

**NOTICE**

This order was filed under Supreme Court Rule 23 and may not be cited as precedent by any party except in the limited circumstances allowed under Rule 23(e)(1).

**FILED**

February 2, 2018

Carla Bender

4<sup>th</sup> District Appellate

Court, IL

2018 IL App (4th) 170693-U

NO. 4-17-0693

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF ILLINOIS

FOURTH DISTRICT

<i>In re</i> MARRIAGE OF	)	Appeal from
GRANT FOWLER,	)	Circuit Court of
Petitioner-Appellee,	)	McLean County
and	)	No. 13D260
STEPHANIE FOWLER,	)	
Respondent-Appellant.	)	Honorable
	)	Pablo A. Eves,
	)	Judge Presiding.

JUSTICE KNECHT delivered the judgment of the court.  
Justices Holder White and DeArmond concurred in the judgment.

**ORDER**

¶ 1 *Held:* (1) The trial court’s finding respondent suffered from a delusional disorder is not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

(2) The trial court’s order allocating parental responsibilities and parenting time is not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 2 Petitioner, Grant Fowler, and respondent, Stephanie Fowler, are the parents of N.F., born July 26, 2002. During proceedings to dissolve their marriage, Grant and Stephanie each sought the majority of parental responsibilities and parenting time. In August 2017, the trial court found it was in N.F.’s best interest to allocate to Grant sole parental decision-making responsibilities regarding N.F.’s education, health care, religion, and extracurricular activities. The court further found Stephanie suffered from a delusional disorder and mandated Stephanie

complete a mental-health evaluation. Stephanie was allocated supervised parenting time as determined by the parties.

¶ 3 Stephanie appeals the order, arguing (1) the trial court’s finding she suffered from a delusional disorder is against the manifest weight of the evidence, and (2) the court’s order allocating parental responsibilities and parenting time is against the manifest weight of the evidence. We affirm.

¶ 4 I. BACKGROUND

¶ 5 Grant and Stephanie were married in November 2001 in San Diego, California. One child, N.F., was born in 2002 to the marriage. In May 2013, Grant filed a petition for legal separation; Stephanie followed with a counter-petition for the dissolution of marriage.

¶ 6 In October 2013, an agreed order was entered. According to the order, Stephanie was granted temporary exclusive possession of the marital residence in Bloomington, Illinois, and temporary custody of N.F.

¶ 7 The procedural history between the agreed order and the hearing at issue in this appeal is lengthy. We need not list the entire history here. Of note, petitions were filed seeking mental and physical examinations for Stephanie, seeking the release of Navy records pertaining to allegations of Grant’s fraternization, alleging the marital home had been abandoned and had mold damage, alleging Grant failed to pay mortgage payments, alleging Grant sexually abused N.F., and noting Grant had moved to Streamwood, Illinois.

¶ 8 A lengthy hearing on “remaining issues” commenced in January 2017, spanned eight days, and ended in April 2017. Many witnesses testified at the hearing.

¶ 9 A. Testimony by the Parties

¶ 10

1. *Grant Fowler*

¶ 11 Grant, 45 years old, testified as of June 26, 2016, Grant worked at Equinix, a data center, as a facility engineer. He worked the night shift from 7 p.m. to 7:30 a.m., working 7 out of every 14 days. Grant intended to work his way to the day shift. Grant's work schedule and the work schedule of his live-in girlfriend, Kelly Koehler, would allow them to insure someone was home at all times with N.F. and Koehler's daughter, M.K. Before Equinix, Grant worked for two years as a reliability manager for Georgia Pacific in Mt. Olive, Illinois. His employment was terminated after new management arrived. Before Georgia Pacific, Grant spent 23 1/2 years in the United States Navy, beginning after his 1990 high school graduation. Grant and his family moved to Bloomington in 2011 for his position as a Navy recruiter. Grant retired honorably in March 2014.

¶ 12 Grant and Stephanie separated in March 2013. The current parenting arrangement allowed Grant to have N.F. at his home every other weekend and every other holiday. A court order permitted nightly phone calls between Grant and N.F. The order followed a period of time in which Stephanie prevented Grant from speaking to N.F. Grant's residence in Streamwood was approximately two hours from Bloomington. The parties met at an exit on the interstate to exchange N.F. Grant tried not to interact with Stephanie during the exchange to avoid arguing in front of N.F. Grant drove to Bloomington for N.F.'s orchestra performances.

¶ 13 According to Grant, Koehler and her teenage daughter, M.K., resided with him in a house in Streamwood. Grant described his relationship with M.K. as "pretty good." They did not argue, but they saw "things differently" and had conversations. Grant taught her about electronics and how to use tools. Koehler disciplined her daughter; Grant did not. Grant testified

N. F. and M.K. got along and they had an interesting dynamic, as N.F. was pretty quiet and M.K. was really loud. N.F. calmed M.K., and M.K. helped get N.F. out of his shell. They got along “really well.” The two cooked together and were comfortable hanging out together. If N.F. were placed with Grant, he would attend Streamwood High School, which M.K. attended. N.F. also recently met Koehler’s adult son. They shared interests in electronics and building cars. The two “clicked.”

¶ 14 Grant testified regarding his discipline technique. Grant testified what worked best with N.F. was to explain the behavior that needed correction and show the impact of that conduct, such as taking food to the basement and leaving it there.

¶ 15 According to Grant, N.F. loved video games, building with Legos in the downstairs hobby room, and Nerf guns. There were books in his room and in the reading nook. N.F. did not bring homework to Streamwood. Grant was concerned about N.F.’s homework not being completed. He was also concerned about Stephanie’s ability to help N.F. with his homework, stating she did not have the necessary skills. Grant pointed to N.F.’s grades in the previous two years and emphasized N.F.’s grades and attendance were horrible—“missing 47 days this year, whatever it is.” To correct these problems, Grant would get N.F. into a good routine and set expectations and dedicated time for homework. Grant would also check the homework. He intended to maintain good communication with the teachers.

¶ 16 Grant testified Stephanie did not inform him of N.F.’s orchestra performances. As to Boy Scouts, Grant was not notified regarding Boy Scout trips. Grant testified he would love to participate in those trips. Stephanie notified Grant of one doctor appointment for N.F.

¶ 17 When asked about N.F.’s schedule when N.F. was with him, Grant testified the

pickup occurred at 7 p.m. The two would stop to eat on the way home. They would hang out at the house. N.F. would play a game with his buddies online before going to bed. The next morning, they typically cooked breakfast as a family and then went on a family outing. Sometimes they played miniature golf or saw a movie. Sometimes they stayed home. Most of the time they cooked at home and N.F. enjoyed pitching in.

¶ 18 Grant did not attend church but knew N.F. had been attending temple with Stephanie. Grant testified N.F. can participate in any denomination he wanted. Grant wanted to be the primary decision maker, but he testified he would consult with Stephanie on major decisions. Grant was willing to jointly parent. He acknowledged, however, that arrangement had not previously worked.

¶ 19 According to Grant, N.F.'s health was generally fine. N.F. had a tendency to have earaches and occasionally had a runny nose. N.F. was born with DiGeorge syndrome, which is the deletion of part of a chromosome. This syndrome affected the heart, the lower face, and sometimes the immune and pituitary systems. There was a spectrum of how DiGeorge syndrome affected children. N.F. was low on the spectrum. He was, however, born with a hole in his heart, and his left pulmonary artery was a little constricted. N.F. had surgery when he was one-week old. Later, a stent was inserted into his left pulmonary artery. At that time, the doctors indicated, unless N.F. wanted to run a marathon, "he would be good for the rest of his life."

¶ 20 Grant described N.F.'s intellectual abilities. N.F. was impatient and did not like to put time into studying something. If he studied through repetition, he did well.

¶ 21 Grant heard N.F., while at Stephanie's, was found looking at some age-inappropriate websites. Grant did not allow N.F. to look at pornography; he had parental controls

on the electronics in his home. Grant denied showing N.F. how to find pornographic material. Grant also denied touching N.F. inappropriately. During the “couple of months” period between when the investigation into the accusation began until the issue was resolved as unfounded, Grant’s visitation with N.F. was suspended.

¶ 22 Grant testified when N.F. arrived for visits, he had a bad smell. When N.F. showed up, Grant asked him to shower and put on fresh clothes Grant provided. N.F.’s hair was greasy almost every time he was picked up. At times he would show up without socks. Grant would buy socks and send him to Bloomington with those socks. Two weeks later, N.F. would show up without socks again. During one visit, N.F. asked for socks and underwear.

¶ 23 Other concerns Grant had regarding Stephanie’s parenting was that Stephanie excessively hovered over N.F. N.F. was not allowed to go anywhere by himself. Even in the house, when he had his own room and a game room in the basement, Stephanie did not allow N.F. to be alone. In Stephanie’s presence, N.F. was overly timid. He cowered. Stephanie also made excessive trips to the hospital and emergency room “for over-the-counter problems.”

¶ 24 Grant testified N.F. was diagnosed by Grant’s doctor with lazy eye and prescribed eyeglasses he was to wear at all times. Grant purchased the glasses and informed Stephanie of the diagnosis. Within one month, the glasses were gone.

¶ 25 According to Grant, Stephanie was not employed. When they were married, the plan was for Stephanie to stay home until N.F. went to school. Grant had no knowledge of Stephanie ever applying for a job. Stephanie had no desire to do anything more than the absolute minimum to maintain a home. In the six-month period after he left the house and the time Stephanie changed the locks, Grant observed a litter box in the yard and animal feces on the

floor. Grant also observed moldy food in the refrigerator and old dried food. There was mildew in the shower. He observed several bags of trash in the kitchen, with trash overflowing onto the floor. During their marriage, Grant helped with cooking and cleaning.

¶ 26 Grant testified he did not physically abuse Stephanie. On one occasion, Stephanie fell in their garage while she was getting out of the car. Grant testified Stephanie protected N.F., but she landed on her arm and wrist and injured herself. Stephanie was not physically violent with him or N.F. On a number of occasions, however, Stephanie would physically block an exit when Grant wanted to leave. Grant testified he would encourage N.F.'s relationship with Stephanie and Stephanie's family, as well as with his father, Tedd Fowler.

¶ 27 On cross-examination, Grant agreed he was living with Stephanie and Grant during the 2012 to 2013 school year when N.F. had 15 absences and in 2010 to 2011 when N.F. had 31 absences and 23 incidents of being tardy. Grant had not spoken to his father Tedd since 2008, after President Obama was elected. Grant explained he did not want Tedd's negative attitude and racism in his life.

¶ 28 Grant denied being in financial trouble. He admitted paying, in August 2013, \$3500 to a Chicago law firm that specialized in military law to defend him against an allegation of fraternization. Grant did not recall the allegation made against him and did not provide documentation, stating he did not have such documentation. The Navy did not comply with the court order for release of the information.

¶ 29 Grant testified he did not attend the individualized educational program (IEP) meetings with N.F.'s school. Regarding the missed IEP appointments, Grant stated for some of the appointments, it was made clear to him by Stephanie he was not welcome. She made it "very

very clear that \*\*\* she felt that that was her job only” and he should stay out of it. For another meeting, he was not informed.

¶ 30 Grant denied any romantic involvement with Tara Marie Buckley and fathering a child with her. Buckley was Stephanie’s friend. Every day during his marriage, Stephanie accused Grant of fathering one of Buckley’s children. No paternity test was done, but he volunteered to take and pay for one.

¶ 31 Regarding the military accusation, Grant stated he received a call regarding an allegation of fraternization, treating one person differently than another. The allegation dealt with a naval family that was having marital problems. “[T]he husband thought I was the reason because I happened to be in the office.” The matter never proceeded beyond the nonjudicial point. Grant retired from the Navy under honorable conditions, earning his full retirement.

¶ 32 *2. Stephanie Fowler*

¶ 33 Stephanie was born in November 1973. When she was six weeks old, she was adopted. Her birth name was Rachel. During Stephanie’s childhood, her family owned a boat and the family went boating every weekend. They spent the summers on Catalina Island, California, and in Mexico and a significant amount of time in Europe. Stephanie’s adoptive mother, Gerda Wittig, was from Poland and her father, Kurt Wittig, was from Lubeck, Germany. Kurt was a physicist who started his own engineering company. Stephanie described a time when her parents took the family on a trip through the Panama Canal and did extensive traveling for about a year and a half. She was homeschooled on the boat with private tutors. Stephanie provided a photo of her father and a three-or four-year-old N.F. on the boat. After high school, Stephanie searched for her biological parents. She learned from a family friend her biological mother’s



name was Karen Luchner. In her research, she did not learn her biological father's name. Stephanie's hunch was that her adopted father was her biological father. At the time of Stephanie's conception, Kurt would have been 41 and her birth mother was 17. This caused huge conflict in the family. Kurt stopped talking to Stephanie and began talking to Grant. Stephanie later did extensive Internet research and requested a document from the San Diego County Recorder that shows Stephanie's birth information. The certificate lists the child's name as "Princess Rachel Ann Wittig." Stephanie was unable to obtain a copy of her original birth certificate.

¶ 34 N.F. was born in July 2002. He had medical issues at birth, requiring open heart surgery. N.F. remained in the hospital 45 days after his birth. N.F. was diagnosed with DiGeorge syndrome, which caused heart and dental defects as well as a suppressed immune system. Because of the dental issues, N.F. was to avoid excess sugar. When he returned home from weekends with Grant, he would at times return with bags of candy and soda. Stephanie was diagnosed with velocardiofacial syndrome, a less severe case of DiGeorge syndrome. Stephanie experienced dental issues, including some missing teeth. During their marriage, Stephanie did not work outside the home. She was the primary caregiver. Grant, who was busy working in the Navy, did not help much with childcare.

¶ 35 Since beginning school, N.F. received special-education services and an IEP. The IEP required annual meetings. Both parents were asked to attend those meetings with teachers and administrators. Stephanie attended all IEP meetings. Grant had not attended one. N.F. also saw a cardiologist annually in Peoria, Illinois. Grant had not attended any appointment.

¶ 36 Stephanie testified she and N.F. attended temple together on the Friday nights

N.F. spent with her. On Saturday mornings, they went to Torah study. On Sundays, N.F. went with his peers at temple to religious school. Occasionally, Stephanie and N.F. went to the Unitarian Universalist church “for concerts and fun things.”

¶ 37 Stephanie testified Grant physically abused her three times during their marriage. In 2003 or 2004, shortly after the family’s move to Bremerton, Washington, Stephanie was sitting on the couch after a long day with N.F. Grant walked in very angry. Grant picked up Stephanie by her collar and then threw her back onto the couch. Grant then walked away. This occurred in front of N.F., when N.F. was an infant. Stephanie did not call the police, but called Vickie, Grant’s stepmother, instead. Vickie called the sheriff’s department. When the officer arrived to investigate, he spoke to Stephanie by phone from the driveway. She told him the situation had calmed and she did not need assistance.

¶ 38 Stephanie described the second incident, which occurred in July 2006. Buckley, Grant’s rumored mistress, was harassing Stephanie. Stephanie asked Grant about Buckley and her two sons. Grant responded by squeezing and fracturing Stephanie’s elbow with his right hand and threatening her not to mention Buckley’s name again. Stephanie sought treatment at the naval hospital, where she was put into a cast. Stephanie did not report the incident. No records of her fractured elbow were presented.

¶ 39 According to Stephanie, the third incident occurred in 2011, after the family moved to Bloomington. Stephanie asked Grant again about Buckley and her sons. Stephanie thought it important to the marriage to get the issue resolved. Grant went after her and twice head butted her. Grant went into the room to console N.F., who observed the attack. Stephanie, fearing additional violence, did not call the police.

¶ 40 Stephanie testified Grant, on their anniversary in November 2008, gave her a pendant and told her “the problem with having a mistress is that they get pregnant.” Stephanie did not ask for details. Shortly before spring break 2013, Stephanie found a photo of Grant that appeared to be a mug shot.

¶ 41 Stephanie and N.F. went on a trip during spring break 2013. When they returned from spring break, Grant picked them up from the airport and told Stephanie he was leaving the marriage. Stephanie was shocked. In this state of shock, Stephanie became motivated to keep the house tidy to keep her mind off things. At times when Grant would go to the house to pick up N.F., Grant would throw things on the floor, take photographs of the mess, and leave with N.F.

¶ 42 Stephanie testified in February 2015 she went to the hospital with a “smashed” heel that needed reconstructing. She was in the hospital and rehabilitation for two weeks. When she returned home, the temperature of the house was in the 40s. The thermostat was not on. Grant controlled the thermostat via cell phone. To manually change the temperature required input of a code, which only Grant knew. Despite the attorney’s attempt to get Grant to share the code, Grant did not comply. Stephanie had to replace the thermostat. The cable and internet were also shut off. Stephanie, Vickie Fowler, or Tedd took N.F. to McDonald’s to use the Wi-Fi to do his homework.

¶ 43 Stephanie testified she and N.F. moved out of the house into an apartment after black mold was found in the basement of the house. Stephanie did not inform Grant of the move.

¶ 44 According to Stephanie, when N.F. returned from his father’s house over the prior weekend, N.F. sat in the car and breathed a sigh of relief. There have been times when he returned that N.F. was extremely upset. After spending a week with Grant over the New Year’s

Day holiday, N.F. returned very angry. He seemed intense and almost distraught. After a session with Thomas Jenkins, his therapist, the following Tuesday, he exited the session happy and relaxed.

¶ 45 Stephanie and N.F. participated in a number of activities through the Bloomington Public Library and through the temple. N.F. played violin since fifth grade. They also tried to go swimming at a local facility three days a week.

¶ 46 Stephanie testified she had an issue with setting appointments with Dr. Kelly Knutson because Dr. Knutson's office scheduled the appointments during N.F.'s weekly therapy appointments.

¶ 47 On cross-examination, Stephanie testified when they were married, Stephanie informed Grant of all of N.F.'s appointments. Grant chose not to go. Since the separation, Stephanie did not inform Grant of the appointments beforehand. The school informed Grant of the IEP meetings.

¶ 48 According to Stephanie, N.F. did not have friends over at the apartment. Stephanie felt it "inappropriate" and the apartment was too small. Stephanie initially testified N.F. was supposed to wear his glasses at all times. In the photographs Stephanie presented into evidence, there were multiple photographs in which N.F. was not wearing his glasses. Stephanie then testified he did not have to wear them "all the time, but mainly for school work and that kind of thing."

¶ 49 In December 2016, Stephanie and N.F. moved into a four-bedroom house purchased by Stephanie's mother. The home remained in her mother's name. It had a garden and swing set. N.F. had not stopped smiling since they moved. Stephanie was last employed before

her marriage to Grant. She had not applied for a job since that time or attended college. Stephanie paid for food with the money she received from Grant. Her mother paid the utilities. For N.F.'s medical expenses, Stephanie's mother helped. Tedd and Vickie helped with school expenses. Stephanie testified she supported N.F. financially through her mother's trust.

¶ 50 Stephanie testified because N.F. had DiGeorge syndrome, she took him to the doctor whenever he was sick to make sure he was okay. These included visits when he had cold symptoms, when it seemed he had lost weight, or when he was stressed. Stephanie testified as the primary caretaker she was responsible for getting N.F. to school.

¶ 51 Stephanie did not send homework with N.F. to Grant's house because there were several instances when the homework was not returned. Stephanie testified she left the marital home in August 2015 because of mold, but she did not inform Grant of the move until October 2015. Stephanie did not call anyone to look at the mold. A dog and a cat lived in the home with N.F. and Stephanie. When N.F. was in sixth grade, N.F. had a ferret.

¶ 52 Stephanie learned Grant fathered Buckley's children from the pastor who baptized the child.

¶ 53 B. Testimony of the Court-Appointed Evaluator

¶ 54 Kelly J. Knutson, Psy.D., a clinical psychologist specialist and the appointed evaluator under section 5/604.5 of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act (750 ILCS 5/604.5 (West 2014)), testified she was "a forensic evaluator" and the court-appointed evaluator in these proceedings. Dr. Knutson estimated she performed over 60 child-custody evaluations. As part of her process, Dr. Knutson would ask both parties to participate in psychological testing and complete questionnaires. The psychological testing included the

Millon Multiphasic Inventory (MMPI-II) and the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI-IV), as well as Beck's depression inventories. Dr. Knutson also observed the child at both residences. At the end of the process, Dr. Knutson performed a clinical interview.

¶ 55 According to Dr. Knutson, both parties participated in the Beck's Anxiety and Depression Inventories. Dr. Knutson testified regarding the MMPI-II, which was used in every child-custody evaluation. The test would show "[a]nything from somatic complaints to mood-related details to personality characteristics to anything substantial that might be concerning." Grant's results were within normal limits. Stephanie's results, however, were "significant." Stephanie's scores were "on the paranoid scale and the psychopathic deviant scale."

¶ 56 Dr. Knutson reported the parties also completed the MCMI-IV, an objective testing measure used for individuals "where there are evaluations or clinical things of concern." Stephanie's results showed "elevations on personality characteristics within those types that were turbulent, that were compulsive, that were histrionic in nature[,] and paranoid." Dr. Knutson diagnosed Stephanie with delusional disorder and unspecified personality disorder. Dr. Knutson explained individuals with personality disorders had difficulty in communications skills. The disorder affected interpersonal relationships. Those individuals had cognitive distortions and did not see information in the same way others did.

¶ 57 The delusional disorder concerned Dr. Knutson in regard to Stephanie's parenting of N.F. Dr. Knutson stated, for example, when Stephanie told N.F. untrue statements about Grant's having multiple affairs, fathering children out of wedlock, and engaging in inappropriate sexual conduct, those statements upset N.F.

¶ 58 Dr. Knutson testified she performed a mental-status examination. In this

examination, examiners look for things like people's hygiene, how they carry themselves, their gait and body language, their thought processes. Dr. Knutson observed at Stephanie's appointment, Stephanie appeared disheveled. Her hair was unkempt. Her hygiene was appropriate. Stephanie's behavioral characteristics were confrontational, uncooperative, and irritable. During the evaluation and testing process, Stephanie would "fluctuate between crying, even while filling out the Beck Depression Inventory and stating that she did not have depressive symptoms," and being irritable and hostile.

¶ 59 As to Grant, Dr. Knutson testified he presented in a way that was "congruent with most parties within a psychological evaluation of this nature." He presented as nervous and worried. Dr. Knutson opined Grant could be "socially awkward." She described him as having exceptional manners and observed Grant was cooperative.

¶ 60 Dr. Knutson had conversations regarding Stephanie's belief she was a German princess. She spoke to the initial guardian *ad litem* (GAL) in the case, attorney Amy McFarland, and a DCFS investigator. Dr. Knutson attempted to interview two clinicians who were recommended to her, Cheryl Gaines and Tom Jenkins, two individuals who counseled N.F. Neither clinician returned her calls. Dr. Knutson spoke to the DCFS investigator regarding the allegations of sexual abuse in the case. The investigator reported the case was determined to be "unfounded." The investigator believed no sexual abuse occurred.

¶ 61 According to Dr. Knutson, Stephanie reported incidents of physical assault by Grant. Stephanie reported Grant had broken her arm while he was in the military. Stephanie did not provide the requested medical documentation to corroborate her report. Stephanie replied the Navy had covered up the incident and would not provide the necessary documents. Stephanie did

not provide documentation establishing her claim she was a German princess.

¶ 62 Dr. Knutson reported Grant was “very up front and forward” about his relationships. Grant denied any extramarital affairs in Seattle, Washington and denied having other children as a result of an alleged affair. Stephanie provided no documentation supporting her claim of extramarital children. The GAL reported having done an extensive background investigation into those allegations and found nothing to substantiate Stephanie’s claim.

¶ 63 Dr. Knutson clinically evaluated N.F. Grant brought him to the interview, as Stephanie refused multiple attempts to set an appointment. Dr. Knutson asked N.F. about the allegations of sexual abuse. N.F. stated “his father had not touched him.” N.F. seemed truthful. Dr. Knutson met with Grant and N.F. together at their home. Grant began showing Dr. Knutson the residence. N.F. then joined in and pointed out things he was excited about: projects he had, a book he was reading, and posters on his wall. The house seemed adequate. The interactions between Grant and N.F. were “comfortable and casual.” N.F. showed no fear of his father.

¶ 64 Regarding her visit with Stephanie and N.F. at their apartment, Dr. Knutson reported the residence “had a very distinct odor” that stayed with her after she left, and the home was unkempt. Upon arriving, N.F. quickly approached and was excited to see her. Stephanie and her mother, however, instructed her to sit on the couch. Dr. Knutson ignored the instruction and followed N.F. into his bedroom to have a conversation and see his space. Dr. Knutson described the room as bleak. His items, items that would normally be out in a child’s room, were in tubs below a foldable table. He began taking out things he was creating. While Dr. Knutson spoke with N.F., Stephanie would frequently stand by the door or enter the doorway. At those moments, N.F. stopped speaking or he would pause and became less vocal. At other times when



they sat together to speak, Dr. Knutson would ask N.F. questions, and Stephanie would speak for him or over him. N.F. indicated there was significant discord between his parents and he wished it would stop as it caused him stress.

¶ 65 Dr. Knutson did not have any concerns about N.F.'s being able to complete schoolwork on the IEP. Dr. Knutson stated this had been a military family, meaning N.F. had been exposed to moving from school district to school district. In addition, the IEP would follow N.F. N.F. made statements indicating he was not socially attached to his school. N.F. had one or two friends. He felt bullied during lunch. Dr. Knutson had concerns about N.F.'s social interactions. Dr. Knutson believed Stephanie was "enmeshed" with N.F., wanting him to spend time doing activities with her. In contrast, boys of N.F.'s age would be more socially engaged with friends and doing outside activities. The only activity N.F. was engaged in was boy scouts, which his mother was also actively involved in. Dr. Knutson noted, "His mother kept him very close."

¶ 66 Dr. Knutson recommended N.F. be placed in the primary legal and residential custody with Grant.

¶ 67 On cross-examination, Dr. Knutson acknowledged it was possible the offered appointment times were Tuesday afternoons when N.F. was in counseling. Before beginning the evaluation, Dr. Knutson spoke with the GAL. The GAL informed Dr. Knutson she needed a child-custody evaluation and two parties were to be evaluated. The GAL asked if Dr. Knutson was available to perform the evaluation. Dr. Knutson acknowledged she reviewed the "Sexual Abuse Evaluation" prepared by Tom Jenkins of ABC Counseling and Family Services (ABC Counseling). In her report, Dr. Knutson did not discuss any of Jenkins's findings or

recommendations.

¶ 68 Dr. Knutson recalled at least two and “probably more” attempts to contact Jenkins. She was aware Jenkins counseled N.F. since fall 2015, stating that was the reason she attempted to contact him. It was important to have a conversation with Jenkins, and “[i]t would have been nice if they had contacted us back.” Dr. Knutson agreed N.F.’s reports to Jenkins were concerning, such as the reports his father taught him how to look at pornography on the Internet, his father touched N.J.’s private parts in the shower, and the father showed him photos of naked people. When asked if N.F.’s statements to Jenkins raised any concern regarding Grant, Dr. Knutson testified, “I think the information is significant. My interpretation of it is probably different than yours.” Dr. Knutson agreed N.F.’s statements were “cause for concern or inquiry” but the statements were “inconsistent with what was stated to [her] and what was gained during this evaluation process.” Dr. Knutson testified she privately spoke to N.F. three times over 3 1/2 hours. Dr. Knutson reported the DCFS investigator reported N.F. did not disclose sexual abuse to his previous therapist. Dr. Knutson considered Jenkins’s report when making her recommendation. She did not believe it was “very likely” talking to Jenkins he would have changed her recommendation.

¶ 69 Dr. Knutson did not attempt to contact N.F.’s teachers because she believed the custody evaluation concerned the parents. Dr. Knutson consulted with the GAL and the DCFS investigator. Dr. Knutson agreed her conclusions regarding Stephanie’s appearance were subjective. Dr. Knutson was not aware of Stephanie’s chromosomal condition that affected her dental health.

¶ 70 Dr. Knutson stated she was aware Stephanie was adopted and was born in San

Diego. Dr. Knutson met Stephanie's adoptive mother once. Stephanie did not inform Dr. Knutson she found evidence her biological father was the same as her adopted father and her biological mother was underage when Stephanie was conceived. Dr. Knutson asked Stephanie to provide birth records. Stephanie indicated she was born in Germany, but the birth certificate states she was born in California. Dr. Knutson asked Stephanie to provide documentation. N.F.'s birth certificate indicates Stephanie was born in California. Dr. Knutson was aware that a new birth certificate was issued following an adoption. Dr. Knutson observed the inconsistencies in the reports regarding Stephanie's birth.

¶ 71 Dr. Knutson explained her conclusion Stephanie's "presentation did not match her report." Dr. Knutson explained "[m]ost individuals who have a lifestyle or claim to have a lifestyle of living on a yacht, of traveling multiple times to Europe, of having extensive resources and class-specific things, do not present consistently with the manner in which [Stephanie] presented while she was in [Dr. Knutson's] presence, including her clothing, her shoes, her presentation. It's inconsistent." Dr. Knutson found Stephanie to be delusional. "Individuals who present[ed] with substantial mental-health issues frequently present[ed] with hygiene-related issues and inconsistencies in their reports into what somebody observe[d] or perceive[d]." Dr. Knutson did not see Stephanie's test results until after meeting Stephanie and observing the "child-parent" behavior.

¶ 72 According to Dr. Knutson, the GAL made a substantial investigation into the allegations of Grant's marital infidelity. The GAL made numerous inquiries to individuals about whom the allegations were made. The GAL reported to Dr. Knutson she made a number of inquiries and was surprised by the fact she could not find anything to substantiate the allegations.

¶ 73 Dr. Knutson agreed there was a range of interpretations in a possible diagnosis. She also agreed two professionals could disagree. Dr. Knutson stated in Stephanie's interactions with Dr. Knutson's staff and Dr. Knutson Stephanie had some disregard for authority figures. Dr. Knutson diagnosed Stephanie with "unspecified personality disorder" because Stephanie had "multiple features of multiple different kinds of personality disorders." The bases for this conclusion were the testing, Dr. Knutson's behavioral observations, and Dr. Knutson's clinical opinion.

¶ 74 When asked her opinion regarding whether custody evaluators should rely on collateral contacts in making the evaluation, Dr. Knutson stated the following:

"In child[-]custody evaluations, evaluators who rely on collateral contacts to make clinical decisions have been found to be unethical. Complaints have been made. Sanctions have been made. It is absolutely our responsibility to not rely upon collateral contacts for information to make clinical decisions.

So, I minimize the amount of collateral contacts. I make sure they are viable sources, i.e., DCFS investigators, [GALs], authority figures as opposed to just family members or people of that nature, because clinicians who do child[-]custody evaluations are not supposed to rely on collateral contacts to make clinical decisions \*\*\*."

¶ 75 Regarding Grant, Dr. Knutson testified the testing did not indicate psychological or psychiatric issues. His "highest scales" in testing were in the areas of compulsive personality

style and schizoid personality style. Those results, however, did not fall into the clinically significant range.

¶ 76 On redirect examination, Dr. Knutson testified the delusions affected Stephanie's parenting ability and N.F.'s mental health. Dr. Knutson stated even if Stephanie led a lifestyle where she lived on a boat as a child, Stephanie's appearance alone was cause for concern. Dr. Knutson explained most individuals participating in a similar evaluation tried "to put their best foot forward." Those individuals arrived in business attire and were well-groomed. They showed concern over how the evaluator saw them. Even if Stephanie were a princess, Dr. Knutson's recommendation would remain the same. Dr. Knutson explained as follows:

"[T]here were substantial issues here that alluded to the fact that something was stated that was inaccurate on a number of occasions, not just the princess: the princess, the birth certificate, the reports of extramarital affairs, of extramarital births that didn't occur.

The specifics for that when you're looking at a delusional disorder is called jealous type. So there's actually a specific delusional aspect when somebody perceives from a paranoid ideation that somebody would be out to get them extramaritally or doing things on purpose."

¶ 77 When Dr. Knutson asked N.F. about the sexual allegations, N.F. responded, "I don't remember any of that." Dr. Knutson believed him. Dr. Knutson believed the evidence suggested N.F. was coerced by his mother or grandmother into making the sexual allegations.

Dr. Knutson pointed to the GAL's references to things stated to her that did not in fact occur. Dr. Knutson further pointed to the DCFS investigator's concerns the mother's "vocalization to the child had absolutely impacted the allegations."

¶ 78 C. Testimony by Stephanie's Opinion Witness

¶ 79 Luke R. Dalfiume, Ph.D., a licensed clinical psychologist, testified he had experience as a child sex-abuse evaluator, performing "maybe 12" such evaluations in his career. Dr. Dalfiume opined Dr. Knutson's evaluation "seemed very incomplete." Dr. Dalfiume read the following from the American Psychological Association's Guidelines for Child Custody Evaluations in Family Proceedings:

“ ‘Psychologists strive to employ optimally diverse and accurate methods for addressing questions raised in a specific child[-]custody evaluation. \*\*\* Psychologists may also have access to documentation from a variety of sources. For example, schools, healthcare providers, child care providers, agencies, and other institutions[,] and [they] frequently make contact with members of the extended family, friends and acquaintances and other collateral sources when the resulting information is likely to be relevant. Psychologists may seek corroboration of information gathered from third parties and are encouraged to document the bases of their eventual conclusions.’ ”

When asked it if would be "unethical for a psychologist or evaluator to seek corroboration from collateral sources," Dr. Dalfiume testified to the following: "I would say if anything it would be

unethical not to seek corroboration based on what these guidelines are saying. And these guidelines are saying you ‘frequently make contact with members \*\*\*\* of the extended family, friends, acquaintances[,] and other collateral sources when the resulting information is likely to be relevant.’ ”

¶ 80 Dr. Dalfiume testified he reviewed Dr. Knutson’s child-custody evaluation provided by Stephanie’s counsel. Dr. Dalfiume concluded the evaluation performed by Dr. Knutson was more of a personality evaluation of the parents. He observed no objective test data “for the kids.” Dr. Dalfiume did not typically do home studies, but he acknowledged he had done so in previous evaluations. Dr. Dalfiume observed, since Dr. Knutson was in the home, “Bricklin” provides she should have looked for unsecured guns or weapons. Dr. Dalfiume found the at-home interviews atypical. He noted the importance of seeing how the child and parent interact but noted he typically invited the parent and child to his office to watch them interact there.

¶ 81 Dr. Dalfiume did not note anything in the evaluation related to the parents’ attitude toward the child in objective measures. At his age, N.F. should have been given a formal evaluation, which Dr. Dalfiume would have expected. Dr. Dalfiume found it troubling Dr. Knutson kept no notes of her conversations with the GAL.

¶ 82 Dr. Dalfiume found “unusual” Dr. Knutson’s lone reference to Jenkins’s report, particularly because the reports reached different conclusions. Dr. Dalfiume noted Jenkins met with N.F. for approximately 24 to 26 sessions over the period of September 15, 2015, to April 5, 2016. Noting the therapist spent at least 20 hours with N.F., Dr. Dalfiume concluded Jenkins knew the child “really well” and performed objective tests of him. Dr. Dalfiume opined “the best

picture of [N.F.'s] functioning is really probably this report.” Dr. Dalfiume noted differences between Dr. Knutson’s report and Jenkins’s report, such as the allegations regarding pornography and the fact Jenkins report shows N.F. suggested a desire Grant would be nicer to Stephanie, but in Dr. Knutson’s report, N.F. suggested “very much” Stephanie was not being fair to Grant.

¶ 83 Dr. Dalfiume questioned Dr. Knutson’s failure to address the pornography issue in her report, noting he would have wanted to follow up on the allegations N.F. looked at pornography at both parents’ homes and at school, and N.F.’s report Grant told him how to do that. He also found it insufficient for the DCFS investigator to say N.F.’s allegation his father sexually abused him in the shower was “unfounded, boom, done.” Dr. Dalfiume stated, “[w]hen you have data available to you like this and you ignore it, it really almost suggests, okay, maybe I have a conclusion before I write the evaluation.”

¶ 84 Dr. Dalfiume noted other areas he believed Dr. Knutson’s report was incomplete or unclear, such as how Stephanie’s belief she was a German princess affected N.F. and Dr. Knutson’s conclusion Stephanie’s presentation did not comport with her alleged lifestyle.

¶ 85 As to the MMPI-2 and the MCMI-IV, Dr. Dalfiume explained the tests were commonly used in court settings and were “the gold standard” for evaluating personality issues. When asked if he found evidence supporting Dr. Knutson’s conclusion Stephanie “had elevation on personality characteristics within those types that were turbulent, that were compulsive, that were histrionic in nature and paranoid,” Dr. Dalfiume testified to the following:

“In the test data—so that when she talked about the turbulent—and I don’t know if she mentioned compulsive. Those



on the MCMI-IV were a more elevated into—on the profiles data you have what’s called a style if it’s a score of 60 to 75. If it’s from 75 to 85, it would be a type. So[,] for her[,] she obtained scores in the turbulent range, for turbulent, rather, that were in the type range. And that’s something Millon, who came up with these scales, there is no formal and/or diagnostic category. There is no formal turbulent personality. So Millon just sort of made it up. What it would mean is somebody who tends to get upset, maybe sort of like your stereotypical Italian grandmother, you know, Mamma Mia, and somebody who is going to be, you know, upset at times and more outspoken. I have often said that. The compulsive for this one, again, this score was in the type range. So there is nothing which is below a score of 60. \*\*\* So her scores were in the style range for both of those. And those were her only elevations on the Millon scale.”

¶ 86 On the MMPI-2, Stephanie’s scores were elevated on scales 6 and 4. However, none of the test results suggested Stephanie had a delusional disorder. Regarding delusional disorder, Stephanie had a score in the style range. The style range suggests some symptoms but does not alone “push it over to disorder.”

¶ 87 As to Grant’s test scores, Dr. Dalfiume initially testified Grant had no elevations in his results. Dr. Dalfiume corrected himself and stated Grant had some “style scores,” which was above nothing, but below disorder and type. Dr. Dalfiume testified regarding Grant,

“Schizoid is in there in terms of style. Turbulent is in there. Narcissistic is in there. Compulsive is in there. And delusional is in there.” Dr. Dalfiume noted none of them rose to the level of a disorder or a type. The data for neither parent, under MCMI-IV, suggested a disorder.

¶ 88 Dr. Dalfiume also questioned Dr. Knutson’s failure to speak with Grant’s paramour. On a questionnaire, Grant indicated he was in a committed relationship but N.F. had not yet met her. Dr. Dalfiume believed since parenting time would be changed and there was a “good likelihood” N.F. would spend time with Grant’s paramour, this individual should have been evaluated.

¶ 89 Dr. Dalfiume opined Dr. Knutson’s conclusions were “much too definitive for the data she present[ed].” He opined the data and the evaluation were incomplete. Dr. Dalfiume mentioned the shortest evaluation he had seen before was approximately 40 pages. He was shocked at the length. Dr. Dalfiume opined the report seemed incomplete and skewed.

¶ 90 On cross-examination, Dr. Dalfiume agreed Stephanie’s score on MMPI-2 indicated an elevation. Stephanie’s score indicated it was elevated on the paranoia scale, indicating she could have feelings of paranoia. Dr. Dalfiume was not familiar with “delusions and the ideas of grandeur” for that same score. Individuals with this score potentially could feel mistreated, angry, and resentful and harbor grudges. On the psychopathic deviance scale, Stephanie’s score was elevated. This indicated an individual “who [was] sort of angry.” That individual potentially was problematic as to authority figures. Dr. Dalfiume testified psychologists would describe individuals with clinically significant elevation on the paranoia and psychopathic deviant scales as argumentative and irritable.

¶ 91 When asked what score on the two tests he would look for to determine an

individual had a delusional disorder, Dr. Dalfiume testified he would look for a score of 75 to 85 on the MCMI-IV, which has a delusional scale. Dr. Dalfiume observed Stephanie's score on that scale was 66. Dr. Dalfiume agreed there was not one set way to do a custody evaluation.

¶ 92 D. Testimony by N.F.'s Therapist

¶ 93 Thomas Jenkins, a child sexual-abuse therapist with ABC Counseling, testified that in September 2015, at Stephanie's request, he performed a sexual-abuse evaluation of N.F. Jenkins prepared a report dated March 16, 2016, which was entered into evidence. Jenkins could not recall how often he met with N.F., but estimated the two had 8, "maybe 10," sessions, meeting once a week for 50 minutes. As of the date of the testimony, Jenkins and N.F. continued the counseling sessions.

¶ 94 According to Jenkins, as part of the evaluation, N.F. participated in a Behavior Assessment System for Children self report. N.F. fell in the "at risk range" for attention problems. The results of the child sexual-abuse assessment tool demonstrated N.F. looked at pornography at both parents' residences and at school. N.F. reported he learned how to look up pornography from Grant. For juveniles, pornography rewires the brain, like heroin. Jenkins did not believe N.F. was addicted to pornography, but he opined this was a "huge problem."

¶ 95 Jenkins testified the results from the anger-trigger worksheet and the hostility inventory indicated N.F.'s anger level was elevated but not at a clinical stage. Jenkins opined the anger was centered on the divorce and the conflict between the parents. Jenkins observed improvements in this area. The inventory indicated N.F. scored in the clinical area for suspicion. N.F. was very suspicious. He overanalyzed everything. N.F. was resentful of the divorce and having to go to different parents' homes. The resentment level was not as high as it had been.

Jenkins testified N.F. was developing pretty well in social skills, as he was involved in Boy Scouts and played in the orchestra.

¶ 96 Jenkins observed N.F. struggled with talking about anything sexual. On one occasion, N.F. took a small piece of paper, wrote on it, and handed it to Jenkins. The note stated when N.F. was taking a shower, his dad opened the shower curtain and wanted to touch N.F.'s penis. N.F. asked why, and Grant responded "just because." Grant touched N.F.'s penis and examined it. N.F. was uncomfortable with the situation and exited the shower. When the situation would come up in session, N.F. would not talk about it other than to tell Jenkins to refer to the letter.

¶ 97 Regarding the Walter Hudson skill test for N.F., Jenkins found some conflict with his dad. N.F. scored as "at risk." The score for his mother showed general contentment.

¶ 98 Jenkins testified he really did not see much emotion from N.F. Once, when they were talking about pornography, N.F. became upset. N.F. stated it was okay to look at pornography, but he quickly calmed after Jenkins told him it was illegal until he reached age 18. Jenkins did not know of other instances of N.F. looking at pornography. N.F. learned his mother was attentive and not much would get past her.

¶ 99 According to Jenkins, N.F. informed him Grant had cameras around the house to monitor N.F.'s behavior while at work. N.F. found this behavior creepy. N.F. also reported his father yelled at him. About every few weeks, Jenkins asked about N.F.'s contact with Grant and the activities they did. There were times when Grant yelled at him and, at those times, N.F. wanted nothing to do with Grant. N.F. complained about having to talk to his father by phone every day. Jenkins reported N.F. was not very talkative, so at times they had nothing to talk

about. In addition, the calls sometimes interfered with activities. N.F. wanted to be able to call his dad, he just did not want to have to do it every day.

¶ 100 Jenkins opined N.F. had progressed in counseling. N.F. was performing better in school. Stephanie was in touch with teachers. N.F.'s grades had improved, and N.F. had made some friends.

¶ 101 When asked if he had observed anything in Stephanie's conduct that was concerning, Jenkins referred to "the whole princess thing." But he stated she showed him a certificate, and it did not really matter. Jenkins did not believe the statement was delusional because he could not prove that it was not true. He believed Stephanie was a great mom, calling her "very nurturing, very caring, right on top of stuff." Jenkins believed there was a very strong bond between N.F. and Stephanie.

¶ 102 Jenkins testified if Dr. Knutson called his office, he called her back. When asked if he would have liked to talk to Dr. Knutson, he stated, "I'm not real interested, for somebody that spent a handful of hours with the family[.]" He did, however, believe it would have been important to share the information he learned about N.F.

¶ 103 On cross-examination, Jenkins testified N.F. did not have a learning disability, but seemed to have attention problems at times. N.F. was a bright young man who wanted to be an inventor. Jenkins had not spoken to N.F.'s teachers, but he received emails from N.F.'s teachers and communicated with Stephanie.

¶ 104 Regarding N.F.'s relationship with Grant, Jenkins testified N.F. did not talk about his dad in a negative way and he did not like to hear anything negative about his parents. At the time Jenkins prepared his report, Stephanie told him Grant molested N.F. multiple times. Jenkins

found no evidence to support that assertion. N.F. was in the room when Stephanie made the assertion. Jenkins stated N.F. tried to appease both parents. He was very shy and introverted.

¶ 105 Jenkins testified he met Grant once. Grant seemed like a nice guy. He was concerned about N.F. and asked several questions. They talked a little about the accusation. N.F. did not complain about his relationship with Grant. At the time of this testimony, Jenkins had no concerns about that relationship. He also did not see any problems in the relationship between Stephanie and N.F.

¶ 106 Stephanie was questioned about what she reported to Jenkins. Stephanie testified, when she first spoke to Jenkins in 2015, she did not report N.F. had been molested multiple times. Stephanie reported the incident in the shower, when N.F. was about 12 years old.

¶ 107 E. Witness Testimony on Grant's Behalf

¶ 108 1. *George Rickert*

¶ 109 Rickert, a Parkside Junior High School teacher, testified N.F. was a student in several of his classes during his sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade years. N.F. was a very likeable young man, who was soft-spoken, curious, and well-behaved. N.F. had no disciplinary issues. N.F.'s grades were declining. In the sixth and seventh grades, N.F.'s grades were in the A and B range. They later slipped to the C range. Rickert was not teaching N.F. in a special-education class. N.F. had an aide in the class who helped him one-on-one. N.F. missed quite a bit of school, which was a problem because there was little homework. It was a challenge to get caught up if one missed the class. Rickert had not noticed any odors from N.F.

¶ 110 2. *Timothy Monson*

¶ 111 Monson, a science teacher at Parkside Junior High School, testified N.F. was his

student that year. N.F. struggled in his class due to his learning disabilities. N.F. enjoyed science. N.F. was earning a C in class, which was not a special-education class. At one point, N.F. was failing the class. Monson had no concerns about N.F.'s hygiene. N.F. had absences, but Monson did not feel they were excessive.

¶ 112

### 3. Jane Rolfs

¶ 113 Rolfs, a teacher at Parkside Junior High School, testified N.F. was in her class in sixth grade. That year, N.F. was enrolled in all special-education classes. Rolfs taught him his five core classes. N.F. was sweet. N.F. did not have a behavioral problem. His grades in the classes that were geared toward special education were As and Bs. When asked about N.F.'s hygiene, Rolfs testified N.F. "had a smell of urine very embedded." Rolfs testified he smelled like cat urine. She "would Febreze [*sic*] the room after he would leave." Rolfs testified they would tell him to shower or bathe and soon realized it was "the clothes and not the kid." This occurred daily for months, but the situation improved.

¶ 114

### 4. Michelle North

¶ 115 North, Grant's aunt, testified she and Grant were like siblings. North lived in Missouri and saw N.F. once or twice a year during his lifetime. It had been approximately two years since the last visit. North's relationship with Stephanie was "pretty tense and uncomfortable and always awkward." Once in 2012 or 2013 when Grant and Stephanie were staying at North's house for a family wedding, Stephanie observed North's family had the same telephone system from Walmart that Stephanie and Grant had. Stephanie believed they conspired behind her back to get the same phone. Stephanie also had accused North on multiple occasions of wanting or trying to steal N.F.

¶ 116

*5. Margo Corley*

¶ 117 Corley, Grant's mother, testified she resided in Missouri. Corley had not seen N.F. in at least two years. She had seen Grant more often. Corley testified Grant and N.F. always had fun together and worked very well together. Corley had no concerns about Grant's parenting of N.F. if he was awarded the majority of parenting time. Corley believed that would be great for N.F., as N.F. talked more when his father was around.

¶ 118 Corley testified Stephanie always liked to keep N.F. pretty close to her. Stephanie was "very clingy." After the separation, Corley asked Stephanie if N.F. could visit her and her husband for a week at their house. Stephanie said no, stating she was not comfortable letting him go anywhere.

¶ 119 Corley testified, at Christmas 2012, N.F., Grant, and Stephanie were at her house. N.F. and Grant were in the computer room playing on the computer. They were talking and laughing. Stephanie became agitated and repeatedly said they were laughing and talking about her. Corley tried to convince Stephanie they were laughing at what they were listening to on the computer. Stephanie continued to repeatedly say they were talking about her and making fun of her. She became upset and insisted they stop what they were doing and join her.

¶ 120 Corley denied having Tara Marie Buckley at her home. Corley stated the only time she had heard of Buckley was in the courtroom. Stephanie had, however, made repeated accusations Grant had a girlfriend since the time Grant "got into professional life." Stephanie had also mentioned Grant's fathering a child. Corley did not believe the accusations.

¶ 121

*6. Kelly Koehler*

¶ 122 Koehler testified she had been in a romantic relationship with Grant since



September 2014. They met online in late August 2014. Koehler worked in the superintendent's office in the Elgin School District in Elgin, Illinois. Koehler had two children, M.K., who was 14, and Trent, who was 18 and a senior in high school. M.K. resided with her in Streamwood, where they moved in June 2016. Trent lived in Waterloo, Illinois, with Koehler's parents so he could finish his senior year there.

¶ 123 According to Koehler, she and Grant moved in together in June 2016, which was the same month she met N.F. They were settled in as a couple. The two shared household chores, including transporting M.K. to her activities. M.K. and N.F. spent time together. They liked to cook together in the kitchen. In October 2016, N.F. accompanied Koehler, Grant, and M.K. on a visit to Koehler's hometown. There, he met Koehler's side of the family. N.F. interacted with Koehler's nieces and nephews as well as with Trent and Trent's girlfriend.

¶ 124 Koehler had observed Grant discipline N.F. when N.F. left trash in one of the rooms. One of the rules in the home was food was to remain in the kitchen or dining-room area. Grant immediately told N.F. to clean up the mess and explained the reason to do so. They had a conversation and N.F. complied. Koehler had not observed corporal punishment or "time outs." The discipline typically involved cleaning up. N.F. had chores at the house. He helped with taking out the trash, cleaning the dishwasher, and cooking.

¶ 125 Koehler and Grant resided in a four-bedroom house they leased. The lease was for two years. They planned to remain in the same school district until the kids finished high school.

¶ 126 Koehler and N.F. had bonded. They had an understanding Koehler would not try to take the place of his mother. She referred to herself as another adult in his life who was willing to listen. They spent a lot of time giggling. They shared the same interests in music. Koehler had

not taken a role in disciplining N.F. Koehler and Grant agreed to each discipline his or her own child. Grant had not disciplined M.K. For M.K., Grant “added another level to her life.” Grant was caring and listened to her. He offered suggestions and has picked her up from school when she was sick. Koehler attended N.F.’s orchestra concert in December 2016. Koehler was concerned N.F. was not wearing his glasses.

¶ 127 F. Witnesses Testifying on Stephanie’s Behalf

¶ 128 1. *Bruce Unterman*

¶ 129 Dr. Unterman, a retired dentist, testified he was “very acquainted” with N.F. and Stephanie. He met them when the two began attending the Moses Montefiore Temple five years earlier. Stephanie brought N.F. to temple for Torah study on the Saturdays N.F. was in town. N.F. would show Dr. Unterman his latest Lego creation or something he thought was cool that week. As N.F. had gotten older, he listened and participated in the discussion. Stephanie’s and N.F.’s interactions were always good. Stephanie supported him and was very proud of his participating. Outside of the Torah group, Dr. Unterman worked with Stephanie on several projects, such as the food fair. Stephanie worked independently on projects when Dr. Unterman was not there. She insured supplies were available and cleaned up properly. Stephanie was very dependable.

¶ 130 Dr. Unterman had not been to Stephanie’s home. N.F. was the only child that participated in the Torah study. When the Torah study began, it had 18 participants. At the time of his testimony, it generally had 6 participants.

¶ 131 2. *Linda Unterman*

¶ 132 Linda testified she was a homemaker and Dr. Unterman’s wife. Linda was

acquainted with Stephanie and N.F. through temple. Linda interacted with Stephanie and N.F. during the Torah study group. N.F. had developed to being able to comment well within the group. Stephanie was very proud of N.F. She was “very positive” and encouraging. Linda had not observed any negative interaction between Stephanie and N.F.

¶ 133 According to Linda, Stephanie and N.F. had been to her house for dinner. They also had gone to dinner with members of the temple after services. The two behaved in a positive social manner. Linda testified Stephanie has stated it is very important to her N.F. be polite to adults and he grows up knowing the difference between right and wrong.

¶ 134 *3. Walker D. Wyman, Jr.*

¶ 135 Dr. Wyman, a retired history professor from Illinois State University, testified he met N.F. and Stephanie through the temple. Dr. Wyman had seen N.F. at services. The spring before, Dr. Wyman decided to meet with N.F. to talk with him. They began meeting once a week after school. N.F. would read things and the two would discuss what N.F. read. Dr. Wyman observed N.F. had a little trouble reading out loud. The two worked on that skill, and Dr. Wyman believed N.F. had improved. When asked if they have a relationship, Dr. Wyman responded “somewhat,” stating “I’m an old man and he’s a young boy, but he seems to respect me when I ask him about schoolwork and reading and things.”

¶ 136 *4. Fred Hoyt*

¶ 137 Dr. Hoyt, a professor of business administration at Illinois Wesleyan University, testified he first became acquainted with Stephanie and N.F. at a synagogue event. Dr. Hoyt was a Boy Scout master of three troops in the community, totaling 30 to 35 boys, ages 11 to 18. Dr. Hoyt asked if N.F. would be interested in joining scouts. Stephanie and N.F. showed up at the

next meeting. Dr. Hoyt knew N.F. reasonably well. N.F. had attended a few activities. Dr. Hoyt would have liked to see him more. N.F. fit in well with some of the younger kids. N.F. recently participated in a wilderness survival camp.

¶ 138 When asked if N.F. had shown growth in terms of his self-concept, Dr. Hoyt believed he had. Dr. Hoyt testified one of N.F.'s first activities was to go on a canoe trip. At that point, he had not been in a canoe before. They went on the Mackinaw River, and N.F. had a great time. In the previous year and a half, N.F. attended four or five camping trips. He attended the meetings. The last activity he participated in, outside of the meetings, was in October 2016.

¶ 139 *5. Vickie Fowler*

¶ 140 Vickie Fowler, Grant's stepmother, testified "Grant is our troubled son." When N.F. was about one month old, Vickie went with her husband, Grant's father, Tedd Fowler, to San Diego to help the family move. The first night N.F. was home, N.F. "was very uncomfortable." N.F. was crying. From the bedroom, Grant yelled, "Some of us have to work in the morning; shut that fucking kid up." Vickie helped Stephanie with N.F. Grant did not help with childcare at that point. Vickie testified when Grant, Stephanie, and N.F. moved to Washington, she and Stephanie tried to keep in touch by phone. Grant would not allow Stephanie to call Vickie. He threatened Stephanie and checked the phone records. They would speak by phone when Stephanie was at her mother's house or when Stephanie called from a pay phone. Once when N.F. was about 3 years old, Vickie and Tedd received a call from N.F. They heard N.F. screaming, "Stop it. Stop it. Don't, daddy. No, daddy." The phone call then ended.

¶ 141 According to Vickie, in the period between mid-February and the beginning of April 2015, she observed N.F. at times when he returned from visits with Grant. Upon his return,

N.F. would at times start shouting at Stephanie immediately. Vickie described N.F. as “a gentle, old soul” who was very well-behaved and had “very, very good manners.” Stephanie, too, had “very, very nice manners.” Grant, however, showed no respect for Tedd.

¶ 142 Vickie testified in July 2015 she discovered N.F. looking at an image of a penis on an electronic tablet when her other grandson voiced concern about the images at which they were looking. She checked the history and found pornography sites. Vickie asked N.F. if he knew what he was looking at and N.F. responded, “[I]t’s not bad because my dad does it.” N.F. told Vickie Grant gave him the pass code to enter some of the websites.

¶ 143 *6. Tedd Fowler*

¶ 144 Tedd testified when Grant was 4 years old, Grant’s mother Martha left him and Grant. Grant resided with Tedd until he was 15, when he moved in with his mother. According to Tedd, he and Vickie visited San Diego, at Grant’s invitation, for a “pinning ceremony” when Grant was promoted. Stephanie did the parenting. It was not until 2009, when Grant visited Martha in Missouri, Tedd and Grant visited again. The two had no relationship at the time of this proceeding. According to Tedd, he and N.F. had a good relationship. They got along “real well.”

¶ 145 *G. Trial Court’s Judgment*

¶ 146 In August 2017, the trial court entered its order allocating parental responsibilities and parenting time under sections 602.7 (750 ILCS 5/602.7 (West 2016)) and 603.10 (750 ILCS 5/603.10 (West 2016)) of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act (Act). The court’s analysis is thorough and extensive, and the court expressly addressed each factor. The court observed the case had “indicators of a high-conflict divorce,” which included allegations of domestic violence, sexual abuse, serial adultery, and pornography. The acrimony allowed the

case to extend to four years. The court observed DCFS concluded Stephanie's allegations Grant sexually abused N.F. were unfounded. The court further concluded the proceedings were lengthened due to uncorroborated allegations Grant physically abused Stephanie and to the mortgage foreclosure proceedings for the marital residence that had a serious mold problem.

¶ 147 The trial court considered the court-ordered evaluation conducted by Dr. Knutson and found Stephanie suffered from a delusional disorder as defined by Dr. Knutson. The court discounted Dr. Dalfiume's critique of Dr. Knutson's evaluation, noting Dr. Dalfiume did not meet with the actors in the case and analyzed the case "from the comfort of 20/20 hindsight." While Dr. Dalfiume recommended the opinion of Jenkins be afforded more weight, the court found Jenkins did not conclude N.F. was sexually abused. Jenkins's role was to presume the veracity of N.F.'s report of abuse and assist N.F. in processing that abuse. The court noted Jenkins concluded N.F.'s reports of abuse did not match the information given to Jenkins of three incidents of sexual abuse. The court doubted Stephanie's testimony she did not tell Jenkins about the three alleged incidents, finding Stephanie met with Jenkins before N.F.'s sessions with him and the information could have come from no one other than Stephanie. As to the mental health of Grant, the court determined his mental health seemed good.

¶ 148 The trial court stated it considered N.F.'s wishes to the extent those wishes were disclosed to others. The court found N.F.'s wishes were tempered by the untrue or uncorroborated information Stephanie shared with N.F. The court considered N.F.'s adjustment to his home, school, and community. The court noted N.F. did not have extensive friendships in the community in which he resided with Stephanie, but he had some friends via scouting and temple activities. In Streamwood, Grant had some online friends and he interacted with Koehler

and her family.

¶ 149 As to the ability of the parents to cooperate to make decisions, the trial court found this to be a high-conflict divorce. The court found Stephanie unable or unwilling to make decisions with Grant. As to the child's needs, the court found it in N.F.'s best interests to be in a household free of Stephanie's delusions and the negative impact they had on N.F.

¶ 150 The trial court further found Stephanie's extensive and long-term delusions seriously endangered N.F.'s mental health and impaired his emotional development. The court thus found a restriction on Stephanie's decision-making was appropriate and, therefore, granted sole significant decision-making to Grant. The court concluded Stephanie was unwilling or unable to facilitate and encourage a relationship between Grant and N.F. but concluded Grant was willing and able to facilitate and encourage the relationship between Stephanie and N.F. The court found Stephanie unwilling or able to place N.F.'s needs ahead of her own. The court found Stephanie's allegations against Grant lacked credibility.

¶ 151 Regarding parenting time, the trial court expressly addressed the factors in section 602.7(b), noting some overlapped with the factors for parenting responsibilities. The court expressly addressed the factors that did not overlap.

¶ 152 The trial court allocated to Grant sole parental decision-making responsibilities for N.F. The court allocated to Stephanie supervised parenting time, the details of which are to be determined by the parties. Stephanie was further ordered to cooperate with a mental-health evaluation and comply with the recommended treatment.

¶ 153 This appeal followed.

¶ 154 II. ANALYSIS

¶ 155

#### A. Standard of Review

¶ 156 Stephanie first challenges the trial court's determination she suffered from a delusional disorder. The court's holding followed an evidentiary hearing, in which the court viewed witnesses and assessed their credibility. The holding is a determination of fact, which we review deferentially under the manifest-weight-of-the-evidence standard. See generally *In re Parentage of W.J.B.*, 2016 IL App (2d) 140361, ¶ 25, 68 N.E.3d 977.

¶ 157 In Stephanie's latter arguments, she challenges the trial court's order allocating parental responsibilities and parenting time. This court will not reverse an allocation of decision-making responsibilities unless the allocation is against the manifest weight of the evidence. *Young v. Herman*, 2018 IL App (4th) 170001, ¶ 64. A strong and compelling presumption favors the trial court's result as the trial court is in the best position to consider and weigh the evidence and to determine the child's best interests. *Id.* We find a trial court's allocation of parenting time, which was formerly part of a custody determination like "decision-making responsibilities" (see *id.*), is reviewed under the same standard.

#### ¶ 158 B. The Finding Stephanie Suffered from a Delusional Disorder

¶ 159 Stephanie initially contends the trial court erred in finding she suffered from a delusional disorder. Initially, Stephanie maintains the trial court denied Grant's motion for a mental-health examination of her and only ordered a custody evaluation. Stephanie seems to contend the mental-health examination done as part of the custody evaluation was thus improper. In addition, according to Stephanie, Dr. Knutson's qualifications to make psychiatric diagnoses were not established. Stephanie contends, without knowledge of Dr. Knutson's qualifications, the trial court should not have given Dr. Knutson's conclusions much deference.



¶ 160 In making this argument, Stephanie cites no hearing or court filing showing she objected to the psychiatric tests or to Dr. Knutson’s qualifications to administer such tests or to diagnose her based on the results. Instead, the record shows Stephanie willingly participated in the tests and made no objection to Dr. Knutson’s qualifications at trial. Stephanie forfeited these arguments raised for the first time on appeal. See *McKinley Foundation at the University of Illinois v. Illinois Department of Labor*, 404 Ill. App. 3d 1115, 1120, 936 N.E.2d 708, 713 (2010) (“Issues not raised before the trial court are considered forfeited, and a party may not raise such issues for the first time on appeal.”).

¶ 161 Stephanie next argues the trial court erred in finding the diagnosis of delusional disorder was “based on a plethora of data including the MMPI 2 [and] the MCMI 4.” Stephanie contends Dr. Knutson did not testify her MCMI-IV scores established a delusional disorder. In addition, Stephanie emphasizes Dr. Dalfiume testified there was a delusional scale on the MCMI-IV. On that scale, according to Dr. Dalfiume, Stephanie’s score was 66, below the minimum score of 75 necessary for a finding delusion was present.

¶ 162 Stephanie’s argument fails because she misstates the trial court’s holding. The court did not find a delusional order exists “based on a plethora of data including the MMPI 2 [and] the MCMI 4.” The “plethora of data” language quoted by Stephanie appears in reference to Dr. Knutson’s findings. Moreover, that language indicates the trial court observed Dr. Knutson made the finding of a delusional disorder on a “plethora of data” that *included* the MMPI-II findings – not solely on the results from the two aforementioned tests:

“Dr. Knutson assessed both parties. She concluded that Stephanie Fowler suffers from a delusional disorder based on a

plethora of data[,] *including* the MMPI 2, the most widely used objective testing measure. \*\*\* Stephanie’s results were significant. Dr. Knutson described the presentation of said results. The data Dr. Knutson relied on included the MCM[-]I4, another objective testing measure. Again, the results for Stephanie Fowler were significant \*\*\*. Dr. Knutson investigated and personally interviewed relevant individuals and did home visits to see the child’s interaction with the parents in their respective households.”  
(Emphasis added.)

Upon observing the extensive list of information Stephanie provided to N.F. that was false, noting Dr. Knutson’s observations about Stephanie and the results of the above tests, and stating Dr. Knutson’s diagnosis, the trial court found Stephanie suffered from a delusional disorder. This finding was not based solely on the results of the above tests. This argument fails.

¶ 163 Stephanie further contends the facts contradict Dr. Knutson’s conclusion she (Stephanie) suffered a delusional disorder. Specifically, Stephanie maintains Dr. Knutson’s “conclusion that Stephanie is delusional because she ‘reported an elaborate lifestyle’ and thinks she might be a princess was fallacious.” Stephanie argues Grant presented no evidence Stephanie’s testimony regarding her childhood or her belief she was a German princess was false and, absent such evidence, the court must accept those assertions as true.

¶ 164 Stephanie’s argument misstates Dr. Knutson’s conclusion regarding Stephanie’s diagnosis. Dr. Knutson did not find the delusional disorder was present solely on Stephanie’s reports regarding her royal lineage or her lavish childhood. Dr. Knutson’s conclusion was based

on test results, questionnaires, the interviews of the parties, and Dr. Knutson's discussions with the GAL and the DCFS investigator. Additionally, during redirect examination, Dr. Knutson explicitly stated her conclusions regarding the diagnosis of delusional disorder would not change if it was proved Stephanie was in fact a princess. Dr. Knutson highlighted multiple incidents supporting the delusional-disorder diagnosis, including the unsupported allegations of extramarital affairs and children born as a result of those affairs. Dr. Knutson further testified Stephanie's presentation during their interview was concerning, even if Stephanie led the childhood lifestyle she asserted. Dr. Knutson admitted her concern with Stephanie's appearance was subjective.

¶ 165 Stephanie's argument is based on an incorrect premise. The argument thus fails to establish trial court error.

¶ 166 Stephanie next contends Dr. Knutson improperly failed to corroborate her diagnosis of delusional disorder. Stephanie maintains Dr. Knutson did not speak to teachers or family members, while deeming such conversations unethical. In contrast, according to Stephanie, Dr. Dalfiume testified the American Psychological Association's Guidelines for Child Custody Evaluations in Family Law Proceedings demonstrate it would be unethical for evaluators not to seek corroboration. Of particular concern to Stephanie was Dr. Knutson's failure to speak to Jenkins. Stephanie argues the evidence adduced at the hearing did not corroborate the finding of delusional disorder but established the contrary. In support, Stephanie points to the teachers' testimonies and the testimonies of her witnesses that showed no concern regarding Stephanie's conduct.

¶ 167 We do not find convincing Dr. Dalfiume's contention the failure to seek

corroboration from other sources is unethical. Dr. Dalfiume stated this conclusion after quoting from the above-mentioned guidelines. According to a plain reading of those guidelines, the American Psychological Association does not mandate corroboration. Instead, the association indicates corroboration is *optional* and not mandated: “Psychologists *may* seek corroboration of information gathered from third parties and are encouraged to document the bases of their eventual conclusions.” (Emphasis added.) This contradicts Dr. Dalfiume’s conclusion it is unethical not to seek corroboration. We note the record shows Dr. Knutson did, in fact, seek corroboration from individuals who were not friends with or related to the parties. Dr. Knutson spoke to the GAL and to the DCFS investigator. Dr. Knutson also attempted to speak with N.F.’s counselors. She also testified she minimized the amount of collateral contacts and implied it was the overreliance on such contacts that might be unethical.

¶ 168           Upon review of the record, we further find Dr. Knutson’s failure to speak with Jenkins was not detrimental to the trial court’s finding Stephanie suffered delusional disorder. Despite failing to connect with Jenkins after attempting to do so, Dr. Knutson reviewed Jenkins’s report and explained the reasons she did not find the contents of the report convincing as to evidence of sexual abuse, such as the fact the statements were “inconsistent with what was stated to [her] and what was gained during this evaluation process,” the DCFS investigator did not believe the abuse occurred, and N.F. did not disclose sexual abuse to his previous therapist. Dr. Knutson also testified she did not believe it “very likely” talking to Jenkins would have changed her recommendation.

¶ 169           We further disagree with Stephanie’s contention no evidence was adduced to corroborate Dr. Knutson’s conclusion. The record is replete with testimony corroborating Dr.

Knutson's diagnosis of Stephanie. Grant denied any relationship with Buckley and thus fathering one or both of her children. According to Grant, Stephanie accused him daily of that relationship. Grant's aunt, North, testified Stephanie believed the existence of the same phone system in North's home indicated a conspiracy against Stephanie. North also testified to multiple incidents where Stephanie accused her of wanting to steal N.F. Grant's mother, Corley testified to a time when Stephanie encountered N.F. and Grant as they were laughing and could not be convinced they were not making fun of or laughing at her. Corley also testified Stephanie repeatedly accused Grant of infidelity and also accused Grant of fathering another child. Dr. Knutson testified the GAL performed an investigation and found no evidence of extramarital affairs.

¶ 170 Stephanie last argues Dr. Knutson incorporated the alleged representations of the GAL without attribution or documentation. Stephanie points to the association's guidelines evaluators create and maintain records that document test and interview data. Stephanie contends Dr. Knutson's failure to document the conversations demonstrates a lack of transparency that undermines the validity of Dr. Knutson's conclusions.

¶ 171 We disagree with Stephanie's conclusion Dr. Knutson's failure to document the conversations with the GAL demonstrated a lack of transparency. Dr. Knutson testified she spoke to the GAL and she acknowledged she had not recorded the information. The trial court was thus aware of this failure and could consider Dr. Knutson's opinions accordingly. In addition, we note Stephanie points to no objection at trial seeking a bar on testimony regarding the GAL's comments based on the lack of documentation by Dr. Knutson or based on the absence of a GAL report. Any argument the GAL's conclusions regarding Stephanie's allegations of marital infidelity may not be a basis for a finding Stephanie was delusional is,

therefore, forfeited. See *McKinley Foundation*, 404 Ill. App. 3d at 1120 (“Issues not raised before the trial court are considered forfeited, and a party may not raise such issues for the first time on appeal.”).

¶ 172 The trial court’s finding of a delusional disorder is not against the manifest weight of the evidence. More important, the diagnosis is not essential to the result. Even without the specificity of the delusional disorder diagnosis, the evidence is sufficient to establish Stephanie had an unspecified personality disorder. The trial court found her not to be credible. The trial court was entitled to conclude her claims and her behavior were detrimental to N.F.’s emotional well-being.

¶ 173 C. The Allocation of Parenting Responsibilities and Parenting Time

¶ 174 1. *Parenting Responsibilities*

¶ 175 Stephanie contends the trial court erred in giving Grant sole decision-making responsibilities to N.F. Stephanie contends the court’s findings were improperly influenced by the finding Stephanie was delusional. Stephanie further maintains consideration of the factors in section 602.5(b) of the Act show the trial court’s order is against the manifest weight of the evidence. Stephanie emphasizes (1) she attended to N.F.’s educational needs, attending each IEP meeting while Grant attended none; (2) she took N.F. to all of his medical appointments, and Grant had not attended any; (3) Grant did not attend church, while N.F. and Stephanie were active in the Jewish faith; and (4) N.F. participated in many extracurricular activities in Bloomington, while Grant only testified those activities were available in Streamwood. Stephanie further highlighted Jenkins’s testimony N.F.’s test score for satisfaction with his father was elevated, N.F. spent his entire life with Stephanie, N.F. learned how to use pornography

from his father, N.F. alleged his father touched and examined N.F.'s penis, and Grant physically abused Stephanie during their marriage.

¶ 176 The Act provides that “[t]he court shall allocate decision-making responsibilities according to the child’s best interests.” 750 ILCS 5/602.5(a) (West 2016). When determining the best interests of the child, the court must consider the following:

- “(1) the wishes of the child \*\*\*;
- (2) the child’s adjustment to his or her home, school, and community;
- (3) the mental and physical health of all individuals involved;
- (4) the ability of the parents to cooperate to make decisions, or the level of conflict between the parties that may affect their ability to share decision-making;
- (5) the level of each parent’s participation in past significant decision-making with respect to the child;
- (6) any prior agreement or course of conduct between the parents relating to decision-making with respect to the child;
- (7) the wishes of the parents;
- (8) the child’s needs;
- (9) the distance between the parents’ residences, the cost and difficulty of transporting the child, each parent’s and the child’s daily schedules, and the ability of the parents to cooperate

in the arrangement;

(10) whether a restriction on decision-making is appropriate under Section 603.10;

(11) the willingness and ability of each parent to facilitate and encourage a close and continuing relationship between the other parent and the child;

(12) the physical violence or threat of physical violence by the child's parent directed against the child;

(13) the occurrence of abuse against the child or other member of the child's household;

(14) whether one of the parents is a sex offender, and if so, the exact nature of the offense and what, if any, treatment in which the parent has successfully participated; and

(15) any other factor that the court expressly finds to be relevant." *Id.* § 602.5(c).

¶ 177 In its lengthy order, the trial court expressly addressed each best-interests factor for the record and found it in N.F.'s best interests Grant have sole decision-making authority. This finding is not against the manifest weight of the evidence. As we determined, the court properly concluded Stephanie suffered a delusional disorder that substantially affected her parenting of N.F. The record shows these delusions and her behavior seriously endangered N.F.'s mental health and impaired his emotional development. Stephanie's behavior further limited N.F.'s social development and hampered his relationship with his father. Stephanie



influenced N.F.'s allegations regarding sexual abuse, which suspended Grant's visitation rights for several months, and denied Grant telephone contact with his son until the court order regarding phone contact was entered. In contrast, the evidence supports the finding Grant has the ability to put N.F.'s needs first and to preserve N.F.'s relationship with his mother. Grant also testified N.F. could continue with his Jewish faith if N.F. so desired. Grant also demonstrated his desire to provide for N.F.'s educational and medical needs. Grant had contacted at least one of N.F.'s teachers and intended to maintain contact with N.F.'s teachers should he attend Streamwood High School. In addition, Grant, who only saw N.F. every other week, took the initiative to have N.F. visit an eye doctor and purchase glasses for N.F.

¶ 178 We find no error in the trial court's decision allocating sole decision-making authority to Grant.

¶ 179 *2. Parenting Time*

¶ 180 For many of the same reasons she stated in regard to the allocation of parental responsibilities, Stephanie argues the trial court's allocation of parenting time is against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 181 Like the parental responsibilities, parenting time is allocated according to the child's best interest. 750 ILCS 5/602.7(a) (West 2016). The court must consider the following statutory factors:

“(1) the wishes of each parent seeking parenting time;

(2) the wishes of the child, taking into account the child's

maturity and ability to express reasoned and independent

preferences as to parenting time;

(3) the amount of time each parent spent performing caretaking functions with respect to the child in the 24 months preceding the filing of any petition for allocation of parental responsibilities or, if the child is under 2 years of age, since the child's birth;

(4) any prior agreement or course of conduct between the parents relating to caretaking functions with respect to the child;

(5) the interaction and interrelationship of the child with his or her parents and siblings and with any other person who may significantly affect the child's best interests;

(6) the child's adjustment to his or her home, school, and community;

(7) the mental and physical health of all individuals involved;

(8) the child's needs;

(9) the distance between the parents' residences, the cost and difficulty of transporting the child, each parent's and the child's daily schedules, and the ability of the parents to cooperate in the arrangement;

(10) whether a restriction on parenting time is appropriate;

(11) the physical violence or threat of physical violence by the child's parent directed against the child or other member of the child's household;

(12) the willingness and ability of each parent to place the needs of the child ahead of his or her own needs;

(13) the willingness and ability of each parent to facilitate and encourage a close and continuing relationship between the other parent and the child;

(14) the occurrence of abuse against the child or other member of the child's household;

(15) whether one of the parents is a convicted sex offender or lives with a convicted sex offender and, if so, the exact nature of the offense and what if any treatment the offender has successfully participated in; the parties are entitled to a hearing on the issues raised in this paragraph (15);

(16) the terms of a parent's military family-care plan that a parent must complete before deployment if a parent is a member of the United States Armed Forces who is being deployed; and

(17) any other factor that the court expressly finds to be relevant.” 750 ILCS 5/602.7(b) (West 2016).

¶ 182 As to parenting time, the trial court considered each factor of section 602.7(b) and found it in N.F.'s best interests the majority of the parenting time be awarded to Grant. The

