PARENTING RIGHTS INSTITUTE

Funding Request to end Discrimination and Criminalization of Fathers in Family Courts

Dr. Leon R. Koziol
Parenting Rights Institute
P.O. Box 8302
Utica, New York 13505
(315) 796-4000

Table of Contents

Opening Statement………… 3

About the Director………… 6

Crusade for Reform and Justice………… 7

Executive Summary………… 10

Organizational Structure…………11

Untapped Market for Accountability………….... 12

Family Court Epidemic…………........... 12

1. Meaningful reform is reliant upon free speech and family activism………….. 13
2. A well financed opposition is suppressing reform, accountability and education …… 14
3. Abuses in family court impact all parents…………........... 15

Federal Child Support Myth ………… 15

1. Litigation incentives produce serious harm to employers and our communities……… 16
2. Litigation costs burden taxpayers to their limits………….. 18
3. Government hypocrisy continues to divide families………….. 20
4. Institutional prejudice is criminalizing parenthood………… 21
5. Constitutional violations in family court lead to moral decay in society……………... 22
6. Government is manufacturing bad parents under the current custody scheme………... 23

Living Under a Custodial Institution of Childrearing…………... 25

A Realistic Plan for Overdue Reform………….. 27

1. An umbrella political action committee must be formed………… 27
2. The fast track for reform lies with our Supreme Court………… 27
3. Individual and group assistance can be achieved through educational programs……… 28
4. Parental advocates must be deployed to investigate misconduct………… 28
5. Creative professional services are being developed for each new client…………..... 29

Conclusion………….. 30

Opening Statement

Over the past half century, western society has seen an alarming transformation in fatherhood, from its traditional respected status to an incompetent, violent, absentee reputation. We have seen this trend in politics, entertainment, school districts, child rearing and social institutions. The act of denigrating a male parent or blaming him for a myriad of problems has become fashionable, even encouraged without so much as a critical footnote from mainstream media.

The infection of social thought with dad stigmatization might not be rectified any time soon, but when reverse sexism obtains legal protection, it is the duty of a self-governing people to respond. That duty begins in our family courts because this is where protected discrimination is most blatant and harmful to all society. A Supreme Court Justice once described these tribunals as "kangaroo" courts, but conditions since the time of that opinion have only seriously worsened.

This prospectus will show how that occurred, why corrective action is urgent, and it comes from a parental advocate who successfully litigated complex cases in federal and state courts for over thirty years. The goal is to raise sufficient funds behind a research, watchdog and lobbying entity to properly police and reform a self-regulated judicial bureaucracy where support enforcement and domestic violence by fathers obtain state prosecution but false accusations, clear perjury by spiteful moms, custody abuses and extortion through incarceration are ignored or covered up.

For background, during the 1970s, Congress began legislating laws to track down absentee fathers to ease a growing welfare burden. Well intentioned, these laws were never divested of male parent targeting. Exemplary is a January, 2016 "Dead Beat Dad" crusade by Arizona Governor Doug Ducey. Over time, the scope of enforcement practices was enlarged to include all "noncustodial parents." Its effect was to merge good, bad and absentee dads so that federal funding could be vastly increased while jeopardizing the long term viability of social security.

In a quest to maximize state revenues under Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, performance quotas were devised based on the number and magnitude of child support orders manufactured in family courts. The new rule of law became a profit motive for lawyers and lawyers on the bench. Through these "incentive grants," judicial impartiality was sacrificed to the almighty buck with much less value placed on father-child relationships. In callous manner, family judges were incarcerating dads to alarming levels for a debt euphemistically termed "child support."

In other debt instances, such imprisonment would be unlawful. But with children as its pretext and contempt of court as a weapon, the unconstitutional debtor prison was functionally resurrected with no public outcry. Gradually, these tribunals were rendered inherently prejudiced against fathers who may have simply been the victim of a bad economy. Lawyers were retained often with borrowed funds on a good faith belief that basic rights would avert the horror of being caged like an animal. No one came to the rescue because foxes were guarding the hen house.

In one of the most ironic twists, girls, women and moms were slaughtered along the way. Their own fathers, brothers, sons and partners became victims while countless dads recognizing the futility of fighting for their parental rights simply walked out of their children's lives. This only added to the epidemic, undermining the original goals behind these laws. As the carnage grew, so did the number and variety of beneficiaries in the way of evaluators, "experts," psychiatrists, pharmaceutical companies, mediators and more. They turned sparks of conflict into forest fires.

At first blush, the notion that courts are criminalizing fathers for profit is a hard pill to swallow. However, stripped of all the legal jargon and propaganda, draconian enforcement practices have been making criminals of non-criminal parents for many years while inciting crimes of horrific proportion including those committed by fatherless children in our schools, communities and workplaces. If those debtor practices were limited to the standard income and asset executions, we would not have the dubious distinction as the most imprisoned nation in the "free" world.

Despite profound advancements in equal rights for women, minorities and newly recognized classes of people, the Census Bureau continues to report that nearly 85% of parents paying child support are fathers. If those statistics were recorded for male employment, women would be rioting well beyond Trump's White House. A review of public warrant lists shows that as much as 20% of arrestees are connected to support. Inmate lists follow the same pattern. Nearly all are fathers with veterans and minorities most vulnerable to suicides, violence and drug addiction.

Fatherless children are often a factor in mass shootings. Even where dads remain active in separate parenting environments, their authority is countermanded by judges purporting to act in the "best interests" of children they can never truly know. The emasculation of men, a futility in asserting a father's basic rights and the sexist stigma of "dead beat dads" promote abandonment of vital parenting roles which have stood the test of time. This is a system which presumes that a dad has no desire to support his offspring while torturing the very incentive for doing so.

There is no refund or accountability when recipients of these welfare styled benefits spend their tax-free "awards" on drug abuse, gambling or vanity excesses. Meanwhile, judges charged with the highest duty of safeguarding our rights are eroding them instead. An antiquated "child custody" system remains "the law" in most states in lieu of progressive shared parenting because custody and support "wars" are lucrative whereas co-parenting is not. For the same reason, the damage caused by this revenue generating scheme is highly suppressed from public knowledge.

Money has become the priority in place of our children's true best interests turning family courts into a socialist industry while making a mockery of our constitutions. Criminals, even violent felons, often receive lower sentences, less stigma and far greater rights than dads do here. They have freedom from self-incrimination, indigent free counsel, stricter due process protections, mandated disclosure, highest standard of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, jury rights and more.

In shocking contrast, a father can be incarcerated for extended periods without so much as an accusation of a crime and none of the rights just cited. And it can be wrapped up in a matter of months, even weeks. So reckless has it become that a contempt prosecution can be commenced by mail service of a summons with boldface capital letter warnings of arrest and imprisonment for up to seven years. Any non-appearance is ruthlessly answered by an arrest warrant instead of the standard default for other civil cases with an undertaking (bail) as a condition for release.

Should an errant debtor be fortunate to avoid immediate incarceration on a warrant, he will be "released on his own recognizance" no differently than an accused rapist. The entire process has been turned upside down with only the prosecuting parent given the benefit of free counsel. Indeed, when viewing the substance and not the formalities of these "family" court cases, they bear all the trappings of a criminal prosecution without the necessary constitutional safeguards.

In short, these "constitution-free zones" facilitate the easy imprisonment of fathers for profit. Worse yet, unlike any other targeted member of society, a debtor can become a revolving door inmate for an indefinite term of confinement, theoretically to the extreme of life imprisonment as a repeat offender. This is achieved through other draconian practices such as "imputed income" (judge speculated earnings), accruing monthly support obligations during incarceration, and a federal felony conviction should a father cross state lines under circumstances of flight.

Collection practices mirror those of loan sharks and underworld figures. Family judges know that payment will be made by high risk loans, employers or loved ones. The fleecing process is backed by the power of confinement. It was this sort of civil contempt, depicted as "keys to the jailhouse," which landed California attorney and judicial whistle blower Richard Fine in solitary at age 70 for 18 months. As the Los Angeles County Sheriff aptly decried on CNN, such cells would have been better occupied by criminals given early releases due to prison overcrowding.

The most ominous aspect of this court process is that the parent who has been advised to war against the other has little knowledge of the potential magnitude of destruction until it is too late. The children may suffer most in the end while the lawyers and beneficiaries simply walk away from the damage they cause when the money has all been tapped. Then they blame the outcomes on their clients. There is no honor, remorse or concern for any of the carnage because this is "the law" without any mention made of the bar associations and special interests which produced it.

In consequence, meaningful reform efforts have failed across the board. Protests have likewise been suppressed through abuses of a *parens patriae* power that would be the envy of the FBI, CIA and IRS. Viet Nam veteran Thomas Ball protested by burning himself alive in front of a New Hampshire family court. Unlike the self-immolation he tried to copy in Morocco resulting in global media coverage, this one got little notice. They merely swept his ashes into a sewer. Still, he left a manifesto showing how to construct Molotov cocktails for attacking courthouses.

What little reform may be evident is focused on symptoms such as domestic violence prevention. Its futility is borne out by such cases as an upstate New York police investigator who committed a murder-suicide leaving four children without either parent. A high conflict divorce led to the easily obtained protection order against the dad followed by career damage and the confiscation of weapons. When support court left investigator Joseph Longo subsisting on marginal income, it was the last straw. He resorted to a common kitchen knife to register his form of protest.

The tactic of child exploitation to serve an illicit purpose is not new. It has been routinely employed by tyrannical regimes throughout history. For example, Adolph Hitler advised in his book, Mein Kampf, that if the state simply declares it is acting for the benefit of children, the people will "happily" give up their rights. Here, the tyrant is not so much a person as it is a giant bureaucracy and the illicit nature is not a war machine but an insatiable taxing monster. It has been unleashed on sensitive family relationships with little regard for the higher laws of nature.

While all this background was not known by Walter Scott on April 4, 2015, the gist of it was when he fled a child support warrant at a traffic stop in South Carolina. A "repeat offender" of child support orders, he had done enough prison time without commission of a crime and was shot dead in the back five times unarmed by a white officer. It would have been publicized otherwise but the horrific act was captured on cell phone by a concealed pedestrian. That event was blamed on racism, but as we shall see, our family courts were now killing for money.

About the Director

Leon R. Koziol, J.D. is a lawyer placement consultant for intellectual property firms. He has established IP Confidential, an entity limited to addressing the employment and highly sensitive needs of professionals in the intellectual property market with a focus on patents. He is also a civil rights advocate who practiced law at all levels of courts until 2010 after more than 23 unblemished years. Self-trained, he generated a perfect record of acquittals in criminal cases.

Dr. Koziol remains an advocate for government abuse victims. He appeared on the CBS program 60 Minutes, front page of the New York Times, and other media.[1] A published book was discussed on CNN and his candidacy for Congress was a headline story in 2006. After years of complex litigation, he secured judgment in state supreme court invalidating the largest (billion dollar) casino compact in New York on constitutional grounds. He succeeded alone against high profile law firms such as Cravath, Swaine & Moore, LLP of Manhattan, one of the most prominent in the nation.

A Juris Doctor degree was conferred by Northern Illinois University, College of Law with an award from the American Bar Association in State and Local Government. Leon earned a Bachelor of Professional Studies degree from the State University of New York, College of Technology. Upon graduation, he joined the management team of a Fortune 500 manufacturer, later serving as a city corporation counsel, school district attorney and city councilman with a focus on risk management. His novel, *Voyage to Armageddon,* exposes a nuclear terrorist threat using domestic waterways.

Precedent cases include Patterson v City of Utica, 370 F.3d 322 (2nd Cir. 2004)($333,820.32 civil rights verdict argued before Justice Sonia Sotomayor); Oneida Nation v Oneida County, 132 F. Supp. 2d 71 (NDNY 2000); Peterman v Pataki, 2004 NY Slip Op 51092(U)(successful casino challenge for citizen group in both federal and state courts); Koziol v Hanna, 107 F. Supp. 2d 170 (NDNY 2000)(free speech challenge invalidating city gag order); Currie v Kowalewski, 842 F. Supp. 57 (NDNY 1994)(successful sexual harassment case), Palaimo v Lutz, 837 F. Supp. 55 (NDNY 1993)(brutality and confinement claims for 72 year old woman).

Dr. Koziol exposed misconduct at all levels of government, making him a predictable target of retribution. It compelled him to testify before the Moreland Commission on Public Corruption.[2]

---

[1] The term doctor is necessarily employed to distinguish between the role of PRI Director and former practicing attorney. This summary is not intended to convey legal advice and should not be relied upon for such purpose.

[2] Dr. Koziol was invited to testify before a "dream team" of experts on September 17, 2013 at Pace University. He recommended dissolution of the state's Judicial Conduct Commission due to a perception of accountability but a record of neglecting misconduct of higher judges convicted by federal authorities. Instead the Corruption Commission was prematurely dissolved when evidence began implicating top state leaders. Undaunted, a federal prosecutor, also a speaker along with future U.S. Attorney Loretta Lynch, secured the files resulting in the 2015 convictions of New York's Senate and Assembly leaders on bribery charges. It has implicated law firms, judges and millions of dollars in public money. Similarly undaunted, Dr. Koziol pressed on with court reform despite a witch hunt by ethics lawyers who were allowed to resign from their court appointed positions for falsifying time sheets. No public charges, ethical or criminal, were ever brought against them. In contrast, Leon was targeted for his public statements as conceded by the same lawyers in confidential proceedings with indefinite license suspension based on orchestrated ethics issues.

He has traveled to Paris, Washington D.C., United Nations, New York, California and elsewhere advocating for human rights in these courts. He submitted reports to oversight committees, international organizations and the Justice Department while monitoring court proceedings such as those of a Manhattan doctor, university professor and resort owner who together spent over $10 million in divorce lawyer fees. He was featured in a documentary produced by Dr. Joseph Sorge and Divorce Corp based on his whistle blowing and court reform activity.

Crusade for Reform and Justice

As a civil rights attorney, Dr. Koziol avoided divorce and family courts. But when he became a victim of both, it was natural to begin a crusade against sex discrimination practiced on fathers. It started innocently enough with public meetings and a plan of action patterned around other civil rights causes he had spearheaded. For example, in 1998, he was retained by a landowners group in upstate New York to fight a 250,000 acre land claim approved for the Oneida Indian Nation by the Supreme Court. That group was highly disorganized and grossly underfunded.

Accordingly, the strategy became multi-faceted insofar as nearly all political leaders were benefitting from the Oneida Turning Stone Casino with its new jobs, entertainment venues and world class resort. But a citizen protest recommended and directed by Leon became an instant success, yielding hundreds of vehicles to surround that casino, frustrating access and drawing national attention with a feature on 60 Minutes. This led to groups elsewhere retaining him for the same purpose regarding other claims. Thousands attended his speaking events, and after six years of fundraising, rallies, and lawsuits, the Supreme Court overturned its earlier decision.

In the case of father discrimination several years later, the same period of effort has yielded little success due to the overwhelming nature of opposition and an utter lack of funding. Nevertheless, Leon devised a similar strategy beginning with a planning session in the Plaza Hotel at Central Park in 2010, a parent convention the following year featuring a five time Super Bowl winner, and a Founding Fathers March in Washington D.C. It ended with a lobby initiative in Congress and the Justice Department where Leon had earlier met with lawyers and officials.

In June, 2012, a rally was held outside a federal appeals court in Manhattan during deliberations on Leon's precedent seeking case, *Parent v New York*. Three years later, he was recruited to promote an awareness campaign at the Super Bowl in San Francisco. Then, on June 17, 2016, a doctor, dentist, lawyer and engineer, all victimized dads from Florida, California, New York and Virginia, joined in a Fathers Day eve news conference on the Supreme Court steps to support Leon's filing for a writ to open our federal courts to victims of constitutional violations in family courts. He has vigorously pursued justice and overdue reform despite overwhelming odds.

Dr. Koziol's personal ordeal has fatefully transformed the current crusade into a life commitment. It began as a candidate for Congress in 2006 when child support under parental agreement was being diverted by the ex-spouse to his adversary in the way of donations made by her divorce lawyer. In the years which followed, family court was exploited to harm his subsequent runs for public office, it impaired operation of his law practice and ultimately caused the loss of contact with his precious daughters, all in retaliation for his reports and reform efforts.

The divorce lawyer's advice and intervention into a two year separation without incident incited controversy between cooperating parents. It was blamed entirely on a model father who was never been found to be unfit or the subject of any agency report. Three early years of litigation over the amount of child support resulted in a state supreme court judge ruling after trial that the figures contained in the parents' original and modified separation agreements were just and proper under the Child Support Standards Act (Title IV-D of the Social Security Act).

Similarly, after another three years of custody litigation, a family judge restored Leon's parenting time to the levels contained in those same agreements. However, during all six years of divorce, support and custody proceedings into the year 2012, Leon exposed vast misconduct not only on his case but among others across the country. With each public forum, news conference or legal challenge, a corresponding act of retaliation occurred among biased judges and ethics lawyers. It led to a record removal of 40 trial level jurists from his ever complicating family court matters.

For example, Leon moved for disqualification of his custody judge before trial in 2011 based on "political espionage" successfully litigated against that judge by his chief family court clerk in the federal civil rights case, Morin v Tormey, Hedges, et. al., 626 F.3d 40 (2nd Cir. 2010). Leon was highly criticized by opposing lawyers for that motion claiming that Judge Bryan Hedges had a reputation beyond reproach until he was removed permanently from the bench after admitting to sexual abuse of his handicapped, five year old niece, In re Hedges, 20 NY3d 677 (2013).

Leon also reported the misconduct of lawyers. Like the political donations, child support was being diverted for fees to effectively avenge and censor public criticisms. The divorce lawyer was reported for filing papers in the wrong court, making false charges of "hiding income," offering a boiler plate decree with his own client guilty of cruel and inhumane treatment, and a protection order for publicizing entrusted information. The judge-appointed, child lawyer was reported for clear perjury. No action was taken against either while Leon was being pursued for "discrepancies," set-ups and anonymous complaints eventually verified to come from lawyers.

Such reports triggered the first ethics prosecution against Leon on January 9, 2008 after more than two decades of unblemished practice. It was commenced the same day as arguments before an appeals judge who was also a member of the lawyer disciplinary court. Those arguments reiterated the misconduct of that divorce lawyer who, unknown at the time, happened to be a member of the prosecuting ethics committee appointed by the same court. Over time, the discreet mission became sadistically clear: to divert harm upon court reputation by defaming a credible whistle blower and his reform message through an abuse of judicial immunity and public office.

In 2010, Leon took a personal stand against the ongoing discrimination against fathers in these courts. He did so by withholding child support payments resulting in the first suspension of his law license. The event gained immediate front page news with the twist that no one is above the law replete with dead beat slurs and other defamatory matter. In continuing news reports and editorials, Leon countered with comparisons to Susan B. Anthony who refused to pay her fine for the crime of voting and Martin Luther King Jr. who refused to leave Birmingham jail until centuries of race discrimination was finally addressed. It expanded into a national reform effort.

When state courts refused to hear Leon's constitutional challenges, [3] he resorted to federal court with a civil rights case attempted initially as a class action. While victimized parents across the country were anxious to join, funding was never included to maintain such a vast undertaking. It was therefore allowed to proceed by a federal judge under the fictitious name, John Parent, to signify all fathers similarly situated. To overcome a complex set of obstacles, it was necessary to name judges individually who were now substituting as parents or oppressors of free speech.

As a seasoned lawyer, litigant and parent at the time, Dr. Koziol was simply following "the law" when he sued so many individuals as opposed to the state as the principal defendant. This law was articulated by the Supreme Court in Ex Parte Young, 209 US 123 (1908) to overcome state immunity and Supreme Court of Virginia v Consumers Union, 446 US 719 (1980) to overcome judicial immunity. Neither case was cited in a 46 page opinion in Parent v New York, 786 F. Supp. 2d 516 (NDNY 2011). Instead the case was dismissed on a series of grounds which routinely protect judge and lawyer misconduct. It was affirmed by a federal appeals court on yet another ground of abstention in deference to state courts for the vindication of federal rights.

Such good faith deference proved to be highly misplaced as the persecution by state judges only elevated in retaliation. On Constitution Day, 2013, Dr. Koziol testified before the Moreland Commission on Public Corruption along with federal prosecutor Preet Bharara and future U.S. Attorney General Loretta Lynch (footnote 2). He exposed the latest family judge for his finding of fictional college degrees in a scheme to elevate child support for punitive contempt and incarceration purposes. Within three months of that testimony, that same judge ended all contact with his critic's daughters through gross violations of due process, such bizarre conditions as "prohibited alcohol related gestures" (wedding toast) and disregarded severe parental alienation.

This triggered a fourth civil rights action in 2014 essentially to prove that the preceding federal judges were wrong in their deference practices given the intervening events, appellate abstention which displaced any decision on the merits, and a 2013 Supreme Court opinion in Sprint v Jacob that unanimously condemned federal court abuses of abstention practices to dismiss valid cases. But the last judge, Gary Sharpe, was adverse from the outset causing a motion for his removal based on Sharpe's prior removal from a case by the same federal appeals court in United States v Cossey, 632 F.3d 82 (2nd Cir. 2011). There, Judge Sharpe was sharply condemned for his finding of a human gene for decisions that would not be discovered "for another fifty years." Because family genetics were at issue in the *Koziol* lawsuit, the motion was proper but denied anyway as a "Hail Mary pass," resulting in punitive sanctions and even a conditional future filing order.

---

[3] The early profound refusal was demonstrated in the decisional series, Koziol v Hawse-Koziol 60 AD3d 155 (4th Dept 2009). There a state appeals court affirmed the rulings of a lower court divorce judge who stated on the record that he would not entertain constitutional challenges to the federal and state Child Support Standards Acts (Title IV-D) or the related misconduct of lawyers and state agents. Hence the statutory prerequisite of notice to the state attorney general was not made pursuant to New York CPLR 1012. However, its companion requirement, Executive Law section 71 placed that duty in the hands of the presiding trial judge if the challenger failed to do so. That legal duty was never mentioned in the 2009 appellate series, hence facilitating the adverse outcome. A simple review of the decisional series and cited statutes shows without question that this high level state court was proclaiming that the people were required to follow our legislated laws but judges could disregard them for self-serving reasons. One year later, that same entire appeals court disqualified itself from all domestic and disciplinary matters then pending, only to return in 2013 with a vengeance after the Supreme Court refused to hear Leon's Parent v New York case.

More than 100 decisions and orders were issued since Dr. Koziol filed his divorce in 2006 as an uncontested case. It was based on agreement and co-parenting. Nearly all those edicts came about through a process Leon has described as "Orchestrated Law" in his latest book, *Satan's Docket: Corruption and Carnage in America's Divorce Industry*. It is a tell-all literary work that documents his horrific ordeal with an education and reform objective. In short, an orchestrated decisional process features judges bent on achieving a predetermined outcome by citing only those facts and laws which enable it while ignoring the proverbial "elephant in the court room."

In retaliation for that publication and editorials of 2017, judge #41 was assigned in 2018 to this endless divorce. Gerald Popeo is a Utica, New York city judge who was publicly censured in 2015 by the New York Commission on Judicial Conduct. He was never removed despite a hearing judge who found that he had made racist remarks to an African-American attorney, violent threats to litigants from the bench, and contempt sentences in violation of due process.

Gerald Popeo was assigned as an "Acting Family Judge." He denied a disqualification motion supported by a sworn witness statement disclosing that only months earlier, citizen Popeo had approached Leon at a bar irate over the false belief that he was part of the witch hunt resulting in that censure. As judge, he denied the bar incident as he did the off-record racist remarks in the censure case. There was also a civil rights case history between the two including a black city official who attempted suicide after Popeo jailed him. All charges were dismissed by a jury.

The serial misconduct of Judge Popeo mandated removal. But a former state supreme court judge was his defense counsel, and he was let loose as a repeat offender might to harm more litigants. His assignment to "family" court was particularly alarming given his condescending arrogance, abuse of contempt power and violent temperament both on and off the bench. Leon's crusade is a testament to his commitment for judicial reform but it also shows the extreme cruelties that will be inflicted to keep this family court gold mine intact. In the end, this conscientious crusade may save vulnerable parents in our family courts with their high percentage of self-representation.

Executive Summary

Parenting Rights Institute was founded as a parental advocacy group in 2010. It relies on donors and purchases to avoid government control and censorship. Such concerns are well placed. A family judge imposed a gag order on personal and organizational websites which was removed after Dr. Koziol obtained a show cause order against that judge in New York Supreme Court on May 3, 2016. Another gag order was effectively placed on the same sites by ethics lawyers in 2013 prior to their discharge for falsified time sheets. The main one, Leon Koziol.com has been visited over 200,000 times by lawyers, doctors, professors, parents, politicians, media, law enforcement, investigators, researchers and an international social media following of 6,000.

PRI has seized upon a growing market of divorce and family court victims with unfilled needs such as lawyer and judge accountability. In virtually all states, judicial commissions and bar associations have failed in their self-regulatory duties. In 2016, for example, both New York and

California reported that over 90% of complaints were never even investigated. PRI has therefore become a "Judicial Watch" for domestic courts with inadequate funding as its main impediment.

Beyond that, a secondary market has arisen for parents seeking periodic professional assistance as self-represented parties. In addition, a high demand has been verified for represented litigants to obtain independent and qualified assessments of divorce, custody and support cases by parent advocates removed from the influences of jurists, politics, bar associations and media. PRI has responded with such unconventional offerings as video documentaries for misconduct victims in targeted courts. It has prepared client manuscripts for book publication, sent reports to oversight committees, provided creative solutions to complex issues, formulated a Court Strategy Program ©, and sponsored public forums. This niche has attracted a worldwide subscription base.

Due to its many reform activities, PRI has secured valuable contacts across the country. From victimized parents to network advocates, a ready base of volunteers exists to exploit an untapped revenue potential while advancing long overdue reforms to a divorce and family court industry that is harming businesses, families and our moral fiber as a nation. A vast pool of human resources is available for various contract assignments that can greatly reduce overhead costs in the early months of strategic growth activity. Satellite offices are already being cultivated through advanced use of laptops, i-phones and other technical devices in a highly mobile society.

This Institute was conceived by an accomplished trial lawyer with management experience in a Fortune 500 firm. Unlike other members of the bar, he is removed from influences that could otherwise compromise this bold project. Although the Institute has yet to file its first test case, Dr. Leon Koziol has filed many. His mixed results are remarkable given the lack of resources and compensated staff. Prior successes and a passion for justice verify a tremendous potential however. This is further verified by such overburdened enterprises as Judicial Watch, Human Rights Watch, Heritage Foundation and Amnesty International which are virtually inaccessible.

There is no comparable entity serving a quickly growing market for divorce and family court accountability. The "Custodial Institution of Childrearing," as described elsewhere in this report, is a trillion-dollar industry exploited by lawyers, psychiatrists, evaluators, counsellors, clerks, mediators, case workers, forensic experts and the latest addition styled as "divorce coaches." Custody courts are now yielding controversy of unprecedented variety and intensity with victims prepared to sacrifice all their assets to achieve justice for their offspring. Donor funding and investments are consequently sought to satisfy this demand without the exploitation. A 2018 goal of raising between three and five million dollars has been set. Tentatively we are committed to a main office in Manhattan to open the same year and a multi-tasking staff of qualified advocates.

Organizational Structure

The organizational structure remains embryonic due to a lack of major funding. At present, it consists of a loose network of parental advocates from around the country who have met periodically, attended conferences and collaborated to address various cases referred for strategic action. In 2012, the first PRI office was opened in a law office suite in Utica, New York. Discussions have arisen to open offices in Chicago, Los Angeles and Texas. It is part of a social media group cultivated over the years that yields vital and highly suppressed information.

Our experience has shown that divorce and family court victims across the country are highly supportive of this initiative. Many have offered office space without charge, others have offered a list of referrals from their volunteer organizations, and the variety of developed services touch upon many lines of employment. The harm to parents of all backgrounds is so extensive that a recruiting enterprise can be harnessed from this initiative to place highly qualified employment candidates with investors. For example, a PRI office in Silicon Valley or other targeted locations could provide discreet assistance to patent agents, IP lawyers and corporate executives to better monitor their divorce cases. A return on such an investment is boundless. Even without financial success, a profound return is made in the way of social justice, children and future generations.

Untapped Market For Accountability

Future generations will look back on today's domestic relations courts and be amazed at how truly barbaric they once were. A scheme of laws and processes derived from feudal equity doctrines has been retained which features loving parents engaged in brutal contests over their offspring in a public arena. A winner-take-all battle for custody leads to overregulation of families by the state and marginalization, alienation or outright extinction of one fit parent from the children's lives. Anal investigations of the combatants' backgrounds by self-serving advisors incite further controversy to last a lifetime. It is a spectacle reminiscent of the Roman Coliseum.

No person or entity has ever completed a comprehensive study of the vast detriment which this archaic custody and support system has had upon our society. Any such effort would assuredly be stymied by the beneficiaries of a lucrative child control industry. However, common sense dictates that our nation could be well served with sweeping reforms here in our least scrutinized branch of government. We can put a man on the moon, split atoms, engage artificial intelligence and achieve vast breakthroughs in medicine but remain unable to extricate family courts from their nineteenth century practices. This public and business initiative aims to do exactly that.

The professional services developed here arise from decades of court experience and specialized activity. A summary of that background is now provided to gain a better appreciation for the potential returns on any investment in this Institute. We begin with an analysis of oppressive court practices, why they have been tolerated so long with hardly an acknowledgment from our Supreme Court. Next, we detail their impact on taxpayers, public health and worker productivity followed by a briefing of institutionalized child rearing. We close with a plan of action built upon existing services. Interwoven among these segments is a free speech initiative based on successful litigation which, as stated, included removal of a judge's "gag order" on our website.

Family Court Epidemic

Welcome to the most important read you may undertake as a concerned citizen. Our government today is engaged in the lucrative expansion of a child control bureaucracy through antiquated custody doctrine that is harming our families, economy and moral fiber as a nation. This vast public enterprise has invaded every aspect of private life, often wielding power beyond that exercised by

the NSA, CIA or IRS. It affects more than half the parenting population, eroding childrearing rights declared by our Supreme Court to be the "oldest liberty interest" protected under our Constitution.

This interest is shared equally by fathers and mothers. But in practice, the male half has not been accorded its rightful place among our human rights due to a profit motive in family courts driven by needless custody, support and divorce contests. The injuries were sufficiently pervasive to cause PRI to take our case for human rights violations to Paris in 2014. One million people gathered in a matter of days there with world leaders to support free press after terrorists attacked a newspaper office. Here, more than 70 million fathers have yet to exploit their own rights after a century of widespread discrimination. In 2016, we participated in related conferences at the United Nations.

Such discrimination may be burdening career women more than their counterparts. High profile figures are particularly vulnerable. It is an epidemic which is causing each new generation to progressively abandon all manner of religion. Fathers are a vital fabric of any social or family structure. Unfortunately, federal entitlement laws have marginalized their roles to eventual extinction. Mothers will be next as part of a New World Order bent on institutionalizing childrearing much like education already is. When lawyers train mainstream parents to war over their children, a case is easily made that the state is more qualified to raise our children. When money is sufficiently fleeced from the combatants, former lawyers on the bench blame the parents.

It is an ominous trend, and this summary explains why it is occurring. An ambitious plan of action is provided to reverse the damage to America's parents and children through private accountability missions, exposure of hidden corruption, shared parenting legislation and public education initiatives. An unprecedented effort is needed to establish a political action group, speaking tours, influential endorsements, precedent seeking actions and united group activity.[4]

1. Meaningful reform is reliant upon free speech and family activism.

We are ostensibly a self-governing nation. But to live up to this ideal, free speech must be "robust" and uncensored according to our Supreme Court and United Nations protocols. To be sure, speech may be more valuable to a free society than voting because it promotes informed decisions, valuable discourse and a government accountable to the people on a daily basis. When it was exercised here, retributions arose through the very courts being criticized despite their high duty to safeguard speech under the same Constitution. Meanwhile, warring parents have fractured

[4] PRI Director Leon Koziol was featured at a Family Law Conference in our nation's capital on November 15-16, 2014. Sponsored by a reform entity known as Divorce Corp, it attracted parental experts and advocates from most of our fifty states. During opening remarks by the host, Dr. Joseph Sorge, it was disclosed that two New York lawyers were being targeted for their public criticisms by our courts including Dr. Koziol by name. It was also explained how the state was endeavoring to censor a June, 2014 public interview by Dr. Sorge on the subject of custody and support reform. It can be viewed by searching Divorce Corp and Leon Koziol on the internet. This kind of censorship is truly alarming for an American form of government particularly as it deprives the public of vital information from those most qualified to secure meaningful reforms. Moreover, it deters lawyers generally from disclosing misconduct which is rampant in our nation's family courts. With overcrowded dockets caused by revenue driven court battles, a vast amount of misconduct is unintentional, but the damage is nevertheless passed on to the litigants, employers, innocent children and extended families with little remorse. The PRI has continued to challenge such abuses despite the severe retributions. At the conference, Dr. Koziol drew a standing ovation.

all hope for a united reform movement. This is how a self-regulated government industry has been able to perpetuate itself through civil rights abuses, if necessary, without detection or recourse.

2. <u>A well financed opposition is suppressing reform, accountability and education.</u>

If you are not yet convinced of the critical need for action and financial support, consider the fact that there are approximately 300,000 lawyers in the states of California and New York alone with as many law school candidates as there are practicing attorneys nationwide. There is no end in sight to this glut entering the market on an annual basis, and the least qualified lawyers typically end up in family court. This is where apprentices learn their trade and marginal advocates can instigate lucrative controversy to last an entire career. It begets a host of forensic additions to the mix by request or court order, including psychiatrists, law guardians and social workers, all in the business of dictating how our children are to be raised on vague, conflicting or utopian standards.

Accountability is as nonexistent as the number of malpractice cases arising in these tribunals. In the medical profession, a surgeon who performs needless operations for profit is discovered through an objective review process. In family court, when a lawyer performs a needless hearing for profit, there is no similar review, no real measure for competent performance. The all-encompassing child's "best interests" can be satisfied by any half-baked participant, and parental alienation is a damage claim that is typically non-recoverable. If you are a person who has not yet been harmed by this system, you pay the price for it in taxes and social costs at the very least.

We all have some recognition of the injustices, but do we really know the severity of harm which is resulting? If a model citizen and conscientious civil rights attorney can be singled out and deprived of his liberties to the extreme verified here, the ramifications for every day citizens and parents should be very alarming. This trend is supported by numerous studies over the past three decades which show that father discrimination is at the root of today's unprecedented social problems. After an exhaustive review of such studies in an article entitled, "Is There Really a Fatherhood Crisis," Professor Stephen Baskerville places the blame on government itself:

> Virtually every major social pathology has been linked to fatherless children: violent crime, drug and alcohol abuse, truancy, unwed pregnancy, suicide, and psychological disorders – all correlating more strongly with fatherlessness than with any other single factor, surpassing even race and poverty. The majority of prisoners, juvenile detention inmates, high school dropouts, pregnant teenagers, adolescent murderers, and rapists come from fatherless homes. Children born from affluent but broken families are much more likely to get into trouble than children from poor but intact ones, and white children from separated families are at higher risk than black children in intact families. The connection between single-parent households and crime is so strong that controlling for this factor erases the relationship between race and crime as well as between income and crime….
>
> Marshalling federal agencies to "promote" something as private and personal as a parent's relationship with his own children raises questions. The assumption that the government has a legitimate role in ameliorating the problem of fatherlessness also glides quickly over the more fundamental question of whether the government has had a role in

creating the problem. What we see in the "fatherlessness crisis" may be an optical illusion. What many are led to believe is a social problem may in reality be an exercise of power by the state. See Independence Review, vol VIII, n 4, Spring 2004, at pp. 485-486.

3. Abuses in family court impact all parents.

This "fatherlessness crisis" is fueled by discriminatory practices with little concern for human rights. Most states claim that no preference exists for either parent in childrearing cases. But this idle declaration is voided by Census Bureau reports or a simple visit to any family court. It is an insult to our Bill of Rights. These courts have been described as "constitution-free zones," but they enjoy no special exclusion under our Constitution simply because they announce a commitment to children. Hence, father discrimination is only one of many court abuses being addressed here.[5]

By simply declaring the child to be a source of concern, the state is able to exploit power which was never ceded to it by the people. It is thereby able to monitor and control our private lives even where the infringements have no justification. As concerned parents, we will applaud any measure stated to be in the best interests of our children. But we fail to recognize the freedoms sacrificed along the way. We fail to test the proclamations, to look behind the political posturing or beyond its propaganda. It gives pause to recall one state leader who understood this power:

> "The state must declare the child to be the most precious treasure of the people. As long as the government is perceived as working for the benefit of children, the people will happily endure almost any curtailment of liberty and almost any deprivation."
>
> Adolph Hitler, Mein Kampf, Publ. Houghton Miflin, 1943, pg. 403.

Federal Child Support Myth

As a general observation, industrialists sell products, government sells services, businesses sell both, doctors sell advice and cures, psychiatrists sell therapy and medications, and lawyers sell controversies and compensation. Of all these "stocks in trade" the last is most harmful to our families. They do not belong in a forum created to protect children. When government makes it profitable for its participants to incite controversy over money, the worst kind of evil emerges. Minor disputes erupt into major ones with the words of an unscrupulous lawyer adept at abusing the system for fee purposes. In the end, a protracted court battle yields irrevocable harm.

---

[5] In July, 2010, PRI Director was a featured speaker at a family preservation conference in Washington D.C. Following his presentation, another speaker described her work as a domestic relations counselor, relating personal horrors as an alienated child and later, an alienating mother. She broke down emotionally after citing the pending death of her own father. The latent suffering she visibly depicted regarding her family and children at the hands of the state could not be reversed or remedied. Years of deprivations could not be regained. Such injuries to direct and collateral victims everywhere must be presented to policymakers and our courts to elicit real change. Diverse harm caused by this system is leading to health costs and premature death in countless victims. Had this effort been properly financed in earlier decades, such harm could have been prevented. It is a timely issue touching upon so many others in dramatic fashion.

Parental discretion over "child support" was systematically seized by the state under a federal entitlement law known as the Child Support Standards Act, or Title IV-D of the Social Security Act. Ostensibly legislated to provide greater regularity, it has instead produced enforcement practices which at least one British court has described as "draconian" when denying extradition to the states. So barbaric has it become that traffic cops are now murdering unarmed fathers fleeing from child support (money collection) warrants in South Carolina (Walter Scott murder). Debtor prisons returned under the guise of "civil contempt" while our federal government has elevated the number of support related suicides among veterans and public safety officers.

This barbaric process has survived decades of progress in other areas of human rights because its beneficiaries have declared "child support" to be at all times in our children's "best interests." In reality, a growing number of self-sufficient parents are being deprived vital involvement in their children's lives due to the court battles incited by this federal law. It has resulted in far greater long term damage to America's children than "child support" was supposed to prevent.

Unfortunately, the laws were drafted to cultivate, encourage and even incentivize conflict. The very structure for resolution is built upon an unsupported foundation for distributing childrearing authority between superior and inferior parents. Shared parenting initiatives have failed time and again in the states due to a universal failure to invalidate the archaic system which is being protected. Many never even make it the floors of our state legislatures. A major objective of this business plan, therefore, is to debunk the child support myth through public awareness of its untold detriments as categorized next.

1. <u>Litigation incentives produce serious harm to employers and our communities.</u>

We are already the most litigious nation in the world. Under the Title IV-D custody mandate and child support framework, the damage to our overall productivity is only escalating. However, the harm is being inflicted upon innocent children. They are being "protected" by taxpayer financed lawyers who exploit the lucrative nature of a parental contest over one's offspring. If we are ever going to reign in this epidemic, conscience and logic dictate that it must start in family court. Here litigious conduct is encouraged by the so-called "law" even where it conflicts with supreme laws such as equal protection, due process and parenting rights. In this report, we show how this contradiction between principle and practice is being achieved even in cooperative settings, thereby inundating our workplaces and communities with all the terrible side-effects.

Parents, employers and witnesses of all variety are required to take time off from work to attend needless family hearings every day, often waiting idle for long periods before being called for stressful testimony, if at all. Countless victims return to work burdened by emotional distresses which lower productivity. This is a subject which warrants greater emphasis because the business community is generally aloof from the combined damage which this "custody" system is inflicting on its bottom line. Industry and community leaders assume that conflict is natural in such forums. Therefore, a candid depiction showing the opposite is needed starting again with our supreme laws.

Parenting is an inherent constitutional right that takes precedence over state law. Equal treatment and due process, on the other hand, are express rights. When all three are invaded simultaneously by profit-oriented custody and support doctrine, the conflicts escalate manifold. As Americans, we

are naturally drawn to fight oppressive (inferior) laws legislated by those beholden to special interests. The 2016 elections represented an outsider fight to restore integrity in Washington. But in family court, the injustices are occurring with little accountability. A growing number of parents are being required to support a child they never knew existed even after ten years. Many more find themselves on the outside subjected to all manner of stigma or stereotype. In short, constitutional violations are being promoted by the very courts where fair and equal treatment is properly sought.

Like "separate but equal" doctrine fashioned at one time by the courts to segregate families on account of race, unequal custody doctrine segregates on account of profit. When parents separate, a form of segregation in childrearing naturally occurs, but it need not be so invasive as the states have made it today. Overregulation has been artificially created based on orchestrated issues for profit. As we have steadfastly asserted in our reports to Congress and Justice Department, federal incentive laws mandate unequal segregation even where parents are predisposed to cooperate. In Bast v Rossoff, 91 NY2d 723 (1998), two attorneys with near equal incomes set up a shared parenting arrangement. It was struck down when the state's high court ordered a "custodial parent" named with support transfers from the one with higher earnings, however nominal the difference.

The federal support law was cited for the court's reasoning, but the funding benefits were omitted. The court simply ordered the inequality with no regard for its predictable conflict so the state could enrich itself with federal money and interest from state banks euphemistically termed "Child Support Collection Centers." To detract from the unjust mandate, family lawyers typically note an "opt out" clause which purportedly allows parents to set up their own arrangements. However, that option is illusory because it requires them to engage the support formula before exercising the option, thereby enticing that winner-take-all award which is a driving force behind the law.

It is impossible to complete this mandatory formula without naming a superior "custodial" and inferior "non-custodial" parent. No option exists for the use of father, mother or other neutral term. Yet the validity of separation, divorce or childrearing arrangements revolves around this formula. The outcome is used to gage a "presumptively correct" level of mandatory transfers using the state's seized authority as guardian of our children. In reality, parents are being exploited when they attempt to calculate a test figure under that formula. They must confront literally hundreds of paragraphs, provisos and phrases in the statutory scheme which confound even the lawyers, accountants and judges in the process. [6]

[6] Serious injustices are consequently arising on a daily basis in these support courts. The vast majority are never publicized or held accountable. To illustrate from our case studies, a callous support magistrate carried over rulings and financial information from a separate irrelevant case to make a determination in the later one before her which obviously made no sense to the litigants. Some of it was boiler plate language adopted to achieve a predetermined outcome. Transcripts in other cases show expert witnesses with fraudulent credentials, judges devoid of basic familiarity with pending petitions, and disparaging statements having no foundation in fact. These orders are being mass produced from overcrowded dockets to feed a profit and revenue generating industry. One family judge referred to his work as the "child business" and another described parents as his "customers." The late Supreme Court Justice, Abe Fortas, referred to these forums as "Kangaroo Courts," see In re Gault, 387 US 1, 27-28 (1967)

In addition to court and lawyer reforms, this initiative targets the federal support mandate for repeal or modification using a shared parenting law to replace it in fit parent cases. The institutional custody framework should be preserved only to the extent that one or both parents are found to be unfit by a higher standard of proof. This would be in line with the Supreme Court's rulings in Santosky v Kramer,455 US 745 (1982)(parent terminations subject to higher "clear and convincing" proof under due process clause) and Parham v J.R., 442 US 584 (1979)(parents presumed to act in their children's "best interests").

Opponents of such an initiative will incorporate a diverse range of "dead beats," absentees or unfit parents as part of their rehearsed propaganda for retaining the custody designations. However, this is easily dispensed by a more accurate presumption that the vast numbers of separated parents are perfectly fit to remain in their children's lives. As will be seen, government is actually manufacturing bad parents under the current oppositional framework bent on discovering a preferred child "caretaker."

2. Litigation costs burden taxpayers to their limits.

The notion that government can legislate a solution to all the variables of an ideal parenting environment is not only unrealistic but often counter-productive and a burden to taxpayers called upon to foot the bill for court operations. With each crafted issue, large or trivial, derived from these federal support laws, the likelihood of conflict escalates in the "custodial" context where petitions are typically exploited as a tactical response. Far more harm is inflicted upon children in the long run than a deferential environment having respect for parent liberties. Divorce and separation are scrutinized unlike married contexts even though they often result in better childrearing conditions. The public pays for this process. Once the finances are opened to exploitation, good parents can be converted into long term combatants in these courts.

The federal support law was initially intended to recoup welfare expenses from absentee fathers. However, it was amended in recent decades by Washington bureaucrats to encompass all "noncustodial parents" or roughly half of the separated parenting population to result in vast increases in federal funding. In effect, it operated on the terrible assumption that separated parents do not want to support their children financially. An entitlement mentality was erected to replace the trust reposed in both moms and dads by the American Constitution. Fraudulent custody petitions increased manifold on the quest to secure ridiculous support awards.

The standards act had the further effect of inducing resistance, hidden income and even violence on the part of both debtors and recipients. Meanwhile wasteful spending was being encouraged for recipients who did not earn the support money particularly in working parent environments typical of today's society. Recurring petitions based on these anomalies then turned our family courts into a gold mine of conflict and false hopes. In an untold number of cases, unfulfilled child support demands became the cause of parental alienation with judges turning a blind eye when it came to enforcing child rearing rights between similarly involved fathers and mothers.

The reality of separated family units in today's society is that they are anything but uniform. Moreover, the notion of fairness is virtually impossible to discern given all the diverse opinions

which could be made of a given set of circumstances. Instead, the wisdom behind an American form of government is that it accommodates diversity, promotes creativity, ingenuity and incentives, thereby yielding ideal outcomes. For example, parents who prefer to omit any child support obligations from their agreements may facilitate business investments or college savings. Conversely, unearned income encourages spending on non-child related or even illegal activity. Children are invariably taught to emulate such dysfunctions in their upbringing.

In the case of most fathers and non-custodial mothers, they are relegated to the standard two monthly weekends under prevailing doctrine and made to exercise "visitation," that degrading form of childrearing more appropriate for funerals and prisons. The injustices inherent with "custody" and "visitation" are not new, but as the central features for child support grants and lucrative contests, their harmful consequences are universally suppressed. In Webster v Ryan, 729 NYS 2d 315 (Fam. Ct. 2001), a veteran family court judge condemned the use of these antiquated terms. The text at footnote one of a highly researched opinion warrants a reprint here:

> "At the outset, the Court notes that the terms 'custody' and 'visitation' have outlived their usefulness. Indeed their use tends to place any discussion and allocation of family rights into an oppositional framework. 'Fighting for custody' directs the process towards determining winners and losers. The children, always in the middle, usually turn out to be the losers… This Court has abandoned the use of the word 'visitation' in its Orders, using the phrase 'parenting time' instead. If the word 'custody' did not so permeate our statutes and was not so ingrained into our psyches, that word would be the next to go… This misplaced focus draws parents into contention and conflict, drawing the worst from them at a time when their children need their parents' best."

Obviously this jurist was ahead of his time and his views have been shared by countless others privately. Five years later, a Matrimonial Commission would make the same recommendations to New York's Chief Justice (The "Miller Report"). But the damaging terms have survived to the present day only because the federal support statute mandates their exclusive use as a condition for mass funding. The Webster decision was quickly reversed the following year and its wisdom has remained suppressed or dormant in the fifteen years since it was issued.

During that period, tremendous harm has occurred. Countless parents never knew the experience of placing a child on or off a school bus, thousands of children were alienated or psychologically damaged, and non-custodial parents were held to self-crafted rules of their severed partners. This all occurred even though no utopian standards for childrearing existed. Indeed, the Matrimonial Commission found that our custody laws created a "shoe horn" effect. To make the unequal scheme work, judges simply used custodial parents as court supervisors over their counterparts, thereby inciting more conflict. In effect, the state became an uninvited party to all court cases.

When parental agreements are upended by the state under federal support guidelines, fathers are typically the ones reduced to "non-custodial" status and an unfair position in custody hearings. Their burdens of proof are artificially elevated beyond reasonable expectation of achieving near equal status in a child's life. To this sort of treatment, Dr. Martin Luther King had this to say:

> An unjust law is no law at all… How does one determine (an unjust law)? Any law that degrades personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust… It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority."

Such wisdom certainly applies here. Unequal "custody" orders presume that parents cannot agree and that one of them will be elevated while the other is degraded. They can easily be replaced with flexible and less intrusive "parenting" orders as they are under the family laws of Australia, see Webster v Ryan, 729 NYS 2d 315 (Fam. Ct. 2001) at fn. 1. Instead mothers and fathers are routinely segregated without any finding of unfit parenting and conformed to an inferior class even when residing only miles apart in the same school district as the superior parent. Here the segregator is the state, its domestic machinery and its mandated "custodial parent" for whom the laws, agencies and public resources are jointly committed. Under this framework, an inferior parent stands alone before a decision maker influenced by law to rule against him for revenue purposes. It begs the question, what kind of court would sacrifice impartiality for such purposes?

3. Government hypocrisy continues to divide families.

This summary identifies a number of government hypocrisies which pervade our family courts to stimulate public support behind a long overdue reform initiative. Putting this in stark perspective, while humans were being imprisoned for support debts by middle level appeals courts in New York, the same courts were entertaining habeas corpus filings on behalf of chimpanzees based on primate similarities to release them from their caged conditions, see New York Law Journal, October 14, 2014. When fathers are caged to coerce money, women suffer along with them.[7]

Another anomaly lies in the absurd justification that children should not suffer "roller coaster" treatment between parent homes under an equal or shared parenting arrangement, see i.e. often cited case of Dintruff v McGreevy, 34 NY2d 887 (1974). According to these courts, stable childrearing requires a dominant "custodial" residence. But the same courts endorse a profound hypocrisy when they place all sorts of non-educational activities above non-custodial rights. The state itself buses the same children from the same homes to an institutional school setting at the age of five. There can be no greater disruption to a child's stability than the kind of roller coaster here involving total strangers and no hearing of the sort routinely mandated in custody courts.

Unjust discrimination flourishes because of a winner-take-all mentality that can keep parents fighting for years, even decades on the issues of support. Shared parenting, as the presumptive starting point for wholesome childrearing, is a direct threat to both the fight mentality and the profits it yields. In shared contexts, the parent who shows the most unjust resistance is the one properly relegated to a lesser role. Under the current system, parents are advised to race to our courthouses armed with lawyer infested petitions containing inflammatory accusations to achieve that all important head start for a drawn-out court battle. The falsely accused parent is

[7] Father discrimination is devastating women as much as it is men. According to reports from one reform group, Fathers 4 Justice, roughly a third of its membership was comprised of women, reflecting the collateral victims from intimate relationships, non-custodial mothers and extended family, see also David Meyer, *The Constitutional Rights of Non-Custodial Parents*, infra.

then playing catch-up ball in a constantly defensive position with the winner taking both the children and the money in a public arena. Again, it is a process reminiscent of medieval times.

In yet another demonstration of government hypocrisy, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) has been routinely re-funded to create special procedures for law enforcement when an incident involves an accused male and a victim female. There are already penal laws on the books which fairly treat violent crimes from whatever source derived and little focus is given to unreported violence upon male victims, much less fraudulent reports for ulterior purposes. A primary justification given for this discrimination is a statistical disparity between gender victims. Yet the same rationale has never been employed to give discriminated fathers statistical preferences in our family courts. Such disparities have produced other ominous trends.

4. **Institutional prejudice is criminalizing parenthood.**

The collective infringements of parenting rights have created a serious epidemic. The mission to collect money from non-custodial parents has reached a level of oppression that can no longer be ignored. Fathers remain as the only institutionally unprotected class of person in America based on birth status and physical traits. Census Bureau reports continue to show that nearly 85% of all child support obligors are men and roughly 90% of contested custody decisions favor women. Congressional history behind the Child Support Recovery Act, 42 USC Section 228, demonstrates an invidious focus upon fathers with no parallel study of delinquent mothers.

Indeed, parent-child relationships are becoming less of a factor in child support determinations with special tribunals created to expedite support orders. These orders, unlike parenting orders, are then enforced by a growing bureaucracy set up strictly to collect money. Only a fraction of public resources is committed to enforcing fathering rights while disproportionately few mothers are held accountable for child alienation tactics. The injustices therefore cause victims to distrust our justice system, increasingly taking the law into their own hands through domestic violence.

The Parent Punishment Act of 1998, once referred to as the "Dead Beat Dad Act," now authorizes government to target parents for criminalization. Although the sexist slurs have been discouraged, the law's focus remains the same statistically. By the simple act of relocating to another state for employment opportunity with support arrears registering at an easily achieved $5,000, an unsuspecting mom or dad can be publicly arrested, convicted of a felony and committed to a debtor's prison for more than a year.

Unsuccessful constitutional challenges to this law, based principally on the Commerce Clause, have remained devoid of discrimination claims. This is because, despite all the evidence, fathers continue to be denied their logical and legal status as a discriminated class. Among so many other atrocities of which the public is typically unaware, a father's monthly support obligations will continue to accrue while he is incarcerated for any reason. Unsuspecting mothers are typically ambushed in the few cases where prison time is imposed with statistically lesser terms.

Due to the lack of public accountability and independent oversight, draconian practices have been fashioned to manufacture and enforce support orders that are logistically unmanageable.

PRI has received countless calls from persecuted parents, mostly fathers, unable to physically, realistically or psychologically satisfy these highly inflated support obligations. By our own direct observations, support magistrates have become utterly sadistic in their abuses of public office. They are able to deflect from their misconduct by citing "child support" as a paramount state interest while no mention is made of the non-monetary benefits which are of greater concern to the child. This has elevated the number of non-criminals imprisoned each day.[8]

5. Constitutional violations in family court lead to moral decay in society.

Our Constitution is more than a mere declaration of supreme principles. It is a blueprint for a moral and civil society to withstand the test of time. Custody and support mandates produce three distinct but related constitutional violations. The first is an invasion of parenting liberties through an inverted form of childrearing that defies laws of nature. It is more than a structural flaw, it is an affront to the "oldest liberty interest" protected by our Constitution, see i.e. Troxel v Granville, 530 US 57, 65, 75 (2000). In Troxel, Justice O'Connor noted in a plurality opinion that at some undefined point, the burden of litigating a custody case can itself constitute a parenting violation.

Under existing laws, parents are drawn to spoil their children to gain favor in custody battles. Conversely, those who discipline misconduct can be subjected to false child abuse claims, thereby inviting more litigation from the state. In short, the tail is wagging the dog. Children are trained by their court appointed lawyers to essentially spy on their parents to find issues that can lead to a tactical advantage in a custody contest. Such issues become a self-employment gold mine for these highly ignored child predators at taxpayer expense. Respect for authority is thereby undermined.

The second transgression is due process. This summary does not allow for a thorough analysis of its procedural and substantive components, however, family court processes with their two-tiered child support structure are designed to control children at parental expense. The money-driven scheme overrides due process in many discreet ways, from the inherent bias of revenue generating magistrates to substandard levels of proof to expedite overloaded dockets. Non-custodial parents are sentenced to prison terms with no jury right and a stigma which exceeds that attaching to serious crimes. For example, Attorney Steven Lever served no jail time for soliciting a thirteen

---

[8] This particular trend has earned our nation a dubious distinction of having the largest prison population in the free world. The mass unjust imprisonment of innocent Americans is well illustrated by judicial misconduct in family cases that have reached unimagined criminal proportion. In the infamous "kids for cash" scandal of 2008, two Pennsylvania judges were convicted of bribery charges stemming from a long term scheme to commit juveniles to detention centers built by contractors in exchange for kickbacks. It resulted in 4000 convictions reversed by the state's Supreme Court which is itself immersed in misconduct. Other examples include New York Supreme Court Judge Gerald Garson, convicted of bribery in 2007. He was caught on camera accepting a $9,000 bribe from a divorce lawyer in chambers to fix a custody case. Had the mother not sought assistance from the FBI, she would have lost her children for a payment much less than most contested divorce retainers. The judge served minimum time in prison due, in part, to colleague references. Another state Supreme Court Judge, Thomas Spargo, was convicted for soliciting $10,000 from a lawyer facing a personal divorce in exchange for favorable treatment. The money was required for growing legal fees to defend against ethics charges. More recently, a Michigan judge presiding over a support case was removed from the bench when he admitted having sexual relations with the litigant mother in chambers resulting in a pregnancy.

year old girl on his law firm's computer. This child predator was prosecuted on the more difficult reasonable doubt standard. An ethics referee recommended a mere six month license suspension.

The third constitutional right routinely violated by the custody scheme is equal protection. It is all but conceded against fathers in these courts. This ongoing prejudice is rooted in the so-called Tender Years Doctrine which presumed that mothers were better care givers, J.C.D v D.W.D., 252 AD2d 441 (1st Dept. 1998); Barkley v Barkley, 60 AD2d 954 (3rd Dept 1978)(dissent). Through our studies, filings and releases, the PRI has emphasized that such gender based defaults work a further erosion in parental status through a legally enforced parenting hierarchy. Over time, a succession of parental substitutes, ranging from care providers to extra-curricular supervisors, are given priority. This hierarchy reduces a non-custodial parent to a visitor or throw-away-dad.

Ostensibly, this centuries old presumption has been rejected, i.e. Stanley v Illinois, 405 US 645 (1972); Caban v Mohammed, 441 US 584 (1979), but in practical terms and through custody mandates, it is still being applied off record, or in many cases on record, without accountability, see i.e. *Gender Bias in the Courts of the Commonwealth, Final Report*, 7 William & Mary J. of Women & Law, 705, 718 (2001); Bookspan, *From a Tender Years Presumption to a Primary Parent Presumption: Has Anything Really Changed?* 8 BYU Journal of Public Law (1993). The injustices often arise from judges, anxious to advance their careers, who yield to feminist groups monitoring their decisional record. Politics is very much alive in these courts.

6. Government is manufacturing bad parents under the current custody scheme.

It can be seen from the foregoing discussion that our government is actually manufacturing bad fathers and throwing them in prison as a result of its own dysfunction. We can apply all sorts of euphemistic terms and rationalizations to dispute this "inconvenient truth" but in the end, that is what is actually occurring from an empirical standpoint. A concerned citizen is compelled to ask why any government would do this to its own people. Added history is now in order.

As stated, this law was intended to offset welfare costs by holding absentee fathers accountable. It was amended more recently to encompass all "non-custodial parents," hence bringing mothers into its ruthless scope. A brainchild of bureaucratic insiders, the effect was to pool good parents separated by happenstance with bad parents having no concern for their children so that larger numbers could be exploited to increase funding to the states. It was a socialist achievement of monumental proportion which attracted no public alarm because, again, the child was exploited.

While the numbers of parents were being expanded to come within the control of our federal government, state court judges were doing their part to further revenue interests. They began by crafting legal fictions to artificially elevate individual support orders. This factored well in performance measures. Among the fictions was this invention called "imputed income" which acted as an evidentiary substitute to assist "custodial parents" in their burdens of proof at support hearings. Non-custodial parents were simply held to the highest level of earnings history in the support calculations and effectively required to disprove a fictional case. Put another way, these family courts managed to reverse the order of proof contrary to fundamental principles of due process so that state revenues, lawyer profits and custodial entitlements could be maximized.

Other fueling changes included a "way of life" factor which had no bearing on the actual needs of a child. This easily abused device sent support amounts skyrocketing into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. A veritable gold mine for all but the debtor parent, support recipients were no longer required to account for expenditures made on such things as recreational drugs, luxury items and vanity excesses. By virtue of a dominant custodial home, non-custodial parents were now being held hostage to the very partners they had divorced. Infinitely scorned ex-spouses returned dutifully to court each time their adversaries obtained a career improvement, thereby undermining higher purposes such as a patent invention, savings and incentive based growth.

The combined effect was to bring in billions of dollars to pay for court operations, judicial pay raises and infrastructure. The arbitrary changes produced unmanageable obligations on a vast scale with add-on expenses and payroll deductions that marginalized the realistic cost of self-support. Parents threatened with prison terms were being forced to rely on friends, family and even their employers to make up the difference between fiction and reality. It remains a money collection scheme to make any underworld figure envious. Collection responsibilities were simply passed on to the private sector in addition to sales and payroll taxes to cause businesses and industry to relocate. Under-the-table jobs further proved the absurd nature of this system.

A natural outcome of this history is lawlessness. Although examples abound throughout the country, their causes are highly suppressed in police and media reports. In one small city in upstate New York, a police investigator committed a murder-suicide upon his ex-spouse after leaving support court which had him reportedly living on $28 per week after all the deductions and asset executions. Draconian enforcement practices lead to seizures of various licenses ultimately producing homeless victims. Facing such prospects, this law man used a common kitchen knife to complete his crime, voiding any deterrent effect of weapons confiscations and inflammatory protection orders. It left four children with no parents and city taxpayers liable for a $2 million wrongful death claim, see Pearce v Longo, 766 F. Supp.2d 367 (NDNY 2011).

In his book, *A Promise to Ourselves*, actor Alec Baldwin gives a scathing report of his protracted divorce with Kim Basinger. After a voice message to his daughter was anonymously made public, Mr. Baldwin was condemned as an abusive parent. Largely censored were the alienation tactics which fueled it. So painful was the aftermath that he admitted to suicidal thoughts at his New York high rise apartment and during a drive through the Berkshire Mountains. Years later the same daughter participated in wedding ceremonies for Mr. Baldwin's second marriage. Reform is plagued by such aftermaths. Victims do not care to revisit their nightmares.

The 2011 case of Thomas Ball is also instructive. An oppressed father seeking to ignite protest burned himself alive in front of a family courthouse. There was no mainstream coverage in contrast to a similar self-immolation in Morocco which attracted world attention. And so, while our federal government escalates its military involvement around the globe, soldiers are returning to empty homes, child alienation and felony support warrants. The PRI was able to save the lives of numerous victims from attempted suicide, but the unsuccessful instances are more telling, see i.e. *Purple Heart's Final Beat,* Second Class Citizen.Org (2009).

Living Under a "Custodial Institution of Childrearing"

We have been universally brainwashed to view childrearing in separated contexts as a form of "custody," that all-encompassing power that strikes fear in parents and opportunity on the part of its facilitators. This is a power which, more often than not, has been exploited to harm a natural or cooperative order of parenting. It is also the means employed by the state to create what we have termed the "Custodial Institution of Childrearing." Not so much a physical institution as an intangible one, it was created progressively over the years by custody laws and compulsory processes that make parents dependent on government for supervision and issue resolution.

A custody process can easily produce an unjust seizure of children through overregulation of the parents. In certain cases, this seizure is overt and recognized. Where a child is severely neglected or abused, most people will support a process which removes the victim from one or both parents. However, when government expands its regulatory powers to reach all separated parents, the child seizure is less transparent. That regulation is justified by all manner of idiotic issue creation. We simply assume that courts are the proper forums for resolving such issues or childrearing plans that are already functioning better than married contexts. In the end, it is a form of institutionalization.

A parallel may be made here to land use doctrine known as inverse condemnation. This occurs when government regulation becomes so intrusive that all meaningful use of private property is made unlawful. A "taking" of land has effectively occurred but without the compensation required from our governments by the due process clauses of both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. Inverse condemnation therefore became a process fashioned by our courts to give compensation for victims of overregulation. This is one useful analogy in a shared parenting effort to invalidate the custody framework and secure parent compensation in extreme cases.

The antiquated custody framework has its origins in a precedent setting decision which attracted little attention at the time it was issued. In Finlay v Finlay, 240 NY 429 (1925), the high court of New York fleshed out the rule in cases of divorce which authorized the state to take control of children in order to serve their so-called "best interests." Eventually adopted by state courts and legislatures throughout the country, this single pronouncement became the workhorse for child controls of every kind. The seizure of power remains unparalleled because it enabled the state to extend its influence into the privacy of our homes and the operations of our businesses.

When Finlay was decided, American society was much different and the seizure of power less noticed. Families were predominantly intact, divorce and single parent households were few, and communications were not so instantaneously damaging. The dynamics have changed to the point where separated family units are now the mainstream, traditional parental roles are becoming obsolete and the people are content to accept status quo. Complacency is a leading cause of government dysfunction and the erosion of our basic rights. Here the impacts are monumental.

The "official act" of separation in this day and age does not trigger sufficient state interest to justify such a sweeping application of laws that together creates this "custodial institution of childrearing." Our PRI Director's case is instructive. A state judge refused to grant his divorce despite two years of successfully observed separation agreements. He forced controversy simply because complete financial information was not included with the uncontested petition and the

"presumptively correct" outcome under the support formula necessitated custody titles. He essentially professed the competency to raise the children better than the natural parents could.

After years of consequential court battles, the same judge concluded that the father had been adequate in his support obligations, but by then, severe damage to the children and families was irreversible. Today, every issue comes before the money seekers because the parents no longer communicate on the risk that it could be used against them in these never-ending court processes. Even simple discussions with the little ones became impaired by attorney-client privileges claimed by the so-called "attorney for the child" who has never had children, disclosed a personal hatred of his own father and made a lucrative career inciting conflict in our family courts.

Parents are at grave risk when they enter this custodial institution. The simple hiring of a lawyer opens the door to years of protracted controversy. There is no sure way of knowing whether this costly representative is competent or properly committed. There is no way of knowing whether a judge or law guardian is conflicted by political or collegial priorities, worse yet, whether personal or financial influences are at play. In the PRI Director's case, it was not known that a custody judge set to meet with his young daughters in chambers without the parents present had engaged in sexual misconduct with his five year old handicapped niece, In re Bryan Hedges, 20 NY3d 677 (2013).

Once institutionalized by this custody system, a parent can incur severe damage to assorted relationships. Fathers and mothers become incapable of moving on with their lives when new partners find themselves alienated by the same needless support and custody battles. Custodial mothers tend to be especially prejudiced with time constraints in their dominant roles. Conversely, to maintain sustenance, a delinquent support obligor without employment, license or benefits becomes reliant upon his or her partner to avoid a life in the streets. The support formulas, imputed income and a dead-beat stigma, already cited, can make such a life inevitable.

The state's seizure of parenting rights enables lawyers to examine every aspect of a family's private life in a public courtroom. Once the financial information is extracted, they are able to gage the extent of liquid assets available from the combatants for fee generating purposes. Child interests provide fertile ground for endless disputes, and settlement efforts are often promoted only when the money runs out. They call it "child support" but in real terms, a non-custodial parent is being required to pay for the process which takes away his children, directly or indirectly, through the parental alienation or marginalization which so often follows from the unequal roles.

This barbaric fight over our offspring produces logical side-effects. However, custody judges view this as yet another opportunity to feed system predators. They routinely order parents and children to undergo psychiatric evaluations or other treatment plans for every manner of natural reaction. Such orders only add to the financial draining which, in turn, aggravates the symptoms. An untold number of victims are prescribed addicting drugs through an abuse of the DSM-5 manual which contains some 300 disorders and 600 conditions for insurance approved diagnoses. In most reports, multiple disorders are found on purely subjective criteria leading sane minds to conclude that this is nothing more than voodoo social science. There is no definition of normalcy in the DSM-5.

The psychiatrist favored by a whimsical referral from an unqualified custody judge is unlikely to offend his employer by reporting that the involuntary patient is perfectly normal. Many victims have responded with racketeering and civil rights claims in federal court but are routinely thrown out based on abstention and immunity defenses that translate more accurately in the low esteem with which federal judges hold these tribunals. Many forensic orders are doled out like candy with inconsistent standards, if any. Typically issued before any hearing to "assist" the custody decision maker, they are, by definition, non-final and thereby removed from a timely appellate remedy.

A Realistic Plan for Overdue Reform

An efficient, economical and realistic action plan draws upon existing organizations to advance our two principal goals of shared parenting and accountability. As profits grow from individual cases, monies can be rolled over to finance larger scale initiatives. These, in turn, will lead to greater family stability and productivity in the workplace. Congested dockets will be reduced, escalating tax burdens will be relieved, and an alarming trend in social costs will be reversed. A flexible, multifaceted and interrelated approach is presented under the headings which follow.

1. An umbrella political action committee must be formed.

Even a cursory look at the landscape surrounding family law reform shows how the movement is fractured, conflicting or essentially non-existent. A well financed opposition composed of big government spenders, family bar associations and assorted special interests has done its job, stamping out reform at all levels. It has been urged by long time reformists that many groups, splintered as they are, have been infiltrated by adversaries, further plaguing any united effort. A realistic action plan must therefore be executed by a highly committed team of qualified parental advocates, preferably from all of our fifty states. They can be recruited from existing groups, dedicated bloggers, financial contributors, freelance experts and many implicated constituencies.

2. The fast track for reform lies with our Supreme Court.

If we use historical precedent as a model for nationwide reform, particularly where, as here, our basic civil rights are at stake, a watershed ruling from our Supreme Court must be secured. Like the race, abortion and gay rights cases in their day, it is expected that lower and middle level courts will reject such efforts due to a lack of high court precedent. However, as part of this action plan, we will seek out organizations to file amicus briefs to support a test case.

A writ should issue in Supreme Court for the following non-exhaustive reasons:

1) to secure greater citizen access to our high court based on population growth and a bench that has only three members more than it did in 1803;

2) to remedy a century of discrimination in America's domestic relations courts;

3) to remedy decades of discredited domestic abstention practices in our federal courts;

4) to remedy unprecedented constitutional violations inflicted upon family court victims and reform activists in retaliation for their public criticisms.

3. **Individual or group assistance can be achieved through educational programs**.

A Self-Representation and Court Strategy Program are offered by the Parenting Rights Institute. These programs assist diverse victims of divorce and family court to manage their cases with or without a lawyer to result in vast savings. Parents can be diverted to mediation and alternative dispute resolution through our referral processes. Our goal is to prevent the commencement and escalation of divorce, custody and support contests. However, if they are unavoidable, we seek to influence early resolution through court monitoring, inquiries and accountability reports.

As part of our education initiatives, the PRI offers seminars and speaking engagements for the benefit of businesses, and employee associations or community groups. Our focus is to divert as many parents as possible from the current harmful system while reform efforts progress. Vital information is shared with family court victims around the country. However, resources are needed to expand these initiatives. We expect to generate a team of professionals who can be dispatched to different parts of the country based on marketing strategies and retainer packages.

4. **Parental advocates must be deployed to investigate misconduct**.

Presently there is no independent or detached entity engaged in the work of investigating misconduct in our nation's domestic relations courts. The PRI envisions a team of parental advocates who are properly trained to investigate corruption and report on it where it can be proven. We find organizations such as the YWCA sending advocates to domestic violence proceedings but none committed to rectifying fraudulent reporting or overbilling practices.

This deployment process is a key aspect of PRI, and it distinguishes us from many other accountability groups. Our PRI Director has been retained to monitor court proceedings which resulted in demonstrable changes in demeanor by abusive judges. One of them involved a doctor in Manhattan who spent over $5 million in lawyer fees and related costs. Notices, subpoenas, Freedom of Information requests and docket searches have supplemented the monitoring process to improve the delivery of justice in these courts. It is a unique, cutting edge and marketable professional service which lacks only the funding to make it highly profitable.

For too long, our domestic tribunals have been protected as "confidential courts" against First Amendment challenges with the latter gaining ground in recent decisions. One of them arose from our earliest website created in 2010. A new family judge in upstate New York issued a "gag order" to limit public criticisms of his peculiar processes while suppressing exposure of serious misconduct that was being ignored by the state's Commission on Judicial Conduct. A show cause order was signed against this judge by a Justice of the New York Supreme Court resulting in removal of both the gag order and family judge from the highly controversial case.

These sorts of hands-on experiences are vital to any accountability organization especially one specializing in divorce or family court corruption. In the sense used here, corruption extends to

the full scope of misconduct, from bribery convictions of such judges as Gerald Garson and Thomas Spargo of Brooklyn and Albany, respectively, to more elusive forms of abuse such as bias, overbilling practices and parental alienation. It strongly urged that a Justice Department or congressional oversight inquiry into Title IV-D processes will yield widespread funding abuses. One PRI report to Congress is still under review. The new administration can make an impact.

5. **<u>Creative professional services are being developed for each new client.</u>**

PRI has developed creative solutions to the diverse ordeals of judicial and lawyer misconduct victims. They range from lawyer referral services to video documentaries and book publishing. A website lists the categories established to date with more in the planning stages. They are based on our specialized work over the past seven years. We obtain case histories at no charge followed by a plan of action that may include one or more form of assistance. We investigate backgrounds for trusted referrals to experts and mediators.

To illustrate our effectiveness, we issue blog publications and reports that we tag to a targeted judge or lawyer, thereby causing our reviews to propagate to the top pages of any Google search. In this way, we secure public accountability where judicial and lawyer commissions are failing us. It has proven very popular. We have completed video documentaries in New York and Pennsylvania involving three moms, a dad and a university professor fleeced of $2 million in lawyer fees during a 12 year divorce protracted in bad faith with no child issues. Given proper funding, trained video crews could be sent on investigative assignments to expose ordeals much like 60 Minutes does on a global scale. The advertisement which follows is exemplary:

NO ONE IN THE COUNTRY IS DOING THIS

Welcome to an extraordinary opportunity to obtain justice.

Let's face it, mainstream media is ignoring widespread corruption in our nation's divorce and family courts. That's because bar associations across America are suppressing a trillion dollar industry that is increasingly exploiting our children. Tremendous harm has resulted as evidenced throughout today's society. So as parents, we have a duty to command our own destinies with documentaries published through secondary and social media. Here at Parenting Rights Institute, we are having remarkable success.

Anyone can slap together a home video and throw it up on You-Tube. But without expertise connected to it, why waste time. Such a video could do more harm than good. Even professional programs with major media can fall short of an ideal product because the sponsors or anchors are unfamiliar with these courts. Time and again we have seen shows that promote the propaganda of the child "experts" who have never had children of their own as they profit from our misfortunes.

Here we do much more through follow-up and professional reports. Dr. Leon Koziol has been featured on 60 Minutes, front page of the New York Times, CNN and other major news organizations. So he certainly has the expertise to do it right and in a way that meets your needs because he is a parent, legal expert and victim of the same system. He knows how it really operates. That is why he founded the Parenting Rights Institute.

Conclusion

For a fledgling operation, Parenting Rights Institute has taken profound steps to address a growing crisis that for all intents and purposes is on no one's radar. We have literally saved lives, provided genuine hope and altered the mindsets of lawyers, judges and litigants. In a recent test run of full page advertising and editorials in the Syracuse-central New York region, startling results were obtained. If this could expand to offset lawyer and pharmaceutical commercials, such results could grow exponentially from a financial, social and accountability standpoint.

However the pressing focus is to reverse this unyielding criminalization process directed at fathers. The last time the Supreme Court addressed the issue was in 2011, the case of Turner v Rogers, 564 US 431. It featured an indigent dad jailed for contempt of a child support order without legal counsel. Surprisingly, the Court stopped short of requiring free representation of the kind previously guaranteed to criminal defendants. But it did rule favorably, albeit after the jail term was served, on the due process issue with improved notice and procedure requirements.

The ruling itself could be considered yet another affront to parental equality insofar as male parents comprise well over 90 % of incarcerated cases in most states. A movement is needed to overcome this unrecognized, institutional discrimination where it should receive the greatest attention. In 2016, Seminole County, Florida Judge Jerri Collins was reprimanded by the state's chief judge for scolding, interrupting and jailing a mother for three days in 2015 based on her refusal to appear at a proceeding she petitioned for against an abusive partner.

Domestic Violence was the rallying cry behind protests leading up to that reprimand. Women groups depicted the contempt sentence as cruel and "intolerable." However, not a peep is heard when a dad is imprisoned for months, even years, for failing to pay a support debt. Despite the same excuses of child care, anxiety and sorrow conveyed by this mom, father victims get no similar favor either in jail time or public outrage. Suicides, depression, violent reactions, health impairments, job losses, public humiliation and vast deprivations in child contact are all ignored.

The reader has now been presented with an extraordinary opportunity to help grow a watchdog enterprise that can reverse the criminalization and help shape the rearing of our children for generations to come. Long overdue reform to the current archaic system of custody and support will not occur if we simply leave it to the beneficiaries. As proud Americans we enjoy a self-governing system which allows us to take charge of our destinies. Let us not forget that right and duty in this request for vital assistance behind a most worthy cause.

May 1, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Leon R. Koziol
Parenting Rights Institute
Office: (315) 380-3420
Direct: (315) 796-4000
leonkoziol@parentingrightsinstitute.com