

# International Multidisciplinary Research Journal

## *Golden Research Thoughts*

Chief Editor  
Dr.Tukaram Narayan Shinde

Publisher  
Mrs.Laxmi Ashok Yakkaldevi

Associate Editor  
Dr.Rajani Dalvi

Honorary  
Mr.Ashok Yakkaldevi

Golden Research Thoughts Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double - blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial board. Readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

### Regional Editor

Dr. T. Manichander

### International Advisory Board

Kamani Perera  
Regional Center For Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka

Mohammad Hailat  
Dept. of Mathematical Sciences,  
University of South Carolina Aiken

Hasan Baktir  
English Language and Literature  
Department, Kayseri

Janaki Sinnasamy  
Librarian, University of Malaya

Abdullah Sabbagh  
Engineering Studies, Sydney

Ghayoor Abbas Chotana  
Dept of Chemistry, Lahore University of  
Management Sciences[PK]

Romona Mihaila  
Spiru Haret University, Romania

Ecaterina Patrascu  
Spiru Haret University, Bucharest

Anna Maria Constantinovici  
AL. I. Cuza University, Romania

Delia Serbescu  
Spiru Haret University, Bucharest,  
Romania

Loredana Bosca  
Spiru Haret University, Romania

Ilie Pinteau,  
Spiru Haret University, Romania

Anurag Misra  
DBS College, Kanpur

Fabricio Moraes de Almeida  
Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil

Xiaohua Yang  
PhD, USA

Titus PopPhD, Partium Christian  
University, Oradea, Romania

George - Calin SERITAN  
Faculty of Philosophy and Socio-Political  
Sciences Al. I. Cuza University, Iasi

.....More

### Editorial Board

Pratap Vyamktrao Naikwade  
ASP College Devrukh, Ratnagiri, MS India Ex - VC. Solapur University, Solapur

Iresh Swami

Rajendra Shendge  
Director, B.C.U.D. Solapur University,  
Solapur

R. R. Patil  
Head Geology Department Solapur  
University, Solapur

N.S. Dhaygude  
Ex. Prin. Dayanand College, Solapur

R. R. Yaliker  
Director Management Institute, Solapur

Rama Bhosale  
Prin. and Jt. Director Higher Education,  
Panvel

Narendra Kadu  
Jt. Director Higher Education, Pune

Umesh Rajderkar  
Head Humanities & Social Science  
YCMOU, Nashik

Salve R. N.  
Department of Sociology, Shivaji  
University, Kolhapur

K. M. Bhandarkar  
Praful Patel College of Education, Gondia

S. R. Pandya  
Head Education Dept. Mumbai University,  
Mumbai

Govind P. Shinde  
Bharati Vidyapeeth School of Distance  
Education Center, Navi Mumbai

G. P. Patankar  
S. D. M. Degree College, Honavar, Karnataka

Alka Darshan Shrivastava  
Shaskiya Snatkottar Mahavidyalaya, Dhar

Chakane Sanjay Dnyaneshwar  
Arts, Science & Commerce College,  
Indapur, Pune

Maj. S. Bakhtiar Choudhary  
Director, Hyderabad AP India.

Rahul Shriram Sudke  
Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya, Indore

Awadhesh Kumar Shirotriya  
Secretary, Play India Play, Meerut (U.P.)

S. Parvathi Devi  
Ph.D.-University of Allahabad

S.KANNAN  
Annamalai University, TN

Sonal Singh,  
Vikram University, Ujjain

Satish Kumar Kalhotra  
Maulana Azad National Urdu University

# Golden Research Thoughts

**GRT**

## SAFE ADOPTION POLICY AND CRIMINALIZING RE-HOMING THE BEST SOLUTION?



**Dr. D. G. Nejkar**

Associate Professor , Department of Social Work Karmaveer Hire Arts , Science, Commerce and Education College, Gargoti, Kolhapur.



### ABSTRACT

This paper will examine existing state arrangements of criminalizing re-homing, and their potential advantages and expenses. Suggestions are made to moderate the potential expenses of criminalizing re-homing and to keep families from achieving the purpose of re-homing their embraced child.

**KEYWORDS** :Safe Adoption Policy ,Criminalizing Re-Homing , Policy Problem.

### INTRODUCTION OF THE POLICY PROBLEM: RE-HOMING

on September 9, 2013, Reuters distributed a five-section article, The Child Exchange, (Twohey, 2013) to convey regard for a practice generally

alluded to as "re-homing," in which guardians exchange care of their undesirable embraced children to non-relative grown-ups or families without educating any experts or government frameworks. The article distinguished a few web-based social networking stages, for example, Yahoo and Facebook, where guardians post promotions both of child holding up to be re-homed or needing to get re-homed children. Since this practice deliberately evades powers and experts, it gives the idea that the main measurements about re-homing originate from the Reuters article, which analyzed messages promoting 261 child in one Yahoo! bunch. The investigation found that offers to re-home child happened at a rate of one tyke for every week. Around 70% of the children offered were embraced globally between the ages of 6 and 13 (Twohey, 2013).

As per a report by the Government Accountability Office [GAO] (2015), families may decide to re-home a tyke for three primary reasons: absence of arrangement to parent a child with uncommon needs, for example, post institutionalized conduct, relational indifference, physical or psychological wellness issues especially for global receptions; absence of access to post adoption administrations to help them adapt to those difficulties or abstain from achieving an emergency point in their selection;

---

and hesitation to look for help because of dread of repercussions and related shame.

Re-homing is an unregulated practice, paying little respect to the cause or level of parent franticness, which has possibly harming outcomes for children. Re-homing makes new open doors for child traffickers<sup>1</sup> (Burdick, 2015) and puts supportive child in incredible risk for mishandle and mental harm (Kunz, 2014). Children are given to unexperienced parents with no defensive measures set up, for example, broad foundation, wellbeing, and monetary screenings, or whatever other pre-adoption trainings and directing, which are required by government or state law before forthcoming new parents get a referral (GAO, 2015).

Reception is a hard procedure for both the family and the child. A few required administrations before the appropriation help the recently shaped families coordinate and change. Foundation screenings are intended to guarantee the qualification and reasonableness of the supportive family. Screenings incorporate a check for child mishandle history and criminal history identified with child. The procedure likewise guarantees that the supportive family is arranged candidly and fiscally to accept another relative. The permanency and maintainability of an appropriation is probably going to be decreased without these essential screenings. Pre-appropriation trainings help families get ready for tyke particular difficulties experienced as an aftereffect of reception and give data on post adoption administrations. These administrations could possibly lessen the danger of fizzled receptions and dodge traumatic encounters for supportive children.

Re-homing detours these supportive strides. There is no exertion taken to ensure the child's best advantages are met. Unregulated exchanges of care could put child in dangerous circumstances. Media reports (Twohey, 2013; Hardy, 2015) refer to cases that incorporate re-homed child being verbally, rationally, and sexually manhandled and abused, required in tyke obscenity or child trafficking (Cousins, 2015).

## **HISTORY AND VARIATION OF POLICY ADDRESSING RE-HOMING**

Government, at both the elected and state levels, has attempted to address re-homing since the media uncovered this destructive practice. A few states adjusted, proposed, or ordered new laws and directions, which incorporate making re-homing unlawful and confining promoting child or potential homes for arrangement.

In April 2014, Wisconsin was the principal state to react to the media presentation by passing enactment focusing on re-homing (Kunz, 2014). Wisconsin criminalizes publicizing identified with selection and also the appointment of the care and care of the tyke to a non-relative for a period more prominent than one year without requesting of a court. These criminal approvals may incorporate up to a \$10,000 fine and 9 months in jail (WIS. Detail. § 48.979 (1m) (g) (2013)).

Colorado made new enactment on May 22, 2014 (Kunz, 2014). The state has not criminalized re-homing—that is, the genuine exchange of guardianship—yet it prohibits commercial on the Internet or through whatever other open medium to discover a child to receive or to locate an assenting home for a child. Approved administrations (i.e. richness facilities, appropriation offices and reception lawyers) are absolved from the publicizing boycott. Infringement of the law, is a Class 6 lawful offense (COLO. REV. Detail. § 19-5-213.5 (4) (2014)). In June 2014, both Louisiana and Florida passed laws restricting the commercial and the re-homing of a child (Kunz, 2014). Infringement of the laws prompt to criminal authorizations.

No government law particularly precludes re-homing, in spite of the fact that the issue has picked up footing with a few individuals from Congress. An appropriation wellbeing bill was presented on April 28, 2015 that would make it illicit to "offer to draw in or participating in the exchange of lasting

authority or control of a minor in contradiction of a required lawful method" under the classification of tyke abuse (Langevin, 2015). The bill likewise advances awards for and the arrangement of pre-and post-assenting bolster administrations. This bill was alluded to the Subcommittee on Health on May 1, 2015, yet no move has been made from that point forward.

In rundown, six states sanctioned laws to criminalize re-homing, and some force criminal punishments on the ad of receptive children or potential homes for position. States' meanings of "re-homing" shift, yet for the most part incorporate moving or helping with an exchange of physical care of a child to a non-relative without court endorsement with the purpose of dodging changeless parental duty.

## **COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF CRIMINALIZING RE-HOMING**

Re-homing is a recently recognized issue that will require more research into the effects of the strategies executed at state levels of government. Information to gauge the achievement of these recently embraced laws are not yet accessible. This segment will, rather, inspect the potential expenses and advantages of passing enactment to criminalize re-homing.

### **BENEFITS**

A few potential advantages are gotten from the criminalization of re-homing. They incorporate raising open mindfulness, discouragement, elevating lawful approaches to end selection, and securing child. In any case, there are a few impediments that may lessen the advantages as far as the seriousness of the discipline and whether the law addresses the hidden issue behind re-homing.

Public awareness is important because, before the Reuters article and consequent state reactions, governments and the general population knew minimal about the act of re-homing children. Guardians for the most part re-home their receptive children, wishing to discover them a more appropriate home, however can't envision the dangerous consequences of this practice. The criminalization not just alarms the receptive families to the hazardous results the child may confront, additionally reminds tyke welfare offices, social specialists, teachers, and the general population everywhere to know that a tyke that may be a casualty of re-homing.

Criminalization is likewise a typical reprimand of the practice (Frase, 2002). The marking of re-homing as a wrongdoing communicates something specific of a social judgment and characterizes the practice as something that is ethically wrong since it hurts child. This judgment may fortify open assessment, which expands the familiarity with this issue and makes a generally safe environment to diminish the danger of children being re-homed.

Public awareness and the criminal penalties associated with re-homing are expected to deter families from re-homing adoptive children themselves. Conviction and sentencing are probably going to decrease the future rate of the criminalized rehearse. Decreases will probably be accomplished through the instructive impact of general prevention (Frase, 2002). With the discipline of fines running from \$5,000 to \$10,000 and additionally up to 5 years in the jail, re-homing can be dissuaded and lessened.

The penalties associated with criminalization help to promote legal ways to terminate adoptions. Regardless of the possibility that the objectives for reception are permanency and solidness, support and administrations must be accommodated families that choose to no longer parent a tyke. Past practices for ending an appropriation obliged families to either to re-home the child secretly or discover a selection or other tyke welfare office to disintegrate the association with the received tyke. The criminalization of re-homing will imply that the main legitimate route for guardians

to exchange authority of a receptive tyke is to advise appropriate work force, for example, a child welfare organization or family court, and to be included in a lawful methodology to end their parental rights. Organization support in the end procedure permits the child welfare framework to screen appropriation disturbance and disintegration, and gives an asset to information gathering. A formalized framework for selection end guarantees the tyke's best advantage is met and gives analysts expanded capacity to break down information and discover approaches to keep receptions perpetual.

Protecting children is the primary benefit of criminalizing re-homing. Decreasing the frequency of re-homing lessens the odds of child misuse, tyke manhandle, and child trafficking, as said above. While not all children will be presented to such hazardous and negative circumstances, the demonstration of setting a child in another and new environment without legitimate care from the guardians and intercession from a social specialist or advisor may in any case damage the child, bringing about enduring effect on the child's improvement. This is frequently the case with re-homing since there is no pre-preparing for the guardians and no expert help included.

Despite the benefits that could be expected after the criminalization, there are a few constraints. At the point when the discipline is not sufficiently serious, the viability of criminalization will be undermined. For instance, as indicated by Reuters, children with uncommon needs are substantially more helpless than sound children to re-homing (Twohey, 2013). One noteworthy explanation behind this vulnerability is that the family contributes all the more sincerely and monetarily on a tyke with exceptional needs, and does as such without much support. The normal cost of private care in Tennessee is roughly \$65,000 every year, contrasted and the normal selection appropriation of \$4,824 every year (The Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute, 2010). In spite of the fact that the fine is a most extreme of \$10,000, edgy guardians may go out on a limb to re-home on the grounds that the cost of child care is much higher.

Also, just banning re-homing does not tackle the fundamental reasons for the issue. To keep the family from re-homing, it is fundamental to have guardians arranged for selection and to make access to post-reception administrations less demanding. The openness of these administrations implies that when the family gets itself caught in social and utilitarian emergencies amid the procedure, they can rapidly recognize moderate and viable administrations that address their difficulties, for example, advising and treatment, care groups, reprieve mind, and instructive and data assets (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2012). Besides, it additionally implies the guardians get a handle on happy with coming to experts or offices when they are settling on a choice about whether to keep on parent their adoptive child.

## CONCLUSION

Adoption is intended to provide children a safe and permanent home to grow and develop healthily and happily. The act of re-homing possibly places children in threat by presenting them to non-confirmed families. Criminalizing this practice is a critical stride to avert re-homing in light of the fact that it makes an impression on the general population, has obstruction and educative impacts to manage guardians' conduct, and ensures children at last. Notwithstanding, it additionally has significant points of confinement and expenses. Thus, I suggest that expresses that criminalize re-homing find a way to moderate the expenses and focus on the hidden issue of how to enhance the rate of effective appropriations and build up techniques for guardians when they experience challenges. These extra strategies could incorporate extended screening of planned guardians, expanded pre-appropriation readiness and family preparing, and expanded access to quality post-selection administrations. Reinforcing the planning and preparing that families get before selection conclusion

can enhance guardians' capacity to evaluate their availability for appropriation and fabricate abilities expected to meet the difficulties of bringing up children with extraordinary needs (Children' Bureau, 2015). Moderate access to top notch post-selection administrations has a basic effect in the long haul accomplishment of receptions (Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute, 2013). Receptive families advantage significantly from advising administrations, care groups, and break administrations (Jordan,2015). These pre-reception and post-selection administrations advance better results for both the child and family and help them move toward permanency.

## REFERENCES

- 1.Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute. (2013). CCAI Response to Reuters "Re-homing" Series: An Opportunity for Reflection and Reform. Retrieved from <http://ccainstituteblog.org/2013/11/15/ccai-response-to-reuters-re-homing-series-an-opportunity-for-reflection-and-reform/>
- 2.Barth, R. P., Lee, C. K., Wildfire, J., & Guo, S. (2006). A comparison of the governmental costs of long-term foster care and adoption. *Social Service Review*, 80 (1), 127-158. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/stable/10.1086/499339?pq-origsite=summon&>
- 3.Burdick, L. (2015). Five States Act to Prevent Dangerous Adoption 'Re-Homing' Practice. FOSTER COALITION. Retrieved from <http://www.fostercoalition.com/#!/Five-States-Act-to-Prevent-Dangerous-Adoption-%E2%80%98ReHoming%E2%80%99-Practice/c1oq3/5525ea5e0cf2aa1811934463> Center for Family representation. (2013) Foster Care Facts. Retrieved from <https://www.cfrny.org/news-blog/foster-care-facts/>
- 4.Langevin, J (2015). To ensure the safety and well-being of adopted children. H.R.2068.
- 5.Zill N., (2011). Better Prospects, Lower Cost: The Case for Increasing Foster Care Adoption. *Adoption Advocate*. No 35. National Council for Adoption. Barth, R. P., Lee, C. K., Wildfire, J., & Guo, S. (2006). A comparison of the governmental costs of long-term foster care and adoption. *Social Service Review*, 80 (1), 127-158. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/stable/10.1086/499339?pq-origsite=summon&>

# Publish Research Article

## International Level Multidisciplinary Research Journal For All Subjects

Dear Sir/Mam,

We invite unpublished Research Paper, Summary of Research Project, Theses, Books and Book Review for publication, you will be pleased to know that our journals are

### Associated and Indexed, India

- \* International Scientific Journal Consortium
- \* OPEN J-GATE

### Associated and Indexed, USA

- EBSCO
- Index Copernicus
- Publication Index
- Academic Journal Database
- Contemporary Research Index
- Academic Paper Database
- Digital Journals Database
- Current Index to Scholarly Journals
- Elite Scientific Journal Archive
- Directory Of Academic Resources
- Scholar Journal Index
- Recent Science Index
- Scientific Resources Database
- Directory Of Research Journal Indexing

Golden Research Thoughts  
258/34 Raviwar Peth Solapur-413005, Maharashtra  
Contact-9595359435  
E-Mail-ayisrj@yahoo.in/ayisrj2011@gmail.com  
Website : www.aygrt.isrj.org