

5069

2015-2016 Regular Sessions

I N A S S E M B L Y

February 12, 2015

Introduced by M. of A. SIMON, CLARK, COLTON, CRESPO, GALEF, GOTTFRIED,
MOSLEY, ROSENTHAL, SKARTADOS -- Multi-Sponsored by -- M. of A. COOK --
read once and referred to the Committee on Judiciary

AN ACT to amend the domestic relations law and the family court act, in
relation to prohibiting the making of decisions concerning guardian-
ship, custody or visitation or adoption petitions solely on the basis
of a parent's, guardian's or custodian's blindness; and to amend the
social services law, in relation to prohibiting the department of
social services from denying, deciding or opposing a petition or
request for guardianship, custody or visitation solely because the
petitioner is blind and to prohibiting a local social services agency
from taking actions solely because a parent, custodian or guardian is
blind

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, REPRESENTED IN SENATE AND ASSEM-
BLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

1 Section 1. This act shall be known and may be cited as the "blind
2 persons right to parent act".
3 S 2. Legislative intent. The legislature finds the following:
4 a. All blind Americans have the right to found a family, to freely and
5 responsibly decide on the number and spacing of their children, and to
6 retain the custody of their offspring on an equal basis with others.
7 This right to parent is rooted in the due process clause of the Four-
8 teenth Amendment; however, blind people are often stripped of these
9 constitutional rights when state statutes, judicial decisions, and child
10 welfare practices are based on the presumption that blindness automat-
11 ically means parental incompetence.
12 b. The presumption that blindness automatically means parental incom-
13 petence is a misconception. Given the proper tools and education, blind-
14 ness can be reduced to a physical nuisance. Because many sighted people
15 do not understand the techniques that blind people use to accomplish
16 everyday tasks, sighted judges, social workers, and state official

EXPLANATION--Matter in *ITALICS* (underscored) is new; matter in brackets
[] is old law to be omitted.

LBD061111-01-5

1 assume that those tasks cannot be completed by a blind person. Using
2 alternative techniques, blind people are capable of living independent,
3 productive lives, which include providing safe and loving homes for
4 their children. For example, blind people put small tactile dots over
5 markers on stoves, washing machines, and other flat surfaces so that
6 they can independently operate those devices. Specific to raising chil-
7 dren, blind parents may have their young children wear a small bell on
8 their shoes so the child's location can be known to the parents. Blind
9 parents will also pull a stroller behind them rather than push the
10 stroller in front of them so their long white cane or guide dog will
11 find obstacles or enter an intersection before the child and stroller.

12 c. When sighted parents are involved in a guardianship, custody or
13 visitation proceeding, their parental capabilities and how those capa-
14 bilities affect the best interest of the child are thoroughly evaluated
15 through a careful review of evidence. Too often, however, judges summar-
16 ily dismiss a blind parent's capabilities under the misconception that
17 blind people are incapable of most anything, despite evidence on record
18 proving otherwise. Blind parents involved in these proceedings must
19 first overcome any bias or low expectations of the judge, and then also
20 provide evidence negating those misconceptions above and beyond the
21 normal burden placed on sighted parents.

22 d. Widespread misconceptions about blindness often trigger a state
23 agency to act, unsolicited, against the wishes of a blind parent. One of
24 many countless, devastating reports of discrimination occurred in 2010,
25 when the state of Missouri wrongfully deemed a blind couple unable to
26 care for their 2-day old daughter, who remained in protective custody
27 until the family was reunited after a 57-day battle. These parents had
28 done nothing to demonstrate parental incompetence other than happening
29 to have had a child and been blind, and yet the agency solely considered
30 their blindness and decided to take action. In fact, the Missouri case
31 and many others, the parents had voluntarily contacted social service
32 officials themselves in order to seek advice and assistance and to
33 ensure that all of their child's needs were being met, but instead found
34 themselves stripped of custody. Thus, hasty actions on the part of state
35 social welfare officials can discourage blind parents from seeking
36 services and assistance for which they and their children are eligible.

37 e. During custody proceedings in cases of divorce, where one parent is
38 blind and the other is sighted, the sighted parent will often try to use
39 the other parent's blindness as a tool to deny the blind parent custo-
40 dial rights. Because custody proceedings related to a divorce are often
41 hostile, the court should demand that each party demonstrate evidence of
42 the other party's incompetence. However, courts often assume that the
43 sighted party is accurate in portraying the blind parent as incompetent,
44 and make custody and visitation decisions based solely on the fact that
45 one parent is blind. These decisions can range from limiting or denying
46 visitation unless a sighted person is present at all times to simply
47 denying the blind parent all custodial rights. This is not only discri-
48 minatory; it denies the blind parent a fair chance at custody and opens
49 courts to manipulation.

50 S 3. The domestic relations law is amended by adding a new section
51 75-m to read as follows:

52 S 75-M. CONSIDERATION OF BLINDNESS DURING GUARDIANSHIP, CUSTODY OR
53 VISITATION PROCEEDINGS. 1. THE COURT MAY NOT DENY OR DECIDE A PETITION
54 FOR GUARDIANSHIP, CUSTODY OR VISITATION SOLELY ON THE BASIS THAT THE
55 PETITIONER IS BLIND. THE BLINDNESS OF THE PETITIONER SHALL BE CONSIDERED
56 RELEVANT ONLY TO THE EXTENT THAT THE COURT FINDS, BASED ON EVIDENCE IN

1 THE RECORD, THAT THE BLINDNESS AFFECTS THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILD
2 WHOSE GUARDIANSHIP, CUSTODY OR VISITATION IS THE SUBJECT OF THE PETI-
3 TION.

4 2. AS USED IN THIS SECTION, "BLIND" OR "BLINDNESS" MEANS:

5 A. VISION THAT IS 20/200 OR LESS IN THE BEST CORRECTED EYE; OR

6 B. VISION THAT SUBTENDS AN ANGLE OF NOT GREATER THAN TWENTY DEGREES IN
7 THE BEST CORRECTED EYE.

8 S 4. The domestic relations law is amended by adding a new section
9 111-d to read as follows:

10 S 111-D. CONSIDERATION OF BLINDNESS DURING ADOPTION PROCEEDINGS. 1.
11 THE COURT MAY NOT DENY OR DECIDE A PETITION FOR ADOPTION SOLELY ON THE
12 BASIS THAT THE PETITIONER IS BLIND. THE BLINDNESS OF THE PETITIONER
13 SHALL BE CONSIDERED RELEVANT ONLY TO THE EXTENT THAT THE COURT FINDS,
14 BASED ON EVIDENCE IN THE RECORD, THAT THE BLINDNESS AFFECTS THE BEST
15 INTERESTS OF THE CHILD WHOSE ADOPTION IS THE SUBJECT OF THE PETITION.

16 2. AS USED IN THIS SECTION, "BLIND" OR "BLINDNESS" MEANS:

17 A. VISION THAT IS 20/200 OR LESS IN THE BEST CORRECTED EYE; OR

18 B. VISION THAT SUBTENDS AN ANGLE OF NOT GREATER THAN TWENTY DEGREES IN
19 THE BEST CORRECTED EYE.

20 S 5. The family court act is amended by adding a new section 643 to
21 read as follows:

22 S 643. CONSIDERATION OF BLINDNESS DURING ADOPTION PROCEEDINGS. 1. THE
23 COURT MAY NOT DENY OR DECIDE A PETITION FOR ADOPTION SOLELY ON THE BASIS
24 THAT THE PETITIONER IS BLIND. THE BLINDNESS OF THE PETITIONER SHALL BE
25 CONSIDERED RELEVANT ONLY TO THE EXTENT THAT THE COURT FINDS, BASED ON
26 EVIDENCE IN THE RECORD, THAT THE BLINDNESS AFFECTS THE BEST INTERESTS OF
27 THE CHILD WHOSE ADOPTION IS THE SUBJECT OF THE PETITION.

28 2. AS USED IN THIS SECTION, "BLIND" OR "BLINDNESS" MEANS:

29 A. VISION THAT IS 20/200 OR LESS IN THE BEST CORRECTED EYE; OR

30 B. VISION THAT SUBTENDS AN ANGLE OF NOT GREATER THAN TWENTY DEGREES IN
31 THE BEST CORRECTED EYE.

32 S 6. The family court act is amended by adding a new section 658 to
33 read as follows:

34 S 658. CONSIDERATION OF BLINDNESS DURING GUARDIANSHIP, CUSTODY OR
35 VISITATION PROCEEDINGS. 1. THE COURT MAY NOT DENY OR DECIDE A PETITION
36 FOR CUSTODY OR VISITATION UNDER THIS PART OR GUARDIANSHIP UNDER PART
37 FOUR OF THIS ARTICLE SOLELY ON THE BASIS THAT THE PETITIONER IS BLIND.
38 THE BLINDNESS OF THE PETITIONER SHALL BE CONSIDERED RELEVANT ONLY TO THE
39 EXTENT THAT THE COURT FINDS, BASED ON EVIDENCE IN THE RECORD, THAT THE
40 BLINDNESS AFFECTS THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILD WHOSE GUARDIANSHIP,
41 CUSTODY OR VISITATION IS THE SUBJECT OF THE PETITION.

42 2. AS USED IN THIS SECTION, "BLIND" OR "BLINDNESS" MEANS:

43 A. VISION THAT IS 20/200 OR LESS IN THE BEST CORRECTED EYE; OR

44 B. VISION THAT SUBTENDS AN ANGLE OF NOT GREATER THAN TWENTY DEGREES IN
45 THE BEST CORRECTED EYE.

46 S 7. The social services law is amended by adding a new section 393 to
47 read as follows:

48 S 393. CONSIDERATION OF BLINDNESS DURING GUARDIANSHIP, CUSTODY OR
49 ADOPTION PROCEEDINGS. 1. THE DEPARTMENT MAY NOT DENY, DECIDE OR OPPOSE A
50 PETITION OR REQUEST FOR GUARDIANSHIP, CUSTODY OR VISITATION UNDER THIS
51 ARTICLE SOLELY ON THE BASIS THAT THE PETITIONER, PARENT, GUARDIAN OR
52 CUSTODIAN IS BLIND. THE BLINDNESS OF THE PETITIONER, PARENT, GUARDIAN OR
53 CUSTODIAN SHALL BE CONSIDERED RELEVANT ONLY TO THE EXTENT THAT THE
54 BLINDNESS AFFECTS THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILD WHOSE GUARDIANSHIP,
55 CUSTODY OR VISITATION IS THE SUBJECT OF THE PETITION.

1 2. THE DEPARTMENT SHALL NOT SEEK CUSTODY OR GUARDIANSHIP OF A CHILD
2 SOLELY BECAUSE THE CHILD'S PARENT, GUARDIAN OR CUSTODIAN IS BLIND. THE
3 BLINDNESS OF THE PARENT, GUARDIAN OR CUSTODIAN SHALL BE CONSIDERED RELE-
4 VANT ONLY TO THE EXTENT THAT THE BLINDNESS AFFECTS THE BEST INTERESTS OF
5 THE CHILD WHOSE GUARDIANSHIP, CUSTODY OR VISITATION IS THE SUBJECT OF
6 THE PETITION.

7 3. AS USED IN THIS SECTION, "BLIND" OR "BLINDNESS" MEANS:

8 A. VISION THAT IS 20/200 OR LESS IN THE BEST CORRECTED EYE; OR

9 B. VISION THAT SUBTENDS AN ANGLE OF NOT GREATER THAN TWENTY DEGREES IN
10 THE BEST CORRECTED EYE.

11 S 8. The commissioner of social services is authorized and directed to
12 promulgate rules and regulations necessary for the implementation of the
13 provisions of this act on or before its effective date.

14 S 9. This act shall take effect on the ninetieth day after it shall
15 have become a law.