H-2539.1			

HOUSE BILL 2251

57th Legislature

2001 Regular Session

By Representatives Lantz, Skinner, Tokuda, Darneille and Lovick

Read first time . Referred to Committee on .

State of Washington

- AN ACT Relating to petitions for visitation for persons related to the child or acting in a parental role; amending RCW 26.09.240 and 3 26.10.160; adding a new section to chapter 26.10 RCW; creating a new 4 section; and declaring an emergency.
- 5 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:
- 6 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 1.** (1) In *Troxel v. Granville*, No. 99-138, 7 decided June 5, 2000, the United States supreme court recognized that 8 the right of parents in the care and custody of their children is a 9 fundamental liberty interest. The court also acknowledged that 10 demographic changes in the past century have created complex family structures, and third-party visitation statutes reflect the changing 11 12 realities of the American family.
- (2) Legislatures and courts across the country recognize that families are composed of individuals who share an emotional attachment and intimacy developed over time, and that such emotional bonds do not necessarily require biological or marital relationships. By acting in a caregiver or other significant emotionally involved role over a period of time, a third party may develop a substantial relationship with a child. In some cases, arbitrarily depriving the child of that

p. 1 HB 2251

- 1 relationship can cause psychological or emotional harm to the child.
- 2 The legislature seeks to prevent the harm to children caused by the
- 3 disruption of such significant bonds.

2223

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

- 4 <u>NEW SECTION.</u> **Sec. 2.** A new section is added to chapter 26.10 RCW 5 to read as follows:
- 6 (1) A person who is not a parent of the child may petition the 7 court for visitation with the child if the petitioner can demonstrate 8 that:
- 9 (a) There is a substantial relationship between the petitioner and 10 the child;
- 11 (b) The petitioner has been unreasonably denied visitation with the 12 child by a parent, custodian, or other person with primary decision-13 making authority over the child; and
- (c) There has been a significant change in circumstances with 14 15 either the child, the petitioner, or the parent, custodian, or other person having primary decision-making authority over the child that 16 threatens the substantial relationship between the child and the 17 18 petitioner. The change in circumstances could include, but is not 19 limited to, a dissolution, legal separation, informal physical separation, death of a parent, or other significant change in the 20 21 family structure.
 - (2)(a) If the court dismisses a petition for visitation brought under this section because the petitioner failed to demonstrate the requirements in subsection (1) of this section, the court must order the petitioner to pay reasonable attorneys' fees and costs to the party responding to the petition. Nothing in this subsection precludes a court from ordering attorneys' fees and costs under RCW 26.10.080.
 - (b) Petitions that are not dismissed by the court must be submitted to mandatory mediation before proceeding to trial. Upon petition of any party that mediation is not appropriate, the court may order or the mediator may determine that the case is not appropriate for mediation.
- 32 Mediation shall be pursuant to mediation procedures established by 33 court rules for third-party visitation cases.
- (3)(a) Except as provided in (b) of this subsection, a petition for visitation brought under this section must be filed in the county in which the child resides.
- 37 (b) If a dissolution, legal separation, modification of parenting 38 plan, or other custody proceeding is pending involving the child, the

- 1 petition for visitation under this section shall be filed in the county 2 in which the proceeding is pending.
- 3 (4) The court may order visitation between the petitioner and the 4 child if the petitioner shows and the court finds that:
- 5 (a) Denial of court-ordered visitation would result in a likelihood 6 of harm to the child's physical, psychological, or emotional well-7 being;
- 8 (b) The likelihood of harm is beyond the normal short-term distress 9 a child suffers due to a change in circumstances;
- 10 (c) Continuation of the substantial relationship between the child 11 and the petitioner would likely have long-term benefits to the child; 12 and
- 13 (d) Visitation would not substantially interfere with the 14 relationship between the child and the parent, custodian, or other 15 person with primary decision-making authority over the child.
- 16 (5) In determining the nature and extent of visitation, the court 17 must consider the wishes of a child who is sufficiently mature to 18 express reasoned and independent preferences as to visitation issues.
- 19 (6) The restrictions of RCW 26.10.160 that apply to parents shall 20 apply to the petitioner under this section.
 - (7) For the purposes of this section:

21

31

- (a) "Person who is not a parent of the child" means a person, other than the parent, who is related to the child by blood or would be related to the child by blood but for the fact the child is adopted, or who is related to the parent or child by marriage or would be related to the parent or child by marriage but for the fact the parents are not or have never been married, or who lived with the child in a parental or quasi-parental relationship; and
- 29 (b) "Unreasonably denied" means a denial of visitation with the 30 child for irrational or unsubstantiated reasons.
- 32 **Sec. 3.** RCW 26.09.240 and 1996 c 177 s 1 are each amended to read 33 as follows:
- (1) <u>Under section 2 of this act, a person other than a parent may</u>
 petition the court for visitation with a child ((at any time)) or may
 intervene in a pending dissolution, legal separation, or modification
 of parenting plan proceeding. ((A person other than a parent may not
 petition for visitation under this section unless the child's parent or
 parents have commenced an action under this chapter.

p. 3 HB 2251

- 1 (2) A petition for visitation with a child by a person other than 2 a parent must be filed in the county in which the child resides.
- 3 (3) A petition for visitation or a motion to intervene pursuant to 4 this section shall be dismissed unless the petitioner or intervenor can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that a significant 5 relationship exists with the child with whom visitation is sought. If 6 the petition or motion is dismissed for failure to establish the 7 8 existence of a significant relationship, the petitioner or intervenor 9 shall be ordered to pay reasonable attorney's fees and costs to the 10 parent, parents, other custodian, or representative of the child who responds to this petition or motion. 11
 - (4) The court may order visitation between the petitioner or intervenor and the child between whom a significant relationship exists upon a finding supported by the evidence that the visitation is in the child's best interests.
 - (5)(a) Visitation with a grandparent shall be presumed to be in the child's best interests when a significant relationship has been shown to exist. This presumption may be rebutted by a preponderance of evidence showing that visitation would endanger the child's physical, mental, or emotional health.
 - (b) If the court finds that reasonable visitation by a grandparent would be in the child's best interest except for hostilities that exist between the grandparent and one or both of the parents or person with whom the child lives, the court may set the matter for mediation under RCW 26.09.015.
- 26 (6) The court may consider the following factors when making a 27 determination of the child's best interests:
- 28 (a) The strength of the relationship between the child and the 29 petitioner;
- 30 (b) The relationship between each of the child's parents or the 31 person with whom the child is residing and the petitioner;
- 32 (c) The nature and reason for either parent's objection to granting 33 the petitioner visitation;
- 34 (d) The effect that granting visitation will have on the 35 relationship between the child and the child's parents or the person 36 with whom the child is residing;
- 37 (e) The residential time sharing arrangements between the parents;
- 38 (f) The good faith of the petitioner;

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

2122

2324

25

- 1 (g) Any criminal history or history of physical, emotional, or 2 sexual abuse or neglect by the petitioner; and
- 3 (h) Any other factor relevant to the child's best interest.
- (7) The restrictions of RCW 26.09.191 that apply to parents shall be applied to a petitioner or intervenor who is not a parent. The nature and extent of visitation, subject to these restrictions, is in the discretion of the court.
- 8 (8) The court may order an investigation and report concerning the 9 proposed visitation or may appoint a guardian ad litem as provided in 10 RCW 26.09.220.
- 11 (9) Visitation granted pursuant to this section shall be 12 incorporated into the parenting plan for the child.
- (10) The court may modify or terminate visitation rights granted
 pursuant to this section in any subsequent modification action upon a
 showing that the visitation is no longer in the best interest of the
 child.))
- 17 **Sec. 4.** RCW 26.10.160 and 1996 c 303 s 2 are each amended to read 18 as follows:
- 19 (1) A parent not granted custody of the child is entitled to 20 reasonable visitation rights except as provided in subsection (2) of 21 this section.
- (2)(a) Visitation with the child shall be limited if it is found 22 23 that the parent seeking visitation has engaged in any of the following 24 conduct: (i) Willful abandonment that continues for an extended period 25 of time or substantial refusal to perform parenting functions; (ii) physical, sexual, or a pattern of emotional abuse of a child; (iii) a 26 history of acts of domestic violence as defined in RCW 26.50.010(1) or 27 an assault or sexual assault which causes grievous bodily harm or the 28 29 fear of such harm; or (iv) the parent has been convicted as an adult of a sex offense under: 30
- 31 (A) RCW 9A.44.076 if, because of the difference in age between the 32 offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (d) of 33 this subsection;
- 34 (B) RCW 9A.44.079 if, because of the difference in age between the 35 offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (d) of this subsection;

p. 5 HB 2251

- 1 (C) RCW 9A.44.086 if, because of the difference in age between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (d) of
- 3 this subsection;
- 4 (D) RCW 9A.44.089;
- 5 (E) RCW 9A.44.093;
- 6 (F) RCW 9A.44.096;
- 7 (G) RCW 9A.64.020 (1) or (2) if, because of the difference in age
- 8 between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists
- 9 under (d) of this subsection;
- 10 (H) Chapter 9.68A RCW;
- 11 (I) Any predecessor or antecedent statute for the offenses listed
- 12 in (a)(iv)(A) through (H) of this subsection;
- 13 (J) Any statute from any other jurisdiction that describes an
- 14 offense analogous to the offenses listed in (a)(iv)(A) through (H) of
- 15 this subsection.
- This subsection (2)(a) shall not apply when (c) or (d) of this
- 17 subsection applies.
- 18 (b) The parent's visitation with the child shall be limited if it
- 19 is found that the parent resides with a person who has engaged in any
- 20 of the following conduct: (i) Physical, sexual, or a pattern of
- 21 emotional abuse of a child; (ii) a history of acts of domestic violence
- 22 as defined in RCW 26.50.010(1) or an assault or sexual assault that
- 23 causes grievous bodily harm or the fear of such harm; or (iii) the
- 24 person has been convicted as an adult or as a juvenile has been
- 25 adjudicated of a sex offense under:
- 26 (A) RCW 9A.44.076 if, because of the difference in age between the
- 27 offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (e) of
- 28 this subsection;
- 29 (B) RCW 9A.44.079 if, because of the difference in age between the
- 30 offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (e) of
- 31 this subsection;
- 32 (C) RCW 9A.44.086 if, because of the difference in age between the
- 33 offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (e) of
- 34 this subsection;
- 35 (D) RCW 9A.44.089;
- 36 (E) RCW 9A.44.093;
- 37 (F) RCW 9A.44.096;

- 1 (G) RCW 9A.64.020 (1) or (2) if, because of the difference in age 2 between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists 3 under (e) of this subsection;
- 4 (H) Chapter 9.68A RCW;
- 5 (I) Any predecessor or antecedent statute for the offenses listed 6 in (b)(iii)(A) through (H) of this subsection;
- 7 (J) Any statute from any other jurisdiction that describes an 8 offense analogous to the offenses listed in (b)(iii)(A) through (H) of 9 this subsection.
- 10 This subsection (2)(b) shall not apply when (c) or (e) of this 11 subsection applies.
- (c) If a parent has been found to be a sexual predator under 12 13 chapter 71.09 RCW or under an analogous statute of any other jurisdiction, the court shall restrain the parent from contact with a 14 15 child that would otherwise be allowed under this chapter. If a parent 16 resides with an adult or a juvenile who has been found to be a sexual 17 predator under chapter 71.09 RCW or under an analogous statute of any other jurisdiction, the court shall restrain the parent from contact 18 19 with the parent's child except contact that occurs outside that 20 person's presence.
- (d) There is a rebuttable presumption that a parent who has been convicted as an adult of a sex offense listed in (d)(i) through (ix) of this subsection poses a present danger to a child. Unless the parent rebuts this presumption, the court shall restrain the parent from contact with a child that would otherwise be allowed under this chapter:
- 27 (i) RCW 9A.64.020 (1) or (2), provided that the person convicted 28 was at least five years older than the other person;
- 29 (ii) RCW 9A.44.073;
- 30 (iii) RCW 9A.44.076, provided that the person convicted was at 31 least eight years older than the victim;
- 32 (iv) RCW 9A.44.079, provided that the person convicted was at least 33 eight years older than the victim;
- 34 (v) RCW 9A.44.083;
- (vi) RCW 9A.44.086, provided that the person convicted was at least eight years older than the victim;
- 37 (vii) RCW 9A.44.100;
- (viii) Any predecessor or antecedent statute for the offenses listed in (d)(i) through (vii) of this subsection;

p. 7 HB 2251

- 1 (ix) Any statute from any other jurisdiction that describes an 2 offense analogous to the offenses listed in (d)(i) through (vii) of 3 this subsection.
- 4 (e) There is a rebuttable presumption that a parent who resides with a person who, as an adult, has been convicted, or as a juvenile 5 has been adjudicated, of the sex offenses listed in (e)(i) through (ix) 6 7 of this subsection places a child at risk of abuse or harm when that 8 parent exercises visitation in the presence of the convicted or 9 adjudicated person. Unless the parent rebuts the presumption, the 10 court shall restrain the parent from contact with the parent's child except for contact that occurs outside of the convicted or adjudicated 11 12 person's presence:
- (i) RCW 9A.64.020 (1) or (2), provided that the person convicted was at least five years older than the other person;
- 15 (ii) RCW 9A.44.073;
- 16 (iii) RCW 9A.44.076, provided that the person convicted was at 17 least eight years older than the victim;
- 18 (iv) RCW 9A.44.079, provided that the person convicted was at least 19 eight years older than the victim;
- 20 (v) RCW 9A.44.083;
- 21 (vi) RCW 9A.44.086, provided that the person convicted was at least 22 eight years older than the victim;
- 23 (vii) RCW 9A.44.100;
- (viii) Any predecessor or antecedent statute for the offenses listed in (e)(i) through (vii) of this subsection;
- 26 (ix) Any statute from any other jurisdiction that describes an 27 offense analogous to the offenses listed in (e)(i) through (vii) of 28 this subsection.
- 29 (f) The presumption established in (d) of this subsection may be 30 rebutted only after a written finding that:
- (i) If the child was not the victim of the sex offense committed by
 the parent requesting visitation, (A) contact between the child and the
 offending parent is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child,
 and (B) the offending parent has successfully engaged in treatment for
 sex offenders or is engaged in and making progress in such treatment,
 if any was ordered by a court, and the treatment provider believes such
 contact is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child; or
- (ii) If the child was the victim of the sex offense committed by the parent requesting visitation, (A) contact between the child and the

offending parent is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, 2 (B) if the child is in or has been in therapy for victims of sexual abuse, the child's counselor believes such contact between the child 3 4 and the offending parent is in the child's best interest, and (C) the 5 offending parent has successfully engaged in treatment for sex offenders or is engaged in and making progress in such treatment, if 6 7 any was ordered by a court, and the treatment provider believes such 8 contact is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child.

9 (g) The presumption established in (e) of this subsection may be rebutted only after a written finding that:

10

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36 37

38 39

- (i) If the child was not the victim of the sex offense committed by 11 the person who is residing with the parent requesting visitation, (A) 12 13 contact between the child and the parent residing with the convicted or adjudicated person is appropriate and that parent is able to protect 14 15 the child in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person, and 16 (B) the convicted or adjudicated person has successfully engaged in 17 treatment for sex offenders or is engaged in and making progress in such treatment, if any was ordered by a court, and the treatment 18 19 provider believes such contact is appropriate and poses minimal risk to 20 the child; or
 - (ii) If the child was the victim of the sex offense committed by the person who is residing with the parent requesting visitation, (A) contact between the child and the parent in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, (B) if the child is in or has been in therapy for victims of sexual abuse, the child's counselor believes such contact between the child and the parent residing with the convicted or adjudicated person in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person is in the child's best interest, and (C) the convicted or adjudicated person has successfully engaged in treatment for sex offenders or is engaged in and making progress in such treatment, if any was ordered by a court, and the treatment provider believes contact between the parent and child in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child.
 - (h) If the court finds that the parent has met the burden of rebutting the presumption under (f) of this subsection, the court may allow a parent who has been convicted as an adult of a sex offense listed in (d)(i) through (ix) of this subsection to have visitation with the child supervised by a neutral and independent adult and

pursuant to an adequate plan for supervision of such visitation. The court shall not approve of a supervisor for contact between the child and the parent unless the court finds, based on the evidence, that the supervisor is willing and capable of protecting the child from harm. The court shall revoke court approval of the supervisor upon finding, based on the evidence, that the supervisor has failed to protect the child or is no longer willing or capable of protecting the child.

- (i) If the court finds that the parent has met the burden of rebutting the presumption under (g) of this subsection, the court may allow a parent residing with a person who has been adjudicated as a juvenile of a sex offense listed in (e)(i) through (ix) of this subsection to have visitation with the child in the presence of the person adjudicated as a juvenile, supervised by a neutral and independent adult and pursuant to an adequate plan for supervision of such visitation. The court shall not approve of a supervisor for contact between the child and the parent unless the court finds, based on the evidence, that the supervisor is willing and capable of protecting the child from harm. The court shall revoke court approval of the supervisor upon finding, based on the evidence, that the supervisor has failed to protect the child or is no longer willing or capable of protecting the child.
- (j) If the court finds that the parent has met the burden of rebutting the presumption under (g) of this subsection, the court may allow a parent residing with a person who, as an adult, has been convicted of a sex offense listed in (e)(i) through (ix) of this subsection to have visitation with the child in the presence of the convicted person supervised by a neutral and independent adult and pursuant to an adequate plan for supervision of such visitation. The court shall not approve of a supervisor for contact between the child and the parent unless the court finds, based on the evidence, that the supervisor is willing and capable of protecting the child from harm. The court shall revoke court approval of the supervisor upon finding, based on the evidence, that the supervisor has failed to protect the child or is no longer willing or capable of protecting the child.
- (k) A court shall not order unsupervised contact between the offending parent and a child of the offending parent who was sexually abused by that parent. A court may order unsupervised contact between the offending parent and a child who was not sexually abused by the parent after the presumption under (d) of this subsection has been

rebutted and supervised visitation has occurred for at least two years with no further arrests or convictions of sex offenses involving 2 children under chapter 9A.44 RCW, RCW 9A.64.020, or chapter 9.68A RCW 3 4 and (i) the sex offense of the offending parent was not committed against a child of the offending parent, and (ii) the court finds that 5 unsupervised contact between the child and the offending parent is 6 7 appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, after consideration of 8 the testimony of a state-certified therapist, mental health counselor, 9 or social worker with expertise in treating child sexual abuse victims 10 who has supervised at least one period of visitation between the parent and the child, and after consideration of evidence of the offending 11 12 parent's compliance with community supervision requirements, if any. 13 If the offending parent was not ordered by a court to participate in treatment for sex offenders, then the parent shall obtain a 14 15 psychosexual evaluation conducted by a state-certified sex offender 16 treatment provider indicating that the offender has the lowest likelihood of risk to reoffend before the court grants unsupervised 17 contact between the parent and a child. 18

19

20

2122

2324

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

3233

34

35

3637

38 39

(1) A court may order unsupervised contact between the parent and a child which may occur in the presence of a juvenile adjudicated of a sex offense listed in (e)(i) through (ix) of this subsection who resides with the parent after the presumption under (e) of this subsection has been rebutted and supervised visitation has occurred for at least two years during which time the adjudicated juvenile has had no further arrests, adjudications, or convictions of sex offenses involving children under chapter 9A.44 RCW, RCW 9A.64.020, or chapter 9.68A RCW, and (i) the court finds that unsupervised contact between the child and the parent that may occur in the presence of the adjudicated juvenile is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, after consideration of the testimony of a state-certified therapist, mental health counselor, or social worker with expertise in treatment of child sexual abuse victims who has supervised at least one period of visitation between the parent and the child in the presence of the adjudicated juvenile, and after consideration of evidence of the adjudicated juvenile's compliance with community supervision or parole requirements, if any. If the adjudicated juvenile was not ordered by a court to participate in treatment for sex offenders, then the adjudicated juvenile shall obtain a psychosexual evaluation conducted by a state-certified sex offender treatment provider indicating that

p. 11 HB 2251

the adjudicated juvenile has the lowest likelihood of risk to reoffend before the court grants unsupervised contact between the parent and a child which may occur in the presence of the adjudicated juvenile who is residing with the parent.

- (m)(i) The limitations imposed by the court under (a) or (b) of this subsection shall be reasonably calculated to protect the child from the physical, sexual, or emotional abuse or harm that could result if the child has contact with the parent requesting visitation. If the court expressly finds based on the evidence that limitations on visitation with the child will not adequately protect the child from the harm or abuse that could result if the child has contact with the parent requesting visitation, the court shall restrain the person seeking visitation from all contact with the child.
- (ii) The court shall not enter an order under (a) of this subsection allowing a parent to have contact with a child if the parent has been found by clear and convincing evidence in a civil action or by a preponderance of the evidence in a dependency action to have sexually abused the child, except upon recommendation by an evaluator or therapist for the child that the child is ready for contact with the parent and will not be harmed by the contact. The court shall not enter an order allowing a parent to have contact with the child in the offender's presence if the parent resides with a person who has been found by clear and convincing evidence in a civil action or by a preponderance of the evidence in a dependency action to have sexually abused a child, unless the court finds that the parent accepts that the person engaged in the harmful conduct and the parent is willing to and capable of protecting the child from harm from the person.
- (iii) If the court limits visitation under (a) or (b) of this subsection to require supervised contact between the child and the parent, the court shall not approve of a supervisor for contact between a child and a parent who has engaged in physical, sexual, or a pattern of emotional abuse of the child unless the court finds based upon the evidence that the supervisor accepts that the harmful conduct occurred and is willing to and capable of protecting the child from harm. The court shall revoke court approval of the supervisor upon finding, based on the evidence, that the supervisor has failed to protect the child or is no longer willing to or capable of protecting the child.
- 38 (n) If the court expressly finds based on the evidence that 39 contact between the parent and the child will not cause physical,

- sexual, or emotional abuse or harm to the child and that the 1 probability that the parent's or other person's harmful or abusive 2 conduct will recur is so remote that it would not be in the child's 3 4 best interests to apply the limitations of (a), (b), and (m)(i) and (iii) of this subsection, or if the court expressly finds that the 5 parent's conduct did not have an impact on the child, then the court 6 need not apply the limitations of (a), (b), and (m)(i) and (iii) of 7 8 this subsection. The weight given to the existence of a protection order issued under chapter 26.50 RCW as to domestic violence is within 9 the discretion of the court. This subsection shall not apply when (c), 10 (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (m)(ii) of this 11 12 subsection apply.
- (3) ((Any person may petition the court for visitation rights at any time including, but not limited to, custody proceedings. The court may order visitation rights for any person when visitation may serve the best interest of the child whether or not there has been any change of circumstances.
- (4))) The court may modify an order granting or denying visitation rights whenever modification would serve the best interests of the child. Modification of a parent's visitation rights shall be subject to the requirements of subsection (2) of this section.
- 22 $((\frac{5}{)})$ (4) For the purposes of this section, a parent's child 23 means that parent's natural child, adopted child, or stepchild.
- NEW SECTION. Sec. 5. This act is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety, or support of the state government and its existing public institutions, and takes effect immediately.

--- END ---

p. 13 HB 2251