

THE ELIZABETH HALSETH STORY



What Nevada GOP Leaders Didn't Want You to Know & the Mainstream Press Wouldn't Tell

by Chuck Muth

CHAPTER ONE

November 11, 2011

Sometimes you're simply damned if you do and damned if you don't. Such is the case with the decision whether to write about the marital woes of conservative state Sen. Elizabeth Halseth.

To refresh everyone's memory: Halseth had her husband arrested on November 21 on an "open and gross lewdness" charge having to do with an incident that took place in their home a week earlier.

In the arrest report (which includes a few "f"-bombs), ***Daniel alleges that Elizabeth "was having an affair"*** and that's what was at the heart of the incident...a fact originally reported by the Las Vegas Sun and then mysteriously deleted from its website.

Daniel, not surprisingly, has now filed for divorce. The couple have three young children; all, I believe, under 10 years of age.

Now, I have considerable more information on this matter, some of which has also already been posted in comments on various newspaper stories. The question is: Do I report it? Is it relevant to Sen. Halseth's elected position and official duties....or is this purely a personal matter?

Believe me, I've wrestled with those questions for almost two weeks now, and have come under some rather significant pressure to leave it alone. There are a lot of people who don't want me to tell the story.

But I'm going to anyway...and I'll tell you why.

Back in the GOP primary race between then-incumbent state Sen. Dennis Nolan and Elizabeth Halseth, Halseth came into possession of a recorded phone message that Nolan had left for the sister of a rape victim, urging her to change her story. And Halseth made the tape public via her campaign website and used it in a campaign radio ad.

Now, it would appear this matter was also of a personal nature completely unrelated to Sen. Nolan's official duties as an elected official. Which is exactly the point made by "Face to Face" host Jon Ralston when he had both Nolan and Halseth on [his program](http://bit.ly/sQUF8w) (<http://bit.ly/sQUF8w>). Ralston specifically asked Halseth why this issue was relevant in the campaign.

"Listen, it was bad judgment to do what he did," Halseth eventually replied.

Indeed, "judgment" was the crux of a [brutal mailer](#) Halseth did against Nolan in the primary. Therefore, exercising bad judgment is Halseth's own criteria for whether or not a personal issue is relevant and deserving of public commentary and scrutiny for a political figure. Those were her exact words, not mine. Keep that in mind.

Senator Nolan,
You are FRIENDS with a RAPIST.
What kind of JUDGMENT is that?
You took the stand to DEFEND
a SEX OFFENDER.
What kind of JUDGMENT is that?

On June 8th, vote against Dennis Nolan...
We need a State Senator with better judgment than that.

ELIZABETH
HALSETH
SENATE DISTRICT 9

8022 S. Rainbow Blvd, Suite 140
Las Vegas, NV 89139

Paid for by Elizabeth Halseth for Senate District 9

Later in the interview, Ralston again asked about the relevance of the issue. “What is the point here?” he inquired.

“Listen,” Halseth replied, “as a sexual assault victim myself...”

Uh-oh. That point itself has relevance in the arrest story...as you’ll see later in this report.

But let’s stick with whether or not Halseth’s personal behavior and marital woes are fair game on the political battlefield. Again, it was Sen. Halseth herself who set the criteria for what can and cannot be used in a political campaign.

Indeed, Halseth’s entire 2010 general election campaign against Democrat Benny Yerushalmi was based on family and “values.” Her campaign signs, posters and mailers featured a wholesome photograph of Elizabeth with husband Daniel and their three adorable children.

On the other hand, in one notorious [campaign mailer](#), Halseth featured a photo of Yerushalmi with his wife (who, and I’m not afraid to write this, looks smoking hot!) in a low-cut evening gown next to the tagline: “Not Our Values.”



Well, live by family values; die by family values.

And if you don’t think the Democrats are going to use this in future campaigns....maybe even during the upcoming campaigns even though Sen. Halseth won’t be on the ballot....you’re nuts.

Having played the family values and judgment cards in her campaign, Sen. Halseth cannot now hide behind “this is a personal matter.” She, herself, has made personal values and judgment fair game.

And now that she's been accused by her husband of having an extramarital affair in an official, public document, THAT raises the hypocrisy question. If the accusation is true (and I have reason to believe it is), is that "our values"? Is that good "judgment"?

Now to be fair, unlike former Sen. John Ensign, Sen. Halseth has not admitted to what her husband has accused her of. Nevertheless, there are some very troubling aspects to the incident in which Daniel was arrested, as well as some potentially devastating political ramifications for Republicans. All of which I'll get to in Part Two of this report tomorrow or the next day. Stay tuned....

CHAPTER TWO

November 13, 2011

I've already laid out the rationale for why I believe the marital troubles of Nevada state Sen. Elizabeth Halseth (R-Las Vegas) and her husband, Daniel – who was arrested and charged with "Open and Gross Lewdness" - are fair game in the political context. But there's more to this story than the mere salacious "National Enquirer" aspect that bothers me, which is why I'm writing about it.

You see, I'm starting to think Daniel may be the actual victim here.

By the time his arrest occurred, I was already well aware of the well-sourced rumors that Sen. Halseth was carrying on an extramarital affair. And before the details of the arrest became known it was assumed the arrest had to do with a Friday, October 21 confrontation between Daniel and Elizabeth to which police were called.

That turned out to not exactly be the case; but more on that later.

Anyway, the morning after Daniel's arrest Sen. Halseth's political adviser released a brief statement about the Friday incident in which she acknowledged she was involved in a personal, family matter and asked for privacy. At that point, everyone pretty much let the story go. Nothing about it appeared in the Sunday papers.

However, on Thursday, October 27, stories based on Daniel's arrest report came out - [including](http://bit.ly/tVFQz1) (http://bit.ly/tVFQz1) his mug shot contrasted with a glamour shot of Sen. Halseth. Frankly, it struck me as the kind of political "hit piece" mailer we often see in campaigns. But something else struck me: Not what was in the stories, but what was left out.

Only the Las Vegas Sun initially reported on Daniel's statements, clearly referenced no less than three times in the arrest report, that he suspected his wife of having an extramarital affair and that that's what the incident was about.

But the Sun - between the time it initially posted the story on its website, including the infidelity accusation, and the time the print edition of the story came out the next day - deleted that initial infidelity reference. The [edited online version](http://bit.ly/uoJ94k) (<http://bit.ly/uoJ94k>) now ends with the following disclaimer: *"This story has been shortened from the original posting."*

Odd.

The marital infidelity accusation wasn't mere gossip. It was alleged, on record, right in the arrest report, a public document. Perfectly fair game, and certainly relevant to the story. Now, if the Sun wants to defend its decision to omit this information after the fact, claiming it was undocumented hearsay provided by the husband, then why did the paper include undocumented hearsay culled from the arrest report that was provided by Elizabeth's mother in the exact same story?

Something smells here.

In addition, after the stories were posted online, individuals appearing to have knowledge of the entire incident began posting comments, including details about the alleged affair Sen. Halseth was having and with whom. That "gossip" squared with information I had obtained separately from reliable, reputable and knowledgeable sources.

As such, as far as I was concerned (*you should draw your own conclusions*) Daniel's suspicion and accusation about his wife was well-founded. And as a courtesy I advised some GOP leaders on Friday, October 28 of my intention to write about the story.

This, understandably, caused great angst among said leaders, who urged me not to write "gossip and rumors" and to read the actual arrest report - which I did not, at the time, have. I was assured that after reading the arrest report, I would know that even if the accusation of marital infidelity was true, Sen. Halseth didn't deserve what happened to her and that she was the victim in the incident.

So I waited and obtained a copy of the arrest report.

And I'm sorry, but after reading what is often painfully graphic descriptions of the incident I gotta say it strikes me that arresting Daniel was total bullsh*t. Wait'll you learn the details of the rest of this story. Stay tuned...

Disclaimer: First, I have nothing personal against Sen. Halseth. She was named my organization's *Conservative of the Year* this year for good, solid reasons that are completely unrelated to this matter. And at this point, we have no intention whatsoever of rescinding that award.

Secondly, Daniel Halseth's criminal attorney is also representing my organization on a completely separate matter dealing with campaign finance laws. However, I have had absolutely, positively NO CONVERSATIONS with him whatsoever in any way, shape, form or fashion regarding the Halseth case, and don't intend to.

Take both for what they're worth.

CHAPTER THREE

November 16, 2011

I think the thing that bothers me most about the Sen. Elizabeth Halseth scandal is that she's the one who was caught allegedly cheating on her husband and children....and the cuckolded husband is the one charged with a sex crime. Where's the justice in that?

So let's take a look at exactly what Daniel Halseth was arrested for: "Open and Gross Lewdness" (NRS 201.2101a).

Now, most people reading that probably immediately think it means Daniel exposed himself in public or something. Not so. That would be "Indecent or Obscene Exposure," a completely separate offense in Nevada Revised Statutes.

So what exactly does "Open and Gross Lewdness" mean according to Nevada law and why was Daniel charged with it? Well, that's a problem...because the terms are NOT defined in statute. In fact, here's the entire law on this offense, word-for-word:

NRS 201.210 Open or gross lewdness; penalty.

1. A person who commits any act of open or gross lewdness is guilty:
 - (a) For the first offense, of a gross misdemeanor.

(b) For any subsequent offense, of a category D felony and shall be punished as provided in NRS 193.130.

As you can see, the law only states what the penalty is; it does not define what constitutes an offense. So with the law being so vague, I did some quick Google searches to see if anyone else could help explain exactly what constitutes “open and gross lewdness” in Nevada.

From attorney [Michael Becker](http://bit.ly/une8dp) (http://bit.ly/une8dp) of The Defense Group:

“Open and gross lewdness is a common charge that we see in Las Vegas and usually it has to do with somebody who inappropriately touches somebody else, usually at a club or a bar; it’s a very common charge.

“Often somebody who’s charged with an ‘open and gross’ is someone who’s been drinking; somebody who has no criminal record. Maybe they thought the contact was invited and they misinterpreted social cues and didn’t realize they were doing something wrong. Or, as a result of consuming alcohol, their inhibitions were low and they did something that they maybe wouldn’t have done when they were sober.

“The significant issue relating to open and gross lewdness in the state of Nevada is, it’s considered a sex offense, and it requires registration as a sex offender. So what might seem like a playful touching after a few cocktails, could end up being something that requires you to register for life as a sex offender. So the consequences are quite severe.”

Becker’s website adds:

“In reviewing the case law, our best definition of Nevada’s ‘Open or Gross Lewdness’ is that it involves exposing one’s private parts or engaging in sexual activity either in public or in any context that would offend other people.”

Now, if you read Daniel’s arrest report, as I’ve done, none of that even remotely came into play. He was fully clothed in the privacy of his own home involved in a heated but non-violent argument with his own wife over suspected adultery on her part.....and there is no indication whatsoever that alcohol was involved.

Of additional concern is that according to [a posting](http://bit.ly/tEJRVN) (http://bit.ly/tEJRVN) on the Las Vegas Criminal Defense Blog, an open and gross lewdness accusation “is one of the more frequently

falsely-accused offenses because police don't need physical proof to make an arrest, and people may play the victim card out of revenge.”

Uh-oh.

And the reason police and those with a grudge can often get away with accusing someone of open and gross lewdness is that despite no definition of the terms appearing in NRS, the Nevada Supreme Court has ruled that those words have generally accepted meanings because “an average person of ordinary intelligence can determine what conduct is proscribed by the statute.”

The problem in this case is that after reading Daniel’s arrest report, average persons of ordinary intelligence could easily come to diametrically differing opinions as to whether or not what transpired was open or gross. But before getting into the details of exactly what led to Daniel’s arrest on the open and gross lewdness charge, consider this:

Daniel was arrested on Friday, October 21, 2012.

But the incident, in which there were no witnesses and no police report, actually took place FIVE DAYS EARLIER, on October 16, not on the day of Daniel’s arrest.

And you’re not going to believe who was there when the cuffs were slapped on!

This is where things start to get **REALLY** ugly, folks. Stay tuned for the next chapter in the Elizabeth Halseth Story.....

CHAPTER FOUR

November 20, 2011

On October 21, 2012, Daniel Halseth - husband of Nevada state Sen. Elizabeth Halseth and stay-at-home dad to their three young children (10, 7 and 5) - was arrested and booked for “Open and Gross Lewdness,” a sex-crime described by a Las Vegas lawyer as “one of the more frequently falsely-accused offenses” which is usually reserved for guys who have had too much to drink and “who inappropriately touches somebody else, usually at a club or a bar.”

As mentioned in Part III of The Elizabeth Halseth Story, nothing even remotely resembling such circumstances factored into Daniel’s arrest, at least according to the official report (ID/Event #2836726), which I have a copy of.

According to the Arrest Report, Elizabeth's mom, Candy Schworak, who lives in Oregon, had a conversation with her daughter the night before, October 20, in which, she told police, "her daughter had confided in her that she and Daniel were having marital issues."

Concerned for her daughter's welfare, Schworak flew to Las Vegas the following day. She was picked up from the airport (we'll get to that later) and taken to the Halseths' home. The following comes directly from the Arrest Report:

"(Schworak) knocked on the door multiple times and could not get an answer. She called the police. Officers arrived and also attempted to call and knock the door with no response. They could see Elizabeth's purse sitting on the table through the blinds and Schworak said that her daughter would not go anywhere without her purse. A locksmith was called. Prior to the locksmith arriving, Elizabeth and Daniel showed up. Elizabeth said that while her kids were at school Daniel made her go with him to speak with a counselor at a church."

The first thing that leaps out here is that Schworak's claim that her daughter wouldn't go anywhere without her purse – the statement that apparently prompted police to try to break into the home – wasn't true. Elizabeth clearly left home without her purse to go to church with Daniel. Which forces one to acknowledge that Schworak was, understandably, anything but an unemotional, objective party here. So any claims in the matter she makes have to be viewed with a healthy dose of skepticism.

In any event, a series of interviews with police officers then ensued, and centered on an incident that took place five days earlier, Sunday, October 16; an incident pretty much described similarly by both Daniel and Elizabeth – with one critical difference. This was the day Daniel confronted his wife about the extramarital affair he believed she was having.

According to both individuals, Daniel called Elizabeth upstairs to the bedroom. Once in the room, an argument ensued in which Daniel confronted his wife in what can be described as considerably less than a cordial manner. Although the incident in question clearly was heated, neither party told police that Daniel tried to "sexually assault" Elizabeth, as Elizabeth's mother alleged in the Arrest Report.

What actually happened, as described by both the parties involved – and I'll try to clean this up in a manner that would be appropriate for my own mother to read – Daniel told Elizabeth he wanted to have, um, marital relations with her – "wanting to know what he was up against,

alleging that she was having an affair” - but in a far less romantic manner involving copious use of a certain “f-word” that rhymes with “truck.”

The argument reportedly escalated, and at one point Daniel dropped to his knees in front of Elizabeth and twice yanked her pants down (“but her underwear remained up”), inviting her, in a decidedly uninviting manner, to engage in, um, carnal knowledge. According to the Arrest Report, during the altercation Daniel asked, “What’s he got that I don’t have? Does he have a big (deleted)? I’m your husband. I just want to know what I’m up against.”

Both parties report that the incident ended when Elizabeth told Daniel to stop and Daniel stopped, saying “he was just joking and just wanted to get her attention.”

Now here’s the part of the story – told five days later and with no corroborating witnesses – that landed Daniel in jail.

According to the Arrest Report, Elizabeth said that during the incident involving her pants, Daniel touched her private area (more graphically described in the report, but I think you get the idea) “on the outside of her underwear.”

For his part, Daniel said he touched his wife on her hip, but did not touch her private area. Nevertheless, “Daniel was arrested for Open and Gross Lewdness for touching without penetrating Elizabeth’s” private parts.

Now, come on.

Clearly this was an ugly and highly emotional incident. I mean, we’re talking about a husband confronting his wife over suspected marital infidelity and a wife undoubtedly scared to death at allegedly being caught.

However, no one is alleging that Daniel struck Elizabeth or otherwise sexually assaulted her - other than the Las Vegas Sun which falsely reported that the Arrest Report said that Elizabeth said that Daniel “had tried to *force her* to have sex with him.” That’s not alleged by Elizabeth in the report. Otherwise, the charge would have been attempted rape, not open and gross lewdness.

Nor did Elizabeth immediately report this incident to authorities. Police were only called by her mother while Elizabeth and Daniel were at a counseling session at church FIVE DAYS LATER.

And there's no suggestion that alcohol was involved. And the touching incident occurred between a husband and wife in the privacy of their own home, not a club or bar.

Again, what Daniel reportedly admitted to and was arrested for was touching his own wife on her HIP. THAT'S "open and gross lewdness"? Something's wrong with this picture.

And the biggest thing wrong with this picture is what's not included in it at this point.

You see, the man Daniel suspected was having an affair with his wife – a golf pro named Tiger (and no, I'm not making that up!) – is, unbelievably, the person who picked up Elizabeth's mother from the airport, was at the house when the police were called, as well as when Daniel and Elizabeth returned from church, and who was reportedly interviewed extensively by authorities inside the Halseth home but for some odd reason was not referenced, as the mother was, whatsoever in the Arrest Report.

What's up with that? More coming in Part V of the Elizabeth Halseth Story.

CHAPTER FIVE

November 27, 2011

Before getting into more details of the alleged "friends with benefits" relationship Nevada state Sen. **Elizabeth Halseth** was accused of having by her husband, Daniel, on the night he confronted her and was arrested for - well, I'm still not sure exactly what - let's revisit why this matter is both fair game and relevant from a political standpoint.

Halseth won her 2010 GOP primary race against moderate Republican Sen. **Dennis Nolan** by slamming him for making a phone call, which was recorded, to the sister of a 16-year-old girl who had been raped by a friend of Nolan's, urging her to recant her testimony.

When confronted in a television interview asking why this personal matter unrelated to the senator's duties as an elected official was relevant in the campaign, Halseth responded, "Listen, it was bad judgment to do what he did."

Bad judgment. Hmmm. How much worse would your own judgment be if you're caught carrying on an extramarital relationship while your stay-at-home-dad/husband is taking care of your three little children (10, 7 and 5)?

And then, in the general election, Halseth attacked her opponent by writing next to a photograph of the opponent's wife, seen in a low-cut evening gown, "Not Our Values."

Values. Hmm. As opposed to, say, carrying on an extramarital relationship while your stay-at-home-dad/husband is taking care of your three little children (10, 7 and 5)?

Now, if you don't think Halseth's opponents are going to use all of the above (and more) against her in a future campaign, you can probably see your pancreas from where your head is. Just turn on the flashlight at the top of your mining helmet (more on that later).

But here are two more reasons why this is a legitimate political story and why some Republican leaders are scared to death of it coming out "too soon."

First, if the allegations of an extramarital affair turn out to be true (and I'm reliably told it has been admitted to privately by both parties, but not publicly), how will Halseth square her staying in office despite such colossal "bad judgment" and conduct which does not comport with "our values" with her call for then-Sen. **John Ensign** to resign after his own extramarital affair became public?

Yep, she went there.

"The people are our strength, and the people have lost faith in Senator Ensign's ability to lead effectively," Halseth told **Sean Whaley** of the *Nevada News Bureau* in [a story](http://bit.ly/aOtssE) (http://bit.ly/aOtssE) published April 11, 2010. "For that reason, I believe it's in the best interest of the people, the party and the state of Nevada that Senator Ensign resigns immediately."

Ruh-roh.

Now, no one prominent has yet to call on Sen. Halseth to resign (publicly), and there is no indication whatsoever that she is mulling such a resignation...but it's only a matter of time. And here's why Republican legislative leaders are so worried over the possibility that Halseth could prematurely be hoisted on her own petard.

At present, Democrats hold a razor-thin 11-10 majority in the state senate. To gain the majority next November, Republicans will need to hold the new "open" seat which has been moved to Clark County. The district leans GOP, but is anything but a slam dunk.

In addition, Republicans would have to hold all of their other seats which are up for re-election next year (highly likely), while picking off one of two potentially vulnerable incumbent Democrats: either Sen. Allison Copening or Sen. Shirley Breeden, both of whom defeated Republicans in 2008 and now enjoy Democrat-majority districts thanks to re-districting.

Now suppose the erupting Halseth scandal and ongoing divorce proceedings result in voters “losing faith” in her ability to represent them effectively, and pressure mounts for her to resign “in the best interest of the people”?

Well, timing is everything.

You see, Halseth is only in the first year of a four-year term. And if she resigns before next year’s elections rather than after, the seven Democrat members of the Clark County Commission would appoint a Republican to fill her vacancy should a special session of the Legislature be called. Absent that, a special election to complete Halseth’s unfinished term would be held next November.

And a Democrat would almost assuredly win that special election because redistricting resulted in a substantial Democrat voter majority there. And that would mean not only would Republicans need to hold all of their incumbent seats, including the new “open” seat, but defeat not *either* Copening or Breeden, but *both* of them.

So you can see why GOP leaders don’t want this story to come out and risk an early resignation by Sen. Halseth. If she is to resign – and again, no one has suggested that’s under consideration at this time – it would be better to resign AFTER next November’s elections and BEFORE the start of the 2013 legislative session, at which point the Clark County Commission would have to appoint a Republican to fill the vacancy without a special election.

With all that’s already known about this matter, not to mention all that’s yet to inevitably come out, the question in the minds of most GOP political operatives familiar with the situation isn’t whether or not Sen. Halseth is Dead Politician Walking, but whether or not they can prop her up, Weekend-at-Bernie’s-like, for a year to give them a shot at gaining the majority for the 2013 session...and then worry about 2014 in 2014.

Can you now see why GOP leaders want to put a lid on this scandal and are so worried about it?

Nevertheless, there are two more issues with potential political fallout yet to be explored here.

First, as you may recall from Part I of this series, in her television interview in which she attacked Nolan for “bad judgment,” Halseth told the public she had been “a sexual assault victim” herself. Well, it turns out there’s a bit more to that claim than met the eye at the time, and it’s directly related to the head-scratching “open and gross lewdness” charge she leveled against her husband on October 21.

And secondly, the young man Halseth’s husband has accused her of having the friends-with-benefits relationship with isn’t just some golf pro named Tiger (and no, it’s NOT Tiger Woods). The young man was considered a promising Republican candidate himself who was being groomed for a legislative race of his own next year...until, of course, the scandal broke. Those political ambitions now appear deader than dirt.

More on both in Part VI of the Elizabeth Halseth Story.

CHAPTER SIX

December 1, 2011

The name of the man-not-her-husband who Nevada state Sen. Elizabeth Halseth was accused of having an inappropriate extra-marital relationship by her husband the night he was arrested is....Tiger Helgelien.

And indeed, it was Helgelien who reportedly picked up Halseth’s mother at the airport and was there at the Halseth household on October 21 when Elizabeth and Daniel came home from a church counseling session. I’m also reliably told that Helgelien was interviewed extensively by police and gave an official statement, although his name is conspicuously missing from the official Arrest Report.

Hmmm.

And before anyone accuses me of “outing” Tiger, his involvement in this entire mess has been known by those close to the situation for many weeks, and his name actually first popped up publicly in the comment section of the story on Daniel’s arrest in the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* over a month ago.

On October 28, here’s what “Steve.Daniels” wrote in response to another commenter who had come to Elizabeth’s defense:

"...(T)he truth of the matter is you have only your sweet Senator to blame for her down fall. She cheated on her husband bro, plain and simple. And when he confronted her, she lied, and a family matter got ugly. So, while her husband's choice was a bad one, go ask Tiger Helgelien -- the real estate guy who thinks he is a political guy -- why your beloved State Senator is messing around with him. When you get that answer, you get to the bottom of this sad, sad tale."

So who is 29-year-old Tiger Helgelien and how did he get involved in this "friends with benefits" mess? Well, here's some background information culled from his campaign website (which has been taken off the 'net, but a copy of which you can still access [here](http://bit.ly/u8EFkP) [http://bit.ly/u8EFkP]):

Tiger was born in Anchorage, Alaska and lived there until he was 12 years old. Tiger was raised by his Mother and Grandparents and when he graduated from Faith Lutheran School they moved to South Dakota to raise him on the family farm. Tiger graduated from Ipswich High School in Ipswich, South Dakota. . . .

In 2003 Tiger came to Las Vegas to help his grandmother retire here. He instantly fell in love with Nevada and decided to make it his home. Although his grandmother moved to Alaska to be close to Tiger's mother he has made Las Vegas his home.

Tiger became a Certified Golf Teaching Professional in 2005 and is still certified by the United States Golf Teaching Federation. . . .

In 2007 he decided to follow his dreams and went back to school and obtained his real estate license. . . . Currently he works with out of state investors that purchase investment properties in Clark County. He also helps run the family business from his office in Las Vegas.

Tiger's love for Nevada and his desire to get the people of Nevada back to work is why he has made the decision to run for State Legislature. His main concern in Carson City will not be politics as usual but what is good for the people of Nevada.

And some of you thought I was *kidding* about the "golf pro named Tiger" part.

Now, you want a real kick in the teeth? Guess who built and designed Tiger's campaign website this past summer.

Yep, Daniel Halseth. So, yeah, the three all knew each other.

Now, I can't tell you when the alleged affair between Tiger and Elizabeth began, and I'm not sure exactly when Daniel first became suspicious (probably shortly after designing Tiger's campaign website in August). But it appears things came to a boil shortly after the pair took a trip to Elko alone together for a mining tour; a visit [captured on film](http://yfrog.com/nyzdgnej) (<http://yfrog.com/nyzdgnej>) and tweeted by the Mining Association (Tiger is on the far right; Elizabeth is the short one standing next to him).

I'm also reliably told that it was shortly after this trip to Elko - a couple weeks before Daniel's arrest - that others became aware of the inappropriate relationship and that both Elizabeth and Tiger admitted to it in private. In addition, word on the street is that there was even discussion of Elizabeth abandoning her legislative seat, packing up and relocating out-of-state with Tiger.

And then there are the phone records.

I'm told by someone close to the situation with personal, first-hand knowledge that Halseth and Helgelien are on par (pardon the golf pun) with Jim Gibbons and Kathy Karrasch in the texting game, with over 600 texts between the two of them in August and almost 1,000 in September. And that doesn't even include actual phone calls.

In fact, the communications between the two were so frequent and intense that Daniel supposedly begged Tiger directly to stop contacting his wife and to leave his marriage alone.

Contrary to the opinion of some, this alleged affair isn't just "rumor and gossip." In fact, the only thing missing at this point is an Ensign-like public admission or denial on the senator's part. But under advice of counsel and/or her political handlers, she's clammed up, hoping this whole thing will just go away.

Ain't gonna happen.

Democrats are salivating like Pavlov's dogs over this; not only because they'll likely pick up this seat, but because they'll take out a fire-breathing conservative in the process.

In any event, Sen. Halseth is guilty of, at the very least, the same kind of "bad judgment" she accused her primary opponent Sen. Dennis Nolan of having last year, as well as personal conduct that doesn't comport with her own stated "values" that she accused her general election opponent Benny Yerushalmi of not having.

But there's something else that still bothers the hell out of me over all of this: Having her husband arrested on a trumped-up "open and gross lewdness" charge. How in the world did she come up with that? And why? I wonder if there's any past history of this young woman filing sex-related complaints and/or charges against other men?

Actually, I don't wonder. I know. And you will, too...in the next (and probably final) edition of *The Elizabeth Halseth Story*.

CHAPTER SEVEN

December 4, 2011

Of everything surrounding the untold story (except here!) of alleged love triangle involving Republican state Sen. Elizabeth Halseth, her husband Daniel, and a prospective GOP legislative candidate named Tiger Helgelien, the thing that still bothers me most is Daniel's arrest, not the alleged affair (God'll sort that one out).

Here's why...

On the surface and when it became public, everyone jumped to the conclusion that Daniel was the bad guy and Elizabeth was the victim, especially because of the mainstream news blackout of the fact that the whole incident erupted after Daniel discovered and confronted his wife about the "friends with benefits" relationship he suspected she was having with Tiger the golf pro.

As you'll recall, the actual confrontation occurred on Sunday night, October 16. And I have no doubt Elizabeth was scared pantless during the incident. After all, if the accusation was true she had been caught by her husband having an extramarital affair; a potentially explosive situation.

But remember, at this point it was Elizabeth's behavior and actions that brought this whole incident on (with a little help from Tiger). Daniel had been a faithful, stay-at-home dad and primary care-giver of the couple's three young children while Elizabeth attended to her political career, especially during the four months she served in Carson City earlier this year.

In any event, the confrontation that took place on October 16 was surely less than cordial; but then again, neither was it the final scene in "War of the Roses." Both parties are on record in the Arrest Report as saying that once Elizabeth demanded that the confrontation stop, it

stopped. And indeed, she did not call the police and report the incident that night, or even the next morning.

In fact, police were only called to the couple's home FIVE DAYS LATER. And they were called by Elizabeth's mother, not Elizabeth. And it was for the purpose of essentially filing a missing person report, not a domestic disturbance.

Recall that on October 21 Elizabeth's mother showed up at Elizabeth's home from Oregon, found her daughter wasn't there, reportedly became concerned about her daughter's safety, and called the police.

When Metro officers showed up, Elizabeth's mother told them she could see Elizabeth's purse in the house through a window and claimed Elizabeth would never leave the house without it. At that point, police attempted to break into the house by calling a locksmith.

But as we all know now, the mother's concern/hysteria was unfounded. Elizabeth was, in fact, in no danger whatsoever when the police were called. In fact, she was at church with Daniel. And indeed, she did leave the house without the purse her mother said she'd never leave the house without, which, again, was the excuse she used to get police to try to break into the house.

The bottom line is that police were called because Elizabeth's mother said she was missing and was possibly in danger, not because of the October 16 incident. And once Elizabeth showed up safely and unharmed, that should have been the end of it for Metro, right? I mean, getting involved in a personal marital spat between a husband and wife is the job of divorce attorneys and the courts, not police officers, right?

And yet....

Daniel ended up getting arrested - with Tiger right there in his house the whole time.

And not for something that happened while the police were at the couple's home or while the couple was at church. Not for domestic violence. Not for kidnapping. Not for sexual assault. Not for rape or attempted rape. Not for child endangerment. Not for drunk and disorderly. Not even for indecent exposure.

For "open or gross lewdness."

A charge the Las Vegas Criminal Defense blog says “is one of the more frequently *falsely-accused* offenses because police don't need physical proof to make an arrest, and people may play the *victim card* out of revenge.”

Keep that in mind - especially since the incident happened in the privacy of the couple's own home, with no witnesses, FIVE DAYS earlier.

Oh, yeah...something indeed stinks like yesterday's diapers here.

Raising the level of suspicion - in addition, of course, to the obvious skepticism caused by the accusation of marital infidelity on Elizabeth's part – are reports that Elizabeth had been involved in at least two, and maybe as many as four sex related/sexual harassment complaints by the tender young age of 24.

First, there was a sexual harassment claim adjudicated in 2006.

[ELIZABETH N. HALSETH v. B.C. TOWING, INC.](http://bit.ly/uav0Hy) (<http://bit.ly/uav0Hy>)

And then there was a complaint Elizabeth filed in 2002 against a decorated Vietnam veteran and ROTC instructor involving an accusation of “inappropriate touching” – coincidentally(?) the exact same accusation used to have Daniel arrested.

[ACTION ON REQUEST FOR INDEMNIFICATION](http://bit.ly/rtf0Ly) (<http://bit.ly/rtf0Ly>)

Hello?

There are also rumors of a third complaint involving an elementary school teacher in Oregon, and a separate incident of some kind with another employer, LightSpeedVT.

So what we have here is a young woman who not only is very familiar with the ins-and-outs of these types of laws and situations, but has a history of using them possibly as a weapon to get what she wants. Or as the Las Vegas Criminal Defense blog put it in describing an “open or gross lewdness” accusation:

Playing the “victim card.”

But to what end?

I'll get to that in the next and (hopefully) final part of this series. I know, I know. I said this would be the final installment. But new, important and potentially explosive information on this matter came to my attention on Friday, and I'll write that up in the next day or so.

Until then...

CHAPTER EIGHT

December 9, 2011

“Why? Why are you writing about this?”

That's the question I received from a prominent Republican donor this week regarding my coverage of the Halseth scandal. It's a fair and reasonable question, and one I'll answer here in what will be the eighth and (I hope) final edition in this series.....

So what does Nevada State Sen. Elizabeth Halseth want that would cause her to have her husband thrown in jail on an obviously trumped up charge over an incident that had occurred five days earlier?

Well, I've now been told by no less than four different people familiar with the situation that in the divorce negotiations between the respective attorneys that took place right after Thanksgiving Elizabeth asked for full custody of the children....so she can take them to Alaska.

You know...where her alleged paramour, Tiger, is from.

Now, under normal circumstances you wouldn't expect a court to allow one parent to move out-of-state in a contested custody dispute involving very young children, especially when the parent being left behind has been the children's primary care provider. It's not fair to the parent being left behind, and certainly is not in the best interest of the children.

Which is where Daniel's arrest comes into play.

Two different sources have told me that on November 29 Elizabeth's attorney - falsely claiming that Daniel had “confessed” to “domestic violence” - suggested that his arrest could mean the court will presume that it is NOT in the children's best interest to award him joint custody.

And so Elizabeth has supposedly agreed to drop the “open and gross lewdness” charges and not drag Daniel through a bitter and costly custody fight if Daniel will just agree to let her take his children away from him and move them out of state far, far away.

However, recognizing that asking to move to Alaska would look kinda skunky under the circumstances, I’m also told Elizabeth is now claiming she wants to move to Oregon, where her mother lives, not Alaska. And the new reason is supposedly because she can’t find work here; that Oregon has a better job market.

Oh, please.

Clearly Daniel’s arrest is now being used as a weapon to wrest custody of his children from him. And remember, “open and gross lewdness” has been described in the legal community as “one of the more frequently falsely-accused offenses because police don't need physical proof to make an arrest.”

And to suggest that a sitting state senator can’t find work in Las Vegas is beyond laughable.

If Elizabeth can’t find work here, it’s not likely to be because of the job market, but because of her history of filing sex-related complaints in the workplace. And if that’s the problem, it will be just as much of a problem in Oregon as it is here.

All that aside, here’s why Republicans need to know all of this about this matter.

Whenever a political scandal like this breaks, there’s always talk about the elected official resigning. Initially, I was assured by GOP leaders that Sen. Halseth was giving NO CONSIDERATION to resigning whatsoever. Well, now we learn that Sen. Halseth is, indeed, considering walking away from her Senate seat...a fact that some GOP leaders reading this may be learning now for the very first time.

In addition, I’ve had a number of elected officials, party leaders and lobbyists - who are already familiar with all the details I’ve outlined in this series (believe me, this is no secret among insiders!) - that while they’ve had private meetings with Sen. Halseth in the past and during the legislative session, there’s no way in Hades they’d ever be caught alone with her in a room, office or restaurant again.

So to suggest that this scandal is in no way impacting her ability to fulfill her official duties simply isn’t true.

That said, it should be painfully obvious to everyone that Sen. Halseth is a political liability for the GOP and could - at any moment if she believes it's in her personal interest - resign her seat and leave Republicans in the lurch. Indeed, some now believe this is no longer a matter of *if* Sen. Halseth resigns, but *when.* And that timing is of critical importance.

You see, if Halseth resigns next year after the deadline to add a special election in November (and no, I'm not sure exactly what that drop-dead date is) to finish her term, then the seven liberal Democrats on the Clark County Commission would pick the GOP replacement.

And you can bet those seven Democrats will pick the weakest, most liberal Republican they can dig up!

That would NOT be in the GOP's best interest. However....

Should Sen. Halseth resign now, then there would be plenty of time for possible Republican candidates to file in March to run in the special election – including a GOP primary if more than one candidate is interested. This way, Republican voters in the district to be represented, not seven liberal Democrat county commissioners, would decide which Republican is going to represent them.

Of course, there's certainly the chance that the Democrat candidate who runs will defeat the Republican candidate in the general election, and Republicans will lose the seat. And there's also certainly a chance that Sen. Halseth won't resign and move to Alaska or Oregon and will finish out her term, obviating the need for a special election.

At this point, anything is possible.

But Republican leaders, activists and central committee members should know all of this so they can discuss it and decide what THEY think is the best course of action. Trying to sweep this situation under the carpet and let Sen. Halseth - who clearly has conflicting and emotionally charged interests here - decide how this is going to play out when it can impact so many other people is just wrong.

And speaking of wrong, let me conclude with this.

The same prominent GOP donor I alluded to at the beginning of this column also suggested that I was “moralizing” over this matter. Nah-uh. Not my job to judge.

What I AM saying is that Sen. Halseth has made herself a political liability and opened herself wide up to the politically lethal charge of hypocrisy. And I'm suggesting it may be time for Republicans to cut bait in this situation for strategic and tactical reasons, not moral ones. Others may have a problem with the moral aspects here, but that is decidedly NOT why I chose to write about this.

So don't shoot the messenger.

All of that said; knowing what you know now; and considering Sen. Halseth's call for then-Sen. Ensign's resignation under similar circumstances, it seems to me it would be in her best interest, the best interest of her children, the best interest of her constituents and the best interest of Nevada Republicans if she would just resign immediately and let the chips fall where they may.

But that's not my call. I've given you the information. YOU all take it from here.

* * * * *

Copyright 2011 Chuck Muth. All rights reserved.