

79978-4

Case No. 57831-6-I

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION I
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS DIV #1
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2001 APR 23 PM 3:44

In re the Marriage of:

MICHAEL STEVEN KING, Respondent,

v.

BRENDA LEONE KING, Appellant.

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2001 APR -3 A 7:57
BY APPELLANT'S COUNSEL
DEAN

AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF OF
NORTHWEST WOMEN'S LAW CENTER

Raegen N. Rasnic, WSBA No. 25480
SKELLENGER BENDER, P.S.
1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3401
Seattle, Washington 98101-2605
(206) 623-6501

Cooperating Attorney for
Northwest Women's Law Center

ORIGINAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. IDENTITY AND INTEREST OF AMICUS.....	1
II. INTRODUCTION	1
III. ARGUMENT	3
A. Contested child custody litigation presents tremendous obstacles for women who are victims of domestic violence.	3
1. Domestic violence victims have diminished access to the courts by virtue of their gender and socioeconomic status.	3
2. Victims are disadvantaged by a daunting legal process.....	4
3. The abuser may contest custody in order to harass the victim.	4
4. Domestic violence allegations present fact-finding challenges which overtaxed family courts may be ill-equipped to handle.	6
5. A court’s desire to achieve “equal parenting” works against mothers who raise domestic violence claims in the custody context.	7
6. Courts may view domestic violence as irrelevant to parenting unless children have been harmed, or view claims of abuse as having been made for tactical advantage.....	8
7. The effects of abuse may cause victims to be perceived as less credible than their abusers.....	10
8. Courts may also be more likely to believe abusers’ claims that their victims are poor parents.	11
B. Contested custody cases are made more complex by the appointment of a Guardian ad Litem.	12
C. The domestic violence victim’s challenges are exacerbated when she is not represented by counsel.	15
IV. CONCLUSION.....	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	PAGE
Cases	
<u>In re Marriage of Olson</u> , 69 Wn. App. 621, 850 P.2d 527 (1993)	17
<u>In re Myricks</u> , 85 Wn.2d 252, 533 P.2d 841 (1975)	16
<u>Patterson v. Superintendent of Pub. Instruction</u> , 76 Wn. App. 666, 887 P.2d 411 (1994)	17
<u>Westberg v. All-Purpose Structures Inc.</u> , 86 Wn. App. 405, 936 P.2d 1175 (1997)	17
<u>R.H. v. B.F.</u> , 653 N.E.2d 195 (Mass. App. Ct. 1995).....	14
 Proposed Legislation	
S.S.S.B. 5470, § 302, 2007 Leg., 60th Sess. (Wa. 2007)	13
 State Statutes	
RCW 2.56.030(15).....	13
 Publications	
American Psychological Association, <i>Violence and the Family</i> (1996).....	5
Lundy Bancroft & Jay G. Silverman, <i>The Batterer as Parent: Addressing the Impact of Domestic Violence on Family Dynamics 1</i> (2002).....	5
Karen Czapanskiy, <i>Domestic Violence, the Family, and the Lawyering Process: Lessons from Studies on Gender Bias in the Courts</i> , 27 Fam. L.Q. 247 (1993).....	10
Clare Dalton, <i>When Paradigms Collide: Protecting Battered Parents and Their Children in the Family Court</i> , 37 Fam. & Concil. Cts. Rev. 273 (1999)	13

Clare Dalton <i>et al.</i> , <i>High Conflict Divorce, Violence, and Abuse: Implications for Custody and Visitation Decisions</i> , <i>Juv. & Fam. Ct. J.</i> (2003).....	8
Deborah Epstein, <i>Effective Intervention in Domestic Violence Cases: Rethinking the Roles of Prosecutors, Judges, and the Court System</i> , 11 <i>Yale J.L. & Feminism</i> 3 (1999).....	4
Ann E. Freedman, <i>Fact-Finding in Civil Domestic Violence Cases: Secondary Traumatic Stress and the Need for Compassionate Witnesses</i> , 11 <i>Am. U.J. Gender Soc. Pol’y & L.</i> 567 (2003).....	4
Mary Grams, <i>Guardians Ad Litem and the Cycle of Domestic Violence: How the Recommendations Turn</i> , 22 <i>Law & Ineq. J.</i> 105 (2004)	12
Cynthia Grover Hastings, <i>Note: Letting Down Their Guard: What Guardians ad Litem should Know about Domestic Violence in Child Custody Disputes</i> , 24 <i>B.C. Third World L.J.</i> 283 (2004).....	5
Peter G. Jaffe, PhD, & Claire V. Crooks, PhD, <i>Understanding Women’s Experiences Parenting in the Context of Domestic Violence: Implications for Community and Court- Related Service Providers</i> 59 (2005)	5
Peter G. Jaffe <i>et al.</i> , <i>Common Misconceptions in Addressing Domestic Violence in Child Custody Disputes</i> , <i>Juv. & Fam. Court J.</i> 58 (Fall 2003)	7
Raven Lidman & Betsy Hollingsworth, <i>Rethinking the Roles of Guardians ad Litem in Dissolutions: Are We Seeking Magicians?</i> , <i>Wash. St. B. News</i> 22 (Dec. 1998).....	15
Martha R. Mahoney, <i>Legal Images of Battered Women: Redefining the Issue of Separation</i> , 90 <i>Mich. L. Rev.</i> 1 (1991)	5
Lisa E. Martin, <i>Providing Equal Justice for the Domestic Violence Victim: Due Process and the Victim’s Right to Counsel</i> , 34 <i>Gonz. L. Rev.</i> 329 (1998/1999).....	3
Joan S. Meier, <i>Domestic Violence, Child Custody, and Child Protection: Understanding Judicial Resistance and Imagining the Solutions</i> , 11 <i>Am. U.J. Gender Soc. Pol’y & L.</i> 657 (2003).....	8

Nat Stern & Karen Oehme, <i>Defending Neutrality in Supervised Visitation to Preserve a Crucial Family Court Service</i> , 35 Sw. U.L. Rev. 37 (2005).....	14
Patricia Tjaden & Nancy Theonnes, <i>Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey 2</i> (1998).	3
Nancy Ver Steegh, <i>The Silent Victims: Children and Domestic Violence</i> , 26 Wm. Mitchell L. Rev. 775 (2000).....	10
Deborah M. Weissman, <i>Gender-Based Violence as Judicial Anomaly: Between “The Truly National and the Truly Local,”</i> 42 B.C. L. Rev. 1081 (2001)	10

I. IDENTITY AND INTEREST OF AMICUS

The Northwest Women's Law Center ("NWLC") is a regional non-profit public interest organization that works to advance the legal rights of all women through litigation, legislation, and the provision of legal information and referral services. Since its founding in 1978, the NWLC has participated as counsel and as *amicus curiae* in cases throughout the Northwest and around the country, and is currently involved in numerous legislative and litigation efforts. The NWLC has developed expertise in many areas of law pertaining to women's rights, including family law, and was and remains an instrumental stakeholder in drafting and lobbying efforts surrounding the Domestic Violence Prevention Act and the Parenting Act. Of additional significance to this case, the NWLC serves as a regional expert on the impact of gender inequity and domestic violence in the family law context. As such, the NWLC has developed expertise on the constitutional importance of meaningful access to the legal system, an issue directly raised in this appeal.

II. INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, domestic violence has increasingly been recognized by courts, legislatures, law enforcement, child protective services, the media, and the general public as a matter of serious concern. The idea that women should be protected from abuse by their male partners is, in most jurisdictions, no longer radical. This awareness has

led to increases in funding for domestic violence protection order programs, increased protection of children through dependency proceedings, and harsher criminal penalties for abusers. However, despite these important gains in areas affecting their personal safety, victims of domestic violence remain vulnerable in an equally crucial context – child custody proceedings. As set forth below, a mother who has been abused by the father of her child is more likely to face a legal battle over child custody. Once in court, she faces disadvantages that make the possibility of a just outcome remote, often including dealing with an additional party in the case, a Guardian ad Litem. And, significantly, she is likely to face these disadvantages alone, without the assistance of counsel.

This scenario is reflected in Brenda King’s case. Brenda raised allegations of domestic violence and attempted to put evidence supporting those allegations into the record at trial, including evidence that Michael King had physically harmed the children and behaved violently toward Brenda, a neighbor, and a co-worker.¹ Subsequently, Brenda faced the potential loss of primary residential care of her children, although she had been primarily responsible for caring for them throughout their lives.² Given the complexities of the process Brenda faced, the severity of the potential loss of her children, and the imbalance of power present in a

¹ See, e.g., 2 RP 68:14-70:25, 71:9-73:7; 3RP 85:5-18; 4 RP 95-96; 97:23-24; 105:1-107:10.

² CP 84, 86, 89, 103.

situation involving evidence of domestic violence, the trial court should have appointed counsel to represent Brenda.

Brenda's case is far from unique. As is set forth below, even a victim parent who is represented by counsel faces an uphill battle in contested child custody proceedings. For a victim who must represent herself, lack of counsel often serves as the tipping point in a custody battle; the final obstacle to any semblance of meaningful access to the legal system to protect her rights and those of her children.

III. ARGUMENT

A. **Contested child custody litigation presents tremendous obstacles for women who are victims of domestic violence.**

1. **Domestic violence victims have diminished access to the courts by virtue of their gender and socioeconomic status.**

It is beyond reasonable dispute that victims of domestic violence are far more likely to be women than men. According to 1998 statistics, over 90% of reported cases of domestic violence in the United States involved male-on-female aggression.³ Victims of domestic violence are also likely to be poor.⁴ As a result of their gender and socioeconomic

³ Patricia Tjaden & Nancy Theonnes, *Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey 2* (1998).

⁴ Lisa E. Martin, *Providing Equal Justice for the Domestic Violence Victim: Due Process and the Victim's Right to Counsel*, 34 Gonz. L. Rev. 329, 343 (1998/1999).

status, domestic violence victims have diminished access to counsel, and to the courts.

2. Victims are disadvantaged by a daunting legal process.

The process for obtaining relief from domestic violence is, at best, overwhelming. The domestic violence victim must navigate complex systems and may be required to initiate multiple cases, “each with a distinct and complicated intake process,” in order to obtain meaningful protection for herself and her children.⁵ Visits to different offices, perhaps in different courthouses, with different hours and procedures, may be required. A process this fragmented would be confusing to a litigant under the best of circumstances.⁶ For a victim in crisis, who may be recovering from recent abuse, trying to locate alternate housing and obtain financial assistance while holding down a job, parenting, and attempting to obtain relief in the few hours she can steal away from a controlling partner, the complexity of the process can be an insurmountable obstacle.

3. The abuser may contest custody in order to harass the victim.

An abusive father is more than twice as likely as a nonabusive

⁵ Deborah Epstein, *Effective Intervention in Domestic Violence Cases: Rethinking the Roles of Prosecutors, Judges, and the Court System*, 11 Yale J.L. & Feminism 3, 21 (1999). Here, Brenda King’s husband sought sole custody of their children though he had had minimal involvement in parenting.

⁶ See Ann E. Freedman, *Fact-Finding in Civil Domestic Violence Cases: Secondary Traumatic Stress and the Need for Compassionate Witnesses*, 11 Am. U.J. Gender Soc. Pol’y & L. 567, 598-99 (2003).

father to seek sole custody of his children.⁷ The abuser may use custody litigation to assert and maintain control over the victim, particularly after she has asserted herself by leaving the relationship.⁸ Frightening the victim, or creating a bargaining chip to use against her in negotiations over child support or the division of property, may motivate the abuser more than the desire to parent.⁹ Without speculating as to the motives of Michael King, it is apparent from the record in this case that Brenda had historically assumed almost all child-rearing responsibilities, and that despite that significant role, she lost primary residential care status to the father.¹⁰

Studies from other jurisdictions show that an abuser who contests custody is likely to prevail.¹¹ This is the case despite the widespread and often-repeated assumption that family courts are biased in favor of mothers and against fathers. As discussed below, whether or not he is

⁷ American Psychological Association, *Violence and the Family* 4, 40 (1996); Lundy Bancroft & Jay G. Silverman, *The Batterer as Parent: Addressing the Impact of Domestic Violence on Family Dynamics* 1, 98 (2002). See also Cynthia Grover Hastings, Note: *Letting Down Their Guard: What Guardians ad Litem should Know about Domestic Violence in Child Custody Disputes*, 24 B.C. Third World L.J. 283, 304 (2004).

⁸ Bancroft & Silverman, *supra*, at 114; Martha R. Mahoney, *Legal Images of Battered Women: Redefining the Issue of Separation*, 90 Mich. L. Rev. 1, 44 (1991); Peter G. Jaffe, PhD, & Claire V. Crooks, PhD, *Understanding Women's Experiences Parenting in the Context of Domestic Violence: Implications for Community and Court-Related Service Providers* 59 (2005).

⁹ Bancroft & Silverman, *supra*, at 115; Mahoney, *supra*, at 44.

¹⁰ CP 84, 86, 89, 103.

¹¹ Bancroft & Silverman, *supra*, at 115; Mahoney, *supra*, at 45.

represented by counsel, the abuser enters contested custody litigation with a number of distinct advantages.

4. Domestic violence allegations present fact-finding challenges which overtaxed family courts may be ill-equipped to handle.

Courts presented with contested custody cases involving allegations of domestic violence do not have an easy task. Statutes demand that the court receive evidence that is frequently contradictory, viscerally disturbing, and (as discussed further below) at odds with the judge's own life experiences. The court must weigh this evidence – which may be presented solely in the form of affidavits – and engage in fact-finding involving the application of numerous statutory factors that may be unclear or overlapping. There may be many potential remedies, or none at all.

Family court judges engage in this weighty task while enduring heavy caseloads and the perception that their cases involve issues that are less important, or less intellectually satisfying, than other types of law. Judges may also dislike custody cases involving domestic violence because of the perception that the litigants are destined for a quick return to court in any event. In truth, the final order in a contested parenting case may not provide the parties with final resolution. “These cases begin rather than end with a judge's ruling.”¹² Based on evidence about the past

¹² Freedman, *supra*, at 569.

and present, the judge must order a remedy that will necessarily shape the lives of the parties and their children into the future.¹³ The task of fact-finding, so critical in cases involving domestic violence, may therefore be all the more challenging. The record in Brenda King's case contains ample evidence to support the difficulty of fact-finding. To the extent this dynamic leads courts to give short shrift to such cases, the resulting injustice falls on victims and their children, as occurred in Brenda's case.

5. A court's desire to achieve "equal parenting" works against mothers who raise domestic violence claims in the custody context.

As awareness of domestic violence has increased over the last decade, so has fathers' involvement with parenting. From this has emerged an assumption, valid in many cases, that a father's involvement with his child is a positive thing which should be encouraged, even to the extent of resolving credibility disputes in the father's favor. A leading scholar has described this dynamic as follows:

the implicit sense that mothers start with an unfair advantage [in contested custody proceedings], presumably because they fit our intuitive image of 'parent,' and are assumed to be primary and/or 'natural' parents. The combined effect of these unspoken assumptions is that custody courts, while believing they are merely furthering parental 'equality,' not infrequently give fathers' claims

¹³ *Id.* See also Peter G. Jaffe *et al.*, *Common Misconceptions in Addressing Domestic Violence in Child Custody Disputes*, *Juv. & Fam. Court J.* 58, 59 (Fall 2003).

and requests greater weight than mothers'.¹⁴

The desire to foster “equal parenting” can lead courts to minimize allegations of domestic violence as “conflict” – for which both parents implicitly share responsibility – rather than recognizing the dynamic as one parent’s victimization of the other.¹⁵ When courts blur the distinction between “high-conflict” divorce and domestic violence, the result is to render domestic violence invisible.¹⁶ As scholar Joan Meier has observed, the resulting “equal” parenting plans, which provide abusers with abundant parenting time, may serve only to provide an ongoing avenue for abuse and control.¹⁷

6. Courts may view domestic violence as irrelevant to parenting unless children have been harmed, or view claims of abuse as having been made for tactical advantage.

Lack of understanding of domestic violence and the desire to achieve equal parenting time often leads courts to conclude that abuse of the mother by the father is irrelevant to parenting unless children have been injured or have witnessed the abuse.¹⁸ This conclusion is counter-

¹⁴ Joan S. Meier, *Domestic Violence, Child Custody, and Child Protection: Understanding Judicial Resistance and Imagining the Solutions*, 11 Am. U.J. Gender Soc. Pol’y & L. 657, 680 (2003) (citing Wellesley Centers For Battered Mothers’ Testimony Project, *Battered Mothers Speak Out: A Human Rights Report on Domestic Violence and Child Custody in the Massachusetts Family Courts* (2002)).

¹⁵ Jaffe *et al.*, *supra*; Freedman, *supra*, at 599.

¹⁶ See, e.g., Clare Dalton *et al.*, *High Conflict Divorce, Violence, and Abuse: Implications for Custody and Visitation Decisions*, Juv. & Fam. Ct. J. (2003).

¹⁷ Meier, *supra*, at 679.

¹⁸ Jaffe *et al.*, *supra* note 12, at 60-61.

intuitive. “Had [the father] been proven to have done these things to another individual, it is hard to imagine them being ignored in a custody decision.”¹⁹

Preference for equal parenting time and dislike for “conflict” also leads courts to take a dim view of litigants who raise allegations of domestic violence in the context of contested custody litigation.

Despite the widespread acceptance of the growing body of evidence that adult domestic violence is detrimental to children, both courts and lawyers commonly separate the issue of domestic violence from custody/visitation, and even sometimes excuse it in a divorce context. More notably, sympathy and concern to an adult battering victim can be transformed into an attitude of disdain and outright hostility when the battered woman seeks to limit the abuser’s access to his child.²⁰

The same judges who preside over protection order calendars and criminal trials involving domestic violence-related crimes may be hostile to domestic violence claims in the custody context because of the assumption that victims are not credible, and that they are acting out of self-interest rather than a sincere desire to protect their children’s safety. This assumption can spring from the judge’s lack of training or experience with domestic violence. As one trial court judge tellingly remarked to a victim who raised domestic violence claims:

I don’t believe anything that you’re saying. . . . The reason I don’t believe it is because I don’t believe that anything

¹⁹ Meier, *supra*, at 701.

²⁰ Meier, *supra*, at 667.

like this could happen to me. . . . Therefore, since I would not let that happen to me, I can't believe that it happened to you.²¹

As discussed below, the manner in which victims and abusers present in court may contribute to this perception.

7. The effects of abuse may cause victims to be perceived as less credible than their abusers.

Even in cases where domestic violence protection orders have been entered, or which have involved criminal charges, courts may disbelieve victims' claims as a result of their in-court affect compared with that of their abusers. "Most batterers will present with no obvious mental health problems. In comparison, many victims suffer from a variety of trauma symptoms likely related to their abuse."²² The effects of trauma can cause the victim to "appear to be exhausted, hyper-vigilant, inarticulate, depressed, hopeless, or angry."²³ The victim may also present as "distrustful, and suspicious with all professionals related to the court proceedings."²⁴ This dynamic is apparent in Brenda King's attempts to question the Guardian ad Litem, which led the trial court to interrupt her several times and fault her demeanor, though her demeanor reflected

²¹ Karen Czapanskiy, *Domestic Violence, the Family, and the Lawyering Process: Lessons from Studies on Gender Bias in the Courts*, 27 Fam. L.Q. 247, 252 (1993)). See also Deborah M. Weissman, *Gender-Based Violence as Judicial Anomaly: Between "The Truly National and the Truly Local"*, 42 B.C. L. Rev. 1081, 1121-22 (2001).

²² Jaffe & Crooks, *supra*, at 8.

²³ Nancy Ver Steegh, *The Silent Victims: Children and Domestic Violence*, 26 Wm. Mitchell L. Rev. 775, 783 (2000).

²⁴ Jaffe & Crooks, *supra*, at 8.

legitimate frustration at trying unsuccessfully to introduce evidence that would have contradicted particularly damaging hearsay testimony from the Guardian ad Litem.²⁵ And, “[p]aradoxically, if she does speak with confidence and authority, she may appear without vulnerability and fear, without – in other words – those traits most commonly associated with victimhood. She will not conform to the stereotype of a battered woman, likewise impugning the credibility of her story in the eyes of a judge.”²⁶

In contrast, it is well-documented that men who are violent toward their intimate partners tend to present very well, and may succeed in portraying the victim in a negative light. “Many perpetrators of domestic violence are facile manipulators, presenting themselves as caring, cooperative parents casting the abused parent as a diminished, conflict-inciting, impulsive or over-protective parent.”²⁷

8. Courts may also be more likely to believe abusers’ claims that their victims are poor parents.

“As capable as abusive partners are of portraying themselves as caring and effective parents, they are just as capable of portraying their partners as abusive, neglectful, and ineffective parents. And, at the point

²⁵ 2 RP 98:5-7; 5 RP 10-33, 43:23-44:10.

²⁶ Weissman, *supra*, at 1123 (citing John Conley & William M. O’Barr, *Just Words* 32 (1998)).

²⁷ Ver Steegh, *supra*, at 784 (citing Barbara J. Hart & Meredith Hofford, *The Best Interest of the Child: Child Custody, The Impact of Domestic Violence on Your Legal Practice*, ABA Commission on Domestic Violence 5-3 (Goelman *et al.*, eds., 1997)).

at which the court is assessing the parenting capacity of both parents, the abused parent may indeed be struggling to parent – either because of the impact of abuse on his or her own functioning, or because of the abusive parent’s undermining of his or her parenting.”²⁸ Parenting difficulties the victim may have as a result of abuse also work to the abuser’s advantage. Children may behave better for the abuser or react more emotionally in the victim’s care, leading experts and courts to conclude that the father-child bond is positive, and to disbelieve the victim’s claims.²⁹

B. Contested custody cases are made more complex by the appointment of a Guardian ad Litem.

Because of the fact-finding challenges presented by abuse claims, courts handling contested custody cases, such as Brenda King’s, frequently appoint Guardians ad Litem (“GALs”) when such claims arise.³⁰ It is well known in family law practice that the position of the GAL, whose role can vary from situation to situation and jurisdiction to jurisdiction, can “make or break a case.”³¹ The presence of a GAL adds a layer of complexity to the contested custody case which may further disadvantage the domestic violence victim. This was certainly a factor in Brenda King’s case, as the record amply demonstrates.

²⁸ Dalton *et al*, *supra*, at 21.

²⁹ Meier, *supra*, at 667.

³⁰ Hastings, *supra*, at 2.

³¹ Mary Grams, *Guardians Ad Litem and the Cycle of Domestic Violence: How the Recommendations Turn*, 22 *Law & Ineq. J.* 105, 120 (2004).

Like judges, GALs may lack training or experience with domestic violence allegations in the contested custody context. One study found that along with custody evaluators, GALs are the professionals with the least training about domestic violence among all actors in the civil legal system.³² This concern has come to the attention of Washington State legislators this session. On March 8, 2007, the Washington State Senate unanimously passed a bill that would explicitly require domestic violence training to be included in the state-mandated curriculum for Guardians ad Litem.³³

Lack of understanding of domestic violence, or unquestioning belief that communication and interaction between parents should be encouraged, can lead GALs to inaccurately interpret the family relationships they are charged with evaluating, and to miss or minimize the relevance of abuse of the mother.³⁴ The GAL may also misinterpret the victim's behavior, viewing her as "distant" or "unstable" in comparison to the "charming" or "friendly" abuser. As one victim recalled,

³² Clare Dalton, *When Paradigms Collide: Protecting Battered Parents and Their Children in the Family Court*, 37 Fam. & Concil. Cts. Rev. 273, 286 (1999) (citing The Family Violence Project of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, *Family Violence in Child Custody Statutes: An Analysis of State Codes and Legal Practice*, 29 Fam. L.Q. 197 (1995)).

³³ See RCW 2.56.030(15) (current requirements for state-created curriculum); see also S.S.S.B. 5470, § 302, 2007 Leg., 60th Sess. (Wa. 2007) (would add domestic violence to the list of required subjects).

³⁴ Hastings, *supra*, at 284.

[The GAL] was saying [that I] was psychologically unstable and, you know, irrational, emotional, and angry. It's like, yeah, if you've been through 10 years of what I've been through You go through hell and try to get out of hell and they punish you, saying "Oh, you cry too much and you're upset, so you know, the kids are more stable with the father."³⁵

Like judges, GALs may assume allegations of abuse are fabricated to gain tactical advantage, or they may feel that the task of remaining a "neutral observer" precludes them from investigating abuse claims at all.³⁶ The result is that the GAL's recommendation may completely overlook the abuse issue, or minimize it, leading the court to do the same.³⁷

Finally, the GAL's role may be confusing to victims. GALs can testify as experts and thereby bring in hearsay and other information that would otherwise be excludable, although they may not have expert qualifications. In this case, Brenda's attempts to question the GAL provide a glaring example of the difficulty a *pro se* litigant encounters when attempting to impeach a GAL's testimony and to counter hearsay evidence presented by a GAL.³⁸ Further, the GAL may be perceived by

³⁵ Hastings, *supra*, at 317 n.238. See also Meier, *supra*, at 709 n.184 (describing case where custody was awarded to father after mother fled to shelter, which GAL concluded was unnecessary without investigation).

³⁶ See Nat Stern & Karen Oehme, *Defending Neutrality in Supervised Visitation to Preserve a Crucial Family Court Service*, 35 Sw. U.L. Rev. 37, 43-44 (2005).

³⁷ See, e.g., *R.H. v. B.F.*, 653 N.E.2d 195, 199 (Mass. App. Ct. 1995) (criticizing trial court's failure to "analyze the family relationships in respect to the characteristics to be found in a battered family" after court followed GAL's recommendation of joint custody despite acknowledged presence of abuse).

³⁸ See, e.g., 5 RP 10-33.

the victim as an advocate or confidante. The multiple roles the GAL may be asked to play – fact finder, neutral, witness, expert, party – may conflict.³⁹

The presence of a GAL created an additional obstacle for Brenda King as she attempted to make her case to the trial court. As a non-attorney, Brenda was unable to counter the GAL's unfavorable view of her as the investigation went forward, and once in court, Brenda was unable to effectively cross-examine the GAL to expose the flaws in her work and cast doubt upon her recommendation. The GAL's disbelief of Brenda, which became the court's view, immeasurably benefited Michael King.

C. The domestic violence victim's challenges are exacerbated when she is not represented by counsel.

The issues discussed above can arise in any contested custody case involving abuse allegations, whether or not the victim is represented. The victim who appears *pro se* faces an additional layer of disadvantage, however. As many commentators have observed, “[w]ithout an attorney to act as a ‘buffer’ between herself and the abuser and also to help her maneuver through an emotionally-draining court battle, the domestic violence victim is being denied, albeit indirectly, access to the courts.”⁴⁰

³⁹ See Raven Lidman & Betsy Hollingsworth, *Rethinking the Roles of Guardians ad Litem in Dissolutions: Are We Seeking Magicians?*, Wash. St. B. News 22 (Dec. 1998).

⁴⁰ Martin, *supra*, at 354.

As the Supreme Court of Washington observed in its decision recognizing the right to legal representation at public expense in the context of dependency proceedings, without the benefit of counsel, the parent must “match wits with social workers, counselors, psychologists, and physicians and often an adverse attorney; cross-examine witnesses (often expert) under rules of evidence and procedure of which he or she usually knows nothing, [and] deal with documentary evidence he or she may not understand.”⁴¹ The challenges identified by the court in *Myricks* are equally present in contested custody litigation.

The unrepresented victim is required to navigate the family court system, including the entry of temporary orders on parenting and possibly child support, investigation by a GAL or parenting evaluator, and eventual preparation of the case for trial, while simultaneously parenting, holding down a job, and attempting to keep herself and her children safe during the dangerous period following separation from the abuser. Whether or not she understands the need to do so, the court will require her to substantiate her claims of abuse, whether with medical records, sworn witness statements, or testimony. She will be required to follow court procedural rules and rules of evidence. Litigants who appear without counsel are

⁴¹ *In re Myricks*, 85 Wn.2d 252, 254, 533 P.2d 841 (1975).

bound by the same rules of procedural and substantive law as those fortunate enough to have representation.⁴²

The unrepresented victim parent will be required to tell her story in the constrained manner mandated by the rules governing hearsay, personal knowledge, page limits for affidavits, and time limits for oral testimony. She will have responsibility for identifying and raising any relevant legal issues, and for framing and sharpening the factual issues of the case so as to make her case persuasive. She will need to make sure the GAL or parenting evaluator has all available witness information and understands her theory of the case. As trial approaches, she will be responsible for making sure her witnesses show up in court and for questioning them in a manner designed to elicit relevant information. She will need to prepare her witnesses for cross-examination. She will be responsible for cross-examining not only the witnesses against her and any GAL or expert who may testify, but also the abuser himself. She will have to maintain a calm and respectful demeanor in the face of disrespect from the abuser and his witnesses, and perhaps from the GAL, court personnel, or judge.

Unsurprisingly, studies indicate that victims who are represented

⁴² Trial courts must hold the self-represented to the same standards as they hold trained counsel, and appellate courts will not relieve a *pro se* litigant from mistakes she made which even a minimally competent lawyer would have avoided. *In re Marriage of Olson*, 69 Wn. App. 621, 626, 850 P.2d 527 (1993); *Westberg v. All-Purpose Structures Inc.*, 86 Wn. App. 405, 411, 936 P.2d 1175, 1177-1178 (1997); *Patterson v. Superintendent of Pub. Instruction*, 76 Wn. App. 666, 671, 887 P.2d 411, 415 (1994).

by counsel are more likely to succeed with their claims.⁴³ “Battered women who appear pro se are unlikely to take cognizance of the procedural requirements for a record.”⁴⁴ Thus, if the unrepresented victim’s claim fails, she may face yet an additional layer of disadvantage in seeking relief on appeal. The result of these cumulative disadvantages is that the victim may lose primary residential placement of her children, or the court may order a parenting plan which places her children at risk and requires her to have regular contact with the abuser.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Northwest Women’s Law Center urges the court to recognize that the imbalance of power created by domestic violence impedes access to justice for abused parents such as Brenda King, who must face their abusers in child custody proceedings without the benefit of counsel. The court should adopt the appellant’s proposed test for the availability of counsel at public expense.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 23rd day of March, 2007.



Raegen N. Rasnic, WSBA No. 25480
SKELLENGER BENDER, P.S.
Cooperating Attorney for
Northwest Women’s Law Center

⁴³ Freedman, *supra*, at n.99, and sources cited therein.

⁴⁴ Weissman, *supra*, at 1132.

Case No. 57831-6-I

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION I
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS DIV. #1
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2007 MAR 23 PM 3:45

In re the Marriage of:

MICHAEL STEVEN KING, Respondent,

v.

BRENDA LEONE KING, Appellant.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Raegen N. Rasnic, WSBA No. 25480
SKELLENGER BENDER, P.S.
1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3401
Seattle, Washington 98101-2605
(206) 623-6501

Cooperating Attorney for
Northwest Women's Law Center

ORIGINAL

THE UNDERSIGNED certifies as follows:

1. I am an employee of SKELLENGER BENDER, P.S.
2. On the 23rd day of March, 2007, I caused the original and one copy of the MOTION OF NORTHWEST WOMEN'S LAW CENTER FOR LEAVE TO FILE *AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF*, *AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF OF NORTHWEST WOMEN'S LAW CENTER* and the foregoing document, to be filed with the Clerk of the Court via legal messenger and true and correct copies of these documents to be served upon the parties listed below via First Class Mail, postage prepaid.
3. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 23rd day of March, 2007.


Vicki L. Brown, Legal Assistant

SERVICE/MAILING LIST

Attorneys for Appellant:

Kathleen M. O'Sullivan
Nicholas P. Gellert
Rebecca S. Engrav
Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Ave, Suite 4800
Seattle, WA 98101-3099

Attorney for Respondent:

Bradley K. Crosta
Crosta and Bateman
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2525
Seattle, WA 98104-4089

Attorneys for State of Washington:

Janice E. Ellis
Robert T. Seder
Bridget E. Casey
Snohomish County Prosecuting
Attorney – Civil Division
Admin. East 7th Floor, M/S 504
3000 Rockefeller Avenue
Everett, WA 98201-4060

Attorneys for *Amicus Curiae* Robert
M. McKenna, Attorney General:

Robert M. McKenna
Jeffery T. Even
Office of the Attorney General
Post Office Box Number 40100
Olympia, Washington 98504-0100