

Highlights of 2026-2027

- *Magee v. Olson*, 260 Ariz. 370, 574 P.3d 1189 (Ct. App. Div.1 2025). (If an active family court case receives notice of a pending dependency, it must transfer the case to the juvenile court clarifying Arizona Rule of Family Law Procedure). 2:6 n. 3
- *In re B.W.*, 260 Ariz. 123, 572 P.3d 88 (2025) (In a termination case for abandonment, the Arizona Supreme Court discusses and defines “just cause” for not maintaining a parent-child relationship). 6:4 n. 5
- *In re M.K.*, 2026 WL 1191712 (Ariz. Ct. App. Div.2 2026) (The juvenile court abused its discretion in finding good cause to deviate from ICWA’s placement preferences). 11:9 n. 2
- *In re C.J.*, 260 Ariz. 166, ¶20, 572 P.3d 597, 601 (Ct. App. Div. 1 2025) (*Anders v. California* and *State v. Clark* do not apply to termination appeals. “[A] parent’s right to counsel in a termination proceeding in Arizona derives purely from statute – A.R.S. 8-221(B) and the Fourteenth Amendment’s Due process Clause.”). 13:14 n. 9

Notice: On July 30, 2026, the Arizona Supreme Court vacated the Court of Appeals (Division One) decision of July 29, 2025 (2026 WL 2203781). The decision of the trial court was affirmed granting the church defendants summary judgment. *Doe v. The Corporation*, 2026 WL 2203781, Ariz. Sup. Ct., July 30, 2026 (three issues addressed regarding Arizona’s mandatory reporting statute: at issue was whether a factfinder—a court or jury—may inquire into whether a clergy member violated religious doctrine by failing to report abuse of a minor. The court also addressed the meaning of the terms “confession” and “confidential communication” in the Reporting Statute. And finally, the court resolved whether a factfinder (court or jury) may determine who qualifies as a “member of the clergy.”