



**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
ORAL ARGUMENT CASE SUMMARY**



**PAUL E. v. COURTNEY F.
CV-18-0111-PR**

PARTIES:

Petitioner/Appellant: Paul E.

Respondent/Appellee: Courtney F.

FACTS:

Paul E. (“Father”) and Courtney F. (“Mother”) disagree about professional treatment for their child. Father has sole legal decision-making authority. *See* A.R.S. § 25-401 (definitions including definition of sole legal decision-making); A.R.S. § 25-410(A) (defining scope of sole legal decision-maker’s authority to “determine the child’s upbringing, including the child’s education, care, health care and religious training”).

The superior court appointed two specific professionals, Vigil and Ehrensaft, to treat the child and to advise the court. *See* A.R.S. § 25-410(A) (permitting court to place a specific limitation on the sole legal decision-maker’s authority to avoid endangering the child’s physical health or significantly impairing the child’s emotional development); A.R.S. § 25-405(B) (permitting court to appoint professionals to assist court); Arizona Rule of Family Law Procedure 95 (“ARFLP 95”) (permitting court to consider ordering additional services as provided by the rule).

Father appealed, and the Arizona Court of Appeals reversed the appointment orders. It determined that Father has sole legal decision-making authority and under the facts here, A.R.S. § 25-410(A), A.R.S. § 25-405(B), and ARFLP 95 do not authorize the court to appoint these specific professionals. *Paul E. v. Courtney F.*, 244 Ariz. 46 (App. 2018).

ISSUE:

Whether the superior court’s orders appointing Vigil and Ehrensaft are authorized by A.R.S. § 25-410(A), A.R.S. § 25-405(B), and ARFLP 95?

This Summary was prepared by the Arizona Supreme Court Staff Attorneys’ Office solely for educational purposes. It should not be considered official commentary by the Court or any member thereof or part of any brief, memorandum, or other pleading filed in this case.