

D.N. FBT-FA-19-6088163-S)	SUPERIOR COURT
CHRISTOPHER AMBROSE)	J.D. OF FAIRFIELD
v.)	AT BRIDGEPORT
KAREN AMBROSE)	OCTOBER 19, 2021

**MOTION FOR CONTEMPT RE: VIOLATION OF COURT ORDERS, PENDENTE
LITE**

The Plaintiff respectfully represents the following:

1. On July 19, 2019, the Plaintiff brought an action by way of Summons and Complaint for a dissolution of marriage;
2. There are three (3) minor children from the marriage, namely, Mia Matthew and Sawyer Ambrose.
3. On March 20, 2020, the Plaintiff filed an Emergency Ex-Parte Motion (#167) to modify custody. On April 24, 2020, the court granted Plaintiff temporary sole legal and physical custody and ordered that, "the mother may not have any contact with the children, directly or via third parties. She is not to respond to any contact the children may initiate." (#192)
4. On June 10, 2021, after Defendant violated the no contact orders multiple times, the court (Grossman, J. #196) affirmed that Defendant should have no contact with the

**ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED
TESTIMONY MAY BE REQUIRED**

5. children, and on August 27, 2020, after additional misconduct by Defendant, the court (Grossman, J.#205.10) prohibited “unsupervised contact between the mother [and the children] and prohibit[ed] contact via electronic means and social media whether direct or indirect.” (Collectively, all of these are the “No Contact Orders”).
6. On September 11, 2020, the court (Grossman, J. #216) entered orders whereby “any party or counsel for any party who contacts the police or DCF about the children in this case must immediately notify the GAL and opposing counsel of their actions,” and further amended these orders on December 3, 2020 (Grossman, J. #239) “to reflect that any party or counsel in this case initiating any law enforcement, court or state agency contact regarding the children must provide opposing counsel and the GAL with notice prior to initiating such contact.”
7. Defendant has violated all of the above court orders multiple times since they were entered. Defendant’s most recent violations, those since July 25, 2021, are the subject of this motion.
8. On July 25, 2021, Sawyer and Mia were in the front yard of 381 Horsepond Road in Madison, where they reside with Matthew and Plaintiff. A man the children did not know drove into the Plaintiff’s driveway, called the children to his car, and gave them two kittens, as a gift from Defendant. Plaintiff, who knew nothing about the man or the kittens, got the plate number and called Madison PD. The police tracked the car and man and learned the Defendant hired him to deliver the cats to the children. The Defendant had covertly communicated with Mia, regarding the drop of the kittens. Defendant’s direct communication with Mia as well using a third party to interact with the children are both violations of the prior no contact Orders. Plaintiff’s custody. A report was filed by the Madison PD officer who responded to this incident.

9. On July 30, 2020, Defendant sent an email to Dr. Paul El-Fishawy, Sawyer's psychiatrist, accusing him and others in this case of unprofessional and unethical conduct. One of the email's three attachments was an audio recording of a therapy session between Mia and her therapist, Dr. Gruen. Defendant obtained this recording from Mia, which is in violation of the no contact Orders.
10. Defendant cc'd two individuals from DCF on the email to El-Fishawy without first notifying the GAL and opposing counsel, in violation of the court orders (#216).
11. In another violation and against the best interests of the child, the Defendant breached Mia's right to privacy and HIPPA rights when the Defendant cc'd two members of the press on this email (tatiana.flowers@thehour.com and karentvproducer@gmail.com). Defendant sharing confidential information about her child's mental health with members of the press and general public is not in the best interests of the child.
12. Dr. El-Fishawy felt threatened by Defendant's email and the attachments and it was unclear he would be able to provide therapy for Sawyer. Defendant's communication to the children's provider interfered with the children's ability to receive court ordered therapy, as well as with Plaintiff's ability to parent his children.
13. Dr. Gruen, Mia's therapist was concerned and inquired of Mia about the recording. Based on that interaction, Dr. Gruen agreed that Mia take a short break from therapy. Defendant's actions also interfered with child's therapy, and Plaintiff's ability to parent the children.
14. An hour after Mia's session on August 13, two Madison Police officers were in the driveway because Attorney Cunha had sent another email to the police alleging that Plaintiff was abusing the children and she included the recording of Mia and Dr.

Gruen. That communication is in violation of the court orders as well as a violation of Mia's HIPAA rights. Plaintiff agreed the police should speak privately to the children, which they did. The police left without further action. This incident was documented by the responding Madison PD officers.

15. At approximately 8PM that same evening, Mia became upset because Plaintiff confirmed that he believed Mia had sent the audio recording to Defendant. A half hour later, Plaintiff found a note from Mia indicating she had left the house. He called Madison PD and suggested they might find the child at 10 Paper Mill Rd in Killingworth.
16. Defendant had not notified the police, the GAL or the Plaintiff that Mia was with her. Defendant claimed Mia walked to her house and arrived without warning. Defendant and Mia were in communication in advance, it is believed Defendant used her vehicle to transport Mia to Paper Mill Rd.
17. Defendant refused the police request to have Mia return to Plaintiff's home with them. Defendant insisted the child remain while she tried to engage 211 and DCF to report Plaintiff's supposed abuse of the child. The officers agreed to wait. In yet another violation of the court orders, Defendant did not first notify the GAL and opposing counsel of the calls to the agencies. Over the next four hours, Defendant made additional phone calls, complaining about and filming the police officers. Only after both DCF and 211 declined to accept the case were the police able to return Mia to Plaintiff after 1AM. Again, Defendant's actions cause emotional distress to Mia and her brothers and interfered with Plaintiff's custody and ability to provide stability for the children.

18. On August 20, Plaintiff was on the phone in his front yard when a car pulled into the driveway. Two men got out, one with a mic, one with a tv news camera on his shoulder. They approached Plaintiff demanding to speak with him and the children. Plaintiff recognized one of the men as Wayne Dolcefino, who, at Defendant's request, had been had observed the court session on Zoom in July. Dolcefino hires himself out to "private citizens who want to expose injustice, fraud and abuse of power."
19. At Defendant's instigation, Dolcefino had come to CT from Texas, and prior to coming to Plaintiff's home had contacted the GAL, Drs. Horwitz, Gruen and Biren Caverly. Defendant's use of third parties to contact the children is a violation of the court orders, and this is another instance of Defendant using a reporter to publicize issues regarding the children, which is not in their best interest.
20. On August 23, 2021, Defendant filed an Application for Ex-Parte Order of Injunction to, among other things, attempt to gain immediate custody of the children and have Plaintiff arrested (Docket No. HHD-CV-21-6146061-S). She also filed an Affidavit that discusses at length and in detail the mental health and treatment of the three minor children. Neither Defendant nor her counsel requested to have these any of these documents sealed. This confidential information about the children is now in the public domain, is yet another violation of their privacy and is not in their best interest.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff respectfully requests:

1. The Defendant be found in willful contempt, these contempts are continuous, escalating in frequency and seriousness, and now involve the Plaintiff having multiple third-party adult males enter Plaintiff's property to interact with the

children, causing them emotional distress and requiring the involvement of the police 4 times in under one month, she be adjudged in contempt of the court orders.

2. The Court order Defendant to be prohibited from coming within one mile of the Plaintiff's home at 381 Horsepond Rd. in Madison, CT;
3. The Court order the Plaintiff to be prohibited from hiring or requesting any third party to come within one mile of Plaintiff's home or the children's schools. Plaintiff has a reasonable, good faith fear that she may attempt to abduct or have a third party abduct the children.
4. The Court order the Defendant be prohibited from threatening, harassing or intimidating, in any manner or by any means, or having a third party she hires or requests to so act on her behalf, any professional working with the children, including but not limited to Drs. Biren Caverly, Gruen, El-Fishawy, Horn and Horwitz, Attorneys Hurwitz and Celantano and any of the children's past or present teachers, school counselors and administrators;
5. The Court order the Defendant be prohibited from violating the privacy of the children by sharing with any third party through any means, any information about the children, including but not limited to their mental/emotional/physical health, their school performance/grades as well as their interactions with and relationship with Plaintiff, without obtaining the prior written consent of the GAL;
6. The Court order the Defendant be prohibited from violating the privacy of the children or Plaintiff by sharing in any manner any information of any kind about the children or Plaintiff with any member of the traditional or social media,

including but not limited to "bloggers," or by sharing with anyone who will communicate on Defendant's behalf such information to any traditional or social media;

7. That the Court order the Defendant to pay reasonable costs in connection with the incidents recited herein and the preparation and prosecution of this motion, including attorney's fees and Plaintiff's portion of the GAL's fees and costs;
and
8. That the Court make such further orders as it deems fair and equitable.

THE PLAINTIFF

BY: _____


Nancy Aldrich, Esq.
Aldrich & Aldrich
152 King's Highway North
Westport, CT 06880
Telephone: 203-221-0055
Juris No. 409128