

## TESTIMONY FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARING

Joint Committee on Judiciary  
Room 2500, Legislative Office Building  
Hartford, CT 06106

Monday March 31, 2014

Dear Judiciary Committee Members:

Good morning and thank you for affording me the opportunity to speak before you today. This is the 5<sup>th</sup> time I have testified since January 9, 2014 about the issues concerning the Family Courts. I refer you to my written testimony from January 9, February 14 and February 19 public hearings. I have attached copies of my testimony here with for easy reference.

I am here to speak against Bill # 494 as it is currently written. I am very disappointed in that it does not address many concerns brought up during the January 9, 2014 and many other public hearings.

I understand many of you are reluctant to accept criticism of a system of which you may have been intimately involved in creating. But for any process, which over time has gone completely unsupervised and for which the participants have been granted complete immunity for their conduct, issues may arise, regardless of its original intentions. Therefore, any criticisms of that system in its current form, may not necessarily be a reflection of the original creators.

Many of the issues brought up illustrate a system in which the participants such as GAL's and outside evaluators freely violate criminal statutes CGS 53a-156, Perjury, CGS 53a-192, Coercion and Conspiracy to commit Perjury and Coercion, CGS 53a-51.

And because of immunity, many of the GAL's carry too much influence in the family law community. For instance On Oct. 10, 2013, the judge on my case issued vague orders making a 3<sup>rd</sup> party responsible for access to my children. I feel this is an illegal passing on of judicial authority. However, I spoke to numerous persons at this 3<sup>rd</sup> party and none would accept the responsibility thrust upon them by the

judge. So I obtained a consult from a lawyer, Chris Storm of Bristol. He essentially told me I have to beg my GAL for time with my kids. I do not see anywhere in CGS 46b-56 where it is said that my time with my kids is based on me begging a GAL for time.

In another example, I spoke to an individual whose own attorney told him to not testify today against the GAL on his case as it would hurt their case. That's coercion.

I can go on for hours illustrating examples of where GAL's have exceeded their authority of just being witnesses and keeping an eye out for the children's best interest. But I am here to help you in coming up with revisions to Bill #494 to address all of these issues.

Bill #494 does not go far enough to address the issues that have arisen with the Family Court system. The following are some of my suggestions. However, I implore you to listen to everyone's suggestions today including but not limited to those of Peter Szymonik, Mark Sargent, Elizabeth Richter, Jennifer Verraneault and Mike Nowacki. These persons have gone out of their way to analyze the system in a way I question whether anyone else has.

1. First and foremost, this bill codifies what I feel is illegal, PB 25-62. Absent abuse or neglect or a determination that a parent is unfit, assigning a GAL without such determination is violation of the US Constitution and our due process. There is substantial case law to support my position. One example is Troxel v. Granville, in which it was established that the presumption is that parents are fit until proven otherwise. The current system of assigning a GAL in divorce matters automatically presumes the parents are unfit without due process. This is not the only example in which the State of Connecticut Judiciary is not in compliance with U.S. Supreme Court rulings. I sat during the public hearing for the proposed bill to revise the sentencing guidelines for juvenile offenders as the current ones in CT violate a Supreme Court ruling. The CT judiciary engages in many other unconstitutional practices – Please refer to my Feb. 19, 2014 testimony concerning ADA violations. Alternately if the court knows the parents disagree about custody and concerns of abuse and neglect of the children are not raised,

the court should just immediately assign an evaluator who will report to the court directly, not a GAL.

2. With respect to Sec 1a: I do not believe that the selection of a GAL from 5 preselected ones by the court provides sufficient transparency to assure litigants that collusion is not occurring. It is very possible that the same 5 persons will be made available over and over and over again. This has the potential for malfeasance to occur as the 5 gal's have no reason to act ethically if they know their names will always be put forth regardless of their past conduct. This essentially codifies the current system of a select few individuals being used repeatedly I recommend that a lottery system be implemented. This will ensure transparency and remove any concerns over collusion. If the judiciary is concerned over the qualifications of the persons in the lottery, they can establish clear criteria for prequalification to the lottery.
3. Sec. 1c:
  - a. Does not provide guidance on what is acceptable scope of work for GAL. IT should specify that the INITIAL scope includes the following:
    - i. Home visits
    - ii. Meeting with children
    - iii. Contact with children's teachers and doctors
    - iv. Contact with relevant persons to ascertain the parents ability to perform their roles (i.e. their employer, physician)
  - b. Does not provide guidance on what is acceptable excuse for extending the GAL appointment.
  - c. Does not provide guidance on when the GAL appointment should end.
  - d. It says it will check every 6 months on how the GAL is doing. This should be reduced to 4 months for 1<sup>st</sup> visit which is 1 month after 90 day waiting period after filing for divorce.
  - e. The initial fees GAL's can charge are not capped. It is ridiculous to pay \$300 per hour to what amounts to an adult babysitter who intrudes on your life and tells you whether it is ok to take your kids away on weekend or not or even sillier

things. For the initial scope of work, the GAL's should be allotted 40 hours total. In this day and age, that is sufficient time to check the background of 2 individuals.

4. Sec 2a: This section does not provide guidance should an AMC be appointed in a case in which parental alienation is alleged. Clear cut guidance must be provided to ascertain if the child(ren) is alienated and offer guidance to address that concern.
5. Sec 4: It is already allowed to file a motion to recuse/remove GAL. So the wording in this section does not provide any additional protections. It is very vague on the grounds for removal of the GAL. There needs to be clearly defined criteria on what conduct allows the removal of the GAL. A Professional Code of Conduct for GAL's must be established or existing code of conduct referenced. As it stands, this language is not sufficiently strong enough to withstand the opposition of a judge who for whatever reason chooses to not acknowledge the GAL's unacceptable conduct. In addition, no independent oversight authority is established. There needs to be an independent entity to provide oversight of the GAL's. The current grievance has yet to make a determination of misconduct against a GAL despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary.
6. Sec 5b: The language is too soft. It uses the term "may" instead of "will". This allows the judicial authority to not follow this section and raid your kids college education to pay for GAL's/AMC's. The wording must be changed. (do you see the difference had I put in "may" in my sentence instead of "must")
7. Sec 6: The judiciary currently has handouts available to litigants on many topics. However, the handouts do not cover controversial issues. I recommend that a well advertised public hearing(s) be held to discuss the content of any publication before it is released officially.
8. I would like to point out also that there are some points made in the majority report of the recent Task Force that should be

included along with most if not all of the points made in the minority report.

9. There are many other issues with respect to GAL's. They include but not limited to:
  - a. They are known to be heavy handed when dealing with mental health professionals, teachers, sports coaches, and every other individual in the process. A Code of Conduct must be established in which their role of SOLELY being an information gatherer is clearly noted.
  - b. They are allowed to admit hearsay into evidence, something no one else is allowed to do. This is not acceptable. They must not be allowed to admit hearsay.
  - c. They are allowed to interfere in the admittance of crucial evidence concerning the children, claiming privilege over that information. How can an impartial assessment be made by a judge with the suppression of crucial evidence? This would not be tolerated in criminal or civil court. If the information is secretive, then a closed hearing can be held to protect the minor children. Short of DCF involvement, concealing records from a parent who has not been found neglectful by in a Juvenile Court, these records must be made available to the parents and not suppressed by GAL's.
  - d. The GAL records are supposed to be discoverable but GAL's will use sympathetic judges to suppress their records.
  - e. GAL's must be required to submit a report of findings before trial. Currently they do not and there is no uniform enforcement of GAL submission of recommendations.

Thank you for your time.

Hector Morera  
119B House St.  
Glastonbury, CT

## TESTIMONY FOR PUBLIC HEARING

The Task Force to Study Legal Disputes Involving the Care & Custody of Minor Children  
Connecticut Legislature  
c/o Legislative Judiciary Committee Office  
Legislative Office Building/Office 2500  
Hartford, CT 06106

Thursday, January 9, 2014

Dear Task Force Members:

Good morning. Thank you for allowing me to speak today and for taking time out of your busy schedules to work on this Task Force. As a professional engineer, I fully understand the time commitment required. My name is Hector Morera and I live in Glastonbury, CT.

Please refer to my written testimony for additional information that I am omitting in my oral testimony due to time limitations.

I would rather not be here today. I would rather be with my children, or working or hiking; anywhere other than here. I have been silent for over 4 years as my first moral obligation is to my children but as I feel I have failed that, I must speak up about what happened to me, to meet my second moral obligation to my fellow Connecticut residents.

On August 9, 2013 my children were stolen from me. The GAL in my case, Margaret Bozek perjured herself in an affidavit. Perjury in Connecticut is a Class D Felony pursuant to CGS 53a-156. In an attempt to come to a solution amicable to all parties, I reached out to Bozek and tried to negotiate with her a solution which overlooks her perjury. However, Bozek chose to recommend to restrict my access to my children. I filed a motion for clarification 2 months ago and it yet has been addressed by the court.

In the past 4 years I have experienced the following inappropriate GAL behavior:

1. Attorneys refusing to advocate for their client for fear of antagonizing an influential GAL. Lynn Ustach of New Britain went so far as to say that I would never find an attorney in all of Hartford County that would go up against Bozek. Lawyers must be allowed to freely advocate for their clients without fear of retribution from a GAL.
2. GAL's are allowed to admit into evidence unsubstantiated hearsay, something no other party is allowed to do. . It is difficult for Pro Se's to submit evidence refuting these claims as:
  - a. Pro Se's must know the rules for admitting evidence.
  - b. Pro Se's do not have the money to subpoena witnesses
  - c. Pro Se's must ask the court to subpoena witnesses. All my subpoenas were mysteriously rejected by the court. GAL's are aware of this inherent difficulty and will essentially tailor their testimony accordingly. GAL's must NOT be allowed to admit hearsay anymore.
3. The Clerks at Hartford Superior Court are very helpful and treat Pro Se's with a compassion typically not seen in public employees. However, I have been intimidated by certain clerks and Family Services personnel from filing motions and presenting evidence to the court. At many times, motions I filed were never calendared or removed from my file by some person in the clerk's office to keep the judges from seeing crucial and damaging evidence. The clerks and Family Services work for the State of CT, which is everyone in this room and must not be allowed to be intimidated by influential lawyers.
4. Mental health professionals will collude with GAL's for whatever reason. The Psychological Evaluation in my case was prepared by a friend of Bozek, Stephen Humphrey. There are so many discrepancies in his evaluation, that either Humphrey is the most incompetent psychologist or he willfully colluded with Bozek to conceal her negligent handling of the case. A week before my trial, Bozek threatened me and told me that the court does not need to

see Humphrey's evaluation if I just settle right there and then and that most of her cases never go to trial. GAL's must not be allowed to interfere with court ordered evaluations.

I can write a book about what I consider to be crimes committed during my divorce but I rather not. I rather see my children again and leave the courts to the persons who work there. But the court which hides behind the GAL refuses to do the right thing.

As such I recommend the complete elimination of GAL's. If I was capable of taking of care of my children properly before divorce, I am capable of taking my children after the divorce. If there are real allegations of abuse or neglect, that's what DCF is for. We do not need a GAL who for whatever reason chooses not to be impartial and present all of the facts accurately to the court and then hides behind immunity.

Thank you for your time.

Hector Morera  
119B House St.  
Glastonbury, CT

**Additional Written Testimony:**

I filed for divorce 4 and ½ years ago after my ex wife had me arrested for Breach of Peace. The charges were dropped. But as Jackie Wilson told me, it worked to get me out of the house. I have a tape recording of that night and the effect it had on my daughter yet the GAL never once asked to listen to it even though she is fully aware of its existence. Is that the role of the GAL, to pick and choose which evidence she wishes to listen to?

For the first 3 months my ex-wife's first attorney Leo Diana and my first attorney tried to get my ex-wife to come to agreement on a divorce. I worked from home and took care of the children 5 days per week, something that would easily be corroborated with discussions with school by any GAL. However, after 3 months, my ex-wife obtained a new lawyer, Ceil Gersten who brought in Bozek as a GAL. I objected to the fact that Gersten appeared to be too friendly with Bozek but my first attorney refused to acknowledge my concerns. That was four years ago. And since then Bozek has engaged in behavior which I feel is inappropriate.

For instance, not once did Bozek bring my extensive involvement in school to the attention of the court. As a Pro Se, I tried to have countless emails admitted as evidence of my involvement in the children's lives but the judge in my trial refused to allow them to be submitted as evidence so Bozek refused to acknowledge them in her testimony. Is that the role of the GAL, to take advantage of the situation and pretend some evidence doesn't exist?

During one hearing, I believe it was Co-Chair Coussineau who stated that GAL's hands are tied as to what they can testify about and can only answer questions. I respectfully disagree. It has been my experience that GAL's can essentially talk about anything they wish to discuss while on the stand. They need only be asked one simple question, "What are your recommendations for this case?" and they can go on a 2 hour monologue if the judge allows them.

Because of my ex-wife's severe anxiety and fear of losing the children, the children were caught in the middle of her anxiety. I

pleaded with my first attorney to bring this to the attention of the court. He refused to do so, merely say Bozek is very influential with the court. Is that the role of the GAL, to intimidate lawyers from advocating for their clients?

In addition, for 10 months Bozek allowed herself to be manipulated by my ex-wife. I instructed my first attorney to file for sanctions but he refused to do so.

After a year of my first attorney not bringing my concerns to the attention of the court, I decided to get a new attorney. However, for 6 months I tried to get a new attorney. I was honest with them and told them that for some reason Bozek was not bringing my concerns to the attention of the court. One after another, each attorney repeatedly told me that they do not want to take the case against Bozek. Lynn Ustach of New Britain went so far as to say that I would not find an attorney in all of Hartford County to take a case against Bozek. Is that the role of the GAL, to intimidate lawyers from taking cases? I am not a lawyer but this sounds very much like racketeering pursuant to RICO to me.

As such, 15 months after I filed for divorce, I got despondent that no one would ever properly advocate for me and my children. Sadly Bozek picked up on this and took advantage of the situation and presumed I would stop advocating for my children and made some recommendations in January 2011, to the court in the hopes of washing her hands of a difficult case by not presenting all of the relevant facts to the court. Is that the role of the GAL?

At this point I had obtained a second attorney from outside Hartford County who stated he would bring my concerns to the attention of the court. However, for some reason he chose not to address my concerns. As such after 3 months of my 2<sup>nd</sup> attorney not bringing my concerns to the attention of the court, I confronted my second attorney and asked him why hadn't the motion I asked him to file not been heard by the court. He told me that it was not calendared. That was not true. I was still receiving the calendars as I had filed a Pro Se appearance and my second attorney for whatever reason chose to not even file an appearance (Attorney Hayes actually scolded him at a status conference for not filing an appearance). I told him that it did

in fact come up on the calendar and he did not mark it ready. My 2<sup>nd</sup> attorney could only respond by saying, "oh, you know about that?"

Completely appalled by once again being betrayed by another attorney, I filed a 23 page motion (see Exhibit A) bringing to the attention of the court my concerns. However, a week after I filed my motion, on a Hartford Court short calendar day, I received a phone call from my second attorney instructing me that I had court that day for a motion he filed months earlier. This was the first I had heard of it. I was appalled that my attorney would do such a thing.

I have heard complaints from Task Force members that it is difficult to schedule hearings and such in court. However, that has not been my experience. I have spoken to many of the clerks in Hartford court. For the most part, they are very helpful and compassionate and understanding to Pro Se's. It is my understanding, if two opposing attorneys agree, they can pretty much come to court any day of the week and squeeze in some time with a judge between cases. This has happened in my case at least 3 times. So this complaint of having difficulty scheduling dates is not necessarily true. It depends entirely on how motivated the opposing attorneys and GAL are.

Finally almost 2 years after I filed for divorce a psychological evaluation was being conducted. However, I suspected from the onset that my concerns would not be addressed. I have a tape recording of a conversation with Bozek in which I contend she intimidated me against bringing certain concerns to the attention of the court.

In the summer of 2011, almost 2 years after I filed for divorce, a concern I brought to the attention of both my attorneys early on in the divorce, a large amount of marital debt in my name for which I could not pay went to trial in civil court. A judge ordered a bank execution be performed and the creditor withdrew all the money I had in my bank accounts. I no longer could afford to pay my attorney or the final payment for the evaluation being performed by Humphrey. What does this have to do with the role of GALs? A lot. Had my attorney not been intimidated from pursuing the case in court, this issue would have been addressed a year earlier.

In the fall of 2011, after both my attorneys refused to address my concerns for 2 years, I started filing my own motions. Very strange things started happening then. My motions would not be calendared by the clerk's office. When I did appear before a judge, motions I filed would mysteriously have been removed from my file so the judge could not see my motions. This happened at least 6 times. A clerk friendly with the attorneys in my case tried to intimidate me from filing a motion saying I need permission from the other attorneys. A Family Service worker during a mediation session intimidated me from presenting damaging tape recordings which I have. This evidence caused Bozek much concern. But after the judge in my case refused to allow me to admit, Bozek approached me and said my case is over. Is that the role of GAL to only make recommendations based on evidence admissible in court?

As I suspected, the psychological evaluation prepared by Stephen Humphrey did not address my concerns. I filed a motion on December 29, 2011 with my concerns (see Exhibit B)

After I fired my second attorney I received numerous threatening emails from Bozek in which I feel she was threatening me from pursuing the case in trial. During trial, my evidence was not allowed to be admitted by Judge Carbonneau. Bozek approached me and said my case is over as my evidence is not admissible. Why do I have pay \$30,000 for a GAL, over \$6000 for evaluation if the GAL and evaluator are not going to present irrefutable evidence that I provided them. In what I feel was retaliation Bozek changed her recommendations from joint to sole custody. (see Exhibit C)

I warned the court that if my ex-wife was awarded sole custody she would use it to eliminate the children from my life. A year later that is exactly what occurred despite the many motions I filed trying to bring to the attention my concerns. See Exhibits D through L.

## **Discussion on Shared Custody**

Shared custody is crucial as awarding sole custody enables a parent who wishes to remove the children from the other parent's life to do so.

Since obtaining sole custody, my ex-wife has

1. Moved the children to another school system in violation of a court order against that. The new school system does not have knowledge of my extensive involvement in the children's lives. Despite my complaint to Bozek, she did nothing to address this concern.
2. Placed the children in the care of mental health professionals 25 miles away from Glastonbury who spend more time talking to my ex-wife's attorney than they spend time talking to me. And when I ask a question, they claim privilege information but they gladly share information with Gersten. One of the mental health professionals is even unlicensed. Bozek is fully aware of that and condones this and the fact that the two professionals are colleagues of a former patient of my ex-wife creates a serious conflict of interest.
3. Moved my daughter out of the local CCD into a CCD in another town. I have volunteered numerous times with our town CCD and they are familiar with my involvement in the children's lives. Bozek is aware of this but did not present it to the court.
4. Removed my daughter from Girl Scouts entirely under a false pretense after finding out that her Troop Leader asked me to be Treasurer. Bozek never investigated this issue.

This is a pattern of alienating the children from their father that began before our divorce was finalized. Something Bozek did not bring to the attention of the courts. It also included the following:

1. Removing my daughter from dance class after the dance instructor asked her if I could bring our daughter to do make ups on a night in which she was with her mother. The dance instructor assured my ex-wife that it would only be to make up

dance class, not to give me more time with my daughter. The dance instructor knew I worked from home and had a more flexible schedule. Bozek never talked to the dance instructor to confirm this.

2. Moving my daughter from one Girl Scout troop to another one comprised of parents who did not know my prior involvement in the children's lives. It took me two years for the new Girl Scouts troop to see my involvement in my children's lives and ask me to volunteer.
3. Moving our children from a pediatrician in town to one located 25 miles who was once a patient of my ex-wife, a serious conflict of interest. The pediatrician in town was very familiar with my involvement with the children.
4. Placing my son in a daycare 25 miles from his home town, in a town where my ex wife used to work, rather than the one in town that my daughter attended and was very familiar with my involvement with the children.

## **Recommendations to the Task Force**

1. No GAL be assigned unless a parent is found unfit in a court of law with the necessary evidence submitted. Judges make \$160,000 per year. That makes them the top 1% wage earners in this country. They should be able to make decisions without a GAL's input. If they can not, they should not be reappointed and judges who realize that they are getting paid to take risks in proportion to their income should be appointed.
2. When GAL's are appointed, they must adhere to strict rules as follows:
  - a. No more than 30 hours billed to the parents. In this day and age, that is sufficient time to investigate two persons.
  - b. At the time of the appointment of the GAL, a return date within 45 days maximum must be scheduled in order to allow for the GAL to present their findings and a determination whether the case will go to trial immediately or an agreement has been reached. Prolonging a case to satisfy the GAL's needs only creates unnecessary anxiety in the parents which is then used against the parents. This inappropriate.
  - c. The GAL shall have limited or peripheral access to Psychological and Custody evaluators. These persons, if as ordered by the court should report solely to the court, not the GAL. There is too much room for collusion and corruption to occur when an unsupervised GAL can dictate what an evaluator can or can not look at.
  - d. GAL's can not submit hearsay. They must provide documentation for all their contentions.
  - e. All GAL records must be provided to each of the parties before trial as part of discovery.
  - f. GAL must share the summary of each and every discussion with all parties. Currently, the GAL will talk exclusively to one attorney but not share the same information with the other party.
  - g. A person responsible for investigating claims against GAL's must be established. This person must be independent enough so that they do not fear retaliation from a GAL.

- h. The copies of the rules must be provided to each of the parties and method for filing complaints against a GAL who does not follow the rules must be established.
3. Motions must be calendared within 4 weeks. GAL's must not interfere with calendaring of motions simply because the GAL does not like the content of the motion.
4. Shared custody must be the norm unless the parent has been deemed unfit by set standards that can not be altered by the GAL. Sole custody just leads to abuse of one parent by the other.
5. And with respect to Ceil Seretta Gersten, Family Services allow her to engage in inappropriate behavior such as screaming and cursing at Pro Se's and other Attorneys during a mediation session solely for the purpose to cause the mediation session to fail. This conduct would not be tolerated from other persons. As such, Family Services must put their foot down and instruct the Judicial Marshals to escort Gersten out of the court, in handcuffs if necessary to send a message that she does not have free reign of the courts, regardless of her family's connections with the court.

## TESTIMONY FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARING

Joint Committee on Judiciary  
Room 2500, Legislative Office Building  
Hartford, CT 06106

Wednesday February 19, 2014

Dear Judiciary Committee Members:

Good morning and thank you for affording me the opportunity to speak before you today. This is the 4<sup>th</sup> time I have testified since January 9, 2013 about the issues concerning the Family Courts. I refer you to my written testimony from January 9 and February 14 public hearings which were submitted to the judiciary previously.

I am here to speak in general about some of the failings of the court system as allowed by Family Court judges and which have been brought to the attention of the Judiciary numerous times in the past by various parties. Many of these concerns are outlined in Federal lawsuits filed against the Connecticut judiciary. It is incumbent that the Judiciary committee look into the seriousness of the allegations made in these lawsuits and the many complaints made to the US Department of Justice.

For example, despite the Judicial Branch's claim to be ADA compliant, ADA violations are rampant in the Connecticut Judiciary. One form of ADA violation is the rampant violations of the Prong 3 test of the ADA by the Connecticut Family Court. Judges routinely exceed their authority by diagnosing a party with a false mental illness despite testimony to the contrary. The persons who are falsely accused are otherwise productive members of society. They are engineers, lawyers, teachers, etc. who contribute daily to our society as a whole by volunteering at church, PTO, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, etc. But when they walk into a Family Court, they are deemed unfit due to so-called hidden mental illness with which the court deems suitable to diagnose the party.

In my case in particular, on August 9, 2013 the GAL in my case falsely accused me of having a mental illness. This required that I

pay for a psychiatrist to evaluate me and produce a report and to pay for a mental health professional to testify on my behalf on August 29, 2013. Yet despite the testimony provided to the contrary, both the GAL and judge insisted that I be evaluated by one of their "friends" if I am to ever see my children again. The GAL's and judge's statements are in writing and irrefutable. I will gladly provide you any documentation you require.

In another particular case with an egregious abuse of ADA protection by a CT judge, it is my understanding after reading the 2012 judgment written by Judge Munro, Ms. Susan Skipp was falsely accused of having an undiagnosed mental illness by Judge Munro. The judgment written by Judge Munro is seriously flawed. First and foremost is that Judge Munro is not a qualified mental health professional to make such determination. In addition, Judge Munro makes many spurious statements in her judgment to support her false allegations. For instance, Judge Munro accused Ms. Skipp of harassing her ex-husband due to her undiagnosed mental illness as evidenced by Ms. Skipp allegedly sending 20+ emails per day for approximately 13 months to her ex husband for an approximate total of 540 emails in that time. I understand that judges are not hired for their math skills. But anyone can easily see that a total of 540 emails over approximately 400 days is NOT 20+ emails per day. It is approximately 1.3 emails per day. This is a very normal amount when children are involved and two parents living in separate households are trying to coordinate issues with the children. Never mind that it is nowhere near Judge Munro's estimate of 20+ emails per day. Yet, Judge Munro used this clearly false allegation and many others to support her claim that Ms. Skipp has an undiagnosed mental illness. Ms. Skipp was a teacher that was courageous enough to work in prisons/ detention centers, places most people would avoid. She was recognized by the Judiciary CSSD for her efforts. None of these facts were taken into account in judgments in Ms. Skipp's case.

This gross abuse of judicial discretion is upheld in the Appellate Courts as they defer to the original judge as the better trier of fact without taking into consideration compelling evidence to the contrary. In a recent case in Ohio, the Appellate court ruled that the original trier of fact did not take into account all of the evidence heard to

refute false allegations and remanded the case back to the trial court. I firmly believe that the CT Appellate courts follow suit.

Many feel that there is collusion between the various vendors used by the court system in these types of situations as some members of the court have relationships with these vendors and appear to profit off the use of these vendors.

In addition, no uniform standards are in place for protecting those accused of having a mental illness. Judges who are not qualified to make these decisions routinely impose restrictions solely on their discretion without any standards in place on the appropriate use of these restrictions. This leaves the affected party unsure on how to proceed as the application of these restrictions are haphazard at best.

In summary, we need better mechanisms in place to ensure that entire judiciary enforces the ADA rules uniformly, ends the illegal discrimination against parties, ensures that the rules of the court are uniformly enforced and that the employees of the court are free to perform their duties without undue influence from outside stakeholders such as attorneys.

Thank you for your time.

Hector Morera  
119B House St.  
Glastonbury, CT

