

[Back](#) | [WordPerfect Version](#) | [ASCII Version](#) | [PDF Version](#)

UNIFORM ADULT GUARDIANSHIP AND PROTECTIVE PROCEEDINGS JURISDICTION ACT

drafted by the

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

and by it

APPROVED AND RECOMMENDED FOR ENACTMENT
IN ALL THE STATES

at its

ANNUAL CONFERENCE
MEETING IN ITS ONE-HUNDRED-AND-SIXTEENTH YEAR
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA

July 27 – August 3, 2007

WITH PREFATORY NOTE AND COMMENTS

Copyright ©2007

By

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

December 3, 2007

ABOUT NCCUSL

The **National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws** (NCCUSL), also known as Uniform Law Commission (ULC), now in its 116th year, provides states with non-partisan, well-

conceived and well-drafted legislation that brings clarity and stability to critical areas of state statutory law.

ULC members must be lawyers, qualified to practice law. They are practicing lawyers, judges, legislators and legislative staff and law professors, who have been appointed by state governments as well as the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands to research, draft and promote enactment of uniform state laws in areas of state law where uniformity is desirable and practical.

- ULC strengthens the federal system by providing rules and procedures that are consistent from state to state but that also reflect the diverse experience of the states.
- ULC statutes are representative of state experience, because the organization is made up of representatives from each state, appointed by state government.
- ULC keeps state law up-to-date by addressing important and timely legal issues.
- ULC's efforts reduce the need for individuals and businesses to deal with different laws as they move and do business in different states.
- ULC's work facilitates economic development and provides a legal platform for foreign entities to deal with U.S. citizens and businesses.
- Uniform Law Commissioners donate thousands of hours of their time and legal and drafting expertise every year as a public service, and receive no salary or compensation for their work.
- ULC's deliberative and uniquely open drafting process draws on the expertise of commissioners, but also utilizes input from legal experts, and advisors and observers representing the views of other legal organizations or interests that will be subject to the proposed laws.
- ULC is a state-supported organization that represents true value for the states, providing services that most states could not otherwise afford or duplicate.

DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM ADULT GUARDIANSHIP AND PROTECTIVE PROCEEDINGS JURISDICTION ACT

The Committee appointed by and representing the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in preparing this Act consists of the following individuals:

DAVID G. NIXON, 2340 Green Acres Rd., Suite 12, Fayetteville, AR 72703, *Chair*

GAIL H. HAGERTY, Burleigh County Court House, P.O. Box 1013, 514 E. Thayer Ave., Bismarck, ND 58502-1013

LYLE W. HILLYARD, 595 S. Riverwood Parkway, Suite 100, Logan, UT 84321

PAUL M. KURTZ, University of Georgia School of Law, Athens, GA 30602-6012

SUSAN KELLY NICHOLS, North Carolina Department of Justice, P.O. Box 629, Raleigh, NC 27602-0629

LANE SHETTERLY, 189 SW Academy St., P.O. Box 105, Dallas, OR 97338

SUZANNE BROWN WALSH, P.O. Box 271820, West Hartford, CT 06127

STEPHANIE J. WILLBANKS, Vermont Law School, P.O. Box 96, Chelsea St., South Royalton, VT 05068

DAVID M. ENGLISH, University of Missouri-Columbia, School of Law, Missouri & Conley Aves., Columbia, MO 65211, *National Conference Reporter*

EX OFFICIO

HOWARD J. SWIBEL, 120 S. Riverside Plaza, Suite 1200, Chicago, IL 60606, *President*
TOM BOLT, 5600 Royal Dane Mall, St. Thomas, VI 00802-6410, *Division Chair*

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION ADVISORS

LARRY CRADDOCK, 2601 N. Lamar Blvd., Austin, TX 78705-4260, *ABA Advisor*
KAREN E. BOXX, 316 William H. Gates Hall, P.O. Box 353020, Seattle, WA 98195-3020, *ABA Section Advisor*
ERICA F. WOOD, 740 15th St. NW, Washington, DC 20005, *ABA Section Advisor*

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

JOHN A. SEBERT, 211 E. Ontario St., Suite 1300, Chicago, IL 60611, *Executive Director*

Copies of this Act may be obtained from:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS
211 E. Ontario Street, Suite 1300
Chicago, Illinois 60611
312/915-0195
www.nccusl.org

UNIFORM ADULT GUARDIANSHIP AND PROTECTIVE PROCEEDINGS JURISDICTION ACT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFATORY NOTE

**[ARTICLE] 1
GENERAL PROVISIONS**

- SECTION 101. SHORT TITLE
- SECTION 102. DEFINITIONS
- SECTION 103. INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION OF [ACT]
- SECTION 104. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN COURTS
- SECTION 105. COOPERATION BETWEEN COURTS
- SECTION 106. TAKING TESTIMONY IN ANOTHER STATE

**[ARTICLE] 2
JURISDICTION**

- SECTION 201. DEFINITIONS; SIGNIFICANT CONNECTION FACTORS
- SECTION 202. EXCLUSIVE BASIS
- SECTION 203. JURISDICTION
- SECTION 204. SPECIAL JURISDICTION
- SECTION 205. EXCLUSIVE AND CONTINUING JURISDICTION

SECTION 206. APPROPRIATE FORUM
 SECTION 207. JURISDICTION DECLINED BY REASON OF CONDUCT
 SECTION 208. NOTICE OF PROCEEDING
 SECTION 209. PROCEEDINGS IN MORE THAN ONE STATE

[ARTICLE] 3
TRANSFER OF GUARDIANSHIP OR CONSERVATORSHIP

SECTION 301. TRANSFER OF GUARDIANSHIP OR CONSERVATORSHIP TO ANOTHER STATE
 SECTION 302. ACCEPTING GUARDIANSHIP OR CONSERVATORSHIP
 TRANSFERRED FROM ANOTHER STATE

[ARTICLE] 4
REGISTRATION AND RECOGNITION OF ORDERS FROM OTHER STATES

SECTION 401. REGISTRATION OF GUARDIANSHIP ORDERS
 SECTION 402. REGISTRATION OF PROTECTIVE ORDERS
 SECTION 403. EFFECT OF REGISTRATION

[ARTICLE] 5
MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SECTION 501. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION
 SECTION 502. RELATION TO ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL
 COMMERCE ACT
 SECTION 503. REPEALS
 SECTION 504. TRANSITIONAL PROVISION
 SECTION 505. EFFECTIVE DATE

**UNIFORM ADULT GUARDIANSHIP AND PROTECTIVE PROCEEDINGS
 JURISDICTION ACT**

PREFATORY NOTE

The Uniform Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Act (UGPPA), which was last revised in 1997, is a comprehensive act addressing all aspects of guardianships and protective proceedings for both minors and adults. The Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act (UAGPPJA) has a much narrower scope, dealing only with jurisdiction and related issues in adult proceedings. Drafting of the UAGPPJA began in 2005. The Act had its first reading at the Uniform Law Commission 2006 Annual Meeting, and was approved at the 2007 Annual Meeting.

States may enact the UAGPPJA either separately or as part of the broader UGPPA or the even broader Uniform Probate Code (UPC), of which the UGPPA forms a part. Conforming amendments to the UGPPA and UPC are expected to be approved in 2009 that will facilitate enactment of the UAGPPJA by states that have enacted the UGPPA or UPC.

The Problem of Multiple Jurisdiction

Because the United States has 50 plus guardianship systems, problems of determining jurisdiction are frequent. Questions of which state has jurisdiction to appoint a guardian or conservator can arise

between an American state and another country. But more frequently, problems arise because the individual has contacts with more than one American state.

In nearly all American states, a guardian may be appointed by a court in a state in which the individual is domiciled or is physically present. In nearly all American states, a conservator may be appointed by a court in a state in which the individual is domiciled or has property. Contested cases in which courts in more than one state have jurisdiction are becoming more frequent. Sometimes these cases arise because the adult is physically located in a state other than the adult's domicile. Sometimes the case arises because of uncertainty as to the adult's domicile, particularly if the adult owns a second home in another state. There is a need for an effective mechanism for resolving multi-jurisdictional disputes. Article 2 of the UAGPPJA is intended to provide such a mechanism.

The Problem of Transfer

Oftentimes, problems arise even absent a dispute. Even if everyone is agreed that an already existing guardianship or conservatorship should be moved to another state, few states have streamlined procedures for transferring a proceeding to another state or for accepting such a transfer. In most states, all of the procedures for an original appointment must be repeated, a time consuming and expensive prospect. Article 3 of the UAGPPJA is designed to provide an expedited process for making such transfers, thereby avoiding the need to relitigate incapacity and whether the guardian or conservator appointed in the first state was an appropriate selection.

The Problem of Out-of-State Recognition

The Full Faith and Credit Clause of the United States Constitution requires that court orders in one state be honored in another state. But there are exceptions to the full faith and credit doctrine, of which guardianship and protective proceedings is one. Sometimes, guardianship or protective proceedings must be initiated in a second state because of the refusal of financial institutions, care facilities, and the courts to recognize a guardianship or protective order issued in another state. Article 4 of the UAGPPJA creates a registration procedure. Following registration of the guardianship or protective order in the second state, the guardian may exercise in the second state all powers authorized in the original state's order of appointment except for powers that cannot be legally exercised in the second state.

The Proposed Uniform Law and the Child Custody Analogy

Similar problems of jurisdiction existed for many years in the United States in connection with child custody determinations. If one parent lived in one state and the other parent lived in another state, frequently courts in more than one state had jurisdiction to issue custody orders. But the Uniform Law Conference has approved two uniform acts that have effectively minimized the problem of multiple court jurisdiction in child custody matters; the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act (UCCJA), approved in 1968, succeeded by the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA), approved in 1997. The drafters of the UAGPPJA have elected to model Article 2 and portions of Article 1 of their Act after these child custody analogues. However, the UAGPPJA applies only to adult proceedings. The UAGPPJA is limited to adults in part because most jurisdictional issues involving guardianships for minors are subsumed by the UCCJEA.

The Objectives and Key Concepts of the Proposed UAGPPJA

The UAGPPJA is organized into five articles. Article 1 contains definitions and provisions designed to facilitate cooperation between courts in different states. Article 2 is the heart of the Act,

specifying which court has jurisdiction to appoint a guardian or conservator or issue another type of protective order and contains definitions applicable only to that article. Its principal objective is to assure that an appointment or order is made or issued in only one state except in cases of emergency or in situations where the individual owns property located in multiple states. Article 3 specifies a procedure for transferring a guardianship or conservatorship proceedings from one state to another state. Article 4 deals with enforcement of guardianship and protective orders in other states. Article 5 contains an effective date provision, a place to list provisions of existing law to be repealed or amended, and boilerplate provisions common to all uniform acts.

Key Definitions (Section 201)

To determine which court has primary jurisdiction under the UAGPPJA, the key factors are to determine the individual's "home state" and "significant-connection state." A "home state" (Section 201(a)(2)) is the state in which the individual was physically present, including any period of temporary absence, for at least six consecutive months immediately before the filing of a petition for a protective order or appointment of a guardian. If the respondent was not physically present in a single state for the six months immediately preceding the filing of the petition, the home state is the place where the respondent was last physically present for at least six months as long as such presence ended within the six months prior to the filing of the petition. Section 201(a)(2). Stated another way, the ability of the home state to appoint a guardian or enter a protective order for an individual continues for up to six months following the individual's physical relocation to another state.

A "significant-connection state," which is a potentially broader concept, means the state in which the individual has a significant connection other than mere physical presence, and where substantial evidence concerning the individual is available. Section 201(a)(3). Factors that may be considered in deciding whether a particular respondent has a significant connection include:

- the location of the respondent's family and others required to be notified of the guardianship or protective proceeding;
- the length of time the respondent was at any time physically present in the state and the duration of any absences;
- the location of the respondent's property; and
- the extent to which the respondent has other ties to the state such as voting registration, filing of state or local tax returns, vehicle registration, driver's license, social relationships, and receipt of services. Section 201(b).

A respondent in a guardianship or protective proceeding may have multiple significant-connection states but will have only one home state.

Jurisdiction (Article 2)

Section 203 is the principal provision governing jurisdiction, creating a three-level priority; the home state, followed by a significant-connection state, followed by other jurisdictions:

- Home State*: The home state has primary jurisdiction to appoint a guardian or conservator or issue another type of protective order.
- Significant-connection State*: A significant-connection state has jurisdiction to appoint a guardian or conservator or issue another type of protective order if on the date the petition was filed:
 - the respondent does not have a home state or the home state has declined jurisdiction on the basis that the significant-connection state is a more appropriate forum; or

- the respondent has a home state, a petition for an appointment or order is not pending in a court of that state or another significant-connection state, and, before the court makes the appointment or issues the order (i) a petition for an appointment or order is not filed in the respondent's home state; (ii) an objection to the court's jurisdiction is not filed by a person required to be notified of the proceeding; and (iii) the court in this state concludes that it is an appropriate forum under the factors set forth in Section 206.
- *Another State:* A court in another state has jurisdiction if the home state and all significant-connection states have declined jurisdiction because the court in the other state is a more appropriate forum, or the respondent does not have a home state or significant-connection state.

Section 204 addresses special cases. Regardless of whether it has jurisdiction under the general principles stated in Section 203, a court in the state where the respondent is currently physically present has jurisdiction to appoint a guardian in an emergency, and a court in a state where a respondent's real or tangible personal property is located has jurisdiction to appoint a conservator or issue another type of protective order with respect to that property. In addition, a court not otherwise having jurisdiction under Section 203 has jurisdiction to consider a petition to accept the transfer of an already existing guardianship or conservatorship from another state as provided in Article 3.

The remainder of Article 2 elaborates on these core concepts. Section 205 provides that once a guardian or conservator is appointed or other protective order is issued, the court's jurisdiction continues until the proceeding is terminated or transferred or the appointment or order expires by its own terms. Section 206 authorizes a court to decline jurisdiction if it determines that the court of another state is a more appropriate forum, and specifies the factors to be taken into account in making this determination. Section 207 authorizes a court to decline jurisdiction or fashion another appropriate remedy if jurisdiction was acquired because of unjustifiable conduct. Section 208 prescribes additional notice requirements if a proceeding is brought in a state other than the respondent's home state. Section 209 specifies a procedure for resolving jurisdictional issues if petitions are pending in more than one state. The UAGPPJA also includes provisions regarding communication between courts in different states, requests for assistance made by a court to a court of another state, and the taking of testimony in another state. Sections 104-106.

Transfer to Another State (Article 3)

Article 3 specifies a procedure for transferring an already existing guardianship or conservatorship to another state. To make the transfer, court orders are necessary from both the court transferring the case and from the court accepting the case. The transferring court must find that the incapacitated or protected person is physically present in or is reasonably expected to move permanently to the other state, that adequate arrangements have been made for the person or the person's property in the other state, and that the court is satisfied the case will be accepted by the court in the other state. To assure continuity, the court in the transferring state cannot dismiss the local proceeding until the order from the state accepting the case is filed with the transferring court. To expedite the transfer process, the court in the accepting state must give deference to the transferring court's finding of incapacity and selection of the guardian or conservator. Much of Article 3 is based on the pioneering work of the National Probate Court Standards, a 1993 joint project of the National College of Probate Judges and the National Center for State Courts.

Out of State Enforcement (Article 4)

To facilitate enforcement of guardianship and protective orders in other states, Article 4 authorizes a guardian or conservator to register these orders in other states. Upon registration, the

guardian or conservator may exercise in the registration state all powers authorized in the order except as prohibited by the laws of the registration state.

International Application (Section 103)

Section 103 addresses application of the Act to guardianship and protective orders issued in other countries. A foreign order is not enforceable pursuant to the registration procedures under Article 4, but a court in the United State may otherwise apply the Act as if the foreign country were an American state.

The Problem of Differing Terminology

States differ on terminology for the person appointed by the court to handle the personal and financial affairs of a minor or incapacitated adult. Under the UGPPA and in a majority of American states, a “guardian” is appointed to make decisions regarding the person of an “incapacitated person;” a “conservator” is appointed in a “protective proceeding” to manage the property of a “protected person.” But in many states, only a “guardian” is appointed, either a guardian of the person or guardian of the estate, and in a few states, the terms guardian and conservator are used but with different meanings. The UAGPPJA adopts the terminology used in the UGPPA and in a majority of the states. An enacting state that uses a different term than “guardian” or “conservator” for the person appointed by the court or that defines either of these terms differently than does the UGPPA may, but is not encouraged to, substitute its own term or definition. Use of common terms and definitions by states enacting the Act will facilitate resolution of cases involving multiple jurisdictions.

The Drafting Committee was assisted by numerous officially designated advisors and observers, representing an array of organizations. In addition to the American Bar Association advisors listed above, important contributions were made by Sally Hurme of AARP, Terry W. Hammond of the National Guardianship Association, Kathleen T. Whitehead and Shirley B. Whitenack of the National Academy of Elder Law Attorneys, Catherine Anne Seal of the Colorado Bar Association, Kay Farley of the National Center for State Courts, and Robert G. Spector, the Reporter for the Joint Editorial Board for Uniform Family Laws and the Reporter for the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997).

UNIFORM ADULT GUARDIANSHIP AND PROTECTIVE PROCEEDINGS JURISDICTION

ACT

[ARTICLE] 1

GENERAL PROVISIONS

General Comment

Article 1 contains definitions and general provisions used throughout the Act. Definitions applicable only to Article 2 are found in Section 201. Section 101 is the title, Section 102 contains the definitions, and Sections 103-106 the general provisions. Section 103 provides that a court of an enacting state may treat a foreign country as a state for the purpose of applying all portions of the Act other than Article 4, Section 104 addresses communication between courts, Section 105 requests by a court to a court in another state for assistance, and Section 106 the taking of testimony in other states. These Article 1 provisions relating to court communication and assistance are essential tools to assure the effectiveness of the provisions of Article 2 determining jurisdiction and in facilitating transfer of a proceeding to

another state as authorized in Article 3.

SECTION 101. SHORT TITLE. This [act] may be cited as the Uniform Adult Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Jurisdiction Act.

Comment

The title to the Act succinctly describes the Act's scope. The Act applies only to court jurisdiction and related topics for adults for whom the appointment of a guardian or conservator or other protective order is being sought or has been issued.

The drafting committee elected to limit the Act to adults for two reasons. First, jurisdictional issues concerning guardians for minors are subsumed by the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997). Second, while the UCCJEA does not address conservatorship and other issues involving the property of minors, all of the problems and concerns that led the Uniform Law Commission to appoint a drafting committee involved adults.

SECTION 102. DEFINITIONS. In this [act]:

(1) "Adult" means an individual who has attained [18] years of age.

(2) "Conservator" means a person appointed by the court to administer the property of an adult, including a person appointed under [insert reference to enacting state's conservatorship or protective proceedings statute].

(3) "Guardian" means a person appointed by the court to make decisions regarding the person of an adult, including a person appointed under [insert reference to enacting state's guardianship statute].

(4) "Guardianship order" means an order appointing a guardian.

(5) "Guardianship proceeding" means a judicial proceeding in which an order for the appointment of a guardian is sought or has been issued.

(6) "Incapacitated person" means an adult for whom a guardian has been appointed.

(7) "Party" means the respondent, petitioner, guardian, conservator, or any other person allowed by the court to participate in a guardianship or protective proceeding.

(8) "Person," except in the term incapacitated person or protected person, means an individual,

corporation, business trust, estate, trust, partnership, limited liability company, association, joint venture, public corporation, government or governmental subdivision, agency, or instrumentality, or any other legal or commercial entity.

(9) “Protected person” means an adult for whom a protective order has been issued.

(10) “Protective order” means an order appointing a conservator or other order related to management of an adult’s property.

(11) “Protective proceeding” means a judicial proceeding in which a protective order is sought or has been issued.

(12) “Record” means information that is inscribed on a tangible medium or that is stored in an electronic or other medium and is retrievable in perceivable form.

(13) “Respondent” means an adult for whom a protective order or the appointment of a guardian is sought.

(14) “State” means a state of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, a federally recognized Indian tribe, or any territory or insular possession subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

Legislative Note: A state that uses a different term than guardian or conservator for the person appointed by the court or that defines either of these terms differently may, but is not encouraged to, substitute its own term or definition. Use of common terms and definitions by states enacting this Act will facilitate resolution of cases involving multiple jurisdictions.

Comment

The definition of “adult” (paragraph (1)) would exclude an emancipated minor. The Act is not designed to supplant the local substantive law on guardianship. States whose guardianship law treats emancipated minors as adults may wish to modify this definition.

Three of the other definitions are standard uniform law terms. These are the definitions of “person” (paragraph (8)), “record” (paragraph (12)), and “state” (paragraph (14)). Two are common procedural terms. The individual for whom a guardianship or protective order is sought is a “respondent” (paragraph (13)). A person who may participate in a guardianship or protective proceeding is referred to as a “party” (paragraph (7)).

The remaining definitions refer to standard guardianship terminology used in a majority of states. A “guardian” (paragraph (3)) is appointed in a “guardianship order” (paragraph (4)) which is issued as part of a “guardianship proceeding” (paragraph (5)) and which authorizes the guardian to make decisions regarding the person of an “incapacitated person” (paragraph (6)). A “conservator” (paragraph (2)) is appointed pursuant to a “protective order” (paragraph (10)) which is issued as part of a “protective proceeding” (paragraph (11)) and which authorizes the conservator to manage the property of a “protected person” (paragraph (9)).

In most states, a protective order may be issued by the court without the appointment of a conservator. For example, under the Uniform Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Act, the court may authorize a so-called single transaction for the security, service, or care meeting the foreseeable needs of the protected person, including the payment, delivery, deposit, or retention of property; sale, mortgage, lease, or other transfer of property; purchase of an annuity; making a contract for life care, deposit contract, or contract for training and education; and the creation of or addition to a suitable trust. UGPPA (1997) §412(1). It is for this reason that the Act contains frequent references to the broader category of protective orders. Where the Act is intended to apply only to conservatorships, such as in Article 3 dealing with transfers of proceedings to other states, the Act refers to conservatorship and not to the broader category of protective proceeding.

The Act does not limit the types of conservatorships or guardianships to which the Act applies. The Act applies whether the conservatorship or guardianship is denominated as plenary, limited, temporary or emergency. The Act, however, would not ordinarily apply to a guardian ad litem, who is ordinarily appointed by the court to represent a person or conduct an investigation in a specified legal proceeding.

Section 102 is not the sole definitional section in the Act. Section 201 contains definitions of important terms used only in Article 2. These are the definitions of “emergency” (Section 201(1)), “home state” (Section 201(2)), and “significant-connection state” (Section 201(3)).

SECTION 103. INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION OF [ACT]. A court of this state may treat a foreign country as if it were a state for the purpose of applying this [article] and [Articles] 2, 3, and 5.

Comment

This section addresses application of the Act to guardianship and protective orders issued in other countries. A foreign order is not enforceable pursuant to the registration procedures of Article 4, but a court in this country may otherwise apply this Act to a foreign proceeding as if the foreign country were an American state. Consequently, a court may conclude that the court in the foreign country has jurisdiction because it constitutes the respondent’s “home state” or “significant-connection state” and may therefore decline to exercise jurisdiction on the ground that the court of the foreign country has a higher priority under Section 203. Or the court may treat the foreign country as if it were a state of the United States for purposes of applying the transfer provisions of Article 3.

This section addresses similar issues to but differs in result from Section 105 of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997). Under the UCCJEA, the United States court must honor a custody order issued by the court of a foreign country if the order was issued under factual circumstances in substantial conformity with the jurisdictional standards of the UCCJEA. Only if the child custody law violates fundamental principles of human rights is enforcement excused. Because

guardianship regimes vary so greatly around the world, particularly in civil law countries, it was concluded that under this Act a more flexible approach was needed. Under this Act, a court may but is not required to recognize the foreign order.

The fact that a guardianship or protective order of a foreign country cannot be enforced pursuant to the registration procedures of Article 4 does not preclude enforcement by the court under some other provision or rule of law.

SECTION 104. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN COURTS.

[(a)] A court of this state may communicate with a court in another state concerning a proceeding arising under this [act]. The court may allow the parties to participate in the communication. [Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), the court shall make a record of the communication. The record may be limited to the fact that the communication occurred.

(b) Courts may communicate concerning schedules, calendars, court records, and other administrative matters without making a record.]

Legislative Note: An enacting state is encouraged to enact the bracketed language so that a record will be created of the communication with the other court, even though the record is limited to the fact that the communication occurred. In some states, however, a legislative enactment directing when a court must make a record in a judicial proceeding may violate the separation of powers doctrine. Such states are encouraged to achieve the objectives of the bracketed language by promulgating a comparable requirement by judicial rule.

Comment

This section emphasizes the importance of communications among courts with an interest in a particular matter. Most commonly, this would include communication between courts of different states to resolve an issue of which court has jurisdiction to proceed under Article 2. It would also include communication between courts of different states to facilitate the transfer of a guardianship or conservatorship to a different state under Article 3. Communication can occur in a variety of ways, including by electronic means. This section does not prescribe the use of any particular means of communication.

The court may authorize the parties to participate in the communication. But the Act does not mandate participation or require that the court give the parties notice of any communication. Communication between courts is often difficult to schedule and participation by the parties may be impractical. Phone calls or electronic communications often have to be made after-hours or whenever the schedules of judges allow. When issuing a jurisdictional or transfer order, the court should set forth the extent to which a communication with another court may have been a factor in the decision.

This section includes brackets around the language relating to whether a record must be made of any communication with the court of the other state. As indicated by the Legislative Note to this section, the language is bracketed because of a concern in some states that a legislative enactment directing when a court must make a record in a judicial proceeding may violate the doctrine on separation of powers. The

language is not bracketed because the drafters concluded that the making of a record is not important. Rather, if concerns about separation of powers leads to the deletion of the bracketed language, the enacting state is encouraged to achieve the objectives of the bracketed language by promulgating a comparable provision by judicial rule.

This section does not prescribe the extent of the record that the court must make, leaving that issue to the court. A record might include notes or transcripts of a court reporter who listened to a conference call between the courts, an electronic recording of a telephone call, a memorandum summarizing a conversation, and email communications. No record need be made of relatively inconsequential matters such as scheduling, calendars, and court records.

Section 110 of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997) addresses similar issues as this section but is more detailed. As is the case with several other provisions of this Act, the drafters of this Act concluded that the more varied circumstances of adult guardianship and protective proceedings suggested a need for greater flexibility.

SECTION 105. COOPERATION BETWEEN COURTS.

(a) In a guardianship or protective proceeding in this state, a court of this state may request the appropriate court of another state to do any of the following:

(1) hold an evidentiary hearing;

(2) order a person in that state to produce evidence or give testimony pursuant to procedures of that state;

(3) order that an evaluation or assessment be made of the respondent;

(4) order any appropriate investigation of a person involved in a proceeding;

(5) forward to the court of this state a certified copy of the transcript or other record of a hearing under paragraph (1) or any other proceeding, any evidence otherwise produced under paragraph (2), and any evaluation or assessment prepared in compliance with an order under paragraph (3) or (4);

(6) issue any order necessary to assure the appearance in the proceeding of a person whose presence is necessary for the court to make a determination, including the respondent or the incapacitated or protected person;

(7) issue an order authorizing the release of medical, financial, criminal, or other relevant information in that state, including protected health information as defined in 45 C.F.R. Section 164.504

[, as amended].

(b) If a court of another state in which a guardianship or protective proceeding is pending requests assistance of the kind provided in subsection (a), a court of this state has jurisdiction for the limited purpose of granting the request or making reasonable efforts to comply with the request.

Legislative Note: A state that permits dynamic references to federal law should delete the brackets in subsection (a)(7). A state that requires that a reference to federal law be to that law on a specific date should delete the brackets and bracketed material, insert a specific date, and periodically update the reference.

Comment

Subsection (a) of this section is similar to Section 112(a) of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997), although modified to address issues of concern in adult guardianship and protective proceedings and with the addition of subsection (a)(7), which addresses the release of health information protected under HIPAA. Subsection (b), which clarifies that a court has jurisdiction to respond to requests for assistance from courts in other states even though it might otherwise not have jurisdiction over the proceeding, is not found in although probably implicit in the UCCJEA.

Court cooperation is essential to the success of this Act. This section is designed to facilitate such court cooperation. It provides mechanisms for courts to cooperate with each other in order to decide cases in an efficient manner without causing undue expense to the parties. Courts may request assistance from courts of other states and may assist courts of other states. Typically, such assistance will be requested to resolve a jurisdictional issue arising under Article 2 or an issue concerning a transfer proceeding under Article 3.

This section does not address assessment of costs and expenses, leaving that issue to local law. Should a court have acquired jurisdiction because of a party's unjustifiable conduct, Section 207(b) authorizes the court to assess against the party all costs and expenses, including attorney's fees.

SECTION 106. TAKING TESTIMONY IN ANOTHER STATE.

(a) In a guardianship or protective proceeding, in addition to other procedures that may be available, testimony of a witness who is located in another state may be offered by deposition or other means allowable in this state for testimony taken in another state. The court on its own motion may order that the testimony of a witness be taken in another state and may prescribe the manner in which and the terms upon which the testimony is to be taken.

(b) In a guardianship or protective proceeding, a court in this state may permit a witness located in

another state to be deposed or to testify by telephone or audiovisual or other electronic means. A court of this state shall cooperate with the court of the other state in designating an appropriate location for the deposition or testimony.

[(c) Documentary evidence transmitted from another state to a court of this state by technological means that do not produce an original writing may not be excluded from evidence on an objection based on the best evidence rule.]

Legislative Note: In cases involving more than one jurisdiction, documentary evidence often must be presented that has been transmitted by facsimile or in electronic form. A state in which the best evidence rule might preclude the introduction of such evidence should enact subsection (c). A state that has adequate exceptions to its best evidence rule to permit the introduction of evidence transmitted by facsimile or in electronic form should delete subsection (c).

Comment

This section is similar to Section 111 of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997). That section was in turn derived from Section 316 of the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (1992) and the much earlier and now otherwise obsolete Uniform Interstate and International Procedure Act (1962).

This section is designed to fill the vacuum that often exists in cases involving an adult with interstate contacts when much of the essential information about the individual is located in another state.

Subsection (a) empowers the court to initiate the gathering of out-of-state evidence, including depositions, written interrogatories and other discovery devices. The authority granted to the court in no way precludes the gathering of out-of-state evidence by a party, including the taking of depositions out-of-state.

Subsections (b) and (c) clarify that modern modes of communication are permissible for the taking of depositions and receipt of documents into evidence. A state that has adequate exceptions to its best evidence rule to permit the introduction of evidence transmitted by facsimile or in electronic form should delete subsection (c), which has been placed in brackets for this reason.

This section is consistent with and complementary to the Uniform Interstate Depositions and Discovery Act (2007), which specifies the procedure for taking depositions in other states.

[ARTICLE] 2

JURISDICTION

General Comment

The jurisdictional rules in Article 2 will determine which state's courts may appoint a guardian or conservator or issue another type of protective order. Section 201 contains definitions of "emergency,"

“home state,” and “significant-connection state,” terms used only in Article 2 that are key to understanding the jurisdictional rules under the Act. Section 202 provides that Article 2 is the exclusive jurisdictional basis for a court of the enacting state to appoint a guardian or issue a protective order for an adult. Consequently, Article 2 is applicable even if all of the respondent’s significant contacts are in-state. Section 203 is the principal provision governing jurisdiction, creating a three-level priority; the home state, followed by a significant-connection state, followed by other jurisdictions. But there are circumstances under Section 203 where a significant-connection state may have jurisdiction even if the respondent also has a home state, or a state that is neither a home or significant-connection state may be able to assume jurisdiction even though the particular respondent has both a home state and one or more significant-connection states. One of these situations is if a state declines to exercise jurisdiction under Section 206 because a court of that state concludes that a court of another state is a more appropriate forum. Another is Section 207, which authorizes a court to decline jurisdiction or fashion another appropriate remedy if jurisdiction was acquired because of unjustifiable conduct. Section 205 provides that once an appointment is made or order issued, the court’s jurisdiction continues until the proceeding is terminated or the appointment or order expires by its own terms.

Section 204 addresses special cases. Regardless of whether it has jurisdiction under the general principles stated in Section 203, a court in the state where the individual is currently physically present has jurisdiction to appoint a guardian in an emergency, and a court in a state where an individual’s real or tangible personal property is located has jurisdiction to appoint a conservator or issue another type of protective order with respect to that property. In addition, a court not otherwise having jurisdiction under Section 203 has jurisdiction to consider a petition to accept the transfer of an already existing guardianship or conservatorship from another state as provided in Article 3.

The remainder of Article 2 address procedural issues. Section 208 prescribes additional notice requirements if a proceeding is brought in a state other than the respondent’s home state. Section 209 specifies a procedure for resolving jurisdictional issues if petitions are pending in more than one state.

SECTION 201. DEFINITIONS; SIGNIFICANT CONNECTION FACTORS.

(a) In this [article]:

(1) “Emergency” means a circumstance that likely will result in substantial harm to a respondent’s health, safety, or welfare, and for which the appointment of a guardian is necessary because no other person has authority and is willing to act on the respondent’s behalf;

(2) “Home state” means the state in which the respondent was physically present, including any period of temporary absence, for at least six consecutive months immediately before the filing of a petition for a protective order or the appointment of a guardian; or if none, the state in which the respondent was physically present, including any period of temporary absence, for at least six consecutive months ending within the six months prior to the filing of the petition.

(3) “Significant-connection state” means a state, other than the home state, with which a respondent has a significant connection other than mere physical presence and in which substantial evidence concerning the respondent is available.

(b) In determining under Sections 203 and Section 301(e) whether a respondent has a significant connection with a particular state, the court shall consider:

- (1) the location of the respondent’s family and other persons required to be notified of the guardianship or protective proceeding;
- (2) the length of time the respondent at any time was physically present in the state and the duration of any absence;
- (3) the location of the respondent’s property; and
- (4) the extent to which the respondent has ties to the state such as voting registration, state or local tax return filing, vehicle registration, driver’s license, social relationship, and receipt of services.

Comment

The terms “emergency,” “home state,” and “significant-connection state” are defined in this section and not in Section 102 because they are used only in Article 2.

The definition of “emergency” (subsection (a)(1)) is taken from the emergency guardianship provision of the Uniform Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Act (1997), Section 312.

Pursuant to Section 204 of this Act, a court has jurisdiction to appoint a guardian in an emergency for a period of up to 90 days even though it does not otherwise have jurisdiction. However, the emergency appointment is subject to the direction of the court in the respondent’s home state. Pursuant to Section 204(b), the emergency proceeding must be dismissed at the request of the court in the respondent’s home state.

Appointing a guardian in an emergency should be an unusual event. Although most states have emergency guardianship statutes, not all states do, and in those states that do have such statutes, there is great variation on whether and how an emergency is defined. To provide some uniformity on when a court acquires emergency jurisdiction, the drafters of this Act concluded that adding a definition of emergency was essential. The definition does not preclude an enacting jurisdiction from appointing a guardian under an emergency guardianship statute with a different or broader test of emergency if the court otherwise has jurisdiction to make an appointment under Section 203.

Pursuant to Section 203, a court in the respondent’s home state has primary jurisdiction to appoint a guardian or issue a protective order. A court in a significant-connection state has jurisdiction if the

respondent does not have a home state and in other circumstances specified in Section 203. The definitions of “home state” and “significant-connection state” are therefore important to an understanding of the Act.

The definition of “home state” (subsection (a)(2)) is derived from but differs in a couple of respects from the definition of the same term in Section 102 of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997). First, unlike the definition in the UCCJEA, the definition in this Act clarifies that actual physical presence is necessary. The UCCJEA definition instead focuses on where the child has “lived” for the prior six months. Basing the test on where someone has “lived” may imply that the term “home state” is similar to the concept of domicile. Domicile, in an adult guardianship context, is a vague concept that can easily lead to claims of jurisdiction by courts in more than one state. Second, under the UCCJEA, home state jurisdiction continues for six months following physical removal from the state and the state has ceased to be the actual home. Under this Act, the six-month tail is incorporated directly into the definition of home state. The place where the respondent was last physically present for six months continues as the home state for six months following physical removal from the state. This modification of the UCCJEA definition eliminates the need to refer to the six-month tail each time home state jurisdiction is mentioned in the Act.

The definition of “significant-connection state” (subsection (a)(3)) is similar to Section 201(a)(2) of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997). However, subsection (b) of this Section adds a list of factors relevant to adult guardianship and protective proceedings to aid the court in deciding whether a particular place is a significant-connection state. Under Section 301(e)(1), the significant connection factors listed in the definition are to be taken into account in determining whether a conservatorship may be transferred to another state.

SECTION 202. EXCLUSIVE BASIS. This [article] provides the exclusive jurisdictional basis for a court of this state to appoint a guardian or issue a protective order for an adult.

Comment

Similar to Section 201(b) of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997), which provides that the UCCJEA is the exclusive basis for determining jurisdiction to issue a child custody order, this section provides that this article is the exclusive jurisdictional basis for determining jurisdiction to appoint a guardian or issue a protective order for an adult. An enacting jurisdiction will therefore need to repeal any existing provisions addressing jurisdiction in guardianship and protective proceedings cases. A Legislative Note to Section 503 provides guidance on which provisions need to be repealed or amended. The drafters of this Act concluded that limiting the Act to “interstate” cases was unworkable. Such cases are hard to define, but even if they could be defined, overlaying this Act onto a state’s existing jurisdictional rules would leave too many gaps and inconsistencies. In addition, if the particular case is truly local, the local court would likely have jurisdiction under both this Act as well as under prior law.

SECTION 203. JURISDICTION. A court of this state has jurisdiction to appoint a guardian or issue a protective order for a respondent if:

- (1) this state is the respondent’s home state;

(2) on the date the petition is filed, this state is a significant-connection state and:

(A) the respondent does not have a home state or a court of the respondent's home state has declined to exercise jurisdiction because this state is a more appropriate forum; or

(B) the respondent has a home state, a petition for an appointment or order is not pending in a court of that state or another significant-connection state, and, before the court makes the appointment or issues the order:

(i) a petition for an appointment or order is not filed in the respondent's home state;

(ii) an objection to the court's jurisdiction is not filed by a person required to be notified of the proceeding; and;

(iii) the court in this state concludes that it is an appropriate forum under the factors set forth in Section 206;

(3) this state does not have jurisdiction under either paragraph (1) or (2), the respondent's home state and all significant-connection states have declined to exercise jurisdiction because this state is the more appropriate forum, and jurisdiction in this state is consistent with the constitutions of this state and the United States; or

(4) the requirements for special jurisdiction under Section 204 are met.

Comment

Similar to the Uniform Child Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997), this Act creates a three-level priority for determining which state has jurisdiction to appoint a guardian or issue a protective order; the home state (defined in Section 201(a)(2)), followed by a significant-connection state (defined in Section 201(a)(3)), followed by other jurisdictions. The principal objective of this section is to eliminate the possibility of dual appointments or orders except for the special circumstances specified in Section 204.

While this section is the principal provision for determining whether a particular court has jurisdiction to appoint a guardian or issue a protective order, it is not the only provision. As indicated in the cross-reference in Section 203(4), a court that does not otherwise have jurisdiction under Section 203

may have jurisdiction under the special circumstances specified in Section 204.

Pursuant to Section 203(1), the home state has primary jurisdiction to appoint a guardian or conservator or issue another type of protective order. This jurisdiction terminates if the state ceases to be the home state, if a court of the home state declines to exercise jurisdiction under Section 206 on the basis that another state is a more appropriate forum, or, as provided in Section 205, a court of another state has appointed a guardian or issued a protective order consistent with this Act. The standards by which a home state that has enacted the Act may decline jurisdiction on the basis that another state is a more appropriate forum are specified in Section 206. Should the home state not have enacted the Act, Section 203(1) does not require that the declination meet the standards of Section 206.

Once a petition is filed in a court of the respondent's home state, that state does not cease to be the respondent's home state upon the passage of time even though it may be many months before an appointment is made or order issued and during that period the respondent is physically located. Only upon dismissal of the petition can the court cease to be the home state due to the passage of time. Under the definition of "home state," the six-month physical presence requirement is fulfilled or not on the date the petition is filed. *See* Section 201(a)(2).

A significant-connection state has jurisdiction under two possible bases; Section 203(2)(A) and Section 203(2)(B). Under Section 203(2)(A), a significant-connection state has jurisdiction if the individual does not have a home state or if the home state has declined jurisdiction on the basis that the significant-connection state is a more appropriate forum.

Section 203(2)(B) is designed to facilitate consideration of cases where jurisdiction is not in dispute. Section 203(2)(B) allows a court in a significant-connection state to exercise jurisdiction even though the respondent has a home state and the home state has not declined jurisdiction. The significant-connection state may assume jurisdiction under these circumstances, however, only in situations where the parties are not in disagreement concerning which court should hear the case. Jurisdiction may not be exercised by a significant-connection state under Section 203(2)(B) if (1) a petition has already been filed and is still pending in the home state or other significant-connection state; or (2) prior to making the appointment or issuing the order, a petition is filed in the respondent's home state or an objection to the court's jurisdiction is filed by a person required to be notified of the proceeding. Additionally, the court in the significant-connection state must conclude that it is an appropriate forum applying the factors listed in Section 206.

There is nothing comparable to Section 203(2)(B) in the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997). Under Section 201 of the UCCJEA a court in a significant-connection state acquires jurisdiction only if the child does not have a home state or the court of that state has declined jurisdiction. The drafters of this Act concluded that cases involving adults differed sufficiently from child custody matters that a different rule is appropriate for adult proceedings in situations where jurisdiction is uncontested.

Pursuant to Section 203(3), a court in a state that is neither the home state or a significant-connection state has jurisdiction if the home state and all significant-connection states have declined jurisdiction or the respondent does not have a home state or significant-connection state. The state must have some connection with the proceeding, however. As Section 203(a)(3) clarifies, jurisdiction in the state must be consistent with the state and United States constitutions.

SECTION 204. SPECIAL JURISDICTION.

(a) A court of this state lacking jurisdiction under Section 203 has special jurisdiction to do any of the following:

(1) appoint a guardian in an emergency for a term not exceeding [90] days for a respondent who is physically present in this state;

(2) issue a protective order with respect to real or tangible personal property located in this state;

(3) appoint a guardian or conservator for an incapacitated or protected person for whom a provisional order to transfer the proceeding from another state has been issued under procedures similar to Section 301.

(b) If a petition for the appointment of a guardian in an emergency is brought in this state and this state was not the respondent's home state on the date the petition was filed, the court shall dismiss the proceeding at the request of the court of the home state, if any, whether dismissal is requested before or after the emergency appointment.

Comment

This section lists the special circumstances where a court without jurisdiction under the general rule of Section 203 has jurisdiction for limited purposes. The three purposes are (1) the appointment of a guardian in an emergency for a term not exceeding 90 days for a respondent who is physically located in the state (subsection (a)(1)); (2) the issuance of a protective order for a respondent who owns an interest in real or tangible personal property located in the state (subsection (a)(2)); and (3) the grant of jurisdiction to consider a petition requesting the transfer of a guardianship or conservatorship proceeding from another state (subsection (a)(3)). If the court has jurisdiction under Section 203, reference to Section 204 is unnecessary. The general jurisdiction granted under Section 203 includes within it all of the special circumstances specified in this section.

When an emergency arises, action must often be taken on the spot in the place where the respondent happens to be physically located at the time. This place may not necessarily be located in the respondent's home state or even a significant-connection state. Subsection (a)(1) assures that the court where the respondent happens to be physically located at the time has jurisdiction to appoint a guardian in an emergency but only for a limited period of 90 days. The time limit is placed in brackets to signal that enacting states may substitute the time period under their existing emergency guardianship procedures. As provided in subsection (b), the emergency jurisdiction is also subject to the authority of the court in the respondent's home state to request that the emergency proceeding be dismissed. The theory here is that the emergency appointment in the temporary location should not be converted into a de facto

permanent appointment through repeated temporary appointments.

“Emergency” is specifically defined in Section 201(a)(1). Because of the great variation among the states on how an emergency is defined and its important role in conferring jurisdiction, the drafters of this Act concluded that adding a uniform definition of emergency was essential. The definition does not preclude an enacting jurisdiction from appointing a guardian under an emergency guardianship statute with a different or broader test of emergency if the court otherwise has jurisdiction to make an appointment under Section 203.

Subsection (a)(2) grants a court jurisdiction to issue a protective order with respect to real and tangible personal property located in the state even though the court does not otherwise have jurisdiction. Such orders are most commonly issued when a conservator has been appointed but the protected person owns real property located in another state. The drafters specifically rejected using a general reference to any property located in the state because of the tendency of some courts to issue protective orders with respect to intangible personal property such as a bank account where the technical situs of the asset may have little relationship to the protected person.

Subsection (a)(3) is closely related to and is necessary for the effectiveness of Article 3, which addresses transfer of a guardianship or conservatorship to another state. A “Catch-22” arises frequently in such cases. The court in the transferring state will not allow the incapacitated or protected person to move and will not terminate the case until the court in the transferee state has accepted the matter. But the court in the transferee state will not accept the case until the incapacitated or protected person has physically moved and presumably become a resident of the transferee state. Subsection (a)(3), which grants the court in the transferee state limited jurisdiction to consider a petition requesting transfer of a proceeding from another state, is intended to unlock the stalemate.

Not included in this section but a provision also conferring special jurisdiction on the court is Section 105(b), which grants the court jurisdiction to respond to a request for assistance from a court of another state.

SECTION 205. EXCLUSIVE AND CONTINUING JURISDICTION. Except as otherwise provided in Section 204, a court that has appointed a guardian or issued a protective order consistent with this [act] has exclusive and continuing jurisdiction over the proceeding until it is terminated by the court or the appointment or order expires by its own terms.

Comment

While this Act relies heavily on the Uniform Child Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997) for many basic concepts, the identity is not absolute. Section 202 of the UCCJEA specifies a variety of circumstances whereby a court can lose jurisdiction based on loss of physical presence by the child and others, loss of a significant connection, or unavailability of substantial evidence. Section 203 of the UCCJEA addresses the jurisdiction of the court to modify a custody determination made in another state. Nothing comparable to either UCCJEA section is found in this Act. Under this Act, a guardianship or protective order may be modified only upon request to the court that made the appointment or issued the order, which retains exclusive and continuing jurisdiction over the proceeding. Unlike child custody matters, guardianships and protective proceedings are ordinarily subject to continuing court supervision. Allowing the court’s jurisdiction to terminate other than by its own order would open the possibility of

competing guardianship or conservatorship appointments in different states for the same person at the same time, the problem under current law that enactment of this Act is designed to avoid. Should the incapacitated or protected person and others with an interest in the proceeding relocate to a different state, the appropriate remedy is to seek transfer of the proceeding to the other state as provided in Article 3.

The exclusive and continuing jurisdiction conferred by this section only applies to guardianship orders made and protective orders issued under Section 203. Orders made under the special jurisdiction conferred by Section 204 are not exclusive. And as provided in Section 204(b), the jurisdiction of a court in a state other than the home state to appoint a guardian in an emergency is subject to the right of a court in the home state to request that the proceeding be dismissed and any appointment terminated.

Article 3 authorizes a guardian or conservator to petition to transfer the proceeding to another state. Upon the conclusion of the transfer, the court in the accepting state will appoint the guardian or conservator as guardian or conservator in the accepting state and the court in the transferring estate will terminate the local proceeding, whereupon the jurisdiction of the transferring court terminates and the court in the accepting state acquires exclusive and continuing jurisdiction as provided in Section 205.

SECTION 206. APPROPRIATE FORUM.

(a) A court of this state having jurisdiction under Section 203 to appoint a guardian or issue a protective order may decline to exercise its jurisdiction if it determines at any time that a court of another state is a more appropriate forum.

(b) If a court of this state declines to exercise its jurisdiction under subsection (a), it shall either dismiss or stay the proceeding. The court may impose any condition the court considers just and proper, including the condition that a petition for the appointment of a guardian or issuance of a protective order be filed promptly in another state.

(c) In determining whether it is an appropriate forum, the court shall consider all relevant factors, including:

(1) any expressed preference of the respondent;

(2) whether abuse, neglect, or exploitation of the respondent has occurred or is likely to occur and which state could best protect the respondent from the abuse, neglect, or exploitation;

(3) the length of time the respondent was physically present in or was a legal resident of this or another state;

(4) the distance of the respondent from the court in each state;

(5) the financial circumstances of the respondent's estate;

(6) the nature and location of the evidence;

(7) the ability of the court in each state to decide the issue expeditiously and the

procedures necessary to present evidence;

(8) the familiarity of the court of each state with the facts and issues in the proceeding; and

(9) if an appointment were made, the court's ability to monitor the conduct of the guardian

or conservator.

Comment

This section authorizes a court otherwise having jurisdiction to decline jurisdiction on the basis that a court in another state is in a better position to make a guardianship or protective order determination. The effect of a declination of jurisdiction under this section is to rearrange the priorities specified in Section 203. A court of the home state may decline in favor of a court of a significant-connection or other state and a court in a significant-connection state may decline in favor of a court in another significant-connection or other state. The court declining jurisdiction may either dismiss or stay the proceeding. The court may also impose any condition the court considers just and proper, including the condition that a petition for the appointment of a guardian or issuance of a protective order be filed promptly in another state.

This section is similar to Section 207 of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997) except that the factors in Section 206(c) of this Act have been adapted to address issues most commonly encountered in adult guardianship and protective proceedings as opposed to child custody determinations.

Under Section 203(2)(B), the factors specified in subsection (c) of this section are to be employed in determining whether a court of a significant-connection state may assume jurisdiction when a petition has not been filed in the respondent's home state or in another significant-connection state. Under Section 207(a)(3)(B), the court is to consider these factors in deciding whether it will retain jurisdiction when unjustifiable conduct has occurred.

SECTION 207. JURISDICTION DECLINED BY REASON OF CONDUCT.

(a) If at any time a court of this state determines that it acquired jurisdiction to appoint a guardian or issue a protective order because of unjustifiable conduct, the court may:

(1) decline to exercise jurisdiction;

(2) exercise jurisdiction for the limited purpose of fashioning an appropriate remedy to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of the respondent or the protection of the respondent's property or prevent a repetition of the unjustifiable conduct, including staying the proceeding until a petition for the appointment of a guardian or issuance of a protective order is filed in a court of another state having jurisdiction; or

(3) continue to exercise jurisdiction after considering:

(A) the extent to which the respondent and all persons required to be notified of the proceedings have acquiesced in the exercise of the court's jurisdiction;

(B) whether it is a more appropriate forum than the court of any other state under the factors set forth in Section 206(c); and

(C) whether the court of any other state would have jurisdiction under factual circumstances in substantial conformity with the jurisdictional standards of Section 203.

(b) If a court of this state determines that it acquired jurisdiction to appoint a guardian or issue a protective order because a party seeking to invoke its jurisdiction engaged in unjustifiable conduct, it may assess against that party necessary and reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, investigative fees, court costs, communication expenses, witness fees and expenses, and travel expenses. The court may not assess fees, costs, or expenses of any kind against this state or a governmental subdivision, agency, or instrumentality of this state unless authorized by law other than this [act].

Comment

This section is similar to the Section 208 of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997). Like the UCCJEA, this Act does not attempt to define "unjustifiable conduct," concluding that this issue is best left to the courts. However, a common example could include the unauthorized removal of an adult to another state, with that state acquiring emergency jurisdiction under Section 204 immediately upon the move and home state jurisdiction under Section 203 six months following the move if a petition for a guardianship or protective order is not filed during the interim in the soon-to-be former home state. Although child custody cases frequently raise different issues than do adult guardianship matters, the element of unauthorized removal is encountered in both types of proceedings.

For the caselaw on unjustifiable conduct under the predecessor Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act (1968), see David Carl Minneman, *Parties' Misconduct as Grounds for Declining Jurisdiction Under §8 of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act (UCCJA)*, 16 A.L.R. 5th 650 (1993).

Subsection (a) gives the court authority to fashion an appropriate remedy when it has acquired jurisdiction because of unjustifiable conduct. The court may decline to exercise jurisdiction; exercise jurisdiction for the limited purpose of fashioning an appropriate remedy to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of the respondent or the protection of the respondent's property or prevent a repetition of the unjustifiable conduct; or continue to exercise jurisdiction after considering several specified factors. Under subsection (a), the unjustifiable conduct need not have been committed by a party.

Subsection (b) authorizes a court to assess costs and expenses, including attorney's fees, against a party whose unjustifiable conduct caused the court to acquire jurisdiction. Subsection (b) applies only if the unjustifiable conduct was committed by a party and allows for costs and expenses to be assessed only against that party. Similar to Section 208 of the UCCJEA, the court may not assess fees, costs, or expenses of any kind against this state or a governmental subdivision, agency, or instrumentality of the state unless authorized by other law.

SECTION 208. NOTICE OF PROCEEDING. If a petition for the appointment of a guardian or issuance of a protective order is brought in this state and this state was not the respondent's home state on the date the petition was filed, in addition to complying with the notice requirements of this state, notice of the petition must be given to those persons who would be entitled to notice of the petition if a proceeding were brought in the respondent's home state. The notice must be given in the same manner as notice is required to be given in this state.

Comment

While this Act tries not to interfere with a state's underlying substantive law on guardianship and protective proceedings, the issue of notice is fundamental. Under this section, when a proceeding is brought other than in the respondent's home state, the petitioner must give notice in the method provided under local law not only to those entitled to notice under local law but also to the persons required to be notified were the proceeding brought in the respondent's home state. Frequently, the respective lists of persons to be notified will be the same. But where the lists are different, notice under this section will assure that someone with a right to assert that the home state has a primary right to jurisdiction will have the opportunity to make that assertion.

SECTION 209. PROCEEDINGS IN MORE THAN ONE STATE. Except for a petition for the appointment of a guardian in an emergency or issuance of a protective order limited to property located in this state under Section 204(a)(1) or (a)(2), if a petition for the appointment of a guardian or issuance of a protective order is filed in this state and in another state and neither petition has been

dismissed or withdrawn, the following rules apply:

(1) If the court in this state has jurisdiction under Section 203, it may proceed with the case unless a court in another state acquires jurisdiction under provisions similar to Section 203 before the appointment or issuance of the order.

(2) If the court in this state does not have jurisdiction under Section 203, whether at the time the petition is filed or at any time before the appointment or issuance of the order, the court shall stay the proceeding and communicate with the court in the other state. If the court in the other state has jurisdiction, the court in this state shall dismiss the petition unless the court in the other state determines that the court in this state is a more appropriate forum.

Comment

Similar to Section 206 of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (1997), this section addresses the issue of which court has the right to proceed when proceedings for the same respondent are brought in more than one state. The provisions of this section, however, have been tailored to the needs of adult guardianship and protective proceedings and the particular jurisdictional provisions of this Act. Emergency guardianship appointments and protective proceedings with respect to property in other states (Sections 204(a)(1) and (a)(2)) are excluded from this section because the need for dual appointments is frequent in these cases; for example, a petition will be brought in the respondent's home state but emergency action will be necessary in the place where the respondent is temporarily located, or a petition for the appointment of a conservator will be brought in the respondent's home state but real estate located in some other state needs to be brought under management.

Under the Act only one court in which a petition is pending will have jurisdiction under Section 203. If a petition is brought in the respondent's home state, that court has jurisdiction over that of any significant-connection or other state. If the petition is first brought in a significant-connection state, that jurisdiction will be lost if a petition is later brought in the home state prior to an appointment or issuance of an order in the significant-connection state. Jurisdiction will also be lost in the significant-connection state if the respondent has a home state and an objection is filed in the significant-connection state that jurisdiction is properly in the home state. If petitions are brought in two significant-connection states, the first state has a right to proceed over that of the second state, and if a petition is brought in any other state, any claim to jurisdiction of that state is subordinate to that of the home state and all significant-connection states.

Under this section, if the court has jurisdiction under Section 203, it has the right to proceed unless a court of another state acquires jurisdiction prior to the first court making an appointment or issuing a protective order. If the court does not have jurisdiction under Section 203, it must defer to the court with jurisdiction unless that court determines that the court in this state is the more appropriate forum and it thereby acquires jurisdiction. While the rules are straightforward, factual issues can arise as to which state is the home state or significant-connection state. Consequently, while under Section 203 there will almost always be a court having jurisdiction to proceed, reliance on the communication, court

cooperation, and evidence gathering provisions of Sections 104-106 will sometimes be necessary to determine which court that might be.

[ARTICLE] 3

TRANSFER OF GUARDIANSHIP OR CONSERVATORSHIP

General Comment

While this article consists of two separate sections, they are part of one integrated procedure. Article 3 authorizes a guardian or conservator to petition the court to transfer the guardianship or conservatorship proceeding to a court of another state. Such a transfer is often appropriate when the incapacitated or protected person has moved or has been placed in a facility in another state, making it impossible for the original court to adequately monitor the proceeding. Article 3 authorizes a transfer of a guardianship, a conservatorship, or both. There is no requirement that both categories of proceeding be administered in the same state.

Section 301 addresses procedures in the transferring state. Section 302 addresses procedures in the accepting state.

A transfer begins with the filing of a petition by the guardian or conservator as provided in Section 301(a). Notice of this petition must be given to the persons who would be entitled to notice were the petition a petition for an original appointment. Section 301(b). A hearing on the petition is required only if requested or on the court's own motion. Section 301(c). Assuming the court in the transferring state is satisfied that the grounds for transfer stated in Section 301(d) (guardianship) or 301(e) (conservatorship) have been met, one of which is that the court is satisfied that the court in the other state will accept the case, the court must issue a provisional order approving the transfer. The transferring court will not issue a final order dismissing the case until, as provided in Section 301(f), it receives a copy of the provisional order from the accepting court accepting the transferred proceeding.

Following issuance of the provisional order by the transferring court, a petition must be filed in the accepting court as provided in Section 302(a). Notice of that petition must be given to those who would be entitled to notice of an original petition for appointment in both the transferring state and in the accepting state. Section 302(b). A hearing must be held only if requested or on the court's own motion. Section 302(c). The court must issue a provisional order accepting the case unless it is established that the transfer would be contrary to the incapacitated or protected person's interests or the guardian or conservator is ineligible for appointment in the accepting state. Section 302(d). The term "interests" as opposed to "best interests" was chosen because of the strong autonomy values in modern guardianship law. Should the court decline the transfer petition, it may consider a separately brought petition for the appointment of a guardian or issuance of a protective order only if the court has a basis for jurisdiction under Sections 203 or 204 other than by reason of the provisional order of transfer. Section 302(h).

The final steps are largely ministerial. Pursuant to Section 301(f), the provisional order from the accepting court must be filed in the transferring court. The transferring court will then issue a final order terminating the proceeding, subject to local requirements such as filing of a final report or account and the release of any bond. Pursuant to Section 302(e), the final order terminating the proceeding in the transferring court must then be filed in the accepting court, which will then convert its provisional order accepting the case into a final order appointing the petitioning guardian or conservator as guardian or conservator in the accepting state.

Because guardianship and conservatorship law and practice will likely differ between the two

states, the court in the accepting state must within 90 days after issuance of a final order determine whether the guardianship or conservatorship needs to be modified to conform to the law of the accepting state. Section 302(f). The number "90" is placed in brackets to encourage states to coordinate this time limit with the time limits for other required filings such as guardianship or conservatorship plans. This initial period in the accepting state is also an appropriate time to change the guardian or conservator if there is a more appropriate person to act as guardian or conservator in the accepting state. The drafters specifically did not try to design the procedures in Article 3 for the difficult problems that can arise in connection with a transfer when the guardian or conservator is ineligible to act in the second state, a circumstance that can occur when a financial institution is acting as conservator or a government agency is acting as guardian. Rather, the procedures in Article 3 are designed for the typical case where the guardian or conservator is legally eligible to act in the second state. Should that particular guardian or conservator not be the best person to act in the accepting state, a change of guardian or conservator can be initiated once the transfer has been secured.

The transfer procedure in this article responds to numerous problems that have arisen in connection with attempted transfers under the existing law of most states. Sometimes a court will dismiss a case on the assumption a proceeding will be brought in another state, but such proceeding is never filed. Sometimes a court will refuse to dismiss a case until the court in the other state accepts the matter, but the court in the other state refuses to consider the petition until the already existing guardianship or conservatorship has been terminated. Oftentimes the court will conclude that it is without jurisdiction to make an appointment until the respondent is physically present in the state, a problem which Section 204 (a)(3) addresses by granting a court special jurisdiction to consider a petition to accept a proceeding from another state. But the most serious problem is the need to prove the case in the second state from scratch, including proving the respondent's incapacity and the choice of guardian or conservator. Article 3 eliminates this problem. Section 302(g) requires that the court accepting the case recognize a guardianship or conservatorship order from the other state, including the determination of the incapacitated or protected person's incapacity and the appointment of the guardian or conservator, if otherwise eligible to act in the accepting state.

SECTION 301. TRANSFER OF GUARDIANSHIP OR CONSERVATORSHIP TO ANOTHER STATE.

(a) A guardian or conservator appointed in this state may petition the court to transfer the guardianship or conservatorship to another state.

(b) Notice of a petition under subsection (a) must be given to the persons that would be entitled to notice of a petition in this state for the appointment of a guardian or conservator.

(c) On the court's own motion or on request of the guardian or conservator, the incapacitated or protected person, or other person required to be notified of the petition, the court shall hold a hearing on a petition filed pursuant to subsection (a).

(d) The court shall issue an order provisionally granting a petition to transfer a guardianship and

shall direct the guardian to petition for guardianship in the other state if the court is satisfied that the guardianship will be accepted by the court in the other state and the court finds that:

(1) the incapacitated person is physically present in or is reasonably expected to move permanently to the other state;

(2) an objection to the transfer has not been made or, if an objection has been made, the objector has not established that the transfer would be contrary to the interests of the incapacitated person; and

(3) plans for care and services for the incapacitated person in the other state are reasonable and sufficient.

(e) The court shall issue a provisional order granting a petition to transfer a conservatorship and shall direct the conservator to petition for conservatorship in the other state if the court is satisfied that the conservatorship will be accepted by the court of the other state and the court finds that:

(1) the protected person is physically present in or is reasonably expected to move permanently to the other state, or the protected person has a significant connection to the other state considering the factors in Section 201(b);

(2) an objection to the transfer has not been made or, if an objection has been made, the objector has not established that the transfer would be contrary to the interests of the protected person; and

(3) adequate arrangements will be made for management of the protected person's property.

(f) The court shall issue a final order confirming the transfer and terminating the guardianship or conservatorship upon its receipt of:

(1) a provisional order accepting the proceeding from the court to which the proceeding is to be transferred which is issued under provisions similar to Section 302; and

(2) the documents required to terminate a guardianship or conservatorship in this state.

SECTION 302. ACCEPTING GUARDIANSHIP OR CONSERVATORSHIP

TRANSFERRED FROM ANOTHER STATE.

(a) To confirm transfer of a guardianship or conservatorship transferred to this state under provisions similar to Section 301, the guardian or conservator must petition the court in this state to accept the guardianship or conservatorship. The petition must include a certified copy of the other state's provisional order of transfer.

(b) Notice of a petition under subsection (a) must be given to those persons that would be entitled to notice if the petition were a petition for the appointment of a guardian or issuance of a protective order in both the transferring state and this state. The notice must be given in the same manner as notice is required to be given in this state.

(c) On the court's own motion or on request of the guardian or conservator, the incapacitated or protected person, or other person required to be notified of the proceeding, the court shall hold a hearing on a petition filed pursuant to subsection (a).

(d) The court shall issue an order provisionally granting a petition filed under subsection (a) unless:

(1) an objection is made and the objector establishes that transfer of the proceeding would be contrary to the interests of the incapacitated or protected person; or

(2) the guardian or conservator is ineligible for appointment in this state.

(e) The court shall issue a final order accepting the proceeding and appointing the guardian or

conservator as guardian or conservator in this state upon its receipt from the court from which the proceeding is being transferred of a final order issued under provisions similar to Section 301 transferring the proceeding to this state.

(f) Not later than [90] days after issuance of a final order accepting transfer of a guardianship or conservatorship, the court shall determine whether the guardianship or conservatorship needs to be modified to conform to the law of this state.

(g) In granting a petition under this section, the court shall recognize a guardianship or conservatorship order from the other state, including the determination of the incapacitated or protected person's incapacity and the appointment of the guardian or conservator.

(h) The denial by a court of this state of a petition to accept a guardianship or conservatorship transferred from another state does not affect the ability of the guardian or conservator to seek appointment as guardian or conservator in this state under [insert statutory references to this state's ordinary procedures law for the appointment of guardian or conservator] if the court has jurisdiction to make an appointment other than by reason of the provisional order of transfer.

[ARTICLE] 4

REGISTRATION AND RECOGNITION OF ORDERS FROM OTHER STATES

General Comment

Article 4 is designed to facilitate the enforcement of guardianship and protective orders in other states. This article does not make distinctions among the types of orders that can be enforced. This article is applicable whether the guardianship or conservatorship is full or limited. While some states have expedited procedures for sales of real estate by conservators appointed in other states, few states have enacted statutes dealing with enforcement of guardianship orders, such as when a care facility questions the authority of a guardian appointed in another state. Sometimes, these sorts of refusals necessitate that the proceeding be transferred to the other state or that an entirely new petition be filed, problems that could often be avoided if guardianship and protective orders were entitled to recognition in other states.

Article 4 provides for such recognition. The key concept is registration. Section 401 provides for registration of guardianship orders, and Section 402 for registration of protective orders. Following registration of the order in the appropriate county of the other state, and after giving notice to the appointing court of the intent to register the order in the other state, Section 403 authorizes the guardian

or conservator to thereafter exercise all powers authorized in the order of appointment except as prohibited under the laws of the registering state.

The drafters of the Act concluded that the registration of certified copies provides sufficient protection and that it was not necessary to mandate the filing of authenticated copies.

SECTION 401. REGISTRATION OF GUARDIANSHIP ORDERS. If a guardian has been appointed in another state and a petition for the appointment of a guardian is not pending in this state, the guardian appointed in the other state, after giving notice to the appointing court of an intent to register, may register the guardianship order in this state by filing as a foreign judgment in a court, in any appropriate [county] of this state, certified copies of the order and letters of office.

SECTION 402. REGISTRATION OF PROTECTIVE ORDERS. If a conservator has been appointed in another state and a petition for a protective order is not pending in this state, the conservator appointed in the other state, after giving notice to the appointing court of an intent to register, may register the protective order in this state by filing as a foreign judgment in a court of this state, in any [county] in which property belonging to the protected person is located, certified copies of the order and letters of office and of any bond.

SECTION 403. EFFECT OF REGISTRATION.

(a) Upon registration of a guardianship or protective order from another state, the guardian or conservator may exercise in this state all powers authorized in the order of appointment except as prohibited under the laws of this state, including maintaining actions and proceedings in this state and, if the guardian or conservator is not a resident of this state, subject to any conditions imposed upon nonresident parties.

(b) A court of this state may grant any relief available under this [act] and other law of this state to enforce a registered order.

[ARTICLE] 5

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SECTION 501. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION. In applying and construing this uniform act, consideration must be given to the need to promote uniformity of the law with respect to its subject matter among states that enact it.

SECTION 502. RELATION TO ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT. This [act] modifies, limits, and supersedes the federal Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7001, et seq., but does not modify, limit, or supersede Section 101(c) of that act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7001(c), or authorize electronic delivery of any of the notices described in Section 103(b) of that act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7003(b).

SECTION 503. REPEALS. The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)

Legislative Note: Upon enactment, the state should repeal existing provisions on subject matter jurisdiction for adult guardianship and protective proceedings. If existing provisions address proceedings for both minors and adults, the provisions should be amended to limit their application to minors. In addition, the state should repeal or limit to minors any existing provisions authorizing transfer of a guardianship or conservatorship proceeding to another state and any provisions authorizing a guardian or conservator to act in another state.

SECTION 504. TRANSITIONAL PROVISION.

(a) This [act] applies to guardianship and protective proceedings begun on or after [the effective date].

(b) [Articles] 1, 3, and 4 and Sections 501 and 502 apply to proceedings begun before [the effective date], regardless of whether a guardianship or protective order has been issued.

Comment

This Act applies retroactively to guardianships and conservatorships in existence on the effective

date. The guardian or conservator appointed prior to the effective date of the Act may petition to transfer the proceeding to another state under Article 3 and register and enforce the order in other states pursuant to Article 4. The jurisdictional provisions of Article 2 also apply to proceedings begun on or after the effective date. What the Act does not do is change the jurisdictional rules midstream for petitions filed prior to the effective date for which an appointment has not been made or order issued as of the effective date. Jurisdiction in such cases is governed by prior law. Nor does the Act affect the validity of already existing appointments even though the court might not have had jurisdiction had this Act been in effect at the time the appointment was made.

SECTION 505. EFFECTIVE DATE. This [act] takes effect.....