

“(A) encourage noncustodial parents to relocate outside the States where their children and the custodial parents reside to avoid the jurisdiction of the courts of such States, resulting in an increase in the amount of interstate travel and communication required to establish and collect on child support orders and a burden on custodial parents that is expensive, time consuming, and disruptive of occupations and commercial activity;

“(B) contribute to the pressing problem of relatively low levels of child support payments in interstate cases and to inequities in child support payments levels that are based solely on the noncustodial parent’s choice of residence;

“(C) encourage a disregard of court orders resulting in massive arrearages nationwide;

“(D) allow noncustodial parents to avoid the payment of regularly scheduled child support payments for extensive periods of time, resulting in substantial hardship for the children for whom support is due and for their custodians; and

“(E) lead to the excessive relitigation of cases and to the establishment of conflicting orders by the courts of various jurisdictions, resulting in confusion, waste of judicial resources, disrespect for the courts, and a diminution of public confidence in the rule of law; and

“(4) among the results of the conditions described in this subsection are—

“(A) the failure of the courts of the States to give full faith and credit to the judicial proceedings of the other States;

“(B) the deprivation of rights of liberty and property without due process of law;

“(C) burdens on commerce among the States; and

“(D) harm to the welfare of children and their parents and other custodians.

“(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—In view of the findings made in subsection (a), it is necessary to establish national standards under which the courts of the various States shall determine their jurisdiction to issue a child support order and the effect to be given by each State to child support orders issued by the courts of other States.

“(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act [enacting this section and provisions set out as a note under section 1 of this title] are—

“(1) to facilitate the enforcement of child support orders among the States;

“(2) to discourage continuing interstate controversies over child support in the interest of greater financial stability and secure family relationships for the child; and

“(3) to avoid jurisdictional competition and conflict among State courts in the establishment of child support orders.”

§ 1738C. Certain acts, records, and proceedings and the effect thereof

(a) IN GENERAL.—No person acting under color of State law may deny—

(1) full faith and credit to any public act, record, or judicial proceeding of any other State pertaining to a marriage between 2 individuals, on the basis of the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of those individuals; or

(2) a right or claim arising from such a marriage on the basis that such marriage would not be recognized under the law of that State on the basis of the sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of those individuals.

(b) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against any person who violates subsection (a) for declaratory and injunctive relief.

(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person who is harmed by a violation of subsection (a) may bring a civil action in the appropriate United States district court against the person who violated such subsection for declaratory and injunctive relief.

(d) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “State” has the meaning given such term under section 7 of title 1.

(Added Pub. L. 117–228, § 4, Dec. 13, 2022, 136 Stat. 2305.)

Editorial Notes

PRIOR PROVISIONS

A prior section 1738C, added Pub. L. 104–199, §2(a), Sept. 21, 1996, 110 Stat. 2419, related to effect not required to be given to certain acts, records, and proceedings of another jurisdiction regarding marriage between persons of the same sex, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 117–228, §3, Dec. 13, 2022, 136 Stat. 2305.

§ 1739. State and Territorial nonjudicial records; full faith and credit

All nonjudicial records or books kept in any public office of any State, Territory, or Possession of the United States, or copies thereof, shall be proved or admitted in any court or office in any other State, Territory, or Possession by the attestation of the custodian of such records or books, and the seal of his office annexed, if there be a seal, together with a certificate of a judge of a court of record of the county, parish, or district in which such office may be kept, or of the Governor, or secretary of state, the chancellor or keeper of the great seal, of the State, Territory, or Possession that the said attestation is in due form and by the proper officers.

If the certificate is given by a judge, it shall be further authenticated by the clerk or prothonotary of the court, who shall certify, under his hand and the seal of his office, that such judge is duly commissioned and qualified; or, if given by such Governor, secretary, chancellor, or keeper of the great seal, it shall be under the great seal of the State, Territory, or Possession in which it is made.

Such records or books, or copies thereof, so authenticated, shall have the same full faith and credit in every court and office within the United States and its Territories and Possessions as they have by law or usage in the courts or offices of the State, Territory, or Possession from which they are taken.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 947.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §688 (R.S. §906).

Words “Possession of the United States” were substituted for “or any country subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.”

Words “or copies thereof” were added in two places. Copies have always been used to prove records and books under section 688 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., and the addition of these words clarifies the former implied meaning of such section.

In the first paragraph of the revised section words “a judge of a court of record” were substituted for words “the presiding justice of the court” and in the second paragraph “judge” was substituted for “presiding justice” for convenience and without change of substance.