

## Blanchard, Deborah

---

**From:** Susan Skipp <susanskipp@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 14, 2013 4:36 PM  
**To:** Blanchard, Deborah  
**Subject:** Please forward to members of judiciary committee

Testimony Jan 14, 2013 against Robert Resha's appointment:

Sen Meyer before I begin, I'd like to comment given your investigatory background, - here's something worth investigating -with the exception of high noon shoot outs- no hyperbole is in the statement that family court in ct is the wild west, replete with racketeering and extortion; not only involving judges and attorneys, but mental health providers appointed by court. Sen Doyle, the gal issue is part of this corruption. For a gal is a function of the family court and this is judiciary. How can an arm of the judiciary, a gal, obstruct a Dcf investigation which is an executive function? Also family GALs have no over site; only way of grievance is to file a complaint against an attorney, yet gal is not regarded as attorney. Family court gals have no over site and immunity - this in itself is a violation of the constitution a only an office and not a person can have immunity.

I address you today to inform you that Judge Resha is not worthy of promotion to senior judge.

He is a metaphor for the existential crisis that faces the state's court system, especially in family court. The graft, corruption, collision and unlawfulness that plagues Connecticut's family court system is symbolized by Robert Resha.

I am speaking for many who have been subject to his court and fear further retribution as I have incurred when questioning the unlawful actions that have taken place in judge resha's court. Since he is recused, I can speak; although I still fear further retaliation.

Judge Resha cannot conduct court in accordance with the law of the people of Connecticut, nor respect the rules of practice nor the code of evidence. I invite anyone to consult my file UWY FA 10-422992s to find extensive examples of trier misconduct and collusion with attorneys. I have been denied due process, participatorial and testimonial access -and even the right to an attorney in judge reshas court room. Aside from allowing a non litigant to sue a defendant and be awarded sanctions in his court, Resha has ignored blatant child abuse in testimony of four mandated reporters. Another occasion In march 2012, judge resha ruled that picking up a child by the hair does not constitute abuse. Judge resha made an order about gun safety in my former husband's home, twice in february 2011 and yet did nothing when my former husband refused to cooperate with weapons surrender in a restraining order when it was before his court aug 1, 2011; even when testimony provided the still illegal status of weapons. Judge Resha continues to harm victims of domestic and family violence with abuse by proxy.

Since no one really seems to care beyond ineffective committees to address the gender bias in court, domestic and family violence, I will cite what people seem to care about: Judge Resha did make a judicial finding of fact on 28 December 2011,

in which he found that Danbury Hospital did engage in unethical and illegal behaviour by terminating the employment of Dr. Shawn Tittle for speech of a third party. He did this in a proceeding of family matters.

Danbury Hospital was not party to the proceedings. No notice or summons for a complaint of the Hospital's conduct regarding employment law was given to Danbury Hospital.

No evidence entered on the record revealed the basis or finding of termination Dr. Tittle. Danbury Hospital, gave no testimony as no representation of the Hospital was before Judge Resha. The Code of Evidence was willfully neglected by the judge.

Judge Resha has no knowledge of why or how Danbury Hospital terminated employment of Dr. Tittle. The court record contains no evidence. Yet this judge has the ability to create facts of the court where none exist.

The judge made a conclusion that was not based on facts. He made many such conclusions based on plaintiff's allegations rendering them as facts without evidence. The judge violated Canon and conscience in conducting a court, without concern for proper proceedings, constitutional protections nor simple decency.

The State does not need to populate the bench with persons such as Robert Resha. He is merely tyranny personified. His conduct is an affront to the good people of Connecticut.

I ask you today not to promote this mistake of jurisprudence to the level of senior judge. He deserves censure and to be thrown off the bench.

If there is any standard of care in the people's selection of its judges, then Robert Resha should not be selected as a senior judge by honest act of the people of this State. Our citizens deserve better, and it is your duty to serve the citizens. Having been only recently aware of the ability of making a complaint on a judge, consider this a complaint that I will follow up in writing.

Thank you in advance for not selecting Robert Resha for a position of senior judge in our state. Please read for further issues plaguing court.

Susan Skipp  
Po box 1383  
Litchfield, CT 06759

203 509-1585

Making sure you saw this:

[http://cga.ct.gov/apa/pdf2010/Judicial\\_90010\\_09.pdf](http://cga.ct.gov/apa/pdf2010/Judicial_90010_09.pdf)

"1. Lack of invoice monitoring- Our review of two providers, involving adult behavioral health services, revealed that the Department made payments without being able to verify the accuracy of the providers' invoices. Information such as monthly client referrals and their treatments were not available to the Department's Court Support Services Division Administration Unit. As a result, payments were made without any confirmation that referrals and treatments were valid. We were informed that this same condition applied to all fees for service contracts involving adult behavioral health services, which totaled \$14,370,039 during the three year audited period. Such payments are part of a State grant for the Alternative Incarceration Program.

2. Lack of audit review- We noted a provider was exempt from the State and Federal single audit requirements and accordingly did not submit any audited financial statements. However, the Department's contract with the provider contains a provision which can require the "exempt" provider to submit to an audit. The Department contracted with the provider to run several juvenile risk reduction centers. The provider was paid a total of \$9,709,776 over the three fiscal years ending June 30, 2007, 2008 and 2009. Such a significant amount of payments should have prompted the Department to require an audit of the provider."

Sent from my iPhone