

Washington Health Law Manual — Third Edition
Washington State Society of Healthcare Attorneys (WSSHA)

Chapter 4C:

Commitment Based on

Mental Illness

Author: Michael Finkle

**Organization: Seattle City Attorney's Office, Public & Community
Safety Division**

Editor: Indu Thomas

**Organization: Washington State Senate, Human Services and
Corrections Committee (staff counsel)**

Copyright © 2007 Washington State Society of Healthcare Attorneys and Washington State Hospital Association. All rights reserved.

Disclaimer: This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information with respect to the subject matter covered. It is provided with the understanding that neither the publisher nor any editor, author, or contributor hereto, is engaged in rendering legal or other professional services. The information contained herein represents the views of those participating in the project, and not, when applicable, any governmental agency or employer of such participant. Neither the publisher, nor any editor, author, or contributor hereto warrants that any information contained herein is complete or accurate. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent licensed professional should be sought.

For reference purposes, this chapter was prepared from laws, cases, and materials selected by the authors, which were available as of January 1, 2006.

Biographies

Michael Finkle, Author

Michael Finkle is a supervising prosecutor in the Public & Community Safety Division of the Seattle City Attorney's Office, and previously practiced as a municipal prosecutor and a civil practitioner in Los Angeles. He graduated UCLA School of Law (1981), where he served as Managing Editor of the UCLA Law Review. He holds an M.B.A. from Seattle University (1995) and a B.B.A. from Loyola Marymount University (1978). A significant part of Mr. Finkle's practice involves mental health issues. He served on the task force that recommended creating Mental Health Courts in Washington, and participated in forming the Seattle Municipal Court's Mental Health Court. He has supervised his office's participation in that Court since its inception (1999). Mr. Finkle has served as an adjunct professor of law at Seattle University School of Law since 1998, teaching Law & Mental Health and Trial Techniques. He has presented papers on competency to stand trial and on mental health courts to judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and mental health professionals. He serves on the Mental Illness and Sex Offender Civil Commitment Subcommittee of the WSBA's Committee on Public Defense, and has served on the state's Designated Mental Health Professional Protocol Advisory Committee. A past president of the Washington State Association of Municipal Attorneys, Mr. Finkle received that organization's inaugural "Outstanding Service Award" (2003). The WSBA has recognized him for "Exemplary Contributions" to the development of its members for his work with the WSBA's Trial Advocacy Program (1997).

Indu Thomas, Editor

Indu Thomas is staff counsel to the Human Services and Corrections Committee of the Washington State Senate. She previously served as the lead attorney for the Western State Hospital team of the Attorney General's Office. She has also practiced as both an assistant attorney general and a public defender in child abuse and neglect cases. She graduated from Cleveland-Marshall School of Law (1996). As staff counsel, Ms. Thomas' advises members and drafts legislation in the areas of mental health, substance abuse, welfare and child custody matters.

Chapter Outline

4C.1	Introduction.....	4C-2
4C.2	Involuntary Civil Commitment through Intervention of a Mental Health Professional.....	4C-2
4C.2.1	Introductory Concepts	
4C.2.2	Parties to the Commitment Proceedings	
4C.2.3	How the Procedure Works	
4C.2.3.1	Initial Detention for up to 72 Hours	
4C.2.3.2	Petition for Additional Treatment	
4C.2.3.3	If Petitioner Prevails at Probable Cause Hearing	
4C.2.3.4	If Petitioner Prevails at 90-Day Hearing	
4C.2.3.5	Renewing 90-Day Commitment	
4C.2.3.6	Early Release from Inpatient Commitment	
4C.3	Involuntary Criminal Commitment through Criminal System.....	4C-5
4C.3.1	Defendants Who Are Incompetent to Stand Trial	
4C.3.1.1	The Competency Evaluation	
4C.3.1.2	Competency Restoration Treatment for Felony Defendants	
4C.3.1.3	Eligibility for Competency Restoration Treatment for Non-Felony Defendants	
4C.3.2	Defendants Who Are Acquitted by Reason of Insanity	
4C.3.2.1	Same Procedures for Felonies and Non-Felonies	
4C.3.2.2	How Those Procedures Work	
4C.3.2.3	Diminished Capacity Distinguished	
4C.4	Involuntary Civil Commitment through Referral from Criminal System	4C-7
4C.4.1	Felony Defendant following Competency Proceedings	
4C.4.2	Non-Felony Defendant following Competency Proceedings	
4C.4.2.1	Non-Felony Defendant not Restored to Competency by Treatment	
4C.4.2.2	Non-Felony Defendant not Eligible for Treatment	
4C.4.3	Felony or Non-Felony Defendant following Commitment for Insanity	
4C.4.4	Felony or Non-Felony Defendant Based Solely on Competency or Insanity Evaluation	
4C.5	“Voluntary” Criminal Commitment through Mental Health Courts	4C-9
4C.5.1	Mental Health Courts and Therapeutic Courts	
4C.5.2	Philosophy of Mental Health Courts	
4C.5.3	Participation Based upon Crime Type and/or Criminal History	
4C.5.4	Structure Governing Form of Voluntary Criminal Commitment	
4C.5.4.1	Pure Diversion System	
4C.5.4.2	Pure Plea System	
4C.5.4.3	Hybrid System	
4C.5.5	Seattle Municipal Court’s Mental Health Court	
4C.5.5.1	Court’s Goals	
4C.5.5.1	Eligible Defendants	
4C.5.5.1	Seattle’s Mental Health Court Team	
4C.5.5.1	Relationship between Mental Health Court Structure and Voluntary Commitment	
4C.5.6	Need for Outcome Measures	
4C.6	Conclusion	4C-14

Volume 1: Patient Care Information, Treatment and Rights

4C.1. Introduction

The concept of commitment based on mental illness is a familiar one in today's society. Indeed, television crime dramas and movies often include commitment based on mental illness as part of their storylines. But many of those depictions gloss over the very real differences between the different models of involuntary treatment interventions. As used in this chapter, commitment refers to an order by a Washington court that an adult undergoes some form of involuntary mental health treatment.¹ Involuntary mental health treatment can occur in a variety of settings and can be initiated through the intervention of mental health professionals or law enforcement.² There are restrictive civil commitment orders that require care in settings such as the state psychiatric hospitals. Those state psychiatric hospitals are designed to serve the chronically mentally ill on an inpatient basis. There are also less restrictive orders, which require care in a variety of settings ranging from residential placements in group facilities to independent living arrangements with outpatient mental health care. Although involuntary commitment is intrinsically civil in nature it can be initiated by a criminal case. Commitment arising through the intervention of a mental health professional is referred to in this chapter as civil commitment; commitment arising out of a criminal case is referred to in this chapter as criminal commitment.

This chapter explores the involuntary commitment process through the civil³ and criminal⁴ systems.⁵ It also identifies areas in which the two commitment systems intersect.⁶ The chapter concludes by discussing how the relatively recent advent of mental health courts has created a new type of voluntary criminal commitment as a proactive step in reducing involuntary civil or criminal commitment for the population that the mental health court serves.⁷

4C.2. Involuntary Civil Commitment through Intervention of a Mental Health Professional

Pursuant to RCW chapter 71.05, an involuntary civil commitment of an adult occurs when a mental health professional detains a person for evaluation and treatment. To understand RCW chapter 71.05's civil commitment process, one must understand the roles of the various players and the procedural road that must be followed. RCW

¹ There are several other commitment laws that this chapter does not cover. On the civil side, RCW chapter 70.96A applies to civil commitment of adults based on alcoholism or chemical dependency, RCW chapter 71.09 applies to civil commitment of sexually violent predators, and RCW chapter 71.34 applies to civil commitment of minors based on a mental disorder. The legislature enacted a new chapter in RCW title 70 creating "enhanced services facilities" to provide treatment and services to those for whom acute inpatient treatment is not medically necessary and for whom placement in other licensed facilities is not appropriate. See E2SSB 5763, secs401, 403-425 (2005 Legislative Session). On the criminal side, RCW chapter 13.50 applies to juveniles and may grant the trial court discretion not to apply adult standards under RCW chapter 10.77. See *State v. E.C.*, 83 Wn.App. 523, 922 P.2d 152 (1996) (involving 90-day period prior to dismissal under RCW 10.77.090).

² As a practical matter, mental health professionals initiate the vast majority of civil commitment actions.

³ RCW chapter 71.05. See section 2.

⁴ RCW chapter 10.77. See section 3.

⁵ This chapter is intended to familiarize the reader with Washington's general principles and statutes behind civil commitment on an introductory level. It is not intended to serve as a practice guide or to substitute for a practitioner reviewing the statutes and case law on his or her own. There are many appellate decisions interpreting and limiting the application of the statutes and cases cited in this chapter. There are also many statutory provisions and cases that clarify, limit or expand the general principles discussed in this chapter. Those cases and statutes are beyond the scope of this chapter, but anyone practicing this area of law will need to review them. See Kristin Miles, *Mental Health Care for Adults and Minor Children*, WASHINGTON HEALTH LAW MANUAL (3rd Ed. 2006).

⁶ See section 4.

⁷ See section 5.

chapter 71.05 provides information about both the players' roles and the procedural road.⁸ For purposes of this article, I will summarize RCW chapter 71.05 in very broad terms rather than in more practice-oriented terms.⁹

4C.2.1. Introductory Concepts

Only the State, as the petitioner, may seek to commit an adult, as respondent, under RCW chapter 71.05. Typically, though not always, court-appointed counsel represents the respondent. Generally speaking, a person may be civilly committed if, as a result of mental disorder, he or she presents a likelihood of serious harm or is gravely disabled.¹⁰ The phrases "mental disorder," "likelihood of serious harm" and "gravely disabled" are specifically defined in RCW chapter 71.05.¹¹

4C.2.2. Parties to the Commitment Proceedings

The petitioner is the party seeking to civilly commit an individual under RCW chapter 71.05. Although technically that means the State, the petition is filed by an individual or agency authorized to do so under the statute. The person the petitioner seeks to commit is the respondent. A Designated Mental Health Professional referred to as the DMHP, initiates civil commitment proceedings.¹² A DMHP is the mental health professional appointed by the county or other authority authorized by rule to perform the duties specified in RCW chapter 71.05.¹³ Depending upon the particular facts and circumstances of the case, the State is represented by the County Prosecutor or the Attorney General.¹⁴

4C.2.3. How the Process Works

This next section focuses primarily on the "commitment" portion of RCW chapter 71.05, and pays little heed to the respondent's rights. The limited discussion is not intended to downplay the importance of the respondent's rights, both from constitutional and morality standpoints, but rather to focus on those aspects of civil commitment that intersect with the criminal justice system.

4C.2.3.1. Initial Detention for up to 72 Hours

The DMHP initiates the civil commitment process in one of two ways. One alternative is an emergency petition, and the other is a non-emergency petition or summons. This first step, whether on an emergency or non-emergency basis, is referred to as an *initial detention*, with the respondent being held at an evaluation and treatment facility for up to 72 hours.¹⁵

4C.2.3.2. Petition for Additional Treatment

The evaluation and treatment facility has up to 72 hours to evaluate the respondent.¹⁶ If the facility determines that mental health treatment is appropriate and that the statutory requirements are satisfied, the facility may file a petition for either 14 days of inpatient or 90 days of a less restrictive alternative treatment.¹⁷ This is referred to as a probable cause hearing.¹⁸ If the facility does not file a petition for a

⁸ RCW 71.05.050 describes a person's right to apply for voluntary commitment to any public or private agency. By definition, the voluntary aspect of the commitment occurs without a court order, and is therefore beyond the scope of this chapter.

⁹ See RCW chapter 71.05 and cases interpreting it for more specific details. See also Kristin Miles, "Mental Health Care for Adults and Minor Children" (2006) published elsewhere in this journal.

¹⁰ RCW 71.05.150(1), (2). The concept of "developmental disability" also impacts the civil commitment provisions. The definition of "developmental disability" is incorporated from RCW 71A.10.020(3) by RCW 71.05.020(11). The impact on the civil commitment process for a respondent who suffers from a developmental disability is beyond the scope of this article.

¹¹ See RCW 71.05.020(22), (21), (16).

¹² See RCW 71.05.150.

¹³ RCW 71.05.020(10). Prior to July 1, 2005, the phrase was "County Designated Mental Health Professional", and referred to a mental health professional designated by the County to carry out the duties under RCW chapter 71.05. The legislature expanded the definition to include a mental health professional designated by an authority, other than the County, authorized by rule to make the designation. See E2SSB 5763, sec. 104 (2005 Legislative Session).

¹⁴ RCW 71.05.130.

¹⁵ RCW 71.05.150.

¹⁶ RCW 71.05.170; RCW 71.05.180.

¹⁷ RCW 71.05.230.

¹⁸ RCW 71.05.170; 71.05.200; RCW 71.05.240.

probable cause hearing, or if it does not meet its burden of proof at the hearing,¹⁹ then it must release the respondent.²⁰ Note that the DMHP neither determines whether to file, nor actually files, the petition. That is the prerogative of the evaluation and treatment facility.

4C.2.3.3. Procedures If Court Grants Acquittal

If the petitioner meets its burden, the court must consider less restrictive alternatives to involuntary detention and treatment. If the court finds that no such alternatives are in the best interests of the respondent or of others, the court must order that the respondent be detained for up to 14 days of inpatient treatment. On the other hand, if the court finds that treatment in a less restrictive setting is in the best interests of the respondent or others, the court must order the respondent into a less restrictive course of treatment for up to 90 days.

The respondent must be released at the end of the 14-day period unless the respondent agrees to further treatment on a voluntary basis or is the subject of a petition for additional confinement, referred to in this chapter as a 90-day hearing.²¹

4C.2.3.4. If Petitioner Prevails at 90-Day Hearing

If the petitioner meets its burden of proof at the 90-day hearing, then the respondent will be placed in a 90-day treatment program. The program will either be inpatient or outpatient, depending upon the findings of facts and conclusions of law in the particular case.²² If the basis for the commitment is based upon a referral from the criminal justice system pursuant to RCW 71.05.280(3), then the period of inpatient or less restrictive treatment is 180 days instead of 90 days.²³

4C.2.3.5. Renewing 90-Day Commitment

At the end of the 90-day treatment period, the facility must release the respondent unless the facility (if inpatient treatment) or the DMHP (if less restrictive treatment) petitions for continued commitment.²⁴ If the court or jury finds that the grounds for additional confinement have been established, the court may order the respondent committed for an additional 180-day period.²⁵ At the end of the 180-day renewal period, the respondent must be released unless another renewal petition is filed. Successive 180-day commitments are permissible on the same grounds and procedures as for the original 180-day renewal.²⁶ The respondent may not be detained unless a valid commitment order is in effect, and no commitment order may exceed 180 days.²⁷

4C.2.3.6. Early Release from Inpatient Commitment

RCW chapter 71.05 provides a mechanism for a respondent's early release from an inpatient commitment. It also provides a mechanism for revoking the early conditional releases.

¹⁹ There are different burdens of proof for the various hearings. For purposes of this article, I am not identifying the particular burden of proof applicable to a particular hearing.

²⁰ RCW 71.05.210.

²¹ RCW 71.05.260(2). *See also* RCW 71.05.280.

²² The court or jury must determine whether the best interests of the respondent or others would be served by a less restrictive treatment, commonly referred to as a less restrictive alternative or a less restrictive order. Even if a jury hears the case, the court determines what happens to the respondent once the jury returns a verdict. If the court or jury finds that the best interests are not served by less restrictive treatment, the court must remand the respondent to a DSHS facility²² for 90 days of inpatient treatment. If the court or jury finds that best interests are served by less restrictive treatment, the court must *either* remand the respondent to DSHS for 90 days of inpatient treatment or to a less restrictive alternative treatment for 90 days. In this context, DSHS includes a facility certified by DSHS to administer 90 days of treatment. *See* RCW 71.05.320(1)

²³ RCW 71.05.320(1).

²⁴ RCW 71.05.320(1).

²⁵ RCW 71.05.320(2).

²⁶ RCW 71.05.320(2).

²⁷ RCW 71.05.320(3).

4C.3. Involuntary Criminal Commitment through Criminal System

Involuntary commitment is criminal in nature when it results from mental illness in the context of a criminal prosecution. The criminal justice system can also serve as a catalyst for involuntary commitment in either of two ways. The first is when a defendant's mental disease or defect renders him or her incompetent to stand trial in the case.²⁸ The second is when a defendant is acquitted by reason of insanity.

4C.3.1. Defendants Who Are Incompetent to Stand Trial²⁹

Competency to stand trial is best described by looking at the circumstances under which a criminal defendant may be found to be incompetent to stand trial. A defendant is incompetent to stand trial if he or she "lacks the capacity to understand the nature of the proceedings against him or her or to assist in his or her own defense as a result of mental disease or defect."³⁰ The phrase "mental disease or defect" is not defined in RCW chapter 10.77.³¹

4C.3.1.1. The Competency Evaluation

Whenever a defendant's competency to stand trial is at issue, the court must order a competency evaluation.³² The contents of the evaluation are the same for felony and non-felony cases.³³ The evaluation must also include two opinions. First, an opinion whether the defendant should be evaluated by a DMHP for civil commitment. Second, an opinion whether the defendant is a substantial danger to other persons or presents a substantial likelihood of committing criminal acts jeopardizing the public safety or security, unless kept under further control.³⁴

Once the trial court finds that the defendant is incompetent to stand trial, the nature of the charge governs the nature of the subsequent proceedings.³⁵ There is one procedure that applies to felony matters, and a second procedure, with two subparts, that applies to non-felony matters.³⁶

4C.3.1.2. Competency Restoration Treatment for Felony Defendants

If a defendant charged with a felony is found incompetent to stand trial, the trial court must commit the defendant to the custody of DSHS for up to 90 days of competency restoration treatment.³⁷ If the defendant

²⁸ In this chapter I discuss only competency to stand trial. Competency issues may arise at any stage of the criminal process, including sentencing after trial. *See* RCW 10.77.050 (no criminal defendant may be tried, convicted or sentenced while incompetent). *Compare* RCW 10.77.060 (competency evaluation *whenever* there is reason to doubt the defendant's competency) (emphasis added) *with* RCW 10.77.090 (stay of proceedings and consideration of competency restoration treatment *prior to judgment*) (emphasis added). Competency issues in other contexts present rather complicated issues that would detract from the discussion in this chapter.

²⁹ This discussion concerns only competency to stand trial. Competency issues may arise at any stage of the criminal process, including sentencing after trial. *See* RCW 10.77.050 (no criminal defendant may be tried, convicted or sentenced while incompetent). *Compare* RCW 10.77.060 (competency evaluation *whenever* there is reason to doubt the defendant's competency) (emphasis added) *with* RCW 10.77.090 (stay of proceedings and consideration of competency restoration treatment *prior to judgment*) (emphasis added). Competency issues at other stages pose complex questions that are beyond the scope of this chapter.

³⁰ RCW 10.77.010(14).

³¹ RCW 71.05.020(22) defines the phrase "mental disorder" in the context of civil commitment. Whether "mental disease or defect" would be similarly defined is an open question.

³² RCW 10.77.060.

³³ RCW 10.77.060(3).

³⁴ *See* RCW 10.77.060(3)(f).

³⁵ RCW chapter 10.77 sets out a series of procedures that apply as soon as competency to stand trial is at issue. This chapter is focusing only on the general concepts as they relate to civil commitment, and is not intended to provide guidance for handling competency issues.

³⁶ Non-felony cases are comprised of misdemeanors (punishable by up to a \$1,000 fine or up to 90 days in jail, or both such fine and imprisonment) and gross misdemeanors (all crimes other than felonies and misdemeanors). *See* RCW 9A.20.010(2). They are often referred to generically as "misdemeanors"

³⁷ RCW 10.77.090(1)(b).

is not restored to competency, the trial court has discretion to order the defendant to undergo an additional 90 days of competency restoration treatment.³⁸

If the defendant is still not restored to competency at the end of the second 90-day period, the trier of fact must answer two questions. The first is whether the defendant is a substantial danger to other persons, or presents a substantial likelihood of committing criminal acts jeopardizing the public safety or security. The second is whether there is a substantial probability that the defendant will regain competency within a reasonable period of time. If the answer to both questions is yes, then the trial court may extend the competency restoration treatment for another six months.³⁹

4C.3.1.3. Eligibility for Competency Restoration Treatment for Non-Felony Defendants

If a defendant charged with a non-felony crime is found incompetent to stand trial, then the court must determine whether the defendant is eligible for competency restoration treatment. That determination impacts what happens next.

If the defendant meets one or more of the eligibility criteria, the court must order DSHS to place the defendant into competency restoration treatment.⁴⁰ If the defendant does not meet any of the eligibility criteria, the court may not order the defendant to undergo competency restoration treatment.⁴¹

4C.3.2. Defendants Who Are Acquitted by Reason of Insanity

A defendant charged with a crime may offer an affirmative defense of insanity. The defendant must establish that, at the time of the commission of the offense, as a result of mental disease or defect,⁴² the defendant was unable to perceive the nature and quality of the act charged, or was unable to tell right from wrong regarding the act charged.⁴³

4C.3.2.1. Same Procedures for Felonies and Non-Felonies

The process by which a criminal defendant asserts an insanity defense⁴⁴ is the same for felonies and for non-felonies. A criminal defendant may make a motion for a judgment of acquittal by reason of insanity, or may raise the issue to the trier of fact at trial.⁴⁵ The defendant must establish the insanity defense by a preponderance of the evidence.⁴⁶

4C.3.2.2. How Those Procedures Work

If the court grants the defendant's motion for judgment of acquittal by reason of insanity, or if the jury renders a verdict at trial of not guilty by reason of insanity, the judge or jury must answer several questions relating to the defendant's potential future behavior.⁴⁷ The questions relate to whether the defendant is a substantial danger to other persons, or presents a substantial likelihood of committing criminal acts jeopardizing public safety or security, unless kept under further control. If the answer to either of those questions is yes, then the judge or jury must answer the additional question of whether it is in the best

³⁸ RCW 10.77.090(3). This option is not available for a defendant whose incompetency is solely the result of a developmental disability "which is such that competence is not reasonably likely to be regained during an extension." *Id.*

³⁹ RCW 10.77.090(4).

⁴⁰ RCW 10.77.090(1)(d). The manner in which the defendant's eligibility for, and the length and location of, the treatment are determined is beyond the scope of this chapter.

⁴¹ RCW 10.77.090(1)(e).

⁴² Note that this is slightly different than the phrase "mental disorder" as defined in RCW 71.05.020(22). The phrase "mental disease or defect" is not defined in RCW chapter 10.77.

⁴³ RCW 9A.12.010(1).

⁴⁴ This article discusses the insanity defense at a very basic level. The technical and strategic aspects of the insanity defense are beyond the scope of this chapter.

⁴⁵ RCW 10.77.080.

⁴⁶ RCW 9A.12.010(2); RCW 10.77.030(2).

⁴⁷ RCW 10.77.040 (if jury verdict); RCW 10.77.080 (if court ruling on motion).

interests of the defendant and others that the defendant be placed in treatment that is less restrictive than detention in a state mental hospital.⁴⁸

The answers to those questions determine what happens to the defendant after the acquittal. The defendant could be released outright, released into some form of less restrictive treatment, or committed to a state mental hospital.⁴⁹ The maximum length of the less restrictive treatment or commitment to a state mental hospital is the maximum possible sentence the defendant could have received for any offense charged for which the defendant was acquitted by reason of insanity.⁵⁰ In other words, even if the defendant were charged with three gross misdemeanors punishable by up to one year in jail each, the maximum length of time the defendant could be committed to a state mental hospital following an acquittal by reason of insanity of all three charges would be one year. There are procedures for conditional release, early release, and revocation of a conditional release.⁵¹

4C.3.2.3. Diminished Capacity Distinguished

Diminished capacity is also a defense predicated upon mental condition. To maintain a diminished capacity defense, a defendant must produce expert testimony demonstrating that a mental disorder, not amounting to insanity, impaired the defendant's ability to form the culpable mental state to commit the crime charged.⁵² It differs from the defense of insanity in several key aspects. While insanity is an affirmative defense, diminished capacity is really nothing more than a challenge to the relevant state of mind.

4C.4. Involuntary Civil Commitment through Referral from Criminal System

As a general proposition, the civil and criminal systems are separate and distinct from one another. But they tend to overlap when a criminal defendant has mental health issues impacting competency to stand trial or providing a potential insanity defense. Depending on the specifics of the case, a criminal defendant might be referred for involuntary civil commitment at the end of his/her criminal commitment in the case or in place of his/her criminal commitment in the case.

4C.4.1. Felony Defendant following Competency Proceedings

If a defendant charged with a felony is not restored to competency at the end of the 180-day or 365-day competency restoration period,⁵³ then the court must dismiss the charges without prejudice.⁵⁴ Unless civil commitment proceedings are instituted, the court must release the defendant.⁵⁵ The civil commitment proceedings in that circumstance would be for a 180-day civil commitment period. The resulting civil commitment hearing has a criminal element; although the state need not prove intent to commit the crime, the nexus between the disorder and the criminal act become crucial. The state must prove that the defendant (now referred to as the respondent) committed acts constituting a felony as a result of a mental disorder and presents a substantial likelihood of repeating similar acts.⁵⁶ The elements of the crime, the nexus to the mental disorder and the substantial likelihood of repeating similar acts must be proven by clear, cogent and convincing evidence.

⁴⁸ RCW 10.77.040.

⁴⁹ RCW 10.77.110(1).

⁵⁰ RCW 10.77.025.

⁵¹ See, e.g., RCW 10.77.120-10.77.200. Not to be confused with the conditional release described in section 2.3.11, see RCW 71.05.340

⁵² *State v. Atsbeha*, 142 Wn.2d 904, 914, 16 P.3d 626 (2001).

⁵³ See section 3.1.2. The 180-day period is actually the end of the discretionary second 90-day period under RCW 10.77.090(3). The 365-day period is actually the end of the six-month extension after the second 90-day period as permitted under certain circumstances by RCW 10.77.090(4).

⁵⁴ The competency restoration provisions are silent as to what happens if a felony defendant is not restored after the initial 90-day competency restoration period and the trial court does not impose the second 90-day restoration period. Presumably the trial court would dismiss the charges without prejudice and release the defendant. If the DMHP were contacted to evaluate the defendant for possible civil commitment, the evaluation would presumably be for an initial detention.

⁵⁵ RCW 10.77.090(3); RCW 10.77.090(4).

⁵⁶ RCW 71.05.280(3); RCW 71.05.320(1).

4C.4.2. Non-Felony Defendant following Competency Proceedings

If a defendant charged with a non-felony is either not restored to competency by treatment or is not eligible for competency restoration treatment, the trial court must dismiss the charges without prejudice.⁵⁷ What happens to the defendant depends upon whether the defendant was or was not eligible for competency restoration treatment.

4C.4.2.1. Non-Felony Defendant not Restored to Competency by Treatment

If the defendant is eligible for competency restoration treatment but was not restored to competency,⁵⁸ the court must refer the defendant for consideration of civil commitment. If the defendant is in custody and not on conditional release at the time of the dismissal and referral, then the defendant is referred to an evaluation and treatment facility for consideration of a full hearing for a 90-day inpatient or outpatient commitment.⁵⁹ Similar to civil commitment cases initiated based upon felonious acts, the burden of proof is clear, cogent and convincing evidence. The petitioner's (state's) attorney must prove that the crime involved the infliction of serious physical harm, and that there is a nexus between the act and the mental disorder and a likelihood of serious harm. If the defendant was on conditional release at the time of the dismissal, then the trial court orders the DMHP to evaluate the defendant for consideration of a 14-day inpatient commitment or a 90-day less restrictive alternative.⁶⁰ Under either situation, the superior court must review a decision not to file a petition for civil commitment unless the DMHP or professional person and the prosecuting attorney or attorney general's office stipulate that the defendant does not present a likelihood of serious harm or is not gravely disabled.⁶¹

4C.4.2.2. Non-Felony Defendant not Eligible for Treatment

If the defendant is not eligible for competency restoration treatment, the court may either release the defendant outright or detain the defendant for sufficient time to allow the DMHP to evaluate the defendant for consideration of civil commitment.⁶² The civil commitment proceeding in this situation would be an initial detention.⁶³

4C.4.3. Felony or Non-Felony Defendant following Commitment for Insanity

Whenever a defendant who has been committed following an acquittal by reason of insanity has not been released within seven days of the maximum possible sentence, the professional person⁶⁴ in charge of the treatment facility may refer the defendant to the DMHP for consideration of civil commitment proceedings.⁶⁵ If the professional person believes that the defendant presents a likelihood of serious harm or is gravely disabled due to a mental disorder, then prior to the expiration of the maximum possible sentence the professional person may provide a copy of all relevant information about the defendant to the DMHP. The information may include the defendant's likely release date, and the professional person must indicate why the professional person does not believe the defendant should be released.⁶⁶ A DMHP who receives notice and records in this fashion must,

⁵⁷ Although RCW 10.77.090(1) does not specify whether dismissal of a non-felony should be with or without prejudice, RCW 10.77.090(4) provides that dismissal of a felony is without prejudice. There is no logical reason to dismiss a felony without prejudice while allowing dismissal of a non-felony with prejudice, especially in light of the fact that SB 6214, amended RCW Ch. 10.77 to treat competency and insanity issues in felony and non-felony cases more similarly. *See* 1998 c 297, sec. 1.

⁵⁸ This also includes the situation in which a professional person (defined in RCW 10.77.010(17)) opines that the defendant is not likely to be restored to competency. *See* RCW 10.77.090(1)(d)(ii).

⁵⁹ *See* RCW 10.77.090(1)(d)(iii)(B); RCW 71.05.235(2) (basing the proceedings on RCW 71.05.310 and RCW 71.05.320).

⁶⁰ *See* RCW 10.77.090(1)(d)(iii)(A); RCW 71.05.235 (basing the proceedings on RCW 71.05.230(4)).

⁶¹ RCW 71.05.235(3).

⁶² RCW 10.77.090(1)(e).

⁶³ Initial detentions are discussed at section 2.3.1., *supra*.

⁶⁴ RCW 10.77.010(17). Note that this definition of "professional person" in RCW chapter 10.77 is similar but not identical to the definition of "professional person" in RCW 71.05.020(26).

⁶⁵ RCW 10.77.025(2).

⁶⁶ *Id.* Note that in this provision of RCW chapter 10.77 the legislature used the civil commitment phrase "mental disorder", which is defined in RCW 71.05.020(22). Yet in defining incompetency (RCW 10.77.010(14)) and insanity (RCW 9A.12.010), the legislature used the undefined phrase "mental disease or defect".)

prior to the expiration of the maximum sentence, determine whether to initiate civil commitment proceedings under chapter 71.05.⁶⁷

4C.4.4. Felony or Non-Felony Defendant Based Solely on Competency or Insanity Evaluation

If the original competency or insanity evaluation includes an opinion that the defendant should be kept under further control as discussed in section 3.1.1. above, then the court must order the DMHP to evaluate the defendant for civil commitment. The timing of that evaluation depends upon the procedural setting of the case.⁶⁸ Nothing in the section conditions the court's duty on a finding that the defendant is incompetent to stand trial. For example, the section expressly requires the evaluation prior to a convicted defendant's release from custody if the defendant is sentenced to 24 months confinement or less.⁶⁹ Nor does the section limit the court's duty to cases in which the court finds the defendant incompetent.

4C.5. "Voluntary" Criminal Commitment through Mental Health Courts⁷⁰

The advent of "mental health courts" within the criminal justice system has created a new form of criminal commitment that can best be described as "voluntary" criminal commitment." Such a commitment is voluntary in the sense that the defendant agrees to comply with mental health treatment. It is "commitment" as defined in this chapter in the sense that the treatment conditions are court-ordered and are enforceable through the court's power to impose criminal sanctions for willful non-compliance.

This new voluntary criminal commitment can take one of two forms within mental health courts. In one form, the defendant enters into an agreement with the prosecution to engage in treatment and avoids a criminal conviction if he/she complies with the agreement. In the other form, the defendant pleads guilty to the charge(s) and engages in treatment as a condition of probation.

This section introduces the concept of mental health courts, which are a specific form of "therapeutic court". It also identifies the philosophical and structural choices that shape mental health courts, and how those choices impact the form that voluntary criminal commitment takes. Finally, this section provides a practical example of how a mental health court might function by examining the Seattle Municipal Court's mental health court.

4C.5.1. Mental Health Courts and Therapeutic Courts

Mental health courts are a subset of the broader category of "therapeutic courts". In therapeutic courts, the prosecution and defense, along with various other courtroom participants, "collaborate" to try and resolve not just a criminal case but also a very specific issue underlying the alleged criminal behavior. In mental health courts, the very specific underlying issue is mental illness.

Another way to view mental health courts is as an attempt to decrease the frequency of civil or criminal commitment for those who are charged with crimes. Mental health courts seek to do so by decreasing barriers to mental health treatment for people who might otherwise receive such treatment solely through civil or criminal commitment.

There are a number of articles discussing the benefits and detriments of therapeutic courts in general. Without recounting all of the arguments here, suffice to say that both sides raise valid concerns.

One of the major benefits put forward in favor of therapeutic courts is that they encourage problem solving in what is otherwise very much an adversarial system. The prosecution benefits by reducing recidivism and increasing public safety; the defense benefits by obtaining treatment for the defendant that might not otherwise be there. Another benefit advanced by proponents is that therapeutic courts provide for more intensive

⁶⁷ RCW 10.77.025(3).

⁶⁸ See RCW 10.77.065(1)(b).

⁶⁹ *Id.*

⁷⁰ The discussion in this entire section is based on the presumption that the defendant is competent to stand trial and does not wish to assert either an insanity defense or a diminished capacity defense.

Volume 1: Patient Care Information, Treatment and Rights

probation supervision. Opponents point to the use of a large amount of resources on a relatively small population, which leaves fewer resources for the rest of the system. Critics also cite the appearance of more favorable treatment being afforded the defendants in such courts than the defendants in the other courts in the system. Critics assert that therapeutic courts erode the traditional adversarial roles that underlie the criminal justice system, and therefore lead to less vigorous representation by the attorneys involved.⁷¹

4C.5.2. Philosophy of Mental Health Courts

Most, if not all, mental health courts have as their primary goal some variation on the same theme. That theme is to protect public safety and reduce recidivism by securing treatment for those whose criminal behavior is caused at least in significant part by a mental illness that is amenable to treatment and who are willing to accept such treatment.⁷²

As an inducement to participate in the voluntary commitment through a mental health court, the defendant receives a settlement offer that is more generous than he/she would ordinarily receive. In return the prosecution resolves the case in a manner that increases the likelihood of protecting public safety and reducing recidivism beyond that which could be achieved if the case were resolved without mental health treatment. Thus, regardless of how mental health courts state their respective philosophies, they all tend to be voluntary.

A defendant does not waive any trial rights unless he/she enters into a voluntary commitment agreement through the mental health court. Thus, if a defendant does not want to participate in the voluntary commitment offered by mental health court, he/she is not required to do so. The defendant can simply decline the settlement offer and proceed as with any other criminal case, either by trial or by settlement without regard to voluntary commitment.⁷³ If the prosecution does not wish to participate because it believes the case is not appropriate for mental health court, it can simply decline to make the settlement offer.

4C.5.3. Participation Based upon Crime Type and/or Criminal History

Mental health courts sometimes limit the cases that they accept based on the level of crime charged. For example, there are some mental health courts nationally that focus solely on defendants charged with felonies.⁷⁴ In Washington, mental health courts generally exist in a district or a municipal court and therefore can only accept non-felony cases. There is no legal impediment to a county creating a mental health court that includes defendants charged with either felonies or non-felonies.⁷⁵

Mental health courts sometimes limit the cases that they accept based on the nature of the offense charged. For example, some mental health courts only accept defendants charged with non-violent offenses. Others accept defendants charged with violent offenses only with the victim's approval. Still others accept a defendant regardless of the crime charged.

Mental health courts sometimes limit the cases that they accept based on a defendant's criminal history. For example, some mental health courts only accept defendants who do not have a prior conviction for a violent offense. Others accept defendants with any criminal history if the court's other criteria are met.

⁷¹ For a discussion of therapeutic jurisprudence and mental health courts, see generally G. Berman & J. Feinblatt, *Problem-Solving Court: A Brief Primer*, New York Center for Court Innovation (2001), and G. Berman & D. Denckla, *Rethinking the Revolving Door: A Look at Mental Illness in the Courts*, New York Center for Court Innovation (2001).

⁷² Information about the defendant's mental illness and current and past treatment for that illness are necessary for the prosecutor or for the defense attorney to evaluate whether their respective clients should agree to a mental health court disposition. The defendant has a strong privacy right in that information, and will not be able to participate in mental health court without signing an appropriate release of information based on advice of counsel.

⁷³ A defendant involuntarily placed in mental health court is not likely to comply willingly with treatment, and therefore is not likely to benefit from the court.

⁷⁴ The author has not specifically researched, nor is he aware of any felony level mental health courts in Washington. In the 2005 session, the state legislature enacted a statute permitting counties to establish and operate mental health courts, and allowing the counties to seek a state appropriation to fund the court if certain conditions are met. RCW 2.28.180. The statute defines "mental health court" to include both nonviolent felony and non-felony defendants. RCW 2.28.180(2). The statute does not mention cities, though that is likely explained by the fiscal nature of the statute. The issue of the impact of RCW 2.28.180 on cities and/or municipal courts is beyond the scope of this paper.

⁷⁵ RCW 2.28.180.

4C.5.4. Structure Governing Form of Voluntary Criminal Commitment

Mental health courts are formed under one of three structures. There is no “one-size-fits-all” structure that will work for every mental health court. A structure that works well in an urban or suburban jurisdiction may not work well in a rural jurisdiction. Some jurisdictions can provide greater economic support or better access to services than other jurisdictions. Other considerations include the general culture within the jurisdiction, the level of support for the mental health court from other parts of the court system or from service providers, and the general relationship between the court, the prosecution and the defense bar.

4C.5.4.1. Pure Diversion System

In a pure diversion system, the defendant and the prosecution agree to continue the case for a specified period of time⁷⁶ without a finding of guilt. Depending on the jurisdiction, that agreement might be referred to as a stipulated order of continuance, dispositional continuance, continuance on conditions, or diversion agreement. Regardless of the name used, the common features are that the defendant waives his/her trial rights, and has an opportunity to have the case dismissed without a finding of guilt.

During the term of the agreement, the defendant must meet certain conditions, obviously including mental health treatment. The prosecution agrees that if the defendant has complied with all of the conditions, then the case will be dismissed at the end of the period. The defendant agrees that if the court finds that he/she willfully failed to comply with the terms of the agreement, then the court may determine guilt based solely on the face of the police report.

Pure diversion systems typically employ clearly delineated guidelines and predictable outcomes, and limit participation to defendants who pose a lower public safety risk based on the crime charged and their criminal history. That makes them an easier system to set up, and enables the parties to assess their participation more clearly. On the other hand, they limit their effectiveness by accepting only those who pose the lowest level of public safety risk, and the clear guidelines leave little room for flexibility.

4C.5.4.2. Pure Plea System

In a pure plea system, the defendant is required to plead guilty and is placed on probation.⁷⁷ The defendant waives his/her trial rights, but is not offered an opportunity for a diversionary agreement that will resolve the case short of a guilty plea. That makes a pure plea system better suited to defendants charged with more serious crimes or who have extensive criminal histories.

Pure plea systems tend to serve those charged with more serious crimes, or with a more serious criminal history. That enables them to accept cases that pose a greater public safety risk, so that positive results from the commitment create a greater impact on public safety. The requirement of a guilty plea more clearly allocates criminal culpability, which in turn gives greater comfort to the victims. On the other hand, pure plea systems tend to overlook those who, though charged with a less serious crime or possessing a less serious criminal history, nevertheless pose a meaningful public safety risk.

4C.5.4.3. Hybrid System

In a hybrid system, some defendants are required to plead guilty while others are offered a diversionary agreement. The nature of the crime charged, the defendant’s criminal history, and the specific facts of the case determine whether there is a guilty plea or diversion.

Hybrid systems are the most flexible of the three systems. They can handle a wider range of cases, and therefore a wider range of mental illness issues. They can accept those who pose high public safety risks regardless of the charge or criminal history, and can also accept those who pose less of a public safety risk but still commit crimes. On the other hand, the lack of clear and consistent protocols for case dispositions, case outcomes may not be as consistent as with either of the other two systems.

⁷⁶ In non-felony courts, the period can range from six months to two years, depending upon the court system and/or the treatment program.

⁷⁷ In non-felony courts, the period generally ranges from 12-24 months. The maximum period of probation in a non-felony case is two years.

4C.5.5. Seattle Municipal Court's Mental Health Court

Seattle Municipal Court's mental health court, created in 1999, is one of the oldest and highest volume mental health courts in the state. As a hybrid system encompassing both diversionary and plea aspects, it provides an up-close look at how one mental health court functions.

4C.5.5.1. Court's Goals

The stated goals of Seattle's mental health court are to:

- (1) Protect public safety,
- (2) Reduce the use of jail and repeated interaction with the criminal justice system for mentally ill persons,
- (3) Connect or re-connect mentally ill persons with needed mental health services, and
- (4) Improve mentally ill persons' likelihood of ongoing success with treatment, their access to shelter, and linkages with other critical support.⁷⁸

The court strives to achieve its goals through voluntary commitment.

4C.5.5.2. Eligible Defendants

Seattle Municipal Court's criminal jurisdiction, as with all municipal courts in Washington, is limited to non-felony cases.⁷⁹ Seattle's mental health court, as a hybrid court, accepts defendants without regard to the non-felony crime charged, and without regard to criminal history, so long both the prosecution and defense agree that the case is appropriate.

- (1) In order for the defense and prosecution to determine if the case is appropriate, the defendant must sign a release of information regarding past mental health treatment. A defendant who declines to sign the release of information will not be eligible for mental health court, but will be able to defend the charge(s) in the same manner as any other defendant.
- (2) The criteria that the defense applies depend upon the particular defense attorney or public defender agency, as well as the defendant's specific situation.
- (3) The Seattle City Attorney's Office has developed its own criteria that must be satisfied before it will agree to resolve the case in a manner that includes voluntary commitment. A defendant must satisfy all of the following criteria: The defendant's mental illness was a significant factor in the crime charged; a mental health professional opines that a reasonable mental health plan exists that is reasonably likely to enable the defendant to conform his/her behavior to the law and that the defendant is amenable to treatment; the mental health professional took into consideration the defendant's criminal history, treatment intervention history, and the current potential danger to the community; and the treatment plan includes provisions to ensure timely and effective monitoring and reporting of the defendant's compliance with the treatment plan.

4C.5.5.3. Seattle's Mental Health Court Team

Seattle's mental health court could not function as effectively as it does without the people who fill the various roles. Those roles and their job descriptions are as follows:

- (1) Judge: As with any other court calendar, the judge presides over the calendar. Seattle's mental health court judge presides over all mental health court calendars. He/she must be familiar with the competency issues and statutes, and must be sensitive to the unique nature of the defendants appearing in the court.
- (2) Court Monitor: The court monitor is a mental health professional who serves as a gatekeeper in the mental health court. He/she interviews defendants who may be eligible for mental health court, coordinates mental health treatment information, assuming there is a valid release of information. For

⁷⁸ E. Trupin, H. Richards, D. Wertheimer and C. Bruschi, *City of Seattle, Seattle Municipal Court Mental Health Court Evaluation Report* 20 (2001).

⁷⁹ See RCW 39.34.180(1).

- those defendants who are at the predisposition stage, the court monitor attempts to arrange for release from jail on conditions including treatment, if that is appropriate in light of public safety. The court monitor also serves in a capacity similar to that of a probation counselor, except that the defendant has not yet resolved the case. In Seattle's mental health court, the court monitor position is filled by way of a contract between the court monitor's employer and the Seattle Municipal Court. The court monitor serves full-time in the mental health court.
- (3) Probation Counselors: The current probation counselors are mental health professionals who serve in the same capacity as a probation officer in a non-mental health court case. They work with and supervise defendants who have entered into a diversionary agreement or who have pled guilty. The probation counselors monitor compliance, report non-compliance to the court along with their recommendation for a sanction or for not imposing a sanction, and keep the court and the attorneys informed about the defendant's compliance with the voluntary commitment. Their entire caseload consists of mental health court cases.
 - (4) Program Manager: The program manager serves as a liaison to the outside, as well as for the internal members of the mental health court team.
 - (5) Court Staff: In addition to carrying out the court's general procedures, the mental health court staff must learn jargon specific to the mental health court and specialized procedures within the court. They help engender communication among the team members and prepare the daily menu of cases for that afternoon's calendar that enables the attorneys and mental health professionals to prepare for the calendar.
 - (6) Prosecutor: The Seattle City Attorney's Office provides prosecutors for the mental health court who have specific and intensive training and experience within the mental health court as well as outside of the mental health court. The specialized prosecutors provide continuity and consistency in the court and help carry out the Office's policies toward the mental health court. There are also specialized staff who carry out important work within the office coordinating case calendaring and other aspects in support of the mental health court.
 - (7) Public Defenders: The public defender's office provides specialized attorneys who work full time in the mental health court, as well as an experienced social worker assigned to the court. The social worker assists the defense attorneys in assessing the appropriateness of particular cases for mental health court, partly by meeting with the defendant and partly by communicating with the court monitor if there has been a valid release of information.
 - (8) Police: The Seattle Police Department created a Crisis Intervention Team, or CIT, that handles matters involving people with mental health issues. As one would expect, the CIT works with the prosecution, referring cases for filing consideration, following up on cases already in the system, and in a host of other ways. Unlike in most systems, the CIT also communicate regularly with the defense to coordinate law enforcement action with mental health court action on a particular case. This willingness of the prosecution, defense and police to work together to obtain an effective case resolution is something that clearly sets mental health courts in general, and Seattle's Mental Health Court in particular, apart from other courts.

4C.5.5.4. Relationship between Mental Health Court Structure and Voluntary Commitment

Seattle Municipal Court's mental health court follows the hybrid structure discussed above.⁸⁰ Some defendants receive a diversionary or dispositional continuance, agreement, in which case the voluntary criminal commitment stems from a disposition short of trial or conviction. Other defendants are required to plead guilty and receive either a deferred or a suspended sentence. In that case, the voluntary criminal commitment stems from a finding of guilt. The mental health court team refer to the voluntary criminal commitment conditions as conditions of sentence, or COS for short, regardless of whether the COS arise from a diversionary or plea disposition. The COS always includes mental health treatment as well as other standard conditions.⁸¹ One of the probation counselors supervises, or monitors, the defendant's compliance with COS.

⁸⁰ See section 5.4.3. *supra*.

⁸¹ The other conditions relate to such things as housing, reporting to probation, abstaining from non-prescribed drugs, not committing any crimes, no threatening harm to self or others, no contact with victims or addresses, and the like.

Volume 1: Patient Care Information, Treatment and Rights

There are cases in which the prosecution is not willing to agree to COS. Because a diversionary disposition is an agreement between the defendant and the prosecution, COS arising from a diversionary disposition requires the prosecution's consent. In a plea disposition, the court imposes the sentence, so in theory the court can impose COS over the prosecution's objection.⁸² This is especially true if the defendant is pleading to all charges in all cases before the court. But if there are multiple charges or cases, the prosecution can decline to dismiss one or more charges in exchange for the plea unless the defendant waives his/her right to argue for a sentence different than the one proposed by the prosecution.

In some cases, the defense has concerns about the defendant's ability to comply with COS. Rather than take a chance committing their client to conditions the defendant may be incapable of complying with, the defense seeks what amounts to a trial run through a mechanism referred to as conditions of release, or COR for short.⁸³ The court imposes the COR as a basis for releasing the defendant from custody, subject to conditions of release that are substantially identical to the conditions of the COS that the defendant would be agreeing to upon a disposition. The court monitor helps set up the COR and monitors the defendant's compliance.⁸⁴

The court has the responsibility and the authority to set conditions of release or to set bail. If the court determines the COR to be appropriate, the court can release the defendant from custody whether the prosecution agrees or not. The prosecution will look at the totality of the case and its impact on public safety, as well as the likelihood the defendant will comply with the COR. As a practical matter, the overwhelming number of COR imposed by the court have the agreement of both parties.

4C.5.6. Need for Outcome Measures

The concept of voluntary criminal commitment is an intriguing one, as is the concept of mental health courts. But intriguing and effective are two different things, and it is effectiveness that holds sway over public opinion, political reality, and the government budget process. Effectiveness can be measured quantitatively, *i.e.* statistically, or qualitatively, *i.e.*, anecdotally. Both are valid measures if the factors being measured are valid.

As between the criminal justice and social services systems, one would probably be more likely to attribute quantitative analysis to criminal justice and qualitative analysis to social services. But there are actually quantitative or statistical measures valuable to each system. For example, the criminal justice system would probably look for decreases in the length of jail stay, the number of bench warrants for failure to appear or the number of new criminal charges over a period of time. The social services system would probably look at the increase in people served by outpatient service providers or the extent medications are provided to those who need but cannot afford them, or the decrease in involuntary civil commitment.

Which statistical measurement is the "right" one? It depends in part upon the section of the budget that funds the mental health court. If funding flows from criminal justice money, then the jail or the criminal-charging statistics are more important. If it is the social services or health section, then the service statistics are more important.

Qualitative measures might sound difficult to conduct in a setting like mental health court, but they have been done.⁸⁵ They tend to focus on the defendant, which may or may not satisfy public opinion or political reality.

4C.6. Conclusion

Commitment of adults based on mental illness has traditionally stemmed from the civil or criminal systems, and has been involuntary in nature. The advent of mental health courts has created a new form of voluntary commitment

⁸² Although this is a rare occurrence in Seattle's mental health court, it does occur from time to time.

⁸³ That is not to say that the defense cannot or does not seek the defendant's release without COR.

⁸⁴ If requested by the defense, the court monitor will prepare the COR form. There are occasions when the court monitor does not feel that COR are appropriate but the defense does. The court monitor will still prepare the COR, but either the prosecutor or the court monitor, or both, will voice objections to the court.

⁸⁵ See, e.g., E. Trupin, H. Richards, D. Wertheimer and C. Bruschi, *City of Seattle, Seattle Municipal Court Mental Health Court Evaluation Report 20* (2001).

Chapter 4C: Commitment Based on Mental Illness

(prepared from reference materials available as of January 1, 2006)

that springs from the criminal system. Whether it is stated directly or not, one of the sought-after results from voluntary commitment through mental health courts is a decrease in the extent of involuntary civil or criminal commitment for mentally ill people charged with crimes. Only time will tell if that result is attainable.