



1 LUKE A. BUSBY, ESQ.
2 SBN 10319
3 316 California Ave.
4 Reno, Nevada 89509
5 775-453-0112
6 luke@lukeandrewbusbyltd.com
7 Attorney for Our Nevada Judges, Inc.

8 **DISTRICT COURT**
9 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**
10 **FAMILY DIVISION**

<p>11 In the Matter of the Guardianship of 12 PALMER PRINCE,</p> <p>13 A Proposed Protected Minor. _____ /</p>	<p>14 CASE NO: G-24-060266-M 15 DEPT NO: U</p> <p>16 <u>RESPONSE TO OBJECTION TO</u> 17 <u>BROADCAST, RECORD,</u> 18 <u>PHOTOGRAPH, OR TELEWISE</u></p>
--	--

19 *Appearance via Simultaneous Audiovisual Transmission Equipment*

20 COMES NOW, Our Nevada Judges, Inc., a Nevada non-profit corporation, by
21 and through the undersigned counsel, and hereby files the following response to the
22 *Objection to Broadcast, Record, Photograph, or Telewise* filed July 19, 2024.

23 This response is based upon the following memorandum of points and
24 authorities, and the exhibits attached hereto.

25 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

26 Alexander Falconi is an SCR 229(1)(c) news reporter who directs Our Nevada
27 Judges, Inc. ('ONJ'), a Nevada non-profit corporation recognized by the IRS as a
28 Section 501(c)(3) organization.

The Objectors appear to conflate physical and camera access at points, but
judging by their concerns and the title of their objection, the camera coverage of the
proposed guardians and child are the actual catalyst of their objection. To the extent

1 Objectors and this Court assert otherwise, it has been held that generic,
2 non-extraordinary circumstances of a domestic nature do not provide a sufficient
3 basis with which to justify barring physical access of a courtroom:
4

5 We acknowledge that there is an interest in protecting litigants'
6 privacy rights in family law proceedings, as those proceedings
7 apply wholly to their private lives. See, e.g., *In re Marriage of*
8 *Burkle*, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 807-18 (Ct. App. 2006). However, a
9 litigant's privacy interests do not automatically overcome the
10 press's and the public's right to access court proceedings. In
11 fact, the majority of jurisdictions to have considered this issue
12 have concluded that when there are no extraordinary
13 circumstances present, the public's right to access family law
14 proceedings outweighs the litigants' privacy interests.

15 *Falconi, v. Eighth Judicial District Court*, 140 Nev., Advanced Opinion 8 (2024). The
16 *Falconi* Court also relied upon *Del Papa v. Steffen*, 112 Nev. 369, 374, 915 P.2d 245,
17 249 (1996), in pointing out not only the positive benefits of “open court proceedings”
18 but, conversely, “the threat that secret judicial proceedings pose to public
19 confidence in this court and the judiciary;” namely, that “secrecy encourages
20 misunderstanding, distrust, and disrespect for the courts.” *Id.* To the extent that the
21 tragedy that has occurred in this case may push the needle in the direction of
22 closure, that same tragedy is precisely what has generated extraordinary public
23 interest in the cases connected to the killing of Ashley Prince. The issue here is not
24 that ONJ intends to make a “spectacle” out of the case, but rather, that a genuine
25 public interest exists in the case, and that ONJ seeks to serve the public consistent
26 with the Supreme Court’s educational and informational mandate. SCR 241(1). “It is
27 not unrealistic even in this day to believe that public inclusion affords citizens a form
28 of legal education and hopefully promotes confidence in the fair administration of

1 justice." *State v. Schmit*, 273 Minn. 78, 87-88, 139 N. W. 2d 800, 807 (1966).
2 "Instead of acquiring information about trials by firsthand observation or by word of
3 mouth from those who attended, people now acquire it chiefly through the print and
4 electronic media. In a sense, this validates the media claim of functioning as
5 surrogates for the public." *Richmond Newspapers*, 448 U. S. 525, 573 (1980).
6

7 What is truly at issue here, and what triggered the objection in the first place,
8 is the request to deploy high-definition cameras to the courtroom. Thus, this Court
9 should look at the objection through the lens of an objection to an SCR 229(1)(c)
10 news reporter's SCR 230(1) request. See also *Solid v Eighth Judicial District Court*,
11 133 Nev. 118, 393 P.3d 666 (2017). If physical access to the proceedings are
12 available, camera access is presumed. SCR 230(1). The Court must consider the
13 SCR 230(2) factors in determining what restrictions, if any, should be imposed. ONJ
14 is not interested in recording the faces of the children. As is standard policy for ONJ,
15 only the attorneys and the judge are typically filmed. Certain witnesses may also be
16 visually blurred, depending on their role; typically, expert witnesses and government
17 employees are not visually blurred. Certain witnesses in this case may have already
18 conducted television interviews and should likewise not be visually blurred. To the
19 extent the child must testify, ONJ would agree to turning the camera off for the
20 portion of the child's testimony. Ultimately, the Court should consider the SCR
21 230(2) factors in determining which restrictions to impose. See also SCR 240(1).
22
23
24

25 Forbidding camera access of these proceedings does not actually thwart
26 media coverage but weakens the accuracy of the public's perception of the
27 operation of the court. The Supreme Court does not allow a denial to occur without
28

1 the evidentiary support and the proper exercise of discretion, as contemplated by
2 the *Solid Court*. "People in an open society do not demand infallibility from their
3 institutions, but it is difficult for them to accept what they are prohibited from
4 observing." *Richmond Newspapers*, 448 U. S., at 572.
5

6 **NRS 239B.030(4) AFFIRMATION**

7 Pursuant to NRS 239B.030 the undersigned hereby affirms that this document
8 does not contain the social security number of any person.

9 **DATED** this Jul 21, 2024

10
11 By: /s/ Luke Busby _____
12 LUKE A. BUSBY, ESQ.
13 Nevada Bar No. 10319
14 316 California Ave.
15 Reno, Nevada 89509
16 775-453-0112
17 luke@lukeandrewbusbyltd.com
18 *Attorney for the Our Nevada Judges*
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DECLARATION OF ALEXANDER FALCONI

I, Alexander M. Falconi, declare that I have read the forgoing *Response* and that the contents are true and correct of my own personal knowledge, except for those matters I have stated that are not of my own personal knowledge, but that I only believe them to be true, and as for those matters, I do believe they are true.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

EXECUTED this Jul 21, 2024



Alexander M. Falconi
205 N. Stephanie St.
Suite D#170
Henderson, NV 89074
Our Nevada Judges
admin@ournevadajudges.com

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I certify that on the date shown below, I caused service to be completed of a
3 true and correct copy of the foregoing document by:

4 _____ personally delivering;

5 _____ delivery via Reno/Carson Messenger Service;

6 _____ sending via Federal Express (or other overnight delivery service);

7 _____ depositing for mailing in the U.S. mail, with sufficient postage affixed thereto;

8 or,

9
10
11 x delivery via electronic means (fax, eflex, NEF, etc.) to:

12 Jason Naimi, Esq.
13 Amanda Connor
14 Megan McDonald
15 Marina Dalia-Hunt, Esq.
16 Julie A Fox
17 Austrey T. Dwiggin
18 Dana A. Dwiggin
19 Ross E. Evans
20 Laura A. Deeter, Esq.
21 Zuri Mendoza
22 Amy Robinson

23
24
25
26
27
28
DATED this Jul 21, 2024

By: /s/ Luke Busby