

2777

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

STEPHEN ALLEN KROMER,

Defendant.

CASE NO.: CR25-2208

DEPT. NO.: 4

ORDER REGARDING ELECTRONIC COVERAGE OF COURT PROCEEDINGS

This Court is in receipt of written request for electronic media coverage by Kenzie Margiott of KRNV/KOLO/KTVN to video and audio record the September 25, 2025 Arraignment Hearing filed on September 10, 2025. Additionally, the Court is in receipt of the written request for electronic media coverage by Alex Flaconi of Our Nevada Judges, Inc. to video and audio record the September 25, 2025 Arraignment Hearing filed on September 11, 2025. Further, the Court is in receipt of the written request for electronic coverage of court proceedings by Mark Robinson of Reno Gazette-Journal to photograph and audio record the Stephen Allen Kromer case without a specific hearing noted in the request. The Court has notified the parties of the requests for electronic media coverage. They have not made any objection.

///

///

///

///

Rules 229 – 246 of the Nevada Supreme Court Rules (hereinafter “NSCR”) govern electronic media coverage of court proceedings.¹ The Court notes that NSCR 230(2) states the following:

[u]nder these rules, there is a presumption that all courtroom proceedings that are open to the public are subject to electronic coverage. A judge shall make particularized findings on the record when determining whether electronic coverage will be allowed at a proceeding, in whole or in part. Specifically, the judge shall consider the following factors:

- (a) The impact of coverage upon the right of any party to a fair trial;
- (b) The impact of coverage upon the right of privacy of any party or witness;
- (c) The impact of coverage upon the safety and well-being of any party, witness or juror;
- (d) The likelihood that coverage would distract participants or would detract from the dignity of the proceedings;
- (e) The adequacy of the physical facilities of the court for coverage; and
- (f) Any other factor affecting the fair administration of justice.

NSCR 231 states the following:

1. If any news reporter fails to comply with the conditions prescribed by the judge, the judge may revoke that individual’s permission to provide electronic coverage of the proceeding.
2. This authorization may be revoked at any time without prior notice when, in the judge’s discretion, it appears that electronic coverage of the judicial proceedings is interfering in any way with the proper administration of justice.
3. If permission is revoked, the judge shall make particularized findings on the record.

NSCR 233 states the following:

1. Unless specifically authorized by the judge, no more than one television camera person and one still photographer should be taking pictures in the courtroom at any one time. If more than one news reporter has permission to participate, it is the responsibility of the news reporters to determine who will participate at any given time or, in the alternative, how they will pool their coverage. This understanding should be reached outside the courtroom and before the court session, and must be done without imposing on the court or court personnel. In the event that the news reporters cannot agree on who will participate, the judge shall select the pool camera that will be allowed to participate. Priority as the video pool camera should favor a media outlet that is televising an entire proceeding.
2. To be eligible to participate in a camera pool, a news reporter must apply prior to a court proceeding for appropriate permission pursuant to Rule 230(1).

///

///

¹ These rules are encompassed in “Part IV. Rules on Electronic Coverage of Court Proceedings” of NSCR.

1 3. Any pooling arrangements necessitated among the news reporters by these
2 limitations on equipment and personnel shall be the sole responsibility of the
3 news reporters and must be arranged prior to coverage without calling upon the
4 court to mediate any dispute regarding appropriate personnel or equipment. Every
5 effort must be made for the joint use of audio and photographic equipment within
6 the courtroom.

7 4. If pooling arrangements are employed, such data or information is to be
8 available equally to all pool participants in a generally accepted form or format,
9 and the pool representative shall charge no fees or expenses to the other pool
10 participants. The pool representative is not to be given any economic or coverage
11 advantage over the other pool participants. If costs are associated with
12 establishing media pool coverage, the costs should be shared among the pool
13 participants.

14 5. News reporters utilizing video or still cameras shall not utilize equipment
15 that produces distracting sounds. News reporters utilizing such equipment may
16 have their permission to video or photograph the proceeding revoked.

17 6. News reporters shall not interrupt a court proceeding with a technical or
18 equipment problem.

19 Having considered the non-opposition and the presumption that all courtroom
20 proceedings that are open to the public are subject to electronic coverage set forth in NSCR
21 230(2) and the factors delineated in NSCR 230(2), the Court finds it appropriate to allow media
22 coverage. The Court will presumptively grant Kenzie Margiott of KRNV/KOLO/KTVN's
23 written request for audio and video electronic media access – subject to revocation pursuant to
24 NSCR 231 and 233, as the first in time received request. The Court finds that if
25 KRNV/KOLO/KTVN do not cooperate in pooling with Alex Flaconi of Our Nevada Judges,
26 Inc., he could be substituted as manager of the pool and the other media required to secure
27 coverage from him. Further, they must also cooperate with the audio pooling for Reno Gazette-
28 Journal. Mark Robinson of the Reno Gazette-Journal will presumptively be granted permission
to be the pool photographer (not audio recorder) for the hearing set September 25, 2025.

 In this instance, three news media outlets have requested permission to video, audio, or
photographically record the proceedings. In order to avoid disruption of the proceedings and in
consideration of the adequacy of the physical facilities of the Court for coverage, the Court will
require, pursuant to NSCR 233, the representatives from KRNV/KOLO/KTVN, Our Nevada
Judges, Inc. and Reno Gazette-Journal, or any other media entity wanting to cover this case to
coordinate pooling arrangements amongst themselves. Any pooling arrangements must be made

1 prior to coverage. No more than one video camera, one audio recording, and one still camera
2 will be permitted in the courtroom at any time.

3 Based on the foregoing and good cause appearing,

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the request for electronic media access is presumptively
5 granted in accordance with NSCR 229-246, inclusive, and is subject to revocation pursuant to
6 NSCR 231.

7 IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the request for video and audio access of all
8 media will be pooled and managed by first in time applicant Kenzie Marigojott, so long as all
9 media may utilize pooling arrangements with KRNK/KOLO/KTVN.

10 IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that all pooling arrangements must be made
11 prior to the Court proceedings, and be managed to not exceed one video, one audio, and one still
12 photographer in the courtroom at any one time., pursuant to NSCR 233, the representatives
13 from KRNK/KOLO/KTVN, Our Nevada Judges, Inc., and Reno Gazette-Journal, or any other
14 media entity wanting to cover this case shall coordinate pooling arrangements amongst
15 themselves. Any pooling arrangements must be made prior to coverage.

16 IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that any electronic coverage equipment must be
17 in place in the courtroom no later than ten (10) minutes before the start of any proceeding and
18 may not be removed from the courtroom except during a natural break in proceedings. Both
19 video and still cameras may only be set up in an area designated by the Department 4 bailiff, and
20 no operator may use electronic equipment that produces distracting sounds.

21 DATED this 18 day of September, 2025.

22
23 
24 DISTRICT JUDGE
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

CASE NO. CR25-2208

I certify that I am an employee of the SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT of the STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF WASHOE; that on the 18 day of September, 2025, I filed the **ORDER REGARDING ELECTRONIC COVERAGE OF COURT PROCEEDINGS** with the Clerk of the Court.

I further certify that I transmitted a true and correct copy of the foregoing document by the method(s) noted below:

 Personal delivery to the following: [NONE]

 X **Electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court, using the eFlex system which constitutes effective service for all eFiled documents pursuant to the eFile User Agreement.**

MELISSA ROSENTHAL, ESQ. for STATE OF NEVADA
LAUREN GORMAN, ESQ. for STEPHEN ALLEN KROMER

 X **Transmitted document to the Second Judicial District Court mailing system in a sealed envelope for postage and mailing by Washoe County using the United States Postal Service in Reno, Nevada:**

Via Email: mbales@sbgtnv.com
Kenzie Margiott

Via Email: admin@ournevadajudges.com
Alex Falconi
Our Nevada Judges

Via Email: mrobison@rgj.com
Mark Robison
Reno Gazette Journal

 Placed a true copy in a sealed envelope for service via:

 Reno/Carson Messenger Service – [NONE]

 Federal Express or other overnight delivery service [NONE]

DATED this 18 day of September, 2025.

