

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

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

<p>10 In the Matter of THE DOE 1 TRUST,</p> <p>11 _____/</p>	<p>CASE NO: PR23-00813 DEPT NO: PR</p>
--	--

12 **OBJECTION TO PROBATE COMMISSIONER’S RECOMMENDATION**

13 COMES NOW, Our Nevada Judges, Inc., a Nevada non-profit corporation  
14 (“ONJ”), by and through the undersigned counsel, and hereby files an objection to  
15 the Probate Commissioner’s Recommendation<sup>1</sup> filed August 19, 2024.

16 This objection is based upon the following memorandum of points and  
17 authorities.  
18

19 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

20 **The Proceedings Have Been Unconstitutionally Closed**

21 The press has a constitutional right of access to civil proceedings, and such  
22 proceedings are *presumed* open to the public. *Falconi v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 140  
23 Nev., Adv. Op. 8, 543 P.3d 92, 97 (2024).  
24  
25  
26

27 <sup>1</sup> Although the order in question is titled *Request and Order re Electronic Coverage of*  
28 *Court Proceedings*, it is signed by the Probate Commissioner and subject to review by  
the Probate Judge in accordance with WDCR 57.3.

1 The Probate Commissioner cites an existing order in this case closing all  
2 hearings filed January 26, 2024 as justification for denial of camera access. In  
3 essence, the Commissioner cites the same rationale considered and rejected by the  
4 *Falconi Court* in the context of domestic relations matters; that a statute may permit  
5 the automatic closure of court proceedings without a requirement for a party  
6 seeking closure to show a compelling interest and that closure be narrowly tailored  
7 to serve that compelling interest. The aforementioned order, which ONJ has not  
8 seen because the order itself is also sealed<sup>2</sup>, according to the Probate  
9 Commissioner's recommendation, relies upon NRS 164.041 and NRS 669A.256.  
10 These statutes, however, do not trump overriding First Amendment issues anymore  
11 than NRS 125.080 did in the *Falconi* matter; statutes categorically and arbitrarily<sup>3</sup>  
12 barring physical access to domestic relations matters are as unavailing as a basis to  
13 categorically and arbitrarily bar physical access to trust proceedings.  
14  
15

16  
17 We take this opportunity to expand our discussion in *Stephens*  
18 *Media*, which concluded that there is a right to access criminal  
19 proceedings, and hold that the right to access also applies in civil  
20 proceedings, including family law proceedings.

21 *Falconi v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct., Id* at 97.

22 The *Falconi Court* reiterated “there is no reason to distinguish family law  
23 proceedings from civil proceedings[.]” *Id.* The Probate Commissioners concern  
24 about potentially exposing the identities and financial information of beneficiaries  
25

---

26 <sup>2</sup> The Supreme Court Rules prohibit the paradoxical practice of sealing a sealing order.  
27 SRCR 3(5)(c)(vi).

28 <sup>3</sup> A statute or rule providing that a party’s mere invocation or demand would trigger  
closure of the court was categorically rejected by the *Falconi Court*. The same analysis  
applies to NRS 164.041 and NRS 669A.256.

1 and other family members is just as baseless in family law situations as it is in this  
2 particular trust-related case - both are simply civil cases which are not exempt from  
3 constitutional requirements.

4  
5 [T]here is an interest in protecting litigants' privacy rights in family law  
6 proceedings as those proceedings apply wholly to their private lives,  
7 as is the case here." See, e.g., *In re Marriage of Burkle*, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d  
8 805, 807-18 (Ct. App. 2006). However, a litigant's privacy interests do  
9 not automatically overcome the press's and the public's right to  
10 access court proceedings under the First Amendment. In fact, the  
11 majority of jurisdictions to have considered this issue have concluded  
12 that when there are no extraordinary circumstances present, the  
13 public's right to access family law proceedings outweighs the litigants'  
14 privacy interests.

15  
16 *Falconi v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, Id.* at 98.

17  
18 [E]very federal circuit court that has considered the issue has  
19 concluded that the constitutional right applies in both criminal and civil  
20 proceedings. *Courthouse News Serv. v. Planet (Planet III)*, 947 F.3d 581,  
21 590 (9th Cir. 2020) (citing to multiple cases, including cases that  
22 recognize the same).

23  
24 *Falconi v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, Id.* at 96.

25  
26 The Probate Commissioner's Recommendation does not make particularized  
27 findings on the nebulous safety and confidentiality concerns raised, and does not  
28 conduct the "strict scrutiny" analysis<sup>4</sup> mandated by the *Falconi Court*. The  
Legislature's intentions in closing cases involving trusts, however, is no more  
relevant than its intentions in codifying NRS 125.080 closing certain family law  
proceedings, which was found to be unconstitutional by the *Falconi* court as the

---

<sup>4</sup> Statutes and rules are unconstitutional that "permit closure of family court proceedings without granting the district court discretion to determine whether the closure is narrowly tailored to serve a compelling interest[.]" *Falconi v. Eighth Judicial District Court, Id.* at 96.

1 United States Constitution is the supreme Law of the Land. U.S. Const. art. VI, § 2  
2 that may not be circumvented by the Nevada Legislature.

3 The Nevada Supreme Court did not strike down NRS 125.080 lightly. There are  
4 profound reasons that go far beyond the interests of Parties that serve as a  
5 counterweight in favor of public access. The *Falconi Court* cited *Press-Enterprise*  
6 *Co. v. Superior Ct.*, 478 U.S. 1, 8 (1986) in referencing the two-pronged First  
7 Amendment analysis, within which are a number of important observations, the  
8 most relevant of which is the lack of a jury. The *Press-Enterprise Court* recognized  
9 efforts to rely on the lack of a jury to distinguish from other precedents allowing  
10 public access; however, in doing so, the majority not only soundly rejected the basis  
11 but countered that “the absence of a jury...makes the importance of public access  
12 to a preliminary hearing even more significant” because the jury is “an inestimable  
13 safeguard against the corrupt or overzealous prosecutor and against the complaint,  
14 biased, or eccentric judge.” Public complaints of “compliant” and “biased” judges  
15 can be weighed when the public and press have access to Court proceedings, and  
16 “one of the important means of assuring a fair trial is that the process be open to  
17 neutral observers” because the “interests [of parties’ and the public] are not  
18 necessarily inconsistent.” The *Falconi Court* also relied upon *Del Papa v. Steffen*,  
19 112 Nev. 369, 374, 915 P.2d 245, 249 (1996), in pointing out not only the positive  
20 benefits of “open court proceedings” but conversely “the threat that secret judicial  
21 proceedings pose to public confidence in this court and the judiciary.” Namely, that  
22 “secrecy encourages misunderstanding, distrust, and disrespect for the courts.” *Id.*  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Even if this Court came to the conclusion that NRS 164.041 and NRS  
2 669A.256 conferred the discretion to close these proceedings, NRS 164.041(3) and  
3 NRS 669A.256(2) can also confer discretion enabling the *Falconi Court's* strict  
4 scrutiny analysis to occur. Compare *Falconi v. Sec'y of Nev.*, 129 Nev. 260, 299 P.3d  
5 378 (2013) (relying upon NRS 217.464(2)(b) to shoehorn in the constitutional  
6 principles necessary to save the statutory scheme.) Even if this Court does not  
7 strike down the statutes relied upon to close the Court, it would still be compelled to  
8 interpret the law in a way that would allow for the Constitutional analysis to occur.  
9 This is because “[w]hen the language of a statute admits of two constructions, one  
10 of which would render it constitutional and valid and the other unconstitutional and  
11 void, that construction should be adopted which will save the statute.” *State v.*  
12 *Castaneda*, 126 Nev. 478, 481, 245 P.3d 550, 553 (2010).

13  
14  
15 This Court should reject the Probate Commissioner’s recommendations  
16 categorically refusing to open the court to the public absent an identified  
17 compelling interest in closure and narrowly tailored restrictions that serve that  
18 particular interest.  
19

20 **The Probate Commissioner Exceeded His Discretion In Analyzing the Camera**  
21 **Access Rules**  
22

23 From the courtroom to the living room, public access and press coverage  
24 builds legal literacy and judicial trust: "It is not unrealistic even in this day to believe  
25 that public inclusion affords citizens a form of legal education and hopefully  
26 promotes confidence in the fair administration of justice." *State v. Schmit*, 273 Minn.  
27 78, 87-88, 139 N. W. 2d 800, 807 (1966). "Instead of acquiring information about  
28

1 trials by firsthand observation or by word of mouth from those who attended, people  
2 now acquire it chiefly through the print and electronic media. In a sense, this  
3 validates the media claim of functioning as surrogates for the public.” *Richmond*  
4 *Newspapers*, 448 U. S. 525, 573 (1980).  
5

6 Nevada’s Supreme Court has bravely and fully embraced transparency, court  
7 access, and freedom of the press in its rules directing how Nevada courts are to be  
8 administered and in its cases interpreting the law. “[T]here is a presumption that all  
9 courtroom proceedings that are open to the public are subject to electronic  
10 coverage.” SCR 230(2). “This is especially important in a state where citizens elect  
11 their judges because it ensures that the public has the necessary knowledge to  
12 serve as a check on the judicial branch on election day.” *Falconi v. Eighth Judicial*  
13 *Dist. Court*, *Id.* at 98.  
14

15 The Probate Commissioner’s reliance on SCR 230(2)(b) is reasonable but,  
16 misapplied and in excess of his discretion. This is because the rules of electronic  
17 coverage concern the use of a camera. In other words, the mere information or  
18 knowledge that certain persons will appear at the hearing do not serve as a  
19 justification to deny camera access, and instead are properly before a probate  
20 commissioner under the strict scrutiny analysis required by the *Falconi Court*.  
21 Instead, SCR 230(2)(b) concerns itself with the video and audio footage recorded by  
22 the camera itself. It would certainly be within the discretion of a court to bar  
23 electronic coverage of certain persons apparently in some unusual danger due to  
24 being recorded, but the same camera could and should still be used to record  
25 arguments between counsel and the judge or commissioner himself. This is  
26  
27  
28

1 consistent with the Supreme Court’s educational and informational mandate. SCR  
2 241(1). Sweeping exclusions of camera access to court proceedings is inconsistent  
3 with SCR 230 and the *Falconi* decision.

4  
5 For these several reasons, this Court should conduct an SCR 230(2) analysis  
6 or remand to the Probate Commissioner with instructions to conduct the analysis in  
7 accordance with *Solid v Eighth Judicial District Court*, 133 Nev. 118, 393 P.3d 666  
8 (2017) and *Falconi*. Particularized findings should be made to determine which  
9 witnesses are apparently in danger of being recorded by camera, and the  
10 proceedings should otherwise be open to the public and recorded. *Id.*

11  
12 **Conclusion**

13 "People in an open society do not demand infallibility from their institutions,  
14 but it is difficult for them to accept what they are prohibited from observing."  
15 *Richmond Newspapers*, 448 U. S., at 572.

16 WHEREFORE, Our Nevada Judges hereby requests this Court reject the  
17 probate commissioner’s recommendation and open the proceedings consistent  
18 with the *Falconi Court’s* mandate, and allow camera access consistent with the  
19 camera access presumption in SCR 230(2).

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

22 **DATED** this Aug 21, 2024  
23  
24 By:  /s/ Luke Busby  
25 LUKE A. BUSBY, ESQ.  
26 Nevada Bar No. 10319  
27 316 California Ave.  
28 Reno, Nevada 89509  
775-453-0112  
[luke@lukeandrewbusbyltd.com](mailto:luke@lukeandrewbusbyltd.com)  
*Attorney for Our Nevada Judges, Inc.*

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

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

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

- \_\_\_\_\_ personally delivering;
- \_\_\_\_\_ delivery via Reno/Carson Messenger Service;
- \_\_\_\_\_ sending via Federal Express (or other overnight delivery service);
- \_\_\_\_\_ depositing for mailing in the U.S. mail, with sufficient postage affixed thereto;

or,

\_\_\_\_\_ delivery via electronic means (fax, eflex, NEF, etc.) to:

NAMES OF COUNSEL WITHHELD FROM COURT DOCKET

**DATED** this Aug 21, 2024

By:       /s/ Luke Busby