

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

GOOD TO PUBLISH!!!!

1/ 23 /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

T0 – The Social Work Licensing Board, New York Stated

Re: Comprehensive Family Services
Richard Spitzer – Director

1

2

3

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

There is a profound problem when the Judge allows himself to be overly influenced, excessively cooperates, to the point of giving the appearance of collusion with the attorney for the child and other actors of authority and influence in this case. While there are multiple actors engaged in disseminating information to the court and exercising supervisory control of information provided to this case, the influence of the Attorney for the subject child, Heather Saslovsky has been most central, a pivotal figure in influencing, coordinating and disseminating false information, seeking to direct the decision of the court in favor of the father, by suppressing, obfuscating information/evidence, that would permanently disqualify the father from having any control or even contact with the child. Evidence of the father's malicious intent toward the child and his spouse, the naivete of the Protective parent in understanding the toxic nature of the person she married, and the extremely poor quality of legal talent hired to defend this case has contributed to the failure of the need to keenly articulate, produce well developed evidence, for this court to understand cause of actions taken

We must also note at this point that the jaundiced eye directed against litigants who terminate counsel for cause, are then viewed as difficult litigants, become subject of criticism that evolves from a history of a lack of attorney accountability for bad behavior on the part of attorneys, not the client. Unfortunately, this case is littered with attorneys whose bad behavior needs to be brought to the attention of the New York Bar Grievance Association. The FCVFC is referring Heather Saslovsky, attorney for the Legal Aid Society, attorney for the child, to the attention of the Grievance Committee and we are reviewing the files of other attorneys who have worked on this case, causing harm on multiple levels, for referral to the Bar Association Grievance Counsel.

While ample solid evidence is in reach of the defense of this case, Judge Richardson has neutered a critical area of vulnerability which would provide clear insight into the critical criminal, duplicitous nature of the Defendant father by blocking proper, aggressive drug testing.

Judge Richardson was under duress, given the Defendant father's drug /violence / recklessness history, to order random, un-announced testing and hair follicle testing so that the Defendant father could not dilute samples or manipulate his drug engagement behavior. A clean record of drug testing would have absolved the father of suspicion and rendered the mother's complaints "unwarranted". Instead, a series of maneuvers were employed to evade reasonable controls and leave Judge Richardson's motives for not ordering proper, reasonable drug testing, under suspicion and now complaint

Ms. Saslovsky, attorney for the child notes that the only reason that she has not been able to appropriate transfer of the child for full custody to the father is that his drug tests are questionable. The bias introduced by Ms. Saslovsky on the part of the father, perverting the level of drug oversight, among other issues is just one aspect of negative influence she has introduced, providing shade for the father and heat for the mother.

The transfer of the father's supervision control from ACS caseworkers, who provided service without charge, to the CFS agency, a for profit organization, has introduced a level of petty, biased, inept surveillance that has not only not contributed to the safety of the child, but has caused the child to be physically injured twice and recently sent to the hospital in a state of acute illness. . Oversight, alarm, intervention on the part of the baby..... none from Ms. Saslovsky, ACS supervisors or ACS Attorney George. CFS caseworkers carp over schedules not fully adhered to in freezing cold weather, file complaints with the court against the grandmother, grandfather, friends, doormen. etc., all while ineptly handling their own responsibilities and racking up huge bills for activity that should never be taking place.

Judge Richardson has no idea as to what is going on in this case. He denied a Protective Order to the mother for Stay Away Relief* protection against the father who has been actively sending death threats* to the mother, her family, friends, household staff, stalking* and manipulating visits with the subject child in such a way as to produce as much chaos, financial pain as possible. The Defendant father has been able to further manipulate inadequate financial support to the mother, a Domestic Violence victim, thrown from her home without any viable source of shelter if her parents were not in close proximity to care for her and her child. The hostile view of the Dawson court is reflected in the punitive financial cutbacks, unnecessarily, unfairly filed by the attorneys for the Defendant father. The emotional impact of the treacherous acts of the father's filings can only be seen in the reflective light of the Defendant Father's retaliatory malevolence and hatred toward the mother and indifference to the child's welfare, consistent with multiple other acts not placed in perspective within the court's rulings. Ms. Saslovsky has been a key player in withholding and distorting evidence from the court's purview as she has consciously tainted the decision making process to the extreme danger of the subject child.

We suspect that through her particular, personal efforts, Ms. Saslovsky, advocate for the father*, has kept from the court, knowledge that he is a self-described, and proud of it, Neo Nazi, racist, homophobic domestic violence abuser, child abuser. *The 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 to suppress all information contrary to increasing contact with the baby, in spite of the fact that current timing of visitation causes the baby to be woken up much earlier than is her routine wake up time. She is described as being woken from a sound sleep in a warm bed to be taken into the cold by

a father who then undresses her when she gets to his apartment. CFS staff in their “forensic” wisdom go along with his nonsense that the snugly, soft baby clothes worn are “fancy” as opposed to thinking that the father is looking for recording devices in the child's clothes. Inconvenient scheduling, feeding, related to the baby's needs are clearly of no consequence to the court that does not inquire into the impact of disruption of a baby's environment and innate timing so that concerns about growth milestones and developmental goals are considered. The baby's growth has been delayed, her mood impacted and she is described since the visitis as displaying temper and upset.

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 of diminished capacity for control and judgment over the Defendant father's ability to control himself from committing acts of violence, confabulation and various other forms of harm to self and others.

In conclusion of this complaint against Judge Richardson, a central feature that relates to causes for concern of bias, prejudice toward Defendant father is the failure to enforce rigorous drug testing* as a scientific, objective standard for evaluation and review of material providing insight into critical factors governing the Defendant father's mental status. Reasonable practice would suggest that the failure, on Judge Richardson's part to order rigorous drug testing, much less such minimal drug testing, suggests a level of cooperation and cover up of the alleged very significant pathology of the Defendant father, and posited extreme risk he poses to multiple member of the family of the Plaintiff mother and their child.

Judge Richardson's order to place the agency CFS* in control of major decision making is also most questionable, given the financial incentive and proximity of the Defendent father to gain preferable treatment by CFS to the father who has a distinct financial advantage and control in this situation. Further, CFS is an agency that has received numerous complaints for displaying bias in favor of the paying client in the face of that

client having been engaged in violent, highly pathological acts toward the opposition party. CFS has been cited for a failure to engage in objective professional behavior* or reporting in cases where the agency was removed from their parent supervision authority.* At this time complaints against the licenses of Richard Spitzer, CFS Director and each social worker assigned to this case is being forwarded to the State Board of Social Work Licensing for deception, false / biased reporting, endangering the welfare of a child under their supervision.

The current state of extreme crisis, immanent harm that now exists for this family directly stems from inadequate court orders to accurately restrict the Defendant father's capacity to manipulate, maneuver court actors to cover, falsely report the bad behavior of the father and fully perpetrate a fraud upon the court, to the ongoing harm of a helpless baby and vulnerable family.

Jill Jones-Soderman

COMPLAINT AGAINST HEATHER SASLOVSKY

Heather Saslovsky has made overt acts, inappropriately to block the Protective Order requested of the court against the Defendant father. She had clearly been in contact with the father 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. * 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. 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.* 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