

WEST VIRGINIA CODE: §48-11-403

§48-11-403. Relocation of a parent.

(a) The relocation of a parent constitutes a substantial change in the circumstances under subsection (a), section four hundred one of this article of the child only when it significantly impairs either parent's ability to exercise responsibilities that the parent has been exercising.

(b) Unless otherwise ordered by the court, a parent who has responsibility under a parenting plan who changes, or intends to change, residences for more than ninety days must give a minimum of sixty days' advance notice, or the most notice practicable under the circumstances, to any other parent with responsibility under the same parenting plan.

Notice shall include:

- (1) The relocation date;
- (2) The address of the intended new residence;
- (3) The specific reasons for the proposed relocation;
- (4) A proposal for how custodial responsibility shall be modified, in light of the intended move; and
- (5) Information for the other parent as to how he or she may respond to the proposed relocation or modification of custodial responsibility.

Failure to comply with the notice requirements of this section without good cause may be a factor in the determination of whether the relocation is in good faith under subsection (d) of this section, and is a basis for an award of reasonable expenses and reasonable attorneys fees to another parent that are attributable to such failure.

The Supreme Court of Appeals shall make available through the offices of the circuit clerks and the family law masters a form notice that complies with the provisions of this subsection. The Supreme Court of Appeals shall promulgate procedural rules that provide for an expedited hearing process to resolve issues arising from a relocation or proposed relocation.

(c) When changed circumstances are shown under subsection (a) of this section, the court shall, if practical, revise the parenting plan so as to both accommodate the relocation and maintain the same proportion of custodial responsibility being exercised by each of the parents. In making such revision, the court may consider the additional costs that a relocation imposes upon the respective parties for transportation and communication, and may equitably allocate such costs between the parties.

(d) When the relocation constituting changed circumstances under subsection (a) of this section renders it impractical to maintain the same proportion of custodial responsibility as that being exercised by each parent, the court shall modify the parenting plan in accordance with the child's best interests and in accordance with the following principles:

(1) A parent who has been exercising a significant majority of the custodial responsibility for the child should be allowed to relocate with the child so long as that parent shows that the relocation is in good faith for a legitimate purpose and to a location that is reasonable in light of the purpose. The percentage of custodial responsibility that constitutes a significant majority of custodial responsibility is seventy percent or more. A relocation is for a legitimate purpose if it is to be close to significant family or other support networks, for significant health reasons, to protect the safety of the child or another member of the child's household from significant risk of harm, to pursue a significant employment or educational opportunity, or to be with one's spouse who is established, or who is pursuing a significant employment or educational opportunity, in another location. The relocating parent has the burden of proving of the legitimacy of any other purpose. A move with a legitimate purpose is reasonable unless its purpose is shown to be substantially achievable without moving, or by moving to a location that is substantially less disruptive of the other parent's relationship to the child.

(2) If a relocation of the parent is in good faith for legitimate purpose and to a location that is reasonable in light of the purpose, and if neither has been exercising a significant majority of custodial responsibility for the child, the court shall reallocate custodial responsibility based on the best interest of the child, taking into account all relevant factors including the effects of the relocation on the child.

(3) If a parent does not establish that the purpose for that parent's relocation is in good faith for a legitimate purpose into a location that is reasonable in light of the purpose, the court may modify the parenting plan in accordance with the child's best interests and the effects of the relocation on the child. Among the modifications the court may consider is a reallocation of primary custodial responsibility, effective if and when the relocation occurs, but such a reallocation shall not be ordered if the relocating parent demonstrates that the child's best interests would be served by the relocation.

(4) The court shall attempt to minimize impairment to a parent-child relationship caused by a parent's relocation through alternative arrangements for the exercise of custodial responsibility appropriate to the parents' resources and circumstances and the developmental level of the child.

(e) In determining the proportion of caretaking functions each parent previously performed for the child under the parenting plan before relocation, the court shall not consider a division of functions arising from any arrangements made after a relocation but before a modification hearing on the issues related to relocation.

(f) In determining the effect of the relocation or proposed relocation on a child, any

interviewing or questioning of the child shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of rule 16 of the rules of practice and procedure for family law, as promulgated by the Supreme Court of Appeals.

WV Legislature