



Canada Court Watch Report



Published by the Canadian Citizen's Free Press – By the citizens and for the citizens of Canada
Website: <http://www.canadacourtwatch.com> – Friday, July 6, 2007.

Barrie, Ontario family court and CAS destroyed our loving family: Teens

Judge's heartless court ruling orders that siblings cannot have any contact with their younger sister until she is 18 years of age!

By Mike March, Justice Reporter

In a scathing letter addressed to **Justice Craig Perkins** of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice and copied to prominent persons including the Prime Minister of Canada, three teenagers blasted the senior judge and the family court system at the Barrie, Ontario courthouse for forcefully severing them from their younger sister and forcing their family into financial ruin.

In a court order dated November 17, 2006, Justice Perkins effectively severed the family and ordered that the teens' younger sister be placed under the sole custody and strict control of their mother and that there was to be no communication or contact between the three teens and their sister until she was 18 years of age, eight years in the future.

The judge also ordered that the three older teens whom had chosen to live with their father were to have no contact with their mother as well.

The court Order, which effectively severed the relationship between the once close siblings, came as a total shock to the teens.

The mother and her prominent, high priced Toronto area lawyer fully supported the separation of the siblings and had fought in court to achieve this objective.

Up until their family got involved with the family court system the children had enjoyed a very close and loving relationship with their younger sister.

Justice Perkins order effectively prevents the children from having contact and building memories with their younger sister during some of her most important years.

Perkins was so mean spirited that he even stated that the mother could apply to the courts to have this time period extended if she wished.

The teens felt that Justice Perkins was punishing them and their father because they had chosen to live with their father who they considered to be the most stable and loving of the two parents. The teens considered their mother as abusive and suffering some from emotional issues.

The teens referred to Justice Perkins as an incompetent and reckless judge who was not worthy of making decisions which affect children and families.

In their letter, the teens enclosed full colour pictures of

themselves and their younger sister which were taken before she was forcefully stripped away from them by the mean-spirited Justice Perkins.

One of the pictures showed the youngest girl blowing out candles together with her older sister at a birthday celebration.

The love that the youngest girl shared with her older sister and other members of her family prior to Justice Perkins order was clearly evident in the photos.

The teens reported that their mother was emotionally unstable and had been physically and emotionally abusive to them as well as their father for a number of years.

Evidence in the case indicated that the mother was suffering from Hostile-Aggressive Parenting (HAP) which is often the result of mental instability.

The oldest girl reported how her mother assaulted her on one occasion when she had come to pick up some clothes at her mother's house, because she allegedly did not call her to wish her a happy birthday.

She reported the assault to the authorities, including police and the children's aid society, but nobody did anything about it.

This same lack of due diligence by authorities to incidents in which mothers abuse their children was publicized in another recent Barrie, Ontario court case in which one father, Mr. Leonardo Campione, reported that the children's aid society snubbed him when he complained about his young children being abused by their mother.

In spite of Mr. Campione's pleas for help to authorities beforehand, both of his two young children were subsequently murdered by their mother.

The teen's claims about their mother's hostilities against members of her family were certainly not without substance.

In court before Justice Perkins, the mother herself admitted that she had personally broken into her ex-husband's home after they had separated and in contravention of the Criminal Code of Canada, covertly installed spyware on the father's computer in his home.

The spyware program automatically intercepted copies of every email message and a history of the internet

activities of the father and the three older children when they were at their father's home and then secretly sent this information back to the mother's own home.

The mother's illegal act and invasion of her own children's privacy could be described as nothing short of perverted and sick, yet the mother was never subjected to any consequences for her unconscionable act.

In his reasons for judgment Justice Perkins blamed the father as the cause of the children's dislike for their mother in spite of evidence from the children that the mother's own actions were much to blame for their feelings.

In addition to the order severing the siblings, Justice Perkins ordered that the loving and devoted father pay in excess of \$300,000 in court costs to the mother's lawyer.

This unprecedented costs award effectively bankrupted the father and financially ruined the family.

While the family court system claims to be working in the best interest of children, it is painfully obvious in this case that the order of Justice Perkins has effectively stripped the children not only of their financial security but many of the opportunities and benefits that these family assets would have made available to them.

The only real winners in the court were the lawyers who pocketed hundreds of thousands of dollars.

In the course of legal proceedings, the father was forced to use his equity in the family home and to cash in all of his savings and investments to defend himself in a court action in which he was forced by his ex-wife and her lawyer to participate in.

The father said that he had been unwillingly forced to trial in order to simply maintain contact with his youngest daughter who the mother was obstructing access to.

The father maintains that he only wanted to have every other weekend access to his daughter and for the teens to see their mother on a regular basis, an arrangement which the mother and her lawyer were unbelievably opposed to.

According to the father, the large award of court costs was not really about costs, but rather a punitive act in retaliation for him and the children speaking up against the abuse as a result of the family court system, the lawyers and the local children's aid society.

This family's case involved a number of improprieties. In one hearing held in the Barrie court, Madame Justice Lydia Olah, using threat of arrest, ordered the media out of the court notwithstanding the requests of the family that the local media attend the court.

While the law recognizes the media have a role to play in protecting the public's interest in the administration of Justice, obviously Justice Olah wanted no media observing her at work in her court.

At a second court hearing in which the family again requested media to attend, armed officers from the Collingwood detachment of the OPP locked the doors to the court and told reporters outside of the courtroom that they had been instructed by Justice Olah to padlock the courtroom doors and to keep members of the media away.

These instructions to OPP appear to have been given without any official judicial order and behind closed doors with the obvious intent to maintain secrecy in Justice

Olah's court.

To further prevent members of the public from knowing about this family's case and trial, Justice Perkins issued a widespread publication ban preventing the publication of the names of the family members, names of lawyer and even the city in which the family resided. Such a widespread publication ban is unheard of in such cases and the reason why names do not appear in this article.

According to the father, Justice Perkins broke his own publication ban by naming individuals in his reasons for judgment which are published.

The father also reported that there were irregularities with court transcripts with reasonable access to court transcripts being denied and in some cases, blocked.

At one hearing prior to the trial, he was threatened by one of the judges and almost as if the outcome had been determined, told the father in no uncertain terms that he will lose if he does not concede to the mother's demands.

According to the children, in spite of the court order banning contact between the children and their mother, their mother sent the older son an email in contravention of Justice Perkins order providing details of the judge's order.

The children maintain that their father is a victim of the anti-male bias in the family court system and that because they have chosen to live with their father and not their mother that this amounts to punishment by the courts.

According to the teens, their sister would prefer to live with them and their father which is why the mother and her lawyer insisted the court totally take her out of their lives.

In their letter, the teens told Justice Perkins that he should have simply asked their sister about what she wanted, as he has the right to do, before stripping her from their lives and away from their loving father.

"Our sister would have been happy to have been given the opportunity to express her wishes to the judge but she was not given the opportunity because everyone, including our mother, knew she was close to us and would not want to be separated from us."

The teens and the father felt that the system and the mother did not want the younger daughter's wishes to be known so they isolated and silenced her.

"Our sister is likely not being told the truth," said the teens believing that their sister is being threatened and coerced by the mother into forced compliance.

"Our sister would love to see us but others in the community have told us that their mother is badmouthing our father and is taking steps to prevent their sister from contacting them."

The three teens vow that they are going to fight to see the truth exposed and their sister's right to have a loving relationship with her other family members is respected.

They are greatly disappointed in a court system that has done so much harm to their family and violated their rights and freedoms.

"Justice Perkins should retire or be fired before he causes any more harm to other children and families," said the teens.

Note: The teen's letter to Justice Perkins may viewed on the internet at <http://www.canadacourtwatch.com>