

LOTL QUARTERLY 2025D (Oct.-Dec. 2025)

“Life on The List” (LOTL) Newsletter is a quarterly newsletter with legal news & relevant info for those forced to register upon release, or those new to life as a person forced to register. Comments & inquiries should be sent to: Derek Logue, OnceFallen.com, 2211 CR 400, Tobias NE 68453. Current & previous issues of LOTL & the former ICoN newsletters can be accessed & printed out for free at <https://oncefallen.com/icon/>

LEGAL NEWS

People v. Kosak, 24CA0178 (CO Ct. Appeals, 8/21/2025): The Colorado Court of Appeals determined that Douglas Co. judge Ryan Stuart acted improperly by refusing to grant a defendant’s request to de-register a a quarter-century after his offense because the man allegedly “smirked” at a hearing. Kosak pleaded guilty in 2001 to one felony and one misdemeanor count for an offense related to a minor. After completing four years of special probation, a judge dismissed the felony, leaving Kosak guilty of only a misdemeanor. He subsequently completed treatment in 2006. Ten years later, without further incident, Kosak petitioned under Colorado law to get off the SOR. Because he only stood convicted of a misdemeanor, his name did not even appear in the state’s database. He was denied in 2017; he moved to Georgia, and GA removed him from their SOR. When he reapplied in 2023, Kosak presented a Georgia judge’s order and a state assessment classifying him at the lowest risk of recidivism. Kosak’s alleged victim testified against the removal & claimed that Kosak “smirked” at him during his testimony, so Judge Stuart accused Kosak of lacking empathy and denied his request. A three-judge Court of Appeals panel concluded Stuart’s handling of the petition was “manifestly arbitrary and unreasonable” in light of the actual evidence presented. “The district court did not properly consider any of this evidence. Moreover, the prosecution introduced no evidence contradicting the evidence that Kosak did not present a significant risk to commit a new offense involving unlawful sexual behavior... the district court did not give Kosak a meaningful opportunity to explain the perceived smirk; instead, it curtly ended the hearing and told Kosak he could file an appeal.”

Baird v. Reyes, Case: 1:24-cv-13162 (No. Dist. IL, 8/26/2025): Court upholds the erroneous use of the P-word to attack a person on the SOR. “Baird’s three-page handwritten complaint ... alleges that, on 2/14/2024, Reyes posted on his Facebook page an image of Baird with the text: ‘If anyone sees this fucking pedo with my kid and baby momma, let me know immediately.’ Here, the Court finds that the facts surrounding his conviction reveal that Baird, as an adult, had a sexual relationship with a minor, and such conduct is commonly associated with the term pedophile. As Baird himself acknowledges, his [1999] conviction for Aggravated Criminal Sexual Abuse arose from his year-and-a-half sexual relationship with a 15-year-old girl when he was 27 years old. As a result of that conviction, he is classified under Illinois law as a ‘child SO.’” ... “Baird disputes the substantial truth of Reyes’s ‘pedo’ accusation, arguing that he had only a single relationship with a minor teenager who he mistakenly believed to be over the age of 18. Essentially, Baird claims that the specific circumstances underlying his conviction establish that he does not meet the criteria of a pedophile—i.e., an adult with an inherent attraction to children. However, substantial truth in this case does not demand that Baird exactly match the clinical or technical definition of the term. It is enough that the public would generally understand the term to refer broadly to adults who engage in sexual conduct with minors, with ‘minor’ not limited to just prepubescent children but encompassing anybody under 18 years old. Nor does Baird’s subjective but mistaken belief regarding the minor’s age change the nature of the conduct established by his conviction or the fact that, based on that conviction alone, Illinois law classifies him as a ‘child SO.’”

Doe v. Sex Offender Registry Bd., 496 Mass. 437 (Mass. 2025): In Massachusetts, judicially assessed need for public notification figures in SORN classification levels. The Supreme Judicial Court held that the trial court did not make an unambiguous finding that public notification was warranted vis-à-vis Doe, vacated the judgment and remanded for this determination.

Matter of B.J.B., 2025 MT 175 (Mont. 2025): Petitioner is a juvenile adjudicated delinquent for several intra-familial sexual offenses. Although adjudicated juveniles are typically exempt from registration, the court can require registration upon finding that registration “is necessary for protection of the public and that registration is in the public’s interest.” The trial court concluded, based on the record, that petitioner must register, be designated a Level 2 registrant, and be subject to lifetime registration due to the nature of his adjudicated offenses. Applying an abuse of discretion standard of review, the Supreme Court affirmed the disposition. A concurring justice agrees with the

outcome but writes to express his concern that registration “could indeed, contrary to its goal, increase, rather than decrease, recidivism rates.” “I would urge courts not to merely parrot the statutory language [regarding risk] but to carefully consider the youth’s potential for rehabilitation together with the unintended collateral consequences of registration.”

People v. Chronis, 2025 COA 72 (Colo. Ct. App. 2025): Chronis petitioned for de-registration, claiming that he was eligible because he satisfied the 10-year required registration period and his prior juvenile adjudication for a sexual offense was expunged. The Court of Appeals rejected the argument, finding that expunged adjudications can be considered if within a specified time period, and Chronis’s was within that period. The court also held that requiring registration for an adult sex offense conviction, and an adjudication for a sex offense, was not punitive and therefore did not violate ex post facto principles. Finally, the court concluded that the rule of lenity did not apply because no ambiguity existed in the statutes under consideration.

People v. Cannon, No. S277995, 2025 WL 2383643 (Cal. 2025): California affords potential SVP committees the right to a jury trial. In this case, the California Supreme Court addressed whether a candidate for commitment must be advised of the jury trial right by the court (rather than the right only being exercised upon demand of the candidate). Cannon argued that not expressly advising a candidate of the right violated equal protection because in other contexts, such as when a criminal defendant raises an insanity plea, advisement is required. The Court held that while the jury right is fundamental and the lack of advisement imposes a burden on the right, the burden is not significant enough to warrant strict scrutiny. Applying rational basis scrutiny to the equal protection challenge, the Court held that no express advisement is required. The trial court must only ensure that the candidate was aware of the right and made the decision to forego the right.

Doe v. Sheridan, No. CV-23-01938-PHX-SMM (US Dist. Ct. AZ, 11/7/2025): Ruled in favor of the state against a challenge to the following—internet identifier reporting requirements (Facial & as-applied, 1st Amendment), lifetime registration (14th Amendment “due process”), & residential registration requirement (as applied, vagueness). The state had argued that Doe had given up his rights as a condition of his plea deal, which included lifetime supervision, but the Courts recognized the waiver only applied to conditions of supervision, not conditions of registration (but even then, Doe could challenge certain conditions if they are a potential constitutional violation). However, the Court determined that Arizona’s law requiring registration of internet identifiers doesn’t violate the 1st Amendment since these internet IDs are not disseminated to the public; it also allows for RPs to report internet IDs by email, not in-person. Lifetime registration was upheld as serving a “compelling government interest”, while upholding the rest as there was no other compelling argument made by Doe that wasn’t addressed by other similar rulings.

INDIANA: MAN WINS TRIAL DUE TO STATE’S CP STATUTE AS RELATED TO AI IMAGES

Images created by “Artificial Intelligence” (AI) are already a controversial topic, especially as AI is becoming capable of making realistic images.

(Source: Russ McQuaid. “Judge finds AI child pornography defendant not guilty due to uncertain law.” Fox 59 Indianapolis. 8/31/2025. <https://fox59.com/news/judge-finds-ai-child-pornography-defendant-not-guilty-due-to-uncertain-law/>)

INDIANAPOLIS — Marion Superior Judge James Osborn was clearly challenged when it came to hearing a case this month consisting of ten counts of child exploitation and child pornography against a former employee of the Marion County Forensic Services Agency. The man was suspended from his job when the charges were leveled last summer. “Your attorney summarized nicely what I’m sure a lot of people think about what you’ve done,” the judge told the defendant at the end of his trial. “It should be against the law, and I imagine at some point it will be, but I don’t think it is yet, at least not what you did in this particular instance.”

What the man was accused of was superimposing actual headshot photographs of juvenile girls onto the AI-created images of nude women. “I don’t buy into the idea of that you can pin somebody else’s body onto a child and say that’s not them,” said the judge. “The child doesn’t have to exist for the statute to apply.” Marion Co. Prosecutor Ryan Mears agreed. “When the allegation is that you are creating pornography or you are creating CP where you’re taking images or AI images of kids...those individuals are still dangerous to our community,” Mears told

FOX59/CBS4. "Our position certainly, when you have real live identifiable children, the position of the Marion Co. Prosecutors' Office is that it's absolutely something that should be and will be prosecuted."

Osborn indicated his sympathies may have been with the prosecution, but his reading of the law suggested the General Assembly needed to go back and tweak its statute, "because it doesn't include language saying that he is aware of the child's age," though "We know (he) knew that." FOX59/CBS4 is not naming the defendant because the judge found him not guilty. Mears said the legal community should not read too much into one judge's ruling regarding a law that is essentially untested.

"It's a new statute and, as always, when there's new statute, how that's going to be applied by judges to specific factual circumstances is something that's going to continue to evolve," he said. "There's no case law to give us guidance. There's no Court of Appeals or Supreme Court opinion saying, 'This is where free speech begins and this is where it ends,' so, we're just gonna have to try and litigate these cases and hopefully create a good record where we can send clear guidance not only to law enforcement but to the community as to when we're gonna be able to hold people accountable."

LOCAL-LEVEL ORDINANCES: A REVIEW

When Registered Persons look to move to a new location, they look at state-level restrictions, but local governments can sometimes pass ordinances that exceed existing statewide restrictions. Before you consider moving to a new location, you may want to find out what the laws are on the local level. Some states, even ones that do not have statewide residency restriction laws, allow municipalities to make their own rules which may include numerous restricted zones and limitations on where you work or visit. First, you must find out what type of government presides over the land where the residence is located, and if there are any local ordinances that may apply to you. Not all local level governments have the ability to pass such laws. You must first find out what states allow local-level laws and which ones do not.

We recognize the difficulties prisoners (or just those who are intimidated by legal research) might face in trying to interpret local-level ordinances, so for most of 2025, OnceFallen.com has conducted a review of municipal level ordinances, and have completed reports for the states of Florida, Maine, Nebraska, Texas, and Wisconsin. This has been a massive project that has taken up most of the year in terms of research.

A number of states are known to allow municipal or local level governments to place restrictions on Persons Forced to Register (PFRs), even if that state lacks a statewide restriction law. States known to allow additional ordinances include Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Missouri, Nebraska, Maine, Minnesota, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. Each state has a different governmental structure. Some state laws may even grant only certain kinds of local-level governments to pass restrictions, or they may pass a limit on distance or other prohibitions. Below are a few examples:

- Florida: Only have cities and counties; counties can override municipal ordinances.
- Kansas: KSA §22-4913 prohibits all local level governments from passing residency restriction laws.
- Maine: Has cities, towns (townships), counties, and "plantations"; plantations can't pass ordinances; Maine limits local-level ordinances to 750 ft.
- Nebraska: Limits municipal ordinances to 500 ft. residency restrictions from schools and daycare centers
- Texas: Has "home rule" (pop. 5000+) and "general rule" (pop.<5000) cities; general rule municipalities were granted the right to pass restrictive ordinances in 2017; counties can't pass ordinances (yet).
- Wisconsin: Has cities, villages, "towns" (townships), and counties; all local-level governments can pass ordinances; WI allows the passage of an "original domicile rule" preventing Registered Persons from residing in the community unless they lived in the community before being convicted of a sex offense.

Just to give you an idea of how municipal ordinances can exacerbate problems with statewide restrictions, let's look at a few states that have allowed local-level restrictions to pass:

ALASKA: The Matanuska-Susitna Borough, just north of Anchorage, adopted an ordinance on 7/18/23 banning RPs from living within 1000 ft. of schools, daycare facilities or public parks (municipal-owned playground, playing field, or community rec. center, not state & national parks).

COLORADO: A September 2021 survey of 138 Colorado communities found that 32 communities have some form of residency restrictions including anti-clustering laws. This is ironic, given that Colorado was one of the first states that conducted a study on residency restrictions and concluded that they do not work.

FLORIDA: The state already has 1000 foot residency restrictions & 300 ft. proximity restrictions from schools, child care facilities, parks, or playgrounds, but many municipalities and counties have additional restrictions. As of April 2025: 220 of 478 (46%) have additional residency restrictions; 87 of 478 (18.2%) have additional presence restrictions, proximity/anti-loitering, or park ban ordinances; 18 counties & 15 cities have shelter bans or segregated shelters; 6 counties have Halloween restrictions; and 3 cities and 2 counties have “anti-clustering” ordinances. The smallest city with an ordinance is Sea Ranch Lakes (pop. 540). Only 11 counties (19.4%) had no additional city/county ordinances.

MAINE: Under MRS §30-A-3014, local-level governments in Maine are allowed to pass residency restriction ordinances of up to 750 feet from schools, parks, athletic fields or recreational facilities only if the Registrant was convicted of an offense against someone under the age of 14. As of August 2025, there are 39 municipalities that have adopted municipal ordinances placing restrictions on Registered Persons, including 11 of 23 cities (47.8%) and 28 of 430 towns (6.5%). Of those communities have ordinances, six cities and nineteen towns have “grandfather clauses” allowing Registered Persons to remain in a home if a school if a school, park, athletic field or recreational facility moves in after residence is established. However, eleven Maine towns have ordinances that violate this narrow restriction, whether by increasing the age at which restrictions apply, adding additional restricted areas, increasing the distance of prohibited zones and/or adding other types of restrictions like employment bans. The smallest community in Maine that has residency restrictions is the town of Cranberry Isles (pop. 160).

MINNESOTA: A report from the Minnesota Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers (MnATSA) found that as of February 2019, 90 communities have passed residency restriction ordinances between 500 ft. and 2500 ft. Like Colorado, past research conducted by the state of Minnesota had concluded that residency restriction laws do not work and may increase recidivism.

NEBRASKA: Like Maine, Nebraska has a law limiting what kind of restrictions municipalities can pass; Nebraska allows municipalities to pass residency restrictions from schools & daycares except in certain narrow circumstances (e.g., 500 ft. exclusion zones applicable to all SVPs). NRS §29-4017. As of April 2025, 143 municipal ordinances have been reviewed. The majority of Nebraska’s incorporated communities (107 of 143, or 74.8%) that have their municipal codes online have passed municipal residency restriction ordinances; three only apply to schools (Lincoln, La Vista, Omaha). Nebraskans Unafraid reported that Omaha has recently added daycares to the list of restrictions. The smallest community with a residency restriction ordinance is Petersburg (pop. 333).

TEXAS: Doesn’t have statewide restrictions for those off supervision but allows all municipalities (but not counties) to make their own restrictions. In 2025, Texas attempted to allow municipalities to pass restrictive ordinances in the unincorporated parts of that community; it failed for the 2025 session but it may be reintroduced in the future. As of August 2025, of 1225 municipalities: 412 (45.5%) have residency restrictions, incl. 230 (65.2%) of cities with “home rule” (pop.5000+). Texas passed a law in 2017 allowing “general rule” cities (pop.<5000) to pass restrictions; 164 (18.1%) have presence restrictions, anti-loitering, or park bans; 109 (12%) have Halloween restriction laws; 17 municipalities force PFRs to place signs in their yards declaring that it is a “Sex Offender” residence; four municipalities place no time limitations on the postage of signs, thus requiring signs at all times: Bay City, Cuero, Gonzalez, & Oyster Creek (Bay City also requires a mark on the RP’s vehicle); 10 have anti-clustering ordinances; and 212 (23.4%) have some form of job or licensing ban. The smallest community with an ordinance is the village of Bonney (pop. 180).

WISCONSIN: As of October 2025, there are 1,922 total cities, villages, townships, and counties in the state of Wisconsin. Of those local-level governments, 577 local-level governments lacked online ordinances and/or did not respond to FOIA request, or had incomplete information on existing ordinances. Of the remaining 1345 local-level governments, 347 (25.7%) had at least one restriction, including 319 (23.7%) with residency restrictions, 156

(11.6%) with an anti-loitering or proximity restriction, 148 (11%) with an original domicile rule, 180 (13.4%) with Halloween restrictions, and 11 (0.8%) with anti-clustering laws. Millston (pop. 136) is the smallest community with local-level restrictions. Three out of 72 counties (4.2%) have a restrictive ordinance; Juneau and Keweenaw Counties have some presence/anti-loitering restrictions, and Walworth County passed an ordinance requiring the Lakeland Health Care Center (a nursing home) to deny admission to RPs. Out of the other local-level governments, 102 out of 190 cities (53.7%), 154 of 416 villages (37%), and 88 of 1244 towns/townships (7.1%) have some form of local-level ordinance.

Adjacent municipalities can have vastly different ordinances. Town A may have no restrictions at all, while Town B has everything from a 2500 foot living and presence restrictions and various other restrictions. Local-level ordinances can include residency restrictions (can include ‘anti-clustering’ laws banning Registered Persons from living near each other), proximity or anti-loitering restrictions, job or job license bans, laws banning Registered Persons from participating in certain Halloween or Holiday events (leaving porch lights on, wearing costumes or decorating in a way that may draw children to your residence, and in a few locations, you may have to post signs in your doors declaring there is no candy at your residence. A handful of communities in Texas require you to post signs in your yard and/or on your car declaring you are on the registry. Some municipalities may apply local-level laws to all Registrants, while others may target only those with offenses against a minor under age 18, or 16, or 14, or those considered a high-risk, or on supervised release. Presence restrictions may only be an anti-loitering ordinance or a ban from being within a certain distance, and exceptions to the rule can vary, if there are exceptions at all. Residency and presence restrictions can vary in distance (as little as 50 ft. or as much as 6000 ft.) and in some instances, can include places you’d never think of as a “place where children congregate.”

Just to illustrate the absurdity of some of the restrictive ordinances, here are some of the most extreme ordinances found during the survey of residency restrictions:

- Bay City TX (§87-5): An ordinance requiring signs placed in the yard and on the vehicle stating “sexual offender’s/predator’s vehicle.”
- Citrus County FL (§70-57): The county’s segregated emergency shelter ordinance applies only to unincorporated parts of Citrus County. Unfortunately, the county’s only two incorporated cities, Crystal River and Iverness, have similar ordinances!
- Elmendorf, TX (Ch. 24, Art. III): You can be penalized for entering a Child Safety Zone, “whether knowingly or not.” There’s a map of restricted zones at city hall, but will you pass through a restricted zone to get to city hall? The ordinance includes school/daycare center bus stops!
- Glenwood City, WI (§344-6): Registered Persons cannot take pictures, shoot video, or have surveillance equipment pointed in the direction of a restriction zone.
- Grafton, WI (§9.67.065): Registered Persons cannot establish residence with a “designated walking zone” (municipal code offers no definition)
- Green Cove Springs, FL (§117-824 & §117-796): Municipal law requires Registered Persons staying in a “short-term vacation rental” to register AND abide by local residency restrictions. This is not in the same section as the municipal residency restriction law (also applies to emergency shelters)
- Hartford, WI (Ord# 850-18) Do you like math? In 2018, “The Village hereby declares a Moratorium prohibiting the establishment of a Temporary or Permanent Residence by a Designated Offender within the Village until such time as the saturation level for Designated Offenders in the Village of Hartland reaches a factor of 1.1 or lower where the saturation level is determined by adding the number of Designated Offenders per square mile in Hartland plus the number of Designated Offenders per 1,000 population in Hartland and dividing the resulting figure by the sum of the number of Designated Offenders per square mile in Waukesha County net of Hartland plus the number of Designated Offenders per 1,000 population in Waukesha County net of Hartland,” The good news is that the number of Registrants in the village dropped low enough that this section of the ordinance was repealed...for now.

There are a couple of ways to find out if there are local-level restrictions in an area. You can perform a web browser search on the name of the community and/or county you plan on moving to and see if that community has their municipal codes or ordinances online and then peruse the municipal ordinances yourself. Alternately, you can ask the local registration office and/or the clerk of the local-level government agency for that information. Some local

ordinances require the local-level government to provide a map of restricted zones or a list of properties that meet the requirements of the local law.

Never assume that small towns or villages don't have local-level restrictions. In Texas, at least 21 municipalities with populations below 1000 residents have local-level residency restriction ordinances; in Florida, three municipalities with populations below 1000 residents have local-level residency restriction ordinances (eight if you count those with countywide ordinances; and in Nebraska, 22 municipalities with populations below 1000 residents have local-level residency restriction ordinances. In Wisconsin, the villages of Marquette (pop. 172) and Navarino (pop. 177), and the town (i.e., township) of Millston (pop. 136), also have restrictive ordinances. Marquette adds the local post office and the village hall as restricted zones.

The village of Hartland placed a moratorium on allowing Registrants to move into the community in 2018: "The Village hereby declares a Moratorium prohibiting the establishment of a Temporary or Permanent Residence by a Designated Offender within the Village until such time as the saturation level for Designated Offenders in the Village of Hartland reaches a factor of 1.1 or lower where the saturation level is determined by adding the number of Designated Offenders per square mile in Hartland plus the number of Designated Offenders per 1,000 population in Hartland and dividing the resulting figure by the sum of the number of Designated Offenders per square mile in Waukesha County net of Hartland plus the number of Designated Offenders per 1,000 population in Waukesha County net of Hartland." So for a time, you had to wait on mathematicians to decide when a Registered Person can move into the area!

In sum, local-level ordinances can exacerbate an already herculean task of finding a place to live, work, or play. Don't assume that looking at state-level laws are enough. Read the statutes/ordinances, if you can, and read the definitions in the statutes and ordinances. Below are a couple of examples from the "Free State" of FloriDUH:

Florida Action Committee (FAC) reported that, "A recent arrest in Melbourne underscores how Brevard County's restrictive proximity ordinance creates a minefield for registrants who are simply trying to go about their daily lives. According to reports, a 46-year-old man was arrested around 9 p.m. after walking through the parking lot of Melbourne High School — long after the school was closed and deserted. Police said the man, who has an offense dating back more than 15 years, admitted he was a registrant but explained he was merely taking a shortcut to the sidewalk before it started to rain. Nevertheless, he was charged with violating Brevard County Ordinance 74-102, which prohibits registrants from being within 1,000 feet of schools, parks, playgrounds, and daycares.

What's troubling is that this arrest took place at night, when no students or staff were present. Yet the ordinance applies 24 hours a day, seven days a week, regardless of whether children are anywhere nearby. It also covers the areas within 1000 feet of schools, parks, playgrounds and daycares, requiring persons to know what path is at least 1000 feet away from the property lines. This creates a situation where registrants must constantly guess whether they've unknowingly stepped into one of countless overlapping 1,000-foot buffer zones that surround nearly every public space in the county. There are no signs marking these invisible boundaries. A person could be in compliance one moment and in violation the next, without ever realizing it.

This is not public safety — it's entrapment by geography. When ordinances are written so broadly that even crossing a parking lot at night becomes a criminal act, we have to ask whether the goal is truly protecting the public or perpetuating punishment. The individual in this case has long since completed his sentence and is trying to stay compliant, yet he continues to get caught up in technical violations that serve no rehabilitative or protective purpose."

Source: "Watch where you step! Proximity ordinances create trip wires for registrants." Florida Action Committee, 11/11/2025. <https://floridaactioncommittee.org/watch-where-you-step-proximity-ordinances-create-trip-wires-for-registrants/>

Here is yet another example of the importance of understanding definitions, and yes, this is ALSO from the "Free State" of FloriDUH and posted by FAC:

Highlands County Detective and Sergeant are at it again. This time, dozens of registrants were arrested within the past couple of weeks for registration violations relating to mobile homes and manufactured homes. Many registrants

live in trailer parks because of affordability and because they are generally located in rural areas which are farther from schools. They live in mobile homes or manufactured homes that have been in the same spot for years. They properly registered the homes as their permanent address, but not as “vehicles owned”.

One member who was violated wrote, “I do not think of the place I live as a trailer it has been in the same place for at least 35 years . It has no tongue for a vin. It has no wheels can’t be pulled down the road no lights no tag.”. One would think that such a structure would not be considered registrable under “vehicles owned” and instead registered the home as their permanent residence. Common sense would dictate that if this is where you reside, where the permanent structure has been affixed for decades, this would satisfy the requirement.

The Highlands County Sheriffs Office and prosecutors don’t think so. Even though dozens of people have been registering for years and this is the first time it comes up, the past couple of weeks it became an issue for the Sheriffs office and they did a mass round up.

Although many of you have reached out to FAC for guidance, since this is a criminal matter, the only person you should be taking guidance from is your criminal defense attorney. The violation is a felony and registrants are being charged with a separate count for each time they went in to re-register and didn’t register the mobile home as a “vehicle”, some of our members are facing serious prison time for an unknowing violation of the law.

Source: “Highlands County Rounds up Dozens for Mobile/Manufactured Home FTRs.” Florida Action Committee, 11/10/2025. <https://floridaactioncommittee.org/highlands-county-rounds-up-dozens-for-mobile-manufactured-home-frs/>

There is one final subject I feel I must address. At the 2025, Safe Living Search App (<https://safelivingsearch.com/>), a Residency Pre-Screening Search Engine created by a company calling themselves Compiled Byte, LLC, was introduced at the NARSOL conference, and is now online. It is a decent attempt to assist Registrants in finding housing but it is NOT a free service. Now, I am not implying at all that this service is a scam or from a dubious source. In fact, I hope that over time, they can address the immense complexity required to find housing in an area where numerous restricted zones exist. But, what I AM concerned about it that folks want to find ways to find housing without talking to a law enforcement agent. Even in the app’s own intro video, the creators state the app uses Google maps, not plat maps; this matters because distance is measured property line to property line, while Google maps will only show distance from building to building. The intro video will even say you should increase distance in your search to compensate for this but you may end up missing available housing. Let me illustrate what I mean—House A and House B are both the same distance from a school with a 2000 foot residency restriction law; Google Maps shows both houses 3000 feet away. But between the school and House A is the parking lot, the school athletic fields, and an empty field that, while not serving a purpose, is property of the school, and that property line now ends about 1500 feet, whereas there is onlt a small lot for parking of about 500 feet, and the property line between the school and House B is 2500 feet. That is why this is an imperfect app. For now it is limited to Florida, as well.

FLORIDA FLORIDAS: HB 45 WILL MAKE MOST OF THE STATE UNLIVABLE FOR RPs

Was the cruelty ever truly gone? As we’ve already discussed, FloriDUH is already a minefield when it comes to searching for housing. For those of you with a conviction for offenses that occur on or after October 1, 2004, & for extra-jurisdictional/“out-of-state” offense for offense occurred on or after May 26, 2010: A person who has been convicted of a violation of FS §794.011, §800.04, §827.071, §847.0135(5), or §847.0145, regardless of whether adjudication has been withheld, in which the victim of the offense was less than 16 years of age, may not reside within 1,000 feet of any school, child care facility, park, or playground.

Additionally, Florida allows municipal ordinances that exceed existing state law. OPPAGA reports that as of 9/2024, there were 196 local ordinances in FL (city & county). Statewide, 129 cities (31%) had at least one ordinance. The number of city ordinances varied widely by the county in which the city is located. Counties most commonly had one to two city ordinances. However, three counties had significantly more city ordinances—Broward (29), Palm Beach (16), & Volusia (13). Statewide, 32 counties (48%) had city ordinances. Forty-three counties (64%) had ordinances that were countywide or covered all unincorporated areas. Overall, 52 counties

(78%) had at least one city or county ordinance within their jurisdiction. Between 2018 & 2024, 19 new ordinances were created.

But now FloriDUH wants to add swimming pools and “public bathing areas” to the list of statewide residency restrictions. HB 45 / SB 212 is a terrible bill because it will make most of FloriDUH off-limits to those forced to abide by the law. In order to understand why this is an issue just look at the definitions of “swimming pool” and “public bathing place.”

"Public swimming pool" or "public pool" means a watertight structure of concrete, masonry, or other approved materials which is located either indoors or outdoors, used for bathing or swimming by humans, and filled with a filtered and disinfected water supply, together with buildings, appurtenances, and equipment used in connection therewith. A public swimming pool or public pool shall mean a conventional pool, spa-type pool, wading pool, special purpose pool, spray pool, splash pad, or water recreation attraction, to which admission may be gained with or without payment of a fee and includes, but is not limited to, pools operated by or serving camps, churches, cities, counties, child care facilities (substituting this term for “day care centers”), group home facilities for eight or more clients, health spas, institutions, parks, state agencies, schools, subdivisions, or the cooperative living-type projects of five or more living units, such as apartments, boardinghouses, hotels, mobile home parks, motels, recreational vehicle parks, and townhouses.

“Public bathing place” means a body of water, natural or modified by humans, for swimming, diving, and recreational bathing used by consent of the owner or owners and held out to the public by any person or public body, irrespective of whether a fee is charged for the use thereof. The bathing water areas of public bathing places include, but are not limited to, lakes, ponds, rivers, streams, artificial impoundments, and waters along the coastal and intracoastal beaches and shores of the state.

To help put this into perspective, look at a few geographical facts about Florida: Total Area - 65,758 square miles; Total land area - 53,625 square miles; Total water area - 12,133 square miles; Coastline - 1,350 statute miles; Tidal shoreline (general) - 2,276 statute miles; Beaches - 663 miles; Longest River - St. Johns, 273 miles; Largest Lake - Lake Okeechobee, 700 square miles; Number of lakes (greater than 10 acres) - about 7,700; Number of first-magnitude springs - 33; Number of islands (greater than 10 acres) - about 4,500. According to a University of Florida survey, only about 15% of Florida is developed land.

Florida State Rep. Rachel Plakon (R) claimed there is no evidence that this latest proposal would increase homelessness. Using an interactive map of Ft. Lauderdale (See “Sex Offender Permissible Living Areas” <https://gis.fortlauderdale.gov/portal/home/item.html?id=ad4e46086b0647c29eff6b3a5adad8e8>), I was able to look at the few places marked in green where Registered Persons could live, at least in theory. Most of the remaining housing available in that city is along the coastline and manmade waterways. It is obvious she is either lying or incompetent, or both.

This may or may not affect you at all in part because Florida’s statewide registry law applies only to those convicted after a certain date. As noted by Florida Action Committee (“Would you be affected by House Bill 45 and Senate Bill 212? We break it down” Posted 10/31/2025 at <https://floridaactioncommittee.org/would-you-be-affected-by-house-bill-45-and-senate-bill-212-we-break-it-down/>)

HB 45 and Senate Bill 212 would ban certain people convicted of specified sexual offenses from living within 1,000 feet of public swimming pools or public bathing places. Whether the rule applies depends on when the underlying conviction happened and when the person moved into the house (or when the pool/bathing place was built).

Point 1: The bill targets (a) people convicted in Florida of qualifying offenses on or after October 1, 2004, and (b) people convicted in other jurisdictions of similar offenses on or after October 1, 2010. These people would now be prevented from residing within 1000 feet of a public swimming pool or public bathing places.

Point 2: The bill contains a key legal carve-out (which is the confusing part). If a person already lives somewhere and a new public pool/bathing place is built after they moved in, the bill says they would not be required to move. But if the person moved into a residence that was already within 1,000 feet of a pool/bathing place, the bill (as written) could put them in violation and force them to move or face penalties — even if they moved in years ago.

Here are a few hypothetical examples that will help you understand the bill:

- “John” was convicted of a qualifying offense in 2003. John moved into his house in 2011. John’s house is within 1,000 ft. of a public pool. John would not be in violation.
- “Sam” was convicted of a qualifying offense in Florida in 2006. Sam moved into his house in 2011. Sam’s house is within 1,000 ft. of an existing public pool built in 2009. Under the bills as written, Sam would be in violation and could be forced to move.
- “Tom” was convicted of a qualifying offense in Florida in 2008. Tom moved into his house in 2011. A public pool was built next door in 2015. Under the bills as written, Tom would not be required to move, because the pool was built after he established residence.
- “Louis” was convicted in another state in 2009 (a qualifying offense). Out-of-state convictions count only if after October 1, 2010, so Louis would be excluded from the bills’ restrictions.
- “Fred” was convicted in another state in 2011 (a qualifying offense). Fred moved into his house in 2020. Fred’s house is within 1,000 ft. of an existing public pool built in 2009. Under the bills as written, Fred would be in violation and could be forced to move.
- “Ted” was convicted in another state in 2011 (a qualifying offense). Ted moved into his house in 2020. Ted’s house is within 1,000 ft. of an existing public pool built in 2021. Under the bills as written, Ted would not be required to move, because the pool was built after he established residence.

YET ANOTHER SCAM TARGETING REGISTERED PERSONS

From Florida Action Committee (<https://floridaactioncommittee.org/beware-another-scam-company/>): We’ve received emails from members that they have received postcards from a company called “Offender Reputation and Registry Removal (O-rep)” and with the website <https://o-rep.org/>. The site claims to offer “Reputation Removal” and “Registry Removal”, that his company can help “get you off the registry”. It talks about “petitions that are over \$25,000” but that his membership is only \$67.22 a month. They claim to only send out 300 invitations a year and send invitations only to those “we know for a fact that we can help.”

BEWARE the scam! IF IT SOUNDS TOO GOOD TO BE TRUE, YOU ARE RIGHT, SO DON’T FALL FOR IT.

Their site says, “Offender Reputation and Registry Removal (O-rep) was founded in 2019 by John Shannon, a former Marine and post-conviction law expert”. When it comes to Florida, they write, “We are currently awaiting a decision from the Florida Supreme Court concerning our fight in the Fifth District in the case of (Michael Crist V State of Florida)”. YEAH RIGHT! Michael Crist is represented by the appellate division of the Public Defender’s office. That’s public record.

Their site claims they brought a case in South Carolina, (Powell v Keel, 433 S.C. 457,860 (2021)) and that the Court “ruled in our favor and determined that South Carolina sex offender registry requirements were in fact unconstitutional.” Well Powell was represented by private attorneys, not John Shannon or his “organization”, and that’s public record also.

Although the site claims to do business in Florida and South Carolina, there is no non-profit “Offender Reputation and Registry Removal” or “O-rep” registered to do business in either state. They have a mailing address in Dublin, Georgia, but guess what... they are not registered to do business there. There’s also no charitable organization with either name (you can check GuideStar) registered anywhere in the country!

The site says, “Offender Reputation and Registry Removal (O-rep) was founded in 2019 by John Shannon, a former Marine and post-conviction law expert.” Well the founder, John Shannon – Actually John Shannon Simpson (the gmail address on the website discloses his last name) does have ties to South Carolina and Florida and to the registry. In 2019 he was convicted of running another Charity Scam (see: <https://www.justice.gov/usao-sc/pr/former-south-carolina-resident-sentenced-federal-prison-charity-fraud-scheme-targeting>) and he’s currently in a Florida prison for Sexual Battery.

2026: A MILESTONE YEAR

For those of you who don't know me or know me well, I was born on Halloween, so my birthday in 2025 was my 49th birthday. Forty-nine isn't a number that sticks out, but should I live another full year, I reach a milestone year in my life. I will turn fifty, the big 5-0, half a century, etc. We're kind of hardwired to celebrate or mourn past events in milestone years, and the longer it goes, the longer the space between milestone events. The difference between me turning 49 and turning 50 is 365 days but it is far more significant because I'll have been on this earth half a century by then. Our number system is a base-ten system and so anniversaries by decade just hits harder the older we get. But for all of us who are on the public sex offense registry, those of us with loved ones on the registry, and those of us who are anti-registry activists regardless of whether or not we have someone we love on this list, 2026 is a milestone year as well. After all, three major pieces of federal legislation were all passed on years ending with the number six:

- On May 17, 1996, Bill Clinton signed Megan's Law into law; 2026 will be the 30th anniversary.
- On July 27, 2006, George W. Bush signed the Adam Walsh Act into law; 2026 will be the 20th anniversary.
- On February 8, 2016, Barack Obama signed International Megan's Law into law; 2026 will be the 10th anniversary.

Each of these laws was major events in our lives as each of these bills have made our lives increasingly difficult. Megan's Law spread community notification to all 50 states; the Adam Walsh Act required children as young as 14 on the public registry and demanded states base tier levels on offense type. International Megan's Law placed registration requirements on travel and put marks of infamy on US passports.

We are, unfortunately, in a time of great fear. So far this year, a handful of states passed death penalty laws targeting persons convicted of sex offenses not involving murder. Local-level laws are making a comeback, at least in Florida. the Proud Boys caused the NARSOL conference to be delayed and moved, and it certainly seems like vigilante attacks against Registered Persons are on the rise. (Thankfully, NARSOL still ended up hosting a conference in Atlanta GA in October 2025, despite the efforts of Proud Boys terrorists attempting to stop the Atlanta conference.) I have said this before and I'll say it again, we need to devise a bold strategy going forward. It is harder than ever to have our voices heard. I'd love to hear some ideas from people. Personally, I was encouraged by PARSOL and their "Stuck in 1995" event held the last week of October. They get it! From PARSOL's post reporting on the event: "Our lives have changed since 1995. You'll all recognize Microsoft's groundbreaking system, Windows 95. But is anyone still using that? Pennsylvania's registry laws are stuck in 1995 while everything else has moved forward," remarked Robert Ciccinnelli (Havertown), PARSOL board member, who opened the event while advocates held signs showing nostalgia from that year including props from the era including the O.J. Simpson verdict headline news, a poster from the hit 90's TV show "ER", the dial-up internet modem, a 22-cent postage stamp, and the floppy disk drive. (<https://parsol.org/parsol-launches-stuckin1995-with-pa-capitol-event/>)

That state's version of Megan's Law passed in 1995. And so they held a rally. And they used props to prove their point. I was once criticized for creating similar events. But this is working. It is working for the No Kings rallies. I have made many calls to action in the past. Many of you fear taking part in such events. I heard folks in the past cite safety concerns. My 2022-2023 survey of anti-registry activists found that was but one of many reasons so few attend calls to action. but it is also the fact that most of us are older, and many of us lack the funds to travel across the US to attend events, be they conferences or rallies or anything else.

I don't think there is any solitary solution for our plight. But I'd like to see a return to DC next year. BUT I don't want it to be another vigil at the steps of SCOTUS. It was not intended to become an annual event. After all, 2023 was 20 years after Smith v. Doe, so it was a landmark year. I think if we were to hold a call to action, we should gather and take our message elsewhere. We should try to meet legislators. We should rally at the front doors of the SMART Office and/or the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. We should at least discuss plans to meet in DC sometime in 2026. Nothing is etched in stone. But I see great potential. The No Kings rallies and the pushback against ICE is gaining traction. And they're doing with gimmicks like inflatable costumes and by doing it despite the hate coming from the far right extremists.