FAMILY LAW REVIEW

Volume 2, Number 4

September 2012

ARTICLES

Proposed guidelines for judges meeting with children in family law proceedings – Michelle Fernando	
This article argues the need for guidelines to be promulgated by the Family Law Courts that give direction to judges on how to meet with children who are the subject of parenting disputes. The article presents the author's proposed guidelines and discusses the rationale behind each aspect of them, drawing on existing literature. The incidence of judges meeting with children is still very rare, but interest is growing. Guidelines are an appropriate step to give guidance to judges and promote consistency in practice	213
Family dispute resolution: The importance of clear protocols for cooperation between family relationship service providers and family lawyers – Danielle Jaku-Greenfield	
Under the Australian family law framework mandating mediation since 2006, the role of the family lawyer dealing with a parenting matter is two-fold. The first responsibility the lawyer has to the client is to give legal advice about the presenting issues in dispute. The second equally important role of the family lawyer is to assist the client in devising the best way to resolve those issues. Not all family lawyers have assumed, or understand, this changed role, and there is a lot of confusion among family lawyers, family relationship service providers, clients and mediation participants about what should be the first step in the process of family dispute resolution. This article argues that the success or otherwise of the mediation process can be attributed to both the timing of the mediation in the parents' separation and, significantly, to the legal advice provided to the parents	225
FAMILY DISPUTE RESOLUTION – Linda Kochanski	
Family mediation and impasses: How to work with them, not against them	232
INTERNATIONAL FAMILY LAW – Alexandra Harland (Ed) – Stephen Page	
International surrogacy: To India via Aberdeen and the Hague	235
RECENT CASES – Geoffrey Monahan FM (Ed) – Olivia Rundle – Dean Foley	
Whistler v Whistler (Property; Mistake; Miscarriage of justice under s 79A(1)(a))	239 246 251
VOLUME 2 – 2011-2012	
	261 270