

MARCH 31, 2014 TESTIMONY RAISED BILL 494

My name is Denise Guerrero.

My brief review of RB 494, tells me there is reform language that addresses a some of the serious, unregulated issues in the CT GAL program. I am here to testify to the rampant bias, prejudice, abuse and gross unaccountability rampantly plaguing the judicial system. I have identified the CT Family Court as a business, not an American judicial system of process that is regulated by procedures that uphold the Law- in the interests of the People - in the interests of Families. The CT Family Court is absent fundamental, regulated, lawful practices.

I am the mother of 3 children. I have been an Administrative Officer for the Department of Interior for 7 years. My daughters are from my first marriage and my youngest child, my son, born in 1999, is from my second marriage. My second marriage lasted only one year due to Domestic Violence. The divorce process lasted longer than I was married. The marriage ended in divorce in 2001 and is heard on post judgment matters, in the Stamford, docket # FST-FA-01-0183136.

RB 494 is a move in the right direction, however, my statements are in the form of questions, does it address the non transparent decisions that are made that negatively impact families and result in the gross violation of constitutional rights for parents and for children? Does it identify the conflict of upholding the Best Interests Of the Child (BIOC) and upholding Constitutional liberties and resolve the potential for discrepancy? Does it control the qualifications and authorities of a GAL and identify the BIOC? In Section 1., if interpreted correctly, regarding the GALs and AMCs fees, as well as all other appointees, stricter regulations are needed that abolish business attitudes of deal-making, profits and any preferential ability of the judicial body. Court appointed officials should not be "rated", either by professional courtesy or otherwise, this allows for deal-making and the breeding of for-profit business professionals when there is a variation of fees. The appointment must be a standardized, persons must be qualified to conduct focused tasks. Specifically, the standard state rate of a \$500 retainer and a \$50 p/h rate. (Section 2.) Does not have enough language to identify nor protect a "Child of Sufficient Age and a child who has the ability to make informed decisions". Under parental alienation circumstances, -or past and current cases of rampant unmanaged GALs or AMCs, prior to October of this year, these able children have no access to the court nor protection of their liberties and well being. I am testifying that currently, as the GAL/AMC program stands, there is no access to the court for my son who is of sufficient age and ability. I applied to subpoena my son 14 1/2 and daughters 19, 22, to testify, and I was denied; and I motioned for an attorney for my son and was denied on the grounds that he has a GAL, a therapist AND there are 2 parent coordinators assigned to the case, as well. I testified he was sufficient age and able and was not represented. Let it be my testimony that none of these professionals promote active involvement by both parents.

RB 494 must control the authority court appointed officials are empowered with under the Best Interest Of the Child (BIOC) statute by enacting transparent reporting language.

Background of my case - For my sons first 12 years of his 14 years of life, he lived with me and his sisters, and 11 of those years we resided in NY state. While he was in my custody, there was never the need to appoint a GAL, a therapist or Parent Coordinators. There has never been alienation, as I have now come to know the definition of parent alienation- child abuse. I naturally fostered a challenged relationship with an active substance abuser, verified by the Superior courts own Family Relations Evaluation report. My son formed wholesome ties to NY State. Due to CT holding exclusive jurisdiction and the appointment of Elizabeth Sharpe as his GAL in 2012 and the GALs hearsay testimony of

my sons preference to live with his father- my son was forced to move to CT. My son is now almost 15 and has in writing pleaded to return home with me and his sisters to NY. How can custody be changed based on hearsay of his preference at 12 years old and then at the age of 14 ½ Atty Sharpe merely states it is in his best interests to reside with his father? with no requirement to base her opinion on facts or evidence?

And it gets worse, in 2013 my sons father relapsed and had a violent outburst while under the influence, documented by a police report. I followed proper procedure, applied for a Protective order, safely brought my son to NY and awaited the hearing and simultaneously filed a motion to modify custody. The GAL, Atty Sharpe, provided no evidence, just a simple form (Form 219) and a few boxes checked off, only armed with the presumption of the BIOC. This gives a GAL the authority to have a judge, Judge Emons, vacate another judges's, Judge Schofield's, Protective order at a hearing held without me present? I am a non-resident under strict federal employment guidelines that without proper notice I could not attend. My son was kidnapped and I have not seen him since, other than a supervised Christmas visit at a restaurant for 2 hours with my daughters at a substantial cost. No supporting evidence or facts and no remedy.

In my case, I have a GAL, Elizabeth Sharpe, two parent coordinators, Nancy Burke and Roger Grenier of Westport Mediations and my son has a court appointed therapist, Dr. Harry Adamakos. None of these professionals are regulated but are court appointed to do various duties, each time I motion the Court, that any reasonable person would conclude they are appointed simply because the Best Interests of the Child (BIOC) are not met. The GAL has the authority to deviate from the statutes, namely, which parent most likely foster a relationship with the other parent is the more fit parent in the BIOC. Atty Sharpe has billed an excess of \$50,000 and spent less than 2 hours with my son.

I have witnessed Atty Sharpe testify rampantly manipulating court processes to hide facts, I have been accused of kidnapping and treated with malice by the court based on off the record testimony by Atty Sharpe. I have witnessed Atty Sharpe behave with no structure providing opinions and hearsay in the courtroom under the Honorable Jane Emons, who presides over my case. Atty Sharpe has no reserve in saying she can do whatever she wants and there is nothing I can do. I filed a 52 page Request for a Referral to Family Relations with 48 pages of facts and evidence to support a custody evaluation and I filed a Request for Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts, Atty Sharpes off the record comment to me was "you could file a phonebook it won't matter" and at another hearing after 5 months of not seeing my son, Atty Sharpe said to me "I have a clear conscious". Atty Sharpe is this callous and unprofessional both in email and in person. GALs are rampant because the manner, actions and non-accountability and zero fear testified here and in countless other cases is zero accountability. The behavior is blatant in and out of the courtroom. Atty Sharpe has manipulated proceedings, and it should be noted she has not ever reported a test was conducted nor has she submitted a report to satisfy the BIOC statutes are met and specifically how the childs best interests are met. GALs have rampant authority over judges.

RB 494 must restore the mission of the State of CT Judicial branch.