

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

HONORABLE WARREN J. GRANVILLE

CLERK OF THE COURT
B. Navarro
Deputy

STATE OF ARIZONA

PATRICIA L STEVENS
MARY-ELLEN WALTER
JULI S WARZYNSKI

v.

MICHAEL LEE CRANE (001)
DOB: June 9, 1980
Booking No.: P840204

HERMAN ALCANTAR JR.
CAPITAL CASE MANAGER
CORRECTIONAL HEALTH SERVICES
COURT FORENSIC SERVICES UNIT
D & C MATERIALS-CSC

**DEFENDANT INCOMPETENT - A.R.S. § 13-4510 (C) -
SUBMISSION ORDER FOR RESTORATION TREATMENT**

This Court ordered mental health experts to review defendant's records, *pro se* pleadings, and correspondence pursuant to Rule 11.2(a) because of his continued refusal to communicate with his counsel. After their review and reports, this Court took evidence in the form of exhibits and testimony presented at a hearing on April 3, 2015 and April 29, 2015, and April 30, 2015. This Court has considered the evidence admitted, the written and oral presentments of counsel, the court file, and the applicable law, and makes the following findings and rulings:

A defendant is not competent if, as a result of a mental illness, defect or disability, he is unable to understand the proceedings against him or to assist in his own defense. Rule 11.1. Mental illness, defect or disability means a psychiatric or neurological disorder that is evidenced by behavioral or emotional symptoms, including congenital mental conditions, and conditions resulting from injury or disease. Rule 11.1. To be competent, a defendant must be able to have a sufficient present ability to consult with his lawyer with a reasonable degree of rational

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

understanding, a rational understanding of the proceedings against him, and a factual understanding of the proceeding against him. The level of competence required for a defendant in a capital case is the same as for any other defendant. *State v. Moody*, 208 Ariz. 424, 94 P.3d 1119 (2004).

Mental illness, defect or disability alone is not a sufficient basis to make a finding of incompetency. Rule 11.1. The issue here is whether defendant not assisting his counsel in his defense is caused by a mental illness that renders him unable to assist in his defense, or a voluntary choice not to cooperate in his prosecution.

The determination of whether a defendant is competent to stand trial is left to the trial court. To assist the trial court, the court may retain mental health experts to examine the defendant, review his mental health history, and render an opinion about the defendant's competence to stand trial. A determination that a defendant is competent is a question exclusively for the court. *State v Lara*, 179 Ariz. 578, 580 (App. 1994), *vacated on other grounds*, 183 Ariz. 233, 235 (1995).

In related cases, defendant is charged with three counts of First Degree Murder, one count of Attempted Second Degree Murder, five counts of Armed Robbery, three counts of Kidnapping, four counts of Armed Burglary, one count of Aggravated Assault, two counts of Arson of an Occupied Structure, one count of Arson of an Unoccupied Structure, one count of Theft of Means of Transportation, one count of Attempted Burglary, one count of Misconduct Involving Weapons, and one count of Theft for the time period between November 30, 2011 and February 1, 2012 involving seven victims.

On October 9, 2012, this Court found defendant competent based upon the most recent Rule 11 reports at that time, this Court's conversations with and observations of him in court, and his appearances before other courts in previous proceedings. (iCIS 105) This Court's finding of competence does not preclude a redetermination based upon a change of defendant's mental health state since 2012 because competence is not a static condition.

Because of signs and concerns that defendant's mental health may have deteriorated, the Court ordered a mental health evaluation of defendant pursuant to Rule 11.2(a) on July 25, 2014. (iCIS 262). When defendant refused any one doctor-patient evaluation, this Court appointed two mental health experts, Dr. Katrina Buwalda and Dr. James Youngjohn to conduct a review of defendant's mental health history, records while he has been incarcerated, and records of his communications that may assist them in rendering an opinion whether defendant's refusal to assist in his defense was a rational decision or a product of a mental health defect or deficiency. (iCIS 270).

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

The defense had retained Dr. Alan Abrams to assist in the gathering, understanding and presenting mitigation evidence for a possible Penalty Phase of defendant's murder trial. After this Court ordered an evaluation of defendant's mental state, defense counsel re-directed Dr. Abrams' purpose to evaluate his competency. Because defendant refused to interview with him, Dr. Abrams was limited to the same type of records review as was done by the Court's appointed mental health experts.

Because of the happenstance of how they were retained, while Dr. Buwalda, Dr. Youngjohn and Dr. Abrams each did a records review, Dr. Abrams was afforded the most time to do it, and his was the most thorough.

Over the course of this Court's interactions with Defendant, he has labeled himself as a "constitutional but not statutory citizen," a "national but not a citizen," a "non-resident alien, but not an alien or resident," and "a stateless person." He claims that this Court has no authority over him, and therefore, cannot require him to attend court sessions or cooperate or communicate with attorneys provided him by the Court. The issue, therefore, boils down to whether defendant's refusal reflects a philosophy-based decision to refuse to assist in his defense and thereby surrender his principles to comply with rules with which he disagrees, or a mental illness, defect or disability rendering him unable to assist in his defense.

Prior to the three-day evidentiary hearing, Rule 11 Reports had been done on defendant with the following results:

Exhibit #3 – Dr. Martin Kassell Report dated April 11, 2009 finding Defendant competent.

Exhibit #4 – Dr. Daniel Blackwood Report dated May 12, 2009 finding Defendant not competent.

Exhibit #5 – Dr. Neal H. Olshan Report dated October 10, 2009 finding Defendant competent.

Exhibit #10 – Dr. Joanne Babich Reports dated March 14 and April 16, 2012 finding Defendant competent.

Exhibit #11 – Dr. Lawrence J. Allen Report dated April 14, 2012 finding Defendant competent.

Exhibit #12 – Dr. James R. Youngjohn Report dated September 3, 2014 finding Defendant "most likely" competent.

Exhibit #13 – Dr. Alan Abrams Report dated November 27, 2014 finding Defendant not competent.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

Exhibit #28 – Dr. Katrina Buwalda Report dated December 5, 2014 finding Defendant not competent.

CHRONOLOGY OF DEFENDANT’S COURT APPEARANCES

Rule 11 law provides that the Court may make observations of the defendant’s demeanor and interactions with the Court in determining competency. Although the Court has appointed mental health experts to assist in its determination and the defendant has offered evaluations from an additional expert, the experts’ opinions are not binding; the determination of both fact and law is the Court’s alone. *Bishop v. Superior Court (Bishop II)*, 150 Ariz. 404, 409 (1986); *State v. Lara*, 179 Ariz. 578, 580 (App. 1994). “On questions of competency to stand trial, not only is the judge a finder of fact, he is also a *de facto* witness who may take into consideration his own observations of the defendant.” *Bishop II*, 150 Ariz. 404 at 409 (1986); *State v. Glassel*, 211 Ariz. 33, 44-45 (2005); *State v. Moody*, 208 Ariz. 424, 444-45 (2004); *See also State v. Brewer*, 170 Ariz. 486, 495 (1992).

Following is a list of the prior court hearings where this Court was able to observe defendant’s manner and demeanor, and assess whether he seemed able to understand his surroundings and the nature and substance of the particular proceeding:

06/27/12 (iCIS 87)

This Court first met defendant. At that time, defendant challenged the Court’s jurisdiction and requested to represent himself.

07/18/12 (iCIS 91)

Defendant again challenged his counsel representing him.

08/06/12 (iCIS 92)

Defendant filed a lengthy *pro se* pleading challenging this Court’s jurisdiction and introducing to the Court his jurisprudential views.

09/18/12 (iCIS 102)

Defendant again asked to represent himself and objected to his counsel’s request for a further competency exam. Defendant agreed to comply when advised that his competency must be determined before the Court could consider his *Faretta* request.

10/03/12 (iCIS 104)

Defendant refused transport, and so, his *Faretta* motion could not be considered.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

10/8/12 (iCIS 106)

After the Court denies defendant's motions to apply the UCC and his motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, defendant "presents additional argument stating this Court's laws do not apply to him;" Defendant moves to represent himself; Court takes motion under advisement.

10/15/12 (iCIS 107)

Court finds competency reports filed under seal by Dr. Babich & Dr. Allen satisfy the requirements of ARS §13-754; Defendant "addresses court regarding his objection to the Court's ruling of October 9, 2012, denying the Defendant's request for self-representation." The Court does agree to permit defendant to make a statement at each court appearance after the attorneys have concluded their progress reports.

12/13/12 (iCIS 118)

Defendant addresses court re his objection to representation by counsel & reads his statement

04/02/13 (iCIS 148)

Defendant addresses court & disputes representation by counsel; reads his statement

06/04/13 (iCIS 161)

Defendant reads his statement

07/17/13 (iCIS 165)

Court admonishes defendant regarding the scheduled depositions. Defendant stated that he understood the admonition, but objected to it. He then reads his statement.

08/16/13 (iCIS 173)

Defendant waits his turn and reads a statement

10/02/13 (iCIS 187)

Defendant waits his turn and reads a statement

11/01/13 (iCIS 205)

Defendant refuses transport

01/10/14 (iCIS 231)

The Court forwards defendant's *pro se* motions to counsel to file if they decide to do so; State moves for fingerprints & defendant objects on grounds that his fingerprints have

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

been taken multiple times already, but allows them to be taken. Defendant waits his turn and reads a statement

1/15/2014 (iCIS 232)

The Court finds that defendant has acted appropriately during court proceedings and does not assume that he will be disruptive

01/17/14 (iCIS 233)

Defendant refuses to be transported to appear for depositions. He confirms his refusal is voluntary even after being told that he would be allowed to make a 5-minute statement at end of each deposition

01/31/14 (iCIS 236)

Defendant refuses transport

02/21/14 (iCIS 241)

Defendant waits his turn and reads a statement; Court agrees to submit to defendant's written interrogatories

03/28/14 (iCIS 248)

Defendant addresses the Court regarding his request for the Court and the State to answer specific written questions; Defendant is told he must first submit copies to the State prior to Court ruling on his request

05/07/14 (iCIS 257)

Defendant refuses transport

07/25/14 (iCIS 262)

Defendant refuses transport; Court *sua sponte* orders Rule 11: "On October 9, 2012, this Court found that Defendant was competent. That finding was based, in part, upon the Court's observations and interactions with Defendant. With Defendant having refused transport for the last proceeding, this Court has not had any recent observations or interactions with Defendant. This Court recognizes that issues related to mental health may be transitory."

9/26/14 (iCIS 270)

Defendant removed for vulgar language & disruptive behavior: "On July 25, 2014, the Court ordered a Rule 11 examination of the Defendant on its own motion. While the Defendant was always responsive and polite in each of his appearances before the Court,

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

he had begun to refuse transport on repeated occasions. Concerned that the Defendant may be decompensating, the Court ordered the Rule 11 examination. Thereafter, the Defendant refused to be interviewed by the court-appointed mental health experts. Because Rule 11 allows the Court to be the alterative fact-finder of competency, this Court has set this hearing for the opportunity to address the Defendant personally. While the Defendant, for the first time before this Court, has been disrespectful, the Court finds that he is aware of the circumstances of these proceedings.”

04/2/15 (iCIS 295)

Court orders defendant brought to court by any means necessary for 4/3/15 hearing because defendant signed waiver of presence “under duress”

04/3/15 (iCIS 294)

Defendant is brought to court. Defendant begins speaking when he thinks case has started, but when the Court tells him to wait until at least case called, he agrees and waits. He then starts his statement by saying, OK, here we are again & I’m going to say the same things and do the same things because it is my right. When advised that he would be removed if he becomes disruptive, defendant replies that he will likely be disruptive. He then proceeded to speak pejoratively to the Court and counsel and was removed.

DEFENDANT’S *PRO SE* SUBMISSIONS

Defendant has filed extensive *pro se* pleadings with the Court that reflect his theory that this Court does not have jurisdiction over him and that his appointed counsel are not “his attorneys.”

iCIS	91	filed 7/18/12	def challenges counsel re-set to 9/18
	92	filed 08/02/12	pleading filed 8/2 citing cases
	128	filed 02/04/13	Affidavit of Reservation of Rights
	129		Power of Attorney
	127		Security Agreement
	130		Trademark Copyright
	131		Special Visit
	132		Subject Matter Jurisdiction
	135	filed 03/25/13	Supplement
	136		Supplement
	134	filed 03/11/13	Writ of Habeaus [sic] Corpus
	143	filed 04/3/13	Notice of Non-response
		filed 08/26/13	Notary Certificate of Dishonor (26 pgs)

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

Notice of Copyright/Trademark Violation (10 pgs)
Wrong Party Notice (7 pgs)
Demand for Verified Evidence of Lawful Federal
Assessment (10 pgs)
(3) Truth Affidavits:
 Re: Alcantar and Associates (3 pgs)
 Re: Notary certificate of Dishonor Process (23 pgs)
 Statement of Facts (6 pgs)

175 filed 09/03/13 86 page treatise
207 filed 11/14/13 Motion to Protect my Rights as a Free Man
208 Motion to Handle Deposition Pursuant to UCC
209 Published Treatise re Sovereignty
210 Published Treatise on Government
211 Published Treatise on Federal Jurisdiction
212 Affidavit of Truth

Dr. Buwalda's Testimony

Dr. Katrina Buwalda testified consistent with her Report dated December 5, 2014 (Ex. 28). Based upon her review of defendant's previous Rule 11 Reports, his DOC records, his CHS records, various phone calls and writings, she opined that defendant suffers from a psychosis that renders him unable to trust or assist his attorneys or track the proceedings. She testified that the defendant's paranoia will interfere with his ability to trust his attorney, and his hallucinations and delusions will interfere with his ability to track what is happening in the courtroom to the extent that he won't listen to or disclose information to his attorney.

Doctor Buwalda agreed with Dr. Abrams and opined that defendant's refusal is a product of being paranoid schizophrenic.

Besides her review of defendant's records, and Dr. Abrams' Report, she testified that her opinion was also supported by her observations of the statements and behaviors defendant demonstrated in her presence in court before she testified on April 3, 2015.

Dr. Buwalda admitted that it is difficult to distinguish between a defendant unable to cooperate with his counsel from one merely unwilling to do so, especially in the absence of a one-on-one evaluation. She testified that the best alternative to assess defendant's current mental state is to determine whether there are signs of hallucinations or bizarre behaviors.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

Based upon her training and experience, her review of defendant's records, and her brief observations of him in court, Dr. Buwalda opined that defendant is not competent but restorable.

Dr. Abrams' Testimony

Unlike Dr. Buwalda and Dr. Youngjohn, Dr. Alan Abrams does not meet Arizona's definition of "mental health expert" because he has not taken the Arizona Supreme Court's approved training or any approved continuing education program mandated by Rule 11.2(b)(2). He is, however, highly qualified and fully meets the criteria of Rule 702.

Based upon the limitations placed upon the doctors by circumstance, Dr. Abrams' review of defendant's previous Rule 11 Reports, his DOC records, his CHS records, various phone calls and writings was the most detailed and extensive. He also was the only individual who met with the defendant personally for evaluation. Based upon that review, his training and experience, Dr. Abrams opined that defendant suffers from paranoid schizophrenia or a related disorder as reflected by his bizarre statements related to aliens, shape shifting, Satan, and non-existent events. He noted that the defendant's mental illness, which encompasses his bizarre ideas, hallucinations and increasingly delusional thoughts, are not likely the result of drug use because he has been incarcerated in an isolated unit for over three years. He opines that this mental condition is the cause of defendant's incapacity to assist his defense attorney.

Doctor Youngjohn's Testimony

Doctor James Youngjohn reviewed defendant's past Rule 11 reports and many of defendant's writings and recitations. Based upon his review, his training and experience, Dr. Youngjohn opined that defendant's decision to not cooperate with his counsel is a rational and strategic decision to thwart his prosecution.

When asked by the Court, Dr. Youngjohn agreed that Dr. Abram's opinion that defendant had "paranoid components," "affective manic depressive components," and may suffer from paranoid schizophrenia could be correct. He agreed that the defendant's letters and phone calls in the jail reflecting his shape-shifting and allusions to Satan, avatars, and aliens would support Dr. Abrams' opinion.

Defense Counsel's Bishop Observations

Defense counsel made a statement of her observations of defendant pursuant to *Bishop*. While defendant had always been adamant in his belief that she and co-counsel were not "his attorneys," he had in fact been cooperating with her in many ways by answering questions,

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

giving some leads, and tracking her efforts. Since the time of the 2012 competency proceedings, there had been significant strides in the attorney-client relationship.

In 2014, defense counsel became concerned that the defendant's mental health was deteriorating. She observed ever-increasing hostility between him and her, increasing frequency of bizarre statements by him, and most concerning, statements by him regarding shape shifting and reports of events that had not really occurred. While during 2012-13, the defendant focused on his beliefs in the sovereign nation and the Uniform Commercial Code, in 2014, his focus was on shape shifters, demons, robots and other realities and/or the entering of other worlds transforming. It has evolved to an almost complete break of communications between defendant and the defense team.

Court's Bishop Observations

This Court's *Bishop* observations reflect that defendant has always understood the nature of these proceedings to the extent that he has consistently regarded them as the wrong way to go. When in court, initially defendant tolerated the lawyers to make their case management progress reports to the Court before making his prepared statement of his jurisprudential philosophy. There has, however, been a dramatic increase in the defendant's hostility and disrespect for the Court, which the Court initially observed in September 2014.

Hallucinations

Dr. Buwalda testified that one way to differentiate whether defendant's actions were the result of choice or mental illness was whether he was suffering hallucinations. The records reflect that some of defendant's episodes of reported hallucinations were likely triggered by drug abuse and not mental illness. At times, defendant's self-reported denying any hallucination episodes.

Both Dr. Abrams and Dr. Buwalda, and defense counsel observed that that there has been a deterioration of defendant's condition since he was evaluated and deemed competent in 2012. Counsel reported a complete breakdown of their previous polite interactions and his increasingly bizarre statements of shape shifting and non-existent meetings. Dr. Abrams based his opinion, in part, on defendant's increasingly bizarre telephone conversations and correspondence regarding aliens and Satan. Dr. Buwalda also commented that defendant's statements to the Court in her presence before she testified reflected indications of paranoid schizophrenia.

CONCLUSIONS

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

A person with a strong and long-held philosophy of jurisprudence that the law deems unacceptable is not incompetent. Where a defendant's decision to not assist his attorneys in his defense is the product of belief and not psychosis, defendant is not incompetent. A defendant's obsession with incorrect legal theories, his distrust of his attorneys, and his belligerent attitude do not render him not competent to be tried. *See, Cheek v. United States*, 498 U.S. 192 (1991); *United States v. Kerr*, 752 F.3d 26,217-18 (2d Cir.), *as amended* (June 18, 2014), *cert. denied*, 135 S. Ct. 388 (2014); *United States v. Alden*, 527 F.3d 653, 660 (7th Cir. 2008); *United States v. Auen*, 846 F.2d 872 (2d Cir.1988). The fact that defendant is among a group that shares an odd jurisprudential philosophy does not render him delusional or mentally incompetent. *Young v. Walls*, 311 F.3d 846 (7th Cir. 2002); *United States v. Dunkel*, 927 F.2d 955 (7th Cir. 1991). Whether "sincerely held" or "advanced only to annoy the other side," expressing bizarre legal theories does not "imply mental instability or concrete intellect ... so deficient that trial is impossible." *United States v. Jonassen*, 759 F.3d 653, 659-60 (7th Cir. 2014); *United States v. James*, 328 F.3d 953, 955-57 (7th Cir. 2003); *also see Alden*, 527 F.3d at 659-60.

Each of the three doctors who testified stated that no true diagnosis could be made without a one-on-one evaluation of defendant. None of the three had the opportunity to actually evaluate defendant. Each was limited by circumstances to reviewing defendant's history as repeated by him, his mother, DOC and MCSO records, and records kept by the jail's health program and the Department of Corrections, and by correspondence and telephone communications defendant had with family.

This Court has three times made rulings referencing the fact that defendant had been appropriate in the Court's presence. That circumstance changed when defendant began to refuse to be transported consistently and became profane and disrespectful when present. Whether those decisions and acts were the result of mental illness or mere belligerence is, as Dr. Buwalda testified, difficult to distinguish.

This Court recognizes the fact that no real diagnosis of mental disease or defect can be made without a personal evaluation, and the defendant has thwarted any effort toward that opportunity. The Court also recognizes a presumption of competence, which may be rebutted by medical testimony and/or the Court's observations.

While this Court is authorized to make a finding independent from that made by the mental health professionals, the wisdom of doing that is questionable. Left with no better option, this Court must rely on the training and experience of the qualified experts who have made their best judgments based upon the limitations of the evaluations that they were able to make under the circumstance imposed upon them, as well as the lay observations of counsel and this Court.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

A review of the experts' opinions and observations of the lay folks evidences a deterioration of defendant's mental health. Dr. Abrams and Dr. Buwalda opine that defendant's refusal to communicate with counsel is a product of paranoia. Dr. Youngjohn opines that defendant's refusal is a rational effort to halt the state's effort to try him and execute him, but he also testified that Drs. Abrams and Buwalda could be right.

Based upon the evidence presented, this Court finds that defendant is currently not competent. Under the constant care and supervision of mental health professionals and the opportunity for a proper evaluation, it may be determined that defendant has no actual mental illness, or that it has been properly diagnosed and treated.

Defendant is not the first defendant to refuse to cooperate with his own lawyers or the Court. This Court has a continuing obligation to ascertain whether the defendant's uncooperative behavior is a result of a conscious decision or is a product of a mental illness. If warranted, after closer, constant observation by mental health professionals, defendant may yet be deemed competent pursuant to *State v. Lewis*, 236 Ariz. 336, 340 P.3d 415 (App. 2014). *See also, State v. Naranjo*, 234 Ariz. 233, 321 P.3d 398 (2014).

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that there is no clear and convincing evidence that the Defendant will not be restored to competency within 15 months pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-4510(C).

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that the Defendant is incompetent to refuse treatment and should be subject to involuntary treatment pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 13-4511 and 13-4512(B).

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that confinement is necessary for treatment and/or the Defendant is a threat to public safety.

IT IS ORDERED committing the Defendant to the Maricopa County Correctional Health Services Restoration Program to receive treatment necessary to restore the Defendant's competency. Furthermore, said facility/program shall submit to the Court a written status report on **July 20, 2015** stating the Defendant's progress and prognosis, unless prior to that date the treatment facility concludes that competency has been restored or that there is no substantial probability that the Defendant will be restored within 21 months after the date of the original finding of incompetency. The written report shall reflect the estimated time period for restoration and any recommendations for treatment modifications if competency is restored. The report shall state what limitations are imposed by medications used to restore competency. The treatment facility shall submit its written report to the Court's Forensic Services Administrator

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

who shall provide a copy to defense counsel. Defense counsel shall provide a copy to the prosecutor pursuant to Rule 11.4(a), Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED setting a **non-evidentiary Status Hearing** for **July 24, 2015 at 8:30 a.m.** in this Division. If the parties wish an evidentiary hearing, they are to contact the assigned Judge and request an evidentiary hearing.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that copies of the experts' reports and police reports are to be furnished by the Maricopa County Attorney's office to the Court's Forensic Services Administrator who will cause them to be sent to the treatment provider to be used by the treatment provider in diagnosis and treatment and not to be released or copied without further Court order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **within three (3) judicial days of receipt of a request by the RTC for specifically identified medical and/or mental health records (records)**, counsel for the Defendant shall request said records and, where necessary, a court order to obtain said records, and shall contemporaneously provide the RTC with notice of said request(s).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that **within five (5) judicial days of receipt of any records**, counsel for the Defendant shall provide a copy of said records to the RTC or shall advise the RTC of any special circumstances that may require additional time, not to exceed five (5) days, for disclosure. Counsel for the Defendant may make redactions where disclosure would be prejudicial to the Defendant and not relevant to the restoration process. In the event of a dispute over redactions, upon request, the Court will conduct an in camera inspection in order to resolve such dispute.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the original report(s) of the mental health expert(s) shall be sealed and maintained in a confidential manner by the Clerk of the Superior Court; said report(s) are not to be disclosed to anyone except as provided for in A.R.S. § 36-509.

IT IS ORDERED that the Defendant shall not possess, purchase or receive any firearms, ammunition or other deadly weapons.

The Department of Public Safety shall be notified and is entitled to information as detailed in ARS Section 36-540(O).

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2012-107176-001 DT
CR2012-007950-001 DT

05/26/2015

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Mercy Maricopa Integrated Care shall conduct a jail evaluation to assess the Defendant for services and provide a report to the Court at the above-scheduled hearing.

SEALED AND FILED: Medical report(s) by the expert(s).

FILED: Hearing Worksheet; Exhibit Worksheet

This case is eFiling eligible: <http://www.clerkofcourt.maricopa.gov/efiling/default.asp>. Attorneys are encouraged to review Supreme Court Administrative Order 2011-140 to determine their mandatory participation in eFiling through AZTurboCourt.