



The Foundation for Child Victims of the Family Courts

advocating for child victims and their protective parent

www.fcvfc.org
866 - 553 - 6931
a 501(c)3 nonprofit

Date: November 7, 2023

To: Judge Daina A. Vitolins
22nd Judicial District Circuit
Court Of Oregon
County Of Jefferson, State Of
Oregon
Justice Building 1100 NW Bond
Bend, Oregon 97701
541 388 5300
541 447 6541

Lauren Kaufman
Jered Reid law office
35 SE C St, Suite D
Madras, OR 97741
Telephone: (541) 475-1111
Fax: (541) 475-1113
lkauffmanlaw@gmail.com

Levi Merrithew Horst PC
610 SW Alder Street, Suite 415
Portland, Oregon 97205
Phone: (971) 229-1241

Fax: (971) 544-7092
Angela Lee
360 NW Vermont Place, Suite 100
Bend, Oregon 97701
(541) 678-5614
Fax: (541) 633-7383
angela@angelaleelaw.com

David Haskett
160 NW Irving Ave, Ste 102
Bend, OR 97703
(541) 527-7515 Cell 254-495-5753
Norah Van Dusen
norah@lmhlegal.com

Wade L. Whiting
Jefferson County Circuit Court
129 SW E Street, Suite 101
Madras, OR 97741
541.475.3317
<https://www.courts.oregon.gov/courts/jefferson/pages/default.aspx>

From: Jill Jones Soderman
Executive Director, Foundation for Child Victims of the Family Courts
Administrator, Foundation for Family Law in the Public Interest

Re: Complaints in Rubio case

The decision to report child abuse when that abuse is connected to and conducted by members of the system of medical, mental health, government, police, or court authorities that are associated with violating the fiduciary responsibility for the protection of children and authorities who are subject to the care and protection of children is a critical issue.

That issue becomes complicated when the authorities who are failing to report child abuse are themselves the perpetrators of abuse.

Children have long been objects of exploitation. Child labor has been exploited as a result of child labor laws that emanated from circumstances that should have long before shocked the conscience of civilized populations. The benefits of child exploitation by governments and institutional authority – courts, police, child protective agencies — wavered between the concerns around the benefits of child exploitation and humanitarian concerns. The valence that tipped the balance has always been cash flow and the power of the purse.

Humanitarian concerns that are motivated by the long-range picture as to benefits to society and future socialization, acculturation, peace and prosperity are driven by education, dissemination and access to literacy, plurality and the rule of law based on shared respect for diversity and the power of mutual cooperation. Contradictory forces of autocratic dominance, control based on brute force, threats, intimidation, prejudice, isolation of those subject to authority through failure to report abuses of power and exploitation degrade the viability of the entire population to grow, prosper and progress.

Similarly, the conflict over the benefits of exploitation of children and their accessibility to exploitation have been found in the criminal world of the sexual exploitation of children through the use of pornography, prostitution/child trafficking as has been experienced in the functioning of the family courts across the USA who have emulated the practice of the criminal mind via the adoption and implementation of the debunked concept of parental alienation advanced by the Gardner theories dealing with children as sexual beings ([see article here](#)).

The idea is promulgated that sexual abuse does not exist and all who profess abuse are liars, and this includes the children who indicate harm promulgated by an adult. The driving concept of fear, threats, intimidation and simple answers to complex questions are consolidated to dismiss complex claims.

Claims that are by nature criminal and subject to severe penalty and which would under normal practice require discovery and evidentiary review are dumbed down to the barest elements so that all claims of abuse are dismissed. The Complainants who raise such issues are instantly dismissed as liars. They have become subject to court administrative decisions demanding loss of custody, isolation of the subject child in the custody of the accused abuser, without Due Process investigation. Sua Sponte – the accused abuser is exonerated and the accuser/victim becomes the instant subjects of false allegations, accusations and punishment.

Motivations for the simplification and streamlining of arduous legal processes were complemented with the generation of a complex cottage industry of anti intellectual, anti scientific / medical /psychological practices. The rewards for those capitalizing on the shortcut to exoneration of capital crimes committed within a family context created a new market for those capitalizing on a population vulnerable to criminal prosecution by providing a get out of jail free argument that has no basis in reality, morality or legitimacy. The arguments promulgated by Bar associations and mouthed by lawyers whose amoral representations result in the destruction of children and families have become the

foundations for the support to children's transfers to the custody of documented abusers across the USA as a practice that has developed and matured over the past 50 years.

As the unmitigated pathological concepts promoted by the Gardner theories have taken hold of the USA family court systems which include dependency, juvenile and family courts in all jurisdictions across the country, the erosion of Due Process, Legal Process and Black letter law has succumbed to the abuses of power underwritten by the paralyzing fear that encompasses litigants subject to the coercive controls of sadistic, character disordered judges who have been chosen by their cohorts to populate courts driven by profit motive and disregard for the public interest.

The direction of what the FCVFC has documented is the growth since the 1980's of malevolent practices that capitalized on defending a criminal population motivated by threat of prosecution for crimes against children and crimes that also involved domestic violence, violence against women as a protected population and crimes against children, an unprotected population having no legal rights and no representation.

Family court is a unique entity as defined by the exemptions of judicial discretion and Absolute immunity of judges within their professional capacity. That which is little known and less popularized is that judicial immunity is regulated by boundaries within a professional role and when those boundaries are acceded, Immunity is limited and responsibility in a personal capacity becomes an entity to be reckoned with.

Just as Richard Gardner MD promulgated the unfounded, unscientific theories indicating children to be sexual exploiters of adults, the Bar Associations across the country leached onto a theory that mitigated the need for discovery and scientific, medical expert testimony. Bar associations across the country are teaching courses on how lawyers should support the Gardner concept of parental alienation and all aspects promulgated by the rapidly expanding illegal practices of the cottage industry related to the many co conspirators facilitating via the malpractice of professionals both psychological and legal practitioners associated with the amoral practice of transferring children into the custody of abusers by promoting a "don't believe your lying eyes" alternate reality where fact is fiction and fiction is science fiction.

[Here is an example of the advertisement and promotion of reunification in cases using parental alienation.](#) This is the article that the United Nations uses to show that parental alienation is a form of torture.

The public must become aware – it is not aware at all at this time – that the American bar is promoting practices that are antithetical to the interest of parents in protecting their children. We are dealing with what should be a protected population protected by American democracy and the US Constitution.

Under color of law, bar associations across the country are guiding legal practitioners in a direction of selling out their clients in the public interest for profit motives driven by driving federal funds into state coffers via the manipulation of title IV programs. Title IV programs

administer aid to dependent needy children by redefining children who are endangered as per the harm inflicted by violent and sexual predators. By redefining these groups as having been impaired and blocked to access to parents who were improperly defined as bad actors these children are immunized against rescue from the abuser. Accurate allegations against those from whom children should be protected have now been reversed and the wolf is guarding the henhouse as a source of continued and sustained food supply.

The funds that are being moved from federal to state coffers are funding the destruction of children and families across the country and contributing to the undermining of the health and welfare of the general population at large. The children who are forced into the custody of abusers whose lives were once ensconced in safety and protection are now in predatory situations that disrupt health and development. The population of children that has been generated since the 1980s is one that the Foundation is stating are the population of mass murderers, serial killers, drug addicted, alcohol addicted, population that are the “survivors” of abuse. The family courts across the country are as per the opinion of FCVFC experts entirely responsible for a rise in the undoing of at least 5 generations of children who remain psychiatrically and educationally deprived, deranged and incapable of acting as functional citizens in a democratic society.

The legacy of 5 generations of the courts terrorizing the population had an incremental impact on the quantity and quality of an adult population capable of functioning in a democratic society. The rise of violent rhetoric and destruction of a level of social morality and respect for equity and pluralism we attribute to the erosion of the social structure of the family within American life directly as result of the abuses of judicial power inflicted on a vulnerable unsuspecting naïve public.

The combination of fear and disbelief on the public's behalf has generated a blanket of silence and a conspiracy of fear of reporting the abuses of judicial authority and of legal professionals. The failure of a mandated reporting system has greatly contributed to an erosion of public mutual respect and deference for competing opinions. However, there is no opinion when it comes to physical sexual and emotional abuse of children. These are actions that have clear parameters and clear markers for diagnosis and treatment. The illiterate and perfidious groups of professionals that propagate all fields of mental health, litter the courts with the detritus of their lies by stating that children, even babies cannot bring testimony against their abusers because of failures of articulation ranging from ignorance to despicable liars as the behavioral and emotional markers of abuse, consistent in the diagnosis of trauma and terror. Dogs who pancake and pee and shit on the floor when faced with an abuser – horses who whinny and scream, buck and rear when faced with an abuser are no less clear than children whose language of terror and torture speak volumes to what they have experienced. The despicable prevarications of those who condemn a life of fear and torture via family court officers of the court and so called experts who lie, cheat and steal their ways into court records, then sealed to protect their criminal activity must be held accountable.

Statements from those parents paralyzed with fear, or those protecting their wealth, their comfortable lifestyles, new relationships and marriages, with hopes of new children may not rest in peace for the knowledge that is embedded in their psyches. The privilege of not acting to speak on behalf of brutalized children, placed by court officers and officials whose character disorders match that of the abusers with whom these predators have ensconced these victims must find ways of overcoming their paralysis in order to act for the benefit of children.

The mandate to report abuse in all its forms (physical, sexual, and emotional) that related to deprivation of medical care and deprivation of educational services or psychological services are related not only to institutional resources and the documented reporting systems that are available to institutions but are also subject to reporting by individuals, whether family members or members of the community where individuals have information and experience as observers of those engaged in abusive behavior.

The mandate to report abuse goes beyond institutional responsibility as individual reporting of acts that clearly support situations of danger to children are critical to a public zeitgeist of humanitarian concern.

Estrangement from empathy for catastrophic suffering as a social norm appears to be present in the 21st century and has much to do with the chilling effect of the legal processes that are available to abusers to protect privacy and reputation by way of the chilling effect of the availability of legal action to sue for various forms of defamation and reputation infringement.

However, the mandate to report that which is demonstrably in one's immediate, present, observable experience is compelling and needs to be addressed in a current societal atmosphere in which child abuse in multiple forms related to highly lucrative forms of child exploitation are easily accessible to those with power and authority.

Yet the moral imperative to report what are clear and present facts available and provable must take precedence in all circumstances when abuse is incontrovertible.

Ethical guidelines in medical practice began with the Hippocratic oath as a formulation of moral truth that dedicated the life of the medical practitioner to the service of humanity with the clear intent of doing no harm. Acknowledgement of autonomy and dignity of patients were at the center of the Hippocratic oath. The respect for human life and the relationship between a physician's fiduciary responsibility to a patient were canonized in the statement that age, disability, nationality, political affiliation, race, sexual orientation, social standing, or any other factor would be allowed to prejudice the physician's responsibility and duty to the patient. Respect for secrecy and privacy between patient and doctor were considered of the utmost importance. So was respect for consciousness and dignity in accord with good medical practice as defined by the medical licensing boards.

Among the tenets of the Hippocratic oath was the acknowledgment that medical knowledge could be used to violate human rights and civil liberties. The acknowledgement in the

Hippocratic Oath was an understanding that, given the capacity to manipulate medical information, that any information within the realm of consciousness of the physician would never be used to threaten, manipulate, or cause harm to patients.

The Hippocratic oath was adopted by the General Assembly of the Medical Association at Geneva in 1948 and, subsequently, that declaration was amended in 1968, 1983, and 1994. It was further revised in 2005, 2006, and 2017. The Declaration of Geneva was reflective of an attempt to articulate humanitarian goals of medicine following medical crimes that had been committed in German-occupied Europe.

During the post World War 2 era and after the foundation of the World Medical Association, concern for the state of medical ethics was reflective of the disclosures related to details of the Nazi doctors' trial at Nuremberg which ended August 1947.

The revelations that were unearthed about the Imperial Japanese Army and their medical experimentation at unit 731 in China during World War 2 informed the medical community of the need for a moral center and an affirmation of a set of guidelines that informed human rights, the rights of patients, and the limits of scientific experimentation. A study committee was appointed to prepare a "charter of medicine," which was adopted as a promise that every doctor would make upon receiving their degree or diploma.

The medical vow that was adopted in Geneva in 1948 was agreed upon in the name of the Declaration of Geneva. The World Medical Association adopted the universal declaration of human rights that was declared by the United Nations general assembly in 1948 which established the "security of the person."

The moral tenets of these declarations appear to have been severely eroded in current medical and legal practice given the threats and intimidations provided by the legal practice to suppress controversial confrontations of multiple forms of abuse against vulnerable populations.

Whistleblower statutes exist to protect whistleblowers within institutions and the unique citizen within a society who seeks to reveal controversial secrets continues to be left to reporting based on their own conscience and moral imperative. The erosion of civil rights and liberties is a process that the medical and legal professions have participated in eroding in the 21st century to facilitate the advances of medical research with respect to an ability to share medical information for the benefit of healthcare as whole and advances in science and for profit motive.

What we have seen is a process in which the medical profession has been freed from exercising fundamental concern for the health, welfare, and dignity of the individual patient to societal concerns that protect against disclosures that have legal/criminal implications of a given patient.

When the rights of individual patients comes into conflict by the need to share information that impacts other individuals or institutions that have control or impact the patient issues

related to physical and emotional harm to the patient attributing responsibility to others that may be accused of harm to the individual patient has become the realm of law in the public interest that has in fact come to be known as compromising protections that should be afforded to vulnerable populations.

The mandate to report abuse as an individual moral imperative must be protected as the most critical bastion of freedom, speech, and reporting criminal acts in the face of potentially overwhelming threat, coercion, and intimidation.

With the coming of the age of the pronouncement of parental alienation as a blanket defense against accusations of all forms of child abuse, the chilling effect upon reporting abuse has been massive. It provides the family court system with the unique authority provided by the ability to hide behind the global assertion of judicial discretion which suggests that judges have extensive information about any given case. It provides them with exclusive authority to make decisions without admitting the underlying evidence.

The ability of judges to hide behind a glacial shield of discretion without providing the authenticated evidence on which their decisions are made is creating a realm for the growth of criminal activity, spearheaded by racketeering and the ability of collusion. This gray area produced by the secrecy provided by discretion has provided a breeding ground for family court collusion and vast criminal activity, exploiting a captive audience subject to an illegal process that involves power and authority over custody and division of marital assets.

The case of the award of custody of a minor child to the family of the known murderer of the child's father is rife with all of the elements that are in direct violation of every known code of ethics that protects vulnerable populations subject to professions of proprietary knowledge.

The Rubio case is the poster child for the exploitation of unwarranted expertise where a legal authority has designated a professional as invested with both intellectual and academic expertise as well as moral authority where that authority first of all does not exist at all and, second, where moral authority according to basic standard professional practice has been violated to the nth degree.

The court in the Rubio case not only violated and abandoned the most meager concerns for basic professional expertise, but for the abandonment of any moral authority or dignity as the individuals who were awarded both financial remuneration for their services and the authority to make critical decisions on behalf of a child were not only professionally incompetent and lacked the most minimal expertise in the actions that they exercised, but the actions of Jan Falk, the unlicensed practitioner, assigned to make custody recommendations on behalf of the case, lacked any and all degrees of even minimal respect for the dignity and privacy of the clients whose most private and confidential information was entrusted to her.

In a visit to a nail salon, Ms. Falk was heard to discuss intimate details of a case that she was retained as an expert for. Ms. Falk provided details of the case as she was the client in

a nail salon, having her nails attended to. She discussed intimate details of the case with the assembled members of the nail salon and other people who were present.

As the case that she was discussing was a high-profile case in the community in which she chose to have her nails attended to, members of the listening audience were personal friends and acquaintances of the individuals Ms. Falk chose to ridicule, humiliate, and defame.

News of her comments were communicated back to the subject of Ms. Falk's ridicule.

Ms. Falk represented herself to the court who appointed her as a licensed professional though her licensing and training fell far below the standard that would dictate any reasonable applicability to the skills needed to evaluate extraordinarily complex issues related to a criminal proceeding and multiple criminal charges against the individual who committed the murder and the circumstances in which this individual was raised and was able to exercise a crime of such heinous magnitude.

The indignities visited upon the subjects of Ms. Falk's enmity and her ability to savagely humiliate those who were party to tragic events speaks to a level of personal depravity and ignominy that should undermine the credibility of the report that she submitted and was able to have accepted by the court, which passed judgment, improperly and illegitimately made decisions that will have incomprehensibly damaging consequences, not only for the subject child but for all members of the two families associated with the tragedy that resulted from the murder of the child's father.

The magnitude of the crimes committed by all parties associated with the adjudication of custody from the moment that this individual was murdered is of such consequence that the entire case needs to be thoroughly scrutinized and studied for an attempt at even potential rehabilitation for the much needed rescue of the child.

We have asked for and will continue to request that this report of Jan Falk from Cascades Family Resolution Center be dismissed, that the damages/charges against her be considered, which are being developed, and the charges both requesting a dismissal of the evaluation and a review of the actions of all those responsible for having retained such a thoroughly incompetent individual.

Jill Jones Soderman
Executive Director, FCVFC
Administrator, Foundation for Family Law in the Public Interest