Law Project for Psychiatric Rights James B. Gottstein, Esq. 406 G Street, Suite 206 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 274-7686 Attorney for Appellant

FILED

SEP 2 6 2016

APPELLATE COURTS OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

## IN THE SUPREME COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA

In the Matter of the Necessity of the Hospitalization of	)	Supreme Court No. S-16467
L.M.	)	
Trial Court Case No. 3AN-16-01656PR		

### NOTICE OF APPEAL

Appellant, L.M., hereby gives notice of appeal to the Alaska Supreme Court from the August 30, 2016, oral order granting the Petition for 90-Day Commitment filed against Appellant. A copy of the transcript of the oral order made on the record is included herewith.

DATED September 26, 2016.

Law Project for Psychiatric Rights

By:

James B. Gottstein

Alaska Bar No 7811100

In the Matter of



SFP 26 2016

APPELLATE COURTS OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

90-Day Commitment Hearing August 30, 2016

H&M Court Reporting

Original File 90-Day Commitment MUS.pm Min-U-Script® with Word Index

# IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT

### AT ANCHORAGE

IN	THE	MATTER	OF:	)	
				)	
				)	
		·	_	)	CONFIDENTIAL
			Respondent.	)	
				)	

No. 3AN-16-1656 PR

90 DAY COMMITMENT HEARING (EXCERPT)

PAGES 1 THROUGH 92

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARK RINDNER Superior Court Judge

Anchorage, Alaska August 30, 2016 8:35 a.m.

**APPEARANCE:** 

FOR THE STATE: Steven Bookman

Aretha Tyus

Attorney General's Office

1031 West 4th Avenue Anchorage AK 99501

FOR THE RESPONDENT: James Gottstein

406 G Street, Suite 206

Anchorage Ak 99501

```
4
 1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
                THE COURT: Based on the arguments of the
24
    parties and the testimony I've received, I'll find,
25
```

under AS 47.37.55, Ms. has been found by clear and convincing evidence to be mentally ill and as a result she is likely to cause harm to others.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Under subsection (b), if the court finds there is a less restrictive alternative available, and the respondent has been advised of it and refused voluntary treatment through the alternative, the court may order the less restrictive alternative treatment after acceptance by the program of the respondent for a period not to exceed 90 days. Less restrictive alter -- "least restrictive alternative" means mental health treatment facilities and/or conditions of treatment that are no more harsh, hazardous or intrusive than necessary to achieve the treatment objectives of the patient and they involve no restrictions on physical movement or supervised residents or inpatient care, except as reasonably necessary for the administration of treatment or the protection of the patient, or others from physical injury.

Given the findings by the jury that she is likely to cause harm for another, a less restrictive alternative would have to, under that definition, I believe, protect others from physical injury and none -- and I would find -- and I find this by clear and convincing evidence, that none of the less restrictive

alternatives that have been proposed by the respondent, or would otherwise be available, will protect and be able to protect the public from the danger to others that Ms.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

While choices, once she stabilizes, may be able to do that, while unstabilized, they are unable to do that. They can't watch her 24/7. Even Dr. Wolf suggested that stabilization would be necessary. That that might include medication.

The idea of crisis lines and stuff are not going to protect the public from the harm of delusions where Ms. might believe she is being chased by others, and cause traffic accidents by her belief that others are out to get her, and she reacts in a physical manner, that's led to the assault charges. When she becomes agitated, she becomes agitated rapidly, and call lines and other things are not sufficient to protect the public from outcomes that might occur when she becomes rapidly agitated and reacts. That could cause others to react to her, but it causes her to take actions that pose risks to the public, which is why the jury has found her to be a danger to others by clear and convincing evidence.

And, so, other than a facility like API, that is locked and provides 24/7 care, I do not believe that

there is a less restrictive alternative under her current status.

I reject the idea that there is a constitutional right that would require the state to fund particular kinds of programs. There would be separation of powers issues, I believe. And I certainly do not believe I've had sufficient evidence that would suggest to me all the reasons that that facility was defunded, went out of business, whatsoever, but it no longer exists. And the legislature is entitled to make choices of how the state spends its money within certain confines.

I also do not believe that the treatment at API, to date, has been inappropriate or has not -- or that there has been an opportunity to determine the efficacy of the treatment. The fact of the matter is is that API is not a long term facility and intended to be that, it's intended to be a short term facility that stabilizes people and then moves them into the community, while stabilized. And that hasn't really been given a fair chance to proceed yet in this case.

The medication, based on the testimony, has not had a full opportunity to reach an effective level, where one could see whether there was stabilization.

There was some period of time where it appears that

medication was helping Ms. although, I will say that that is still somewhat up in the air.

Medication, oftentimes, takes a while to figure out dosage and the right medication and the interactions of medication, and I don't think there's been an opportunity, given the legal proceedings, of where --when Ms. was unwilling, and has been unwilling to take medication on her own. She -- there was an order for her to be involuntary medicated. That was stayed for a period of time, at the request -- with the understanding that Ms. was requesting that so she could take an appeal to the Alaska Supreme Court to see if they would stay the order for medication, which I allowed.

Once she was on medication, she was on it for a while and then she went off the medication, because, either the 30-day petition was being said to expire -- although, it would have been my understanding that medication could have continued once the 90-day petition was filed. But it also was done because of a request that Ms. \_\_\_\_\_\_ not be medicated during these proceedings. So, my understanding is, she currently is not being medicated. That has -- because of that, the medication -- the efficacy of any medication has not been fully explored, and, while there may be competency

9

1	groups that were designed to restore her to competency
2	and that other part of these legal proceedings, I don't
3	really think that API was seen as a place where
4	psychotherapy was going to have any significant effect.
5	It, in my mind, was clearly designed as a medication
6	oriented facility to stabilize her on medication and
7	then move her into less restrictive alternatives. That
8	hasn't happened yet. And as long as she remains a
9	danger to the community, to others, I think API is the
10	only facility that is available.
11	(12:55:57)
12	(End of requested portion)
13	***END***
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

#### CERTIFICATE

THIRD DISTRICT

STATE OF ALASKA

I, Georgi Ann Haynes, Certified Professional Court Reporter for the Third Judicial District, State of Alaska, hereby certify:

That this transcript was prepared to the best of my knowledge and ability from a recording, recorded by someone other than H&M Court Reporting, therefore "indiscernible" portions appear in the transcript.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 8th day of September, 2016.

Georgi Ann Haynes Notary Public in and for Alaska My commission expires: 10/05/2015