NFLR
NEVADA FAMILY LAW REPORT

Volume 22, Issue 2 Fall 2009

ELVIS has now left the building: the *RIVERO* saga continues...

By Jason P. Stoffel, Esq.

On August 27, 2009, the Supreme Court of Nevada denied rehearing *on the merits of the Rivero case, but withdrew a prior opinion, affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded the decision in this contested post-decree custodial case. See 125 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 24.*

As every family law practitioner knows, *Rivero* is the case that recently attempted to define what exactly "joint physical custody" is and how this designation factors into a child support calculation from one parent to the other. *Rivero v. Rivero*, 195 P.3d 328, 124 Nev. Adv. Rep. 84 (2008). The court is supposed to determine the time each parent has with their child (or children for purposes of this article) and determine custody in terms of "**s**ignificant, **f**requent, **c**ontinuous, and **m**eaningful time." (Practice Tip: When I litigate these types of cases and wants to include the above "buzz words" in oral argument, I use the acronym SFCM, which I can remember as "San Francisco Chow Mein." As cheesy as this may sound, this works – and you just laughed, didn't you?)

The Supreme Court determined that a rehearing on the October 30, 2008 decision was not warranted, since the court did not overlook material facts or question of law. However, portions of the October 2008 decision were withdrawn for a number of reasons.

(cont'd. inside on page 4)

IN THIS ISSUE:

THE *RIVERO* SAGA
Page 1

EDITOR'S NOTES
Page 2

THE SENIOR JUDGE SETTLEMENT PROGRAM
Page 8

THE BASICS OF FAMILY LAW JURISDICTION
Link Page 11

EDITOR'S NOTES

By Bob Cerceo, Esq.

✷

Tracey Itts Steps Down from the Family Law Section Executive Council

Our good friend and long-time devoted FLS Executive Council member Tracey Itts has stepped down from her council position. After recovering from several health setbacks, Tracey is returning to a full schedule of family practice. Choosing to devote herself to reestablishing her office, Tracey is healthy and happy, and she is accepting referrals (tracey@ittslaw.com). We offer our best wishes for Tracey's success. We note the FLS Executive Council is accepting letters of interest for the open seat, which can be directed to Ray Oster before December 31, 2009.

✷

FAMILY LAW CONFERENCE at Ely

New Dates and Information for Ely

The Executive Council has moved the annual family law conference in Ely to Thursday and Friday, March 4 and 5, 2010. This eliminates the prior overlap with other national conferences, including accommodating our Nevada fellows of the AAML. In addition to the main topics, we're introducing a seminar on an advanced topic, to be moderated by Mary Anne Decaria, the AAML chapter president. And we will continue with the paralegal track, which will focus on the fundamentals by working through a model divorce case with contested issues on custody, separate and community property and debts, a professional practice and related matters.

(cont'd. on page 3)

EDITOR'S NOTES

cont'd. from page 2

"Nevada Alimony: An Important Policy in Need of Coherent Policy Purpose"

✷

The Nevada Law Journal from the Boyd School of Law has published what is possibly our state's most comprehensive review on alimony, a detailed and good read by the Hon. David A. Hardy. Our review? Find it, read it, learn it. 9 Nevada L.J. 325 (Winter 2009).

And while getting cozy with a good alimony read, take a look at Marshal Willick's CLE material on the topic from the 19th Annual Symposium of the Family Law Council of Community Property States (May 3 through May 5, 2007, Las Vegas, Nevada), *Inter-Relation of Alimony Awards with Community Property*, located at **www.willicklawgroup.com/published_works**.

✷

Articles Sought for Family Court Bench-Bar Topics for Clark and Washoe

As our state embraces e-filing and the inevitable long-distance Internet oral arguments (though it's not as much fun as driving a high-speed flying car between Clark and Washoe Counties to make hearings), the differences between the two family divisions are shrinking. NRCP 16.2 is marching us to uniformity. Quarterly updates from the Washoe and Clark Bench-Bar Committees and from the rural counties are requested, so we can keep the entire section apprised of developments.

✷

Family Law Specialization Exam

The specialization exam was administered in October to those registered. For new aspirants, start early on next year's application. The information sought is detailed, and it requires a self-review of your cases from the past five years. Give yourself enough time to assemble the information and case counts. The next test is slated for October 2010. Applications and the standards can be found on the Family Law Section's website at: www.nvbar.org/sections/sections_family_law.htm.

✷

Domestic Partnerships are Off and Running

October 1 marked the start of Domestic Partnerships in Nevada. The required form is a simple one-page filing with the Secretary of State. Pre-registered couples and those registering on October 1 exceeded 750 statewide, more than triple the expected initial applications. Rights and benefits for couples include: marriage equivalent, same-sex or heterosexual couples, hospital visitation and medical decisions, spousal privilege, community property and debts, parentage presumption, District Court dissolution required (NRS Chapter 125), intestate succession, spousal support, body disposition rights and priority appointment as a decedent's administrator, and dissolution revokes will bequests. For more information, contact Kim Surratt, Esq. and read her article in the Summer 2009 NFLR.

✷

Now is the Time to Reevaluate Parenting Plans in Nevada

The recasting of *Rivero* provides us with a much clearer definitional path in custody cases. Whatever the format (parenting plan/order/MSA/PSA, etc.), a cohesive approach is needed for drafting the "rule book," the minimum rights and duties for coparenting.

The AAML published a Model Parenting Plan in the form of a checklist of most, if not all, coparenting issues, with suggested language. It is a great form to give to clients and opposing counsel to promote a detailed, and possibly self-directed, result. The model plan helps lawyers and parents structure a personalized plan of parenting responsibilities to protect children caught in the separating and divorcing process. It consists of printed copy and an MS Word document on CD. Find it at www.aaml.org/go/library/publications/.

NFLR Editor Bob Cerceo can be reached at (702) 252-5002 or rc@slwlaw.com.

RIVERO
cont'd. from page 1

First, and consistent with the brief submitted by the Family Law Section of the State Bar of Nevada, "joint physical custody" requires that each party have physical custody at least 40 percent of the time. This is a label that practitioners can readily apply to basically add up the hours that each parent has with the children and basically "bean count" so that a specific designation of a custodial arrangement now has a bright line test that can be applied in practice.

In *Rivero*, Ms. Rivero had the minor child five days a week and Mr. Rivero had the child two days per week. Because the parties stipulated on the label of joint physical custody in their decree, the court was not persuaded at the District Court level to change this custody designation. Rather, the District Court, in reading the plain language of the stipulated agreement of the parties within the four corners of this document, determined that an equal child timeshare was appropriate, although specific findings were required for this change in each parties' custodial time to show that the change was in the child's best interest. The court further clarified that "parties may enter into custody arrangements and create their own custody terms and definitions." This is basically telling the parties that they can certainly proceed at their own peril should they agree to one thing but basically intend it to mean another.

However, the court (in this case with the label of joint physical custody) left it up to the court to decide what was actually intended, and thus the District Court basically made the call that joint physical custody meant an equal timeshare. Such a change in custodial time required findings of facts and conclusions of law that this modification served the child's best interest.

CUSTODY ISSUES

Two Prongs of Custody: Legal and Physical Custody

1. Legal Custody

Legal custody has long been defined as the decision-making component of a child's life, such as education, religion and health-care decisions. See *Mack v. Ashlock*, 112 Nev. 1062, 921 P.2d 1258 (1996). In *Rivero*, this custody component was never really at issue but the Supreme Court took the time at the persistence of the Family Law Section to go ahead and define labels used in custody cases. Sole custody is simply where one parent basically calls all of the shots, whereas joint legal custody instills this decision-making obligation to both parents.

Moreover, joint legal custody requires a level of communication and cooperation between parties which in reality is not always possible. At least in Clark County, the COPE class (required by EDCR 5.07) is an attempt to get parents the message that relationships sometimes end but families don't: Mom will always be Mom and Dad will always be Dad, as I personally explain it to my clients. Luckily, cooperative parenting classes are available and are occasionally ordered in high-conflict custody cases. If the parties have joint legal custody, major decision-making must be done jointly whereas minor decisions can be made by the parent having the child during the particular timeshare.

The exceptions to this is basically involve education (child must go to a particular school in one parent's district to avoid being simultaneously enrolled and attending two schools) and health care (if little Johnnie or Suzie falls off the bike and needs immediate medical attention, one parent should just make the decision for immediate medical attention rather than confirming with the other parent if taking the child – screaming bloody murder – to the hospital is the right thing to do). However, having a child get braces or another non-emergency surgery is quite another story and requires court intervention, and the court is free to determine what is appropriate under the circumstances.

2. Physical Custody

Physical custody is simply defined as the amount of time that the child spends with each parent. The labels are joint physical custody or primary physical custody (subject to the visitation rights of the other parent). *Rivero* reiterated past decisions that the label of physical custody affects three situations: (1) standard of review to modify physical custody; (2) procedure to move out of state with the child; and (3) child support.

A. Joint Physical Custody

To clarify existing confusion, the Supreme Court adopted the idea that joint physical custody does not necessarily mean an "equal" timeshare. We cannot simply "split the baby" or wake a kid up in the middle of the night because that may be determined as the 84th hour in a 168-hour week. The Legislature was free to adopt a definition of a label of a specific timeshare in NRS

(cont'd. on page 5)

RIVERO

cont'd. from page 4

125 and the time was right for a case to come along and clear the air. *Rivero* was that case.

The *Rivero* decision identified that at least one prior case, "joint physical custody approximates a 50/50 timeshare." *Wesley v. Foster*, 119 Nev. 110, 65 P. 3d 251 (2003). The question then becomes: is a 50/50 timeshare "to the hour" required for the label joint physical custody?

ANSWER: NO.

However, the court held that "consistent with legislative intent and our case law, in joint physical custody arrangements, the timeshare must be approximately 50/50." *Rivero* identified the need for flexibility in any timeshare and that an exact 50/50 timeshare is not possible in every circumstance. The Supreme Court adopted the "40 percent rule" (adopting the Family Law Section definition) so that in a joint physical custody arrangement, each parent must have the child 40 percent of the time, or 146 days of the year. The quality of the time is more important than counting hours when the child is sleeping, in school, being taken care of by a third-party provider, etc. This "40 percent rule" is the bright-line test that Nevada family law attorneys have long sought.

B. Primary Physical Custody

Primary physical custody can then be defined as basically where the child is going to reside most of the time, subject to the other parent's visitation rights. See also *Ellis v. Carucci*, 123 Nev. 145, 161 P.3d 239 (2007) and *Barbagallo v. Barbagallo*, 105 Nev. 546, 779 P.2d 534 (1989). To say it another way, under NRS 125C.010, when addressing physical custody subject to the visitation rights of the other parent, the court must determine the "habitual residence" of the child as stated in the *Rivero* decision.

In *Rivero*, the court had discretion to apply Nevada law – what exactly is the approximate timeshare for joint physical custody, i.e., approximately 50/50 – and not necessarily what the parties intended, a 5/2 split in favor of Ms. Rivero. Thus, specific findings of facts were required so that it could be determined if the modification of the timeshare did support a conclusion that the modification also served the best interest of the child.

CHILD SUPPORT ISSUES

When other family law colleagues of mine initially reacted to the "modified" *Wright v. Osburn* in place from the initial *Rivero* decision, it could only be described in one word: ***HEADACHE***. Some firms had computer programs to determine child support based on each side's custodial time. However, the flavor was still there: it should not require a Ph.D in mathematics to determine child support in Nevada. Child support calculations should not be in the same book as a calculus book. More importantly, this new child support formula proved to cause more work for the judiciary and also increased litigation because each hour that each parent has with the child was relevant. It was well known that some members of the judiciary were even reluctant to even apply the *Rivero* child support formula.

(cont'd. on page 6)

RIVERO

cont'd. from page 5

This invited litigation and that is probably what the Supreme Court of Nevada did NOT have in mind. Luckily, as this case was discussed at the 2009 Family Law Conference in Ely as well as in a briefing by the Family Law Section in anticipation of revisiting the child support issue under *Rivero*, the Supreme Court correctly withdrew the *Rivero* formula for calculating child support.

A change of circumstances is always required to modify child support. The NRS 125B.145(1) "three- year review" only gets the matter in front of the judge but the court still must consider the best interests of the child to determine if modification of the child support calculation is appropriate. Under NRS 125B.145(4), the court may review the child support award based on a showing of changed circumstances (change of 20 percent or more of the obligor's income). However, the court is not required to modify child support in this discretionary review. Rather, these reviews only get the litigant in front of the judge.

The reason that the *Rivero* court made it clear that a change of circumstances is always required in child support litigation is to prevent multiple motions like Ms. Rivero filed subsequent to her decree of divorce was entered (two months after the decree was entered, a motion to establish child support was denied, and 11 months later, a motion to modify custody and set child support was denied).

Evidently the Family Law Section's brief to the Supreme Court was convincing and thus, the child support formula set for joint physical custody situations under *Wright* and *Barbagallo* was reaffirmed. Child custody considerations should of course always be under the "best interest of the child" standard rather than just spending time with the child. Public policy considerations were not ignored since having more "time" with the child (including sleeping or school time) did in fact matter with the child support calculations as the percentage of time the child had with each parent was part of the multi-step calculation that is no longer a part of Nevada jurisprudence and therefore does not need to be repeated here.

Since joint physical custody in Nevada is now defined as a near-equal timeshare, a separate formula put in place by the October 2008 *Rivero* decision became unnecessary (as hundreds of practitioners jumped for joy reading the 2009 August *Rivero* decision). As it has been said, in my experience, many attorneys chose the law-school route to avoid math, but the October 2008 *Rivero* decision interpreting new child support calculation became every practitioner's worst nightmare.

1. Child Support in Primary Physical Custody Cases

Child support is set under NRS 125B.070, subject to the legislative presumptive maximum amounts established every year by the Nevada Supreme Court, although the court can consider the deviation factors enumerated in NRS 125B.080(9) to modify the obligor's child support obligation. This was also expressly identified in the *Barbagallo* decision in primary physical custody situations. Given the fact that the *Rivero* case was one where the parties have joint physical custody of the child, this calculation remained unchanged under *Rivero*.

2. Child Support in Joint Physical Custody Cases

As clearly stated in the *Rivero* decision, family law practitioners must know that the *Wright v. Osburn* joint physical custody child support formula overrules *Barbagallo's* primary physical custody child support calculations.

Rivero confirmed the holding in *Wright v. Osburn* as to how to calculate child support in joint physical custody situations. The parents' respective incomes are determined and then the NRS 125B.070 formula is applied based on the number of children. The differences in each parties' obligation to the other is determined and then the parent with the higher income pays the parent with the lower income. For example, if Parent One earns $4,000 per month and Parent Two earns $3,000 per month and

(cont'd. on page 7)

RIVERO

cont'd. from page 6

there are two children, Parent One would pay 25 percent of the difference of the incomes. Thus, Parent One's child support obligation would be $250 per month to Parent Two. The label of Joint Physical Custody is all that matters and not the actual hours each parent spends with the child (e.g., the court no longer needs to bean count and determine which parent to credit school time, etc.).

OTHER RIVERO ISSUES

The main reason for this lengthy briefing on the August 2009 *Rivero* decision is based on basically doing away with the modified joint physical custody child support calculations and to provide the 40-percent label to joint physical custody cases.

Another item of note that we can take away from the new *Rivero* decision is that the court must make specific findings regarding deviations to child support calculations. At the District Court level, the court improperly denied Ms. Rivero's request for child support without findings but rather merely relied on the specific language of the decree that neither party would pay nor receive child support from the other. This issue has been remanded to the District Court to determine if a child support obligation is appropriate based upon a finding of a change of circumstances since entry of the decree.

There was a claim of bias and that the District Court judge should have recused herself. However, the motion lacked merit and the District Court judge did not abuse her discretion by remaining the trier of fact. It was determined that "Ms. Rivero did not prove legally cognizable grounds support an inference of bias, and therefore, summary dismissal was proper." In other words, based on the record before the Chief Judge of the Eighth Judicial District Court, the claim of bias lacked merit and no hearing on the merits was warranted. Ms. Rivero was sanctioned $750 in attorney's fees for filing the motion for recusal and disqualification of the District Court judge but the record does not support the sanction and therefore the sanction was set aside since it was an abuse of the District Court judge's discretion. There needed to be findings of fact and it needed to be shown that the motion was brought without reasonable grounds. This was not done so the sanction cannot stand but the issues were reversed and remanded to the District Court for further proceedings.

The dissent by Justice Pickering stated that the Legislature should establish child support formulas and social policy, not the court. Also, since the court must determine the exact percentage of time (e.g., 40 percent rule for joint physical custodians) that each parent has with the child as determined by the preceding year, this encourages litigation and contrary to public policy. Moreover, the record did not show that Ms. Rivero had a basis to file for child support and therefore the majority was incorrect remanding this issue back to the District Court. In other words, the August 2009 *Rivero* decision just encourages more litigation. Justice Pickering is concerned that the 40 percent rule is too rigid and does not allow the court to basically consider all factors necessary in custodial determinations. By making the parties still count hours, this is contrary to allowing flexibility while focusing on the best interest of the child.

Since the 40 percent rule basically encourages parties to keeps a log of time spent with the child, this may hinder the co-parenting process. The court should have just enforced the stipulated decree of the parties and not remanded the case for more litigation.

In conclusion, the *Rivero* decision fills gaps in Nevada custody law. The astute family law practitioner should have a copy of this decision, easily downloaded from the Supreme Court website. It is truly a disservice (and malpractice) for attorneys not to check the website for new decisions from the Supreme Court. The purpose of this article is to not only educate the members of the bar about this decision but to promote responsibility in the practice of law. Mission accomplished.

***

***Jason Stoffel** is a family law practitioner in private practice since 2004. He is employed by Hanratty Roberts in Las Vegas, and can be reached at (702) 821-1379, or www.hrfamilylaw.com.*

TWO VIEWS OF THE SENIOR JUDGE SETTLEMENT PROGRAM

#1: Attorney's View

SENIOR JUDGE SETTLEMENT CONFERENCES – THE BEST BANG FOR OUR CLIENTS' BUCK

By Jason Stoffel, Esq.

More now than ever, our clients want a means to resolve their dispute without the necessity of having counsel fully retained for an expensive trial that our clients may not be able to afford, especially with very few assets and houses that are upside-down. There has to be another way to resolve a dispute, since money does not grow on trees in the Silver State. There is an answer: The Senior Judge Settlement Conference.

The Supreme Court of Nevada has recognized the need for the Settlement Conference Program, where a senior judge will preside over the matter, typically in a "roundtable" session – as is common down in the Eighth Judicial District – in a conference room at court but far away from the actual adversarial courtroom. It is prudent to contact the applicable department to see how one goes about getting one of these settlement conferences arranged, but even at oral argument, the court can make the judgment call if the case is appropriate for a settlement conference. More times than not, it is, especially when there are no custody issues, always a hot topic for debate. Even in cases that I did have in front of the senior judges, we never wanted to bargain children for support or a certain outcome for asset distribution. The senior judges paid by the Supreme Court to take part of this program know the games that some attorneys play and maintain dignity and decorum in the proceedings.

Additionally, sometimes my client may be out of line with a position but when the Settlement Judge separates the parties, it can then be known whether an argument will hold water or whether it is just full of hot air. I'd rather know that sooner than have the trial judge make the finding or conclusion adverse to my client, anyway. However, a knowledgeable senior judge who chimes in his or her two cents has valuable insight and sometimes provides the wake-up call that our clients need without breaking the bank.

I can honestly say that my success rate with this program is 100 percent, thanks to the help, of most recently, Judges Estes and Marren, among others involved with the program. I routinely request settlement conferences either as a claim for a relief in a

(cont'd. on page 9)

SENIOR JUDGES

cont'd. from page 8

pleading or filing a motion for a settlement conference as the only claim for relief.

Even in cases where we have difficulty getting on the same page with opposing counsel (e.g., return your phone calls and timely correspondence to opposing counsel in writing), this requires the attorneys to actually work a case (sometimes an archaic concept) and I have settled several cases on the day of the motion for a settlement conference in the hallway and the matter was proven up on the record. CASE OVER. Sometimes just the thought of knowing the case is done is enough for client to be happy their case is over (at least for now) and their stress level is reduced. After the hearing, I typically like to run a client bill since, according to respected attorney Edward Kainen, happy clients pay their bills. The longer an attorney waits to send the bill after the settlement conference, the more chance the client will de-value the attorney's work and the more likely that they will not pay their attorney for legal services rendered.

Settling the case in either the hallway or a few days before the actual hearing – requesting a settlement conference and then having the attorneys settle the case on terms that the clients can live with – is the best possible outcome. Family law practitioners must not forget that this is a legitimate option, as the goal is to reduce the caseload of the departments we practice before. Our clients rely on their counsel to not only hear the dispute but to have options of resolution. Trial is not the only way and we can select private mediation or take advantage of the senior judge settlement conference.

There is statutory authority on point for settlement conferences found in NRS 3.225 (encourage resolution through non-adversarial methods) and NRCP 16(a)(5) (pre-trial conferences as a means to settle cases). I cite both as authorities for the court to set the settlement conferences since it can be worded that the parties basically desire an equal distribution of assets/debts, but the parties just do not agree with what is "equal." The settlement conference should be used to sort of bridge that gap to resolve disputes.

The recession that Nevadans are experiencing has hurt everyone financially, and nothing is worse than, at the end of the month, having to file motions to withdraw and reduce outstanding legal fees to judgment. I like to practice family law and not debt collector law. However, recognizing that in some cases our clients just want to be heard in a non-adversarial/mediation setting and now that the Supreme Court has allotted funds for the senior judges to hear such settlement conferences, the responsible practitioner will take advantage of these opportunities as these funds are available.

***

#2: Judge's View

A SETTLEMENT JUDGE'S PERSPECTIVE

By Senior District Judge Terrance P. Marren

I have been involved with the Family Court since July 1, 1985. On that date, I became the Eighth Judicial District Court's first appointed Domestic Relations Referee. I was elected to Department A of the Family Court when it was first created, along with Departments B-F.

I stayed with the court until I became City Attorney of Mesquite, Nevada in February, 1998. I retired June 30, 2005 and was recalled as a senior judge effective the next day, July 1, 2005.
I have worked steadily for the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) since that time. The AOC assigns senior judges to various vacancies and programs such as the Senior Judge Settlement Conference Program.

The foregoing history was presented to evaluate the success of the program. Since the beginning of

(cont'd. on page 10)

SENIOR JUDGES
cont'd. from page 9

everything, all of the judges wanted to resolve disputes in a non-adversarial manner. But there were simply no resources to do so. The financial assistance provided by the 2005 Nevada Legislature presented the opportunity to meaningfully address this goal. Prior to that session, per our pension rules, senior judges were only permitted to work about four months per year. The Legislature added senior judges to the list of "critical personnel," a move that permitted all of us to work for almost a full calendar year.

While Senior Judge Brennan has been around for many years, the largest influx of senior judges came after the 2005 legislative session. Beginning in 2006, as I recall, the Supreme Court established the civil settlement conference program under the leadership of Justice Rose. Based on assignment by the chief judge and the presiding civil judge, senior judges were assigned to settle civil matters. Almost all of the cases referred were tort cases. I personally participated in that program along with other senior judges. About a year later, the Supreme Court created the Family Settlement Conference Program and the civil program was shut down until its recent revival.

Meanwhile, the Family Court program has remained a constant caseload for a full week every other week. Most of the departments are given one half-day per session for either a settlement conference or a short trial. Given our explosive growth in the past two years, and given our lack of adequate courtroom space or support staff (such as court clerks and marshals), settlement conferences are more often assigned.

I must say that working as a senior settlement judge is my favorite work in the Family Court. In part, that is true due to the satisfaction of the benefits of settlement such as the conservation of precious judicial, attorney and financial resources. But the real pleasure comes from bringing two warring parties together and assisting them in finding their own resolution of their issues.

It's also very interesting because it is so different from the traditional adversarial process. The clients are in charge in that they must agree to the terms of settlement. The clients are the stars; the lawyers and settlement judge are there as the supporting cast. The rule of confidentiality (nothing may be disclosed from the settlement conference unless settlement is reached) means the settlement judge may discuss the issues of the case with the parties openly and fully. Settlement offers may even be discussed with the settlement judge during the conference or in private session. I have been amazed at how comfortable the clients are in discussing the details of their case in the presence of the settlement judge. They even get to express, either in group session or privately with the settlement judge, those things you don't want them to say in open court.

I agree totally with Jason Stoffel (see above article) that the program saves time, money and client relations. It also saves the emotional expense of a contested trial. We sometimes forget our obligation as attorneys and judges to leave the parties to a domestic dispute with some ability to communicate and deal with each other after the current legal dispute is finished. The program allows them to do that in many cases.

But a few things are essential for this process to work, in my opinion. First, the judges who work in this program must want to work as settlement judges. Second, the judges who work in this program must be trained to do so. Third, the attorney must understand his/her new role in this process while, at the same time, not forgetting the continuing role of counsel. Fourth, in order to be successful, the settlement conference must be for a half-day in duration in my opinion. A change occurs with clients and counsel as the conference progresses. The client can often work through the anger and mistrust often present at the outset of the conference, but this takes time and motivation. I have often seen a transition in a particularly angry client in about hour two or three of the conference. Attorneys realize that if their client is willing to settle, that client will be as happy as he/she can be. In my experience, without that time to transition, the settlement conference has a markedly diminished chance of success.

***

Judge Marren has been commissioned as a Senior District Court Judge since July 1, 2005.

THE BASICS OF FAMILY LAW JURISDICTION

by Richard Crane, Esq., and Marshal Willick, Esq.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The Concept of Divisible Divorce
II. Divorce Jurisdiction
III. Child Custody – Initial Jurisdiction
IV. Child Custody – Modification Jurisdiction
V. Child Support – Initial Jurisdiction
VI. Child Support – Modification Jurisdiction
VII. Division of Military Retirement Benefits As Property
VIII. Awarding Fees Where Jurisdiction is Contested
IX. Conclusions

[Ed. Note: One of the benefits of electronic publication is the ability to include CLE-length works, and we have more to come. The above article has been subject to development since first conceived by Marshal and Rick. This is the latest, most up-to-date version covering a problematic area of law. Please visit the link below to view the article in its entirety. And please give us your comments on this format.]

www.willicklawgroup.com/get_file/id=480.

Articles Are Invited!

The next NFLR is expected in January 2010. Please submit your proposed articles by December 15, 2009 to Bob Cerceo at rc@slwlaw.com. With our electronic format, we are less limited by space or length considerations.

State Bar of Nevada:

www.nvbar.org

Phone: (702) 382-2200 ✸ Toll-Free: (800) 254-2797
Fax: (702) 385-2045 ✸ Toll-Free: (888) 660-0060