

# Maydelle Trambarulo



Our family's nightmare began in August 2004. My parents, Ralph and Maydelle Trambarulo, had moved to Delaware to be near son Paul in 2003, after living in Red Bank, NJ for 47 years. Mom, now 76, suffers from Parkinson's disease and related dementia. Dad, aged 82, suffers from normal pressure hydrocephalus, and has difficulty walking and breathing.

After Mom broke her hip, our cousin Teresa Sirico reappeared after an absence of 8-10 years. Teresa is Dad's niece and is a real estate broker in New Haven, CT.

When Teresa proposed bringing Mom to Connecticut for treatment, we agreed, wanting the best medical care for our wife and mother. We trusted Teresa as a family member. Once in Connecticut, she told us Mom couldn't come back to Delaware.

In October 2004, we received notice that Teresa had been appointed Mom's Temporary Conservator by the Probate Court of Woodbridge CT. This was done "ex parte" (emergency), so we weren't notified until afterwards. We agreed to an independent conservator, envisioning a neutral party who would work with us. Three attorneys were then appointed, the conservator, Mom's attorney and the guardian ad litem (GAL). These total strangers advise the court on "what is best for Maydelle". Their view of us has been formed not through direct knowledge, but through (mis)information supplied by Teresa.

Judge Clifford Hoyle denied our motion disputing the Connecticut court's jurisdiction of the case, even though Mom has never been a Connecticut resident, never voted in Connecticut, has never had a Connecticut driver's license or paid taxes in Connecticut. Ralph, her husband of 50 years, and two daughters live in New Jersey. Judge Hoyle decided that it was in Mom's "best interests" that she stay in Connecticut. This effectively ends my parent's marriage of 51 years, as Dad cannot travel to Connecticut. We are appealing Judge Hoyle's decision in Superior Court. Our family (Dad, myself and my siblings, Alice, Margaret and Paul), is united in wanting Mom to return to New Jersey to be near us in her final years.

Dad had to obtain a mortgage (at age 80!) because he was denied access to funds in joint accounts. In a proposed division of the estate, Judge Hoyle stated that he was being "generous" in allowing Dad 50% of the joint funds, when in fact Dad was the principal contributor to that estate.

Despite our protests, Mom was moved to an assisted living facility near Teresa. After 2 years of brainwashing by Teresa and her allies, Mom is now separated from us not only by distance, but also emotionally.

There's a very obvious conflict of interest here: the court and its officers are the ones who get to decide whether the source of their financial "gravy train" stays in Connecticut or is allowed to leave the state! It is clearly in THEIR best interests financially that Mom stay in Connecticut. The Probate Court's primary function in this case should be the reuniting of Maydelle with her FAMILY, and the true conservation of her person and financial estate, NOT the reallocation of her hard-earned assets to court officers' own bank accounts!

I would not wish our circumstances on anyone. A loving family has been torn apart by a self-serving legal system containing an insidious corruption of cronyism and greed, used to the utmost by someone who knows how to manipulate the system for her own perfidious ends. Unfortunately, we now know our family is not alone in this horrible situation. As more Americans approach what should

be their "Golden Years", this assault on fundamental rights is being repeated nationwide. Being aware of the disastrous possibilities is the first step to protecting yourself and your loved ones!