

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

March 16, 2004 LB 1084

information that the perpetrator uses to commit the offense?

SENATOR ERDMAN: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If that person knows the information is false, how can that exist without there being an intent to defraud? If you prove the knowledge, are you at the same time proving an intent to defraud? That's what I'm asking you.

SENATOR ERDMAN: I believe you would be. But it does say that no proof of specific intent to defraud is required. So you could prove that the individual had specific intent to defraud, but it's not required...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Time.

SENATOR ERDMAN: ...under this act in order for the charges to be levied.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Senator Chambers, you may continue.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, what Senator Erdman said is correct. You don't have to prove it, but you may. Now, you actually don't have to prove actual knowledge, the way this language is structured, do you? Or do you? Here's what I'm getting at. These elements are not connected by the word "and," meaning that they must all be there, but there is "or." But what they're giving here is a definition of knowing or knowingly. It could mean has actual knowledge of the information, acting in deliberate ignorance of the truth or falsity of the information, or acting in reckless disregard. So it means any one of those would be sufficient to qualify you as somebody who knows or knowingly does whatever it is that you do. So if a person is acting in deliberate ignorance, it's clear that that person lacks actual knowledge. Would you agree?

SENATOR ERDMAN: Yeah, that would (inaudible)...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, by definition of the term they're using.