

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE JUDICIARY STANDING COMMITTEE**

April 6, 2011
1:07 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Carl Gatto, Chair
Representative Steve Thompson, Vice Chair
Representative Wes Keller
Representative Bob Lynn
Representative Lance Pruitt
Representative Max Gruenberg
Representative Lindsey Holmes
Representative Mike Chenault (alternate)

MEMBERS ABSENT

All members present

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

HOUSE BILL NO. 215

"An Act relating to the judicial review of a right-of-way lease or the development or construction of an oil or gas pipeline on state land."

- HEARD & HELD

HOUSE BILL NO. 171

"An Act relating to arrests without warrants by peace officers for certain misdemeanors."

- MOVED CSHB 171(JUD) OUT OF COMMITTEE

HOUSE BILL NO. 1

"An Act stating a public policy that allows a person to choose or decline any mode of securing health care services."

- MOVED CSHB 1(JUD) OUT OF COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR SENATE BILL NO. 31(JUD)

"An Act relating to the counting of write-in votes."

- BILL HEARING RESCHEDULED TO 4/8/11

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 215

SHORT TITLE: JUDICIAL REVIEW OF PIPELINE PROJECT/ROW
SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) CHENAULT

03/29/11 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
03/29/11 (H) JUD
04/06/11 (H) JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120

BILL: HB 171

SHORT TITLE: ARRESTS FOR MISDEMEANORS
SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) MUNOZ BY REQUEST

02/25/11 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
02/25/11 (H) JUD
03/25/11 (H) JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120
03/25/11 (H) Heard & Held
03/25/11 (H) MINUTE(JUD)
03/28/11 (H) JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120
03/28/11 (H) Heard & Held
03/28/11 (H) MINUTE(JUD)
04/06/11 (H) JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120

BILL: HB 1

SHORT TITLE: POLICY FOR SECURING HEALTH CARE SERVICES
SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) GATTO, LYNN

01/18/11 (H) PREFILE RELEASED 1/7/11
01/18/11 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/18/11 (H) HSS, JUD
03/01/11 (H) HSS AT 3:00 PM CAPITOL 106
03/01/11 (H) Scheduled But Not Heard
03/08/11 (H) HSS AT 3:00 PM CAPITOL 106
03/08/11 (H) Heard & Held
03/08/11 (H) MINUTE(HSS)
03/15/11 (H) HSS AT 3:00 PM CAPITOL 106
03/15/11 (H) Moved CSHB 1(HSS) Out of Committee
03/15/11 (H) MINUTE(HSS)
03/16/11 (H) HSS RPT CS(HSS) 2DP 3NR
03/16/11 (H) DP: DICK, KELLER
03/16/11 (H) NR: SEATON, MILLER, HERRON
04/01/11 (H) JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120
04/01/11 (H) Heard & Held
04/01/11 (H) MINUTE(JUD)
04/04/11 (H) JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120
04/04/11 (H) Heard & Held
04/04/11 (H) MINUTE(JUD)

04/06/11

(H)

JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120

WITNESS REGISTER

TOM WRIGHT, Staff
House Majority Office
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: During discussion of HB 215, responded to questions and provided comments on behalf of the sponsor, Representative Mike Chenault, Speaker, House of Representatives.

JOHN HUTCHINS, Assistant Attorney General
Oil, Gas & Mining Section
Civil Division (Juneau)
Department of Law (DOL)
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Responded to a question during discussion of HB 215.

TINA M. GROVIER, Attorney at Law
Birch Horton Bittner & Cherot
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Responded to questions during discussion of HB 215.

DANIEL R. FAUSKE, President
Alaska Gasline Development Corporation (AGDC)
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC)
Department of Revenue (DOR);
CEO/Executive Director
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC)
Department of Revenue (DOR)
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided comments and responded to questions during discussion of HB 215.

HAROLD HEINZE, Chief Executive Officer
Alaska Natural Gas Development Authority (ANGDA)
Office of the Commissioner
Department of Revenue (DOR)
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Responded to questions and provided comments during discussion of HB 215.

KENDRA KLOSTER, Staff
Representative Cathy Munoz

Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: During discussion of HB 171, responded to a question on behalf of Representative Munoz, sponsor by request.

KAREN SAWYER, Staff
Representative Carl Gatto
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Addressed HB 1 on behalf of Representative Gatto, one of the bill's joint prime sponsors.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[1:07:24 PM](#)

CHAIR CARL GATTO called the House Judiciary Standing Committee meeting to order at 1:07 p.m. Representatives Gatto, Lynn, Pruitt, Thompson, Holmes, and Chenault (alternate) were present at the call to order. Representatives Gruenberg and Keller arrived as the meeting was in progress.

HB 215 - JUDICIAL REVIEW OF PIPELINE PROJECT/ROW

[1:07:34 PM](#)

CHAIR GATTO announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 215, "An Act relating to the judicial review of a right-of-way lease or the development or construction of an oil or gas pipeline on state land."

[1:08:31 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON moved to adopt the proposed committee substitute (CS) for HB 215, Version 27-LS0741\I, Bullock, 4/5/11, as the working document.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES objected for the purpose of discussion.

[1:10:11 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CHENAULT, as the sponsor, explained that the objective of HB 215 is to prohibit the filing of lawsuits that have the potential to delay construction of intrastate natural gas pipelines. Proposing to modify current statute, HB 215's provisions would only apply to right-of-ways on state land. Under the bill, claims may be filed only by an applicant, a

competing applicant, or a person who has a direct financial interest affected by the lease of a right-of-way; the requests for judicial review must be filed within 60 days of the publication of notice for a right-of-way lease application; judicial review may only be granted for claims challenging the validity of the statute, or claims [asserting] a denial of rights [provided by] the Alaska State Constitution; any claim not filed within the 60-day timeframe would be barred; and all claims must be filed with the Alaska Superior Court, which would have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the proceeding but no jurisdiction to grant any injunctive relief with the exception of the issuance of a final judgment. House Bill 215 was modeled after 43 U.S.C. 1652(d) - the federal Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act (TAPAA) adopted in 1973 - and is similar to legislation passed in 1973 - that being Senate Bill 3.

CHAIR GATTO, noting that [both existing and proposed AS 38.35.200(a)] would allow those who have a direct financial interest affected by the lease of a right-of-way to seek judicial review, asked whether environmental groups or the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) would be considered to have such an interest.

[1:13:43 PM](#)

TOM WRIGHT, Staff, House Majority Office, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of the sponsor, Representative Mike Chenault, Speaker, House of Representatives, offered his understanding that such entities wouldn't have standing to seek such a review. He then went on to explain that Version I incorporates a change suggested by the Alaska Gasline Development Corporation (AGDC). Specifically, Section 1 of Version I, by altering AS 38.34.050(c)(3), would exempt the AGDC - as a subsidiary of the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC) - from having to include in its right-of-way lease certain of the covenants outlined in proposed AS 38.35.120 related to common carriers; this change would ensure that the AGDC's proposed natural gas pipeline, as a contract-carrier pipeline, could obtain a right-of-way lease under AS 38.35. He characterized the existing statutory language as redundant and prohibitive towards the development of an intrastate natural gas pipeline.

MR. WRIGHT explained that Sections 2-4 provide conforming changes to AS 38.35.100(d) and AS 38.35.120(a) and (b) related to Section 1's proposed changes. In response to a question, he offered his understanding that an intrastate natural gas

pipeline would fall under the purview of the Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA), and that HB 215 would not apply to the proposed natural gas pipeline authorized under the Alaska Gasline Inducement Act (AGIA). He then went on to explain that Version I's Section 5 would ensure that only the applicant, a competing applicant, or a person who has a direct financial interest affected by the lease of a right-of-way would have standing to seek a judicial review, with the applicant himself/herself being able to seek such a review at any time; this is intended to limit the ability of those who are simply opposed to the construction of natural gas pipelines to stop such necessary projects in Alaska.

MR. WRIGHT explained that Section 6 - again, modeled on the TAPAA - is intended to preclude lawsuits against any phase of development or construction after a right-of-way has been issued. Under Section 6, [claims] must be brought within 60 days from the [date of the particular action in question], and must be filed with the Alaska Superior Court, which, except in conjunction with the issuance of a final judgment, would have no jurisdiction to grant injunctive relief, whether it be in the form of a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, a permanent injunction, or a stay against the issuance of a right-of-way, permit, lease, certificate, license, or other authorization.

MR. WRIGHT, in conclusion, added that conforming changes were made throughout Version I such that the bill would apply to the construction of all natural gas pipelines within the state.

[1:20:41 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES sought clarification regarding whether such pipelines must be entirely within the state in order for the bill to apply.

REPRESENTATIVE CHENAULT offered his understanding that that would be the case: HB 215 would only apply to state-issued right-of-ways on state land.

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT sought clarification that the bill could also apply in situations involving a natural gas pipeline's "spur line" if that spur line were entirely within Alaska.

REPRESENTATIVE CHENAULT indicated that that would be the case. Regardless of how any interstate natural gas pipeline project is progressing, in terms of resource development in Alaska, HB 215

would allow the state to control [its intrastate natural gas pipelines].

[1:29:14 PM](#)

JOHN HUTCHINS, Assistant Attorney General, Oil, Gas & Mining Section, Civil Division (Juneau), Department of Law (DOL), in response to a question, offered his understanding that under existing [AS 38.35], any pipeline right-of-way lease must include certain covenants, one of them being that the pipeline shall be a common carrier. Under HB 215, that covenant would not be required in the AGDC's right-of-way lease pertaining to its proposed natural gas pipeline.

[1:32:00 PM](#)

TINA M. GROVIER, Attorney at Law, Birch Horton Bittner & Cherot, in response to further questions, explained that natural gas pipelines, in contrast to oil pipelines, tend to be contract carriers, which allows contracting shippers to send a specified amount of their natural gas through the pipeline without having their "interests" diminished.

[1:34:03 PM](#)

DANIEL R. FAUSKE, President, Alaska Gasline Development Corporation (AGDC), Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC), Department of Revenue (DOR); CEO/Executive Director, Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC), Department of Revenue (DOR), indicated that HB 215 is one of two pieces of legislation that would help the AGDC to continue working on its proposed natural gas pipeline project. The main issue [the AGDC and the AHFC] wanted addressed pertained to common carriers versus contract pertaining to state-leased lands, [has been addressed via Version I]. In conclusion, he indicated that [the AGDC and AHFC are] in support of HB 215.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES sought clarification regarding Section 6's proposed repeal and reenactment of AS 38.35.200(b).

MS. GROVIER reiterated that the language of Section 6's proposed subsection (b) was derived largely from the TAPPA - specifically 43 U.S.C. 1652(d) - and indicated that that language, although altered to address state issues instead of federal issues, would essentially limit the types of lawsuits that could be brought against [an intrastate natural gas pipeline] and the types of relief that could be received via such litigation. In response

to a question, she explained that the language on page 6, lines 25-29, sets out both the aforementioned 60-day timeframe and the stipulations that a judicial review may only be granted for claims challenging the validity of the statute, or claims asserting that a particular action [would result or had resulted] in a denial of rights provided by the Alaska State Constitution.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES surmised, then, that under Section 6's proposed AS 38.35.200(b), failure to follow the procedures outlined in AS 38.35 would no longer be grounds for judicial review.

MS. GROVIER concurred. In response to another question, she offered her understanding that due to energy shortages and the desire to make the resources of the North Slope available in order to meet the country's urgent energy needs, the language of the TAPPA precluded judicial review based on such a challenge. She said she presumes that similar motivations regarding natural gas engendered Section 6's proposed removal of such grounds from existing AS 38.35.200(b). In response to other questions, she indicated that Section 5 would apply to both oil pipelines and natural gas pipelines - though predominately oil pipelines - and that Section 6 would apply only to natural gas pipelines; and surmised that those sections primarily address pipeline right-of-ways because that's what AS 38.35 pertains to.

CHAIR GATTO questioned whether Section 6's proposed 60-day deadline for bringing a claim alleging the invalidity of AS 38.35 was constitutional.

MS. GROVIER surmised that if the court finds that restriction to be unconstitutional, then it would allow such claims to be brought forth. In response to a further question, she offered her belief that HB 215 would not change any existing statutory or constitutional notification requirements pertaining to the disposal/lease of state lands or interests therein.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES questioned whether the adoption of HB 215 would raise primacy issues.

[1:51:15 PM](#)

HAROLD HEINZE, Chief Executive Officer, Alaska Natural Gas Development Authority (ANGDA), Office of the Commissioner, Department of Revenue (DOR), mentioned that he'd not yet had a chance to review Version I of HB 215; offered his understanding

of what the original version of the bill would do; and, describing what the ANGDA went through several years ago with regard to a proposed spur line, characterized the state's existing process for obtaining a lease for an intrastate pipeline right-of-way as a very good, comfortable, [appropriate,] and effective process. He also noted that existing AS 38.35.200(b) already provides a very limited basis for challenges, and indicated that the ANGDA hasn't any problem with that provision because the ANGDA's intention is to follow the process, thereby precluding any such legal challenges from being brought forth to begin with. In response to a question, Mr. Heinze agreed to provide additional comments on HB 215 once he's had a chance to read Version I.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES removed her objection to the motion to adopt Version I as the working document. There being no further objections, Version I was before the committee.

CHAIR GATTO relayed that HB 215, Version I, would be held over.

HB 171 - ARRESTS FOR MISDEMEANORS

[1:59:19 PM](#)

CHAIR GATTO announced that the next order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 171, "An Act relating to arrests without warrants by peace officers for certain misdemeanors." [Left pending from the hearing on 3/28/11 was the motion to adopt Conceptual Amendment 1.]

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES withdrew Conceptual Amendment 1, which read [original punctuation provided]:

Page 2, line 5

following "AS 11.41":

Insert "and there is reasonable cause to believe arrest without warrant is a practical necessity to prevent imminent physical harm to the public"

[2:01:04 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES then made a motion to adopt Conceptual Amendment 2, which read [original punctuation provided]:

Page 1, lines 1 - 2:

Delete "**certain misdemeanors**"

Insert "assault in the fourth degree or an ordinance with elements similar to assault in the fourth degree under certain circumstances"

Page 2, lines 3 - 5:

Delete all material and insert:

"(D) committed assault in the fourth degree under AS 11.41.230 or an ordinance with elements similar to assault in the fourth degree under AS 11.41.230 and the officer has reasonable cause to believe arrest without warrant is necessary to prevent imminent physical harm to a person;"

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT objected for the purpose of discussion.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES explained that Conceptual Amendment 2 would narrow the scope of HB 171 such that its proposed warrantless-arrest authority would apply only in situations involving the misdemeanor crime of assault in the fourth degree or a local ordinance with similar elements, and only when the officer has reasonable cause to believe that a warrantless arrest is necessary to prevent imminent physical harm from occurring. The intent is to ensure that law enforcement officers have the ability to prevent further harm from occurring even when they don't witness the initial assault, without having the bill apply to all other misdemeanor offenses against the person.

[2:02:53 PM](#)

KENDRA KLOSTER, Staff, Representative Cathy Munoz, Alaska State Legislature, relayed that Representative Munoz, HB 171's sponsor by request, was amenable to Conceptual Amendment 2.

REPRESENTATIVE PRUITT removed his objection.

CHAIR GATTO, noting that there were no further objections, announced that Conceptual Amendment 2 was adopted.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON began a motion to report the bill from committee but then withdrew it.

[2:04:44 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG made a motion to adopt Conceptual Amendment 3, to add to Amendment 2's proposed new subparagraph (D) the words, "that an" after the word, "believe", and the

word, "a" after the word, "without". There being no objection, Conceptual Amendment 3 was adopted.

[2:06:45 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON moved to report HB 171, as amended, out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes. There being no objection, CSHB 171(JUD) was reported from the House Judiciary Standing Committee.

The committee took an at-ease from 2:07 p.m. to 2:14 p.m.

HB 1 - POLICY FOR SECURING HEALTH CARE SERVICES

[2:14:03 PM](#)

CHAIR GATTO announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 1, "An Act stating a public policy that allows a person to choose or decline any mode of securing health care services." [Before the committee was CSHB 1(HSS), and a proposed committee substitute (CS) for HB 1, Version 27-LS0006\B, Bailey, 4/1/11, which had been adopted as the working document on 4/4/11.]

CHAIR GATTO mentioned that he's one of HB 1's joint prime sponsors.

[2:14:22 PM](#)

KAREN SAWYER, Staff, Representative Carl Gatto, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of Representative Gatto, one of HB 1's joint prime sponsors, relayed that during the bill's last hearing, a concern was raised about whether the language of the proposed state policy could possibly be interpreted as allowing for something that's contrary to public policy or current law, and offered her belief that language on page 2, lines 5-6 - which defines the term, "mode of obtaining" in part as meaning directly purchasing healthcare services from a healthcare provider - addresses that concern. However, she relayed, members' packets do include a proposed conceptual amendment the second part of which would further clarify that particular issue by adding a reference to the statutory definition of the term, "health care provider" [as its used in Title 9]. Another concern raised during the bill's last hearing revolved around the bill's proposal to establish a short title in uncodified law, and the first part of the aforementioned conceptual

amendment would delete the short-title provision located on page 1, lines 4-6 - Section 1 of Version B. The proposed conceptual amendment read [original punctuation provided]:

Page 1, Line 4-6
Delete lines 4-6

Page 2, Line 6
Insert after health care provider (AS DEFINED IN SEC. 09.55.560)

MS. SAWYER noted that members' packets now also contain a six-page document from the Goldwater Institute that addresses questions pertaining to the model legislation - developed by the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) - upon which HB 1 was modeled.

[2:17:03 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG [made a motion] that the conceptual amendment be divided into Conceptual Amendment 1 and Conceptual Amendment 2, with Conceptual Amendment 1 being the proposed change to page 1, lines 4-6, and Conceptual Amendment 2 being the proposed change to page 2, line 6. There being no objection, the conceptual amendment was so divided.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG made a motion to adopt Conceptual Amendment 1 [original punctuation provided]:

Page 1, Line 4-6
Delete lines 4-6

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER objected.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG said it is generally the legislature's policy not to provide for short titles in uncodified law, and so unless there is a really important reason, regardless of the merits of the bill, he doesn't see a need for providing for a short title for HB 1.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER offered his understanding that this is the first time the legislature has done anything related to healthcare freedom, and shared his belief that to call the bill the [Alaska Health Freedom Act], therefore, implies that there may be more adjustments needed later on. He said it seems like retaining that provision wouldn't cause harm but could help.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG pointed out, though, that if [the bill] is called the Alaska Health Freedom Act, and it is subsequently added to, it could raise questions regarding whether any such addition still falls under the title, because currently it only addresses this one short policy.

CHAIR GATTO, indicating agreement with Representative Keller, surmised that if the bill is so added to, its short-title provision could be deleted at a later date.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG argued that the phrase, "Alaska Health Freedom Act" is not a neutral term and connotes that it is Alaska's very best policy for healthcare. So although people might agree with the substance of the bill, they might not agree that they want to have that kind of a slanted definition. Again, very rarely are bills given short titles. In conclusion, he ventured that removal of the short-title provision might render the bill less controversial.

[2:22:30 PM](#)

A roll call vote was taken. Representative Gruenberg voted in favor of Conceptual Amendment 1. Representatives Lynn, Keller, Pruitt, Thompson, and Gatto voted against it. Therefore, Conceptual Amendment 1 failed by a vote of 1-5.

[2:23:26 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON made a motion to adopt [Conceptual] Amendment 2 [original punctuation provided]:

Page 2, Line 6

Insert after health care provider (AS DEFINED IN SEC. 09.55.560)

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG objected for the purpose of discussion, and suggested that that definition be made available to members.

The committee took an at-ease from 2:24 p.m. to 2:27 p.m.

CHAIR GATTO noted that members now have a copy of AS 09.55.560(2), which read:

(2) "health care provider" means an acupuncturist licensed under AS 08.06; an audiologist or speech-language pathologist licensed under AS 08.11; a chiropractor licensed under AS 08.20; a dental

hygienist licensed under AS 08.32; a dentist licensed under AS 08.36; a nurse licensed under AS 08.68; a dispensing optician licensed under AS 08.71; a naturopath licensed under AS 08.45; an optometrist licensed under AS 08.72; a pharmacist licensed under AS 08.80; a physical therapist or occupational therapist licensed under AS 08.84; a physician or physician assistant licensed under AS 08.64; a podiatrist; a psychologist and a psychological associate licensed under AS 08.86; a hospital as defined in AS 47.32.900, including a governmentally owned or operated hospital; an employee of a health care provider acting within the course and scope of employment; an ambulatory surgical facility and other organizations whose primary purpose is the delivery of health care, including a health maintenance organization, individual practice association, integrated delivery system, preferred provider organization or arrangement, and a physical hospital organization;

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG expressed concern that AS 09.55.560(2) doesn't include midwives.

MS. SAWYER mentioned that another state used the term, "lawful" when referring to health care providers, rather than referencing a specific definition.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG said he prefers the approach taken by Amendment 2, since what may be considered "lawful" could change.

[2:30:07 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG, therefore, made a motion to conceptually amend Conceptual Amendment 2 such that it would include midwives. There being no objection, Conceptual Amendment 2 was conceptually amended to that effect.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG then removed his objection to the motion to adopt Conceptual Amendment 2.

CHAIR GATTO, noting that there were no further objections, relayed that Conceptual Amendment 2, as conceptually amended, was adopted.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG asked whether HB 1 does anything other than set a policy.

MS. SAWYER indicated that the bill is doing just that, setting a policy that the [legislature] believes in the right established by the Tenth Amendment, that being that the state has the right to regulate health insurance and healthcare services.

CHAIR GATTO, after ascertaining that no one else wished to testify, closed public testimony on HB 1.

[2:32:45 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON moved to report the proposed committee substitute (CS) for HB 1, Version 27-LS0006\B, Bailey, 4/1/11, as amended, out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes. There being no objection, CSHB 1(JUD) was reported from the House Judiciary Standing Committee.

[2:33:21 PM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Judiciary Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 2:33 p.m.