		/			1	
IN '	THE SUPI	ERIOR COU	RT FOR TH	E STATE OF	ALASKA	
	THIRD	JUDICIAL	DISTRICT	AT ANCHOR		ূ ভু সু
PLANNED PAREN JAN WHITEFIEL KLEM, M.D., J	LD, M.D.	, ROBERT	)		DEPUTY	100 DE

JAN WHITEFIELD, M.D., ROBERT KLEM, M.D., JANE DOES I-X,

Plaintiffs.

V.

STATE OF ALASKA,

Defendant.

Civ. No. 34N 97-6014 CI

# COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Plaintiffs, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby set forth the following allegations as their complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief:

## PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. On May 2, 1997, HCS CSSB 24(Fin)("SB 24" or "the Act") was enacted. A true and authentic copy of SB 24 is attached hereto as Exhibit A. The effective date of the act is July 31, 1997. In pertinent part, this law prevents any unmarried woman under 17 years of age from having an abortion in Alaska unless she has obtained the consent of a parent, guardian or custodian or a court order authorizing this procedure. Any person who performs an abortion on a minor who has not complied with these consent procedures is subject to criminal and civil liability.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- The Act requires that the minor seek consent or judicial approval even if she is mature enough to make an informed decision, even if she will suffer physical abuse if she were to confer with a parent, even if she is pregnant as a result of incest, and even if the pregnancy poses a threat to her health. No similar requirement is imposed where a minor seeks contraceptive, prenatal care or testing, or even when she undergoes a cesarean section. Indeed, for more than twenty years, no parental consent requirement has been enforced for minors needing abortions. With passage of SB 24, that has changed.
- 3. SB 24 will unlawfully interfere with a young woman's fundamental right of reproductive choice. This law will prevent many minors from obtaining safe abortions and force them into continuing their pregnancies to term even when this decision is adverse to their best interests. SB 24 will delay or impede others from obtaining an abortion to the detriment of their Moreover, SB 24 discriminates against young women health. needing abortions.
- 4. The State of Alaska cannot show a compelling state interest to justify enactment of this new law.
- SB 24 therefore violates the Alaska Constitution's right to privacy, Art. 1, sec. 22, its guarantee of equal protection under the laws, Art. 1, sec. 1, its guarantee of due process under Art. 1, sec. 7, its guarantee of equal rights,

6. This Court has jurisdiction under AS 22.10.020. Venue is appropriate in the Superior Court, Third Judicial District, at Anchorage.

### PARTIES

- 7. Plaintiff Planned Parenthood of Alaska, Inc. (`PPA'') is a non-profit corporation duly organized in accordance with the laws of the State of Alaska and has its principal place of business in Anchorage, Alaska. PPA operates clinics in Anchorage, Sitka, and Soldotna, where it provides services to more than 3500 patients per year, including young women under the age of seventeen. Included among services PPA provides to its clients are family planning, pregnancy testing and counseling and referral on pregnancy options, including prenatal care, abortion and adoption. PPA also provides educational services to adolescents in schools and other institutional settings. PPA is a public interest litigant. It sues on its own behalf and that of its patients.
- 8. Plaintiff Dr. Jan Whitefield is a physician licensed to practice medicine in the State of Alaska. Dr. Whitefield is board-certified in obstetrics and gynecology and is the medical director of Alaska Women's Health Services in Anchorage. Dr. Whitefield and other physicians at that facility perform

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

approximately 1200 first trimester abortions per year; of these approximately five percent are provided to young women under the age of seventeen. For fear of being abused, thrown from the home, or prevented from having abortions, some of these minor patients who need abortions cannot seek consent as now required under SB 24. These patients include unemancipated minors who are mature enough to make an independent decision about abortion and minors whose best interests would be served by an abortion. Before proceeding with these services, Dr. Whitefield provides his patients with counseling on pregnancy options, and performs abortions on those patients whom he believes have made an informed decision regarding their pregnancy. Under the new law, Dr. Whitefield may be both criminally and civilly liable should he provide abortion services to a minor who has not obtained appropriate consent or a court order approving the abortion. Dr. Whitefield is a public interest litigant who sues on behalf of himself and his patients.

Plaintiff Dr. Robert Klem is a physician licensed to practice medicine in the State of Alaska. Dr. Klem is the chief of obstetrics/gynecology at the Sitka Community Hospital and is a family practitioner at the Sitka Medical Center. Dr. Klem provides medical abortions to women in Sitka through seven weeks of pregnancy measured from the woman's last menstrual period Dr. Klem's patients include unmarried and pregnant women under the age of seventeen. For fear of being abused, thrown

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

from the home, or prevented from having an abortion, some of these minor patients who need abortions cannot seek consent as now required under SB 24. These patients include unemancipated minors who are mature enough to make an independent decision about abortion and minors whose best interests would be served by an abortion. Before proceeding with these services, Dr. Klem provides his patients with counseling on pregnancy options, and performs abortions on those patients whom he believes have made an informed decision regarding their pregnancy. Under the new law, Dr. Klem may be both criminally and civilly liable should he provide abortion services to a minor who has not obtained appropriate consent or a judicial order approving the abortion. Dr. Klem is a public interest litigant who sues on behalf of himself and his patients.

- 10. Plaintiff JANE DOES 1-X are anonymous minor and pregnant woman who may in the future seek abortion services without complying with the consent or judicial bypass provisions mandated under the new law. The rights and interests of Plaintiffs Jane Does I-X with respect to autonomous reproductive decisionmaking and access to safe, legal abortions may be represented by the other named plaintiffs in this case.
- 11. Defendant, the State of Alaska, represented by the Attorney General through the Department of Law, is charged with prosecuting physicians and others who provide abortion services in violation of the act. The State Medical Board is the agency

FELEPHONE (907) 274-4004

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

charged with adopting procedures, regulations and standards to implement AS 18.16.010, except for the forms for the complaint and notice of appeal and court rules which are to be drafted by the Alaska Supreme Court under SB 24.

#### SUMMARY OF SB 24

- 12. SB 24 prohibits physicians from providing abortion services to ``an unmarried, unemancipated minor under 17 years of age'' unless: (a) the minor's parent, custodian or guardian has consented in writing to the abortion, (b) a court issues an order authorizing the minor to consent to the abortion without consent of the minor's parent, guardian or custodian, and the minor consents to the abortion, or (c) a court, by not acting, constructively authorizes the minor to consent to the abortion without consent of her parent, guardian or custodian and the minor consents.
- Violations of the Act give rise to civil and criminal 13. SB 24 provides that any person who knowingly provides an abortion in violation of the consent or judicial bypass provisions is subject to prosecution for a Class C felony, punishable by up to 5 years imprisonment and a fine up to \$1000 and may be civilly liable to the minor, her parents, guardian or custodian for compensatory and punitive damages.
- The Act provides no exceptions to its mandates. Rather, SB 24 only makes available affirmative defenses to prosecution or a civil action. Even then, the defenses are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SB 24 provides for affirmative defenses where (a) the minor gave the provider false, misleading or incorrect information about the minor's age, marital status or emancipation and the provider did not have reasonable cause to believe the minor was under 17, unemancipated and unmarried, or (b) compliance was not possible because, in the good faith clinical judgment of the physician, an immediate abortion was necessary to avert the minor's death or to prevent a ``serious risk of substantial and irreversible impairment of a major bodily function''. Under SB 24, a physician is subject to penalty even if provided misleading information as to the consent of the parent, guardian or custodian, or if the pregnancy presents a serious risk of substantial, but temporary, compromise of the minor's physical health. In these circumstances, the Act does not provide a defense.

15. Under SB 24, to avoid the consent requirements, a minor must proceed to court. She must file a complaint in superior court alleging either that (a) she is ``sufficiently mature and well enough informed to decide intelligently whether to have an abortion without parental, guardian or custodial consent'', (b) a parent, guardian or custodian physically, sexually or emotionally abused the minor or that the consent of such person is ``otherwise not in the minor's best interest,'' The Court must strictly construe the minor's petition and consider only the grounds alleged in the petition.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

court must accordingly deny the petition if the minor fails to prove the asserted basis even if shows she is entitled to judicial authorization.

- Under SB 24, failure of the superior court to hold a hearing within the fifth business day of the minor's filing the complaint constitutes a constructive order authorizing the complainant to consent to the abortion.
- SB 24 permits a complainant to request that the hearing be held telephonically. However, the Act does not require the Court to accommodate the minor at the hearing, whether in person or telephonically.
- Should the superior court hold the hearing, the minor must prove her allegations by clear and convincing evidence. after a hearing the court dismisses the complaint, the minor may appeal to the Supreme Court. The minor must file a brief within four days of the notice of appeal being docketed. The Supreme Court must hold a hearing within five days after the appeal is Failure of that court to enter judgment within five days of docketing of the appeal constitutes a constructive order of the court authorizing the minor to obtain an abortion.
- 19. SB 24 states the court may not notify the parents, guardian or custodian that a complainant is pregnant and seeks an abortion and that judicial proceedings are to be done in a manner to preserve the anonymity of the complainant. also states that the complaint and all other records pertaining

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

to the action are to be kept confidential and are not public records.

- If a minor alleges abuse as a ground for judicial authorization, or during the bypass hearing evidence is introduced indicating that the minor has been subjected to abuse, the superior court may order a preliminary investigation to determine whether the minor is a child in need of aid (CINA) under A.S. 47.10.010, et seq. If the investigation results in a CINA petition being filed, the minor's parents must receive notice of the CINA proceedings under A.S. 47.10.030(b).
- SB 24 also requires the court to appoint an attorney 21. if the complainant has not retained counsel. However, this right to appointed counsel does not arise until after the minor files her petition alleging the basis for the requested relief.
- SB 24 was enacted over the veto of the Governor and despite an opinion letter from the Attorney General that the act is ``vulnerable to a successful challenge under the United States Constitution and will likely be determined unconstitutional under the Alaska Constitution". authentic copy of this April 24, 1997 Attorney General opinion letter is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
- 23. SB 24 repeals, in part, former AS 18.16.010(a)(3) which contained a parental consent requirement for minors seeking abortions. That provision, however, has not been enforced since 1976 because the Department of Law opined repeatedly that the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

statute was constitutionally infirm. As a result, the law has not been enforced since 1976.

# STATEMENT OF THE CASE

- Women in Alaska, including minors, seek abortions for a variety of physical health, psychological, familial, economic and personal reasons.
- In Alaska and throughout the United States, in the 25. majority of cases, one or both of the minor's parents know she is obtaining an abortion. The younger the minor, the more likely she is to involve a parent.
- When minors do not involve a parent in deciding whether to have an abortion, they generally have compelling Forced notice can lead to a number of serious adverse consequences, including, but not limited to, physical violence against the minor, physical violence against other family members, forced pregnancy, childbirth and motherhood (when the parent prevents the minor from terminating the pregnancy), or other types of parental retribution against the minor, such as expulsion from the home or other punishment.
- Minors who cannot involve a parent in the decision 27. whether to continue or terminate their pregnancies will take extreme action to avoid parental involvement, including, but not limited to, suicide, obtaining illegal abortions, self-inducing abortions, or carrying an unwanted pregnancy to term. these alternatives seriously risks a minor's life and health.

- 28. Minors tend to seek abortions later in pregnancy than adult women for a number of reasons, including the increased irregularity of their menstrual cycles, making it harder to detect their pregnancy, a greater likelihood of denying their pregnancies, and added difficulties in amassing funds and arranging travel to obtain an abortion.
- 29. Abortion at any stage of pregnancy is considered one of the safest medical procedures. However, delay in the performance of an abortion increases the health risk that women face in connection with the procedure. While the risks associated with abortion increase with gestational age, the risks of childbirth are twice the risk of an abortion after twelve weeks. At no time before 21 weeks do the risks of abortion exceed those incurred with childbirth.
- 30. Abortions become more expensive the later in pregnancy they are performed, and there are fewer providers available to provide the service later in pregnancy. In Southeast Alaska, abortion services are not available after seven weeks of pregnancy. Alaskan women who seek an abortion after 14 weeks LMP have limited options and often must travel outside the state.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- The farther a woman has to travel to obtain an abortion, the less likely she is to obtain one. burdens such as increased cost and time on women seeking abortions.
- 32. A requirement that all minors consult a parent, guardian or custodian will harm minors. Some, if forced to consult a parent, will suffer harm including abuse, eviction from the home, or forced parenthood. In other instances, the parent or other adult who may consent will be unavailable, leading to delay in the minor obtaining care, to the detriment of her health.
- The mandated parental consent requirements will not foster family structure. When a fundamental conflict exists between a parent and a minor child, affording parents a veto power over the minor's fundamental right to reproductive choice will not remedy an already troubled relationship.
- The mandated consent requirement also will not protect the health of minor women. Most minors seeking abortion services are sufficiently mature to provide informed consent in consultation with their physician. In those limited circumstances where minors are unable to consult with their parents on their medical needs, minors in consultation with their physicians, other family members and other counseling resources are able to best address the decision of whether to continue or terminate the pregnancy. Physicians will not provide

- 35. For those minors who cannot obtain parental, guardian or custodial consent, the judicial bypass provisions does not provide an adequate substitute. The reasons include, but are not limited to, the following:
- (a) Minors forced to pursue a judicial bypass will be delayed in obtaining care, as they struggle to determine how to pursue a bypass, await a time when they can travel to court undetected by a parent or guardian, and pursue the bypass.
- (b) The problems presented by the bypass will be particularly great for minors in rural areas. They will face increased hurdles attempting to travel to court and to do so without detection from a parent or guardian. Should they get to court, they risk being seen by a family friend or acquaintance, and thus losing confidentiality. A telephonic hearing does not cure these problems since a minor still must find access to a private line, outside the home, during court hours.
- (c) For all minors, the delay created by the bypass will come at the expense of their health. The delay also will make the abortion more expensive and less available. For some minors, the delay inherent in the bypass will prevent them from being able to obtain an abortion in Alaska. For still others, even attempting the bypass will be impossible, leaving the minor little choice but to continue the pregnancy to term.

	•
9	)
10	)
11	L
12	3
13	3
14	Ļ
15	5
16	3
17	7

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

(d) The specific bypass procedure under SB 24 burden
minors seeking abortions. The act's strict pleading
requirements will infringe on a minor's right of reproductive
choice, by causing the court to deny some minors bypasses to
which they would be entitled but for these strictures.

- The standard of proof required by the Act will impermissibly restrict minors' access to abortion.
- The Act burdens the minor's right to (f) confidentiality for the grounds set forth above and by permitting the court to trigger a CINA investigation under AS 47.10. et seq. when, in the course of a bypass, the minor discloses abuse.
- (q) A requirement of a judicial bypass will not further the minors' health or otherwise serve a state interest.
- (h) By its express language, the Act does not allow the court to address whether the abortion is in the best interest of the minor.
- The Act precludes the court from providing (i) substitute consent for an abortion procedure for a minor whom the court finds is insufficiently mature to make this decision if the Court concludes that the minor's best interest is served by obtaining parental consent.
- SB 24 will impair a minor's exercise of her right of reproductive choice by deterring physicians from providing abortion services. Physicians will be chilled from providing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

care for reasons including but not limited to the act's failure to provide a life and health exception to civil or criminal prosecution, the act's limited and vague definition of medical emergency, and the act's failure to include as a defense fraud or misrepresentation as to the provision of parental consent.

- The inadequacies of the judicial bypass provision will result in some minors being forced to leave the State to obtain an abortion. These young women will face not only prohibitive expenses, but possibly substantial risks to their health from undue delay in access to these medical services. Other minors may simply forego seeking an abortion rather than comply with the consent or judicial bypass provisions of the act and carry an unwanted pregnancy to term. Others may resort to self-help or inadequately trained persons to seek to terminate their pregnancies.
- SB 24 will immediately and irreparably harm some pregnant minors by denying them the opportunity to obtain timely and safe abortions. These young women will suffer the irreparable harm of forced parenthood.
- For some minors in need of abortion services, SB 24 will pose an insurmountable barrier because they do not want or cannot obtain parental or guardian consent, they are fearful of the judicial bypass procedure, they cannot satisfy those requirements in a timely fashion, or they cannot locate

40. SB 24 subjects minors choosing to terminate their pregnancies to unique burdens. Under Alaska law, unemancipated minors under the age of seventeen can obtain other medical services and exercise other privileges and rights, including the right to carry a pregnancy to term, without being required to obtain parental consent or satisfy a judicial bypass provision. Minors choosing to carry a pregnancy can obtain prenatal services, invasive testing and even cesarean sections without parental consent or court order. Minors also may obtain treatment for venereal disease, among other services, without parental consent.

## COUNT I -- CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO PRIVACY

- 41. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in pars. 1-40 above.
- 42. SB 24 unlawfully infringes upon a minor's right to reproductive choice under the Alaska Constitution's right to privacy, article 1, sec. 22. That constitutional section is interpreted by the Alaska Courts to provide privacy protection greater than that afforded under the U.S. Constitution.

#### COUNT II -- EQUAL PROTECTION

43. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in pars. 1-42 above.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SB 24 violates the equal protection and inherent rights clause of Art. 1, Sec. 1, of the Alaska Constitution by unjustly discriminating among suspect and arbitrary classifications, including but not limited to, between those minors who reside in rural areas and those who reside in urban areas, between those minors who reside in areas with ready access to the courts and those who do not, between those minors who seek abortion services and those who seek to carry their pregnancies to term, between those minors who seek abortion services and those minors who seek other services, between those persons under age 17 and those persons who are older, and between those persons who are married and emancipated and those persons who are not. SB 24 also discriminates against young women based on their residency, marital status, pregnancy, medical needs and sex.

#### COUNT III -- DUE PROCESS

- Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in pars. 1-44 above.
- SB 24 violates the due process clause of Art. 1, sec. 7 of the Alaska Constitution denies substantive due process because this law is not substantially related to any lawful, valid purpose and it is unconstitutionally vaque.

COUNT IV -- VIOLATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL CIVIL RIGHTS

Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-46 above.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SB 24 violates the civil rights of plaintiffs 48. protected by the Alaska Constitution, Article I, section 3, which provides, in relevant part, that `[n]o person is to be denied the enjoyment of any civil or political right because of sex . . . '' by imposing substantial restrictions on the constitutional rights of young women.

### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, plaintiffs pray for the following relief:

- That the Court issue a judgment declaring that SB 24 is unlawful and void under the Alaska Constitution;
- That the Court issue an injunction permanently restraining the State of Alaska and its agencies and instrumentalities from implementing or enforcing this act;
- That the Court declare plaintiffs are public interest litigants;
- 4. That the Court award plaintiffs attorneys fees and costs; and
- 5. That the Court award plaintiffs such other relief as it deems just.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter Judgment in their favor on the claims made and for the relief requested in this complaint.

						î
						2
						3
						4
						5
						6
						7
						8
	ATTORNEY AT LAW	ATTORNEY AT LAW 1036 WEST 22ND STREET ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99503 TELEPHONE (907) 274-4004			9	
JOYCE E. BAMBERGER					10	
					11	
			_			12
			ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99503	1-4004		13
				77 27		14
				TELEPHONE (90		15
						16
2						1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18
						18
						19
					,	20
					,	21
					,	22
					;	23
						24
						25
						26
						27

Dated this $25^{\text{fW}}$ day of July, 1997.								
Dated	this	23	day	of	July,	1997.		

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

Jøyce E. Bamberger)
Law Office of Joyce E.
Bamberger

Cooperating Attorney
Alaska Civil Liberties Union
Foundation

Janet Crepps
Janet Crepps
Center for Reproductive Law &
Policy
500 East 8th Avenue, Suite 100

Denver, Colorado 80203