



INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL ABDUCTION

Office of Children's Issues

The Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction

Legal Analysis

(51 Federal Register 10494)

Introduction

The [Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction](#) (Hague Abduction Convention) is the primary civil law mechanism for parents seeking the return of the children from other treaty partner countries. Countries that are party to the Convention have agreed that a child who was living in one Convention country, and who has been removed to or retained in another Convention country in violation of the left-behind parent's custodial rights, shall be promptly returned. Once the child has been returned, the custody dispute can then be resolved, if necessary, in the courts of that jurisdiction. The Convention does not address who should have custody of the child; it addresses where the custody case should be heard.

Each country [party to the Convention](#) designates a Central Authority, a specific government office, to carry out specialized Convention duties. Central Authorities communicate with each other and they assist parents in filing applications for return of or for access to their children under the Convention. The Department of State is the U.S. Central Authority for the Convention. The Department's Office of Children's Issues within the Bureau of Consular Affairs is responsible for administering the day-to-day functions of the U.S. Central Authority.

The Hague Abduction Convention consists of six chapters containing forty-five articles. This legal analysis was prepared to facilitate understanding of the Convention by the Senate and the use and interpretation of the Convention by parents, judges, lawyers and public and private agency personnel. The articles are analyzed and discussed in the categories outlined in the table of contents below.

For more information, please contact AskCI@state.gov.



Table of Contents

[Guide to Terminology Used in the Legal Analysis](#)

[I. Children Protected by the Convention](#)

- (Preamble, Article 1)
- A. Age (Articles 4, 36, 18, 29, 34, 13)
- B. Residence (Article 4)
- C. Timing/cases covered (Article 35)
- D. Effect of custody order concerning the child
 - 1. Existing custody orders (Articles 17, 3)
 - 2. Pre-decree removals or retentions (Article 3)

[II. Conduct Actionable Under the Convention](#)

- A. International "child abduction" not criminal: Hague Convention distinguished from extradition treaties (Article 12)
- B. "Wrongful removal or retention" (Articles 1, 3, 5(a))
 - 1. Holders of rights protected by the Convention (*i.e.*, with respect to whom the removal or retention is wrongful)
 - (a) "Person, institution or other body" (Article 3(a), (b))
 - (b) "Jointly or alone" (Article 3(a), (b))
 - 2. Defined
 - (a) Breach of "custody rights" (Articles 3(a), 5(a))
 - (b) "Custody rights" determined by law of child's habitual residence (Articles 3(a), 31, 32, 33)
 - (c) Sources of "Custody rights" (Article 3, last paragraph)
 - i. Operation of law (Articles 3, 15)
 - ii. Judicial or administrative decision (Article 3)
 - iii. Agreement having legal effect (Article 3)
 - (d) "Actually exercised" (Articles 3(b), 5, 8(c), 13)

[III. Judicial Proceedings for Return of the Child](#)

- A. Right to seek return (Articles 29, 12, 34, 8)
- B. Legal advice and costs (Articles 25, 26, 42)
- C. Pleading requirements (Articles 8, 24)

- D. Admissibility of evidence (Articles 30, 23)
- E. Judicial promptitude/status report (Article 11)
- F. Judicial notice (Article 14)
- G. Court determination of "wrongfulness" (Articles 15, 3, 11, 12, 14)
- H. Constraints upon courts in requested states in making substantive custody decisions (Article 16)
- I. Duty to return not absolute
 - 1. Temporal qualifications
 - (a) Article 4
 - (b) Article 35
 - (c) Article 12
 - 2. Article 13 limitations on return obligation
 - (a) Legislative history (Articles 13, 20)
 - (b) Non-exercise of custody rights (Articles 13(a), 3(b))
 - (c) Grave risk of harm/intolerable situation (Article 13(b))
 - (d) Child's preference (Article 13)
 - (e) Role of social studies
 - 3. Article 20
 - 4. Custody order no defense to return (Article 17)
- J. Return of the child (Article 12)
 - 1. Return order not on custody merits (Article 19)
 - 2. Costs, fees and expenses shifted to abductor (Article 26)

IV. Central Authority

- (Articles 1, 10, 21)
- A. Establishment of Central Authority (Article 6)
 - B. Duties (Article 7)
 - C. Other Tasks (Articles 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 21, 26, 27, 28)
 - 1. Processing applications (Articles 8, 9, 27, 28)
 - 2. Assistance in connection with judicial proceedings
 - (a) Request for status report (Article 11)
 - (b) Social studies/background reports (Article 13)
 - (c) Determination of "wrongfulness" (Article 15)

(d) Costs (Article 26), reservation (Articles 42, 22)

[V. Access Rights -- Article 21](#)

- A. Remedies for breach (Articles 21, 12)
- B. Defined (Article 5(b))
- C. Procedure for obtaining relief (Articles 21, 8, 7)
- D. Alternative remedies (Articles 18, 29, 34)

[VI. Miscellaneous and Final Clauses](#)

- A. Article 36
- B. Articles 37 and 38
- C. Articles 42, 43 and 44
- D. Articles 39 and 40
- E. Article 41
- F. Article 45

[Recommended Return Application Form](#)

[Bibliography](#)

Guide to Terminology Used in the Legal Analysis

"*Abduction*" as used in the Convention title is not intended in a criminal sense. That term is shorthand for the phrase "wrongful removal or retention" which appears throughout the text, beginning with the preambular language and Article 1. Generally speaking, "*wrongful removal*" refers to the taking of a child from the person who was actually exercising custody of the child. "*Wrongful retention*" refers to the act of keeping the child without the consent of the person who was actually exercising custody. The archetype of this conduct is the refusal by the noncustodial parent to return a child at the end of an authorized visitation period. "Wrongful retention" is not intended by this Convention to cover refusal by the custodial parent to permit visitation by the other parent. Such obstruction of visitation may be redressed in accordance with Article 21.

The term "*abductor*" as used in this analysis refers to the person alleged to have wrongfully removed or retained a child. This person is also referred to as the "alleged wrongdoer" or the "respondent."

The term "*person*" as used in this analysis includes the person, institution or other body who (or which) actually exercised custody prior to the abduction and is seeking the child's return. The "person" seeking the child's return is also referred to as "applicant" and "petitioner."

The terms "*court*" and "*judicial authority*" are used throughout the analysis to mean both judicial and administrative bodies empowered to make decisions on petitions made pursuant to this Convention. "Judicial decree" and "court order" likewise include decisions made by courts or administrative bodies.

"*Country of origin*" and "*requesting country*" refer to the child's country ("State") of habitual residence prior to the wrongful removal or retention. "*Country addressed*" refers to the country ("State") where the child is located or the country to which the child is believed to have been taken. It is in that country that a judicial or administrative proceeding for return would be brought.

"*Access rights*" correspond to "*visitation rights*."

References to the "reporter" are to Elisa Perez-Vera, the official Hague Conference reporter for the Convention. Her explanatory report is recognized by the Conference as the official history and commentary on the Convention and is a source of background on the meaning of the provisions of the Convention available to all States becoming parties to it. It is referred to herein as the "Perez-Vera Report." The Perez-Vera Report appears in *Actes et documents de la Quatorzieme Session (1980), Volume III, Child Abduction*, edited by the Permanent Bureau of the Hague Conference on Private International Law, The Hague, Netherlands. (The volume may be ordered from the Netherlands Government Printing and Publishing Office, 1 Christoffel Plantijnstraat, Postbox 20014, 2500 EA The Hague, Netherlands.)

[Back to top](#)

I. Children Protected by the Convention

A fundamental purpose of the Hague Convention is to protect children from wrongful international removals or retentions by persons bent on obtaining their physical and/or legal custody. Children who are wrongfully moved from country to country are deprived of the stable relationships which the Convention is designed promptly to restore. Contracting States are obliged by Article 2 to take all appropriate measures to implement the objectives of the Convention as set forth in Article 1: (1) To secure the prompt return of children wrongfully removed to or retained in any Contracting State; and (2) to ensure that rights of custody and of access under the law of one Contracting State are effectively respected in other Contracting States. While these objectives are universal in their appeal, the Convention does not cover all children who might be victims of wrongful takings or retentions. A threshold inquiry, therefore, is whether the child who has been abducted or retained is subject to the Convention's provisions. Only if the child falls within the scope of the Convention will the administrative and judicial mechanisms of the Convention apply.

A. Age

The Convention applies only to children under the age of sixteen (16). Even if a child is under sixteen at the time of the wrongful removal or retention as well as when the Convention is invoked, the Convention ceases to apply when the child reaches sixteen. Article 4.

Absent action by governments to expand coverage of the Convention to children aged sixteen and above pursuant to Article 36, the Convention itself is unavailable as the legal vehicle for securing return of a child sixteen or older. However, it does not bar return of such child by other means.

Articles 18, 29 and 34 make clear that the Convention is a nonexclusive remedy in cases of international child abduction. Article 18 provides that the Convention does not limit the power of a judicial authority to order return of a child at any time, presumably under other laws, procedures or comity, irrespective of the child's age. Article 29 permits the person who claims a breach of custody or access rights, as defined by Articles 3 and 21, to bypass the Convention completely by invoking any applicable laws or procedures to secure the child's return. Likewise, Article 34 provides that the Convention shall not restrict the application of any law in the State addressed for purposes of obtaining the child's return or for organizing visitation rights. Assuming such laws are not restricted to children under sixteen, a child sixteen or over may be returned pursuant to their provisions.

Notwithstanding the general application of the Convention to children under sixteen, it should be noted that the wishes of mature children regarding their return are not ignored by the Convention. Article 13 permits, but does not require, the judicial authority to refuse to order the child returned if the child "objects to being returned and has attained an age and degree of maturity at which it is appropriate to take account of its views." The role of the child's preference in return proceedings is discussed further at III.I(2)(d), *infra*.

B. Residence

In order for the Convention to apply the child must have been "habitually resident in a Contracting State immediately before any breach of custody or access rights." Article 4. In practical terms, the Convention may be invoked only where the child was habitually resident in a Contracting State and taken to or retained in another Contracting State. Accordingly, child abduction and retention cases are actionable under the Convention if they are international in nature (as opposed to interstate), and provided the Convention has entered into force for both countries involved. *See* discussion of Article 38, VI.B, *infra*.

To illustrate, take the case of a child abducted to California from his home in New York. The Convention could not be invoked to secure the return of such child. This is true even if one of the child's parents is an American citizen and the other a foreign national. The Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act (UCCJA) and/or the Parental Kidnapping Prevention Act (PKPA), domestic state and federal law, respectively, would govern the return of the child in question. If the same child were removed from New York to Canada, application under the Convention could be made to secure the child's return provided the Convention had entered into force both for the United States and the Canadian province to which the child was taken. An alternative remedy might also lie under other Canadian law. If the child had been removed from Canada and taken to the United States, the aggrieved custodial parent in Canada could seek to secure the child's return by petitioning for enforcement of a Canadian custody order pursuant to the UCCJA, or by invoking the Convention, or both.

C. Timing/Cases Covered

Article 35 states that the Convention shall apply as between Contracting States only to wrongful removals or retentions occurring after its entry into force in those States. Following a strict interpretation of that Article, the Convention will not apply to a child who is wrongfully shifted from one Contracting State to another if the wrongful removal or retention occurred before the Convention's entry into force in those States. However, under a liberal interpretation Article 35 could be construed to cover wrongful removal or retention cases which began before the Convention took effect but which continued and were ongoing after its entry into force.

D. Effect of Custody Order Concerning the Child

1. Existing Custody Orders

Children who otherwise fall within the scope of the Convention are not automatically removed from its protections by virtue of a judicial decision awarding custody to the alleged wrongdoer. This is true whether the decision as to custody was made, or is entitled to recognition, in the State to which the child has been taken. Under Article 17 that State cannot refuse to return a child solely on the basis of a court order awarding custody to the alleged wrongdoer made by one of its own courts or by the courts of another country. This provision is intended to ensure, *inter alia*, that the Convention takes precedence over

decrees made in favor of abductors before the court had notice of the wrongful removal or retention.

Thus, under Article 17 the person who wrongfully removes or retains the child in a Contracting State cannot insulate the child from the Convention's return provisions merely by obtaining a custody order in the country of new residence, or by seeking there to enforce another country's order. Nor may the alleged wrongdoer rely upon a stale decree awarding him or her custody, the provisions of which have been derogated from subsequently by agreement or acquiescence of the parties, to prevent the child's return under the Convention. Article 3.

It should be noted that Article 17 does permit a court to take into account the reasons underlying an existing custody decree when it applies the Convention.

2. Pre-Decree Removals or Retentions

Children who are wrongfully removed or retained prior to the entry of a custody order are protected by the Convention. There need not be a custody order in effect in order to invoke the Convention's return provisions. Accordingly, under the Convention a child will be ordered returned to the person with whom he or she was habitually resident in pre-decree abduction cases as well as in cases involving violations of existing custody orders.

Application of the Convention to pre-decree cases comes to grips with the reality that many children are abducted or retained long before custody actions have been initiated. In this manner a child is not prejudiced by the legal inaction of his or her physical custodian, who may not have anticipated the abduction, and the abductor is denied any legal advantage since the child is subject to the return provisions of the Convention.

The Convention's treatment of pre-decree abduction cases is distinguishable from the Council of Europe's Convention on Recognition and Enforcement of Decisions Relating to the Custody of Children, adopted in Strasbourg, France in November 1979 ("Strasbourg Convention"), and from domestic law in the United States, specifically the UCCJA and the PKPA, all of which provide for enforcement of custody decrees. Although the UCCJA and PKPA permit enforcement of a decree obtained by a parent in the home state after the child has been removed from that state, in the absence of such decree the enforcement provisions of those laws are inoperative. In contrast to the restoration of the *legal* status quo ante brought about by application of the UCCJA, the PKPA, and the Strasbourg Convention, the Hague Convention seeks restoration of the *factual* status quo ante and is not contingent on the existence of a custody decree. The Convention is premised upon the notion that the child should be promptly restored to his or her country of habitual residence so that a court there can examine the merits of the custody dispute and award custody in the child's best interests.

Pre-decree abductions are discussed in greater detail in the section dealing with actionable conduct. See II.B(2)(c)(i).

[Back to top](#)

II. Conduct Actionable Under the Convention

A. "International Child Abduction" Not Criminal: Hague Convention Distinguished From Extradition Treaties

Despite the use of the term "abduction" in its title, the Hague Convention is not an extradition treaty. The conduct made actionable by the Convention -- the wrongful removal or retention of children -- is wrongful not in a criminal sense but in a civil sense.

The Hague Convention establishes civil procedures to secure the return of so-called "abducted" children. Article 12. In this manner the Hague Convention seeks to satisfy the overriding concern of the aggrieved parent. The Convention is not concerned with the question of whether the person found to have wrongfully removed or retained the child returns to the child's country of habitual residence once the child has been returned pursuant to the Convention. This is in contrast to the criminal extradition process which is designed to secure the return of the fugitive wrong-doer. Indeed, when the fugitive-parent is extradited for trial or to serve a criminal sentence, there is no guarantee that the abducted child will also be returned.

While it is uncertain whether criminal extradition treaties will be routinely invoked in international custody cases between countries for which the Hague Convention is in force, nothing in the Convention bars their application or use.

B. Wrongful Removal or Retention

The Convention's first stated objective is to secure the prompt return of children who are wrongfully removed from or retained in any Contracting State. Article 1(a). (The second stated objective, i.e., to ensure that rights of custody and of access under the law of one Contracting State are effectively exercised in other Contracting States (Article 1(b)), is discussed under the heading "Access Rights," V., *infra*.) The removal or retention must be wrongful within the meaning of Article 3, as further clarified by Article 5(a), in order to trigger the return procedures established by the Convention. Article 3 provides that the removal or retention of a child is to be considered wrongful where:

(a) it is in breach of custody rights attributed to a person, an institution or another body, either jointly or alone, under the law of the State in which the child was habitually resident immediately before the removal or retention; and (b) at the time of the removal or retention those rights were actually exercised, either jointly or alone, or would have been so exercised but for the removal or retention.

This Article is a cornerstone of the Convention. It is analyzed by examining two questions:

- 1.) Who holds rights protected by the Convention (or, with respect to whom is the removal or retention deemed to be wrongful?); and
- 2.) What are the factual and legal elements of a wrongful removal or retention?

1. Holders of Rights Protected by the Convention

(a) *"Person, institution or other body"*. While the child is the ultimate beneficiary of the Convention's judicial and administrative machinery, the child's role under the Convention is passive. In contrast, it is up to the "person, institution or other body" (hereinafter referred to simply as "the person") who "actually exercised" custody of the child prior to the abduction, or who would have exercised custody but for the abduction, to invoke the Convention to secure the child's return. Article 3 (a), (b). It is this person who holds the rights protected by the Convention and who has the right to seek relief pursuant to its terms.

Since the vast majority of abduction cases arises in the context of divorce or separation, the person envisioned by Article 3(a) most often will be the child's parent. The typical scenario would involve one parent taking a child from one Contracting State to another Contracting State over objections of the parent with whom the child had been living.

However, there may be situations in which a person other than a biological parent has actually been exercising custody of the child and is therefore eligible to seek the child's return pursuant to the Convention. An example would be a grandparent who has had physical custody of a child following the death of the parent with whom the child had been residing. If the child is subsequently removed from the custody of the grandparent by the surviving parent, the aggrieved grandparent could invoke the Convention to secure the child's return. In another situation, the child may be in the care of foster parents. If custody rights exercised by the foster parents are breached, for instance, by abduction of the child by its biological parent, the foster parents could invoke the Convention to secure the child's return.

In the two foregoing examples (not intended to be exhaustive) a family relationship existed between the victim-child and the person who had the right to seek the child's return. However, institutions such as public or private child care agencies also may have custody rights the breach of which would be remediable under the Convention. If a natural parent relinquishes parental rights to a child and the child is subsequently placed in the care of an adoption agency, that agency may invoke the Convention to recover the child if the child is abducted by its parent(s).

(b) *"Jointly or alone"*. Article 3 (a) and (b) recognize that custody rights may be held either jointly or alone. Two persons, typically mother and father, can exercise joint custody, either by court order following a custody adjudication, or by operation of law prior to the entry of a decree. The Convention does not distinguish between these two situations, as the commentary of the Convention reporter indicates:

Now, from the Convention's standpoint, the removal of a child by one of the joint holders without the consent of the other, is wrongful, and this wrongfulness derives in this particular case, not from some action in breach of a particular law, but from the fact that such action has disregarded the rights of the other parent which are also protected by law, and has interfered with their normal exercise. The Convention's true nature is revealed most clearly in these situations: it is not concerned with establishing the person to whom custody of the child will belong at some point in the future, nor with the situations in which it may prove necessary to modify a decision awarding joint custody on the basis of facts

which have subsequently changed. It seeks, more simply, to prevent a later decision on the matter being influenced by a change of circumstances brought about through unilateral action by one of the parties. Perez-Vera Report, paragraph 71 at 447-448.

Article 3(a) ensures the application of the Convention to pre-decree abductions, since it protects the rights of a parent who was exercising custody of the child jointly with the abductor at the time of the abduction, before the issuance of a custody decree.

2. "Wrongful Removal or Retention" Defined

The obligation to return an abducted child to the person entitled to custody arises only if the removal or the retention is wrongful within the meaning of the Convention. To be considered wrongful, certain factual and legal elements must be present.

(a) *Breach of "custody rights"*. The removal or retention must be in breach of "custody rights," defined in Article 5(a) as "rights relating to the care of the person of the child and, in particular, the right to determine the child's place of residence."

Accordingly, a parent who sends his or her child to live with a caretaker has not relinquished custody rights but rather has exercised them within the meaning of the Convention. Likewise, a parent hospitalized for a protracted period who places the child with grandparents or other relatives for the duration of the illness has effectively exercised custody.

(b) *"Custody rights" determined by law of child's habitual residence*. In addition to including the right to determine the child's residence (Article 5(a)), the term "custody rights" covers a collection of rights which take on more specific meaning by reference to the law of the country in which the child was habitually resident immediately before the removal or retention. Article 3(a). Nothing in the Convention limits this "law" to the internal law of the State of the child's habitual residence. Consequently, it could include the laws of another State if the choice of law rules in the State of habitual residence so indicate.

If a country has more than one territorial unit, the habitual residence refers to the particular territorial unit in which the child was resident, and the applicable laws are those in effect in that territorial unit. Article 31. In the United States, the law in force in the state in which a child was habitually resident (as possibly preempted by federal legislation enacted in connection with U.S. ratification of the Convention) would be applicable for the determination as to whether a removal or retention is wrongful.

Articles 32 and 33 also control, respectively, how and whether the Convention applies in States with more than one legal system. Perez-Vera Report, paragraphs 141 and 142 at 470.

(c) *Sources of "custody rights"*. Although the Convention does not exhaustively list all possible sources from which custody rights may derive, it does identify three sources. According to the final paragraph of Article 3, custody rights may arise: (1) by operation of law; (2) by reason of a judicial or administrative decision; or (3) by reason of an agreement having legal effect under the law of that State.

i. *Custody rights arising by operation of law*. Custody rights which arise by operation of law in the State of habitual residence are protected; they need not be conferred by court

order to fall within the scope of the Convention. Article 3. Thus, a person whose child is abducted prior to the entry of a custody order is not required to obtain a custody order in the State of the child's habitual residence as a prerequisite to invoking the Convention's return provisions.

In the United States, as a general proposition both parents have equal rights of custody of their children prior to the issuance of a court order allocating rights between them. If one parent interferes with the other's equal rights by unilaterally removing or retaining the child abroad without consent of the other parent, such interference could constitute wrongful conduct within the meaning of the Convention. (See excerpts from Perez-Vera Report quoted at II.B.1(b), *supra*.) Thus, a parent left in the United States after a pre-decree abduction could seek return of a child from a Contracting State abroad pursuant to the Convention. In cases involving children wrongfully brought to or retained in the United States from a Contracting State abroad prior to the entry of a decree, in the absence of an agreement between the parties the question of wrongfulness would be resolved by looking to the law of the child's country of habitual residence.

Although a custody decree is not needed to invoke the Convention, there are two situations in which the aggrieved parent may nevertheless benefit by securing a custody order, assuming the courts can hear swiftly a petition for custody. First, to the extent that an award of custody to the left-behind parent (or other person) is based in part upon an express finding by the court that the child's removal or retention was wrongful within the meaning of Article 3, the applicant anticipates a possible request by the judicial authority applying the Convention, pursuant to Article 15, for a court determination of wrongfulness. This may accelerate disposition of a return petition under the Convention. Second, a person outside the United States who obtains a custody decree from a foreign court subsequent to the child's abduction, after notice and opportunity to be heard have been accorded to the absconding parent, may be able to invoke either the Convention or the UCCJA, or both, to secure the child's return from the United States. The UCCJA may be preferable inasmuch as its enforcement provisions are not subject to the exceptions contained in the Convention.

ii. *Custody rights arising by reason of judicial or administrative decision.* Custody rights embodied in judicial or administrative decisions fall within the Convention's scope. While custody determinations in the United States are made by state courts, in some Contracting States, notably the Scandinavian countries, administrative bodies are empowered to decide matters relating to child custody including the allocation of custody and visitation rights. Hence the reference to "administrative decisions" in Article 3.

The language used in this part of the Convention can be misleading. Even when custody rights are conferred by court decree, technically speaking the Convention does not mandate recognition and enforcement of that decree. Instead, it seeks only to restore the factual custody arrangements that existed prior to the wrongful removal or retention (which incidentally in many cases will be the same as those specified by court order).

Finally, the court order need not have been made by a court in the State of the child's habitual residence. It could be one originating from a third country. As the reporter points out, when custody rights were exercised in the State of the child's habitual residence on the

basis of a foreign decree, the Convention does not require that the decree have been formally recognized. Perez-Vera Report, paragraph 69 at 447.

iii. *Custody rights arising by reason of agreement having legal effect.* Parties who enter into a private agreement concerning a child's custody have recourse under the Convention if those custody rights are breached. Article 3. The only limitation is that the agreement have legal effect under the law of the child's habitual residence.

Comments of the United States with respect to language contained in an earlier draft of the Convention (*i.e.*, that the agreement "have the force of law") shed some light on the meaning of the expression "an agreement having legal effect". In the U.S. view, the provision should be interpreted expansively to cover more than only those agreements that have been incorporated in or referred to in a custody judgment. *Actes et documents de la Quatorzieme Session, (1980) Volume III. Child Abduction, Comments of Governments at 240.* The reporter's observations affirm a broad interpretation of this provision:

As regards the definition of an agreement which has "legal effect" in terms of a particular law, it seems that there must be included within it any sort of agreement which is not prohibited by such a law and which may provide a basis for presenting a legal claim to the competent authorities. Perez-Vera Report, paragraph 70 at 447.

(d) *"Actually exercised"*. The most predictable fact pattern under the Convention will involve the abduction of a child directly from the parent who was actually exercising physical custody at the time of the abduction.

To invoke the Convention, the holder of custody rights must allege that he or she actually exercised those rights at the time of the breach or would have exercised them but for the breach. Article 3(b). Under Article 5, custody rights are defined to include the right to determine the child's place of residence. Thus, if a child is abducted from the physical custody of the person in whose care the child has been entrusted by the custodial parent who was "actually exercising" custody, it is the parent who placed the child who may make application under the Convention for the child's return.

Very little is required of the applicant in support of the allegation that custody rights have actually been or would have been exercised. The applicant need only provide some preliminary evidence that he or she actually exercised custody of the child, for instance, took physical care of the child. Perez-Vera Report, paragraph 73 at 448. The Report points out the informal nature of the pleading and proof requirements; Article 8(c) merely requires a statement in the application to the Central Authority as to "the grounds on which the applicant's claim for return of the child is based." *Id.*

In the scheme of the Convention it is presumed that the person who has custody actually exercised it. Article 13 places on the alleged abductor the burden of proving the nonexercise of custody rights by the applicant as an exception to the return obligation. Here, again, the reporter's comments are insightful:

Thus, we may conclude that the Convention, taken as a whole, is built upon the tacit presumption that the person who has care of the child actually exercises custody over it. This idea has to be overcome by discharging the burden of proof which has shifted, as is

normal with any presumption (*i.e.* discharged by the "abductor" if he wishes to prevent the return of the child.) Perez-Vera Report paragraph 73 at 449.

[Back to top](#)

III. Judicial Proceedings for Return of Child

A. Right to Seek Return

When a person's custody rights have been breached by the wrongful removal or retention of the child by another, he or she can seek return of the child pursuant to the Convention. This right of return is the core of the Convention. The Convention establishes two means by which the child may be returned. One is through direct application by the aggrieved person to a court in the Contracting State to which the child has been taken or in which the child is being kept. Articles 12, 29. The other is through application to the Central Authority to be established by every Contracting State. Article 8. These remedies are not mutually exclusive; the aggrieved person may invoke either or both of them. Moreover, the aggrieved person may also pursue remedies outside the Convention. Articles 18, 29 and 34. This part of the report describes the Convention's judicial remedy in detail. The administrative remedy is discussed in IV, *infra*.

Articles 12 and 29 authorize any person who claims a breach of custody rights within the meaning of Article 3 to apply for the child's return directly to the judicial authorities of the Contracting State where the child is located.

A petition for return pursuant to the Convention may be filed any time after the child has been removed or retained up until the child reaches sixteen. While the window of time for filing may be wide in a particular case without threat of technically losing rights under the Convention, there are numerous reasons to commence a return proceeding promptly if the likelihood of a voluntary return is remote. The two most crucial reasons are to preclude adjudication of custody on the merits in a country other than the child's habitual residence (see discussion of Article 16, *infra*) and to maximize the chances for the child's return by reducing the alleged abductor's opportunity to establish that the child is settled in a new environment (see discussion of Article 12, *infra*).

A petition for return would be made directly to the appropriate court in the Contracting State where the child is located. If the return proceedings are commenced less than one year from the date of the wrongful removal or retention, Article 12 requires the court to order the return of the child forthwith. If the return proceedings are commenced a year or more after the alleged wrongful removal or retention, the court remains obligated by Article 12 to order the child returned unless it is demonstrated that the child is settled in its new environment.

Under Article 29 a person is not precluded from seeking judicially-ordered return of a child pursuant to laws and procedures other than the Convention. Indeed, Articles 18 and 34 make clear that nothing in the Convention limits the power of a court to return a child at any time by applying other laws and procedures conducive to that end.

Accordingly, a parent seeking return of a child from the United States could petition for return pursuant to the Convention, or in the alternative or additionally, for enforcement of a foreign court order pursuant to the UCCJA. For instance, an English father could petition courts in New York either for return of his child under the Convention and/or for recognition and enforcement of his British custody decree pursuant to the UCCJA. If he

prevailed in either situation, the respective court could order the child returned to him in England. The father in this illustration may find the UCCJA remedy swifter than invoking the Convention for the child's return because it is not subject to the exceptions set forth in the Convention, discussed at III.I., *infra*.

B. Legal Advice and Costs

Article 25 provides for the extension of legal aid and advice to foreign applicants on the same basis and subject only to the same eligibility requirements as for nationals of the country in which that aid is sought.

Article 26 prohibits Central Authorities from charging applicants for the cost and expenses of the proceedings or, where applicable, those arising from the participation of legal counsel or advisers. This provision will be of no help to an applicant, however, if the Contracting State in question has made a reservation in accordance with Articles 26 and 42 declaring that it shall not be bound to assume any costs resulting from the participation of legal counsel or advisers or from court proceedings, except insofar as those costs may be covered by its system of legal aid and advice.

It is expected that the United States will enter a reservation in accordance with Articles 26 and 42. This will place at least the initial burden of paying for counsel and legal proceedings on the applicant rather than on the federal government. Because the reservation is nonreciprocal, use of it will not automatically operate to deny applicants from the United States free legal services and judicial proceedings in other Contracting States. However, if the Contracting State in which the child is located has itself made use of the reservation in question, the U.S. applicant will not be eligible for cost-free legal representation and court proceedings. For more information on costs, including the possibility that the petitioner's costs may be levied on the abductor if the child is ordered returned, see III.J 2 and IV.C (d) of this analysis.

C. Pleading Requirements

The Convention does not expressly set forth pleading requirements that must be satisfied by an applicant who commences a judicial return proceeding. In contrast, Article 8 sets forth the basic requirements for an application placed before a Central Authority (discussed IV.C(1), *infra*) for the return of the child. Since the objective is identical -- the child's return -- whether relief is sought through the courts or through intercession of the Central Authority, it follows that a court should be provided with at least as much information as a Central Authority is to be provided in a return application filed in compliance with Article 8. To ensure that all necessary information is provided, the applicant may wish to append to the petition to the court a completed copy of the recommended model form for return of a child (see Annex A to this analysis).

In addition to providing the information set forth in Article 8, the petition for return should allege that the child was wrongfully removed or retained by the defendant in violation of custody rights that were actually being exercised by the petitioner. The petition should state the source of the custody rights, the date of the wrongful conduct, and the child's age at that time. In the prayer for relief, the petitioner should request the child's

return and an order for payment by the abducting or retaining parent of all fees and expenses incurred to secure the child's return.

Any return petition filed in a court in the United States pursuant to the Convention must be in English. Any person in the United States who seeks return of a child from a foreign court must likewise follow the requirements of the foreign state regarding translation of legal documents. See Perez-Vera Report, paragraph 132 at page 467.

D. Admissibility of Evidence

Under Article 30, any application submitted to the Central Authority or petition submitted to the judicial authorities of a Contracting State, and any documents or information appended thereto, are admissible in the courts of the State. Moreover, under Article 23, no legalization or similar formalities may be required. However, authentication of private documents may be required. According to the official report, "any requirement of the internal law of the authorities in question that copies or private documents be authenticated remains outside the scope of this provision." Perez-Vera Report, paragraph 131 at page 467.

E. Judicial Promptitude/Status Report

Once an application for return has been filed, the court is required by Article 11 "to act expeditiously in proceedings for the return of children." To keep matters on the fast track, Article 11 gives the applicant or the Central Authority of the requested State the right to request a statement from the court of the reasons for delay if a decision on the application has not been made within six weeks from the commencement of the proceedings.

F. Judicial Notice

In ascertaining whether there has been a wrongful removal or retention of a child within the meaning of Article 3, Article 14 empowers the court of the requested State to take notice directly of the law and decisions in the State of the child's habitual residence. Standard procedures for the proof of foreign law and for recognition of foreign decisions would not need to be followed and compliance with such procedures is not to be required.

G. Court Determination of "Wrongfulness"

Prior to ordering a child returned pursuant to Article 12, Article 15 permits the court to request the applicant to obtain from the authorities of the child's State of habitual residence a decision or other determination that the alleged removal or retention was wrongful within the meaning of Article 3. Article 15 does not specify which "authorities" may render such a determination. It therefore could include agencies of government (*e.g.*, state attorneys general) and courts. Central Authorities shall assist applicants to obtain such a decision or determination. This request may only be made where such a decision or determination is obtainable in that State.

This latter point is particularly important because in some countries the absence of the defendant-abductor and child from the forum makes it legally impossible to proceed with an action for custody brought by the left-behind parent. If an adjudication in such an action

were a prerequisite to obtaining a determination of wrongfulness, it would be impossible for the petitioner to comply with an Article 15 request. For this reason a request for a decision or determination on wrongfulness can not be made in such circumstances consistent with the limitation in Article 15. Even if local law permits an adjudication of custody in the absence of the child and defendant (*i.e.*, post-abduction) or would otherwise allow a petitioner to obtain a determination of wrongfulness, the provisions of Article 15 will probably not be resorted to routinely. That is so because doing so would convert the purpose of the Convention from seeking to restore the *factual* status quo prior to an abduction to emphasizing substantive legal relationships.

A further consideration in deciding whether to request an applicant to comply with Article 15 is the length of time it will take to obtain the required determination. In countries where such a determination can be made only by a court, if judicial dockets are seriously backlogged, compliance with an Article 15 order could significantly prolong disposition of the return petition, which in turn would extend the time that the child is kept in a state of legal and emotional limbo. If "wrongfulness" can be established some other way, for instance by taking judicial notice of the law of the child's habitual residence as permitted by Article 14, the objective of Article 15 can be satisfied without further prejudice to the child's welfare or undue delay of the return proceeding. This would also be consistent with the Convention's desire for expeditious judicial proceedings as evidenced by Article 11.

In the United States, a left-behind parent or other claimant can petition for custody after the child has been removed from the forum. The right of action is conferred by the UCCJA, which in many states also directs courts to hear such petitions expeditiously. The result of such proceeding is a temporary or permanent custody determination allocating custody and visitation rights, or joint custody rights, between the parties. However, a custody determination on the merits that makes no reference to the Convention may not by itself satisfy an Article 15 request by a foreign court for a determination as to the wrongfulness of the conduct within the meaning of Article 3. Therefore, to ensure compliance with a possible Article 15 request the parent in the United States would be well-advised to request an explicit finding as to the wrongfulness of the alleged removal or retention within the meaning of Article 3 retention within the meaning of Article 3 in addition to seeking custody.

H. Constraints Upon Courts in Requested States in Making Substantive Custody Decisions

Article 16 bars a court in the country to which the child has been taken or in which the child has been retained from considering the merits of custody claims once it has received notice of the removal or retention of the child. The constraints continue either until it is determined that the child is not to be returned under the Convention, or it becomes evident that an application under the Convention will not be forthcoming within a reasonable time following receipt of the notice.

A court may get notice of a wrongful removal or retention in some manner other than the filing of a petition for return, for instance by communication from a Central Authority, from the aggrieved party (either directly or through counsel), or from a court in a

Contracting State which has stayed or dismissed return proceedings upon removal of the child from that State.

No matter how notice may be given, once the tribunal has received notice, a formal application for the child's return pursuant to the Convention will normally be filed promptly to avoid a decision on the merits from being made. If circumstances warrant a delay in filing a return petition, for instance pending the outcome of private negotiations for the child's return or interventions toward that end by the Central Authority, or pending determination of the location of the child and alleged abductor, the aggrieved party may nevertheless wish to notify the court as to the reason(s) for the delay so that inaction is not viewed as a failure to proceed under the Convention.

I. Duty to Return not Absolute

The judicial duty to order return of a wrongfully removed or retained child is not absolute. Temporal qualifications on this duty are set forth in Articles 12, 4 and 35. Additionally, Articles 13 and 20 set forth grounds upon which return may be denied.

1. Temporal Qualifications

Articles 4, 35 and 12 place time limitations on the return obligation.

(a) *Article 4.* Pursuant to Article 4, the Convention ceases to apply once the child reaches age sixteen. This is true regardless of when return proceedings were commenced and irrespective of their status at the time of the child's sixteenth birthday. *See I.A., supra.*

(b) *Article 35.* Article 35 limits application of the Convention to wrongful removals or retentions occurring after its entry into force between the two relevant Contracting States. *But see I.C., supra.*

(c) *Article 12.* Under Article 12, the court is not obligated to return a child when return proceedings pursuant to the Convention are commenced a year or more after the alleged removal or retention *and* it is demonstrated that the child is settled in its new environment. The reporter indicates that "[T]he provision does not state how this fact is to be proved, but it would seem logical to regard such a task as falling upon the abductor or upon the person who opposes the return of the child . . ." Perez-Vera Report, paragraph 109 at page 459.

If the Convention is to succeed in deterring abductions, the alleged abductor must not be accorded preferential treatment by courts in his or her country of origin, which, in the absence of the Convention, might be prone to favor "home forum" litigants. To this end, nothing less than substantial evidence of the child's significant connections to the new country is intended to suffice to meet the respondent's burden of proof. Moreover, any claims made by the person resisting the child's return will be considered in light of evidence presented by the applicant concerning the child's contacts with and ties to his or her State of habitual residence. The reason for the passage of time, which may have made it possible for the child to form ties to the new country, is also relevant to the ultimate disposition of the return petition. If the alleged wrongdoer concealed the child's whereabouts from the custodian necessitating a long search for the child and thereby delayed the commencement of a return proceeding by the applicant, it is highly

questionable whether the respondent should be permitted to benefit from such conduct absent strong countervailing considerations.

2. Article 13 Limitations on the Return Obligation

(a) *Legislative history.* In drafting Articles 13 and 20, the representatives of countries participating in negotiations on the Convention were aware that any exceptions had to be drawn very narrowly lest their application undermine the express purposes of the Convention -- to effect the prompt return of abducted children. Further, it was generally believed that courts would understand and fulfill the objectives of the Convention by narrowly interpreting the exceptions and allowing their use only in clearly meritorious cases, and only when the person opposing return had met the burden of proof. Importantly, a finding that one or more of the exceptions provided by Articles 13 and 20 are applicable does not make refusal of a return order mandatory. The courts retain the discretion to order the child returned even if they consider that one or more of the exceptions applies. Finally, the wording of each exception represents a compromise to accommodate the different legal systems and tenets of family law in effect in the countries negotiating the Convention, the basic purpose in each case being to provide for an exception that is narrowly construed.

(b) *Non-exercise of custody rights.* Under Article 13(a), the judicial authority may deny an application for the return of a child if the person having the care of the child was not actually exercising the custody rights at the time of the removal or retention, or had consented to or acquiesced in the removal or retention. This exception derives from Article 3(b) which makes the Convention applicable to the breach of custody rights that were actually exercised at the time of the removal or retention, or which would have been exercised but for the removal or retention.

The person opposing return has the burden of proving that custody rights were not actually exercised at the time of the removal or retention, or that the applicant had consented to or acquiesced in the removal or retention. The reporter points out that proof that custody was not actually exercised does not form an exception to the duty to return if the dispossessed guardian was unable to exercise his rights precisely because of the action of the abductor. Perez-Vera Report, paragraph 115 at page 461.

The applicant seeking return need only allege that he or she was actually exercising custody rights conferred by the law of the country in which the child was habitually resident immediately before the removal or retention. The statement would normally include a recitation of the circumstances under which physical custody had been exercised, *i.e.*, whether by the holder of these rights, or by a third person on behalf of the actual holder of the custody rights. The applicant would append copies of any relevant legal documents or court orders to the return application. *See* III, C., *supra*, and Article 8.

(c) *Grave risk of harm/intolerable situation.* Under Article 13(b), a court in its discretion need not order a child returned if there is a grave risk that return would expose the child to physical harm or otherwise place the child in an intolerable situation.

This provision was not intended to be used by defendants as a vehicle to litigate (or relitigate) the child's best interests. Only evidence directly establishing the existence of a

grave risk that would expose the child to physical or emotional harm or otherwise place the child in an intolerable situation is material to the court's determination. The person opposing the child's return must show that the risk to the child is grave, not merely serious.

A review of deliberations on the Convention reveals that "intolerable situation" was not intended to encompass return to a home where money is in short supply, or where educational or other opportunities are more limited than in the requested State. An example of an "intolerable situation" is one in which a custodial parent sexually abuses the child. If the other parent removes or retains the child to safeguard it against further victimization, and the abusive parent then petitions for the child's return under the Convention, the court may deny the petition. Such action would protect the child from being returned to an "intolerable situation" and subjected to a grave risk of psychological harm.

(d) *Child's preference.* The third, unlettered paragraph of Article 13 permits the court to decline to order the child returned if the child objects to being returned and has attained an age and degree of maturity at which it is appropriate to take account of the child's views. As with the other Article 13 exceptions to the return obligation, the application of this exception is not mandatory. This discretionary aspect of Article 13 is especially important because of the potential for brainwashing of the child by the alleged abductor. A child's objection to being returned may be accorded little if any weight if the court believes that the child's preference is the product of the abductor parent's undue influence over the child.

(e) *Role of social studies.* The final paragraph of Article 13 requires the court, in considering a respondent's assertion that the child should not be returned, to take into account information relating to the child's social background provided by the Central Authority or other competent authority in the child's State of habitual residence. This provision has the dual purpose of ensuring that the court has a balanced record upon which to determine whether the child is to be returned, and preventing the abductor from obtaining an unfair advantage through his or her own forum selection with resulting ready access to evidence of the child's living conditions in that forum.

3. Article 20

Article 20 limits the return obligation of Article 12. It states: "The return of the child under the provisions of Article 12 may be refused if this would not be permitted by the fundamental principles of the requested State relating to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms."

The best explanation for this unique formulation is that the Convention might never have been adopted without it. The negotiating countries were divided on the inclusion of a public policy exception in the Convention. Those favoring a public policy exception believed that under some extreme circumstances not covered by the exceptions of Article 13 a court should be excused from returning a child to the country of habitual residence. In contrast, opponents of a public policy exception felt that such an exception could be interpreted so broadly as to undermine the fabric of the entire Convention.

A public policy clause was nevertheless adopted at one point by a margin of one vote. That clause provided: "Contracting States may reserve the right not to return the child when such return would be manifestly incompatible with the fundamental principles of the law relating to the family and children in the State addressed." To prevent imminent collapse of the negotiating process engendered by the adoption of this clause, there was a swift and determined move to devise a different provision that could be invoked on the rare occasion that return of a child would utterly shock the conscience of the court or offend all notions of due process.

The resulting language of Article 20 has no known precedent in other international agreements to serve as a guide in its interpretation. However, it should be emphasized that this exception, like the others, was intended to be restrictively interpreted and applied, and is not to be used, for example, as a vehicle for litigating custody on the merits or for passing judgment on the political system of the country from which the child was removed. Two characterizations of the effect to be given Article 20 are recited below for illumination.

The following explanation of Article 20 is excerpted from paragraph 118 of the Perez-Vera Report at pages 461-2:

It is significant that the possibility, acknowledged in *article 20*, that the child may not be returned when its return 'would not be permitted by the fundamental principles of the requested State relating to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms' has been placed in the last article of the chapter; it was thus intended to emphasize the always clearly exceptional nature of this provision's application. As for the substance of this provision, two comments only are required. Firstly, even if its literal meaning is strongly reminiscent of the terminology used in international texts concerning the protection of human rights, this particular rule is not directed at developments which have occurred on the international level, but is concerned only with the principles accepted by the law of the requested State, either through general international law and treaty law, or through internal legislation. Consequently, so as to be able to refuse to return a child on the basis of this article, it will be necessary to show that the fundamental principles of the requested State concerning the subject-matter of the Convention do not permit it; it will not be sufficient to show merely that its return would be incompatible, even manifestly incompatible, with these principles. Secondly, such principles must not be invoked any more frequently, nor must their invocation be more readily admissible than they would be in their application to purely internal matters. Otherwise, the provision would be discriminatory in itself, and opposed to one of the most widely recognized fundamental principles in internal laws. A study of the case law of different countries shows that the application by ordinary judges of the laws on human rights and fundamental freedoms is undertaken with a care which one must expect to see maintained in the international situations which the Convention has in view.

A. E. Anton, Chairman of the Commission on the Hague Conference on Private International Law that drafted the Convention, explained Article 20 in his article, "The Hague Convention on International Child Abduction," 30 I.C.L.Q. 537, 551-2 (July, 1981), as follows:

Its acceptance may in part have been due to the fact that it states a rule which many States would have been bound to apply in any event, for example, by reason of the terms of their constitutions. The reference in this provision to "the fundamental principles of the requested State" make it clear that the reference is not one to international conventions or declarations concerned with the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms which have been ratified or accepted by Contracting States. It is rather to the fundamental provisions of the law of the requested State in such matters . . . If the United Kingdom decides to ratify the Hague Convention, it will, of course, be for the implementing legislation or the courts to specify what provisions of United Kingdom law come within the scope of Article 20. The Article, however, is merely permissive and it is to be hoped that States will exercise restraint in availing themselves of it.

4. Custody Order no Defense to Return

See I.D.1, supra, for discussion of Article 17.

J. Return of the Child

Assuming the court has determined that the removal or retention of the child was wrongful within the meaning of the Convention and that no exceptions to the return obligation have been satisfactorily established by the respondent, Article 12 provides that "the authority concerned shall order the return of the child forthwith." The Convention does not technically require that the child be returned to his or her State of habitual residence, although in the classic abduction case this will occur. If the petitioner has moved from the child's State of habitual residence the child will be returned to the petitioner, not the State of habitual residence.

1. Return Order not on Custody merits

Under Article 19, a decision under the Convention concerning the return of the child shall not be taken to be a determination on the merits of any custody issue. It follows that once the factual status quo ante has been restored, litigation concerning custody or visitation issues could proceed. Typically this will occur in the child's State of habitual residence.

2. Costs, Fees and Expenses Shifted to Abductor

In connection with the return order, Article 26 permits the court to direct the person who removed or retained the child to pay necessary expenses incurred by or on behalf of the applicant to secure the child's return, including expenses, costs incurred or payments made for locating the child, costs of legal representation of the applicant, and those of returning the child. The purposes underlying Article 26 are to restore the applicant to the financial position he or she would have been in had there been no removal or retention, as well as to deter such conduct from happening in the first place. This fee shifting provision has counterparts in the UCCJA (sections 7(g), 8(c), 15(b)) and the PKPA (28 U.S.C. 1738A note).

[Back to top](#)

IV. Central Authority

In addition to creating a judicial remedy for cases of wrongful removal and retention, the Convention requires each Contracting State to establish a Central Authority (hereinafter "CA") with the broad mandate of assisting applicants to secure the return of their children or the effective exercise of their visitation rights. Articles 1, 10, 21. The CA is expressly directed by Article 10 to take all appropriate measures to obtain the voluntary return of children. The role of the CA with respect to visitation rights is discussed in V., *infra*.

A. Establishment of Central Authority

Article 6 requires each Contracting State to designate a Central Authority to discharge the duties enumerated in Articles 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 21, 26, 27, and 28.

In France, the Central Authority is located within the Ministry of Justice. Switzerland has designated its Federal Justice Office as CA, and Canada has designated its Department of Justice; However, each Canadian province and territory in which the Convention has come into force has directed its Attorney General to serve as local CA for cases involving that jurisdiction.

In the United States it is very unlikely that the volume of cases will warrant the establishment of a new agency or office to fulfill Convention responsibilities. Rather, the duties of the CA will be carried out by an existing agency of the federal government with experience in dealing with authorities of other countries.

The Department of State's Office of Citizens Consular Services (CCS) within its Bureau of Consular Affairs will most likely serve as CA under the Hague Convention. CCS presently assists parents here and abroad with child custody-related problems within the framework of existing laws and procedures. The Convention should systematize and expedite CCS handling of requests from abroad for assistance in securing the return of children wrongfully abducted to or retained in the United States, and will provide additional tools with which CCS can help parents in the United States who are seeking return of their children from abroad.

The establishment of an interagency coordinating body is envisioned to assist the State Department in executing its functions as CA. This body is to include representatives of the Departments of State, Justice, and Health and Human Services.

In addition to the mandatory establishment of a CA in the national government, Contracting States are free to appoint similar entities in political subdivisions throughout the country. Rather than mandating the establishment of a CA in every state, it is expected that state governments in the United States will be requested on a case-by-case basis to render specified assistance, consistent with the Convention, aimed at resolving international custody and visitation disputes with regard to children located within their jurisdiction.

B. Duties

Article 7 enumerates the majority of the tasks to be carried out either directly by the CA or through an intermediary. The CA is to take "all appropriate measures" to execute these responsibilities. Although they are free to do so, the Convention does not obligate Contracting States to amend their internal laws to discharge Convention tasks more efficaciously. *See* Perez-Vera Report, paragraph 63 at page 444.

The following paragraphs of subsections of Article 7 of the Convention are couched in terms of the tasks and functions of the United States CA. The corresponding tasks and functions of the CA's in other States party to the Convention will be carried out somewhat differently in the context of each country's legal system.

Article 7(a). When the CA in the United States is asked to locate a child abducted from a foreign contracting State to this country, it would utilize all existing tools for determining the whereabouts of missing persons. Federal resources available for locating missing persons include the FBI-operated National Crime Information Center (NCIC) computer (pursuant to Pub. L. No. 97-292, the Missing Children Act), the Federal Parent Locator Service (pursuant to section 9 of Pub. L. No. 96-611, the Parental Kidnapping Prevention Act) and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. If the abductor's location is known or suspected, the relevant state's Parent Locator Service or Motor Vehicle Bureau and the Internal Revenue Service, Attorney General and Secretary of Education may be requested to conduct field and/or record searches. Also at the state level, public or private welfare agencies can be called upon to verify discreetly any address information about the abductor that may be discovered.

Article 7(b). To prevent further harm to the child, the CA would normally call upon the state welfare agency to take whatever protective measures are appropriate and available consistent with that state's child abuse and neglect laws. The CA, either directly or with the help of state authorities, may seek a written agreement from the abductor (and possibly from the applicant as well) not to remove the child from the jurisdiction pending procedures aimed at return of the child. Bonds or other forms of security may be required.

Article 7(c). The CA, either directly or through local public or private mediators, attorneys, social workers, or other professionals, would attempt to develop an agreement for the child's voluntary return and/or resolution of other outstanding issues. The obligation of the CA to take or cause to be taken all appropriate measures to obtain the voluntary return of the child is so fundamental a purpose of this Convention that it is restated in Article 10. However, overtures to secure the voluntary return of a child may not be advisable if advance awareness by the abductor that the Convention has been invoked is likely to prompt further flight and concealment of the child. If the CA and state authorities are successful in facilitating a voluntary agreement between the parties, the applicant would have no need to invoke or pursue the Convention's judicial remedy.

Article 7(d). The CA in the United States would rely upon court personnel or social service agencies in the child's state of habitual residence to compile information on the child's social background for the use of courts considering exceptions to a return petition in another country in which an abducted or retained child is located. *See* Article 13.

Article 7(e). The CA in the United States would call upon U.S. state authorities to prepare (or have prepared) general statements about the law of the state of the child's habitual residence for purposes of application of the Convention in the country where the child is located, *i.e.*, to determine whether a removal or retention was wrongful.

Articles 7(f) and (g). In the United States the federal CA will not act as legal advocate for the applicant. Rather, in concert with state authorities and interested family law attorneys, the CA, through state or local bodies, will assist the applicant in identifying competent private legal counsel or, if eligible, in securing representation by a Legal Aid or Legal Services lawyer. In some states, however, the Attorney General or local District Attorney may be empowered under state law to intervene on behalf of the applicant-parent to secure the child's return.

In some foreign Contracting States, the CA may act as the legal representative of the applicant for all purposes under the Convention.

Article 28 permits the CA to require written authorization empowering it to act on behalf of the applicant, or to designate a representative to act in such capacity.

Article 7(h). Travel arrangements for the return of a child from the United States would be made by the CA or by state authorities closest to the case in cooperation with the petitioner and/or interested foreign authorities. If it is necessary to provide short-term care for the child pending his or her return, the CA presumably will arrange for the temporary placement of the child in the care of the person designated for that purpose by the applicant, or, failing that, request local authorities to appoint a guardian, foster parent, etc. The costs of transporting the child are borne by the applicant unless the court, pursuant to Article 26, orders the wrongdoer to pay.

Article 7(i). The CA will monitor all cases in which its assistance has been sought. It will maintain files on the procedures followed in each case and the ultimate disposition thereof. Complete records will aid in determining how frequently the Convention is invoked and how well it is working.

C. Other Tasks

1. Processing Applications

Article 8 sets forth the required contents of a return application submitted to a CA, all of which are incorporated into the model form recommended for use when seeking a child's return pursuant to the Convention (see Annex A of this analysis). Article 8 further provides that an application for assistance in securing the return of a child may be submitted to a CA in either the country of the child's habitual residence or in any other Contracting State. If a CA receives an application with respect to a child whom it believes to be located in another Contracting State, pursuant to Article 9 it is to transmit the application directly to the appropriate CA and inform the requesting CA or applicant of the transmittal.

It is likely that an applicant who knows the child's whereabouts can expedite the return process by electing to file a return application with the CA in the country in which the child is located. The applicant who pursues this course of action may also choose to file a duplicate copy of the application for information purposes with the CA in his or her own

country. Of course, the applicant may prefer to apply directly to the CA in his or her own country even when the abductor's location is known, and rely upon the CA to transfer documents and communicate with the foreign CA on his or her behalf. An applicant who does not know the whereabouts of the child will most likely file the return application with the CA in the child's State of habitual residence.

Under Article 27, a CA may reject an application if "it is manifest that the requirements of the Convention are not fulfilled or that the application is otherwise not well founded." The CA must promptly inform the CA in the requesting State, or the applicant directly, of its reasons for such rejection. Consistent with the spirit of the Convention and in the absence of any prohibition on doing so, the applicant should be allowed to correct the defects and refile the application.

Under Article 28, a CA may require the applicant to furnish a written authorization empowering it to act on behalf of the applicant, or designating a representative so to act.

2. Assistance in Connection With Judicial Proceedings

(a) *Request for status report.* When an action has been commenced in court for the return of a child and no decision has been reached by the end of six weeks, Article 11 authorizes the applicant or the CA of the requested State to ask the judge for a statement of the reasons for the delay. The CA in the country where the child is located may make such a request on its own initiative, or upon request of the CA of another Contracting State. Replies received by the CA in the requested State are to be transmitted to the CA in the requesting State or directly to the applicant, depending upon who initiated the request.

(b) *Social studies/background reports.* Information relating to the child's social background collected by the CA in the child's State of habitual residence pursuant to Article 7(d) may be submitted for consideration by the court in connection with a judicial return proceeding. Under the last paragraph of Article 13, the court must consider home studies and other social background reports provided by the CA or other competent authorities in the child's State of habitual residence.

(c) *Determination of "wrongfulness".* If a court requests an applicant to obtain a determination from the authorities of the child's State of habitual residence that the removal or retention was wrongful, Central Authorities are to assist applicants, so far as practicable, to obtain such a determination. Article 15.

(d) *Costs.* Under Article 26, each CA bears its own costs in applying the Convention. The actual operating expenses under the Convention will vary from one Contracting State to the next depending upon the volume of incoming and outgoing requests and the number and nature of the procedures available under internal law to carry out specified Convention tasks.

Subject to limited exceptions noted in the next paragraph, the Central Authority and other public services are prohibited from imposing any charges in relation to applications submitted under the Convention. Neither the applicant nor the CA in the requesting State may be required to pay for the services rendered directly or indirectly by the CA of the requested State.

The exceptions relate to transportation and legal expenses to secure the child's return. With respect to transportation, the CA in the requested State is under no obligation to pay for the child's return. The applicant can therefore be required to pay the costs of transporting the child. With respect to legal expenses, if the requested State enters a reservation in accordance with Articles 26 and 42, the applicant can be required to pay all costs and expenses of the legal proceedings, and those arising from the participation of legal counsel or advisers. However, see III. J 2 of this analysis discussing the possibility that the court ordering the child's return will levy these and other costs upon the abductor. Even if the reservation under Articles 26 and 42 is entered, under Article 22 no security, bond or deposit can be required to guarantee the payment of costs and expenses of the judicial or administrative proceedings falling within the Convention.

Under the last paragraph of Article 26 the CA may be able to recover some of its expenses from the person who engaged in the wrongful conduct. For instance, a court that orders a child returned may also order the person who removed or retained the child to pay the expenses incurred by or on behalf of the petitioner, including costs of court proceedings and legal fees of the petitioner. Likewise, a court that issues an order concerning visitation may direct the person who prevented the exercise of visitation rights to pay necessary expenses incurred by or on behalf of the petitioner. In such cases, the petitioner could recover his or her expenses, and the CA could recover its outlays on behalf of the petitioner, including costs associated with, or payments made for, locating the child and the legal representation of the petitioner.

[Back to top](#)

V. Access Rights – Article 21

A. Remedies for Breach

Up to this point this analysis has focused on judicial and administrative remedies for the removal or retention of children in breach of custody rights. "Access rights," which are synonymous with "visitation rights", are also protected by the Convention, but to a lesser extent than custody rights. While the Convention preamble and Article 1(b) articulate the Convention objective of ensuring that rights of access under the law of one state are respected in other Contracting States, the remedies for breach of access rights are those enunciated in Article 21 and do not include the return remedy provided by Article 12.

B. Defined

Article 5(b) defines "access rights" as including "the right to take a child for a limited period of time to a place other than the child's habitual residence."

A parent who takes a child from the country of its habitual residence to another country party to the Convention for a summer visit pursuant to either a tacit agreement between the parents or a court order is thus exercising his or her access rights. Should that parent fail to return the child at the end of the agreed upon visitation period, the retention would be wrongful and could give rise to a petition for return under Article 12. If, on the other hand, a custodial parent resists permitting the child to travel abroad to visit the noncustodial parent, perhaps out of fear that the child will not be returned at the end of the visit, this interference with access rights does not constitute a wrongful retention within the meaning of Article 3 of the Convention. The parent whose access rights have been infringed is not entitled under the Convention to the child's "return," but may request the Central Authority to assist in securing the exercise of his or her access rights pursuant to Article 21.

Article 21 may also be invoked as a precautionary measure by a custodial parent who anticipates a problem in getting the child back at the end of a visit abroad. That parent may apply to the CA of the country where the child is to visit the noncustodial parent for steps to ensure the return of the child at the end of the visit -- for example, through appropriate imposition of a performance bond or other security.

C. Procedure for Obtaining Relief

Procedurally Article 21 authorizes a person complaining of, or seeking to prevent, a breach of access rights to apply to the CA of a Contracting State in the same way as a person seeking return of the child. The application would contain the information described in Article 8, except that information provided under paragraph (c) would be the grounds upon which the claim is made for assistance in organizing or securing the effective exercise of rights of access.

Once the CA receives such application, it is to take all appropriate measures pursuant to Article 7 to promote the peaceful enjoyment of access rights and the fulfillment of any conditions to which the exercise of those rights is subject. This includes initiating or facilitating the institution of proceedings, either directly or through intermediaries, to

organize or protect access rights and to secure respect for conditions to which these rights are subject.

If legal proceedings are instituted in the Contracting State in which the noncustodial parent resides. Article 21 may not be used by the noncustodial parent to evade the jurisdiction of the courts of the child's habitual residence, which retain authority to define and/or condition the exercise of visitation rights. A parent who has a child abroad for a visit is not to be allowed to exploit the presence of the child as a means for securing from the CA (or court) in that country more liberal visitation rights than those set forth in a court order agreed upon in advance of the visit. Such result would be tantamount to sanctioning forum-shopping contrary to the intent of the Convention. Any such application should be denied and the parent directed back to the appropriate authorities in the State of the child's habitual residence for consideration of the desired modification. Pending any such modification, once the lawful visitation period has expired, the custodial parent would have the right to seek the child's return under Article 3.

The Perez-Vera Report gives some limited guidance as to how CA's are to cooperate to secure the exercise of access rights:

... it would be advisable that the child's name not appear on the passport of the holder of the right of access, whilst in 'transfrontier' access cases it would be sensible for the holder of the access rights to give an undertaking to the Central Authority of the child's habitual residence to return the child on a particular date and to indicate also the places where he intends to stay with the child. A copy of such an undertaking would then be sent to the Central Authority of the habitual residence of the holder of the access rights, as well as to the Central Authority of the State in which he has stated his intention of staying with the child. This would enable the authorities to know the whereabouts of the child at any time and to set in motion proceedings for bringing about its return, as soon as the stated time-limit has expired. Of course, none of the measures could by itself ensure that access rights are exercised properly, but in any event we believe that this Report can go no further: the specific measures which the Central Authorities concerned are able to take will depend on the circumstances of each case and on the capacity to act enjoyed by each Central Authority. Perez-Vera Report, paragraph 128 at page 466.

D. Alternative Remedies

In addition to or in lieu of invoking Article 21 to resolve visitation-related problems, under Articles 18, 29 and 34 an aggrieved parent whose access rights have been violated may bypass the CA and the Convention and apply directly to the judicial authorities of a Contracting State for relief under other applicable laws.

In at least one case it is foreseeable that a parent abroad will opt in favor of local U.S. law instead of the Convention. A noncustodial parent abroad whose visitation rights are being thwarted by the custodial parent resident in the United States could invoke the UCCJA to seek enforcement of an existing foreign court order conferring visitation rights. Pursuant to section 23 of the UCCJA, a state court in the United States could order the custodial parent to comply with the prescribed visitation period by sending the child to the parent outside the United States. This remedy is potentially broader and more meaningful

than the Convention remedy, since the latter does not include the right of return when a custodial parent obstructs the noncustodial parent's visitation rights, *i.e.*, by refusing to allow the other parent to exercise those rights. It is possible that a parent in the United States seeking to exercise access rights with regard to a child habitually resident abroad may similarly find greater relief under foreign law than under the Convention.

[Back to top](#)

VI. Miscellaneous and Final Clauses

A. Article 36

Article 36 permits Contracting States to limit the restrictions to which a child's return may be subject under the Convention, *i.e.*, expand the return obligation or cases to which the Convention will apply. For instance, two or more countries may agree to extend coverage of the Convention to children beyond their sixteenth birthdays, thus expanding upon Article 4. Or, countries may agree to apply the Convention retroactively to wrongful removal and retention cases arising prior to its entry into force for those countries. Such agreement would remove any ambiguity concerning the scope of Article 35. The Department of State is not proposing that the United States make use of this Article.

B. Articles 37 and 38

Chapter VI of the Hague Convention consists of nine final clauses concerned with procedural aspects of the treaty, most of which are self-explanatory. Article 37 provides that states which were members of the Hague Conference on Private International Law at the time of the Fourteenth Session (October 1980) may sign and become parties to the Convention by ratification, acceptance or approval. Significantly, under Article 38 the Convention is open to accession by non-member States, but enters into force only between those States and member Contracting States which specifically accept their accession to the Convention. Article 38.

C. Articles 43 and 44

In Article 43 the Convention provides that it enters into force on the first day of the third calendar month after the third country has deposited its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. For countries that become parties to the Convention subsequently, the Convention enters into force on the first day of the third calendar month following the deposit of the instrument of ratification. Pursuant to Article 43, the Convention entered into force on December 1, 1983 among France, Portugal and five provinces of Canada, and on January 1, 1984 for Switzerland. As of January, 1986 it is in force for all provinces and territories of Canada with the exception of Alberta, the Northwest Territories, Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan.

The Convention enters into force in ratifying countries subject to such declarations or reservations pursuant to Articles 39, 40, 24 and 26 (third paragraph) as may be made by each ratifying country in accordance with Article 42.

The Convention remains in force for five years from the date it first entered into force (*i.e.*, December 1, 1983), and is renewed tacitly every five years absent denunciations notified in accordance with Article 44.

D. Articles 39 and 40

Article 39 authorizes a Contracting State to declare that the Convention extends to some or all of the territories for the conduct of whose international relations it is responsible.

Under Article 40, countries with two or more territorial units having different systems of law relative to custody and visitation rights may declare that the Convention extends to all or some of them. This federal state clause was included at the request of Canada to take account of Canada's special constitutional situation. The Department of State is not proposing that the United States make use of this provision. Thus, if the United States ratifies the Convention, it would come into force throughout the United States as the supreme law of the land in every state and other jurisdiction.

E. Article 41

Article 41 is another provision inserted at the request of one country, and is best understood by reciting the reporter's explanatory comments:

Finally a word should be said on Article 41, since it contains a wholly novel provision in Hague Conventions. It also appears in the other Conventions adopted at the Fourteenth Session, *i.e.*, the *Convention on International Access to Justice*, at the express request of the Australian delegation.

This article seeks to make it clear that ratification of the Convention by a State will carry no implication as to the internal distribution of executive, judicial and legislative powers in that State.

This may seem self-evident, and this is the point which the head of the Canadian delegation made during the debates of the Fourth Commission where it was decided to insert such a provision in both Conventions (see P.-v. No. 4 of the Plenary Session). The Canadian delegation, openly expressing the opinion of a large number of delegations, regarded the insertion of this article in the two Conventions as unnecessary. Nevertheless, Article 41 was adopted, largely to satisfy the Australian delegation, for which the absence of such a provision would apparently have created insuperable constitutional difficulties. Perez-Vera Report, paragraph 149 at page 472.

F. Article 45

Article 45 vests the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, as depository for the Convention, with the responsibility to notify Hague Conference member States and other States party to the Convention of all actions material to the operation of the Convention.

[Back to top](#)

Recommended Return Application Form

The following model form was recommended by the Fourteenth Session of the Hague Conference on Private International Law (1980) for use in making applications pursuant to the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction for the return of wrongfully removed or retained children. The version of the form to be used for requesting the return of such children from the United States will probably seek additional information, in particular to help authorities in the United States in efforts to find a child whose whereabouts are not known to the applicant.

Request for Return

Hague Convention of 25 October 1980 on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction.

Requesting Central Authority or Applicant

Requested Authority

Concerns the following child: who will attain the age of 16 on , 19 .

Note. -- The following particulars should be completed insofar as possible.

I -- Identity of the Child and its Parents

1 Child

Name and first names

Date and place of birth

Passport or identity card No., if any

Description and photo, if possible (see annexes)

2 Parents

2.1 Mother:

Name and first names

Date and place of birth

Nationality

Occupation

Habitual residence

Passport or identity card No., if any

2.2 Father:

Name and first names

Date and place of birth

Nationality

Occupation

Habitual residence

Passport or identity card No., if any

2.3 Date and place of marriage

II -- Requesting Individual or Institution (who actually exercised custody before the removal or retention)

3 Name and first names

Nationality of individual applicant

Occupation of individual applicant

Address

Passport or identity card No., if any

Relation to the child

Name and address of legal adviser, if any

III -- Place Where the Child Is Thought To Be

4.1 Information concerning the person alleged to have removed or retained the child

Name and first names

Date and place of birth, if known

Nationality, if known

Occupation

Last known address

Passport or identity card No., if any

Description and photo, if possible (see annexes)

4.2 Address of the child

4.3 Other persons who might be able to supply additional information relating to the whereabouts of the child

IV -- Time, Place, Date and Circumstances of the Wrongful Removal or Retention

V -- Factual or Legal Grounds Justifying the Request

VI -- Civil Proceedings in Progress

VII -- Child Is To Be Returned To:

a. Name and first names

Date and place of birth

Address

Telephone number

b. Proposed arrangements for return of the child

VIII -- Other Remarks

IX -- List of Documents Attached *

* E.g. Certified copy of relevant decision or agreement concerning custody or access; certificate or affidavit as to the applicable law; information relating to the social background of the child; authorization empowering the Central Authority to act on behalf of applicant.

Date

Place

Signature and/or stamp of the requesting Central Authority or applicant

[Back to top](#)

Bibliography

Explanatory Report by E. Perez-Vera, Hague Conference on Private International Law, Actes et documents de la Quatorzieme session, vol. III, 1980, p. 426.

Anton, A.E. -- The Hague Convention on International Child Abduction; *30 Int'l & Comp. L.Q. (1981), p. 537.*

Bodenheimer, B. -- The Hague Convention on International Child Abduction; XIV Fam. L.Q. (1980), p. 99.

Chatin, L. -- Les conflicts relatifs a la garde des enfants et au droit de visite en droit international prive; Travaux du Comite francais de droit international prive, Seance du 12 mai 1982, Publication du Ministere de la Justice.

Crouch, R.E. -- Effective Measures Against International Child Snatching; *131 New L.J. (1981), p. 592.*

Deschenaux, D. -- La Convention de La Haye sur les aspects civils de l'enlevement international d'enfants, du 25 octobre 1980; XXXVII Schweizerisches Jahrbuch fur internationale Recht (1981), p. 119.

Dyer, A. -- International child abduction by parents; 168 Recueil des Cours de l'Academie de droit international de La Haye (1980), p. 231.

Eekelaar, J.M. -- The Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction; Explanatory Documentation prepared for Commonwealth Jurisdictions, Commonwealth Secretariat, 1981.

Farquhar, K.B. -- The Hague Convention on International Child Abduction Comes to Canada; *4 Can. J. Fam. L. (1983), p. 5.*

Frank, R.J. -- American and International Responses to International Child Abductions, *16 N.Y.U.J. Int'l L. & Pol. (Winter 1984), p. 415.*

Hoff, P., Schulman, J. and Volenik, A. -- Interstate Child Custody Disputes and Parental Kidnapping: Policy, Practice and Law, Legal Services Corporation -- American Bar Association, 1982.

Huesstege, R. -- Internationale Kindesentfuehrungen und Landesverfassungsrecht; IPRax (1982), p. 95 -- Der Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act -- Rechtsvergleichende Betrachtungen zu Internationalen Kindesentfuehren, Verlag fur Standesamtswesen, Frankfurt am Main, 1982.

Morgenstern, B.R. -- The Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction: The Need for Ratification; *10 N.C.J. Int'l L. & Com. Reg. (1985), p. 463.*

Reymond, P.H. -- Convention de La Haye et Convention de Strasbourg. Aspects comparatifs des conventions concernant l'enlevement d'un enfant par l'un de ses parents; Revue de droit suisse 1981, p. 329.

Schulman, J. -- cf. Hoff, P.

Vink, E.L.M. -- Enkele civielrechtelijke aspecten van de internationale ontvoeringen van kinderen door een van de ouders; Leiden, mai 1981.

Volenik, A. -- cf. Hoff, P.

Westbrook, G.R. -- Law and Treaty Responses to International Child Abductions; *20 Va. J. Int'l L. (1980)*, p. 669.

[Back to top](#)