

1-1968

## Issue Editor's Preface

Gary G. Striker

Follow this and additional works at: [https://repository.uchastings.edu/hastings\\_law\\_journal](https://repository.uchastings.edu/hastings_law_journal)



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Gary G. Striker, *Issue Editor's Preface*, 19 HASTINGS L.J. 601 (1968).

Available at: [https://repository.uchastings.edu/hastings\\_law\\_journal/vol19/iss3/1](https://repository.uchastings.edu/hastings_law_journal/vol19/iss3/1)

This Comment is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Hastings Law Journal by an authorized editor of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository.

## Issue Editor's Preface

Current interest in the subject has not left the matter of narcotic and hallucinogenic drugs entirely untouched by legal periodicals. It is our purpose to avoid in this issue what has been treated elsewhere, and to plug some conspicuous gaps.

Mr. Peter Belton contributes an exhaustive analysis of the legislative and judicial history of the California civil commitment program for narcotics addicts—a system which serves as a prototype for other states. Professor Joel Jay Finer explores the constitutional challenges presented by those who attach religious significance to the ingestion of illegal drugs. Doctors Brill and Kline offer some medical perspective in areas of legislative interest. Several pieces of student work complete our symposium collection.

A considerable part of this issue is composed of off-topic discussion, headed by Mr. Michael Moore's treatment of problems and solutions in criminal discovery

The production of this issue could not have been achieved but for that cadre of the dedicated on our Editorial Board and Staff, most notably Donna Spragg, Tom Wood, Sam Young and Richard Smith.

GARY G. STRIEKER  
*Issue Editor*

[The table of contents below has been prepared to facilitate use of the following article by Mr. Belton.]

## Table of Contents

Introduction and Scope .....	603
I Constitutionality: Legislative Response to Judicial Impetus ..	605
1. Cruel and Unusual Punishment: the "Indicia of Criminality" .....	605
2. Vagueness: the Definition of Addiction .....	614
3. Equal Protection of the Law: the Right to a Trial de Novo .....	617
II Commitment Procedure in General .....	620
1. Strict Compliance With the Statute: the Rule Declared ..	620
2. The Aftermath of <i>Raner</i> .....	622
3. Legislation by Cross-Reference: the Prior Law .....	623
4. The 1967 Amendments: a Unitary Procedure .....	625
5. Waiver of Commitment Hearing .....	629
III The Trial Court's Discretion Not to Institute Commit- ment Proceedings .....	632
1. "Fit Subject for Commitment": Standards and Pre- sumptions .....	632
2. Statutory Ineligibility for Commitment .....	637
3. Statutory Exception to Ineligibility .....	640
IV The Director of Corrections' Discretion to Return the Person Committed to Court .....	646
1. Constitutionality: the "Unresponsive" vs. the "Uncooperative" Addict .....	647
2. Scope of Review Upon Return to Court .....	649
3. Challenges on Questions of Fact .....	651
4. Challenges on Questions of Law: the Director's Duty to Comply With the Statute .....	653
V Credit for Time Spent Under Commitment to the Cali- fornia Rehabilitation Center .....	657
VI Appeal From the Order of Commitment .....	661
1. Appealability .....	662
2. Scope of Appeal: Effect of Failure to Demand a Trial de Novo .....	662