LEX LOCALIS-JOURNAL OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT
ISSN:1581-5374 E-ISSN:1855-363X
VOL. 20, NO. S2(2022)

THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE CHILD PRINCIPLE IN CUSTODY DISPUTES

Rao Qasim Idrees[1], Naveed Hussain[2], Ali Shahid[3]

[1]Assistant Professor, School of Law, University of Gujrat, Pakistan
[2]Lecturer, School of Law, University of Gujrat, Pakistan
[3]Advocate High Court.

qasim.rao@uog.edu.pk[1]
naveed.hussain@uog.edu.pk[2]
Ali_shahid1996@hotmail.com[3]

Abstract
The principle of the best interests of the child has been adopted by many countries as a foundation of child custody and guardianship proceedings in most countries around the world where the welfare of a child is the most important factor in the decision of cases in family courts. This paper studies the legal background and the international and comparative view of the principle with attention paid to the child rights, guardianship, and family court practice. We consider the development of the best interest standard in domestic and international law, its major literature and case law, that have influenced its interpretation. The statutes, case precedents, and scholarly critiques of different jurisdictions are analyzed with the help of a doctrinal methodology. The results demonstrate that the principle of the best-interests is universally proclaimed codified in documents such as the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and integrated into national legislation, but its interpretation is rather open-ended and left at the discretion of a judge. Comparative law Comparisons between jurisdictions reveal how jurisdictions have evolved principles (such as statutory checklists and case law principles) to organize best-interests assessments, and how courts strike a balance between this child-centered principle and parental rights and cultural values. The article talks about the struggles like subjectivity, the possibility of biasness and the conflict between universal principles and local norms. We in turn suggest proposals to improve the uniform and child-centered use of the best-interests principle with more specific legislative standards, greater judicial education, child involvement procedures, and inter jurisdictional education all towards the goal of ensuring that the results of custody and guardianship practice actually lead to the comprehensive welfare of the child. The conclusion restates the long-standing relevance of the best-interests principle, but calls on the continued development and upkeep as children rights protection tools in custody proceedings.

Keyword: Best interest, Child custody, Disputes, Statutes, Principles

Introduction

When child custody and guardianship disputes arise in the world, family courts all over the world are oriented by one basic question: What will be of best service to the child and its best interests? This question is reflected in the principle of the best interests of the child, which is a common law that dictates that the best interests of the child must be paramount whenever courts make a decision that would touch upon the upbringing of the child. The best-interests principle has gained almost universal adoption in the contemporary family law and child rights debate. It is secured in international instruments primarily in Article 3(1) of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and enshrined or established in the domestic legislation of millions of jurisdictions. (Pobjoy, J. M. 2015) (Nations, U. 1989)

Although widely supported as a child-centric and intuitive norm, there are complicated challenges in the application of the best-interests principle. In highly controversial situations, judges have the duty of considering numerous issues regarding the welfare of the child, including emotional attachment and stability, schooling, health and safety, among many others. Besides, the principle should be used under various cultural and legal circumstances, which does not always coincide with the family traditions or the rights of the parents. Throughout the years, jurists and academics

have been dealing with some basic questions: How can the best interests be defined and determined? What can be done to guarantee uniformity and equity in such decisions? And how can we courts reconcile the interests of the child and the rights of parents or other caregivers particularly when such interests come into conflict?

This paper thoroughly examines the best-interests-of-the-child standard as it is used in custody cases with an emphasis on child rights, guardianship and family court procedures. The authors use a global and comparative perspective and look at how the principle has developed and how it has been applied in different regions and legal cultures. The authors examine statutes, case law and academic commentary through a doctrinal research approach to shed light on the strengths and weaknesses of the best-interests standard. Among the major themes are the vagueness of the principle and the resulting freedom that it grants to courts; the creation of statutory checklists and evidentiary schemes that can be used to restrain their discretion; how the best-interests principle interacts with other legal principles (including parental rights or cultural/religious presumptions in custody); and how the principle can be used as an instrument to promote child rights in the courts. Through researching literature and case law in many other jurisdictions, the article indicates how both common law and civil law regimes have put the welfare of the child as the lodestar of custody determination, and also finds out the practice of differences. The analysis highlights significant cases, whether it be the welfare checklist of the United Kingdom or factor-based statutes of the United States, or the impact of the Islamic law of such countries as Pakistan and Egypt or the international law and human rights institutions guidance. Eventually, the exploration should reveal the best practices, and suggest reforms that will make the custody decisions more transparent, consistent, and child-focused. Seeing to it that the principle of best interests actually fulfils the best interest of the children is not only a legal but a moral requirement that requires consistent amendment of the laws, policies, and jurisprudential orientations. Below, we provide the review of the relevant literature, introduce our methodology, our comparative findings and analysis, and give some recommendations to the policymakers and the courts and conclude with some thoughts on the relevance of the principle in the long-run.

Literature Review

Thoughts Evolution and Universalization of the Best-Interests Principle: The principle of putting the welfare of a child first in custody issues has a long history, but its modern form as the best interest of the child principle has been developed over the last 200 years (Dolgin, J. L. 1996). During the 19th and early 20th centuries, numerous legal systems in the Western world began to move toward a more child-focused approach, and many Western legal systems no longer relied on strict paternal custody rights or an otherwise uniform rule (such as the “tender years doctrine of young children favoring the mother) in their custody practices. This development corresponded to the shift in the social attitudes which have acknowledged children as persons with their rights and needs, not as the property of their parents. In the middle of the 20th century, best-interests standard was fully established in the domestic family law in the United States and Europe. It was also supported by international agreement in the late 20th century: the best interests of the child were entrenched by the 1989 UN Convention on the Rights of the Child which states that in all operations relating to childre the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration. The UNCRC has been ratified in nearly all countries (excluding a few) and the concept of the best-interests principle has become an essential principle in the guidelines of child welfare and custody adjudication used in most of the countries. (Zermatten, J. 2010)

A striking feature of the best-interests standard is its inherent vagueness a necessary flexibility that allows courts to account for each child's unique circumstances, but one that also raises concerns about indeterminacy. Most jurisdictions do not define "best interests" in a fixed or narrow way. For instance, a survey of U.S. state laws shows that *"most States have no standard definition of 'best interests of the child'"*, treating it as an open-ended legal concept rather than a concretely defined term. Only a couple of U.S. jurisdictions (such as Montana and Puerto Rico) have attempted statutory definitions, which essentially describe best interests in broad terms of the child's well-being and development (Kalverboer, et al, 2017). Generally, the standard is implemented through lists of *factors* that courts must consider to ensure a holistic evaluation of the child's welfare. These factors tend to cover the child's emotional ties, physical needs, safety, stability, and developmental needs, as well as the capacities and circumstances of each parent or caregiver. Common examples across various legal systems include: the love and affection between the child and each parent; the child's age, health, and special needs; the moral, emotional, and financial fitness of the parties seeking custody; the child's educational and social needs; and, in many cases, the child's own wishes (especially if the child is older and capable of expressing a reasoned preference). (Salter, E. K. 2012)

Jurisdictions often embed these considerations in statutes or guidelines. In the United States, 31 states and D.C. enumerate specific factors in their statutes for determining a child's best interests. Frequently cited factors include *"the emotional ties and relationships between the child and their parents, siblings… or other caregivers," "the capacity of the parents to provide a safe home and adequate food, clothing, and medical care," "the mental and physical health needs of the child," "the mental and physical health of the parents,"* and *"the presence of domestic violence in the home."* Similarly, the United Kingdom's Children Act 1989 provides a structured *Welfare Checklist* of seven criteria that courts *"must consider under the Children Act 1989 when reaching [a] decision"* in custody and upbringing cases. These criteria include: (1) the ascertainable wishes and feelings of the child (in light of their age and understanding); (2) the child's physical, emotional and educational needs; (3) the likely effect of any change in the child's circumstances; (4) the child's age, sex, background, and any characteristics the court considers relevant (such as culture or religion); (5) any harm the child has suffered or is at risk of suffering; (6) the capability of each parent (or other relevant person) to meet the child's needs; and (7) the range of powers available to the court in the proceedings. This checklist essentially operationalizes the best-interests principle by ensuring the court addresses all key aspects of the child's welfare in a systematic way, rather than relying on an abstract notion of what is "best." (Driscoll, J. 2016)

The literature also frames the best-interests principle as a child-rights issue. Internationally, the UNCRC not only positions best interests as a primary consideration but links it with other child rights, such as the child's right to be heard (Article 12). Thus, *how* best interests are determined should involve, whenever appropriate, hearing the views of the child concerned. Many jurisdictions reflect this in their laws: for example, numerous U.S. states and the UK require courts to take account of a mature child's wishes as part of the best-interests analysis. The weight given to a child's preference may depend on age and maturity; as a general practice, courts are more inclined to respect the wishes of teenagers, while very young children's preferences carry little weight (and are often conveyed via a guardian or expert). Scholars note that including the child's perspective serves not only to inform the outcome but also affirms the child's agency and dignity in the process, aligning with a rights-based approach to custody adjudication. (Krappmann, L. 2010)

However, in spite of its good intentions, the best-interests standard has faced continued academic criticism, mostly because of its vagueness. The concept of defining the best interest of the child is vastly indeterminate, and even child development experts cannot agree on what is best in a particular case, as early as 1975, Robert Mnookin made the well-known argument that it is. Janet Dolgin, has noted that the best-interests credo, though virtually unassailable rhetorically (who would disagree with the welfare of children?), practically offers little to direct court decision-making, and gives judges considerable leeway which results in highly divergent, even contradictory, outcomes in custody cases, depending on the judge who founds the case. In fact, the subjective value judgments can be concealed under the veil of vagueness of the standard, which is a recurrent theme in the literature. The interpretations of what best interest means by each judge may also be affected by their own beliefs or cultural affiliation, which may lead to discrepancies in the outcomes that are achieved or even unfair. Dolgin (Dolgin, J. L. 1992) made an incisive observation that the standard, as it is perceived to establish and safeguard the interests of the children, tends to appear to be encouraging the courts to concentrate on and to safeguard the interests of the fighting adults. That is, the indeterminacy may permit such aspects as the sympathies of judges with one of the parents, or social prejudices (e.g., feminist ideas of parenting) to influence the decision in the name of the best interest of the child. (Mnookin, J. L. 2012)

These concerns are reflected in contemporary analysis. According to Victoria Mather, there is a gap between the concept of applying the best interest of the child as a central consideration and the issues of conflicting interests. She indicates that almost anything that touches the child can be taken into consideration during a best-interests inquiry, which does not inherently weigh factors in any particular way, so the result can be very undetermined by how a specific judge puts the numerous factors in their priorities. Mather and others point out that as a matter of fact, the interests of the child are often subordinated to other interests. As an illustration, the rights of the parents tend to provide a check on the best interests of the child. In the United States, especially, parents have their constitutional rights guaranteed in the upbringing and custody of children. This implies that the courts cannot just do whatever they deem best in a child as long as it violates the fundamental rights of a fit parent. According to scholars, the trend is the constant increase of parental rights in comparison to children in such spheres as a custody and visitation dispute. Among the most striking examples is the case of Troxel v. the U.S. Supreme Court. In the case of Granville (2000) where the Court invalidated a statute that granted third-party (grandparent) visitation only upon a best-interests test, it was pointed out that fit parents should be entitled to the determination of their children associations; the case pointed out that even the best-interests test alone did not suffice to override a parent decision unless there was evidence of child harm. Similar tensions in contexts like third-party custody or visitation (e.g. cases that involve grandparents or step-parents) and medical judgements, where the authority of parents may constrain an uncredentialed best-interests approach, are highlighted by Mather in his review.

The other important perspective is the one that deals with situations in which there is a competition of interests among the society or groups. As an example, Mather cites the case of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) in the U.S., which demonstrates a policy choice to promote the long-term welfare of Native American communities and families through the introduction of special conditions to the removal of Native children out of their cultural framework essentially a best interest analysis restrained by the factors of the identity and heritage of a child. Similarly, such decisions as gender-affirming care of transgender youths are characterized by a collision of the immediate best interests of the child (as understood by the child and the professionals who treat

them and must provide them) and political or social interests that could limit such treatment. These examples demonstrate that the operation of best interests is not in a vacuum: they may be redefined or limited by some higher principles of law or social norms.

Nevertheless, such criticisms do not kill the best-interests principle because it is the prevailing rule in custody cases, and probably cannot be replaced by a clearly better rule. So why has the best-interests standard remained? Dolgin (1996) approaches this question on a historical level, the standard has played an important role in the development of the law of family, and continues to do so because it reflects the desire by the society (at least in principle) to have its child-welfare. It is also fluid to conform to emerging social values (such as to support new family forms or conceptions of child development), but it possesses strong rhetorical impact. Nonetheless, the literature also indicates continuous attempts to change and perfect the use of standard. Legal theorists and law commissions have suggested ways of making best-interest decisions more objective and transparent. These consist of: the establishment of more elaborate statutory principles and so-called welfare checklists (as the UK has done) to organize judicial reasoning; the provision of an explicit reason on the part of the judicial decision making in cases involving custody; the establishment of a linkage between facts and the best interest of the child; enhanced use of expert evidence (such as child psychologists or custody assessors) to furnish an empirical basis to the evaluation of a child needs and the ability of each parent to meet them; and the establishment of a sufficient voice of the child, such as independent children counsel or guardian Mather comes up with one of the most critical reforms that are having children being directly represented by counsel independently in complex, high-conflict or high-stake cases directly, so that the child has direct representation of his/her interests in the process. (Dolgin, K. G. 1996)

Another active area of reform is addressing biases and ensuring fairness in best-interest analyses. Many jurisdictions have explicitly legislated that certain factors *cannot* be held against a parent in determining a child's best interests a response to historical biases. For example, some U.S. states forbid courts from preferring one parent over the other based on gender (abolishing any *de jure* remnants of the "Tender Years" presumption that young children belong with mothers). Several states also prohibit considering a parent's race, ethnicity, or national origin as a factor in custody a principle reinforced by the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Palmore v. Sidoti* (1984), which held that private biases and racial considerations are not legitimate grounds in custody determinations. In order to avoid disadvantaging LGBTQ + parents, California law indicates that sex of gender, gender identity, gender expression, or sexual orientation would not be used to determine the best interests of the child. Similarly disability rights activists have pushed in favor of laws (such as the Idaho law) that guarantee that disability of a parent cannot simply be assumed to make him/her unfit unless proven. These actions indicate an emerging common view among the literature that although the best-interests principle is child-oriented, it must be implemented based on principles of equality and human rights with no prejudice favoring one against the other and ensure the child is not denied the right to continue relations with both absent parents without good reason. (Silverberg, M. H., & Jonas, L. A. 1984)

To sum up, scholarly and legal literature represents the best-interests-of-the-child principle as a sound but flawed concept. It is groundbreaking because it lays the child welfare as the core of the custody conflicts in line with the fact that a broader understanding of the rights and needs of children has been realized by the family law. Still it is not perfect and constantly developing because lawmakers and scholars want to reduce its indeterminacy and prevent the occurrence of unequal or biased results. The following sections of this paper discusses the practice of these

themes with reference to a comparative analysis of approach, case law, and family court practice in other jurisdictions.

Methodology

The paper follows a doctrinal methodology of legal research where it focuses on the systematic analysis of legal texts such as statutes, case law, treaties and commentaries on the application of the best-interests principle in custody cases. The methodology is mainly qualitative and presupposes an elaborate process of collecting and thoroughly reading primary and secondary sources, which are based in different jurisdictions. It has the following key procedural phases of the methodology:

The authors thoroughly searched the academic literature, including law-review articles, monographs, and institutional reports, which include information on child custody and the best-interests test. This gave it both a theoretical and historical background helping to shed light on the relevant discussions and find the most effective approaches or lack thereof in the legal use.

The study questions a number of jurisdictions with different legal traditions, such as common-law jurisdiction (e.g. the United States, the United Kingdom, and other Commonwealth states), civil-law jurisdiction (e.g. in continental Europe), and mixed or religious jurisdiction (e.g. countries in which Islamic family law has an influence such as Pakistan and Egypt). A comparison of statutes (e.g. the Children Act 1989 in the United Kingdom and some state family-law codes in the United States) and case law across the systems enables us to identify some patterns and some distinct deviations in the definition and use of the best-interests principle. Cross-jurisdictional resources (such as the Law Library of Congress reports and books of cross-national collections of case law) that provide an overview of national practice are used to enable the comparative approach.

Methods: the authors reviewed prominent judicial rulings within each of the jurisdictions under review, which express or provide examples of the best-interests principle. Through this analysis of the doctrine, the court can be seen as interpreting the statutory requirements, evaluation of evidence and settling the conflicts of the interest of the child and that of other factors (parental rights or the current cultural standards). Distinct jurisprudence--including Mst. Feroze Begum v. Among the ones that are used to show the principle in play are Muhammad Hussain (Pak SC 1987) and J v C (UK HL 1970), among others.

One more element of the methodology is the analysis of international law and of human-rights instruments. We examined the text and meaning of Article 3 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and General Comment No. 14 (2013) of the Committee on the Rights of the Child that gives the guidance on the application of the best-interests principle. We also found it relevant to take into account the regional human-rights bodies and international family-law instruments, including the 1980 Hague Convention on the Intercountry Transfer of Children, to determine how each works with the best-interests framework.

After gathering and examining the above materials, the authors generalized findings to make conclusions on the most frequent challenges and methods of implementing the best-interests principle. The recommendations contained in a later section rely on the doctrinal and comparative insights. The given recommendations are aimed at the policy (legislative reform, considerations of a treaty) and practice (court procedure, professional training, and use of expert opinion).

As the research progressed, primary and secondary sources of the recent past were given priority in order to ensure that the analysis is informed using the up-to-date information that is authoritative. Legal rules were found in official statutes and case reporters, and scholarly viewpoints were obtained in peer reviewed journals and reputable law reviews. Such a stringent

methodological practice will ensure that the inferences reached represent the current position of the legal theory and family-court practice in respect of the best interests of the child.

Findings and Analysis

1. International Framework and Child Rights Context

It is a well-established aspect of the international law, the principle according to which the best interests of the child are to be considered as a primary (or paramount) consideration, a leitmotif that runs all through the various national systems. The most sensible version is contained in article 3(1) of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC): the best interests of the child should be a key consideration in all actions affecting children, taken by public or non-governmental social welfare agencies, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies. This sweeping mandate means that not only courts in custody disputes, but all decision-makers affecting children (from lawmakers to schools and child welfare agencies), are obliged to weigh how children will be affected and give due priority to their well-being. The UNCRC, nearly universally ratified, has propelled countries to incorporate the best-interests principle into their constitutions, statutes, or case law. Many national laws echo the language of Article 3. For example, the *South African Constitution* explicitly states that *"a child's best interests are of paramount importance in every matter concerning the child."* Similarly, Pakistan's Guardians and Wards Act 1890 (a law inherited from British India and still in force with modifications) provides in Section 17 that custody decisions should regard the welfare of the minor as the paramount consideration. (Taylor, R. 2016)

However, the UNCRC's framing of best interests as "a primary consideration" rather than the sole or paramount consideration leaves room for balancing against other factors in certain contexts. The UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, in its General Comment No. 14 (2013), clarified that a child's best interests could potentially be outweighed by other considerations (for instance, public safety or rights of others) but *never neglected*. In practice, this means that while custody and family disputes generally center on the child's welfare above all, other areas (such as immigration or public health decisions affecting children) might involve calibrated balancing. Some national courts have wrestled with this distinction between "a primary" and "the paramount" consideration. Notably, UK courts, interpreting domestic law in light of the UNCRC, have observed that *"a primary consideration"* implies a very strong weight to the child's interests, even if not an absolute trump card. In family court disputes, though, it is common for domestic law to use even stronger language favoring the child. For instance, the English Children Act 1989 declares the child's welfare to be *"the court's paramount consideration"* in decisions on upbringing. This *paramountcy principle* admits no competing interest that can override the child's welfare in a custody contest between parents or others effectively the child's best interest is decisive. (Pobjoy, J. M. 2015)

Another global influence on the best-interests concept has been the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (1980). While the Hague Convention's focus is on prompt return of children wrongfully removed across borders (to deter parental abductions), it implicitly endorses the philosophy that long-term custody should be decided by the proper jurisdiction with consideration of best interests, rather than by self-help relocations. The Convention does allow courts to refuse returning a child if there is a *grave risk* of harm to the child an exception that essentially invokes the child's immediate best interests (safety) over the general rule of return. Some commentators have criticized tension between the Convention's objectives and individualized best-interests assessments in cross-border cases, but over time, even Hague

cases have increasingly incorporated child-centric considerations, especially after the child is returned and a custody determination is made under normal best-interest standards. (Maxwell, A. 2017)

To conclude, the best-interests of the child is codified in the international legal framework as an imperative of good sense, which has found its way into the legal framework of nations worldwide. The fact that almost everyone agreed to this doctrine, testifies to the importance of the rights of children as one of the most pressing issues of the second part of the twentieth century. It redefines the meaning of custody battles but puts the emphasis on the needs and the entitlements of the child and the parents take a back seat. Their active involvement of international bodies and treaties also adds to the fact that national custody statutes are constantly involved in communication with the changing global norms, such as through encouraging the involvement of the child and eliminating discriminatory practices in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. The following analysis deals with how the same principle is operationalized in the confines of the various legal traditions in disparate jurisdictions.

2. National Approaches to Best-Interests Determinations

United States: The best-interests principle is a common principle in the family law of the United States, applied in the determination of both physical custody and legal custody in divorce or separation, as well as in relocation, custody modification, and third-party visitation cases. No universal federal definition of the best interests exists: rather, the state laws provide the necessary framework. As it is the usual practice, most jurisdictions can list certain areas of consideration by the judge. These standards are intended to help complete an in-depth assessment of the situation of the child. Some of the most common include the connection between the child and both parents; the residential stability of both parents; the ability of both parents to provide love, direction, and basic necessities to the child; the adaptation of the child to both the home and school, as well as the community; the psychological and physical health of all parties; and signs of domestic violence or substance abuse. Other states have subtler factors, like the degree to which each parent is interested in the relationship that the child has with the other parent, a strategy that is meant to discourage uncooperative behavior, and care taken in regard to the cultural and religious background of the child, as well as how each parent will help the child develop those aspects.

Crucially, U.S. courts have clarified that *the best-interests standard applies when comparing two fit parents or potential custodians against each other*, but it does not automatically override a fit parent's right to custody against a non-parent. The U.S. Supreme Court's jurisprudence (e.g., *Troxel*) establishes that the Constitution protects parents' decisions regarding their children, so the state cannot intervene solely on a judge's view of "best interest" absent some showing of unfitness or harm. Thus, in a typical divorce, both parents are presumed fit and the court uses best interests to decide the residential arrangement; however, if a grandparent or other third party seeks custody or visitation against a fit parent's wishes, the parental-rights doctrine raises the bar. This dynamic is an example of how *the best interests of the child, though paramount between parents, is not an all-purpose tool to override family autonomy*. State laws post-*Troxel* often require deference to parental preferences unless clear evidence shows the child's welfare necessitates otherwise.

Another feature of U.S. practice is the use of custody evaluations and expert testimony. In contentious cases, courts may appoint a mental health professional to perform a custody evaluation a process where the evaluator meets with the child, parents, and sometimes teachers or doctors, and reviews records, then produces a report recommending what arrangement is in the child's best interests. While not binding, these evaluations carry weight and help provide an objective

foundation for the court's decision. Additionally, all states allow (and some require) the appointment of guardian ad litem or *attorney for the child* in certain cases an independent voice to represent the child's best interests (especially if abuse is alleged or the case is high-conflict). Mather's recommendation for independent counsel for children resonates with an existing trend in U.S. family courts, although the practice and funding of such representation vary widely.

U.S. jurisprudence has also confronted specific issues under the best-interests umbrella. For instance, in relocation cases (when a parent with primary custody wants to move far away with the child), courts struggle to balance the benefits of the move (better job, closer to extended family, etc.) with the loss of regular contact with the other parent. There is no nationwide rule; some states place the burden on the relocating parent to prove the move is in good faith and in the child's interest, while others presume a custodial parent may move unless it's proven harmful. This is an area where best-interest analysis can become complex, requiring courts to predict future impacts on the child. Another area is the consideration of race or culture: in the past, some U.S. courts openly considered racial factors (as in whether a child of a mixed-race family might face prejudice), but as noted, that is now deemed impermissible. However, in adoption contexts, federal law (the Multiethnic Placement Act) forbids denying or delaying placements based on race. Cultural continuity is officially not a reason to deny custody, except under the ICWA for Native American children, where cultural identity and tribal membership are explicitly part of the "best interests" by federal statute.

United Kingdom: English and Welsh law (similarly in Northern Ireland, and with parallels in other Commonwealth countries) places the child's welfare as the *paramount* consideration in custody (now often referred to as "child arrangements") decisions. The Children Act 1989 is the key statute. As detailed earlier, Section 1(3) of the Act provides the Welfare Checklist. This checklist has been lauded for bringing structure to best-interests decision-making. Judges in family courts explicitly walk through each factor on the record, which promotes transparency. For example, in a written judgment, a judge will typically outline the evidence related to each of the checklist points what are the child's wishes (if any, through the CAFCASS officer's report), what are the child's needs (medical, educational, emotional), what changes are being proposed and how they might affect the child, has the child suffered or is at risk of harm (which includes examining any allegations of abuse or neglect), etc. By systematically addressing these, the court demonstrates that it has not overlooked any aspect of welfare.

UK courts have also elaborated on what "paramountcy" means. In *J v C* (1970), a landmark case, Lord MacDermott described the welfare of the child as a consideration *"ruling upon or determining the course to be followed"* in other words, it should decisively guide the outcome. This does not necessarily mean that a court will grant *every* request that might marginally improve a child's life; practical considerations and evidence still govern. But if a tension arises between the child's welfare and say the parent's preferences or interests, welfare should prevail. The UK has also confronted cases involving religion and upbringing for instance, disputes where parents have different faiths or where one parent's lifestyle is at odds with the other's beliefs. The court's approach is child-centric: it evaluates how each upbringing scenario would likely affect the child, rather than deeming one religion or lifestyle inherently superior. Notably, English judges have stated that the court is *"not choosing between religions"* but rather considering the effect on the child's welfare (including stability and identity) of being raised in one faith or another. (Lowe, N. V. 2011)

A prominent component of UK family proceedings is CAFCASS (Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service) in England and Wales, which assigns officers (often trained social workers) to be independent advisers to the court in disputes involving children. CAFCASS officers will often meet the family and produce a report with recommendations rooted in the child's best interests, similar in function to a custody evaluator in the U.S., though typically less psychological and more practical/social in orientation. Their input, along with any expert evidence, feeds into the judge's welfare analysis.

Civil Law Jurisdictions (Europe): In many civil law countries (such as France, Germany, and others in continental Europe), the best-interests principle is equally entrenched, though sometimes phrased as the "welfare of the child" or simply inferred from broad provisions. These countries often have detailed family codes. For example, the *German Civil Code (BGB)* provides that decisions on parental custody must consider *"das Wohl des Kindes"* (the child's well-being). German courts use a concept of Kindeswohl which mirrors best interests and have developed case law around what that entails. French law, similarly, has the notion of the *"intérêt de l'enfant"* guiding judges in *autorité parentale* (parental authority) disputes. Civil law judges traditionally have more inquisitorial powers than common law judges, which can mean a more court-driven investigation into the child's circumstances (sometimes the judge can even meet the child privately, though with care to avoid putting pressure on the child). (witte et al, 2016)

European jurisdictions universally consider factors like continuity of care, sibling relationships, and the capacity of each parent to provide a stable environment. There is also a strong trend towards joint custody (shared parental responsibility) in many European countries, reflecting a view that it is usually in a child's best interest to have both parents involved in upbringing after separation, barring issues like violence. For instance, Sweden and many other countries have presumptions or preferences for joint custody. That said, joint custody does not always mean equal physical time; the living arrangements are still based on practical best-interest considerations (school, child's age, etc.).

The European court of human rights (ECtHR) which is a part of the European Convention on human rights (ECHR), is a major body in the resolution of family and custody issues in the member states. Mainly, parents who appeal to Article 8 of the Convention the right to respect to a personal and family life make use of the jurisprudence that notes the primacy of the best interests of the child. The principle is especially relevant in the context of cross-border and public care cases, since the Court always confirms that the domestic decisions should be treated with a wise consideration of the proportionality and real interest in the child well-being.

The jurisprudential approach of ECtHR further narrows down the interpretation of Article 8 by defining the margin of appreciation to be given to the national authorities. Although these authorities are given discretion, they must still prove that whatever action taken is reasonable, and clearly it is taken with the aim of protecting the interests of the child. Practically by this it is required, that any giving up or restriction of the rights of parents shall be conditional upon the full production of evidence, that such a step is necessary to the security of the welfare of the child, and not an arbitrary or punitive deprivation of the parental relationships.

As an example, a typical case will mean that although a parent may have proved to have some shortcomings or lacking in some areas, the Court will examine whether these shortcomings do indeed override the best interest of the child to continue the attachment with the parent. When supportive interventions like counselling, monitored visits or parental education courses would allow the parent to contribute to the life of the child, the Court will not support the latter as opposed

to the former. As a result, a golden mean develops: family relations will be maintained to the maximum extent possible, but the Court will be ready to grant the ban or discontinuation under the condition when the welfare of such a child requires such drastic measures, especially in the situations of severe abuse or neglect.

Lastly, ECtHR lays stress on procedural fairness as the part of its decision-making process. States should make well-grounded decisions based on sound and context-dependent evidence on the circumstances of the child. Such a requirement is compatible with the general principle of best-interests, which holds that the judicial decisions are based not only on the substantive requirements of the child, but also on the procedural principles prescribed by the Convention (Thym, D. 2008).

Religious Law Influences Islamic Law Context: In countries where family law is influenced by Islamic jurisprudence (Sharia), such as Pakistan, Egypt, Malaysia, and many Middle Eastern states, the best-interests principle operates alongside traditional rules of custody (often termed *hizanat* or *hidāna* in Islamic law). Classical Islamic law (particularly under the Hanafi school, which influenced South Asian and some Middle Eastern practices) provides a general framework: mothers have priority for custody of young children (the age limit varying by jurist, often until around 7 for boys and puberty for girls), and fathers (or the father's family) assume custody thereafter. These rules were historically justified by presumptions about who is better suited to care for a child at different stages. Modern statutory laws in these countries have modified and codified such rules for example, Egypt's law gives mothers custody until age 15, and Pakistan's case law traditionally gave mothers custody of sons until age 7 and daughters until puberty, subject to welfare considerations.

Contemporary courts in these jurisdictions are increasingly willing to override the traditional presumptions when the child's actual welfare requires it. The Supreme Court of Pakistan, as cited in a 1987 case, firmly stated that *"the overriding and paramount consideration always is the welfare of the minor… the fact that the father is the lawful guardian… does not compel the Court to pass an order in his favour unless it is in [the children's] welfare to do so."* This pronouncement effectively elevated the child's best interest above the father's default right under personal law. Pakistani courts have deviated from classical Hanafi rules by, for instance, allowing a mother to retain custody beyond the traditionally prescribed age if the child's best interest so dictates. A good example is seen in the case of maternal remarriage. The tradition of common law has been to follow the principle that a mother who marries a second time with a non-relative of the child relinquishes any custodial rights. Current judicial systems, though, sometimes defy this assumption whereby evidence shows that the child is well-maintained and established in the custody of the mother. The Pakistani court has added that although the general rule, whereby a mother who marries-a-second cannot claim any right to children, is unconditional, the court can, in special circumstances, in which the interests of the child are best served, permit a mother to keep the custody (Sabreen, 2017). This kind of jurisprudence reflects a radical change in the strict rules of the statute to a subtler, case-based welfare consideration, which is further advised by the laws of the land such as the Pakistani Guardians and Wards Act, which explicitly instruct the courts to take the welfare of the child as the utmost priority.

Similar trends are witnessed in the Middle East. Courts in a number of the Gulf states, not to mention the internal situation in Egypt, are still using codified Sharia-based statutes but presently apply best-interests analyses to decide on issues not covered by express legislation or are used to settle conflicts between conflicting statutory provisions. As an example, a mother could require an exception to the law so specifying a custodial transfer at a certain age, by invoking either the

unfitness of the father, or by invoking the preference of the child to stay with her, thus seeking protection based on welfare factors to prolong her custody of the child. H. A. According to Nour El-Din (2021), because of the lack of specificity in the phenomenon of defining the concept of the best interests in the statutory language and the inelasticity of Sharia-grounded assumptions, there remains a wide discretionary margin in the rulings of judges on whether the compliance with a traditional rule is in the best interests of a particular child. This judicial discretion has discretely elicited calls to provide more specific guiding principles- the extent to which codified rules are predictable and the extent to which the best-interests framework is flexible. Reform proposals have involved incorporating a list of welfare factors, which are based on the Western jurisprudence, and are subject to be assessed by the judges, which has made the best-interests analysis more tied to a procedural structure instead of making it vulnerable to blanket discretionary judgment based on ingrained assumptions (Ahmed nour El Din, 2021).

Summary of Comparative Observations: Across jurisdictions, a common theme is that the best-interests principle acts as a child-centered counterweight to other considerations, ensuring that the child's welfare is not lost in adult-centric disputes. However, the degree to which it is *determinative* varies. In liberal democracies with strong individual rights traditions, one finds that best interests determine *custody between parents*, but cannot justify unwarranted state interference with parental rights or cultural identity without compelling reasons. In more rule-based systems or those with religious laws, best interests serve as a possible exception or modification to default rules increasingly invoked to modernize outcomes in line with child welfare, even if the law on the books is conservative.

Practically, courts worldwide tend to emphasize certain *universal considerations*: children generally benefit from stability, love, and safety; continuity in caregiving is important (thus, many courts avoid disrupting an established attachment without good cause); siblings should ideally stay together for mutual support; and violence or abuse by a custodian is often a decisive factor against their custody. On the other hand, we see divergence on issues like how much to weigh a parent's moral lifestyle (e.g., cohabitation, sexual orientation many jurisdictions now say "not at all" explicitly), or how to factor in the child's own wishes (with cultural differences on the weight given to children's voices).

Notably, in jurisdictions where extended family plays a large role in child-rearing (including many non-Western societies), the best-interests principle may also allow courts to consider grandparents or other relatives as potential custodians if neither parent is clearly suitable. In Western contexts, non-parent custody is rare absent parental unfitness, but in some cultures, children have been traditionally raised by broader kin, and courts may consider, say, the maternal grandmother as a better caregiver than a struggling single father, if evidence supports that, even if it means deviating from paternal preference.

It is also found that most legal regimes are making an effort to balance between flexibility and predictability in terms of best-interests adjudication. Decisions have to be made to suit the needs of individual children but at the same time there has to be consistency in order to be fair and predictable. To balance this, measures such as factor checklists and judicial findings necessary on each factor, appellate review standards (generally, appellate courts are deferential of the trial judge in custody cases, as these are situations-intensive cases of fact), etc.

3. Challenges in Applying the Best-Interests Principle

Despite near-universal endorsement, the implementation of the best-interests principle faces several challenges:

- **Indeterminacy and Subjectivity:** As extensively discussed in the literature review, the open-textured nature of "best interests" can lead to subjective decision-making. Judges bring their own conscious or unconscious biases for example, traditional gender roles might lead a judge to favor a mother for a young child (even if formally gender-neutral), or cultural bias might disadvantage an immigrant parent with an unconventional lifestyle. Training and experience are critical to mitigate this, as is diversity on the bench. Some jurisdictions address this by guidelines; for instance, Canada's courts have used bench books or practice notes detailing how to weigh evidence in custody cases, and emphasizing that decisions must be evidence-based (e.g., a parent's *mental illness*, often stigmatized, should only count against custody if it demonstrably affects parenting capacity, not simply because of a diagnosis). Without careful reasoning, a "best interests" justification can become a broad-brush rationalization for what the judge *personally* thinks is best, rather than what evidence shows the child needs.
- **Resource and Time Constraints:** Optimal best-interests decisions may be rigorous with custody investigations, repeated hearings, attorney of the child, etc. In busy court systems and backlogs the judges would not have the time to explore all factors. This increases the risk of perfunctory decisions. In addition, low-income parties may have no finances to hire expert witnesses or may be self-represented, which may bias the results (such as an un-affordable parent who is unable to bring forth important information regarding the child needs). It has been seen that in some countries there are special family courts or mediation conditions that are instituted to go through custody disputes in a better manner. Although a decision is not arrived at, mediation may enable the parties to agree upon a solution that they are both satisfied with serving the child hence lessening the load on the courts and usually leading to more lasting results.
- **Enforcement and Evolving Circumstances:** What is in a child's best interest can change as the child grows or circumstances shift. A custody order is not necessarily permanent; it can be revisited if there's a substantial change in circumstances. However, frequent litigation is itself harmful to children's stability. Courts must balance the need for finality with flexibility for modification. Typically, a high bar (significant change of circumstances) is set to reopen custody, to prevent relitigating whenever one parent is dissatisfied. Still, enforcement issues arise, for example, if a custodial parent sabotages visitation or if a teenager refuses to comply with a schedule. In such cases, the child's evolving maturity and autonomy add complexity: forcing a 16-year-old to visit a parent they hate might be theoretically in their best interests for maintaining the relationship, but practically it can be counterproductive. Some jurisdictions allow children of a certain age to essentially "age out" of forced visitation and have their wishes respected more.
- **Cultural and Religious Tensions:** In pluralistic societies, the child's best interests might be viewed differently by different communities. One contentious area is education (secular vs religious schooling) or medical care (e.g., blood transfusions opposed by Jehovah's Witness parents, or vaccines, etc.). Courts generally will override parental wishes if a child's life or health is at serious risk, considering the child's best interests in the immediate sense (life and health trump other considerations). But in more nuanced scenarios, courts try to respect family culture unless it clearly harms the child. There have been cases of disputes between parents of different faiths courts try to ensure the child is exposed to and

respectful of both heritages, again focusing on the child's ability to develop her identity without conflict.

- **Alienation and High-Conflict Cases:** Some of the hardest cases are those involving alleged *parental alienation* (one parent poisoning the child's relationship with the other). It can be extremely difficult to discern the child's true wishes in such cases and to decide what is best: leave the child with the currently favored parent (perhaps the alienator) because that's where the child feels secure, or change custody to undo the alienation but at risk of distress to the child. These cases test the limits of the best-interests analysis as virtually any outcome has negative effects. Experts and intensive therapeutic interventions are often needed. The best-interests principle doesn't give a formula here; it only provides the framework that the judge must do the least detrimental thing for the child. (Charlow, A. 1986)
- **Legitimacy and Perception:** Lastly, one of the issues associated with scholarship is that, when the discretion of judges is extremely wide, parties might find the procedure to be unpredictable or biased, and thus do not trust the justice system. This is why the openness provided by the reasoning opinion and following the familiar factors matter. To give an example, when it is possible in the judgment view of the parent to observe that both sides of the family were taken into consideration, child voice was heard, and the decision taken was on the basis of actual findings, e.g., one home offers greater stability, or one parent was observed to be more likely to serve the special needs of the child, the losing parent is more inclined to accept the decision than when it simply states that the decision was made on the basis of the best interests of the child on the basis of the best findings. The key to the legitimacy of the principle of best interests is to make sure that the principle is based on a fair, evidence-based process. (Artis, J. E. 2004)

Recommendations

Based on the comparative analysis and the challenges that have been identified, this section provides recommendations on how the best-interests-of-the-child principle can be reinforced to be applied in cases of custody and guardianship. These recommendations are aimed at improving the content of decisions (to make it more child-centered, holistic, and more just) and the model under which the decisions are taken (to make it more transparent, consistent, and inclusive of the rights of the child).

Establish Specific but Adaptable Rules: The legislatures and the courts need to work together to strengthen the guidelines to be used to determine the best-interests and make them less specific and more flexible. Countless jurisdictions already provide factors, although they can be revised to include modern knowledge of child welfare. To illustrate, domestic violence must become a compulsory factor (as it is already the case in a number of locations due to its drastic influence on children welfare). Similarly, the cooperative co-parenting can be incentivized by factors that address the willingness of the parent to facilitate the relationship between the child and the other parent (so-called friendly parent factor). Any policy must clearly prohibit irrelevant or biased considerations supporting nondiscrimination (e.g. the gender, race, sexual orientation or disability of a parent should not be used against him without showing its actual effect on the child). Meanwhile, it also ought to be stated by legislation that the specified aspects are not exhaustive and that the overall welfare of the child is the ultimate goal of the court. One of the options would

be to have a general statement like: the court can take all pertinent considerations including though not limited to the following, which is already provided by many laws.

Make Child Participation and Representation: To really respect the child-rights perspective, the child must speak in his or her own voice in age-appropriate fashion during the custody proceedings. We suggest that courts re-examine the issue of appointing a guardian ad litem or attorney of the child in a contested custody case, particularly in cases that are of abuse or high conflict. This independent representative will be able not only to communicate the wishes of the child, but also represent the best interests of the child (although at times they may conflict, e.g. a child may prefer to remain with a permissive but negligent parent; a good representative can find the way out). It should also train judges to know how to interview children where it is allowed, or how to understand children (e.g. not to be coached). The practice of taking children into account at an early age of approximately 12 years or even earlier provided they are mature should be introduced in most jurisdictions as advocated in Article 12 of the UNCRC. Nevertheless, children must never be put to a final decision between parents, and this may be traumatizing so the whole process must be carried out with sensitivity considering the child before giving him or her the comfort.

Invest in Judicial Training and Specialization: Family law is a specialty that is useful through knowledge in child development and psychology. Making judges (or magistrates or other officers hearing custody cases) on the issues of attachment theory, effects of divorce on children of various ages, cultural competency, and the realization of implicit bias should become regular. Training may also include the details of how to write clear custody opinions which explain the connection between evidence, factors and the final best-interests conclusion. In situations where possible, the courts could have special family divisions or courts so that judges deciding such cases can gain experience and are not brought in on an unrelated basis. In certain countries, family or children court already exists; in others, it can be a question of administrative appointment. The better the knowledge of the decision-makers, the better the result will be a true representation of what is in the best interest of the child and not the misconception or a hunch.

Apply Interdisciplinary Knowledge: Custody cases are frequently accompanied by problems that are not rooted in pure law the issues of psychology, education, and medicine. Interdisciplinary expertise should be available to the courts. This may imply the hiring of neutral custody assessors or the commissioning of home examination in conflict situations to find facts. It may also refer to the employing social workers or psychologists (some family courts do so) to counsel judges. We suggest that there should be standards to be followed in custody evaluations to make such evaluation ethical and effective (e.g., an evaluator should meet both parents, watch parents and children interact and may even discuss with collateral contacts such as teachers or pediatricians). Furthermore, when the budget exists, forming a panel of neutral experts (in different areas child psychology, domestic violence, substance abuse) that a judge may call on to provide an assessment can enhance the quality of the information that is inputting the best-interests analysis. The shift to problem-solving courts in family law where judges cooperate with a team to help the family solve its problems (such as order parenting courses or counseling and monitoring progress) would also be more beneficial to children in the long-term as it does not merely pick a custodian but assists the family after the divorce.

Promote Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) with Conditions: Although not directly relevant to the legal standard, the encouragement of parents to have consensus agreements, through mediation or collaborative law can produce win win results that the child can be content with. Mediation enables the parents to come up with flexible parenting arrangements that a court may

not be imposing but which may meet the needs of their family (such as innovative schedules, or arrangements on communication). Nevertheless, ADR should be used very carefully in situations where there is the history of domestic violence or power imbalances the best interests of a child could be at risk when an abused parent was forced into an unsafe settlement. In this manner, we suggest that mediation should be regularly provided (and even mandatory as such a step in suitable situations) but on a no-opt basis or special procedures as applied in situations involving violence, and one that always leaves the ultimate agreement open to judicial scrutiny as to whether it is fair to the child or not. The agreements that involve child welfare should not be rubber-stamped by the courts; a short session during which the judge will make sure that the agreed-upon mediation serves the best interests of a child is reasonable.

Enhance the Caution of the Long-Term Well-Being of the Child: The courts tend to concentrate on short- term aspects, whereas the best interests consider the long-term growth of the child as well. Among the suggestions is that the judges should clearly take into account the probable long term consequences of each course of action. As an example, how will every situation benefit the child and his or her future? Is a parent more apt to contribute to the ultimate transition of the child into independence (into college or vocational education)? Does the child have special needs, which are going to develop with time, and who will be more qualified to deal with them? Expanding the temporal lens will allow the court to evade rulings that might appear benign in the present, but will cause trouble in the future (such as handing a teenage child to a parent who is good in the current, but indifferent to the teenager's developing independence or schooling). Experts should be invited in the reports and testifying to these issues of the future rather than the current situation.

Foster Cross-Jurisdictional Learning and Best Practices: The comparative character of the research paper brings out the fact that various locations have experimented with various innovations. Best practices of best-interests principle should be exchanged through international bodies, e.g., Hague conference convents or regional judicial councils. As an example one jurisdiction could post about the success of their checklist or scoring system adding more consistency, and another could post about the success of the child-inclusive mediation models. The transnational discussion of the Best Interests of the Child is a concept that is ready to debate since the major issues of child welfare are universal despite the cultural background. We suggest that legal education and professional development should involve experience of the operation of other systems in custody disputes. Reforms back home can be stimulated by such cross-pollination whether this is the legislative focus in Australia on the protection of the child as a primary emphasis in addition to benefit of both parents, or the need to hear the child in Scotland (and even grant the child a party status in some cases). Through an inter-jurisdiction learning, the jurisdictions will be able to improve their practice to respond to the growing evidence of what works best with children.

Periodic Review and Empirical Research: Lastly, we encourage that the best-interests principle should also become the target of periodic review guided by empirical studies. Is the overall condition of outcomes benefiting children? Social scientists and family law scholars ought to collaborate to research, such as, the outcome of children in different custody arrangements (joint vs sole custody, frequent vs limited visitation, etc.), and the effects of court proceedings on the mental health of children (such as, does the ability to voice opinion in court enhance children adjustment?). In case a study discovers that a particular method produces more successful child outcomes, on the average, then legislation may be changed to correspond (without losing the case-by-case complexity). Another example is that many jurisdictions might be interested in keeping the record of custody cases including percentages of various types of custody, the frequency of the

change of parenting plans, etc. to see the trends and problems. The motto should be continuous improvement since the needs of children and the societal standards change.

Overall, these suggestions are expected to support the essence of the best-interests principle, which is to make all rulings in a custody case with a conscientious and informed approach, that is, regarding what will produce the greatest benefits to the child, not necessarily in the short term, but over the course of a childhood and into adulthood. Such suggestions would not come easy or at minimal cost, but the rewards would be high in more stable families after the divorce or any other form of separation, and eventually, a generation of kids who were not trauma-inflicted issues by the legal proceedings to resolve their family disputes.

Conclusion

The best interests of the child principle is a central point, almost sacrosanct, in the field of custody battles and guardianship law. As discussed in this paper, the principle acts as a moral and legal guide that helps the courts to give consideration to the welfare and rights of children first before deciding on matters concerning their care. Since its inception as a part of domestic legal reforms to its adoption in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, the best-interests standard indicates a radically new perspective of legal thinking that acknowledges children as personalities who should be safeguarded and cared about in order to achieve and bloom to their fullest potential. As we have seen in our comparative analysis, although the principle of best-interests is almost universal in its aspiration, its practical application depends on the jurisprudential culture of the jurisdiction, social values of the jurisdiction and its institutional structures. All common law systems, all civil law systems, and systems with some influence of religion, give a fealty to the welfare of the child, but the means by which they do so (be it factor checklists, judicial discretion, presumptive rules with welfare exceptions) may vary. Positively, a trend within the different systems is towards closer convergence on what is relevant to the welfare of a child. There are such issues as the necessity of a safe, loving environment, the necessity of continuity in the life of a child, and the necessity to save children against harm or excessive turmoil, which are recognized everywhere. Even in systems previously dominated by dogmatic traditions, we find courts that are creative and where they must, transcend the tradition to fulfil the short-term and long-term interests of a child.

Nonetheless, the process of achieving the principle of the best-interests to the fullest continues. The indeterminacy and bias criticisms cannot be passed off lightly, they are a reminder of the fact that a noble principle does not execute itself; it needs proper implementation. The list of recommendations presented in this article will help to strengthen the principle by making the decision-making process more evidence-based, participatory, and aware of the voice of the child and the current concept of child welfare. Essentially, we are trying to humanize the law application in order to see that behind all the legal standards, it is the lived experience of the child in question which we want to keep in the foreground.

In a more general context, the best interests served of a child during a custody conflict is also a sense of commitment of the society to the future generation. It is a heartrending experience that family courts are exposed to parents against each other, children between emotional tornado. The principle of best-interests when employed in an upright manner can be used to light up these murky and convoluted conflicts. It puts the blame or the rights of the parents aside, and asks the question in a more productive way: What can we do to make this child love, safe, and able to live his or her life? The simplicity of that question, in its turn, summarizes the reason why the principle is so appealing and significant to people.

Judges and legislators should be careful and responsive. With the constantly developing family structures (with more and more acceptance of various types of families, as well as single-parent ones, same-sex parents and others) and the growing knowledge regarding child psychology, the concept of best interests will be interpreted differently as well. The strength of the principle in this aspect is that it can be flexible and adapted to new knowledge, including the role of the cultural identity of a child or the role of technologies and moving to another country in preserving relationships between parents and their children.

Finally, the success of any standard in the law is measured by the effects of the law in practice. The best-interests principle is only truly tested when the results of the intervention are more beneficial to the children: Have the courts made them safer and happier? Are they having meaningful relationships with the people who are important to them? Do they get the protection against preventable damage and a chance to fulfill their potential? These are the questions that count. Based on the results of the present study, we summarize that the principle of best-interests-of-the-child has been a difficult concept to concede but an essential theory. It is a principle urging judges, lawyers, parents, and the society in general to focus outside of the adult disputes and make the child the focus of the discussion on the vulnerability, hopes and the future of a small human being who is at our mercy to get it right.

By and large, the principle of the best interests of the child in custody cases is not a fixed and rigid rule but a living and breathing doctrine. It must be safeguarded by constant nursing with good legislation, professional judicial work and professional advice. Likewise when well utilized it will keep its promise of ensuring that we end up in making decisions that despite being not exactly perfect, at least are well intended to provide children with the best opportunity of having a stable and nurturing childhood. In the hope that our analysis meets the standards of a good scholarly and practical discussion, we find ourselves saying what nowadays is iconic truth in the field of family law, and which is the best interests of the child, our lodestar against which we must row. With that lodestar at hand, the family courts will be still able to promote the rights and well-being of children, thus building a better society, one that is healthier and more pleasant to all.

References:

"Indeterminacy of the Best Interest of the Child and Shari'a Rules in C" by Hala Ahmed Nour El-Din

"The Myth of the Best Interest of the Child" by Victoria Mikesell Mather

"Why Has the Best Interest Standard Survived?: The Historic and Social " by Janet L. Dolgin

A Comparative Overview Of Child Relocation - Osbornes Law

Ahmed Nour El-Din, H. (2021). Indeterminacy of the Best Interest of the Child and Shari'a Rules in Custody Adjudications: Egypt Case.

Artis, J. E. (2004). Judging the best interests of the child: Judges' accounts of the tender years doctrine. Law & Society Review, 38(4), 769-806.

Charlow, A. (1986). Awarding custody: The best interests of the child and other fictions. Yale L. & Pol'y Rev., 5, 267.

Dolgin, K. G. (1996). Parents' disclosure of their own concerns to their adolescent children. Personal Relationships, 3(2), 159-169.

Driscoll, J. (2016). The rights of the child: United Kingdom national report. In The Rights of the Child in a Changing World: 25 Years after The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (pp. 331-348). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

fordhamlawreview.org
https://childlawadvice.org.uk/information-pages/the-welfare-checklist/
https://cwig-prod-prod-drupal-s3fs-us-east-1.s3.amazonaws.com/public/documents/determining-best-interests-child_1.pdf?VersionId=42E4_Y_URQM6xU8aXHKAtckRAcFMW1.R
https://fordhamlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Huntington-Scott_May.pdf
https://fount.aucegypt.edu/etds/1641/
https://osborneslaw.com/blog/comparative-overview-child-relocation/
https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr/vol127/iss2/6/
https://scholarlycommons.law.hofstra.edu/faculty_scholarship/433/
https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/international-and-comparative-law-quarterly/article/abs/best-interests-of-the-child-principle-as-an-independent-source-of-international-protection/BBED3939352C2FF5DC83B2F67C968902
Kalverboer, M., Beltman, D., Van Os, C., & Zijlstra, E. (2017). The best interests of the child in cases of migration: Assessing and determining the best interests of the child in migration procedures. The International Journal of Children's Rights, 25(1), 114-139.
Lowe, N. V. (2011). J v C [1970] AC 668. J v C: placing the child's welfare centre stage.
Maxwell, A. (2017). The Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction 1980: The New Zealand courts' approach to the grave risk exception for victims of domestic violence. Victoria U. Wellington L. Rev., 48, 81.
Mnookin, J. L. (2012). Atomism, holism, and the judicial assessment of evidence. UCLA L. Rev., 60, 1524.
Nations, U. (1989). Convention on the Rights of the Child. Geneva: Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights.
Pakistan: International Child Custody
Pobjoy, J. M. (2015). The best interests of the child principle as an independent source of international protection. International & Comparative Law Quarterly, 64(2), 327-363.
Sabreen, M. (2017). Law on the Custody of Children in Pakistan: Past, Present and Future. LUMS LJ, 4, 72.
Salter, E. K. (2012). Deciding for a child: a comprehensive analysis of the best interest standard. Theoretical medicine and bioethics, 33(3), 179-198.
Silverberg, M. H., & Jonas, L. A. (1984). Palmore v. Sidoti: Equal Protection and Child Custody Determinations. Family Law Quarterly, 335-353.
Taylor, R. (2016). Putting children first: children's interests as a primary consideration in public law. Child & Fam. LQ, 28, 45.
The Welfare Checklist - childlawadvice.org.uk
Thym, D. (2008). Respect for private and family life under Article 8 ECHR in immigration cases: a human right to regularize illegal stay. International & Comparative Law Quarterly, 57(1), 87-112.
Witte, S., Miehlbradt, L., van Santen, E., & Kindler, H. (2016). Briefing on the German Child protection system. Geraapdleegd via: http://www.projecthestia.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/POLICY-BRIEFINGGERMANY.pdf.
Zermatten, J. (2010). The best interests of the child principle: literal analysis and function. The International Journal of Children's Rights, 18(4), 483-499.