JUSTICE COURT, GOODSPRINGS TOWNSHIP
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

STATE OF NEVADA, **Plaintiff,** **-vs-** **JOSE DECASTRO,** **Defendant**	**CASE NO.:** 23CCG005348 **ORDER REGARDING MEDIA REQUEST FOR ELECTRONIC COVERAGE OF COURT PROCEEDINGS**

WHEREAS, the Court has reviewed the media request received from ALEX FALCONI and has considered the following factors:

(a) The impact of coverage upon the right of any party to a fair trial--
The Court will ensure that a fair trial is conducted, and the Court will impose any and all necessary safeguards.
(b) The impact of coverage upon the right of privacy of any party or witness--
In Stephens Media, LLC. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, 125 Nev. 849 (2009), the Supreme Court of Nevada recognized that the presumption of an open court is firmly rooted in American jurisprudence, grounded in logic, and integral to the administration of justice. Supreme Court Rule 230(2) also recognizes this presumption. In the event that any particularized privacy concerns are subsequently raised in this case, the Court will allow any sensitive information to be presented in camera for potential redaction or restriction in order to protect any party or witness.
(c) The impact of coverage upon the safety and well-being of any party, witness or juror--
The Court finds that coverage of the instant case will not endanger the safety and well-being of such individuals.
(d) The likelihood that coverage would distract participants or would detract from the dignity of the proceedings--
The Court is confident that the decorum and dignity of the proceedings will be maintained at all times.
(e) The adequacy of the physical facilities of the court for coverage--
The Court has adequate physical facilities to ensure proper coverage.
(f) Any other factor affecting the fair administration of justice--
No additional factors have been identified as relevant in this case. Media access may be revoked in the event of noncompliance or if it is shown that electronic coverage of the judicial proceedings is distracting the participants, impairing the dignity of the Court, or otherwise materially interfering with the administration of justice.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

☒ The media request is **GRANTED** for the following requested method(s):
[ ] Audio Broadcasting (live) [ ] Televising (live) [ ] Live-streaming audio and/or video
[ ] Audio Broadcasting (not live) [ ] Televising (not live) ☒ Recording ☒ Photographing
[ ] Other: _____
because there is a presumption that all courtroom proceedings that are open to the public are subject to electronic coverage, and the factors set forth above favor such coverage in this case.

☐ The media request is **GRANTED** for the following additional reason(s): _____
_____.

☐ The media request is **DENIED** because it was submitted less than 24 hours before the scheduled proceeding was to commence, and no "good cause" has been shown to justify granting the request on shorter notice.

☐ The media request is **DENIED** for the following additional reason(s): _____
_____.

The requested media access will remain in effect for each and every hearing in the above-entitled case, at the discretion of the Court, and unless otherwise ordered. **This Order is specific to the above-entitled case only. No other cases on calendar may be broadcast, televised, recorded, photographed, and/or live-streamed without the Court's express, written permission.** This Order is made in accordance with Supreme Court Rules 229-246, inclusive, at the discretion of the judge, and is subject to reconsideration upon motion of any party.
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this document shall be made a part of the record of these proceedings.

Dated this 25 day of March, 2024

_____
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE

Revised 3/21/2024