STATE OF NEVADA  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
100 North Carson Street  
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717  

April 13, 2016  

ADAM PAUL LAXALT  
Attorney General  

WESLEY K. DUNCAN  
First Assistant Attorney General  

NICHOLAS A. TRUTANICH  
First Assistant Attorney General  

Via First Class Mail  

Linda A. Davies  
1291 16th Street East  
Ely, Nevada 89301  

Re: Open Meeting Law Complaint, A.G. File No. 13897-179  
Ely City Council  

Dear Ms. Davies:  

The Office of the Attorney General (OAG) is in receipt of your complaint alleging a violation of the Nevada Open Meeting Law (OML) by the Ely City Council (Council) at a public meeting held on January 14, 2016. In response to the complaint, the OAG reviewed the public notice and agenda for the meeting, the written minutes, and audio and video recordings of the meeting, together with a response from Ely City Attorney Charles Odgers.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND  

The complaint alleges that Mayor Melody VanCamp failed to remove a member of the public during the Council's January 14, 2016, meeting for several verbal outbursts that included profanity and were not confined to periods devoted to public comment. The member of the public who uttered these outbursts was Gary Tull, the husband of Mayor VanCamp. Mr. Tull was admonished for his outbursts but was not removed from the meeting.

The agenda for the meeting provided for public comment at the beginning and at the end of the meeting, and specified that:

[The] public body may prohibit comment if the content of the comments is a topic that is not relevant to, or within the authority of, the public body, or if the content of the comments is willfully disruptive of the meeting by being irrelevant, repetitious, slanderous, offensive, inflammatory, irrational, or amounting to personal attacks or interfering with the rights of other speakers.
The complaint also alleges violations of NRS 281A.202(1), NRS 281A.420(1) and NRS 241A.500. These are provisions of the Nevada Ethics in Government Law, NRS Chapter 281A. The Commission on Ethics enforces these provisions and the OAG does not have jurisdiction over ethics violations; therefore those allegations are not addressed in this response.

**DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS**

The OML does not "[p]revent the removal of any person who willfully disrupts a meeting to the extent that its orderly conduct is made impractical." NRS 241.030(4)(a); see also Kindt v. Santa Monica Rent Control Bd., 67 F.3d 266 (9th Cir. 1995). A public body has a legitimate interest in conducting orderly meetings. Public bodies may adopt reasonable restrictions to ensure the orderly conduct of a public meeting and orderly behavior on the part of persons attending the meeting.¹

However, nothing in the OML requires that a member of the public be removed for disruptive behavior, even when removal would be lawful. The decision whether to remove a person for disrupting a public meeting in such instances is left to the discretion of the presiding officer. See White v. City of Norwalk, 900 F.2d 1421, 1426 (9th Cir. 1990). Mayor VanCamp's restraint in not removing Mr. Tull from the January 14th Council meeting was not a violation of the OML.

**CONCLUSION**

No violation of the OML occurred; the OAG will be closing its file on this matter.

Sincerely,

ADAM PAUL LAXALT
Attorney General

By: ____________

BRETT KARI
Chief Deputy Attorney General
100 North Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717
Telephone: (775) 684-1201

WBK/klr
cc: Melody VanCamp, Ely Mayor
    Charles Odgers, Ely City Attorney

¹ NRS 241.020(2)(d)(7) requires that an agenda include "[a]ny restrictions on comments by the general public. Any such restrictions must be reasonable and may restrict the time, place and manner of the comments, but may not restrict comments based upon viewpoint."