

Montana Court Rules in Favor of Aid in Dying

BY JOYCE FRIEDEN

Physicians in Montana may legally assist terminally ill patients in hastening death, according to a ruling by the Montana Supreme Court.

The decision in the case of *Baxter v. State of Montana* concerned Robert Baxter, a retired truck driver from Billings, Mont., who was terminally ill with lymphocytic leukemia with diffuse lymphadenopathy. As a result of the disease and its treatment, Mr. Baxter suffered from symptoms including “infections, chronic fatigue and weakness, anemia, night sweats, nausea, massively swollen glands, significant ongoing digestive problems, and generalized pain and discomfort,” according to the decision.

The court said further, “The symptoms were expected to increase in frequency and intensity as the chemother-

‘We know aid in dying happens in every state, even where the legality is unclear. In Montana, this [decision] brings clarity to this issue.’

apy lost its effectiveness. There was no cure for Mr. Baxter’s disease and no prospect of recovery. Mr. Baxter wanted the option of ingesting a lethal dose of medication prescribed by his physician and self-administered at the time of Mr. Baxter’s own choosing.”

Mr. Baxter, along with four physicians and Compassion & Choices, a pro-aid-in-dying group, filed suit in Montana’s district court for the first judicial district, challenging the constitutionality of Montana homicide statutes being applied to physicians who provide aid in dying to mentally competent, terminally ill patients. Mr. Baxter’s attorneys contended that the right to die with dignity was constitutional under Montana law.

The district court ruled in favor of Mr. Baxter, but the state appealed the ruling to the Montana Supreme Court. On Dec. 31, 2009, that court also ruled in favor of Mr. Baxter, by a vote of 5-2, although it declined to comment on whether aid in dying complied with the Montana constitution. Mr. Baxter had died in December 2008.

“This court is guided by the judicial principle that we should decline to rule on the constitutionality of a legislative act if we are able to decide the case without reaching constitutional questions,” wrote Justice W. William Leaphart. “We find nothing in Montana Supreme Court precedent or Montana statutes indicating that physician aid in dying is against public policy. ... Furthermore, the Montana Rights of the Terminally Ill Act indicates legislative respect for a patient’s autonomous right to decide if and how he will receive medical treatment at the end of his life. ... We therefore hold that under [Montana law], a terminally ill patient’s consent to physician aid in dying

constitutes a statutory defense to a charge of homicide against the aiding physician when no other consent exceptions apply.”

Justice James Rice, one of the two dissenting judges, argued that under current Montana law, a physician can be prosecuted for helping a patient commit suicide—if the patient survives, the crime falls under the category of aiding suicide; if the patient dies,

the crime is regarded as a homicide.

“Importantly, it is also very clear that a patient’s consent to the physician’s efforts is of no consequence whatsoever under these statutes,” he wrote. “[The majority] ignores expressed intent, parses statutes, and churns reasons to avoid the clear policy of the State and reach an untenable conclusion: that it is *against* public policy for a physician to assist in a suicide if the patient happens to *live* af-

ter taking the medication; but that the very same act, with the very same intent, is *not* against public policy if the patient *dies*. In my view, the Court’s conclusion is without support, without clear reason, and without moral force.”

In the wake of the court ruling—which cannot be appealed—opinions vary as to whether more Montana physicians will now provide aid in dying to terminally ill patients. Chicago health care attorney

People who have had chicken pox are at risk for shingles and postherpetic neuralgia (PHN) pain^{1,2}
This year, ~1 million Americans will develop shingles.^{1,2}
1 in 5 of them will go on to develop PHN pain¹



Indication

LIDODERM (lidocaine patch 5%) is indicated for relief of pain associated with post-herpetic neuralgia. Apply only to **intact skin**.

Important Safety Information

LIDODERM is contraindicated in patients with a history of sensitivity to local anesthetics (amide type) or any product component.

Even a *used* LIDODERM patch contains a large amount of lidocaine (at least 665 mg). The potential exists for a small child or a pet to suffer serious adverse effects from chewing or ingesting a new or used LIDODERM patch, although the risk with this formulation has not been evaluated. It is important to **store and dispose of LIDODERM out of the reach of children, pets, and others**.

Excessive dosing, such as applying LIDODERM to larger areas or for longer than the recommended wearing time, could result in increased absorption of lidocaine and high blood concentrations leading to serious adverse effects.

Avoid contact of LIDODERM with the eye. If contact occurs, immediately

wash the eye with water or saline and protect it until sensation returns.

Patients with severe hepatic disease are at greater risk of developing toxic blood concentrations of lidocaine, because of their inability to *metabolize lidocaine normally*. LIDODERM should be used with *caution* in patients receiving Class I antiarrhythmic drugs (such as tocainide and mexiletine) since the toxic effects are additive and potentially synergistic. LIDODERM should also be used with caution in pregnant (including labor and delivery) or nursing mothers.

Allergic reactions, although rare, can occur.

During or immediately after LIDODERM treatment, the skin at the site of application may develop blisters, bruising, burning sensation, depigmentation, dermatitis, discoloration, edema, erythema, exfoliation, irritation, papules, petechia, pruritus, vesicles, or may be the locus of abnormal sensation. These reactions are generally mild and transient, resolving spontaneously within a few minutes to hours. Other reactions may include dizziness, headache, and nausea.

When LIDODERM is used concomitantly with local anesthetic products, the amount absorbed from all formulations must be considered.

Miles J. Zaremski, who wrote a “friend of the court” brief in support of Mr. Baxter in the Montana case, said that even though the decision came out in their favor of them plaintiff, physicians in Montana will be reluctant to aid terminally ill patients in dying until legal protocols for the procedure have been established.

“In Montana, if the patient gives the doctor consent to provide aid in dying, the physician can escape homicide laws,” said Mr. Zaremski, who is also a former president of the American College of Legal Medicine. “Well, how was that consent given? Were there witness-

es to it? Did you wait 10 days? I think you need protocols and standards in place.”

Oregon and Washington, the only states with aid-in-dying statutes, have protocols written into their laws, he noted. As to who would write the Montana protocols, “I think the legislature should, with input from the medical community,” he said.

Kathryn Tucker, legal director of Compassion & Choices, noted that another aid-in-dying case with which her group is involved is being litigated in Connecticut. Ms. Tucker disagreed with the idea that Montana physicians would not immediately feel freer to provide aid in dying to

terminally ill patients in the wake of the state supreme court decision.

“Montana physicians can feel safe that in providing aid in dying they don’t run risk of criminal prosecution,” she said. “We know aid in dying happens in every state, even where the legality is unclear. In Montana, this [decision] brings clarity to this issue.”

Ms. Tucker added that most medical care “is not governed by statute; it’s governed by the standard of care and best practices. So most physicians will approach aid in dying in Montana as something regulated by the standard of

care. I think what’s going to happen with Montana ... [is that this case] will move aid in dying into normal medical practice that’s governed by the standard of care and we’ll get away from the notion that there need to be elaborate statutes.”

As to whether other states will adopt aid-in-dying statutes, “It’s almost like gay marriage,” Mr. Zaremski said. “Gay marriage and rights for gay couples was an unknown and foreign concept, and now it’s inching forward bit by bit, so maybe someday aid in dying will be the norm and not the exception.” ■

For the many places patients may experience PHN pain LIDODERM® fits

Proven efficacy in 2 randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trials³⁻⁶

- In a 12-hour study, patients experienced pain relief at 30 minutes after the first dose vs observation cohort ($P=0.0001$; $N=35$)^{4,a}
 - Significant reduction in pain intensity vs placebo at hours 4-12 ($P<0.001$ to $P=0.038$)
- In a 2-week study, 84% of patients had moderate to complete pain relief at 2 weeks vs placebo ($P<0.001$; $N=32$)^{5,b,c}

Favorable safety profile³

- Nonnarcotic, nonsedating, nonscheduled
- May be used in patients who have comorbidities or are taking concomitant medications

Immediately discard used patches or remaining unused portions of cut patches in household trash in a manner that prevents accidental application or ingestion by children, pets, or others.

Before prescribing LIDODERM, please refer to the accompanying brief summary of full Prescribing Information.

^a A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, 4-way crossover trial ($N=35$) assessed safety and efficacy of LIDODERM. Patients were allodynic with a mean age of 75 years and mean PHN duration of 48 months. Pain intensity measured with horizontal 100-mm Visual Analogue Scale: 0=no pain and 100=worst pain imaginable. Measurements were recorded before patch application, at 30 minutes, and hours 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, and 12. Least-squares means were used as the best unbiased estimate of patients’ mean values.

^b Demonstrated over 14 days in a post hoc analysis of a randomized, enriched-enrollment, double-blind, placebo-controlled, crossover trial. Patients enrolled in the study had been using LIDODERM for ≥ 1 month (ie, enriched enrollment); mean age of 77.4 years and mean PHN duration of 7.3 years. Pain relief measured using 6-item verbal scale: 0 (worse), 1 (no relief), 2 (slight relief), 3 (moderate relief), 4 (a lot of relief), and 5 (complete relief). Patients exited the study if their verbal pain relief rating decreased more than 2 categories for any 2 consecutive days from baseline.

^c Results of enriched-enrollment studies can’t be generalized to the entire population; subjects in such studies may be able to distinguish the active drug from placebo based on nontherapeutic features of the treatments.

References: 1. Cluff RS, Rowbotham MC. *Neural Clin.* 1998;16(4):813-832. 2. Weaver BA. *J Am Osteopath Assoc.* 2007;107(3 suppl 1):S2-S7. 3. Lidoderm Prescribing Information. Chadds Ford, PA: Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc; 2008. 4. Rowbotham MC et al. *Pain.* 1996;65(1):39-44. 5. Data on file, DOF-LD-02, Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc. 6. Gaier BS et al. *Pain.* 1999;80(3):533-538.

10
YEARS
OF USE

Lidoderm®
LIDOCAINE PATCH 5%