

## Moniz-Carroll, Rhonda

---

**From:** Susan Skipp <susanskipp@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 24, 2015 8:06 PM  
**To:** JudTestimony  
**Subject:** Fwd: Ct public corruption Gals never had immunity

Please publish

**From:** "Susan Skipp" <susanskipp@gmail.com>  
**Date:** Tue, Mar 24, 2015 at 6:01 pm  
**Subject:** Ct public corruption Gals never had immunity

Dear Jay,

Unfortunately, I have grown to read the CT Law Tribune. According to the last oped of court reform Chicken Littles: the caliber of brain power that pollutes the bench and bar while abusing citizens seems rather dull:

GALs have never had immunity in statute. This is noted by Hennessey in the dissenting opinion of Carrubba v Moskowitz.

<http://www.jud.ct.gov/.../supapp/Cases/AROap/AP81/81ap552e.pdf>

"I believe that it is the legislature and not the judiciary that should, if it chooses, exercise its authority to extend immunity to court-appointed attorneys for minors. It is clear that neither the statutes of this state, nor the decisions of this court or our Supreme Court, extend the protections of immunity to court-appointed attorneys for minor children under § 46b-54. Consequently, I perceive the conclusion of the majority to be synonymous with legislating and "[m]ore importantly . . . [as] exceeding our constitutional limitations by infringing on the prerogative of the legislature to set public policy through its statutory enactments." State v. Reynolds, 264 Conn. 1, 79, 824 A.2d 611 (2003)."

Later in Gross v Rell, the Carrubba decision was referenced:

<https://www.jud.ct.gov/.../sup.../Cases/AROCr/CR304/304CR42A.pdf>

"...extensive procedural safeguard in place, taken together with the striking similarities of the functions served by conservators and both AMCs appointed pursuant to 46b-54, and, PARTICULARLY GUARDIANS AD LITEM, both of whom already enjoy quasi-judicial absolute immunity, for actions WITHIN HIS STATUTORY AUTHORITY, with the exception of actions for financial malfeasance or malfeasance brought by or on behalf of the conserved person."

A court cannot take any legislative action GALs never had immunity: 1. Immunity can only be conferred to an office and 2. Legislation, new laws cannot be done by the judicial branch. This is a cross over of powers. However the judicial branch has been creating it's own legislation since 1969 and do this all the time in family court citing 1-9A from the PRACTICE book not STATUES.

Emphasis mine:

GALs enjoy their judge-turned-lawmaker, fabricated immunity for actions within statutory authority.

There is no statutory authority for any GAL in a family proceeding, only juvenile or dependency cases.

Not one argument made in testimony against 5505 is more than a logical fallacy in the form of an emotional plea, failure or judicial cannons and failure to be forthright to a tribunal.

I never considered myself a "disgruntled parent" or an "angry parent." My family and I were victimized by fraud, racketeering and extortion within the family court system. And we are still abused under color of law and denied access to court let alone meaningful access with effective communication.

So if people who have had their rights egregiously trampled under color of law are to be name called as "disgruntled litigants" and "angry parents" those opposing 5505 are "criminally insane attorneys, mental health workers and judges." As they all profit by their brilliant business model of incentivizing conflict for long term revenue stream and use family court, the wrong jurisdiction, as a collection agency. Just two years ago CT Law Tribune ran a front page story about incarcerating a mother who could not access her sons college savings account to pay the gal \$15,000.

36 hours of training gets the cashier to hit the French fry button on the fast food register.

It would be nice to see this published, but I am not a lawyer and don't pay for a subscription. But a lawyer from Halloran and Sage who sends out a frantic email to the family bar to testify against this bill Chicken Little-ing it into the undoing of Carrubba v Moskovitz is likely a paying subscriber. Sarah Stark Oldham writes family law chapters for textbooks squawks about Curruba v Moskowitz too, and she is probably a paid subscriber. Barbara Aaron and Sharon Dornfield probably have a scheme to avoid paying for a subscription with AFCC pal Zazlow.

And Hon. Bozzuto, she does her usual farthest thing from the truth in a pink sweater. Not to worry for her, she'll get a hold of 5505 if it passes and she and fellow peers Hon Elliot Solomon and Hon Patrick Carroll will rewrite the whole bill before it goes to senate - just like they did on 494. However I think people will be watching that this doesn't happen this time around. (When you start writing about the AFCC?)

5505 only hurts the fat slices of litigant assets that makes tax free income for the "criminally insane" folks. With the refusals of providing TINs or EINs, judges using these GAL tools, that are to help make a finding within discretionary berth of judges- families should not pay for discretionary tools- said judges are ordering litigants to be complicit in attorney and gal tax fraud to boot while they move money to various LLCs.

Are family court judges really that feeble of decision makers they need GALs? They make quite a sum with a lovey retirement. It's not unreasonable to expect them to do their jobs and not rely on people who have trained less than a fast food worker to know the best interests of someone's child. Also, no where in best interest of the child standard is found health, safety and psychological well being of the child.

It's all about exploiting them for profit. "Criminally insane attorneys, judges and mental health uhhemm professionals" need a paradigm shift to ethical behavior, if possible.

Thanks  
Susan

Sent from my iPhone