By the Committee on Judiciary; and Senators Berman, Book, Hutson, and Garcia

590-02347-23 2023130c1

A bill to be entitled

An act relating to domestic violence; providing a short title; amending s. 61.13, F.S.; requiring the court with jurisdiction over the proceeding to consider certain factors in deciding whether shared parental responsibility is detrimental to the child; making technical and conforming changes; providing additional conduct regarding domestic violence which the court must consider when ordering a parenting plan; amending s. 741.30, F.S.; providing an additional factor that the court must consider in determining whether a petitioner of a domestic violence injunction is in imminent danger; providing an effective date.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

- Section 1. This act may be cited as "Greyson's Law."

  Section 2. Paragraph (c) of subsection (2) and paragraph

  (m) of subsection (3) of section 61.13, Florida Statutes, are amended to read:
- 61.13 Support of children; parenting and time-sharing; powers of court.—

(2)

(c) The court shall determine all matters relating to parenting and time-sharing of each minor child of the parties in accordance with the best interests of the child and in accordance with the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act, except that modification of a parenting plan

590-02347-23 2023130c1

and time-sharing schedule requires a showing of a substantial, material, and unanticipated change of circumstances.

- 1. It is the public policy of this state that each minor child has frequent and continuing contact with both parents after the parents separate or the marriage of the parties is dissolved and to encourage parents to share the rights and responsibilities, and joys, of childrearing. Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, there is no presumption for or against the father or mother of the child or for or against any specific time-sharing schedule when creating or modifying the parenting plan of the child.
- 2. The court shall order that the parental responsibility for a minor child be shared by both parents unless the court finds that shared parental responsibility would be detrimental to the child. In determining detriment to the child, the court shall consider:
  - a. Evidence of domestic violence, as defined in s. 741.28;
- b. Whether either parent has or has had reasonable cause to believe that he or she or his or her minor child or children are or have been in imminent danger of becoming victims of an act of domestic violence as defined in s. 741.28 or sexual violence as defined in s. 784.046(1)(c) by the other parent against the parent or against the child or children whom the parents share in common regardless of whether a cause of action has been brought or is currently pending in the court;
- c. Whether either parent has or has had reasonable cause to believe that his or her minor child or children are or have been in imminent danger of becoming victims of an act of abuse as defined in s. 39.01(2), abandonment as defined in s. 39.01(1),

590-02347-23 2023130c1

or neglect as defined in s. 39.01(50) by the other parent against the child or children whom the parents share in common regardless of whether a cause of action has been brought or is currently pending in the court; and

- d. Any other relevant factors.
- <u>3.</u> The following evidence creates a rebuttable presumption that shared parental responsibility is detrimental of detriment to the child:
- a. A parent has been convicted of a misdemeanor of the first degree or higher involving domestic violence, as defined in s. 741.28 and chapter 775;
  - b. A parent meets the criteria of s. 39.806(1)(d); or
- c. A parent has been convicted of or had adjudication withheld for an offense enumerated in s. 943.0435(1)(h)1.a., and at the time of the offense:
  - (I) The parent was 18 years of age or older.
- (II) The victim was under 18 years of age or the parent believed the victim to be under 18 years of age.

If the presumption is not rebutted after the convicted parent is advised by the court that the presumption exists, shared parental responsibility, including time-sharing with the child, and decisions made regarding the child, may not be granted to the convicted parent. However, the convicted parent is not relieved of any obligation to provide financial support. If the court determines that shared parental responsibility would be detrimental to the child, it may order sole parental responsibility and make such arrangements for time-sharing as specified in the parenting plan as will best protect the child

590-02347-23 2023130c1

or abused spouse from further harm. Whether or not there is a conviction of any offense of domestic violence or child abuse or the existence of an injunction for protection against domestic violence, the court shall consider evidence of domestic violence or child abuse as evidence of detriment to the child.

- $\underline{4.3.}$  In ordering shared parental responsibility, the court may consider the expressed desires of the parents and may grant to one party the ultimate responsibility over specific aspects of the child's welfare or may divide those responsibilities between the parties based on the best interests of the child. Areas of responsibility may include education, health care, and any other responsibilities that the court finds unique to a particular family.
- 5.4. The court shall order sole parental responsibility for a minor child to one parent, with or without time-sharing with the other parent if it is in the best interests of the minor child.
- $\underline{6.5.}$  There is a rebuttable presumption against granting time-sharing with a minor child if a parent has been convicted of or had adjudication withheld for an offense enumerated in s. 943.0435(1)(h)1.a., and at the time of the offense:
  - a. The parent was 18 years of age or older.
- b. The victim was under 18 years of age or the parent believed the victim to be under 18 years of age.

A parent may rebut the presumption upon a specific finding in writing by the court that the parent poses no significant risk of harm to the child and that time-sharing is in the best interests of the minor child. If the presumption is rebutted,

590-02347-23 2023130c1

the court  $\underline{\text{must}}$   $\underline{\text{shall}}$  consider all time-sharing factors in subsection (3) when developing a time-sharing schedule.

7.6. Access to records and information pertaining to a minor child, including, but not limited to, medical, dental, and school records, may not be denied to either parent. Full rights under this subparagraph apply to either parent unless a court order specifically revokes these rights, including any restrictions on these rights as provided in a domestic violence injunction. A parent having rights under this subparagraph has the same rights upon request as to form, substance, and manner of access as are available to the other parent of a child, including, without limitation, the right to in-person communication with medical, dental, and education providers.

- (3) For purposes of establishing or modifying parental responsibility and creating, developing, approving, or modifying a parenting plan, including a time-sharing schedule, which governs each parent's relationship with his or her minor child and the relationship between each parent with regard to his or her minor child, the best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration. A determination of parental responsibility, a parenting plan, or a time-sharing schedule may not be modified without a showing of a substantial, material, and unanticipated change in circumstances and a determination that the modification is in the best interests of the child. Determination of the best interests of the child shall be made by evaluating all of the factors affecting the welfare and interests of the particular minor child and the circumstances of that family, including, but not limited to:
  - (m) Evidence of domestic violence, sexual violence, child

590-02347-23 2023130c1

abuse, child abandonment, or child neglect or evidence that a parent has or has had reasonable cause to believe that he or she or his or her minor child or children are in imminent danger of becoming victims of an act of domestic violence, regardless of whether a prior or pending action relating to those issues has been brought. If the court accepts evidence of prior or pending actions regarding domestic violence, sexual violence, child abuse, child abandonment, or child neglect, the court must specifically acknowledge in writing that such evidence was considered when evaluating the best interests of the child.

Section 3. Paragraph (b) of subsection (6) of section 741.30, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

741.30 Domestic violence; injunction; powers and duties of court and clerk; petition; notice and hearing; temporary injunction; issuance of injunction; statewide verification system; enforcement; public records exemption.—

(6)

- (b) In determining whether a petitioner has reasonable cause to believe he or she is in imminent danger of becoming a victim of domestic violence, the court shall consider and evaluate all relevant factors alleged in the petition, including, but not limited to:
- 1. The history between the petitioner and the respondent, including threats, harassment, stalking, and physical abuse.
- 2. Whether the respondent has attempted to harm the petitioner or family members or individuals closely associated with the petitioner.
- 3. Whether the respondent has threatened to conceal, kidnap, or harm the petitioner's child or children.

590-02347-23 2023130c1

4. Whether the respondent has intentionally injured or killed a family pet.

- 5. Whether the respondent has used, or has threatened to use, against the petitioner any weapons such as guns or knives.
- 6. Whether the respondent has physically restrained the petitioner from leaving the home or calling law enforcement.
- 7. Whether the respondent has a criminal history involving violence or the threat of violence.
- 8. The existence of a verifiable order of protection issued previously or from another jurisdiction.
- 9. Whether the respondent has destroyed personal property, including, but not limited to, telephones or other communications equipment, clothing, or other items belonging to the petitioner.
- of abusive, threatening, intimidating, or controlling behavior composed of a series of acts over a period of time, however short, which evidences a continuity of purpose and which reasonably causes the petitioner to believe that the petitioner or his or her minor child or children are in imminent danger of becoming victims of any act of domestic violence.
- 11. Whether the respondent engaged in any other behavior or conduct that leads the petitioner to have reasonable cause to believe that he or she is in imminent danger of becoming a victim of domestic violence.

In making its determination under this paragraph, the court is not limited to those factors enumerated in subparagraphs 1.-11.

204	)2347-23 Section	4 .	This	act	shall	take	effect	.T11 l v	1.	2023	2023130	c1
		- •		0.00	2110.11	00.110	011000	0 0.11	-,			

Page 8 of 8