

**SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON
COUNTY OF**

In re:

Child(ren),

Petitioner(s),

and

Respondent(s).

NO.

**ORDER ON OBJECTION TO
RELOCATION/MODIFICATION OF
CUSTODY DECREE/PARENTING
PLAN/RESIDENTIAL SCHEDULE
(RELOCATION)
(ORDYMT or ORGRRE)**

I. BASIS

This order is entered pursuant to:

- A hearing on the Objection to Relocation/Petition for Modification of Custody Decree/Parenting Plan/Residential Schedule held on _____ [Date].
- An agreement of the parties.
- An order of default entered on _____ [Date].

II. FINDINGS

The court FINDS:

2.1 ADEQUATE CAUSE.

The relocation of children was pursued. There was no need for adequate cause for hearing this petition for modification.

2.2 JURISDICTION.

This court has jurisdiction over this proceeding for the reasons below.

- This court has exclusive continuing jurisdiction. The court has previously made a child custody, parenting plan, residential schedule or visitation determination in this matter and retains jurisdiction under RCW 26.27.211.

- This state is the home state of the children because:
 - the children lived in Washington with a parent or a person acting as a parent for at least six consecutive months immediately preceding the commencement of this proceeding.
 - the children are less than six months old and have lived in Washington with a parent or a person acting as parent since birth.
 - any absences from Washington have been only temporary.
 - Washington was the home state of the children within six months before the commencement of this proceeding and the children are absent from the state, but a parent or person acting as a parent continues to live in this state.

- The children and the parents or the children and at least one parent or a person acting as a parent, have significant connection with the state other than mere physical presence; and substantial evidence is available in this state concerning the children's care, protection, training and personal relationships and
 - the children have no home state elsewhere.
 - the children's home state has declined to exercise jurisdiction on the ground that this state is the more appropriate forum under RCW 26.27.261 or .271.

- All courts in the children's home state have declined to exercise jurisdiction on the ground that a court of this state is the more appropriate forum to determine the custody of the children under RCW 26.27.261 or .271.

- No other state has jurisdiction.

- This court has temporary emergency jurisdiction over this proceeding because the children are present in this state and the children have been abandoned or it is necessary in an emergency to protect the children because the children, or a sibling or parent of the children are subjected to or threatened with abuse. RCW 26.27.231.

- Other:

2.3 FINDINGS REGARDING OBJECTION TO THE RELOCATION:

Based upon the following factors, the detrimental effects of the relocation do do not outweigh the benefits of the change to the children and the relocating person:

2.4 FINDINGS REGARDING OBJECTION TO RELOCATING PARTY'S PROPOSED PARENTING PLAN/RESIDENTIAL SCHEDULE.

- The petition for modification should be denied. The relocating party's proposed parenting plan should be approved.
- The petition for modification should be granted. The objecting party's request for an adjustment of the residential aspects of the relocating party's proposed parenting plan should be granted. The adjustment does not include a change in the residence in which the child resides the majority of the time.
- The petition for modification should be granted. The objecting party's request for a modification of the relocating party's proposed parenting plan/residential schedule, including a change in the residence in which the child resides the majority of the time, should be granted.

III. ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

3.1 OBJECTION TO RELOCATION.

- The relocating party is restrained from relocating the children.
- The relocating party is permitted to relocate the children.

3.2 MODIFICATION OF PARENTING PLAN.

- The petition for modification is denied. The relocating party's parenting plan/residential schedule signed by the court and entered on _____ [Date] is approved and incorporated as part of this order. This decree or parenting

plan/residential schedule supersedes all previous decrees or parenting plans/residential schedules.

- The petition for modification is granted.
- The custody decree/parenting plan/residential schedule signed by the court and entered on _____ [Date] shall remain in effect.
- The objecting party's parenting plan/residential schedule signed by the court and entered on _____ [Date] is approved and incorporated as part of this order. This decree or parenting plan/residential schedule supersedes all previous decrees or parenting plans/residential schedules.

3.3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED.

- Child support shall be modified in accordance with the objecting party's parenting plan/residential schedule approved by the court. The order of child support signed by the court and entered on _____ [Date] is approved and incorporated as part of this order. This order of child support supersedes all previous child support orders.
- The Order of Child Support signed by the court and entered on _____ [Date] in _____ County shall remain in effect.
- Other:

Dated: _____

JUDGE/COMMISSIONER

Presented by:

Approved by:

Signature

Signature

Print or Type Name

Print or Type Name