CHILD CUSTODY AND THE WELFARE PRINCIPLE IN NIGERIA: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL ATTITUDES AND LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

Idehen Irene Esohe*
G L. Umoru**
Ugiomo Eruteya***

Abstract

Child custody in Nigeria is governed by the overarching principle of the best interest of the child, which places the welfare, development, and overall well-being of the child above the competing claims of parents. This article examines the legal and jurisprudential framework regulating child custody in Nigeria, with particular emphasis on applicable statutory provisions, relevant constitutional and international human rights instruments. It further analyses judicial interpretations of the best interest principle in celebrated Nigerian cases which collectively affirm that custody is not a reward to parents but a legal responsibility grounded in child welfare considerations. Despite the strong legal foundation, the article revealed persistent challenges in practice, including cultural and religious influences, gender bias, weak enforcement of custody orders, and conflicts between statutory and customary law systems. A comparative analysis of custody frameworks in the United Kingdom and the United States further highlights theCollege of Law, Igbinedion University Okada, Edo State, Nigeria benefits of structured welfare guidelines, psychological assessment mechanisms, and institutional support systems. The article concludes that while Nigerian custody law is

* PhD Candidate, College of Law, Igbinedion University Okada, Edo State, Nigeria. Email: irene.idehen@iuokada.edu.ng
** Professor of Law, College of Law, Igbinedion University Okada, Edo State, Nigeria
*** PhD, Senior Lecturer, College of Law, Igbinedion University Okada, Edo State, Nigeria

firmly rooted in the best interest principle, effective implementation requires legal, institutional, and judicial reforms to ensure consistency, fairness, and stronger protection of children's rights.

Keywords: Child Custody; Best Interest Principle; Child Welfare; Nigerian Family Law; Judicial Discretion

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Child custody disputes are among the most sensitive issues in family law because they directly affect the welfare, upbringing, and future development of children. In Nigeria, custody is not treated as a proprietary right of parents but as a fiduciary responsibility exercised for the benefit of the child. The courts have consistently held that custody determination must prioritize the welfare and best interest of the child above all other considerations. See Williams v. Williams[1], where the court emphasized that the paramount consideration in custody matters is the welfare of the child and not the absolute legal rights of either parent. Similarly, in Alabi v. Alabi [2] the Court of Appeal reiterated that the child's welfare, happiness, education, moral upbringing, and general well-being are the decisive factors in awarding custody. The principle is also statutorily recognized under Section 71(1) of the Child Rights Act 2003, which provides that in every action concerning a child, the best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration.

This position is grounded in both statutory and judicial authorities. Section 71(1) of the Matrimonial Causes Act[3], empowers the court to make such orders relating to custody, guardianship, welfare, advancement, or education of children of the marriage as it considers

[1] (1987) 2 NWLR (Pt. 54) 66
[2] Ibid
[3] Cap M7, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 2004

proper in the circumstances of the case. Similarly, Section 1 of the Child Rights Act 2003 provides that in every action concerning a child, whether undertaken by an individual, public or private body, institution, or court of law, the best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration.

Judicial interpretation has further reinforced this principle. In Williams v. Williams[4], the Supreme Court held that the welfare of the child is the "first and paramount consideration" in custody matters. The Court emphasized that custody is not awarded as a form of reward or punishment to either parent, but strictly in accordance with what will best promote the child's welfare and overall well-being. See also Alabi v. Alabi [5]where the Court of Appeal reiterated that the child's moral, educational, and physical welfare remains the overriding consideration in determining custody disputes.

This position is grounded in both statutory and judicial authorities. Section 71(1) of the Matrimonial Causes Act, Cap M7, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria (LFN) 2004[6], empowers the court to make such orders regarding custody, guardianship, welfare, advancement, and education of children of the marriage as it considers proper, having regard to the welfare of the child. Similarly, Section 1 of the Child Rights Act 2003 provides that in every action concerning a child, whether undertaken by public or private institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities, or legislative bodies, the best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration.

[4] (1987) 2 NWLR (Pt. 54) 66 at 74–75
[5] (2007) 9 NWLR (Pt. 1039) 297 at 308,
[6] Section 71(1) of the Matrimonial Causes Act, Cap M7, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria (LFN) 2004

Judicial interpretation has reinforced this position. In Williams v. Williams[7], the Supreme Court held that the welfare of the child is the "first and paramount consideration" in custody matters. The Court emphasized that custody is not awarded as a reward or punishment between parents but strictly to serve the child's best interest. See also *Alabi v. Alabi*[8], where the Court of Appeal reiterated that the welfare, happiness, and proper upbringing of the child remain the overriding factors in custody determination. The evolution of custody law in Nigeria has also been influenced by international human rights instruments such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 20 November 1989 and ratified by Nigeria on 19 April 1991, particularly Article 3(1),[9] which provides that the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration in all actions concerning children. Similarly, Article 4(1) of the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child 1990 emphasizes that in all judicial or administrative proceedings affecting a child, the best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration.

Despite the existence of clear statutory and judicial guidance, custody disputes in Nigeria continue to present significant legal and social challenges. First, there is inconsistent judicial application of the best interest principle, as courts sometimes attach undue weight to cultural, religious, or gender considerations rather than focusing strictly on the welfare of the child. [10]This inconsistency often creates unpredictability in custody outcomes. Second, there exists a conflict between statutory

[7]Ibid
[8] ibid
[9] The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 20 November 1989 and ratified by Nigeria on 19 April 1991, particularly Article 3(1),
[10] E.I. Nwogugu, Family Law in Nigeria, 3rd Edition, HEBN Publishers Plc, Ibadan, 2014, pp. 295–301.

law and customary practices, particularly in rural communities where customary norms still prioritize paternal authority over children irrespective of welfare considerations.[11].

Third, the enforcement of custody orders remains weak, with frequent violations of court orders by non-custodial parents, leading to prolonged litigation and emotional instability for children. [12]

Fourth, socio-economic disparities influence custody decisions in practice, as financially stronger parents often gain custody even where emotional or psychological welfare may be better served elsewhere[13] Finally, there is increasing concern over the lack of structured mechanisms to evaluate children's emotional and psychological needs, resulting in custody orders that do not fully reflect modern child psychology principles. [14]These problems highlight the need for a more coherent and uniform application of the best interest principle in Nigerian custody jurisprudence.

Custody refers to the legal authority and responsibility vested in a person to care for a child, including providing shelter, education, guidance, and overall welfare. In Nigerian family law, custody is not synonymous with guardianship; rather, it is more concerned with the physical care and day-to-day upbringing of the child. [15]

---

[11] A.B. Kasunmu & J. E. Salacuse, Nigerian Family Law, Butterworths, London, 1966, pp. 247–250

[12] Sagay, I. E., Nigerian Law of Family, Spectrum Books Ltd., Ibadan, 1999, pp. 412–415.

[13] O. A. Adesina, "Child Custody and the Best Interest Principle in Nigeria," (2019) 5 Redeemer's University Law Journal 112 at 118–120.

[14] UNICEF Nigeria, Implementation of Child Rights in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects, Abuja, 2021, pp. 33–35.

[15] E. I. Nwogugu, Family Law in Nigeria, 3rd Edition, HEBN Publishers Plc, Ibadan, 2014, pp. 281–283.

In *Olowu v. Olowu*[16], the Court of Appeal explained that custody involves the right to care, control, and physical possession of a child, subject to judicial supervision where necessary to protect the child's welfare. Custody is therefore a dynamic legal arrangement capable of modification whenever circumstances affecting the child's best interest change.

1.2 Types of Custody

The types of custody include:

1.2.1 Legal Custody

Legal custody refers to the authority to make major decisions concerning the child's education, religion, healthcare, and general welfare. This authority may be jointly exercised by both parents or exclusively vested in one parent. [17]

1.2.2 Physical Custody

Physical custody involves the actual day-to-day care and residence of the child. Under this arrangement, the child primarily lives with the custodial parent. [18]

1.2.3 Joint Custody

Joint custody allows both parents to share responsibilities in raising the child even where the child resides primarily with one parent. Nigerian courts increasingly encourage this arrangement where

[16] (1985) 3 NWLR (Pt. 13) 372 at 381 CA
[17] I. E. Sagay, Nigerian Law of Family, Spectrum Books Ltd., Ibadan, 1999, pp. 398–400.
[18] A. B. Kasunmu & J. E. Salacuse, Nigerian Family Law, Butterworths, London, 1966, pp. 244–246.

cooperation exists between the parties and where it best serves the welfare of the child. [19]

1.2.4 Sole Custody

Sole custody grants full parental responsibility to one parent, usually where the other parent is considered unfit or where joint custody is impracticable.[20].

In *Nanna v. Nanna*[21], the Court of Appeal emphasized that custody decisions must always be fashioned according to the welfare of the child and not rigidly tied to any formal classification of custody.

2.0 MEANING OF THE BEST INTEREST PRINCIPLE

The "best interest of the child" principle is the cornerstone of custody law. It requires courts to prioritize the welfare, happiness, emotional stability, education, and overall development of the child in all custody decisions. This principle is codified under Section 1 of the Child Rights Act 2003, which provides that the best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration in all actions concerning the child. In *Odogwu v. Odogwu*[22], the Supreme Court held that welfare extends beyond financial provision and includes the emotional, psychological, and physical well-being of the child. The principle was further reinforced in *Adeleke v. Adeleke* [23]where the Court of Appeal stressed that custody must be determined by the arrangement that best promotes the child's total development and long-term welfare.

2.1 Legal Framework Governing Child Custody in Nigeria

[19]O. A. Adesina, "Child Custody and the Best Interest Principle in Nigeria" (2019) 5 *Redeemer's University Law Journal* 112 at 121–123.
[20]E. I. Nwogugu, Family Law in Nigeria, 3rd Edition, HEBN Publishers Plc, Ibadan, 2014, pp. 290–292
[21] (2006) 3 NWLR (Pt. 966) 1 at 15 CA
[22] 1992) 2 NWLR (Pt. 225) 539 at 560 SC
[23] (2013) 16 NWLR (Pt. 1381) 556 at 575 CA,

2.1.1 The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (as amended)

The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria provides the foundational human rights framework for child custody through Chapter IV, which guarantees dignity of the human person, freedom from discrimination, and the right to personal liberty and development. Although the Constitution does not specifically regulate custody matters, its provisions indirectly reinforce the welfare principle by protecting the dignity and equality rights of children. [24]

2.1.2 The Child Rights Act 2003

The Child Rights Act 2003 is the most comprehensive legislation governing child welfare in Nigeria. Section 1 expressly provides that the best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration in every action concerning a child. The Act further guarantees protection against abuse, neglect, exploitation, and harmful treatment, thereby significantly influencing custody determinations. [25]

2.1.3 The Matrimonial Causes Act

The Matrimonial Causes Act, Cap M7, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 2004, governs custody issues arising from divorce and separation proceedings. Section 71 empowers courts to make custody orders based on the welfare of the child. Nigerian courts have interpreted this discretion broadly in order to ensure child-centered custody decisions. See Williams v. Williams[26]

2.1.4 Relevant State Child Rights Laws[27]

[24]Sections 34, 35, and 42 of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (as amended).
[25]Sections 11–17 of the Child Rights Act 2003.
[26] Ibid
[27] The Matrimonial Causes Act, Cap M7, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 2004

In states that have not fully domesticated the Child Rights Act 2003, customary and family law principles continue to apply, although courts increasingly adopt welfare-based interpretations consistent with modern child rights standards. States that have adopted the CRA apply it as the primary statutory framework regulating custody matters. [28]

International Instruments. Nigeria is a signatory to major international instruments relating to child welfare, including the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child adopted on 20 November 1989 and ratified by Nigeria on 19 April 1991, particularly Article 3(1), which provides that the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration in all actions concerning children.

Nigeria is also a party to the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child 1990, Article 4(1) of which similarly provides that in all judicial or administrative proceedings affecting a child, the best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration.[29]

2.2 The Best Interest of the Child Principle

2.2.1 Origin and Evolution of the Principle

The best interest principle originated in international child welfare law and gradually evolved from the old paternalistic custody system, where fathers possessed dominant custodial rights, to a child-centered approach emphasizing the emotional, psychological, educational, and developmental welfare of children. [30]The principle was internationally strengthened through the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989, particularly Article 3(1), which provides that the best

[28] UNICEF Nigeria, Child Rights Legislation in Nigeria, Abuja, 2020, pp. 18–24.
[29] The African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child 1990, Article 4(1)
[30] J. Eekelaar, Family Law and Personal Life, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006, pp. 132–136.

interests of the child shall be a primary consideration in all actions concerning children. Nigeria ratified the Convention on 19 April 1991. The principle is also reflected in the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child 1990, Article 4(1), which mandates that the best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration in all judicial and administrative proceedings affecting children[31].

2.2.2 Statutory Recognition in Nigeria

The principle is firmly embedded in Section 1 of the Child Rights Act 2003, which states that in every action concerning a child, the best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration. It is also reflected in Section 71(1) of the Matrimonial Causes Act, [32] empowering courts to make custody orders about the welfare, advancement, and education of the child.[33]

2.2.3 Judicial Interpretation by Nigerian Courts

Nigerian courts consistently apply the best interest principle as the overriding standard in custody disputes.

In Williams v. Williams [34]the Supreme Court held that welfare is the "first and paramount consideration" in custody matters. In Olowu v. Olowu [35], the Court of Appeal reinforced maternal preference for children of tender years on welfare grounds, unless exceptional circumstances exist. In Odogwu v. Odogwu, the Supreme Court expanded the meaning of welfare to include emotional and psychological stability, not merely material provision. This demonstrates that Nigerian custody jurisprudence is firmly rooted in

[31] Ibid
[32] s 71(1) of the Matrimonial Causes Act, Cap M7, LFN 2004
[33] E. I. Nwogugu, Family Law in Nigeria, 3rd Edition, HEBN Publishers Plc, Ibadan, 2014, pp. 295–302.
[34] Ibid
[35] (1985) 3 NWLR (Pt. 13) 372 at 381 CA

the best interest principle, supported by statutory provisions, judicial precedents, and international human rights instruments, although practical inconsistencies still necessitate reforms.

3.0 AGE AND SEX OF THE CHILD

In custody proceedings under Nigerian law, the age and sex of the child remain relevant but not conclusive considerations in determining welfare. The controlling principle remains the best interest of the child rather than parental entitlement. Section 71 of the Matrimonial Causes Act requires courts to regard the welfare of the child as paramount. Nigerian courts interpret this to include age, developmental needs, and emotional dependency. In *Williams v. Williams*[36], the Supreme Court held that custody decisions must consider the child's sound education and moral and physical welfare. The "tender years doctrine" generally supports maternal custody for infants and very young children. In *Olowu v. Olowu*[37], the court held that children of tender years are ordinarily better placed under maternal care unless compelling circumstances dictate otherwise. However, Nigerian courts have increasingly rejected rigid gender assumptions. In *Otti v. Otti*[38], the Court of Appeal clarified that custody is not automatically determined by gender but by the child's welfare, emotional bonding, and stability. Similarly, in *Onyejekwe v. Onyejekwe*[39], the court stressed that cultural or gender preferences cannot override the welfare principle. Modern judicial reasoning aligns with Article 3 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, which prioritizes the child's best interests over parental gender preference.

3.1 Emotional and Educational Needs

[36] Ibid
[37] Ibid
[38] (1992) 4 NWLR (Pt. 234) 210 at 228 CA
[39] (2014) 11 NWLR (Pt. 1418) 384 at 405 CA

Emotional stability and educational development are central considerations in Nigerian custody law. Courts consistently recognize that custody extends beyond physical possession to include psychological welfare and intellectual development. In *Odogwu v. Odogwu*[40], Belgore JSC held that welfare encompasses emotional happiness, security, and moral development. Educational welfare is equally important. In *Williams v. Williams*[41], Obaseki JSC held that a parent unable to provide proper educational opportunities may be denied custody. Section 71 of the Matrimonial Causes Act specifically empowers courts to consider the advancement and education of children in custody proceedings. In *Adeleke* v. *Adeleke*[42], the Court of Appeal reiterated that emotional bonding and psychological stability are crucial welfare considerations. Thus, Nigerian courts adopt a holistic welfare test that integrates emotional, educational, moral, and psychological development.

3.2 Conduct and Financial Capacity of Parents

The conduct and financial standing of parents are relevant considerations in custody disputes, though subordinate to the welfare principle. In *Nanna* v. *Nanna*[43], the Court of Appeal held that financial capability alone is not decisive where a parent's moral conduct threatens the child's welfare. Similarly, in *Ehinmosan v. Ehinmosan* [44] the court emphasized that custody requires moral suitability because custody involves the moral upbringing of the child. In *Okoro v. Okoro*[45], the court held that violence, neglect, or exposure to immoral

[40] (1992) 2 NWLR (Pt. 225) 539 at 560 SC
[41] (1987) 2 NWLR (Pt. 54) 66
[42] (2013) 16 NWLR (Pt. 1381) 556 at 575 CA
[43] (2006) 3 NWLR (Pt. 966) 1 at 15 CA
[44] (1964) 1 All NLR 233 at 236,
[45] (2003) 8 NWLR (Pt. 822) 250 at 270 CA

environments may disqualify a parent from custody regardless of financial strength[46].

3.3 Stability of the Home Environment

Stability of the home environment is one of the strongest determinants in custody proceedings because courts seek to minimize disruption to the child's emotional and social development. In *Nwokoro* v. *Nwokoro* [47]the court held that continuity of care and environmental stability are essential in determining custody. Similarly, in *Okala v. Okala*[48], the Court of Appeal emphasized that consistent schooling, emotional continuity, and stable caregiving are critical welfare considerations. Under Nigerian jurisprudence, stability includes continuity of education, emotional consistency, absence of domestic conflict, and secure accommodation. [49]

3.4 Wishes of the Child

The wishes of the child may be considered where the child possesses sufficient maturity and understanding to express an informed preference. In *Eguamwense v. Amaghizemwen* [50] the Supreme Court recognized that the opinion of a mature child may be considered in custody proceedings

Similarly, in *Adeleke v. Adeleke*[51], the Court of Appeal held that although the wishes of the child are not binding, they are persuasive where the child demonstrates maturity and independent judgment.

---

[46] I. E. Sagay, Nigerian Law of Family, Spectrum Books Ltd., Ibadan, 1999, pp. 410–415.
[47] (1996) 3 NWLR (Pt. 435) 135 at 145 CA,
[48] (1997) 8 NWLR (Pt. 516) 253 at 268 CA
[49] O. A. Adesina, "Child Custody and the Best Interest Principle in Nigeria" (2019) 5 Redeemer's University Law Journal 112 at 124–126.
[50] (1993) 9 NWLR (Pt. 315) 1 at 25 SC,
[51] (2013) 16 NWLR (Pt. 1381) 556 at 577 CA

Section 14 of the Child Rights Act 2003 also guarantees the child's right to participate in decisions affecting his or her welfare, consistent with Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

3.5 Religio[52]us and Cultural Considerations

Religious and cultural factors are relevant in Nigeria's plural legal system but remain subordinate to the welfare principle. In *Anyanwu v. Anyanwu* [53]the court acknowledged that cultural background may be considered provided it promotes the welfare of the child.

Similarly, in *Onyejekwe v. Onyejekwe*[54], the Court of Appeal held that religious considerations cannot override the child's best interest. Under customary law systems, courts may consider cultural identity and religious upbringing, but these considerations remain subject to statutory child welfare protections under the Child Rights Act 2003.

4.0 JUDICIAL APPROACH TO CUSTODY DECISIONS IN NIGERIA

4.1 Role of the Courts

The Nigerian judiciary plays the primary role in determining custody disputes, especially within matrimonial proceedings. Courts function as impartial arbiters whose foremost responsibility is to protect the welfare of the child rather than reward or punish parents. The statutory basis for this judicial role is found in Section 71 of the Matrimonial Causes Act and Section 1 of the Child Rights Act 2003. In *Williams v. Williams*, the Supreme Court emphasized that custody decisions must

[52] Supra
[53] (1993) 5 NWLR (Pt. 291) 1 at 14 CA,
[54] (2014) 11 NWLR (Pt. 1418) 384 at 405 CA

exclusively promote the child's welfare. Modern scholarly commentary also supports this child-centered judicial approach. [55]

4.2 Discretion of Judges

Custody disputes in Nigeria are largely governed by judicial discretion. Judges are not bound by rigid formulas but must evaluate each case according to its peculiar facts and welfare considerations. In *Olowu* v. *Olowu*[56], the Court of Appeal held that custody depends on the welfare of the child and not on parental claims or rights. Similarly, in *Nanna* v. *Nanna* [57]the court stressed that judicial discretion must be exercised to secure the child's total welfare and not merely parental convenience. Judicial discretion allows courts to consider emotional attachment, educational continuity, moral upbringing, environmental stability, and psychological welfare. However, some scholars argue that broad judicial discretion occasionally produces inconsistent decisions where cultural or gender bias influences judicial reasoning. [58]

4.3 Analysis of Relevant Nigerian Case Law

Nigerian custody jurisprudence reveals a consistent but evolving application of the welfare principle.

In *Odogwu v. Odogwu* [59]the Supreme Court held that welfare extends beyond financial provision to include psychological and emotional stability. Belgore JSC emphasized that custody must promote the holistic development, happiness, and moral upbringing of the child.

---

[55] Bukola Oyaleke, "Judicial Protection of Child Welfare in Nigeria" (2025) 12 *Obafemi Awolowo University Law Journal* 44 at 58–61.
[56] (1985) 3 NWLR (Pt. 13) 372 CA
[57] Ibid
[58]C. Ilodibe & J. Chimeziri, "Judicial Discretion and Child Custody in Nigeria" (2022) 8 *Nigerian Journal of Family Law* 77 at 90–93.
[59] Ibid

In *Williams v. Williams* [60] the Supreme Court declared that the welfare of the child is the "first and paramount consideration" in custody disputes. This decision remains the foundation of modern Nigerian custody jurisprudence.

In *Olowu v. Olowu* [61] the Court of Appeal applied the tender years doctrine and granted custody of young children to the mother based on welfare considerations, holding that children of tender years are ordinarily better cared for by their mother unless exceptional circumstances exist. In *Adeleke v. Adeleke* [62] the Court of Appeal emphasized that custody must reflect the overall best interest of the child, including emotional stability, educational continuity, and psychological development. These decisions collectively demonstrate that Nigerian courts consistently prioritize welfare while retaining broad judicial discretion in the application of custody principles.[63].

5.0 CHALLENGES IN THE APPLICATION OF THE BEST INTEREST PRINCIPLE

5.1 Cultural and Religious Influences

One of the major challenges confronting Nigerian custody law is the continued influence of cultural and religious norms, particularly within customary and Islamic law systems. In many communities, patriarchal traditions favor paternal custody irrespective of welfare considerations, thereby conflicting with statutory child welfare principles under the Child Rights Act 2003.

[60] Ibid
[61] Ibid
[62] (2013) 16 NWLR (Pt. 1381) 556 at 575–577 CA
[63] E. I. Nwogugu, Family Law in Nigeria, 3rd Edition, HEBN Publishers Plc, Ibadan, 2014, pp. 295–310

A doctrinal study by A. A. Adeyemi [64] found that cultural considerations frequently influence judicial outcomes in ways that undermine welfare-based adjudication. Similarly, Brickman's Law Review [65] observed that religious norms continue to shape custody outcomes in jurisdictions where the Child Rights Act has not been fully domesticated.

5.1.2 Gender Bias in Custody Decisions

Historically, Nigerian courts displayed a maternal preference, particularly regarding children of tender years. While originally justified on welfare grounds, modern jurisprudence increasingly adopts gender-neutral custody reasoning.

In *Olowu v. Olowu* [66] maternal preference was accepted for young children. However, later decisions such as Nanna v. Nanna [67]demonstrate a shift toward evaluating parental capacity rather than gender. Academic commentary supports this transition. Adesina emphasized that Nigerian courts are increasingly emphasizing welfare and parenting ability over gender stereotypes, although implicit bias still exists in some lower courts.[68]

5.1.3 Weak Enforcement Mechanisms

Weak enforcement of custody orders remains a serious challenge in Nigeria. Non-compliance with custody judgments often results in prolonged litigation, emotional instability for children, and police

[64] A. A. Adeyemi, "Child Custody and Cultural Conflicts in Nigeria" (2023) 7 Nigerian Journal of Family Law 88 at 96–99
[65] Brickmans Law Review, "Religious Influences on Child Custody Decisions in Nigeria" (2024) 4 Brickmans Law Review 51 at 60–63,
[66] Ibid
[67] Ibid
[68] O. A. Adesina, "Gender Neutrality in Nigerian Custody Jurisprudence" (2021) 9 University of Lagos Law Review 144 at 150–154

reluctance to intervene in domestic disputes. I. E. Sagay observes that enforcement difficulties significantly undermine the effectiveness of judicial custody determinations.[69] Similarly, UNICEF Nigeria, Child Protection and Family Justice in Nigeria, notes that poor enforcement mechanisms reduce public confidence in family court judgments.[70]

5.1.4 Conflict Between Statutory and Customary Law

Nigeria's plural legal system creates tension between statutory law, customary law, and Islamic law in custody disputes. While the Child Rights Act 2003 prioritizes welfare, some customary systems emphasize paternal lineage, inheritance rights, or religious continuity.

In *Anyanwu* v. *Anyanwu*[71]the court held that cultural considerations may be relevant but cannot override the welfare of the child. Academic commentary confirms that this legal pluralism often produces inconsistent custody outcomes depending on jurisdiction and applicable legal systems.[72]

5.2 Comparative Analysis

i. Custody and Best Interest Principle in the United Kingdom

The United Kingdom adopts a highly structured statutory framework under the principle that the welfare of the child is the paramount consideration. This principle is codified in Section 1(1) of the Children Act 1989, which provides that the child's welfare shall be the court's paramount consideration in all decisions relating to upbringing.[73]

---

[69] I. E. Sagay, Nigerian Law of Family, Spectrum Books Ltd., Ibadan, 1999, pp. 420–423,
[70] UNICEF Nigeria, Child Protection and Family Justice in Nigeria, Abuja, 2022, pp. 39–42,
[71] Ibid
[72] A. B. Kasunmu & J. E. Salacuse, Nigerian Family Law, Butterworths, London, 1966, pp. 251–255.
[73] Section 1(1) of the Children Act 1989

Jonathan Herring[74]explains that the UK system reflects a transition from parental-rights adjudication to child-centered welfare adjudication.

In Re G (Children) (Residence: Same-Sex Partner) [75]The House of Lords emphasized that the welfare principle overrides all competing parental claims or moral assumptions. Baroness Hale stated that courts must focus exclusively on the child's overall well-being.

Andrew Bainham, [76] explains that UK custody law operates a "no presumption" model in which neither parent possesses preferential custody rights.

Section 1(3) of the Children Act 1989 establishes the welfare checklist, including: emotional needs, educational needs, physical needs, harm suffered or risk of harm, and parental capability.[77]

Judith Masson, Principles of Family Law, argues that the welfare checklist promotes structured judicial discretion and reduces inconsistency in custody adjudication.[78]

[74] Jonathan Herring, Family Law, 9th Edition, Pearson Education Ltd., London, 2019, pp. 522–526,
[75] Re G (Children) (Residence: Same-Sex Partner) [2006] UKHL 43; [2006] 2 AC 596 at 605–607,
[76] Andrew Bainham, Children: The Modern Law, 4th Edition, Jordan Publishing, Bristol, 2005, pp. 215–220,
[77] s 1(3) of the Children Act 1989
[78] Judith Masson, Principles of Family Law, Sweet & Maxwell, London, 1997, pp. 312–316

5.3 Custody and Best Interest Principle in the United States

The United States applies the "best interest of the child" doctrine through state-based statutes and judicial precedents. The principle is reflected in §402 of the Uniform Marriage and Divorce Act.

In *Palmore* v. *Sidoti*, [79] the United States Supreme Court held that custody decisions must not be influenced by racial or social prejudice and reaffirmed that the child's welfare remains the sole guiding consideration.

Linda D. Elrod and Robert G. Dale explain that American custody law has evolved from maternal preference to gender-neutral parenting-capacity evaluation. [80] In Troxel v. Granville, [81] the Supreme Court recognized parental rights while emphasizing that such rights remain subject to the child's welfare. Robert H. Mnookin argues that the best interest standard is flexible but susceptible to unpredictability because of broad judicial discretion. [82]. Modern US custody considerations include parental fitness, environmental stability, child preference, and history of abuse or neglect.

6.0 LESSONS FOR NIGERIA

Comparative analysis of the UK and US systems reveals several lessons for Nigeria.

---

[79] 466 U.S. 429 (1984),
[80] Linda D. Elrod & Robert G. Dale, "Paradigm Shifts and Pendulum Swings in Child Custody: The Interests of Children in the Balance" (2008) 42 Family Law Quarterly 381 at 390–394,
[81] 530 U.S. 57 (2000),
[82] Robert H. Mnookin, "Child Custody Adjudication: Judicial Functions in the Face of Indeterminacy" (1975) 39 Law and Contemporary Problems 226 at 257–260,

First, the UK model demonstrates the importance of a statutory welfare checklist in reducing judicial inconsistency. Nigerian custody law under the Matrimonial Causes Act and the Child Rights Act lacks a comprehensive checklist, leaving courts with broad discretion.

John Eekelaar argues that structured discretion improves predictability and minimizes judicial bias.[83] Second, the US system illustrates the need to eliminate implicit gender, racial, and socioeconomic bias in custody decisions, as emphasized in *Palmore* v. *Sidoti.* [84] Third, both jurisdictions emphasize psychological evaluation and expert evidence in custody disputes, which remains underutilized in Nigeria. Barbara Ann Atwood, Child Custody and the Best Interests of Children: A Review of Psychological Evidence, argues that professional psychological assessments improve the accuracy of welfare determinations.[85]

6.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REFORM

6.1.2 Legal Reforms

Nigeria should strengthen statutory custody provisions by amending the Child Rights Act 2003 to include a detailed welfare checklist similar to Section 1(3) of the Children Act 1989. See C. C. Eboh, where the author argues that statutory clarification reduces inconsistency and improves predictability in custody decisions.[86]

---

[83] John Eekelaar, "The Interests of the Child and the Child's Wishes: The Role of Dynamic Self-Determinism" (1994) 8 *International Journal of Law and the Family* 42 at 50–53

[84] 466 U.S. 429 (1984).

[85] A Review of Psychological Evidence, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010, pp. 188–194,

[86] C. C. Eboh, "Child Custody Reform and Welfare Adjudication in Nigeria" (2021) 6 Nigerian Bar Journal 71 at 80–83,

Nigeria should also harmonize customary and statutory law to reduce conflicts within the plural legal system.[87]

6.1.2 Judicial Reforms

Judicial officers should receive specialized training in child psychology, welfare assessment, and international child rights standards. The author attributes inconsistent custody outcomes to a lack of standardized welfare reasoning.[88] Courts should also increase reliance on welfare reports, child psychologists, and social welfare officers during custody proceedings. This recommendation aligns with advocating structured discretion supported by expert evidence in custody adjudication.[89]

6.2 Policy and Institutional Improvements

Nigeria requires stronger institutional frameworks to improve the effective implementation of custody decisions and the protection of children's welfare. These reforms should include the establishment of specialized Family Courts nationwide, the creation of Child Welfare Assessment Units, and stronger enforcement mechanisms through social welfare agencies.

The need for institutional strengthening has been emphasized by UNICEF Nigeria in the Child Protection and Family Justice Report, where it was observed that weak institutional enforcement remains a major barrier to effective custody implementation in developing

[87] See Jonathan Herring, Family Law, 9th Edition, Pearson Education Ltd., London, 2019, pp. 522–530; and Robert H. Mnookin, "Child-Custody Adjudication: Judicial Functions in the Face of Indeterminacy" (1975) 39 Law and Contemporary Problems 226 at 257–260.

[88] M. O. Olowu, "Judicial Discretion and Child Welfare Protection in Nigeria" (2020) 14 *African Human Rights Law Journal* 211 at 225–228, A. B. Kasunmu & J. E. Salacuse, *Nigerian Family Law*, Butterworths, London, 1966, pp. 251–255.

[89] Robert H. Mnookin, "Child-Custody Adjudication: Judicial Functions in the Face of Indeterminacy" (1975) 39 Law and Contemporary Problems 226 at 257–260,

jurisdictions. [90] The report further notes that inadequate welfare infrastructure often leads to delays in enforcement, prolonged parental conflict, and emotional instability for children. Similarly, Olowu argued that the absence of specialized family courts and trained welfare professionals contributes significantly to inconsistent custody adjudication. [91] Additionally, the integration of mediation and alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms in custody disputes is increasingly recommended as a means of reducing adversarial conflict and protecting children from litigation trauma. Adeyemi, in "Alternative Dispute Resolution in Family Law Matters in Nigeria where the author argues that mediation-centered custody resolution promotes cooperation between parents and minimizes emotional harm to children.[92]

6.3 CONCLUSION

Child custody law in Nigeria is firmly grounded in the best interest of the child principle as reflected in statutory provisions, judicial precedents, and international human rights instruments. Section 1 of the Child Rights Act 2003 and Section 71 of the Matrimonial Causes Act establish the welfare of the child as the paramount consideration in custody proceedings. Nigerian courts have consistently affirmed this position in cases such as *Williams v. Williams*, *Odogwu v. Odogwu,* and *Olowu v. Olowu*. Despite this strong legal foundation, the practical application of the welfare principle continues to face significant challenges, including cultural expectations, gender perceptions, inconsistent judicial discretion, and weak enforcement mechanisms. The coexistence of statutory, customary, and Islamic legal systems

[90] UNICEF Nigeria in Child Protection and Family Justice Report, Abuja, 2022, pp. 39–45

[91] M. O. Olowu, "Judicial Protection of Child Rights in Nigeria" (2021) 15 *African Human Rights Law Journal* 221 at 230–234

[92] See A. A. Adeyemi, "Alternative Dispute Resolution in Family Law Matters in Nigeria" (2020) 8 *Nigerian Journal of Dispute Resolution* 102 at 110–115,

also contributes to inconsistent custody outcomes across jurisdictions. [93] Comparative insights from the United Kingdom and the United States further demonstrate the importance of structured welfare guidelines, expert psychological evaluation, and strong institutional support systems in strengthening custody adjudication. Therefore, while Nigerian custody jurisprudence is conceptually sound and firmly rooted in the welfare principle, substantial legal and institutional reforms remain necessary to ensure that the rights, welfare, emotional stability, and overall development of children are fully protected in practice.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

i. The Child Rights Act 2003 should be strengthened through statutory amendment introducing a structured welfare checklist similar to Section 1(3) of the Children Act 1989 to guide judicial discretion and reduce inconsistency.
ii. Specialized Family Courts should be established nationwide with trained judges, psychologists, and child welfare professionals to ensure efficient and child-centered custody adjudication.
iii. Courts should adopt mandatory psychological and social welfare assessments in custody proceedings to properly evaluate the emotional, developmental, and psychological needs of children.
iv. Continuous judicial training programmes should be introduced to reduce inconsistency and eliminate cultural or gender bias in custody determinations.
v. Stronger enforcement mechanisms should be created to ensure compliance with custody orders through collaboration between

[93] E. I. Nwogugu, Family Law in Nigeria, 3rd Edition, HEBN Publishers Plc, Ibadan, 2014, pp. 305–312.

courts, social welfare agencies, and law enforcement institutions.

vi. Efforts should be made to harmonize customary law practices with statutory child welfare provisions to reduce conflicts and promote uniform application of the welfare principle.

vii. Public enlightenment and awareness campaigns should be conducted to educate parents and guardians on the legal rights of children and the importance of the welfare principle in custody disputes.