

Peter Nicita – Burlington CT

My case deals with Severe Parental Alienation

The Raised and proposed bill #494 gives no mention on the topic of parental alienation

This is a court order from July 2011, which stipulated reunification and a recommendation from an court approved therapist.

These are transcripts from that hearing in July 2011 when Judge Taylor asked my ex-wife 4 times if she would do EVERYTHING possible to ensure reunification.

Here is a letter from the therapist noting after just two visits, my ex wife refused to take my children to the court ordered reunification therapy

Bill #494 gives no mention on non compliance of court orders

In the same letter the therapist recommended to the GAL that I have overnights with my children, reinstating my parenting plan.

The GAL sat on the recommendations and did nothing, despite subsequent visits to court

Bill #494 gives no mention for recovery when a GAL does not follow court orders.

The same recommendation noted many red flags, including my ex wife openly joking to my children that I am just a "sperm donor" and the therapist noting that my ex-wife does not support me as a biological father. Despite this, the GAL insists my ex-wife is supportive of me as a father.

Here is CT's Best Interest of The Child Standards

6 - the willingness and ability of each parent to facilitate and encourage such continuing parent - child relationship between the child and the other parent as is appropriate, including compliance with any court orders

Bill #494 gives no mention when a GAL's ignores Standards for Best Interest of Child Standards

In October 2012, I complained to Judge Prestley about the GAL's lack of diligence, ability to follow court orders and lack of effort and urgency to reunify me with my children, despite the therapist letter.

Judge Prestley stated in no uncertain terms that the GAL did not have to listen to me nor the therapist.

Bill #494 gives no clear solution to when a GAL does not follow court orders.

Other items that Bill #494 fails to recognize:

- **Bill #494 gives no mention of a GAL's removal of immunity.**
- **Bill # 494 provides no mention of maximum dollar amounts for GALs/AMCs to charge. The state of CT charges \$50 for GAL services to the indigent. Are laws any different for the indigent?**
- **Bill #494 gives no mention of improved and expedited processes when a parenting plan is vacated by one parent, despite court orders. Currently parents don't children for months or years even when court orders are in place**
- **Bill #494 gives no mention of a protecting family's assets only IRS 539 funds. A judge can force a family to sell their home, liquidate retirement funds or seek GAL/AMC payments from extended families.**
- **Bill #494 gives no mention of shared parenting**
- **Bill #494 should NOT provide for children to have the ability to request their own attorney. This would be disastrous for families where Parental Alienation is involved.**