

**From:** Court Forms Info  
**To:** Dan Jakeway  
**Date:** 6/15/2009 9:11 AM  
**Subject:** Re: PCM 201 In Dire Need of Modification

Thank you for your comments. They will be placed on file for consideration by the forms committee at its next meeting.

>>> Dan Jakeway <[jakewayd@gmail.com](mailto:jakewayd@gmail.com)> 6/12/2009 9:34 PM >>>  
To Whom It May Concern,

In addition to modification of PCM 201, Petition for Hospitalization, I strongly recommend modification of PCM 214, Initial Order Following Hearing on Petition for Hospitalization.

Item 6: Testimony was not given because parties stipulated to entry of the order, is highly misleading as to the statutory authority and substance of the stipulation. The stipulation must have been entered on form PCM 235, Request to Defer Hearing on Commitment, but it is not uncommon for judges to append a stipulation to Waiver of Attendance on PCM 223 without proper authorization. The provisions set forth in MCL 330.1455(5)(6), whereby the patient reserves the right to refuse treatment at any time and demand a hearing, are made clear on the uncommonly used PCM 235 form.

Item 6 must be updated to include the language "stipulation to entry of the order does not imply an effective order of an involuntary commitment, but it merely postpones the entry of an order, and the patient reserves the right to refuse treatment at any time and demand a hearing"

Item 6 is grossly misunderstood owing to ignorance of the statues by virtually every Probate Court in practice.

Finally, because of widespread disregard for MCL 330.1404, and MCL 600.855 requiring use of SCAO/Supreme Court authored forms, I recommend the addition of language, as succinct as possible, to the effect of,

"SCAO approved, use of form, verbatim, mandatory" in the upper left.

--

Dan Jakeway  
Electrical Engineer  
[jakewayd@gmail.com](mailto:jakewayd@gmail.com)