

#FAMILYCOURTCORRUPTION

Testimony in Support of HB 5505

House Bill 5505 is a terrific example of democracy at work. HB5505 is a well measured response from the legislature to honor and preserve First Amendment rights of citizens to “petition the Government with redress of grievances.”

Today, the citizens of this State stand to praise this committee in drafting HB5505, as well measured responsive legislation to provide limits to long standing abuse of “judicial discretion”.

At a public hearing of a Task Force to Study Dispute in Family Court Matters held on January 9, 2014, nearly four score of parents joined arm in arm in a civil rights march to Capitol Hill to protect our children from alleged “racketeering” in the family court industry in Connecticut.

On March 30, 2014, in an 11 hour public hearing on HB 464, “vox populi”, the voice of the people again reverberated in this hearing room.

Public Act 14-3 was the first step re-claiming the rights of fit parents to have access to the care, companionship and unquestioned value of love as an enduring value worthy of defense.

We thank Senator Kissel and others who publicly stated on March 30, 2014 that HB 464 was the beginning of a process for maintaining an “open mind” to further amendments to family law reform. .

HB 5505 initiates further reforms and provides much needed relief from the inherent authority provided in two words: “judicial discretion”. Earlier today, Representative Gonzalez asked what should be the consequences for a judge who fails to comply with the law.

Judge Buzzuto’s answer that she wasn’t prepared to answer that question and then suggested it would be the responsibility of the Appellate and Supreme Court.

If parents are stripped by family court appointees of their financial resources to educate our children, the question the family court should ask, how can the family court practitioners suggest their income as court appointees advances the best interest of the children.

HB 5505, removes any doubt that the intention of the legislature for court appointees is captured in the Attorney’s Oath, which requires lawyers to “do nothing dishonest in court.” Removing immunity will create an accountability which is currently unavailable when a GAL or AMC is appointed.

I would like this committee to consider a little known fact gleaned from a email from the Statewide Bar Counsel--there has never been an attorney appointed as a GAL or AMC who has been sanctioned after conducting a public hearing.

The language in HB5505 to remove immunities for GALs and AMCS as a legal defense will provide for relief from what has been a widespread protection provided to the legal profession to be “insured” from “legal misconduct” as a result of Carruba v. Moskowitz and also positively impact the operations of the Statewide Bar Counsel enforcement of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

To conclude my prepared remarks, as you deliberate on supporting this HB 5505 which are the 28 words of federal RICO, statute 18 U.S.C 1346: “For the purposes of this chapter, the term artifice or scheme is defined as any artifice or scheme to defraud an individual of the intangible right to honest services.

We urge the adoption of HB5505 with the same unanimous endorsement received in the passage of Public Act 14-3.