



Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 284

Recorded 12-2-23

Announcer 0:00

Registry Matters is an independent production. The opinions and ideas here are those of the host, and do not reflect the opinions of any other organization. If you have problems with these thoughts, F Y P.

Andy 0:17

Recording live from FYP studios, east and west, transmitting across the internet. This is episode 284 of Registry Matters. Larry, we've brought you back from the dead! How are you feeling?

Larry 0:28

I'm feeling much better.

Andy 0:31

You sound a lot better. The couple of days after you were like (croaks) I was like, wow, you sound really bad.

Larry 0:38

Yeah, I was on my deathbed for two or three days.

Andy 0:42

So now that we have you back, almost healed?

Audio Clip 0:45

"How much longer are you planning to stay?" "A long time. Get used to me."

Andy 0:52

We tried to get rid of you. But it didn't really work.

Larry 0:55

Well, I don't know why you try so hard.

Andy 0:58

Our patronage would go way up, if we were to get rid of you. I think that's how that would go.

Larry 1:05

Well, I'm seeing a different trend. It went way down while I was gone.

Andy 1:10

(laughs) We did seem to lose a few. And so for the people that did decide to leave... you can replace them by going over to YouTube and pressing the like, and the subscribe and the bell notification and those things. Also make sure that you go to your favorite podcast app, or even not-your-favorite podcast app, and subscribe to the program. And then it will be just delivered to your mobile device on Tuesday morning, as if by magic. Do you have a podcast app player?

Larry 1:35

I do. I don't use it. But I see it on the phone.

Andy 1:37

(laughs) You have just the Apple -- they changed the name of it recently, I think -- "Apple Podcasts", is that what it's called now?

Larry 1:44

I believe so. Yes.

Andy 1:46

Gotcha. Do you want to tell me what we're doing this evening?

Larry 1:50

Well, we have a guest, I guess you could call it. We're going to be talking about removal from registration obligations in the Great Peach State of Georgia. And we're going in some depth into his situation. We have news of a lawsuit filed in Tennessee. And then you're wanting to talk about the expulsion of a member of Congress. I don't know what it has to do with registration, but I'm sure you have something.

Andy 2:19

It doesn't have anything to do with it. We're just trying to run off everyone else.

Larry 2:23

Okay! That sounds like a plan.

Andy 2:26

Well, so should we just dive right into this interview?

Larry 2:29

Let's do it. Now, folks, this is one of those, of Andy's favorite: it's unscripted, unplanned, we have no idea where we're going. All we know is that several days ago I had a talk with "Bob" and we talked about what we *might* do on the podcast, but we have no idea where this is going.

Andy 2:52

Perfect! But you *do* know, because you know everything about registry removal, and you know about the legal strategy of all this stuff. So without anything else, joining us now is Bob from the western side of Georgia. Muskogee? Did I pronounce that right, you local people? Muskogee?

Bob 3:09

Close enough.

Andy 3:10

Okay, Muskogee County, to be more specific. Bob and I met back in roughly 2010, and while we were (clears throat) "down," we instantly hit it off. After much coaxing, he agreed to come on the show and get beat up by Larry. And I'm pleased to introduce him to the podcast. So, not only are you a first-time listener, you're a first-time guest, and caller and all those things. And I really do appreciate very much that you've come on.

Bob 3:31

I'm happy to do it. I'm glad to get both of those things out of the way. First time, you know, so...

Andy 3:36

(laughs) You can only be a first-timer once.

Bob 3:39

Exactly, and what a special evening it is!

Andy 3:42

Yeah, because you're busy watching "foosball."

Bob 3:45

I am a fan. It's a legal obligation here in Georgia.

Andy 3:50

Take it away there, Larry.

Larry 3:55

I'll try to set it up. This is a person who has completed all obligations related to his sentence, and has been removed from supervision, early if I remember the conversation correctly, and then he wanted to get off the registry, so he hired an attorney. And he petitioned to be removed and that petition flows to the county of the conviction, if it was a Georgia conviction. He filed a petition, and the petition was not granted. And there were some nuances that we got into, so let's just set it up a little bit better. How many years have you been offense-free? How many years ago did this incident happen?

Bob 4:36

How many years ago did it happen? Okay, in 2009. That's when the offense occurred. Or 2007, actually.

Larry 5:00

2007. And so we're talking about something that happened 15 years ago, right?

Bob 5:04

Correct.

Larry 5:07

Okay, when you completed your sentence, then you had a period of post-prison supervision. And how long was that?

Bob 5:19

Well, I was in prison for two years. And then on probation, I got off probation three and a half years ago now, at this point.

Larry 5:31

But I'm trying to set up, how long was your supervision compared to how long you served in prison? Because you were released early? What was your period of supervision that you were *going* to serve?

Bob 5:44

Oh what was the period of supervision? 2012 to 2019.

Andy 5:55

So, six years or so?

Bob 5:56

Yeah, yeah.

Larry 5:58

But you were granted early termination, is that correct?

Bob 6:02

No, it wasn't early. I petitioned, and I was denied that.

Larry 6:07

Okay I got that mistaken. So, you've been off supervision since 2019. And then you filed for removal from the registry. And you did all the right things. You went and hired a lawyer. You went to an in-person hearing. Before we get into the hearing, how did you identify this lawyer? How did you determine that he or she was capable of assisting you with this endeavor?

Bob 6:40

It was a referral, as I recall, and we interviewed him pretty well. At the *time*, I thought we interviewed him pretty well. He had handled cases like this before. He had been practicing in the county, seemed to be familiar with the players, and presented very, very well. I literally don't have any issues with the way that he presented the evidence that he collected. He collected, seemingly all the right things. Minus one thing that you and I talked about. We can talk about it here, if you like, another psychosexual assessment. I had one previously, but it was many years ago. So, I felt pretty good about him, going in. I also warned him that my victim was pretty aggressive, and pretty dramatic. She was prone to making her case very well known.

Larry 7:55

When you say she's "pretty aggressive," I think it would help the audience to know that it was an adult, consensual situation.

Bob 8:07

Right.

Larry 8:07

But under the circumstances, the adult was not allowed to do the consent because the relationship that was taking place provided a power mismatch, and that adult cannot give consent, even though it was consensual, as I understand it.

Bob 8:22

Correct.

Larry 8:24

And that adds a different nuance to what happened, because in the realm of this type of offending, that would have been considered a power mismatch, a significant power mismatch. That adds what I call (unprofessionally) a "yuck factor" to it. It would be similar to -- I don't think it'd be *quite* as yucky, but it'd be similar to -- a client I worked with some years ago that had had an encounter with a horse. And the supervising authorities treated him worse than if he'd had an encounter with a human being, because of the yuck factor. "Anybody that would do something sexual to a horse has got to be deranged." And there's a certain yuck factor to it that a person who has a relationship when they're in a position of power, or authority, or perceived control. Like you could have an adult in a prison, a guard or staffer, and supposedly the prisoner is at a disadvantage because of all the "power" that the person who works in the institution has, that the poor, helpless prisoner doesn't have. They're in a dependent situation. So there was a yuck factor in your case, and I don't know if we want to take it any further than that. But that's what you had going on. And when you did the interview with your attorney, you

did all the right things. You said the attorney went and talked to the local prosecutor, which is what I would have recommended, to see what their position was going to be, and the prosecutor said to your attorney how they were going to feel about the petition. What was their office's position going to be, prior to the hearing?

Bob 10:15

My attorney said that the prosecutor had no objections, and it looked like it was going to go through. And that's how we entered the court proceedings. It didn't go that way. Not even close.

Larry 10:30

Okay, so when that court date rolled around, you were in court with your attorney, and what happened as it unfolded? We didn't go into great detail, but the judge obviously called the case, and asked the parties to state their appearances. And since you were making the motion, your attorney should have gone first, and explained why they were there.

Bob 10:59

He did.

Larry 10:59

What happened, and how did it unfold? And you can have a little bit of leeway to just go into that with some details. I'm trying to draw a visualization to how this process works, so people will not want to go do it "pro se." So tell them how it worked.

Bob 11:12

Well, my attorney presented, and he was very organized. He went through the law, he quoted how much time I served, all that, and the fact that I had completed treatment. I had a psychosexual assessment, I did two years of outpatient treatment, I had character letters. I was gainfully employed in another career, another industry, not the previous one. I mean, I thought he was very organized in all of that. Once he completed his presentation, the prosecutor presented a letter from my victim that was very "detailed" let's say? In fact, it presented information that was inaccurate and quite honestly, bold faced lies. And I sat there and listened to that, and my attorney listened to that and, actually, time seemed to slow down. The judge ruled on it and denied it almost instantly, after hearing that letter, so that was a fun, fun day.

Larry 12:29

So, the judge is sitting there and when your attorney rested, and said he had nothing further, and the district attorney representing the state of Georgia took over, the district attorney said, "And, Your Honor, I have this letter." I mean, how did that go down from that point?

Bob 12:59

He said, "I have this letter." He read it very passionately. Let's use that word. In a very animated way he read it, and added his own, at the end, saying, "and based on this letter I have, I don't recommend he come off the registration." So that's basically it.

Larry 13:30

If I had been sitting next to your attorney as an assistant, I would have said, "When did this letter come in?" I would have put it this way, "When did we get this?" Was there any discussion about

when that letter manifested itself? Because it sounds almost like an ambush took place. Your prosecutor tells your attorney that there's going to be no objections, and then this letter materializes, and we have a "continuing duty to disclose." If that letter came into his office, he should have disclosed it to your attorney so there was no ambush. How did your attorney react to that letter? Did he tell you later that that's the first he'd ever heard of it?

Bob 14:18

Yeah, that's exactly what he said. Honestly, I think he was as shocked as I was about the *level* of the letter, and the level of the prosecutor's lack of composure in reading it. Because he was pretty vehement, pretty animated. I think that completely. I know that it blindsided my attorney, and based on that, he didn't ask for any kind of continuance and, at that time, I didn't think that was even an option. I didn't know, I'm not an attorney. So, I wasn't as blindsided by it, because I kind of expected her input, and her to be not supportive, obviously. My attorney just walked out, shaking his head. He said, "I have no idea what just happened. He and I had a great conversation, and he seemed supportive so I have no idea where this is coming from. So, like we talked about, he didn't do the right thing in regards to me at all.

Larry 15:26

Well, here's my hypothetical. And this is looking backwards. And we never know when we're in the pressure cooker of the moment, what we will do when we're looking backwards. But looking backwards, I'd like to think that what I would have done, if Georgia law provides for a victim statement, and I'm sure it does, because for some reason, even though this is a civil regulatory scheme, those states that have these removal processes, seem hell-bent on bringing the victim into it. And if our side could learn to utter the word "civil regulatory scheme," we would be able to tell the judge, "Hey, this is a civil regulatory scheme. And what the victim has to say should be considered with that weighing, with less weighing, because the punishment component of this person's sentence has already expired. And this is merely a civil regulation now." But anyway, I'd like to think what I would have done was, when the prosecutor said, "and I've got a letter," I would stand up and say, "Objection, Your Honor, I've not seen that letter." I can't imagine the process would allow for an ambush like that. So that's what I'd like to *think* that I would have done. And then, if the judge wanted to say, "Okay. Well, counsel, take a look at the letter and see what you think, and then I'll rule on your objection." You may not object, after you read the letter. If the letter had said, "He's wonderful, and I think he should be allowed to go on with his life," you'd probably have consented to have that read, correct?

Bob 16:59

(laughs) I would have fallen out of my chair, but yes.

Larry 17:03

Therefore, the first thing I would like to think I would have done would have been to ask for a pause, and a timeout to take a look at the letter and see what it says, what was about to be presented. And based on what you described, at that point, I would have had to come up with a more extensive objection after reading it. And I don't know what all I would have objected to, but I would have certainly thrown in the civil regulatory scheme, saying, "You know this is a civil regulatory scheme. The punishment is over with. And this sounds like a person who is hell-bent on causing this person

difficulty with the remainder of his life." That's what I'd like to think I would say, but I'd have to know the temperature level of that judge, and how that judge would react to that. The judge might have not reacted very well and that's why you need a person, when you do these petitions, who *knows* the players. This is one of the rare situations where you *don't* need an outsider. There's times when I tell you, "Bring in an outsider because you need to be like a bull in a china cabinet. You need to go in and be ready to raise hell." This is not one of those times where you need an outsider. This is one of those times where you clearly need an insider, that has a great relationship with that DA's office and hopefully, a little bit of honesty, where you can go back and forth. That DA should have called your attorney and said, "I got this letter and I know I told you I was going to not object to it, but I'm in a real conundrum here now because I got this letter, and the victim is just adamant. And you know, I just got this yesterday. I'm gonna email it to you right now." That's what should have happened, in my opinion.

Bob 18:38

Because you and I have spoken about this, and you know that I was entertaining the thought of going back to petitioning the court again to be removed from the registry, and part of my logic, quite honestly, is financial consideration; to pay five to ten thousand dollars for an attorney, to get another "No." I don't have an endless supply of money in that regard. It does appear that things are stacked against me as it is. Obviously, my attorney did the right thing by going to the prosecutor and asking, but it didn't matter. I would not be able to go to the prosecutor and ask that question. But, you can see from my history now why I'm like, "Okay, that seems like it would be a smart thing to do, and a helpful thing to do. But it sure didn't pay off the last time." Intuitively, I know the right thing is to have a lawyer present. The other part of that is that a lawyer cannot -- okay, let me back up. My overarching concern here is that, every time I go to court to petition off the list, he can come back with *another* letter, introducing more lies about me, that my lawyer can't defend at all, without consulting with me. But that's where your kind help would come in handy. So I don't know, I go back and forth with all that.

Andy 20:20

Larry, let me ask you this. If these letters get introduced every time he tries to get removal relief, does that end up in "jacket"? In his file to then look up every time? Ten years from now, every two years? So he's got five new letters saying what a horrible person is?

Larry 20:36

I suspect, but I don't know for a fact. I suspect this part of the file is redacted from the public. I suspect that when you look at the file, it's not available on the public side. But if Georgia law provides for a victim response every time the person files, there's going to be a victim response, as long as this victim is alive and coherent enough to come in. But I wouldn't give up just because there's going to be a victim response. What I would do, is I would get, maybe the same lawyer, maybe a different lawyer, but someone who is *well* connected, that knows this judge. It happens to be a female judge, which adds to the compounding of the yuck factor. But then this, based on the circumstances of his offense, that would add a little bit of consternation to the situation. But I would want to talk to the district attorney's office and say, "Look, we're

not going to do the same thing we did last time. If you come in with an ambush like that, with another letter, then I'm going to have to respond with an objection. And we're going to have to argue this out in court. I just can't let this happen again." So you put the district attorney on notice that that's not gonna be allowed to happen again. Then you can have a conversation, an educational opportunity, with the district attorney. You remind them that this is the civil regulatory scheme! Your attorney may not even know that.

Bob 20:39

That's a good point.

Larry 22:06

He may not have even thought of it, and heard those words. And say, "We need to play down the victim involvement here. I've paid my debt to society. This is merely a law enforcement public notification of my past history. But this is not a part of my punishment. There's supposed to be no punishment to it whatsoever. Because if it were punishment, it would not be constitutional." And so I would go back, do research on the judge, find out if she has *granted* any of these. We talked about that and I don't know if that's something that you can retrieve from the administrative office of the courts, to find out how many of these have been granted, but the practitioners in that county would know that. They would know how this judge reacts to early termination from probation petitions, and de-registration petitions. And if this attorney can find that information out, and come back to you and say, "She ain't never granted a petition to de-register. So that makes this an uphill climb." But if you come back and find out, "Well she grants, actually, over half of these petitions," then you've got a whole new ballgame. Then I would go get a current psychosexual evaluation. And that was a little point of disagreement you and I had because you said you've already had one. But remember this is a superior court judge. They're elected. They have to campaign, and be campaigned against in Georgia. And this judge, if she is inclined to want to give you relief, she needs the maximum protection that you can provide her, which is the best, most respectable, psychosexual evaluation that you can afford to have, and as current as possible, saying that you are not that person from 2007, and your risk is very low. Now there's nobody who has zero risk, but if you could get a respectable psychosexual evaluation, and you could get the DA to understand that his walls are going to come crashing down if the same shenanigan is tried again with an ambush, I think that you do have chance of getting off the registry. I would not give up. You have almost no chance of doing it, pro se (without an attorney). You can go through the machinations, but it's not going to be granted.

Bob 24:24

I gotcha. Well, I am the poster child in terms of criteria. In terms of legal criteria for coming off the list, I'm a level one, I've never had any issues, yadda, yadda, just every criteria you can think of I've needed. So that's part of my frustration. And when you say "Get a psychosexual assessment," part of my mind goes to, "Okay, my first psychosexual assessment said: this is a normal heterosexual male, interested in females, and you know, because of, basically his loneliness in his marriage, he committed this heinous crime. I mean, honestly, that's what it was. I still look at it that way. So, another psychosexual assessment seems more or less just an

expense, and hoops to go through. Which, and I hear ya and I'm willing to do it. I'm not saying I'm not. But it seems like a pointless machination to go through. But for the benefit of the court yeah, sure okay, fine. If that's the cost of admission, I would be happy to.

Larry 25:36

Well, I would want to know that this judge has a history of letting people off registration.

Bob 25:41

Right.

Larry 25:42

The county we're talking about is large enough that this would not be the first petition that she's ever gotten. It would only be possible that it's the first petition if she were a brand new judge. But she's not a brand new judge, she's the one that sentenced you, correct?

Bob 25:54

No, the female judge that sentenced me has retired.

Larry 25:58

How new is this judge? How long has she been on the bench?

Bob 26:03

At the time of this proceeding? I want to say she was pretty new, within the year, within her first year. I guess that's a factor now that you bring it up.

Larry 26:15

This could have, if she had not granted any de-registrations, this could have been new territory for her. I would give her a second chance, *after* trying to find out what her history is with early terminations from supervision. Those are risky endeavors as well, when you terminate someone from a court-imposed obligation early, you're taking a risk. Because those cameras are gonna come rolling in from Channel 11 in Atlanta saying, "Why did you release this person early? They had eight more years of supervision, and now they have been out committing crimes. Because of you." And no superior court judge wants that.

Bob 26:55

Of course.

Andy 26:59

Larry, is there, legal-strategy-wise, in talking about elections, do you think that there's a *better* time than others? Let's say the judge has just won reelection. Would that be a better time than if they are about to be going up against someone else in the polls?

Larry 27:20

That's a great question. Absolutely those are considerations we haven't even talked about, even in the pre-show. You do not want to be doing this at a time when the district attorney's office (with the District Attorney, him or herself are the only ones that face election) but when the office is facing an election, every associate, assistant, and deputy DA, they're thinking *politics*. They're thinking about making the boss look good, and not looking bad, not taking any hits. You don't want to be doing this right when they're bearing down on an election. You prefer, like Andy said, to

do it right *after* the election, when they're safely secure for several more years. And since 2024 is likely an election year in Georgia, I don't know that that'd be the best time, if the DA and the judge up for election in 2024. You might not want to do it until afterwards. So you might be on the registry for another year, to pass that risk, and also to give the judge more experience with de-registration petitions. By the time you get into 2025, she will have had a number of these come through by then.

Bob 28:27

That's a good point. I didn't think about that. I appreciate that.

Andy 28:29

And it's not like you show up at court and you have a court date tomorrow. I don't have any idea what the lead time is to get a court date. Is it six-ish months? Three months?

Bob 28:30

Oh, it's several months. It depends. During COVID, of course, it was much longer, but I think it's a lot shorter now.

Larry 28:49

Well, your lawyer can control that. You can file the petition in June and if you get to the October setting, the lawyer can file a motion and plead for additional time, and it's always going to be granted. No judge wants to do work they don't have to do, and the prosecutor doesn't want to do work they don't have to do either. So you ask the prosecutor to consent to a rescheduling and you push it out. But just be careful when you're filing because again, the lawyer ought to know how the dockets are running, if they're in court on a regular basis. I can just about tell you, here, how long it's gonna take you to get certain things done, within a reasonable variation. When you file something, I can tell you about how long it's gonna take. Unless you get one of these judges that notoriously just sits on motions, I know about how it's gonna flow.

Andy 29:32

Is there anything else that we need to cover?

Larry 29:38

Well, I think I've done the best I can. I would not recommend he do this pro se. Unless you're just content to get a "no" because I can't think of anything that would change. If you did it pro se, that wouldn't generate anything other than a "no" answer, and then you're waiting for another two years under Georgia law.

Andy 30:01

Is there anything else, Bob, before we move on to other pieces of the podcast? Let you go back to your foosball? ...Bob? Bob is typing. We may have lost Bob.

Larry 30:15

We may have lost him.

Andy 30:16

Because he is typing in Discord, I'm going to assume that that is going to be the end of that, yep, he lost us. So that's fine. I think we were done anyway. Larry, do you have any closing points that you would want to fill in, any last-minute thoughts?

Larry 30:31

No. Did you have any other questions? I know when we were doing this, you and I were bantering a little bit about it because you've gone through a similar process.

Andy 30:38

Oh, yeah. Well, it was that the timing was super important, and I was trying to express to Bob, when we had some conversations about, "I mean, sure, you can certainly go back in there," but isn't there, like if you get denied, aren't you then put on hold, in timeout for two years I think, before you try again?

Larry 30:55

That is correct. If he gets denied, he's got a two-year wait.

Andy 31:25

Did you end up back Bob?

Bob 31:25

Yeah, I'm here. Sorry.

Andy 31:31

Okay, good. The one other thing, Larry, I feel ashamed because I should know this. Isn't there new legislation that, I'm not saying they are *required* to let you off the registry, but, there's more of an incentive? I don't know what the right word is in here. There is legislation to help you get relief after X years if you meet XYZ criteria.

Larry 31:31

I'm not familiar with that. I know that Georgia has been trying to cut their bloated probation supervision caseloads because they have the highest per capita supervised offender population in the nation. But I haven't heard a thing about de-registration being a push.

Andy 31:46

Okay, maybe I am conflating the two. It's been a few years now for me, so I'm not paying that much attention to it anymore. Bob, do you have any further questions or anything of that sort to ask Larry before we go?

Bob 32:01

I don't think so. I do want to say I really appreciate you taking the time, and giving me guidance. It'd just been a pleasure talking to you. Absolutely.

Andy 32:13

This is the time where we obligatorily ask you for your COVID relief money, the fourteen hundred bucks?

Bob 32:19

(awkward silence)

Larry 32:19

Yes, it's a fourteen-hundred-dollar donation to the podcast.

Bob 32:24

(all laugh) Okay.

Andy 32:29

That's a joke.

Larry 32:30

But it's tax deductible!

Andy 32:32

Perfect. Yes, it is totally. Bob, I really appreciate it man. After all these years, I appreciate you coming on and sharing things with us and experiencing Registry Matters for the first time.

Bob 32:42

No problem. I'm happy to embarrass myself in a new and creative way.

Andy 32:45

Perfect. That's why we used an alias. Take care, my friend, and enjoy your foosball. Appreciate it again. Thank you.

Bob 32:54

Alright, see y'all.

Announcer 32:56

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 F Y P.

Larry 33:45

So I can announce, for those who are in live-chat, that the game he was watching so intently went against his team, the Georgia Bulldogs.

Andy 33:54

Ha! That's why we lost him, Larry! (laughs)

Larry 33:58

They were defeated by the Alabama Crimson Tide, 27 to 24. So, Georgia's number-one ranking is in jeopardy, they may not even make the college playoff series after this defeat. And it's upset the whole apple cart for them to lose after 29 straight victories.

Andy 34:04

Wow! And when we started, wasn't it 20 - 17?

Larry 34:19

Yes.

Andy 34:25

So, they both scored a touchdown in just that little bit of time, wow. Nail biter! Yeah, he's about to go slit his wrists I think and I'm JUST KIDDING. Don't trigger anybody. I'm sorry. He's about to go be very sad.

Larry 34:39

I'm sure he is because I was looking forward to a repeat of the national championship and I don't see how they can do it.

Andy 34:45

Gotcha. Well, let's move over to an article that you put in for some unholy reason. And it's from The Tennessean: "Class action lawsuit challenges retroactive placement on Tennessee's [PFR list]". We have this from the state of Tennessee obviously, a class action lawsuit challenges retroactive placement. Eight people in Tennessee, on Tennessee's PFR registry, filed a federal class action lawsuit last week asking that thousands of people with decades-old convictions be removed from the registry. The eight plaintiffs who are using pseudonyms in the lawsuit all have convictions from before, or shortly after, 2004, when the state's current laws, the "Tennessee Sexual Offender and Violent Sexual Offender Registration, Verification and Tracking Act" -- holy moly, Larry! How would you say that? So it'd be T-S-O-V-S-O-R. You can't make this into a word, Larry. Anyway, all of that "and Tracking Act" was passed. They are seeking class action status for people on Tennessee's PFR list "whose convictions predate the law or one of its later enacted punitive requirements." Why did you put this gobbledegook in here?

Larry 36:02

Well, because the lawsuit alleges that it violates the U.S Constitution's protections from retroactive punishment. And federal courts have repeatedly ruled against the state of Tennessee. "However, Tennessee refuses to follow the law," the lawsuit says. Plaintiffs say that Tennessee's registry law violates the Constitution's protection against retroactive punishment. And we, here at FYP, we agree.

Andy 36:30

Have we discussed this before?

Larry 36:32

Yes, this litigation in Tennessee has been running for a while. "To date, the state has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer money defending the retroactive application of its [PFR] registry law against individuals who were convicted or pled guilty before the law even existed, despite numerous courts holding that it violates the Constitution," said Nashville attorney, Ryan Davis, who represents some of the plaintiffs.

Andy 37:02

And you are a Big Fan of class action lawsuits?

Larry 37:07

Not really.

Andy 37:08

(laughs) Can you remind us what a class action lawsuit is?

Larry 37:12

I'll do my best. It differs from other lawsuits in that the person or people who are suing, they're suing not only on behalf of themselves, but on behalf of a larger group of people, called "the class", who have suffered a similar loss, or similar circumstances. In this case, the plaintiffs estimate that there are thousands who match the same description as they're in. The plaintiffs are asking

the court to order the state to remove the plaintiffs and the class members from the PFR registry. Before the lawsuit proceeds, a judge will have to decide if class certification is appropriate, and then certify the proposed class. I don't like this because it slows down the process because it gives the state something new to argue about. They get to litigate and spend hundreds of hours of briefing and argument about whether a class should be certified. And then the law firms on the defense have to show that they have the capacity to represent the interests of the class, and that they can communicate with the class members. And it's just a needless amount of bureaucracy that I don't like.

Andy 38:21

And so I'm thinking back to let's say it's the year 2000, Larry, plus or minus. Ford Explorers were sold with some botched tires from Firestone and they were like rolling over from the tire exploding or something like that. That's an example of a class action lawsuit, I imagine?

Larry 38:37

It could be, yes.

Andy 38:40

Okay, I just want to try to make a comparison that maybe at least the older people would potentially remember. I would imagine that that would be a class action, because so many people have Fords, across all kinds of different spectrums of race, and income levels, and states and so forth. And they're all impacted by these exploding tires on their cars rolling down the interstate.

Larry 38:59

Correct. And one of the things you argue, when you seek certification, is that the claims are similar in nature, that "judicial economy" is going to be achieved by doing this as a class, rather than having all these individual cases. That appeals to the court. "Man, I don't want five thousand cases to inundate our state court system. So I'll certify this as a class." That's the appealing aspect of seeking a certification. But you've got to have that commonality. And you gotta argue judicial economy, but you have all those hoops to jump through. And it gives the state an opportunity to beat you down, and I just don't like class actions. I think that you can achieve the same result without a class action.

Andy 39:40

I was just going to ask you that. Wouldn't an individual being victorious in a case like this, then the next person down the line has similar circumstances and they can go "Here! I'm similar" and you would at least have a cookie cutter situation made to take it into court and it would certainly be easier. You're the leading crow or whatever, goose and all the ones are following behind you. And that lead one is breaking the wind for you, so that it's an easier path for you. You don't have to do it as a class action.

Larry 40:10

Yes, in this particular situation, it may be appropriate for a class certification because there's already been that important decision from the Sixth Circuit. This is an on-going, protracted battle, and they're going to lose eventually. So this one may be okay. But as a general rule, when you're at the beginning of a case where there's no precedential decision behind you, I'm not in favor of trying to do a class action.

Andy 40:32

So how has the state responded so far?

Larry 40:36

Oh, well, a spokesman for the Tennessee Attorney General's Office, which of course represents the state, said, "The office is aware of the lawsuit, and it's reviewing the complaint, but does not comment on pending litigation."

Andy 40:49

That's such typical boilerplate response. You can say that to anything. Just like somebody wouldn't release their taxes because they were "under audit".

Larry 40:57

Oh, yes. I remember that candidate "under audit".

Andy 41:01

All right. According to the article, "Tennessee's first sex offender registry, created in 1984, was a *private* database, used only by law enforcement. The 2004 law created a public-facing database that has been amended over the years into a far-reaching structure for regulating the conduct and lifestyles for [PFRs] after their punishments were complete, and in many cases for the rest of their lives." That's according to U.S. District Judge Aleta A. Trauger. "Registrants must follow residence, work, and travel restrictions, including a prohibition against living or working within 1,000 feet of [...all of humanity...] schools, daycares, public parks, as well as other restrictions."

Larry 41:45

So yes, according to this article, another U.S. District Judge named Eli Richardson, "first ruled in February 2021, that those who committed a qualifying crime before the registry's creation by the General Assembly in 2004", and that's the current iteration, it was actually created 1994, the first iteration, "were subject to punishment that didn't even exist when they were convicted" which, Judge Richardson said, "violates the ex post facto clause of the U.S. Constitution". After that, the state has continued to suffer losses in court.

Andy 42:24

The article states that things reached a tipping point in March of this year when Judge Trauger wrote in a decision that past rulings "definitely suggest" that "Tennessee's policy of continuing to apply the Act to other individuals who committed pre-enactment offenses is unconstitutional." What, Larry, did the state do in response to Judge Trauger?

Larry 42:48

I bet you didn't even really need to ask me that. The State appealed Trauger's decision to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. And remember, this is the same circuit that said Michigan couldn't do a similar thing. So they took it back to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals in March, arguing that the placement on the PFR registry "is not punitive, and thus is not unconstitutional". So, they're cocking their head, and they're hoping that a new panel on the Sixth Circuit will undo a previous panel's decision. That's what they're hoping for.

Andy 43:20

Sounds unlikely. Come on, Larry, that would be "stare decisis" and we can't have that anymore. Stare decisis definition: The doctrine or principle that precedent should determine legal decision making in a case involving similar facts and the principle of following judicial precedent.

Larry 43:26

That's correct. Well, "While that case has been pending, a flood of lawsuits by individuals on the [PRF] registry have been filed in federal court", as you mentioned, and they're saying, "Hey, I should get off!" Those plaintiffs are generally able to get off the registry, at least temporarily, in a matter of a few weeks", according to this article.

Andy 43:46

And this is all possible because the Sixth Circuit found, in 2016, that Michigan's registry law, which is similar to Tennessee's, violated the Ex Post Facto Clause of the Constitution. How do you think that this will end, Larry?

Larry 44:02

Well, the state of Tennessee will eventually, at some point, be forced to modify its registration requirements for those who have older convictions. All these add-ons that the victims' advocates and law enforcement insisted be added through the decades after 1994, they will have to peel many, if not all of those, off. They'll have to peel it down to where it looks a lot like a regulatory scheme. They will eventually do that. But they will do that the same way Michigan did, after fighting tooth and nail, after the legislature being given the opportunity to legislate, they likely will not legislate. And the federal courts will have to give them a date in certain that the registry is going to go dark, and then they will eventually, as that date certainly is approaching, they will do something. But until then, they're not likely to do anything but continue to fight. And then the next question you're gonna ask is, "Why will they continue to fight?" They will continue to fight because that's what the Attorney General perceives the citizens of Tennessee want done.

Andy 45:06

Riddle me this, sir. If there's only one day that separates a crime that you commit, and I commit, and in that window, the laws change, how does the later person, I'll say me, how do I end up with more registry (not punishment. I'm gonna call it punishment) how do I end up with more registry restrictions for doing essentially the same thing, just based on one day? How does that come out to be constitutional at the end of the day?

Larry 45:32

Well, because the ex post facto clause was designed to prevent you from having obligations and consequences that did not exist. If those existed at the time you did it, a day later, you were on notice of what you could be facing when you chose to plead guilty, or when you chose to roll the dice and go to trial.

Andy 45:49

There's nothing that says something, anything about some level of "equal punishment"? and I'm going to call that equal protection of punishment?

Larry 45:59

Well punishments are allowed to be changed as long as they're not done retroactively. We change punishments, "we" meaning "society", we change punishments all the time. Things are sometimes made less serious, that people have gotten harsher sentences for, and things are made more serious that people have gotten lesser sentences for. We don't often go back and adjust those sentences. We certainly can't go back and adjust the ones of people who got more lenient sentences. But the battle comes in to people who have gotten, like things that are decriminalized, like same-sex, drug possession, what were those laws called, where homosexual sex were, what do they say?

Andy 46:38

Sodomy?

Larry 46:39

Sodomy. Yes. Georgia was big on sodomy laws and Texas and some other southern states, you know, they were very big on making sure that nobody enjoys the comfort of another person of the same sex. "We can't have that around here."

Andy 46:52

I think you could look up the law and determine that sodomy can include the opposite sex as well.

Larry 46:59

It could.

Andy 47:00

Opposite-couple, opposite-sex, but certain acts.

Larry 47:03

Well it could, but we didn't enforce that, that way. That was normal. We just couldn't have the same-sex.

Andy 47:09

(laughs) That was normal. Okay. Anything else here?

Larry 47:17

No, I think we've beat this up. Folks, this is just gonna be a continuation of litigation that's gonna go on for some time. Eventually it will end, and the Tennessee registry will have to be modified. But the Tennessee legislature will do as minimal an amount of modifications as they have to. And that's the way it's gonna be, unless you can flip up the friends in Tennessee and convince people that they don't like the registry anymore. Good luck doing that.

Andy 47:42

Yeah, good luck. Good luck. All right. I am going to play a YouTube video after you set this up. I'm literally going to play this raw from the internet. I did not download it and like load it into a queue or anything. So man, I hope it works. But what are we doing?

Larry 47:57

Well, I'm gonna talk about the excessive bond that was set for this individual. And I really wanted to pontificate about the presumption of innocence, and how much of this person's liberties are being taken away from him just because of an accusation. And

it's probably going to lead into the final segment where we're talking about your favorite subject of The Expulsion.

Andy 48:21

(laughs) Okay, here we go: https://youtu.be/667NmRxx_3E

Fox 5 San Diego News Anchor 48:25

We begin tonight with new developments surrounding a North County school counselor and water polo coach accused of sex acts with a minor.

News Anchor #2 48:33

A 27-year-old made his first court appearance today and Fox Five's Zara Barker starts us off, live in Vista, with what we learned inside that courtroom. Zara?

Reporter Zara Barker 48:41

Yeah, Hi, Andrew. Today, inside of the courtroom, we learned a little bit more information about what exactly led up to this situation, an alleged relationship between this 27-year-old suspect and this 13 year-old victim. Today in court the suspect also denied any and all allegations related to the four charges he's facing, and the judge reduced his bail from one million dollars, down to \$325,000. [video of defendant in courtroom with his lawyer] A North County school counselor and girl's water polo coach appeared in court for the first time Monday, accused of having sexual contact with a 13-year-old.

Lawyer 48:41

Mr. Chanove is entering a not guilty plea.

Reporter Zara Barker 49:20

Twenty-seven-year-old Connor Chanove was arraigned Monday, and faces up to twelve years in state prison if convicted on four charges.

DA Jessica Stehr 49:27

He's charged with two counts of committing a lewd act on a minor under the age of fourteen. He's also charged with initiating a meeting with a minor, and also the fourth charge is actually 'going to that meeting to meet with a minor in order to commit a sexual act.'

Reporter Zara Barker 49:48

According to the Deputy District Attorney, the victim is an eighth grade student at the school where Chanove was a counselor at. The two had reportedly talked on Snapchat and agreed to meet at a park in Oceanside, and that's where the suspect was caught with the teen.

DA Jessica Stehr 50:02

"On November 18th, the victim's mother was unable to locate her. She tracked her to Guajome Park, where she located the defendant's car. She could see at that time that her daughter was in the backseat of the car with the defendant. When she opened the door, she found that the defendant had his pants down."

Reporter Zara Barker 50:25

Chanove was arrested last Monday. Authorities said, along with working at Vista Unified School District, he had been a coach for the all-girls Seaside Water Polo Club in Carlsbad, and a lifeguard

for the city of Encinitas, in Carlsbad as well. The judge reduced bail from one million dollars to \$325,000. If Chanove posts bail, he will only be released under conditions including GPS monitoring, an order to stay away from all school grounds, and:

Judge 50:50

"I'm gonna order that he have no contact or communication with children, members of our community under the age of eighteen. I'm going to order that he stay, fifteen feet away from children, and then the Fourth Amendment waiver, including electronic devices."

Reporter Zara Barker 51:10

And we talked with one of Chanove's family members who was in the courtroom today. He declined to speak with us and so did his attorney after the arraignment today. I want to point out the deputy district attorney told the judge today that, so far in this investigation, although it is on-going at this time, there does not appear to be any more victims related to this case. Live in Vista, Zara Barker, Fox Five news.

Andy 51:32

Yikes!

Larry 51:35

Okay, so I start with every suspect that's accused of a crime, presuming that they are innocent because I actually believe in our presumption of innocence. These are very salacious and very serious accusations. But that's all they are at this point. They're accusations. He is presumed innocent, and he has the right to go to a full-blown trial and force the state of California to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he did these things that they're alleging. Until he does that or chooses to plead guilty, he's an innocent man. And to set a bond at one million dollars? And then to reduce it to a whopping still \$325,000? For a person who has obviously no criminal history, because he wouldn't have been able to have been a teacher with all the background checks they go through, to get their teaching certification and be hired as a teacher. So we've got a person who's had to surrender his Fourth Amendment rights, and is gonna be electronically monitored, as if he's been convicted of this crime. And I have no problem with a couple of conditions that were imposed, they seem to be appropriate. You shouldn't be going around school facilities, or any type of school events, I have no problem with those. That's a legitimate concern. But no children, period?

Andy 52:57

Fifteen feet away which is a pretty good distance!

Larry 53:01

And the confidentiality of every electronic device, everything has to be searched. But the state would respond, they would say, "Well, Larry, you don't understand. If he was in jail, we would be monitoring his electronic devices", but he shouldn't be in jail. He's a first-time offender. He should be presumed innocent, he should be given a reasonable bond that a person can make. Most 27 year-olds are not going to have the capacity to raise \$300,000. You know, the 10% is one thing, but the collateralization of the bond is another thing. And most 20-somethings are just not going to have that kind of financial background, to collateralize a bond that size. So he's likely to sit in jail, pretrial.

Andy 53:01

Yeah, I would imagine so. We talked about this, that on the lower end, maybe in the four-digit range, that maybe the number is somewhere around 10,000 bucks, if it's under that, that you can just post the 10% and you're good to go. But maybe, I don't know, over that, then you have to post the bond *and* collateral?

Larry 54:04

Well you don't post the collateral with the court, you sign the collateral agreement with the bonding agent. It's all individual to the bonding agent, how much risk they're willing to take. If they really feel that you're so connected to the community you would never run, they may not require full collateralization. But if you go to see a bondsman, they're on the hook for that entire amount of money if you no-show. When they have to go out and start searching for you, the court gives them a certain amount of time before that bond goes into a forfeiture status. And they're likely, if this guy doesn't show up and someone posts his bond, they're looking at having to pay to the court 300-plus thousand dollars. So they're going to want some element of collateral. They're not going to do that just on the 10%.

Andy 54:47

I see. And literally Larry, if the guy runs away, and it comes due, the bail bondsman's out 325?

Larry 54:55

If he can't produce the person within a reasonable period of time, the judge, the court, is gonna give them some time, but if they can't produce him, that bonding company is going to be out the money. And that's the thing that really wrecks some bonding businesses.

Andy 55:14

I can imagine!

Larry 55:15

They end up taking a gamble, because the \$30,000 looks great, they have to make payroll. But when the person no-shows, and they can't fetch them, then they're out \$300,000. It's not so great, the \$30,000 at that point. And people don't understand that, that it's a risky business that they're in. And they have, under the court rulings, they have almost unfettered access. They can come into your home without a warrant. It's in your contract for agreement with a bondsman. They have rights that are contractually given to them. And you don't have to sign the binding agreement, but you basically let them come arrest you anywhere you are.

Andy 55:52

Right. Well, that was the whole show "Dog the Bounty Hunter."

Larry 55:56

Yep.

Andy 55:58

All right. So 325 seems excessive, is what you're saying?

Larry 56:04

I think that a bond of anything more than \$50,000 for that guy would be extremely excessive. Those allegations are serious, yes.

You don't want 27 year-olds having consensual relations with a 13 year-old. I think that's what they said.

Andy 56:19
Yup.

Larry 56:20
That is not ideal. But also, it's not as if he killed her.

Andy 56:25
It's true. But she would have *years* of treatment and therapy and yada yada, yada.

Larry 56:32
Yes, indeed.

Andy 56:34
All right. So now you and I are going to duke it out over the individual from New York who got booted yesterday, I believe, right? December 1st?

Larry 56:44
That's correct.

Andy 56:46
Who do you want to go first? Do you want to go first? Or do you want me to go first?

Larry 56:49
I don't think it matters. I was very disappointed to see the expulsion because I do not believe that a person should be expelled from Congress. It's not the same as if you're employed as a member of a staff, if you're a staffer in Congress. Anyone who's elected, they have been employed by The People. And therefore, if you're kicking Mr. Santos out because of criminality, as I understand the allegations, they all occurred before he was a member of Congress. And, so as I looked up what it says about this in the Constitution, it's very vague about what it says about expulsion. But it tends to be related to, under Article One, Section Five, the Constitution provides that "each house of Congress may punish its members for disorderly behavior and, with a concurrence of two thirds, expel a member." That's pretty vague. But he certainly, I don't think, has been accused of any disorderly behavior in Congress, since he's been there. All the shenanigans that he likely did have not been proven beyond a reasonable doubt. He went under an ethics investigation, which is a political process. Anything that Congress does is a political process. And every member of that ethics committee had to decide how this was going to play out for *them*. If they took one position, how it would play out, and they had to compare that to, if they took another position, how that would play out. They're bearing down, a year from now, of having to face election themselves. And I am not a big fan of kicking someone out of Congress, particularly when it seems politicized to me. We've got a senator, on the other side of the rotunda, that has been accused of taking bribes of all sorts of gold bars, and no telling what all, that was on his list of allegations. And the *Democratic* Party has been in no hurry whatsoever, to have an ethics investigation of Mr. Bob Menendez from New Jersey, and he was the chair of the Foreign Relations Committee! He could have done untold damage to the United States. And, of course, now with a 51 to 49 majority, if they were

to expel Mr. Menendez, all of a sudden they've only got 50 seats! And all of a sudden it's a whole new ballgame. So it just makes me question, if there's a slight bit of a political motivation here, to narrow the Republican majority in the House, and if there was political underlying motivations here for this expulsion. I'm very disturbed about it and I wish that they would have just let him face the election coming up in November of next year. He's not going to run, by all accounts. He could change his mind, but he said he's not running, and the people will get a choice of a new representative.

Andy 57:01
Well, hold on, though. If the Democrats control the Senate, 51 to 49. But the Republicans control the House by five or something, plus-five seats or something like that? So they would have brought the vote up, wouldn't they? They ousted their own guy!

Larry 1:00:07
That would be correct. The Democrats could not have done this on their own. So, there's no doubt that there was Republican support for it. But they couldn't have done it without Democratic support.

Andy 1:00:17
Certainly. But if they would bring up the senator guy, I'm certain all 50 Republican senators would vote to oust the one Democrat and that would make 50-50!

Larry 1:00:28
Yeah, but you're missing one point. You can't move things as a minority, unless the majority wants it.

Andy 1:00:33
No, no I'm not missing. I gotcha.

Larry 1:00:34
Okay. But they could bring it up but there's no way that you could move the process along, because the Democrats control the machinations on the Senate side.

Andy 1:00:42
Yeah yeah yeah, I totally got that. But the other thing is that they tried to do this, if I'm not mistaken, November first (please forgive me if I have the nuances off.) They attempted to vote, but they couldn't do it November first because they were waiting on this ethics violation. I read some of it, man, and it's like transcripts and copies of bank checks? I have no idea what I was reading nor what I was looking at, but in many of them they said there is "strong evidence" of a lot of campaign violations and ethics violations and so forth. And apparently, like you said earlier, the yuck factor kicked in, that he was spending campaign funds on OnlyFans, which is a porn website, and also for Botox (giggles). And apparently, that crosses the line. You can sell stock as a representative or senator. And then the whole world shuts down to COVID, you can sell stocks, that kind-of-like Insider Trading? Of course, that doesn't matter. You can say terrible things about all kinds of people and not be impeached and removed from office. But if you get Botox you get removed.

Larry 1:01:47
Well, I think you're kind of spinning it a little bit there. The selling stock because of COVID, everybody would have the same

opportunity to sell stock. Insider trading means you have to have information that's not available to the public at large. We all knew about COVID, right?

Andy 1:02:03

We did, but I'm reading an article about two senators, and they attended a private briefing about the Coronavirus pandemic, even as they publicly amplified the Trump administration line that the virus did not pose a major threat. So, in closed-door meetings, they were hearing that the world is about to collapse. And then in public, they're saying "Eh, don't worry about it, it's no big deal."

Larry 1:02:28

Well, that's problematic, but no charges have been brought. There's been charges brought against this man.

Andy 1:02:34

Sure

Larry 1:02:35

He's facing charges and I believe, as with any person who's accused of anything, that the criminal justice system needs to be allowed to run its course. If he's being kicked out for misbehavior in the House, like those members in Tennessee, I believe it was that they were kicked out because they disobeyed the rules. I don't believe he's being accused of disobeying any rules of misconduct of the House. He's been a sleazebag for telling continuous lies. And he's been a sleazebag in terms of; if these allegations are true, he's mismanaged and mishandled his campaign cash. He could very well be incarcerated for these violations, if they're sustained at trial. But there's no need to rush to kick the man out, because he's already not running. And all these things are just allegations. That process of that ethics investigation is very tainted; those people were thinking about the political ramifications if they didn't do it. Here's what they would be likely having the discussion around the Republican caucus table, "Well they're going to hit us with all this stuff", the Democrats being they. "They're going to hit us about how we stood by Trump no matter what he's done, and what he's said, we've stuck with Trump. So here we are. If we stick with this guy, politically, it may be impossible for us to continue to turn a blind eye to ethical breaches." So it may be that they pull a political analysis and they put this thing to make it look worse than what it already is. I have no faith in a political process when it comes to kicking someone out. If we start kicking people out for this, we're gonna have an empty chamber pretty soon. Because there's a lot of campaign violations taking place. And this is going to open up a whole new slippery slope I'm afraid of. I like to have evidence, if someone's going to be accused of criminal behavior. I like for the process to run its course. And I like to see evidence and a conviction in federal court where there's not the political considerations. These Article Three judges that are going to be trying Mr. Santos, they're not going to have to worry about running for re-election. These members on the ethics committee, they *are* running for re-election, most of them.

Andy 1:04:48

I want to make a statement after I ask you this, and help me word this the way that you have in the past where, it's the police, 95% of the police are probably honorable people, some number are the bad apples. Why would you want to keep the bad apples and

make your whole organization look bad? Does that ring a bell with how you would phrase something like that?

Larry 1:05:10

It does, indeed. And I stand by that. You would not want Mr. Santos to stay in office. Every time you get interviewed on the Sunday shows, you would say, "I hope that District 24 in New York (whatever it is) votes for a different representative, if he chooses to run again. But. We don't have enough evidence to expel him. You People in New York sent him *to* us. And it's up to You People in New York to remove him *from* us. But we think he should not be here." That would be my answer to that. But yes, I do stand by that. When you've got a bad apple, you would want to turn over all the evidence you have. If you're a cop, and you're observing a dirty cop, why would you want to protect that dirty cop? If there are people who are serving with Mr. Santos who have evidence, they need to come public with it. And they need to show that evidence and say, "Hey, this guy really is a bad apple."

Andy 1:06:03

And I have one final thing. I think that they did this because of how, I'm going to be as politically correct as I can: he is effeminate. To a massive degree. He is very, very, very flamboyant in his nature. Flamboyant, thinking "RuPaul" kind of thing. He is very color kind of suits, and walks with a certain kind of gait about him. And it's very not masculine. I'm not against it! I'm just pointing it out, that I don't think that that agrees with the party. Just saying.

Larry 1:06:39

So your theory is that, since he's in the Republican Party, and they're not very hospitable to that lifestyle, as they call it, a choice.

Andy 1:06:50

Yes.

Larry 1:06:51

That they came down on Mr. Santos because he's gay?

Andy 1:06:54

That, I guess. And someone in chat says, "Santos was kicked out for being too fabulous." Yes, I think that is part of the calculation, that he is too fabulous. Flamboyant. That's my thought. We can close the show after that one, Larry.

Larry 1:07:09

Until you told me about that, yesterday when we were having our chat about it, I had no idea. I had not even heard any of those rumors about him being gay. Never had given it a second thought.

Andy 1:07:18

I don't know that he's gay, but he sure does act in a certain way and, take that for whatever it is. I'm not knocking it. It's just an observation.

Larry 1:07:27

So, all right, well, I'm sure every patron we have now has canceled!

Andy 1:07:31

(laughs) Well, as always, show notes can be found over at registrymatters.co. And you can leave voicemail over at 747-227-

4477, email RegistryMattersCast@gmail.com, and please consider becoming a supporting member of the program at patreon.com/registrymatters -- just a dollar a month helps. I would like to see more numbers. Forget the money side of it (money's great) but having higher, higher numbers would be just a boost of ego, so to speak. I can't thank Larry enough, and thank Bob for coming on. And I guess we'll see you next weekend!

Larry 1:08:09
Take care.

Andy 1:08:10
Bye.

Announcer 1:08:13
You've been listening to F Y P

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**