

CERTIFIED FOR PUBLICATION

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION THREE

In re RACHEL L., et al., Persons Coming
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

B192878

JONATHAN L. and MARY GRACE L.,

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. JD00773)

Petitioners,

v.

ORDER MODIFYING OPINION
[NO CHANGE IN JUDGMENT]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF
LOS ANGELES,

Respondent;

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND
FAMILY SERVICES,

Real Party in Interest.

THE COURT:

It is ordered that the opinion filed herein on February 28, 2008, be modified
as followed:

(1) Page 1, delete paragraph 2, beginning Children's Law Center, and
replace with the following paragraphs:

Children's Law Center of Los Angeles, Cameryn Schmidt and
Christine Caldwell; Lori A. Fields, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Petitioners;

Christopher Blake, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for father
Philip L.; and

Aida Aslanian, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for mother
Mary L.

No appearance for Respondent.

Friday, March 07, 2008

In Re Rachel L. (Cal. Ct. App. - Feb. 28, 2008)

Things aren't going very well for [Justice Croskey](#) lately.

[He published an opinion late last week](#) about homeschooling that was interesting, but which I didn't think was especially worthy of comment because I understood (I think) what he meant and where he was coming from, at least in the context of the children at issue in the case, who had been allegedly highly abused and neglected. As I read the opinion, he meant to say -- albeit in a somewhat overbroad fashion -- that parents don't possess a categorical constitutional or statutory right to educate their children in whatever fashion they wish, and that a reasonable response to the neglect at issue here would be to require the children to be educated in a public or real private school, not in a "homeschool" with virtually no supervision run by neglectful parents.

But then the firestorm began.

The press got a hold of the opinion, the homeschoolers went up in arms, and all of the sudden Justice Croskey was barraged, I'm sure, with a plethora of phone calls, e-mails, and critiques. All for a loosely-worded opinion that, I believe, anyway, wasn't intended to stand for the extreme proposition claimed for it by its opponents.