



Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 201

Recorded 11-6-21

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 problems with these thoughts, fyp.

Andy 00:17

Recording live from FYP Studios, east and west. Transmitting across the internet. This is episode 201 of Registry Matters. Happy November. Larry, this is the first episode of the November. How are you?

Larry 00:29

Awesome. Thanks for having me back again.

Andy 00:32

We were just talking about having a GoFundMe campaign that we might be able to raise some funds to get you to permanently disappear.

Larry 00:41

Yeah, I'm sure that would be one of our most successful campaigns yet.

Andy 00:44

We could get all kinds of people to pile on that one. For sure. Chat is streaming comments by as we speak saying they agree with this plan.

Larry 00:56

So well, why don't we see what we can raise and I'll decide if I want to take the journey.

Andy 01:01

We could do it and then really in like fine print, say we're going to donate it to some kind of charity.

Larry 01:07

That's a great idea. That's what everybody else does.

Andy 01:12

All right. What do we got going on tonight on this evening of November 6? It's set your clock back night, by the way.

Larry 01:19

It is indeed. It's the end of daylight savings time until March. And last week, it was so funny. I went home. I'm so old. I remember when it was the last week of April going forward and it was the last week of October going back. And I just went to bed knowing that I had an extra hour. So I stayed up later. And I got up expecting the news cast because I normally watch the Sunday morning programs. They were already over.

Andy 01:49

Yep. You know, Larry, these things that maybe you're not familiar with yet. They're called computers. And they auto update for you. And pretty reliably, if you look at your phone, the clock will be accurate.

Larry 02:01

So I did look at that. And I saw it had not changed. I thought this is really weird that they haven't caught on to the change yet. That's fair.

Andy 02:10

So here we have it. Larry doesn't trust technology. Larry is always right to the point that the technology is wrong. I gotcha.

Larry 02:17

That is correct. (Andy: Well, what do we have going on?) We have questions that mostly come in from the electronic resources out there. And we have something from, what is that, Tik Tok?

Andy 02:33

Yeah, there's a little video that got posted on the NARSOL social site from Tik Tok. It's quite disturbing.

Larry 02:39

So and we're, we may even do a patron extra where we talk about the economy. I love that so much all the hate mail from the last one. So that would inspire me to do another one about the economy. (Andy: All right.) We're gonna be talking about the Adam Walsh Act as the regulations are moving forward. And then there's... we're just all over the map tonight. This is going to be a totally free form. There are no questions that have been prepared in advance. This is live radio.

Andy 03:16

All right. Well, then we shall begin with the first question that comes from a listener. Says, I have just listened to the Registry Matters podcast the other day. I like very much what you and your guests from West Virginia had to say about the legislative process and the need to do your best to stop bad bills when they're in committee. So I must write again regarding the IML reauthorization that is on the agenda for the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The next opportunity to defund it won't be for another five years. And as I've already written to you a couple times, the potential damage its expansion could do not only overseas but domestically is great. So far, it has only half the number of co-sponsors it had last time, and it's being buried in the popular Bill suggests most members are lukewarm about it. Please, won't you and your members lobby the committee to remove these provisions from the bill?

Larry 04:16

Well, that's a lot. In terms of won't you or your members lobby? We've actually suggested -both we being the podcast and we to the extent of NARSOL - we've actually suggested people contact their members of Congress in the house, particularly where this legislation is. So we've done that. I think the consternation is that NARSOL doesn't have a lobbyist in the DC. We don't have the money. That's a quite an expensive place to operate and it's year-round. So you're looking at I mean, probably close to a six figure to have someone in DC you're round. That's even maybe on the low side. I truly don't know, because it's so expensive in DC. There have been members of Congress who choose to live in the office rather than pay the rent and expenses because they have their home in their district where they represent, and they just can't

afford it and to pay for their kids to go to school. And \$174,000 I believe is the congressional salary right now, which sounds fairly attractive. But when you're taking that out of the most expensive place in the nation. DC is probably certainly in the first five most expensive places. And then if you represent an area where it's expensive. Say you're from Seattle, or, or San Francisco, or any of these really expensive places. That 174,000 really doesn't go very far. So I don't know that we could afford any time in the future to have someone in DC lobbying. But, yeah, we are encouraging people to make phone calls. I think he's a little disappointed that I'm not as optimistic that those phone calls are going to be beneficial. And we can start breaking that down. We have an article about a representative that serves from the district serves in Congress from a district in Northern Virginia, Bobby Scott. And we could tie these two together, if you like. Where we can talk about what an elected official can do. But what I can tell you that that's not going to happen is this legislation has till the end of this congressional session, which is not in December, but it has the entire year 2022 for it to move through the process. And as the year begins to move closer and closer towards primaries and elections in 2022, there's going to be more and more interest in this bill. Right now, it doesn't seem like it's moving. And it's not because there's a lot of other things on the agenda. But this is going to become probably something that moves in 2022. And if it does gain traction, which we're hoping it doesn't, but if it does, it's going to be very difficult to stop it. Because here's the analysis: you've got the Democratic party who's already on the ropes for being soft on crime. And I think we talked about last episode. They're demolishing the bail system. They believe everybody should be able to get on their signature. So it's a catch and release program. So that's one talking point. The Democrats are for catch and release. The Democrats are for defunding the police. The Democrats or for doing away with qualified immunity, which protects the good officers who are out there doing their best and happen to make a mistake. The Democrats are for softer sentencing for letting people out of prison. And I just don't see the Democrats signing on in great numbers to have another talking point used against them. Now, I'm not trying to scare people, and I'm not trying to be negative. I'm just applying the political reality to the situation. You've got a Democratic party who's already vulnerable to being weak on criminal justice. Do you think they would want to add PFRs to the attack ads? I mean, that's the question. What do you think? Do you think they'd like to add that to the attack ads that are coming out them?

Andy 08:33

I was gonna pile on to that. Like they only have six seats as the majority, I think? And a lot of those are under threat. So no, they're not going to be in a position to expend any political capital and go against what would be popular by the public.

Larry 08:46

That is correct. So if representative Smith, who happens to be a Republican from New Jersey, he's the one who is big on this stuff. If he manages to get this thing gaining traction, and it goes through the committee process... Now, at this particular moment, the Democrats would have a very slight majority on the committee, and they would also have the chairmanship. The chairpersonship, I should say, which would mean if they wanted to wreck the train, they could. Because chairs have a lot of power, and the calendar is controlled by the Democrat Party. But do you

think they would want to take the abuse for slowing this train down if Smith goes on the attack?

Andy 09:34

Can we back up for a minute? I was having a conversation with some other people in my state regarding lobbyists. And I was trying to express that you could certainly spend all of the money and get right in Mitch McConnell's face, and that's got to be some exorbitant amount of money. And I'm using that just because he's a wildly well-known individual and scale things down to your local House and Senate representatives. But you're paying for access. You could find a lobbyist that'll charge you hundreds of dollars, probably, but they're not going to have the clout to get in to be able to speak to represent your issue. Can you expand on that a little bit?

Larry 10:13

I'll have to agree, except I doubt in DC would find anybody who would do anything for hundreds of dollars. That would be 10s of thousands of dollars. (Andy: Right. Right.) But at a local level, in the State Assembly, maybe in Wyoming or somewhere, you might could find somebody to do something for 1000 bucks. I doubt it. But McConnell is not going to go against his constituents. You are right, he would get access. Lobbyists do make donations. That's one of the things that goes on in our in our system. They are notorious for making donations. And that donation buys them access, but it doesn't buy... people think that somehow if you've made a donation, that you've bought that vote. You haven't, because McConnell is gonna vote what he perceives to be the will of the people. At least that he hears from. And people saying, Larry, you don't understand. Everybody doesn't support that? Nope, I understand that actually, quite well. But it's all about 50% plus a few, not everybody. And the political analysis is how can I keep my support above 50%, you're never gonna get 100%. You're never gonna get 90% in all likelihood. So you're trying to analyze what keeps you above that threshold so that you can stay in office. Mitch is not going to go against the will of the people of Kentucky very often. If he does, he risks not being there.

Andy 11:39

All right. Um, so basically, what you're saying is, rots of ruck in getting anybody to go against this?

Larry 11:50

Well, I'm hoping that there are so many distractions with things going on that it just gets buried in the busy schedule. I mean, there's a lot going on. We've got a national debt crisis coming in early December. So that means that nothing is going to happen in terms of any substantive legislation. They're going to be focused on the build back plan. And I don't know if they're gonna vote on that this week or not. They did already vote on the bipartisan, which is on its way to the President. But they're going to be distracted a lot. The question will be, how much will they be distracted in 2021? What will the solution to the national debt crisis be? Because we've punted till December. And the Republicans are taking the position that they're not going to increase the debt limit and that it's the Democrats' problem, and the Democrats are taking the position that you have helped us create this mess because we've all spent this money together. Most of the spending is on automatic pilot. These are commitments that are already made before this president were

sworn in. And people say, well, Larry, you don't understand. He's proposing big new spending. Yes, he is. But it hasn't been approved, the trillions of dollars that we're currently spending, those are decisions that were made before he ever got here to the presidency. And so that probably will be a very distracting thing. And then depending on economic conditions and the pandemic, depending on how the economy, which is stellar right now, but the economy could very well sputter at early next year, because of the extreme labor shortage we have. So the economy could distract. There's all sorts of things that could keep this from moving. An international crisis could keep this from moving. I mean, we can go on and on with things that this may not move. But if it does start moving, what you said... what was that terminology you said about stopping it? Could you repeat that one more time? (Andy: Rots of ruck.) That was that one. I don't know what the transcriptionist is going to pick up on that. But if there are not sufficient distractions, and if this thing starts moving, I do not foresee any meaningful opposition. And I realize I'm not supposed to say that, but I don't see where it would materialize. I do not believe the Republicans will oppose it, being that they're sponsoring it. That doesn't seem like - I mean the Chiefs sponsor. People are gonna say, well Larry, I looked at the list and there's more Democrat co-sponsors. Yes, there are. But the leader of this is Christopher Smith. On this particular resolution, HR 5150.

Andy 14:29

Okay, let's move along then. This one came off of YouTube, off of our Registry Matters YouTube channel. Says regarding Registry Matters 200 where we rediscussed the new SORNA stuff. How does this work if you were removed from the registry already? Especially if you took a plea and got 10 years on the registry prior to the implementation of AWA in 2012 in Pennsylvania. Those people were taken off the registry due to the Muniz case

Larry 14:58

And just for clarity, the AWA actually passed in 2006 by the Congress. The 2000 date he's throwing in is when it became applicable in Pennsylvania when their legislature adopted it. I believe they adopted in 2010. And I believe it became effective in 2012. If my memory is good. What we have here is a question that's just floating around in all types of form all over the land right now. And if he's off the registry, in Pennsylvania, as a result of the Muniz case, my advice would be, do not leave Pennsylvania, do not move to another jurisdiction. Because as long as you have been relieved of registration obligations in your state, and you have a document reflecting that. Some people would have been removed by court decisions in other states, they filed a petition that's been granted, they have timed out like in New Mexico on the 10 or 20 years, they will receive a letter, you will receive a letter. If you have officially been relieved of registration obligations, then there's no expectation that you would know anything about registration at that point, because as a general rule, most people don't check the law every five minutes to see if it's changed. So you would be notified if the law were to change. The officials will be amazingly efficient at finding you. Trust me on that. If they need you to come back and register again, they will let you know. They will check the driver's database, the driver's licenses, they will check all sorts of databases that you're in, that you don't even know you're in, and they will find you. And they will serve you a certified letter, they'll knock at your door, and they'll let you know you need to register again. In the meantime,

go live your life and keep a close eye on what's going on in the legislative bodies. Because what I fear is going to happen across the country is that states are going to adopt a catch all phrase they are going to put into their registry scheme. So it's gonna say- even the states that have removal petition processes - they're going to say that the judge shall grant not this petition, if the granting of the petition would be contrary to federal SORNA. And they'll have another part, it'll say that a person shall register in this state... Like, for example, if you move to a new state and you've been released, they will have an additional catch all that says, and if you would be defined as a sex offender, pursuant to the AWA and federal standards. So that that's the Trojan horse that people need to be worried about, is does their state already have that language that says, if you're defined as a PFR, by federal law, or if there's a proposal to put that in there? Because that's the easy way to do it, is to put a provision in that says, a PFR shall be defined as all the convictions that you have on your list, or any person that would be defined as a PFR, pursuant to federal law, and then you've got it. And at that point, arguably, the Feds would have that jurisdictional hook to prosecute you, even though you've never left the state. And this is what I really fear the most is that right now, there's a lack of jurisdiction. If a person was convicted in the state, and they never left the state. I don't see how the feds can prosecute, because they may be an independent duty, but if that state has terminated your registration obligation, then you're done. But what happens if they put that clause in there that you have to register if you're defined as a PFR by federal law. So you've timed out under your state requirement, but the feds say, Well, wait, not so fast. There's a provision in Pennsylvania law, hypothetically, that says that you have to register if you're defined as a PFR by federal law. And then I think they've got a more valid prosecution. This is complicated stuff, folks. And the truth is,

Andy 19:11

yeah, you just went all 4-D Chess on me right there.

Larry 19:13

Yeah. We don't know the answer to all this. People are wanting answers that we do not have. And you can call to you're blue in the face to the PFR offices. They don't know. You can call the SMART Office. They don't know. They can tell you what they think their opinion is, and it's usually going to be biased in terms of what they would like it to be. But no one knows. And I think we have a quote, do you have the unknown unknowns that you can play? Because this is an unknown unknown. We have the Sixth Circuit with the Wilma decision saying there's an independent federal duty to register. Well, I happen to personally disagree with that. But I'm not a court. I'm just a citizen. But within the Sixth Circuit, there has been an independent duty to register, but good luck enforcing that. If a state of the Sixth Circuit says you don't have to register and since there's no federal registry, good luck trying to enforce that. Where would you go register if the state says we won't register you? But what if they put in the state law that if you're defined by federal law as being a PFR, that changes everything, doesn't it? (Andy: Yes, it does.) And that's what you need to be afraid about. You need to stop calling the PFR offices, you need to stop raising all these hypotheticals that nobody has an answer to. You need to start watching what's going on in your legislative assembly bodies and through your regulatory frameworks. Because as regulations are changed by the process, they normally have to publish them and give a comment period.

And you got to make sure they're not sneaking any of this through the regulatory process to require a person to register because there's a federal independent duty. But that decision is only binding in the Sixth Circuit states. It hasn't been decided in most of the other circuits to my knowledge. They could choose to go a different direction. They could say no, there is not an independent duty. So asking questions is fine, but no one has the answers. We don't know.

Andy 21:13

And apparently I never saved that clip. But Donald Rumsfeld famously said, we have known knowns, known unknowns, unknown knowns and unknown unknowns.

Larry 21:23

So yes, and this falls into that category. People, the safest thing you can do is not leave your state if you've been discharged. And when I say leave, I mean, as far as becoming a resident or a student, I'm not talking about a 24-hour trip, or 48 hour trip. I'm talking about becoming a resident of new state. If you stay put, you have the strongest defensible position if you've been discharged from registration. And people say, well, Larry, you don't understand. I want to travel. Yes, I understand that quite well. I like traveling as well. But as you travel, these questions arise that we don't have answers to, and neither does the law enforcement apparatus. Because it's that complicated in terms of what can and can't be done. This is a developing piece of art. The Adam Walsh Act is only 15 years old. This is not hundreds of years of experience. This it's relatively new.

Andy 22:21

Do you consider this to be something somewhat unique in what it's covering as far as quote unquote, civil regulatory scheme? Not punishment, even though everyone gets punished by it?

Larry 22:32

It is very unique and novel because the federal government questionably doesn't have jurisdiction to do what they're trying to do. So they clearly know that they don't have a federal registry. Now, you know, they could theoretically create a federal registry for the federal family of crimes. But it's doubtful that they could create a federal registry and impose a registration obligation for state crimes for a person who doesn't ever leave that state. But when you leave that state, the AWA chose to invoke the Commerce Clause. They say that that once you cross state boundaries, your vessel, yourself, has engaged in interstate commerce. Is that a proper use of the Commerce Clause? We don't know. Because the court hasn't given us that guidance in terms of the Supreme Court. There's been lower court decisions, but we don't know if that's the proper use of the Commerce Clause. There'd be people that would say it's overreach, there'd be people say it's just fine because of the greater good. I mean, there's all these different judicial philosophies. We will know if that's a proper use of the Commerce Clause when the Supreme Court tells us.

Andy 23:41

Okay, um, and in chat, someone asks, am I understanding Larry correctly that the Sixth Circuit states do have a binding case to register federally? Tennessee is in the sixth. I hope you can extrapolate from that.

Larry 23:53

That's what the Willmann case. We talked about that on this podcast. That was silliest case I've ever seen in my life where they threw everything but the kitchen sink in the argument trying to crash the registry and the court shot down every one of those arguments. So there is that decision dangling out there if there was an independent federal duty. If you're already a lifetime in Tennessee, it doesn't make any difference. You're a lifetime registrant. So isn't Tennessee a lifetime state? I mean, I don't, I can't keep up with when you can get off in every state in terms of what the duration of registration is, but Tennessee is actually one of the tougher states.

Andy 24:30

Is that the case with like 90 attacks against the registry?

Larry 24:34

Yes. Yeah, yeah, we talked about that on here. So that holds that there is an independent duty. I don't get to vote on that, but I disagree with it. But at this point, the Feds theoretically clear could prosecute you. But still, there's a knowing requirement. So if you've been finished and concluded your registration obligation, unless you've been notified of that independent duty to register there, they're not going to show up in the middle of night with a black limousine, or those SUVs and cart you away about something you didn't know about. They will notify you of this independent duty. So everybody's getting paranoid over something that there's no reason to be. As we said when we played it a few weeks ago, there's nothing to fear except fear itself.

Andy 25:26

Okay, we should move along, sir. This one came off of the NARSOL social media site, please go over and register there. It is social.narsol.org. It's a fun place to be. Hello, everyone. I'm writing this due to a neighbor moving in across the street from me and wanting to open a daycare there. I own my own home, and would be forced to move. My wife and I are fighting the license for the daycare application by the city and was wondering if anyone knows what else can be done. And I shared that with you. I believe that was from Illinois.

Larry 25:58

I do believe it was from Illinois. And I didn't catch it the first time when you sent it to me. I did a glance read of it. But as he's mentioned that, the case law is all over the map on this. I think they're places where they can force you to move with the arrival of a park. And they're places where the statute says they can't. And in case of Kentucky, I believe the case law says that they can't do that. There was a decision many years ago in Kentucky by the state Supreme Court that said you can't do that. What I would recommend he do and you said he was quite up in years, so I don't know that he can actually approach the city leaders. But I would of course try to stop it if there is the retroactive component. But I would, if you can't stop it, you need to find out if he's grandfathered, so probably you'd want to do both to make sure that they don't have that ability to force you out. It would certainly be applicable to someone who would want to move in. But if you're already there, I find that very problematic from a constitutional point of view that they could force a person to

leave. (Andy: Isn't that what happened in Rhode Island, though?) Well, that's what almost happened, except for that injunction was granted, but that is what they were going to do. But Rhode Island is a slightly different situation, because they don't have the one size fits all approach. That was only applied to the highest risk people, not the highest tier, but the highest risk. And I think they are still a risk-based system there. So you've got some due process in a state that has the risk base registry. If you have a categorical approach, there has been no due process. Just simply the category of crime that that your offense is listed. That's where you are on the tier system. And we've spent episode after episode going through tiers versus risk. And they're not the same. So this is another opportunity to say that Rhode Island has a risk system to my understanding. We had the lawyer on a couple of conference calls from ACLU, but they're the ones who are working on that case, which has been stalled by the state fighting everything that they can come up with. And it's great because the injunction lasts until the conclusion of the case. So if the state never wants it to go to trial, that's great. We've got the benefit as if we had won the case, because with an injunction you could never enforce your law until the court holds it constitutional. So you stall all you want to.

Andy 28:29

So that one, so you think probably he's safe? Is that what I heard you say?

Larry 28:32

He needs to talk to an attorney that knows the law there. But I would say the odds are that he's safe if he's already there. But anybody certainly won't be able to establish residence there if that daycare goes in. But he may be safe, but he may not be. He needs to talk to an attorney. So I would hope he safe.

Andy 28:54

Right? No kidding. Oh, this is uh, this is another one. It says, I kind of threw this on you. I'm gonna hit you with this one cold. Says good morning, serious question from the last episode of Registry Matters. And we this is kind of going on the whole SORNA thing. What were the changes made to SORNA Larry? You did great job of talking politics. But did he ever say what changed? Or did I miss that part? It's kind of the throwing some tomatoes at you, Larry.

Larry 29:21

So well, I don't know what question he is asking. There's two things that's going on. There's the HR 5150, which is a legislative proposal. And it's so lengthy that I have not analyzed it. And then there is the regulatory proposal that was put out during the last year of the Trump administration, which is not a legislative proposal, which we've talked about. So I'm not clear what the question pertains to. Does it pertain to the regulatory changes or does it pertain to hr 5150, which I'm woefully unprepared to talk about? But the regulatory stuff is what I'm more prepared to talk about.

Andy 30:04

I just think that because we don't know what is changing, then maybe the conversation last week kind of meandered because we can't go, Hey, if you have, I don't know, I'm going to make something up. If you didn't have 1000 foot living restrictions, you do now. So like, there was no side by side comparison of what was and what will be that to tell you what has changed, what people

have to worry about, what roadblocks and whatnot are in your in your path that are going to trip you up.

Larry 30:35

Well, in terms of the regulatory proposal, remember, this is the existing law. The Adam Walsh Act passed in 2006. It's been the law for 15-16 years now. And each administration has been dealing with trying to convince the states to substantially comply. So the first regulations came out during the Bush administration, promulgated by Attorney General Alberto Gonzalez. Now everybody says AG Garland. Attorney General Garland never even saw this stuff. He has no idea what's in it, never looked at it, but it's his office. But the Attorney General's through the succeeding administrations have been trying to put forth a framework to help the states to comply. They have not been successful. The states have not been able to beat the rigorous criteria. So what this is, as simple as I can make it, this is the most creative proposal yet to try to allow more regulatory flexibility so that there won't have to be things changed by statute. That's component one. Component two of what they're trying to do is to make things more federal, like the independent duty now that they have that Willmann decision, the SMART Office in DC, they're on board with there being an independent duty. If you look at their correspondence, they are reminding people on the listserv that we chat on. There was a person who pointed out that they mentioned the independent duty and then the state has the right to have its own registry and the person said is that a conflict? Yes, it is. It absolutely is. So what they're trying to accomplish is to help the states by every creative hook they can come up with to comply. One of the ways to get the people in the states to comply is to provide the paperwork like happened in West Virginia about a year and a half ago. I think in the summer of 2019. They sent every PFR a letter and said you need to sign this and bring it in saying that you will notify us of any international travel pursuant to the 21-day provision that's in federal law. The state of West Virginia has not adopted that. So using regulatory processes rather than laws, the West Virginia State Police I believe it is sent those forms to everyone. And they dutifully went rushing down and signed them saying that I will do this. So now they're on notice that there is a notice required prior to international travel. But had they not signed those, since there was no law at that time, and I don't know, our guest last week might tell us if they actually had passed that law putting that in statute. But since there was no law at that time, hypothetically, if a PFR had told them, I'm not signing it, there would not have been any way to prosecute them for not signing the form that said, I'll do this. Now I will need to qualify that by perhaps West Virginia has a catch all provision that says that your duties as a PFR is to do all these things, giving your DNA and blah, blah, blah, your fingerprints and place of employment. There may be a provision that says as such ever other things as substantially aid in the compliance and intent of furthering this act? Well, that's blatantly unconstitutional, because that is so vague that you have no idea what you have to do. But despite the fact those things are vague, they're in statutory schemes. So it could be a person in West Virginia who said no, I'm not doing that. They might have prosecuted them had had there been such a clause. All these things are complicated, folks. So when you're going to ask a question, the best thing to do is to try to find a competent attorney that actually can tell you if such a clause exists in your law. But I don't sign nothing. I shouldn't say that. That's an absolute. I try not to sign anything that imposes an obligation on

me unless that obligation is in the law and that is what is the best approach, but even that may cause you problems. Because the PFR registration office doesn't like being questioned about the documents they had you. I mean, have you detected that they would be happy if you want to have a discussion about the documents?

Andy 34:56

Yeah, I pretty much just go in there and sign and walk out because the longer you stay there, the more chances for something to go bad.

Larry 35:03

You are correct. So again, that's the reason since this is a civil regulatory scheme, we need to get it out of law enforcement hands. This is not a proper function for a law enforcement agency. This is more appropriately handled by an agency such as motor vehicles where all they do is process regulatory compliance. There's no reason for you to be dealing with the police. This is simply providing information and keeping it current, like you do with your driver's license. Motor vehicles is well equipped to handle that. They're well equipped to take a picture of you. And then the next question will be well Larry, you don't understand. There are state's out there where they do that in motor vehicles, and a person has to pay a whole bunch of extra money. Well no, that doesn't have to be in the statute that you have to pay a whole bunch of extra money. There doesn't have to be a driver's license issued every year or every six months or whatever. All that's not required, you could get a regular driver's license, just like everybody else. You can stand on the line just like everyone else. There would be no reason to have a special line for PFRs because all you're doing is going in and updating a form. But when you go up there, you could print your form online and say this is a PFR update. And you could go ahead and hand it into there and if they need to update your picture, they could do it just like they do a driver's license when they update your picture every four or six or eight years or whatever. There's no reason for people to have such fear of Motor Vehicles handling it. There's usually more motor vehicle offices throughout the state, gives you more options, more locations, and they're generally open more hours. And they're a lot more friendly than the sheriff's offices as a general rule. That would be my expectation. You're going to get treated more courteously, than you're going to be treated by law enforcement where sometimes you have to put in a jumpsuit, you have to be locked behind a locked door while you're waiting to be processed. I've never heard of that at motor vehicles, have you?

Andy 36:55

No, no. To be fair, though, Larry, on even on our Discord server for the podcast, like it's nonstop chatter between half dozen people just constantly going back and forth. And I'm not saying that they aren't unwarranted fears are conversations. They there's just a furious amount of conversations going back and forth, scrutinizing every line almost, it seems.

Larry 37:16

well, on this one, the motor vehicles really scares people, because the first thing they say, is I don't want to sit for four hours. Well, first of all, you never sit for four hours at the motor vehicle office. That's an exaggeration. In fact, I don't think I've ever sat more than 20 minutes to the motor vehicle office in the state at the most.

Andy 37:30

And it's because I give you an old age, like privilege, head of the line thing.

Larry 37:35

So I think I think that's an exaggerated condition. And there's no reason for there to be a special line. Now they do have special lines for like commercial driver's license, because it's a special test to process. And you have to get more background information. It's a little more thorough than a regular driver's license. But they're quite competent at verifying identity. And they can do everything that's required for registration. And the home verifications, since it's the regulatory scheme, those are not necessary. Those are something that sheriffs do because it's makes them feel good. Most of the time, it's not even under state law. There are a few where it says the sheriff shall make contact once or twice a year. But that's really not necessary. If you're out of compliance, then the prosecution penalties could kick in with a civil regulatory scheme. If you don't comply, you can be prosecuted. So if a person doesn't keep their obligations up, it doesn't matter who the registrar is, it matters that you stay current on your information. And all that stuff can be filed electronically. We have technology these days where people can actually update their address, their employment. All this stuff can be done electronically. I mean, am I missing something here?

Andy 38:45

No, but the question in chat is, did you get your license while they still had horses?

Larry 38:50

So well, not quite that long ago. But yeah, it's been it's been a while. But the biggest problem we have with motor vehicles nowadays is thanks to the REAL ID Act that was passed after 9/11 by the Conservatives is that you have so much information you have to come up with all over again, even though you've been in the system 40,50, 60 years. You have to provide them real source documentation. So you got to go in with a with a real birth certificate, not a photocopy. And you have to let them scan it into a big ol' federal database. And you have to give them your social security card, you have to give them several documents to prove where you live. And that you are who you say you are for real ID compliance. And that is the biggest thing in motor vehicles. But once they get you in a system, then it's back to normal, you just go in and take your eye test as long as your license is not suspended. Renewing your driver's license is not a really big deal.

Are you a first-time listener of Registry Matters? Well, then make us a part of your daily routine and subscribe today. Just search for Registry Matters through your favorite podcast app. Hit the subscribe button and you're off to the races. You can now enjoy hours of sarcasm and snark from Andy and Larry on a weekly basis. Oh, and there's some excellent information thrown in there too. Subscribing also encourages others of you people to get on the bandwagon and become regular Registry Matters listeners. So, what are you waiting for? Subscribe to Registry Matters right now. Help us keep fighting and continue to say FYP.

Andy 40:32

You put something in here to cover a particular politician named Bobby Scott from Virginia. And there's a voting record chart that you want me to show. Otherwise, I don't really have any idea what you're going for here.

Larry 40:47

Sure. This was a conversation that happened between a fellow board member. We were chatting just a few days ago. She says, Well, wish we had more people like Bobby Scott in the Congress. I said, Oh, do you now? She said, Oh, yeah, that'd be wonderful. I said, really? And so let's just talk about that. So Bobby Scott represents a district that he's represented since the 1990s. I think he was first elected in 1992. So he's been in Congress, almost 30 years. And I said, but think about what you're saying. Bobby Scott has a lot of political capital. So we're going to talk a little bit about political capital or the absence thereof. Bobby Scott is a pretty progressive liberal democrat representing a district in Northern Virginia. I think it's in the Hampton Roads area, I didn't spend a lot of time. But he was originally elected in 1992. And he ran them first time in '86. And he lost. But then every 10 years when they redistrict, after the after the 10-year census, they created a newly drawn district. And he won in 1992. So that's where I wanted to start looking at the chart of his of his Electoral history. So I'm just going to look at it in the original source, and I'm not looking at what you've got up there. But in 1992, he won his office by 79% of the vote. He did it again in 1994, cause House members come up every two years. So he won by 79% of the vote. And then he increased it to 82%. And you can see that after that, people quit running against him, because they realized the futility. So starting in 1998, he goes through 3 elections with no with no opposition.

Andy 42:49

I got a question. How do you only get 76% of the vote with no opposition?

Larry 42:55

Well, you had write-in independent. So you had an exceptionally strong third party candidate in '98.

Andy 43:05

Wow. Okay. Oh, I see that over there. All right. All right.

Larry 43:06

So So, but, but So you, as you look through here, you see a person who either faces no opposition, or they smash their opponent. And the most recent 2020 election, he didn't have any opposition and in 2018, but he had only token opposition in 2020. He still got almost 70% of the vote. And so that that's an individual who basically can do whatever he wants to do. And he can, and he has spoken against the PFR laws. And he has been someone we would identify as an ally on this issue. But almost everything else that our conservative leaning audience would be in favor of, he's against. You'd be diametrically opposed to him, because his politics are very moderate, to left. So therefore, you would find yourself not aligned with him on everything else. But that's really not the point of this. The point is he has the safety of those numbers. If I could convey anything to the audience, when you're trying to figure out what a politician or elected official is going to do, this is the first step you do, whether they run for city council, State House State Representative, or whatever office they're in. This tells you what

they're capable of doing. This is the first step that tells you what they're capable of doing. This guy's capable of doing almost anything, because he has a lot of political capital at he numbers he wins by or people just don't even bother to challenge him because they know it's futile. So he has a lot of political capital. And his district, although probably they're not fond of PFRs, they're fond of Bobby Scott and if Bobby Scott says it, it makes it so because they trust him. He's been there almost 30 years now delivering for them, and representing them in a way that they want to be spoken for. So Bobby Scott can do what few people can do. But I asked my colleague, I said, so you really would like to have people who cannot be defeated. I said, Now think about what you're asking for right now. If we had 435 members of Congress who could not be defeated, would you really like that, particularly if they have positions that you're so opposed to that you can't stand them? Their politics?

Andy 45:37

I know that this isn't a great comparison, because it's house versus Senate. But Joe Manchin is the inverse of this, who may be in favor of every issue, which isn't really the point. But he is so close to very down the middle about how people are going to vote for him, it's a very red state versus him being a Democrat, like he is in the opposite position of Bobby Scott,

Larry 45:58

You're spot on with that. Joe Manchin has very little political capital. Now, political capital is not the same thing as political power. So political capital is not the same thing as political power. The capital I'm talking about, this comes from the voters. If you are very popular with your voters, that's political capital, at least that's my definition of it. He has political power, because the Senate is evenly divided, and his vote is essential. But he doesn't have a lot of capital to burn, because of his ratio of victory last time was 3.2%. We looked that up after the show. And that was pretty close to what I said, from my memory of 3.2% I believe on his last election. So he doesn't have a lot of political capital to burn, it would only take one bad decision for him, and he's no longer senator. In the case of Bobby Scott, he could make a few bad decisions and his voters are not going to renounce him. They're just not, they love him. And Joe Manchin is not in the same position that Bobby Scott. So you can't expect Joe Manchin to do what Bobby Scott could do. He just can't. And we talk about Governor versus the Congress. But still, he cannot take a position that's just totally adverse to his position. But when you have a limited amount of capital that Manchin has, you're trying to build capital, you're not trying to burn it. And if he were to do anything, he's in such a tough position because the administration is pressuring him for the bill back better plan, which I can't even understand I was going to pontificate about that later in the extra edition. But he doesn't have the political capital to risk for positions that this administration is advocating for. So that's why he's having to stay right on that fence. And he's trying to placate the state of West Virginia. And Bobby Scott is not in that position. But if you'll do this analysis, this is the first thing you want to do is figure out how long your person's been in office, and what type of margins they're working with in terms of political capital. When you conclude that they have some political capital, then the next step is to figure out where they're positioned in the legislative process. If they serve on a committee that's vital to what you're interested in. If they're a committee chair, that's awesome. But if

they serve on a committee that's likely going to review legislation for PFRs, you can't do any better than that. Because then you've got somebody who's in the decision making process that's going to really have a lot to say about our issue. So that's who you want to go to. And I can refer back to the 2012 national conference that happened in Albuquerque, we brought in a state senator named Cisco McSorely. He's no longer a senator. But he was at that time, and he'd been in office since '84. So '84 to 2012 would have been how many years? He got elected in '84.

Andy 49:01

Almost, what 40 years?

Larry 49:08

Well, quite a while. He had for a long time, and he had lots of political capital. He had elections where there were no opponents. And when he had an opponent, he had numbers like this, like we're seeing here. So McSorely was able to come give a nice inspirational speech to the attendees to the conference because he had the luxury of being able to do that. But you cannot expect everyone to have that kind of luxury. And I mentioned it to him later after what I said that you really came down hard on people. He said they didn't have any courage. And part of it that's not so much courage is that they just can't do what you did. They haven't been there 30 years, and they don't have the kind of margins of victory that you have. So he had a lot of capital burn. And his constituents were not going to abandon him if they disagreed with one issue. In fact, he fought like crazy to prevent us from having a state lottery. And his constituents did not agree with that. But they agree with him on so many other things that they were not one issue voters. He represents an area around the University of New Mexico. Here, he did represent an area around the University of New Mexico. And even though they were pro lottery, that gave him a pass on that. So figure out what their election margins are, and where they are sitting in the legislative process. That will help you know what they can do for you. If they are not connected in the legislative process, where they're going to be directly reviewing the stuff, their vote is important on the floor. But if this stuff makes it to the floor that you're opposed to, they're going to vote for it. Trust me, they're going to vote for it. You can't take the hit politically for voting. Now McSorely could. Bobby Scott can. But a person who's with 52%, 53%, they don't have that luxury of being able to vote against a PFR bill. They're not going to take the political risk of doing that and be vilified in the next election cycle. And as I'm so fond of saying, I don't make these rules. I'm here walking you through what they are, but I don't make these rules.

Andy 51:26

Okay. Let's move over to the next segment, which is where we're going to discuss the unseen consequences of probation revocation. And you brought up something to me recently. We're dealing with two people that we know closely that both had probation revocations recently. And so we know these two people that had probation revocations recently, and one of them is not going to max out his sentence, I guess is the way to word it. So he's still going to have probation time after he gets out from the revocation. Where the other person, he would have had time, but they actually collapsed the back end of it. He had three years remaining. And they gave him two years of a revocation. And they smashed the back of that said, Hey, we're done with you. And you have started describing how detrimental this is going to be to him

and any future. I don't know if it'll impact his... I guess it would impact his advocacy work, because he would be something of a tarnished entity. But what are his chances of trying to petition to get off the registry in the future, perhaps?

Larry 52:30

What we're talking about is an unsatisfactory discharge from supervision. And the one individual that you're talking about of the two, he has been given an unsatisfactory discharge from probation. So therefore, they didn't deem him fit to continue with probation. So they're giving him to the rest of his time. He'd already served time in prison before he came out on probation. And they're deciding that he's not a good candidate for probation. And therefore, they're going to final him out. And when you final out, at least in this state, and I'm assuming it's similar in other states, when you final out your supervision in custody, the paperwork will reflect an unsatisfactory release from probation. You are released because you've finished the duration of your sentence in a custodial setting. But that is not a good thing. Because when you've been relieved of supervision because you can't comply, imagine what would happen if you were to be in trouble again, which is something we don't yearn for, but it can happen. If the prosecutor is negotiating with your defense attorney, and the defense attorney is saying, I'd like probation. The prosecutor is going to say, well, you know, counselor, I'd really like to help you out on this. But back in 2021, your client was revoked for substantial violations of supervision that went to the very core of the underlying offense. He used the internet for the same thing that got him in trouble on the internet. So he had great difficulty with probation. So I'm not sold yet on why should I agree to probation. So that's step one, you've shot yourself in the foot unless a lot of years go by before you need probation again. But beyond that, it's even more insidious. Because if you file removal petition, which Georgia allows you to do... remember, you serve those petitions on the prosecuting attorney in the jurisdiction where you're convicted unless you have a non-Georgia conviction. So this individual in particular will be filing a petition for removal in the county that revoked his supervision. So what's gonna happen is the prosecutor... you're gonna make that journey that I always advocate to go see the district attorney and see what they're going to say. So you say, Mister/Madam District Attorney I'd like to talk to you about a removal petition for my client. And yeah, I remember your client. Yeah, I remember him quite well. And as I remember, we had to send him to prison because he was on the internet, breaking every prohibition that we had imposed on him. And that was his original crime. So let me make sure I've got this straight. You're asking me to turn the lights out on the registry so the public won't know about a guy who did not do what he was supposed to do. And he had to final out his sentence in prison? Do I have that correct? That's what the prosecutor is going to say. And your response, pretend you're the defense attorney, what would your response be when the prosecutor said that?

Andy 55:51

That would be correct. Yeah, I did. Uh, we maxed him out.

Larry 55:56

Okay, so you're asking me to turn the lights on this guy out and let him disappear into the general population, and he was misusing the internet, thumbing his nose at supervision requirements. And as far as I can say, he might have committed another crime, had

we not caught him breaking those rules. So you want me to turn the lights out on him? And let him disappear? Is that correct? (Andy: Yeah, that's correct. That sounds like a great idea.) Okay, so that's what the prosecutor was going to say. Now, you can counter that. I mean, that's not the end of all life as we know it. You could counter that with a person who comes out of prison, and without being required to go and gets treatment, and successfully completes a real program of PFR specific treatment. And they can show that along with a psychosexual evaluation, along with a period of stability of being in the community successfully complying with registration. But you're in a much weaker position trying to petition off after this has happened. And it's gonna take some time to recover from this. So, if he gives the PFR office any problems with complying with registration, it's only going to compound the problem. So that's the bad thing about this. Now, in terms of his advocacy, I don't know if it'll diminish his advocacy, but it certainly is going to be an impediment towards him getting off of the registry by that petition process. I would be very surprised if any prosecutor would concur with that. My expectation would be that they would rigorously oppose his removal petition. And I think they would be on solid grounds for doing that.

Andy 57:46

I'm acquainting this to getting from the military, a DD214. And you get an honorable or dishonorable discharge, and even just getting like a less than honorable one, it's not like... bad things can happen to you. But when an employer goes and looks at your record, they're going to find that this was not a stellar person, and you couldn't follow those rules. How do we know you're going to follow our rules?

Larry 58:09

That's a great comparison. And so I feel bad for the individual. We all like this individual. And this is so tragic. But it was, I think we talked in preshow about decisions that people make. We're all faced with decisions in our lives. And this was a series of bad decisions that had consultation been sought, I would of strongly urged not to do that. I urge everyone to comply with their conditions of supervision. Unequivocally, I say that. I don't like the conditions. But as long as they're on you, and as long as you've been able to successfully petition that they be removed, you need to take every condition of your supervision seriously and to comply with it. Because if you don't, you're subject to revocation. I don't make those rules, either. I'm just telling you that compliance, compliance, compliance. If your PO tells you to do something, even though you have great consternation about it, the right answer is Yes, sir. Yes, ma'am. I will do that. And then you go consult with legal professional as to what the viability of the challenge is to that. What would be the upside and what would be the downside, and you decide if you want to risk the downside of those things. You know, we talk about downside all the time, you know, people that, you know, I've got an issue right now where a person contacted me that has been told that they have to register - And I think this is common - that you have to register weekly in this state and you don't. You do not have to register weekly if you're homeless. No such requirement. But guess what? They are at risk if you tell the PFR office, you're not going to do that. I think we talked about one last week where the person has to text in at Barrell County, Georgia. (Andy: Yep. Every night) That's not in the law. But they're certainly risk. So you tell the person gently, I

certainly want to comply, can you help me understand where that is just so I make sure I've got all the requirements that I'm supposed to do. Because I haven't heard that one before. But you don't tell them you're not going to do it. And see, I'm telling people to do things that are not realistic for someone to do. If you're homeless, you probably don't have a lawyer on call. You call the organizations like us, we don't answer the telephones, because we don't have full time staff. And then, when we call you back, when we do choose to call you back, you don't answer yours. So we have a catch 22 where no one can ever talk to anybody because I don't leave numbers when I call people back. So this is good time to pontificate about my phone policy, don't you think? (Andy: Nope, nope, nope, nope, nope, nope. Nope. Not doing it. We're gonna move on to the next one) You don't want hear about my phone policy?

Andy 1:01:07

We're already at an hour. I'm trying to move on and you want to keep talking, haha.

Larry 1:01:10

All right, let's, let's move on.

Andy 1:01:13

Alright, well, these next two segments are... ones kind of about making poor decisions. This one is from East Idaho news. Utah PFR Opened Door nude invited trick or treaters inside his house. Police say. There's a guy that's on the registry, and probably not supposed to be doing Halloween stuff. But maybe. And he wants to open up the door nude. There's nothing even say other than like just facepalm. Yeah, dumbass. That's what someone says in chat. Totally.

Larry 1:01:42

Yeah, he has a new conviction from 2019. And it was only a Class A misdemeanor. And he was on probation at the time. So he was probably told, I'm guessing, this is all conjecture on our part, but I'm guessing he had restrictions on Halloween and he was supposed to not answer the door. Certainly not be handing out candy and certainly not be inviting kids in.

Andy 1:02:05

And not be nude doing it.

Larry 1:02:08

I'm going to give the benefit of there may be some embellishment in this which media can do. But if this is 50% true, the guy made a series of bad decisions. You don't answer the door nude. Yes, you technically have a right to be nude in your house. But when you answer the door, then perhaps other people might see you. So don't answer your door nude. Don't invite minors into your home when you're on probation for something sexually oriented, like indecent exposure was. That's the offense he had, although they didn't call it that's, that's what it essentially was, indecent exposure. The best advice I could give him now is you better hope that the judge has a sense of humor, because your probation is going to be revoked.

Andy 1:02:59

Right. Okay, and then this one is super disturbing. We're not going to cover this for very long but this one showed up again on the

NARSOL social site. And hopefully I can make all my things work. I'm not going to play very much of it because it's really annoying. This is a guy over on Tik Tok. And he went up to a drive thru and here's how this interaction went.

Tik Tok Video 1:03:23

So there's a fucking sex offender working here. *Hi welcome to *something something* can I take your order?* Hi. If I place an order, will the sex offender be making my food?...

Andy 1:03:37

Alright, I don't want to give this guy a platform at all. But that's a that's what I wanted to hit with. He goes to the drive thru at a restaurant in a fast food joint in Tennessee. And asks is the PFR gonna deliver his food, cook his food. This is obviously Larry, the problem with having a business's address listed on the registry.

Larry 1:04:00

I agree. This is one of the many problems with having the business address listed. Unfortunately, a lot of states do it. And it's a part of the AWA compliance package that at least for the tier two and tier threes. The tier ones do not have to be on the website. But the tier two and tier threes have to be on the website and at least a pinpoint location where you can follow a link that shows you the location. You don't have to actually list the name of the business. But what difference would it make if you do a pinpoint location? It wouldn't be that difficult to figure out where the person's working. So this is apart of the compliance package that's in the federal SORNA recommendations. And some states have been creative working around it to some degree by not putting the name but actually just putting that locator on there, but I would prefer it not be there. But unfortunately it is.

Andy 1:05:01

I got to think that makes a very tepid, cold response to getting our people hired. Even, as that video goes on, they say he works and back, he just does dishes and stuff. So he's got a meager existence at best just doing dishes at a Popeye's. And if people are going to come up to the speaker box, and almost like ridicule you for it, that's gonna make them have a very cold response as far as hiring our people.

Larry 1:05:28

Well, it does. And we had one when we were doing more generalized practice of law. We had an employer who posed a very good question, you know, what do you want me to do? I mean, I've got these people. And I'm getting harassed for being sympathetic and hiring people on the registry, what do you want me to do? My businesses is not to... I mean, they have a line of people at that drive through. They don't want to have to stop and explain their corporate policy of forgiveness and second chances and all that kind of stuff. I mean, they were dumbfounded, I'm sure when someone drives up with a question like that. You've got people who would not know what to say, they would not have been prepped for that. They would not have been expecting that. And that's just a distraction of business doesn't need. And you remember, when the baseball player out of Oregon State was gonna be a big hit in national baseball success, and I said no team will pick him up. And people said, oh, Larry, there you go again. Remember that?

Andy 1:06:24

I do. I want to say he's playing for Japanese team. But I could have that wrong.

Larry 1:06:29

Yeah, but that's a distraction that no major league baseball team would have wanted. This is a distraction that no business wants. But this is also an opportunity. Because this is something that conservatives should be able to understand. They have a predisposition to want to accommodate business. Now, that's not bad, that's a good thing. We need business. They have a predisposition to want to be accommodating to business needs. So this is something where you ought to be able to do what Texas Voices did, and to reach out to business trade associations like the Chamber of Commerce, the New Mexico Association of Commerce and Industry and all these different trade associations and ask them to work with you to approach conservative leaning law makers who are pro-business to make a case that this should not be on the registry. The registry information should not be listed as a part of the profile where that person is employed, because it's detrimental to the business community. They're not going to give a crap about the PFR or their family. But business is something that they will relate to. This is an opportunity for conservatives to help our cause. Because if they're intellectually honest, they do want to help business. They don't want things like this stuff that we're gonna talk about in the patron extra about all the stuff that's being imposed on business by about vaccine mandates. That's something conservatives usually rile against. And this is an imposition on businesses that's very destructive to them. And I think that's where your traction is. And if you could get the conservatives on board, I think you can get the Democrat party to go along with this. But I think you're going to need the conservatives to take the leadership on this.

Andy 1:08:14

One final thing before we hit the Who's that Speaker? is just to acknowledge a long letter from Frank, that will take a little bit of time to digest, I suppose.

Larry 1:08:25

So we're gonna send it to our research staff in New Mexico that we just talked about.

Andy 1:08:34

Oh, excellent. Alright, then. Alright, well, then last week, I played this one.

George HW Bush

My opponent won't rule out raising taxes, but I will. And then Congress will push me to raise taxes. And I'll say no, and they'll push, and I'll say no, and they'll push again. And I'll say to them, read my lips. No new taxes.

Andy 1:09:07

And like, before we even finished recording the program Larry, we have a winner named Peter. And he said, read my lips, no new taxes is a phrase spoken by American presidential candidate George HW Bush at the 1988 Republican national convention as he accepted the nomination on August 18, 1988. And I did that because that one was so super easy. It was like, come on, you got to give me more than just saying it's Bush. So that's the right

answer. (Larry: Who's that winner?) That was a Peter with a C as an initial.

Larry 1:09:42

Okay, well, I'm just wondering if Peter is my sidekick for political discussions, or if he just did Google research really quickly to figure out that backdrop, because that is not something the average person would have known from memory. In terms of all the detail he provided. I mean, you would have heard the quote, you would have heard him saying that, but very few people would be able to set that up the way he did.

Andy 1:10:04

He was even like chomping at the bit to answer it in chat. He's one of our patrons. So thank you very much for being a patron. Because he was listening live too. (Larry: That's the \$1,400 a month one, right?) Probably, yes. Yes, yes. Yes. And all right. So this one, probably similarly, because, gosh, if you don't know who this one is, I got nothing for you. But so you're gonna have to tell me more than just who this is. But you're gonna have to give me some context around who sang it and where they were and what was going on at the time.

Who's that Speaker?

Because people have got to know whether or not their president's a crook. Well, I'm not a crook.

Andy 1:10:40

Alright, I, I'm telling you, if you don't know who that is, you need some help.

Larry 1:10:44

I'm struggling with that one. Play that one more time. Okay, one more time.

Who's that Speaker?

Because people have got to know whether or not their president's a crook. Well, I'm not a crook.

Andy 1:10:52

Is that enough? Did I capture enough of that Larry?

Larry 1:10:56

It's Yeah, it sounds like that person might have been, maybe, I'm not gonna say, but they might have been the president, Maybe?

Andy 1:11:01

Maybe? I mean, gosh, if you want to give it away, jeeppers.

Larry 1:11:06

So all right. Well, that sounds like an old audio. That may go back 100 years?

Andy 1:11:12

Could be could be. Yeah, even Jen knows who that one is. And she's like, 30 or something. Um, all right, new patrons. Kirk became a bigger patron. So thank you very much for Kirk for doing that. And then also, we had a new patron named Joey, thank you very much to the new patrons and the increasing patrons. Thank you very much. Do we get any snail mail subscribers? You're gonna say, you didn't check?

Larry 1:11:35

No, no, new subscribers, but we're getting a lot of inquiries wanting a sample issue. And that usually has led to many subscriptions after they see the fabulous job that our transcription service does, and how beautiful it comes out and how reliable it comes out. Usually, they leave our Global Operations Center on Monday. And they're usually handed out to most prisons by Friday. So that's the timeline. We record on Saturday night. Transcript goes out from global operations on Monday. And usually you're getting those by Thursday or Friday in your institution

Andy 1:12:15

FYP Global Operations Headquarters, huh?

Larry 1:12:18

That's right. We have we have the global operation center. And then we have the regional operations centers around the various parts of the country.

Andy 1:12:27

Yes, we do. And sometimes then we even become a mobile operation as well. And then we just record where we are.

Larry 1:12:33

Well, let's do a tease. We might have a guest next week, possibly. We're working on having someone to talk about the registry petition process in Georgia. But it'll be a different guest than what you've heard in the past when we've talked to this person. We're working on having a brand new guest about getting off the PFR list in Georgia! (Stay tuned!)

Andy 1:12:56

Very good. Yeah. Do you want to dig more into that or like just leave it there?

Larry 1:13:01

This is a Fabisch young attorney that's been at our conferences, and he is willing to talk about other issues. But the issue of getting off of the list is very important, because the Georgia assembly has had under its consideration this last year changing the process and forcing people to wait longer. So those who are contemplating wanting to get off, now may be the time to do it. Because that bill will likely resurface again. And I don't know if Georgia lets it carry over to the next year. Our state doesn't. So the first session of the legislature, when it ends, the legislation dies and you go into their two year sessions. The second session, you have to start all over. But I'm not familiar if Georgia lets it carry over.

Andy 1:13:46

I think Georgia let some carry over because there's been talk about how it passed this house, so it just has to go past the other one next time. That's ridiculous.

Larry 1:13:55

If that's the case, then then see, we have a better system here because we can kill stuff that has to start all over, be vetted all over again. But that is something that people in Georgia need to be thinking about. If you're trying to get off the PFR list, you'd better be listening to episode 203 if it turns out we're really

working on having him on the next weekend. (Andy: You can't count, it'd be 202.) Oh, this is 201, so it's be 202.

Andy 1:14:24

Alright, well then I we can close everything down here you can find all the show notes and everything over at registrymatters.co. The voicemail 747-227-4477. registrymatterscast@gmail.com if you want to send me an email message. And of course as always, the best way to support the program is patreon.com/registrymatters. And thank you so very much for the patrons and thank you every month everyone for joining in on the live stream. It's a lot of fun to have everyone around and poke fun at me while we have technical problems while we're recording. With that Larry I hope you have a wonderful weekend and I will talk to you soon.

Larry 1:15:03

Thanks for having me. And that is why I am here.

Andy 1:15:07

Oh, see I can do that. (Audio Clip: That is why I am here.) There you go. Have a good night.

Larry 1:15:14

We haven't done that for a while

You've been listening to FYP.

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.

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