

ANNE E. LOPEZ 7609
Attorney General of Hawai'i

JAMES W. WALTHER 6097
LYNNE M. YOUMANS 7174
Deputy Attorneys General
Department of the Attorney General,
State of Hawai'i
465 South King Street, Rm. 200
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813
Telephone: (808) 587-3050
Facsimile: (808) 587-3077

Electronically Filed
FIRST CIRCUIT
1CCV-20-0000762
25-SEP-2023
02:54 PM
Dkt. 89 MER

Attorneys for Appellee
STATE OF HAWAI'I,
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAI'I

DAVID ALAN LOPEZ,)	1CCV-20-0000762
)	
Appellant,)	DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES'
)	SURREPLY TO REPLY MEMORANDUM
vs.)	IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO UNSEAL;
)	DECLARATION OF LYNNE M.
DIANE R. CORN, Hearing Officer,)	YOUMANS; EXHIBITS "1" AND "2";
Administrative Appeals Office, State of)	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
Hawai'i Department of Human Services, and)	
STATE OF HAWAI'I DEPARTMENT OF)	DATE: October 12, 2023
HUMAN SERVICES,)	TIME: 1:00 p.m.
)	JUDGE: Honorable James H. Ashford
Appellees.)	
)	
)	

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES' SURREPLY TO REPLY
MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO UNSEAL

I. ARGUMENT

In their Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Unseal (Reply Memo),

Movants request that this Court make public the "non-confidential portion" of this case. There is

not a “non-confidential portion” of a case involving an investigation pursuant to the Child Protective Act (Hawai‘i Revised Statutes §587A, et. seq.).

In May of 1998, the Honolulu Advertiser petitioned the family court for records regarding a missing boy, Peter Kema, Jr. (also known as Peter Boy). Kema v. Gaddis, 91 Hawai‘i 200, 203, 982 P.2d 334, 337 (Sup. Ct. 1999). The case had garnered significant media attention and the sitting Family Court Judge issued an order allowing for the release of limited information regarding the case from a closed file. Id. at 204 and 338. The Hawai‘i Supreme Court, in issuing a writ of prohibition preventing even that limited release of information, held that “[u]nder the Child Protective Act, the interests of other parties or non-parties seeking information are not as compelling as the interests of the children involved.” Id. at 206 and 340. The Court held that “the overriding concern of the Child Protective Act in determining whether to release such information remains the best interest of the children involved.”

The Family Court Judge, in struggling with his decision, provided an eloquent statement of the privacy interests involved in Child Protective Act cases. He wrote:

Often when DHS is involved with families in abuse and neglect cases, the families are in the midst of conflict, denial, pain and suffering. It is extremely important that family members be encouraged to communicate openly with DHS and service providers. Good DHS social workers succeed in opening lines of communication within families. Effective and honest communication by DHS with family members allow many children to remain safely with person [whom] they know and love rather [than] in foster care. DHS workers routinely solicit information from families with the understanding that the information shared will not become public knowledge. Such assurances of confidentiality may be compromised when court records and files about a family are opened to the news media.

Id. at 204 and 338.

It was this compelling privacy interest of the children and families involved in child abuse and neglect investigations that counsel for DHS attempted to communicate to counsel for Movant by telephone. Rather than address this compelling privacy interest, counsel for Movant dismissed the interest by misrepresenting counsel's concerns as anger at him for filing a motion. Counsel for Movant does not acknowledge that the Hawai'i Supreme Court specifically held that it is the interests of the minor children in these cases that are paramount, and must be protected over any third party interest, including his own. There is no reasonable argument that the release of Appellant's name, and sufficient information to determine that case involved a Child Protective Act investigation, is in the best interests of the minor child involved. Counsel for Movant wisely does not even try to make one.

Both the Hawai'i Supreme Court and the Intermediate Court of Appeals seal Child Protective Act cases in the same way that this Court sealed this record. Attached as Exhibits 1 and 2 are a recent Intermediate Court of Appeals opinion and Supreme Court order along with the eCourt Kokua search results for the cases. No party names are included and none of the pleadings are publicly available. DHS requests that this Court treat this case the same way.

II. CONCLUSION.

DHS requests that the Motion to Unseal be denied.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, September 25, 2023.

/s/ Lynne M. Youmans
LYNNE M. YOUMANS
Deputy Attorney General
Attorney for Department of Human Services

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAI'I

DAVID ALAN LOPEZ,) 1CCV-20-0000762
)
 Appellant,) DECLARATION OF LYNNE M. YOUMANS
)
 vs.)
)
 DIANE R. CORN, Hearing Officer,)
 Administrative Appeals Office, State of)
 Hawai'i Department of Human Services, and)
 STATE OF HAWAI'I DEPARTMENT OF)
 HUMAN SERVICES,)
)
 Appellees.)
)
 _____)

DECLARATION OF LYNNE M. YOUMANS

STATE OF HAWAI'I)
) SS.
 CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU)

I, LYNNE M. YOUMANS, declare under penalty of perjury as follows:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of Hawai'i.
2. I am a Deputy Attorney General and the attorney of record for the State of Hawai'i, Department of Human Services (DHS), in the above-entitled action.
3. I am competent to make this declaration and do so on personal knowledge of the facts herein, except as to matters averred to upon information and belief, which I am informed and believe to be true. I submit this Declaration in support of Department of Human Services' Motion to Dismiss Administrative Proceedings.

4. The opinion and order attached hereto as Exhibits 1 and 2 were downloaded from the Judiciary website. The search results were screenshots that I took after looking up the underlying cases in the Judiciary's online system, eCourt Kookua.

Executed at Honolulu, Hawai'i, September 25, 2023.

/s/ Lynne M. Youmans
LYNNE M. YOUMANS
Deputy Attorney General
Attorney for Department of Human Services

EXHIBIT

1

**Electronically Filed
Intermediate Court of Appeals
CAAP-22-0000636
19-SEP-2023
08:02 AM
Dkt. 62 MO**

NO. CAAP-22-0000636

IN THE INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS
OF THE STATE OF HAWAI'I

IN THE INTEREST OF THE P CHILDREN

APPEAL FROM THE FAMILY COURT OF THE SECOND CIRCUIT
(FC-S NO. 19-1-0083 AND FC-S NO. 19-1-0084)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

(By: Ginoza, Chief Judge, Leonard and Hiraoka, JJ.)

Respondent-Appellant Mother (**Mother**), appeals from orders entered on September 26, 2022, revoking foster custody and granting permanent custody of FP and AP (collectively **Children**) to Petitioner-Appellee Department of Human Services (**DHS**) in the Family Court of the Second Circuit (**Family Court**) in FC-S Nos. 19-1-0083 and FC-S 19-1-0084, respectively (**TPR Orders**).^{1 2}

Mother raises two points of error asserting the Family Court erred by: (1) appointing a guardian ad litem who had previously represented Mother in a prior Child Protective Services (**CPS**) matter, and (2) failing to appoint new counsel for Mother after granting her court-appointed counsel's post-trial motion to withdraw.

¹ The Honorable Michelle Drewyer presided.

² The Children's father (**Father**) did not appeal the TPR Orders.

On June 13, 2023, this court issued an order referencing holdings by the Hawai'i Supreme Court in In re L.I., 149 Hawai'i 118, 482 P.3d 1079 (2021), and ordered the parties to submit supplemental briefing as to "whether appointment of counsel for Mother was timely."

Based on the record and pursuant to requirements under prevailing case law, we vacate orders affecting custody of the Children from June 21, 2019, when the Family Court first ordered temporary foster custody without appointing counsel for Mother in this case. We remand to the Family Court for further proceedings.

I. Background

FP was born in May 2017 and AP was born in April 2019.

On June 6, 2019, DHS filed a Petition for Family Supervision (**Petition for Supervision**) due to Mother's drug abuse impairing her ability to safely care for the Children. That day, DHS also filed a safe family home report, identifying safety factors as "Mother's history of substance abuse, and family is transient."

On June 8, 2019, DHS personally served Mother with the Petition for Supervision.

On June 21, 2019, the Family Court held a return hearing on the Petition for Supervision wherein DHS moved for, and the Family Court granted, DHS's oral motion for temporary foster custody of the Children upon location. Mother did not appear at the hearing and the Family Court stayed default against her.

On July 2, 2019, Mother appeared and the Family Court ordered her to return on July 16, 2019 with counsel.³

³ The hearing minutes do not reflect what, if any, advisement Mother received regarding the availability of court-appointed counsel. Additionally, the record does not contain a transcript of the July 2, 2019 hearing. Thus, it is unclear what, if any, advisement Mother received regarding the availability of court-appointed counsel.

On July 16, 2019, Mother failed to appear, thus the Family Court entered an order establishing jurisdiction and granting DHS foster custody of the Children.

On November 12, 2019, Mother applied for and received court-appointed counsel. This occurred 159 days (over 5 months) after DHS filed its Petition for Supervision, and 144 days (over 4 months) after the Family Court granted DHS temporary foster custody of the Children.

The underlying cases proceeded, and on September 26, 2022, the Family Court entered the TPR Orders.

II. Discussion

"[T]he appellate court, at its option, may notice a plain error not presented." HRAP Rule 28(b)(4).⁴ Further, "[w]e answer questions of constitutional law by exercising our own independent constitutional judgment based on the facts of the case. Thus, we review questions of constitutional law under the right/wrong standard." State v. Ui, 142 Hawai'i 287, 292, 418 P.3d 628, 633 (2018) (citation omitted).

The Hawai'i Supreme Court, in In re T.M., held that:

We recognize that parents have a substantive liberty interest in the care, custody, and control of their children that is protected by the due process clause of article I, section 5 of the Hawai'i Constitution. Therefore, we additionally hold that parents have a constitutional right to counsel under article I, section 5 in parental termination proceedings and that from and after the filing date of this opinion, courts must appoint counsel for indigent parents once DHS files a petition to assert foster custody over a child.

131 Hawai'i 419, 421, 319 P.3d 338, 340 (2014) (emphasis added) (citation and footnote omitted).

Subsequently, in In re L.I., the Hawai'i Supreme Court further clarified:

⁴ HRAP Rule 28(b)(4) also states: "If an appellate court, when acting on a case on appeal, contemplates basing the disposition of the case wholly or in part upon an issue of plain error not raised by the parties through briefing, it shall not affirm, reverse, or vacate the case without allowing the parties the opportunity to brief the potential plain-error issue prior to disposition." In this appeal, we issued an order for supplemental briefing on the plain error issue we address herein.

We now take this opportunity to clarify that In re T.M. mandated that family courts appoint counsel for indigent parents when DHS files a petition asserting custody over a child. We now further hold that family courts must appoint counsel for indigent parents when DHS files a petition for family supervision because, at that point, parental rights are substantially affected as foster custody can be ordered by the court at a subsequent hearing.

. . . .

The failure to timely appoint counsel is structural error which . . . requires vacatur without the necessity of proving harmful error. The family court's failure to appoint Mother counsel when DHS filed its petition for family supervision was structural error and cannot be deemed harmless.

149 Hawai'i 118, 122-23, 482 P.3d 1079, 1083-84 (2021) (emphasis added) (citations and footnotes omitted).⁵ Thus, the supreme court in In re L.I. held that this court had erred by failing to vacate the family court's orders granting foster custody to DHS and terminating parental rights in that case. Id. at 123, 482 P.3d at 1084.

In this appeal, we notice plain error based on the prevailing case law and conclude that counsel for Mother was not appointed in a timely manner. Initially, we note that In re T.M. was issued in January 2014, prior to the initiation of this case in June 2019. Thus, the rulings in In re T.M. applied at the beginning of the proceedings in this case. However, In re L.I. was issued in March 2021, and thus the ruling therein extending

⁵ In Interest of JH, 152 Hawai'i 373, 526 P.3d 350 (2023), the Hawai'i Supreme Court subsequently distinguished In re L.I. and held:

A family court must timely appoint counsel in parental rights cases. Otherwise, structural error will nullify an outcome adverse to a parent. But the appointment, discharge, and reappointment of counsel is different.

We hold that if the family court appoints counsel at the onset of a parental rights case, and later there's a break in representation due to a parent's voluntary absence, then there is no structural error. As long as a fundamentally fair procedure ensues and due process is satisfied, the family court's decision will stand.

Id. at 376, 526 P.3d at 353 (emphasis added). In the instant case, we address the failure to timely appoint counsel for Mother at the initial stage, when DHS first asserted custody over the Children, and thus Interest of JH does not apply.

In re T.M. to the filing of a "petition for family supervision" was issued after the Petition for Supervision was filed in this case. We thus hold that, under In re T.M., the Family Court in this case failed to appoint counsel upon DHS's oral motion for temporary custody made at the June 21, 2019 hearing.⁶

In reaching this holding, we address DHS's position that a family court is required to confirm that a parent is indigent prior to appointing counsel. Based on the applicable authority, particularly In re L.I., DHS's position is incorrect. In re L.I., is instructive because, although it was issued in 2021, it dealt with a case initiated in the family court in June 2014, and is relevant to whether a court must decide indigency before counsel is appointed.

In In re L.I., this court, and subsequently the Hawai'i Supreme Court, addressed a factually similar scenario to the instant case, wherein a family court appointed counsel for a mother three months after her eldest child was placed in foster care. 149 Hawai'i at 120, 482 P.3d at 1081. Several years later, the family court terminated mother's parental rights. Id. On appeal, mother argued that the family court's three-month delay in appointing her counsel violated In re T.M. Id.

This court acknowledged the family court's error, but declined to overturn the termination of mother's parental rights noting, among other things, that mother's early departure from court the day her child was placed into foster custody, and her inconsistent responses to instructions to complete the paperwork necessary to establish indigency, contributed to the delay in her

⁶ Although DHS's motion seeking to assert custody of the Children was made verbally at the hearing, and not in a written filing, we conclude that In re T.M. would apply at that time. The analysis in In re T.M. is concerned with when a parent's liberty interest in the care, custody and control of their child is at stake. 131 Hawai'i at 421, 433-36, 319 P.3d at 340, 352-55. As demonstrated in this case, a verbal motion for foster custody can result in an immediate order granting the motion.

appointment of counsel. In re L.I., No. CAAP-18-0000773, 2020 WL 1679419, at *3 (Haw. App. April 6, 2020) (SDO), vacated, 149 Hawai'i 118, 482 P.3d 1079 (2021).

As noted above, the Hawai'i Supreme Court vacated this court's decision. In re L.I., 149 Hawai'i at 123, 482 P.3d at 1084. In doing so, the supreme court clarified that "In re T.M. mandated that family courts appoint counsel for indigent parents when DHS files a petition asserting custody over a child[.]" and the court further held that "family courts must appoint counsel for indigent parents when DHS files a petition for family supervision[.]" Id. at 122, 482 P.3d at 1083 (emphasis added).

The Hawai'i Supreme Court re-emphasized its rationale underlying In re T.M., namely, that parental rights are substantially affected upon the filing of a petition asserting custody over a child, and that mandating appointment of counsel once DHS initiates action for custody removes the vagaries of a case-by-case approach. In re L.I., 149 Hawai'i at 122, 482 P.3d at 1083.

In In re L.I., the supreme court also noted it had explained in In re T.M. that "indigent criminal defendants have a right to an attorney whenever they are threatened by imprisonment, even if imprisonment is not subsequently imposed[.]" and that "attempting to determine in advance of the proceedings whether legal representation would ultimately be required is an exercise in futility. The safeguard for parental rights thus rests on the appointment of counsel at the beginning of proceedings[.]" Id. at 122 n.5, 482 P.3d at 1083 n.5 (emphasis added) (quoting In re T.M., 131 Hawai'i at 435 n.23, 319 P.3d at 354 n.23).

The Hawai'i Supreme Court did not specifically address the question of when a family court is required to determine indigency for purposes of appointing counsel in a termination of parental rights proceeding, which the court recognized as a right under article I, section 5 of the Hawai'i Constitution. However, In re L.I. constructively forecloses DHS's argument in this case,

that a family court must determine indigency before appointing counsel. First, In re L.I. holds that counsel must be appointed when DHS **files** a petition for family supervision or for custody, and also noted that to safeguard parental rights the appointment should be at the beginning of the proceedings. Id. at 122, 122 n.5, 482 P.3d at 1083, 1083 n.5. Further, in In re L.I., the supreme court rejected this court's rationale for not vacating the family court orders, which was that the mother's "early departure from the courtroom on January 13, 2015, her failure to provide DHS a specific street address for her new residence, and her inconsistent responses to voicemail messages and instructions for completing the paperwork necessary to establish her indigency all contributed greatly to the delay." Id. at 121, 482 P.3d at 1082 (emphasis added) (footnote omitted). In short, the supreme court focused on DHS's filing of a petition as the trigger for the family court's obligation to appoint counsel; not the family court's determination of indigency.⁷

Applying In re T.M. and In re L.I. here, we hold that: (1) the Family Court was not required to determine indigency prior to appointing counsel for Mother; and (2) the Family Court's failure to appoint counsel for Mother for 144 days, between June 21, 2019 (when temporary foster custody was requested and granted) to November 12, 2019 (when counsel was appointed) was structural error which requires vacatur of orders affecting custody of the Children from June 21, 2019. Id. at 123, 482 P.3d at 1084 ("Pursuant to the holding in In re T.M., the failure to appoint counsel is a structural error that requires vacatur of orders made after DHS's filing for foster custody"). Consistent with In re L.I., we must remand this case to the Family Court for further proceedings to consider the best interest of the Children. Id.

⁷ In re L.I. is silent about the possibility that a family court consider indigency of a parent after counsel is initially appointed to protect the parent's rights.

We decline to address the parties' remaining arguments.

III. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, we vacate the orders revoking foster custody and granting permanent custody of FP and AP to DHS, entered on September 26, 2022, in the Family Court of the Second Circuit in FC-S Nos. 19-1-0083 and FC-S 19-1-0084, respectively. We also vacate orders affecting custody of the Children issued from June 21, 2019. This case is remanded to the Family Court for further proceedings consistent with this Memorandum Opinion and considering the best interests of the Children.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, September 19, 2023.

On the briefs:

Matthew Mannisto,
for Mother-Appellant

Terence Y. Herndon,
Julio C. Herrera,
Patrick A. Pascual,
Abigail S. Dunn Apana,
Deputy Attorneys General,
for Petitioner-Appellee

Nicole Forelli,
Guardian Ad Litem

/s/ Lisa M. Ginoza
Chief Judge

/s/ Katherine G. Leonard
Associate Judge

/s/ Keith K. Hiraoka
Associate Judge



- Home
- Party Search
- Vehicle Search
- Case Search**
- Upcoming Court Hearings Search
- View / Purchase Documents

Case Search • Filing Date Search

Case Search

Search Criteria

Please enter as much information as possible (*denotes required field).

Case ID or Citation Number:

Application Number:

Beginning Case Filing Date:

Arrest Number:

TCT Number:

Ending Case Filing Date:

OTN:

SID:



Privacy - Terms

Search results for criteria: Case ID or Citation Number: CAAP-22-0000636

Case ID	Court	Location	Case Type	Case Title	Filing Date ▲	Status
CAAP-22-0000636	CA	CA	AP	Case Title Redacted	26-OCT-2022	ACTIVE





- Home
- Party Search
- Vehicle Search
- Case Search**
- Upcoming Court Hearings Search
- View / Purchase Documents

Case Search • Filing Date Search

Case Search

Search Criteria

*Please enter as much information as possible (*denotes required field).*

Case ID or Citation Number:

Application Number:

Beginning Case Filing Date:

Arrest Number:

TCT Number:

Ending Case Filing Date:

OTN:

SID:

 • The case you are attempting to view is confidential and not public record at this time. 

EXHIBIT

2

**Electronically Filed
Supreme Court
SCWC-21-0000557
21-AUG-2023
09:36 AM
Dkt. 21 ODAC**

SCWC-21-0000557

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAI‘I

IN THE INTEREST OF KY Y

CERTIORARI TO THE INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS
(CAAP-21-0000557; FC-S No. 18-1-0150)

ORDER REJECTING APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
(By: Recktenwald, C.J., and McKenna, J., Circuit Judge Morikone,
in place of Eddins, J., recused, and Circuit Judge Nakamoto
and Circuit Judge Park, assigned by reason of vacancies)

Petitioner/Appellee-Intervenor Paternal Grandmother’s
Application for Writ of Certiorari, filed on July 3, 2023, is
hereby rejected.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai‘i, August 21, 2023.

/s/ Mark E. Recktenwald

/s/ Sabrina S. McKenna

/s/ Henry T. Nakamoto

/s/ Kevin T. Morikone

/s/ Shanlyn A.S. Park





- Home
- Party Search
- Vehicle Search
- Case Search**
- Upcoming Court Hearings Search
- View / Purchase Documents

Case Search • Filing Date Search

Case Search

Search Criteria

Please enter as much information as possible (*denotes required field).

Case ID or Citation Number:

Application Number:

Beginning Case Filing Date:

Arrest Number:

TCT Number:

Ending Case Filing Date:

OTN:

SID:



Privacy - Terms

Search results for criteria: Case ID or Citation Number: SCWC-21-0000557

Case ID	Court	Location	Case Type	Case Title	Filing Date	Status
SCWC-21-0000557	SC	SC	WC	Case Title Redacted	03-JUL-2023	CLOSEDS





- Home
- Party Search
- Vehicle Search
- Case Search**
- Upcoming Court Hearings Search
- View / Purchase Documents

Case Search • Filing Date Search

Case Search

Search Criteria

*Please enter as much information as possible (*denotes required field).*

Case ID or Citation Number:

Application Number:

Beginning Case Filing Date:



Arrest Number:

TCT Number:

Ending Case Filing Date:

OTN:

SID:

 • The case you are attempting to view is confidential and not public record at this time. 

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was
duly served this date on the following parties at the address listed below:

ROBERT BRIAN BLACK. ESQ.
BENJAMIN M. CREPS, ESQ.
Civil Beat Law Center for the Public Interest
700 Bishop Street, Suite 1701
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813

Attorneys for Movant

DAVID LOPEZ
91-153A Ewa Beach Road
Ewa Beach, Hawai'i 96706

Appellant Pro Se

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, September 25, 2023.

/s/ Lynne M. Youmans
LYNNE M. YOUMANS
Deputy Attorney General
Attorney for Department of Human Services