


MEMORANDUM DECISION

Pursuant to Ind. Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision shall not be regarded as precedent or cited before any court except for the purpose of establishing the defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, or the law of the case.



ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

Amy P. Payne
Monroe County Public Defender's
Office
Bloomington, Indiana

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

In the Matter of the
Commitment of: N.D.

N.D.,
Appellant-Respondent,

v.

Indiana University Health
Bloomington Hospital,
Appellee-Petitioner.

October 24, 2018

Court of Appeals Case No.
18A-MH-1328

Appeal from the
Monroe Circuit Court

The Honorable
Mary Ellen Diekhoff

Trial Court Cause No.
53C07-1805-MH-168

Kirsch, Judge.

- [1] In *In re: Commitment of J.M.*, 62 N.E.3d 1208, (Ind. Ct. App. 2016), we noted that the question of how persons subject to involuntary commitment are treated by our trial courts is a matter of great importance to both society and to the person who has been committed. Accordingly, our statutory and case law affirm that the value and dignity of the individual facing commitment or treatment is a matter of great societal concern. *See* Ind. Code 12-26-5-1 (establishing procedures for seventy-two-hour commitment); Ind. Code 12-26-6-2 (establishing procedures for ninety-day commitment); *In re: Mental Health Commitment of M.P.*, 510 N.E.2d 645, 646 (Ind. 1987) (noting that the statute granting a patient the right to refuse treatment “profoundly affirms the value and dignity of the individual and the commitment of this society to insuring humane treatment of those we confine”)
- [2] Here, N.D. appeals the trial court order of her involuntary mental health commitment and forced medication contending that it was not supported by clear and convincing evidence. “When a court is unable to render effective relief to a party, the case is deemed moot and usually dismissed.” *In re: J.B.*, 766 N.E.2d 798 (Ind.Ct.App.2002) (citing *In re Lawrance*, 579 N.E.2d 3(Ind. 1991)). We have previously considered, discussed, and resolved the issues that N.D. raises here, and they are moot. *See In re: Commitment of J.R.*, 766 N.E.2d 795, 798 (Ind. Ct. App., 2002) and *In re Commitment of J.M.*, 62 N.E.3d 1208 (2016).
- [3] Dismissed.

Vaidik, C.J., and Riley, J., concur.