

I am writing the Committee to support the recent comment submitted by Jenni Cartwright. The relative income of an obligor should only be considered in the most extreme cases, whereas the relative income of an obligee, especially an obligee in a joint custody scenario, should always be taken into consideration. The reasoning behind this seems simple and clear, but I'm someone who is on the giving end of a custody arrangement. It is a settled matter that both parents are financially responsible for their children, and the parents alone. The most common abuse of the system is the scenario where two parents split, and an obligee remarries a new breadwinner, feigns a lack of job skills or lack of opportunity, to remain underemployed to maximize support. Another common excuse is that the obligee wishes to stay at home for the sole benefit of the child. I am acquainted with several obligors with joint custody that pay support amounts equal to the same amount they would pay if they didn't have custody at all! These obligees are not struggling, they're enjoying the income of their new partner while exploiting the obligor. Courts will justify this at times, depending on which court master is tasked with deciding, that the new spouse or financial sponsor doesn't have a responsibility to the child, therefore, the obligees living situation is irrelevant and these poor folks that are trying to do things the right way suffer for it. The children's quality of life never being in jeopardy, it's just smoke and mirrors.

There are instances where an obligor may find themselves in a situation where they could hide behind a sponsor, of course this may occur, and I support language to protect against such a scenario, however, there should also be strong language included to instruct courts to only consider those cases where abuse is present, merely including both the obligor and the obligee will only lead to more abuse, and good faith obligors have been putting up with enough abuse for long enough. If an obligor is working to the best of his ability to provide for their children, then please let them be. Don't they deserve some shot at prosperity? Do their future partners not deserve the chance at bettering their standing in life? This system just takes and takes and the stress that it causes, in my honest assessment, causes an overall net negative affect on families in Nevada. Too often child support does more harm than good, and the best way to minimize that, while producing the best efforts of both parents to generate income, is to minimize support awards. I can't stress this enough in the case of joint custody, Nevada awards some of the largest support awards nationally in joint custody cases as parent's incomes move further apart. This is the cause of so much abuse and damage to the children caught in the middle of it.

Please provide us proper protection. Thank you.

Glen Baker