

*Baehr v. Miike*, No. 91-1394  
First Circuit Court, Hawaii (1996)

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

This case came on for trial before the Honorable Kevin S.C. Chang on September 10, 1996. . . . The Court having reviewed all the evidence admitted at the trial and having considered the arguments and other written submissions of counsel for the parties and the briefs filed by the amicus curiae, hereby makes the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. . .

VI. SPECIFIC FINDINGS

116. The following are specific findings of fact for this case based on the credible evidence presented at trial.

117. Defendant presented insufficient evidence and failed to establish or prove any adverse consequences to the public resulting from same-sex marriage.

118. Defendant presented insufficient evidence and failed to establish or prove any adverse impacts to the State of Hawaii or its citizens resulting from the refusal of other jurisdictions to recognize Hawaii same-sex marriages or from application of the federal constitutional provision which requires other jurisdictions to give full faith and credit recognition to Hawaii same-sex marriages. See Article IV, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution (The Full Faith and Credit Clause).

119. Defendant presented insufficient evidence and failed to establish or prove the legal significance of the institution of traditional marriage and the need to protect traditional marriage as a fundamental structure in society.

120. There is a public interest in the rights and well-being of children and families. See H.R.S. Chapters 571 and 577.

121. A father and a mother can, and do, provide his or her child with unique paternal and maternal contributions which are important, though not essential, to the development of a happy, healthy and well-adjusted child.

122. Further, an intact family environment consisting of a child and his or her mother and father presents a less burdened environment for the development of a happy, healthy and well-adjusted child. There certainly is a benefit to children which comes from being raised by their mother and father in an intact and relatively stress free home.

123. However, there is diversity in the structure and configuration of families. In Hawaii, and elsewhere, children are being raised by their natural parents, single parents, stepparents, grandparents, adopted parents, half parents, foster parents, gay and lesbian parents, and same-sex couples.

124. There are also families in Hawaii, and elsewhere, which do not have children as family members.

125. The evidence presented by Plaintiffs and Defendant establishes that the single most important factor in the development of a happy, healthy and well-adjusted child is the nurturing relationship between parent and child. More specifically, it is the quality of parenting or the "sensitive care-giving" described by David Brodzinsky, which is the most significant factor that affects the development of a child.

126. The sexual orientation of parents is not in and of itself an indicator of parental fitness.

127. The sexual orientation of parents does not automatically disqualify them from being good, fit, loving or successful parents.

128. The sexual orientation of parents is not in and of itself an indicator of the overall adjustment and development of children.

129. Gay and lesbian parents and same-sex couples have the potential to raise children that are happy, healthy and well adjusted.

130. Gay and lesbian parents and same-sex couples are allowed to adopt children, provide foster care and to raise and care for children.

131. Gay and lesbian parents and same-sex couples can provide children with a nurturing relationship and a nurturing environment which is conducive to the development of happy, healthy and well-adjusted children.

132. Gay and lesbian parents and same-sex couples can be as fit and loving parents, as non-gay men and women and different sex couples.

133. While children of gay and lesbian parents and same sex couples may experience symptoms of stress and other issues related to their non-traditional family structure, the available scientific data, studies and clinical experience presented at trial suggests that children of gay and lesbian parents and same-sex couples tend to adjust and do develop-in a normal fashion.

134. Significantly, Defendant has failed to establish a causal link between allowing same-sex marriage and adverse effects upon the optimal development of children.

135. As noted herein, there is a benefit to children which comes from being raised by their mother and father in an intact and relatively stress-free home. However, in this case, Defendant has not proved that allowing same-sex marriage will probably result in significant differences in the development or outcomes of children raised by gay or lesbian parents and same-sex couples, as compared to children raised by different-sex couples or their biological parents. In fact, Defendant's expert, Kenneth Pruett, agreed, in pertinent part, that gay and lesbian parents "are doing a good job" raising children and, most importantly, "the kids are turning out just fine."

136. Contrary to Defendant's assertions, if same-sex marriage is allowed, the children being raised by gay or lesbian parents and same-sex couples may be assisted, because they may obtain certain protections and benefits that come with or become available as a result of marriage. See *Baehr v. Lewin*, 74 Haw. 530, 560-561, 852 P.2d 44, 59 (1993), for a list of noteworthy marital rights and benefits.

137. In Hawaii, and elsewhere, same-sex couples can, and do, have successful, loving and committed relationships.

138. In Hawaii, and elsewhere, people marry for a variety of reasons including, but not limited to the following: (1) having or raising children; (2) stability and commitment; (3) Personal closeness (4) intimacy and monogamy; (5) the establishment of a framework for a long-term relationship; (6) personal significance; (7) recognition by society; and (8) certain legal and economic protections, benefits and obligations. In Hawaii, and elsewhere, gay men and lesbian women share this same mix of reasons for wanting to be able to marry.

139. Simply put, Defendant has failed to establish or prove that the public interest in the well-being of children and families, or the optimal development of children will be adversely affected by same-sex marriage.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

. . . 18. Defendant has not demonstrated a basis for his claim of the existence of compelling state interests sufficient to justify withholding the legal status of marriage from Plaintiffs. As discussed hereinabove, Defendant has failed to present sufficient credible evidence which demonstrates that the public interest in the well-being of children and families, or the optimal development of children would be adversely affected by same-sex marriage. Nor has Defendant demonstrated how same-sex marriage would adversely affect the public fisc, the state interest in assuring recognition of Hawaii marriages in other states, the institution of traditional marriage, or any other important public or governmental interest. The evidentiary record presented in this case does not justify the sex-based classification of HRS 572-1.

Therefore, the court specifically finds and concludes, as a matter of law, that Defendant has failed to sustain his burden to overcome the presumption that HRS 572-1 is unconstitutional by demonstrating or proving that the statute furthers a compelling state interest. Further, even assuming *arguendo* that Defendant was able to demonstrate that the sex-based classification of HRS 572-1 is justified because it furthers a compelling state interest, Defendant has failed to establish that HRS 572-1 is narrowly tailored to avoid unnecessary abridgments of constitutional rights.

#### IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT:

1. The sex-based classification in HRS 572-1, on its face and as applied, is unconstitutional and in violation of the equal protection clause of article I, section 5 of the Hawaii Constitution.

2. Defendant Lawrence H. Miike, as Director of Department of Health, State of Hawaii, and his agents, and any person in acting in concert with Defendant or claiming by or through him, is enjoined from denying an application for a marriage license solely because the applicants are of the same sex.

3. To the extent permitted by law, costs shall be imposed against Defendant and awarded in favor of Plaintiffs.

KEVIN S. C. CHANG, Judge of the Above-Entitled Court  
Honolulu, Hawaii. December 3, 1996.