

CONTACT: GLORIA ALLRED
(323) 653-6530
Email: gallred@amglaw.com

Statement of Gloria Allred

On July 20, 2017, I watched the Nevada Parole Board hearing for O.J. Simpson. Mr. Simpson was seeking parole after having been convicted of numerous felonies in Nevada. He had served 9 years of a 33 year sentence.

Convicted felon O.J. Simpson answered questions of the Parole Board, but he did not answer the Board's questions under oath and under penalty of perjury. Mr. Simpson was therefore, able to lie with impunity to the Parole Board.

For example, inmate Simpson stated, "I've always thought I'd been pretty good with people, and I basically have spent a conflict free life." The Board was unable to challenge him on that statement because under current Nevada law, they were unable to take into account that in 1997 a civil jury in Los Angeles County Superior Court found Mr. Simpson responsible for the wrongful death of his wife and mother of his children, Nicole Brown Simpson and the wrongful death of Ronald Goldman. The jury had found by clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Simpson's killing of Nicole and Ron was with malice and oppression and therefore ordered him to pay 25 million dollars in punitive damages to the estate of Nicole Brown Simpson and the estate of Ron Goldman and 8 million dollars in compensatory damages to the estate of Ronald Goldman.

Obviously this verdict and judgement of the court would have contradicted Mr. Simpson's statement that he has led a conflict free life since he was found to have maliciously killed two people with a deadly weapon, a knife, which he used to almost decapitate Nicole and leave her bloody body in front of her home where their young children could have found their mother lying in a pool of blood.

Further, because Nevada guidelines did not require the Parole Board to ask Mr. Simpson specifically if he had ever been convicted of an act of domestic violence, the Board also did not question Mr. Simpson about the fact that in 1989, Mr. Simpson was convicted of misdemeanor battery of his wife Nicole. In the subsequent criminal case of the People v. O.J. Simpson, in which Mr. Simpson was charged with Nicole's murder, prosecutors alleged that at the time of the spousal battery of Nicole, Mr. Simpson had punched, kicked and slapped Nicole while he was shouting "I'll kill you".

Although he was acquitted of murder, in the subsequent civil trial, the jury was shown a large photo of Nicole with a black eye, a swollen face and a cut lip. Unfortunately the Nevada Parole Board did not have this domestic violence information and therefore did not use it to challenge Mr. Simpson's lie to them that he had led "a conflict free life".

As I watched the hearing and heard the Board conclude that Mr. Simpson was "at low risk to reoffend" and should be granted Parole, I immediately felt that the law in Nevada should be changed so that in the future the Parole Board would be able to take into account domestic violence, including spousal battery and the ultimate act of violence, the killing of other human beings with malice and oppression.

I also felt that an inmate should be required to make his statement to the Parole Board under oath and under penalty of perjury. After all, parole is a privilege not a right, and a Parole Board should be able to take into account a record of civil and criminal violence against women and men.

A Parole Board should not be forced to engage in legal fictions and should instead be required by statutory guidelines to consider the reality of an inmate's legal record and history when considering if the release of that inmate may create a risk that the inmate may reoffend and present a threat or danger to the community

if released prior to serving his full sentence for the crimes for which he has been convicted.

Assemblymember Lisa Krasner is a strong advocate for victims of domestic violence and she has a record of working in the legislature to strengthen and protect victim's rights.

I commend her for agreeing to introduce this bill which if passed into law will assist the Nevada Parole Board by adding clarifying guidelines for their decision making process regarding an inmate's parole.

Assemblymember Krasner's bill will add to the current standards to be considered in granting parole:

- 1) if an individual had been convicted of domestic violence,
- 2) if an inmate had been found responsible for the wrongful death of another where punitive damages have been awarded, and
- 3) all persons who come before the Parole Board must sign a statement under penalty of perjury that information that they give to the Parole Board, either orally or written is truthful to the best of their knowledge.

Although this bill, if passed into law, will not have an impact on O.J. Simpson, it will have an impact on others in the future who seek parole.

The people of Nevada and of every state have a right to a full and truthful assessment of the facts, so that a Parole Board may decide who may or may not be a threat or a risk to the community if paroled.

I commend Assemblymember Krasner for taking the lead to protect the truth and the people of Nevada.

Gloria Allred
Attorney at Law
September 126, 2017