

Submitter:

Steve White

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

House Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

HB2467

I support these minor revisions to clarify the standards for civil commitment. The current language is vague and has led to a situation where precedent is clearly at odds with the ordinary meaning of the statute. For example, clarification that evaluation of "dangerous[ness] to self" requires (with -3 amendment) "the court [to] consider . . . the person's threat or attempt to inflict significant serious physical harm upon self . . ." simply clarifies what most people think is obvious.

I strongly support the amendment that singles out "whether a person has insight into their illness" although it could be improved by noting that the court "shall" instead of "may" consider this factor and by changing "appreciate the necessity for ongoing treatment" to something like "appreciate the main costs and benefits of ongoing treatment options enough to make an informed choice."