

1
2 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA
3 THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT AT ANCHORAGE

4 In the Matter of the Necessity)
5 for the Hospitalization of:)
6 ROSLYN WETHERHORN,)
7 Respondent.)

Case No. 3AN 05-459 PR-S

RECEIVED

AUG 08 2005

Law Project For
Psychiatric Rights

8 SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM IN REPLY TO
9 OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES

10 The Law Office for Psychiatric Rights (Law Office) asks for a court order
11 requiring the state to pay the Law Office enhanced fees for work done in this case. The
12 state provided good reasons in its opposition to the Law Office's motion, as to why it
13 should be denied. In this supplemental memorandum, the state will further show that,
14 under the holding of *Cooper v. State*¹ and related cases, the court does not have the
15 statutory authority to award attorney's fees to the Law Office in this case. The state will
16 also challenge the Law Office's claim for enhanced fees and the respondent's claim to
prevailing party status.

17 **A. The court lacks statutory authority to award attorneys' fees in this
18 case**

19 "The common law does not permit the recovery of attorney's fees, as
20 costs, from the opposing party."² "The authority to make such awards is derived from
21 AS 09.60.010."³ That provision provides, in part that "[t]he supreme court shall
22 determine by rule or order the costs, if any, that may be allowed a prevailing party in a
civil action."⁴

23 1 638 P.2d 174 (Alaska 1981)

24 2 *McDonough v. Lee*, 420 P.2d 459, 460 (Alaska 1966).

25 3 *Stepanov v. Gavrilovich*, 594 P.2d 30, 37 (Alaska 1979).

26 4 AS 09.60.010(a).

1
2 In *Cooper v. State*⁵ the Alaska Supreme Court determined that, AS
3 09.60.010 did not give courts authority to order that attorneys' fees be awarded to the
4 prevailing party in a Child in Need of Aid Proceeding.⁶ The court also found that Civil
5 Rule 82 does not apply to actions governed by the Children's Rules.⁷ For the same
6 reason, this court lacks statutory authority to award the Law Office attorneys' fees in
7 this case.

8 Involuntary mental commitment proceedings, such as this one, are
9 governed by the Probate Rules, not the Civil Rules.⁸ In its reply, the Law Office cites
10 *Crittell v. Bingo*⁹ for the proposition that probate matters are civil actions for the purpose
11 of Civil Rule 82.¹⁰ This reliance is flawed because the nature of the proceeding in
12 *Bingo* was fundamentally different than the nature of an involuntary mental
13 commitment.

14 *Bingo* involved a will challenge brought by private individuals against the
15 will's proponents---other private individuals.¹¹ In this case, a state entity petitioned the
16 court to permit the state to take protective actions to preserve the well being of the
17 respondent and her community. Therefore this case lacked the private adversarial
18 component present in private probate disputes, such as the one in *Bingo*, and in normal
19 civil actions.

20 ⁵ *Supra*

21 ⁶ 638 P.2d at 178.

22 ⁷ *Id.*

23 ⁸ Probate Rule 1(b) "These rules govern practice and procedure in the trial courts
24 in ...mental commitments under AS 47.30..."

25 ⁹ 83 P.3d 532 (Alaska 2004).

26 ¹⁰ Reply at 2.

¹¹ 83 P.3d at 532 ("Will proponents, an acquaintance of testator who was primary
beneficiary under will and acquaintance's husband who was named as executor, filed
petition for informal probate of will. Interested parties objected, alleging testator lacked
testamentary capacity and acted under undue influence in executing the will.").

1
2 Mental commitments are more like child in need of aid proceedings than
3 civil actions. The court in *Cooper* found that child protection proceedings were not
4 "civil actions" for purposes of the attorneys' fees authorization statute, AS 09.60.10.
5 While *Bingo* acknowledged that AS 09.60.010 gives courts authority to apply Civil Rule
6 82 to civil actions that take place in probate court, it did not reverse the basic holding of
7 *Cooper*---- that AS 09.60.010 does not allow the award of attorneys fees in non-civil
8 actions such as governmentally initiated children's cases. For the same reason, the
9 statute does not authorize attorneys' fees award in governmentally initiated mental
10 commitments.

11 *Cooper* supported its limited interpretation of AS 09.60.10, with a public
12 policy analysis equally applicable in this case. The court found that "Children in need
13 of aid proceedings are intended to promote an important public interest: the welfare of
14 children."¹² Therefore, "[e]xposing the state to costs and attorney's fees when a child is
15 ultimately determined not to be in need of aid would significantly chill the state's
16 willingness to commence protective proceedings for children."¹³ This, the court found
17 would be inconsistent with the underlying purpose of children's proceedings.¹⁴ The
18 same can be said of mental commitment cases.

19 The purpose of the involuntary mental commitment proceedings is to
20 hospitalize individuals who, as the result of mental illness are either gravely disabled, a
21 risk to themselves, or a risk to others.¹⁵ Hospitalization protects mentally ill individuals
22 and the community. Therefore, the underlying purpose of the mental commitment
23 statutes is to promote the welfare of the subject individuals and their community. As it
24 would in children's proceedings, placing the state at risk of attorney's fee awards

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

12 638 P.2d at 178.

13 *Id.*

14 *Id.*

15 AS 47.30.735(c).

1
2 anytime a court finds a commitment petition unfounded could have a chilling effect on
3 the willingness of the state to file commitment petitions.

4 *Cooper* is still good law. The Alaska Supreme Court cited it as authority
5 for refusing to award Rule 82 attorney's fees in juvenile delinquency or criminal cases
6 where the respondent is represented by private counsel.¹⁶ Its principles are consistent
7 with the statutory scheme for mental commitments that require the superior court to
8 appoint counsel for every respondent at the time the ex parte commitment order is
9 issued¹⁷ and requires the respondent to pay for his appointed counsel if he or she can
10 afford it.¹⁸ Clearly the legislature did not expect respondents to hire their own lawyer,
11 let alone expect the state to pick up the costs if the respondents are not committed.
12 Therefore, the court, in this case should follow *Cooper* and deny the Law Office's
13 motion for attorney's fees.

14 **B. In the alternative, the Law Office would not be entitled to fees,
15 enhanced or not, even if Civil Rule 82 applied to this case.**

16 Even if Civil Rule 82 applies here, respondent is not entitled to an
17 attorney's fee award because she was not the prevailing party in the case.¹⁹ The state
18 prevailed at the April 15, 2005 hearing on its petition for a 30-day commitment and for
19 administration of medication.²⁰ The state also prevailed over the Law Office's
20 objection, in its motion to dismiss the 90-day commitment petition without prejudice.²¹
21 Acknowledging this court holding, the Law Office claimed that "whether dismissed
22

23 ¹⁶ *State v. Superior Court*, 743 P.2d 381 (Alaska 1987).

24 ¹⁷ Alaska Statute 47.30.700(a) ("Within 48 hours after completion of the screening
25 investigation, a judge may issue an ex parte order...The court shall...appoint an
26 attorney to represent the respondent, and may direct that a peace officer take the
27 respondent into custody...").

28 ¹⁸ Alaska Statute 47.30.905(b)(1).

29 ¹⁹ Civil Rule 82(a).

30 ²⁰ State's Opposition at 1.

31 ²¹ Memorandum in Support of Motion for Attorney's Fees at 2.

1 with or without prejudice, Ms. Wetherhorn is the prevailing party in this matter.”²² The
2 Law Office presses its claim on the theory that the state moved to dismiss the 90 day
3 petition because the Law Office requested a jury trial on the state’s 90 day commitment
4 petition. In fact, the state asked for dismissal of the 90 petition because the respondent
5 had already been released from the Alaska Psychiatric Institute.²³ She was released
6 because she no longer required hospitalization.²⁴ The respondent did not prevail in
7 court. Therefore, neither she nor the Law Office is entitled to an attorney’s fees award.

8 The court’s actions in this case also eliminates respondent’s claim for
9 enhanced fees. The Law Office asks for an award of full attorney’s fees in this case to
10 punish the state for allegedly failing to comply with some technical statutory
11 requirements of AS 47.30. The Law Office’s representative paints with a broad brush in
12 this portion of his reply. He alleges that in this case the state exhibited “cavalier
13 disregard for Ms. Wetherhorn’s statutory rights, enabled and emboldened by the Public
14 Defender Agency’s complete abdication of its responsibility to protect the rights of its
15 AS 47.30 clients.”²⁵ Even if these allegations were true, they do not support a claim for
16 full fees.

17 The Alaska Supreme Court has “consistently held that an award of full
18 attorney’s fees is ‘manifestly unreasonable’ in the absence of a bad faith defense or
19 vexatious conduct by the losing party.”²⁶ He does not allege that the state brought the

20 ²² *Id.*

21 ²³ Motion to Dismiss at 1.

22 ²⁴ See Discharge Summary, attached as exhibit 1 to respondent’s Response to
23 Motion to Dismiss.

24 ²⁵ Reply at 5.

25 ²⁶ *State v. University of Alaska*, 624 P.2d 807, 817 (Alaska 1981). See also *Bingo*,
26 83 P3d at 537, n. 20, *Marathon Oil Co. v. ARCO Alaska, Inc.*, 972 P.2d 595, 605
(Alaska 1999); *State, Child Support Enforcement Div. v. Allsop*, 902 P.2d 790, 795
(Alaska 1995); *Demoski v. New*, 737 P.2d 780, 788 (Alaska 1987).

1
2 case in bad faith or for a vexatious purpose. How could he? The state won at every step
3 in this case. Respondent was released, as appropriate, when she no longer needed
4 hospitalization. Therefore the state was not vexatious and did not bring the case in bad
5 faith. Furthermore there is nothing in the record or in the Law Office's filings that
6 support any enhancement of attorneys' fees in this case.

7 **CONCLUSION**

8 The motion for attorney's fees should be denied because this court lacks
9 statutory authority to grant it. Even if the court had such authority, the motion should
10 be denied because respondent is not the prevailing party here and there is no
11 justification for the court to make an enhanced attorney fees award.

12 DATED: 8/04/05

13 DAVID W. MÁRQUEZ
14 ATTORNEY GENERAL

15 By: *Blair M. Christensen*
16 for Dan N. Branch
17 Assistant Attorney General
18 Alaska Bar No. 7710100

19 DEPARTMENT OF LAW
20 OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
21 ANCHORAGE BRANCH
22 1031 W. FOURTH AVENUE, SUITE 200
23 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
24 PHONE: (907) 269-5100