Enrolled Copy

1

ed Copy	H.B. 150
CUSTODY AMENDMENTS RELATED TO PARENTS W	ITH
DISABILITIES	

2	DISABILITIES
3	2017 GENERAL SESSION
4	STATE OF UTAH
5	Chief Sponsor: Patrice M. Arent
6	Senate Sponsor: Todd Weiler
7 8	LONG TITLE
9	General Description:
10	This bill modifies provisions related to custody of children in a divorce.
11	Highlighted Provisions:
12	This bill:
13	 addresses a court taking into consideration the disability of a parent in determining
14	custody; and
15	 makes technical changes, including modifying references to husband and wife and
16	mother or father.
17	Money Appropriated in this Bill:
18	None
19	Other Special Clauses:
20	None
21	Utah Code Sections Affected:
22	AMENDS:
23	30-3-10 , as last amended by Laws of Utah 2014, Chapter 409
24	
25	Be it enacted by the Legislature of the state of Utah:
26	Section 1. Section 30-3-10 is amended to read:
27	30-3-10. Custody of children in case of separation or divorce Custody
28	consideration.

(1) If a [husband and wife having] married couple having one or more minor children 29

H.B. 150

30	are separated, or their marriage is declared void or dissolved, the court shall make an order for
31	the future care and custody of the minor children as it considers appropriate.
32	(a) In determining any form of custody, including a change in custody, the court shall
33	consider the best interests of the child without preference for either [the mother or father]
34	parent solely because of the biological sex of the parent and, among other factors the court
35	finds relevant, the following:
36	(i) the past conduct and demonstrated moral standards of each of the parties;
37	(ii) which parent is most likely to act in the best interest of the child, including
38	allowing the child frequent and continuing contact with the noncustodial parent;
39	(iii) the extent of bonding between the parent and child, meaning the depth, quality,
40	and nature of the relationship between a parent and child;
41	(iv) whether the parent has intentionally exposed the child to pornography or material
42	harmful to a minor, as defined in Section 76-10-1201; and
43	(v) those factors outlined in Section 30-3-10.2.
44	(b) There [shall be] is a rebuttable presumption that joint legal custody, as defined in
45	Section 30-3-10.1, is in the best interest of the child, except in cases where there is:
46	(i) domestic violence in the home or in the presence of the child;
47	(ii) special physical or mental needs of a parent or child, making joint legal custody
48	unreasonable;
49	(iii) physical distance between the residences of the parents, making joint decision
50	making impractical in certain circumstances; or
51	(iv) any other factor the court considers relevant including those listed in this section
52	and Section 30-3-10.2.
53	(c) The person who desires joint legal custody shall file a proposed parenting plan in
54	accordance with Sections 30-3-10.8 and 30-3-10.9. A presumption for joint legal custody may
55	be rebutted by a showing by a preponderance of the evidence that it is not in the best interest of
56	the child.

57

(d) [The children] <u>A child</u> may not be required by either party to testify unless the trier

Enrolled Copy

of fact determines that extenuating circumstances exist that would necessitate the testimony of
the [children] child be heard and there is no other reasonable method to present [their] the
child's testimony.

(e) The court may inquire of [the children] <u>a child</u> and take into consideration the
[children's] child's desires regarding future custody or parent-time schedules, but the expressed
desires are not controlling and the court may determine the [children's] child's custody or
parent-time otherwise. The desires of a child 14 years of age or older shall be given added
weight, but is not the single controlling factor.

(f) [If interviews with the children are] If an interview with a child is conducted by the
court pursuant to Subsection (1)(e), [they] the interview shall be conducted by the judge in
camera. The prior consent of the parties may be obtained but is not necessary if the court finds
that an interview with [the children] a child is the only method to ascertain the child's desires
regarding custody.

(2) In awarding custody, the court shall consider, among other factors the court finds
relevant, which parent is most likely to act in the best interests of the child, including allowing
the child frequent and continuing contact with the noncustodial parent as the court finds
appropriate.

(3) If the court finds that one parent does not desire custody of the child, the court shall
take that evidence into consideration in determining whether to award custody to the other
parent.

(4) (a) Except as provided in Subsection (4)(b), a court may not discriminate against a
parent due to a disability, as defined in Section 57-21-2, in awarding custody or determining
whether a substantial change has occurred for the purpose of modifying an award of custody.

[(b) If a court takes a parent's disability into account in awarding custody or
 determining whether a substantial change has occurred for the purpose of modifying an award
 of custody, the parent with a disability may rebut any evidence, presumption, or inference

84 arising from the disability by showing that:]

85

(b) The court may not consider the disability of a parent as a factor in awarding custody

- 3 -

H.B. 150

86	or modifying an award of custody based on a determination of a substantial change in
87	circumstances, unless the court makes specific findings that:
88	(i) the disability [does not] significantly or substantially [inhibit] inhibits the parent's
89	ability to provide for the physical and emotional needs of the child at issue; [or] and
90	(ii) the parent with a disability [has] lacks sufficient human, monetary, or other
91	resources available to supplement the parent's ability to provide for the physical and emotional
92	needs of the child at issue.
93	(c) Nothing in this section may be construed to apply to adoption proceedings under
94	Title 78B, Chapter 6, Part 1, Utah Adoption Act.
95	(5) This section establishes neither a preference nor a presumption for or against joint
96	physical custody or sole physical custody, but allows the court and the family the widest
97	discretion to choose a parenting plan that is in the best interest of the child.