

A Formal Request was made to The Judicial Review Board of New York by The Foundation for the Child Victims of the Family Courts, for Immediate Removal of Judge Gloria Lintner Sosa from a Custody Hearing to be held 2/18/2015; Case: M vs. M

Basis of Complaint:

Judge Sosa previously removed custody of two children from Ms. M, a protective mother, and placed them into the hands of the absentee parent, Mr. M, who has an extensive history of Domestic Violence, Child Abuse, Child Neglect, and Animal Abuse. There are also accusations of his collusion with attorneys representing his ex-wife, and other serious complaints against Mr. M.

Complaints against numerous lawyers involved in this case are being referred to the appropriate authorities, and are of course not part of this complaint against Judge Sosa. However, we wish to make explicitly clear that there are indications of Judge Sosa's alleged collusion with lawyers against Ms. M., the primary custodian of the children for sixteen years, which will be indicated in the complaint and attached exhibits.

The case involves Ms. M and her two children, age 13, and age 16. Evidence has been documented as to the degree of emotional, personal and economic pain Mr. M has purposefully directed toward Ms. M.

Multiple abuses and unconscionable harm done to Ms. M and her two children, harm which was facilitated by the Court, Mr. M, and the collusive attorneys of Ms. M. Our client and her children cry out for immediate intervention and justice, which will begin with the removal of Judge Sosa from this case, allowing the Court to move forward objectively, so that Ms. M can rightfully be reunited with her children.

Please note that Judge Sosa transferred custody of the above named children on Oct. 10, 2013 from the care of the protective parent, who had been the sole caretaker of the children for sixteen years, until custody was suddenly transferred to Mr. M under highly bizarre and questionable circumstances, which are described in detail below.

Judge Sosa's actions in this case speak to her indiscriminately transferring custody to a wealthy parent who could afford to litigate his case for vindictive purposes. Over many years, we allege that Mr. M has harassed, and abused his wife, who had filed domestic violence charges against him and fled from the comforts of their home, community and sumptuous life style.

Ms. M's ex-husband is Mr. M, is employed by Morgan Stanley as a highly paid executive whose compensation, aside from salary, includes bonus income, all of which should be well documented, but is curiously not in the record. His job involves extensive

travel over long periods of time – minimally weeks at a time. This fact as well should be well documented but was not noted by the Court. His children, since the custody transfer to him, have been allegedly cared for by a nanny, and transported as needed by car services. His many attempts at alienating the children from their mother have included his refusal to allow any contact with her via phone or visitation. In fact, no such Visitation Schedule exists.

Judge Sosa neglectfully failed to attend to an Order for a Parenting Plan, or a Visitation Schedule. Her decision left all control, decision making, and visitation in the hands of the accused abuser without any inquiry as to why a change of custody was suddenly being requested. In fact, Mr. M presented no verified complaint against Ms. M in Judge Sosa's Court to in any way justify transferring custody of her two children from her. More relevant to this immediate complaint, Ms. M never even received notice of that highly significant hearing, and was therefore not present at the hearing.

This very bizarre event was apparently arranged by Ms. M attorneys with her ex-husband's lawyer, and permitted the clear violation of the due process rights of Ms. M, with the alleged knowledge of Judge Sosa. The matter of mysterious hearings in Judge Sosa's Court related to this case include the disappearance/ sudden appearance of key actors in Court, and form the basis of this complaint. We therefore allege that Judge Sosa's failure to conduct her Court properly in that case, and Ms. M's attorneys' failure to object to the outrageous Court proceedings at that time, and their failure to provide an active defense for her on numerous fronts constitutes a clear violation of her rights and the law, and violates the Judge's right to preside over the hearing on Feb. 18, 2015.

It is important to note, as part of the context and egregious damages implicit in this complaint, that both children have an extensive history of physical and emotional disabilities and challenges of an extremely serious, life threatening nature. As the children were impetuously transferred to Mr. M's custody, the many services provided for these children's care, including educational, medical and psychiatric, have been terminated. Public school has been substituted for the private schools they attended; medical and psychiatric providers with on-target specialties have been substituted with providers covered by Mr. M chosen medical plan, which appears to be the least generous policy provided by the normally platinum-standard insurance available to employees of Morgan Stanley.

When the children were in the care of their mother, Mr. M contributed minimally to the children's expenses, such as private school. Ms. M's mother, Mrs. H paid enormous amounts of money to care for her grandchildren's special needs.

Mrs. H has been totally cut off from any contact with her grandchildren, and has been unable to support their needs or have a relationship with them. Mr. M has done

everything in his power to harass, deprive, interfere with, and fail to repay his financial obligations to her. Mrs. H loaned hundreds of thousands of dollars to Mr. M., which he failed to repay.

The promissory notes and other forms of proof of his fiscal negligence toward his wife, children and mother-in-law are in our possession. Funds due to Mrs. H., as a result of loans and as a result of litigation for which Mrs. H paid, resulting in financial settlement have not been paid by Mr. M. Additionally, Mr. M has sought to block Mrs. H from having her funds disbursed to her from an attorney's trust account. The funds in question have been due to Mrs. H since 2007. Because of Mr. M's interference, additional funds due to Mrs. H cannot be pursued through the Board of Education, as the statute of limitations has been exceeded re payment of special education needs not covered by the public school system.

Due to Judge Sosa's empowering Mr. M, he has blocked all visitation and phone contact between the children and their extremely devoted grandmother. Parental alienation is an actionable offense, particularly in New York. The numerous documented accounts of Mr. M's alienation of the children while they were in Ms. M's custody, considered a form of severe child abuse, was never noted or taken into consideration by Judge Sosa in her decision to transfer custody and complete control to Mr. M.

Since the time Mr. M has laid claim to the possession of the children as per the earlier order of Judge Sosa, he has refused the children any contact with their mother by phone or personal visitation. His attempts at alienation of both children from their mother are well known, and we anticipate his attempt to charge Ms. M with abandonment of her children, when in fact she had not.

As a domestic violence victim with a history of TRO's against Mr. M in two states, and multiple police reports against him for intimidation, personal harm, and defamation, Ms. M cannot engage in reasonable contact with her children by phone or personal communication. Any attempt to contact the children results in a barrage of threatening, intimidating, controlling, and manipulative e-mails in batches of 40 to 50 on every occasion. Attempts at personal contact with the children have proven to be of a life threatening nature, as per multiple documentations in police reports. Ms. M has repeatedly asked for protection from her ex-husband, describing her intense fear for her own life and that of her children and her pets. Her dogs were sent to live with her mother when she feared for their lives after the death of one dog and abuse of two other dogs by Mr. M.

It is also important to note that Mr. M has been accused of heinous acts of child and animal abuse. The most serious charges of various forms of child abuse and neglect were referred to CPS and taken seriously, until Mr. M made contact with a corrupt CPS

worker, who operates a “visitation center” and is a CPS resource. Suddenly Mr. M became a devotee of this CPS worker, paying Ms. M fees to him as an appointed “parenting coordinator”, despite the fact that Ms. M never requested such payment by Mr. M.

The Forensic Evaluation team that are a division of The Foundation are inquiring into what further payments Mr. M made to the CPS worker, as once that worker entered the case, CPS case workers were clearly intimidated, as per correspondence in the records. Investigations related to charges made by the children were dropped, as were investigations into the three hospitalizations for suicidal threats made by the thirteen year old son, who stated intense fear of the father. The children were exposed to extreme, incessant domestic violence and animal abuse on the part of Mr. M, yet due to Judge Sosa's casual handling of this case, Mr. M has become the arbiter of all information in the case, effectively shutting up anyone who would speak against him.

It is alleged that Mr. M was able to perpetrate a fraud upon the Court, with the suspected collusion of Judge Sosa, Ms. M appeared at a hearing before Judge Sosa in 2013. Her attorney was present and Mr. M's attorney was present, and Ms. M was told that Mr. M was away on a business trip. What transpired was, that the date at which all the attorneys and Ms. M were present, was suddenly deemed an “incorrect date” and Ms. M was asked to leave the Court. An ex parte communication between Mr. M's lawyer and Ms. M's lawyer was then held with the Judge. Ms. M was given a new court date, along with her attorney. However, several days late, her attorney mysteriously withdrew his representation of Ms. M via a phone call, leaving her with no representation at the next hearing.

Ms. M was without counsel, and, as per her sworn statements, subject to various forms of intimidation, manipulation and withholding of alimony payments, which then caused her to lose the home she rented as a residence with her children, in the neighborhood where the children attended school. Ms. M was left in financial crisis because of Mr. M's manipulation of alimony payments, and no one referred him to court for an order of payment through probation. At that point, Ms. M was forced by Judge Sosa to give temporary custody of the children to Mr. M.

Had Mr. M been ordered by Judge Sosa to repay funds that he borrowed from Mrs. H, or, had the Judge ordered those funds held in escrow, owed to Ms. H, Ms. M would not have had any financial instability. Judge Sosa questioned Ms. M, but never questioned Mr. M's contribution to destabilizing Ms. M's situation, his abusive behavior toward the children, or his ability to care for the children.

Ms. M's whereabouts were always known to her attorney and to Mr. M's attorney. The court date scheduled by her attorney to discuss custody was, as per accusations of failure

to present notice of service, was never known to Ms. M. The written notice of the court date was never received by her. Instead of the court ordering Mr. M to pay his alimony debt, the court failed to provide any form of notification to the protective parent, in effect manipulating her so that she would not appear in court on the date ordered for the crucial hearing.

Ms. M would have been present at the court date if informed of the date by the court, or even by Mr. M's attorney, with whom she was in touch. At this time Mrs. H sent a fax to Mr. M's attorney. Ms. M was not informed of the hearing date, though Mr. M's attorney was well aware of her new address, as noted by the fact that her office sent a check for \$9,000 to Ms. M immediately after the hearing in which Judge Sosa agreed to the custody transfer, but with no arrangements for a parenting or visitation plan, despite the clearly high-conflict nature of the custody suit.

Ironically, Ms. M was not present at the hearing but was contacted by cell phone while court was in session. She was blind-sided by the Judge and Mr. M's attorney, who knew that Ms. M was not aware of the date of the hearing. As she was not represented, she was not aware of her right to demand a mistrial and to demand a postponement of this hearing date, based on alleged manipulation and fraud. Ms. M was then threatened with being held in contempt of court, but was not in any manner aware of her rights to object to the proceedings, or then to immediately appeal the proceedings set up to entrap her in Judge Sosa's Courtroom.

The complaint against Judge Sosa involves her alleged collusion with various attorneys involved in this case, and with Mr. M, who has been able to get away with spouse and child abuse, threats of physical harm, intimidation of witnesses and failure to pay alimony.

Spurious checks made out to Ms. M have been sent to different addresses in an attempt, we suspect, to locate her whereabouts. Debts of hundreds of thousands of dollars owed to Mr. M's mother in law were never paid. There are numerous exhibits we have in our possession indicating a level of extortion, fraud and fiscal malfeasance on the part of Mr. M, of which we allege allow him the cash flow to pay off various attorneys, court officials and others to serve his unconscionable purposes.

We state that Judge Sosa has allowed Ms. M's rights to be undermined and trampled, leading to the loss of custody of her children, and her current nearly helpless state. Judge Sosa's indifference to the plight of Ms. M and her children was an egregious action and must not be replayed on Feb. 18, 2015.

The actions of Judge Sosa are sadly not unique to this case, but are in fact part of her pattern of indifference and cruelty toward children. While we have great respect for the

undue burden placed on the Court staff and Judges due to under-funding and egregiously large case loads, we respectfully request the immediate removal of Judge Sosa from the case to be heard on Feb. 18th, 2015.