



AMBER McFEE (17532)  
ALIXANDRIA YOUNG-JUI (16205)  
McFEE LAW, LLC  
9677 South 700 East, Ste. A  
Sandy, UT 84070  
Tel: 801.758.8746  
amber@amcfeelaw.com  
alix@amcfeelaw.com

*Petitioner's Attorney*

---

IN THE FOURTH DISTRICT COURT, FILLMORE  
MILLARD COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH

---

---

IN THE MATTER OF THE CHILD OF  
  
ALEXIS SORENSEN,  
  
Petitioner,  
  
&  
  
CAMERON SCOTT FUELL,

---

Respondent.  
**MODIFIED DECREE OF CUSTODY,  
PARENT-TIME, AND SUPPORT**

Case No. 224700061

Judge Shawn R Howell

---

This matter came before the Court on Petitioner's Petition to Modify the Decree of Custody, Parent-time, and Support, entered February 2, 2023. This was resolved through an informal trial on August 12, 2026, before the Honorable Judge Shawn Howell. Petitioner, Alexis Sorensen, was present and represented by attorney, Alixandria Young-Jui. Respondent, Cameron Scott Fuell, was present and representing himself pro se. The Court, having reviewed the exhibits and heard the arguments of the parties, issued an oral ruling. From the records, files, and papers in this matter, the Court being fully advised, and having previously made and entered its Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, now

## ORDERS, ADJUDGES, AND DECREES

### Jurisdiction

1. Both Parties were residents of Utah when the custody action was filed, as well as when the Decree of Custody, Parent-Time, and Support and Judgment was finalized February 02, 2023.
2. Parties are the natural parents of the minor child at issue in this action: O.J.F., born June 2020.
3. Utah had initial jurisdiction over the Parties and issues regarding child custody and parent-time at the time of the filing and finalization of the Decree of Custody, Parent-Time, and Support and Judgment.
4. Utah has continuing jurisdiction over the Parties and issues regarding child custody and parent-time pursuant to Utah Code, Section 78B-13-202.

### Controlling Orders

5. The Decree of Custody, Parent-Time, and Support entered on February 02, 2023, provides:
  - a. Under ¶ 1, “[t]he Parties shall share joint legal custody and share physical custody of the minor child.”
  - b. Under ¶ 2(d), “[o]nce the child turns 5 years old, the parties agree to a 60/40 schedule outlined in Utah Code 30-3-35.1.” (*Recodified to 81-9-303.*)

### Grounds for Modification

6. A Petition to Modify must be supported by a material and substantial change in circumstance that warrants a modification of the Decree. The Court finds that Mother has met that threshold showing.

- a. The parties' ability to interact without harassment is compromised and the Decree is not working as written.
- b. Father has not been taking parent-time with the child consistent with the Decree, and in such a way that makes consideration of a change to the Decree appropriate.
- c. Since the entry of the Decree, Father has increased in his harassment and aggression. Father is unpredictable, and his unpredictability is making it such that the provisions of the Decree are no longer workable.

#### Custody Factors

- 7. The Court's consideration is always guided by the best interest of the child. Statutory factors in making that determination are set forth in Utah code.
- 8. Under Utah Code § 81-9-205, there is a rebuttable presumption that joint legal custody is in the best interest of the minor child. That presumption may be rebutted by showing by a preponderance of the evidence that joint legal custody is not in the best interest of the minor child. Considerations that are exceptions to the presumption include:
  - a. Evidence of domestic violence, neglect, physical abuse, sexual abuse, or emotional abuse involving the minor child, a parent, or a household member of the parent. Subpart (2)(a)(i).
  - b. The Court heard testimony that domestic violence occurred between the parties but did not hear sufficient details.
  - c. The Court heard testimony that an incident of sexual abuse occurred at school but did not find either parent responsible.
  - d. The Court heard testimony from Father discovering the minor child's "seal" broken, which the Court understood to refer to her hymen, upon seeing what the evidence supports was

diaper rash; the Court believes that a medical doctor would be the only person appropriate to make that kind of determination. The Court does not find that this constitutes sexual abuse per se, but indicates deep concern regarding Father's investigation, probing, and mindset in this scenario.

e. Special physical or mental needs of a parent or minor child, making joint legal custody unreasonable. Subpart (2)(a)(ii).

f. The Court finds Father suffers from some mental impairments but lacks sufficient evidence to determine the nature of those impairments. The Court indicates Father's manner of communicating would make exercising joint legal custody unreasonable.

g. The Court finds that joint legal custody would be unreasonable under these circumstances and finds that it would be in the best interest of the minor child to award Mother sole legal custody.

h. This shall not prevent Father from having access to information. Father shall have access to school and medical records and shall be consulted on all major decisions regarding the minor child, with final decision-making presiding with Mother.

i. Any other factor the court considers relevant. Subpart (2)(a)(iv).

j. The Court finds that the nature of communication between the parties rebuts the presumption that joint legal custody is in the minor child's best interest.

k. Whether the physical, psychological, and emotional needs and development of the minor child will benefit from joint legal custody or joint physical custody or both joint legal custody and joint physical custody. Subpart (5)(a).

l. The Court does not find that joint legal or physical custody is in the minor child's best interest.

m. The ability of the parents to give first priority to the welfare of the minor child and reach shared decisions in the minor child's best interest. Subpart (5)(b).

n. The Court finds the text communication provided to the Court supports Mother's position that the parties are not able to come to shared decision making regarding the child's best interest. There is significant conflict on outlook and approach on how to approach decision making. The Court finds that some of Father's ideas expressed about parenting are unreasonable.

o. The Court finds that this factor weighs in favor of Mother.

p. The past and present ability of the parents to cooperate with each other and make decisions jointly. Subpart (5)(h).

q. The Court finds that the Decree was entered with the understanding that the parties would be able to work and cooperate with one another and that since has shifted and become untenable.

9. Utah Code § 81-9-204 provides custody factors for legal and physical custody as well as parent-time.

10. Under Utah Code § 81-9-204, the Court shall consider:

a. Evidence of domestic violence, physical abuse, or sexual abuse involving the minor child, the parent, or a household member of the parent. Subpart (3)(a).

b. The Court addressed this factor above.

c. Whether the parent has intentionally exposed the minor child to pornography or material harmful to minors. Subpart (3)(b).

d. The Court did not hear evidence of this for either party.

- e. Whether custody and parent-time would endanger the minor child's health or physical or psychological safety. Subpart (3)(c).
- f. The Court finds the current custody arrangement would endanger the minor child's health or physical or psychological safety.
- g. The Court finds concerning that: Father has engaged in threats and threatening behavior and has communicated with an air of aggressiveness; Father conducting exams on the child in a way that would be inappropriate and invasive; Father's expressions of forcefully wanting to keep the child from interacting with other people based on race or country of origin; and in light of Father's examining his child's private areas, that without solicitation Father volunteered to the Court that he has an STD.
- h. The Court is concerned for the minor child's health, safety, and bodily autonomy.
- i. Evidence of psychological maltreatment. Subpart (4)(b).
- j. The Court did not hear evidence of this for either party.
- k. The parent's demonstrated understanding of, responsiveness to, and ability to meet the developmental needs of the minor child, including the minor child's: physical needs; emotional needs; educational needs; medical needs; and any special needs. Subpart (4)(c).
- l. The Court is concerned about Father's ability to meet the minor child's physical and emotional needs based on his expressions in court.
- m. The Court does not have concerns about Mother's ability to meet the minor child's physical, emotional, medical, or any special needs.
- n. The parent's capacity and willingness to function as a parent, including:
  - i. Parenting skills. Subpart (4)(d)(i).

- ii. The Court does not have concerns about Mother's parenting skills.
- iii. The Court has concerns about Father's parenting skills as referenced above, as well as concerns about Father's aggressiveness, and that aggressiveness affecting his parenting skills.
- iv. Co-parenting skills, including:
  - 1. Ability to appropriately communicate with the other parent. Subpart (4)(d)(ii)(A).
  - 2. The Court finds that Mother has the ability to appropriately communicate.
  - 3. The Court finds that Father struggles with communication through making threats, communication that is confusing to understand, and lengthy messaging that constitutes harassing communication to the other parent. The Court has concerns about Father's ability to appropriately communicate with the other parent.
  - 4. Willingness to allow frequent and continuous contact between the minor child and the other parent. Subpart (4)(d)(ii)(C).
  - 5. The Court did not necessarily receive evidence that either party is attempting to diminish contact with the other parent, however, the Court received evidence that Father is deeply concerned and interfering with the child's interactions with extended family members based on Mother having been adopted. The Court finds this weighs against Father's coparenting skills.
  - o. The emotional stability of the parent. Subpart (4)(f).
  - p. The Court did not receive evidence that Mother is lacking in emotional stability.
  - q. The Court received evidence that Father is aggressive and threatening, and that weighs against his emotional stability.
  - r. The parent's inability to function as a parent because of drug abuse, excessive drinking, or other causes. Subpart (4)(g).

- s. The Court did not receive evidence that would weigh this factor against Mother.
- t. The Court has concerns about Father's thinking patterns, behaviors, and mannerisms.
- u. Duration and depth of desire for custody or parent-time. Subpart (4)(g).
- v. The Court finds that both parents deeply love their child.
- w. The Court has expressed a great deal of concern about his daughter's safety and Father has a deep desire to love and protect his daughter.
- x. The child's interaction and relationship with step-parents, extended family members, or other individuals who may significantly affect the minor child's best interests. Subpart (4)(l).
- y. The Court received some evidence about extended family on Mother's side, but did not receive sufficient evidence to make a finding either way.
- z. Who has been the primary caretaker of the minor child. Subpart (4)(m).
- aa. The Court finds that Mother has filled that role. This Factor weighs in favor of Mother.
- bb. Previous parenting arrangements in which the minor child has been happy and well-adjusted in the home, school, and community. Subpart (4)(n).
- cc. The Court finds that Mother has primarily cared for the child.
- dd. The Court finds that Father lacks stable housing, which the Court finds concerning.
- ee. The relative strength of the minor child's bond with the parent, meaning the depth, quality, and nature of the relationship between the parent and the minor child. Subpart (4)(q).
- ff. The Court received some evidence about the minor child's resistance to go with Father and leave Mother but did not receive sufficient evidence regarding this factor.

Mother's Petition Is Granted

11. Having considered the statutory custody factors, the Court finds that Mother's Petition to Modify is appropriate and grants the relief sought.
12. Communication between the parties shall be through a parenting app with a tone monitor such that communication can be effective and non-harassing.
13. The parties are ordered to not engage in behavior that is harassing, personal attacking, unduly repetitive, or in such a way that would undermine ability to coparent.
14. Mother is awarded sole legal and sole physical custody.
15. Father is awarded supervised visitation under Utah Code § 81-9-302. Father's parent-time shall be supervised by a third party approved by Mother until Father has completed a mental health evaluation and returned to the Court for review of lifting supervised visitation if the parties do not agree.
16. Father's overnight parent-time is suspended until he procures appropriate and safe housing.
17. Child support shall be awarded based on the parties' incomes and parent-time.
18. Any provision of the previous Decree of Custody, Parent-Time, and Support not addressed herein shall continue in force and effect.

JUDGE'S ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE APPEARS ON THE TOP OF PAGE ONE

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO SUBMIT ORDER FOR COURT'S SIGNATURE**

**TO: RESPONDENT**

As authorized by Utah Rule of Civil Procedure 7(j)(4)–(5), the undersigned attorney will submit the foregoing Modified Decree of Custody, Parent-time, and Support for the Court's signature upon the expiration of seven days from the date of this Notice, unless written objection is filed prior to that time.

Dated 14 August 2026.

McFEE LAW, LLC

/s/ Alixandria Young-Jui

---

Alixandria Young-Jui

*Attorney for Petitioner*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify on 14 August 2026 I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing by email, addressed to the following:

Cameron Fuell  
fuellcameron08@gmail.com  
*Respondent Pro Se*

/s/ Melanie Cramer Manarite

Melanie Cramer Manarite  
*Lead Paralegal, McFee Law*