ACCOUNTABILITY MATTERS
A PRIVATE MEMBERSHIP ASSOCIATION

Parental Custody Rights in Texas

Requirement of Alleged Crime and Jury Trial Judgment

This outline provides a concise, legally grounded argument within the Texas and Federal Constitutional constraints. It integrates constitutional principles, *Troxel*'s precedent, and Texas-specific protections to assert that child removal must be justified by an alleged crime and adjudicated by a jury.

- **I. Introduction**
  - Parental rights are fundamental under both the U.S. and Texas Constitutions, requiring robust protections against state interference.
  - *Troxel v. Granville* establishes a presumption that fit parents act in their children's best interests, limiting state intervention absent compelling justification.
  - Argument: Removal of a child from a parent's custody in Texas without an alleged crime against the child and a jury trial judgment violates constitutional due process and liberty interests.

- **II. United States Constitution – Fourteenth Amendment Protections**
  - A. Due Process Clause
    - The Fourteenth Amendment guarantees that no state shall "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."
    - Parental rights to the care, custody, and control of children are a protected liberty interest (*Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. at 65-66).
    - Removal without an alleged crime lacks a clear, constitutionally sufficient basis, undermining procedural due process:

        - No notice of specific wrongdoing tied to criminal conduct against the child.
        - No opportunity for a meaningful hearing with a jury to adjudicate facts.
    - *Troxel* emphasizes that state interference must be narrowly tailored; broad removal authority absent a crime fails this test (530 U.S. at 68-69).
- B. Substantive Due Process
    - The right to raise one's child is "perhaps the oldest of the fundamental liberty interests" (*Troxel*, 530 U.S. at 65).
    - State action removing a child without evidence of a crime against the child infringes on this right without a compelling state interest.
    - The presumption of parental fitness in *Troxel* requires the state to justify intervention with specific, severe harm tied to criminal conduct (530 U.S. at 73).
- C. Right to Jury Trial – Implied Protection
    - While the Seventh Amendment applies to federal civil cases, the Fourteenth Amendment incorporates fundamental fairness principles, including jury trials for significant liberty deprivations.
    - Child removal is a grave deprivation akin to criminal sanctions, warranting jury adjudication to ensure impartial fact-finding.

- **III. Texas Constitution – Article I Protections**
    - A. Section 19: Due Course of Law
        - "No citizen of this State shall be deprived of life, liberty, property, privileges or immunities … except by the due course of the law of the land" (Tex. Const. art. I, § 19).
        - Mirrors the Fourteenth Amendment but interpreted to offer robust protection for parental rights as a liberty interest.
        - Removal without an alleged crime violates due course by:

        - Failing to specify a legal standard tied to criminal harm.
        - Denying a jury trial, a cornerstone of Texas justice for resolving factual disputes (*see* Tex. Const. art. I, § 15).
    - B. Section 15: Right to Trial by Jury
        - "The right of trial by jury shall remain inviolate" (Tex. Const. art. I, § 15).
        - Applies to civil and criminal matters where liberty is at stake, including child custody disputes with state involvement.
        - Historical Texas practice supports jury trials in family law cases (e.g., termination proceedings under Tex. Fam. Code § 161.001).
        - Removal without a jury judgment bypasses this inviolate right, undermining parental liberty absent a crime.
    - C. Section 9: Protection Against Unreasonable Seizures
        - "The people shall be secure … from all unreasonable seizures or searches" (Tex. Const. art. I, § 9).
        - Removing a child from a parent's custody is a seizure of the parent-child relationship.
        - Without an alleged crime, such action lacks a reasonable basis, violating this safeguard.

- **IV. *Troxel v. Granville* – Precedent for Parental Presumption**
    - A. Core Holding
        - The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that fit parents have a fundamental right to make decisions about their children's care, custody, and control (530 U.S. at 66).
        - Washington's visitation statute was struck down for allowing third-party intervention without deference to parental decisions (530 U.S. at 67-68).
    - B. Application to Child Removal
        - *Troxel*'s presumption of parental fitness applies to custody removal cases:

        - State must prove unfitness or harm tied to a specific crime against the child.
        - Absent such evidence, removal unconstitutionally overrides parental authority.
    - Texas courts must give "special weight" to a parent's decisions, precluding removal without clear, adjudicated criminal conduct (530 U.S. at 70).
- C. Procedural Implications
    - *Troxel* critiques judicial overreach absent harm (530 U.S. at 73); removal without a jury trial exacerbates this by denying parents a fair process to contest state action.

- **V. Texas Statutory Context – Reinforcing Constitutional Limits**
    - A. Texas Family Code
        - Removal under Tex. Fam. Code § 262.201 requires "immediate danger" to the child's physical health or safety.
        - Without an alleged crime, "danger" is speculative, conflicting with *Troxel*'s presumption and constitutional due process.
    - B. Jury Trial Availability
        - Tex. Fam. Code § 105.002 allows jury trials in custody disputes; extending this to removal proceedings aligns with Texas Constitution art. I, § 15.
        - A jury ensures factual disputes (e.g., criminal harm) are resolved impartially, not by unilateral state discretion.

- **VI. Policy and Practical Justifications**
    - A. Preventing Arbitrary State Action
        - Requiring an alleged crime and jury trial prevents overbroad removals based on vague "best interest" standards (*Troxel*, 530 U.S. at 67).
        - Protects families from bureaucratic overreach, a concern echoed in Texas's strong liberty tradition.

- B. Ensuring Fairness
  - Jury trials provide a community check on state power, aligning with Texas's constitutional commitment to justice (Tex. Const. art. I, § 15).
  - Criminal allegations ensure specificity, avoiding the "breathtakingly broad" interference condemned in *Troxel* (530 U.S. at 67).
- C. Balancing Child Safety
  - This standard still allows removal where a crime (e.g., abuse, neglect) is alleged and proven, preserving the state's parens patriae role ***within*** constitutional bounds.

- **VII. Conclusion**
  - The U.S. Constitution (Fourteenth Amendment) and Texas Constitution (art. I, §§ 9, 15, 19) protect parental custody as a fundamental right.
  - *Troxel v. Granville* reinforces that state intervention requires deference to fit parents, absent specific harm like a crime against the child.
  - Removal without an alleged crime and jury trial judgment violates due process, due course of law, and the right to a jury, rendering such actions unconstitutional in Texas.

DISCLAIMER

The information contained within these documents is provided by Accountability Matters and are for organizational and educational purposes only. Although we have performed extensive research regarding legal principles, our trustees, officers, and supporting members, of Accountability Matters PMA are not licensed Members of the State Bar of Texas. Information provided by Members of Advocacy Matters should not be considered a substitute for the advice of a licensed attorney in handling your legal affairs.