

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, APPELLATE DIVISION,  
FOURTH JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

Matter of Paliani v. Selapack

2019 NY Slip Op 09170 (App. Div. 2019) (Supreme Court of the State of New York Appellate Division Fourth  
Judicial Department 2019) · No. 1156 CAF 18-01010 · Decided December 20, 2019

SUMMARY

The Appellate Division, Fourth Department affirmed orders granting an order of protection and finding that the respondent willfully violated a custody order. The court upheld supervised visitation, concluding that the father established the family offense and custody-order violation and that supervised visitation was supported by the record and the child's best interests.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, Fourth<br>Judicial Department                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Whalen, P.J.; Centra, J.; Peradotto, J.; Nemoyer, J.; Winslow, J.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| JURISDICTION          | New York                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| DECIDED               | December 20, 2019                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| DOCKET                | 1156 CAF 18-01010                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| DISPOSITION           | affirmed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Respondent mother appealed from an order of protection issued in a<br>Family Court Act article 8 family-offense proceeding and from an<br>order in a Family Court Act article 6 custody proceeding determining<br>that she willfully violated a custody order. Both orders limited her to<br>supervised visitation.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | The family-offense determination was reviewed under whether the<br>father established the offense by a preponderance of the evidence, with<br>great weight given to the Family Court's credibility determinations.<br>The custody-order violation was reviewed under the clear-and-<br>convincing-evidence standard, with deference to credibility<br>determinations where supported by a sound and substantial basis in the<br>record. The supervised-visitation determination was reviewed for<br>abuse of discretion and upheld if supported by a sound and substantial<br>basis in the record. |
|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

**PRECEDENTIAL VALUE**

Published New York Appellate Division opinion

**PARTIES**

Stephanie Selapack v. Nicholas Paliani

**TOPICS**

family law procedure

domestic violence

child custody

visitation

appellate procedure

**PRACTICE AREAS**

family law

family law procedure

appellate procedure

child custody

visitation

domestic violence

**QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

1. Whether the father established by a preponderance of the evidence that the mother committed aggravated harassment in the second degree.
2. Whether the father established by clear and convincing evidence that the mother willfully violated the custody order by failing to timely notify him of the child's medical issues.
3. Whether the Family Court properly directed that the mother's visitation with the child be supervised.

**HOLDINGS**

1. The father established by a preponderance of the evidence that the mother committed aggravated harassment in the second degree, and the Family Court's credibility determinations were supported by the record.
2. The father established by clear and convincing evidence that the mother willfully violated the custody order by failing to notify him of the child's medical issues as soon as reasonably possible.
3. The Family Court properly directed that the mother's visitation be supervised because the record provided a sound and substantial basis for finding that supervised visitation was in the child's best interests.

**KEY QUOTATIONS**

*“whether visitation should be supervised is a matter left to [the c]ourt's sound discretion and it will not be disturbed as long as there is a sound and substantial basis in the record to support it” (at \*2)*

**FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

After the Family Court issued a decision granting the father sole custody, the mother allegedly told him that she would kill herself and the child if he took the child away from her. The Family Court credited the father's testimony over the mother's denial and found that she committed aggravated harassment in the second degree. The court also found that the mother willfully violated the custody order by failing to notify the father of medical issues involving the child as soon as reasonably possible. The record further showed threatening and disparaging behavior toward the father and attempts to limit his involvement with the child, supporting supervised visitation as being in the child's best interests.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Genesee County Family Court issued an order of protection after finding that the mother committed the family offense of aggravated harassment in the second degree. In a separate custody proceeding, the court found that she willfully violated the custody order by failing to notify the father of the child's medical issues as soon as reasonably possible. The Appellate Division affirmed both orders without costs.

## DISPOSITION

affirmed

## CASES CITED

- Matter of Clausell v Salame, 156 AD3d 1401, 1402 [4th Dept 2017]
- Matter of Parameswar v Parameswar, 109 AD3d 473, 474 [2d Dept 2013]
- Matter of Danielle S. v Larry R.S., 41 AD3d 1188, 1189 [4th Dept 2007]
- Matter of Martin v Flynn, 133 AD3d 1369, 1370 [4th Dept 2015]
- Matter of Tarrant v Ostrowski, 96 AD3d 1580, 1580-1581 [4th Dept 2012], lv denied 20 NY3d 855 [2013]
- Matter of Palazzolo v Giresi-Palazzolo, 138 AD3d 866, 867 [2d Dept 2016]
- Matter of Wojcik v Newton [appeal No. 2], 11 AD3d 1011, 1012 [4th Dept 2004]
- Matter of Chilbert v Soler, 77 AD3d 1405, 1406 [4th Dept 2010], lv denied 16 NY3d 701 [2011]
- Matter of Talbot v Edick, 159 AD3d 1406, 1407 [4th Dept 2018]
- Matter of Watson v Maragh, 156 AD3d 801, 802-803 [2d Dept 2017]
- Matter of Stewart v Stewart, 56 AD3d 1218, 1218-1219 [4th Dept 2008]