

**UNIFORM INTERSTATE FAMILY SUPPORT ACT (EXCERPT)**  
**Act 310 of 1996**

**552.1328 Physical presence of petitioner not required; documents admissible as evidence; testimony.**

Sec. 328. (1) The petitioner's physical presence in a responding tribunal of this state is not required for the establishment, enforcement, or modification of a support order or the rendition of a judgment determining parentage.

(2) A verified petition, affidavit, document substantially complying with federally mandated forms, or document incorporated by reference in any of them that would not be excluded as hearsay if given in person is admissible in evidence if given under oath by a party or witness residing in another state.

(3) A copy of a record of child support payments certified as a true copy of the original by the record's custodian may be forwarded to a responding tribunal. The copy is evidence of the facts asserted in it and is admissible to show whether payments were made.

(4) If furnished to the adverse party at least 10 days before trial, a copy of a bill for testing for parentage, or for the mother's or child's prenatal or postnatal health care, is admissible in evidence to prove the amount billed and that the amount is reasonable, necessary, and customary.

(5) Documentary evidence transmitted from another state to this state's tribunal by telephone, telecopier, or other means that does not provide an original writing shall not be excluded from evidence on an objection based on the means of transmission.

(6) In a proceeding under this act, this state's tribunal may permit a party or witness residing in another state to be deposed or to testify by telephone, audiovisual means, or other electronic means at a designated tribunal or other location in that state. This state's tribunal shall cooperate with other states' tribunals in designating an appropriate location for the deposition or testimony.

(7) If a party called to testify at a civil hearing refuses to answer on the ground that the testimony may be self-incriminating, the trier of fact may draw an adverse inference from the refusal.

(8) A privilege against disclosure of communications between spouses does not apply in a proceeding under this act. The defense of immunity based on the relationship of husband and wife or parent and child does not apply in a proceeding under this act.

**History:** 1996, Act 310, Eff. June 1, 1997.