

# The Foundation for the Child Victims of the Family Courts

## A Non Profit Foundation

From – Jill Jones-Soderman, PHD, MSHS

Executive Director, FCVFC

Address – 295 Madison Ave.. suite 930, NY, NY, 1016

Phone – 866 – 229 - 6793

Date – 8/8/2014

Bouma - v - Bouma

Case No. – 14 – C – 11 – 087 - 058

Re: Complaint against Judge William Tucker

The Judicial Disabilities Board

Att. Alex Wright

The People's Resource Center Room

100 Community Place

Crownsville, Maryland 21032

Sent by mail and fax

Dear Mr. Wright,

It has come to my attention that various members of the court dealing with the above noted case have been engaged in extensive ex parte communication with regard to libelous, defamatory, statements more in the character of gossip slung in the television shows of the whatever housewives.

The fact that multiple fraudulent and hearsay statements have been presented by Christopher Rand, Esq, and Alissa Cummins, Esq., “Best Interest attorney” have been supported and allowed into the record without query or skepticism, by Judge William Tucker without any evidentiary foundation and no cross examination of witnesses is the subject of this immediate complaint.

No witnesses on behalf of the libeled/defamed mother have been allowed to be present in court, though witnesses have been subpoenaed, were present in court yet never allowed to testify. The last date of such a violation of this client’s due process rights was Mon. 7/28/2014. Factual evidence, eyewitness testimony was never allowed to be heard, seen or vetted in any manner. A prior complaint involved the blocking of the appearance of Dr. Monty Weinstein as an expert witness on behalf of Jase Bouma, the minor child and Laura Bouma, his mother. This court has gone to the greatest lengths to humiliate degrade, discredit mother and son. The suppression of evidence even in the form of not releasing CPS reports which graphically describe the heart break and misery the child experiences at the hands of a father he hates and has reported hating since the age of four is clearly known by this court to be in violation of this child’s rights, even under CPS rules and clearly under the Bill of Rights and the Human Rights Commission. This child has been clear and consistent in his vociferous complaints, yet court minions continue to mutually support the alleged mutual prevarications espoused.

Jason Bouma has been allowed to violate every order and recommendation put forth by the court. Recommendations for visitation are routinely ignored. The implications for a clear intent to attempt to alienate the child from the mother he adores are alleged and would be testified to if the child/when the child speaks outside of the overwhelming, threatening presence of his father. We have found orders placed by every judge and even by mental health professionals ignored by Jason Bouma as his lawyer Christopher Rand brazenly offers false testimony welcomingly accepted by the court.

The reputations of experts in the area of parental alienation and judicial/legal fraud and malfeasance are libeled and defamed by nameless, mute cowards who make veiled statements behind the backs of those whom appear in court, file complaints and publish about the shameful acts of this court which can and will be fully verified. Dr. Weinstein’s credentials are posted on his own web site, The Family Therapy Center of New York and Georgia. My credentials as a Psychoanalyst and Forensic Expert, my

extensive training and work are similarly posted on my web sites, beginning with [familycourtintervention.com](http://familycourtintervention.com). There are extensive articles and published writing dealing with Judicial corruption, fraud and malfeasance which I am sure is well known to this court and it's minions. An innocent mother and child are now the victims of a ruthless court which appears to naively fantasize that their alleged actions of fraud and abuse of power will escape our eyes or reporting. While Dr. Weinstein and I know each other as colleagues who pass in the halls of many courts, our organizations and our work remain independent of each other. If we arrive at the same conclusions independently it is because of the hard evidence and verifiable truth of the facts of our fields of expertise.

Experts for the mother of the child sequestered in an environment which the child, Jase Bouma describes as a place that he hates and fears has been an issue of aggressive suppression. CPS reports, now two reports, written by Bobbi Feher and repeating the same painful exhortations for help and relief, have been subjects of bizarre accusations as per the commentary muttered in court by an untrained, inexperienced CPS worker and an attorney whom has not seen her child client in two years as per her testimony. It is also odd that a court would accept the testimony of an attorney for a child whom has not interviewed, seen, met with, telephoned or interviewed in any manner any member of the child's maternal family, whom he has stated he adores.

Alissa Cummins stated in the court of Judge William Tucker that a "CPS report was posted on the internet". Ms. Cummins did not bring to the court any form of documentation, copies of such reports that she alleged were on the internet or where such reports may have resided on the internet. Her hearsay statements were accepted as fact by Judge Tucker, thought there was no evidence verifying the presence of a report. Unless the report was explained to the general public the nature of this report would basically not be understood as to it's depth and breadth of meaning.

Judge Tucker responded to Ms. Cummins without any request for information or confirmation as to the whereabouts of such reports or proof of the existence of such a report on the internet. Judge Tucker's wholesale acceptance of such a statement clearly indicates a bias in the direction of suggesting that one of Ms. Bouma's attorneys provided her with a copy of the report and that in some manner shape or form she was responsible for placing the report on the internet. The intrinsic interpretation of such a comment by Judge Tucker is indicated by a suggestion of finger pointing in the most flagrant manner. No one suggested that either attorney Rand or Jason Bouma himself may have placed a copy of a report on the internet, if in fact that action was precluded, in order to implicate his ex wife in an action that would be disapproved by the court.

The court's actions have been blatantly unlawful in the manner in which this case has proceeded from the onset to the present. One only needs to refer to the docket to follow the actions of the court as to procedural matters to view the peculiarity of action taken and the constant flow of false to out rightly allegedly fraudulent information which could have been proven if such information was admitted for discussion. Mr. Rand, the attorney for Jason Bouma is constantly found credible, his requests appear to always be granted, however factually flawed,

Judge Tucker's questioning and management of the case, following the insinuations and nonsensical statements of Ms. Cummins, noted in the attached document/complaint has the effect of inflicting a chilling element or warning to all lawyers who represent a client in which the court has by all of its actions indicated prejudice and dislike, without sense or reason. Denial of motions, denial of all requests, denial of witnesses, denial of expert witnesses, denial of routine due process procedures, the wholesale acceptance of a highly toxic psychological report written by psychologist Paul Berman has poisoned the atmosphere of the court to the point that the cheer –“off with her head appears” more likely than “Ms. Bouma, does your lawyer have any statement to make in rejoinder to the remarks of Mr. Rand, “, a comment I have yet to hear or see in reading the case transcripts.

Complaints against Ms. Cummins will be sent to the appropriate authorities. Further complaints will be filed against Christopher Rand, with the Bar Association Grievance committee as per a series of alleged improprieties have been committed by Christopher Rand whom is alleged to have filed blatantly false statements. Rand is suspected to have engaged in an inappropriately intimate relationship with Jase Bouma whom has stated that he has spent many weekends with his father at the home of Christopher Rand. Jason Bouma and Christopher Rand are alleged to have a close personal and business relationship which has extended over many years. Rand had been removed as Jason Bouma's attorney for a period of time, yet for some reason was allowed to again become Jason Bouma's attorney.

In closing, the imbalance in judgments and decisions solely in favor of one party and decisions made against the other party who very simply wishes to see her child purely does not make sense!

Respectfully submitted,

Jill Jones-Soderman

Joel Walter, Esq.

Laura Bouma

Dr. Monty Weinstein

Office of the Attorney General – Civil Rights Division

HHSA – Office of Children’s Affairs

Chief Judge –

Judge Tucker –

The US Whistle Blower – News From the Mandated Reporters