



AN ANALYSIS OF THE INSTITUTES OF UNILATERAL CUSTODY AND SHARED CUSTODY IN THE FIGHT AGAINST PARENTAL ALIENATION



<https://doi.org/10.56238/levv16n47-085>

Submitted on: 03/23/2025

Publication date: 04/23/2025

Gunar Guimarães de Lima¹ and Hubcarmo Souza Amorim²

ABSTRACT

Parental alienation is a legal and psychological phenomenon that often occurs in contexts of dissolution of family life, directly affecting the child's emotional development and compromising the balanced exercise of family power. In the Brazilian legal system, the approach to this problem involves the application of judicial measures that seek to mitigate its effects, including the definition of the custody regime. In this context, the present study aimed to analyze the effectiveness of unilateral and shared custody modalities as legal instruments capable of preventing and combating parental alienation. To this end, a methodology based on the analysis of legal and scientific sources was adopted, through bibliographic research in academic articles and publications available in the CAPES, SciELO and Google Scholar databases. From this investigation, it was observed that shared custody, by promoting parental co-responsibility and favoring balance in decision-making, tends to be more effective in preventing parental alienation, contributing to a healthier coexistence between parents and children. However, it was found that its adoption should be carefully evaluated in contexts of domestic violence or accentuated marital conflicts, in which unilateral custody may be more appropriate to the protection of the minor. The study concludes that both modalities have applicability and efficacy conditioned to the analysis of the concrete case, and the sensitive and interdisciplinary action of the legal operators is essential. Finally, it is suggested the expansion of psychosocial support measures and qualified listening to the child, as a way to improve judicial interventions in these family conflicts.

Keywords: Family power. Family life. Domestic violence.

¹Graduating in Law, from the University of Higher Education of Southern Maranhão – Unisulma.
E-mail: gunar_lima1210@hotmail.com

²Bachelor of Laws (FACIMP). Graduated in History (UEMA) Esp. People Management. Esp. Direito de Família.
E-mail: hubcarmo.amorim@unisulma.edu.br

INTRODUCTION

Parental alienation has been consolidated as a growing phenomenon in contemporary family relationships, with devastating consequences for the emotional, psychological and social development of the children involved. This concept refers to the set of behaviors of one of the parents that aims to hinder or even prevent the child's relationship with the other parent, through manipulation, distortion of facts, and even the incitement of feelings of hostility (Santos, 2021). The issue of parental alienation, therefore, requires a detailed approach, which involves both the understanding of its causes and the legal and social means for its prevention and combat.

The Brazilian legal context, for example, recognizes parental alienation as a violation of the rights of the child, and is governed by Law No. 12,318/2010, which establishes rules for prevention and judicial intervention in cases of this type (Brasil, 2010). However, law enforcement and addressing parental alienation remain challenging as they often involve intense and complex disputes over child custody, which raises the need for further examination of custody modalities and their implications.

Within this scenario, the modalities of custody, especially unilateral and shared, emerge as ways to prevent parental alienation. Unilateral custody, where only one parent assumes responsibility for the child's care, is indicated when there is incompatibility between the parents or incapacity of one of them (Alves; Vieira, 2024). Shared custody, on the other hand, has been a rule since the reform of the Civil Code in 2008, seeks to ensure balanced coexistence with both parents (Palhares; Saints; Melo, 2022). This modality promotes a cooperative environment in favor of child well-being. The choice between them must consider the particularities of each case.

In relation to parental alienation, shared custody emerges as a promising solution to minimize the effects of this phenomenon, since it promotes the active participation of both parents in the child's life, preventing either of them from placing themselves in a position of exclusivity or dominance (Carvalho; Flowers; Lelis, 2024). On the other hand, unilateral custody can protect the child from an alienating environment, but also aggravate the situation if the guardian does not favor coexistence with the other parent. Thus, it is essential to understand how each type of custody affects family dynamics and the overcoming of parental conflicts.

In this context, the central question to be investigated in this study is: what is the effectiveness of the institutes of unilateral custody and shared custody as viable solutions to combat parental alienation, and how can these modalities be applied in order to protect the rights of children and promote the emotional health of the families involved? The general

objective of this work, therefore, is to investigate the effectiveness of these custody modalities as solutions to mitigate the effects of parental alienation, analyzing the adequacy of each of them, in the light of existing legal practices, and identifying interventions that can result in a more balanced and healthy family life.

To this end, the methodology adopted in this study will be the analysis of legal and scientific sources, through research in academic articles and publications available in the CAPES, SCIELO and Google Scholar databases. These sources will be essential to support the investigation of custody modalities and their relationship with parental alienation, considering the empirical and theoretical evidence already produced on the subject. The organization of the article will follow the structure of a theoretical framework, which will be divided into the following topics: (i) the concept and implications of parental alienation, (ii) unilateral custody: characteristics, implications and effectiveness in the fight against parental alienation, (iii) shared custody: principles, benefits and effectiveness in combating parental alienation, and, finally, (iv) the final considerations, which will present the conclusions about the research carried out and suggestions for future legal interventions.

THE CONCEPT AND IMPLICATIONS OF PARENTAL ALIENATION

Parental alienation, a phenomenon of a psychological, legal and social nature, gains prominence in Family Law, especially in custody disputes after marital dissolution. This practice, in which one parent tries to take the child away from the other, hurts human dignity and violates the child's fundamental rights to family life. Such guarantees are provided for in Article 227 of the Federal Constitution of 1988, Article 19 of the ECA (Law No. 8,069/1990) and Article 9 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (Decree No. 99,710/1990), to which Brazil is a signatory (Brasil, 1990).

The World Health Organization (WHO), in the most recent version of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11), has officially recognized Parental Alienation Syndrome as a Caregiver-child relationship problem (QE52.0). Although its operationalization in the Brazilian territory is at an early stage, this international classification inserts the phenomenon in a list of pathologies that deserve interdisciplinary attention (UN-BRAZIL, 2022).

As pointed out by Saini et al. (2016), the term Parental Alienation (PA) is widely used to describe the repeated behavior of the child refusing to maintain affective bonds with one of the parents, as a result of manipulations exercised by the other. This practice, although

old, has only recently begun to receive systematic attention from doctrine and jurisprudence, as highlighted by Maria Berenice Dias (2019).

Madaleno (2018, p. 115), jurist and judicial expert working in the field of Family Law, reinforces that

Parental Alienation as a social, psychological and legal phenomenon has been a frequent finding in the scope of family law. And in this sense, Maria Berenice Dias warns that it is a practice that has always existed, however, it has only now started to receive due attention. (Madaleno, 2018, p. 115)element.

From a legislative point of view, the Brazilian legal system began to deal directly with parental alienation with the enactment of Law No. 12,318/2010. This rule typifies and exemplifies conducts that constitute acts of alienation. Article 2 defines alienation as any interference in the psychological formation of the child or adolescent promoted by a parent, grandparents or guardian, with the aim of removing or disqualifying the other parent. The sole paragraph, item I, of the same article, characterizes as a typical act the "carrying out of a campaign to disqualify the conduct of the parent in the exercise of maternity or paternity".

It is important to highlight that the contemporary debate on Parental Alienation in Brazil gained strength in 2008, with the clash between shared custody and the protection of women by the Maria da Penha Law (Law n. 11.340/2006). According to Thurler (2019), parents' movements reacted to protective measures that kept men away from the home, interpreting them as parental alienation. In this context, Severi and Villarroel (2021) point to the introduction of the Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS) theory in the country, originally proposed by Richard Gardner (1985) in the United States.

Despite the scientific fragility of Gardner's propositions, criticized for the lack of methodological rigor and for presenting a gender bias that harms, above all, mothers and children (Malta; Nicácio, 2021), his theory decisively influenced the formulation of Law 12.318/2010. However, at the end of the legislative process, the parliamentarians chose to suppress the term "syndrome" from the legal text, recognizing the controversies involved (Correia, 2012).

Santos and Silva (2019, p. 254) point out that

The lack of public investment means that there is only the guardianship counselor and the legal psychologist to act in all phases of analysis in which the processes of Parental Alienation occur, not perceiving the performance of the very important figure of the forensic psychiatrist and all his baggage of psychic studies (Santos; Silva, 2019, p. 254).

However, as Santos and Silva (2019) point out, the public structure is still insufficient for the adequate treatment of these situations, as often only the guardianship counselor and the legal psychologist are present, to the detriment of specialists such as the forensic psychiatrist, whose participation would be fundamental.

Despite this, as shown by Dalgarno et al. (2023), in the Brazilian legal context there is still confusion between the legal concept of parental alienation and the pathological notion of syndrome, it is in this scenario that the ground is established for the dissemination of the theory of Parental Alienation Syndrome (PAS), developed by Richard Gardner (1985) in the United States. Although harshly criticized by the scientific community – especially regarding the lack of methodological rigor and the harmful effects on mothers and children – this theory strongly influenced the Brazilian legal system.

In terms of state response, the Judiciary has evolved in the application of protective and sanctioning measures in cases of parental alienation, always in light of the principle of the best interest of the child and adolescent, provided for in article 227 of the Federal Constitution and reiterated in the ECA.

The jurisprudence of the Brazilian courts has recognized the psychosocial damage caused by alienation, as demonstrated by the judgment of the Court of Justice of the Federal District and Territories (TJDFT, APC 20140310277634, 2014) determined the expansion of the visitation regime in favor of the father, even without configuring parental alienation. Similar decisions were handed down by the Court of Justice of Paraíba (TJ-PB, 0017006-86.2013.815.2001, 2013) and by the Superior Court of Justice (REsp 1.330.172/MS, 2013; REsp 1.605.477/RS, 2018; REsp 2.133.506/SP, 2020), which reinforce that parental alienation can justify measures such as loss of custody or suspension of family power.

In view of the finding of acts of parental alienation, it is essential for the Judiciary to act quickly and effectively, through the application of legal measures capable of mitigating the deleterious effects of this conduct on the child or adolescent. To this end, the Brazilian legal system provides for a list of judicial measures in article 6 of Law No. 12,318/2010, giving the magistrate the power to adopt, autonomously or cumulatively, various measures, according to the seriousness of the specific case. See:

Article 6 - In the case of typical acts of parental alienation or any conduct that hinders the coexistence of a child or adolescent with a parent, in an autonomous or incidental action, the judge may, cumulatively or not, without prejudice to the resulting civil or criminal liability and the wide use of procedural instruments capable of inhibiting or mitigating its effects, according to the seriousness of the case: I - declare the occurrence of parental alienation and warn the alienator; II - to expand the family coexistence regime in favor of the alienated parent; III - stipulate a fine to the alienator; IV - to determine psychological and/or biopsychosocial follow-up; V -

determine the change of custody to shared custody or its inversion; VI - to determine the precautionary determination of the child's or adolescent's domicile; (BRAZIL, 2010)

Regarding the legal measures provided for, article 6 of Law 12,318/2010 establishes that, once acts of parental alienation are characterized, the judge may, cumulatively or not, adopt measures ranging from warnings, expansion of the cohabitation regime, application of fines, referral to biopsychosocial monitoring, to the change of the custody regime.

According to Figueiredo and Alexandridis (2020, p. 75), "the judge may promote the combination of two or more measures, which he deems necessary in order to avoid the proliferation of damages related to parental alienation, in the preservation of the minor's coexistence with the victim". Cury (2018, p. 57) adds that "the warning consists of verbal admonition, serving as a pedagogical measure, so that there is reflection by parents or guardians".

In this context, Augusto and Scherer observe that,

The concept of family adopted by the parental alienation law breaks with the historical patriarchy, as it admits that anyone in the custody of the child can configure the position of alienator/alienated. In addition, two other positions need to be demarcated, the alienated person — who is the parent removed by the defamatory campaign — and the child, who is configured as a victim of the process (Augusto; Scherer, 2022, p. 8).

The Parental Alienation Law breaks with the traditional patriarchal logic by admitting that anyone in custody of the child can occupy the role of alienator. The authors also highlight the need to identify the positions of the alienator (who promotes the removal), alienated (the removed parent) and the child, the true victim of the process.

Civil liability has also been applied by the Judiciary as a way to curb the practice of alienating acts. In a decision published by IBDFAM (2022), the 3rd Civil Court of the District of Pindamonhangaba/SP sentenced a mother to pay R\$ 10 thousand as moral damages to the child's father, after verifying, via a psychosocial report, the repeated conduct of hindering the coexistence between father and daughter.

Finally, it is imperative to highlight that article 6 of Law 12.318/2010 has an illustrative character, which allows the magistrate, in the specific case, to adopt other measures not expressly provided for, as long as they are in line with constitutional principles and the rights of children and adolescents. Such an interpretation is essential to ensure the effectiveness of the rule and preserve the affective bonds threatened by the alienating conduct.

UNILATERAL CUSTODY: CHARACTERISTICS, IMPLICATIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST PARENTAL ALIENATION

In the Brazilian legal system, unilateral custody is supported by paragraph 1 of article 1,583 of the Civil Code, which defines it as "the one assigned to only one of the parents or to someone who replaces him". This is an exceptional regime, whose granting depends on the express manifestation of will of one of the parties or the consensus between the parents, according to the terms of paragraph 2 of article 1,584, item I, of the same law.

The adoption of unilateral custody, in certain contexts, can be configured as a measure of protection for the child or adolescent, especially in cases of domestic or family violence. Data from Dial 180, analyzed by Thaís Batista (2016), indicate that 79% of the women who sought the service had children; Of these, 60% reported that their children witnessed aggression, and 23% that their own children were also direct victims. In this sense, Gois and Oliveira (2019, p. 52) state that "coexistence can constitute a space of protection and recognition, but also of humiliation, disqualification and subordination".

In the legal field, unilateral custody imposes on the custodial parent the exclusive responsibility for the exercise of family power, which, according to Maria Berenice Dias (2019, p. 325), can "give rise to various traumas and implications", especially when the other parent is excluded from the child's life.

The guardian parent exercises family power without the other's consent, giving rise to various traumas and implications. If these situations are proven, the judge may determine the reversal of custody, which must be monitored by teams of qualified professionals, an occasion that is difficult to carry out due to the large number of demands. (DIAS, 2019, pg. 325).

In these cases, the plaintiff defends the possibility of reversal of custody, to be duly accompanied by a specialized technical team, a measure that, however, faces practical difficulties in the face of the high judicial demand.

Although the history of domestic violence is a relevant factor in the definition of custody, the focus of the analysis should be the child's interest, especially in view of the strategic use of the accusation of parental alienation as a form of retaliation in separation proceedings. Severi and Villarroel (2021, p. 15) draw attention to the increase in allegations that protective measures would be used as alienation tactics, which reinforces the need for careful analysis based on concrete evidence.

Parental alienation, in these contexts, often manifests itself through the affective instrumentalization of children as a form of revenge between parents. Lucena, Burton, and Oliveira (2023) warn of the irreversible psychological effects of this practice, highlighting

that unilateral custody, when misused, can contribute to the worsening of the distance between the child and the non-custodial parent.

Brazilian jurisprudence has faced these issues with caution. In the judgment of Interlocutory Appeal No. 70073185886, the TJ-RS decided to maintain shared custody, rejecting a request for modification to unilateral custody due to lack of evidence of parental alienation. The rapporteur, Des. Rui Portanova pointed out that "there is no proof or likelihood of the alleged parental alienation, or of any urgent situation that justifies the decision without prior hearing of the father/aggravated party" (TJ-RS, 2017).

In this debate, Rodrigo da Cunha Pereira (2018) proposes a critical reflection on the term "custody" itself, as he considers it linked to the idea of possession, suggesting its replacement by "family coexistence", a concept more aligned with the principle of parental care and co-responsibility. This view is reinforced by article 21 of the Statute of the Child and Adolescent (Law No. 8,069/1990), which provides for the joint exercise of family power and the duty to preserve affective bonds with both parents. In a complementary way, article 226, paragraph 5, of the Federal Constitution ensures parental equality, reiterating that the rights and duties in the conjugal society are exercised equally by the man and the woman (Brasil, 1990).

Therefore, unilateral custody, although legitimate in specific contexts such as cases of proven unfitness of one of the parents or risk to the integrity of the child, cannot be seen as an automatic solution to parental alienation. Its adoption must be judicious, based on robust evidence and accompanied by specialized technical support, in order to ensure the preservation of family ties and the full psychological development of the child. When well founded, it can act as an effective instrument to interrupt alienating practices. However, without due caution, it can contribute to deepening the distance and generate new forms of conflict and child suffering.

SHARED CUSTODY: PRINCIPLES, BENEFITS AND EFFECTIVENESS IN COMBATING PARENTAL ALIENATION

Shared custody, as governed by articles 1,583 and 1,584 of the Civil Code of 2002, consists of joint responsibility and the balanced exercise of parental rights and duties by both parents, even if they do not live under the same roof. This model is directly related to the promotion of the child's best interests, as it ensures their broad coexistence with both parents, guaranteeing the full exercise of family power.

Farias and other collaborators point out that,

Shared custody was instituted as a general rule, whenever there is no agreement between the parents on the custody of the children, as provided for in the amendment of Law No. 13,058, of December 22, 2014 on article 1584, § 2: "when there is no agreement between the mother and the father regarding the custody of the child, it will be applied, whenever possible, shared custody." In addition to the issue of the exercise of egalitarian family power, the law brought other important issues that aim at the interest of the minor, such as the issue of housing being in the place that best meets the interest of the minor; the discarding of the punishment previously imposed on the defaulting parent not to have the right to visits, which violated the Principle of the Best Interest of the Minor; access to information about children regarding attendance at public and private establishments, school, the doctor, among others (Farias et al., 2022, p. 5).

Shared custody was expressly introduced into the Brazilian legal system by Law No. 11,698/2008 and consolidated as a general rule with the enactment of Law No. 13,058/2014. The latter determines its preferential application, even when there is no agreement between the parents, as a way to ensure balance in parental relationships (Farias et al., 2022). Paragraph 2 of article 1,584 of the Civil Code reinforces this understanding by providing that, in the absence of consensus, shared custody must be judicially imposed, always in the best interest of the child.

Within this context, shared custody is understood as an effective mechanism in coping with parental alienation. According to article 6 of Law No. 12,318/2010, the change in the custody regime can be determined as a protective measure in the face of the finding of alienating conducts (Brasil, 2010). This is due to the fact that shared custody avoids the monopoly of parental power, promoting dialogue and co-responsibility between parents, which significantly reduces the possibilities of affective manipulation or disqualification of the other parent (Coutinho et al., 2020; Santana et al., 2016).

Lucena, Burton and Oliveira (2023, p. 11) highlight that shared custody is the most sensible alternative to ensure the well-being of children and, therefore, should be preferred by the magistrate, as established by law. However, they also note that, in Brazilian forensic practice, the adoption of unilateral custody still prevails, often due to cultural and structural factors that make it difficult to carry out parental co-responsibility.

Understanding the historical evolution of family power is essential to contextualize the paradigm shift brought about by shared custody. The Civil Code of 1916 established "paternal power", giving the father exclusive authority over his children – a reflection of a patriarchal society. This structure began to be transformed with legislative milestones such as the Statute of Married Women (Law No. 4,121/1962) and was definitively superseded by the 1988 Constitution, which enshrined equality between men and women in the exercise of parental duties (art. 226, §5).

Based on this principle of equality, Ramos (2016, p. 49) defines shared custody as the "exercise of rights and duties of the father and mother who do not live under the same

roof, concerning the family power of the common children", emphasizing autonomy and joint responsibility, regardless of marital cohabitation. The regime, therefore, aims not at the division of time, but at co-responsibility in important decisions in the child's life, promoting balance and affective presence.

However, the application of shared custody is not exempt from criticism. Part of the doctrine warns of the inadequacy of the model in contexts of domestic violence, in which the imposition of coexistence can reinforce abusive relationships. Brandão (2019) argues that, in these cases, the shared regime can deepen the suffering of the woman and the child, especially when the father's estrangement stems from his violent conduct.

In line with this view, Thurler (2019) observes that paternal rejection by the child can be a direct result of the trauma experienced when witnessing aggression against the mother, which is often misinterpreted as parental alienation. Nakamura (2020) also criticizes the superficiality with which the principle of the best interest of the child is applied in custody disputes, especially when the child's voice is manipulated to meet adult interests. D'Almeida (2018) adds that, under the pretext of combating parental alienation, the rights of women and children are often neglected, perpetuating discriminatory practices.

Despite these limitations, it is undeniable that shared custody has mechanisms capable of mitigating the effects of parental alienation, as long as its application considers the family context and the particularities of the case. By guaranteeing both parents equal access to information about health, education, and other aspects of the child's life, the regime promotes an environment of cooperation and co-responsibility (Possamai, 2024), strengthening the affective bond and hindering parental exclusion strategies.

However, national jurisprudence shows that, in certain contexts, the change of custody to the shared model can be rejected when the legal requirements for it are absent. In the judgment of Interlocutory Appeal No. 10702140781239001, the Court of Appeals of Minas Gerais upheld a decision of the first instance that denied a preliminary injunction to change unilateral custody to shared custody, highlighting:

ACTION FOR MODIFICATION OF CUSTODY. PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION REQUEST FOR SHARED CUSTODY. PRECAUTIONARY PROVISION. FUMUS BONI IURIS. PERICULUM IN MORA. MAINTENANCE OF THE DECISION OF THE FIRST INSTANCE. 1. The process relating to the custody of a minor does not aim to meet the interests of the parents, but, primarily, to prevail in the best interests of the child. 2. In the absence of the *prima facie* case and *periculum in mora* requirements, in order to characterize the apparent plausibility of the claim filed and the well-founded danger of damage, before the final provision, the singular decision that rejected the preliminary injunction request for modification of the custody agreed between the parties unilaterally to shared custody must be maintained. 3. Appeal dismissed. (TJMG, AI10702140781239001, 8th C. Cív. Rel. Des. Teresa Cristina da Cunha Peixoto, j. 02/07/2015).

In addition, the doctrine also recognizes the limits of shared custody. According to Paulo Lôbo (2018), although this regime is preferential, its application should not be automatic, especially when practical unfeasibility, absence of dialogue or strong animosity between the parents is demonstrated. He points out that, if poorly implemented, shared custody can compromise the child's psychic, social and emotional stability.

About this type of guard, Paulo Lôbo (2018) states:

Unilateral or exclusive custody, in the system of the Civil Code, and after Law No. 11,698/2008, is assigned by the judge to one of the parents, when they do not reach an agreement and shared custody becomes unfeasible, given that it is preferential. Custody attributed to a third party is also qualified as unilateral when the judge is convinced that neither of the parents meets the necessary conditions for it. In conventional judicial divorce, the parents may agree on sole custody of one of the two, if this results in the best interests of the children; This motivation is necessary and must be included in the respective instrument signed by the spouses who intend to divorce.

In this scenario, it is also worth highlighting the warning of Maria Berenice Dias (2019, p. 325), when she states that the guardian parent can exercise family power without the other's knowledge, causing trauma and distortions in family relationships. In these cases, the reversal of custody can be determined judicially, but must be accompanied by qualified professionals, which, in practice, is not always feasible given the scarcity of resources and the overload of the justice system.

Therefore, shared custody represents a relevant legal advance and can indeed be effective in combating parental alienation as long as it is applied with responsibility, sensitivity and technical support. Its indiscriminate imposition, especially in contexts of violence or intense litigation, can compromise the well-being of the child. Thus, its effectiveness depends not only on the legal provision, but on the capacity of the Judiciary to adequately assess family dynamics and to ensure that co-responsibility between parents does not become a new space for dispute, but rather a real instrument for the protection of child development.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In view of the analysis carried out throughout this study, it is concluded that the institutes of unilateral custody and shared custody have potentialities and limitations in coping with parental alienation, and their adoption should be guided, as a priority, by the principle of the best interest of the child. The investigation showed that, although unilateral custody may be necessary in situations of risk or domestic violence, it is shared custody that is presented, as a rule, as the most effective instrument to promote balanced

coexistence between parents and ensure the full exercise of family power in an equitable manner.

It was found that shared custody, by imposing parental co-responsibility, dilutes asymmetries in the exercise of family authority, contributing to the reduction of conflicts and discouraging alienating behaviors. Its legal provision, especially after the changes introduced by Law No. 13,058/2014, evidences the legislative movement in favor of equal rights and duties between father and mother, even after the dissolution of the marital union. However, it was also recognized that, in contexts marked by domestic violence or strong legal disputes, its application must be carefully evaluated, in order not to put the child's psychic and emotional integrity at risk.

On the other hand, unilateral custody, although more limited in terms of promoting coexistence with both parents, is still a necessary solution in cases where there is proven inability of one of the parents to exercise parenthood or when shared custody proves to be unfeasible. In such circumstances, it is essential for the Judiciary and multidisciplinary teams to actively act to assess the real capacity of each parent to ensure a healthy, affective and safe environment for the formation of the child or adolescent.

In summary, this study achieved its objective by demonstrating that there is no single or absolute solution for the prevention of parental alienation, but rather the need for a case-by-case analysis, sensitive to family dynamics and the vulnerabilities involved. The effectiveness of custody modalities depends directly on the conscious action of the legal operators, on the qualified listening of the child and on the articulated application between the legal system and interdisciplinary knowledge. Only in this way will it be possible to foster a fairer, more balanced and protective family life for the interests of children and adolescents.

REFERENCES

1. Alves, N. U. G., Vieira, T. U. M., & De Oliveira Brum, A. L. (2024). Prestação de contas de alimentos em guarda unilateral. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Humanidades, Ciências e Educação*, 10(4), 1974–1987.
2. Amaral, F. (2018). *Direito civil: Introdução*. Saraiva.
3. Augusto, I. A., & Scherer, D. C. (2022). Alienação parental na interface da psicologia e do direito. *Humanidades em Perspectivas*, 4(9), 63–75.
4. Batista, T. (2016). *Judicialização dos conflitos intrafamiliares: Considerações do Serviço Social sobre a alienação parental* [Master's thesis, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo].
5. Brandão, E., & Conselho Federal de Psicologia. (2019). Os problemas de gênero na alienação parental e na guarda compartilhada. In *Debatendo sobre alienação parental: Diferentes perspectivas* (pp. 173–184). Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
6. Brasil. (1990). Decreto nº 99.710, de 21 de novembro de 1990: Promulga a Convenção sobre os Direitos da Criança. *Diário Oficial da União*. http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/decreto/1990-1994/D99710.htm
7. Brasil. (1990). Lei nº 8.069, de 13 de julho de 1990: Dispõe sobre o Estatuto da Criança e do Adolescente e dá outras providências. *Diário Oficial da União*. http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/LEIS/L8069.htm
8. Brasil. (2010). Lei nº 12.318, de 26 de agosto de 2010: Dispõe sobre a alienação parental e altera o Código Civil Brasileiro. *Diário Oficial da União*. http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2010/lei/l12318.htm
9. Brasil. (1988). *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988*. *Diário Oficial da União*. http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/Constituicao/Constituicao.htm
10. Carvalho, G. P., De Figueiredo, L. C., & Lelis, H. R. (2024). Guarda compartilhada e a sua efetividade na redução da alienação parental. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Humanidades, Ciências e Educação*, 10(3), 655–665.
11. Correia, E. de C. (2012). *A família funcionalizada e a ocorrência da alienação parental: Uma discussão sobre a responsabilidade civil do genitor alienante* [Master's thesis, Universidade de Fortaleza].
12. Coutinho, M. C. L., Faria, A. L. L., & Gonçalves, J. R. (2020). A alienação parental e seu ordenamento jurídico. *Revista Processus de Estudos de Gestão, Jurídicos e Financeiros*, 11(41), 1–30.
13. Cury, M. (2018). *Estatuto da Criança e do Adolescente comentado* (13th ed.). Malheiros Editora.
14. Dalgarno, E., & et al. (2024). 'Swim, swim and die at the beach': Family court and perpetrator induced trauma (CPIT) experiences of mothers in Brazil. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 46(1), 11–38.

15. D'Almeida, R. G. F. (2018). A (síndrome de) alienação parental: Uma nova forma de patriarcado? *Revista Jurídica Portucalense*, 131–162.
16. Dias, M. B. (2019). *Manual de direito das famílias* (13th ed.). Juspodivm.
17. Dias, M. B. (2017). *Manual de direito das famílias* (12th ed.). *Revistas dos Tribunais*.
18. Farias, R. da S., & et al. (2022). A guarda compartilhada como prevenção à alienação parental. *Revista Acadêmica Universo Salvador*, 6(12).
19. Figueiredo, F. V., & Alexandridis, G. (2020). *Alienação parental* (3rd ed.). *Revista dos Tribunais*.
20. Fiuza, C. (2019). *Direito civil: Curso completo* (20th ed.). D'Plácido.
21. Gardner, R. (1985). Recent trends in divorce and custody litigation. *The Academy Forum*, 29(2), 3–7.
22. Gomes, Q. de S., & et al. (2020). Instrumentos de avaliação sobre alienação parental: Uma revisão sistemática da literatura. *Contextos Clínicos*, 13(3), 945–966.
23. IBDFAM. (n.d.). Mulher deve indenizar ex-marido por prática de alienação parental, decide Justiça de São Paulo. <https://ibdfam.org.br/noticias/9603/Mulher+deve+indenizar+exmarido>
24. Lôbo, P. (2018). *Direito civil: Volume 5: Famílias* (8th ed.). Saraiva Educação.
25. Lucena, J. V. M., Burton, A. A., & De Oliveira, M. L. (2023). As implicações jurídicas para o autor da alienação parental. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Humanidades, Ciências e Educação*, 9(4), 1425–1444.
26. Madaleno, R. (2018). *Direito de família* (8th ed.). Gen & Forense.
27. Nakamura, C. R., & Conselho Regional de Psicologia de São Paulo. (2020). O mito do superior interesse da criança e do adolescente. In *Cristalização, patologização e criminalização da vida no sistema de Justiça: “Alienação Parental” e a atuação da/o psicóloga/o* (pp. 27–41). Conselho Regional de Psicologia de São Paulo.
28. Oliveira, D. (2019). O uso da categoria ‘alienação parental’ como ‘solução’ em laudos psicológicos sobre abuso sexual infantil. In *Debatendo sobre alienação parental: Diferentes perspectivas* (pp. 161–172). Conselho Federal de Psicologia.
29. Palhares, D., Santos, I. A. dos, & Melo, M. A. de A. P. de. (2022). Guarda compartilhada à luz da bioética e do biodireito. *Revista Bioética*, 29, 743–755.
30. Pereira, R. C. (2019, March 11). Divórcios aumentaram e casamentos estão durando menos. <http://www.rodrigodacunha.adv.br/divorcio/>
31. Possamai, E. D. (2024). Tensões legais da alienação parental e os desafios da implementação da guarda compartilhada.

32. Ramos, P. P. de O. C. (2016). O poder familiar e a guarda compartilhada: Novos paradigmas do direito de família (2nd ed.). Saraiva. file:///C:/Users/Jhon/Downloads/docsity-poder-familiar-e-guarda-compartilhada.pdf
33. Saini, M., & et al. (2016). Empirical studies of alienation. Oxford University Press.
34. Santana, P., Sousa, A. M., & Alves, M. (2016). Alienação parental - Meios de prevenção adotados pelo estado democrático de direito. *Revista Univap*, 22(40), 334.
35. Santos, C. R. dos, & Silva, D. S. R. da. (2019). Alienação parental e o papel da perícia multidisciplinar no judiciário brasileiro. *Derecho y Cambio Social*, (56), 245–259.
36. Santos, S. O. C. dos. (2021). Uso indevido da Lei 11.340/06 como mecanismo legal para a prática de alienação parental – Denúnciação caluniosa [Undergraduate thesis, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro].
37. Severi, F. C., & De Lima Villarroel, C. M. (2021). Análise jurisprudencial dos tribunais da região sudeste sobre a aplicação do instituto: (Síndrome da) alienação parental. *Pensar - Revista de Ciências Jurídicas*, 26(2).
38. Souza, F. R. (2021). Alienação parental e violência de gênero: Uma análise sociojurídica da Lei 12.318/10 [Master's thesis, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul].
39. Superior Tribunal de Justiça. (2015, July 2). Agravo de Instrumento-Cv: AI 10702140781239001 MG (T. C. da Cunha Peixoto, Relatora). Jusbrasil.
40. Superior Tribunal de Justiça. (2014, June 3). Recurso Especial: REsp 1428596 RS 2013/0376172-9 (N. Androghi, Relatora). Jusbrasil.
41. Thurler, A. L. (2019). Violências domésticas e guarda compartilhada: Uma oposição inconciliável. Conceito.