



## Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 168

Recorded 3-6-21

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 168 of Registry Matters. Happy Saturday again there, it seemed like I couldn't get anybody else to join us. So I had to get you back again.

Larry 00:27

That's really sad.

Andy 00:30

But you're the best we got end up but legit Larry you are the best we got it's pretty damn good. I would have to say I bet you if we unmuted Brenda's microphones, she's not here at the moment. She would probably agree with us.

Larry 00:41

Well, she's gonna be with us later. We're going to bring her in just a tad bit on on that letter that, that we've discussed a similar letter previously. But yes, we're going to have Oh, oh,

Andy 00:54

I did. Oh, she may have mentioned something that but you hadn't said anything to me back about it before but okay. So I need ample time to remind her to come on over when when it is that time. First of all, hey, like and subscribe and share this on YouTube and all the podcast apps and all the other places. Tell us what's going on tonight Larry.

Larry 01:16

Yeah, if you don't hit that YouTube like button, we are going to disconnect you from our side.

Andy 01:23

Where did you get that from?

Larry 01:25

Oh, that was from Neil Bortz.

Andy 01:26

Neil Bortz He was entertaining.

Larry 01:31

Yes, he he got his start and talk radio in Atlanta, Georgia, for those who have never heard of him on a talk radio station called WRNG radio. And the host of a show program on WRNG radio abruptly died. That deal board showed up to see to see the station manager and he said I would like to take that Prime drive slot and the station manager said I don't think so.

Andy 02:02

He ended up on a pretty high power station in Atlanta and coincidentally, towards the probably roughly the middle of my little vacation. He I just happened to be able to pick it up one day because it's really hard to pick up stations particularly AM during the day. And I picked it up and it was his final day. He was like well, I'm off the air. Guys. Take care. Bye. Peace out.

Larry 02:23

Yes. He he actually went from WRNG to WSB. And then he they went into to what do they call it syndication when they when they distribute it. He had he had a couple 100 stations study thing like Rush. But he had a respectable sized network. But he was the one who, who told his unhappy listeners if you don't like us, go to the radio, retrieve the numbers and let us know And we'll disconnect you from this side.

Andy 02:55

And truth be told there if we really wanted to, to a certain degree, you could circumvent it, but I could cut you off from our end. I can block you. So I better watch yourself. So what do we have going on?

Larry 03:08

Well, we have two questions from the inside. These come from people who are serving time. And we have a comment from a listener from not a listener, but a transcript reader. And we have we have a plethora of clips tonight where I went clip crazy this week. So we got video. Some of them are current events. And some of them go back to the 1940s. I'm setting the table for bringing back Harry Truman in a future episode. But I didn't want to I didn't want to put the clip down tonight. But I'm letting people become familiar with Harry Truman, former President Harry Truman,

Andy 03:53

because people don't know who that is.

Larry 03:57

There are a lot of people have never heard the name Harry Truman. (Andy: Interesting.) And then we're going to be talking about a case out of the Pennsylvania. It's an important case dealing with PFRs being held up on parole because of housing. And that's going to be a great topic to discuss.

Andy 04:15

Excellent. Excellent. I guess then I will run off to question number one. All right, and I don't have it up on the screen. But it says:

### *Listener Question*

Dear Mr. Larry, why do you think the Federal Bureau of Prisons can do anything they want to an inmate? Our mailroom has denied my religious material. I'm going through the administrative process and ask why you wish to violate my first amendment rights and my religious right to a Bible study through any Minister through the mail. Now another issue back in October of 20. A federal judge ordered the US Treasury Department and the IRS to make federal stimulus payment to people in prison plus jail. I did mine on October 13, 2020 mounted out and for the \$1200 stimulus check five months ago, and it's still not here. Also, there was another \$600 stimulus that was filed for and passed in December 2020. I put in for that in January 2021, as we were told, and some inmates got their 600 bucks before the \$1200 and many are, are still in the post office in Texas. All I can do about that is wait and see if it hits my account. I believe the IRS is still blocking inmates from getting the stimulus tax. I don't have anyone our

way to look into this. I still have no money on my account and I know that my subscription is running out. I don't know if you can do anything. And I would hope that you can and any help that you have, please and thank you.

That's a kind of neat question. And there's more money on the way isn't there?

Larry 05:47

Yeah, I believe there will be. I don't know that I've indicated that they can do anything they want to talk to prisoners or probationers. And I'd like to clear that up. They can't do anything they want. They can do an awful lot of things to both prisoners and probationers because of the differential treatment that courts afford correctional facility managers. That doesn't mean that you have no rights, but it is kind of like a kid in school. And I know I'm gonna get hate mail for making the comparison. But kids do not have the same rights as adults. When they're in school, they're minors. Well, when you're serving prison time, you have a very diminished amount of rights. But you still do have some. Yeah, would you agree that you had a limited right to privacy?

Andy 06:44

Limited? I would say that it was extremely limited.

Larry 06:48

Would you agree that you had a limited right to access people of your choosing to acquaint yourself with while you're in prison?

Andy 06:54

Absolutely. Especially on the outside, yes, you had to fill out all kinds of paperwork to say I'd like to add this person and then they, they they verified them.

Larry 07:02

Well, and see those things are done in the interest of, quote, institutional security. A judge with a black robe is not going to come in and second guess institutional security in most circumstances. So therefore, the prison administrators get a lot of deference, and they deserve a lot of deference, because running a prison is a very tough job. And I admit that freely. It's like running a small city of people who don't want to be there. Most people that are there would probably prefer another housing option. So you've got a lot of things and a lot of moving parts of running a prison. If we went through all the things that are that are required to administer a prison. You don't even think about them, because they just automatically happen. So it's a tough job. They do get a lot of deference. But in terms of some rights, you do have the right I mean, the courts have been deferential on many things, but in terms of your right to worship, prisons have to make accommodations for those things. But he doesn't have the rights that he would have if he were on the street as a non-convicted person. And I'm sorry, but that's the reality of the situation. But in terms of the stimulus payments, this was the previous administration, that without it being expressed in Congress, by the will of Congress, that people not received those payments, they decided on their own. And that's why it's important when you elect an administration, they're running the day to day affairs of government. And they decided to take that to suppress and to try to prevent prisoners from getting those payments. The courts have not been favorable to my knowledge in terms of because

Congress has the final say so and they did not prohibit prisoners from having if you were otherwise qualified for those for those payments, you're supposed to receive them. Now, unfortunately, here's the sad thing about it is when you eventually get those payments, particularly in the state systems, not as much in the federal systems, but in the state systems. They have a way of taking your money from you, for unpaid things, sick call for example. You'll have an accrued bill for sick call, you'll have accrued bill for restitution. And in some state statutory schemes, they have an automatic withholding of a certain percentage of anything that's put on your books, to meet your obligations of your conviction, you know, all those, all those that whole list of fees that they assess. When you look at your conviction when you do a plea, there's a list in some states, it's a very lengthy list of things and all those runs run hundreds and hundreds of dollars. And you'll end up you'll end up possibly losing a significant amount of money. But I believe you'll eventually get the stimulus payment and if you'll make sure I have this letter back in my file because I'm not seeing it, I'll make sure that we extend his subscription until this is resolved because we don't want to lose connection with the newsletter. That's one of the lifelines that people look forward to their serving time is that someone's out there at least doing something trying to change what they're facing when they get out.

Andy 10:20

Oh, righty then what about the religious side of that part? I remember somebody while I was gone, who was Catholic and he was trying to get wine brought in to do communion, which I thought was hilarious. I just didn't see that that was ever going to happen. And he would file grievances left and right. You have that first amendment right. And they have been and not necessarily with people that are in prison, I think the Supreme Court has been pretty much in favor of however you want to worship, you get to worship that way.

Larry 10:51

I know our state Supreme Court has been very, very accommodating to people and their religious beliefs, they get to do little smoking here as one of religious things here, in particular, the Native American population.

Andy 11:07

but i don't i don't like what I know it as is like, this is gonna I don't know of any other word on how to say this. So just whatever peace pipe? Is that what you're sort of referring to? I know that's gonna come across terrible.

Larry 11:18

No, I don't think that's what they call it.,

Unknown Speaker 11:21

But yeah I don't think it is either. But I'm gonna get hate mail.

Larry 11:27

Yeah, you're, you have a way of doing that.

Andy 11:29

I know, clearly, because we have that coming up, I think, Well, next next. Wampum? Chat is giving me choices here. Wampum or sweat lodges?

Andy 11:45

I don't know what this is. But anyway, okay. So not the one that I picked.

Larry 11:50

But but but if the if the prison can assert a legitimate security concern with what you're proposing to do it, I don't know of any such religion that builds bonfires. But I have a feeling, I have a feeling that the courts would probably say that you don't get to do that, because that would be that would jeopardize institutional security. And the courts are very deferential to the need to keep a prison secure. Prisons are supposed to be secure places to the extent they can be. It's hard to have workers or to work at a prison if they're not secure. And people are being sentenced to confinement but not to the loss of their life or their lives. So it's our duty to keep those institutions as safe as they can be.

Andy 12:36

And as another example, if I'm not mistaken, this happened after I left that the Muslim community filed grievances. And I don't know if they went through actual legal challenges that they be allowed to grow beards. And Georgia has a deal where you have to shave and they give out razors and all that garbage. But then next, I know people have beards in Georgia prisons, and I'm pretty sure that was and they can't just say you have to claim to be a Muslim to do it. You just have to let everybody do it.

Larry 12:59

So peyote, that's what I'm looking for. Can be smoked by rolling it into a marijuana leaf or tobacco the powder is referred to as a I don't even know how to read this stuff. But anyway, it that's what I was trying to think of.

Andy 13:15

that's fine. Okay. Question number two, then I think you said in pre pre show that this is a follow up to something we covered a handful of episodes back. It says:

#### *Listener Question*

To the Larryinator I'm writing in regards to a question that you addressed in Episode 165 of your podcast recorded on 213 21. Regarding the possibility of parole being brought back to the feds, I just wish to make a rebuttle. I do not need to reply. You stated about how the American public would be whipped into a frenzy about people not paying their debt to society if parole existed in the federal system. However, I would just like to point out that most every state prisoner has the possibility of parole despite their charges user receiving less time and being more severe than federal, i.e. sex offenders in particular, the state of Texas has parole for many, many years and the American public does not seem to be offended by that. Maybe this is just an American public's ignorance, but I feel this should be addressed. Federal inmates have to do 85% of our time, with the additional punishment of supervised release versus state which is often 10 to 50% at most with parole. I would like to state that my current celly was charged with vehicular manslaughter in the state killing a man while drunk driving. He received a 10 year sentence and only did a few months due to parole after being sentenced, meanwhile, I asked an undercover cop for some photos, was charged with attempted production of child pornography and was sentenced to 22 years. 18 and a half I have to do if my good time remains intact.

That no matter how you slice it is not justice. And I feel that the American public would would not be outraged if I only did a paltry 11 years in prison, for example 50%. I appreciate your reading. Thank you for answering my question in your podcast.

Interesting.

Larry 15:03

this has got a lot of stuff. We could actually do a podcast on this. But what what I intended to communicate was that the system we have now in the federal system, it's been entrenched since 1984. So we're coming up on 40 years. And we've talked about the prison industrial complex, and the prosecution industrial complex and the law enforcement industrial complex. The outcry back in '84, when this was done, and he may not even be alive in '84 when this happened, I have no idea. But we had, we had vastly different sentences in the federal judicial system. You had federal judges in Alabama, who would impose very lengthy sentences for the exact same crime that someone out in San Francisco would receive a probated sentence for and in those days, half of the Federal crimes ended up on probation. Now, I think it's somewhere that in the area of 8 to 10% actually get a probated sentence, if you could remember, Martha Stewart went to prison for lying to a federal investigator. She was so dangerous by telling that lie that she went to prison. So we had we had the public outcry that pushed this through Congress. Undoing something that's national policy is very difficult, especially when it's been entrenched for 40 years. Just take a look at the first step act, and how timid that was and how controversial it was, and how it was even weakened, after having found achieved the bipartisan support of both parties. Then you had this Renegade bunch of Republicans in the Senate that thought it went too far. So I'm judging based on what I know about the system. Now he's probably right, if you took a poll of the American people, and you actually talked about what we have people serving how much time we have. And if we were able to have that intellectually honest conversation, and we compared it to the various states, he's probably correct, that people would be shocked. But the federal system doesn't have the constraints of a budget, like the states do. The federal government doesn't have to balance its budget. That's not important to the American people anymore. We're happy to put it on the charge cards. Most states must balance their budget. And Texas, in particular, they don't have an income tax, if I'm recollecting correctly. And they believe in keeping low taxes, and they just got to where they couldn't afford their prisons. And then the federal courts stepped in as a result of litigation, and they had to reduce their population. And they've got a fairly lenient parole system. But what when he says, all states, we don't have parole in New Mexico. Now someone's gonna write and tell me, I'm an idiot. Because we do have a period of time we call parole. But in order to get to that period of time, you must serve all of your sentence, less, you're good time. In all violent offenses, we are mirrored exactly in the federal model, you get 50% for a serious violent offense, and then other offenses get 50%. And then that extinguishes your sentence, and then you go into a mandatory period of supervised release, but they label it parole, so they can put it on the parole board. So you don't get out here until you serve, in many cases, 85% of your time. But I get his point. I agree with him, that if you could have this intellectual discussion with the American people, and if you could keep the grand standers out of it, who want to whip people into a frenzy with sound bites like

they did with the first step act, you might could achieve that reform. But it's going to be tough. It's going to be very tough. And that's what I was trying to communicate.

Andy 19:04

What about the disparity in the amount of time that people receive though for miscellaneous, different crimes?

Larry 19:11

Are you comparing this disparity between the state and the federal system because there's no comparison.

Andy 19:16

No, I in this he's talking about and I don't know if so he's talking about he got, I guess he got fed time for distribution, and then he's talking about somebody that had vehicular manslaughter. And he went home after like, three years or whatever.

Larry 19:32

Well, well, obviously, the celly he's talking about is in federal custody waiting for something else. But he's talking about that celly got released on parole after doing a small fraction of the time for vehicular homicide. But that, I mean, that that has nothing to do with the federal system. Vehicular homicide would likely not even be a federal crime because you'd have to I mean, most of these crimes that people complain about are state crimes, there's no federal jurisdiction. So I'm quite certain he's talking about somebody who ultimately ended up in federal prison for something else.

Larry 20:06

Okay. And then...

Larry 20:09

alright, well, but he but he is but he, but he is making one point that that the that the crime of which of his conviction for the for the photos is that 22 years is so extreme that if you ask the average person that but see it's all about how you ask the question, if you ask the person, should a prison sentence of 22 years be impose for possession of photos of minors? The average person would say no, but if you ask the question, should 22 years be imposed for exploitation of children? Now remember, all you did is change the term from exploitation, for pictures to exploitation, and from minors to children? And you would get a whole different reaction on that same question. 22 years would seem just about the right amount of time, if you said exploitation of children.

Andy 21:12

Sure. Yeah, term terms matter in this case a lot, don't they?

Larry 21:16

Yep. And I would dare say that a lot of people who are serving these sentences right now these long sentences before they got into trouble and me included. If you had posed the question that way, I would have said, Well, of course people will exploit children should be punished with significant penalties. I would have said that.

Andy 21:33

wouldn't you have? I believe you would have for sure. Yep. All right. Well, then I guess this is the hate mail for me, which I'm going to get in trouble for saying it's hate mail to me, because the person said that he wasn't sending and I was saying all this stuff. I have a tendency to exaggerate Larry. I don't know if you've noticed this. Maybe.

Larry 21:54

No, I could not have ever thought of that.

Andy 21:58

It begins:

#### *Listener Question*

Dear, RMP Registry Matters podcast. Am I wrong? It's happened before, but I don't feel wrong. I feel the one wronged. It's so frustrating. You know it, I know it. Now. I find myself on the wrong side of friendship. Maybe it was mutual. Perhaps it stemmed from my fears and insecurities. But I don't like it and I'm left vulnerable to too much scrutiny or in worse. Instead, I want to help. I wish to be part of the solution. Not a hindrance. But how, how can I help? Registry Matters Episode 164, approximately 33 minutes and 57 seconds. The person who wrote this is going to get a copy of this transcript. That person was me. My efforts are page five. And Andy said that would be me some level of hate mail. I am the subject matter of scorn and the waste of valuable resources. Where did I go wrong? A year ago, I kept writing to NARSOL about what it is I can do asking what it is they are working on. But mostly I was begging for communication. For a year, I've wanted to help them. All they have to do is tell me what they need. And I want to help them. For a year, I have written, donated, read the Digest, sought our state's affiliates, who never responded to any of my mail, reached out and asked over and over only to be told my potential limitations. Hate mail I never wanted it to be. yes, I spoke out of vexation, maybe spewed to an extent. And yes, I questioned their leadership. Because as I see it, communication is the foundation of leadership. I have so much to offer. And I've even tried to assist in picking up the slack for them. I deeply feel as if I can be very useful. But now I feel chagrin. Instead of you guys doing more important things, you're chastising my petulance. So, for that. I'm sorry. Can I make it up by subscribing? Seriously, I'm glad you reached out to me. Is there something I could do for you? Much love Mr. Trent. Wow, is this where I'm supposed to be bringing up Brenda on?

Larry 24:01

Well, not yet. But yeah, she's getting ready. So what I was gonna focus on was the, the writing to the States. And I'd like for like for the writer to understand and everybody to understand that we'll be talking about the states, we're talking about people who are working full time jobs. The funding is not there to have an organization that's staffed with individuals who are sitting around, ready to respond via mail. In every state that has any level of organization, almost all of them work full time jobs. The executive director of NARSOL is also the equivalent head of the state that she lives in. And she works a full-time job. And she does the executive director for the state and the national organization and the states that they just don't have the resources to respond to the mail. And as we said in the letters that we've sent to him, we've, we've heard this, these offers before, and it's just hard to

integrate people in. But we're gonna bring on Brenda again a second time because she has written a very elaborate response, it will probably be published in a newsletter with some edits. But in terms of her idea is in terms of how to try to get people involved in in prison. So let's see if we can bring Brenda on now.

Andy 25:27

I've been trying to reach her, we might have to vamp for a few minutes. Brenda, are you there? (Brenda: I'm here.) Oh, sweet. Okay. I kept trying to ask if you were ready. Welcome back. You are the Executive Director as Larry, just more or less introduced you, the Executive Director of NARSOL? And you're also the executive director of your Maryland affiliate named FAIR, correct?

Brenda 25:49

Yeah. So so he's, I was looking at Mr. Trent's letter earlier and and tried to make another response. He brings up some really good point about, you know, wanting to help and wanting responses. Larry is absolutely right. Most of us, I think, I would say legitimately, that you're not going to find too many other advocacy organizations around definitely not in this field, that send responses at all. And it's not because we don't love you, it's not because we think you're useless, we simply don't have the time where we're trying to deal with, you know, dealing with legislation, that kind of thing. And stopping and writing letters takes up what little time we have available, because we are in fact working or have family obligations, etc, etc. What I did respond to Mr. Trent about in particular, though, was, you know, he has all these ideas, and he wants to help, and we get this a lot, both inside and outside. And my response is, your ideas are great. What can you do? You personally, if you can come to us and say, I am ready to do these things, to make a project happen, I will provide you all the support I can possibly provide, I will, I won't just stay an Attaboy, I'll help advertise it, etc. But just coming to me with an idea, and say y'all ought to be doing such and such or so and so to fix the world, that doesn't help me at all. We've already got a list a mile long things that we know we ought to be doing. And if we had \$1, for every time somebody came to us and said, here's this wonderful idea, we'd be filing so many lawsuits, oh my gosh, we'd be solving all kinds of problems. So but we need people to do things. So wherever you are, in prison, outside of prison, if you've got a great idea, tell me what you are going to do to make that idea happen. Because that's what we need is people doing stuff. So I'll get down off my stump speech.

Larry 28:13

So well, I, I had written in one of the letters that NARSOL sent I had a hand in writing it. And I tried to outline what we do in terms of our functions and how it would be very difficult for people in prison to do that. I mean, you don't have access to the internet, largely, you don't have access to the telephone to make phone calls to lawmakers. In all likelihood, you don't have relationships. But now if he does have relationships with lawmakers, and I'm talking about, not knowing their name, that's not a relationship, but actually having personal relationships, where his name is important, then that can be significant. But he needs to tell us what it is he can do within the confines of what where he finds himself. Generally speaking, they do not allow prisoners to leave their prisons and go to their capitals to lobby and to speak on behalf or in opposition to bills. So like, on the things that we're currently doing at NARSOL, There's, I don't see how an inmate

behind bars can pray, but fit in. But we would love to have, we would love to have family members. If he could rally the family members out there to be more involved. I mean, the bottom-line folks, all we need is we need a whole lot more money. And that money is not everything, but it certainly it's a big part of it because you could hire people and you have access that you don't have without money. We need lobbyists. We need boots. These people cost money. Yeah, lobbying is a profession. And it requires a lot of expertise and relationship building. And wining and dining people to build relationships takes time and money. So So I would like to hear more. But But yes, we're probably going to turn that into a to an article for the newsletter so that everyone can see what we have said in the context of this communication, because there's there has to be more that feel frustrated that they can't do anything.

Andy 30:10

Brenda anything else?

Larry 30:13

Yeah, I I really, really appreciate you. Appreciate you coming on, I really appreciate the effort you put into the letter.

Brenda 30:20

Sure. And and I do think you're one of the folks in in chat is mentioning, unlike the the writer of this letter, who feels like he's got all kinds of things to offer, I also get a lot of people who say, I don't know what to do, I just feel helpless. And yes, we kind of have that other extreme. Again, if you got the funds, funds are always good, and you will not be helpless and you will be contributing. If you don't have funds, there can often be at least small things that you can do, you can get involved in contacting lawmakers when bills are being heard. There's a number of you know, they seem little, but they add up. So just check in with us at NARSOL, and we'll find a way to get you involved either at the National or at the state level.

Andy 31:12

I would like to chime in if that would be okay? (Larry: Sure.) When I when I first found NARSOL, I felt exactly as the person in chat feels who says my biggest issue is I feel so helpless in trying to help. I call it lurked, I hung out, I participated in the phone calls and got new email stuff. And I was like, what could I do? And I, I have a particular set of skills. And I offer those and got in touch with Brenda and others at the time to then figure out how I could offer whatever, but I started donating money but then offering my time and supporting and being a cheerleader on the sidelines. That I mean that that that means a lot to is participating when we when we have calls and 10 people show up versus 200 people like the 200 is a little bit more inspiring.

Larry 31:57

Absolutely. And you've been you've been there with us on a lot of the development of the of what used to be the NARSOL in action, and then we transitioned to doing this weekly podcast. And again, that's your skill set that you're contributing to help make this possible. We're getting information out weekly, weekly now. And we we've tried to integrate it into what NARSOL does so that people can get... who would have ever thought of distributing the podcast into the prisons? You know, there's there's additional source, and it's a very limited circulation list right now. But I do

believe that that list is going to grow over time when people when people realize that we exist.

Andy 32:41

And then just sort of complete the thought the individuals asking about the state he's in and Brenda is replying to him in chat as we are speaking says there are two groups in his state. He's like there are and nothing against the individual. (Brenda: It can be hard to find, sorry.) Sure. But doing searching in this particular case around the NARSOL site, I think you would find them not necessarily saying that a Google search would get you there. I'm saying that digging around or even emailing or asking someone on the default list of communications@narsol.org, like that information would get distributed about?

Brenda 33:20

Yeah, the way to you can go on our site and just do contact us and ask. There is a list of our contacts, like a list of our affiliates. But there are often people in other states where we don't list them online. Like if it's just an individual or a small group. We don't put their information up online for obvious reasons. But if you do the contact form, our contact people will definitely get you in touch with people in the state. Reach out, reach out.

Larry 33:52

Thank you. Thank you for joining us again.

Brenda 33:55

You're welcome.

Larry 33:56

So alrighty.

Andy 33:59

Larry, you selected it turns out to be for miscellaneous clips that we're going to play. Do you want to set up the first one with the former president like from 100 years ago?

Larry 34:09

Yeah, this is former President Harry Truman talking about the importance of not making sure the constitution applies to everyone. And the context it was the pre-civil rights when Harry Truman was one of those courageous guys that said that colored people's they were referred to in that era deserve to be treated equally. And so this tis ol' give them hell, Harry.

Andy 34:32

All right. Let's see, hopefully this works.

Pres. Harry Truman (Audio Clip) 34:34

I talked about Roosevelt in the New Deal and how it ought to be supported and democratic achievements in Congress and I didn't blow my own horn didn't have to people caught on and I talked about civil rights, that was in Sedalia, Missouri. And I was talking to nothing but white faces and a good number of more Klan members. And I said that I believed in the brotherhood of man. And I didn't mean just white men but the Brotherhood of all men. And I told him that I believed in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and that if any class or race can be pushed down below the rest in political and civil rights, well so could any other class or race when the time came. And I told them it was their duty to see to it

that the colored in their locality got increased opportunities to exercise their rights as free men. Do you see? If you believe in the Constitution, well, then everybody's got to have their rights. And that means everybody and it doesn't matter a damn who they are or what color they are. And if you start making exceptions, well, then you just might as well not have a constitution at all. You don't play fast and loose with that.

Andy 35:31

He said, don't give a damn Larry.

Larry 35:32

He was known for, for his cultural language in that era. But, but the relevant part is about the Constitution. When we start playing with the constitution and saying that, if it saves one, we're on that slippery slope that ol' Harry feared. The Constitution applies to everybody. You don't take a poll on the Constitution. So I set that up, because I'm bringing Harry back in future episodes.

Andy 36:00

Oh, and those are the fireside chats? Is that what that was?

Larry 36:02

No, that was just that was just him reminiscing about his his political career and including his his presidency. But yeah, he was he was just talking.

Andy 36:13

Okay. Ready to be a part of Registry Matters? Get links at registrymatters.co. If you need to be all discreet about it, contact them by email. registrymatterscast@gmail.com. You can call or text a ransom message (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. And do you want to set up the next one?

Larry 37:08

Oh, the next one is about... I kept it short. We can talk about legislative process and one of the tools the legislative process you're getting to watch a tool being used right now. So roll the roll the clip

Reporter 37:25

A \$1.9 trillion COVID relief bill is advancing in the senate after a tie breaking vote by the vice president but there are new hurdles to tell you about, Alexander explains.

Kamala Harris 37:38

The vice president votes in the affirmative

Reporter 37:40

tonight after vice president Kamala Harris cast the tie breaking vote to advance the COVID relief bill in the Senate Republican Ron Johnson in a last ditch effort to delay its passage forcing the clerk to read all 628 pages.

Ron Johnson 37:53  
Section one short title section two table of contents

Reporter 37:56  
Senate Democrats mocking the move.

Unknown Speaker 37:58  
And if the Senator from Wisconsin wants to read it, let everybody listen. Because it has overwhelming support.

Reporter 38:05  
But after President Biden signed off on changes that would send direct payments to fewer Americans, individuals making more than \$80,000 and couples earning more than 160,000 will now not get a check. Some progressive Democrats complain that compromise is a mistake.

Unknown Speaker 38:21  
Is it really worth saving point .05 percent to have less checks go out? This doesn't make much sense to me.

Reporter 38:28  
Still republicans argue it's too expensive.

Unknown Speaker 38:31  
Count me out for \$1.9 trillion spend fest unrelated to COVID in a partisan fashion. This is everything President Biden said he wouldn't do.

Reporter 38:45  
At this pace, it'll take the senate clerks 15 hours to finish reading the bill. But democrats vow that will not stop them from voting to pass the relief plan this week. All right, Peter. Thank you.

Andy 38:58  
Tell me what you want out of that legislative process. Like what are we going after there?

Larry 39:03  
Okay, when you when you don't have the votes to kill something, and at this particular juncture, it doesn't look like the republicans are going to have the votes to kill the \$1.9 trillion stimulus. I'm not opining one way or the other way. This is all procedural. When you don't have the votes to kill that, then what you do is you use the tools you do have, which are parliamentary procedures, which we've talked about in the last couple episodes. And the republicans since they realize that if a vote happens, they're going to lose the vote. They're using the parliamentary procedure of stalling. Now, they'll force the reading of the 600 pages when that's done, then they'll offer amendments which will all be voted down on a party line vote. There'll be 50-50 votes in all likelihood on all the amendments. And they'll do that till they exhaust themselves with amendments. These are all permissible parliamentary moves. There's nothing illegal about them. And people that are watching this take place, they'll say, well, they're all crooked politicians. No, it's not. When you when you're using the system, when you don't have the votes, you're doing what you can try to stop the train. They don't know. But that's something large might happen that might sway public opinion against the democrats on the stimulus. I don't know what it could be right now. But right now, the democrat democratic proposal that

passed the House is now the Senate has broad public support, I imagine because all the free money, it's going to be handed out, you know. I would imagine that that that is one of the reasons for the for the broad support. I mean, who doesn't support free money? But you don't know if something might could change that. And like I say, I can't conceive of what that would be right now. But as as long as you stall, you have the hope that something can change the dynamics. What would happen, for example, if one of the Democratic senators, you know, they seemed to have a propensity to die in airplane crashes? What would happen if a democratic senator died in an airplane crash?

Andy 41:15  
Well, especially if it was in a republican state than a republican governor would... (Larry: Right.) A republican would get appointed, then it would be a 51-49 and that would be turtlehead, he would become the majority leader again.

Larry 41:32  
Yeah. So now, that's a brilliant come back on you. Because that's exactly what I was getting at. If every republican governor says they are allowed to appoint senators, that what would happen all of a sudden you've got a new ballgame. So what you do when you're in the minority is you use the tools you have to advance your agenda and their agenda is to stop Biden's agenda. And like I say, I don't want to get into the which way we're leaning all that. But just understand, these are valid parliamentary tools. And that's what that clip was for. That's what the republicans were doing. And that's all they can do.

Andy 42:12  
And then next one, you want to talk about something going on in New York?

Larry 42:17  
Yeah, this is our beloved Governor of New York who has had some political issues arise recently. And I think the clip will set it up nicely.

Andy 42:29  
Okay, hopefully I don't have any tech meltdowns.

Reporter 42:32  
Two of the women who have accused New York Governor Andrew Cuomo of sexual harassment are speaking out with more. Here's Dan Thompson.

Reporter 42:41  
A day after Andrew Cuomo tried to extinguish the scandal engulfing him.

Gov. Cuomo 42:46  
I feel awful about it. And frankly, I am embarrassed by it.

Reporter 42:56  
Two of the three women accusing the New York Governor of sexual harassment speak out both former employees without explicitly saying it.

Charlotte Bennett 43:08  
He implied to me that I was old enough for him and he was lonely.

Reporter 43:14

25 year old Charlotte Bennett was an executive assistant to Cuomo. In June, she says Cuomo asked her a series of intimate questions, including whether she had ever been with an older man.

Charlotte Bennett 43:29

I thought he's trying to sleep with me. The governor is trying to sleep with me.

Larry 43:35

Okay, so I think if you've been a regular listener for a while, I don't think anybody would say that I'm a great fan of, of Andrew Cuomo. And I did like Mario, the father, but I've not been enamored by him. But I set us up because we stopped at her accusation. Can you imagine that? A person, two adults, and he said, comments that suggested he thought that she was attractive. Should that disqualify him from holding that office?

Andy 44:16

Should we not hold the individual to a higher standard?

Larry 44:21

Of course, we should. The voters absolutely should. But that that's what we have elections for. But there's no crime being alleged. She said that the that the comments that he made, led her to believe that he wanted to sleep with her. Now I doubt he actually wanted to sleep.

Andy 44:44

That's a euphemism that, I think is the definition of euphemism.

Larry 44:48

So, but, but that's the extent she did not say that he threatened me with the motion, with demotion, termination or anything else. Her Particular allegations are that he found her attractive. Now I'm just wondering what kind of society can we live in where humans will not ever find another human attractive?

Andy 45:14

I wonder where does the line get crossed? I was having a minor conversation with someone just a short conversation before we started recording about this subject. And where does the line get crossed between? Especially because he's a pretty powerful person, even like as a as a national stage set. I mean, New York's what the second was the second most populated state, he would be a pretty powerful person has been the governor that sets up a very large power differential between him and whomever he is flirting with, and where does it become workplace harassment?

Larry 45:46

Well, that's what the investigations gonna reveal. If there was any quid pro quo, if there was any. But I'm not sitting here saying that I like that. I like to think when I was supervising workplaces, I tried to keep all the appropriate stuff down. But I did recognize I was dealing with humans. And although I had a rigid policy in property management that my staff could not have relations with our tenants. I have no doubt that it probably occurred unbeknownst to me. And should the governor be flirting with the staff and suggesting that he that he would like to have a romantic...? Ideally,

No, you probably shouldn't be doing that. There's no question about it. But does that disqualify him from being fit for office? Now, I personally don't like him. I do not think he has done enough for criminal justice reform. I think he's been absent completely on his power using his powers in terms of reducing prison population as a result of the pandemic. I think... I could go on and on about but I'm focusing on this one thing. If the fact that you find an adult attractive disqualifies you, then we're in serious trouble.

Andy 47:09

Where does the line get drawn between? Great job it's really great to work with you. Wow, that's a really nice tie you're wearing today or nice blouse to some other kind, you know, pushing the the line, where does it cross to? I'm really happy that I work from home. That's what I can really honestly say,

Larry 47:28

Well, I mean, I see

Andy 47:30

It's complicated and murky to navigate.

Larry 47:33

When I'm in public, I occasionally see a well-dressed guy, I still feel it's okay to tell the guy you look really wonderful today that that that suit is well coordinated. But I'm really hesitant to tell a woman anymore that you look good. Because it's the seems like that that is translates into all of a sudden sexual harassment. You can't just admire the color coordination. And I saw the former senator Claire McCaskill from Missouri, coincidence with Harry Truman. She is a regular on meet the press on Sunday. A couple three episodes ago, she had the most beautiful suit. She looked magnificent. I mean, she's as old as I am, if not older. But I thought wow, she's a fantastic dresser. I wonder if you can actually say that to anybody anymore.

Andy 48:17

Yeah, I don't know. All right. So send hate mail to crackpot at Registry Matters. And the final one, will you set it up or just run it?

Larry 48:25

So the final one is, is about the police reform in the US and the US Congress. And there's no intended partisanship here. This is merely a factfinding demonstration. But we're going to show the clip about the proposal and what it would do. And then hopefully the screenshot materializes about which how the votes broke down between the parties. So roll the tape.

Reporter 48:57

The US Senate will get a sweeping police reform bill named after George Floyd as Minneapolis braces for the most anticipated police murder trial in memory. Here's Gabe Gutierrez.

Gabe Gutierrez 49:11

With tensions high in downtown Minneapolis ahead of next week's jury selection for the murder trial of former officer Derek Chauvin, who knelt on George Floyd's neck. Overnight the US House passed a police reform bill in Floyd's name.



Interviewee 49:30

What it signifies is we have people that understand that what happened on that day was wrong.

Gabe Gutierrez 49:32

Louisville, Kentucky banned no knock warrants following Breonna Taylor's death after Elijah McLean died, Colorado got rid of qualified immunity, a policy that made it harder to sue police officers banning both at the federal level is now part of the reform bill along with banning chokeholds and creating nationwide databases of police misconduct.

Andy 49:55

Oh, right. And then I do you asked for it, Larry. And how About that? Wait not that, that there is a vote tally. Well, I have the screenshot up for those watching YouTube for the votes of the yeas and the nays in the house.

Larry 50:15

Okay. Well, if you if you look at that the measure passed in the House with 219 democratic votes and one republican vote in favor. The opposition was two democratic representatives voted no and 210 republicans voted no. So what that tells us as that these measures are perceived as being too radical for the Republican Party. And that's why when you mentioned that they had a proposal in the Georgia a general assembly, I said, there's no way in the world that's going to pass the Georgia legislature because...

Andy 50:58

They're predominantly Republican.

Larry 51:01

That's correct. You'll never get you'll never get that out with Georgia General Assembly, not as, as it's currently made up today. The police will have too much sway over the republican party when it comes to law enforcement and that that clip, we stopped prematurely, but that's fine. It made the point. The other point I was gonna make where the clip stopped is that Mr. Floyd's brother was talking about that, that he shouldn't have to go through a trial. And nobody could feel worse. I don't think them than I would feel about my brother being deprived of oxygen and essentially, it looks like a murder. But Mr. Chauvin is not required to plead guilty. He is entitled to a presumption of innocence. That's the accused. He's entitled to have a trial. He's entitled to assert any defense that's reasonable that his team wants to put on and he's entitled to have that verdict read by jury, and he owes you no obligation to plead guilty. But that was part of the clip where he said he shouldn't have to sit through that. I'm sorry. But that's our system. We have an adversarial system. The accused owes you no obligation to plead guilty.

Andy 52:21

And that would be the right to trial and all that good stuff. And confrontation. That's where I was going. That's Eighth Amendment. Is that where the c confrontation comes in?

Larry 52:30

Do you expect me to know the constitution?

Andy 52:33

I kind of do Larry. I mean, we talked about this particular one fairly frequently. I'm sure yeah, we're not going to talk about the 22nd, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and seventh amendments are but I'm pretty sure 8<sup>th</sup> is Confrontation Clause.

Larry 52:46

Yeah, I never can keep those straight. I'm not I'm not a numbers guy. I can keep the I can keep the first one straight. I think the second one then I start getting lost sector when your buddy watch. The fifth one.

Andy 52:59

The first one is the weirdest one to me. It's the government cannot quarter soldiers in your house. I don't think that one has ever been ever been stomped on.

Larry 53:07

So that that yes, I disagree with Mr. Floyd's brother, but but on those reforms, we're going to end up in the same situation the Senate, that it probably won't go to the Senate because of the filibuster rule. You're going to need 60 votes. And if the republicans if you can't win more votes, this was voted on last year when the Republicans controlled the Senate. And they couldn't get but a few Republicans to support it. So you're gonna end up with the same thing. It's gonna die again in the Senate. So those of you out there who think that criminal justice reform is important. If you live in a state where you have Republican senators, lean on them, and tell them you support these proposals. They need to hear from constituents. They need to hear loud and clear that these are reasonable proposals, even Kentucky after Breonna, even Kentucky conservative Kentucky did it.

Andy 53:59

Yeah. And there was a US car there was another state was that Texas that said something that was ever Colorado? Okay, well, then Never mind. Wasn't that where... I remember some police incident shooting somebody and they unfortunately kind of run all together at this point. I think that was one of almost like, not home invasion, but the police were responding to a call. I think so. And it was a woman just in her house.

Larry 54:25

There's so many I can't keep track of and let's go to the main event.

Andy 54:31

Very good. Very good. I guess I'll just start with these questions. So you people put this case in called *Lacey Stratford et. al. v. John Wetzel*, Secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Corrections. And I think it was released a couple of weeks ago, back in sort of the beginning of February and we're just now getting to talk to it. What does it have to do with us and maybe you're just bored Larry?

Larry 54:57

I wouldn't sound bored at all. It's an important case for us.

Andy 55:01

Well, then why is it important for us?

Larry 55:03

Well, because it's, it's it's a decision that deals with an important issue of people who are required to register being denied release, even though they've actually been approved for parole. So the the This case has been bobbing around for years. But this the claims are the although they've been granted parole, they're released from prison and placement into Department of Corrections operated halfway houses, has been significantly delayed because of a policy, considering community sensitivity to a criminal offense and making these placements. And that's what this case is about.

Andy 55:43

Is this done at the appellate level or is this in trial court?

Larry 55:46

Well it has been up since it's been pending since 2016. The state has tried their best to extinguish this is a Pennsylvania case. But it's gone up on appeal. And the appellate court has kept the case alive. And so now we've got a decision on the on the merits through summary judgment, and it's really good stuff. Really good stuff. I mean, this

Andy 56:10

Summary judgment, your favorite thing?

Larry 56:13

Well, in some cases, it works out okay. In this case, it appears to have done just what we needed.

Andy 56:17

Um, all right. Well, and the way I read the opinion is it says that these plaintiffs like all incarcerated individuals in Pennsylvania are statutorily eligible for parole after serving their minimum sentence as fixed by their sentencing judge. Next, it stated that the Pennsylvania Board of probation and parole the PBPP, say that 10 times fast, investigates all individuals eligible for parole. In deciding whether to grant parole the PBPP considers several factors including the nature and circumstances of the offense, the recommendations of the judge and prosecuting attorney, the character and background of the individual, the individual's conduct in prison and participation and treatment, the individual's physical and mental condition and the individual's complete criminal record. The PBPP also considers the positive recommendations, the Department of Corrections, and individuals demonstrated motivation for success and whether the individual has accepted responsibility for the offense committed. These all sound reasonable. So, Larry, where's your problem with this?

Larry 57:19

Well, that is actually the problem. And you spent a lot of time trying to pull all that out of the decision, but that's exactly. That's what sunk the state. These people have already gone through this process of having all those considerations done before they were determined eligible for release. So, my beef is individuals with sex offense classifications are subject to additional requirements as part of the parole process. Prior to being considered for parole a PFR must complete a sex offender treatment program. At the time of parole consideration, the Pennsylvania sex offenders assessment board consisting of psychiatrists, psychologists and criminal justice experts and behavior and treatment professionals evaluates each PFR. When the PBPP grants parole, we should just

say when the board grants parole, it's typically with a condition that the individual have an approved home plan. And this approved home plan can be a personal approved residence or placement at a DOC operated halfway house. And due to difficulty in finding approved residences, obtaining sufficient money to cover rent and cost of living, most of them rely on placement in halfway house, and the halfway houses are not taking the PFRs because of community sensitivity. And that's what this case is all about.

Andy 58:42

So they are granted, isn't this almost like them being held past their sentence date, then? Is that what this is?

Larry 58:49

No, they're eligible for parole but they're stalling their community reintegration because they don't have a place to go. That's why that long question you had was so relevant, because between what you said and what I said about the additional steps that a PFR must go through, they've been vetted and vetted and vetted but yet, they're still being restrained from being allowed to reintegrate after everyone has said, this person is reasonably safe for release. They won't release them because of the heightened community sensitivity.

Andy 59:25

Larry, I'm getting the feeling that we talked about this, like I mean, like a million years ago, has the policy related to PFRs changed during this case?

Larry 59:35

Oh, yes, yes, yes. We've discussed this case before, and the policy regarding that community placement has evolved over the life of the case. And 2016 when the case was initiated, the policy treated parolees with a sex offense classification differently from other parolees, under the. Under the policy at that time, PFRs who received positive parole actions were precluded from community placement until they were the within 24 months of their maximum sentence, unlike other parolees without sex offense classifications who were placed upon receiving a positive parole action recommendation. So PFRs were regularly designated as hard to place and they were rejected, simply because of the community sensitivity. The parole authorities in Pennsylvania did not want the community correction centers to have too many of these kinds of people.

Andy 1:00:31

Um, my thoughts on Pennsylvania are that they don't have they don't have any sort of 1000 foot kind of restrictions. So if they're granted parole, then what is the what is the problem of putting them into a halfway house?

Larry 1:00:45

Well, it was the sensitivity of the community that they were worried about, that they were going to have clustering.

Andy 1:00:50

Don't you post flyers on people's doorsteps?

Larry 1:00:54

Well, the registry itself would pick the people up, if you if you had, if you had 14 PFRs in one halfway house, it would be easy to see the cluster.

Andy 1:01:05

Um, and now we could then move over to equal protection, which is going to be like 13, 14, 15, something like that amendments, and I know you're not into numbers, how can they have two separate tracks for people that are PFRs versus not PFRs?

Larry 1:01:18

Well, that's what the court had trouble understanding. The court noted that although the parties offer competing views on whether the DOCs policy comports with equal protection clause, the court concludes quote, it does not, the court held the DOC's policy of considering community sensitivity and delaying the release of parolees with a sex offense classification on that basis violates the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th amendment. The court therefore granted plaintiffs motion for summary judgment, and they denied the DOC's motion, and they enjoined the DOC from continuing this unconstitutional practice. And that's on page 10 to 11 of the opinion.

Andy 1:02:00

I've heard you talk about different levels of judicial scrutiny many times which is going to be rational basis and strict scrutiny. And I'm missing one of those. (Larry: Intermediate scrutiny.) And the one that I'm screwing, oh, intermediate, okay. And the one that's sticking in my brain is the rational basis test. And you said this level of scrutiny is where the appellate court is most deferential to the challenge, what level of scrutiny was applied to this case?

Larry 1:02:26

Well, oddly enough, they struggled with it. And they concluded that the correct level of scrutiny this judge concluded that was not intermediate, was rational basis. But it didn't even pass the rational basis test which is so differential. The DOC asserted that it has legitimate interest in assured that no one that no one particular CCC community corrections center and the surrounding community be required to house a disproportionate number of PFRs. The DOC claimed that, without evidence, that if it were released PFRs without delay, at the pace as other classifications of offenders, that the CCCs would be overburdened by PFRs, which in turn, would overburden the communities where the CCCs are located. And the court didn't buy into that.

Andy 1:03:16

Yeah, I struggle with that one. Just rational basis. That's the bottom tier, because obviously strict would be the hardest one. So then rational basis has to be the bottom one. We just have to figure out whether does this even make sense before we try and challenge it at a constitutional level. Does this just even make sense? You're prejudging the people that just because they have a PFR type offense that they are inherently going to, like spontaneously offend on people. Well, it doesn't seem like that even fits.

Larry 1:03:45

let's just go to the rational basis because it's so misunderstood. People think that rational basis means that what they're doing is

rational because it says rational basis. It doesn't mean what they're actually doing is rational. It means what they hope to accomplish is a rational underlying motivation. So all they have to assert to pass the rational basis test is that this is what we would like the result to be. The courts don't get into determining if it's the most efficient, if there could be a better way of doing it. They don't redesign public policy. But they determined that a rational basis test applying to this particular situation, it doesn't pass that test because they didn't have the evidence to support what they were saying. I mean, they they proffered all these reasons for why they're doing it but they didn't have any evidence to support it.

Andy 1:04:43

And we need to get out of this one. What's the bottom line?

Larry 1:04:47

Well, the bottom line is we've got a great decision from a trial court and as states typically do, they will likely appeal, but the court noted that the department corrections has not proffered a legitimate justification for its policy of delayed release of PFR to community correction centers, there's after they receive a positive, proactive meeting that that board has granted them release. And then that extra step that a PFR has to go through that all that has been taken in consideration. And they say, any consideration, this is a quote, of community sensitivity, which on the read this record is, is merely private biases against PFRs is not permissible. And I substituted PFRs with what the court said, where they said sex offenders, for treating PFRs differently. As for the concerns with public safety, these considerations are misleading, because PFR seeking placement in a CCC, like all other vendors have received a positive parole action and have received a termination there was no reasonable indication that they may pose a risk to public safety, and are subject to structures of Megan's Law, as well as for the protection of the public. So this is a great decision. I hope they don't appeal, but I suspect they likely will. And, and this will be tied up for it's been going since 2016. So it may run another couple of years.

Andy 1:06:16

If we can use rational basis to jump over to the Georgia bill that the two knuckleheads, Representative in some small county proposed, they didn't like that a level one person got off the registry, and they're trying to propose this as a law. They didn't have anything to back up what they were saying. They just didn't like it. They didn't have some level one some cadre of a level one offenders that went out and reoffended. They just had it that they didn't like it. Is that something that that doesn't pass a rational basis? If it were to go to court and enter into at that level? I know that it's assumed to be constitutional when it's signed in. But if it were to make it to court, does that is that something that doesn't pass a rational test?

Larry 1:06:57

You know, that's an interesting question. I'm gonna need some time to cogitate on that one. So the Georgia assembly hypothetically might pass the proposal, because... it's not uncommon. States have passed laws that limit people's ability to get off. New York would be a good example. You know, their registry was 10 years and they added another 10-year extension onto it. So if Georgia tightens their eligibility for getting off of that petition process, That's an interesting question. Because do you

have to have a petition for removal process? Absolutely not, at least at least aware of any case law that requires on it, that's what we should work towards is to keep someone on the shaming list, there has to be has to be some due process. But if iGA makes it more difficult, and they increase the minimum amount of time before you can apply, can they do that without any evidence? We need to we need to think about that. That might be a cause of action. You may have invented a new claim that has never been previously asserted.

Andy 1:07:56

Woo, go me. I need to press the button that says applause. But I don't have one. Hey, wait. I'll try this one. \*complete silence\* There. You didn't laugh.

Andy 1:08:07

I didn't hear any applause.

Andy 1:08:09

Oh, no, I don't have applause. It just said I'm trying to win the game.

Larry 1:08:12

Oh, I didn't hear that one, either.

Andy 1:08:14

Oh, it didn't come over. I'll try again. There.

Audio Clip

I'm trying to win the game.

Larry 1:08:19

That is what we're in the business of doing. We're trying to win the game. Interesting.

Andy 1:08:23

That's super interesting that they listed all of those things. Basically, people have been given parole by the parole board, yet they can't get into housing. So then they're just denied. And then to me, that sounds like they're detained past. I know, parole isn't any sort of guarantee that's totally a privilege. So they're not being held past their maximum release date, but they're being held up to because they don't have a place to stay.

Larry 1:08:48

I think I think they might be actually held past their release date, if they've been granted parole. And you would normally be integrated into a community facility, if you don't have your own facility, which is what it sounds like they do in Pennsylvania, then the fact that they are adding an additional layer of community sensitivity. So we don't want too many of this kind in the community. That sounds like ] to me that you're actually being held in prison past your release date. And it sounds like that's what the court agreed with.

Andy 1:09:17

Right? Interesting. Oh, that's super interesting. And again, this is only at the state level? Just trying to see where it would apply outside of PA this isn't this isn't any sort of appellate level. This is just within pa itself?

Larry 1:09:32

Well, it has been up to appeal before the state tried to extinguish by making modifications to the policy. And they tried to extinguish the claim several times. So it's already been up on appeal. And I didn't have the time to do all the work on the previous of what the appellate court has decided. But it very well could go back on appeal again. Because the state is not going to want to have to make these changes. They're not going to, I hate to tell you they're not going to want to say oh well, we've had this wrong all along and get these people out of prison as quickly as possible. So if they have not already had the door shut on the previous appeal that went up, they're likely to appeal again. So we will be staying tuned and probably have our Pennsylvania people come in. And once they make their decision on whether they're going to appeal, we can have Theresa come in fill us in with additional detail.

Andy 1:10:23

Fantastic. All right, man. Um, anything else? We had a handful of articles, but we are already way past an hour, and we should shut it down pretty soon.

Larry 1:10:32

I think we should just close down because we we've got a time limit here now of one hour and seven minutes.

Andy 1:10:39

Oh, well, we're like four minutes past it. All right. Well, we do have a new patron, Jason came on board. Thank you, Jason, that is super awesome that you came on to be one of our Registry Matters patrons. We really love all of the listeners that we have. And the patrons help keep this whole shebang going and going and going and they're really special people to me. Otherwise, you can head over to registrymatters.co and get show notes and get the podcast and links and places everywhere. voicemail is 747-227-4477, registrymatterscast@gmail.com. And of course I just mentioned it go over to patreon.com/registrymatters. Sign up for just as little as \$1 a day. \$1 a month excuse me and goes a long way to help show that the podcast is appreciated by all you people.

Larry 1:11:28

What is this you people stuff?

Andy 1:11:32

I think it came before you learned me of where it came from? Because Hang on.

Ross Perot (Audio Clip) 1:11:39

I don't have to tell you who gets hurt first, when this sort of thing happens, do I? You people do, you people do. I know that, you know that.

Larry 1:11:49

That's Ross Perot, former independent candidate for President in 1992. He was the head of a company called I think it was like EDS, electronic data systems or something

Andy 1:12:01

correct. Yes, EDS Corp and one of the first billionaires that I heard about.

Larry 1:12:06

Yep, he was a looney tune. But but that seems to run a run that seems to run in the family of people get rich, they somehow go nuts.

Andy 1:12:15

I've heard of this. Well, cool, man. As always, Larry, you're the bomb. And I appreciate it. And I know our listeners appreciate it too. So give a big round of applause for Larry. And with that, I will I'll see if I can't find somebody else for next week. But otherwise, if you'll mark off your calendar. Maybe we'll have you back next week, too.

Larry 1:12:30

Sounds good. Thanks for having me.

Andy 1:12:34

Take care, buddy.

**You've been listening to Registry Matters Podcast.**

Registry Matters Podcast is a production of FYP Education.

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.

<b>REGISTRY MATTERS</b>		
<b>MAIL-IN SUBSCRIPTION FORM</b>		
Sign me up for _____ months X \$6 = \$_____		
(Minimum 3 months) * <b>We do accept books or sheets of stamps. No singles please.</b>		
_____	_____	
First Name	Last Name	
_____	_____	
Name of Institution	ID Number	
_____		
Address		
_____	_____	_____
City	State	Zip Code
<b>Make check payable to FYP Education and send to RM Podcast, Post Office Box 36123, Albuquerque, NM 87176</b>		