



Hancock Hancock <hancockinvestigation@gmail.com>

Fwd: Campaigns for Governor of Nevada / Campaigns for Attorney General of Nevada

Hancock Hancock <hancockinvestigation@gmail.com>

Thu, May 28 at 12:55 PM

To: <info@zachconine.com>, <info@nicolecannizzaro.com>, <adriana@adrianafornevada.com>, <aaron@fordfornevada.com>, <info@joelombardofornv.com>, <info@alexisfornevada.com>
Cc: Edward Wynder <wynder@snhd.org>, <aeenglish@nnph.org>, <mail1@labor.nv.gov>

Dear Candidates,

This correspondence is being forwarded simultaneously to all major campaigns across both competitive races during this active early-voting window. Every recipient can see the full distribution.

I am an independent Nevada voter with documented learning differences including dyslexia, dysgraphia, and ADHD. I spent approximately 50 hours constructing a precise preliminary public records inquiry and a formal Title II ADA accommodation request directed to the Nevada Labor Commission. That inquiry asked for basic enforcement metrics — specifically, how many times the \$5,000 per-incident administrative penalty under NRS 608.195 has been applied against repeat corporate violators for willful nonpayment of overtime. It also asked a direct conditional question: if a Treasury audit or IRS audit were to produce a documented per-incident trail of willful nonpayment of overtime, would the Nevada Labor Commission be positioned to assess the \$5,000 per-incident statutory penalty at that point — given that the audit work establishing each incident would already be complete?

I began preparing this correspondence the Thursday before the statutory deadline — not after — because based on observable institutional patterns, I anticipated the outcome before it occurred. That anticipation was correct.

The Nevada Labor Commission provided no acknowledgment, no confirmation of receipt, and no response of any kind within the mandatory five-day statutory window required under NRS 239.0107. Nevada law required a response within five business days. The ten-day window referenced in my submission was a courtesy extension I offered as part of my ADA accommodation request — the legal obligation was the five-day deadline, and they failed to meet it.

This did not happen in a vacuum. On this same documented thread, two Nevada health regulatory bodies received identical methodology and responded in compliance:

The Southern Nevada Health District legal counsel processed and fulfilled the request cleanly. Northern Nevada Public Health formally acknowledged the ADA formatting accommodation, responded within the statutory window, and looped in the Washoe County ADA Compliance Coordinator to ensure equal access.

Both agencies proved the request was legally sound, administratively manageable, and processable under Nevada public records law. The Nevada Labor Commission's silence is therefore not a procedural ambiguity. It is an isolated, documented failure against an established compliance baseline.

This creates direct questions for Nevada's next executive and law enforcement leadership:

The fiscal accountability question: If a regulatory body declines to provide basic metrics on whether \$5,000 per-incident corporate penalties are being enforced — and will not even answer a straightforward conditional question about whether a Treasury or IRS audit would activate that enforcement mechanism — Nevada voters have no way to know whether that statutory penalty structure is functioning at all. When candidates stand on a debate stage discussing Nevada's budget shortfalls, the unanswered question becomes unavoidable: if large corporate violators are not being held to the penalties the statute already mandates, that is uncollected state revenue — money that could offset the very shortfalls Nevada voters are already feeling while everyday Nevadans continue to carry the tax burden.

The civil rights barrier question: When a state agency responds to a disabled citizen's formal ADA accommodation request with complete silence, it does not create a minor inconvenience. It creates an impossible barrier. Forcing a person with documented learning differences to navigate administrative courts and legal mechanisms simply to compel an agency to acknowledge an email is not a theoretical hardship. It is a real one. It cost me the better part of a week, working from a phone, around a part-time job, to build what you are reading right now.

If elected to lead the executive branch or serve as Nevada's chief law enforcement officer, would you actively work to ensure that a single constituent — whose vote counts for one, the same as everyone else's — can safely and effectively interact with a state regulatory body without that interaction becoming a civil rights barrier?

And more directly: if a constituent with severe documented learning differences — someone for whom every administrative interaction carries a significantly higher cognitive and logistical burden than it would for the average person — came across your desk having been met with complete institutional silence from a state agency after a formal ADA accommodation request, would your office actively support that individual in getting the response the law requires?

Respectfully,
Hancock

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Hancock Hancock** <hancockinvestigation@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, May 19, 2026 at 11:44 PM

Subject: NPRA Preliminary Records Inquiry & Title II ADA Accommodation Request – The Hancock Investigation

To: <mail1@labor.nv.gov>

Dear Labor Commissioner,

My name is Hancock and I am reaching out on behalf of The Hancock Investigation. I am following up on prior correspondence regarding labor law compliance tracking within Nevada. This inquiry is directed to your office to identify what enforcement records exist under specific statutory categories before any formal records requests are submitted.

Section One - ADA Title II Accommodation Request

This inquiry is submitted with an explicit request for a reasonable accommodation under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act. I have documented learning differences including dyslexia, dysgraphia, and ADHD.

Under 42 U.S.C. § 12132 and 28 C.F.R. § 35.107, public entities employing 50 or more persons — including the Nevada Department of Business and Industry and its subordinate divisions — are required to designate at least one employee to coordinate ADA compliance. I respectfully request that your designated ADA Compliance Coordinator personally review this inquiry and ensure that all responses and data are provided in a clear scannable format accessible to someone with these documented learning differences. Consistent with Department of Justice guidelines for reasonable accommodations, I request a written response within 10 business days. Please confirm in writing the name and title of the individual on your staff designated under 28 C.F.R. § 35.107 who will be managing this request.

Cross-Agency Coordination & Data Integrity Notice: Please be advised that this preliminary records inquiry is being submitted as part of a coordinated outreach to multiple Nevada regulatory bodies simultaneously. Cross-referencing enforcement baseline metrics across these concurrent inquiries allows me to evaluate the consistency of state administrative enforcement and ensure the accuracy and completeness of the record framework before any formal public records requests are initiated.

Federal Compliance Validation Note: The methodology, formatting parameters, and civil rights citations outlined in this correspondence have been structured to ensure strict alignment with Department of Justice Title II ADA compliance guidelines. Should your department's designated ADA Title II Coordinator or risk management staff require technical assistance or regulatory guidance regarding their explicit legal obligations to accommodate

documented learning differences within administrative workflows, they may contact the Department of Justice Civil Rights Division directly for verification at 800-514-0301 or via email at Disability.Outreach@usdoj.gov.

Accessibility Barrier Note: Due to my documented learning differences, the standard process of submitting a sweeping records request for vast case files without first understanding what specific data frameworks exist creates a significant structural barrier. Receiving the initial number of instances and names of entities allows me to evaluate the landscape effectively before determining which specific records to formally request. This preliminary inquiry is itself an ADA accommodation request and must be processed as such.

Section Two - Preliminary Inquiry Under the Nevada Public Records Act

Before submitting any formal records requests, I am asking your department to identify what baseline metrics exist on the record under the following specific categories.

Category A: Repeat Statutory Fine Implementations - Past Five Years

In the past five years, how many specific instances has your office formally executed an administrative fine up to the statutory \$5,000 threshold against a single corporate or employment entity where that specific entity has received multiple separate statutory fine implementations?

To streamline this request and reduce administrative burden, I am not asking for a comprehensive list of all single-incident wage claims. This inquiry is strictly limited to identifying systemic compliance patterns. For this category I am requesting only the total number of instances where a fine was issued multiple times to the same entity and the names of those specific repeat entities.

Category B: Conditional Statutory Enforcement Capability

Your office previously indicated that you generally do not conduct resource-heavy companywide compliance audits of large employers due to administrative constraints.

My question is conditional and straightforward: If the Treasury Department or the IRS completes a full audit and produces a documented per-incident trail of willful nonpayment of overtime across Nevada locations — and if a full per-incident dossier could be provided to your office alongside those completed audit findings — would your office assess the statutory \$5,000 per-incident penalty based on those external findings, given that your office would not need to expend resources to conduct the audit itself?

Section Three - Correspondence Instructions

Please direct all future correspondence through the individual designated under 28 C.F.R. § 35.107 for ADA compliance coordination and confirm that person's name and title in your response.

Respectfully,
Hancock
The Hancock Investigation Team