Ĺ			
*			

Approved _	February	4,	1986	
F F ······		Date	<u> </u>	

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMI	TTEE ONJUDIC	IARY	
The meeting was called to order by	Senator Robert	Frey Chairperson	at
10:00 a.m./xxn. on	28	, 1 <u>986</u> in room <u>514-S</u> of the Capito	ol.
All members was present examps were:		Hoferer, Burke, Feleciano, thy, Parrish, Steineger, ter and Yost	

Committee staff present:

Mike Heim, Legislative Research Department Mary Hack, Office of Revisor of Statutes

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Louis Mata, Wyandotte County Legal Services Professor David Ryan, Washburn University School of Law Representative Sandy Duncan Ron Smith, Kansas Bar Association

Louis Mata, Wyandotte County Legal Services, presented a request for a bill concerning the protection from abuse act to simplify and strengthen a restraining order or protection order (See Attachment I).

The chairman announced a 27 minute film on medical malpractice will be shown tomorrow, January 29, in Room 519-S.

Senate Bill 415 - Application of act for judicial review and civil enforcement of agency actions to political subdivisions.

Professor David Ryan, Washburn University School of Law, who served on the Administrative Law Committee of the Judicial Council, explained this bill amends the administrative judicial review act which was adopted two years ago. It established for all state appeals a uniform appeal to court, and it has worked out to date by and large very well. This bill expands from the state level agencies to local units of government. He said accessibility to court can get unduly complicated, which is wrong, and this bill will eliminate that. The opposition's greatest concern is that this will open the flood gates of litigation in this state. Professor Ryan stated this bill does not change the scope of review in court. The act codifies the current very limited scope of review. The bill is to the benefit of local units of government.

Representative Sandy Duncan, a member of the Administrative Law Committee of the Judicial Council, testified that two years ago the League of Kansas Municipalities stated they needed a couple of years to go out and check with the municipalities, and when they have them educated, there would be no problem. Representative Duncan said we have waited the two years that they had requested. He said the basic concept is to want to protect the right of citizens to have their right to court. It does not expand the scope of review as the opponents may testify tomorrow. Committee discussion with him followed.

Ron Smith, Kansas Bar Association, stated the bar is in support of the bill. Copies of Mr. Smith's handouts are attached ($\underline{\text{See}}$ Attachments II, III).

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENAT	TE COMMITTEE ON	JUDICIARY	,
room <u>514-S</u> , Statehouse, at <u>1</u>	10:00 a.m./pxnq. on	January 28	

Senate Bill 415 continued

Considerable committee discussion followed with Professor Ryan concerning Section 7 of the bill relating to sufficient evidence and substantial evidence. Professor Ryan said he will bring this matter to the attention of the administrative law committee which meets this Thursday.

The meeting adjourned.

Copy of the guest list is attached (See Attachment IV).

GUEST LIST

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE DATE: Jan. 28 1986 COMMITTEE: ADDRESS' COMPANY/ORGANIZATION NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

attach. IV

A bill is needed that would simplify and strengthen the process by which a victim of domestic violence may obtain a restraining order or protection order.

- The Act needs to be simplified and a procedure set out so that a victim may petition for a protection order herself without the assistance of counsel. The present statute is so complicated that a victim is essentially barred from utilizing the Act without legal representation.
 - A) To make the Act capable of pro se representation, the forms need to be made available at the Clerk of the District Court with instructions for the petitioner. Such forms have been developed in other states, Missouri and Kentucky are good examples.
 - The preamble to the Act would need to be amended so that the District Courts, and their personnel would be mandated with the obligation to affirmatively assist the victims process the necessary. forms, get temporary orders signed, final hearing scheduled and effect service on the respondent.
- Practical problems have arisen with some of the current provisions and requirements of the Act.
 - The current jurisdictional requirement that the abuser or respondent have "legal access to the residence" should be stricken. This requirement has barred a number of victims from the use of the Act as technically the abuser may not have legal access.
 - B) The requirement that a hearing must be held within 10 days should be amended to allow for a longer time for the respondent to be served and answer to the petition. While included for due process reasons, no such requirement is in place for ex-parte temporary orders in divorce cases. A better time limit would be from 30-40 days for a hearing be scheduled. If a respondent wishes to contest the Order prior to that time, he/she could seek a modification of the Order. An expedited modification procedure could be set out. Many times, the Sheriff's Department is unable to secure service on the respondent prior to the 10-day hearing date and the case simply gets continued.
 - It would also be helpful if there would be statutory provision allowing for the extension of the protection order until such. time as a final hearing may be held.
 - D) A need to allow a court to extend the protection order beyond the one year limit would be in order. Easily the time limitation of one year could remain with another one year extension possible upon the application of the petitioner.
 - The Act needs to spell out that the protection order will remain in effect or be valid until modified or dismissed by the Court. This will eliminate judgement calls by police officers whether an order is valid or not when by coercion or trick the respondent has gained access to a residence.
 - F) The 60 day time limitation for child support should be stricken so that support is available for the duration of the Order.
- It is recommended that in addition to the civil contempt provision for violation of the restraining order and the criminal trespass statute, a civil penalty could be assessed against a respondent for violating a restraining order. The impact would be to further strengthen the Court's authority upon a finding that the Order has been violated. First violation could result in a \$200.00 penalty. Second violation: \$400.00. Onehalf of the penalties collected could go to defray the additional administrative costs of the District Court system. One-half of the penalties collected could go to domestic violence programs for their services to victims. The hope would be that respondents would think twice before violating the restraining order. Similar civil penalties have been authorized by the legislature, eg. Consumer Protection Act.

ion Act. 5. Judiciary 1/28/86



KANSAS BAR ASSOCIATION

OFFICERS

PRESIDENT
Gerald L. Goodell
215 E. 8th
Topeka, KS 66603 (913) 233-0593
PRESIDENT-ELECT
Jack R. Euler
P. O. Box 326
Troy, KS 66087 (913) 985-2322
VICE-PRESIDENT
Christel Marquardt
1100 1st Nat'l Bank Tower
Topeka, KS 66603 (913) 235-9511
SECRETARY-TREASURER
Dennis L. Gillen
621 1st Nat'l Bank Bldg,
Wichita, KS 67202 (316) 265-9621

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL DISTRICT 1 John J. Jurcyk P.O. Box 1398 4th Floor, 707 Minnesota Ave. Kansas City. KS 66101 (913) 371-3838 DISTRICT 2 Massachusetts at South Park P. O. Box 666 Lawrence, KS 66044 (913) 843-6600 DISTRICT 3 Leigh Hudson 200 Citizens Nat'l. Bank 200 S. Main Fort Scott, KS 66701 (316) 223-2900 DISTRICT 4 Warren D. Andreas 303 State Bank Bldg. Winfield, KS 67156 (316) 221-1610 DISTRICT 5 Edward L. Bailey 1100 1st Nat'l, Bank Tower Topeka, KS 66603 (913) 235-9511 DISTRICT 6
Robert W. Wise
P.O. Box 1143
McPherson, KS 67460 (316) 241-0554 DISTRICT 7 A. J. "Jack" Focht 807 N. Waco Suite 300, Brooker Plaza Wichita, KS 67203 (316) 269-9055 DISTRICT 8 DISTRIC.1 8
William B. Swearer
Box 1907
Hutchinson, KS 67504-1907
(316) 662-3331 DISTRICT 9 Lelyn J. Braun 1505 E. Fulton Terrace Garden City, KS 67846 (316) 275-4146 DISTRICT 10 Edward Larson P.O. Box 128 Hays, KS 67601 (913) 628-8226 PAST PRESIDENT Darrell D. Kellogg 200 W. Douglas, #630 Wichita, KS 67202 (316) 265-7761 YOUNG LAWYERS PRESIDENT Danton C. Hejtmanek P.O. Box 2667 Topeka, KS 66601 (913) 357-0333 ASSOCIATION ABA DELEGATES John Elliott Shamberg 860 New Brotherhood Bldg. Kansas City, KS 66101 (913) 281-1900 Glee S. Smith, Jr. P.O. Box 360 Larned, KS 67550 (316) 285-3157 STATE ABA DELEGATE William C. Farmer 200 W. Douglas, #830 Wichita, KS 67202 (316) 267-5293 KDJA REPRESENTATIVE Hon, Michael Corrigan 525 N. Main — Courthouse Wichita, KS 67203 (316) 268-7661 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Marcia Poell P.O. Box 1037

Topeka, KS 66601 (913) 234-5696

SB 415 Senate Judiciary Committee January 21, 1986

Mr. Chairman. Members of the committee. I am Ron Smith, Legislative Counsel, Kansas Bar Association.

KBA has supported the Kansas Administrative Procedures Act since its early days when Senator Pomeroy was working hard for passage.

SB 415 extends to local units of government the traditional concept of judicial review of administrative decisions through the required use of the Kansas Act for Judicial Review.

The legislation has the support of the Administrative Law section of KBA, which is one of our fastest growing sections. The KBA Executive Council, which is our legislative policy-making organization, supports such extension, and supports SB 415.

S. Judicióry 1/28/81 attch. II

LAWRENCE A. DIMMITT 220 EAST SIXTH STREET TOPEKA, KANSAS 66603

January 27, 1986

Mr. Ron Smith, Legislative Counsel Kansas Bar Association 1200 Harrison P.O. Box 1037 Topeka, Kansas 66601

Re: Senate Bill 415

Dear Mr. Smith:

You have asked me whether the Administrative Law Section of the KBA is in favor of the passage of S.B. 415, which would extend the Act for Judicial Review and Civil Enforcement of Agency Actions to political subdivisions.

Of course there is no "single position" of all members of our Section on this legislation. However, as John Richeson, attorney from Ottawa and First Vice-President of our Section, told the Special Committee on Judiciary on August 29, 1985, our Section planned to recommend that the KBA favor extension of KAPA generally to political subdivisions. And, while there may need to be specific issues addressed, S.B. 415 seems to be a step in the direction of promoting uniformity of agency decisions and not limiting such uniformity to state agencies.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding the above.

Very truly yours,

cc: John Richeson

Mark Hinderks Patricia Casey

1/28/8L

Ettach III