DEPARTMENT OF LAW OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL	ANCHORAGE BRANCH	1031 W. FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 200	ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501	PHONE: (907) 269-5100
--	------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT AT ANCHORAGE

In the Matter of the Protective Proceedings of:	RECEIVED
BRET BYRON BOHN,	APR 4 2014) BY:
Respondent.) Case No. 3AN-13-02737 PI

PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF INTENT TO RULE ON ADMINISTRATIVE RULE 37.7 REQUEST

Department of Health and Social Services, Adult Protective Services, through the Office of Attorney General (department), files its response and opposes Psych Rights' request to publicize the case file, exhibits, recordings of proceedings and any other material in this matter for the following reasons.

I. The Public Access to Court Records is Not Absolute and the Intensity of Public Interest in This Case Does Not Justify the Court Record Be Made Public.

Psych Rights correctly asserts that courts recognize public's right to have access to court records but this is not an absolute right. The US Supreme Court held that "every court has supervisory power over its own records and files, and access has been denied where the court files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes." Even though this issue and specifically Administrative Rule 37.7 has not been a subject of litigation in Alaska courts, other jurisdictions have considered the same issue and decided to maintain the confidentiality of private information of individuals especially in protective cases. For instance in *Webster Groves School District v. Pulitzer Publishing Company*, the Eight Circuit affirmed the district court's decision to seal the court file to prevent the public dissemination of a juvenile's sensitive information when a newspaper sought to gain

Nixon v. Warner Communications, 435 US 589, 597, 98 S. Ct. 1306, 1312 (1978).

² Id., at 598.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

25

26

access to the proceedings.³ The court even considered redaction of certain parts of the records but found it impossible to do so because it included documentation, evaluations and other information regarding the juvenile's learning disabilities and other personal information. 4 In Jaufre ex rel. Jaufre v. Taylor, Louisiana District court, where parties moved to seal the court records after a parent sued a school official for administrating corporal punishment on a minor, maintained the confidentiality of the records that made references to the minor's detailed medical records including emotional condition and problematic behavior.⁵ The court also withheld the disclosure of portions of the records including pictures of injuries that could be humiliating or stigmatizing for the minor.⁶ Even in Baby Doe v. Methacton School District which is cited by Psych Rights, the court's decision to disclose the court record to the public was driven by the court's desire to make public aware of alleged wrongdoings of a public official. ⁷

In the Matter of Protective Proceeding of Bret Byron Bohn is a guardianship proceeding. Unlike Baby Doe where the focus of the matter was to show the wrongdoing of a school district official, this matter is about Mr. Bohn and his capacity to manage his own affairs. And similar to Webster Grooves School District and Jaufre ex rel Jaufre matter, the records in this case make references to detailed medical information regarding Mr. Bohn's medical condition - past and present- diagnosis, extensive medical notes taken by all the medical professionals, laboratory results, and evaluations. Additionally, records include statements and information regarding Mr. Bohn's family members, relatives, friends, employees as well as acquaintances and his relationships with these individuals. As such all the records, the exhibits, the videos, the testimony that Psych Rights is seeking to have access includes highly private, sensitive and possibly

I.T.M.O.: Bret Byron Bohn Response to Notice of Withdrawal of Stipulation to Incapacity Case No. 3AN-13-02737 PR Page 2 of 5

⁸⁹⁸ F.2d 1371 (Eighth Circuit, 1990).

Id., at 1377.

³⁵¹ F. Supp. 2d 514,519 (2005)

Id., at 518.

⁸⁷⁸ F. Supp. 40 (E.D. Pa. 1995)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

26

stigmatizing information on an adult who has been deemed to be incapacitated by this court after days of testimony and evidence. Additionally, some of the most sensitive and private information has already been made public by release of the court's order dated February 7, 2014. In that order, Mr. Bohn's medical condition including diagnosis, the testimony of experts as well as family members and others and his appearance and physical condition as it appears in videos are discussed in a detailed manner. The court's order also outlines the court's reasoning for its decision in appointing the Office of Public Advocacy as Mr. Bohn's guardian. To the extent that the public may have any interest in this proceeding, which the department does not believe that the public does, the public has already been provided access to the information by the release of the court's order and therefore any public interest in this matter should be considered to have been satisfied at this time.

There Is No "Incestuous" Relationship Between Adult Protective II. Services, Office of Public Advocacy and the Providence Hospital

Psych Rights asserts that there is an incestuous relationship between Adult Protective Services, Office of Public Advocacy and Providence Hospital. There is no relationship, "incestuous" or otherwise, between Adult Protective Services and Office of Public Advocacy or Adult Protective Services and Providence Hospital.

The department, Adult Protective Services, is mandated to provide protection to vulnerable adults under AS 47.24.8 The same statute requires certain persons including but not limited to physicians, administrators of a health care facility, social workers to file a report with the department if they have a reasonable cause to believe that a vulnerable adult suffers from undue influence, abandonment, exploitation, abuse, neglect or selfneglect. Once a report is filed with the department, the department is required to investigate the report and take action on the report by providing services to the adult

AS 47.24.900 (21).

AS 47.24.010

including but not limited to filing a protective proceeding with the court which may include a petition for guardianship or conservatorship.¹⁰

In this case, Adult Protective Services filed a petition for guardianship after it received a report of harm regarding Mr. Bohn and litigated the matter as the petitioner under the applicable statutes and rules. Accordingly, each party acted independently and under its own statutory authority during the proceedings. Release of Mr. Bohn's medical records and private information will not shed further light on the statutory authority of the parties in this case but will only violate Mr. Bohn's right to privacy.

III. Neither Psych Rights nor Public's Interest Outweighs Mr. Bohn's Interest in Privacy and Confidentiality.

In its letter, Psych Rights questions the actions of the court and the parties and provides an opinion as what should have happened in this case. The department contends that Psych Rights disagreement with the court's actions or holding does not outweigh the privacy considerations of Mr. Bohn. Any case or court proceeding may be cause for disagreements with the court system or other agencies, but such a disagreement in itself should not render that proceeding public, nor does it equate to a finding that the public would have an interest in knowing the most private aspects of one's life including their medical condition.

Furthermore, despite the fact the court has entered the ruling that this proceeding to remain confidential and, despite the fact that none of the parties ever filed an opposition for the proceedings to be confidential during the trial, much of Mr. Bohn's private information is already in the public domain. In fact, Psych Rights cited the articles and websites that the public may be able to access information regarding Mr. Bohn's case. These sites include newspapers, blogs, as well as media pages such as Free Bret Bohn Facebook website. Psych Rights also referred to the videos that are part of the court record and were to remain confidential. While the court cannot un-ring that bell, and the material that is already in the public domain cannot be turned off, there is no compelling

AS 47.24.013, AS 47.24.015, AS 47.24.017 and AS 47.24.019.

reason to add to that material by including over 1900 pages of medical records. The release of this information violates Mr. Bohn's right to privacy and confidentiality.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, what remains of Mr. Bohn's privacy, including the additional medical records and testimony that was part of the detailed hearing should remain privileged and confidential and should not be violated under the thin argument of the public's right to know further than it already has. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the court deny Psych Rights' request to access and publicize the court record in this matter.

DATED: April 3,201

MICHAEL C. GERAGHTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

By:

Nevhiz E. Calik Russell Assistant Attorney General Alaska Bar No. 0606043

I.T.M.O.: Bret Byron Bohn
Response to Notice of Withdrawal of Stipulation to Incapacity

Case No. 3AN-13-02737 PR Page 5 of 5

	1					
	2	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT AT ANCHORAGE				
	3					
	4	In the Matter of the) Protective Proceedings of:)				
	5	BRET BYRON BOHN,)	•			
	6)				
	7	Respondent.)	Case No. 3AN-13-02737 PR			
	8	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE				
	9	I certify that on this date, true and correct copies of the PETITIONER'S				
	10	RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF INTENT TO RULE ON ADMINISTRATIVE RULE				
	11					
	12	37.7 REQUEST and this CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE in this proceeding were				
	13	mailed to the following:				
	14	Tamara Hunter Adult Protective Services	James B. Gottstein, Esq. Psych Rights			
15		550 West 8 th Avenue	406 G Street, Suite 206			
·	16	Anchorage, AK 99501 Mario L. Bird	Anchorage, AK 99501 Christopher Slottee			
	17	Ross & Miner, PC	Atkinson, Conway & Gagnon, Inc.			
	18	372 E. Fireweed Lane, Suite 201 Anchorage, AK 99503	420 L Street, Suite 500 Anchorage, AK 99501			
	19	Carolyn Perkins	Elizabeth Russo			
RNEY GE BRANCH NUE, SUI ASKA 995 269-5100	20	Adult & Juvenile Representation 900 West 5 th Avenue, Suite 702	Office of Public Advocacy 900 West 5 th Avenue, Suite 525			
DEPARTMENT OF LAW OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ANCHORAGE BRANCH 1031 W. FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 200 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501 PHONE: (907) 269-5100	21	Anchorage, AK 99501	Anchorage, AK 99501			
	22	Collene Brady-Dragomir PO Box 113252				
FFICE 1031 W AN	23	Anchorage, AK 99511	Musa A 4/3/2014			
J	24	1	aura Sis Date aw Office Assistant II			
	25	<u> </u>	un Ollivo i libilimitt II			