

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

February 10, 1997 LB 68

Court modifies it in some way. It takes away from the appellate court the power to change an earlier decision and replace it with a later decision that would become precedent. So now to try to state that simply, if I can. The early decision says you pronounce t-o-m-a-t-o, tomato, the later decision says it is pronounced "tomoto", well, the later decision cannot change the earlier decision so it is pronounced tomato and "tomoto". If we are dealing with words, it makes no difference, but if we are talking about a legal principle, then the first articulated position of the court is precedent and it binds the lower courts. The later opinion decision is also precedent. Since they contradict each other, the courts are bound by both those decisions even though they contradict. So another problem is thereby demonstrated. The appellate court sits by division, three judges over here, three judges over there. You have Panel A that reaches one decision, you have Panel B that reaches a contrary decision. Both are binding on the lower courts even though they contradict. If you choose to accept what I am offering, we will strike this language from the statute. Many of those who supported this language acknowledged that it probably constitutes a violation of the principle of separation of powers. It is the Legislature trying to tell the State Supreme Court how to conduct its business. The adoption of the amendment was supposed to send "a message" to the Supreme Court. I don't think that is a wise way to legislate. Some of you may decide that once the foot of a person has stepped into something which is odious, the stepper should stay there. I cannot lose in this situation. If you reject this language, you keep in the books a provision that is self-contradictory, that is unworkable, that confuses,...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...a memorandum opinion with a decision, and there is no way it can stand. So if you accept or reject what I'm offering, the court, the Nebraska Supreme Court is not going to be dictated to by this language. I am going to listen to the discussion, and if anybody has any question, I will answer it. I realize that the way I explained it may not have been the clearest because the issue, itself, is not very clear, but further discussion, I am sure, can make it at least understandable by most of us.