

THE FOUNDATION FOR THE CHILD VICTIMS OF THE FAMILY COURTS
A NOT FOR PROFIT ORGANIZATION
275 MADISON AVE.
6TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10016
866 – 553 - 6931

INTRODUCTION TO COMPLAINTS

The following complaint is being filed against staff employees of four agencies through their administrative staff and the licensing boards that address the standard of practice engaged in by these individuals. The agencies have acted in concert with each other, excersizing defective judgment, incompetent professional standard of basic care and malevolent intent toward innocent subjects entrusted with fiduciary responsibility for their legal representation, care and protection .

The agencies being addressed are the Legal Aid Society, court appointed attorney Heather Saslovsky Esq., for the child; Administration for Children's Services of the City of New York, case supervisors and caseworkers who will be addressed by name in the report to their licensing boards, and Comprehensive Family Services, supervisors and “forensic” social workers and caseworkers. Each complainant will be addressed under separate cover letters to each agency, breaking out the names of culpable employees, directly responsible for the health, welfare, care and protection of a tender years child. In spite of the fact that the sound, credible direction of the Tender Years Doctrine is no longer a guideline in the Family Court, any well informed child care professional would recommend conforming to the basic care guidelines for young children provided by Tender Years Doctrinal wisdom.

The court of Judge Clark Richardson has been influenced by incompetent professionals whose practice skills are seriously deficient to the task they were assigned. The court has completely ignored many red flag issues which should have created pause for reflection – Domestic Violence and Drug Abuse being two major ticket items. The common sense directives for care of infants and young children resulting in the recent hospitalization of a toddler baby under the court ordered protection of these agencies whose negligence, indifference, open hostility toward the maternal caretakers, in clear favor of the Domestic Violence abuser, Drug Abuser, father who has been stalking, harrassing, issuing death threats to the Protective Parent mother, her family, friends and all caretakers associated with working with the baby. The accused abuser father has hired a team of attorneys, including high profile criminal attorney Joe Taccopina.

Beyond basic scholarly wisdom any competent agency dealing with care and protection of young children is fully aware of the need for all moving parts of the team to be in

close contact and in close communication. In the following case there is a clear collaboration in the form of a distinct bias to communicate information that clearly, inaccurately/negatively paints the maternal side of the family in negative terms as related to depriving the father of parenting time with the child. The terms of hostility to the mother and her family are couched in the code words of “parental alienation” hot buttons to the New York Family Court” that has a lurid history of overlooking multiple forms of egregious child abuse because their vision – seeing red with rage over the how dare..... obscured notice of physical and sexual abuse of a child. (Brigitte Mark) .

This attitude of support for the father over the interests of care and protection of the baby, completely callous, hostile, dismissive attitudes and interactions to be described and are documented on behalf of the Legal Aid Society staff, ACS, CFS staff against the mother and baby's maternal grandmother are of grave concern. Any concern raised by the maternal caretakers are greeted with a startle response of support and dismissive action to the maternal side of the family and then parallel court action in the form of motions to the court for child transfer to the father, by the Legal Aid Society attorney follow.* 1

The Legal Aid Attorney for the child uses the twitter like communications of CFS staff in their hotline to ACS and the Legal aid Attorney to send hostile communications via e mail with copies to attorneys, creating what is clearly meant to be an abundance of “evidence/testimony” against the mother/grandmother/housekeeper to make their nonexistent case.*2 The intensity of the overt hostility of the Legal Aid attorney was fully present through her brooding, dark presence in court, before Judge Richardson on Jan. 9th, 2018. The hearing on Jan. 9th, 2018 was set to hear an action brought by the Family Court attorney for the Defendant father for a Protective Order against the maternal grand mother. It must be noted that the action accusing the baby's diminutive, mature, grand mother as a threat, as insinuated by the ludicrous action of the father's Family Court attorney, Robert Wallack, to the stocky, muscular gun owner, Drug abusing, Domestic Violence Abuser who has been substantiated by ACS for child abuse and neglect (Defendant admitted to child neglect) is implausible.*3

The case at the center of this current litigation deals with a high profile, exotic family engaged in litigation against a wealthy father/short term marriage custody dispute, not simply about money and property but about allegations of criminal behavior, life and death acts of violence and destruction and murderous intent. The level of insipid response to demands for criminal intervention and prosecution of a parent/father known to engage in violent aggression toward his spouse and infant child,*4 extensive drug abuse with drugs associated with precipitating severe altered consciousness and violence (steroids, cocaine, ketamine (horse tranquilizer known to precipitate intense depression as a paradoxical side effect) is of grave concern.

The team of family court and criminal attorneys hired by the father, include Mr. Wallack and Mr. Tacopina. They stand to bullet proof the defendant father against serious criminal allegations, backed by evidence and witnesses. The criminal complaints lodged against the father for demonstrable cause, have resulted in retaliatory actions toward the mother and grandmother*5 of the subject child. Very serious criminal charges against the father which include death threats pronounced in vile language against the grandmother*5 and mother of the child*6 have been mitigated by the filing of an ACD*7, which presumes the father will not have further charges placed against him. With concerns about potential further police charges, it appears from circumstances to be described, that the father has armed himself, not only with the consistent accompaniment of a private investigator, Bo Dietle and other hirlings, but also the pack of protective social workers.

The court appointed social workers employed by the agency CFS act more as apologists for the father/a safety brigade around the father, as opposed to neutral, professional gatekeepers to facilitate exchanges and court ordered supervised visitation with the father.

ACS staff members have similarly acted as apologists for the father dismissing activity and behavior which caused injury, could cause serious injury and failed to act in circumstances that resulted in the hospitalization of the baby – which none of these agencies appears to take seriously at all. The palpably dangerous acts engaged in by the father, while under the direct and immediate supervision of the CFS “forensic” social workers indicate a level of basic incompetence in caring for a child, stupidity, as to a lack of simple common sense and or callous disregard for their basic fiduciary responsibility, all of which are unconscionable and actionable as to the extent of personnel and expense expended which should assure the complete safety and well being of this child.

When one looks at the facts of the events that have unfolded, what is clear is that the father's demands for access to the child are retaliatory against the mother, geared toward reducing the financial baggage engendered by the “experiment” engaged in by the Defendant father, whose idea of marriage and family was tantamount to a brief trip down the Blue Danube, more equivalent for the mother and child as a bucket over Niagara Falls. The malevolent, bullying forces of agencies ordered into action by the Family court are attempting to provide legitimacy to the defendant father whose risk to the individuals he has threatened has not been taken with proper, major concern. The court is thus threatening to move the outcome of this case in favor of a father whose rights need to be terminated, not enforced, based on proper understanding of evidence provided as fraud, suppressed and manipulated, by the paid providers of services whose testimony has not been challenged or unmasked .

COMPLAINT AGAINST THE LEGAL AID SOCIETY
COURT APPOINTED ATTORNEY H. SASLOVSKY

COMPLAINT AGAINST ACS – CASE SUPERVISORS AND
CASEWORKERS, ATTORNEY, ADA GEORGE
COMPLAINT AGAINST CFS – DIRECTOR, RICHARD
SPITZER, CASEWORKERS