

New Orders

The Friend of the Court=s responsibilities include making recommendations for orders addressing child custody, parenting time and support in domestic relations cases. In every new case that is filed, the parties are invited to attend an appointment with the Friend of the Court for the purposes of exploring settlement and agreement and gathering information for making a recommendation to the Court.

In **2004** the office conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 555 new cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 57% granted custody to the mother, 6% granted custody to the father, **30%** provided for ***shared physical custody*** and the balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, usually due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In **67%** of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody at the initial conference; in 15% of the new cases, custody was determined by default (the defendant failed to appear or respond).

In **2005** the office conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 480 new cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 59% granted custody to the mother, 5% granted custody to the father, **29%** provided for ***shared physical custody*** and the balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, usually due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In **70%** of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody at the initial conference; in 12% of the new cases, custody was determined by default (the defendant failed to appear or respond).

During **2006** the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 543 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 60% granted custody to the mother, 5% granted custody to the father, **28%** provided for ***shared physical custody*** and the balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, usually due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In **67%** of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody at the initial conference; in 16% of the new cases, custody was determined by default (the defendant failed to appear or respond).

For **2007**, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 547 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 61% granted custody to the mother, 4% granted custody to the father, **31%** provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, usually due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In **62%** of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody at the initial conference; in 21% of the new cases, custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In **2008**, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 545 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 57% granted custody to the mother, 5% granted custody to the father, **31%** provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In **70%** of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 14% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In **2009**, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 594 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 56% granted custody to the mother, 6% granted custody to the father, **34%** provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In **68%** of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 16% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In **2010**, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 513 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 55%

granted custody to the mother, 6% granted custody to the father, 35% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 70% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 13% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In 2011, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 529 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 53% granted custody to the mother, 8% granted custody to the father, 36% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 70% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 15% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In 2012, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 549 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 55% granted custody to the mother, 6% granted custody to the father, 36% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 68% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 17% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In 2013, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 418 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 56% granted custody to the mother, 8% granted custody to the father, 34% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 61% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 12% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In 2014, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 460 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 59% granted custody to the mother, 7% granted custody to the father, 32% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 65% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 14% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In 2015 the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 451 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 47% granted custody to the mother 4% granted custody to the father, 28% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 65% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 12% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In 2016 – the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 391 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 49% granted custody to the mother, 5% granted custody to the father, 30% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 64% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 5% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In 2017, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 400 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 33% granted custody to the mother, 4% granted custody to the father, 28% provided for ***shared physical***

custody. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 65% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 1% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In **2018**, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 430 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 43% granted custody to the mother, 2% granted custody to the father, 31% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 66% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 14% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In **2019** – the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 387 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 34% granted custody to the mother, 5% granted custody to the father, 36% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 68% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 2% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In **2020** – the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 291 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 37% granted custody to the mother, 3% granted custody to the father, 36% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 53% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 7% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In **2021**, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 329 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 35% granted custody to the mother, 4% granted custody to the father, 29% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 55% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 4% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In **2022**, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 398 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 36% granted custody to the mother, 4% granted custody to the father, 34% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 60% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 2% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

In **2023**, the Case Management staff conducted investigations and made recommendations for temporary orders in 387 cases. Of the initial orders recommended by the Friend of the Court Office, 35% granted custody to the mother, 4% granted custody to the father, 33% provided for ***shared physical custody***. The balance represents split care, third party care and cases where custody was reserved initially, typically due to the fact that the parties were still residing in the same household. In 46% of the new cases, the parties **agreed** to custody and in 7% of the new case custody was determined by default (one of the parties failed to appear or respond).

Reviews

Friend of the Court reviews orders for possible modification. Child support reviews are conducted once every three years upon request of either party. Parenting time is reviewed when referred by court order or upon demonstration of a significant change in circumstances.

The Friend of the Court Office conducted 677 reviews in **2004**; an average of 56 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 24, although the law permits up to 180 days to complete reviews. 72% of the reviews addressed child support; 26% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2005** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 550 reviews; an average of 46 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 19. 78% of the reviews addressed child support; 20% addressed parenting time issues.

The Friend of the Court Office conducted 571 reviews in **2006**; an average of 48 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 21. 79% of the reviews addressed child support; 16.5% addressed parenting time issues.

565 reviews were conducted in **2007**; an average of 47 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 22. 80% of the reviews addressed child support; 17% addressed parenting time issues.

605 reviews were conducted in **2008**; an average of 50 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 23. 83% of the reviews addressed child support; 12% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2009** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 578 reviews; an average of 48 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 24. 85% of the reviews addressed child support; 17% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2010** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 711 reviews; an average of 59 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 23. 82% of the reviews addressed child support; 16% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2011** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 766 reviews; an average of 64 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 26. 83% of the reviews addressed child support; 14% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2012** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 735 reviews; an average of 61 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 27. 80% of the reviews addressed child support; 15% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2013** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 734 reviews; an average of 61 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 23. 88% of the reviews addressed child support; 16% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2014** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 635 reviews; an average of 53 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 23. 79% of the reviews addressed child support; 17% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2015** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 626 reviews; an average of 52 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 22. 82% of the reviews addressed child support; 16% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2016** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 671 reviews; an average of 56 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 24. 85% of the reviews addressed child support; 13% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2017** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 641 reviews; an average of 53 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 20. 76% of the reviews addressed child support; 11% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2018** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 664 reviews; an average of 55 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 20. 83% of the reviews addressed child support; 12% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2019** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 585 reviews; an average of 49 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 23. 83% of the reviews addressed child support; 11% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2020** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 409 reviews; an average of 34 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 25. 84% of the reviews addressed child support; 10% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2021** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 421 reviews; an average of 35 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 23. 85% of the reviews addressed child support; 6% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2022** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 475 reviews; an average of 40 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 29. 80% of the reviews addressed child support; 5% addressed parenting time issues.

In **2023** the Friend of the Court Office conducted 467 reviews; an average of 39 monthly. The average number of days for the completion of a review was 28. 81% of the reviews addressed child support; 10% addressed parenting time issues.

Stipulated Orders

Friend of the Court also prepares court orders based upon agreements submitted by the parties. When parties reach agreements concerning custody, support or parenting time and provide those to the Friend of the Court, the Friend of the Court will prepare and obtain a new court order incorporating the agreed upon changes. This is currently done without charge to the litigants.

Friend of the Court prepared 231 stipulated orders for clients in 2004, 222 in 2005, 200 in 2006, 221 in 2007, 236 in 2008, 245 in 2009, 211 in 2010, 214 in 2011, 223 in 2012, 204 in 2013, and 188 in 2014, 182 in 2015, 153 in 2016, 133 in 2017, 172 in 2018, 114 in 2019, 111 in 2020, 128 in 2021, 114 in 2022, & 120 in 2023 .