10-169. Criminal contempt.

1

2 A. **Scope.** This rule addresses the inherent and statutory powers of the court to impose 3 punitive sanctions for criminal contempt of court. This rule shall not apply to the imposition of 4 other sanctions specifically authorized by these rules, statute, or the common law, or to the 5 imposition of remedial sanctions for civil contempt of court. 6 B. **Definitions.** 7 "Contempt" or "contemptuous conduct" includes but is not limited to (1) 8 (a) disorderly conduct, insolent behavior, or a breach of peace, noise, or 9 other disturbance, if such behavior actually obstructs or hinders the administration of justice or 10 tends to diminish the court's authority; 11 misconduct of court officers in official transactions; or (b) 12 (c) disobedience of any lawful order, rule, or process of the court. 13 (2) "Direct contempt" means contemptuous conduct committed in the immediate presence of the court that is personally observed by the judge. 14 15 (3) "Indirect contempt" means contemptuous conduct that occurs outside the 16 presence of the court, or conduct that is not personally observed by the judge and requires further fact finding. 17 18 **(4)** "Punitive sanction" means a sentence imposed to punish a person for 19 committing an act of criminal contempt and may include a reprimand or unconditional fine or 20 unconditional sentence of imprisonment. 21 C. **Criminal contempt.** Adult. The children's court shall hold an adult in direct or indirect criminal 22 (1) 23 contempt of court only as provided by Rule 1-093 NMRA.

1	(2) Child. The children's court shall not hold a child in direct or indirect
2	criminal contempt of court. Nothing in this rule shall affect the authority of the children's court to
3	hold a child in civil contempt of court.
4	[Approved by Supreme Court Order No. 17-8300-019, effective for all cases filed or pending on
5	or after December 31, 2017; suspended by Supreme Court Order No. 21-8300-032, effective
6	November 22, 2021, until further order of the Court.]
7	
8	Committee commentary. — Judicial powers of contempt provide courts with authority to enforce
9	orders and protect the dignity of the court. New Mexico law classifies contempts of court as either
10	civil or criminal. See Concha v. Sanchez, 2011-NMSC-031, ¶ 24, 150 N.M. 268, 258 P.3d 1060.
11	Civil contempt sanctions are remedial and may be imposed as coercive measures to compel a
12	person to comply with an order of the court or to enforce the rights of a private party to a
13	lawsuit. Id. ¶ 25; State ex rel. Bliss v. Greenwood, 1957-NMSC-071, ¶ 6, 63 N.M. 156, 315 P.2d
14	223. A person held in civil contempt "carries the keys to his prison" and can end continuing
15	contempt sanctions by complying with the court's orders. Concha, 2011-NMSC-031, ¶ 25
16	(internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Criminal contempt sanctions are imposed to punish
17	the contempt defendant for a completed act of contempt and to preserve the dignity and authority
18	of the court. See Concha, 2011-NMSC-031, \P 26; Greenwood, 1957-NMSC-071, \P 6.
19	Many judges in New Mexico regularly address children who are unable to properly regulate
20	their conduct inside or outside the courtroom. Indeed, courts can anticipate that children will
21	behave improperly at times, and they can anticipate that children will not always follow directives.
22	The imposition of criminal contempt towards children, however, is unnecessary and is not in

23

keeping with the purposes of the Children's Code. Historically, New Mexico has recognized that

1	children need to be treated as children, even by courts. Since 1917, when the state established its
2	first juvenile court, New Mexico courts have adopted special procedures governing treatment of
3	children accused of criminal offenses. See Peyton v. Nord, 1968-NMSC-027, ¶ 11, 78 N.M.
4	717, 437 P.2d 716. New Mexico's juvenile court aligned with the national juvenile court
5	movement, which rejected the historic common law approach towards children, under which all
6	children over seven years of age accused of criminal offenses were treated the same as adults. See
7	In re Gault, 387 U.S. 1, 16-17 (1967). The juvenile justice system in New Mexico presumes that
8	while children must be held accountable for criminal acts, their conduct "is not to be measured by
9	the same standard as that of a matured person." State v. Adam J., 2003-NMCA-080, \P 18, 133
10	N.M. 815, 70 P.3d 805 (Alarid, J., specially concurring) (citations and internal quotation marks
11	omitted).
12	Similarly, the legislature has declared that the purpose of the Children's Code is "first to
13	provide for the care, protection and wholesome mental and physical development of children."
14	NMSA 1978, § 32A-1-3(A). The Code also seeks to reduce overrepresentation of minority
15	children in the juvenile justice system. NMSA 1978, § 32A-1-3(E). The Delinquency Act, NMSA
16	1978, §§ 32A-2-1 to -33, for example, articulates legislative intent regarding treatment of juveniles
17	accused of committing delinquent acts as follows:
18	A. Consistent with the protection of the public interest, to remove from
19	children committing delinquent acts the adult consequences of criminal behavior, but to still hold
20	children committing delinquent acts accountable for their actions to the extent of the child's age,
21	education, mental and physical condition, background and all other relevant factors, and to provide
22	a program of supervision, care and rehabilitation, including rehabilitative restitution by the child
23	to the victims of the child's delinquent act to the extent that the child is reasonably able to do so;

1 B. To provide effective deterrents to acts of juvenile delinquency, *including an* 2 *emphasis on community-based alternatives;* 3 4 E. To develop juvenile justice policies and procedures that are supported by 5 data; 6 . . . 7 H. To develop *community-based alternatives to detention*; 8 I. To eliminate or reduce disparities based upon race or gender; 9 NMSA 1978, § 32A-2-2 (emphasis added). 10 The Delinquency Act reflects "an evolving concern that children be treated as children so 11 long as they can benefit from the treatment and rehabilitation provided for in the Delinquency 12 Act." State v. Jones, 2010-NMSC-012, ¶ 32, 148 N.M. 1, 229 P.3d 474. Unlike the adult criminal 13 justice system, which places emphasis on punishment and deterrence, the juvenile justice system "favor[s] the rehabilitation and treatment of children." Id. ¶ 35 (citing State v. Jose S., 2007-14 15 NMCA-146, ¶ 16, 142 N.M. 829, 171 P.3d 768). The New Mexico legislature and courts have 16 uniformly emphasized that children's lack of maturity must be taken into account in decisions 17 involving the justice system and children. See, e.g., State v. Jonathan M., 1990-NMSC-046, ¶

18

19

20

21

22

23

8, 109 N.M. 789, 791 P.2d 64. Importantly, New Mexico has chosen not to criminalize status

offenses, activities that are unlawful due to a child's age and that would not be criminal if engaged

in by an adult. See ACLU v. City of Albuquerque, 1999-NMSC-044, ¶ 25, 128 N.M. 315, 992 P.2d

866 (holding that the Children's Code preempts city ordinance providing criminal sanctions for

violations of curfew). These principles strongly suggest that children are not proper subjects of the

criminal contempt power and its focus on punishment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

In addition, the children who appear in court, especially those in abuse and neglect, mental health, and juvenile delinquency proceedings, often have experienced adverse childhood events and trauma. See the National Child Traumatic Stress Network "NCTSN Bench Card for the Trauma-Informed Judge," which is distributed through the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and is available at: https://swrtc.nmsu.edu/ files/2013/10/ Letter-andjudge bench cards final.pdf (last visited August 28, 2016). The children in abuse and neglect proceedings, in particular, are parties to the proceeding because they are allegedly or have been adjudicated as abused or neglected children. See NMSA 1978, § 32A-4-10. The Abuse and Neglect Act requires that courts order "the department to implement and the child's parent, guardian or custodian to cooperate with any treatment plan approved by the court." See NMSA § 32A-4-22(C). The Abuse and Neglect Act thus contemplates that the adults — not the children bear the responsibility for complying with the court's directives. Under these circumstances, holding a child in criminal contempt of court for misbehaving in the court room risks further traumatizing a child who already has been the subject of abuse or neglect.

By favoring the use of civil contempt powers as to children and prohibiting criminal contempt as to children, this rule balances the court's inherent authority with the larger purposes of the Children's Code. *Accord* NMSA 1978, § 32A-1-5(B) ("The supreme court shall adopt rules of procedure not in conflict with the children's code governing proceedings in the children's court, including rules and procedures for juries."); § 32A-1-18(C) (providing that the court may "punish a person for contempt of court for disobeying an order of the court or for obstructing or interfering with the proceedings of the court or the enforcement of its orders").

Judges, however, are not without tools to maintain the authority and integrity of the court.

New Mexico law provides multiple alternatives to address misbehavior by children. The

- delinquency act provides courts with the authority and procedures to address delinquency. The
- 2 mental health code provides courts with the authority and procedures to address circumstances
- 3 when children require treatment. And civil contempt provides courts with the authority to compel
- 4 compliance with judicial orders. Thus, despite the rule's focus on helping the child achieve
- 5 appropriate behavior, rather than on punishment, the judiciary remains well-equipped to respond
- 6 to contemptuous conduct without resorting to use of the criminal contempt power.
- 7 [Approved by Supreme Court Order No. 17-8300-019, effective for all cases filed or pending on
- 8 or after December 31, 2017; suspended by Supreme Court Order No. 21-8300-032, effective
- 9 November 22, 2021, until further order of the Court.]