WASPLC – SPC: STATE

Tanya Goodman
Date: 2024-12-02

Type of Paper: Policy Brief

Strengthening Accountability and Limiting Judicial Discretion in Family Court to Protect Survivors of Abuse and Ensure Fair Proceedings

Abstract

Family court decisions profoundly affect the lives of children and families—particularly in cases involving domestic violence and child abuse. While judicial discretion can allow for flexibility, its unchecked use often erodes constitutional protections, such as due process and equal protection, and contributes to outcomes that harm survivors. In many instances, abuse victims experience continued trauma through the legal process itself, which becomes normalized as standard practice.

This policy brief outlines practical reforms to limit excessive judicial discretion and enhance accountability. The goal is to promote decisions that are consistent, evidence-based, and aligned with constitutional rights, thereby restoring trust in the family court system.

Section 1: Problem

Family courts are entrusted with decisions that shape the safety and stability of vulnerable populations. When judges operate with broad discretion and no enforceable checks, significant harm can occur—especially in cases involving domestic violence.

Too often, courts rely on ambiguous standards or unscientific theories such as Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS)—a discredited theory that is not recognized by major psychological or legal bodies [1]. The American Psychiatric Association has declined to include PAS in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5), and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges has denounced PAS for failing to meet evidentiary standards [3]. In 2023, the United Nations Human Rights Council called PAS a 'pseudo-concept' and recommended that member states ban its use in court proceedings [2]. Critics argue PAS is frequently used by abusers to discredit protective parents and obscure legitimate abuse claims [4], [5].

These approaches minimize or misinterpret abuse, frequently shifting blame onto the protective parent. Shifting nomenclature to disguise PAS to “Abusive Use of Conflict” or “Emotional Impairment” to mask coercive control and discredit legitimate safety concerns.

In these environments, survivors often face inconsistent rulings, lack of transparency, procedural violations, and retaliation when challenging misconduct. Oversight mechanisms are rare, and accountability is difficult to achieve without personal cost. As a result, courts inconsistently prioritize safety, thereby, eroding public trust.

Section 2: Solution

1. Codify Decision-Making Standards: Require judges to issue written findings of fact and conclusions of law documenting how rulings comply with due process and equal protection standards [10]. Establish statutory thresholds for custody determinations in abuse cases to prevent biased or arbitrary decisions.
2. Enhance Due Process Protections: Standardize evidentiary procedures and ensure both parties have equal opportunity to present or rebut evidence. Provide access to court-appointed advocates or legal aid for survivors and low-income parents [11].
3. Introduce Oversight Mechanisms: Create independent review panels to audit family court cases involving abuse, assessing legal and ethical compliance. Require annual public reporting on family court outcomes to monitor disparities and compliance with child safety standards.
4. Strengthen Equal Protection: Mandate bias mitigation and trauma-informed training for judges, guardians ad litem, parenting evaluators, and attorneys. Adopt uniform statewide guidelines for handling domestic violence and child abuse cases.
5. Promote Evidence-Based Decision-Making: Require reliance on peer-reviewed research and established abuse frameworks—not discredited theories like PAS [12]. Apply strict scrutiny when fundamental rights are at stake and intermediate scrutiny for protected classes [13].
6. Enforce Professional Accountability: Mandate reporting of misconduct by attorneys and professionals. Implement disciplinary actions for ethics violations, including retraining, fines, or case removal [14].
7. Monitor Abusive Parent Compliance: Require documentation of compliance with court-ordered interventions and shift financial responsibility for safety measures (e.g., therapy, supervised visitation) to the abusive parent.

Expected Outcomes

1. Decisions grounded in transparent, lawful, and consistent procedures.
2. Improved safety and outcomes for children and abuse survivors.
3. Reduced harm from unaccountable or biased professional practices.
4. Reestablishment of public trust in family court processes.

Section 3: Conclusion

The brief draws upon foundational parental rights cases such as Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000), that affirmed the constitutional protection of parental rights in custody disputes [9]. Santosky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745 (1982), established that the state must provide 'clear and convincing evidence' before terminating parental rights [6]. Likewise, Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205 (1972), reinforced parents' rights to direct the upbringing of their children, reflecting deeply rooted legal traditions [7].

Unchecked judicial discretion and the lack of professional accountability in family courts have enabled systemic failures that harm children and survivors of abuse, and at times has resulted in death. These harms are not merely anecdotal, they are the byproduct of a system that permits constitutional violations to persist under the veil of 'best interest.'

Reforms must address both individual and structural failures. Clear standards, transparency, and enforceable accountability are essential to restoring due process, equal protection, and public confidence. Until courts are required to operate within enforceable bounds, survivors and children will remain at risk—and the system will continue to serve an industrial complex that profits from their suffering rather than protecting them from it.

References

[1] American Psychiatric Association, DSM-5 (Parental Alienation not recognized)
[2] United Nations Human Rights Council, Report on Custody and Violence Against Women, 2023
[3] National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, Position on PAS and Evidence Standards
[4] ProPublica, 'The Junk Science of Parental Alienation', 2023
[5] Women's Aid, 'Parental Alienation: A Dangerous and Harmful Concept'
[6] Santosky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745 (1982)
[7] Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205 (1972)
[8] ABA Model Rule 8.3, Reporting Professional Misconduct.
[9] Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000).
[10] https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/essay/amdt14-S1-5-8-1/ALDE_00013775/
[11] https://www.americanbar.org/groups/public_interest/child_law/resources/child_law_practiceonline/child_law_practice/vol-35/february-2016/parental-rights-cases-to-know/
[12] https://nomas.org/sanders-report-part/
[13] https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/essay/amdt14-S1-5-8-1/ALDE_00013775/
[14] https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_rules_of_professional_conduct/rule_8_3_reporting_professional_misconduct/