EDITORIAL NOTE: CHANGES MADE TO THIS JUDGMENT APPEAR IN [SQUARE BRACKETS].

NOTE: PURSUANT TO S 437A OF THE ORANGA TAMARIKI ACT 1989, ANY REPORT OF THIS PROCEEDING MUST COMPLY WITH SS 11B, 11C AND 11D OF THE FAMILY COURT ACT 1980. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, PLEASE SEE https://www.justice.govt.nz/family/about/restriction-on-publishing-judgments/

IN THE FAMILY COURT
AT MANUKAU

I TE KŌTI WHĀNAU
KI MANUKAU

FAM-2016-092-000534
[2021] NZFC 3068

IN THE MATTER OF	The Oranga Tamariki Act 1989
BETWEEN	CHIEF EXECUTIVE ORANGA TAMARIKI- MINISTRY FOR CHILDREN Applicant
AND	[JA] Applicant and First Respondent
	[DC] Second Respondent

Hearing:	29 - 31 March 2021
Appearances:	Oranga Tamariki – Ms Berger [JA] – self represented [DC] – Ms Tagi Lawyer for Children – Ms Muller
Judgment:	7 April 2021

RESERVED DECISION OF JUDGE M L ROGERS

Background

[1] [EC] is the daughter of [JA] and [DC]. Ms [JA] is also the mother of [BV], [DV] and [CV]. [SV] has been identified as the children's father, although there is a question mark over [BV]'s paternity. Mr [SV] does not live in New Zealand and has taken no part in these proceedings. The children have an older sibling [AV] who also lives overseas.

[2] On 24 May 2016, an order was made placing all five children in the custody of the Chief Executive pursuant to s.78 of the Oranga Tamariki Act 1989 ('the Act'). Matters then progressed to a lengthy hearing before Judge Malosi in 2018. In her decision dated 30 August 2018 the judge concluded;

> "Although Ms [JA] and Mr [DC] have both undertaken a number of courses targeting the violence within their relationship, their parenting and personal issues; neither of them in my view has demonstrated an ability to apply those learnings to real life situations. If anything, over time they seem to have become more entrenched in their perception that the 'system' is weighted against them and they are suffering great injustices as a result. To be fair to Mr [DC], I find that he has been socialised to those views by Ms [JA]."[1]

[3] Judge Malosi found the children to be in need of care and protection pursuant to ss 14(1)(a) and (b) of the Act. She discharged the interim custody order and made s 101 custody orders placing [BV], [DV], [CV] and [EC] in the custody of the Chief Executive.

[4] Considering the Chief Executive's application for appointment as an additional guardian (s 110(2)(b)), Judge Malosi said;

> "Given Ms [JA] and Mr [DC]'s reluctance to work with OT, I find they cannot be relied upon to be available to make guardianship decisions for the children or make the right guardianship decisions for any of them. Mr [SV] of course is off the scene. I therefore consider it appropriate for the Chief Executive to be appointed as an additional guardian for all of the children [that included their older sibling [AV]]."[2]

[5] Finally, addressing the determination sought under s 18B of the Act, Judge Malosi concluded;

---

[1] *Chief Executive of Oranga Tamariki v [JA]* [2018] NZFC 4705, Malosi FCJ [100]
[2] Above n 1, Malosi FCJ [105]

> "As to the issue of a determination that there is no realistic possibility of return of the children to either Ms [JA] or Mr [DC], it is important that these parents appreciate the determination is not whether there is a *mere* possibility of return, but rather whether that is *realistic.* The determination must be considered objectively, with due regard to the objects and principles of the Act, with particular emphasis of course on s.6 - the welfare and interests of the child or young person is paramount.
>
> The children have been out of Ms [JA] and Mr [DC]'s care for over two years now. I find that over that period neither of them have taken sufficient steps to address the concerns that led to the removal of the children in the first place. Arguably, they have both stepped backwards. At best, they have stood still.
>
> The children cannot be expected to wait any longer. They are entitled to certainty and ongoing security. They all have that in their current placements, and [AV], [BV] and [DV] have expressed very clear views that they do not wish to return to the care of their mother, and certainly not to Mr [DC].
>
> I am satisfied, given of the circumstances of this case, that it is appropriate to make a determination pursuant to s.18(B)(2)(c) in respect of all of the children. I do not make that lightly."[3]

[6] Judge Malosi's decision bears reading in full in order to understand the lengthy history of challenging behaviour demonstrated by Ms [JA] and to a lesser extent Mr [DC] in their dealings with Oranga Tamariki and the Court, amongst others. Ms [JA] appealed the decision to the High Court, but her appeal was unsuccessful and Judge Malosi's findings were upheld. Ms [JA] then sought to relitigate the issues before me on 28 July 2020. I declined leave pursuant to s 206A of the Act.

[7] As will be apparent from my decision of that date and more recent minutes in connection with this hearing, Ms [JA] continues to struggle to represent her own interests. Ms [JA] has access to legal aid and has in the past had the assistance of counsel. Despite the complex and distressing nature of the issues to be traversed, Ms [JA] has chosen to represent herself for some years now. That is Ms [JA]'s right, but it has not been a right exercised to her advantage.

[8] By contrast, Mr [DC]'s presentation and conduct in the proceedings before me were very different to that described in 2018. Mr [DC] was respectful, courteous and eloquent in explaining himself. He says he has been working very hard to change and become a better person. Mr [DC] has worked hard to improve his English and has reconnected with his family and his Cook Island culture. As noted in Judge Malosi's

[3] Above n 1, Malosi FCJ [106] – [109]

decision, Mr [DC]'s relationship with Ms [JA] had led to him becoming estranged from his own family.

[9] The relationship between Ms [JA] and Mr [DC] continues and continues to be unhealthy and volatile. There has been Police involvement in family harm incidents this year and Ms [JA] currently has a Police safety order against Mr [DC].

[10] [BV], [DV] and [EC] have been living with their maternal grandaunt, her daughter and her daughter's husband. The girls have been living with those family members since 7 May 2017. Ms [JA] is estranged from her relatives.

[11] [CV] lives in a specialised CCS placement. [CV] has global developmental delay and special needs. Although he lives apart from his sisters, [CV] does have some regular access with them. As for access with his mother, Ms Freeman gave evidence that:

> "The possibility of access with [CV] and Ms [JA] is a real possibility. There's just a matter of an access contract that is the main barrier to that occurring. He is progressing well."[4]

[12] [EC] and [BV] have had no form of access with their mother since 2017. [DV] had one access visit in 2018. [CV] has had sporadic access with his mother, which ended when Ms [JA] refused to sign an access agreement with a new supervisor. [CV] has not had access with his mother for over a year.

The children's views

[13] All the children are doing well in their placements. [EC] has found her access with her father very challenging and that process has stalled. Ms Muller's report of 17 March 2021 advises that when asked about access with her mum, [EC] simply said "no". [EC] is keen to get her ears pierced like [BV] and would also like her very long hair cut.

[4] Notes of evidence, p 48 ll. 7 - 9

[14] [DV] also wants to get her ears pierced and is frustrated because she thinks her mum reneged on an earlier agreement to allow it on [DV]'s birthday. [DV] would like to be immunised, especially against measles and Covid-19.

[15] [DV] is described as "firm about not wanting to have any access with her mum". [DV] said, "No thanks. I'm not ready to see her. I still remember the things she's done to me in the past."

[16] [BV] shares the same views on access as her sister. She says "there's nothing that my mum can do to make me change my mind about seeing her. Even if mum made changes, I wouldn't believe her, and it wouldn't change my mind."

[17] [BV] thinks it is "silly" that she and her sisters have so much difficulty getting their mother's consent to things like haircuts and thinks it makes things "hard" for them. [BV] wants to get immunised, so she does not miss out on school trips when immunisation is required.

[18] [BV] would also like for all the children to be able to travel when the borders re-open and thinks they should be able to get passports.

[19] Finally, [BV] really wants to know is who her father. She would like DNA testing to try to clarify this, although that issue is not specifically before the Court. Ms [JA] said during the hearing that she would consent to inter-sibling DNA testing but as Ms Freeman pointed out, if that shows [BV]'s paternity is different to [DV] and [CV] [BV] will still lack crucial information about her identity. Hopefully this matter can be the subject of ongoing discussions and investigation, for [BV]'s sake.

[20] [CV] has very limited verbal capabilities and cannot express his views on any of the issues before the Court.

Current s 128 plan provisions for access

[21] The current plans for implementation of the children's custody orders all address access for Ms [JA] and Mr [DC]. [DV] and [BV]'s current plans (2 September 2020) record the same comments;

> "At this time [BV]/[DV] does not want to have access with her mother. Access will be dependent on [BV]'s/[DV]'s willingness to engage.
>
> In the meantime, Ms [JA] may engage in other forms of access such as letter writing and sending cards."

[22] [EC]'s plan of the same date records;

> "At this time [EC] is not having access with her mother. Access will be dependent on Ms [JA] being able to evidence that she can put [EC]'s needs before her own.
>
> In the meantime, Ms [JA] may engage in other forms of access such as letter writing and sending cards."
>
> "[EC] has shown signs of trauma and psychological and emotional distress while having SKYPE access with Mr [DC].
>
> Oranga Tamariki will explore options to engage a psychologist and /or qualified counsellor to provide support for [EC] around access.
>
> Mr [DC] will provide cards and letters to his lawyer every month so they can be sent to the social worker and read out to [EC]".

[23] Mr [DC] has an interim access order dated 13 July 2020. That order, which was made by consent, provides a detailed access plan setting out a progression of access between Mr [DC] and [EC].

[24] The plan for [CV] (23 July 2020) proposes access for Ms [JA] on the basis that it will be with supervision from ADAPT family solutions. The idea is that access can then occur in a more relaxed environment than an Oranga Tamariki office (Ms [JA]'s previous request). An access contract needs to be signed by Ms [JA] for access to be advanced. That has not occurred yet.

Ms [JA]'s proceedings

[25] This long cause fixture was scheduled to consider Ms [JA]'s application for an access order and her opposition to the guardianship directions sought by Oranga Tamariki. As noted in an earlier minute, Ms [JA] left the Court mid-morning on the second day of hearing and indicated she would not take any further part in the proceedings.

[26] Before she left the courtroom, I advised Ms [JA] that I would adjourn proceedings until 10.00am the following day in the hope that she would reconsider her position and continue with the proceedings. However, I also warned Ms [JA] that if she left Court and did not return, I would have no choice but to strike out her proceedings.

[27] On Wednesday 31 March 2021, we waited until 10.30 am. Ms [JA] did not attend the hearing, nor did she make any contact with the Court or counsel. I then recorded the abovementioned minute, striking out Ms [JA]'s proceedings for want of prosecution.

[28] I note that striking out Ms [JA]'s specific opposition to the guardianship directions sought, does not alter that she is a guardian and has not consented to those guardianship directions. There continues to be dispute between the children's guardians that require the court's directions.

Guardianship directions

[29] The Chief Executive filed application for guardianship directions on 4 December 2019. The directions sought were;

a) For [BV], [DV] and [EC] to be authorised to undergo a Gateway assessment and for Oranga Tamariki to carry out any recommendations arising out of that assessment.

b) For [BV], [DV], [EC] and [CV] to be immunised against measles. The application was broadened to encompass all scheduled immunisations when an application was filed in respect of [CV].

c) For the Chief Executive to be able to obtain passports for [BV], [DV], [EC] and [CV].

d) For [BV], [DV], [EC] and [CV] to be able to travel overseas with their caregivers.

[30] Two further issues have arisen more recently;

e) Should [DV] and [EC] be allowed to have their ears pierced.

f) The Chief Executive now also requests a direction that [BV], [DV], [EC] and [CV] are all vaccinated against Covid-19.

[31] The Court has not received late applications in respect of the additional guardianship issues but they have been clearly signalled to Ms [JA] and Mr [DC] and prior to the hearing starting I noted that s 115 gives the Court considering an application for guardianship directions the power to "make such order relating to the matter as it thinks fit".

[32] The Act gives guardianship the same meaning as s 15 of the Care of Children Act 2004;

> "…guardianship of a child means having (and therefore a guardian of the child has), in relation to the child,—
>
> (a) all duties, powers, rights, and responsibilities that a parent of the child has in relation to the upbringing of the child:
>
> b) every duty, power, right, and responsibility that is vested in the guardian of a child by any enactment:
>
> (c) every duty, power, right, and responsibility that, immediately before the commencement, on 1 January 1970, of the Guardianship Act 1968, was vested in a sole guardian of a child by an enactment or rule of law."

[33] In considering what weight to accord Ms [JA]'s 'non-consent' as a guardian, I have referred to the current access provisions and the children's views on access. I consider that information relevant to the guardianship dispute as it reflects the sadly minimal role Ms [JA] now plays in her children's lives. She has little, if any, opportunity to exercise any of the duties, powers, rights and responsibilities of a parent. I consider that reduces the weight I should give her non-consent.

[34] Mr [SV] is in a very similar position. He has not taken any part in the Court proceedings about his children and has not played an active role in their lives for some years.

[35] When considering what directions, it should make, the Court must have as its first and paramount consideration, as emphasized by s 4A, the well-being and best interests of the children. Further, the Court must have regard to the principles set out in sections 5 and 13.

[36] The s 5 principles to be applied in exercise of powers under the Act are;

> 5(1) Any court that, or person who, exercises any power under this Act must be guided by the following principles:
>
> > (a) a child or young person must be encouraged and assisted, wherever practicable, to participate in and express their views about any proceeding, process, or decision affecting them, and their views should be taken into account:
> >
> > (b) the well-being of a child or young person must be at the centre of decision making that affects that child or young person, and, in particular,—
>
> (i) the child's or young person's rights (including those rights set out in UNCROC and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities) must be respected and upheld, and the child or young person must be—
>
> (A) treated with dignity and respect at all times:
>
> (B) protected from harm:
>
> > (ii) the impact of harm on the child or young person and the steps to be taken to enable their recovery should be addressed:
> >
> > (iii) the child's or young person's need for a safe, stable, and loving home should be addressed:
>
> (iv) mana tamaiti (tamariki) and the child's or young person's well-being should be protected by recognising their whakapapa and the whanaungatanga responsibilities of their family, whānau, hapū, iwi, and family group:
>
> (v) decisions should be made and implemented promptly and in a time frame appropriate to the age and development of the child or young person:
>
> (vi) a holistic approach should be taken that sees the child or young person as a whole person which includes, but is not limited to, the child's or young person's—
>
> > (A) developmental potential; and
> >
> > (B) educational and health needs; and
> >
> > (C) whakapapa; and
> >
> > (D) cultural identity; and

(E) gender identity; and

(F) sexual orientation; and

(G) disability (if any); and

(H) age:

(vii) endeavours should be made to obtain, to the extent consistent with the age and development of the child or young person, the support of that child or young person for the exercise or proposed exercise, in relation to that child or young person, of any power conferred by or under this Act:

(viii) decisions about a child or young person with a disability—

(A) should be made having particular regard to the child's or young person's experience of disability and any difficulties or discrimination that may be encountered by the child or young person because of that disability; and

(B) should support the child's or young person's full and effective participation in society:

(c) the child's or young person's place within their family, whānau, hapū, iwi, and family group should be recognised, and, in particular, it should be recognised that—

(i) the primary responsibility for caring for and nurturing the well-being and development of the child or young person lies with their family, whānau, hapū, iwi, and family group:

(ii) the effect of any decision on the child's or young person's relationship with their family, whānau, hapū, iwi, and family group and their links to whakapapa should be considered:

(iii) the child's or young person's sense of belonging, whakapapa, and the whanaungatanga responsibilities of their family, whānau, hapū, iwi, and family group should be recognised and respected:

(iv) wherever possible, the relationship between the child or young person and their family, whānau, hapū, iwi, and family group should be maintained and strengthened:

(v) wherever possible, a child's or young person's family, whānau, hapū, iwi, and family group should participate in decisions, and regard should be had to their views:

(vi) endeavours should be made to obtain the support of the parents, guardians, or other persons having the care of the child or young person for the exercise or proposed exercise, in relation to that child or young person, of any power conferred by or under this Act:

(d) the child's or young person's place within their community should be recognised, and, in particular,—

(i) how a decision affects the stability of a child or young person (including the stability of their education and the stability of their connections to community and other contacts), and the impact of disruption on this stability should be considered:

(ii) networks of, and supports for, the child or young person and their family, whānau, hapū, iwi, and family group that are in place before the power is to be exercised should be acknowledged and, where practicable, utilised.

(2) Subsection(1) is subject to section 4A.

Mr [DC]'s consent to certain guardianship directions

[37] In the course of his evidence, Mr [DC] indicated he would be willing to make certain concessions on some of the guardianship issues. When his evidence was finished, I invited Mr [DC], his counsel Ms Tagi, and the Cook Island Interpreter to have some further discussions with the children's lawyer, counsel for Oranga Tamariki and the social workers.

[38] Those discussions gave rise to a consent memorandum recording Mr [DC]'s agreement to a number of guardianship directions as set out below.

Gateway Assessment

[39] Mr [DC] consents to [EC] undertaking a Gateway assessment and to any recommendations made being implemented.

[40] The above is conditional upon:

a) Mr [DC] being part of the assessment, by way of a phone call with the paediatrician. That phone call will include his legal counsel Ms Akesa Tagi. Oranga Tamariki will provide reasonable notice to Mr [DC] and his counsel of the gateway appointment.

b) The Gateway report and all medical records that Oranga Tamariki currently have on file for [EC] will be released to Mr [DC]'s counsel, Ms Tagi to discuss with him.

c) Mr [DC] is to be informed in writing (via his counsel) and consulted regarding any recommendations carried out and when.

Travel overseas and passport

[41] Mr [DC] consents to the Chief Executive obtaining a passport for [EC], and reasonable travel overseas to any Hague Convention signatory country.

[42] The above is conditional upon:

a) Return tickets and itineraries being provided to Mr [DC] (via his counsel) at least six weeks before travel commences;

b) Information about where [EC] will be staying and who she will have contact with while overseas being provided to Mr [DC] (via his counsel) at least six weeks before travel commences;

c) [EC] is not to have any form of contact with Mr [SV].

Haircut

[43] Mr [DC] consents to [EC] having her hair trimmed.

[44] The above is conditional upon:

a) [EC] is taken to a professional hairdresser by her social worker for a trim;

b) A video is taken of her trim, and provided to Mr [DC] (via his counsel);

c) Any hair cut off will be sent (by courier) Mr [DC]'s counsel;

d) [EC]'s hair shall not be trimmed more than 5 inches from the bottom at any given time.

Mr [DC]'s concerns about immunisation

[45] It is entirely reasonable for parents to worry about their children receiving immunisations. Although immunisation has become a routine part of health care and given the Covid-19 pandemic is likely to become even more so, it is not without risk. There is a potential for side effects with any immunisation.

[46] Mr [DC] has given evidence about his traumatic experience of a baby in his family dying after being immunised against Dengue fever. Although he was only a young man at the time and had no children, Mr [DC] was so shocked by what happened, he made a commitment to himself that no child of his would ever be immunised.

[47] This tragedy is the main reason why Mr [DC] does not want [EC] immunised. Mr [DC] has also heard about cases in Samoa where babies died after being immunised against measles and is aware of the general unease about immunisation in many sections of the community. Even if nothing goes seriously wrong, Mr [DC] worries that [EC] might experience side effects and he won't be there to care for her.

[48] I acknowledge the absolute sincerity of Mr [DC]'s concerns. His account of his baby relative's death was very moving. But the Court's position is that in determining health matters, we must be guided by the advice of experts. The expert position as reflected in the National Immunisation Schedule is that the risks of immunisation are outweighed by the much greater risks of not being protected against diseases such as measles. As Ms Muller observed to Mr [DC], sadly more babies in Samoa died from measles than died from issues with their immunisations.

[49] Mr [DC] has in the past spoken to his uncles who are doctors and believes they agree with his views. But Mr [DC] has not presented any expert evidence about immunisation. In the absence of such evidence, I accept the orthodox position that immunisation in accordance with specific medical advice and the National Schedule will enhance the children's wellbeing and will be in their best interests.

Court's directions on guardianship issues

Gateway Assessments

[50] I am satisfied that these assessments will contribute to the children's wellbeing and best interests. [EC]'s Gateway assessment is to proceed on the terms agreed between her father and the Chief Executive.

[51] The Gateway assessments for [BV] and [DV] are to proceed and any recommendations from the same are to be implemented by the Chief Executive. I cannot identify any valid reason why the children should not have these important assessments.

[52] I have considered whether I should authorise Ms [JA]'s participation in the assessments by phone on similar terms to Mr [DC], but I am not confident of her ability to refrain from inappropriate comments, which could unsettle the children and derail their assessments. Instead, I direct that copies of the assessment be sent to Ms [JA] and /or her representative, together with details of what if any steps the Chief-Executive will be taking as a result of the assessments.

[53] As a guardian, Ms [JA] will retain the right to have any discussions she may wish to have with the assessor but for the reasons noted, I do not authorise her direct participation in the assessment.

Immunisation

[54] I do not purport to have any expertise in medical matters. But as I have already observed, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the Court must be guided by mainstream medicine and its practitioners. Provided they assess immunisations as being necessary for the children, then the children should be vaccinated.

[55] Each of the children is to receive all the immunisations recommended by any medical practitioner responsible for the child in question's care.

[56] I anticipate the immunisations completed will be in accordance with the Ministry of Health National Immunisation Schedule and associated recommendations on immunisation. Unless there is any contraindication, I anticipate the children will all in due course be vaccinated against Covid-19.

[57] Prior to recommending immunisation for any of the children, the medical practitioner concerned is to undertake a child specific assessment as to whether there is any elevated risk of side effects for that child.

[58] If the child's assessment identifies an elevated risk of anything more than minor side effects, then Oranga Tamariki must advise the child's other guardians and endeavour to negotiate an agreed guardianship decision. If that is not possible, then formal steps will be required to resolve the dispute between guardians.

[59] If the child's assessment does not identify an elevated risk of anything more than minor side effects, then the child is to be immunised as recommended.

[60] The Chief Executive is to ensure that the child's other guardians are advised when any immunisation is scheduled and that they receive confirmation of the immunisation having occurred. In the event of any child experiencing more than minor side effects from immunisation, that child's other guardians are to be advised immediately.

[61] Whether side effects are deemed minor will be a matter for the assessment of the child's medical practitioner.

Passports and overseas travel

[62] From time to time the children's caregivers may wish to travel and take the children with them. Obviously, while the pandemic continues travel options are limited but it is hoped travel horizons will expand soon.

[63] I consider the desire to take the children on holiday with them is entirely reasonable and reflects normal family life. The children are not going to return to the care of their parents. Their family lives revolve around their caregivers and those

relationships should be strengthened and maintained. Participating in activities like holidays will enhance the children's sense of belonging to that family unit. Travel will not disrupt parental access rights as access is not occurring.

[64] Mr [DC] is agreeable to [EC] travelling and there will be directions in terms of his agreement with the Chief-Executive.

[65] I am satisfied that there should be similar directions for [BV], [DV] and [CV].

[66] The Chief Executive may obtain passports for all the children.

[67] The children may travel overseas with their caregivers for holidays on the following conditions;

(i) The children will only travel to countries who are signatories to the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of Child Abduction.

(ii) The children will not be absent from New Zealand for more than 21 days. Longer trips will require further guardianship agreement or court directions.

(iii) Copies of the return tickets and detailed itineraries are to be provided to Mr [DC] (via his counsel) and Ms [JA] (via her support person) at least six weeks before the planned travel.

(iv) The itineraries are to include information about where the children will be staying and who they will have contact with while overseas. As noted previously in terms of Mr [DC]'s agreement, [EC] is to have no contact with Mr [SV].

[EC]'s haircut and haircuts generally

[68] [EC] is authorised to have her hair cut on the terms agreed between her father and the Chief-Executive. Mr [DC] explained to the Court that he had not previously

consented because of cultural and family traditions around haircutting. After thinking things over, he was willing to allow [EC] to have a haircut on the agreed terms.

[69] I have considered whether I should make some global direction around haircuts generally, which was briefly discussed in the hearing. I agree with [BV]'s observation that it is "silly' for the children to have to ask for simple things like haircuts. On balance, I consider a conservative direction is merited so the children can be relieved from constant court proceedings over minor aspects of their lives.

[70] Any of the children may have their hair cut by arrangement with their caregivers and on the basis that no haircut will reduce the child's hair by more than two-thirds in length overall and all haircuts must be completed by a qualified hairdresser.

[DV] and [EC] – Ear-piercing

[71] [BV] has her ears pierced and this is much admired by her younger sisters. [DV] has been hoping for some time that her mum would agree to her getting her ears pierced and feels frustrated by what she sees as her mother's failure to keep a promise.

[72] Mr [DC] does not like the idea of his little girl having earrings. He does not think they are appropriate for very young girls and does not think six is old enough to maintain proper care of the holes.

[73] Obviously, this is not the type of issue for which there is any legal precedent. It would usually come down to the parents' personal tastes and preferences. [DV] is 10, turning 11 in [month deleted] 2021. [EC] is 6, turning 7 in [month deleted] 2021. [BV] is already 13. I am going to take (again) the stance of a relatively conservative parent and say that [EC] and [DV] may have their ears pierced but not until they turn

13 and only then if it is done by an appropriately qualified person (e.g. a chemist or similar).

_____
Judge M Rogers
Family Court Judge

Date of authentication: 07/04/2021
In an electronic form, authenticated electronically.