



Registry Matters Podcast

Episode 286

Recorded 12-16-23

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 286 (who didn't update the document?) of Registry Matters, Larry, it's a fine evening. How are you?

Larry 0:30

I'm doing awesome. I just hate my computer. It's broken.

Andy 0:34

I hate your computer, too. I don't know anything about Macs. Seriously, they've been around forever. I don't get it. That one mouse button thing drives me crazy.

Larry 0:44

Well, I was thinking about throwing it in a dumpster, but then if we go back to the old PC, we're gonna have other issues.

Andy 0:52

Yes, there would. We could use the infinite money from the FYP budget and buy you one.

Larry 0:59

No, we couldn't do that.

Andy 1:01

Be sure to head over to YouTube and thumbs-up, like, subscribe and notification bells, and do that in your podcast app, Pocket Cast, overcast, all of those places. I was listening to something they said Stitcher shut down. And it's probably really, really old news, because this was an old podcast, but still, Find us and write a review. And that would be fantastic. That's a great way to support the show. And I think that's everything. So Larry, this is on you. What are we doing tonight?

Larry 1:29

We're going to be doing a free-form where it's taking questions, and only questions, unless we don't have enough of them. So we're going to be talking about stuff I don't know anything about, and irritating people that are posting things on Reddit about how crazy we are, and what else are we going to be doing? We're trying to give a holiday gift to our loyal supporters who listen faithfully to our babble. Hopefully it's worth paying attention to, but it's truly unscripted and unplanned. I do have some questions here

but I've spent very little time, so this is gonna be just the type of program you like: no planning!

Andy 2:09

I don't even think that's actually true. That's just how we started. You're embellishing, as someone put it in chat. Let me ask you this question, out of the gate, before I get into the first issue because it will be tied together. So I'm pretty sure that you graduated magna cum laude from Harvard Law. Is that true?

Larry 2:33

Not exactly. No.

Andy 2:35

Did you graduate like, whatever, valedictorian in high school?

Larry 2:40

No, not exactly. No.

Andy 2:42

Okay. So why are you qualified to answer any questions about this topic? Like even in general, like the whole thing? Why are you qualified to answer questions in a legal frame, either legal strategy or (not give legal advice... but) comment?

Larry 3:03

Well, I try not to provide advice, because that is a questionable gray area. But I guess what makes me qualified is, I'm schooled in the operational art, as it's known, and I'm an American and I'm entitled to an opinion. So therefore, I express my opinions, and some lawyers find my opinions to be offensive. And I've heard that, boy have I heard that lately, that some lawyers are finding objections to my opinions. But that's their right to also. They have their right to their opinion. What makes me qualified is I've studied this issue with great detail. I've been personally impacted by the issue, and I work in the arena. And I know stuff, and those who find my conversation not to be appealing, I mean, they would have other choices, maybe other podcasts or other programs or other sources of information. They probably shouldn't spend their time worrying about what I say, if they don't agree with it and find it useful. The audience here should show up to listen because they find what we do to be helpful and useful to them.

Andy 4:13

Would you even say that we're trying to mislead people and provide false information?

Larry 4:18

Well we're absolutely not trying to provide any false information. Out of all the Reddit exchanges you told me about, they didn't cite any false information. They have opinions that are different, like the person who feels like being on the registry, listed on a registry but not having a registration obligation, makes them subject to disabilities and restraints. And then I said, "Well, what disabilities restraints?" and they said, "Well, because you can't travel." Well, even under the IML, even if you are required to register, you still can travel. You just may not be admitted. But you still can travel. There's no prohibition anywhere. That's a matter of fact, that you could travel to any nation you want to travel to. Am I right so far? Is there a law that says you cannot travel on the American side? Not on the foreign nation side? Is there a law that says that an American cannot travel?

Andy 5:10

The only caveat that I understand of this, if you are on the registry, you have to provide whomever some twenty-one day notice, advising them that you're going to. I don't even think that you're asking them, you're just notifying them that you are going. And that is not a request, that is just notification.

Larry 5:25

Yes, there's no prohibition on traveling. And when you're listed on the Florida website, after maybe a temporary visit there, that's not the same thing as being required to register. And they have created in their mind, without any supporting evidence, that simply being on the registry as a listed former person who has been there, that that imposes a notification under IML. It does not. I'm not saying it's not happening. I'm just saying it's not required. A lot of things happen that's not required to happen. But I have not been able to unearth anywhere that says a person who has formally been registered and still carried on a website, that a notification has to take place. In fact, just the opposite. I believe that each time the Attorney General of the United States, be it under Obama, or Trump or under Biden, they have said that it applies to people who are actively registered. And I believe that they draw their information from the NCIC. I'm not sure that they draw it from state registry databases, because a lot of people in states are not listed publicly on that database. So that would mean that anybody who was not listed publicly would escape that notification requirement, even though they had a target offense against a minor. Now, what kind of sense does that make from a logical point of view, that you would only rely on publicly available information?

Andy 7:00

Well, we've kind of even gone into what some of these questions are. So let's go into at least the initial thread from

this person on Reddit. And sandiegoburner2022 says, - "I have a serious question that is not meant to be sarcastic, attacking, or the like," (I would contest that. I'm going to be nice, though) "But on what grounds does Larry feel he has the justification to be able to openly and freely, publicly critique the legal strategy of individuals who have formal education and experience in the law, legislatively, and judicially? Larry isn't a lawyer, although he has experience working with them in the legislatures, he is not a lawyer. Every lawyer (at least 4 very active in this area with tons of experience and legislation, and in a courtroom) of whom I have spoken about the podcast, finds many of his takes wrong and inappropriate."

Larry 7:51

Okay, there were no specifics there, but legal professionals disagree. You put a group of lawyers together, and you'll have an immense amount of debate about strategy. We do it regularly on the NARSOL side when we have the legal strategy meetings. Those lawyers, some of whom that person's probably talking about, would be a part of that legal team. And we have those discussions, and the lawyers often are in disagreement. But what qualifies me is that I have the right to have an opinion. And I have the right to express my opinion. I find it very odd that someone that would likely profess to believe in the Constitution and the freedom of speech, would say that I should be silenced, that I shouldn't have the right to an opinion, or to critique these lawyers. I think the lawyers, if they have any problem, if those four lawyers really exist and they have those problems, I would invite that person to get them in touch with us and we'll have them live on the podcast, and we'll allow them a microphone to express where I'm wrong, and we can have that discussion. So I invite you to do that. Tell me who they are. Now I suspect I might know who one of them might be on the west coast of the United States. But other than that, I have no idea who that person may be referring to because I think I work with those lawyers.

Andy 9:16

So can we noodle around on the "formal education" experience? I mean, I personally take exception with this because, you know, I had GI Bill money, and that afforded me to go to college. But when I went to college and learned about quote, unquote, I learned about computers. Like, I didn't learn anything new when I went through the college course and I like walked out with a degree. Because I had been studying computers for essentially all of time, and continue to do so today. So just because I have the little piece of paper at this point is just icing on the cake from what I learned by just reading, studying and going through the action of learning how to do network administration and programming. I personally take exception to the "formal education" and I think you have a similar experience.

Larry 10:04

Well, you know, this can of worms was opened by someone else, not me. But I will tell you this. I'll say that an active state senator named Antonio Maestas, and a former state senator named Lisa Torracco, have both publicly proclaimed that no one in the state knows more about sex offender registration than I do. They've proclaimed that to their colleagues, as I've been introduced as their expert witness. Obviously, this person doesn't know that. But I have sat on the floor of the House, on the floor of the Senate and I've answered questions as an expert, and helped. I've crafted two bills that have been passed, one was vetoed. And they've got the right to their opinion, but what qualifies me is that I'm qualified and people recognize that!

Andy 10:53

It's sort of like, why is the dollar valuable? Because we say it is.

Larry 10:57

Yes. And the reason why I'm qualified is because people recognize that I know more about this stuff than they do, and they come to me for advice. You'd have to ask the lawyers why they hire me to work for them when they have a complicated case and they reach out and say, "Do you want to be on our team in this case?" I suppose lawyers, maybe just have money to burn and they feel sorry for me, would be one way. But I think they come to me for my knowledge, maybe.

Andy 11:24

And to close up this one little block, I want to almost like backtrack to the beginning. During the week, we have a handful of phone conversations and figure out what we're going to talk about. "Oh my god, this landmark case just dropped" whatever. And we kind-of sort-of draft the outline of what the show is going to be. And you said, "Hey, you know, it's like almost Christmas and there isn't going to be anything coming out because everyone is partying and buying gifts and whatnot. So why don't we ask for questions, and see what develops from that?" So I did, I asked the people on the Discord server, I got a handful of questions. And then I was like, oh, yeah, hey, there's like 4,000 people over on the subreddit for the support group. And I asked there, and I got a handful of people saying thanks for all you do. And then this one presented itself. And so to close out this first little section: "Please find the time", this individual said, "Find the time to introduce us to the attorneys. And if they're interested, they are openly and welcomed to come on, where we can create what the subject would be, so that it like stays within the zone of what the conversation should be about, and doesn't get drifted all over the place, so that we can craft a conversation like, "Look, man, people disagree. There's like

that whole abortion thing that just happened. Some people are on one side, some people are on the other. Who's right?" We all decide publicly. And we could have an open debate with whomever these four esteemed lawyers are that disagree with Larry. And I mean, that's fine. They could disagree. But the invitation is open. To anybody!"

Larry 12:59

I would say that, in response to part of what that person said, I feel very strongly that people should not be unnecessarily frightened by imaginary boogymen that have been created in their head. Some of the stuff that -- I don't want to call out any lawyer in particular, but there's a particular lawyer -- that seems to take great satisfaction in creating things that are not a threat, and then saying, "I'm going to save you from the imaginary threat." So they'll go out and tell people that, you know, "They're coming for you," and no one has said they're coming for them. And then they tell them, "I'm gonna save you from the people that are coming for you, if you'll just follow me." And it's like, really? There's no threat here. There is no threat. And when you litigate things where there are questions that do not need to be answered, they need to be answered when they're ripe. And go back and ask your lawyer what "ripeness" means. There has to be a justiciable controversy and something has to be ripe for litigation. And even if it's ripe, you may not want to take it up to the Supreme Court of the United States, because you may get an answer you don't like. An example we talked about in pre-show would be like on same sex marriage. The Conservatives were not happy that some of the circuits in the country had decided that the Defense of Marriage Act, which forbade benefits to people who had married a person of the same sex, they could not collect social security benefits. They couldn't collect military and various other benefits. And they had won favorable decisions in the circuit. And DOMA, the Defense of Marriage Act, was the culprit, because it violated the Equal Protection and Due Process clauses of the Constitution. And the Obama Administration stopped defending the DOMA. They said "This is clearly unconstitutional in our opinion." The Conservatives went crazy and said, "Well, then we're going to see if we have legal standing" and they took that to the US Supreme Court. They got a decision, they wanted a decision and they got a decision. But now the Supreme Court has held that same sex marriage is the right, and the law of the land. So rather than having sporadic places around the country where same sex marriage had to be recognized, within those circuits (and I cannot tell you what circuits they were but there were some precedential decisions among the circuits) all of a sudden, we have a nationwide decision. And the Conservatives now will have to spend decades trying to undo that, like they did with Roe v. Wade. And if they had not asked that question, they wouldn't be in that position. I'm happy for the position we're in, because I think same

sex marriage is fine, my personal opinion. But you can pose a question that doesn't need to be answered, and you may not get the answer you're looking for.

Andy 12:59

And I don't think you said it. Can I say the issue that you are speaking of?

Larry 15:55

Are you talking about Merrick Garland and the regulations?

Andy 16:00

Well, the "Federal Duty"?

Larry 16:02

Yeah, that's what I meant, the Merrick Garland regulations. Yeah, that is a case that does not need to be litigated. It is not ripe. That is my personal opinion. And anyone out there who does not agree with that, that's fine! That's your right not to agree with that. My personal opinion is when a prosecutorial entity proclaims that, "Yes, even though we've released you from your duty to register, we're going to come after you. You better get yourself back in here and get signed up." Then you've got a justiciable controversy that's ripe. It's *hypothetical* up until that point. And so you scare somebody about a hypothetical, and then you file a lawsuit to save them from the hypothetical, that no one's even thinking about, and you save their lives. And I don't think it's fair to scare people that you don't need to. There's enough stress being on the registry, without people telling you about things that are not even on the horizon. And what happens if they lose that litigation? What happens then? Do you have another DOMA situation where all of a sudden you got an answer and you didn't like it? Are you going to take ownership of that?

Andy 17:17

Moving on to the next question from the same individuals, "Additionally, what sense does it make to openly and freely state possible legislative and judicial strategies in order to become more successful in changing registration laws and challenging them too? It's like giving the opponent the opportunity to see our playbook before the game starts." So I was talking to my kid about this one at dinner, and I was like, "So if you're playing a game of chess, and then all of a sudden, your opponent makes a move that you're like, 'Oh, damn, I didn't see that coming!' Well, if you were better at the game, you would have seen it coming! And you could have prepared for that to be coming. And then at least that one wouldn't have hit you." I'm using that as an analogy to go (you've said this repeatedly, Larry) "If I can think of it, they can, too." So you need to be aware of as many different angles and facets of this that you can, and it would be wise to discuss it with people.

Larry 18:12

Well, that you've kind of answered the question you've asked. That's what sense it makes. When I look at the level of sophistication of most of the state advocacies, it's not that good. They don't understand basic things about how the process works. I traveled to a state on my own time to try to help them out, and it's not much embellishment to say they barely knew where the doors were to the building, much less how it worked inside those doors. And, people, if you want to continue to fail, and you want to continue just to bumble around and not understand how this works in the legislative arena, then that's fine. But I think it makes sense to educate people so they understand it. We're not giving away any trade secrets. The legislators, they already know this strategy. They know exactly what we're doing. And that's fine. It doesn't change the outcome. They're driven by what they perceive public opinion to be. And they're driven by things like I point out, like needing to have political cover, if you're asking them to make a tough vote. These things, they already know these things. These are not trade secrets. If someone can, who wants to tell me some trade secret that I revealed that caused a legislative proposal to crash, that's fine. But I don't understand how teaching people the basics of how they need to conduct themselves ... not to be personally offensive, but to be gentle, to work within the playbook, operate within the rules. If that offends you, then I don't think you're capable of being in the arena because you don't understand how it works. I don't really, that wasn't doesn't make much sense to me. So I don't understand the question, but to the extent I understand it, I'm trying to help people to be better at what they do. How else would I do this? What would be another way to help people? Do we have one-on-ones? How would we do it?

Andy 20:04

I believe the idea here, Larry, is that you would have closed-door sessions with the people that are going down into the trenches to go battle against, or for legislation, it doesn't really matter. And that way, it's not released publicly where the other side could listen to it and know, "Oh, they're gonna bring this up. Here's what we're going to counter that back with."

Larry 20:28

Okay, well, something comes to mind. It's like I tell people constantly to say, "It's a civil regulatory scheme." They're the ones who say that! For example, we're not releasing a trade secret. They have said that in the preamble of the registration schemes. They have said that in their defense strategies when we're fighting to try to challenge the registry, that's in their answer brief. They already know this stuff! So, when I tell you to use their language, I'm not sure I'm disclosing anything that's a secret! (laughs)

Andy 21:05

We'll move over to the final block. So finally, "Why does Larry and Registry Matters present material opinions differently than lawyers, such as his takes about being listed on the Florida registry, even though not living there as quote, unquote, not being registered or on a registry because you aren't subject to the specific registration obligations there, even if it still impacts your life being displayed on a registry?" It's really a convoluted way to word it. Please, go ahead with that one.

Larry 21:38

Well I think, as I said, it's about disabilities and restraints. I zeroed in on that because being listed on any website, be it a state registry or a private registry, a private listing of sorts, if it shows that you have been a PFR, that's going to have disabilities and restraints, I'm not an idiot, I can figure that out. You're going to be denied employment potential, you gotta be denied housing. Those things could happen. But remember, that's not a *registry* disability. That's not in the state statute, saying that you can't have these particular benefits. They're not telling you, as a matter of law, that you can't live in a particular place, or you can't be employed at a particular place. That is the residual fallout from life on a website. If anything, I think I'm helping people to understand that we need to talk about, and have an open discussion in this country about, the unlimited access to people's dirty laundry, and how long it lives on. I would like for no one to be listed on a registry after they're no longer required to register. But that's not the way it is. They are listed. But Florida is not imposing any obligation on the individual, when they simply list them as being formerly registered. And it generally says "living out of state". And sometimes I've been able to find addresses where they moved to, but sometimes those addresses are many years out of date. I looked at one that I knew in New Mexico that had been listed in Florida, and the picture is like so old, you can tell it's ancient, from the 1990's. And it shows an address that he hasn't lived at, since about the early 2000s. And is that ideal? No. It's not ideal. I wish it didn't happen. But he has no obligations. He has no lawful disabilities and restraints. He has residual fallout. That's a different discussion, right?

Andy 23:42

It's taken me, actually, a lot of beating over my head from you, to really grasp this. It is: You are on a website, you are publicly being doxed by the state, from an event that happened. But going forward, after you have been released from registration obligation, you don't have to go back into the office and tell them anything. Am I misreading that one?

Larry 24:09

No, you're not. And you don't have a single prohibition of what you can do.

Andy 24:14

I can go from this state to this state and go stay as long as I want at that point.

Larry 24:19

Well, not necessarily because that state may have a registry obligation that would encompass you if they knew about you. But Florida doesn't have any obligation on you at all. They can't prosecute you from being in the proximity of a school. They can't forbid you from doing anything. They can't require you to come in and give your fingerprints, or your DNA, your butt-prints and all that stuff. They can't do any of those things to you. You're ancient history, other than that residual fallout. And that is significant, could be significant. If you're 80 years old, and you're not looking for employment, it's going to be less significant. But if you're 30 years old, and you've visited Florida, and you went down and dutifully registered because you were going to be there 49 hours and knew the hovercraft was going to come over you, that would potentially be a very disabling condition. If you'd gotten off of all registration obligations in states that did not continue listing you, and you had this one thing in Florida that kept popping up. In particular, if you had an uncommon last name, and every time they Google that name, you pop up as being a big "Formally registered in Florida". That is not ideal. I am not too stupid to understand that! I get it. But it's not the same as having active obligations. You're not listed in the NCIC as an active registrant if you're no longer registered anywhere. The NCIC, in my view from my conversations with probably no less than a dozen, maybe more, law enforcement officers, is what they go by. They don't run to their patrol cars (laugh) "Let me look at the public-facing sex offender website." They look at the NCIC listing, they run you through there, and they see which person files you pop up on, if you're actively supervised, if you have any active warrants, if you're actively registered anywhere. That's where they draw their information from because that NCIC has you listed if you're registered anywhere, even if you're invisible to the public. The cops still can see you because if you're entered by a local agency as being registered with them, it pops up, and they see that. So I worry a lot more about the NCIC than I worry about the state database. Although, again, I keep saying, I would prefer it not be there. I don't know why they don't hear that part of what I'm saying. I just don't know that you have a constitutional claim. It's one thing to say that something shouldn't be that way. It's another thing for it to be unconstitutional. What right, can you cite to, in Florida, that says that they can't keep truthful information around? What constitutional right is there, that once you are no longer registered, that they must remove

that? What right are they violating? Is it in the Florida constitution that you have the right to be forgotten? I don't think so. Is it in the US Constitution that you have the right to be forgotten? No one's ever shown it to me.

Andy 27:11

Only those super liberal lefty European countries are doing that one.

Larry 27:15

Yes and it's time for us to have that conversation here. Technology has moved us to where that conversation is necessary. It wasn't necessary in 1980. But it's necessary today because things have changed.

Andy 27:29

I want to make it clear also that we have spent thirty minutes talking about this individual's initial gripe and grief. But it is open to continue this. What I'm trying to make clear is that the door is open to have this conversation, if you have that much of a grievance with us. And I'm happy to clear them up. But every post that I made, got a thumbs-down in reply to it, like just being cantankerous. And I'm trying to be very judicious and polite with my responses, here.

Announcer 28:09

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.

Andy 28:55

I think we can move on to our next section, which is really going to be some free-form with an individual who wants to possibly go move around a little bit. And so, Steve, are you there?

Steve 29:11

Yes, I am here.

Andy 29:12

Sweet, you haven't been responding to me, "Are you ready?" ... nothing but crickets. So you are Steve, and I believe I met you at the conference. Is that correct?

Steve 29:23

Correct. Yep.

Andy 29:24

Very good. And I didn't get my shirt.

Steve 29:27

That's right. I still have it. Holding on to it.

Andy 29:29

So I'm now hanging up on you for that. Just kidding. Please, have your dialogue with Larry about moving into an RV.

Steve 29:38

Sure. Larry, so my question is, you know, thinking about maybe traveling around the country in an RV for a certain time out of the year. Just trying to think of all the issues, you know besides the normal making sure that you are checking in with the sheriff's departments where you travel. What other kinds of considerations would someone want to think about, living like "Van Life" or "RV Life" on the registry?

Larry 30:28

Well, now this is one of those questions where perhaps maybe you need to be calling on one of those four lawyers that you mentioned and see if they'll chew the fat with you, and you'd probably get four different answers. We're getting some feedback here. Andy do you have any idea?

Andy 30:49

I do. I'm sure it's with Steve, but I can't do a whole lot about it.

Larry 30:55

Well, I'm so limited, mentally, I may not be able to focus. But we have a situation where you have the consideration of the state that you're currently registered in. And it may have -- not only may, likely does have -- obligations for you. If you're going to be moving, there's no doubt, if you're going to relocate and establish a residence somewhere else, you're going to have to notify the state where you're currently registered. And that begs the question, "Does being absent from home constitute establishing a new residence?" There are multiple opinions, if you call lawyers, and even if you call the registration officials. Like in my state, there's no such requirement that I'm aware of. And most of the law was drafted by me. But I don't know of any requirement that you would have to notify the registry. You would not have to notify the registry people that you're going to be off on a vacation. But that doesn't change the receiving end. If you go to another state, they may have obligations if you're physically present there. So, you're getting into a very murky area about when you leave the state that you're in, what do you have to tell that state? Well, some states say if you're going to be absent for more than seven days, you must notify them of travel. So does the state you live in have that obligation, in terms of, if

you're going to be temporarily absent, that you have to notify them?

Steve 32:32

Yes, they do. There are requirements that I would have to meet. You know, we talked a little bit before the show, and that was one of the questions that came up was, "Where would my permanent residence be?" And that's one of those questions that I've kind of thought about. "Do I keep a permanent residence in Indiana?" And does that mean that then even though I tell them that I'm going to be traveling, if that time that I'm going to be traveling is during a time where I'm supposed to be registering. You know, like, I'm worried about that. So, then I wonder if I just become a permanent resident in a different state? As I move around, do I become a permanent resident in that state if I'm going to be there for so long? Those kinds of questions that, again, I can't find an answer to online. And I wasn't really expecting you to have a solid answer. Just maybe, you know, some of those ideas that maybe a lawyer wouldn't think of.

Larry 33:48

Well, I'm not sure I got the question clearly answered. Does Indiana require if you're going to be temporarily absent for X number of days, that you notify them of that absence? Are you aware of such a requirement? I know if you are moving, you have to do that. But do they have a particular section that says "any absence of seven days, ten days", whatever?

Steve 34:08

Yes. Yes, it says that if I'm going to be gone from my residence for more than seven days, that I need to let them know that I'm going to be gone. But that's about as much as the law really states. It doesn't tell them, or it doesn't tell me, what information I need to give them. It just says that "in writing, I need to inform them" that I'm going to be gone for X amount of time.

Larry 34:42

And I'm assuming that Indiana registration is done by the county. Is that the sheriff's office or some law enforcement?

Steve 34:48

Yes.

Larry 34:49

Okay. Well, it's gonna vary from county to county. Each county will have invented their own requirements. If the law didn't invent it for them, they will have been devising how they interpret this. And they would have decided what they would want you to do. Now, I realize, according to the person on Reddit, I'm not allowed to tell you this, but what I

would do, if I were in your position (this is not legal advice. Man, is this not legal advice!) but if I were facing this conundrum, I would want to get to a state that had the most minimized requirements, in terms of out-of-state travel, temporary absences. I would want to be in a state that was totally silent on that. If you could find such a state, that's what I would be looking for is a state that has no obligations to report temporary absences. Now, that doesn't solve your other part of the problem, because even though they don't have such a requirement in the statute, they may have invented it anyway, and tell people "You have to do this," even though it's not in the law. So that doesn't get you to where you're trying to go, but it saves you from a successful prosecution, if they try to prosecute you. If it ain't in the statute, wishful thinking is not grounds for a prosecution. The law the way they wish it could be is not what will hold up and sustain a prosecution. So I would want to be in a state, as a resident -- I would want to be handed off from Indiana to a state that has nothing in the statute that requires any notification of temporary absences. Then when I started my travel, I would be a lot freer. Then all you would need to know about is that if you have a certain date that you had to report by in the state that you are a resident, you would need to be able to get to that state within that zone. Say the state says you've got to check in within three days of your birthday, hypothetically. Well, that gives you a chance to get back there and check in, right?

Andy 36:52

That's my take on it from Georgia. Larry, I don't remember them having anything that you had to tell them if you were leaving for any length of time. So yeah, 72 hours within the date of your birthday, whatever it is.

Larry 37:05

Yeah. So that would be what I would want to do. And then, once I was in a state like that, that did not require me to notify them of temporary absences, then all my mental energy would be focused on what the requirements would be in the states that I plan to put the RV in. And those are voluminous. I mean, they could be. Say, hypothetically, you wanted to go to a state that had all sorts of proximity restrictions, things that a person required to register couldn't be near. So, you look at the state statute and you say "Well, gee, I can be there for fourteen days, I don't have to register, I can park my RV." Well, that all sounds well and good except for, what happens if they have local restrictions, where you've got that RV parked, and it happens to be within 997 feet rather than 1000 feet limit of something that you're not allowed to be near, as a PFR? That, no lawyer is going to think of, in all likelihood. But then, say that the cops for some reason have contact with you, and they run you through the NCIC -- Oh, no they check you on the Florida website to see if you're listed.

Andy 38:17

(laughs) Now you're just being snarky!

Larry 38:20

(laughs) They run you through the NCIC, and they see that you're actively registered in whatever state it is, no longer Indiana but whatever state it is, they see you're actively registered and they say, "Well did you know that this park where you are right now, did you realize that you're within 872 feet of a church? And you can't do that?" You say "No, I didn't realize that." And if they're a cool cop, they'd say, "Well, you're gonna have to clear on outta here," and if they're not such a cool cop they'd say, "Well, ignorance of the law is no excuse! Guess I'm gonna have to run you in!" So, you see where I'm coming from with that hypothetical?

Steve 39:07

Yes, I do understand where that's coming from. And I guess a lot of what I've been worried about you kind of answered on that one. You know, maybe having my permanent residence in a different state where that requirement isn't, would be beneficial. And I did see in chat where somebody had asked if it's the same thing as an over-the-road trucker. And that's kind of what I thought about at first, except for the fact that I don't plan on coming back every week or you know, once a month, more like maybe coming to visit family once a year. Those kinds of things.

Larry 40:01

Well, I can see that you're going to be spending a lot of energy, if you do decide to live in an RV, trying to familiarize yourself with state and local restrictions. And you may find yourself on websites that linger after you're gone. Now remember, the website, although it's not the same as being required to register, it could hinder your life so I would be thinking about things like that. I would not want to be on a website that I'm not already on. And if I'm risking doing that, that would make me want to stay away from that type of nomadic life, although it has a certain appeal to it. You can see the beauty of the country, and you can go park in all these different states, but you may find yourself on listings that you'd rather not be a part of. Because if you actually get off the registry at some point in the future, and you're on three states that you've been temporarily in, that's going to be less than ideal.

Andy 41:02

I want to point out that someone in chat says that he's in an RV now. And he knows that several of them will do

background checks. KOA or something like that (Kampgrounds Of America, a franchise of over 500 campgrounds). He says they're almost always going to do it. And my thought is then, go to state parks.

Larry 41:19

But then you run into states' laws where they say that you can't be in a park as a PFR. And the question is, if you're a PFR temporarily there, are you a PFR or you're not a PFR when you're only temporarily there, that's a question I don't know the answer to. I would say that you probably are a PFR.

Andy 41:41

And then somebody else says, "Hey, man, just go to a really big state. And then you have the whole state to go play around in, instead of moving," Like if you're in Delaware. I mean, like there's probably two campgrounds in the whole state of Delaware. Because it's so small."

Larry 41:51

Do you think they even have two campgrounds in Delaware?

Andy 41:57

I know of one of them! Steve, is there anything else that you would like to ask, before we move on to the next block?

Steve 42:05

No, I think that that gives me a good starting place, or another area to look at anyway, as far as, you know, maybe this isn't my permanent state. When I leave, maybe it does need to be from somewhere else. Thank you very much for thinking outside the box!

Andy 42:31

Thanks, buddy. Appreciate you coming on. And I want my shirt. That's going to wrap up part one of this two-part episode. And of course, you can always find the show notes over at registrymatters.co. And you can, please, like and subscribe and share at all your favorite podcast apps and YouTube, etc., etc., etc. And we will see you next week! Again, so like I said, this is a two-part episode, and we will finish things up in part two. This way we can all celebrate Christmas, and those of you that are Jonesin' for another episode and don't want to miss out, you can have one next week! Take care. Thanks.

Announcer 43:16

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**