



STATE OF NEVADA PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE

MEETING MATERIALS

Meeting Date and Time: July 22, 2026, 1:00 PM

1. Written Public Comment received as of July 21, 2026

A person may submit comments to be attached to the minutes of the meeting, in writing, one business day before the meeting date, in addition to testifying in person, or in lieu of testifying in person. Written comments are limited to two pages. The attached written comments were submitted electronically by email at AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov.

From: [Jared M. Frost](#)
To: [Leslie M. Nino Piro](#)
Subject: FW: Input for Public Records Task Force
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 2:37:14 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-A picture .png](#)

More input for the Task Force.

Jared M. Frost
Senior Deputy Attorney General
Transportation Division - DMV/DPS
702-486-3177
jfrost@ag.nv.gov

From: Kristi Defer <kdefer@dps.state.nv.us>
Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 2:25 PM
To: Jared M. Frost <JFrost@ag.nv.gov>
Cc: Gordon R. Goolsby <GGoolsby@ag.nv.gov>; George Togliatti <gtogliatti@dps.state.nv.us>; Melissa Sabatini <msabatini@dps.state.nv.us>; John Fansler <jfansler@dps.state.nv.us>
Subject: Re: Input for Public Records Task Force

Good afternoon Jared,

Thank you for forwarding the information and requesting input from DPS.

From a Department of Public Safety perspective, we would encourage the Task Force to consider several issues unique to public safety agencies:

- Clarification regarding records associated with active criminal, administrative, intelligence, and threat assessment investigations.
- Increased guidance regarding body-worn camera, dash camera, and other digital evidence requests, including recovery of reasonable costs associated with review and redaction.
- Development of a process for handling extraordinarily burdensome records requests requiring significant agency resources.
- Expanded protections for security-sensitive information, including critical infrastructure, emergency response plans, dignitary protection operations, and law enforcement tactical or operational records.
- Clear statutory guidance regarding electronic communications, including text messages, Teams messages, and other collaboration platforms.
- Additional protections for personal identifying information of public safety employees where disclosure could create safety concerns.
- Greater consistency regarding response timelines for complex requests that require extensive legal review and redaction.

In addition, DPS believes there should be further discussion regarding how to balance government transparency with the growing operational burden associated with public records requests. DPS fully supports public access to government records and recognizes the importance of transparency and accountability. However, public safety agencies are increasingly receiving large-scale requests for electronic communications, video footage, datasets, and other records that require significant staff time to locate, review, redact, and produce.

In many cases, these requests appear to be made for commercial purposes, social media content generation, data aggregation, or other uses that are not directly related to increasing public understanding of government operations. Unlike many other jurisdictions, Nevada agencies have limited ability to recover the actual costs associated with fulfilling these requests. As a result, agencies must divert existing staff and resources away from core public safety functions to respond to increasingly complex requests.

DPS has sought additional resources to assist with public records compliance but, like many agencies, continues to face resource constraints. We encourage the Task Force to explore options that preserve transparency while recognizing the significant workload associated with large or complex requests. Potential considerations could include reasonable cost recovery for requests requiring substantial staff time, extensive redaction, or production of large volumes of digital records, as well as consideration of whether requests made for commercial purposes should be treated differently than those made in the public interest.

Public records compliance is an important function of government; however, agencies should not be forced to choose between responding to large-scale records requests and carrying out critical public safety missions. We believe there is an opportunity to improve the current framework in a manner that protects both transparency and the efficient delivery of government services.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback and would be happy to discuss any of these issues further as the Task Force continues its work.

Thank you,



Kristi Defer, CPM
Deputy Director
Department of Public Safety
Nevada State Police | Director's Office
555 Wright Way, Carson City, NV 89711
T: 775-684-4556 | C: 775-431-7276 | E: kdefer@dps.state.nv.us
Find Careers at www.NevadaStatePolice.com

From: Jared M. Frost <JFrost@ag.nv.gov>

Sent: Monday, June 1, 2026 8:37 AM

To: Kristi Defer <kdefer@dps.state.nv.us>

Cc: Gordon R. Goolsby <GGoolsby@ag.nv.gov>

Subject: Input for Public Records Task Force

Hello DD Defer,

The OAG's general counsel has requested input for upcoming Public Records Task Force meetings on changes your agency would like to see in the NPRA. The attached materials from a meeting in April outline issues other government entities have flagged for discussion. I've also attached minutes from the first meeting in February that includes more information about the composition of the group. Thanks and let me know if you and your team have comments you would like me to pass along.

Kind regards,

Jared M. Frost
Senior Deputy Attorney General
Transportation Division - DMV/DPS
702-486-3177
jfrost@ag.nv.gov

From: [WatchDogJeff](#)
To: [Jeffrey Church](#)
Cc: [Jeffrey Church](#)
Subject: A Good Public Doc Example
Date: Monday, June 8, 2026 10:04:15 AM

WARNING - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

(The PDR Task Force is meeting now, Monday morning, excellent presentations worth review)

This was discovered by a citizen and only after a battle to make such records public, just a typical example (I am a former SDSO Deputy and am in San Diego now for Padres so I should get the sympathy vote):

San Diego Sheriff's Captain Overpaid in Pension

A former San Diego County Sheriff's Captain, **John Burroughs**, was found to have been **overpaid by nearly \$500,000** in pension benefits over a 13-year period due to a clerical error [ar15.com](#) . The San Diego County Employees Retirement Association (SDCERA) acknowledged the mistake and filed a lawsuit to recover the funds

Jeff Church
[WatchDogJeff.com](#)

From: [Kathleen Faye Light](#)
To: [AGGeneralCounsel](#)
Subject: Public Records Task Force Meeting comment
Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 9:36:26 AM
Attachments: [NPRA Comment 2.pdf](#)
[Npra narrative with rec.pdf](#)
[Aministrative synopsis.pdf](#)
[Screening Decision to C 076-2025 \(1\).pdf](#)

WARNING - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello,

I appeared in person yesterday, and I wasn't able to complete my comment. Please find my comment, an expanded narrative, and supporting public records attached.

--



[RapeIsRape.org](#)

702-469-7523

Joe Lombardo
Governor



George Togliatti
Director

Sheri Brueggemann
Deputy Director

Investigation Division

555 Wright Way
Carson City, Nevada 89711
Telephone (775) 684-7412 - Fax (775) 684-7409

Mike Edgell
Chief

Administrative Synopsis

DATE: July 18, 2024

TO: Nevada Department of Human Resource Management

FROM: Mike Edgell, Investigation Division, Chief

SUBJECT: Synopsis of complaint against David Cassetty

On July 8, 2024, the Nevada State Police, Investigation Division received notification from Capitol Police regarding an email that was sent to Todd Rich, the Nevada Division of Insurance, Chief Deputy Commissioner of Accounting Services, alleging illegal/immoral acts by a state employee. The email stated "Sir- I want to make you aware of the moral character of your deputy. Mr. Cassetty is a sexual predator. He is an alcoholic who regularly shows up at work under the influence of alcohol." The purported sexual predator was identified as David Cassetty, the Deputy Commissioner of the Nevada Division of Insurance. Attached to this email was also a short, pornographic video.

This email was generated by the purported victim of the sexual assault, claiming that Mr. Cassetty had sexually assaulted her in February 2024, at a "cocaine fueled party." The video shows Mr. Cassetty performing a sexual act causing pain to the female, where the female begs/tells him to stop, which he did not. It is very graphic and disturbing.

A criminal investigation was initiated by the Nevada State, Police Investigation Division. During the investigation the author of the email was interviewed extensively regarding the criminal acts she had reported. During the interview the victim identified herself as the female in the video being assaulted. She stated that the sexual encounter started off consensually, but he was hurting her so she told him to stop.

The criminal investigation has been presented to the Clark County District Attorney for review.

Separate from the criminal investigation there are serious concerns regarding the fitness of a state division administrator. Though the criminal act was not committed on State property, one could

speculate that an unclassified division administrator is always on State time and should always represent themselves and their division appropriately. Division administrators are scrutinized for their on/off duty conduct as their activities could be perceived as incompatible with the employee's conditions of employment.

As such, the disgraceful conduct displayed in the video that was sent to many people in Mr. Cassetty's division not only could impair the performance of his duties, but also cause discredit to the agency. Should Deputy Commissioner Cassetty's identity be publicized from this pornographic video that was sent to an investigative reporter at Channel 8 News, in Las Vegas, it would undoubtedly bring discredit to his division, and quite possibly, the Governor's office.

AFTER COMMENT

Hello again, my name is Kathleen Light

I would like to explain the personal toll and collateral damage in my public records case

One record I eventually obtained only by mistake on the part of the agency was an administrative synopsis written by Mike EDGELL the **Chief** of the Nevada State Police.

It described the conduct of the deputy insurance commissioner at issue as **immoral, disgraceful, and criminal.**

The synopsis also noted that if the matter became **public**, it could reflect poorly on the State, and that I had spoken to the press. The police knew that because I allowed them to search my phone while they interviewed me.

The press was waiting for an arrest before running the story.

There was no arrest. Thus, There was no story.

That former Deputy Insurance Commissioner was asked to resign shortly thereafter with a neutral reference according public record and went on to be an Assistant Attorney General in Vermont. He was again asked to resign based upon my very credible allegations. His disbarment due to this matter is currently pending in Vermont. He is trying to give up his law license so there is no PUBLIC record of what happened.

Nearly two years later, I am still trying to determine who received the evidence, who, if anyone, reviewed it, and why they decided that a violent crime recorded on video would not result in charges.

The only explanation I received came from District Attorney Steve Wolfson. He told me that because I had stayed in that relationship, a relationship that was fraught with further sexual assaults, threats of physical violence, and threats of murder-suicide, QUOTE his office could prosecute men who raped prostitutes, but that I had stayed with him. END QUOTE

Under Nevada law, that does not negate my screams that night.

Nor should it.

The Attorney General's office has refused in opposition to Matcy's law to even acknowledge any call or email or social media post I have made for the past two years. They simply refuse to

respond to me when all I want to know is why **a public official** who **raped me** on video was not prosecuted.

For me, these records are not abstract.

They are not curiosity.

They are not politics.

They are the only path I have left to understanding what happened

The night I was raped, I screamed and begged to be heard.

No one stopped it.

Years later, I am still in that night, screaming through records requests, complaints, court filings, and hearings.

These are not public records to me.

They are my records.

They are how I am trying to understand why I was not heard that night, and why I am still fighting to be heard by the Attorney General now.

This body has been entrusted with the responsibility of making certain that the public records process is fair to the public. I am the public and I do not want any other woman to ever go through what I have in this process and you have the power to see to that. Please remember my story and that I am not the only one as you make your recommendations.

As a rape victim, I would gladly give up my information, social security number, blood type, or whatever else anyone wanted to know for my rapist to be charged or at least be publicized so I can find his other local victims.

I will openly and vehemently state that utilizing Marcy's law to prevent me from having that information and records is inexcusable.

I personally became infuriated at the last presentation in the meeting, Ms. Piro, to you directly, please let your boss know that regardless of any presentation about the victimization of crime victims and their trauma response, that does not mean that he gets to have it both ways, He does not get to weaponized Marcy's Law against me as a victim while ignoring the other mandates and provisions within those constitutional rights I have as the victim of a violent crime.

Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 239.001 establishes that public records serve as the foundation of democratic accountability, mandating that the government provide prompt access to information to foster transparency. Yet, as I learned through my own harrowing experience, that statutory promise often dissolves when a citizen, particularly a crime victim, attempts to hold institutions accountable for their actions. My story—a journey through bureaucracy, lost documents, and systemic failures—began not as an academic exercise in research, but as an intimate struggle to reclaim the truth behind my own victimization.

The Gap Between Statute and Reality

My public-records journey began with a police report I should never have had to request through the public-records process at all. After reporting my rape in 2024, I asked law enforcement for a copy of the police report in my own case. I was told by the police that I needed to submit a public-records request to obtain it. As I later learned, that was not actually the process available to crime victims seeking records related to their own case. At the time, however, I had no reason to know that the information I was being given was incorrect. I trusted the agency responsible for handling the investigation and followed the process I was told to follow.

What followed was months of delay. I was told the investigation needed to be closed. I was told records could not yet be released. I was given various explanations as to why the report remained unavailable, including that it didn't exist. Eventually, after months of waiting, I received a heavily redacted police report, but the report did not answer the question that mattered. By that point, Nevada State Police had investigated allegations that I had been raped by the Deputy Insurance Commissioner for the State of Nevada. During the investigation, I was informed that an expedited warrant had been drafted and that an arrest was happening, at the moment they were calling me. The Deputy Insurance Commissioner was escorted from his public office by law enforcement, but no arrest occurred.

The Clark County District Attorney's Office declined prosecution and referred the matter to the Nevada Attorney General's Office. The Attorney General's Office subsequently declined prosecution as well, twice. The police report did not explain why. It also raised additional questions because it failed to account for a fourth video recording of the incident. By the time I received the report, I knew four videos existed. I had fought with the detective to make him take the fourth video from me, yet that video was not identified in the report at all. Its absence immediately raised an obvious question: if the video was not properly reflected in the report, who had reviewed it?

To this day, I do not know whether prosecutors reviewed that fourth video. I do not believe decision-makers within the Attorney General's Office reviewed it, and all I have on that question is a partially redacted email in which a deputy attorney general told a police sergeant that collecting additional evidence would not resolve the issues with the case. I do not know whether every person involved in evaluating the matter was even aware the fourth video existed. I know only that it existed, that I tried to make sure law enforcement had it, and that it was absent from the police report eventually provided to me.

The documents coming out of the Division of Insurance raised still more concerns. Those records stated that a confidentiality agreement had been crafted. The actual complaint that went to the Nevada State Police was delayed by three days, had no heading, and had no signature. There is no way to tell from that document who authored it, what office authored it, or why a complaint concerning a senior state official moved through government in that form. The police report also did not tell me why the prosecution was declined, who reviewed the evidence, or what happened after the investigation concluded. The report gave me records, but it did not give me answers. What it did say was who participated in the decision-making process, and those were some names. Ultimately, it gave me more questions, and those questions were not minor.

The Labyrinth of Institutional Secrecy

That absence of an answer is what led me to seek records from the agencies directly involved in the matter, including the Nevada Attorney General's Office, the Nevada Division of Insurance, and the Governor's Office. These agencies were not peripheral participants. They were directly involved in the handling of a matter concerning a senior state official. If records existed explaining what happened after the investigation, these agencies were the places where those records should have been found. I was not seeking opinions or asking anyone to justify a decision in a private conversation. I was seeking records showing who received information, who reviewed evidence, who forwarded documents, who discussed the matter, and who made decisions.

Nevada law recognizes the importance of those questions. NRS 239.001 states that the purpose of Nevada's Public Records Act is "to foster democratic principles by providing members of the public with prompt access to inspect, copy or receive a copy of public books and records to the extent permitted by law." It further provides that the chapter "must be construed liberally to carry out this important purpose" and that any exemption, exception, or balancing of interests limiting access "must be construed narrowly." The principle is not complicated: government cannot be accountable if citizens cannot determine how governmental decisions were made.

My experience was the opposite of transparency. The Attorney General's Office did not respond to my requests. The Division of Insurance did not respond to my requests. The Governor's Office did not respond to my requests. They did not provide partial responses, inadequate responses, confusing responses, or delayed responses. They provided no responses at all. The requests went unanswered, and when I submitted complaints regarding compliance with Nevada's Public Records Act to the agency to which public-records complaints are supposed to be submitted, the Attorney General's Office, those complaints also produced no response.

This created an obvious structural problem. Citizens are told they may seek assistance from the Attorney General's Office when agencies fail to comply with public-records law, yet the Attorney General's Office was itself one of the agencies from which I was seeking records and one of the agencies that had failed to respond. The system had no meaningful answer for that conflict. At

that point, the statutory right existed only on paper. If I wanted the agencies to comply with the law, I had to force the issue in court.

As a pro se litigant, I filed petitions seeking judicial enforcement of Nevada's Public Records Act. At my first hearing, the State appeared through three attorneys to oppose production. Only after litigation commenced did records begin to appear. First, I heard from the Governor's Office, which apologized and said the person who had been working on my request had left the position and my request had gotten lost in the shuffle. The Attorney General's Office told me that I had been caught in its email filter, Barracuda, although I later checked the Barracuda database and my email address was not included on its list. The Division of Insurance simply did not bother with an excuse.

Then the games began in getting the records. The explanations that followed only deepened my concerns because agencies cited delays, administrative issues, and production schedules that stretched months into the future. The Division of Insurance cited problems related to a cyberattack. Excuses accumulated, but what never changed was the basic fact that records were not produced until litigation forced the issue. If records can be located and produced after litigation begins, then those records existed before litigation began. If agencies are capable of responding once sued, then they were capable of responding when the requests were originally submitted.

Evidence Through Error

The records that finally emerged were not produced through agency diligence, but through agency error. In a striking lapse of bureaucratic protocol, the Governor's Office accidentally disclosed an administrative synopsis—prepared by the Chief of the Nevada State Police—describing the conduct under investigation as "immoral, disgraceful, and criminal." In the same inadvertent transmission, they included the video of my own rape. These errors were not merely procedural slips; they were the most consequential records I received, shattering the official narrative and revealing the stark reality that, to the system, these documents are data points to be managed rather than the lives of human beings.

The records that eventually emerged revealed facts that had previously been hidden. They revealed that the Deputy Insurance Commissioner resigned under a separation agreement that included confidentiality provisions and a neutral reference. They revealed that records existed documenting discussions occurring behind the scenes and that the public record surrounding this matter was larger than what had initially been disclosed. They also revealed something more troubling: some of the most important records I received were not produced because the system worked. They were produced because someone made a mistake.

The records also revealed something else I never expected to find. In response to a subsequent records request, I received information indicating that I had been the subject of attention from a counterterrorism unit based upon alleged indirect threats after I publicly discussed what had happened and criticized the government's handling of the matter. I had reported being raped by

a public official, attempted to understand why he was not arrested or prosecuted, and used Nevada's public-records laws to seek answers. Yet somewhere within that process, records suggested that attention had shifted toward me.

As a historian, I am accustomed to working with incomplete records. Historical research often involves reconstructing events through fragments of surviving evidence, but government records typically create redundancy. Emails are copied. Memoranda are forwarded. Reports are distributed. Multiple agencies retain overlapping versions of the same communications. That redundancy is often how researchers determine whether a record is complete, because when the same communication appears in multiple productions, it confirms that the record moved through government in a traceable way.

In my case, that redundancy was absent. Despite obtaining records from agencies directly involved in the matter, I found, remarkably, that no overlap among many of the records produced. Communications that should have appeared in multiple locations often appeared only once. Records that should have generated corresponding records elsewhere frequently lacked obvious counterparts. The result was not a complete documentary history but a collection of fragments, and although those fragments were important, they were also insufficient.

Nearly two years later, the central questions remain unanswered. Who received the evidence? Who reviewed the videos, including the fourth video? Who participated in discussions concerning the case? Who made recommendations? Who made final decisions? Who decided prosecution would not occur? Who decided what records would be released and what records would remain hidden? Why was a violent crime reported, investigated, documented, and then followed by silence?

This is not merely a personal grievance; it is a public problem. If a citizen with training, research experience, and the willingness to spend years litigating public-records cases still cannot obtain a complete record from her own government, then the average Nevadan has little practical recourse when agencies refuse to comply with the law. A right that exists only for those capable of enforcing it through litigation is not a meaningful right for most citizens.

Nevada law promises transparency. It promises liberal construction in favor of access, narrow construction of secrecy, and a public-records system through which citizens can understand the conduct of their government. Promises written into statutes, however, mean very little when agencies can ignore requests until a citizen sues them. For me, these records are not abstract, academic, or political. They are the only path I have left to understanding why a man I reported for rape, a man who occupied a senior position within Nevada government, was not arrested, was not prosecuted, and was allowed to leave public employment under circumstances that continue to raise more questions than answers.

The Fragility of Accountability

The consequences of this administrative silence, however, did not stop at the Nevada state line. The lack of an accurate, accessible public record created a dangerous bureaucratic blind spot. Because Nevada's records—or the lack thereof—provided no warning, the Deputy Insurance Commissioner was able to secure a new position as an Assistant Attorney General in Vermont just three months after my report. He was granted a position of public trust in a new jurisdiction simply because the state that hired him lacked the information to know otherwise.

When his tenure in Vermont ended five months later, it was not due to a proactive vetting process, but rather a reactionary discovery: internal accounts suggest he was forced to resign only after Vermont officials encountered my public account of the incident. This was an entirely preventable failure. The absence of a formal record in Nevada did not merely insulate an official from accountability; it exported that risk to another state, placing the public trust of Vermonters in jeopardy. This is the starkest illustration of why public records are a public safety necessity, not just a matter of administrative preference.

The response from Vermont authorities has mirrored this same preference for quiet resolution. While the Vermont Judiciary is currently investigating the matter, the process has been defined by an effort to contain the fallout. I was informed in late 2025 that the former official sought to voluntarily surrender his law license—effectively the functional equivalent of disbarment—under the condition that the proceedings remain sealed and without a public record. Currently, he remains administratively suspended, ineligible to practice. I have actively petitioned the disciplinary counsel to reject this quiet exit and instead convene a public hearing. We cannot allow accountability to be negotiated away behind closed doors; a matter of this gravity demands the light of a public record, not the convenience of a private settlement. A final resolution remains pending, caught in the tension between procedural closure and the necessity of public truth.

Transparency as a Public Necessity

Ultimately, the story of my public-records requests is not merely about documents; it is a case study in the fragility of democratic accountability. When a system designed to illuminate government conduct operates in the shadows—forcing citizens to navigate labyrinths of delay, accidental disclosures, and litigation just to learn the truth about their own lives—the promise of transparency becomes an empty formality. We cannot claim to have an open government when the truth is hidden behind a wall of procedural inertia, and we cannot demand accountability from our officials if we cannot see the evidence of their actions. My experience has shown that public records are often the only tool citizens have against institutional silence; without them, we are left not with justice, but with the haunting echoes of the questions we were never allowed to ask.

Recommendations to the Attorney General's Public Records Task Force

My experience demonstrates that Nevada's Public Records Act, while strong in principle under NRS 239.001's liberal construction mandate, lacks the enforcement mechanisms and structural safeguards necessary to make transparency a practical reality rather than an aspirational one. To prevent similar failures—particularly in cases involving senior officials, crime victims seeking records in their own matters, or allegations of institutional conflicts—I urge the Task Force to recommend the following to the Legislature:

1. **Mandatory Response Timelines with Escalating Penalties:** Require agencies to acknowledge requests within 3 business days and produce records (or a detailed denial with exemption citations) within 10-15 business days for standard requests, with shorter timelines (5 business days) for victims seeking records related to their own cases. Impose automatic daily fines (e.g., \$100-\$500 per day after the deadline) payable to the requester, plus full costs and attorney's fees (including for pro se litigants via a reasonable hourly rate equivalent) for prevailing parties in enforcement actions. Intentional delays or incomplete productions should trigger personal liability for responsible officials and potential disciplinary action.
2. **Independent Dispute Resolution Mechanism (Ombudsman or Review Board):** Establish a neutral, independent public records ombudsman or review board outside the Attorney General's Office to handle complaints, mediate disputes, and issue binding determinations with expedited timelines. This addresses the inherent conflict when the AG's Office is both a records custodian and the enforcement body—precisely the barrier I encountered.
3. **Improved Custodianship, Retention, and Redundancy Standards:** Mandate clear designation of records custodians in each agency, centralized electronic tracking systems for all requests (with public dashboards), and standardized retention policies ensuring redundancy for high-profile or sensitive matters. Require audit trails for any redactions, searches, or "lost" requests, and prohibit destruction of potentially responsive records once a request is received.
4. **Transparency for Credible Accusations Against Public Officials:** Narrow personnel record exemptions under the NPRA for senior public officials or those in positions of public trust when there are credible allegations of misconduct, particularly criminal acts, sexual misconduct, or abuse of authority. Agencies should be required to proactively disclose (or make readily available via public log) the existence of formal complaints, internal investigations, or credible accusations—redacted as needed to protect victim privacy and ongoing proceedings—along with outcomes such as resignations, firings, or NDAs. The public has a compelling interest in knowing when officials accused of serious wrongdoing continue to serve or move to new roles; "confidential personnel matters" should not serve as a shield for accountability. This balances individual privacy with the public's right to evaluate fitness for office, drawing on the principle that substantiated or video-supported claims (as in my case) demand disclosure over blanket secrecy.
5. **Victim and Conflict-of-Interest Protections:** Create specific presumptions favoring disclosure for crime victims requesting records in their own investigations or related agency actions.

Require recusal or independent review when an agency or official has a direct conflict (e.g., investigating its own personnel). Narrow exemptions strictly, with mandatory segregation of non-exempt portions.

6. Standardized Fees, Training, and Technology: Adopt a uniform, reasonable fee schedule with presumptive waivers for public interest, journalistic, or victim-advocacy requests. Require annual training for records officers and investment in modern records management technology to reduce burdens on both agencies and requesters.

7. Data Collection and Annual Reporting: Implement statewide tracking of request volumes, response times, denial rates, and litigation outcomes, with public annual reports to identify patterns of non-compliance.

These changes would transform the NPRA from a law that relies on litigation as the primary enforcement tool into one that delivers prompt, reliable access for all Nevadans. Without them, accountability remains fragile, and powerful interests continue to operate behind an “Archive of Silence.”

**Vermont Supreme Court
Professional Responsibility Program**

Andrew R. Strauss
Screening Counsel
andrew.strauss@vtcourts.gov



32 Cherry Street, Suite 213
Burlington, VT 05401
802-951-0139

December 18, 2024

Kathleen Light
Via email only to: mrskatielight@gmail.com

Re: PRB File No. 076-2025
David R. Cassetty, Respondent

Dear Ms. Light,

As required by Rule 12 of Supreme Court Administrative Order 9, I screened the disciplinary complaint that you filed against Attorney David Cassitty. In my judgment, the conduct which is the subject of the complaint appears to constitute misconduct that may require disciplinary sanctions. Therefore, pursuant to Rule 12.C of Administrative Order 9, I am referring the complaint to Disciplinary Counsel Jon T. Alexander for further investigation.

Disciplinary Counsel will investigate the complaint. Upon concluding the investigation, Disciplinary Counsel will either dismiss it, refer it for non-disciplinary dispute resolution, or commence formal proceedings against the Respondent's law license. Disciplinary Counsel will notify you of their decision.

Having made this referral, my involvement ends. Please direct all inquiries to Attorney Alexander at jon.alexander@vtcourts.gov or Administrative Coordinator Brandy Sickles at brandy.sickles@vtcourts.gov.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Andrew R. Strauss".

Andrew R. Strauss
Screening Counsel

From: [David](#)
To: [AGGeneralCounsel](#)
Subject: Re: Public Records Task Force
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 4:49:43 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

WARNING - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

General Counsel's Office
Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau, Legal Division
401 S. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701-4747
Via email: generalcounseloffice@lcb.state.nv.us

Re: NV-SEFA-001 — Response to Letters of May 1, 2026 and June 12, 2026

Dear General Counsel's Office:

I write in response to your letters of May 1, 2026, and June 12, 2026, regarding my April 24, 2026 public records request (NV-SEFA-001). I have reviewed both letters carefully and am raising the following concerns, which I ask you to address in writing before the current June 18, 2026 deadline.

1. Applicability of *Davis v. Thompson*. Your May 1 letter cites *Davis v. Thompson*, 1986 OK 38, 721 P.2d 789 (Okla. 1986), for the proposition that the LCB may determine for itself, subject to a rule of reason, how much time it will take to respond to my request. I have reviewed the full opinion. It does not address public records requests, response deadlines, or anything resembling NRS Chapter 239. It resolves a discrete dispute over whether the Oklahoma Legislature could finish voting on appropriation bills after midnight on the constitutionally limited ninetieth day of its regular session, under Article 5, Section 26 of the Oklahoma Constitution. The “rule of reason” language you quote was the court’s standard for measuring how long a single legislative floor session may run past midnight — not a general rule about how long any legislative office may take to respond to a public information request. It is also Oklahoma persuasive authority, not binding on Nevada courts. I ask that you identify any Nevada authority, if one exists, that actually addresses the timeliness standard applicable to LCB’s response to records requests, rather than relying on a case addressing an unrelated constitutional question from a different state.

2. Scope of the claimed exemption. Your letter asserts that NRS Chapter 239 “does not apply to any records requested from the Legislative Department,” citing NRS 218F.150(1) and (3). That statute, by its terms, protects the nature or content of “any matter entrusted to” the Legislative Counsel Bureau and “work produced by” officers and employees of the Legal and Fiscal Analysis Divisions — it is not a blanket exemption for every record in the Legislative Department’s custody. Several categories in my request (e.g., SEFA allocations and federal award expenditures, NVPERS and JRS fund transfers, vendor contracts) describe financial and administrative records, not legal work product or matters entrusted for legal advice. I ask that the LCB identify, category by category, which specific records you contend fall within the NRS 218F.150 privilege, rather than relying on a categorical assertion that the entire request is exempt.

3. Internally inconsistent position. Your letter states in the same breath that the Public Records Law “does not apply” to the Legislative Department, and that the LCB will nonetheless review materials to determine whether they contain “publicly disclosable information.” Under NRS 239.0113, the burden of establishing that a record is confidential rests with the governmental

entity. I ask that you state plainly what standard governs the LCB's review, and confirm that all reasonably segregable non-exempt portions of responsive records will be produced.

4. Open-ended extensions. My request was submitted April 24, 2026. Your initial response set a production date of June 12, 2026; your June 12 letter then extended that date to June 18, 2026, using language that allows for further indefinite extension if the LCB "determines that it is unable" to meet the new date. I ask for a firm date certain for production of any responsive, disclosable materials, and, if any portion is withheld, a written explanation citing the specific statutory or constitutional basis relied upon for each withheld category.

I also note, for the record, that I separately received correspondence reflecting the Attorney General's Public Records Task Force, including materials titled "Protecting and Reinforcing the Public's Right to Know" and "Public Transparency with Private Dignity," prepared for the Task Force's June 8, 2026 meeting. Those materials reflect that the State's own current policy effort favors construing the public's right to know broadly and tailoring privacy-based exceptions narrowly — a framework in tension with a categorical, blanket non-applicability position supported by a case addressing an unrelated question of Oklahoma constitutional law. I am not asking the LCB to disregard any legitimate privilege it may hold. I am asking for a response that applies accurate, on-point authority, is specific to the records at issue, and is bound by a firm date. Please respond in writing on or before June 18, 2026.

Sincerely,

David Lee Nace

Petitioner — NV-SEFA-001

4255 Channel 10 Drive, Apt. 96

Las Vegas, NV 89119

(702) 689-0580

lvmsms.2006@gmail.com

David Lee Nace

On Fri, Jun 5, 2026 at 2:33 PM AGGeneralCounsel <AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Please see attached updated agenda and new materials for the upcoming Public Records Task Force meeting being held on Monday, June 8, 2026.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

State of Nevada

Office of the Attorney General



Office of General Counsel

Leslie M. Nino Piro, General Counsel

Sophia G. Long, Deputy General Counsel

Jeffrey W. Chronister, Deputy General Counsel

Email: AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov



PLEASE BE GREEN. *Please don't print this email unless necessary.*

Notice: This e-mail message and any attachments thereto may contain confidential, privileged, or non-public information. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this information by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy all copies.

From: [Discount Office Supply](#)
To: [AGGeneralCounsel](#)
Subject: NEVADA PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE JULY 22, 2026 MEETING
Date: Friday, July 17, 2026 5:12:38 PM
Attachments: [Task Force.docx](#)

WARNING - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

See attached email
And please distribute to each Task Force member.

Thank You
Joe

NEVADA PUBLIC RECORDS TASK FORCE JULY 22, 2026 MEETING

Task Force Members:

My name is Joe Panicaro. I'm a lifelong resident of Reno, Nevada, a paralegal and longtime activist. Throughout my lifetime, I've filed many public records suits, having prevailed on each. However, the majority of these required my appealing the District Court's ruling to the Nevada Supreme Court. My last four Appeals took between 16 and 19 months from the filing of Appeal until Appellate Court Decision. This must change. When public records are requested, they are needed now not a year and a half later.

The Nevada Legislature has made it clear that contestation of public records must be expedited and prioritized as dictated by its language under NRS 239.011(2). Although the Legislature has mandated District Courts "give this matter priority over other civil matters to which priority is not given by other statutes", the Legislature has not mandated Appellate Courts do the same. I propose that the Task Force seek amendment to the Nevada Public Records Act mandating that Appellate Courts prioritize public records cases as District Courts have been mandated to do. Furthermore, public records Appeals need to be automatically exempted from the settlement conference procedure in keeping with the expeditious manner the Legislature has intended when adjudicating these cases.

I have also requested that I be allowed to speak on these issues at the July 22nd meeting.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Please feel free to call me.

Joe Panicaro
2255 Koldewey Drive
Reno, Nevada 89509
(775) 203-6852

From: [Kathleen Faye Light](#)
To: [AGGeneralCounsel](#)
Subject: Re: Public Records Task Force Meeting Public Comment
Date: Friday, July 17, 2026 5:30:07 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[2pagesforpubrecords.pdf](#)

WARNING - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

No worries I completely understand. How about you guys take a look at the warrant.

The two main pages really set the scene for what happened. In fact I directly quote that on the homepage of my website.

Here you go.

Have a wonderful weekend!

Kathleen Light

Kathleen Faye Light

On Fri, Jul 17, 2026 at 5:06 PM AGGeneralCounsel <AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov> wrote:

Ms. Light,

Your email is received. However, your attachments exceed the two-page allotted length and include non-written material (i.e., video). The agenda states:

A person may submit comments to be attached to the minutes of the meeting, ***in writing***, one business day before the meeting date, in addition to testifying in person, or in lieu of testifying in person. ***Written comments are limited to two pages.***

The video cannot be included in written public comment. Please indicate which two pages you would like us to include.

Thank you.



State of Nevada

Office of the Attorney General

Office of General Counsel

Leslie M. Nino Piro, General Counsel

Sophia Long, Deputy General Counsel

Jeffrey Chronister, Deputy General Counsel

Email: AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov

From: Kathleen Faye Light <vegasquill@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2026 11:20 AM

To: AGGeneralCounsel <AGGeneralCounsel@ag.nv.gov>

Subject: Re: Public Records Task Force Meeting Public Comment

WARNING - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hi there!

I noticed you have seemed to have been able to put my second comments up on the website but I just wanted to make certain you received these as well. I can't seem to find them publicly available there on the website. I'm sure it was my mistake so I am attaching them as pdf files here for you. I'm certain you'll take care to put those up as well.

See you all next week!

Kathleen Faye Light

Nevada State Police Investigation Division

NV DPS ID Case No: 24I000512

STATE OF NEVADA)

COUNTY OF CLARK)

AFFIDAVIT FOR WARRANT OF ARREST

Jeffrey Musheno, being first duly sworn, deposes and states that he is the affiant herein and that he is a Detective with the Nevada State Police Investigation Division (NSP ID) and that he has been employed for a period of seventeen (17) years.

That affiant is currently assigned to the Southern Area Major Crimes Office and has been assigned since August 2019.

In support of your affiant's assertion, affiant has developed the following facts:

On July 5, 2024, Kathleen Light emailed Todd Rich, Chief Deputy Commissioner, Nevada Division of Insurance regarding [REDACTED] Deputy Commissioner of Consumer Services, Nevada Division of Insurance. In her email, Light stated she was sexually assaulted by [REDACTED] at a "cocaine fueled party." Light also provided a video of the incident, which "speaks for itself."

The video (1 minute 54 seconds in length) showed a white male adult (Identified by Light as [REDACTED] wearing dark colored pants, no shirt and a silver watch on a bed with Light, who is lying completely naked with her legs spread open. [REDACTED] entire right fist is inside Light's vagina, while he switched between his left index finger and left thumb and rubbed near her clitoris. [REDACTED] moved closer to Light on the bed and appeared to penetrate her vagina deeper with his fist. Light, who appeared to be in pain, rolled towards [REDACTED] with her legs visibly shaking, said multiple times, "ow," "no," and "please stop."

Despite her pleas to stop and even grabbing [REDACTED] wrist, he said multiple times, "You're in. Don't be stupid," while his fist remained inside Light's vagina and his left hand pushed her left leg down toward the bed. Light told [REDACTED] "Don't go any deeper, ok, please. Don't go deeper than that ok." [REDACTED] responded by saying multiple times, "You're good, relax." At that point, [REDACTED] took his hand off Light's left leg while his fist remained inside her vagina and pulled on Light's right nipple. Light said, "it hurts, it fucking hurts dude." [REDACTED] told Light to "shut up" multiple times and followed with "this is literally what your pussy is built for. It's built for that."

Light repeatedly demanded [REDACTED] pull it out while he pulled on her right nipple. [REDACTED] said, "I'm not going to pull out, I'm going to fuck you with it." [REDACTED] continued penetrating Light and even removed her hand from his wrist. Light said "ow," "please," and "God Dammit [REDACTED]" [REDACTED] told Light, "Don't be stupid, relax" multiple times. Light said, "I'm trying." [REDACTED] still with his entire right hand inside Light's vagina, put his mouth on her left breast. Light again said, "no" multiple times. [REDACTED] said multiple times, "you're good." Light repeatedly said, "we're done, we're done, we're done, right? It hurts like a bitch." At that point, Light used her left hand and removed [REDACTED] fist from her vagina. The video ended.

On July 9, 2024, Detective Musheno and Detective Crowe conducted an audio recorded interview with Light. Light, in part, stated the following: Light agreed to have a "three-way" sexual experience with [REDACTED] On February 2, 2024, Light, [REDACTED] went to the Fairfield Inn on Warm Springs Road. The incident captured on video, which was recorded by [REDACTED] with his cell phone and subsequently shared with Light, happened very early on in the encounter. Light stated [REDACTED] penetrated her vagina with his right hand. She asked him to stop repeatedly. Light said [REDACTED] told her to shut up and she was being stupid. Light stated she was in pain and described it as "being ripped open." Light felt she needed to "suck it up and make it through" so [REDACTED] would stop. "Let him have what he wants, and he will stop." Light confirmed that when she told [REDACTED] to stop that is exactly what she wanted to happen.

From: [WatchDogJeff](#)
To: [AGGeneralCounsel](#)
Cc: [AGINFO](#); [Leslie M. Nino Piro](#)
Subject: Public Comment for PDR Task Force July 22
Date: Monday, July 20, 2026 8:59:24 PM
Attachments: [PDR TF PC July 2026.doc](#)

WARNING - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Please see attached public comment for the NRS239 Task Force.

Jeff Church
[RenoTaxRevolt.com](#)

To: Public Records Task Force
Subj: Public Comment
Ref: Template 3.6 and 4.4
From: Jeff Church, RenoTaxRevolt.com
RenoTaxRevolt@SBCGlobal.net

CONCLUSION: We need an expedited process ombudsman, hearing officer etc) and in-camera review.

I want to mainly address the listed templates:

3.6 Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

- Identify existing processes
- List effectiveness and current gaps

4.4 Penalties for Delayed or Incomplete Responses

- Recommend enforcement mechanisms and accountability measures.

But first a few examples and updates:

On my PDR matter vs WCSD, after two years in addition to the usual emails we found that Mr (redacted) reached out to a female encouraging her to apply including offering to meet one on one with her,

"...I was just thinking about you and ... I am staff to the commission." Followed by a private meeting from the future applicant, *"Hi (redacted), I got to the HUB UNR campus a bit early. ... See you soon!"*

A clear sign of favoritism and ex-parte contacts that took two years and \$40,000 to drag out but by then the issue was moot.

On about July 6, 2026 to Washoe County and DMV I submitted carefully crafted and limited requests for a copy of a single contract and tax calculations on an increase known as RTC5. Two weeks later, well beyond the 5 day requirement, no substantial response. Typical of Washoe, not the exception. This matter concerns about \$110 million yearly in tax revenue. I clearly hit pay dirt and let the obstruction begin.

On another Washoe matter I simply asked for the application by a developer of a zoning change. I'm not delving into anything personal. It's his application, here is what is on line for the public as of today in spite of my many written complaints here is the main page of the application in spite of the first sentence that states: **"Your entire application is a public record."**

https://www.washoecounty.gov/csd/planning_and_development/applications/current-applications.php#docaccess-23e4791c42794fc3619626a2def5b0d3

"Hi Jeff,

I spoke with our admin staff and the title page is accurate, the contact information for the applicant and consultant are redacted."

Abnormality? No, common practice with apps

https://www.washoecounty.gov/csd/planning_and_development/applications/current-applications.php

The Washoe County mantra: ignore the law, obstruct, delay and make them sue us at considerable expense! It's only taxpayer money.

 **Washoe County Development Application**
 Your entire application is a public record. If you have a concern about releasing personal information, please contact Planning and Building staff at 775.328.6100.

Project Information		Staff Assigned Case No.:	
Project Name: Fawn Lane Master Plan & Regulatory Zoning Map Amendment			
Project Description: The applicant is seeking a Master Plan Amendment (MPA) to change the master plan designation from 92% Rural Residential (RR)/8% Open Space (OS) to 74% Suburban Residential (SR)/26% Open Space (OS), and a Regulatory Zoning Amendment to change the current zoning designation from 92% Medium Density Rural (MDR)/8% Open Space (OS) to 74% Low Density Suburban (LDS)/26% Open Space (OS).			
Project Address: 0 Fawn Lane			
Project Area (acres or square feet): ± 40.01 Acres			
Project Location (with point of reference to major cross streets AND area locator): The project is approximately ±0.25 mile southeast of the intersection at Mount Rose Highway and Fawn Lane.			
Assessor's Parcel No. (s):	Parcel Acreage:	Assessor's Parcel No. (s):	Parcel Acreage:
150-080-08	±40.01		
Indicate any previous Washoe County approvals associated with this application: Case No. (s)			
Applicant Information (attach additional sheets if necessary)			
Property Owner:		Professional Consultant:	
Name: Mezger Trust		Name: Wood Rodgers	
Address:		Address:	
Zip:		Zip:	
Phone:	Fax:	Phone:	Fax:
Email:		Email:	
Cell:	Other:	Cell:	Other:
Contact Person: Chad Martinson		Contact Person: Eric Hasty	
Applicant/Developer:		Other Persons to be Contacted:	
Name: Same as Applicant		Name:	
Address:		Address:	
Zip:		Zip:	
Phone:	Fax:	Phone:	Fax:
Email:		Email:	
Cell:	Other:	Cell:	Other:
Contact Person:		Contact Person:	
For Office Use Only			
Date Received:	Initial:	Planning Area:	
County Commission District:		Master Plan Designation(s):	
CAB(s):		Regulatory Zoning(s):	

You can't make this stuff up. Stated as public record. A routine zoning and plan application, 99.9% redacted even the case # and date received.

Leading to the template. It has become obvious, telling the band on the Titanic to play a jazz tune is fruitless. We need true legislative reform. It has become obvious per 3.6:

1. An ombudsman that can expeditiously have free rein to mediate, resolve and litigate.
2. A statewide hearing officer(s) to hold hearings (Zoom OK) within a short time frame (i.e. 30 days) and render a decision within a set timeframe (14 days).
3. Assign these matters to Small Claims. Different from most but small claims judges, as lawyers are and will become qualified to adjudicate these. All should mandate an en-camera review by any judge or hearing officer.
4. Mandating the District Court Judge to hold an expedited evidentiary finding hearing and do an in-camera review

*Of course either can be appealed but hopefully this would address the vast majority of most matters.

Regarding 4.4 yes on attorney fees and some penalties but those are on the taxpayer's back so I'm not smart enough to figure a true detriment but something must be done and a penalty paid to the complainant is a step in that direction.

Whereas the A.G. defends state agencies on NRS 239 and whereas the A.G. is over one year behind in his mandatory "shall" OML investigations, rendering them moot, the idea of assigning responsivity to the A.G. must be abandoned, a non-starter.

Summary: PDR Task Force: Do Something!