EXHIBIT 12

The Constitutional Right to Be a Parent

Below are excerpts of caselaw from state appellate and federal district courts and up to the U.S. Supreme Court, all of which affirm, from one perspective or another, the absolute Constitutional right of parents to actually BE parents to their children.

No case authoritative within this circuit, however, had held that the state had a comparable obligation to protect children from their own parents, and we now know that the obligation does not exist in constitutional law." K.H. Through Murphy v. Morgan, 914 F.2d 846 (C.A.7 (Ill.), 1990.

"Rights to marry, have children and maintain relationship with children are fundamental rights protected by the Fourteenth Amendment and thus, strict scrutiny is required of any statutes that directly and substantially impair those rights." P.O.P.S. v. Gardner, 998 F2d 764 (9th Cir. 1993)

"Parents right to rear children without undue governmental interference is a fundamental component of due process."
Nunez by Nunez v. City of San Diego, 114 F3d 935 (9th Cir. 1997)

The rights of parents to the care, custody and nurture of their children is of such character that it cannot be denied without violating those fundamental principles of liberty and justice which lie at the base of all our civil and political institutions, and such right is a fundamental right protected by this amendment (First) and Amendments 5, 9, and 14. Doe v. Irwin, 441 F Supp 1247; U.S. D.C. of Michigan, (1985).

The several states have no greater power to restrain individual freedoms protected by the First Amendment than does the Congress of the United States. Wallace v. Jaffree, 105 S Ct 2479; 472 US 38, (1985).

Loss of First Amendment Freedoms, for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury. Though First Amendment rights are not absolute, they may be curtailed only by interests of vital importance, the burden of proving which rests on their government. Elrod v. Burns, 96 S Ct 2673; 427 US 347, (1976).

Law and court procedures that are "fair on their faces" but administered "with an evil eye or a heavy hand" was discriminatory and violates the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 US 356, (1886).

Even when blood relationships are strained, parents retain vital interest in preventing irretrievable destruction of their family life; if anything, persons faced with forced dissolution of their parental rights have more critical need for procedural protections than do those resisting state intervention into ongoing family affairs. Santosky v. Kramer, 102 S Ct 1388; 455 US 745, (1982).

Parents have a fundamental constitutionally protected interest in continuity of legal bond with their children. Matter of Delaney, 617 P 2d 886, Oklahoma (1980). .

The liberty interest of the family encompasses an interest in retaining custody of one's children and, thus, a state may not interfere with a parent's custodial rights absent due process protections. Langton v. Maloney, 527 F Supp 538, D.C. Conn. (1981).

Parent's right to custody of child is a right encompassed within protection of this amendment which may not be interfered with under guise of protecting public interest by legislative action which is arbitrary or without reasonable relation to some purpose within competency of state to effect. Regenold v. Baby Fold, Inc., 369 NE 2d 858; 68 Ill 2d 419, appeal dismissed 98 S Ct 1598, 435 US 963, IL, (1977).

Parent's interest in custody of her children is a liberty interest which has received considerable constitutional protection; a parent who is deprived of custody of his or her child, even though temporarily, suffers thereby grievous loss and such loss deserves extensive due process protection. In the Interest of Cooper, 621 P 2d 437; 5 Kansas App Div 2d 584, (1980).

The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment requires that severance in the parent-child relationship caused by the state occur only with rigorous protections for individual liberty interests at stake. Bell v. City of Milwaukee, 746 F 2d 1205; US Ct App 7th Cir WI, (1984).

Father enjoys the right to associate with his children which is guaranteed by this amendment (First) as incorporated in Amendment 14, or which is embodied in the concept of "liberty" as that word is used in the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment and Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. Mabra v. Schmidt, 356 F Supp 620; DC, WI (1973).

"Separated as our issue is from that of the future interests of the children, we have before us the elemental question whether a court of a state, where a mother is neither domiciled, resident nor present, may cut off her immediate right to the care, custody, management and companionship of her minor children without having jurisdiction over her in personam. Rights far more precious to appellant than property rights will be cut off if she is to be bound by the Wisconsin award of custody." May v. Anderson, 345 US 528, 533; 73 S Ct 840, 843, (1952).

A parent's right to care and companionship of his or her children are so fundamental, as to be guaranteed protection under the First, Ninth, and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution. In re: J.S. and C., 324 A 2d 90; supra 129 NJ Super, at 489.

The Court stressed, "the parent-child relationship is an important interest that undeniably warrants deference and, absent a powerful countervailing interest, protection." A parent's interest in the companionship, care, custody and management of his or her children rises to a constitutionally secured right, given the centrality of family life as the focus for personal meaning and responsibility. Stanley v. Illinois, 405 US 645, 651; 92 S Ct 1208, (1972).

Parent's rights have been recognized as being "essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free man." Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 US 390; 43 S Ct 625, (1923).

The U.S. Supreme Court implied that "a (once) married father who is separated or divorced from a mother and is no longer living with his child" could not constitutionally be treated differently from a currently married father living with his child. Quilloin v. Walcott, 98 S Ct 549; 434 US 246, 255^Q56, (1978).

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit (California) held that the parent-child relationship is a constitutionally protected liberty interest. (See; Declaration of Independence --life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution -- No state can deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law nor deny any person the equal protection of the laws.) Kelson v. Springfield, 767 F 2d 651; US Ct App 9th Cir, (1985).

The parent-child relationship is a liberty interest protected by the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment. Bell v. City of Milwaukee, 746 f 2d 1205, 1242^Q45; US Ct App 7th Cir WI, (1985).

No bond is more precious and none should be more zealously protected by the law as the bond between parent and child." Carson v. Elrod, 411 F Supp 645, 649; DC E.D. VA (1976).

A parent's right to the preservation of his relationship with his child derives from the fact that the parent's achievement of a rich and rewarding life is likely to depend significantly on his ability to participate in the rearing of his children. A child's corresponding right to protection from interference in the relationship derives from the psychic importance to him of being raised by a loving, responsible, reliable adult. Franz v. U.S., 707 F 2d 582, 595^Q599; US Ct App (1983).

A parent's right to the custody of his or her children is an element of "liberty" guaranteed by the 5th Amendment and the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution. Matter of Gentry, 369 NW 2d 889, MI App Div (1983).

Reality of private biases and possible injury they might inflict were impermissible considerations under the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. Palmore v. Sidoti, 104 S Ct 1879; 466 US 429.

Legislative classifications which distributes benefits and burdens on the basis of gender carry the inherent risk of reinforcing stereotypes about the proper place of women and their need for special protection; thus, even statutes purportedly designed to compensate for and ameliorate the effects of past discrimination against women must be carefully tailored. the state cannot be permitted to classify on the basis of sex. Orr v. Orr, 99 S Ct 1102; 440 US 268, (1979).

The United States Supreme Court held that the "old notion" that "generally it is the man's primary responsibility to provide a home and its essentials" can no longer justify a statute that discriminates on the basis of gender. No longer is the female destined solely for the home and the rearing of the family, and only the male for the

marketplace and the world of ideas. Stanton v. Stanton, 421 US 7, 10; 95 S Ct 1373, 1376, (1975).

Judges must maintain a high standard of judicial performance with particular emphasis upon conducting litigation with scrupulous fairness and impartiality. 28 USCA § 2411; Pfizer v. Lord, 456 F.2d 532; cert denied 92 S Ct 2411; US Ct App MN, (1972).

State Judges, as well as federal, have the responsibility to respect and protect persons from violations of federal constitutional rights. Gross v. State of Illinois, 312 F 2d 257; (1963).

The Constitution also protects "the individual interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters." Federal Courts (and State Courts), under Griswold can protect, under the "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness" phrase of the Declaration of Independence, the right of a man to enjoy the mutual care, company, love and affection of his children, and this cannot be taken away from him without due process of law. There is a family right to privacy which the state cannot invade or it becomes actionable for civil rights damages. Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 US 479, (1965).

The right of a parent not to be deprived of parental rights without a showing of fitness, abandonment or substantial neglect is so fundamental and basic as to rank among the rights contained in this Amendment (Ninth) and Utah's Constitution, Article 1 § 1. In re U.P., 648 P 2d 1364; Utah, (1982).

The rights of parents to parent-child relationships are recognized and upheld. Fantony v. Fantony, 122 A 2d 593, (1956); Brennan v. Brennan, 454 A 2d 901, (1982). State's power to legislate, adjudicate and administer all aspects of family law, including determinations of custodial; and visitation rights, is subject to scrutiny by federal judiciary within reach of due process and/or equal protection clauses of 14th Amendment...Fourteenth Amendment applied to states through specific rights contained in the first eight amendments of the Constitution which declares fundamental personal rights...Fourteenth Amendment encompasses and applied to states those preexisting fundamental rights recognized by the Ninth Amendment. The Ninth Amendment acknowledged the prior existence of fundamental rights with it: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." The United States Supreme Court in a long line of decisions, has recognized that matters involving marriage, procreation, and the parent-child relationship are among those fundamental "liberty" interests protected by the Constitution. Thus, the decision in Roe v. Wade, 410 US 113; 93 S Ct 705; 35 L Ed 2d 147, (1973), was recently described by the Supreme Court as founded on the "Constitutional underpinning of ... a recognition that the "liberty" protected by the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment includes not only the freedoms explicitly mentioned in the Bill of Rights, but also a freedom of personal choice in certain matters of marriage and family life." The non-custodial divorced parent has no way to implement the constitutionally protected right to maintain a parental relationship with his child except through visitation. To acknowledge the protected status of the relationship as the majority does, and yet deny protection under Title 42 USC § 1983, to visitation, which is the exclusive

means of effecting that right, is to negate the right completely. Wise v. Bravo, 666 F.2d 1328, (1981).

FROM THE COLORADO SUPREME COURT, 1910

In controversies affecting the custody of an infant, the interest and welfare of the child is the primary and controlling question by which the court must be guided. This rule is based upon the theory that the state must perpetuate itself, and good citizenship is essential to that end. Though nature gives to parents the right to the custody of their own children, and such right is scarcely less sacred than the right to life and liberty, and is manifested in all animal life, yet among mankind the necessity for government has forced the recognition of the rule that the perpetuity of the state is the first consideration, and parental authority itself is subordinate to this supreme power. It is recognized that: 'The moment a child is born it owes allegiance to the government of the country of its birth, and is entitled to the protection of that government. And such government is obligated by its duty of protection, to consult the welfare, comfort and interest of such child in regulating its custody during the period of its minority.' Mercein v. People, 25 Wend. (N. Y.) 64, 103, 35 Am. Dec. 653; McKercher v. Green, 13 Colo. App. 271, 58 Pac. 406. But as government should never interfere with the natural rights of man, except only when it is essential for the good of society, the state recognizes, and enforces, the right which nature gives to parents [48 Colo. 466] to the custody of their own children, and only supervenes with its sovereign power when the necessities of the case require it.

The experience of man has demonstrated that the best development of a young life is within the sacred precincts of a home, the members of which are bound together by ties entwined through 'bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh'; that it is in such homes and under such influences that the sweetest, purest, noblest, and most attractive qualities of human nature, so essential to good citizenship, are best nurtured and grow to wholesome fruition; that, when a state is based and builded upon such homes, it is strong in patriotism, courage, and all the elements of the best civilization. Accordingly these recurring facts in the experience of man resulted in a presumption establishing prima facie that parents are in every way qualified to have the care, custody, and control of their own offspring, and that their welfare and interests are best subserved under such control. Thus, by natural law, by common law, and, likewise, the statutes of this state, the natural parents are entitled to the custody of their minor children, except when they are unsuitable persons to be intrusted with their care, control, and education, or when some exceptional circumstances appear which render such custody inimicable to the best interests of the child. While the right of a parent to the custody of its infant child is therefore, in a sense, contingent, the right can never be lost or taken away so long as the parent properly nurtures, maintains, and cares for the child.

Wilson v. Mitchell, 111 P. 21, 25-26, 48 Colo. 454 (Colo. 1910)

SHARE

EXHIBIT 13

FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT

JD-FM-6 Rev. 5-06
P.B. 25-30

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
SUPERIOR COURT
www.jud.state.ct.us

FINAFF

FOR THE JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF	AT (Address of court)	DOCKET NO.
Stamford/Norwalk	123 Hoyt Street Stamford, CT 06905	FA04 0201276S

NAME OF CASE	NAME OF AFFIANT (Person submitting this form)
Suzanne Nowacki v. Michael Nowacki	Suzanne Sullivan

OCCUPATION	NAME OF EMPLOYER	
Vice President	Fox Broadcasting	[redacted]

ADDRESS OF EMPLOYER
1211 Avenue of Americas, 20th Floor New York, New York 10036

1. MONTHLY INCOME

A. MONTHLY INCOME FROM PRINCIPAL EMPLOYMENT (Use monthly average not fewer than 3 months)

DEDUCTIONS (Taxes, FICA, etc.)	AMOUNT/MONTH	DEDUCTIONS (Cont.)	AMOUNT/MONTH		
1. Federal tax	$ 6,316	4. Federal FICA EE	$ 552	GROSS MTHLY WAGE PRINCIPAL EMPLOYMENT →	$ 23,517
2. Medicare	$ 334	5. 401K	$ 1,375	TOTAL DEDUCTIONS →	$ 10,784
3. NY State Inc Tax	$ 1,617	6. Other total (attached)	$ 590	NET MONTHLY WAGE →	$ 12,733

B. ALL OTHER INCOME (Include in-kind compensation, gratuities, rents, interest, dividends, pension, etc.)

SOURCE OF INCOME	GROSS AMT/MO	SOURCE OF INCOME	GROSS AMT/MO		
1. Car Allowance	$ 600	2. Total other income	$ 8,102	GROSS MONTHLY INCOME FROM OTHER SOURCES →	$ 8,702
DEDUCTIONS	AMOUNT/MONTH	DEDUCTIONS	AMOUNT/MONTH	TOTAL DEDUCTIONS →	$ 2,113
	$	Total (attached)	$ 2,113	NET MONTHLY INCOME FROM OTHER SOURCES →	$ 6,589
	$		$		
	$		$		
	$		$		
	$		$		
	$		$		

ADD "NET MONTHLY WAGE" FROM SECTION A, AND "NET MONTHLY INCOME" FROM SECTION B, AND ENTER TOTAL BELOW:

[redacted] $ 19,322

2. MONTHLY EXPENSES

1. RENTOR MORTGAGE		$ 2,000	6. TRANSPORTATION	Gas/Oil	$ 250	11. DAY CARE	$ 57 (6)
2. REAL ESTATE TAXES		$ 0		Repairs	$ 20	12. OTHER (specify below)	
3. UTILITIES	Fuel	$ 575		Auto Loan	$ 505 (3)	Other utilities	$ 15 (2)
	Electricity	$ 500		Public Trans.	$ 264	Meals outside of home	$ 300
	Gas	$ 0	7. INSURANCE PREMIUMS	Medical/ Dental	$ 0	Vacation (not children)	$ 550 (5)
	Water	$ 0		Automobile	$ 230	Septic Maintenance	$ 25
	Telephone	$ 195 (1)		Homeowners	$ 16 (4)	Oil Burner Maintenance	$ 15
	Trash Collection	$ 52		Life	$ 32	Chimney Sweep	$ 20
	Cable T.V.	$ 176	8. MEDICAL/DENTAL		$ 150	Other total (attached)	$ 15,286
4. FOOD		$ 725	9. CHILD SUPPORT (order of court)		$ 0	Other misc (attached)	$ 1,124
5. CLOTHING		$ 500	10. ALIMONY (order of court)		$ 0	[redacted]	$ 23,582

3. LIABILITIES (DEBTS)

CREDITOR (Do not include mortgages or loan balances that will be listed under assets.)	AMOUNT OF DEBT	BALANCE DUE	DATE DEBT INCURRED	MONTHLY PAYMENT
	$	$		$
	$	$		$
	$	$		$
	$	$		$
	$	$		$
[redacted]	$	$		$
[redacted]	$ 0	[redacted]		$

4. ASSETS	A. Real Estate	Home	ADDRESS 183 Brushy Ridge Road New Canaan, CT. 0684		VALUE (Est.) $ 2,100,000	MORTGAGE $ 1,500,000	EQUITY $ 300,000 50%
		Other:	ADDRESS		VALUE (Est.) $	MORTGAGE $	EQUITY $
		Other:	ADDRESS		VALUE (Est.) $	MORTGAGE $	EQUITY $
	B. Motor Vehicles	Car 1:	YEAR	MAKE	MODEL	VALUE $	LOAN BALANCE $	EQUITY $
		Car 2:	YEAR	MAKE	MODEL	VALUE $	LOAN BALANCE $	EQUITY $
	C. Other Personal Property	DESCRIBE AND STATE VALUE OF EACH ITEM					TOTAL VALUE
		Jewelry (est.)				$20,000 100%	
		Mink Coat (est)				$10,000 100%	
		Other personal property (see attached page)				$66,500	$ 96,500
	D. Bank Accounts	BANK NAME, TYPE OF ACCOUNT, AND AMOUNT					TOTAL BANK ACCOUNTS
		Chase			Checking	$26,426 100%	
		Chase			Joint Checking	$9,826 50%	
							$ 36,252
	E. Stocks, Bonds Mutual Funds	NAME OF COMPANY, NUMBER OF SHARES, AND VALUE					TOTAL VALUE
		Stocks total				$0	
		Bonds total				$0	
		Mutual funds total				$0	$ 0
	F. Insurance (exclude children)	NAME OF INSURED	COMPANY	FACE AMOUNT	CASH VALUE	AMT. OF LOAN	TOTAL VALUE
				$	$	$	
				$	$	$	
				$	$	$	$ 0
	G. Deferred Compensation Plans	NAME OF PLAN (Individual I.R.A., 401K, Keogh, etc.) AND APPROX. VALUE					TOTAL VALUE (less loans)
		(27) Neuberger IRA				$52,331 100%	
		(28) FOX 401K				$103,229 100%	
							$ 155,560
	H. All Other Assets	(29) Securities- Neuberger Account				$689,628 100%	TOTAL VALUE
		(30) Securities-Neuberger Account Joint				$50,709 50%	
	I. Total						$ 740,337
							$ 1,328,649

5. HEALTH INSURANCE	NAME AND ADDRESS OF HEALTH OR DENTAL INSURANCE CARRIER United Health Care 450 Columbus Boulevard Hartford, CT	
	INSURANCE POLICY NO. 931052997	NAME(S) OF PERSON(S) COVERED BY THE POLICY Affiant, David Barrington, Timothy Nowacki, Kerry Nowacki

TOTAL NET MONTHLY INCOME (A)	$ 19,322	TOTAL CASH VALUE OF ASSETS (E)	$ 1,328,649
TOTAL MONTHLY EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES (B + D)	$ 23,582	TOTAL LIABILITIES (TOTAL BALANCE DUE ON DEBTS) (C)	$ 0

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing statement is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

SIGNED (Affiant)	Subscribed and sworn to before me on	DATE	SIGNED (Notary, Comm. of Superior Court, Assistant Clerk)
Suzanne Sullivan (Suzanne Sullivan)		11/10/09	Wendy McCammon

JD-FM-6 Rev. 5-06 (Back)

Neuberger Accounts(2), valued 9/2009; held for minor children: Tim: $264,312.99; Kerry: $151,889.36-accounts are funded by Affiant's family for children and not for college tuition. 529 Plans; valued 6/2009: Tim $9,541.14.09 and Kerry $9,532.33

WENDY McCAMMON
Notary Public - State of New York
No. 01MC5084175
Qualified in New York County
Commission Expires Sept. 05, 2005

11/10/09

2/24/10

Additional Information

Income Sources

Description	Monthly
Dividends	1,381
Gifts from Parents	417
Excess Life	54
Bonus Check from FOX	6,250
	8,102

Income Deductions (primary income source)

Description	Monthly
Flex MED	250
Long Term Disability	77
NY SDI EE	3
United Fam	260
	590

Income Deductions (additional income sources)

Description	Income source	Monthly
Federal tax	Bonus Check from F	1,563
Deduction ##		0
Medicare	Bonus Check from F	91
State Inc Tax	Bonus Check from F	459
NY SDI EE	Bonus Check from F	0
		2,113

Other Expenses

Description	Monthly
Window Washers	33
Plants/landscaping/trees	905
Snowplowing	35
Pool Maintenance	500
Breakfast and Lunch in NYC	100
Drycleaning	375
Housewares	150
Newspapers/magazines	50
Books/Stationery supplies	50
Flowers	50
Housekeeper	607

Tolls		
Parking	25	
License/registration/emission test	50	
Property Taxes on Affiant's vehicle	6	
Nanny Ford Explorer Lease	42	
Nanny gas	185	(7) reflects 35%
Nanny Satellite Radio	38	(8) reflects 35%
Nanny Auto insurance	6	(9) reflects 35%
Nanny car repair and maintenance	31	(10) reflects 35%
Nanny AAA	35	(11) reflects 35%
Personal grooming	1	(12) reflects 35%
Psychiatrist/Psychologist	235	
Prescription drugs	55	
Eyeglasses/contact lenses	15	
Family YMCA Membership	40	
Accountant	106	
Legal Fees	70	
Childrens clothing	10,000	
Childrens medical	330	(13) Reflects 100% cost to affiant
Childrens dental	10	(14) Reflects 35%
Nanny Salary	5	(15) Reflects 35%
Nanny Cell Phone	645	(16) Reflects 35%
Sport's Equipment	19	(17) Reflects 35%
Hockey tuition and team fees	70	(18) Reflects 35%
Tim's baseball	145	(19) Reflects 35%
Kerry's soccer, softball, and sports equ	8	(20) Reflects 35%
School Supplies	40	(21) Reflects 35%
Tim's Cell phone	100	(22) 100%
Children's Eyeglasses/Contact lenses	100	(23) 100%
Hockey Trips	12	(24) Reflects 35%
CCD	100	(25) Reflects 35%
	12	(26) Reflects 35%
	15,391	

Miscellaneous Expenses

Description	Monthly
Charities	208
Holiday presents	750
Birthday Presents	83
Wedding/Baby Presents	83
	1,124

Footnotes

(1) Inclusive of cell and landlines
(2) internet
(3) Lease Payment
(4) Chubb insurance for contents of home
(5) With & without children
(6) Nanny overtime-babysitting expenses
(7) reflects 35%
(8) reflects 35%
(9) reflects 35%
(10) reflects 35%
(11) reflects 35%
(12) reflects 35%
(13) Reflects 100% cost to affiant
(14) Reflects 35%
(15) Reflects 35%
(16) Reflects 35%
(17) Reflects 35%
(18) Reflects 35%
(19) Reflects 35%
(20) Reflects 35%
(21) Reflects 35%
(22) 100%
(23) 100%
(24) Reflects 35%
(25) Reflects 35%
(26) Reflects 35%
(27) val. 9/30/09
(28) val. 11/5/09
(29) val. 9/30/09
(30) val. 9/30/09

EXHIBIT 14

Connecticut Judicial Branch Law Libraries

Copyright © 2007, Judicial Branch, State of Connecticut. All rights reserved.

Best Interest of the Child Standard in Connecticut

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

- "We have consistently held in matters involving child custody that while the rights, wishes and desires of the parents must be considered it is nevertheless the ultimate welfare of the child which must control the decision of the court." In re Appeal of Kindis, 162 Conn. 239, 242, 294 A.2d 316 (1972).
- "The guiding principle in determining custody is the best interest of the child." Schult v. Schult, 241 Conn. 767, 777, 699 A.2d 134 (1997).
- **JOINT CUSTODY:** "There shall be a presumption, affecting the burden of proof, that joint custody is in the best interests of a minor child where the parents have agreed to an award of joint custody or so agree in open court at a hearing for the purpose of determining the custody of the minor child or children of the marriage. If the court declines to enter an order awarding joint custody pursuant to this subsection, the court shall state in its decision the reasons for denial of an award of joint custody." CONN. GEN. STATS. § 46b-56a(b) (2007)
- **NONPARENT:** "In any dispute as to the custody of a minor child involving a parent and a nonparent, there shall be a presumption that it is in the best interest of the child to be in the custody of the parent, which presumption may be rebutted by showing that it would be detrimental to the child to permit the parent to have custody." CONN. GEN. STATS. § 46b-56b (2007).

Sections in this chapter:

§ 1. New statutory factors (effective October 1, 2005)
§ 2. Prior factors used by the courts
§ 3. Custody orders and presumptions in Connecticut
§ 4. Parental responsibility plan
§ 5. The psychological parent
§ 6. Wishes of the child
§ 7. Parental relocation out of state
§ 8. Parental misconduct

Tables in this chapter:

Table 1. Factors court may consider effective October 1, 2005
Table 2. Criteria Used by the Courts in Determining Best Interest of the Child
Table 3. ALR Annotations on Factors Used by the Courts
Table 4. Survey of the States: Best Interest of the Child Standard
Table 5. Proof of denial of child visitation rights
Table 6. Proof of justification of denial of visitation rights
Table 7. Proof as to which parent should be awarded custody of child
Table 8. New Factors used in relocation

Section 1

New Statutory Factors

EXHIBIT 15

EXHIBIT 16

EXHIBIT 17

EXHIBIT 18

EXHIBIT 19

EXHIBIT 20

EXHIBIT 21

EXHIBIT 22

EXHIBIT 23