

2025 HOUSE JUDICIARY

HB 1409

2025 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Judiciary Committee
Room JW327B, State Capitol

HB 1409
2/12/2025

A BILL for an Act to create and enact a new section to chapter 32-01 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to general provisions for judicial remedies.

10:14 a.m. Chairman Klemin opened the hearing.

Members Present: Chairman Klemin, Vice-Chairman Karls, Vice-Chairman Vetter, Representatives Christianson, Henderson, Hoverson, Johnston, McLeod, S. Olson, Satrom, Tveit, VanWinkle, Wolff, Schneider

Discussion Topics:

- Small claims court
- Average cost for lawyers in North Dakota
- Rules of professional responsibility

10:14 a.m. Representative Lori VanWinkle, North Dakota Representative for District 3, introduced the bill and provided testimony #37370.

10:17 a.m. Paul Sorum, independent, testified in favor.

10:37 a.m. Petra Mandigo Hulm, Secretary-Treasurer at the State Board of Law Examiners, testified in opposition and provided testimony #37319.

10:41 a.m. Kara Erickson, Disciplinary Counsel for the Disciplinary Board of the ND Supreme Court, testified in opposition and provided testimony #37203.

10:48 a.m. Todd Kranda, Lobbyist for North Dakota Petroleum Council, testified in opposition and provided testimony #37329 and #37330.

10:55 a.m. Matthew Sagsveen, Office of North Dakota Attorney General, testified in neutral and provided testimony #37180.

Additional written testimony:

Debrah Hoffarth, independent, submitted testimony in opposition #37212

10:59 a.m. Chairman Klemin closed the hearing.

Wyatt Armstrong, Committee Clerk



Drew H. Wrigley
ATTORNEY GENERAL

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
www.attorneygeneral.nd.gov
(701) 328-2210

HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 12, 2025

TESTIMONY OF MATTHEW SAGSVEEN
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
HOUSE BILL 1409

Chairman Klemin, members of the Committee.

I am Matthew Sagsveen, Assistant Attorney General and Director of the Attorney General's Natural Resources and Native American Affairs Legal Division. I appear here today on behalf of the Attorney General in a neutral capacity to discuss House Bill (HB) 1409, which pertains to the definition of the word "interest" in N.D.C.C. ch. 32-01.

House Bill 1409 adds a definition of the word "interest" to N.D.C.C. ch. 32-01. The definition does not contain any limitations on its applicability. The North Dakota Supreme Court has explained that "[w]hen the meaning of a word or phrase is defined in a section of [the North Dakota Century] Code, that definition applies to any use of the word or phrase in other sections of the Code, except when a contrary intent plainly appears." *State v. Glaser*, 2015 ND 31, ¶ 13, 858 N.W.2d 920 (alteration in original) (quoting *Northern Z-Ray CO., Inc. v. State*, 542 N.W.2d 733, 735-36 (N.D. 1996)). Therefore, where the word interest is undefined, or a contrary intent is not apparent, House Bill 1409 could be construed to modify the definition of the word throughout the entire Century Code.

We conducted a Westlaw search for the word interest limited to N.D.C.C. Title 32, and the word appears 196 times. The word interest appears 4,375 times throughout the Century Code. The word is used in many different contexts because the word has multiple meanings.

The second sentence of House Bill 1409 provides that a legal interest may be a legal interest or an equitable interest. It is generally true that courts distinguish between legal and equitable interests. For example, the North Dakota Supreme Court has described these interests in the context of standing:

A party is entitled to have a court decide the merits of a dispute only after demonstrating the party has standing to litigate the issues placed before the court A person cannot invoke the jurisdiction of the court to enforce private rights or maintain a civil action for the enforcement of those rights unless the person has in an individual or representative capacity some real interest in the cause of action, or a *legal or equitable right, title, or interest in the subject matter of the controversy*. Litigants cannot by consent, either passive or express, dispense with necessary parties, or confer upon a person who does not have a sufficient interest in a controversy entitlement to bring suit.

In re Estate of Bartelson, 2011 ND 219, ¶ 14, 806 N.W.2d 199 (emphasis added) (quoting *Nodak Mut. Ins. Co. v. Ward Cnty. Farm Bureau*, 2004 ND 60, ¶ 11, 676 N.W.2d 752). The North Dakota Supreme Court has also recently examined the difference between legal and equitable interests in the context of N.D.C.C. ch. 32-17. *Nelson v. Lindvig*, 2024 ND 208, 14 N.W.3d 66.

One problem with House Bill 1409 is the last sentence, which provides “[a] party with a legal interest in property or rights may be represented by a party who has an equitable interest in the subject property or rights of a judicial action.” It could be argued that this provision effectively enables non-lawyers to engage in the practice of law, and this conflicts with N.D.C.C. § 27-11-01, which prohibits persons from practicing law if they do not have a certificate of admission to the bar and a bar license.

More importantly, it could also be argued that this sentence statutorily confers consent by the owner of a legal interest to the owner of an equitable interest to represent the legal interest owner, without any adjudication of the legal interest holder. One specific example of where this would be problematic is in N.D.C.C. ch. 32-17. Section 32-17-01, N.D.C.C., provides:

32-17-01. Action to determine adverse claims.

An action may be maintained by any person having an estate or an interest in, or lien or encumbrance upon, real property, whether in or out of possession thereof and whether such property is vacant or unoccupied, against any person claiming an estate or interest in, or lien or encumbrance upon, the same, for the purpose of determining such adverse estate, interest, lien, or encumbrance.

The North Dakota Supreme Court has interpreted this provision to mean that only a person “with a valid interest in real property has standing to have a court decide the merits of a dispute regarding the property.” *Nelson v. Lindvig*, 2024 ND 208, ¶ 15, 14 N.W.3d 66 (citing *Finstad v. Gord*, 2014 ND 72, ¶ 23, 844 N.W.2d 913). If the definition of the word interest is applied to N.D.C.C. ch. 32-17, and interest includes “equitable interest”, the meaning of N.D.C.C. § 32-17-01 could be altered to allow strangers to title to assert ownership in mineral quiet title actions. This language could significantly impact the adjudication of mineral ownership in North Dakota.

The bill could also have other adverse effects on property ownership, liens, estate planning and inheritance, insurance, and other matters, but it is not feasible to review each of the 4,375 uses of the word interest in the Century Code.

House Bill 1409
House Judiciary Committee

Testimony Presented by Kara J. Erickson
Disciplinary Counsel
February 12, 2025

Good morning, Chairman Klemin and members of the committee. For the purposes of the record, my name is Kara Erickson. I serve as Disciplinary Counsel for the Disciplinary Board of the North Dakota Supreme Court. In that role, I lead the Office of Disciplinary Counsel which handles the administration, investigations, and prosecutions of lawyers for violations of the North Dakota Rules for Professional Conduct.

I am here today on behalf of the Disciplinary Board in opposition to House Bill 1409. My concern with this bill is with the last sentence, which allows a party with an interest to represent another party with an interest. This representing party is not required to be a licensed lawyer. My office would then be likely to receive complaints regarding individuals who are engaged in the unauthorized practice of law. Additionally, these individuals may be reported for a failure to follow the ethical rules that lawyers are required to follow the North Dakota Rules of Professional Conduct.

Additionally, these other interested parties are not required to have any legal background or training. This creates a potential danger to the public because these individuals may cause more harm than good to the cases and would not have oversight by my office due to the lack of licensure.

Further, it seems that this bill is encouraging the “representing party” to engage in conduct which would likely be a Class A Misdemeanor under NDCC § 27-11-01, because the individuals are not licensed to practice law.

For these reasons, I would encourage you not to pass this bill. Thank you for your consideration.

WRITTEN TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO HB 1409

House Judiciary Committee

Date of Hearing: February 12, 2025

Debra L. Hoffarth, 1320 11th Street SW, Minot, ND 58701

This written testimony is presented in opposition to HB 1409, which would expand the definition of interest and allow any individual with a legal interest in a judicial action to be represented by a party who has equitable interest in a judicial action.

Whoever is determined to have a legal interest or equitable interest is very nuanced and depends upon the context of litigation. This bill is vague and will create confusion for the courts to resolve. This will undermine judicial efficiency and increase the cost of litigation.

This proposed legislation creates an inherent conflict of interest between the legal and equitable interest parties as it allows the equitable interest party to represent the legal interest party. Although they both may have interests in a particular case, their goals or rights may not be aligned. This litigation creates a circumstance in which an individual could interfere with or insert themselves into other legal disputes.

This proposed legislation also opens the door to the unauthorized practice of law as it allows one party to represent another, which is a class A Misdemeanor, and prohibited by N.D.C.C. § 27-11-01 and the North Dakota Rules of Professional Conduct.

Please oppose HB1409.



House Judiciary
February 12, 2025

Testimony of the State Board of Law Examiners
HOUSE BILL NO. 1409

Chair Klemin and members of the Committee, I am Petra Hulm, Secretary-Treasurer of the State Board of Law Examiners, appearing on behalf of the State Board of Law Examiners in opposition to HB 1409.

The Board is not addressing the larger scope of this bill giving standing to a person with an interest in property. However, the Board is concerned with the possible intent in the last sentence of this legislation to allow people who are not licensed to practice law to represent others in civil or criminal actions. The proposal specifies that interest is to be broadly construed. Therefore, it appears a spouse, business partner, co-landowner, co-trustee, etc. would be permitted to represent another in legal matters. Practicing law without a license is a class A misdemeanor under N.D.C.C. § 27-11-01.

The potential harm to the public is significant. Incompetent representation could result in a person losing their freedom in criminal matters. Convictions could be subject to petitions for post-conviction relief based on ineffective assistance of “counsel”. Civil litigation is complex and can result in monetary judgments, again putting the public in harm’s way.

The representing party is not subject to rules regarding licensing or education of lawyers. The proposal does not address fees and unreasonable fees could be charged. The representing party is also not subject to complaints or to discipline. At the least, the proposal will pose issues for the attorney disciplinary system.

To the extent this bill is intending to address access to legal services, the Board shares the concern. It is an issue nearly every jurisdiction in this Country is experiencing. The Supreme Court and the Board continue to examine ways to increase the availability of legal services. If this is the concern, I urge you to support the budget request by the Court for allied legal professionals and for a navigator. Those proposals were reviewed by the Supreme Court task force which examined the need for legal services in detail during the interim session.

The Board requests you to vote do not pass. This legislation is not advised and is not a solution to availability of legal services. It has the potential to do a great disservice, indeed harm, to the public.

HOUSE BILL 1409
Testimony of Todd D. Kranda
House Judiciary Committee

- February 12, 2025 -

Chairman Klemin and members of the House Judiciary Committee, for the record, my name is Todd D. Kranda, I am an attorney with the law firm of Kelsch Ruff Kranda Nagle & Ludwig law firm in Mandan, ND. I am appearing before you as a lobbyist on behalf of the North Dakota Petroleum Council.

The North Dakota Petroleum Council represents more than 550 companies involved in all aspects of the oil and gas industry, including oil and gas production, refining, pipeline development, transportation, mineral leasing, consulting, legal work, and oilfield service activities in North Dakota, South Dakota, and the Rocky Mountain region.

The North Dakota Petroleum Council is opposed to HB 1409 which proposes to add a new section to the general provisions for Title 32 NDCC, judicial remedies, under Chapter 32-01 NDCC (copy attached with ND Rules of Civil Procedure for “parties”) regarding “interest” which appears to broadly expand who might be a party deemed to have standing to commence litigation proceedings in North Dakota.

North Dakota already has sufficient and adequate rules to address who has an interest or standing to seek a legal remedy, namely a sufficient connection to and harm from the law or action being challenged to support a party’s participation in the litigation. Standing is an essential prerequisite for a party to seek a court action for a decision, and prevents an individual or group from pursuing litigation unless impacted and affected.

The changes proposed in HB 1409 are unnecessary and could actually create uncertainty, legal confusion, and unintended consequences. HB 1409 could greatly expand litigation activity in ND courts which already have a reasonable and fair determination process as to who might have standing, namely an interest sufficient to be a party in litigation.

The North Dakota Petroleum Council opposes the passage of HB 1409 and urges this committee to give HB 1409 a **Do Not Pass Recommendation**. Thank you for the opportunity to provide this information. I would be happy to try to answer any questions.

TITLE 32
JUDICIAL REMEDIES

CHAPTER 32-01
GENERAL PROVISIONS

32-01-01. Remedies - Classification.

Remedies in the courts of justice are divided into:

1. Actions.
2. Special proceedings.

32-01-02. Action defined.

An action is an ordinary proceeding in a court of justice, by which a party prosecutes another party for the enforcement or protection of a right, the redress or prevention of a wrong, or the punishment of a public offense.

32-01-03. Actions - Classification.

Actions are of two kinds:

1. Civil.
2. Criminal.

32-01-04. Special proceeding defined.

A special proceeding is any remedy other than an action.

32-01-05. Criminal action defined.

A criminal action is one prosecuted by the state as a party against a person charged with a public offense for the punishment thereof.

32-01-06. Civil action defined.

A civil action is any action other than a criminal action.

32-01-07. Process in civil action.

All process in civil actions shall run in the name of the state of North Dakota.

32-01-08. Civil and criminal remedies not merged.

When the violation of a right admits of both a civil and a criminal remedy, the right to prosecute the one is not merged in the other.

32-01-09. Civil action - One form - Plaintiff and defendant defined.

Superseded by N.D.R.Civ.P. 2.

32-01-10. Provisional remedies classified.

The provisional remedies in civil actions are:

1. Claim and delivery of personal property.
2. Attachment.
3. Garnishment.
4. Receivers.
5. Deposit in court.

32-01-11. Compensation for violation of private rights - Other relief, when.

As a general rule compensation is the relief or remedy provided by the law of this state for the violation of private rights and the means of securing their observance. Specific and preventive relief may be given in no cases other than those specified in this title.

32-01-12. Conditions of relief from forfeiture.

Whenever by the terms of an obligation a party thereto incurs a forfeiture, or a loss in the nature of a forfeiture, by reason of the party's failure to comply with its provisions, the party may be relieved therefrom upon making full compensation to the other party, except in case of a grossly negligent, willful, or fraudulent breach of duty.

32-01-13. How special issues not made by pleadings are tried.

Superseded by N.D.R.Civ.P. 39(b).



STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA COURTS

North Dakota Rules of Civil Procedure

I. Scope and Purpose of Rules--One Form of Action

- Rule 1. Scope and Purpose of Rules.
- Rule 2. One Form of Action.

II. Commencement of Action; Service of Process, Pleadings, Motions, and Orders

- Rule 3. Commencing an Action.
- Rule 4. Persons Subject to Jurisdiction; Process; Service.
- Rule 5. Service and Filing of Pleadings and Other Papers.
- Rule 6. Computing and Extending Time; Time for Motion Papers.

III. Pleadings and Motions

- Rule 7. Pleadings Allowed -- Form of Motions and Other Papers.
- Rule 8. General Rules of Pleading.
- Rule 9. Pleading Special Matters.
- Rule 10. Form of Pleadings.
- Rule 11. Signing of Pleadings, Motions, and Other Papers; Representations to Court; Sanctions.
- Rule 12. Defenses and Objections; When and How; Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings; Consolidation and Waiving Defenses; Pretrial Hearing.
- Rule 13. Counterclaim and Crossclaim.
- Rule 14. Third-Party Practice.
- Rule 15. Amended and Supplemental Pleadings
- Rule 16. Pretrial Conferences; Scheduling; Management.

IV. Parties

- Rule 17. Plaintiff and Defendant; Capacity.
- Rule 18. Joinder of Claims and Remedies.
- Rule 19. Required Joinder of Parties.
- Rule 20. Permissive Joinder of Parties.
- Rule 21. Misjoinder and Non-Joinder of Parties.
- Rule 22. Interpleader.
- Rule 23. Class Actions.
- Rule 24. Intervention.
- Rule 25. Substitution of Parties.

V. Depositions and Discovery

- Rule 26. General Provisions Governing Discovery.
- Rule 27. Depositions Before Action or Pending Appeal.
- Rule 28. Persons Before Whom Depositions May Be Taken



STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA COURTS

RULE 17. PLAINTIFF AND DEFENDANT; CAPACITY

Effective Date: 3/1/2011

(a) Real Party in Interest.

(1) Designation in General. An action must be prosecuted in the name of the real party in interest. The following may sue in their own names without joining the person for whose benefit the action is brought:

- (A) a personal representative;
- (B) a conservator;
- (C) a guardian;
- (D) a bailee;
- (E) a trustee of an express trust;
- (F) a party with whom or in whose name a contract has been made for another's benefit; and
- (G) a party authorized by statute.

(2) Action in the Name of the State for Another's Use of Benefit. When a statute so provides, an action for another's use or benefit must be brought in the name of the State of North Dakota.

(3) Joinder of the Real Party in Interest. The court may not dismiss an action for failure to prosecute in the name of the real party in interest until, after an objection, a reasonable time has been allowed for the real party in interest to ratify, join, or be substituted into the action. After ratification, joinder, or substitution, the action proceeds as if it had been originally commenced by the real party in interest.

(b) Minor or Incompetent Person.

(1) With a Representative. If a minor or incompetent person has a representative, such as a general guardian, or like fiduciary, the representative may sue or defend on behalf of the minor or incompetent person.

(2) Without a Representative. A minor or incompetent person who does not have a duly appointed representative may sue by a next friend or by a guardian ad litem. The court must appoint a guardian ad litem, or issue another appropriate order, to protect a minor or incompetent person who is self-represented in an action. The court may appoint a guardian ad litem to represent a minor or incompetent person, even though the minor or incompetent person may have a general guardian and may have appeared.

(c) **Capacity to Sue or Be Sued.** The capacity of all other persons to sue or be sued is determined by appropriate statutory provisions.

(d) **Public Officer's Title and Name.** A public officer who sues or is sued in an official capacity may be designated by official title rather than by name, but the court may order that the officer's name be added.

Explanatory Note ▼

Version History ▼



STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA COURTS

RULE 19. REQUIRED JOINDER OF PARTIES

Effective Date: 3/1/2011

(a) Persons Required to Be Joined if Feasible.

(1) Required Party. A person who is subject to service of process and whose joinder will not deprive the court of subject-matter jurisdiction must be joined as a party if:

(A) in that person's absence, the court cannot accord complete relief among existing parties; or

(B) that person claims an interest relating to the subject of the action and is so situated that disposing of the action in the person's absence may:

- (i) as a practical matter impair or impede the person's ability to protect the interest; or
- (ii) leave an existing party subject to a substantial risk of incurring double, multiple, or otherwise inconsistent obligations because of the interest.

(2) Joinder by Court Order. If a person has not been joined as required, the court must order that the person be made a party. A person who refuses to join as a plaintiff may be made either a defendant or, in a proper case, an involuntary plaintiff.

(3) Venue. If a joined party objects to venue and the joinder would make venue improper, the court must dismiss that party.

(b) When Joinder is not Feasible. If a person who is required to be joined if feasible cannot be joined, the court must determine whether, in equity and good conscience, the action should proceed among the existing parties, or should be dismissed. The factors for the court to consider include:

(1) the extent to which a judgment rendered in the person's absence might prejudice that person or the existing parties;

(2) the extent to which any prejudice could be lessened or avoided by:

(A) protective provisions in the judgment;

(B) shaping of the relief; or

(C) other measures;

(3) whether a judgment rendered in the person's absence would be adequate; and

(4) whether the plaintiff would have an adequate remedy if the action were dismissed for non-joinder.

(c) Pleading the Reasons for Non-Joinder. When asserting a claim for relief, a party must state:

(1) the name, if known, of any person who is required to be joined if feasible but is not joined; and

(2) the reasons for not joining that person.

(d) Exception for Class Actions. This rule is subject to [Rule 23](#).

Explanatory Note ▼

Version History ▼



STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA COURTS

RULE 20. PERMISSIVE JOINDER OF PARTIES

Effective Date: 3/1/2011

(a) Persons Who May Join or Be Joined.

(1) Plaintiffs. Persons may join in one action as plaintiffs if:

- (A) they assert any right to relief jointly, severally, or in the alternative with respect to or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences; and
- (B) any question of law or fact common to all plaintiffs will arise in the action.

(2) Defendants. Persons may be joined in one action as defendants if:

- (A) any right to relief is asserted against them jointly, severally, or in the alternative with respect to or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences; and
- (B) any question of law or fact common to all defendants will arise in the action.

(3) Extent of Relief. Neither a plaintiff nor a defendant need be interested in obtaining or defending against all the relief demanded. The court may grant judgment to one or more plaintiffs according to their rights, and against one or more defendants according to their liabilities.

(b) Protective Measures. The court may issue orders, including an order for separate trials, to protect a party against embarrassment, delay, expense, or other prejudice that arises from including a person against whom the party asserts no claim and who asserts no claim against the party.

Explanatory Note ▼

Version History ▼



STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA COURTS

RULE 21. MISJOINDER AND NON-JOINDER OF PARTIES

Effective Date: 3/1/2011

Misjoinder of parties is not a ground for dismissing an action. On motion or on its own, the court may at any time, on just terms, add or drop a party. The court may also sever any claim against a party.

Explanatory Note ▼

Version History ▼



STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA COURTS

RULE 24. INTERVENTION

Effective Date: 3/1/2011

(a) Intervention of Right. On timely motion, the court must permit anyone to intervene who:

- (1) is given an unconditional right to intervene by a statute; or
- (2) claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action, and is so situated that disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the movant's ability to protect its interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest.

(b) Permissive Intervention.

(1) In General. On timely motion, the court may permit anyone to intervene who:

- (A) is given a conditional right to intervene by a statute; or
- (B) has a claim or defense that shares with the main action a common question of law or fact.

(2) By a Government Office or Agency. On timely motion, the court may permit a federal or state governmental officer or agency to intervene if a party's claim or defense is based on:

- (A) a statute or executive order administered by the officer or agency; or
- (B) any regulation, order, requirement or agreement issued or made under the statute or executive order.

(3) Delay or Prejudice. In exercising its discretion, the court must consider whether the intervention will unduly delay or prejudice the adjudication of the original parties' rights.

(c) Notice and Pleading Required.

(1) Procedure. A motion to intervene must be served on the parties as provided in [Rule 5](#). The motion must state the grounds for intervention and be accompanied by a pleading that sets out the claim or defense for which intervention is sought. The same procedure must be followed when a statute gives a right to intervene.

(2) Constitutional Question. A party questioning the constitutionality of a legislative act affecting the public interest in an action in which neither the state nor any agency or officer is a party must notify the attorney general. On timely motion, the court must permit the attorney general to intervene on behalf of the state.

Explanatory Note ▼

Version History ▼

Mr Chairman my Name is Lori VanWinkle and I represent the great people of District 3 in Minot.

HB 1409 is before you today creating and enacting a new section to judicial remedies in CH 32-01 of Century Code.

The reason for the bill is because there is a recognizable need in ND for a broader approach for our citizens to be allowed representation when their rights are also at stake in a case. Most people already struggle to be able to afford an attorney representation, and with shortages and struggles with concern that a citizen's case may not be well represented, this bill create an avenue for a citizen to use representation that they believe is willing to uphold their rights and is more affordable than an attorney, because that person has an equitable or legal interest in doing so.

We need to make sure our citizens are allowed due process of law are not restricted or hindered in their ability to retain counsel that they believe will put their interests as priority in their legal matter. This gives citizens more options if they take the path of pro se litigation and may give them more confidence for their defense and it would no longer limit them to the narrow restrictions of only being able to stand alone, or hire an attorney, when they may believe someone else with equitable or legal interest in their civil or criminal action may be better qualified and competent to represent their interest than an attorney.

You will see the bill is relatively short and is not complicated.

Interest is defined right there within the bill on line 7 and line 8, and states it is to be liberally interpreted and a party able to represent someone can do so with either a legal interest in a matter or an equitable interest.

I have testimony following who will more broadly explain the implications of what an equitable and legal interest mean in practical senses.

Thank you Mr. Chairman I stand for questions.

2025 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Judiciary Committee
Room JW327B, State Capitol

HB 1409
2/18/2025

A BILL for an Act to create and enact a new section to chapter 32-01 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to general provisions for judicial remedies.

3:18 p.m. Chairman Klemin opened the hearing.

Members Present: Chairman Klemin, Vice-Chairman Karls, Vice-Chairman Vetter, Representatives Christianson, Henderson, Hoverson, Johnston, McLeod, S. Olson, Satrom, Tveit, VanWinkle, Wolff, Schneider

Discussion Topics:

- Legal definition of "interest"
- Legal advisors
- Self-representation in court

3:35 p.m. Representative Karls moved a Do Not Pass.

3:35 p.m. Representative Schneider seconded the motion.

Representatives	Vote
Representative Lawrence R. Klemin	Y
Representative Karen Karls	Y
Representative Steve Vetter	Y
Representative Nels Christianson	Y
Representative Donna Henderson	N
Representative Jeff Hoverson	N
Representative Daniel Johnston	N
Representative Carrie McLeod	Y
Representative SuAnn Olson	Y
Representative Bernie Satrom	Y
Representative Mary Schneider	Y
Representative Bill Tveit	N
Representative Lori VanWinkle	N
Representative Christina Wolff	N

3:39 p.m. Motion passed 8-6-0

3:40 p.m. Representative Satrom will carry the bill.

3:40 p.m. Chairman Klemin closed the hearing.

Wyatt Armstrong, Committee Clerk

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE
HB 1409 ([25.0893.02000](#))

Judiciary Committee (Rep. Klemin, Chairman) recommends **DO NOT PASS** (8 YEAS, 6 NAYS, 0 ABSENT OR EXCUSED AND NOT VOTING). HB 1409 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.