



## Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 172

Recorded 4-10-21

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 and freshly vacation from FYP Studios, east and west transmitting across the internet. This is Episode 172 of Registry Matters. Larry, here we are again. took a week off how you been?

Larry 00:27

Fantastic.

Andy 00:29

Did you do anything exciting? Did you galivant across the globe?

Larry 00:34

I did not.

Andy 00:35

Oh, well. All right, then. Well, I did some galivanting. And it was good time. And I'm glad that had the week off. I didn't have to worry about talking to you people so much. So there's that.

Larry 00:45

Yeah, that was really, really great for me, too, was respite.

Andy 00:51

Before we move on, make sure that you press the like and subscribe and write reviews and go to all those places and do that stuff on your podcast app of choice and all those things that would help out the show a lot if you would do those things. Larry, tell me what we have on the program for this evening. Before we get going.

Larry 01:09

More time permitting, we're going to have a few current events, we're going to talk about denial of cert petition filed. In a case that NARSOL was participating in *May versus Ryan* from the Ninth Circuit, we've got some listener submissions. And in fact, we received a plea from a prisoner who's read the NARSOL Digest newsletter, and I think one of our transcripts, and he's finding the interstate compact to be very troubling and causing consternation for him. So he wrote a long question. And I condensed it as best I could. And we'll get to that question later in the program. But I had to summarize it, because we'd be here for way too long reading this submission in its entirety. And we have an audio clip from our super patron as well.

Andy 01:56

That is awesome. I also he had he did his registration stuff this weekend, we'll get to that. But he gave me a little bit of like a transcript of what he did. And it was it's quite entertaining what happened with him at the registration office. So we'll get to that. And I will do, I was gonna like actually turn this into like, put audio clips behind it turned into this big theatrical thing. But I didn't have time to get through all that. But I'll do my best to portray it out until the story narrate the incident as it occurred. All right, then. Well, I guess we'll we'll get going with what happens up first, right?

Larry 02:31

Let's do it.

Andy 02:32

Alright. Well, I think we'll posted a question over at Patreon. And it says, Is it just me? Or should judges who are lawyers, in most cases, be

smart enough and knowledgeable enough to actually know and understand the nature of the AWA Adam Walsh Act? What does it say when our judges and justices don't even understand the law? If they can't don't won't understand it correctly? How can they fairly expect anyone else to? Is that not part of the design? Make it so confusing and vague that people of ordinary intelligence cannot navigate it correctly without running afoul of some little technical? Gotcha. I think that's a kind of a fair question. But I know I'm pretty sure your answer is going to be that the body of law is just so freakin huge. How could anybody actually have a clue of everything? You can't be an expert on everything. Unless your name is Larry. Larry, you're an expert on everything.

Larry 03:24

Right? Well, he's partly correct of it. The last part of it, about having a personal ordinary intelligence. The laws are supposed to be written with sufficient clarity, that a person of ordinary intelligence can understand what is required of them. And it's supposed to be written in such a way, succinctly enough, that that there won't, won't be arbitrary and capricious enforcement by law enforcement. But he jumped off on the AWS. So first of all, that's federal law. And it's only recommendations to states. So it really seldom comes into play in terms of your registration obligations in a particular state. They may have decided to adopt parts or substantial amount of the Adam Walsh recommendations are virtually none. Vermont has adopted virtually none. But in terms of whether a judge should understand all that stuff, you're right, the body of case law, the body of law, case law is so large, that that's why we have adversarial system there. It's your attorney's duty to understand the law that you're going to be subjected to based on your conviction. And in the United States Supreme Court case of *Padilla vs. Kentucky* many years ago, the Supreme Court made that clear that all the known consequences of your plead are supposed to be explained to you by the lawyer not future consequences that have not been determined yet. They are not they're not required to be clairvoyant, anticipate any change in regulations that might apply to you but they're supposed to disclose what is known at the time. It's not the judge's duty per se, but in some states actually they do require that the laws have been evolved into where courts are required to explain all these things and make sure the person understands on the record. But now the judge wouldn't understand the Adam Walsh Act, that that's an unreasonable expectation.

Andy 05:15

Can is it sort of like your attorneys' job is to then say dumb it down, I don't mean it that way. But to compact all of the stuff, providing the judge with references to case other case law that they can then go reference, like, here's case number such and such, maybe it's from the state and other state, but give them the cheater notes almost of how of how you're presenting your case and why it should go your way.

Larry 05:42

Yes, but in any case of this, I think Will is focusing on registration, I'm guessing, because he mentioned the Adam Walsh Act, which has to do with registration. Like, for example, you might have a state that has multiple registration obligations, and depending on what offense you're convicted of, the judge is not going to know all that they're not going to wall 38 to 40 to maybe 50 offenses that are on the registry. And what triggers a particular type of registration obligation that your attorneys' job to tell you that. If you plead to this offense, this is what's going to be required of you. Now, the truth of the matter is attorneys don't always know in our state, I'm constantly advising attorneys, you've got it wrong, they won't be subject to that they'll be subject to this. But that's the that's the attorney's job to do that. The

judge may have to apprise you of and the judge may ask that the two attorneys, the state's attorney and the defense attorney. Do we agree that this is a 10-year registration obligation? But the judge is not going to know that other than what the judge is told? If the parties agreed the judge is going up? Yep, to 10-year registration obligation, and everyone may be wrong.

Andy 06:43

And while I get Will's point about them, their lawyers most of the time, then they're just there to make sure that there's order that people follow protocol that it's something close to fair. I mean, they're, they're referees so to speak, they're not necessarily supposed, I mean, could you throw just an average intelligence person up there to be a judge and give them some sort of playbook, then the prosecution and defense go at it. And they just make sure that there's order kept. I know that there's a ruling in the end by the judge, but I'm just not trying to diminish their purpose. I'm just I'm trying to sort of explain away their necessity to know everything so to speak.

Larry 07:21

Well, the judge will ultimately decide the law if the parties disagree, the judge would ultimately So being a lawyer will be helpful for the judge, because the judge might have to retire to chambers and say I'm going to look at the law because the parties don't agree, and the judge may then have to rule. But really good judges try to get the parties to agree that this is what this is what this is what the law says.

Andy 07:44

And I'm trying to think back to me attending the case with the Butts county thing with the signs and the yards, and both sides pulling out guns blazing, saying that this is this rule, this is this rule or this is undecided. This is a new information that you're talking specifically in that case about the easement stuff, that that's right, settled of where that would fall, just trying to point like, we don't know the answer to this. So then the judge has to decide which way that goes based on what we don't know.

Larry 08:13

Or the judge says we're have a trial, and we find out. Right, right. Right, right.

Andy 08:18

All right. Well, then I guess we shall move on to the next thing. And this is from a longtime patron is named Mike and he's in Jersey. And it says, I've got a question for you, Larry, when I used to drive I-355 in Illinois, was a private toll road. And I think it still is, I believe there was a court decision saying that since it is considered infrastructure, that they could not discriminate, who can use it? Could the same apply to Facebook, Twitter, etc? Since they are so large, they should be considered media? Could they legally block PFRs And even Donald Trump? That's for you, Larry, from using it, or would this be a good way to fight it? At the very least a way the PFRs are not convicted of internet related crimes to at least be allowed to use the internet where they are not allowed? I like that question a lot. I think that's kind of a neat way to frame it. Going against a private toll road versus these social media companies the big glamour the big social media companies.

Larry 09:14

Well, I don't I don't know the particulars. But toll roads I don't really know that are truly private. I mean, they operate on government right of way. And they need to be open to every everyone. Again, Facebook and Twitter. These are all privately owned. It is interesting and humorous to watch the flip flop that the conservatives have done on this for all the years since media deregulation. And being told that we do not need to try to have government imposing on broadcasters what they

should carry and how they should set up their programming. The market will take care of it and the market will respond and correct. That's what we've been told since the late 70s, early 80s when they when the massive deregulation of media was done. Yeah. When they, when they abolished the Fairness Doctrine and equal time and all those different things that the big old bad government required the same people that said, you don't need to worry about that they have amazingly flipped now. And they're saying that Facebook and Twitter are too large. And we need to use the powers of government to come in and force them to care force them to carry. But see, it's interesting, because the voices are being silenced are now conservatives. It used to be the liberals that were complaining about their voices being silenced by the large conglomerate broadcasters that carried Rush Limbaugh and Sean Hannity and Michael Levin and all these people there from the conservative side. And they said, Well, we don't carry the liberals because there's no demand for it. And if there's a demand for it, we'll carry them we'll have we'll have them on. So it's just one of those things where, depending on which side of an issue you're on, you magically see it differently now that the hand of government is being sought to force Facebook and social media to carry things but in terms of his question, I don't see it ever coming that way. It might move in that direction, but I don't see. I don't see nationalization of Facebook and forcing them to do to allow people on their network that they choose not to. I really don't see that happening. I could be wrong but I don't

Andy 11:15

I listened to an incredibly high - end podcast called Exponent (<https://exponent.fm>). The guy writes a blog called Stratechery (<https://stratechery.com>) Every one of the things that has that he is he's super in favor of not deregulating these, the consuming not regulating them, excuse me, and letting market because at some point in time, Google appeared, you had all that you had a Microsoft, you had Yahoo, they were already in a place that they could have built the thing. But Google came up, came out of nowhere, and change the world as we know it as far as Internet search, then Facebook takes over and no other social media platform goes Twitter fits into its own niche. But then you have this new thing called Tick Tock. So like things can come up and take over. And I don't know that I've ever heard of anybody being banned from Tick Tock. And that's where people are migrating to. Now I hear you know, that is parlor. And now I hear that maybe Trump is setting up his own social media network, there are places for people to go to, to do their social media gatherings. Just you can't necessarily do it. There. And but there's, there's a market driven reason for other ones to pop up that they don't necessarily need to be forced for our people be to be allowed on their platform.

Larry 12:29

You made the point better than I could have on terms of broadcasting, there's always so much bandwidth, there's only so much spectrum available. When you look at your radio dial, there's only so many slots on there. And in terms of this, I don't know that we have those limitations. So I just don't see this happening. I know that our people are wishing for it. And I'm supposed to tell them what they want to hear. But I just don't see that happening.

Andy 12:52

And Facebook is such a cesspool. But that is where 2 billion people maybe like close to 3 billion people per month use. And if that's where all of your family and friends post their stuff, and you want to keep up with it, I think it's kind of crappy that that our people can't be there, under some level of scrutiny. I think that's kind of a crap move, that that just not everybody can go there. But that's I'm in favor of them. If that's what they want, that they want it to be, then that's the rule that go take your way or somewhere else. I'm in favor.

Larry 13:23

They really never wanted to be that way. They were pressured by government. And the government was responding to concerned parents who didn't think it was right for their little ones to be subject to all these predators roaming around on the social media sites. So they, they they stood, they stood tall for a while said no, we're gonna we're going to be available to everyone. But then they backed off because public pressure was enormous.

Andy 13:48

which is so weird, because they are, they are certainly willing to cave to anybody that wants to advertise and super hyper target to discriminate against people in housing markets, and whatnot. I've heard some really diabolical stories about the advertising the super micro targeting that you can do on Facebook, how you can determine almost down to a number of years if you want like a 32 year old, a 35 year old, like you can get hyper focused in this neighborhood at least down to a zip code. You can super target market people. My understanding of the Trump campaign is they like I don't want say weaponized but I mean they put this on supercharge to hyper target market, to people that were potentially on the fence, whatever, how to get people to sway away from a candidate or towards a candidate. It's incredible what these very, very smart people have done to utilize the Facebook marketing platform. It's incredibly impressive what they do.

Larry 14:42

So yeah, I don't see it being a public utility time.

Andy 14:45

all right, I'm with you. And then let me We'll do the voicemail from Mike in a little bit. But he reached out to me a handful of days ago. He did his Annual Registration there in Florida. And he sent me this long Text Message describing out what had happened. And I think this is quite hilarious. It's just I had a very interesting conversation with the registry officer today. Basically, he tried to tell me that the registry was a civil regulatory scheme. I looked him dead in the eye and I said, Are you going to stand there and tell me you don't think it's punitive? And I waited? He responded by saying quietly. Well, honestly, man, you got railroaded, and no one should ever have to register this long. He said, You got screwed like a lot of other guys. He went on to say that he believes very few guys who register are actually dangerous. He said he honestly thinks the whole entire thing is bull. But he still is, and I quote, just doing his job. I asked him, Well, what if your job was hitting baby seals in the head with a board and killing them? He looked at me and said, I would never do that. So I asked him about the people who have been targeted and killed because they were on the registry. Then I asked about the ones who died locked up over civil violations. He just looked at me and he didn't have an answer. He really wasn't ready for me. Keep in mind, I've been seeing this guy for like 20 years, he knows me well, and always talks with me. I like Mike a lot. He's pretty badass. And is that that's a pretty funny conversation to have with someone to say, Well, I'm just doing my job. But suppose your job was doing something really horrific? Would you still go do your job?

Larry 16:17

Well, that's the that's the question, though. He doesn't consider it that horrific. In his mind he's treating people with respect. And he's doing what they're telling him. And it's the law made by all the people. And he doesn't see it that way. Killing baby seals. I'm not sure that's a law that anybody would be able to cite to that that is your job to kill baby seals. He's doing what the people Florida, told him to do. And they tasked his agency he works for with doing that. So I don't know if I can make that comparison and do it with good conscience, because it really isn't.

Andy 16:47

But no, I totally I mean, it's taking it to an incredibly extreme, because like you said, The law requires him to do the things. But he could go get another job is I guess, where Mike is going with that, that he's just doing his job. And potentially someone could have some sort of, quote unquote, civil regulatory violation of not registering, they put them in prison. And we've covered it halfway recently, someone had something like that happen. They died while they were locked up for a civil violation. So I can see him making the parallel, but it is an extensive, it's pretty deep jump.

Larry 17:20

Well, I mean, he's doing his job in his chosen career. And I mean, there are people who do give up jobs. We had a judge here and his name escapes me at the moment, he ultimately became Chief Justice of our state Supreme Court. When he was a district judge, he would not do, he decided to resign his judgeship, because of mandatory sentences. He said, I'm not going to be a cash register. Okay. So there are people who do that. But I don't think it's a reasonable expectation, to tell someone that the law that's been made by all the people of Florida, that he should resign his job, and put in 20 years and maybe jeopardize his retirement because he's doing something he finds a little bit distasteful. I don't think that's the reason why exploitation, would you give up your job, as it has to be things that you've been required to do through your life that you'd rather not do? I know, I have.

Andy 18:09

Yeah, depending on the extent how extreme it goes, you could have some conscience issue with them, asking you to do a thing, and then you choose to resign. Like they're, they were going to make a new search engine specifically targeted for people living in China, and they were going to restrict conversations of things like Tiananmen Square, if you tried to do a search, Google was going to modify the search engine that if people in China did a search for Tiananmen Square, that it wouldn't return anything, or be filtered, whatever. And there were Google engineers that at least like walked out. I don't think they quit because they're probably very high paying jobs but they at least tried to form some kind of collective to push back and I don't know to what degree they did. I don't remember following it that that closely, but people do sometimes. Take a take the moral high ground on something if they can.

Larry 18:59

take the judge I mentioned earlier. His name was Gene Franchini. He did do that. He was not going to impose a sentence required by law so he resigned. He didn't think the sentence was just, but that is the abnormal person.

Larry 19:09

There, there are people lining up. Despite law enforcement's pretensions to the contrary, there are people who are lining up to be cops. There's pretty good job stability, there's pretty good pay and pretty good benefits. And I think we did maybe 50 episodes ago, or however, we talked about, we talked about how many people were applying, but law enforcement was trying to scare folks and say that this all this defund the police that's causing us and I think we ended up saying, showing that there was like 2000 applicants in some city in Texas for like 100 jobs. Yeah, so remember that episode? Yeah. Like, it's like it's so this job would not discontinue being done because this one person left the sheriff's department, they would just simply assign a task to someone else that it would continue to be done. The right thing to do is to try to change the law.

Andy 20:00

Alright, well, then we will move on from there. Let's do this little segment about the interstate compact piece. I think. Are you ready for that part?

Larry 20:11

I can I can get ready. Sure.

Andy 20:13

I've been a subscriber to newsletter for several years. And I appreciate all that you do. My question has to do with how I might get approved to live in another state so I can be released on parole. I'm in prison in Tennessee. And you people have convinced me that I should not live here. If I can avoid doing so. The part you conveniently leave out is how, how do we get the transfer process underway? I've resorted to writing to several states and most do not answer. I've enclosed the responses I've received. What should I do next?

Larry 20:43

So Well, just out of curiosity, what were those responses that he received? What did they say?

Andy 20:48

Well, one of them says this one looks like it came from Oregon and says this letter is in response to your letters and phone calls to our department regarding a possible compact, we require you to have a blood relative that is a resident of our state in order to be eligible for combat. Is this true?

Larry 21:07

that is nowhere in the compact.

Andy 21:10

Nothing says that you have to have some sort of biological relative in the receiving state to do transfer.

Larry 21:18

I have not been aware of it. And I've studied that document with great intensity and I'm not aware of any such provision in the interstate compact.

Andy 21:26

It says regarding parole to transfer to Tennessee to California State transfer requests was brought to our office for your information. All 50 states have provisions to supervise parolees from other states under the terms of the interstate compact for adult offender supervision. While you are in custody at a Tennessee correction facility, it is the responsibility of that facility to process the interstate transfer investigation request or for more information, please log on to website listed for details on the transfer process. A state may permit a parolee to reside in that state, while on parole, if the offender is in substantial compliance with the terms of supervision. The offender is a current resident of receiving state and has family residing in the receiving state who are willing to have and the ability to assist the offender as specified in the plan of supervision from the sending state. And finally, offender can obtain appoint employment and has documented financial means of support, then say they can't initiate the transfer investigation at the request of an inmate or family members. So they're telling them that they have to go through their institution, they're from their sending state to get that whole process underway.

Larry 22:31

That is correct. And we actually, this may be in response to the I think it actually has a response to the February newsletter NARSOL Digest, we had a column in there of, of a person wanting to transfer and asking similar questions. And as I explained in that column, you can't seek

to have your supervision transferred through that formal process you just described. But what frustrates people is that the applications must be initiated by the authorities. There's no, there's no initiation by you, or your family. And I'm stressing that because you see it now on the letterhead from the corrections department in state of California, applications must be submitted by the state that's convicted you, they have the discretion to allow you to seek transfer, if they choose, there are only some rare circumstances where they must permit you to leave, you have no right to be supervised in a state other than the one you were convicted in. That's the one right you do have. After you've done your time, as you have the right to be supervised, if you can remain violation free, but you do not have a right to go to another state. It's a privilege. And in fact, many states impose an application fee, I think as high as \$250 to submit an application to transfer. And this means it could be very expensive for you to request to be transferred. it it's not a right. It's a privilege. And you've got to get your caseworker if you're in prison, your community reintegration your reentry people to help you initiate that process. If you do it, you will get the letters if you get any response at all, just like the ones we read.

Andy 24:27

We've talked about this however many dozen times how is it there is process to transfer supervision and nobody really like it seems that nobody including me really completely understands it? I know that you got to get your sending state your current existing state to initiate the transfer. I got that part. But then all the conditions like it's complicated, what should a person do?

Larry 24:51

If you're a PFR person forced to register, we get asked about that regularly. Those seeking transfer supervision should keep in mind that few states desire to supervise and other states PFRs for fear of potential liability, should that person reoffend. I didn't make that rule of life. I'm just telling you what it is. So you should attempt to find a proposed residence in the state you'd like to go to that would meet the requirements and then you asked me, Well, how do you do that, and it's very difficult, particularly you're behind bars. But there could be your house could be too close to a school or a park. And you've got, you've got limitations of where you're allowed to live by law of the registration in the state you're going to, and then there may be no residence restrictions by law, and the supervising authorities may have their own policies, that anybody who's subject to registration is not allowed to live within X number of feet of all these things. So simply researching the registration statute, doesn't do it. Because you might do come out very clean, say there's no residence restrictions that state and then you, you get your applications turned down, because they say it's within 940 feet of a school, they have 1000 feet record requirement. So it's very difficult. It is very difficult. There's no one sitting there on the phone ready to talk to you. Since they're not, they're actually hoping that you do not come. So it's very difficult. I wish I had answers.

Andy 26:25

Though, let's edtry and think about this, like strategically for a minute. If, if someone were to want to transfer, should they take into consideration the state that they're going to and what kind of rules, regulations restrictions, all those other words that we're gonna throw in there to try and figure out where they want to go? For example, they want to go from an easier state and they want to go to Florida like, wouldn't you'd not want to go that way. And you would try and go from hard to easy and not from easy to hard?

Larry 26:53

Generally speaking, yes, you would not want to go to Florida, if you were being released from a Vermont prison. Because if you were being released for from a Vermont prison, I can guarantee you that the

registration requirements of Vermont are fair, are just much fairer, and more reasonable than Florida. But you may have other issues in play, like you have nowhere to go in Vermont, and it's very cold. And it's very expensive. And you really had no connections you only came through for a weekend. And you've got a conviction because you propositioned somebody who was under the legal age and you didn't know it in blah, blah, blah, you may end up in a position where you need to leave Vermont. Well, your support structure is in Florida. Well, then what do you do? Yeah, well, that's the whole that's the whole problem. Guess what Vermont's conditions go with you. Whatever they imposed on you. Florida has the opportunity to add conditions as long as their conditions are reasonably related to your offense, and consistent with how they supervise people convicted of similar offenses in Florida, they can add additional conditions on your supervision that you did not have in Vermont. And they can, not only can they will require you to register and compliance with their laws, because Vermont is no longer in control of your registration. So guess what, you get to lose Vermont's 10 year registration and a mail-in form in favor of a quarterly registration for lifetime, you get to have a state that has no statutory restrictions in terms of where you can live to go to a state that has up just a checkerboard of restrictions. If you're a Dade County, Miami area, 2500 feet, 1000 feet here, all these different restrictions, they're imposed throughout the state of Florida, and you have a much more hostile environment to live in. I mean, the climate might be better, but you went from you went from a relatively rational place to a completely irrational place. And that's what that's what would happen if you if you transferred for Vermont to Florida, but you may end up that's your only choice.

Andy 28:58

I think you kind of mostly answered the next question that I have about which state controls Was there anything you wanted to hone in on that one at all? Well,

Larry 29:07

It's confusing, though, because people want to lump the registration and their sentence together because they in their mind, they have decided that it's a part of the punishment and it isn't.

Andy 29:20

Right like that, that is super confusing of the whole thing.

Larry 29:24

And, and the sooner you will accept the fact that registration is not a part of your punishment. It is a collateral consequence. That goes with your conviction, like certain occupational debarments they might go with it, your prohibition against owning a weapon. Yeah, that's a collateral consequence the that the obligation to participate in this regulatory scheme is a consequence, therefore, the regulatory scheme that controls the scheme and the state that you are living in, so you left Vermont's behind when you left that left that state and when you went to Florida, you're now subject to Florida's registration requirements.

Andy 30:05

if we compare it to driving, which is a civil regulatory scheme, and you f up like royally, you're driving 150 miles an hour and you're drunk, they're going to like that you will get punished for that aspect. But the regulation side is you may not get your driver's license back.

Larry 30:21

And that is that is a somewhat valid comparison. But the states have agreed to honor each other suspension. So if you're suspended or revoked in Vermont, Florida will not honor it will not give you a license. That was a racket that people used to do. Before computerization, I

was able to get a license. But nowadays, if you're under suspension or revocation and one state, you're not likely to be able to escape that by going to another state, they're going to tell you to get your to get what's called a restoration of your driving privileges in the state where you're suspended or revoked, and then they'll issue your license. But the rest of it is correct. If you went from a state where they had a free driver's license, because you're over 75. And you go to Florida, and you say, Well, I got a free license in New Mexico because I was over 75. That was like, isn't that swell? Go back to New Mexico. And they'll give you a free license there. But we don't do that here. Our requirements are that you pay the same thing everybody else does. And if you if you argue with them, they'll say, Well, you didn't have to come here.

Andy 31:25

Derek in chat asked about he said he made the same he says, in doing this transfer because he transferred from California to Texas. And he says that they take their sweet, precious time, my understanding is that they can't take their time, there are time limits on this.

Larry 31:41

That is correct. But what they'll do is they'll take the full 45 days, yep. And then at the end of the 45 days, they'll notify them of a deficiency and in the application packet, because they were they were snowed under so on the 43rd day, they'll say the packet was missing, there was a list of stuff that the packet supposed to contain. And then when that trick runs out there, they'll tell them that that the place is 939 feet from something and their restrictions are 1000 feet. And you can go back and forth a lot with trying to be transferred because they do not want you to come.

Andy 32:16

And something we talked about pre-show is, if you were the registration office for your particular state, you would be like, I got this down to an assembly line process. I want to get rid of as many people as I can. I have no reason to deny anybody to leave.

Larry 32:32

While I say but make sure that we emphasize the if because people conveniently tune that out. They say that Larry said that he would like to get rid of as many. I'm saying if I were tasked with being in their role if I had the responsibility of compact administration. And if I were going to be the one where the cameras came to my door asking me about offenders who messed up, the logical philosophy would be that you would want to get rid of as many as you can. Because the more you get rid of, the more likelihood the cameras will roll in on another state's contract administrator rather than you. So that would be my philosophy. If I were in that position, I would want to get rid of as many as I could. That would there's nothing illogical about that at all. So I would not stand in in the way. In fact, I would ask the legislature to repeal any transfer fees or in statute. And I would train our case-workers to facilitate as many transfers as we possibly could.

Andy 33:32

Sure. I mean, that sounds totally reasonable. And then on the other side of that, if you were in charge of that office, you would probably try to figure out how to gum up any transfer coming in.

Larry 33:40

That's exactly what I would do. If, if, if I were training them on the other side of it on the receiving end, I would say look, we are going to follow the absolute requirements of the compact to a letter. But we're not going to give any additional flexibility. We're going to take the 45 days that we have, and we're going to reject where we can as long as we're not blatantly violating the compact, and we're going to try to

stem the flow of people coming to our state. That would be my philosophy if I were in that role, because the more I can keep out the less likely the cameras are going to come in on me and that would be my goal because your career lasts a whole lot longer when you don't have problems when you're when you're when you're in government service.

Andy 34:22

Gotcha man. Ready to be a part of Registry Matters. Get links at Registry Matters.co. If you need to be all discreet about it, contact them by email Registry Matters cast@gmail.com you can call or text a ransom message to 747 227.4477. Want to support Registry Matters on a monthly basis. Head to patreon.com slash Registry Matters. 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.

Andy 35:18

Okay, then let us move over to a letter that was sent over to NARSOL about victims' rights. Is that okay to go there? Sure, yeah, cool, says Dear NARSOL. An area the sex offender laws I have not seen addressed is the rights of the victims, specifically the right to remain silent and against cruel and unusual punishment. Under the Texas family code section, blah, blah, blah, it states and maybe Texas family Code Section 32.005. A, except as provided by subsection C, a physician, dentist or a psychologist having reasonable grounds to believe that a child's physical or mental condition has been adversely affected by abuse or neglect, may examine the child without the consent of the child. Without the child the child's parents, or other persons authorized to consent to treatment under the subchapter. Subsection B states an examination under this section may include x rays, blood tests, photographs, and penetration of tissue necessary to accomplish those tests. When the victim states they do not want to be examined. The attending physician under the statute is authorized to sedate the victim, place them on the Examination Table and probe them. This is legalized rape and cruel and unusual punishment. Also, when the victim is interviewed and they state that nothing or that they do not want to talk about it. They are then interrogated repeatedly for days until they say whatever the interrogator wants them to say, these are the same interrogation techniques that have been ruled illegal for law enforcement to use in criminal investigations. Yet, it's acceptable to use this against a minor, giving the victims, their constitutional rights would actually reduce the amount of people incarcerated for these crimes, they should be automatically be appointed an attorney to protect their rights. These are the laws that should be addressed. interesting points, I can see later, I could totally split the fence on this one and go either way.

Larry 37:15

Well, I do like his concluding paragraph, about a minor. But everything else in the letter is just totally off of base we (society) have enormous power, to require minors to do things, they do not have the full plethora of rights that adults have. And they can be examined against their will. There's a lot of things they can do not normally up, there's a parent cooperating in this process. Normally, you would never do anything like that. And I can only speak for my state's process. Texas as a nation to itself in terms of how they do things. And this letter comes from Texas. But normally, that wouldn't happen to over the objections of a parent but in terms of children, a child a child does not have the same rights and the greater good of society is to determine if there has been a crime and the only way we can determine that since we cannot, children are not competent enough to be recognized as as reliable witnesses, we need some way to determine if they have been a

victim. And one way to do that is with a physical examination. So like I said, I like his closing paragraph but in terms of examining a child that that's the normal way things are done.

Andy 38:33

And certainly like to take the other side of this equation, there's a kid that is getting the crap beat out of it on a daily basis from an alcoholic parent. And the parent is being strategic in the way that they're beating the crap out of it. So there are no like visible bruises, but they're in places where clothing hides it easily. And something comes up and they're like, hey, look, oh, crap, you have bruises all over yourself. Where do those come from? Oh, I fell down the stairs. Come on, man. When you fell down the stairs, you didn't knock every elbow and shoulder and hip and all that stuff for you to get all those bruises. There has to be some way for the state to then intervene and protect the child even in an environment where the kid cannot safely speak out.

Larry 39:15

Correct. And I was I was responding to when the child's not the perpetrator when, when that's when the parents would be not the suspect. But in cases where the parent is the suspect. Yes, the process is considerably different. Because we're investigating the parent now. Would it be great if the parent could shut down the investigation against themselves? Would that be a fantastic system?

Andy 39:38

Yes, yes.

Larry 39:41

Very few parents would they were abusing their children but with consent an examination would they?

Andy 39:46

I'm confident of that one. Confident, confident, confident. Um, so I think we're done there too.

Larry 39:55

Yeah, I was like sad. I think he's put a lot of energy into writing the letter, but I think he's not going to get any traction with those arguments other than the fact that a child, a child should have, at some age an advocate to make sure that they're not being that the whole process is not abusing them. So I did like that aspect of the letter.

Andy 40:15

Very good. And then if we head on over to the script that you prepared for the show notes. The first news story that you wanted to talk about was congressman Matt Gaetz and the recent public disclosures about him, and I'm betting that you have a point, Larry, because I know how you are about these things. My understanding is that he sent a Venmo payment to another person that that were to get him set up with younger women. They say that that one had turned just turned 18. How does that relate to our cause? Larry, what are you trying to bring up here?

Larry 40:48

Well, it relates because I continuously harp about our cherished principle that a person is presumed innocent, regardless of what the allegations are. And it hasn't been that many episodes ago that I've been pontificating about Governor Cuomo, who happens to be supposedly a liberal, progressive democrat. And I said that he deserves that presumption. So now I want to show that I would say the exact same thing. It would be totally hypocritical for me if I said anything to the contrary. In this instance of congressman Gaetz, he's a conservative Republican who represents the first congressional district of Florida,

which covers the western panhandle. And, and he deserves the exact same presumption. He deserves exactly what I said about the police officer. And exactly what I said about Cuomo, no difference whatsoever. And the funny thing is that I'm not sure there's anything illegal about sending money on Venmo. The question was, of course, what was the money sent in exchange for was there a solicitation for of anything that would constitute illegal conduct? And I'm not sure I mean, that's what the investigation is going to show. But I would have a tidbit advice for any Venmo user, make certain that you set your transaction history to private. And then also there's a payment line and it won't let you make a payment to someone without putting something in that payment line. And people put all sorts of jokes in there of anything from drugs, do you name it, I've seen it. And make sure if you're going to put something in the payment line, it doesn't resemble illegal activity. Because if you have that in the public feed, and you say for the great, whatever drug you name, you just might trigger an investigation of yourself. So be careful, not what you say in public.

Andy 42:32

And I have a feeling that that would then be used in court to go here, they are admitting to what they're doing.

Larry 42:39

It very well could be but I'm not aware of any cases like that. But if you put that you're buying drugs, which I've seen that several times on Venmo, if you put that as a reason for the payment, and then the person who receives the payment is found to be selling drugs, and they point a finger at you and say that you're one of their customers, it would seem like that would be some evidence, at least as a prosecution might seek to introduce because no one forced you to put that down.

Andy 43:09

Some people have been calling for him to resign, which I mean, I guess that would be the pattern because what's his name had to resign. Guys, what's the guy? The guy from Minnesota? Yeah, Frank.

Larry 43:22

Are you talking about Al Franken?

Andy 43:22

Yeah.

Andy 43:29

Yes. Yes, I am. Yes, I am. Oh, my internet just blew up for a second. Um, so but then how does that play out in the long way on the long run?

Larry 43:37

With Congressman Gaetz, I'm not sure. But based on Wikipedia, you can take that for what it's worth, he's engaged to be married. And I do know that this part of Florida, I know it very well is very conservative. And it could be that he just can't withstand the public pressure. Because if he's engaged to be married, and if there's substantial evidence that he's seeking romance from young women, it could be that his constituents are not going to be very supportive of that. That would be my expectation from that part of Florida. So I've also heard on the news that he's now retained legal counsel. So there may be something that has developed on this if he felt the need to get legal counsel, they may be going somewhere.

Andy 44:23

Well, that would that would be like, I mean, as soon as you are contacted by law enforcement of anything, it seems like you should

lawyer like instantly, because you don't want to then potentially make matters worse, right?

Larry 44:36

Well, there are those who say he hasn't done anything wrong. Why does he need to lawyer up? Why does he need to be all lawyered up? There are people who say that.

Andy 44:43

because our system is garbage, and you will get trapped in to like it's, it seems so easy, and now that the public is in it like he probably his careers probably is just about doomed just because the public isn't on it.

Larry 44:57

Well, I'd say he needs to be lawyered up because whether or not you've done anything wrong, or illegal is not the issue anymore. And I don't really do it ever has been. But the issue as always, and I get a lot of eye rolling, when people would come into our office that I would say the issue is not what you did. Yeah, the issue is, what can they convict you of doing? Yep. People say, Well, how can they convict me of doing something I didn't do? And I say they do it all the time. Because of the way the law is written, and the circumstantial evidence they have, they may be able to convict you of something you did not do. So we'd look at what can they convict you of as part of the analysis?

Andy 45:36

I mean, if we roll back to the thing just a minute ago, about Venmo, let's just hypothetically work with if someone if, Larry, if I send you 10 bucks, because you bought lunch, and I say Hey, man, thanks for the great weed. And some investigator picks up on that, and they go investigate. And that starts the process because I have admitted to using weed. So now there's some kind of investigation process, even though we just went to lunch. Correct. And I'm not saying I get convicted of anything. But that starts the scrutiny. Now. Yeah, the police coming by the house. Now the neighbors are talking and things it just gets tense and stressful. And then maybe I have used weed and things just go at all because we went to lunch and I made some kind of snide comment about thanks for the weed.

Larry 46:16

But the other end, there are people who more often than you would think, put some sort of drug on there the reason for the payment. And I've been playing with Venmo for the last six or eight months, and I've seen so many things. I would never put that up and never say that. But I don't think they give it a second thought. I don't think this highly sophisticated Congressperson who's quite young, comparatively, in his 30s, I think 38 is what Wikipedia said, he grew up with this technology of all people he should know not to be putting everything. Of course, maybe I'm just too conservative in terms of how I use the internet. I won't even send an email a critical email someone. People start a thread talking trash about someone and they say, you never respond. I say you will never see me talking trash about someone in an email. I'm just not going to do it.

Andy 47:04

It's too easy. But now that's on record. And I totally understand where you're coming from and anything that you would post on anything of social media, including Venmo, including tik tok, is very easy for someone to screen capture and build up a profile against you.

Larry 47:19

So yeah, but I feel that the guy deserves due process. If he hasn't broken any law, he shouldn't have to step down from his office. I think that's people in the in the first congressional district of panhandle, Florida, they can decide in 2022 if he represents their values, but I'm

tired of hearing of this, everybody should resign for every little thing, you know, he, if he if he wants to have an affair, which this would be if he's having a romantic engagement with a younger woman. That is an issue between him and his fiancé. It does not involve his public service in any way.

Andy 48:03

All right. Shall we move on to the cert petition? Deal with Steven May?

Larry 48:07

Let's do that.

Andy 48:09

Cool. And I understand that SCOTUS, the Supreme Court of the United States has issued their one-line order denying the cert for Steven May's case. You've harped on this for years down, Larry, and why are you so fixated on this thing? Because I'm tired of it. Just kidding. I'm not because I like Steven May and I think this is garbage. But let's what has happened now?

Larry 48:30

Well, as I, we've talked about this a couple of times recently, so I cannot spend gobs of time on it. But I think we were even on episode 169. But what we found NARSOL and I found so troubling, is that the Arizona burden of proof has been shifted to the accused. And that's becoming more common in American law. And it's just mind boggling to me, how we can require the accused to prove anything. And people think well, it only has to do with our type of offense. And that's just simply not true. It's just not true. The state of Florida has strict liability drug possession, you do not need to know that you're possessing a drug. You do not need to know what's in your car, you do not need to know that your teenage offspring, put it in your car. If the cop pulls you over and the dogs alert on it, you're in possession, and Florida is a strict liability state. So the obsession, people believe that Arizona is the only state, that's just not true. And that's what makes the issue made the issue. So, so important to us is that we want the state to have to prove that you had a requisite criminal intent in your mind that you knew that you had contraband in the case of Florida's drug statute that you knew and intended to possess the drugs and we want in the case of Arizona's child molestation statute. We want you when you're accused of child molestation in the state of Arizona or any state for that matter, for the state to have to prove that that touching was motivated by sexual interest? Not it was just simply a touching and the erogenous zones of a child or young adult. I think this applies all the way down to 16. In Arizona, but we want the state to have to prove that I mean, what a concept.

Andy 50:29

Tell me, can you give me where strict liability is a valid way to have a law written?

Larry 50:37

Well, according to the Supreme Court, the strict liability offenses are, very frowned upon. And there's no exact line, but it's in offenses where there are no significant life altering consequences, and I think we would all agree, okay, okay. Okay, of being convicted of a sexual offense is a life altering thing. If you're speeding, there's generally not a life altering consequences, you're going to get three points on your record, and you're going to have to pay some fees. And the fact of the matter is that we really don't care if you knew what the speed limit was, yeah, if you were texting on your phone, and you missed the sign, that's really not our problem. The problem is that public safety was compromised, because you were going 50 in a 25 miles per hour zone. And therefore, you're, you're liable because you were speeding.

Andy 51:32

Strict liability is used for something inconsequential minor kinds of things where, like you said, life altering, but something just it doesn't matter. You've left your library book checked out for too long, and eventually it becomes something significant, but nothing happens. You get your library card revoked.

Larry 51:48

That's correct. But in case of a serious felony offense, or are there life altering consequences, there should be no strict liability offenses, the state, the prosecution should always have to prove that your mind was trying to break the law, that there was a there was a requisite criminal knowledge and intent. A 70-year-old lady who happens to have some drugs on her person because her grandson forgot to take his dope to school when she gave him the ride. That does not make her a felon shouldn't make her a felon, but it could in Florida.

Andy 52:23

Okay, I was just gonna say so you and I go out to lunch and you get the car and you leave your whatever pills or dope bag whatever in my car. I'm toast because you left it in my car.

Larry 52:33

Well, you would be in the state of Florida.

Andy 52:35

Yeah. Um, is there any Do you have any sort of like, how many states do like, I don't know if that's even like the right kind of question is, how many states do this sort of thing is that are all states strict liability. I remember Catherine Carpenter talking about strict liability stuff. I'd never heard the term before until the first Atlanta conference. I had no recollection of at that before my life.

Larry 53:00

There are strict liability offenses, probably most all the states. I know Michigan that that was the case of Zach Anderson, his journey from Indiana to hook up from with a with a student resulted in a strict liability because she was under age, and he didn't know it. In case of Michigan law, they did not care. It was a strict liability offense and his family was having trouble comprehending that the issue was the strict liability. Zack would never have been into court if the prosecution had been required to prove that he traveled from Indiana to Michigan, with the knowledge that he was going to be meeting up with a person who was under age. It just so happened that the person was under age and Michigan takes the position that they don't care. And so that was the issue. But he struggled with that. And he fixated on the fact that they didn't give him the Holmes Youthful Trainee Act relief where he would have had to register. And of course, you would want that. But the but the but the big Boogeyman in the room was the strict liability. Zack would never have been in that position if Michigan had been required to prove anything, but they didn't have to. So Michigan certainly has that. Arkansas does there are a number of states that have strict liability offenses that shouldn't be.

Andy 54:26

What about like the reason why was not something that's non sexual oriented? Why would an adult be touching a minors private parts?

Larry 54:36

You might be doing it to save their life. If you were a lifeguard in case what Steven was you might be doing it to grab onto whatever you could to get them out to safety. I don't know all the details of the case. Because my issue was not the details. I'm not detail oriented when it comes to a particular person's offense. I'm on the on the grand cause,

which is we need to require Arizona to prove it. If they're gonna evict someone of child molestation, that there was some criminal intent other than just touching a child's private parts, so I didn't fixate on all that. But that would be some reasons come to mind I, maybe when your coach congratulating a player slapped your butt, but maybe that's maybe that would be a situation I don't know people say that wouldn't ever be prosecuted. But you know what? Things that you never think of prosecuted if you've been listening this podcast, we've talked about things that you thought would never be prosecuted because the police are overworked, and the system is just so short staffed, but yet we have case after case after case of things that you thought would never happen. that did happen.

Andy 55:37

How about is there anything else that Mr. May can do at this point as the out of options, and I heard that Maricopa County has created a prosecution integrity unit. Is that an option? Is there anything that you can do for a pardon? Or since a sentence commutation by Biden anything? Like I'm thinking he's pretty much out of options?

Larry 55:56

Well, in terms of the last question, I'll take that first, Biden wouldn't have any authority because it's an Arizona conviction. So keep in mind, presidents can only pardon people for federal offenses. So this is not a federal offense. So there's nothing that Biden could do. But even if you could do anything he wouldn't. Can you imagine what the right wingers would be saying? If he turned on a 75 year convicted sex offender and said, Gee, I don't like that. I've got it. Can you imagine what though, but this would fall to the governor of Arizona, or whatever clemency processes they have in Arizona. But as you know, it's not likely for a person who has a sexual offense to get any type of executive clemency. Then in terms of the prosecution integrity unit, that's also an extreme long shot. Even a reform minded prosecutor would be hesitant on that, but let's even talk about this particular prosecuting attorney. The Maricopa County prosecuting attorney's website says, has the bio 'of the prosecutor. And it says quote, Adele began her legal career in Maricopa County Attorney's Office, where she was an award-winning litigator, prosecuting felonies and advocating for victims' rights. During her more than seven years as Deputy District Attorney she served in vehicular homicide, gang and drug enforcement bureaus. Does this sound like a person who wants to free a convicted PFR to you.

Andy 57:25

No, not at all.

Larry 57:28

So, in addition, these types of special units need public support in order to secure funding for their existence. So if a person who had recently formed a prosecution integrity unit, and they were trying to build public support for its ongoing existence, do you think that the general public will be supportive of freeing a person who had been convicted of molesting more than one child?

Andy 57:51

No, not even close.

Larry 57:54

So therefore, I know that I'm the bearer of bad news. But I do not believe that the prosecution integrity unit would actually even give this case any consideration of what they will be, what they'll be interested in, won't be that they will try to find cases of actual innocence. So they can parade around and say that due to the fact that we have diligently used the resources that you've entrusted us with, that we have discovered through our diligent and thorough investigation, that there was

evidence that this person should never have been convicted, that that was actually the innocence of this individual. And we're putting a free person, we're setting our we're making our wrong, right. That's the type of thing that they would build public support doing. And therefore, I think this is an extreme long shot that they would get involved.

Andy 58:45

Ah, all right. All right. Are we done with that move on?

Larry 58:51

Well, I guess I'll express a personal sadness that we gave it our we gave our best. He had the best legal team I have ever seen, assembled working for him. I have no idea what his families put out for him. He did the impossible. He wrote to us when he was fighting his habeas case. And I gave it such a limited chance that he could win and habeas court because of the rules of the anti-terrorism and effective death penalty act of 1996. The law that limits federal courts from doing anything to relieve a person of a state conviction. And he did the impossible he was able to have a US District Judge declare the Arizona child molestation statute unconstitutional. Then he lost that on appeal in the Ninth Circuit, which used to be a pretty liberal circuit. But under the four recent years of appointments, they've packed the courts with people who are not nearly as receptive like Stephen Reinhardt who was a good judge out there. Unfortunately, he died and he actually was one of my favorites, and that's because he flooded the Supreme Court with cases they didn't like. And there used to be the joke about the Supreme Court's constantly overturning the ninth circuit. And he was asked why do you keep ruling that way? And he says, Well, one reason we do it is that they (Supreme court) can't review them all. They can't review all of them. So we continue to do the right thing. And, but people like Reinhardt are hard to find. And Steven fought a great battle. Unfortunately, the courts did not want to hear his argument, including the Supreme Court. He's facing the remainder of a 75-year sentence and that is tragic. And I am really sorry. I'm really sorry.

Andy 1:00:37

And it's not like he's two years old and he's going to get out when he's 77 years old. I mean, he's not a spring chicken. He's not old. I don't know. Maybe he's 40 already I don't know how old he is. Exactly. But I mean, this is, for all practical purposes, a life sentence, which is just crappy.

Larry 1:00:50

And there are hundreds out there in Arizona prison, we receive letters from more than just Steven. He was just the fortunate one who had the resources to do what he did. And the federal judge was so incensed about the statutory scheme when he declared unconstitutional, he ordered him released immediately. And he has been out since 2017. Now he's got till May 17. to surrender back into custody is just a tragedy.

Andy 1:01:18

Yep, yep. Yep. Alright, so here's a here's an audio clip from Mike.

Mike 1:01:32

Hey, guys, this is Mike down in Central Florida. Larry Andy, just wanted to call in and say how much I appreciate you guys. And I missed you last week. I'm glad you got some time off. But I'm looking forward to the show. I wanted to make a statement about something I've heard Larry mention many times. And that's fiscal conservatives. And while they would rather have folks locked up and instead of paying taxes, and you know, contributing, my tax bill this year was just shy of about \$18,000. With that said, I did make some really good money. I understand a lot of people haven't been in that situation. And I've been very blessed. I work very hard for what I have. But with that said, it makes

no sense to me why our state legislature would continually work to take someone like me and make it harder and harder to maneuver the registry laws in the state of Florida, even though my charges are close to 3 decades old, and no re-offenses, none of that. But that's an even issue. Just it doesn't seem like they really care if you contribute if you re assimilate back into the community. And it seems like the end game is just getting that pound of flesh and that hate and they can't appear soft on any kind of sex crime of any kind. As no matter whether it costs a fortune and makes no financial sense at all. And I think I can bear witness to that. Hopefully, I didn't mumble through that, and it was clear enough. I really appreciate you guys. I'm looking forward to the show and FYP to anybody who doesn't like the Registry Matters Podcast.

Andy 1:03:17

I think at the end there, he either got a text call, like a text message or maybe a truck drove by and tooted the horn. But thanks, always, Mike, it is a pleasure to have you support the show and talk to you when we do on the text message stuff.

Larry 1:03:31

And, and I agree with that, I want to thank Mike for his longtime support. I think he's one of our original patrons. Very much. So. Second, I want to drift a bit from his actual point because I have to pontificate. I'm wondering if he was including the amount of what he pays in taxes, if it's including Social Security, Medicare, that \$18,000. Since Florida doesn't have any personal income tax, I'm assuming that he's referring to like his federal tax assessments. And some try to have it both ways in terms of social security. They include that as a part of their total tax burden. And then they turn around and assert that it's their personal retirement fund. And it's not your personal retirement fund or your personal retirement account. It's an assessment that insures workers and eligible family members and dependents that's what it is. Now back to the point that that is that Mike is trying to make. This was actually an opportunity or maybe an opening for him to influence the legislative process in Florida. It's quite conceivable that no one has ever presented that argument about the importance of paying taxes to support government. And I would urge him to determine who his state legislators are and reach out to both his senator and his representative and have that discussion with them about that. It's in our societal, greater interest to have people who've been convicted of all offenses and even including sexual offenses to have them working and paying taxes and not on any type of system and tell them they're conservative that would really appeal to them. Because they don't want to increase taxes because it's so dreadful to have the even a discussion about taxes and say, look the more people we have putting into our systems of revenue streams, the better off we are, and the more you can keep taxes low. And, and I know how dedicated you are to keeping taxes really low.

Andy 1:05:21

Um, yeah. So how about making that communication flow easier? Does he just go? Hi, I'm Mike, I'm a constituent. And this sucks. Can we have lunch? I mean, like, what do you do?

Larry 1:05:34

I would recommend that he do some research by checking out the bios of his senator and representative and find out as much as they possibly can about their achievements, and what their committee assignments are. And then you need to initiate an opening short communication thanking him or her for their work on the issues that they've worked on. And I don't care what the issues are because very few lawmakers don't have something that they work on. And thank them for that work. And then request a short constituent meeting and they are more than likely going to agree to meet with you. And

request a short meeting to talk about criminal justice without being too specific, you do not want to tell them that you want to do anything good to help people required to register, but just tell them that you know that you realize that Florida has a very expensive criminal justice system. And you've got some ideas that you think you could what would benefit to have a short conversation and stay true to your word, intend to go on with a short conversation. And you might be surprised that they respond, provide a phone number, an old-fashioned phone number and your communication and plan to answer that phone. Because I promise you, I absolutely promise you that they prefer to talk to you by phone. Rather than trying to have a series of digital exchanges, it might come back to bite them in the you know what later. So if you if you if you provide a phone number, please answer the phone.

Andy 1:07:03

And I know you said don't get into specifics, but here is you're asking something of a legislator to initiate some sort of bill that's going to help PFRs in his Florida year round state, I must I'm gonna guess that they are.

Larry 1:07:17

No, they're not.

Andy 1:07:18

Oh, my God.

Larry 1:07:21

But no, you're not gonna, have to get specific, they're not, you're not going to win with a bill in mind, you're going in mind with, by the time you get to see them, you already know what their priorities are. So you're going to you're going to go in knowing a little bit about them. And you're going to say, I know that you're committed to fiscal responsibility, because I can just about guarantee you that based on Mike's income level, he's probably living in a place where it tends to be politically conservative. And people, the more income they have, the more they all of a sudden don't think that they should pay taxes. And I'm not picking at him particular, I'm just saying that that's just the tendency of people they, the more they have, the more they see, like what the government's trying to take everything that I make. So I suspect that he's gonna have conservatives as senator and representatives. And he's gonna know that that person is dedicated to keeping the cost of government particular corrections, there's no public support for spending a lot of money on corrections. So if you tell him you have some ideas, him or her some ideas about making government more efficient in terms of criminal justice system, and I just want to talk about the broader issue of criminal justice, you don't have a particular wish list, you're going to get to know your senator or representative. That's all your going to do at this stage. But I say the importance of forming relationships, this is step one, sure, of forming a relationship. And that's what I would recommend. And when you when you're making that pitch that those are, those are your important points. Madam representative, we've got to have all these people out working in paying taxes, so that you don't have to raise taxes and look for new revenue streams we need, the government is has so many responsibilities that we need to raise revenue for so that we're not doing budget cuts on critical things that you support. I mean, you can to talk their language.

Andy 1:09:07

And he's not going in there saying, Hi, I'm Mike on the PFR for 30 years, he's saying that here's a situation that we could be addressed. Just these people are riddled with all this extra baggage. And it would help if they didn't have all this baggage. That's the end of that conversation.

