

No. 2—10—1303
Order filed May 16, 2011

NOTICE: This order was filed under Supreme Court Rule 23 and may not be cited as precedent by any party except in the limited circumstances allowed under Rule 23(e)(1).

IN THE
APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS
SECOND DISTRICT

In re MARRIAGE OF)	Appeal from the Circuit Court
DAVID T. MOON,)	of Du Page County.
)	
Petitioner-Appellee,)	
)	
and)	No. 09—D—2093
)	
PAULA MOON,)	Honorable
)	Robert J. Anderson,
Respondent-Appellant.)	Judge, Presiding.

JUSTICE BURKE delivered the judgment of the court.
Presiding Justice Jorgensen and Justice Bowman concurred in the judgment.

ORDER

Held: Where the trial court heard evidence that mother had mental health issues and there was a risk of domestic violence between the mother and child, the court’s decision to restrict visitation was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

Petitioner, David T. Moon (“Tom”), and respondent, Paula Moon (“Paula”), were married in 1987 and had one child, Claudia, who was born in 1998. On October 5, 2009, Tom petitioned for dissolution of the marriage. The parties continued to live together with Claudia until the trial court entered a judgment of dissolution on November 18, 2010. As part of the judgment, the trial court granted Tom custody of Claudia and ordered supervised visitation between Paula and Claudia. The

court also barred Paula from having telephone contact with Claudia. Paula appeals the visitation rulings only. We affirm.

FACTS

Tom and Paula met and were married in Costa Rica, and they moved to the United States in 1989, where Claudia was born. Paula was born in Costa Rica but became a U.S. citizen several years ago. She worked as a chemical engineer at Argonne National Laboratory for several years but became unemployed in 2008. Tom is employed as a full-time, bilingual school teacher for elementary students who are mostly recent immigrants to the U.S. Tom has a college degree, Paula acquired a Ph.D. during the marriage, and Claudia is a thriving 12-year-old who earns “straight A’s” and participates in many extracurricular activities. Both parties have been very involved in Claudia’s life but began to clash over her upbringing. Paula became increasingly strict after losing her job, which led to conflict with Claudia. Tom convinced Paula to allow Claudia to begin seeing Dr. Joanne Braun, a psychologist, but Claudia withdrew her consent to the counseling after a year.

On appeal, Paula explains that she does not challenge the award of child custody to Tom or the equitable division of marital property pursuant to the dissolution judgment. Instead, Paula argues that “[t]he trial court’s finding that unsupervised visitation between [Paula] and her daughter would seriously endanger the physical, mental, and emotional health of the parties’ minor child was against the manifest weight of the evidence.” We summarize the evidence presented on the visitation issue.

During the proceedings, Paula and Tom agreed to share joint legal custody of Claudia but each requested residential custody. Paula said she intended to move with Claudia to Dallas, Texas, where Paula expected to find better employment opportunities. Tom opposed the removal and stated

that he would like Claudia to spend liberal amounts of time with each parent and hoped to avoid a visitation schedule that caused Claudia to be away from either parent for long periods.

Dr. Margaret Bongiorno, a licensed clinical psychologist, was appointed to prepare an evaluation concerning Claudia's best interest as it relates to custody, visitation, and removal. See 750 ILCS 5/604.5 (West 2008). In the June 14, 2010, report, Dr. Bongiorno described her impressions of each parent. Paula conveyed the image that she had raised Claudia single-handedly and that she needed to institute rules because she takes parenting very seriously. Paula chose Claudia's day care and schools, spent lunchtime with Claudia every day, and volunteered at her school. Paula took credit for Claudia's accomplishments and scrutinized her homework to the extent that Paula actually completes the work herself to check for accuracy. Although Tom petitioned to dissolve the marriage, Paula explained that she had made the unilateral decision to end the marriage when she lost her job. Paula did not involve Tom in the decision because she wants complete personal freedom.

Paula told Dr. Bongiorno that she wishes to shield Claudia from marital discord and ensure that Claudia's schoolwork does not suffer. However, Paula appeared unsympathetic to the way a move to Texas would affect Claudia's emotional welfare and disrupt her life. Paula was relatively unconcerned with disruptions in Claudia's relationship with her father, schooling, peer relationships, and extracurricular activities. In fact, Paula indicated that moving to Texas would make it easier to parent Claudia without interference from Tom.

Paula's representation that she acted almost like a sole parent seemed exaggerated and inconsistent with Tom's version of Claudia's upbringing. After losing her job, Paula became more rigid in her micro-management, which caused tension with Claudia. In March 2010, Paula and

Claudia had a physical altercation that prompted the Department of Children and Family Services (“DCFS”) to consider instituting a safety plan to protect Claudia from harm by her mother. DCFS did not pursue the matter, but an investigator told Dr. Bongiorno that the agency had some reservations about Paula’s mental health.

Paula reported to Dr. Bongiorno that the March 2010 incident was precipitated by Claudia’s defiance and invasion of Paula’s personal space. Paula said that Claudia grabbed her angrily and that Paula responded by holding Claudia down on a staircase. Paula refused to speak with the DCFS investigator. Paula insisted that, before the incident, she was the only parent who disciplined Claudia and that she does not believe in hitting as punishment. After the incident, Paula blamed Tom for refusing to enforce her rigid rules, which Tom views as inappropriate and excessive. Paula viewed Claudia’s psychologist, Dr. Braun, with suspicion and withdrew her approval of Claudia’s therapy.

Paula was adamant in conveying that she is the superior parent, but she described Tom as a good person at heart and said he should raise Claudia if something happened to Paula. Paula felt that Tom had not reciprocated the respect that she had shown him during the marriage. Paula thought Tom interacted with Claudia more as a friend than a parent, which illustrated the difference between the parents’ own upbringing. Paula said she wants Claudia to be more like her and not like Tom.

Paula denied Tom’s concerns regarding her mental health and her excessive discipline of Claudia. When describing how she removes privileges, such as access to toys for long periods, Paula appeared to Dr. Bongiorno to be so rigid as to be unlikely to evaluate or alter her methods if they were not having the desired effect. Paula insisted that her tactics worked even though she had to remove privileges for longer and longer periods for repeated infractions.

Paula admitted that she had experienced some paranoid ideation, such as when she believed she was the victim of spying. Paula said Tom was unwilling to listen at the time, but his detailed documentation of her delusional beliefs belied Paula's claim. Dr. Bongiorno thought that Paula might have thought Tom was not listening because he did not endorse her irrational ideas. Paula refused to elaborate about her paranoid ideation, claiming that she had chosen not to believe those ideas any more. Paula accused Tom of raising the issue to make her look bad, and she did not agree with Dr. Bongiorno that mental health is an appropriate issue to examine in determining custody issues.

Dr. Bongiorno reported that Tom believed he should have residential custody because he is more nurturing and stable than Paula is. Tom pointed out that both parents worked full-time during most of Claudia's life and that they shared responsibility for her upbringing. Tom described Claudia as performing extremely well in school, and he seemed to view her accomplishments appropriately as belonging to her and not to either parent. Tom emphasized that he is more attuned to Claudia's overall well-being, including her emotional life and her personal development, and that Claudia preferred to live with him. When the divorce appeared inevitable, Tom arranged Claudia's counseling.

Tom indicated to Dr. Bongiorno that Paula's version of family life is highly egocentric and not a good depiction of reality. During the marriage, Tom believed that each parent respected the other's point of view and encouraged Claudia to respect each parent, but now Paula views him as interfering with her parenting. Tom explained to Dr. Bongiorno that Paula was too focused on the external tasks of parenting, such as meeting deadlines and arranging activities, which he views as

excessive. Tom stated that, after Paula lost her job, her mental health deteriorated, which adversely affected her relationships with her husband and daughter.

Tom was shocked when Paula told him in 2008 that she wanted a divorce. Paula suggested that they wait until she found a new job, but when she did not and the marriage deteriorated further, Tom filed for divorce himself. At the time, Tom had been concerned about Paula's reaction to losing her job. She exhibited illogical and paranoid ideation, and Tom thought she might be experiencing severe depression. Paula's thinking had always appeared somewhat rigid to Tom, but Paula became even more meticulous and controlling. Tom reported examples of Paula's paranoia, such as her belief that their conversations were being intercepted by phone, television, and internet connections and that television programs were referring to those conversations. Paula seemed obsessed with contacting the President of the United States, such as during a book signing event involving the president's wife and daughter, where Paula approached the secret service to contact the president.

Tom asserted that Paula's unhealthy level of regimentation imposed on Claudia adversely affected the mother-daughter relationship because Claudia perceived Paula as harsh, distant, and cold. Tom believed that Paula escalated relatively minor issues with Claudia, such as hairstyles and clothing, into frequent arguments.

Tom reported that he was at work during the March 2010 physical altercation between Paula and Claudia. Claudia called him at work in distress and said that Paula believed Claudia was wearing unlaundered clothing and wanted Claudia to sit in "time-out" for 20 minutes, which would have made Claudia late for school. Claudia sat for a while and then left without Paula's permission. Claudia met a friend on the way as was her routine, and Paula arrived at the friend's house and

berated Claudia in front of the friend and the friend's mother. Tom reported that, after school, the conflict became physical, with Paula squeezing Claudia's shoulder and pinning her down.

Claudia told her psychologist about the altercation, and the psychologist contacted DCFS to start an investigation. Tom expressed concern over Paula using physical restraint to control Claudia. Even after the investigation began, Tom saw Paula grab Claudia and push her against a wall, but Claudia was not injured during either incident. Tom believed Paula viewed her actions as warranted because Claudia had been verbally disrespectful.

Dr. Bongiorno conducted separate psychological testing with Paula and Tom, using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory ("MMPI-2"), which is a clinical assessment instrument widely used by mental health professionals. Paula responded to the test by claiming to be unrealistically virtuous, but her clinical profile was within normal limits. Paula's test-taking attitude weakened the test's validity and showed an unwillingness or inability to disclose personal information. Paula showed an atypical pattern of interests for her gender and appeared to reject many female roles, preferring distinctly masculine activities. Dr. Bongiorno concluded that Paula may be aggressive, dominant, and somewhat insensitive and blunt in social relationships and values autonomy and independence. Tom's clinical profile was within normal limits also. However, Tom attempted to place himself in an overly positive light by minimizing faults and denying psychological problems, which undermined the test's validity.

The Parenting Alliance Measure ("PAM"), which measures the parenting aspects of a couple's relationship, indicated that Paula rated the parenting relationship as within normal limits, while Tom rated it as problematic. The Parent Child Relationship Inventory ("PCRI") is designed to identify specific aspects of the parent-child relationship that may cause problems and then give

an overall picture of the quality of the relationship. The couple's results indicated that they probably hold attitudes that are congruent with good parenting, except that Paula scored low as to her emotional involvement with Claudia.

Claudia told Dr. Bongiorno that she preferred to live with Tom because his way of parenting makes her want to do what he says. Claudia did not reject her mother, but she conveyed a sense of frustration because Paula seems selfish, impractical, and oblivious to Claudia's perspective. Claudia repeatedly said she does not want Paula to move away.

Dr. Bongiorno concluded that, although the psychological testing did not reveal any signs of serious mental illness in either parent, Paula had shown signs of an untreated paranoid disorder in the past. Paula seemed to recognize that her ideas were irrational, but she continued to display a rigidity in her thinking that should be evaluated. Dr. Bongiorno further concluded that future physical altercations are a risk due to Paula's rigidity and her justification of her behavior.

Dr. Bongiorno made the following recommendations: (1) Paula's request for removal should be denied; (2) the parties should share legal custody; (3) Tom should receive residential custody; (4) the parties should cooperate with DCFS recommendations and requirements; and (5) Paula should participate in a psychiatric evaluation to determine her treatment needs, if any, and should comply with the treatment recommendations from the evaluation; and (6) the parties should enable Claudia to participate in individual counseling, with the counselor having discretion to involve Tom and Paula as needed. Dr. Bongiorno recommended two visitation schedules depending on whether Paula continued to reside in Illinois. Dr. Bongiorno did not recommend any restrictions on visitation, such as requiring supervision or limiting telephone contact.

Melanie McBride, the guardian *ad litem*, testified to a November 4, 2010, report that she prepared for the case. McBride's factual findings and recommendations were mostly consistent with Dr. Bongiorno's. Tom told McBride that Paula occasionally held Claudia's completed homework hostage until it was redone to Paula's satisfaction. McBride consulted Dr. Braun, who confirmed that the homework experience had escalated to the point that it was traumatizing for Claudia. Tom told McBride that he does not get involved in the homework battles because he wants to avoid escalating the situation.

Tom reported to McBride that Paula changed significantly since losing her job. Although many people told Paula that she likely would not be allowed to remove Claudia to Dallas, Paula has never wavered in her plan. Claudia reported that Paula had packed many of their belongings and placed them in the basement, telling Claudia that she could have access to them after they moved. Paula also interfered with Claudia's audition for a play, telling the director that Claudia should not be cast because she would be moving soon. Paula told McBride that Texas has better job prospects for her, but she did not document that claim and or identify a specific job, close friends, or family that might be there.

Tom also reported Paula's paranoid behavior about being the target of spying. In April 2008, Paula disconnected the television, internet, and phone services because she believed that the house was bugged and that the radio and television dialogue was being lifted from their conversations. Paula also told Tom about her "secret file" that the government wanted. Tom recounted the incident involving the secret service at the book signing. Paula admitted to McBride that she had some paranoid behaviors, but she was adamant that consulting a mental health professional was

unnecessary because she consciously chose not to believe the paranoid ideas. The family doctor suggested that Paula see a psychiatrist, but she did not follow up on the referral.

Tom also reported the physical altercations between Paula and Claudia. Tom told McBride about the March 2010 incident where Paula pinned Claudia down on the stairs after a disagreement about whether Claudia was wearing laundered clothes. Tom explained that Paula believes that no clothing should be worn twice without being washed. DCFS recommended a safety plan that would have barred Paula from being alone with Claudia, but Tom and Paula objected and DCFS took no further action. Paula confirmed the incident to McBride, but she declined to elaborate about it.

McBride reported that, in September 2010, the police responded to an incident where Claudia had locked herself in Tom's bedroom with him after a fight with Paula. Tom said that he kept the door locked because he was concerned the conflict might escalate. Paula accused Tom of acting inappropriately in certain circumstances, such as sitting too close to Claudia on the couch. However, Dr. Braun told McBride that, based on her observations of Tom and Claudia during counseling sessions, they appear to have a comfortable, normal relationship. Tom also expressed to McBride his concerns about several new rules Paula has instituted for Claudia. McBride concluded that the rules are not unusual because of their strictness, but rather because they are dramatically more strict than those in place when Claudia was much younger.

McBride also summarized her consultation with Dr. Braun, who counseled Claudia from April 2009 until March 2010, when Paula withdrew her approval. Claudia repeatedly told Dr. Braun that she was seriously scared of both physical and verbal abuse from Paula and that Paula would frequently threaten to slap her for being disrespectful. Claudia told Dr. Braun that Paula would humiliate her in front of neighbors and friends, even following her to school. Dr. Braun concluded

that Paula was attacking Claudia's self esteem, self confidence, and self image. Dr. Braun told McBride that Paula should have restricted contact with Claudia until her moods could be better analyzed by a trained psychiatric professional. Dr. Braun further recommended that Paula have no overnight visits and that Claudia should have a cell phone to call the police or Tom in case something gets out of control with Paula. Paula rejected the idea that Claudia needed to resume counseling.

McBride opined that both parties deserved credit for being extremely involved with Claudia's upbringing and for Claudia being accomplished, personable, and mature. However, McBride concluded that Paula exhibited some behaviors that indicated problems with mental health and would continue to negatively impact Claudia. McBride conceded that she is not qualified to diagnose someone as being mentally ill, but she viewed Paula's behavior as being unable or unwilling to deal with reality. Claudia was aware of Paula's paranoia about spies in the home, and Claudia was upset by Paula's increasingly severe rules. McBride believed that Paula could not adequately diffuse incidents with Claudia when they occur. McBride concluded that Paula definitely should seek the assistance of a mental health professional. McBride was particularly concerned with Paula's unwillingness or inability to discuss the possibility that she and Claudia remain in Illinois and how Paula might react if removal was denied.

McBride recommended that visitation be limited to daytime weekend days unless or until Paula allowed Claudia to do her homework independently, in which case weekday afternoon and early evening visits would also be appropriate. Overnight visits might be appropriate if Paula has a psychiatric evaluation and obtains a residence near Claudia. McBride's visitation recommendations were consistent with those of Dr. Braun, Claudia's counselor.

Paula and Tom also testified at the hearing. Paula admitted that, during the divorce, Claudia's behavior had changed and that their relationship now involved pushing, shouting, and "back talk," but Paula did not know why Claudia was behaving that way. Paula also admitted that she did not allow Claudia's Girl Scout leaders to photograph Claudia because Paula had always been private about family photos. The remainder of the parties' testimony was consistent with the reports submitted by Dr. Bongiorno and McBride.

On November 17, 2010, the trial court entered a written order awarding Tom sole legal and residential custody of Claudia and possession of the family home. The court also granted Paula at least two supervised visits per week at the Du Page County Family Center. The court made oral findings that supervised visitation was appropriate because Paula's mental health problems would endanger seriously Claudia's physical, mental, and emotional health. The court ruled that visitation should be supervised until Paula submitted to a mental health evaluation and followed the recommended course of treatment, if any.

The court expressed sadness that Paula was unwilling to recognize that she had mental health issues. The court found credible the evidence that Paula was paranoid about ideas regarding cable company spying and that Paula conflicted with neighbors and Girl Scout leaders. The court also mentioned the evidence that Paula had denied Claudia access to some of her belongings until they moved to Dallas and unpacked them. The court found Dr. Bongiorno and McBride to be credible, and the court believed that Paula was paranoid in thinking that the health professionals in this case were prejudiced against her because she is a professional woman. The court was concerned about how Claudia would be affected by Paula's mental health and her altercations with Claudia and the community.

The court set forth a procedure to facilitate the transition, directing Paula to retrieve her belongings from the home and scheduling visitation to be supervised by McBride that day. Paula took some of Claudia's belongings from the home and cut short the visitation session. The next day, McBride reported to the court that Paula had called Claudia and made her very upset. Paula allegedly told Claudia "this is what you get for talking to Miss McBride" and said Claudia would be moving with Paula to Texas. Based on the incident and McBride's recommendation, the trial court specified that Paula was barred from having phone contact with Claudia to limit the risk of verbal altercations. Paula filed a timely notice of appeal.

ANALYSIS

On appeal, Paula argues that the trial court erred in requiring visitation to be supervised and barring phone contact with Claudia. Section 607(a) of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act (Dissolution Act) governs visitation and provides that "[a] parent not granted custody of the child is entitled to reasonable visitation rights unless the court finds, after a hearing, that visitation would endanger seriously the child's physical, mental, moral or emotional health." 750 ILCS 5/607(a) (West 2008). In *In re Marriage of Chehaiber*, 394 Ill. App. 3d 690 (2009), this court recently explained that the right to reasonable visitation in section 607(a) "implies a 'best interest of the child' standard," which is to say that a noncustodial parent's right to visitation in the first place is determined by the child's best interests. *Chehaiber*, 394 Ill. App. 3d at 696. A more stringent endangerment standard exists to place a greater burden on a party seeking to reduce a parent's visitation time where the reduction is based on reasons pertaining to perceived deficiencies of the parent, as opposed to reasons pertaining directly to the child's best interests. *Chehaiber*, 394 Ill. App. 3d at 696.

Section 607 sets forth a cohesive scheme for setting (section 607(a)) and changing (section 607(c)) visitation. Pursuant to section 607(a), the noncustodial parent is entitled to reasonable visitation, which a court sets based on the child's best interests. The child's best interests may change as circumstances progress, and thus the amount of reasonable visitation for the noncustodial parent may change; section 607(c) accounts for this by allowing modification of visitation in accord with the child's best interests. *Chehaiber*, 394 Ill. App. 3d at 696.

However, reasonable visitation comes with the limitation (sometimes made explicit by a court order or a parenting agreement, but otherwise stated in section 607(a)) that the child not be exposed to morally or psychologically inappropriate settings or to physical danger. *Chehaiber*, 394 Ill. App. 3d at 696. Thus, a party also may seek to reduce a noncustodial parent's visitation, either from the outset, under section 607(a), or after visitation has been set, under section 607(c), because the party believes the noncustodial parent to be unsuited for full visitation. In that case, the reduction in visitation will be a restriction, and the party must show endangerment under section 607(a) or 607(c). *Chehaiber*, 394 Ill. App. 3d at 696.

A restriction of visitation, which must meet the serious-endangerment standard, is an action that limits, restrains, or confines visitation, for example, a termination of visitation, a prohibition on overnight visitation, or a requirement of supervised visitation. See *In re Marriage of Ross*, 355 Ill. App. 3d 1162, 1167 (2005). Termination of visitation, a ban on unsupervised or overnight visitation, or a ban on visitation at the noncustodial parent's home will almost certainly be imposed due to unsuitable attributes of the parent whose visitation is limited, and to the extent that those limitations are imposed to account for the attributes of one or both of the parents, those conditions are properly labeled restrictions. *Chehaiber*, 394 Ill. App. 3d at 697.

Ordinarily, the “ ‘trial court has broad discretion in fashioning the terms of visitation and those terms will not be overturned absent proof that the court has abused its discretion.’ ” *In re Marriage of Saheb and Khazal*, 377 Ill. App. 3d 615, 621 (2007) (quoting *In re Marriage of Engelkens*, 354 Ill. App. 3d 790, 792 (2004)). However, when a restriction on visitation is proposed, the burden is upon the custodial parent to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that full visitation would endanger the welfare of the child. *In re Marriage of Manhoff*, 377 Ill. App. 3d 671, 676 (2007) (citing *In re Marriage of Marshall*, 278 Ill. App. 3d 1071, 1078 (1996)). Whether unrestricted visitation “would endanger seriously the child’s physical, mental, moral or emotional health” (750 ILCS 5/607(a) (West 2008)) is a question of fact that requires the presentation and consideration of evidence. It is well settled that a trial court’s findings of fact will not be disturbed unless they are against the manifest weight of the evidence (*Harris Trust & Savings Bank v. Village of Barrington Hills*, 133 Ill. 2d 146, 156-57 (1989)). “ ‘A factual finding is against the manifest weight of the evidence when the opposite conclusion is clearly evident or the finding is arbitrary, unreasonable, or not based in evidence.’ ” *In re Marriage of Holthaus*, 387 Ill. App. 3d 367, 374 (2008) (quoting *Samour, Inc. v. Board of Election Commissioners*, 224 Ill. 2d 530, 544 (2007)).

Requiring supervised visitation at the Du Page County Family Center and barring phone contact qualify as restrictions on Paula’s visitation with Claudia. The trial court stated that Paula’s mental health and the possibility of violence between Paula and Claudia required the restrictions to avoid endangering seriously Claudia’s physical, mental, and emotional health. See 750 ILCS 5/607(a) (West 2008).

We conclude that the trial court’s finding of serious endangerment is not against the manifest weight of the evidence. The court was concerned that Paula was unwilling or unable to recognize

that she had mental health issues, and the court specifically cited Paula's paranoid ideas about cable company spying. The court also mentioned evidence that Paula had packed some of Claudia's belongings and denied Claudia access to them even though no removal to Dallas was imminent or authorized. Paula also experienced unusual conflicts with neighbors and Girl Scout leaders, and her rules for Claudia had become inexplicably strict even as Claudia was thriving in school and extracurricular activities. The court found Dr. Bongiorno and McBride to be credible, and the court believed that Paula was paranoid in thinking that the health professionals in this case were prejudiced against her because she is a professional woman. The court found that Claudia would be endangered seriously by Paula's mental health and her altercations with Claudia. Under these circumstances, we cannot say that the opposite conclusion is clearly evident or that the finding is arbitrary, unreasonable, or not based in evidence.

Once the trial court properly found that unrestricted visitation would endanger seriously Claudia's physical, mental, moral or emotional health, the court had discretion to fashion a visitation schedule to meet Claudia's best interest. To that end, the court required visitation to be supervised and barred telephone contact until Paula submitted to a mental health evaluation and followed the recommended course of treatment, if any. The court explained that supervised visitation was needed to reduce the risk that an argument between Paula and Claudia might escalate to a physical altercation. Phone contact also was barred because Paula already had called Claudia and upset her on the day after Tom was awarded custody. We conclude that the court did not abuse its discretion in imposing these temporary restrictions. Although Dr. Bongiorno did not recommend the restrictions on visitation that the trial court ultimately ordered, the temporary nature of the restrictions is consistent with the recommendations of Dr. Bongiorno, McBride, and Dr. Braun that

Paula participate in a psychiatric evaluation to determine her treatment needs, if any, and should comply with the treatment recommendations from the evaluation. Once Paula undergoes a mental health evaluation and follows the recommended treatment, she may seek modification of the visitation. Changing the conditions that led to the restrictions is within Paula's control.

For the preceding reasons, the judgment of the circuit court of Du Page County is affirmed.

Affirmed.