry, I hope you have a splendid night and weekend and we will we will recoup and do this again next weekend.

Larry 1:12:57  
Sounds fantastic.

MacArthur 1:13:02  
That is why I am here.

Andy 1:13:04  
Awesome. Have a great night. I'll talk to you soon.

**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) \* **We do accept books or sheets of stamps. 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**