DEVIATION	
Family Code Section 4057 • (a) Guideline calculation is presumed to be correct. • (b) Rebuttable presumption—application would be "unjust or inappropriate" consistent with the principals in FC Section 4053	
Family Code Section 4057 (cont.) • (b)(1) Parties stipulate—requires inquiry per FC Section 4065 (ability to meet child's needs, no coercion or duress, etc.)—requires calculation of guideline • (b)(2) Deferred sale of home—where rental value exceeds mortgage payment	

Family Code Section 4057 (cont.)

- (b)(3) Extraordinarily high income—guideline exceeds the needs of the child
 - Burden on high earner <u>IRMO Cheriton</u> (2001)
 92 CA4th 269
 - Substantial evidence test <u>IRMO Wittgrove</u> (2004) 120 CA4th 1317
 - Needs of children vary with standard of living of the parent per 4053(f) IRMO Hubner (2001) 94 CA4th 175; IRMO Wittgrove, supra

Family Code Section 4057 (cont.)

- (b)(4) Failure to support commensurate with custodial time
- (b)(5) Guideline would be unjust or inappropriate due to special circumstances, including but not limited to:
 - (A) Different time share for different children
 - (B) Equal parenting time, one parent substantially less housing expense $\,$
 - (C) Medical or other needs requiring higher support
 - (D) More than two parents

Family Code Section 4052.5

- (a) Guideline applies in case with more than two parents
- (b) Presumption that guideline is correct may be rebutted (similar language to 4057)

-	
-	

Calculation of guideline	
 Still required to calculate guideline support prior to deviation <u>IRMO Hubner</u>, supra 	
 Except parties may stipulate that payor is high earner and what is an appropriate amount of child support Estevez v. Superior Court (Salley) (1994) 22 CA4th 423 	
-Extraordinarily low income. City and County of San Francisco v. Miller (1996) 49 CA4th 866, at 869, 56 CR2nd 887, at 888.	
Federal Poverty Guideline	
Concept used to reduce arrears in public assistance case. <u>City and County of San Francisco v. Funches</u> (1999) 75 CA4th 243, at 247, 89 R2nd 49, at 52.	
"The court is not supposed to punch numbers into a computer and award the parties the	
computer's result without considering the circumstances in a particular case which would make that order unjust or inequitable" • Marriage of Fini (1994) 26 CA4th 1033 It's true, we are not mere robots or potted plants!	