

March 3, 2013

Nevada State Legislature
Members of the Nevada Legislature
401 S. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701-4747

Nevadans for Civil Liberties
info@nevadans-for-civil-liberties.org

RE: 120 Stories in 120 Days, Story 3, a continuation of Story 1

Honorable Senate and Assembly Members,

Story 3

I would like to continue the story of the first visit to my home by Officer Howald and Officer Avilla. In summary, I am the spouse of an offender, who has never committed a crime. I retain all of my constitutional rights, as well as all of the protections of the Nevada Revised Statutes, and the Policies and Procedures of the Division of Parole and Probation. I am a citizen and registered voter of the State of Nevada. I am a professional in my field who has earned a Bachelor's and dual Master's Degrees and I am board certified in my profession.

At the end of Officer Howald's and Officer Avilla's lengthy first visit to my home, I specifically asked her what she might need from my husband and me concerning the business/leisure trip to Maui that my family and I were planning. I explained to her what we had done in the past with previous Officers and she said that she would probably approve and give my husband his travel pass providing nothing occurred prior to that time. She then told me to book our tickets, reservations for my conference, hotel, etc. She added that I could contact her at any time if I needed to in regards to this issue.

Shortly after this my husband was able to finalize his "pee test" by urinating. Obviously he passed as the test does not check for alcohol levels as related to you previously in Story 2 and both officers left. At that time I felt some sense of resolution to some of my concerns by Officer Howald and believed Officer Avilla would actually revise the documentation in my husband's file to include previous changes and the correct conditions, though I do not know if this has ever been done, as no one has followed up on any of these issues with me or my family.

As is my practice, on June 1, 2010, I followed up on this issue of a family business vacation and graduation present for my daughter by asking for a written response from Officer Howald to my request prior to booking any of the tickets, hotels and rental cars for our family trip. I never did receive a response from Officer Howald, and at my husband's next life time supervision visit to Officer Howald's office she told him that she was not going to give me anything in writing and that 'this' was his responsibility to ask

here about and do. I know that my husband turned in the appropriate paperwork on his and our behalf as he is expected to do so and that this was a confirmation and a request from me, which she had offered to reply to and do for me during the first home visit by her. This is a direct lack of courtesy by this Officer.

I believe that Officer Howald's intimidation and coercion continued with my husband. Upon picking up his approved travel pass on approximately June 29, 2010, she held his travel pass in her hand with a copy of revised rules to his life time supervision agreement and the ability to appear before the board to contest it. I am not an attorney but that appears to me to be coercion.

At the very least, this is intimidation and harassment and I believe that my husband signed those papers foregoing his legal ability to attend the hearing to object to this change of conditions under duress. He did this in order to keep from losing a large sum of money for our family and our daughter's graduation present. I am not sure I would have done the same or asked him to do so had I known about this prior to his signing the above documentation.

I believe that she did this to our family in direct retaliation to me for her interpretation of being defensive and questioning her motives in regards to the "pee test", and for stating that I did not agree with her in breaching my confidentiality concerns relating to my husband and my therapist.

As you will see in the following story, I will define the condition and the circumstances for the condition change which Officer Howald instituted with the approval of Sergeant Diek of the Division of Parole and Probation. We later came to find out in discussions with other family members of offenders that the Division and many of the Officers also tried to and did impose this same condition upon offenders, with no specific danger to any child or any testimony relating to any issues. They only wished to further punish an offender and make the situation harder for an offender and his/her family to deal with. This also goes against the Policy and Procedure of the Division, And to top it all off, it violates their own Mission Statement, where they specifically state that they wish to "

Please continue to follow along and see what you think of these issues.

Thank you for your time in regards to my family and our concerns.

Sincerely,

A founding member of Nevadans for Civil Liberties