# PROBATE COURT OF FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO Judge Jeffrey D. Mackey

IN THE MATTER OF:	Case No. MI -		
Montally III			
Mentally III Date: <u>HEARING ON CONTESTED MATTERS</u> <u>MEDICATION / MEDICAL PROCEDURE</u> [R.C. 2101.24(A)(1)(t); R.C. 5122.271; Steele v. Hamilton Cty. Community Mental Health Board, 2000-Ohio-47]			
Initial Application	Prior Order Review		
DECISION OF MAGISTRATE			
HEARING	NOTES		
Attorney for Respondent ("R")			
Attorney for  Franklin Co Attorney for  Franklin Co Attorney for  Attorn	ADAMH Board 🔲 ODMH		
Court Reporter	Interpreter		
Independent expert	Guardian		
R present  yes no Presence waived by	R's counsel		
Attorney for R discuss hearing and rights with R $\Box$ yes $\Box$ no			
Hospital physician Authenticity and admissibility of medical records st Stipulated that hospital physician may testify base	<ul> <li>Testimony as to qualifications</li> <li>tipulated Reserving right to object</li> </ul>		
Treating physician Since	reat previously 🗌 yes 🗌 no 🗌 unknown		
Testifying for treating physician	who is unavailable to testify		
due to			
Collaborating physician for	nurse practitioner		
Discuss medication ("Rx") benefits & risks			
Based on education, training, experience, review of medical records, and all information available regarding R, able to reach an opinion to a reasonable degree of medical certainty regarding R's capacity to make an informed consent decision regarding R's care and treatment?			
Capacity?  yes no Insight yes no basis of opinion			

Respondent Case No. MI
Medication offered ges no refused yes no completely not completely Treatment ("Tx") regimen per application supported by testimony yes no amended
Nature/risk of side effects per application supported by testimony  yes  no
Benefits of prescribed Rx outweigh risk of side effects 🗌 yes 🗌 no
Any less intrusive Tx available 🗌 yes 🗌 no
Is proposed Tx in the best interests of R
Expected results w/ prescribed Tx
Expected results w/o prescribed Tx
<ul> <li>Requesting authority to: obtain prior medical records; obtain collateral information from family members without disclosing HIPAA protected information</li> <li>Objection: yes no Basis:</li> </ul>
Sustained Overruled Basis
Motion by to amend application by ADAMH/MHRSB/ODMH attorney R's attorney
to add delete medication lab work other
Objectionyes R's attorney ADAMH/MHRSB/ODMH attorney no objection Basis
Sustained Overruled Basis
Additional notes regarding hospital physician direct examination testimony

Respondent Case No. MI	
Hospital physician cross examined 🗌 yes 🗌 no	
Court physician Qualifications stipulated Authenticity and admissibility of medical records stipulated Stipulated that court physician may testify based upon review of current medical records	
Interview R 🗌 yes 🗌 no When	
Read application 🗌 yes 🗌 no Hear testimony of hospital physician 🗌 yes 🗌 no	
Capacity to make informed consent decision  yes no Insight yes no	
Concur w/ opinion of hospital physician re: Tx and Rx	
Concur w/ opinion of hospital physician re: side effects	
Benefits of prescribed Rx outweigh risk of side effects 🗌 yes 🗌 no	
Any other less intrusive Tx available 🗌 yes 🗌 no	
Is proposed Tx in the best interests of R $\Box$ yes $\Box$ no	
Concur w/ opinion of hospital physician re: expected results w/ prescribed Tx 🗌 yes 🗌 no	
Concur w/ opinion of hospital physician re: expected results w/o prescribed Tx Dyes D no	
Additional notes regarding court physician direct examination testimony	
Court physician cross examined  ges no	

Respondent	Case No. <u>MI-</u>
R testify  yes no	
Any other witness(es)	
Additional notes:	
Motion for continuance R's attorney ADAM	MH/MHRSB/ODMH attorney
Basis independent expert independent co	unsel 🗌 other
	DDMH attorney
FINDING	S OF FACT
Respondent's county of residence	
The evidence is 🗌 is not 🗌 clear and convincing a	as to all of the following:
Respondent is is not a mentally ill person where medication.	no would benefit from the proposed treatment and
Respondent is unable able to process inform proposed medication and treatment in relation to the informed consent decision regarding the taking of the	e potential risk of side effects in order to make an
Respondent therefore does  does not lack the decision regarding the taking of the proposed media	
The benefits of the proposed medication do do effects of such medication.	not 🗌 outweigh the risk of potential side
There is is not a less intrusive treatment registreatment and medication	imen for Respondent other than the proposed
The application is is not amended to include medication	delete the following provisions:

Respondent	Case No. <u>MI-</u>	
other		
☐ The hospital requests authority to: ☐ obtain prior medical records; ☐ obtain collateral information from family members without disclosing HIPAA protected information		
Other findings of fact		
CONCLUSIONS OF L	_AW	
Respondent is  is not  subject to medication and treatmen as amended to include  delete	nt per the terms of the application	
☐ The hospital should be authorized to: ☐ obtain prior medic information from family members without disclosing HIPAA		
other conclusions of law		
RECOMMENDATIONS		
The Magistrate recommends that:		
The hospital be $\Box$ not be $\Box$ authorized to treat and medicate of the application $\Box$ as amended.	Respondent in accordance with the terms	
☐ for <u>n/a</u> days or not to exceed the current commitment ☐ for days or not to exceed the current commitment		
The hospital be into the into authorized to: into obtain prior me information from family members without disclosing HIPAA pro-	dical records;   obtain collateral tected information	
The hearing be continued to, 20	for the following reason(s)	
🗌 obtain independent expert 🛛 🗌 obtain independent couns	sel	
other		
Other recommendations		
Date Mag	gistrate	