

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

SECTION OF FAMILY LAW
STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL
STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AID & INDIGENT DEFENDANTS
STANDING COMMITTEE ON ARMED FORCES LAW
GENERAL PRACTICE, SOLO AND SMALL FIRM DIVISION
GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC SECTOR LAWYERS DIVISION
JUDICIAL DIVISION
YOUNG LAWYERS DIVISION

REPORT TO THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 RESOLVED, That the American Bar Association opposes the enactment of
federal legislation that would:
- 2 (a) create federal-question jurisdiction in child custody cases, including cases
involving servicemember-
3 parents,
4
5
- 6 (b) dictate case
7 outcomes or impose evidentiary burdens in state child-custody matters involving
8 servicemember-parents,
9
- 10 (c) co-opt the discretionary authority of state courts, in cases involving
servicemember-
11 parents, to determine the best interests of the child and award custody
accordingly,
12
13
- 14 (d) pre-empt the growing body of state laws that comprehensively address
15 servicemember domestic relations matters, including child custody,
16
- 17 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the American Bar Association urges the states to
enact legislation prohibiting
18 denial of child custody to a servicemember based solely on absence due to
military
19 deployment.

REPORT

We Americans owe many things to those who disproportionately bear the burden of national sacrifice, but bad law is not one of them. Today as always, the American Bar Association is as resolutely committed to the legal rights of American military members as it is to those of America's children. Yet there can be no Solomon-like splitting of interests when it comes to legislation that, in the name of deployed servicemembers' parental rights, would create a federal child custody law that usurps the historic primacy of the states in domestic relations law and relegates the best interests of the child to a secondary consideration in custody disputes.

Such legislation was kept out of the Fiscal Year 2009 National Defense Authorization Act at the eleventh hour. Similar measures had been introduced in prior sessions of Congress, and there is every reason to believe that this measure will keep resurfacing until either passed, or finally dispatched after a full vetting. Should such a measure re-surface, the ABA urges Congress to reject in its entirety this unsound incursion into the realm of the states, however well-intentioned its proponents, with the understanding that the rights of servicemembers and their children are best served within the existing framework of state laws and court-integrated social services, and the formidable procedural protections already built into the federal Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA).

The Recent Legislation

The latest iteration of the opposed legislation, section 4510 of H.R. 5658, 110th Congress, would have amended 50 U.S.C. App. § 521, the SCRA, by adding language dictating outcomes in child custody cases, where a servicemember parent had legal custody of the child at the time the parent was deployed to a contingency operation such as Iraq or Afghanistan. The bill would have compelled courts to restore custody of the child to the servicemember parent upon his or her return home post-deployment, unless it could be demonstrated by "clear and convincing evidence" that it was not in the child's best interest to have custody restored to the returning servicemember parent. The bill also would have prohibited a court, in deciding the child's interests, from considering how a servicemember's extended absence due to deployment may have affected those interests. The bill further would have prohibited change in child custody while a servicemember was deployed, through modification of a child custody arrangement that existed at the time of deployment, absent clear and convincing evidence that the change was in the child's best interests.

The Threat to Existing, Effective Legal Mechanisms

On its face, the proposition that an American servicemember must not lose custody of his or her child by virtue of service to our country in distant danger zones seems unassailable. On the other hand, is it ever reasonable to suggest that a court, in deciding a child's best interest, be prohibited from even considering how a parent's prolonged

military deployment, *among other factors*, might affect the child's-best-interests analysis? The reality is that conflicting interests within separated families do not lend themselves to inflexible legal prescriptions. Such matters must be decided on a case-by-case basis, always focusing on the best interest of the child as the primary factor.

Wielding the club of a federal child-custody law that pre-ordains pro-servicemember outcomes in these cases would compromise the generally-accepted "best interests of the child" standard governing custody decisions.

- A. Creating a Federal Law of Child Custody for These Servicemember-Parent Cases Would Invade the Province of State Courts and Disrupt Existing, Effective Legal Frameworks for Resolving Child Custody Disputes.

Child Custody Is Not a Federal Question.

The opposed legislation would create a new substantive legal interest in restored child-custody rights, under the SCRA. It would thus create federal-question jurisdiction over covered child custody cases, forcing federal judges to venture into the *terra incognita* of child custody jurisprudence when a covered case is originally filed in federal court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 or removed to federal court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1446.

Such an outcome would run counter to a long and unbroken history of federal deference to state courts on subject matters not expressly reserved to federal judicial authority. In particular, federal courts have not entertained claims addressing child custody or visitation, or other "adjustments to family status." *See Ankenbrandt v. Richards and Kessler*, 504 U.S. 689 (1992); *Thompson v. Thompson*, 798 F.2d 1547 (9th Cir. 1986), *aff'd* 484 U.S. 174 (1988); *Cole v. Cole*, 693 F.2d 1083 (4th Cir. 1980); *Doe v. Doe*, 660 F.2d 101 (4th Cir. 1981). In *Ankenbrandt*, the Supreme Court observed:

Issuance of [custody] decrees . . . not infrequently involves retention of jurisdiction by the court and deployment of social workers to monitor compliance. As a matter of judicial economy, state courts are more eminently suited to work of this type than are federal courts, which lack the close association with state and local government organizations dedicated to handling that arise out of conflicts over divorce, alimony, and child custody decrees. Moreover, as a matter of judicial expertise, it makes far more sense to retain the rule that federal courts lack power to issue these types of decrees because of the special proficiency developed by state tribunals of the past century and a half. 504 U.S. at 703-04.

The same reasoning must guide Congress in consideration of the next bill purporting to create a federal law of child custody.

Such Legislation Would Tie the Hands of Judges.

Whether these matters are decided in federal or state court, the opposed legislation would tie the hands of judges by mandating a particular result in favor of the servicemember parent returning from deployment. It would mandate automatic restoration of custody to the returning parent, provided that he or she had custody of the child at the time of deployment. In forcing that decision, the opposed rule would bar a court from even considering the effect of prolonged parental absence, due to deployment, on the child's best interests. The court would have no discretion in these custody decisions, absent a showing by "clear and convincing" evidence that the child should not resume residence with that parent.

Even where it could be proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the child's best interests lay with a grant of custody to the other parent, the court would be forced to restore the child to the custody of the returning servicemember, unless the more stringent "clear and convincing" threshold could be met.

The States Are Making Rapid Progress in Addressing These Matters.

The states have moved rapidly and responsibly to address the extraordinarily complex set of family law and other legal issues confronting this generation of servicemembers and their families, of whom so much has been demanded. Nine states have enacted legislation squarely addressing the child custody circumstances at issue in the opposed legislation: Arizona, California, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, North Carolina and Virginia. More than 20 states have adopted legislation acknowledging the potentially competing interests of the child and custodial servicemember and seeking to balance those interests within the framework of the individual states family service systems. These recent state statutes provide, or will provide, broad protections of family member interests, addressing not only restoration of custody but representation of the servicemember's interests in state proceedings and incorporation of mental health and other state support services.

The typical emergent state statute goes much further than the opposed federal bill in protecting servicemembers' interests. For example, it provides for electronic testimony by deployed servicemembers and expedited dockets for those wishing to organize their affairs in advance of deployment.

Importantly, many of the new comprehensive state laws, unlike the proposed federal legislation, also address child-visitation for servicemembers who do *not* have custody. Most active-duty servicemembers who have minor children are not custodial parents. Department of Defense regulations generally prohibit first-term single parents from having legal custody of a minor child. Moreover, the military lifestyle often compels the servicemember parent to relinquish custody to the non-servicemember parent.

These state-law solutions, tailored to and consonant with particular state social service systems and the broad array of servicemember parental interests, represent by far the better and more effective remedy.

The U.S. Department of Defense strongly opposes the type of legislation at issue — the department has urged in its position statement on point:

The progress with which the states have embraced the military-specific issues has been phenomenal and shows no indication of waning. Five military custody bills became law in just the first six months of 2008. It would be a mistake to intrude on the significant protections and creativity demonstrated by the states.

The opposed bill would do substantial damage to this significant new line of state-based protections, as federal law would be pre-emptive on the burden of proof question and, in a radical and unprecedented departure from the long history of state dominion over family relations disputes, would mandate custody-dispute outcomes from afar without due consideration of the child's best interests. It must be recognized that, at the end of the day, the creative servicemember-parent protections offered by the new and growing array of state statutes are significantly stronger than those contained in this misguided proposal.

B. This Legislation Would Undermine and Misuse
The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

The opposed bill would compromise the purpose and effect of the SCRA by converting it into a results-driven hammer for forcing particular outcomes in child custody cases. Such a misuse of this far-reaching legal shield for American servicemembers and their families would destroy its procedural focus, as it applies to courts and litigation, with its provisions for issuing automatic stays, vacating default judgments and appointing counsel for servicemembers.

As the Department of Defense noted in its opposition:

The SCRA . . . currently provides powerful rights to mobilized custodial caregivers. A number of high-visibility custody cases have resulted in custody decisions adverse to deployed servicemembers; however, in many of these cases the basic and generally easily met prerequisites for automatic 90-day stays under the SCRA were not followed. In other cases, judges simply ignored the SCRA. This indicates a problem of a lack of education about the effect and use of the SCRA rather than a problem with its substantive limitations.

The opposed initiative would also introduce a real risk of dilution of important protections already found in the SCRA, by creating the possibility of a legal inference

that those protections *only* apply to the particular child custody circumstances addressed by the bill, (i.e., the custody rights of servicemembers who had custody pre-deployment and are returning from deployment.)

The Department of Defense also points out that passage of the proposal could leave “other types of domestic cases vulnerable to arguments that the failure to explicitly address them indicates a legislative intent to exclude them” from SCRA procedural protections.”

The SCRA, as it is written, provides clear protections for civil litigants in uniform, including deployed servicemembers in child custody matters, and it means what it says. Doubt as to the scope and reach of this seminal statute’s array of servicemember protections must not be legislatively introduced, where no such doubt currently exists.

Damage to the purpose and function of this pre-eminent servicemember-protection statute was a primary consideration of an original sponsoring entity of the instant resolution, the Standing Committee on Legal Assistance for Military Personnel (LAMP), in its decision to strongly oppose the legislative proposal at issue here. LAMP exists to serve and support American servicemembers and their families. While on its face the offending legislation purports to support servicemember parents, the LAMP Committee has concluded that this support is largely illusory, as the bill would do irreparable harm to state-law-based servicemember protections, which are rapidly improving, and upset the well-established legal-social framework for managing child custody cases affecting military and civilian families alike.

C. The Best Interests of the Child Standard Must be Preserved in Custody Cases.

The opposed bill would compromise the best interest of the child standard in custody decisions. To be sure, in fairness to those who leave home to answer their country’s call to arms, the mere fact of deployment of a custodial caregiver, standing alone, cannot constitute legal grounds for depriving a servicemember parent of custody. But the proposal in question veers off to the opposite extreme, making restoration of pre-deployment custody *automatic* and relegating the child’s interests to a secondary consideration, unless it can be shown by “clear and convincing” evidence that restoring custody to that servicemember-parent would be against the child’s best interests. In the murky world of most family relationships, proving anything to a “clear and convincing” certainty is a tall order indeed. The proposed standard thus would turn on its head the generally-accepted “best interests” standard, a deviation that would represent a dangerous precedent that ultimately serves no one’s interests, including those of servicemembers or their families.

Additional Considerations

The proposal is also unworkable to the extent that it would only create custody rights in cases involving the actual deployment of a servicemember to a “contingency operation,” which means a designated conflict zone such as Iraq or Afghanistan. As the Department of Defense noted, this introduces

another arbitrarily created distinction between those involved in a contingency operation and those who must be absent from their child for other military-directed reasons. Why should the deployment of a servicemember in support of a humanitarian operation, as opposed to a peacekeeping operation, be forced to operate under different laws and perhaps different courts? Few other provisions of the SCRA turn on such arbitrarily imposed distinctions.

Likewise, no protections would be afforded servicemembers who are called up to replace those mobilized and who take their places, yet are not on a humanitarian mission, and those who face military absence due to the nature of the mission – an “unaccompanied tour.” There is no reason why these members of the military should face disparate treatment.

On a separate point, all of the service branches (Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard and Marine Corps) have been developing new Family Care Plan instructions designed to encourage servicemembers to create explicit plans for the handling of child custody issues and other family matters in the event of deployment. Going forward, the revised Family Care Plan instructions, once completed by all the services, should prevent a number of these custody disputes from arising, further obviating a statutory fix that would be far worse than the problem.

Respectfully submitted by:

Anita M. Ventrelli, Chair, Section of Family Law

Donald J. Guter, Chair, Standing Committee on Legal Assistance for Military Personnel

February 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Summary of the Recommendation

The Recommendation calls for the American Bar Association to urge Congress to oppose legislation that would create a federal law of child custody controlling state custody cases involving servicemember-parents. The Recommendation urges that the legislation be stopped because it would dictate court outcomes in child custody cases, even where the child's best interests do not support that outcome; create federal-question jurisdiction over child custody cases, long the province of state courts; impose federally-mandated evidentiary burdens on state courts; co-opt the growing body of state laws that comprehensively and appropriately address domestic relations matters affecting servicemembers; and cast doubt on existing servicemember protections found in the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA), 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 501-596.

2. Summary of the Issue that the Resolution Addresses

The issue arises from strong concern among child advocates, military legal assistance experts and others that the opposed legislation would inappropriately employ federal fiat to invade the province of the states by dictating court outcomes in child custody cases affecting deployed servicemembers. The opposed legislation provides that deployed servicemembers who had child custody at the time of their deployment would automatically have that custody restored upon their return, irrespective of other considerations affecting the best interests of the child. The opposed legislation would provide that custody could be denied to the returning servicemember in such a case only by a showing of "clear and convincing" evidence that it was not in the child's best interests. The opposed legislation improperly creates federal substantive law and evidentiary rules for custody determinations historically left to state courts. The opposed legislation would misuse the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, the source of important procedural protections for servicemembers in litigation, to dictate substantive outcomes in custody cases. The legislation would cast doubt of the ample and adequate servicemember protections already found in the SCRA. The opposed legislation would create federal-question jurisdiction over these child custody cases, a role federal courts are ill-equipped to fulfill. The opposed legislation would pre-empt the emerging body of state laws that comprehensively and organically address servicemember domestic relations interests. The essence of the issue is that the opposed legislation is not in the interest of children or servicemembers.

3. Please Explain How the Proposed Policy Position will Address the Issue

The Proposed Policy would influence the United States Senate and the House of Representatives to oppose the legislation and thereby remove the threat to the interests of children and servicemembers posed thereby.

4. Summary of Minority Views

We are aware of no minority views within the ABA.