

1 **FFCL**

2
3 **DISTRICT COURT**
4 **FAMILY DIVISION**
5 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

6
7 [REDACTED]

8 PLAINTIFF,

9 vs.

10 [REDACTED]

11 DEFENDANT.

Case No.: D-25-[REDACTED]-P

DEPT. NO. S

Hearing Date: 12/05/2025

Hearing Time: 9:15AM

12
13 **DECREE OF CUSTODY**

14 **FINDINGS OF FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

15
16 The above-entitled cause having come before the Court for an
17 Evidentiary Hearing for the Initial Determination of Custody on November
18 12, 2025. Plaintiff [REDACTED] was present with his Attorney,
19 Danielle Dawson. At the start of trial, he dismissed his counsel last minute
20 and proceeded in proper person. Defendant [REDACTED] was
21 present with her attorney, Brandon Leavitt.
22
23

24 The matter was taken under advisement on December 29, 2025 when
25 both parties submitted their pre-trial memorandum to the Department. Dad
26 did not file the brief and opted instead to send it directly to Department staff.
27
28

1 The Court has considered the testimony of the parties and their
2 respective witnesses, the admitted exhibits, the pleadings and papers on file,
3 and having weighed the credibility of the parties, their witnesses, and the
4 evidence presented. The Court issues the following Decree of Custody,
5 Findings of Fact, and Conclusions of Law as set forth herein.
6
7

8 **FINDINGS OF FACTS**

- 9
- 10 1. The parties have never been married and separated in 2015.
 - 11 2. The parties share one (1) minor child, [REDACTED], born
12 December 3, 2013, who is currently twelve (12) years old. This Court
13 finds that it has proper jurisdiction under the Uniform Child Custody
14 Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA) to enter and maintain
15 continuing Orders concerning the minor child in her best interest.
16
17
 - 18 3. Dad initiated this case in February 2025.
 - 19 4. From February through May of 2025, Dad was represented by Attorney
20 Trevor Creel. Dad terminated Attorney Creel after their second (2nd)
21 Court hearing and was represented by Attorney Danielle Dawson
22 thereafter.
23
 - 24 5. On March 13, 2025, the Court conducted a Case Management
25 Conference. At that time, the Court temporarily ordered that the parties
26 share joint legal custody, with Dad continuing to exercise primary
27
28

1 physical custody of the minor child. Mom's parenting time was set from
2 Saturdays at 3:00PM to Mondays at 3:00PM [two (2) days], with
3 audiovisual visits on Tuesdays and Thursdays at 7:00PM through an
4 agreed upon parenting application.
5

6 6. Pursuant to the parties' May 30, 2025 stipulation and Order, the agreed
7 upon parenting application was Our Family Wizard.
8

9 7. At the parties' Return Hearing on May 8, 2025, the Court increased
10 Mom's parenting time to Fridays after school, or 5:00PM if there was
11 no school, until Mondays at 3:00PM [three (3) days]. The Court further
12 ordered that Dad notify Mom of any doctor visits involving the minor
13 child and prohibited medical appointments without such notice.
14

15 8. The Court also authorized each party two (2) ATI drug tests, which they
16 could elect to use at their own expense. The Court set the matter for a
17 Non-Jury Trial on custody for December 5, 2025.
18

19 9. Dad used one (1) ATI drug test on Mom. The Court received the results
20 on October 17, 2025. The tests was negative.
21

22 10. Mom used two (2) ATI drug tests on Dad. The Court received the first
23 result on November 12, 2025, which was negative. The second test
24 result received on December 3, 2025, indicated the presence of opiates,
25
26
27
28

1 hydrocodone, and hydromorphone. The results further indicated that
2 Dad had valid prescriptions for those substances.
3

4 11. Dad was represented by Attorney Danielle Dawson from May 2025
5 through December 5, 2025, the scheduled date of trial.
6

7 12. On December 5, 2025, the date of the Non-Jury Trial which had been
8 **pending for roughly seven (7) months**, Dad advised to the Court for
9 the first time on the day of trial, that he no longer wished to be
10 represented by Attorney Dawson and was requesting a continuance.
11

12 13. Mom's counsel agreed to a continuance conditioned upon the parties
13 exercising temporary week on, week off physical custody. Dad refused
14 those terms, and the matter proceeded to trial.
15

16 14. Dad testified that he was seeking to reduce Mom's parenting time to
17 only six (6) to eight (8) hours per week of supervised visitation. Dad
18 further testified that he understood this request sounded unreasonable,
19 but believed that if he presented his perspective, the Court would be
20 persuaded to grant the request.
21

22 15. Dad makes this request for supervised visitations despite Mom having
23 exercising parenting time with the minor child for three (3) days
24 unsupervised per week for much of 2025, and roughly two (2) days a
25 week unsupervised since 2022.
26
27
28

1 16. However, throughout the Full-Day Trial, Dad did not present *any*
2 substantive evidence at trial of any recent or relevant incident occurring
3 during Mom's parenting time that would support his request for
4 supervised visitation.
5

6 17. The minor child currently has a full bedroom and appropriate
7 accommodations in Mom's home.
8

9 18. Both parties had issues with drug abuse throughout their relationship
10 from 2012 - 2015.
11

12 19. Mom struggled with substance abuse involving prescription drugs and
13 methamphetamine. She successfully completed rehabilitation in 2019,
14 and has remained sober from alcohol and drugs since September 2019.
15

16 20. Mom would then live in a sober living home for three (3) years and it
17 helped her rebuild her life and become a functional member in society
18 again.
19

20 21. Mom has continued to maintained sobriety through weekly therapy and
21 having a support system. It has been over six (6) years since Mom has
22 used drugs or alcohol, and Dad is fully aware of her sustained sobriety.
23 Despite this, Dad wants to insist that Mom is still addicted to drugs,
24 despite having been drug tested by this Court and testing negative for
25 all drugs or alcohol.
26
27
28

1 22. Mom currently has no current substance abuse issues and only gambles
2 occasionally.

3
4 23. Mom has two (2) other children from a different relationship, XXXXX
5 XX (19) and XXXXXXXX (17), who reside in California with their
6 father and are not parties to this case. They have been out of her home
7 roughly one (1) year at the date of the trial.
8

9 24. Despite XXXXXXXX (19) and XXXXXXXX (17) not being parties to this
10 matter, not residing in Mom's home for approximately one (1) year,
11 and residing in a different state, Dad devoted a portion of his trial
12 testimony and questioning to them.
13

14 25. The Court advised Dad on numerous occasions that certain matters
15 raised by him were not relevant. Despite such advisements, Dad
16 continued lines of questioning involving irrelevant and outdated issues
17 from years earlier, including matters occurring over a decade ago, Dad
18 continued to focus on recounting his personal narrative rather than
19 presenting current, relevant facts to assist the Court in reaching a
20 determination.
21
22
23

24 26. In August 2020, a family member of Dad's girlfriend, Jasmin, sexually
25 assaulted the minor child. When Mom enrolled the minor child in
26
27
28

1 therapy to address the minor child's mental health struggles. Dad
2 unilaterally removed the child from therapy.
3

4 27. In December 2024, Mom enrolled the minor child at Changing Minds
5 Therapy while advocating for the child to obtain an Individualized
6 Education Program (IEP) due to the child's academic struggles.
7

8 28. [REDACTED] currently suffers from anxiety and ideations of self-harm.

9 29. Mom only learned of the child's self-harm related issues only through
10 therapy notes for the minor child.
11

12 30. Dad believes therapy introduced suicidal ideation to the minor child
13 because such issues were not disclosed prior to therapy commencing.
14

15 31. Dad does not believe [REDACTED], who was sexually abused, by a member of
16 his significant other's family in August of 2020, under his care, needs
17 therapy.
18

19 32. According to Dad, Mom's failure as a parent include, when the minor
20 child was eleven (11) years old, Mom permitted the child to drive a
21 Tesla in a remote desert area during a family bonfire. The child was
22 under mother's supervision, with another minor child who was also
23 eleven (11) years old present in the car.
24
25
26
27
28

1 33. Dad reported the incident to law enforcement and Child Protective
2 Services. Mom has never permitted something similar to this to occur
3 again due to Dad's actions.
4

5 34. When the minor child was in fifth (5th) grade in 2024 and was
6 experiencing difficulty concentrating in school, Mom allowed the child
7 to have a Frappuccino *once* from a gas station. Dad believed this was a
8 major issue warranting bringing it up to the Court's attention.
9

10 35. Mom has also allowed the child to take melatonin once to help her
11 sleep. Dad is fully against this.
12

13 36. Around 2024 to 2025, on a Sunday evening prior to a school day, Mom
14 requested that Dad wash the minor child's school uniform, which was
15 located at his residence, so she could pick it up. Dad became upset that
16 Mom would not permit the minor child to come to his home on Monday
17 morning to get dressed, which would have resulted in Dad having
18 additional minutes of parenting time.
19
20

21 37. This small disagreement brought up by Dad and explored by him with
22 cross-examination of Mom, served as one of his basis for sole physical
23 custody of the minor child.
24
25
26
27
28

1 38. Further, these incidences brought up by Dad, formed the majority of
2 his major arguments in support for his request for sole physical custody
3 of the minor child at trial.
4

5 39. Dad has posted photographs of the minor child on his social media
6 accounts during the parties' co-parenting relationship, which he
7 asserted was done to keep Mom informed regarding the child.
8

9 40. From 2022 through 2024, Mom resided in an apartment complex with
10 the minor child and her two (2) sons, [REDACTED].
11

12 41. Since at least 2022, Mom has exercised parenting time consisting of
13 either Tuesdays and Wednesdays with overnights and alternating
14 Fridays or Mondays and Wednesdays with alternating Fridays.
15

16 42. The parties had a low level of conflict prior to 2024. The parties' co-
17 parenting relationship at that time was generally positive because Mom
18 was passive and agreeable.
19

20 43. Once Mom more seriously sought increased parenting time and greater
21 respect as a coparent beginning in or around 2024, the level of conflict
22 between the parties significantly increased.
23

24 44. Dad does not want to coparent with Mom, nor does he respect Mom as
25 a coparent. Mom has consistently parented the child for at least the past
26 three (3) years.
27
28

- 1 45. Both parties also do not trust one another and tend to assume the worst
2 of each other due to their inability or refusal to effectively coparent.
3
- 4 46. The parties are in such a high-conflict co-parenting relationship that on
5 one occasion near the end of 2025, when Dad took the minor child to a
6 doctor's appointment, resulting in the child being approximately one
7 (1) hour late to Mom's custodial time, the parties engaged in a dispute
8 over that one (1) hour difference.
9
- 10 47. Despite the minor child suffering from bug bites, Mom scheduled a
11 medical appointment to treat the issue, notified Dad approximately one
12 (1) hour after scheduling the appointment, and approximately three (3)
13 hours before the appointment occurred. Dad did not approve of the
14 appointment.
15
- 16 48. In 2025, Mom took day trips out of state with the minor child without
17 notifying Dad. Dad does not approve of this conduct.
18
- 19 49. Mom established a rule in her home that if the minor child wishes to
20 call or communicate with Dad during Mom's custodial time, the child
21 is free to do so through the parties' stipulated parenting application, Our
22 Family Wizard. This rule was implemented because Dad repeatedly
23 texted and contacted the minor child directly on the child's personal
24 phone during Mom's custodial time, which Mom found disruptive.
25
26
27
28

1 50. Despite being notified of Mom's household rule, Dad and his
2 girlfriend, Jasmin, continued to call and text the minor child directly on
3 her personal phone during Mom's custodial time. Mom testified that
4 this conduct frequently placed the minor child in a position of divided
5 loyalty, interfering with the child's ability to enjoy uninterrupted
6 custodial time with Mom.
7
8

9 51. Mom does not prevent the minor child from communicating with Dad,
10 or texting him, but seeks to prevent unprompted, repeated contact
11 initiated by Dad during Mom's custodial time that places pressure on
12 the child to choose between parents.
13

14 52. Mom currently works as a bartender at a casino.
15

16 53. Mom described the minor child as a beautiful, brave young girl who is
17 adventurous and loves animals and the outdoors.
18

19 54. Mom has a loving and playful relationship with the minor child.
20

21 55. Mom was awarded an additional day of parenting time (from two [2]
22 to three [3]) by this Court because she never stopped Dad from
23 exercising his parenting time, never withheld the minor child,
24 continued to facilitate the child's relationship with Dad, and continued
25 to exercise her parenting time diligently.
26
27
28

1 56. Mom was awarded audiovisual visitation with the minor child pursuant
2 to the Court's March 2025 Orders. Without Court direction, and in the
3 spirit of co-parenting, Mom also scheduled regular phone calls for Dad
4 during her custodial time.
5

6 57. Dad routinely withholds information from Mom and fails to make
7 reasonable co-parenting accommodations.
8

9 58. In May 2025, Dad enrolled the minor child at SLAM! Nevada without
10 obtaining Mom's consent. Although Mom had previously mentioned
11 SLAM! Nevada as a school the parties should tour, she did not agree to
12 enrollment and learned of the enrollment and vaccinations through the
13 minor child. Dad never notified that it occurred and did not obtain her
14 approval before he took these actions.
15
16

17 59. Although Mom's email address was listed with the school, she was not
18 listed as a guardian and had to independently contact the school to
19 correct the information.
20

21 60. For this occasion, Dad declined to list Mom as a primary contact for
22 the minor child's school, stating that Mom could provide her own
23 information.
24
25
26
27
28

1 61. For the 2025–2026 school year, Dad and his girlfriend, Jasmin, were
2 listed as contact numbers one (1) and two (2) for the minor child, with
3 Mom listed as contact number three (3).
4

5 62. In 2023, when Mom raised parenting concerns, Dad told her that her
6 messages were too long, stated that he would not read them, and
7 instructed her to shorten them. Mom testified that she did not feel heard
8 or respected and that this was a normal occurrence that when she raises
9 parenting concerns, Dad dismisses or minimizes them.
10
11

12 63. In late 2024, Mom learned that Dad allowed the minor child, who was
13 eleven (11) years old, to shower with a cousin who was fifteen (15)
14 years old. When Mom raised concerns to Jasmin first, Jasmin stated the
15 conduct was normal and further stated that she showers with the minor
16 child.
17

18 64. When Mom raised this concern to Dad, he dismissed her concerns.
19

20 65. Without any Court directive, Mom voluntarily attended parenting
21 classes in an effort to improve her parenting skills for the benefit of the
22 minor child.
23

24 66. Mom has always been actively involved in the minor child's life,
25 including enrolling her in ballet, advocating for tutoring, and enrolling
26 her in math classes.
27
28

1 67. Since at least 2022, Mom has taken the minor child on various
2 enriching activities and trips, including kayaking, rock climbing,
3 visiting the Grand Canyon, and visiting Bearizona, which Mom
4 testified help engage the child's curiosity and development.
5

6 68. Mom attended all parent-teacher conferences for the minor child for
7
8 2025.

9 69. Until recently, Dad has also historically asked Mom to be a part of the
10 child's life throughout their co-parenting relationship.
11

12 70. In or around 2021, Mom offered to purchase school clothes for the
13 minor child, transported the child to school when asked, and assisted
14 the child with studying when requested by Dad.
15

16 71. Since at least July 2022, Mom has consistently requested increased
17 parenting time with the minor child for approximately three (3) to four
18 (4) years. Mom has consistently requested joint physical custody.
19

20 72. In 2023, Mom expressed confusion to Dad as to why she could not
21 have three (3) days per week with the minor child despite being actively
22 involved and co-parenting with both Dad and Jasmin. Throughout the
23 parties' co-parenting relationship, communications concerning the
24 minor child have frequently included Dad, Mom, and Jasmin in a three-
25 way exchange.
26
27
28

1 73. Mom is frequently required by Dad to coordinate parenting matters
2 concerning the minor child with Dad's girlfriend, Jasmin, who is not
3 married to Dad.
4

5 74. Dad routinely delegates his parenting responsibilities to Jasmin and
6 directs Mom to communicate with Jasmin instead of communicating
7 directly with Dad.
8

9 75. Jasmin takes care of the minor child's needs when Dad is not available,
10 which often includes picking the child up after school.
11

12 76. Mom testified that this dynamic has interfered with her ability to
13 effectively coparent directly with Dad and see the minor child as Jasmin
14 has kept the minor child from her.
15

16 77. Jasmin physically struck the minor child, most recently in April 2024.

17 The minor child did not initially disclose this incident to Mom, and
18 Mom discovered it after the child woke the following day with a
19 swollen eye. Dad was aware of the incident and did not inform Mom.
20

21 78. [REDACTED] is currently enrolled in gymnastics and previously participated in
22 volleyball. Mom testified that she attempted to enroll [REDACTED] in
23 competitive gymnastics, but Jasmin opposed the enrollment, stating
24 that gymnastics was something she and [REDACTED] did together.
25
26
27
28

1 79. Jasmin has interfered with Mom's access to the minor child by
2 asserting parenting authority delegated by Dad.
3

4 80. Mom has never disparaged Jasmin to [REDACTED]

5 81. Mom believes that Dad has been unreasonable throughout this
6 litigation and in his approach to co-parenting the minor child.
7

8 82. Mom has a significant extended family presence in Nevada, including
9 her Dad, aunts, uncles, and cousins, with whom she maintains close
10 relationships and sees approximately one (1) to two (2) times per
11 month.
12

13 83. Despite Mom's efforts to facilitate the minor child's relationship with
14 Dad's extended family during her own custodial time, Dad's extended
15 family has ceased contact with Mom due to the pendency of this
16 litigation.
17

18 84. Despite a Court Order in place since May 2025 requiring therapy for
19 the minor child, Dad was difficult in initiating therapy and provided
20 names of providers unrelated to the child's needs, including providers
21 focused on autism, which the child does not have.
22

23 85. It took more than two (2) months to successfully initiate therapy for
24 the minor child due to Dad's lack of cooperation. When the parties
25
26
27
28

1 sought therapy records and required Dad's signature to obtain them,
2 Mom had to involve counsel to secure Dad's compliance.
3

4 86. Mom currently transports the minor child to therapy.

5 87. Dad has also misrepresented information to Mom regarding the minor
6 child's medical treatment in the past, including falsely stating that
7 prescribed antibiotics had been fully administered during his custodial
8 time when the child had not received any doses during that period.
9

10 88. The minor child is close to her half-siblings, [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED] and wishes to visit them in California.
12

13 89. Dad was charged with domestic violence in 2011 involving a former
14 girlfriend.
15

16 90. Dad is highly controlling of both Mom's relationship with the minor
17 child and the child's relationship with Mom. Dad's actions demonstrate
18 a focus on controlling Mom's relationship with the minor child rather
19 than prioritizing the minor child's best interests.
20

21 91. Dad refers to Jasmin using parental titles such as "Mommy" in
22 reference to the minor child. Mom believes this conduct is intended to
23 undermine her role as the child's mother and to hurt her emotionally.
24
25
26
27
28

1 92. When asked whether Mom delegated parental authority to her new
2 partner in the same manner Dad delegated authority to Jasmin, Dad
3 testified that he believed such conduct would be inappropriate.
4

5 93. Dad has resided in the same home in Henderson since October 2013
6 with Jasmin, his two (2) sons, and the minor child.
7

8 94. Near the conclusion of trial, for the first time, Dad requested that Mom
9 submit to a toenail drug test as he believed that all of the other drug
10 tests were not valid and that a toenail drug test would be able to find
11 that Mom was on drugs.
12

13 95. Mom disputes Dad's Financial Disclosure Forms and requested that
14 child support be calculated using tax returns and verifiable financial
15 documentation.
16

17 96. Dad filed Financial Disclosure Forms on March 13, 2025 and
18 November 20, 2025, both signed under penalty of perjury, which
19 contain numerous inconsistencies and inaccuracies. Dad did not
20 provide a legally sufficient explanation for these discrepancies and
21 attempted to blame them to his attorney or his mother.
22
23

24 97. Dad's 2024 W-2 reflects annual income of \$82,000. His Schedule K
25 reflects income of \$145,072 for the same year, for a combined income
26 of approximately **\$225,072**. Dad's March 2025 Financial Disclosure
27
28

1 Form reflected only the W-2 income and omitted the Schedule K
2 income.
3

4 98. In Dad's November 2025 Financial Disclosure Form, he failed to list
5 any annual income. Additionally, monthly rental income previously
6 listed as \$3,850 was reduced to \$1,440 without explanation, and no
7 gross monthly income was reported. Dad acknowledged at trial that the
8 Financial Disclosure Form was incomplete.
9

10 99. Based on the only accurate verifiable figure the Court has to calculate
11 Dad's income figure, his child support obligation should be \$1,630.24
12 per month. [$\$225,072 / 12 \text{ months} = \$18,756 \text{ per month}$], [Tier 1
13 ($\$6,000.00 * 16.00\% = \960.00) + Tier 2 ($\$4,000.00 * 8.00\% =$
14 $\$320.00$) + Tier 3 ($\$8,756.00 * 4.00\% = \350.24) Obligation amount is
15 $\$1,630.24$].
16
17

18 100. Based upon XXX latest Financial Disclosure Form filed
19 December 4, 2025, her child support obligation is \$528.58 per month.
20 [$\$33,033.66 / 10 \text{ months} = \$3,303.60 \text{ per month}$]. [Tier 1 ($\$3,303.60 *$
21 $16.00\% = \$528.58$)].
22
23

24 101. If the parties share joint physical custody, Dad's monthly child
25 support obligation would be \$1,101.66 per month. [$\$1,630.24 - \528.58]
26
27
28

1 102. Mom requested a week on, week off parenting schedule and a
2 holiday schedule. Mom resides approximately ten (10) to fifteen (15)
3 minutes from Dad's residence.
4

5 103. Mom requested that both parties be prohibited from using drugs
6 or alcohol within twenty-four (24) hours prior to exercising custodial
7 time and that the Court consider additional random drug testing.
8

9 104. Mom requested additional Christmas parenting time, as she has
10 not exercised Christmas parenting time with the minor child for the past
11 four (4) years.
12

13 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ANALYSIS**

14 ***Child Custody***

15 The Supreme Court has consistently recognized the district court's
16 broad discretionary powers to determine child custody matters. In reviewing
17 child custody determinations, the Supreme Court will not set aside the district
18 court's factual findings if they are supported by substantial evidence which is
19 evidence that a reasonable person may accept as adequate to sustain a
20 judgment. Ellis v. Carucci, 123 Nev. 145, 149, 161 P.3d 239, 241–42 (2007).
21

22 The evidentiary standard that applies to the best interest factors is a
23 preponderance of the evidence. See Mack v. Ashlock, 112 Nev. 1062, 1066,
24 921 P.2d 1258, 1261 (1996) (explaining that the preponderance-of-the-
25
26
27
28

1 evidence standard generally governs civil matters, including child custody
2 determinations). Cheyenne Soldo-Allesio, Appellant, v. Kevin Alan
3 Ferguson, Respondent. 141 Nev. Adv. Op. 9 (Nev. App. 2025).
4

5 In Nevada, the “best interests of the child” standard is a polestar of
6 judicial decision making in family law matters. See Schwartz, 107 Nev. at
7 382, 812 P.2d at 1270-71. . . .In the physical custody context, for example, the
8 Nevada Legislature delineated a nonexhaustive list of 12 factors that the
9 district court must consider, among other things, to determine the child's best
10 interest. See NRS 125C.0035(4). Monahan v. Hogan, 138 Nev. 58, 62, 507
11 P.3d 588, 592 (Nev. App. 2022).
12
13

14 Under NRS 125C.0035(4), “[i]n determining the best interest of the
15 child, the court shall consider and set forth its specific findings concerning,
16 among other things ... Those factors are reviewed below (A-L):
17

18 *A. The wishes of the child if the child is of sufficient age and capacity*
19 *to form an intelligent preference as to her or his custody.*
20

21 XXX is twelve (12) years old. No evidence was presented regarding her
22 capacity to form an intelligent preference as to custody, nor were her wishes
23 regarding custody presented to the Court.
24

25 Accordingly, this factor is neutral and not given weight in the Court’s
26 analysis.
27
28

1 *B. Any nomination by a parent or a guardian for the child.*

2 This factor is not applicable. Neither party has nominated a guardian
3
4 for the minor child in this matter.

5 *C. Which parent is more likely to allow the child to have frequent*
6 *associations and a continuing relationship with the noncustodial*
7 *parent?*
8

9 The Court finds that both parties have experienced difficulty co-
10 parenting. However, the evidence establishes that Dad's conduct has been the
11 primary source of the co-parenting conflict. Dad is seeking new reasons to
12 deny mother parenting time with the child. This is Dad's interest, not the
13 child's best interest.
14
15

16 The evidence demonstrates that Mom has consistently facilitated and
17 supported the minor child's relationship with Dad. Mom has never withheld
18 the minor child from Dad, has complied with all parenting time Orders.
19 Rather, Mom was awarded additional parenting time after the Court found
20 that she did not interfere with Dad's parenting time and continued to foster
21 the child's relationship with him. Mom further permitted additional phone
22 contact beyond what was ordered by the Court and implemented household
23 rules designed to allow appropriate communication with Dad while protecting
24 the child from divided loyalty pressures.
25
26
27
28

1 In contrast, the evidence reflects that Dad has repeatedly acted in ways
2 that hinder the minor child's relationship with Mom. Dad seeks to drastically
3 reduce Mom's parenting time to only six (6) to eight (8) hours per week of
4 supervised visitation, despite Mom having exercised two (2) to three (3) days
5 per week of unsupervised parenting time for several years and despite Dad
6 presenting no evidence of any recent conduct during Mom's parenting time
7 that would justify such a restriction. Dad acknowledged that his request
8 sounded unreasonable.
9
10
11

12 The Court further finds that Dad has minimized Mom's role as a
13 coparent by withholding information, excluding her from educational and
14 medical decisions, enrolling the minor child in school and obtaining
15 vaccinations without Mom's consent or notification. Dad has delegated
16 parental authority to his girlfriend while directing Mom to communicate
17 through her. Dad has also engaged in conduct that placed the minor child in a
18 position of divided loyalty by repeatedly contacting the child directly during
19 Mom's custodial time after being asked to utilize the parties' agreed upon
20 parenting application.
21
22
23

24 Based on the evidence and testimony before this Court, the Court
25 clearly finds that Mom is significantly more likely than Dad to allow and
26 encourage frequent associations and a continuing relationship between the
27
28

1 minor child and the noncustodial parent. This factor weighs heavily in favor
2 of Mom and against Dad.

3
4 *D. The level of conflict between the parents.*

5 The Court finds that the level of conflict between the parties is
6 extremely high.

7
8 The evidence establishes that the parties were able to coparent with
9 relatively low conflict prior to 2024. However, once Mom sought increased
10 parenting time and greater respect as a coparent beginning in or around 2024,
11 the level of conflict escalated significantly. The Court finds that this escalation
12 coincided with Dad's resistance to Mom's expanded role as a coparent.
13

14 The evidence further reflects that Dad repeatedly focused on stale,
15 outdated, and irrelevant issues from the parties' relationship history, including
16 matters predating Mom's sobriety and rehabilitation, rather than current facts
17 relevant to the minor child's best interests. Despite advisements from the
18 Court regarding relevance, Dad persisted in pursuing such topics at trial.
19

20
21 The parties' high-conflict dynamic is further demonstrated by repeated
22 disputes over minor issues, including routine scheduling matters, medical
23 appointments, school uniforms, and brief delays in custodial exchanges.
24 These disputes were disproportionate to the underlying issues and contributed
25 to ongoing hostility between the parties.
26
27
28

1 Based on the evidence, the Court finds that the elevated level of conflict
2 is primarily driven by Dad's conduct and unwillingness to accept Mom as an
3 equal and capable coparent. Accordingly, this factor weighs in favor of Mom.
4

5 *E. The ability of the parents to cooperate to meet the needs of the child.*

6 The Court finds that the parties have demonstrated a limited ability to
7 cooperate in meeting the needs of the minor child.
8

9 The evidence shows that even routine and necessary parenting
10 decisions have resulted in conflict. The parties have disputed medical
11 appointments despite clear health needs, argued over minor scheduling
12 adjustments, and disagreed over routine matters that required cooperation for
13 the benefit of the child.
14
15

16 The Court finds that Dad has repeatedly failed to engage in cooperative
17 decision-making by withholding information, excluding Mom from
18 educational and medical decisions, and unilaterally making significant
19 choices without notice or consent. Dad has also delegated parental
20 responsibilities to his girlfriend and directed Mom to communicate through
21 her, further undermining effective co-parenting.
22
23

24 In contrast, the evidence reflects that Mom has taken affirmative steps
25 to cooperate and meet the child's needs, including attending school
26 conferences, advocating for educational support, facilitating therapy,
27
28

1 scheduling medical care, and maintaining communication through the agreed
2 upon parenting application.
3

4 Given the parties' ongoing inability to cooperate and Dad's
5 demonstrated resistance to collaborative decision-making, this factor weighs
6 in favor of Mom.
7

8 *F. The mental and physical health of the parents.*

9 The Court finds that both parents appear to be in generally good
10 physical health.
11

12 With respect to mental health, the evidence establishes that Mom has
13 acknowledged her prior substance abuse issues, successfully completed
14 rehabilitation in 2019, and has maintained sobriety for over six (6) years. Mom
15 continues to engage in weekly therapy, has complied with all Court ordered
16 drug testing, and has consistently tested negative. The Court finds no evidence
17 that Mom's mental or emotional health currently impairs her ability to parent.
18
19

20 Dad did not present evidence of any diagnosed mental health condition.
21 The evidence reflects that Dad seeks an extreme restriction of Mom's
22 parenting time despite a long history of unsupervised parenting time without
23 incident. Dad is more focused on the older issues predating Mom's sobriety,
24 and persists in pursuing irrelevant matters. The Court further notes Dad's
25
26
27
28

1 resistance to therapy for the minor child, minimization of the child's mental
2 health needs, and repeated efforts to control or limit Mom's role as a coparent.
3

4 Dad's conduct reflects poor insight and judgment into the child's
5 emotional needs and difficulty separating his own parental desires from the
6 child's best interests.
7

8 Accordingly, this factor weighs in favor of Mom.

9 *G. The physical, developmental and emotional needs of the child.*

10 The Court finds that the minor child, [REDACTED] is twelve (12) years old and
11 has demonstrated emotional and developmental needs. The evidence
12 establishes that [REDACTED] suffers from anxiety and experiences ideations of self-
13 harm. These needs require consistency, stability, and appropriate mental
14 health support.
15
16

17 The evidence further establishes that Mom has actively sought to
18 address the child's emotional and developmental needs by advocating for
19 therapy, educational support, and appropriate medical care. Mom enrolled the
20 child in therapy, has consistently transported the child to therapy, and has
21 taken steps to ensure the child receives professional support tailored to her
22 needs.
23
24

25 Dad does not believe therapy is necessary for the child and has resisted
26 mental health intervention. Dad has removed the child from therapy in the
27
28

1 past, delayed initiation of court-ordered therapy, and attributed the child's
2 emotional struggles to external influences rather than acknowledging the
3 child's demonstrated mental health needs.
4

5 The Court further finds that the child's emotional needs have been
6 exacerbated by ongoing high conflict between the parties, repeated disputes
7 over routine matters, and conduct that places the child in a position of divided
8 loyalty. Without consistent parental support the child's emotional well-being
9 is at risk.
10

11 Based on the evidence, the Court finds that Mom is better positioned to
12 recognize, address, and prioritize the physical, developmental, and emotional
13 needs of the child. Accordingly, this factor weighs heavily in favor of Mom.
14

15 *H. The nature of the relationship of the child with each parent.*
16

17 The Court finds that XXXX shares a meaningful and loving relationship
18 with both parents. The evidence establishes that the child enjoys her time with
19 both Mom and Dad. No testimony was presented indicating that the child is
20 fearful of or unwilling to spend time with either parent.
21

22 The Court further finds that Dad has served as the de facto primary
23 physical custodian for significant periods due to Mom's addiction problems
24 and his continued refusal to grant expanded parenting time for Mom.
25
26
27
28

1 The Court also finds that Mom currently maintains a loving, nurturing,
2 and appropriate relationship with the child. Mom has exercised consistent
3 parenting time since at least 2022, has a suitable home environment for the
4 child, and has actively supported the child's educational, emotional, and
5 extracurricular development when allowed to see the child.
6

7
8 Accordingly, this factor favors Dad, as he has served as the longest and
9 most consistent custodial figure in the child's life.

10 *I. The ability of the child to maintain a relationship with any sibling.*
11

12 The Court finds that XXX has a close and bonded relationship with her
13 half-siblings, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], who reside in California.
14 Testimony established that [REDACTED] wishes to maintain and strengthen her
15 relationship with them and to visit them.
16

17 The Court received minimal evidence regarding the child's relationship
18 with half-siblings residing in Dad's household, and no testimony was
19 presented regarding the child's desire to maintain or expand those
20 relationships.
21

22 *J. Any history of parental abuse or neglect of the child or a sibling of*
23 *the child.*
24

25 The Court finds no evidence that Mom has abused or neglected the
26 minor child. Although Child Protective Services was contacted following an
27
28

1 incident in which Mom allowed the child to drive a vehicle under supervision
2 in a remote desert area, no evidence was presented to substantiate abuse or
3 neglect by Mom, and no further incidents of a similar nature occurred.
4

5 In contrast, the Court received unrefuted testimony that the minor child
6 was physically struck by Dad's partner, Jasmine, in 2024, resulting in visible
7 injury. The Court further received testimony that Dad was aware of the
8 incident and did not notify Mom. The Court also received notice regarding
9 prior sexual assault of the child by a member of Dad's partner's family in
10 August 2020.
11
12

13 Accordingly, this factor weighs in favor of Mom.

14 *K. Whether either parent or any other person seeking custody has*
15 *engaged in an act of domestic violence against the child, a parent of*
16 *the child or any other person residing with the child.*
17

18 "As our Legislature has recognized, domestic violence poses a very real
19 threat to a child's safety and well-being." Castle v. Simmons, 120 Nev. 98,
20 105, 86 P.3d 1042, 1047 (2004). Therefore, one of the twelve best interest
21 factors that district courts are required to consider is whether either parent has
22 engaged in an act of domestic violence. See NRS 125C.0035(4)(k).
23
24

25 For purposes of conducting a best interest analysis under NRS
26 125C.0035(4), a district court need only find that domestic violence occurred
27
28

1 by a preponderance of the evidence. Monahan v. Hogan, 138 Nev. 58, 69, 507
2 P.3d 588, 597 (Ct. App. 2022) (noting that a “preponderance of the evidence
3 is still the default evidentiary standard in family law absent clear legislative
4 intent to the contrary”). Additionally, NRS 125C.0035(5) provides that, after
5 an evidentiary hearing, if the district court finds by clear and convincing
6 evidence that a parent has engaged in domestic violence, there is a rebuttable
7 presumption that it is not in the child's best interest to award that parent sole
8 or joint physical custody. Crosier v. Crosier, 558 P.3d 810 (Nev. App. 2024).
9

10
11
12 Here, the evidence establishes that Dad was previously charged with
13 domestic violence in 2011 involving a former partner. The incident was not
14 further developed through testimony or evidence, and no evidence of any
15 recent or ongoing domestic violence was presented.
16

17 Accordingly, this factor is given minimal weight in the Court’s
18 analysis.
19

20 *L. Whether either parent or any other person seeking physical custody*
21 *has committed any act of abduction against the child or any other*
22 *child.*
23

24 There have been no allegations of any acts of abductions against the
25 other parent. For this reason, this factor is not applicable.
26

27 ***Sole Physical Custody***
28

1 Sole physical custody is a custodial arrangement where the child resides
2 with only one parent and the noncustodial parent's parenting time is restricted
3 to no significant in-person parenting time. Sole physical custody is different
4 than primary or joint physical custody because sole physical custody conflicts
5 with this state's general policy for courts to support “frequent associations and
6 a continuing relationship” between parent and child. *See* NRS 1250.001(1).
7 Likewise, sole physical custody orders substantially impede the fundamental
8 parental rights of the noncustodial parent. Roe v. Roe, 139 Nev. Adv. Op. 21,
9 535 P.3d 274, 280 (Nev. App. 2023).
10

13 When entering an order for sole physical custody, the District Court
14 must first find either that the noncustodial parent is unfit for the child to reside
15 with, or to make specific findings and provide an adequate explanation as to
16 the reason primary physical custody is not in the best interest of the child.
17 Following either of these findings, the District Court must consider the least
18 restrictive parenting time arrangement possible to avoid constraining the
19 parent-child relationship any more than is necessary to prevent potential harm
20 caused by an unfit parent and meet the best interest of the child. Id.
21

24 If the court enters a more restrictive parenting time arrangement than is
25 otherwise available, it must explain how the greater restriction is in the child's
26 best interest. Further, we reiterate that district courts must retain substantive
27
28

1 decision-making authority over custodial modifications and parenting time
2 allocations and may not substitute a third party's discretion for their own. Roe
3
4 v. Roe, 139 Nev. Adv. Op. 21, 535 P.3d 274, 280–81 (Nev. App. 2023).

5 This matter proceeded to trial because Dad sought a custodial
6 arrangement that would functionally amount to sole physical custody. Dad
7 requested that Mom's parenting time be reduced to only six (6) to eight (8)
8 hours per week of supervised visitation, with no defined end point. Granting
9 such relief would require the Court to find that Mom is unfit, or to make
10 specific findings demonstrating why a less restrictive arrangement would not
11 serve XXX's best interests. Notably, Mom had been exercising three (3) days
12 of parenting time since May of 2025 with no incident.
13
14
15

16 Dad did not present substantive, current, or credible evidence to support
17 a determination that sole physical custody in his favor is warranted. The issues
18 relied upon by Dad consisted primarily of isolated and minor incidents,
19 including Mom allowing the child to drive a vehicle under supervision in a
20 remote desert setting, permitting the child to consume a caffeinated beverage
21 while in fifth (5th) grade, requesting the child's school uniform on a Sunday
22 evening, and referencing the behavior of Mom's older children who are adults
23 or near-adults, reside out of state, and are not parties to this case.
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dad further attempted to attribute the child's anxiety and ideations of
2 self-harm to entirely Mom or to the child's therapist, despite the evidence
3 showing that child was sexually abused in his home in 2020, Dad opposed
4 therapy and did not believe it was needed despite this traumatic event
5 occurring, delayed court-ordered mental health intervention, and removed the
6 child from therapy in the past. The Court finds no evidentiary basis to support
7 Dad's assertion that Mom is responsible for the child's emotional struggles or
8 that restricting Mom's parenting time would serve the child's best interests.
9

10 Accordingly, the Court finds that Dad has not established a legal or
11 factual basis for sole physical custody, nor has he demonstrated that a less
12 restrictive custodial arrangement would be inadequate to meet XXXX's needs.
13

14 Conclusion

15 Stability is an important concern in making custody and visitation
16 determinations. In re V.L.K., 24 S.W.3d 338, 343 (Tex.2000) (stating that
17 "modification suits raise additional policy concerns such as stability for the
18 child and the need to prevent constant litigation in child custody cases").
19 Rennels v. Rennels, 127 Nev. 564, 572, 257 P.3d 396, 401 (2011).
20

21 The evidence establishes that for approximately two (2) years prior to
22 this litigation, Dad permitted Mom to exercise two (2) to three (3) days per
23 week of unsupervised parenting time, including overnight visits. Following
24

1 the initiation of this case, the Court likewise permitted Mom to exercise
2 unsupervised weekend parenting time for much of 2025. No new safety
3 concerns, incidents, or evidence were presented demonstrating that this
4 arrangement was harmful or inappropriate.
5

6 Dad's request to reduce Mom's parenting time to no more than six (6)
7 to eight (8) hours per week of supervised visitation is not supported by the
8 evidence. Dad's concerns focus primarily on Mom's past substance abuse
9 during the period from 2012 through 2020. The evidence shows that Mom has
10 been sober since September 2019, has complied with Court ordered drug
11 testing, has tested negative, and has exercised consistent and appropriate
12 parenting time for several years without incident. No current evidence was
13 presented establishing a basis to reduce or supervise Mom's parenting time.
14
15
16

17 The evidence further establishes that the child is doing well. No
18 significant concerns were raised regarding the child's academic performance,
19 daily functioning, or adjustment in either household. Parenting time has been
20 proceeding successfully with both parents.
21

22 Although Dad exercised his right to request drug testing of Mom, the
23 results confirmed Mom's continued sobriety. Mom has acknowledged her
24 past addiction, has remained sober for over six (6) years, and has voluntarily
25 supported additional safeguards, including sobriety conditions before their
26
27
28

1 exercised parenting time and random drug tests. The Court finds no
2 evidentiary basis to conclude that Mom presently poses any risk to the child.
3

4 The Court further finds that Mom has consistently attempted to avoid
5 unnecessary litigation and has made good faith efforts to coparent, including
6 facilitating communication, accommodating Dad's parenting time, and
7 engaging cooperatively even beyond what was ordered. In contrast, the
8 evidence demonstrates that Dad has focused heavily on past events that are no
9 longer relevant, has withheld information, has excluded Mom from decision-
10 making, and has sought to significantly restrict Mom's role despite the
11 absence of any current justification.
12
13

14 Custody determinations must be based on present circumstances and
15 the child's current best interests. A parent's struggles from many years ago
16 cannot outweigh years of demonstrated stability, sobriety, and appropriate
17 parenting. The evidence does not support a finding that reducing Mom's
18 parenting time would serve the child's best interests. Rather, such a reduction
19 would undermine the child's relationship with Mom and unnecessarily disrupt
20 an arrangement that has been functioning without harm.
21
22
23

24 The Court has reviewed the NRS 125C.0035(4) best interest factors and
25 concludes that the applicable factors supports a joint custody arrangement and
26 do not support awarding either party sole legal or physical custody. See Ellis,
27
28

1 123 Nev. at 149, 161 P.3d at 242 (providing that, in resolving requests to
2 modify child custody, the sole consideration is the child's best interest); see
3
4 also Roe v. Roe, 139 Nev., Adv. Op. 21, 535 P.3d 274, 287 (Ct. App. 2023)
5 (defining sole physical custody “as a custodial arrangement where the child
6 resides with only one parent and the noncustodial parent's parenting time is
7 restricted to no significant in-person parenting time”).

9 Based on the totality of the evidence, the application of the statutory
10 factors under NRS 125C.0035, and the child’s best interests, the Court finds
11 that Mom’s request for joint physical custody is appropriate and supported by
12 the evidence. There is no basis to grant Dad custody in excess of joint physical
13 custody, nor is there any basis to impose supervised parenting time on Mom.

16 The Court finds that both parents are important in the child’s life and
17 that continued involvement by both parents serves the child’s best interests.
18 The Court cautions that continued attempts by the father, [REDACTED] to
19 undermine the other parent’s role, refuse reasonable cooperation, may be
20 harming the child.

22 ORDERS

24 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
25 the Court has complete jurisdiction in the premises, both as to the subject
26 matter thereof as well as the parties thereto.
27
28

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
2 both parties shall share joint legal custody of the minor child, [REDACTED]
3

- 4 • Each parent will encourage liberal communication between the child
5 and the other parent. Each parent will be entitled to reasonable
6 telephone communication with the child; and each parent agrees he
7 or she will not unreasonably interfere with the child's right to
8 privacy during such telephone conversation.
9
- 10 • Both parents shall use their best efforts to foster the respect, love
11 and affection of the child toward the other parent.
12
- 13 • The parents agree to communicate directly with each other
14 regarding the needs and well-being of the child, and each parent
15 further agrees not to use the child to communicate with the other
16 parent regarding parental issues, including financial issues
17 pertaining to the child (examples include uniform fees, art fees,
18 extracurricular fees, etc.).
19
- 20 • The parents shall use self-control and not verbally or physically
21 abuse each other in the presence of the minor child.
22
- 23 • Neither parent will disparage the other in the presence of the child,
24 nor will either parent make any comment of any kind that would
25 demean the other parent in the eyes of the child. Additionally, each
26
27
28

1 parent shall instruct their respective family and friends to make no
2 disparaging remarks regarding the other parent in the presence of
3 the child. The parents will take all action necessary to prevent such
4 disparaging remarks from being made in the presence of the child.
5

- 6 • Both parents will instruct their respective family, partners, and
7 friends to make not disparaging remarks regarding the other parent
8 to the other parent or have any unnecessary interactions with them.
9
- 10 • Both parents will not talk about the Court's proceedings with their
11 minor child.
12

13 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
14 both parties shall share joint physical custody of the minor child, XXXXXXXXXX
15
16 Visitations shall be **on a week on, week off basis**, with exchanges occurring
17 on Fridays after school, or 5:00PM if school is not in session. Both parties
18 may use third (3rd) parties to pick up the minor child.
19

20 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
21 the Department S Holiday schedule shall be adopted and be part of this Order.
22
23 *See Attached Department S Holiday Schedule.*

24 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
25 Mom shall continue to maintain and provide health insurance coverage for the
26 minor child. Any unreimbursed or out-of-pocket medical, dental, orthodontic,
27
28

1 optical, mental health, or other related healthcare expenses not covered by
2 insurance shall be shared equally by the parties pursuant to the 30/30 Rule. If
3
4 any premium costs are incurred, it shall be split evenly between the parties.

5 Under the 30/30 Rule, the parent who incurs or receives a bill for an
6 unreimbursed medical expense must provide the other parent with a copy of
7
8 the bill, proof of payment, and any explanation of benefits within thirty (30)
9 days of receipt. The other parent shall then reimburse their fifty percent (50%)
10 share within thirty (30) days of receiving said documentation.
11

12 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
13 based upon the parties' gross monthly incomes, Dad's monthly child support
14 shall be set at **\$1,101.66 per month beginning January 1, 2026.**
15

16 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
17 the parties shall alternate in claiming the minor child as a dependent for
18 federal income tax purposes. Dad shall have odd years, Mom shall have even
19
20 years.

21 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
22 the parties shall continue to utilize the designated communication application,
23
24 Our Family Wizard for all communications regarding the minor child.

25 All messages shall be limited to matters directly related to the child's
26
27 needs and must remain cordial, respectful, and appropriate at all times. Should
28

1 either party engage in unnecessary, excessive, or disrespectful communication
2 through this platform, the Court may consider the imposition of sanctions
3 against the offending party.
4

5 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
6 the non-custodial parent shall have one (1) phone call on Wednesdays at
7 7:00PM for up to thirty (30) minutes through Our Family Wizard.
8

9 Neither parent shall spam or act in bad faith in texting the minor child
10 outside of their custodial time.
11

12 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED** that
13 the Defendant, [REDACTED], is considered the prevailing party in this
14 matter. As such, Defendant's counsel may submit a memorandum for
15 attorney's fees and costs, including a detailed analysis under the Brunzell
16 factors, and properly serve it upon Plaintiff within the next twenty-one (21)
17 days from the date of this Order. Plaintiff shall have fourteen (14) days to file
18 any opposition.
19
20

21 Upon expiration of this period, Defendant's counsel shall have seven
22 (7) days to submit an Order granting attorney's fees with the amount left blank
23 to the Department inbox for the Court's determination.
24

25 **NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that you have an affirmative duty to
26 update any changes in your personal information by filing a Notice of Change
27
28

1 of Address form. The form can be found at the following link:

2 <https://www.familylawselfhelpcenter.org/images/forms/misc/address->
3 [change-pdf-fillable.pdf](https://www.familylawselfhelpcenter.org/images/forms/misc/address-)
4

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated this 5th day of February, 2026

7 
8

9 FFF 1E2 E0B7 264C
10 Vincent Ochoa
11 District Court Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DEPT. S DEFAULT HOLIDAY AND VACATION PLAN
Adopted Jan. 2020

THE COURT ENCOURAGES THE PARENTS TO COMMUNICATE REGARDING SHARING TIME WITH THEIR CHILDREN FOR HOLIDAY AND VACATION.

The following Holiday and Vacation plan is a default schedule when Parents are unable to otherwise agree. **THE PARTIES MAY AGREE TO DEVIATE FROM THIS PLAN NOW OR UP TO 30 DAYS BEFORE ANY HOLIDAY BY SIGNING A WRITTEN AGREEMENT THAT IS FILED WITH THE COURT.** However, this Default Schedule shall apply when Parties cannot agree.

HOLIDAYS take precedence over RESIDENTIAL TIME and neither Party shall give notice to take VACATION TIME during the other party's HOLIDAY TIME or during the SCHOOL YEAR.

*This default plan is based on the 2020-2021 Clark County School District Calendar. If the child is enrolled in a charter school, private school, parochial school, or other school outside of the Clark County School District, school attendance shall take priority over holiday and vacation time established in this plan.

THREE-DAY HOLIDAYS

The Holiday will begin after school or at 5:00 PM on the Friday proceeding the Holiday and end at 7:00 PM on the day of the Holiday.

	<u>ODD YEAR¹</u>	<u>EVEN YEAR</u>
MARTIN LUTHER KING DAY	MOM	DAD
PRESIDENT'S DAY	DAD	MOM
MEMORIAL DAY	MOM	DAD
LABOR DAY	DAD	MOM
VETERAN'S DAY	MOM	DAD

¹ The Odd/Even Year refers to the calendar year and not the age of the child.

ONE-DAY HOLIDAYS

	<u>ODD YEAR</u>	<u>EVEN YEAR</u>
HALLOWEEN (4:00 pm to 8:30 pm only)	MOM	DAD
INDEPENDENCE DAY (July 4th)	DAD	MOM

In years Independence Day falls on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday, it shall begin on the Holiday at 9:00 AM and end the following day at 9:00 AM.

In years Independence Day falls on a Friday, Saturday, Sunday, or Monday, it shall be treated as a three-day holiday.

INDIVIDUAL DAYS

The Holiday Visitation shall begin at 9:00 AM on the individual holiday (or after school on school days), and end at 9:00 PM the same day.

	<u>EVERY YEAR</u>	
MOTHER'S DAY	MOM	
FATHER'S DAY	DAD	
MOTHER'S BIRTHDAY	MOM	
FATHER'S BIRTHDAY	DAD	
	<u>ODD YEAR</u>	<u>EVEN YEAR</u>
CHILDREN'S BIRTHDAY	DAD	MOM

EASTER/SPRING BREAK

The Holiday Visitation shall begin at 9:00 AM following the last day of school and concludes at 12:00 PM (noon) the day before returning to school. If a child must travel outside the county for the Holiday, they should be home no later than 7:00 PM the evening before school resumes. If the child is not in a Clark County School District school, the parents shall refer to the School Calendar for the school where the child is enrolled regarding exact dates for break time and/or travel. If the child is not school age, the parents shall refer to the Clark County School District Calendar.

	<u>ODD YEAR</u>	<u>EVEN YEAR</u>
SPRING BREAK	MOM	DAD

THANKSGIVING BREAK

The Holiday Visitation shall begin after school or at 5:00 PM on the Tuesday preceding Thanksgiving and ends at 12:00 PM (noon) the day before returning to school. If a child must travel outside the county for the Holiday, they should be home no later than 7:00 PM the evening before school resumes. If the child is not in a Clark County School District school, the parents shall refer to the School Calendar for the school where the child is enrolled regarding exact dates for break time and/or travel. If the child is not school age, the parents shall refer to the Clark County School District Calendar.

	<u>ODD YEAR</u>	<u>EVEN YEAR</u>
THANKSGIVING	DAD	MOM

CHRISTMAS HOLIDAY & WINTER BREAK

The Christmas/Winter Break shall be divided into two (2) segments. The first segment shall begin after school on the last day prior to Christmas/Winter Break and conclude at 2:00 PM Christmas Day. The second segment shall begin at 2:00 PM Christmas Day and conclude at 2:00 PM the day before school resumes. If a child must travel outside the county for the holiday, they should be home no later than 7:00 PM the evening before school resumes. If the child is not in a Clark County School District school, the parents shall refer to the School Calendar for the school where the child is enrolled regarding exact dates for break time and/or travel. If the child is not school age, the parents shall refer to the Clark County School District Calendar.

	<u>ODD YEAR</u>	<u>EVEN YEAR</u>
CHRISTMAS SEGMENT 1	DAD	MOM
CHRISTMAS SEGMENT 2	MOM	DAD

SUMMER/TRACK BREAK VACATIONS

Each parent shall be entitled to a **minimum** of one (1) vacation each year, not to exceed a consecutive two (2) week period, unless there is a **mutual written agreement signed by both parties**. Otherwise, the two week period can only be divided into two (2) periods.

The parent with vacation selection priority shall designate their vacation time by May 1st by certified mail. The other parent shall designate their vacation time by May 15th by certified mail. Vacations are not to interfere with school attendance. **HOLIDAYS** take precedence over **RESIDENTIAL TIME**, and no Party shall give notice to take **VACATION TIME** during the other party's **HOLIDAY TIME**.

	<u>ODD YEAR</u>	<u>EVEN YEAR</u>
VACATION SELECTION PRIORITY	MOM	DAD

**THE PARTIES MAY AGREE TO DEVIATE FROM THIS PLAN NOW OR
UP TO 30 DAYS BEFORE ANY HOLIDAY BY SIGNING A WRITTEN
AGREEMENT THAT IS FILED WITH THE COURT**