

From: Dewitt Barker
Sent: Friday, July 20, 2012 10:32 AM
To: Invitations
Subject: Strategic Evaluation Committee report comments

Dear Judicial Council - I strongly disagree with the proposal of the strategic evaluation committee that the Judicial Council be stripped down further from supervisory functions to simply being a "customer service" organization for the courts. The local county courts are NOT the customers, the people of California are the customers. I agree with the suggestion that the Judicial Council "refocus on it's mandatory and core" responsibilities, which should increase, not decrease the power of the Judicial Council to enforce local rules and protocols. I propose that the Judicial Council have the power to enforce the guidelines and rules of court set forth by the Judicial Council. In limiting the efforts of the Mentoring program to education and not empowering the Judicial Council mentoring program with duties of enforcement, it leaves the public at risk to abuses of power by family court services mediators. The particulars of my experience illustrate this issue: I have a serious concern as a consumer of Family Law services here in Sonoma County. The Sonoma County Bar Association provides "as a service" the "Court Involved Therapist Referral List" available at the Family Court Services office. I have doubts about the ethics of the Sonoma County Bar Association providing references to therapists without performing any due diligence or background checks. I was told by the executive director of the Bar Association that the "Referral List" is put together in conjunction with mediators and other members of Family Court Services. [REDACTED], who is on the referral list in several places is a three time convicted felon, cocaine distributor, perjurer, forger and car thief determined by the Board of Psychology to be a danger to himself and others. His crimes of moral turpitude are associated with the practice of his profession. [REDACTED] submitted a Curriculum Vita in my divorce proceeding which was a fraud upon the court (he claimed to be working for the Ananda Institute which had closed it's doors a year earlier.)

[REDACTED] made a child custody recommendation to the court WITHOUT EVER HAVING MET ME or my daughter, a violation of Bus. and Prof. Code 2936 and the ethical standards of the American Psychological Association. [REDACTED] unethical declaration was submitted the day of the custody hearing, violating CCP 1005 and violating my rights to apply the tools of discovery to challenge [REDACTED] credibility as an expert witness. Quoting from page 30 of the SEC report "Developing procedures including those designed to ensure due process protections..." A procedure designed to ensure due process protections would be to have a "Court-Involved Therapist Referral List" provided at the local court level vetted by the Judicial Council. I believe it is not a public service to be recommending (referring) the general public to an individual who is ineligible to be considered as a Qualified

Medical Examiner due to his extensive criminal history involving crimes of moral turpitude, as per the determination of Honorable Judge [REDACTED] of the Sonoma County Superior Court (court decision in first link below.) It is my understanding that the local district attorney's office will not use him as an expert witness due to his easy impeachability based on his extensive criminal history and lying on applications to the State Department of Worker's Compensation.

I do not believe it is in the best interest of children and families in Sonoma County for the Bar Association and the Sonoma County Superior Court's Family Court Services department to be referring people to [REDACTED], as he is not reputable - according to Burton's Legal Thesaurus - as [REDACTED] is not law-abiding or unimpeachable. It should be a direct responsibility of the Judicial Council to supervise and enforce local rules and protocols which require due diligence in vetting a "Court Involved Therapist Referral List."

Here are three 'court involvements' [REDACTED] is associated with (testifying on behalf of murderers and a child molester.)

[http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/\[REDACTED\]](http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/medicalunit/[REDACTED])

[http://www.courts.ca.gov/opinions/nonpub/\[REDACTED\]](http://www.courts.ca.gov/opinions/nonpub/[REDACTED])

[http://blog.sfgate.com/localnews/2008/02/28/\[REDACTED\]](http://blog.sfgate.com/localnews/2008/02/28/[REDACTED])

I request that the Judicial Council initiate an investigation into how a three-time convicted felon guilty of crimes of moral turpitude could be on a referral list offered at a Sonoma County courthouse. Children and families of Sonoma County deserve to have a reference list vetted before being offered to the public. Children and families should be PROTECTED from perpetrators of crimes of moral turpitude, rather than being directed to engage with known sociopath criminals. Without oversight by the Judicial Council, the system is open to abuse by mediators such as [REDACTED], who made a recommendation to the court based on [REDACTED] unethical and illegal declaration. [REDACTED] also made a recommendation to the court for [REDACTED] and I to continue seeing two therapists on the co-parenting list "for the duration and frequency to be determined by the therapists." [REDACTED] should have appropriate oversight before he is allowed to recommend open checkbooks for a hand-picked inner circle of therapists. I have been told by long-time licensed clinical social worker [REDACTED] that the State of California years ago came in and told [REDACTED] and other Sonoma County courthouse family law mediators to discontinue making direct recommendations to specific therapists. When I spoke with Family Law facilitator/attorney [REDACTED] about my concerns of a long established and

potentially unethical relationship [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], she told me the relationship between the two still exists within the secret cases conducted at the Sonoma County courthouse.

In conclusion, how can the Judicial Council explain the fact that there are 330 licensed MFTs and over 120 psychologists in the Sonoma County Yellow Pages, yet the FCS "Court Involved Therapist Referral List" only contains a listing for 29 individuals for co-parenting, one of which is a known sociopath and convicted felon? This is a system set up to benefit a relative few with no apparent oversight, ripe for kick-backs and impropriety. My former attorney [REDACTED] referred to this system in Sonoma County as "witness manufacturing" and the "slop-line."

If you have any questions, please call me at [\(707\) 508-6977](tel:7075086977)

Thank you,
DeWitt Barker

Sent from my iPad