

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

1/ 6 /2018

To – The New York State Commission On Judicial Conduct
61 Broadway, suite 1200
New York, New York 10006
phone – 646 – 386 – 4800
fax – 646 – 458 - 0037

Re: Complaint Against Judge Clark V. Richardson
Manhattan Family Court

To – Director – The Legal Aid Society
199 Water St.
NY, NY 10038
phone – 212 – 577 – 3300
fax – 212 – 509 - 8761

To – Heather Saslovsky
60 Lafayette St.
New York, New York
phone – 212 - 312 – 2260
fax – 212 – 349 -0874

From – Jill Jones-Soderman
Executive Director FCVFC
Publisher – US Whistle Blower – On Line Press
Producer – Special Angels Productions Media

On Behalf Of Client – Protective Parent Julianne Michelle Reeves
and Dependent Child

Docket No. 0-28626-17

Attached - Exhibits

By Fax and Express Mail

Complaint Against Judge Clark V. Richardson

Complaint Against Heather Saslovsky, Esq.

There is a profound problem when the Judge cooperates and colludes with the attorney for the child who is the advocate for the father who is a self-described and proud of it, racist, homophobic domestic violence abuser, child abuser. The defendant father has been substantiated for child abuse by ACS, yet the attorney for the child has mobilized the forces of ACS, CFS, and Judge Richardson, who has failed to order adequate drug testing in the form of conclusive hair follicle tests. The Defendant father has been substantiated for child abuse and neglect and agreed to a neglect charge.* The substantiated abuser is alleged to use extensive polypharmacy. He has admitted to being a “recreational drug abuser”, Exhibits attached, indicate use of Cocaine with Ketamine, a horse tranquilizer known to induce intense altered psychological states including unremitting depression. The failure of Court Orders within the authority of this court allow the obfuscation of the most accessible, objective data available to hold this individual accountable for his savage acts against mother and child. The record evidences a history of violence, legal and illegal gun possession within the Manhattan/ New York City, Jurisdiction.*

The father's actions of interpersonal violence, self-inflicted injury, which resulted in personal harm, such as the “hunting accident” that left a bullet in his head, and the violent car and sports accidents that left him with a significant level of personal physical deficit are circumstances that must be evaluated as contributing psychiatric factors to acts of violence and uninhibited lying, all fully documented with multiple exhibits attached. Further documentation includes the acts of bias and a naked level of hostility directed at the Protective mother, grandparents and all who attempt to provide evidence for the mother.*

Heather Saslovsky has made overt acts, inappropriately to block the Protective Order requested of the court against the Defendant father*. As per documents attached, it is clear that Ms, Saslovsky has been in touch with Defendant father attorney and his lawyer, Robert Wallack, in a clear attempt to join forces to strip the mother of her Due Process Rights for protection from a violent Domestic Abuser. Ms. Saslovsky needs to be reminded that she is the lawyer for the child, not the advocate for the father, who through undue influence, wishes to be the next sole custodian of the child for whom he was adjudicated to be culpable of neglect and abuse. The fact of fancy legal foot work on the part of Mr. Reeve's attorney resulting in Mr. Reeves receiving an ACD, instead of the jail time he deserves, speaks poorly for the criminal judicial system.

Further, Ms. Saslovsky filed an Order to Show Cause Nov. 22, 2017, Docket N0. NN03153-17 mislabelling legal charges/confusing alleged with adjudicated. Mr. Reeves was Adjudicated of charges by ACS, not alleged for charges of which he was found guilty*. In these papers Ms. Saslovsky makes false wild statements of grandparent “stalking” and “enmeshment” of relations between the child's mother and her mother, alleging fictitious crimes such as being “over protective” of the infant and interfering with the father's parenting time, during which he appears to spend more time sleeping or avoiding the responsibility of properly being engaged in the convenient, safe transport of his child from one residence to the next.*

Ms. Saslovsky actively attempted to suppress and interfere with the presentation of evidence provided by a witness, who was a former intimate partner, to the Defendant father’s verbal and physical abuse, by suggesting that the material was inappropriately obtained and in fact coerced. Ms. Saslovsky has actively interfered with each witness presenting evidence against the drug abusing, domestic violence, child abuser father, causing a cooperating witness to suddenly, in the midst of the case to become angry with the victim mother and child. There is evidence, exhibits attached, that Karl Reeves has been engaged in threatening acts toward witnesses so that they would not come forward in court. There is evidence that attorney Saslovsky has manipulated witnesses, providing information that created a hostile atmosphere between such individuals as critical mental health providers and the protective mother, such as in the case of Dr. Murphy, where Ms. Saslovsky communicated information that resulted in a hostile relationship between Dr. Murphy and the Plaintiff mother. * The level of witness interference and suggestion of witness intimidation warrants investigation of 18USC1512 as a Cause of Action to be deployed against both Ms. Saslovsky and Mr. Reeves.

The ineptitude and perhaps criminal collusion between the Defendant’s attorney and multiple court actors, including Judge Richardson, the level of bias, failure to properly secure court orders that would protect the Plaintiff’s rights has left the Plaintiff in dire circumstances, facing a mob, rather than a judicial proceeding. Prior court proceedings were conducted with such a manner of loose procedure and sloppiness that the Plaintiff mother was left homeless.

To briefly recap history, the Plaintiff mother was married, entered graduate school as a social worker, became pregnant, and began to experience an escalating level of domestic violence and severe abuse, which led her to begin to become acquainted with the man she actually married. The person she thought she married was a successful businessman, who wanted a devoted wife and family. She then to her shock and horror became aware that a “trophy” wife with a pedigreed family was part of an unanticipated picture that also included a level of intense micromanagement control, with an insatiable desire for critical, demeaning, punishing, and humiliating endless commentary of her every move.

He in fact married a person who cared about social welfare, being a productive, active citizen and mother. She graduated a social work program, not a lucrative form of work, but she thought that income was not an issue. It became clear that a long-term relationship was an impossibility because of the level of threat to personal harm both to mother and infant. The person whom the Plaintiff married is an individual with a chaotic lifestyle, whose business practices we allege will reveal to the court and then to IRS criminal enterprise, criminal associations, extensive drug abuse and interpersonal violence involving debauchery with women and a variety of forms of depraved behaviors.*

The Defendant has already displayed a total callousness to the welfare of his wife and child with the participation of the court, both Judge Richardson and Judge Dawson have issued Orders that are witheringly destructive to the Protective mother and toddler. We suggest that these Orders were significantly as a result of the false and misleading statements of Ms. Saslovsky, as indicated in attached documents. First, the Plaintiff mother was rendered financially incapable of renting an apartment in Manhattan, where she had to live in proximity for purposes of continuing visitation of the partner whose violent actions nearly caused the skull crushing death of her infant, that required her to seek refuge apart from him. Had the Plaintiff mother not departed the home, ACS would have substantiated her for neglect, allowing the child to be in danger. The Plaintiff mother had to seek refuge with her parents, who have had to support her as to food, shelter and child care, placing her in the position of being seen as the person who cannot afford to care for the child and so the child should go to the father who has income and flexible work hours because his multimillion dollar business affords him flexibility to work from home.

The actions of the court have endangered the Plaintiff's parents by bringing them into contact and conflict with a violent, dangerous, drug using criminal who has threatened their lives in word and deed*. The Defendant father's callous, depraved recent acts are echoed by his attorney and the attorney for the child, who describes the baby's enrichment activities of music and swimming to be part of a criminal enterprise - "disgusting" for causing the Defendant inconvenience, words echoed by the attorney for the childjust "terrible".*

What is disgusting is the orgy of professionals that are engaged in a bacchanalian festival of removing an infant, now toddler from her home, waking her two hours earlier from her usual sleep too early in the morning, disrupting her daily schedule, to visit the Defendant father. The transport through a series of "forensic social workers" who oversee child transfers from the mother's apartment to the father's apartment with a level of dysfunction rarely seen, other than second only to the level of dysfunction in communicating, complaining, and screwing up timing and transportation. The case of the halt leading the blind include the attorney for the baby, ACS case workers and the

bevy of “forensic social workers” who conference and dispute, and the multiple communications with lawyers, all leaving the baby moving through rain and freezing cold for the purpose of being present in the home of a sleeping/napping father*. The incomprehensible process by which a baby was transferred from her home over 12/30/2017, the coldest on record in Manhattan, to see her father, who then cancelled the visit because he was “sick”, immediately after all transfer personnel left the quarters proves a spiteful act against the mother and depraved indifference to the child.

CFS social workers made demands that the staff retained and paid by the mother who had already departed the defendant’s residence then had to the return immediately to retrieve the already disrupted child. The events that unfolded were incomprehensibly cruel and resulted in the following hospitalization of the 14 month old toddler child who became acutely ill and remains acutely ill, to date (including hospitalization).* That professionals would have participated in this one moronic episode of many travesties is worthy of very serious review and complaint.

To date, the forces of malevolent, incomprehensible failure of child protection, child jurisprudence, and child advocacy, supported in rulings by Judge Richardson*, are continuing to conspire to deprive a young mother of her right to protect her child's health, welfare, safety, and right to thrive. The despicable act of irrational retaliation in the form of child support and alimony reduction are an inexplicable form of retaliation against a mother who has sought to protect herself and her child against massive harm.*

The staff of the FCVFC are outraged and indignant over the multiple, unspeakable acts that have occurred over the too long process of divorce and custody adjudication. The presence in this case of Psychiatric Forensic, Financial Forensic expert testimony will provide hard evidence of the criminal acts perpetrated by the guilty. The FCVFC will be present to pursue enforcement of protection and accountability of guilty court actors and the bottom feeders that profit from the spoils of rotten court orders.

Jill Jones-Soderman

CC:

Heather Saslovsky, Esq. New York Bar Asc. - Disciplinary Division
Legal Aid Society - Director

ACS Director
ACS – Ombudsman's Office

ACS Caseworker – Donna West

CFS -Social Work Licensing Board, Albany NY Complaint Against:

CFS – Caseworkers – Social Work Licensing Board

CFS - Director Richard Spitzer

The Legal Aid Society – Director, et. al.