Comments on Child Protective Proceedings Agenda, Item 3

Our primary "authorization" form has always been the petition itself. I guess we've not viewed the JC 11a or our [locally-created] inquiry order as you do - the authorizing document. But, the JC11a does authorize the petition. It gets me to wondering what other courts do and think around the state. Do they even bother affixing their signature to a petition when it is authorized by a JC 11a? If we had both forms state-wide (a SCAO version of our inquiry form and the JC 11a), would there even need to be a signature line on the petition? Same for delinquency cases? Maybe. There seems to be nothing in the court rules requiring the court to authorize a petition by affixing the court signature to that document. In Oakland County, we do not "authorize" supplemental or amended petitions by signing them. We simply take them and hold hearings on them in the same way we do signed petitions. Maybe it would be better to sign NO petitions.

I guess that check box or current language is helpful to us because this is the way we've done it all along. We sign that petition no matter if it's after a hearing or an inquiry. If you keep the language, I would suggest simply eliminating the word "and/". If you eliminate the whole phrase, I will train our hearing officers to sign the original petition only after an inquiry. If I was in control of the SCAO forms universe, I think I would look at eliminating the signature lines and authorization boxes completely on all petitions and come up with a form to use for authorizations after inquiries as well as hearings in DL and NA cases.

Scott Hamilton