

No. _____

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

V.L.,

Petitioner,

v.

E.L., AND GUARDIAN AD LITEM, AS REPRESENTATIVE
OF MINOR CHILDREN,

Respondents.

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari
to the Alabama Supreme Court**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

SHANNON MINTER
CATHERINE SAKIMURA
EMILY HAAN
NATIONAL CENTER FOR
LESBIAN RIGHTS
870 Market Street,
Suite 370
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 392-6257
sminter@nclrights.org

PAUL M. SMITH
ADAM G. UNIKOWSKY
Counsel of Record
JENNER & BLOCK LLP
1099 New York Ave., NW,
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 639-6000
aunikowsky@jenner.com

TRACI OWEN VELLA
VELLA & KING
3000 Crescent Ave.
Birmingham, AL 35209
(205) 868-1555
tvella@vellaking.com

HEATHER FANN
BOYD, FERNAMBUCQ, DUNN
& FANN, P.C.
3500 Blue Lake Drive,
Suite 220
Birmingham, AL 35243
(205) 930-9000
hfann@bfattorneys.net

QUESTION PRESENTED

Does the Full Faith and Credit Clause permit a court to deny recognition to an adoption judgment previously issued by a court from a sister state, based on the forum court's de novo determination that the issuing court erred in applying its own state's adoption law?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIESiv

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI 1

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION..... 1

INTRODUCTION 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 4

 A. The Georgia Superior Court’s
 Adoption Order..... 4

 B. The Alabama Supreme Court’s
 Refusal To Recognize The
 Adoption Order..... 7

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT..... 13

I. THE ALABAMA SUPREME COURT’S
 DECISION VIOLATES THE FULL
 FAITH AND CREDIT CLAUSE 13

 A. The Full Faith and Credit Clause
 Authorizes Collateral Attacks on
 Out-of-State Judgments Only
 Under Narrow Circumstances. 13

 B. The Alabama Supreme Court
 Should Have Given Full Faith and
 Credit to the Georgia Judgment. 16

II.	THIS CASE IS WORTHY OF THIS COURT'S REVIEW.	27
A.	The Decision Below Is An Unprecedented Application Of The Full Faith and Credit Clause.....	28
B.	The Decision Below Will Harm Alabama Families.....	32
	CONCLUSION	37
	Appendix A <i>Ex parte E.L.</i> , No. 1140595, --- So. 3d ---, 2015 WL 5511249 (Ala. Sept. 18, 2015)	1a
	Appendix B <i>Ex parte E.L.</i> , No. 2130683, --- So. 3d ---, 2015 WL 836916 (Ala. Ct. Civ. App. Feb. 27, 2015)	36a
	Under Seal Appendix	
	Appendix C Final Decree of Adoption	49a
	Appendix D Order, <i>V.L. v E.L.</i> , No. CS-2013-000719.00 (Ala. Dist. Ct. Apr. 3, 2014)	52a
	Appendix E Amended Verified Petition To enroll Foreign Judgment and Complaint for Declaratory Judgment, <i>V.L. v E.L.</i> , No. CS-2013-000719.00 (Ala. Dist. Ct. Dec. 27, 2013)	53a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>In re Adoption of B.Y.</i> , 356 P.3d 1215 (Utah 2015).....	34
<i>In re Adoption of K.L.M.</i> , No. 15 AP-118, 2015 WL 4656633 (Ohio Ct. App. Aug. 6, 2015).....	34
<i>In re Adoption of K.M.</i> , 31 N.E.3d 533 (Ind. Ct. App. 2015).....	35
<i>In re Adoption of R.B.F.</i> , 803 A.2d 1195 (Pa. 2002).....	31
<i>Amerson v. Vandiver</i> , 673 S.E.2d 850 (Ga. 2009).....	25
<i>Arbaugh v. Y&H Corp.</i> , 546 U.S. 500 (2006).....	17
<i>Baker by Thomas v. General Motors Corp.</i> , 522 U.S. 222 (1998).....	13, 14, 27
<i>Bates v. Bates</i> , 730 S.E.2d 482 (Ga. Ct. App. 2012).....	20, 25, 26
<i>In re B.J.C.</i> , 163 So. 3d 905 (La. Ct. App. 2015).....	35
<i>Brown v. Harper</i> , 761 S.E.2d 779 (S.C. App. Ct. 2014).....	35
<i>Carlton v. State</i> , 816 N.W.2d 590 (Minn. 2012).....	22
<i>Coe v. Coe</i> , 334 U.S. 378 (1948).....	16, 24
<i>Colby v. Colby</i> , 369 P.2d 1019 (Nev. 1962).....	32
<i>Delaney v. First National Bank in Albuquerque</i> , 386 P.2d 711 (N.M. 1963).....	30

<i>Embry v. Ryan</i> , 11 So. 3d 408 (Fla. 2d DCA 2009).....	31
<i>Fauntleroy v. Lum</i> , 210 U.S. 230 (1908).....	15
<i>Finstuen v. Crutcher</i> , 496 F.3d 1139 (10th Cir. 2007).....	22
<i>Giancaspro v. Congleton</i> , No. 283267, 2009 WL 416301 (Mich. Ct. App. Feb. 19, 2009).....	31
<i>Hawley v. Murphy</i> , 736 A.2d 268 (Me. 1999)	29
<i>Henry v. Himes</i> , 14 F. Supp. 3d 1036 (S.D. Ohio 2014).....	31
<i>Hersey v. Hersey</i> , 171 N.E. 815 (Mass. 1930).....	30
<i>Ex Parte H.H.</i> , 830 So. 2d 21 (Ala. 2002).....	27
<i>In re J.C.J.</i> , 349 P.3d 491, 2015 WL 3514197 (Kan. Ct. App. 2015) (unpublished table decision).....	34-35
<i>In re J.S.G.</i> , 505 S.E.2d 70 (Ga. Ct. App. 1998)	21
<i>Kalb v. Feuerstein</i> , 308 U.S. 433 (1940).....	28
<i>Lofton v. Secretary of Department of Children & Family Services</i> , 358 F.3d 804 (11th Cir. 2004)	11, 26
<i>Mack v. Mack</i> , 618 A.2d 744 (Md. 1993)	29
<i>In re Marks</i> , 684 S.E.2d 364 (Ga. Ct. App. 2009).....	20, 21
<i>Marshall v. Marshall</i> , 360 S.E.2d 572 (Ga. 1987).....	25
<i>Milliken v. Meyer</i> , 311 U.S. 457 (1940).....	14, 15, 18

<i>Morrison v. National Australia Bank, Ltd.</i> , 561 U.S. 247 (2010).....	17
<i>In re Noelia M.</i> , 121 A.3d 1 (Conn. Super. Ct. 2014).....	35
<i>Obergefell v. Hodges</i> , 135 S. Ct. 2584 (2015).....	36
<i>Palazzolo v. Mire</i> , 10 So. 3d 748 (La. Ct. App. 2009).....	31
<i>Routh v. State, ex rel. Wyoming Workers’ Compensation Division</i> , 952 P.2d 1108 (Wyo. 1998)	29
<i>Russell v. Bridgens</i> , 647 N.W.2d 56 (Neb. 2002).....	31
<i>S.J.S. v. T.D.L.</i> , No. 2014-CA-01901, 2015 WL 5223511 (Ky. Ct. App. Sept. 4, 2015)	34
<i>San Remo Hotel, L.P. v. City and County of San Francisco</i> , 545 U.S. 323 (2005).....	14
<i>Shine v. Moreau</i> , 119 A.3d 1 (R.I. 2015)	22
<i>Ex parte State ex rel. Alabama Policy Institute</i> , No. 114060, -- So. 3d --, 2015 WL 892752 (Ala. Mar. 3, 2015)	27
<i>Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment</i> , 523 U.S. 83 (1998).....	18
<i>Tennessee ex rel. Sizemore v. Surety Bank</i> , 200 F.3d 373 (5th Cir. 2000)	29-30
<i>In re T.S.D.</i> , 419 S.W.3d 887 (Mo. Ct. App. 2014).....	35
<i>In re Trust Created by Nixon</i> , 763 N.W.2d 404 (Neb. 2009)	30

<i>Underwriters National Assurance Co. v. North Carolina Life & Accident & Health Insurance Guaranty Ass'n</i> , 455 U.S. 691 (1982).....	15, 16, 25, 26
<i>United Student Aid Funds, Inc. v. Espinosa</i> , 559 U.S. 260 (2010).....	17
<i>Webb v. Webb</i> , 451 U.S. 493 (1981).....	33
<i>Wheeler v. Wheeler</i> , 642 S.E.2d 103 (Ga. 2007).....	19
<i>Williams v. North Carolina</i> , 325 U.S. 226 (1945).....	28
<i>Williams v. Williams</i> , 717 S.E.2d 553 (Ga. Ct. App. 2011)	23

STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1257	1
Ala. Code § 26-10A-25(d)	23
Ga. Code Ann. § 19-8-2(a)	16
Ga. Code Ann. § 19-8-5(a)	21
Ga. Code Ann. § 19-8-6.....	21
Ga. Code. Ann. § 19-8-18.....	9
Ga. Code Ann. § 19-8-18(e)	23
Ga. Code Ann. § 9-11-60(d)(1)	20
Ga. Code Ann. § 9-11-60(d)(3)	19

OTHER AUTHORITIES

2 Ann M. Haralambie, <i>Handling Child Custody, Abuse and Adoption Cases</i> § 14:28, Westlaw (database updated Nov. 2014).....	23
Leslie Harris, <i>Voluntary Acknowledgments of Parentage for Same-Sex Couples</i> , Am. U.J. Gender, 20 Soc. Pol’y & Law 467 (2012).....	36

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

V.L. petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the Alabama Supreme Court.

OPINIONS BELOW

The decisions of the Alabama Supreme Court (App. 1a-35a) and the Alabama Court of Civil Appeals (App. 36a-48a) in *V.L. v. E.L.* are not yet reported in the Southeastern Reporter.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Alabama Supreme Court was entered on September 18, 2015. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1257.

INTRODUCTION

In this case the Alabama Supreme Court refused to grant full faith and credit to an adoption judgment duly issued by a court from a sister state, based on its *de novo* determination that the issuing state misapplied its own adoption law. The Alabama Supreme Court's decision flouts a century of precedent on the Full Faith and Credit Clause and will have a devastating impact on Alabama adoptive families. This Court's review of the Alabama Supreme Court's decision is urgently needed.

Petitioner V.L. and Respondent E.L. are two women who were in a committed relationship for nearly seventeen years. In May of 2000, V.L. changed her last name to E.L.'s last name, and the parties decided to start a family together. E.L. gave birth to one child in 2002, and to twins in 2004, through assisted reproduction. E.L. and V.L. took an equal role in

raising the children during their early childhood.

To ensure that both V.L. and E.L. would be legally recognized as the children's parents, the parties agreed that V.L. would adopt the children and become the children's second, legally recognized parent, with E.L. retaining her parental rights. Thus, in 2007, V.L. filed a petition in the Superior Court of Fulton County, Georgia, for V.L. to adopt the children as a second parent with E.L.'s consent. The Superior Court granted the petition and ordered that V.L. would have full parental rights.

Several years later the couple separated and a dispute over child custody arose. V.L. sought joint custody in an Alabama circuit court based on her status as the children's adoptive mother. The Alabama Circuit Court and Court of Civil Appeals concluded that the Georgia adoption judgment must be honored.

The Alabama Supreme Court reversed, refusing to grant full faith and credit to the Georgia judgment. It concluded that the Georgia Superior Court misapplied Georgia's own adoption statute, which, in the Alabama Supreme Court's view, barred V.L. from adopting the children unless E.L. would relinquish her own parental rights. Having found that the Georgia Superior Court misapplied its own state's adoption law, the Alabama court then found that the Georgia court's error was "jurisdictional." Its justification for this conclusion was that adoption is a matter of statute under Georgia law and that a misapplication of an adoption statute must therefore deprive a court of jurisdiction. Based on this determination, the Alabama Supreme Court held that V.L.'s adoption of the children, which the Georgia court

had granted eight years earlier, was not entitled to full faith and credit. In so doing, it effectively stripped V.L. of parental rights over the children she had raised since they were born.

The Alabama Supreme Court's decision is irreconcilable with this Court's Full Faith and Credit precedents. This Court has laid down three fundamental principles under the Full Faith and Credit Clause pertinent to this case. First, although collateral challenges to an out-of-state judgment based on lack of *jurisdiction* are permitted in limited circumstances, collateral challenges to the *merits* of an out-of-state judgment are categorically forbidden. Second, when a court of general jurisdiction issues a judgment, sister state courts must *presume* that the issuing state court had jurisdiction. Third, a jurisdictional determination by a state court is itself entitled to full faith and credit in the courts of other states.

The Alabama Supreme Court's decision contravenes each of those principles. First, the alleged error in the Georgia Superior Court's decision went to the merits, not to jurisdiction; the Alabama Supreme Court's conclusion that the Georgia court lacked jurisdiction was based on a wildly overbroad definition of "jurisdiction" without any basis in this Court's or Georgia's case law. Second, the Alabama Supreme Court failed to honor the presumption that the Georgia Superior Court possessed jurisdiction, instead conducting a *de novo* analysis of Georgia law of a type prohibited by the Full Faith and Credit Clause. Third, the Alabama Supreme Court failed to honor the Georgia Superior Court's decision that it could exercise

jurisdiction over the adoption petition, in plain violation of this Court's Full Faith and Credit precedents.

If allowed to stand, the decision below will carry profound consequences for Alabama families. The Alabama Supreme Court's decision not only has effectively stripped the parental rights of V.L., but also places at risk numerous other families in which parents have relied on the stability of adoption judgments issued by the courts of sister states. As the dissent explained, the decision below "creates a dangerous precedent that calls into question the finality of adoptions in Alabama: Any irregularity in a probate court's decision in an adoption would now arguably create a defect in that court's subject-matter jurisdiction." App. 35a.

Because the decision below reflects a grievous misinterpretation of the Full Faith and Credit Clause and has far-reaching practical consequences, the Court should grant certiorari.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. The Georgia Superior Court's Adoption Order

Petitioner V.L. and Respondent E.L. are two women who were in a committed relationship for nearly seventeen years. The parties began their relationship in 1995. In May of 2000, V.L. changed her last name to E.L.'s last name, and the parties decided to start a family together.

The parties decided that E.L. would be the children's biological mother and that the children would be conceived through donor insemination. E.L. gave

birth to one child on December 13, 2002, and gave birth to twins on November 17, 2004. After the birth of each of the children, V.L. took leave from work to be at home and care for the children. V.L. paid the children's pre-school tuition and fees and shared responsibility with E.L. for all household expenses.

In 2007, V.L. petitioned the Superior Court of Fulton County, Georgia for an adoption judgment, with E.L.'s express consent. Following a home study, Judge Jerry Baxter granted the petition in a detailed written order. App. 49a-51a.¹ Under "Findings of Fact," the Superior Court found:

- V.L. "is qualified to petition for adoption and is a fit person to become the adoptive legal parent of" the children, "and is capable of continuing with the responsibilities she has shared with the legal and biological mother, [E.L.], for the children's care, supervision, training, and education." App. 49a.
- E.L. "expressly consented to this adoption." *Id.*
- The record provided "clear and convincing evidence that [V.L.] has functioned as an equal second parent to the children, since their birth" and that "[t]he children relate to

¹The Georgia Superior Court's adoption order, as well as the complaint and visitation order in the Alabama Circuit Court, contain the parties' full names. Thus, they are filed in a sealed appendix.

both their legal mother and [V.L.] on an equal basis.” *Id.*

- “The adoption is in the best interests of the children. It would be inconsistent with the reality of this parenting arrangement to either terminate the rights of the sole legal parent or to deny the adoption by the second parent, which is with the express consent of the legal parent.” App. 50a.

Under “Conclusions of Law,” the Superior Court held:

- “The adoption should be granted in the best interest of the children. The children should have the legal benefits and protections of both their parents which will accrue as a result of their adoption. It would be contrary to the children’s best interest and would adversely impact their right to care, support and inheritance and would adversely affect their sense of security and well-being to either deny this adoption by the second parent or to terminate the rights of the legal and biological mother. The adoption will result in legal recognition of the actual parenting arrangement which has existed since their births.” *Id.*
- “The Petitioner has complied with all relevant and applicable formalities regarding the Petition for Adoption in accordance with the laws of the State of Georgia.” *Id.*
- Because the children were conceived by anonymous donor insemination, “no biological

or legal father exists with rights requiring termination.” *Id.*

In view of these determinations, the Superior Court “CONSIDERED, ORDERED, AND ADJUDGED” that “the parent-child relationship between [E.L.] and the children is hereby preserved intact and that [V.L.] shall be recognized as the second parent of” the children. App. 51a. It was “FURTHER, ORDERED” that the adoption of the children by V.L. “be and is hereby made permanent in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 8 of Title 19 of the Official Code of Georgia, Annotated.” *Id.* It was “FURTHER, ORDERED” that a new birth certificate be issued listing both E.L. and V.L.’s names. *Id.* It was “FURTHER, ORDERED” that “this order shall act as sufficient evidence for the Social Security Administration to prepare and issue a new social security card to the children.” *Id.*

B. The Alabama Supreme Court’s Refusal To Recognize The Adoption Order

In 2011, V.L. and E.L. ended their relationship. Although V.L. continued to see the children for a time after the relationship ended, E.L. eventually prevented V.L. from having access to the children. Thus, on October 31, 2013, V.L. filed a Petition to Enroll Foreign Judgment with the Jefferson County Circuit Court in Alabama, asking the Circuit Court to give Full Faith and Credit to the Georgia adoption judgment and to grant her visitation or custody of her children. App. 53a-56a. On April 2014, the Circuit Court entered an order granting visitation to V.L. on the first and third weekends of each month. App. 52a.

E.L. appealed to the Alabama Court of Civil Appeals. In an initial decision, the Court of Civil Appeals reversed the Family Court's order, but the Court of Civil Appeals granted rehearing, reversed itself, and held that the Georgia adoption was entitled to full faith and credit. App. 36a-48a. The court observed that "[t]he Georgia Supreme Court has not yet construed the provisions of the Georgia Adoption Code to determine if it allows adoption by a same-sex partner who has assumed a de facto parental role." App. 44a. It concluded, based on its "independent review of the Georgia Adoption Code," that such adoptions were impermissible under Georgia law. App. 45a. But it held that "[a]lthough it may be that the Georgia court erroneously construed Georgia law so as to permit V.L. to adopt the children as a 'second parent,' that error goes to the merits of the case and not to the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Georgia court." *Id.* It concluded that "even if the law of Alabama generally disallows adoption by same-sex partners, under the Full Faith and Credit Clause, a court of this state must still enforce a duly entered foreign judgment approving the adoption petition of a same-sex partner." App. 47a (citation omitted). The Court of Civil Appeals remanded the case for an evidentiary hearing on visitation. App. 48a.

The Alabama Supreme Court reversed. It held that the Georgia adoption judgment was not entitled to full faith and credit because, in its view, the Georgia Superior Court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction to enter the adoption judgment. App. 1a-35a.

The court began by rejecting V.L.'s argument that

the Alabama Supreme Court should not entertain E.L.'s jurisdictional attack on the adoption order based on established Georgia law that "a Georgia court would enforce the Georgia judgment *even if* there is a lack of subject-matter jurisdiction." App. 12a. V.L.'s argument was premised on Ga. Code. Ann. § 19-8-18, a statute of repose which provides that "[a] decree of adoption issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this Code section shall not be subject to any judicial challenge filed more than six months after the date of entry of such decree." As the Alabama Supreme Court acknowledged, Georgia courts have held that the statute of repose bars even jurisdictional collateral challenges to adoptions after six months. *Id.* (citing *Williams v. Williams*, 717 S.E.2d 553 (Ga. Ct. App. 2011)). Nevertheless, the Alabama Supreme Court concluded that the statute of repose did not apply in this case because Georgia's statute of repose applied only to adoptions that complied with statutory requirements. App. 16a-17a.

The Alabama Supreme Court further concluded that the Georgia Superior Court erred in granting the adoption. It held that "Georgia law makes no provision for a non-spouse to adopt a child without first terminating the parental rights of the current parents." App. 22a. In the view of the Alabama Supreme Court, it was not possible under Georgia law for V.L. to adopt without terminating E.L.'s rights: either V.L. or E.L. could be the children's legal parent, but not both. The court reached this conclusion based on its "own analysis of the Georgia adoption statutes," and despite the Georgia Superior Court's express conclusion that it had

the power to grant the adoption without terminating E.L.'s parental rights. *Id.*

Having found that the Georgia Superior Court misapplied Georgia law in granting the adoption, the Alabama Supreme Court then concluded that the Georgia Superior Court lacked *jurisdiction* to enter the adoption judgment—again despite the Georgia Superior Court's express conclusion regarding its power to grant the petition. The Alabama Supreme Court acknowledged that Georgia law “gives superior courts such as the Georgia court exclusive jurisdiction to enter adoption decrees.” App. 24a. However, it cited a Georgia case stating that the requirements of Georgia's adoption statutes “are mandatory and must be strictly construed in favor of the natural parents.” App. 23a-24a. The court concluded from this statement that a court that grants an adoption which is not in strict compliance with every provision of the adoption statutes automatically lacks jurisdiction to grant the adoption. App. 24a. Thus, the Alabama Supreme Court found that “[t]he Georgia judgment is accordingly void, and the full faith and credit clause does not require the courts of Alabama to recognize that judgment.” *Id.* The Alabama Supreme Court declined to reach E.L.'s arguments that Alabama should refuse to recognize the Georgia judgment because the parties were allegedly non-residents of Georgia and because permitting same-sex parents to adopt conflicted with Alabama's own public policy. App. 24a-25a n.10.

Justice Parker filed a concurring opinion agreeing with the majority's decision on public policy grounds.

He stated that “the State has a legitimate interest in encouraging that children be adopted into the optimal family structure, i.e., one with both a father and a mother.” App. 31a. Justice Parker included a lengthy quotation from *Lofton v. Secretary of Department of Children & Family Services*, 358 F.3d 804, 819-20 (11th Cir. 2004), in which the court upheld Florida’s “codified prohibition on adoption by any homosexual person.” App. 29a-31a; see *Lofton*, 358 F.3d at 806-07 (quoting Fla. Stat. § 63.042(3)).

Justice Shaw dissented. He argued that the statutory requirements cited by the majority “speak to the *merits* of whether the adoption should be granted—not to whether the trial court obtains subject-matter jurisdiction.” App. 32a. He explained that the Georgia Superior Court had statutory jurisdiction over “all matters of adoption,” and “[t]he fact that the adoption should not have been granted does not remove the case from the class of cases within that court’s power.” App. 32a.

Justice Shaw noted that “Georgia’s adoption code seems to provide the opposite,” given that it grants superior courts the authority to “continue the case” even if “the court determines that any petitioner has not complied with” the adoption code. App. 33a. He also noted that “[u]nder Georgia law, although the trial court may find that the requirements for an adoption were not met, it may nevertheless place custody of the child with the petitioners, an act antithetical to the idea that the court possesses no subject-matter jurisdiction.” App. 33a n.14. He concluded by expressing his “fear that this case creates a dangerous

precedent that calls into question the finality of adoptions in Alabama: Any irregularity in a probate court's decision in an adoption would now arguably create a defect in that court's subject-matter jurisdiction." App. 35a.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

This Court should grant certiorari. The decision of the Alabama Supreme Court conflicts with a century of this Court’s Full Faith and Credit case law and deals a serious blow to the principles of comity and finality underlying the Clause. Moreover, the decision will result in grave practical harm. It yields the ultimate conflict of authority—dueling court orders in different states—and threatens to shatter the legal ties that bind numerous Alabama adoptive parents to their children.

I. THE ALABAMA SUPREME COURT’S DECISION VIOLATES THE FULL FAITH AND CREDIT CLAUSE

A. The Full Faith and Credit Clause Authorizes Collateral Attacks on Out-of-State Judgments Only Under Narrow Circumstances.

Article IV, Section 1 of the Constitution states: “Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State.” “Regarding judgments, ... the full faith and credit obligation is exacting.” *Baker by Thomas v. General Motors Corp.*, 522 U.S. 222, 233 (1998). A state is constitutionally required to honor a sister state’s judgment even if it disagrees with that judgment: there is “no roving ‘public policy exception’ to the full faith and credit due *judgments*.” *Id.* (emphasis in original).

This Court has long recognized the importance of finality of judgments. Finality “is demanded by the very object for which civil courts have been established, which is to secure the peace and repose of

society by the settlement of matters capable of judicial determination.” *San Remo Hotel, L.P. v. City and County of San Francisco*, 545 U.S. 323, 336-37 (2005) (quoting *S. Pacific R. Co. v. United States*, 168 U.S. 1, 49 (1897)). The Full Faith and Credit Clause ensures that judgments, once rendered, are final not only in the state where they were rendered, but nationwide. As this Court has explained, “[t]he animating purpose of the full faith and credit command ... ‘was to alter the status of the several states as independent foreign sovereignties, each free to ignore obligations created under the laws or by the judicial proceedings of the others, and to make them integral parts of a single nation throughout which a remedy upon a just obligation might be demanded as of right, irrespective of the state of its origin.’” *Baker*, 522 U.S. at 232 (citation omitted).

This Court has carved out a narrow exception to the Full Faith and Credit Clause: a court need not grant full faith and credit to a judgment issued by a sister state court that lacked jurisdiction. *Id.* at 233. But to ensure that this exception does not swallow the rule, the Court has limited it in three respects.

First, the Court has made clear that only genuinely *jurisdictional* collateral challenges are permissible. Collateral challenges to the *merits* of an out-of-state judgment are categorically forbidden. *See Milliken v. Meyer*, 311 U.S. 457, 462 (1940) (holding that although collateral challenges based on “a want of jurisdiction” are permitted, the Full Faith and Credit Clause “precludes any inquiry in to the merits of the cause of action, the logic or consistency of the decision, or the

validity of the legal principles on which the judgment is based”). The difference between an examination of jurisdiction and of the merits is that jurisdiction “goes to the power,” whereas merits goes “only to the duty[] of the court.” *Fauntleroy v. Lum*, 210 U.S. 230, 235 (1908).

Second, the Court has adopted a presumption that when a court of general jurisdiction renders a judgment, it has jurisdiction to render that judgment. *See Milliken*, 311 U.S. at 462 (“if the judgment on its face appears to be a record of a court of general jurisdiction, such jurisdiction over the cause and the parties is to be presumed unless disproved by extrinsic evidence, or by the record itself”) (internal quotation marks omitted). In particular, a court must presume that when a court of general jurisdiction interprets a statute, it has the jurisdiction to do so, and its interpretation is simply a decision on the merits. *Fauntleroy*, 210 U.S. at 235 (where a law “affects a court of general jurisdiction and deals with a matter upon which that court must pass,” the forum court must “be slow” to interpret that provision as imposing a limit on the court’s jurisdiction, as opposed to fixing a “rule by which the court should decide”).

Third, the Court has held that even *jurisdictional* collateral attacks are barred by the Full Faith and Credit Clause if the issuing court made a jurisdictional determination that is itself entitled to *res judicata*. “The principles of *res judicata* apply to questions of jurisdiction as well as to other issues.” *Underwriters Nat’l Assur. Co. v. N.C. Life & Acc. & Health Ins. Guar. Ass’n*, 455 U.S. 691, 706 (1982) (quotation marks

omitted). Thus, this Court has held that where “both parties were given full opportunity to contest the jurisdictional issues” and the judgment is “not susceptible to collateral attack in the courts of the State in which it was rendered ... the requirements of full faith and credit preclude the courts of a sister State from subjecting such a decree to collateral attack.” *Coe v. Coe*, 334 U.S. 378, 384 (1948). This principle applies to any litigant who had the opportunity to contest jurisdiction, regardless of whether that litigant actually did: “A party cannot escape the requirements of full faith and credit and res judicata by asserting its own failure to raise matters clearly within the scope of a prior proceeding.” *Underwriters*, 455 U.S. at 710.

B. The Alabama Supreme Court Should Have Given Full Faith and Credit to the Georgia Judgment.

The Alabama Supreme Court’s decision violated this Court’s Full Faith and Credit precedents in numerous respects.

First, the alleged error in the Georgia Superior Court’s adoption order went to the merits, not to jurisdiction. Georgia law provides that superior courts have “exclusive jurisdiction in all matters of adoption,” Ga. Code Ann. § 19-8-2(a), and the Alabama Supreme Court observed that it was “undisputed that Georgia superior courts like the Georgia court have subject-matter jurisdiction over, that is, the power to rule on, adoption petitions.” App. 19a. Thus, the Georgia Superior Court plainly had the power to *adjudicate* the parties’ adoption petition. That should have been the end of the matter for purposes of the Full Faith and

Credit Clause. Whether the Superior Court's decision to *grant* V.L. an adoption was correct, or whether it was legally required to strip E.L. of her parental rights as a condition for granting V.L. an adoption, is a classic argument that went to the merits of the case, not the power to decide it.

This Court's recent cases distinguishing "jurisdiction" from "merits" confirm that Georgia's provision for terminating an existing parent's rights is non-jurisdictional. As this Court has explained, "[i]f the Legislature clearly states that a threshold limitation on a statute's scope shall count as jurisdictional, then courts and litigants will be duly instructed and will not be left to wrestle with the issue. ... But when [the legislature] does not rank a statutory limitation on coverage as jurisdictional, courts should treat the restriction as nonjurisdictional in character." *Arbaugh v. Y&H Corp.*, 546 U.S. 500, 515-16 (2006) (footnote and internal quotation marks omitted). The Court has repeatedly applied that principle in recent years, holding that statutory preconditions to relief were non-jurisdictional. *See, e.g., Morrison v. Nat'l Australia Bank, Ltd.*, 561 U.S. 247, 253-54 (2010) (territorial requirement in securities fraud statute is non-jurisdictional); *United Student Aid Funds, Inc. v. Espinosa*, 559 U.S. 260, 271-72 (2010) (requirement that bankruptcy court find undue hardship before discharging student loan debt is non-jurisdictional); *Arbaugh*, 546 U.S. at 515-16 (15-employee requirement under Title VII is non-jurisdictional). Here, there is nothing approaching a clear statement in Georgia law establishing that terminating an existing parent's

parental rights when a second person adopts her child is a jurisdictional prerequisite to granting an adoption. The Alabama Supreme Court had no basis for characterizing the Georgia Superior Court's decision as containing a jurisdictional defect.

Other features of Georgia law confirm that the Georgia Superior Court had jurisdiction to grant the adoption petition. As the dissent pointed out, Georgia law permits a Superior Court to continue a case, and even grant custody, *even if it concludes that the statutory requirements for an adoption are not met.* App. 33a & n.14. These provisions are irreconcilable with the view that the Georgia Superior Court lacked jurisdiction over the parties' petition for adoption. *See Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't*, 523 U.S. 83, 94 (1998) ("Without jurisdiction the court cannot proceed at all in any cause. Jurisdiction is power to declare the law, and when it ceases to exist, the only function remaining to the court is that of announcing the fact and dismissing the cause" (quotation marks omitted)).

Second, if the Alabama Supreme Court had any doubt as to whether the termination provision was jurisdictional or rather simply established a legal rule, it was constitutionally obligated to apply a *presumption* that the Georgia Superior Court had jurisdiction to grant V.L.'s adoption petition. It is undisputed that the Georgia Superior Court is a court of general jurisdiction that has "subject-matter jurisdiction over, that is, the power to rule on, adoption petitions." App. 19a. Under the Full Faith and Credit Clause, it is therefore presumed to have had jurisdiction to grant an adoption to V.L. *Milliken*, 311 U.S. at 462.

Nothing in Georgia law comes close to undermining this presumption. Nothing in the Georgia Code states that termination of an existing parent's parental rights is a jurisdictional prerequisite to granting an adoption to a second parent. Nor has any court ever adopted such an interpretation of the Georgia Code. The Superior Court judge in V.L.'s case certainly saw no jurisdictional impediment to granting the adoption; to the contrary, that court expressly concluded that it had the power to grant the petition without terminating E.L.'s parental rights. And there are no reported cases of any other Superior Court judges who have concluded they lack jurisdiction to grant such adoptions.

Nor is there any appellate authority in Georgia adopting such a holding. The Alabama Supreme Court relied on Justice Carley's dissent from denial of certiorari in *Wheeler v. Wheeler*, 642 S.E.2d 103 (Ga. 2007), in which a trial court *refused* to set aside an adoption by a second parent, and the Georgia Supreme Court denied discretionary review. App. 16a-17a. That dissent by definition did not obtain the votes of the majority of the court, and it acknowledged that "[t]here is not any appellate opinion addressing same-sex adoptions in Georgia, even though they have been permitted at the trial court level in certain counties." 642 S.E.2d at 104. Nor did Justice Carley suggest that the trial court lacked *jurisdiction* to grant the adoption; to the contrary, Justice Carley argued that the adoption was subject to challenge under Ga. Code Ann. § 9-11-60(d)(3) because it contained a "nonamendable defect," which under Georgia law, is an error on the *merits*. See *id.*; compare § 9-11-60(d)(3) (permitting

collateral attack based on “nonamendable defect”) *with* § 9-11-60(d)(1) (permitting collateral attack based on “[l]ack of jurisdiction over ... the subject matter”).

The Alabama Supreme Court also relied on dicta in *Bates v. Bates*, 730 S.E.2d 482 (Ga. Ct. App. 2012). App. 21a. But in that case, the court *denied* a collateral challenge to an adoption similar to V.L.’s. The challenger had already filed one collateral challenge to the adoption which was unsuccessful, and the Court of Appeals held that a second collateral challenge to the adoption was barred by *res judicata*. *Id.* at 486. The court made clear that it was “decid[ing] nothing in this case about whether Georgia law permits a ‘second parent’ adoption,” *id.*, and certainly decided nothing about whether such adoptions are void for lack of jurisdiction.

In sum, there is no Georgia authority that would defeat the presumption that the Superior Court had jurisdiction to allow V.L. to adopt her children. The Alabama Supreme Court had no warrant to disregard the Georgia Superior Court’s order based on its *de novo* examination of Georgia law.

Third, the Alabama Supreme Court’s reasoning for its holding that the Georgia Superior Court lacked jurisdiction was indefensible under this Court’s Full Faith and Credit precedents. The Alabama Supreme Court held that any failure to strictly apply every provision of a state’s adoption law renders the adoption judgment void. In reaching this conclusion, the Alabama Supreme Court cited *In re Marks*, 684 S.E.2d 364, 367 (Ga. Ct. App. 2009), for the proposition that “[t]he requirements of Georgia’s adoptions statutes are

mandatory and must be strictly construed in favor of the natural parents.” App. 23a-24a. It also cited an Alabama case holding that “[i]n Alabama, the right of adoption is purely statutory and in derogation of the common law.” App. 24a. Based on that authority, the Alabama Supreme Court held that a statutory error in granting an adoption deprived the granting court of jurisdiction.

This reasoning is flawed. The Alabama Supreme Court had no basis for transforming a requirement that a statute be construed strictly²—which is a principle of statutory interpretation—into a rule that a deviation from such a statute is a jurisdictional defect. Such a rule would dramatically expand the scope of permissible collateral attacks on out-of-state judgments, in direct contravention of the principles

² Moreover, that requirement does not even apply to this case. *Marks* held: “The requirements of Georgia’s adoptions statutes are mandatory and must be strictly construed in favor of the natural parents, because the application thereof results in the complete and permanent severance of the parental relationship.” 684 S.E.2d at 367 (emphasis added). Thus, under *Marks*, the “strict construction” requirement does not apply to this case, because the very statutory defect that E.L. was complaining about was that the adoption judgment did *not* sever her parental relationship. Indeed, other Georgia courts have explained that the provisions of the Georgia Code which allow for third-party adoptions and stepparent adoptions, Ga. Code Ann. §§ 19-8-5(a) and 19-8-6, are to be *liberally* construed to meet their primary purpose of protecting their best interests. See, e.g., *In re J.S.G.*, 505 S.E.2d 70, 71 (Ga. Ct. App. 1998) (liberally construing stepparent adoption statute to find that former stepfather could petition alone to adopt stepchild even after he was no longer married to child’s mother).

underlying the Full Faith and Credit Clause. It is exceedingly common for state courts to find that state statutes are in derogation of the common law, and must be strictly construed. *See, e.g., Shine v. Moreau*, 119 A.3d 1, 10 (R.I. 2015) (holding attorney fees recovery statutes had no common law analog, and therefore must be strictly construed); *Carlton v. State*, 816 N.W.2d 590, 605 (Minn. 2012) (holding that wrongful death statutes had no common law analog, and therefore must be strictly construed). Thus, the Alabama Supreme Court's reasoning would imply that *any* judgment based on *any* such claim is subject to collateral attack if the issuing court deviated from any statutory requirements. Such a holding would create a massive loophole in the Full Faith and Credit Clause.

Even assuming the Alabama Supreme Court's ruling is confined to the adoption context, it reflects a misapplication of Full Faith and Credit principles. The Alabama Supreme Court's was premised on Georgia's strict-construction requirement, which applies to *all* Georgia adoptions. Thus, in effect, the Alabama Supreme Court held that *any* statutory defect in an adoption necessarily means that the rendering court lacked jurisdiction. This holding has no basis in law. Adoption judgments warrant the full protection of the Full Faith and Credit Clause. *See, e.g., Finstuen v. Crutcher*, 496 F.3d 1139 (10th Cir. 2007) (invalidating Oklahoma statute barring recognition of same-sex couple adoptions because such adoptions are entitled to full faith and credit). There is no legal or practical basis for singling out adoptions as uniquely unworthy of full faith and credit.

To the contrary, legislatures nationwide have consistently recognized that adoptions require *more* protection from collateral attacks than other types of judgments, in light of “the compelling public interest in the finality and certainty of judgments, ... an interest that is especially compelling with respect to judgments affecting familial relations.” App. 14a (quoting *Bates*, 730 S.E.2d at 483). For example, Georgia has an adoption-specific provision barring even *jurisdictional* attacks on adoptions after six months. See Ga. Code Ann. § 19–8–18(e); *Williams v. Williams*, 717 S.E.2d 553 (Ga. Ct. App. 2011). Alabama similarly prohibits virtually any kind of attack on an adoption after one year has passed. Ala. Code § 26-10A-25(d). Most states have similar limitations on collateral attacks in adoption cases. See 2 Ann M. Haralambie, *Handling Child Custody, Abuse and Adoption Cases* § 14:28, n.1, Westlaw (database updated Nov. 2014) (collecting statutes). The Alabama Supreme Court’s rule that statutory requirements for adoptions are automatically jurisdictional is not only legally baseless, but undermines the nationally-recognized public policy in ensuring the finality of adoptions.³

³ The Alabama Supreme Court concluded that Georgia’s bar on collateral attacks did not apply to this case because it applied only when an adoption *complied* with statutory requirements—the precise situation in which it is not needed. App. 14a-17a. This reasoning was not only an exceedingly dubious interpretation of the Georgia statute, but it overlooked a critical point: given that Georgia and numerous other states have enacted statutes granting adoption *heightened* protection from collateral attack, it makes no sense to hold that any statutory defect in an adoption is a

Fourth, even if the Georgia Superior Court’s decision not to terminate E.L.’s parental rights could be characterized as a jurisdictional defect—which it cannot—the Alabama Supreme Court was *still* constitutionally barred from overturning the Georgia Superior Court’s adoption order. This Court has repeatedly held that jurisdictional determinations, like any others, are entitled to full faith and credit. *See supra* at 15-16.

Here, the Alabama Supreme Court’s should have given full faith and credit to the Georgia Superior Court’s decision to exercise jurisdiction over V.L.’s adoption petition. The Georgia Superior Court specifically addressed the fact that E.L.’s parental rights were not being terminated, and expressly made the “conclusion[] of law” that “[i]t would be contrary to the children’s best interest ... to either deny this adoption by the second parent or to terminate the rights of the legal and biological mother. The adoption will result in legal recognition of the actual parenting arrangement which has existed since their births.” App. 50a. It found that “[t]he Petitioner has complied with all relevant and applicable formalities regarding the Petition for Adoption in accordance with the laws of the State of Georgia.” *Id.* Even if this determination could be characterized as “jurisdictional,” the Alabama Supreme Court owed full faith and credit to the Georgia Superior Court’s determination of its own jurisdiction. *Coe*, 334 U.S. at 384. E.L. did not raise

“jurisdictional” error that permits a collateral attack in the courts of any other state.

her jurisdictional objection in the Georgia Superior Court; to the contrary, she affirmatively asked the Superior Court to grant the adoption. Thus, E.L. participated in the adoption and had every opportunity to raise the jurisdictional arguments she now raises, and her failure to raise these arguments in 2007 does not entitle her to raise these arguments in 2015. *Underwriters*, 455 U.S. at 710 (“A party cannot escape the requirements of full faith and credit and res judicata by asserting its own failure to raise matters clearly within the scope of a prior proceeding.”).

Further, the Georgia Supreme Court has repeatedly held that a prior judgment determining parental rights cannot be challenged later by a parent who participated in the prior litigation, even if the issuing court did not have subject matter jurisdiction, because the public interest in family stability requires finality of these judgments. *Amerson v. Vandiver*, 673 S.E.2d 850, 851 (Ga. 2009) (holding that where a father agreed to termination of his parental rights in a divorce proceeding, he could not move to set aside the order even though the Georgia Superior Court had no subject-matter jurisdiction to terminate parental rights in the context of a divorce); *Marshall v. Marshall*, 360 S.E.2d 572 (Ga. 1987) (holding that where husband participated as a plaintiff in a divorce action, he could not later argue that the court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction). Moreover, in *Bates*—a case cited by the Alabama Supreme Court majority—the panel included a footnote strongly implying that Georgia law would prohibit a collateral attack on an adoption under circumstances indistinguishable from this case. 730

S.E.2d at 486 n.5 (“To some of us, it seems that the present attack upon the validity of that decree amounts to an attempt to play the courts for fools, and that is the sort of thing that judges ought not tolerate.”); *see also id.* at 483 (noting that the “compelling public interest in the finality and certainty of judgments” may prevent a collateral attack based on jurisdiction (citing *Abushmais v. Erby*, 652 S.E.2d 549 (Ga. 2007)). The Alabama Supreme Court’s decision to disturb an adoption that could not have been disturbed in the courts of Georgia was blatantly unconstitutional. *Underwriters*, 455 U.S. at 704 (under the Full Faith and Credit Clause, Alabama was required to give the Superior Court’s judgment “the same credit ... which it had in the state where it was pronounced”) (quotation marks omitted).

Finally, although the majority opinion in this case declined to reach E.L.’s argument that the Alabama Supreme Court could deny recognition of the Georgia judgment for public policy reasons, App. 24a-25a n.10, there is reason to be concerned that the Alabama Supreme Court’s departure from full faith and credit precedent reflects a public policy objection to adoption by a parent’s same-sex partner. Justice Parker’s concurring opinion stated that the state “has a legitimate interest in encouraging that children be adopted into the optimal family structure, i.e., one with both a father and a mother.” App. 31a. He relied on *Lofton*, 358 F.3d at 819-20, in which the court upheld Florida’s “codified prohibition on adoption by any homosexual person.” *Id.*; *see Lofton*, 358 F.3d at 806-07 (quoting Fla. Stat. § 63.042(3)).

Yet there is no roving ‘public policy exception’ to the full faith and credit due *judgments*,” and the “Full Faith and Credit Clause ordered submission ... even to [the] hostile policies reflected in the judgment of another State.” *Baker*, 522 U.S. at 233 (quotation marks omitted, ellipses in original). It was impermissible for Justice Parker or any other member of the Court⁴ to rely on these views as a basis to deny full faith and credit to a sister state’s judgment.

II. THIS CASE IS WORTHY OF THIS COURT’S REVIEW.

The Court should grant certiorari and reverse the Alabama Supreme Court’s judgment. The decision

⁴ Other members of the Alabama Supreme Court have expressed strong views on the public policy issues presented by this case. For instance, Chief Justice Moore, who joined the majority opinion, has previously opined that “the homosexual conduct of a parent ... creates a strong presumption of unfitness that alone is sufficient justification for denying that parent custody of his or her own children or prohibiting the adoption of the children of others.” *Ex Parte H.H.*, 830 So. 2d 21, 26 (Ala. 2002) (Moore, C.J., concurring). He reasoned that “[h]omosexual conduct is, and has been, considered abhorrent, immoral, detestable, a crime against nature, and a violation of the laws of nature and of nature’s God upon which this Nation and our laws are predicated. ... It is an inherent evil against which children must be protected.” *Id.*; see also *Ex parte State ex rel. Alabama Policy Institute*, No. 1140460, -- So. 3d --, 2015 WL 892752 (Ala. Mar. 3, 2015) (directing Alabama officials not to issue same-sex marriage licenses, even after federal district court invalidated Alabama’s prohibition on same-sex marriage); *id.* at *28 & nn.19-20 (suggesting that legalization of same-sex marriage would necessitate the complete invalidation of Alabama marriage law).

below is an unprecedented departure from foundational full faith and credit principles. Moreover, it has profound practical consequences that warrant this Court's review.

A. The Decision Below Is An Unprecedented Application Of The Full Faith and Credit Clause.

The Court should grant certiorari in this case because it is a gross deviation from case law from this Court and other jurisdictions applying the Full Faith and Credit Clause, both to judgments generally and to adoptions specifically.

As explained above, this Court has made clear that the circumstances under which an out-of-state judgment may be disregarded are exceedingly narrow. Although collateral attacks based on lack of subject-matter jurisdiction are permitted under limited circumstances, courts are constitutionally barred from questioning the merits of out-of-state judgments, and constitutionally required to presume that courts of general jurisdiction possessed jurisdiction of cases before them. *Supra*, at 14-15. In light of these limitations, only two modern Supreme Court cases have authorized a collateral attack on a state-court judgment for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction: *Williams v. North Carolina*, 325 U.S. 226, 231 (1945), in which the Court upheld a collateral attack on a state-court divorce issued to a non-domiciliary because domicile is constitutionally required for divorce jurisdiction, and *Kalb v. Feuerstein*, 308 U.S. 433, 438-39 (1940), in which this Court upheld a collateral attack on a state-court judgment on a claim that could be

heard only in federal court.⁵ Thus, *Williams* and *Kalb* held that the state court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction because it was the wrong *forum*: in *Williams* the divorce should have been issued by the court in the couple's home state, while in *Kalb* the judgment should have been issued by a federal court.

As in this Court, successful collateral attacks in lower courts on out-of-state judgments for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction are very rare. And attacks that have succeeded share a common thread: like in *Kalb* and *Williams*, in such cases, the courts have upheld the collateral attack on the ground that the rendering court lacked power to issue a judgment because that power was lodged in the courts of a different jurisdiction. *See, e.g., Hawley v. Murphy*, 736 A.2d 268, 272 (Me. 1999) (denying full faith and credit to Connecticut order imposing a lien on real property in Maine); *Routh v. State, ex rel. Wyoming Workers' Compensation Div.*, 952 P.2d 1108, 1114-15 (Wyo. 1998) (holding that Wyoming courts, not Mississippi courts, had subject-matter jurisdiction over claims under the Wyoming Worker's Compensation Act); *Mack v. Mack*, 618 A.2d 744, 750 (Md. 1993) (holding that Maryland courts, not Florida courts, had subject-matter jurisdiction over child in Maryland); *Tennessee ex rel. Sizemore v. Surety Bank*, 200 F.3d 373, 380-81 (5th Cir.

⁵ *Kalb* was technically not a full faith and credit case: it involved a collateral challenge to a Wisconsin judgment lodged in a Wisconsin state court. But the Court's holding, that under *federal* law the judgment was subject to collateral attack, would have applied to a collateral challenge brought in any state.

2000) (refusing to grant full faith and credit to a Tennessee chancery court order that applied outside of Tennessee's territorial borders). These decisions are consistent with the ordinary understanding of subject-matter jurisdiction as regulating the power of a court to resolve a dispute.

Here, by contrast, it is undisputed that the Georgia Superior Court was the right forum to grant Georgia adoptions. Thus, the decision below appears to be unique—prior to the Alabama Supreme Court's decision, V.L. has been unable to identify a single successful collateral attack based on subject-matter jurisdiction from a federal appellate or state supreme court that did not challenge the forum in which a judgment was rendered.

The Alabama Supreme Court's decision is also a stark departure from how courts have applied the obligation of Full Faith and Credit to adoptions. Courts uniformly hold that adoptions, like any other judgments, are entitled to full faith and credit regardless of whether they would have been authorized under the law of the forum state. *See, e.g., In re Trust Created by Nixon*, 763 N.W.2d 404, 408-09 (Neb. 2009) (granting full faith and credit to adoption from sister state that would have violated local law); *Delaney v. First Nat. Bank in Albuquerque*, 386 P.2d 711, 714 (N.M. 1963) (same). Decisions invalidating out-of-state adoptions are extremely rare, and typically involve a finding that a parent was not notified of the proceeding, thereby raising due process concerns. *E.g., Hersey v. Hersey*, 171 N.E. 815, 819 (Mass. 1930). V.L. has not identified any court applying a rule remotely similar to

the Alabama Supreme Court's rule broadly authorizing collateral attacks on adoptions *whenever* the issuing court allegedly failed to strictly comply with a statutory provision.

In the context of adoptions involving same-sex couples, no prior court (other than courts reversed on appeal) has denied full faith and credit to an adoption from another jurisdiction. *See, e.g., Russell v. Bridgens*, 647 N.W.2d 56, 60 (Neb. 2002) (in factually similar case, reversing decision denying full faith and credit to Pennsylvania adoption because there was insufficient evidence in the record that the Pennsylvania court lacked jurisdiction);⁶ *Henry v. Himes*, 14 F. Supp. 3d 1036, 1057-58 n.24 (S.D. Ohio 2014) (holding that out-of-state same-sex adoption was entitled to full faith and credit); *Embry v. Ryan*, 11 So. 3d 408 (Fla. 2d DCA 2009) (same) *Giancaspro v. Congleton*, No. 283267, 2009 WL 416301 (Mich. Ct. App. Feb. 19, 2009) (same); *Palazzolo v. Mire*, 10 So. 3d 748, 755 (La. Ct. App. 2009) (same).

The unprecedented nature of the Alabama Supreme Court's decision warrants this Court's review. The Full Faith and Credit Clause elevates comity principles to a constitutional requirement, and states have historically honored that requirement, granting full faith and credit even to decrees with which they disagreed. The

⁶ Shortly after the Nebraska Supreme Court's opinion, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court held that Pennsylvania courts do have jurisdiction to this type of adoption. *In re Adoption of R.B.F.*, 803 A.2d 1195 (Pa. 2002).

Alabama Supreme Court circumvented that constitutional obligation by adopting a new understanding of “jurisdiction” that is completely unheard of in the long history of Full Faith and Clause jurisdiction. The stark departure of the decision below from historical Full Faith and Credit case law fully justifies granting certiorari.

B. The Decision Below Will Harm Alabama Families.

Finally, the severe practical consequences of the decision below on Alabama families justify this Court’s review.

The Alabama Supreme Court’s decision yields the ultimate conflict of authority: directly conflicting court orders in two different states. The Georgia Superior Court’s adoption order has never been overturned by any Georgia court and remains binding on Georgia officials,⁷ so in Georgia, V.L. is the children’s legally-recognized adoptive mother. Yet in Alabama, as a result of the decision below, V.L. is a legal stranger to her children. Moreover, V.L. is not the only parent in this situation: All Georgia orders that allowed an unmarried second parent to adopt without terminating the existing parent’s rights are now void in Alabama, and so all such families are simultaneously recognized

⁷ It is unlikely that the Georgia Superior Court would be required to give full faith and credit to an Alabama order invalidating the Superior Court’s own judgment. *See Colby v. Colby*, 369 P.2d 1019, 1022 (Nev. 1962) (refusing to give full faith and credit to Maryland decision invalidating Nevada judgment).

in Georgia and not recognized in Alabama.

This interstate inconsistency creates practical difficulties for families in this situation—consider the difficulties that a Georgia adoptive mother who works in Alabama will experience while filling out her taxes, or traveling with her child between states. Moreover, it also creates the risk of forum-shopping in child custody disputes. For instance, if an unmarried Georgia couple who obtained an adoption breaks up, the biological parent could avoid the effect of the adoption order by moving to Alabama and obtaining a declaration that the adoption is void. The risk of dueling parentage decrees and associated inter-state friction justifies this Court’s review. *Cf. Webb v. Webb*, 451 U.S. 493, 494 (1981) (granting certiorari to resolve Full Faith and Credit issue because “because the state courts of Florida and Georgia have reached conflicting results in assigning custody of the child”).⁸

Even setting aside these practical difficulties, the Alabama Supreme Court’s decision will have a devastating effect on Alabama families who obtained similar adoptions in Georgia. Adoptive parents in this situation may not be eligible to register their children for school, to make medical decisions for their children, or to make innumerable decisions that parents take for granted. Worse, if the biological parent unexpectedly

⁸ The Court ultimately dismissed the writ because the Full Faith and Credit issue had not been litigated in the lower courts, 451 U.S. at 501-02. That consideration does not apply here, as that issue was litigated and decided below.

dies, the adoptive parent may not be able to take custody of her children—because the adoptive parent is now a legal stranger to her children in Alabama, the children will become legal orphans and wards of her state. If the adoptive parent dies, the child may not have the right to inherit, receive child’s Social Security survivor benefits or worker’s compensation benefits, or bring an action for wrongful death.

The Alabama Supreme Court’s decision would warrant this Court’s review even if it applied only to same-sex couples and others who obtained similar adoptions in Georgia. But it applies far more broadly than that. First, as explained above, the Court’s reasoning was not specific to adoptions by an unmarried second parent; it establishes that *any* Georgia adoption that deviates from statutory requirements can be collaterally attacked in Alabama.

Second, the court’s decision is not limited to Georgia judgments. The court cited Georgia case law holding that adoption is purely a matter of statute and that adoption statutes should be strictly construed. App. 23a-24a (citing *In re Marks*, 684 S.E.2d 364, 367 (Ga. Ct. App. 2009)). But adoption is a purely statutory cause of action in all fifty states, and courts from other states routinely use language virtually identical to the language in *Marks* on which the Alabama Supreme Court relied.⁹ The Alabama Supreme Court’s

⁹ See, e.g., *S.J.S. v. T.D.L.*, No. 2014-CA-01901, 2015 WL 5223511, at *1 (Ky. Ct. App. Sept. 4, 2015); *In re Adoption of B.Y.*, 356 P.3d 1215, 1223 (Utah 2015); *In re Adoption of K.L.M.*, No. 15AP-118, 2015 WL 4656633, at *2 (Ohio Ct. App. Aug. 6, 2015); *In re J.C.J.*,

reasoning would therefore apply in indistinguishable form to *any* statutory defect in *any* adoption in *any* state—a point that the dissent made, App. 35a, and that the majority conspicuously did not dispute.

Thus, under the Alabama Supreme Court’s decision, if an adoptive parent lives in Alabama, *any* parent who regrets permitting a second parent to adopt her child, or even any parent whose parental rights were terminated in another state’s adoption proceeding, could presumably attack an adoption in an Alabama circuit court. And if she can convince the circuit court that there was a deviation from statutory requirements—which, under the Alabama Supreme Court’s decision, ranks as a “jurisdictional” defect—she could win. Permitting an adoption judgment to be collaterally attacked years after the fact is catastrophic for the children and parents affected.

The Alabama Supreme Court’s decision will have a particularly adverse impact on same-sex couples. All fifty states have long recognized adoptions by married couples, as well as step-parent adoptions, in which a step-parent could adopt the child of his or her spouse. However, before marriage between same-sex couples became legal, such adoptions were unavailable to same-sex couples. Thus, in many states (including Georgia),

349 P.3d 491, at *3 (Kan. Ct. App. 2015) (unpublished table decision); *In re Adoption of K.M.*, 31 N.E.3d 533, 538 (Ind. Ct. App. 2015); *In re B.J.C.*, 163 So. 3d 905, 909-10 (La. Ct. App. 2015); *In re Noelia M.*, 121 A.3d 1, 17 (Conn. Super. Ct. 2014); *Brown v. Harper*, 761 S.E.2d 779, 780 (S.C. App. Ct. 2014); *In re T.S.D.*, 419 S.W.3d 887, 892 (Mo. Ct. App. 2014).

the only way that same-sex couples could ensure their joint parental rights was by one member of the couple becoming a parent (either biologically or through adoption), and then the second parent adopting the child, with the existing parent preserving his or her parental rights. As a result, for *all* Georgia same-sex couples who adopted a child prior to *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 135 S. Ct. 2584 (2015), the Alabama Supreme Court's decision strips those couples of the legal bonds tying both parents to their children if those families cross the Alabama state line. Moreover, the decision affects same-sex couples who adopted children outside of Georgia as well, because the legal landscape in Georgia matches the legal landscape in numerous other states: trial courts have granted adoptions similar to that obtained by V.L., without any appellate authority expressly affirming the validity of such adoptions.¹⁰ Thus, all families who obtained adoption judgments in those states may now have a parent whom Alabama courts may hold to be a legal stranger to her children in Alabama. In light of these serious consequences to family stability, the Court should grant review.

¹⁰ While such adoptions are granted to unmarried couples in the majority of states, only about ten states have expressly authorized such adoptions either by statute or case law. Thus, in most states, the state of the law is similar to Georgia: trial courts routinely grant them, but the state appellate courts have not ruled on their permissibility. *See generally* Leslie Harris, *Voluntary Acknowledgments of Parentage for Same-Sex Couples*, Am. U.J. Gender, Social Pol. & Law 467, 471-72 (2012).

CONCLUSION

The petition for writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

SHANNON MINTER
CATHERINE SAKIMURA
EMILY HAAN
NATIONAL CENTER FOR
LESBIAN RIGHTS
870 Market Street,
Suite 370
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 392-6257
sminter@nclrights.org

TRACI OWEN VELLA
VELLA & KING
3000 Crescent Ave.
Birmingham, AL 35209
(205) 868-1555
tvella@vellaking.com

PAUL M. SMITH
ADAM G. UNIKOWSKY
Counsel of Record
JENNER & BLOCK LLP
1099 New York Ave., NW,
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 639-6000
aunikowsky@jenner.com

HEATHER FANN
BOYD, FERNAMBUCQ, DUNN
& FANN, P.C.
3500 Blue Lake Drive,
Suite 220
Birmingham, AL 35243
(205) 930-9000
hfann@bfattorneys.net

November 16, 2015