

My name is Susan Skipp, of Litchfield, and I am here today to deliver public testimony in opposition to Governor Malloy's re-nomination to the position of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Having self sworn my testimony today, I am declaring myself as an "adverse" witness to Chief Justice Rogers less than the "whole truth". Chief Justice Rogers testimony earlier today was "less than transparent" and will be discredited by mine inasmuch as Chief Justice Rogers is a citizen of this state and under the 14th Amendment, and the due process and equal protection clause, my testimony today to the judiciary committee is factually based.

I come here today "to petition the Government for redress of grievances. Citizens do not elect judges in this State of the "several states" among the first dozen State of The Union. The General Assembly in CT approves the nominations of judges.

When lawyers who are legislators, sit as "majority" members of this judiciary committee and who also appear before Chief Justice Rogers or her subordinates as Judges of the Superior Court, do members of this committee and members of the General Assembly properly recuse them selves voting for conflicts of interest? We see such a small percentage of recusals captured in the fully transparent CT-N coverage of these public hearings and in televised votes in CT

We thank today those who work at CT-N to provide important non-partisan coverage today as a public service and for the ability to be able to view testimonies on the replays at their website.

So we ask today, whose interests do the 18 lawyers who serve as their legislators who will vote today or at some later publicly televised hearings, after consideration of all of the evidence, including oral and written testimony, as to which elements of your sworn oath of office will you apply when you carefully consider the evidence here today--THE OATH OF YOUR OFFICE, YOUR CONSTITUENCY AS A WHOLE IN YOUR VOTING DISTRICT, THE INTERESTS OF THOSE WHO ARE LICENSED PRACTITIONERS OF LAW, OR YOUR CONSCIENCES? We pose this question to the 16 lawyers who received a copy of an email from "Attorney Allen Palmer on March 11"--which master do you serve as an elected represented.

We the people, who do not vote for the election of judges, would like to submit today, that all inherent powers of government in this country is grounded in your oath of affirmation, contained in Article VI of the United States Constitution, not in your "personal" belief to have discretion to operate in "your own vested personal self interests" for those who are lawyers elected as legislators.

Copies of your oath of office and the Constitution of the United States were provided to you by an anonymous individual who has identified himself as the Grand Inquisitor profiled in Chapter 4 of the book The Brother's Karamazov.

The vote in opposition of Chief Justice Chase Rogers would constitute a Pledge of Allegiance to Article VI to support the U. S Constitution as the "supreme Law of this Land."

It is my position that Chief Justice Rogers should not be re-appointed for the following reasons grounded in the U.S. Constitution:

1. Last year, allowed judges to rewrite legislation after passing the house. Rep Rosa Rembimbas was one of the legislators who allowed Judges Bozzuto, Solomon and Carroll to rewrite 494, now public Act 14-3. What the reps voted, was not what the senate voted on- not even the same document. And did similar activity took place with HB 5505. This was under Chase Rogers Watch.
2. Chase Rogers clearly ignored unlawful acts in the superior, appellate and supreme courts. I have submitted four direct appeals and three petitions for certification to the supreme court, all denied and all detailing criinal actions within the judicial branch.
3. Chase Rogers has given Constructive notice that family court is a problem in her March 2014 article.
4. Chase Rogers has personally ignored wrongs, frauds, instead blaming them on a small group of people.

As a self represented litigant in Waterbury and Middletown, I have testified in an estimated 76-80 court proceedings and at public hearings on proposed bills conducted by this committee.

In speeches delivered by the Chief Justice since April 25, 2007, various Bar Association groups, Justice Rogers has consistently used the word "we".

When Chief Justice Rogers that the judiciary branch had commissioned with taxpayer money the Judicial Satisfaction Survey she did so six weeks after the contract was signed and she chose to announce it in an opinion piece in the Connecticut Law Tribune.

Nearly all of Justice Rogers' speeches have been delivered to members of the CT Bar, and not to the public. In fact, through the external affairs director Melissa Farley, the Chief Justice refused to meet with members of the public to discuss the Judicial Satisfaction Survey which was posted in early February 2015.

When a Judge leaves the practice as an attorney, they are no longer considered "active" members of the Connecticut Bar. Justice Rogers use of the word "we" in speeches delivered since 2007, "we the people" ask this question, "are self represented parties of equal standing and shouldn't they be invited to attend such

"private meetings" with the Supreme Court.

Chief Justice Rogers has failed over the last eight years to properly serve the stated mission statement of the judiciary: The mission of the Connecticut Judicial Branch is to serve the interests of justice and the public by resolving matters brought before it in a fair, timely, efficient and open matter.

The litmus test is not in "legislative discretion" to ignore the facts of this public hearing, but to carefully consider all of the facts, including every public hearing or decisional law case, during the course of her administration as part of a "fact based" inquiry by this judiciary committee who operates today in the "court of public opinion"

"We the people" at this public hearing stand in opposition to the Chief Justice today and seek "due diligence consider" to justify how the public interest is served by refusing to require an equal number of non-lawyers to lawyers in the public committee judiciary committees.

Instead, lawyers who appear before the judges of the Superior Court which include the Appellate and Supreme Court fail to declare conflicts of interest when they vote on judges who they have appeared, serve on administrative committees.

Allowing judges to testify in opposition of bills introduced through the First Amendment Rights to petition the government of redress of grievances" raises series issues of abridges of the separation of powers of govt. Can this judiciary committee fail to consider constitutional issues governed by Article VI of the Constitution? Allowing Judges to rewrite bills between house and senate votes is illegal, and sent judges to jail. But it happens.

The injustices of this Supreme Court in adopting Probate Court Rules, a Code of Evidence perpetrated by a lack of the supervision and proper review by this committee of C.G.S. 51-14 has gone on without any consideration of the required oversight of this committee is a far more than benign neglect of your responsibilities, it borders on a seditious conspiracy between two branches of the government to operate in tandem rather than in the spirit of independent balance.

The Constitution is less than respected than it deserves in the actions of elected public officials in the "Constitution State". Today, "vox populi" serves as the duty of citizens to defend our liberty interests, our rights of due process and equal protection, and those "unenumerated rights" referenced in the Ninth Amendment to the Constitution.

In my case, Justice Rogers has personally ignored fraud, unethical and illegal acts made known to her in April 2014, she sent these to the rules committee, who sent them to the family commission, another AFCC partnership running in tandem with GAL training and Family relations training and judicial training.

My testimony 4/2014 with 40 pages of an appendix clearly outline the failings of Connecticut to abide by the Americans with Disabilities Act. The general rule is to ignore this in family court and violate a persons rights, say that a mental health condition exists (unfounded except in the unqualified brains of GALS and Judges) and use the perception of a disability to discriminate against a litigant and segregate her from her family, thus actually giving her a disability recognized as legal abuse syndrome and or PTSD.

Chase Rogers ignored the clearly detailed harm of three families, including mine, as my children have been deprived of a mother for nearly three years by a very good paint by numbers by unscrupulous attorneys and judges, fueled by the federal funding that is gender discriminatory.

Chase Rogers had direct knowledge of the egregious harm to my children and me, other families, and chose to ignore it. For example, Attorney Mary Brigham violated a federal stay nine times, put in her own appearance and filed 37 motions, including two custody modifications- they are allowed to file motions and they have to be appointed- she wasn't, but the courts and lawyers allowed this to happen and ignored my well documented account. I implore anyone to look in my file UWY FA 10 4022992-s. Complex thinkers will notice that past the vilification of me, no fact exists, no change in circumstances to change custody. No real loss of employment of my former husband, nothing done about no discovery, my repeatedly denied subpoenas, Judge Maureen Murphy, a defendant in a federal case, telling the clerks to return my motions. This too is under the watch of Chase Rogers.

The appellate and the superior court are complicit with this fraud. I am speaking factually and with the legal definition of fraud. Complaints to the grievance committee are ignored, I filed seven on Brigham, but difficult when Sharon Dornfield, master GAL AMC plunderer is on the panel. Complained to JRC, many times, the judges dismiss.

Family court has been used and the collection agency for forced contracts of GALS (who are actually unconstitutional and have no immunity no matter what mountain of Carbuba V Mosowitz one yells from. Sorry- supreme court can't make legislation and US Constitution prevents immunity conferred to a person, only an office.

Chase Rogers regime runs on whim and money fetching. For example in family court, no data is collected to see if programs work- decisions must be data driven. If the scant data available reveals custody battles- **not** including the post judgment wars the attorneys like to create for a long term revenue stream that nearly doubled every year Justice Rogers was at the helm. She ignored blatant crimes committed by some judges, attorneys and clerks. Instead she blamed the pro se who actually were harmed by their own attorneys and judges and other

officers of the court. When things continued not working, finally last year a task force was formed to look at the role of Guardians ad litem. The majority of the Task force of AFCC ringers were put on the panel, the very ones who stand to profit from the status quo, not just to the expense of parents, but to the destruction of entire childhood. GALS Sue Cousineau and Sharon Dornfield both refused transparency.

Chase Rogers, by complicity is guilty of the federal crimes and civil rights violations that happen daily in Connecticut's family courts. I know the saying "better the devil you know," but maybe the next in line isn't another devil in a black robe. She is complicit with tax evasion by attorneys, GALS, mental health professionals and transcriptionists.

In her tenure, she has openly discriminated against pro se litigants, ignored the pleas of families whose children have been "legally kidnapped" and offered to the other parent as pay per view. She has ignored the people, the citizens she swore an oath to uphold the constitution to protect the rights of. She has allowed the judicial branch to create legislation and pass it under the people of Connecticut's noses, and the non-lawyer senators and reps; however the lawyers know what is happening. I hope they can put can notice the obvious conflict of interest and abstain from the vote.

Chase Rogers is guilty of crimes against the most vulnerable citizens, has done nothing more than lip service to address horrific activities under her watch. It is long over due for a change. It is long over due to make progress to ending corruption. It is long over due for the representatives of the citizens of this state to have justice made available to them. It is long over due for the state of Connecticut to stop the abuse of its children. It is long over due that the pandering stop to these judges, including Chase Rogers by the Connecticut Bar who stands to make large profits from her complicity.



April 10, 2015

Susan Skipp