



www.lsc.ohio.gov

# OHIO LEGISLATIVE SERVICE COMMISSION

Office of Research  
and Drafting

Legislative Budget  
Office

H.B. 352  
134<sup>th</sup> General Assembly

## Bill Analysis

**Version:** As Introduced

**Primary Sponsors:** Reps. Crawley and Ray

Kathleen A. Luikart, Research Analyst

### SUMMARY

- Prohibits a court, public children services agency (PCSA), private child placing agency (PCPA), or private noncustodial agency (PNA) from using a person's disability as a reason to deny or limit that person's care for a minor, except when necessary to serve the best interests of the minor.
- Permits a court, PCSA, PCPA, or PNA, when evaluating the best interests of a minor with a particular person with a disability, to consider a detrimental impact determination.
- Establishes requirements for a court to follow when making a detrimental impact determination that a disability-connected behavior endangers the health, safety, or welfare of a minor:
  - Places the burden on the party asserting the detrimental impact to show that impact by clear and convincing evidence;
  - Requires a court to permit the person who has a disability to demonstrate how supportive services could alleviate any detrimental impact on a minor and permits a court to order implementation of supportive services that alleviate possible detrimental impact;
  - Requires a court, if it determines detrimental impact, to make specific written findings of fact and conclusions of law providing the basis for the determination and why supportive services cannot alleviate any detrimental impact.

### DETAILED ANALYSIS

#### **Disability generally barred as a factor for minor's caretaker**

The bill generally prohibits a court, public children services agency (PCSA), private child placing agency (PCPA), or private noncustodial agency (PNA) from denying or limiting a person from any of the following because the person has a disability:

- Exercising custody, parenting time, or visitation rights with a minor;
- Adopting a minor;
- Serving as a foster caregiver for a minor;
- Appointment as a guardian for a minor.<sup>1</sup>

Under the bill, “disability” has the same meaning as in the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. In that federal law, “disability” with respect to an individual means “(A) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities of such individual; (B) a record of such an impairment; or (C) being regarded as having such an impairment.” A few examples of major life activities listed in the Act are: caring for oneself, performing manual tasks, seeing, hearing, walking, standing, speaking, communicating, working, and the operation of a major bodily function.<sup>2</sup>

### **Exception: best interests of a minor**

The bill permits a court, PCSA, PCPA, or PNA to deny or limit a person with a disability from caring for a minor as described above, when necessary to serve the best interests of the minor.<sup>3</sup>

### **Court determination of detrimental impact**

The bill permits a court to determine that a person’s disability has or could have a detrimental impact on a minor.<sup>4</sup> The bill also provides that a court, PCSA, PCPA, or PNA may *consider* a detrimental impact determination when determining the best interests of a minor.<sup>5</sup>

#### **Detrimental impact determination process**

##### **Step 1: Assertion of detrimental impact**

A party may assert that a person’s disability would have a detrimental impact on a minor. The burden is on the party asserting the detrimental impact to show, by clear and convincing evidence, that a disability-connected behavior endangers the health, safety, or welfare of the minor.<sup>6</sup>

“Clear and convincing evidence” has been defined as a degree of proof that is more than the usual “preponderance of the evidence” standard employed in most civil cases but less than

---

<sup>1</sup> R.C. 2131.031(A).

<sup>2</sup> R.C. 2131.03; 42 United States Code 12102, not in the bill.

<sup>3</sup> R.C. 2131.031(A).

<sup>4</sup> R.C. 2131.032(A).

<sup>5</sup> R.C. 2131.031(B).

<sup>6</sup> R.C. 2131.032(A).

the “beyond a reasonable doubt” standard required in criminal cases.<sup>7</sup> It is evidence that will produce in the mind of the trier of facts a firm belief or conviction as to the issues to be proved.<sup>8</sup>

### **Step 2: Supportive services**

The bill requires a court to permit the person with the disability to demonstrate how supportive services could alleviate any detrimental impact on the minor, before it can make a determination of detrimental impact.<sup>9</sup>

The bill also permits a court to order that supportive services that alleviate possible detrimental impact be implemented. A court that issues such an order may review the need for continuation of the services, after a reasonable amount of time.<sup>10</sup>

### **Step 3: Court’s determination**

Finally, if the court determines that custody, parenting time, visitation rights, adoption, service as a foster caregiver, or appointment as a guardian should be denied or limited in any manner, it must make specific written findings of fact and conclusions of law providing the basis for the determination and why supportive services cannot alleviate any detrimental impact.<sup>11</sup>

---



---

## **HISTORY**

Action	Date
Introduced	06-17-21

---

H0352-I-134/ts

<sup>7</sup> *McLintock v. Sweitzer*, 138 Ohio St. 324, 327-28 (1941).

<sup>8</sup> *Cross v. Ledford*, 161 Ohio St. 469, 477 (1954).

<sup>9</sup> R.C. 2131.032(B).

<sup>10</sup> R.C. 2131.033.

<sup>11</sup> R.C. 2131.034.