



**House
Legislative
Analysis
Section**

Washington Square Building, Suite 1025
Lansing, Michigan 48909
Phone. 517/373-6466

OPEN JUVENILE PROCEEDINGS

House Bill 4572 as enrolled
Third Analysis (6-29-88)

RECEIVED

AUG 04 1988

Sponsor: Rep. Nick Ciaramitaro
House Committee: Judiciary
Senate Committee: Judiciary

Mich. State Law Library

THE APPARENT PROBLEM:

The juvenile code allows the court to exclude the general public from hearings, and juvenile court judges have generally done so. The closing of juvenile hearings is a practice that reflects the origins of separate juvenile procedure: the belief that the proper role of the state is to protect and reform young offenders, not subject them to the open trial and punishment of adult criminal law, and the continuing stigma attached to them. In recent years, however, perspectives have shifted so that now many people believe that the benefits of opening juvenile proceedings to public scrutiny outweigh the risk of harm to juvenile offenders. Although there are occasions when it is appropriate to limit public access, especially in abuse and neglect cases, the closing of juvenile hearings impedes the public's ability to assess the juvenile justice system, evaluate juvenile judges, and learn the extent of juvenile crime. It has been proposed that juvenile court proceedings be opened to the public except where warranted by individual circumstances.

THE CONTENT OF THE BILL:

The juvenile code allows a juvenile court judge to exclude the general public in any juvenile case. The bill would delete this broad authorization and replace it with conditions under which the court may close juvenile proceedings.

For any proceeding under the juvenile code, the court could, upon the motion of any party or victim, close the hearing during the testimony of a child witness if necessary to protect the welfare of that child or victim. In making that determination, the court would have to consider the age and psychological maturity of the child witness or victim; the nature of the proceeding, and the desire of the child, his or her family, or the victim to have the testimony taken in a room closed to the public.

A "child witness" would not include a child brought into court for breaking the law.

The bill also would incorporate language from Public Act 92 of 1988, which deals with establishing various due process requirements within the juvenile code, and would require recordkeeping consistent with the juvenile diversion act, Public Act 13 of 1988.

MCL 712A.17 and 712A.28

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

According to the House Fiscal Agency, the bill has no fiscal implications for the state. (5-20-87)

ARGUMENTS:

For:

Juvenile proceedings, especially delinquency hearings, should generally be open to the public. The Probate Court Task Force (the "Riley Commission") and the House Ad-hoc Special Committee on Youthful Offenders, two groups that

extensively studied the juvenile justice system and released reports in April 1987, recommended that juvenile proceedings be opened. Open hearings would foster a better public understanding of the juvenile justice system and its needs, an understanding that is at present hampered by the common practice of closing juvenile proceedings. An informed public would be better able to assess the system, its problems, and proposed solutions, and evaluate judicial candidates. An open courtroom would act as a check on potential abuses of judicial authority. Hearings could become more formal in order to prevent the appearance of arbitrariness, and that formality could assure better due process of law to all parties. Formality and public scrutiny could help to make both juveniles and their parents aware of the seriousness of the matter at hand.

Despite these benefits of open proceedings generally, there will be instances where it will be more appropriate to close a hearing to the public. The bill accommodates those occasions by allowing a hearing to be closed to protect the victim or a child witness, using criteria paralleling those in Public Acts 44 through 47, which allow videotaped testimony and support people for children in certain court proceedings. The bill would make the juvenile justice system more accountable to the public while retaining sufficient flexibility to respond appropriately to individual circumstances.

Against:

There is little to gain from opening abuse and neglect hearings to the general public. Any desire to subject the wrongdoer to public scrutiny can be met in criminal court where charges would be brought; the purpose of the juvenile court hearing is to determine the disposition of the child. These proceedings are very sensitive and inquisitory; they probe into many private family matters. The privacy of the child and the family should be protected more than they would be by the bill. Privacy could be better guarded by allowing the court to close a hearing upon its own initiative (rather than only in response to a motion), by conditioning public and media access on an assurance that parties' identities would be kept confidential, by prohibiting publication of names, or by some combination of such protections. Indeed, many would argue that the courts should continue to protect identities in delinquency hearings, where public identification could unfairly stigmatize some youngsters and encourage others toward more flagrant violations. To this end, some may argue, courts should be able to retain the degree of discretion which they now have.

H.B. 4572 (6-29-88)