Chris Karsaz

ckarsaz@karsaz-law.com

November 30, 2022

Via Email to Clerk of the Court: nvscclerk@nvcourts.nv.gov

Chief Justice Ron Parraguirre Nevada Supreme Court 201 South Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-4702

Re:

AKDT 602 and ADKT 603

Dear Chief Justice Parraguirre:

I provide these comments in my capacity as an Officer of the Court in hopes of raising serious concerns regarding the perception of bias in the creation of the Eviction Diversion Program (EDP).

"An independent, fair and impartial judiciary is indispensable to our system of justice. The United States legal system is based upon the principle that an independent, impartial, and competent judiciary, composed of men and women of integrity, will interpret and apply the law that governs our society. Thus, the judiciary plays a central role in preserving the principles of justice and the rule of law. Inherent in all the Rules contained in this Code are the precepts that judges, individually and collectively, must respect and honor the judicial office as a public trust and strive to maintain and enhance confidence in the legal system."

These are the first lines of the Code of Judicial Conduct. As an Officer of the Court, I call upon the greatest judicial body in our State to commission a study to determine whether these precepts were compromised in the crafting of the Eviction Diversion Program.

The grant of monies from Wells Fargo, or any other corporation, does not imbue any branch of government with more powers than the Constitution, and judiciary's prime directive is to delineate the limits of power for all branches of government, including its own.

I believe that the very process of crafting the Eviction Diversion Program was an ethical and legal quagmire:

1. It allowed judicial officers to assume the role of policymakers, instead of impartial arbiters of disputes.

FILED

DEC 01 2022

- 2. It forced advocates to lobby against policies espoused by the very arbiters of their cases, resulting in concerns about retribution and the proper exercise of power.
- 3. It created the serious perception that the judiciary was biased in favor of one side of unlawful detainer disputes.
- 4. It highlighted the unique power that Legal Aid, an advocate for one side of unlawful detainer disputes, has over the judicial system.
- 5. It fostered the belief that politics in an election year controlled the drafting of the proposals.

The end product placed before your Honors shows that the statute enacted by the Nevada legislature is being contravened. However, the process through which this final draft was created is even more troubling:

- 1. When representatives of the apartment industry voiced concerns about due process and separation of powers, we were sidelined.
- 2. When we asked to be allowed to provide feedback on future drafts, we were ignored.
- 3. When we voiced opposition to the measures, it was announced publicly that we supported it.
- 4. While the entire process was celebrated as an open collaboration, it lacked transparency and was controlled by a few.
- 5. Even though we believed that the matter would be afforded due process through a public hearing before the Nevada Supreme Court on December 7, 2022, it was announced that the program would be launched November 1, 2022.

By raising these concerns, I hope to expose your Honors to the perceptions of not only myself, but many. More than two thousand people have signed a Petition against these measures.

While I do not pretend to have all of the facts needed for you to determine the propriety of the process which created these measures, I will make all of my information available to you. And, while I cannot know how you will rule on these concerns, I beg that you view them as legitimate concerns worthy of examination. In doing so, I submit that your Honors will respect and honor the judicial office as a public trust and strive to maintain and enhance confidence in the legal system.

Sincerely,

Chris Karsaz, Esq. An Officer of the Court