## MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the

LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY

at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library

http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied (searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

This document is from the files of the Office of the Maine Attorney General as transferred to the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library on January 19, 2022 Mrs. Diane Marles, Social Merker

Courtland D. Perry, Asst. Atty. Gen'l.

Status-Geraldine Gilbert

Social Service Nivision, Fineland Rospital and Training Center Nuntal Health and Corrections

Under date of April 18, 1963, you requested of this office an opinion, relative to the prosent status of one, Geraldine Gilbert, equalited to your institution under the previsions of Chapter 152-A, Section 17, Sub-section IV G, of the R.S., of Mains, 195h, as enacted by Chapter 342, Section 1 of the P.L., of 1959, and asked, specifically, if this patient is presently considered to be still a committed involuntary patient, or has the repeal and replacement of the above Section by Chapter 296, F.L., of 1961, placed this patient in a voluntary status and subject to discharge in accordance with the previsions of Section 143-C, Chapter 27 of the E.S., of Naime, 195k.

A sticky technical quantion of law is relead here. It is, however, clear that Section 143-6 of Chapter 27, is inapplicable since this Section refers to the discharge of mentally 121 children and the patient in question was consisted as, and is mentally retarded. The technical question exists us to the possibility of a patient so committed being discharged, pursuant to Section 146-4 of Chapter 27 of the R.S., referred to in new Section 17, Sub-section 170, Chapter 152-4 of the R.S., referred to in new Section 17, Sub-section 170, Chapter 152-4 of the R.S.

In view of the Pineland stail's professional opinion, that the best interest of the patient would be served by continuing participation in the Pineland program, it would behave you to take the position which I consider to be well founded in law that the patient is still under involuntary Municipal Court commitment. The coundiment of this patient was proper at the time, the Court having jurisdiction to dispose of the case by committing the patient to Pineland, which commitment was

perfected prior to the effective date of the repealer, and in view of the nature of the subject matter of the legislation in question the repeal and replacement of Chapter 152-A, Section 17, Sub-section IV 0 of the R.S., operated prespectively and not retrospectively, thus, applying only to cases, either pending at, or arising after, the effective date of the repealer, to wit: September 16, 1961.

Gourtland M. Perry Assistant Attempy General

CDP/E

der Attorney General's Office