

Case - Bushey v. Bushey – FA 09-4010792

Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2014 4:27 PM

To: Jud Testimony

Subject: Colleen & Scott Buden testimony for Raised Bill S.B. 494

The current Bill being put in front of the Judiciary Committee does not address the use of children as weapons of retribution by a Judge to punish the targeted parent. On 8/15/13 mom's 8th amendments rights were violated when Judge Holly Wetstone punished mom with the removal of her children, and I quote "her X-husband got his original papers back, didn't say she couldn't keep a photo copy, which is what she did, which is why she is losing the children. So I think that's punishment enough."

Mom lost the children because of the sharing of a public document to a 3rd party, the document in question was a gun denial permit letter because the father was arrested for what bordered sexual assault of a minor.

The CLC was court ordered on the case 12/14/09 within a few week stint between the father quitting a 100k job and getting another job 12/31/09. The mom was an at-home mom but gained full employment in 3/2010. Mom repeatedly asked the GAL, Parul Patel, and Justine Rakich Kelly to do a financial review as we do not meet the financial requirements for indigent families using this service, both my x-husband and I had a combined income of \$150,000, all requests were ignored. This is not a parents job to ask the CLC to do a Financial Review, this is the job of the person running the organization to ensure parents meet their financial requirements to continue their service. The CLC refused to do a financial review and would not get off our case until the final decision was made, when they pulled the kids from moms care. Justine Rakich Kelly was there on the final day, representing the GAL, Parul Patel, in my case.

Justine Rakich Kelly lied in front of the Judicial Committee on 3/31/14. She stated the CLC gave mom adequate time with the children. 6 days a month is not adequate. Not when I was the primary caregiver to the children averaging 20-24 days a month, this is a 75% reduction in mom's parenting time. The dad is an Executive Chef working primarily nights and

Case - Bushey v. Bushey – FA 09-4010792

weekends, he rarely had time to see them. Even though this was repeatedly pointed out to Justine Rakich Kelly and Parul Patel, they were fully aware that the dad did not have the hours to parent the children and that the kids would be left alone with the dad's girlfriend, when both children told Parul Patel about their fear of the dad's girlfriend, they felt safe with their mom and wanted to live with their mom, they only want to visit dad when he was there and not be left alone with Sheri. Parul ignored my children's wishes. Parul ignored the children and put forth the change, both kids were devastated. They do not want to see Parul again, not want another GAL again, both children were lied to and they lost trust in GAL's.

The CLC took the kids out of a safe environment in a residential home (moms) and placed them in an unsafe environment in an industrial park (dads). Mom's lives in an excellent school district, that fell on deaf ears too.

The bill does not address the fact that GAL's constantly opine outside of their resume. Our GAL was placed on this case fresh out of law school, even before she completed her 35 hour required GAL course, accusing mom of parental alienation. This was based off of the GAL's testimony solely, no expert witnesses supported the CLC's allegations.

The AFCC runs the GAL training programs and Family Services Department programs. In our case there was a lack of disclosure by Judge Holly Westone who was a Director of the AFCC, also inclusive of this organization was Justine Rakich Kelly and Parul Patel (the court appointed GAL) from the Children's Law Center, Stephanie Stein-Leite (the court appointed evaluator), and Andy Hechtman (an unlicensed college student the Court appointed to our case for mediation, who rents space from the Children's Law Center). This is an obvious conflict of interest, as the Children's Law Center has a vested interest in making sure Andy Hechtman is assigned to their cases.

The Bill does not address the highly inefficient power given to the GAL being able to quash a child's therapist testimony. How is this in the best

Case - Bushey v. Bushey – FA 09-4010792

interest of the children when you are not hearing from the therapist who can testify what the children want? Instead the court only hears from a GAL who is blatantly lying and turning the case in the direction they want. There is no relief for a parent when a GAL is clearly purging themselves on the stand, both GAL's from the CLC that were assigned to my case blatantly lies on the stand. The Statewide Grievance Committee hasn't held a GAL accountable to date.

The Bill does not address when the CLC recommends children to primarily reside in an industrial park, this decision was overseen by Justine Rakich Kelly. The industrial zoned area, which the children are now living in. This property is shared with heavy equipment businesses, not a residential zone. The house is near a 30 x 100' high bay industrial garage building, septic haul business, construction and welding companies on site, heavy equipment stored on lot, heavy truck traffic, no sidewalks. This was raised to Justine's attention before and after the 8/15/13 decision, she did nothing about it.

The Bill does not address the Judicial Abuse at the hand of a GAL. The GAL was constantly accusing the mom of parental alienation and having a mental health issue. Even though the parental alienation was coming from the father, she ignored it and stayed steadfast on the mom. We got 2 top psychiatrists to evaluate mom and clear her from the allegations constantly coming at her from the CLC, Judge Wetstone left them out in the hallway and refused to allow them to testify.

We had the resources to fight the allegations from the GAL, however, it didn't matter. When you are up against the AFCC juggernaut who's only goal is to move those children from the protective parent to the abusive one, you have no way of fighting it in the state of CT. We had professionals that covered all basis in regards to the allegations, we had a professional to speak about the school comparison stating we lived in the better school district, we had an alcohol therapist to speak about the dangers of the father's alcoholism, we had 2 top Psychiatrists in CT and mom's therapist who cleared the GAL's and evaluator's allegations against

Case - Bushey v. Bushey – FA 09-4010792

the mom. It doesn't matter what you have in regards to evidence to help your case, you have no chance against the AFCC group.

The Bill does not address the GAL's non-disclosure of guardian collaboration with court appointed psychological evaluator. GAL review of draft evaluation. Non-disclosure of discussions to limit parenting time as punishment / restrictions on mother.

The GAL did not disclose the father's actual work hours, as an Executive Chef the father primarily works nights and weekends, leaving the children to be raised by fathers live in girlfriend when mom is available to parent the children. Even though the Court deemed mom to be a fit parent.

The CLC did not disclose that just months before the father moved into the girlfriends house, that his girlfriend was arrested and had a DCF charge for attacking her x-husband in front of their child and then attacking herself, calling the police and trying to pin the assault on her x-husband. Judge Wetstone would not allow the DCF Report to be entered in as evidence, stating that unless the father's girlfriend is currently sex trafficking her child she does not want to hear it. Judge Wetstone did not care about any history when it came to father and his girlfriend; his arrests, his untreated alcoholism; the girlfriends arrest/DCF record were stopped short from being heard by Wetstone. Additionally for a 4 month period, September 2012 – January 2013, the kids were widely mistreated by the dad's girlfriend, coming home crying saying they do not want to be left alone in her care, over the course of those 4 months the verbal/mental attacks on the children got worse, the dad's girlfriend was screaming in their faces with her fists clenched, the kids were scared of her. Within months Judge Wetstone took the kids from a mom who has never harmed them and placed them in the care of this same woman. The mom has no history, no arrests, no addictions.

An alarming failure of the bias trial is that the court, Wetstone, J. is listed with the Secretary of the State as a Director of an AFCC, Inc. organization. The court appointed guardian ad litem is also an AFCC, Inc. member. The court appointed psychological evaluator is an AFCC, Inc. member. The

Case - Bushey v. Bushey – FA 09-4010792

family services persons involved also participate in AFCC, Inc. organizations and such organization is run out of the Court Support Services Division under direction of former Chief Court Administrator, Judge Quinn. State resources are used in support of this organization within the judiciary, extending up to the judges of family court, Munro, Wetstone and Adelman who are all currently listed with SOTS in business filings for Connecticut Chapter of AFCC, Inc. Such business relationship among the players in the instant case was never made public and was willfully withheld from the parties, such being beyond the appearance of a conflict of interest, but being a grotesque example of conflicted interest in a forum designed under the Constitution to be impartial.

CT Family Courts are consistently removing children from a parent who is deemed fit and have never harmed the children. CT Family Court at its finest.

CT Family Courts are consistently removing children from a parent who is deemed fit and have never harmed the children. I used to think that if you were a good parent, never got in trouble with the law, stayed away from drugs & alcohol there would be no reason for you to lose your children – then I entered CT Family Courts and witnessed something right out of a 3rd world country. Parents are treated like criminals.

Almost all the cases are the same, it's CT Family Court playbook: the targeted parent is accused of being crazy, at that point the targeted parent hires professionals to fend off the allegations, but once you clear one allegation, along comes another, it's endless. Most allegations come from the GAL, a lawyer who takes a 35 hour course and the Judges consider these lawyers experts with your children. Would you want a lawyer to tell you where your children are going to live? I hired 2 psychiatrists and cleared my name, it didn't matter, Judge Wetstone would not let them testify and focused on her AFCC business partners Dr. Stephanie Stein Leite, the CT Children's Law Center Justine Rakich Kelly and Parul Patel ultimately removing the children from my care.