

5421
5425
5842
5980

5981
5982
6145
6148
6149
6150
6352

To members of the Human Service committee. My name is Jerome Richardson of Griswold and I am here to testify in support of H.B. No. 6352 (RAISED) an act concerning oversight of the Department of Children and Families... SUBJECT MATTER THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES H-B No. 5421, 5425, 5842, 5980, 5981, 5982, 6145, 6148, 6149, 6150 and 6352. The objective of this testimony is to address the inappropriate behavior conducted by social workers in the Norwich office.

I strongly disagree with the procedures and tactics that were used to obtain temporary custody of my child. These tactics were abuse of the judicial power and judicial system. DCF is a "moving force" behind the on-going violations of federal law and violations of the Constitution... DCF takes on the personal of the feeling of exaggerated power over parents and that they are totally immune. Further, that they can basically do anything they want including engaging in deception, misrepresentation of facts and lying to the judge as well as the AAG.

Child removals are "seizures" under the Fourth Amendment. Seizure is unconstitutional without court order or exigent circumstances. Court order obtained based on knowingly false information violates Fourth Amendment. *Brokaw v. Mercer County, (7th Cir 2000)*. It is not enough to have information that the children are in some form of serious danger. The evidence must also pass a test of reliability that our justice system calls probable cause.

Making false statements to obtain a warrant, when the false statements were necessary to the finding of probable cause on which the warrant was based, violates the Fourth Amendment's warrant requirement. The Warrant Clause contemplates that the warrant

Applicant is truthful: "no warrant shall issue, but on probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation." Deliberate falsehood or reckless disregard for the truth violates the Warrant Clause.

On November 30th, 2007 my son, Jordon R was removed from Hospital and taken into custody by the DCF. Jordon R did not require immediate removal to ensure his safety, or were the conditions or circumstances surrounding his care require immediate attention as Carrie Quinley (social worker) of DCF sworn to, on Nov 30, 2007.

Social workers Carrie L. Quinley, Stephanie Browder (Supervisor) and David Silva (Program Director) who had no knowledge of the case but was filling in for Beth Saypalia signed summary of facts documents stating that there were reasonable efforts made to the Family where in fact there were no efforts made on the Father's behalf. After the OTC was granted based on false and reckless statements made by social worker Carrie Quinley. Father and Mother did not receive equal opportunity to bond with their child as required by law; the scale of equality was craftily tip by the Department of Children and Family to favor both the Mother and the state.

The state's absence of responsibility to comply with Connecticut General Statute's 46b-129. That the agency should give primary consideration to placing child or youth in the town where child or youth resides. The agency shall file in writing with the clerk of the court the reasons for placing the child or youth in a particular placement outside the town where the child or youth resides. Created numerous problems, i.e. around visitation schedules, transportation, communication difficulties (language barriers) denying me my fundamental rights to bond with my child. The Father is not aware of anything filed by DCF to the court to date. Although the Honorable Judge Driscoll order the

Department to make reasonable effort for visitation for myself on May 5th, 2007 rather than comply with such order. The Department filed a motion to suspend visitation in order to protect its social workers failure of responsibility.

With no respect of due process I was denied significant time with my son which in return gave the state and the foster parents an advantage, from the state point of view the reason being some courts view this time with one parent or guardian as a significant factor related to maintaining continuity in the child's life. Although a lost opportunity to spend significant time with my child cannot be replaced by a subsequent order of custody as part of an ultimate dissolution judgment. Madigan v. Madigan 224 Conn, 620 a 2d 1276 9 1993). The state relied on this tactic.

It was also documented by Dr. Mary Cheyenne – court appointed psychologist that they were no concern of Father's role as a parent and an assessment of my interaction with my child. Instead psychological notes from 10 years ago were introduced to court to discredit Father's current state today. I have achieved sufficient personal and professional rehabilitation that is well documented to date to allow me to assume a responsible position in my child's life.