

Washington Law Review

Volume 30
Number 3 *Washington Legislation-1955*

8-1-1955

Juveniles

William E. Love
University of Washington School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr>



Part of the [Family Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

William E. Love, Washington Legislation, *Juveniles*, 30 Wash. L. Rev. & St. B.J. 210 (1955).
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol30/iss3/6>

This Washington Legislation is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews and Journals at UW Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington Law Review by an authorized editor of UW Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact lawref@uw.edu.

recently litigated provision of the Massachusetts Adoption Law.⁹ The data concerning religion presumably is simply an element to be considered in the general decision bearing upon the propriety of the proposed adoption.

A final observation should be made of a change in section 2. That section provides who may adopt and where the proceedings shall be initiated. It permits petition in either the county of the petitioner's *residence* or the county in which the person to be adopted is *domiciled*. The word "domiciled" has been substituted for the word "resides" used in the prior act. There is substantial agreement among the authorities¹⁰ that jurisdiction for adoption requires that either the adopter or person to be adopted is domiciled within the state. Prior to 1943 a non-domiciliary could not adopt in the Washington courts.¹¹ By a 1943 amendment to the code it was made possible for such persons to adopt, in Washington, if the petition was made in the "county in which the person to be adopted resides."¹² The present amendment makes express what was heretofore probably intended. The effect of this amendment upon venue for the proceeding is, of course, obvious.

LUVERN RIEKE

JUVENILES

The governor is authorized to enter into interstate compacts with respect to cooperative supervision of delinquent juveniles, the apprehension and return of delinquents who have escaped or absconded, and the return of nondelinquent run-away juveniles.¹

Any juvenile apprehended under the act must be brought before a judicial officer in the state in which he is taken into custody before he can be returned to the demanding state. The juvenile has the right to a hearing with counsel to test the legality of the proceeding if he so desires, before being returned to the demanding state.

Two provisions affecting parents and guardians of children before the juvenile court were enacted. One permits the court to order parents and guardians, who are able, to contribute to the payment of the cost of detention of their child or ward, notwithstanding the fact that such

⁹ *Petitions of Goldman* (Mass.) 121 N.E.2d 843 (1954) *Cert. Denied*, 75 S. Ct. 363.

¹⁰ GOODRICH, *CONFLICT OF LAWS*, 2nd Ed., West Publishing Company, § 142, p. 382.

¹¹ *Knight v. Galloway*, 42 Wash. 413, 85 Pac. 21 (1906); *Platt v. Magagnini*, 110 Wash. 39, 187 Pac. 716 (1920).

¹² RCW 26.32.020.

¹ C. 284.

child may not have been found to be either a dependent or delinquent child.² There also is in existence an older law which permits the court to order parents and guardians, who are able, to contribute to the support of *delinquent* and *dependent* children who are committed.³

Both RCW 13.04.100 and Chapter 284, Laws of 1955, provide that orders or decrees against parents can be enforced by "execution or in any way a court of equity may enforce decrees." Another new enactment provides that in any case in which a parent or guardian is in default on any payments, the court may, by following the appropriate procedure, enter judgment for such amount against the defaulting party, and docket the judgment in order to obtain a lien.⁴ The prosecuting attorney may then procede in the usual manner to collect the judgment on behalf of the county.

WILLIAM E. LOVE

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Statute Law Committees. Of the 412 laws passed by the 1955 legislature at both the regular and special sessions, 24 were submitted by the statute law committee largely to undo what was done in putting together the Revised Code of Washington. All of the committee's bills were enacted into law, and may be found in Chapters 5-15 and 32-44 inclusive. Explanatory notes follow the text of each bill prepared by the committee for submission to the legislature.

Seven of the committee's bills resulted in reenactments of complete titles of RCW.¹ The committee also completed a comprehensive review of Titles 2 and 3 and in several instances successfully recommended the removal, repeal and correction of obsolete or conflicting provisions, and the restoration of certain ambiguous sections of RCW to the original language of the session laws.

The seven titles and other enactments in their revised form become, of course, the law. The RCW version—should there be any discre-

² C. 369. In *In Re Hudson*, 13 Wn.2d 673, 126 P.2d 765 (1942), the court held that a juvenile court lacked statutory authority to make a custody order unless it first found the child dependent or delinquent. Whether under this 1955 act the court can place in detention one not found to be delinquent or dependent, as technically set forth by statute, is not clear.

³ RCW 13.04.100.

⁴ C. 183.

¹ RCW Title 20 (Commission Merchants); Title 25 (Partnerships); Title 30 (Banks and Trust Companies); Title 32 (Mutual Savings Banks); Title 62 (Negotiable Instruments); Title 75 (Food and Shellfish); Title 77 (Game and Game Fish).