



**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT  
ORAL ARGUMENT CASE SUMMARY**

---



**JANE DOE I, et al. v. SHAUNICE WARR  
CV-25-0107-PR**

**PARTIES:**

*Petitioner:* Shaunice Warr (“Warr”)

*Respondents:* Jane Doe I, Jane Doe II, and John Doe

**FACTS:**

Respondents endured extensive sexual abuse by their father for many years while they were between the ages of six weeks and twelve years old. During the years of abuse, Warr was a fellow member of Respondents’ church and a friend of their mother. Warr also served as Respondents’ Sunday school teacher, visited their home, and occasionally babysat them.

Respondents sued Warr, seeking to recover damages for the abuse their father inflicted on them. Each of Respondents’ claims relied on the assertion that Warr owed them a common law duty to report any suspected abuse and/or a statutory duty under A.R.S. § 13-3620(A)(5) to do so as a mandatory reporter.

Warr moved for summary judgment on all of the claims against her. The superior court granted the motion, finding no common law duty to report suspected abuse. The court also found that Warr was not a mandatory reporter under § 13-3620(A)(5) because she did not have a professional relationship with Respondents.

The court of appeals unanimously agreed with the superior court that Warr did not have a common law duty to report the abuse. However, it issued a split opinion on the issue of whether Warr had a statutory duty to report under § 13-3620(A)(5). The majority interpreted the phrase “[a]ny other person who has responsibility for the care . . . of the minor” as applying to individuals not already mentioned in the statute who also have a relationship to the minor that has placed them in a position of responsibility. The dissent disagreed, finding that the most reasonable interpretation of the phrase is any person, other than a parent or guardian, who serves in a professional relationship in caring for or treating the child.

**ISSUE:**

Did the court of appeals err in finding that the phrase “[a]ny other person who has responsibility for the care . . . of the minor” as used in A.R.S. § 13-3620(A)(5) “is most reasonably interpreted as applying to individuals not already mentioned [in the statute] who also have a relationship to the minor that has placed them in a position of responsibility”?

**RELEVANT STATUTE:**

A.R.S. § 13-3620 states, in pertinent part, as follows:

A. Any person who reasonably believes that a minor is or has been the victim of physical injury, abuse, child abuse, a reportable offense or neglect that appears to have been inflicted on the minor by other than accidental means or that is not explained by the available medical history as being accidental in nature or who reasonably believes there has been a denial or deprivation of necessary medical treatment or surgical care or nourishment with the intent to cause or allow the death of an infant who is protected under § 36-2281 shall immediately report or cause reports to be made of this information to a peace officer, to the department of child safety or to a tribal law enforcement or social services agency for any Indian minor who resides on an Indian reservation, except if the report concerns a person who does not have care, custody or control of the minor, the report shall be made to a peace officer only. . . . For the purposes of this subsection, “person” means:

. . . .

5. Any other person who has responsibility for the care or treatment of the minor.

*This Summary was prepared by the Arizona Supreme Court Staff Attorneys’ Office solely for educational purposes. It should not be considered official commentary by the Court or any member thereof or part of any brief, memorandum, or other pleading filed in this case.*