

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, APPELLATE DIVISION,
THIRD DEPARTMENT

Matter of Rachel QQ. v. Jaime QQ.

2026 NY Slip Op 03494 (3d Dep't 2026) · No. CV-25-0595 · Decided June 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The Appellate Division, Third Department affirmed an order granting the mother sole legal and physical custody of the parties' children and imposing conditions before the father could seek contact. The court upheld the denial of the father's requests to appear virtually and set aside his default, concluding that the custody determination had a sound and substantial basis in the record, and dismissed the appeal from the expired order of protection as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Powers, J.; Garry, P.J.; Ceresia, J.; Mackey, J.
JURISDICTION	New York Appellate Division, Third Department
DECIDED	June 4, 2026
DOCKET	CV-25-0595
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The father appealed from a Family Court order granting the mother sole legal and physical custody and from an order of protection. The custody order was entered after the father failed to appear at a fact-finding hearing and was found in default; counsel nevertheless participated in the contested inquest.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Abuse of discretion for denial of an adjournment or virtual appearance and termination of virtual participation; custody determination reviewed for whether it has a sound and substantial basis in the record; dismissal for mootness applied to the expired order of protection.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published New York Appellate Division opinion
PARTIES	Jaime QQ., respondent-father v. Rachel QQ., petitioner-mother

TOPICS

child custody

default

appellate procedure

mootness

domestic violence

PRACTICE AREAS

family law

custody

appellate procedure

domestic violence

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the father's appeal from a custody order entered upon his default was barred by CPLR 5511 when counsel actively contested the issues at the inquest.
2. Whether Family Court abused its discretion by denying the father's request to appear virtually at the scheduled fact-finding hearing and finding him in default when he failed to appear.
3. Whether Family Court abused its discretion by terminating the father's virtual participation in the inquest after his misconduct toward the attorney for the children.
4. Whether the custody determination and conditions imposed before the father could seek contact with the children had a sound and substantial basis in the record.
5. Whether the appeal from the order of protection was moot because the order had expired.

HOLDINGS

1. A defaulting party may obtain appellate review of matters actually contested during an inquest; CPLR 5511 does not require dismissal of an appeal to the extent the challenged matters were contested below.
2. Family Court did not abuse its discretion by denying the father's request to appear virtually at the scheduled fact-finding hearing and finding him in default after he failed to appear.
3. Family Court did not abuse its discretion by terminating the father's virtual participation after he called the attorney for the children a derogatory name while she was presenting her position.
4. The award of sole legal and physical custody to the mother and the requirement that the father complete specified evaluations and classes before seeking contact were supported by a sound and substantial basis in the record.
5. The premature notice of appeal from the custody order was treated as valid under CPLR 5520(c).
6. The appeal from the order of protection was dismissed as moot because the order had expired and the father did not raise a specific argument concerning its merits.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“a defaulting party is still free to seek review of the proceedings on a contested inquest” ([*1])

“does not bar the . . . review [of] matters which were the subject of contest below” ([*2])

“The granting of an adjournment for any purpose is a matter resting within the sound discretion of the trial court” ([*2])

“a custody determination, whether made upon the default of a party or not, must always have a sound and substantial basis in the record” ([*2])

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties are the parents of children born in 2021 and 2023. The mother alleged domestic violence, including an incident in which the father choked her while she was pregnant and another in which he kicked the older child, and testified that she had been the children's primary caregiver while the father had not seen them in more than a year. The father repeatedly failed to appear, relocated to California without explaining why he could not return for the hearing, and made offensive and accusatory comments during supervised FaceTime calls. The mother also presented text messages reflecting the father's combative conduct and evidence concerning his mental-health issues and arrests.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The mother commenced a Family Court Act article 6 custody proceeding after alleged domestic violence and the father's repeated departures from the family home. Family Court initially granted temporary custody, later set aside the father's first default, and then found him in default again after he failed to attend the scheduled fact-finding hearing. At the inquest, the father appeared virtually with new counsel, whose motion to vacate the default was denied. Family Court granted the mother sole legal and physical custody, imposed conditions on any future custody or contact petition, and entered a stay-away order of protection. The Appellate Division affirmed the custody order and dismissed the appeal from the order of protection as moot.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Matter of Amanda I. v. Michael I., 185 AD3d 1252, 1254 [3d Dept 2020]
- Matter of Daniel RR. v. Heather RR., 221 AD3d 1301, 1302 n 2 [3d Dept 2023]
- James v. Powell, 19 NY2d 249, 256 n 3 [1967]
- Matter of Hanrahand v. Hanrahand, 222 AD3d 753, 754 [2d Dept 2023]
- Matter of Otero v. Walker, 221 AD3d 714, 715 [2d Dept 2023]
- Matter of DiNunzio v. Zylinski, 175 AD3d 1079, 1080 [4th Dept 2019]
- Matter of Spearman v. Hulen, 231 AD3d 1043, 1043 [2d Dept 2024]
- Matter of Anthony M., 63 NY2d 270, 283 [1984]
- Matter of Jerry VV. v. Jessica WW., 186 AD3d 1799, 1800-1801 [3d Dept 2020]
- Matter of Jessica HH. v. Sean HH., 196 AD3d 750, 752 [3d Dept 2021]
- Matter of Ariane I. v. David I., 82 AD3d 1547, 1548 [3d Dept 2011], lv denied 17 NY3d 703 [2011]
- Matter of Naomi KK. v. Natasha LL., 80 AD3d 834, 835 [3d Dept 2011], lv denied 16 NY3d 711 [2011]
- Matter of Smith v. Bullock, 202 AD3d 697, 698 [2d Dept 2022]
- Matter of Bartosz B. [Andrzej B.], 187 AD3d 894, 896 [2d Dept 2020]
- Matter of Nyree S. v. Gregory C., 99 AD3d 561, 562 [1st Dept 2012], lv denied 20 NY3d 854 [2012]
- Matter of Mackenzie OO. v. Ian NN., 242 AD3d 1345, 1350 [3d Dept 2025]

- Matter of Megan UU. v. Phillip UU., 193 AD3d 1287, 1290 [3d Dept 2021]
- Matter of Casey Q. v. Jeffrey O., 244 AD3d 1519, 1522 [3d Dept 2025]
- Matter of Evelyn EE. v. Jody CC., 222 AD3d 1294, 1296 n 3 [3d Dept 2023], lv denied 41 NY3d 907 [2024]
- Matter of Steven M. [Stephvon O.], 88 AD3d 1099, 1100 [3d Dept 2011]
- Matter of Tina X. v. Thomas Y., 233 AD3d 1272, 1276-1277 [3d Dept 2024]
- Matter of Kristine Z. v. Anthony C., 43 AD3d 1284, 1284-1285 [4th Dept 2007], lv denied 10 NY3d 705 [2008]

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/new-york-appellate-division-third-department-supreme-court-of-the-state-of-new-york-appellate-divisi/2026/matter-of-rachel-qq-v-jaime-qq-5gth3oo0>