

## OUTLINE OF MY STORY [WHICH SPANS 6 YEARS]. THIS IS THE STORY THEY DON'T WANT YOU TO READ:

My story exposes corruption in the Courts, Police, Local Authority, Social Services and other spheres of power and also shows, most shockingly, how our taxes are, all too often, spent and the lengths our Authorities will go to silence the 'thorns in their side'.

My diary of a year in the life of a single mother has been appraised by Scott Meredith Literary Agency as follows: "This is a terrifying work, a searing and unsparing account of the torment you have suffered at the hands of a brutal, even maniacal ex-spouse, a vengeful stalker, ne're-do-well and sadist who embodies the most fervid and fearful possibilities one could face. You write of this year of torment without self-pity, with detachment, control, a notable unwillingness to sentimentalise or make special pleading for your circumstance and to open this anywhere is to be moved by the unforced clarity and integrity of the narration. The justice system and the 'protecting' agencies are incompetent, venal, corrupt and essentially against the single mother, victimized as you have been by an errant, abusive and brutal spouse and what has emerged from these pages is an indictment of the system, handled with courage. The ordeal has been extreme and you've recorded it with unflinching self-awareness and a great deal of insight. We are taken with many aspects of this manuscript."

When I left Gareth Williams, my ex fiancé and the father of my two youngest children Jordan and Melissa, on October 5th 1998, his stated objective was to have all four of my children [then aged four months old, 18 months old, 8 years old and ten years old] taken off me. He's had the full support of the State in his quest. The theme throughout has been of 'neutralizing' the situation wherever possible, and worse, to attack me through my kids - the easy targets. Andy [aged 10], in particular, was targeted by the Police. I will give examples of Police 'games', where they framed Andy and Shelly [aged 8] for phantom crimes. It was portrayed through various reports that I was suspected of abusing my children, when all the facts and all the evidence pointed to Gareth Williams being the abuser - of women and children.

For months GW stalked, harassed and intimidated me and my children. He even swerved his car into Andy and he did criminal damage to my house. There was also a stream of Social Workers and Health Visitors and a DSS official sent by him and various members of his family. Some of the calls were allegedly made by 'anonymous' informants. All referrals were venomous, vengeful and unfounded. Social Services acknowledged this and asked GW not to waste their time.

Police didn't believe GW when he made up stories that I'd been harassing him and that my kids were supposedly committing crimes on his property and that of his neighbours. However they refused to arrest him when there was plenty of evidence of him harassing me. [Police actually caught him in the act on one occasion. Neighbours could corroborate my statements; he was even seen climbing over my newly painted gate whereby he would've smeared himself and his clothes.] Instead police neutralized the situation. [When GW complained to them that he'd been forced to resign his position as a Special Constable as a "direct consequence" of my

actions, they wrote back, "the *parties* difficulties and continued involvement of the police in *their* differences was not compatible with the role." Later the police threatened me with a binding over order if I continued to call them out regarding GW, this was despite the fact that the bobbies who attended had stated GW was spiteful and a troublemaker and some had said that they couldn't understand why he wasn't being prosecuted. The court Welfare Officer remarked that such threats were out of order.

Eventually I tried to take out an injunction against GW, but my then solicitor, John Owens, persuaded me to accept a lesser order, an undertaking, which he pressured me into signing as well. John Owens said that if the injunction failed, I'd be weakened in court regarding the more serious issues of Custody and Contact. He also said that my signing would prevent "*further inflammation of the tensions between*" us. Neutrality was the theme throughout. It was reported in a Welfare report that we'd "*both signed undertakings in relation to alleged harassment.*" It was portrayed in Welfare reports and in Court that this was a case of just a domestic squabble between ex partners. All the evidence of serious abuse of me and my children by GW was ignored.

On February 5th 1999 I had to leave my 8-month old baby in hospital overnight because a doctor [Dr Macareth] misdiagnosed a rash for a burn. The doctor called in Social Services, saying that all cases of "*suspected child abuse need to be investigated.*" BUT hospital paediatricians and three local GPs diagnosed common infantile eczema and Melissa was prescribed hydrocortisone cream. They said there had been no need for a referral to Social Services. This was never reported though. Instead the Court W/O Vera Nolan reported that Social Services had "done a Section 47 investigation and had held a strategy meeting" and that "doctors had been unable to establish the cause of the mark." The W/O further hinted that I was abusing my child by reporting that "social workers would be making another *unannounced* visit before they could *close the case.*" This suspected 'burn' was brought up frequently in various reports for the court. I was now beginning to suspect that something sinister was going on and that my abhorrent ex was being protected.

Gareth Williams' ex wife was left distraught and destroyed when she was denied all contact to her two children after their marriage collapsed. She told me she never knew what hold GW had over the Authorities.

Alcohol Anonymous failed to safeguard my children. They stated to the W/O that GW and I had *both* sought help for *our* alcoholism, [*neutrality again - the picture portrayed is that we are both as bad as each other*] even though it was clear that he was attending the sessions and his name was on their books. [I'd accompanied him on the first night only, to support him; otherwise he would never have gone.]

Even though Vera Nolan, the W/O reported that he "did smell strongly of alcohol" during her visitation with him, she continued her 'neutral' stance, stating that we were "both looking for ways to denigrate each other in court." She accused me of being hostile. This was despite the fact I'd informed her that alcohol was the trigger for GW's violence and irresponsible behaviour and the Headmistress of GW's older children, Miss James of Dolgellau High School had confirmed to her everything that I'd said. Miss James had spoken to Conwy Social Services, the court W/O and my

new solicitor Delyth Hughes and had written a statement for court expressing her fears for my children's safety whilst in their father's care. She had said, with regard to her knowledge of him, his ex wife and his older children that there was "obvious neglect", his ex wife had been "beaten up by him and abused" and she'd even "witnessed Mr Williams pulling a gun on his ex wife." Despite all this and more, the Dolgellau police had not prosecuted him, instead they'd helped him secure custody of his older children by writing him a good character reference [which he had shown me]. Local Dolgellau people and the Headmistresses of Dolgellau High and Primary schools told me that they had referred to Social Services numerous times, but were effectively told to keep their noses out. Eventually an Educational Social Worker Nia Smith was called to GW's house to do an investigation.

I was not allowed to see the official records prepared by Nia Smith. I spent 14 months trying to get disclosure, during which time I was continuously fobbed off by social worker Maureen Catherall and W/O Vera Nolan and lied to by my old solicitor, John Owens. Eventually I was told they'd been destroyed. Gareth Williams contacted the Education Authority, threatening to Sue Miss James with defamation of character.

I was interrogated by the benefits agency because of GW's malevolent allegations of benefit fraud. Despite being able to produce documents to prove GW's lies and discredit him, the agency continued to target me. The CSA gave him immunity too. The B/A demanded the return of almost £17,000 'overpayment'. Solicitor John Owens told me to appeal, but strangely would not allow me to see the transcript of my own interview with the B/A official Mr John Drew. I produced more documents, which were required and I again wrote to him. Months passed without any correspondence from Mr Drew and it wasn't until a year later when I received a £1,000 demand for Council Tax that I learned via the Citizens Advice Bureau that the B/A still expected their repayment in full. The CAB discovered on my behalf that, for reasons known only to himself, Mr Owens had not lodged my appeal, despite my instructions to do so. He had only sent a letter to the B/A requesting the correct appeal form [which incidentally lay for over a month in the wrong department and thus wasted more of the time that I was given to appeal.] Then I was told it was too late to appeal, that the B/A would not negotiate with me and there was nothing I could do about it. John Owens was allowed to remain unanswerable. I wrote to the Law Society, but despite evidence incriminating both Mr Owens and GW's solicitor Mr Chris Hind of Amphetts, the Law Society sided with my solicitor.

On March 5th 1999 Police came to my house to tell me that I should be grateful because they'd spotted my children [aged 10 and 9] on CCTV, under the pier, in grave danger from the rough sea. The police reprimanded my kids and ordered them home. I was warned that if it happened again they'd be placed on "the At Risk register". By this time I knew that GW's words were no idle threat - he could pull strings. Something powerful but ugly was lurking in the background. The facts are:- My children were not in any danger - the PC agreed that they were both bone dry. The camera didn't focus under the pier and it wasn't even working [it was turned on a week later.] I was not allowed to see the tape or the stills. The CCTV control room official [who refused to reveal his identity] gave me a story which contradicted the police officer's version. A photo of A & S on the promenade with rough seas in the background appeared soon after in the Daily Post. This kafkaesque scenario

pointed to collaboration between GW, the Police and Council to enable the court W/O to submit that I was an unfit mother. GW informed me that the police were considering charging me with neglect. How did he know that?

On June 12th 1999 my neighbour's children and mine had an argument, which resulted in police accusing Andy, without any substance [on the contrary, various reports from the Education Authority, W/O and ESW had described him as "intelligent, polite and well-behaved"] of being a well-known, unruly, undisciplined job and that he'd be taken down to the police station for a "stern talking to". Andy was aggressively warned that he'd be going on the "*At Risk Register*" and that he'd "*end up being taken into care*". I was warned by the PC that, "*this will all end in tears*" and he said, "*you will lose all of your children.*" I was told to expect a visit from Social Services. Furious and frustrated, there was nowhere I could turn. I could only try and console Andy and tell him that he was not in the wrong and that the police were liars and were targeting him, almost certainly, on GW's orders.

On June 15th 1999 all four of my children were placed on the Child Protection At Risk Register, despite Social Workers voting against it. This was due to the numerous malicious referrals to Social Services [all of which were reported to be baseless] and a small, unexplained kitchen curtain fire; also due to the fact that I'd been honest about what I thought were some 'spiritual happenings' that we'd experienced. Detective constable Chris Walsh accused Andy of arson, despite any evidence. The firemen who attended on the night thought it could've been caused by the kettle or washing machine. There was no fire representative at conference or a fire report available. It was claimed that an out-of-hours social worker had attended on the night of the fire, which I knew was untrue and which later proved to be the case. [Please see Part 1 of my story for more.] I was powerless to prove that there was something shady going on. I faced the real risk of losing my children, just because I was the victim of a vicious, vengeful, venomous man who happened to have 'friends in high places'. The panel could only nit pick about trifling matters, of which I was proven to be innocent, such as the '*burn*' gave them "cause for concern" and the fact that I successfully Home Educated my children, despite the fact that the Education Authority had stated that they were pleased with my children's progress. I was ordered to be assessed by a psychiatrist and Andy was referred to a child psychologist.

During the 'Comprehensive Risk Assessment' which followed, social workers and the court W/O continued to misrepresent the true picture and instead concentrated on creating an image of quarrelsome parents who couldn't/wouldn't work together for the sake of their children. A & S and myself were subjected to endless meetings with Family Protection Social Workers, a Mental Health Social Worker, Health Visitors and Psychiatrists and the W/O. Most of the questioning was about my family history - my parents' marriage, my brother and his family, my pregnancies, how Andy [aged 16 months] had reacted when Shelly was born... A lot of it was about digging around, trying to find something that they could pretend to be 'concerned' about. The social workers tried to get me to describe my children as "demanding" and "difficult" and they referred to A & S as needing help with "their emotional, social and behavioural problems". [The only problems they had were those which resulted from being treated unjustly.] They weren't concerned that GW was still boasting about knowing my every move and having me watched. They weren't interested in my

experiences of police skulduggery, GW's ex wife's fate or that he was still being allowed to make a mockery of the Child Welfare Agencies and that he was *still* tormenting us with a bombardment of malevolent referrals via:- Child-line, NSPCC, Health Visitors, Doctors, Hospital A & E, Police and Social Services to try and trigger care proceedings and that we were being victimized. The W/O, although mentioning the "unhelpful trickle of fabricated referrals", continually stressed expressions such as, "If they continue to maintain their antagonistic stance towards each other, Jordan's and Melissa's emotional needs will be severely hampered" and "The babies will obviously be reluctant and upset at changeovers if the parents are arguing." She didn't report the truth i.e that J & M would get upset because their father would yell at, threaten or hit, me or be rough with them. I said very little at changeovers for fear of provoking my ex. She also stated that neither of us had anything good to say about each other, yet I distinctly remember praising my ex up for his good points and telling her that there had been good times. When I made her aware that the ESW had been called in by worried teachers at the Dolgellau schools, her attitude was, "So what, the ESW visited you too." She didn't seem to grasp the point that GW was being investigated for child abuse, whereas I was in receipt of a routine visit, as all Home Educators are. The W/O described us as collecting "proof" for the purpose of belittling each other in court. There is a world of difference in my aim which was/is my desperate need to expose the truth in order to limit any future damage to my children, compared with GW's evil, criminal intentions. At the end of it all no one could find anything to be concerned about, except my "preoccupation with society being corrupt." To that end their fear was that I might be a bad influence on my children.

The 'At Risk' registration also caused me to be deregistered as a carer of Special Needs children. This was despite the fact that I had a good work record and good references and after nine months of assessment I was reported to be a "loving and capable mother" and my children reported to be: "loved, contented, well-cared for, happy, safe, polite, pleasant, intelligent and mature." The Child Protection Coordinator Mr Graham Seale had assured me that the Registration would not prevent me resuming my work, but after giving me his word that he'd look upon my application favourably, he later retracted. [He also fed me a pack of lies about re-registering.]

Other conferences followed. The people sitting in judgement wanted to put my kids in 'care'; this in an area which is famous for paedophilia in care homes and where the finger of suspicion has been pointed at police officers and Masons.

On September 22nd 1999 Police accused Andy [aged 11] and Shelly [aged 9] of causing criminal damage near GW's house in Llysfaen, of seriously injuring a horse owned by his neighbour Mr Dewi Jones and of stealing things [although DJ wasn't quite sure what!] None of this was true. It was another stitch up by the police. The police did not question me until the Wednesday, yet the alleged crimes were committed on the preceding weekend. They couldn't tell me details, such as the date/time of occurrence or what 'feed' my kids had supposedly fed to the horse. They didn't even know if an officer had visited Dewi Jones' premises. I visited DJ's stables and spoke to his wife. She was clearly flustered and told lies. My dad and I demanded an investigation. We were sent a constable who was very cagey and unable to answer our questions. He told us he'd visit the DJ family to find out more.

Why didn't he check the police record? He then returned and told *me* to visit the DJ family to get more information so that he could trace the incident on the Police Computer and thus give me the information that I wanted; that is the *Police's* version of events. [He might have had to alter them!!!!] There followed more obfuscation. It would have been laughable, had it not been so utterly outrageous. Good job I have it all tape recorded. [Please see Part 1 of my story.] Eventually Inspector Philip Hare did an 'investigation' which *didn't involve the questioning of police officers or the DJ family or his employees!* I wrote to the Police Complaints Authority, but my complaint was referred back to the police for them to investigate themselves! There is no independent body overseeing police dealings. They can and do go about their business, doing exactly whatever they please. And they're doing it with *your* money. The findings of Chief Inspector Scott were that my children were "exonerated, they having done nothing wrong" and yet he concluded: "I'm perfectly satisfied that all police officers have acted correctly." Talk about conflicting statements! There was no apology and no explanation, just the brief additional patronizing comment: "Finally Miss Kilby, I sincerely hope that you now have a clear understanding of the situation as there is nothing further we can assist you with in regard to this particular matter." This is a clear case of corruption and cover up at the highest levels. The sheer arrogance of the Police is truly breathtaking and the sinister web of secrets and lies conceals a deadly truth known only to the perpetrator and the victim.

Some of my mail began to arrive open or otherwise tampered with. To date, more than 40 open or damaged envelopes have arrived. Royal Mail's security officer Mr Neil Roberts has been unable to discover the culprit. He assured me that investigations have been done, yet *local postmen were not questioned!*

On June 5th 2000 I took my children for a short Butlins break. During this time GW and his solicitor Mr Chris Hind of Amphletts went to court to take out an urgent 'ex-parte prohibited steps order' against me banning me from leaving the country as GW was alleging that I intended to flee to my birthplace in the USA. It wasn't until the Wednesday [June 7th] that GW [in his "great distress and upset" contacted SS, whereby it was suggested that I might be on holiday. Everyone [including the W/O] agreed that GW's story was doubtful and they questioned his motives. They were amazed that I was being dragged into court yet again and said that GW had some explaining to do this time. They were surprised that Mr Hind was taking such legal action because his client had not made any effort to check my whereabouts - he hadn't even contacted the police. After a few days, however, I received a statement from him, saying [amongst a pile of other lies and vicious allegations] that he had in fact gone to the Police on the Monday [June 5th] but that they'd been "somewhat unhelpful". As we are talking about the whereabouts and wellbeing of two very young children, it would've been the police's *duty* to try and trace a 'runaway' family. Didn't GW and the Police realize that all they had to do was make a swift call to my dad or even Social Services or the H/V on the *Monday*? It would've saved us all a load of hassle and the taxpayer a lot of expense. Social Workers and my barrister stated that the reference to police was an afterthought and that GW was clearly causing trouble and wasting everyone's time. They agreed that if he had to pay the legal fees himself, instead of handing the bill to the taxpayer, he wouldn't have been so hasty. Also, surely questions should have been asked about Mr Hind's decision to rush to Chester Crown Court for Prohibition Order Hearings? Maybe *he* wouldn't have been in such a hurry if he wasn't paid so generously by the Public Purse. At

Court, the Judge had not one word of criticism for GW. Instead he gave us *both* a lecture about how he sees warring couples like us all the time and he quoted from a Welfare Report: "They are totally unwilling or unable to work together, communicate effectively, agree arrangements or make rational decisions together regarding their children." **Neutrality again.** It is quite breathtaking.

Despite the fact that Social Services and the Court Welfare Officer did finally believe that whatever I did I was damned and that GW was guilty of harassment, a view which they communicated to the police, the police disagreed. They wrote: "Contacting the police, engaging in legal process and making reports to social services are not courses of action which constitute harassment." It beggars belief! Moreover they refused to confirm whether or not GW *had* contacted the police on Monday 5th June, as it would be breaching "Mr Williams' confidentiality" since such information is "subject to the Data Protection Act". They would say that, wouldn't they!

On July 25th 2000 another cock and bull story emerged about A & S supposedly drifting dangerously out to sea on rubber rings. Please see Part 1 of my story for more. It shows collaboration between GW, the Coastguard, two Seaboard Inspectors, MP Elfyn Llwyd and the Police to try and portray me as a negligent and unfit mother. [GW had warned me that my kids would be going back on the At Risk Register, with the next step being 'care'.] In relation to this story, in spite of all the twists, the police absolved GW from blame and insisted that the call [to the Police, erm or was it to the Coastguard!] was genuine and made with goodwill. In reply to my letter to them asking that GW be investigated for harassment in connection with this latest incident, Inspector K Jones wrote: "With regard to any harassment of yourself by Mr Williams and his family, we would require more than one incident or pattern of behaviour which so far has not been demonstrated." [How many more calls to the Welfare agencies etc did they want? Their conceit and pretension knows no bounds!] The Inspector also informed me that the Coastguard had received a call from a "member or the public" and had logged it as a "false call with good intent". Inspector K Jones added that the coastguard "did not consider it a HOAX call". He would write that!

On April 30th 2001 GW announced [for the umpteenth time] that Police were watching my kids. He said that they've "got it in for Andrew" and that he'd be getting a criminal record. He was right! On May 5th 2001 Andy and I were ordered to attend the police station to hear more trumped up charges - of Andy shooting at a newborn baby a week prior and to be told that Andy faced criminal charges. PC Mailer told me that he'd just been approached by a man [name unknown to Mailer!] who had pointed Andy out to him and said, "**That's the lad with the gun.**" He stated that the man had **reported the incident last week, but that he didn't have the information in front of him at the present time.** On June 26th 2001 Andy was formally reprimanded at the police station. I asked Sergeant Williams for a copy of PC Mailer's report. He refused, saying it is confidential as the man wished to remain unidentified. I asked him to investigate GW for his possible involvement. Sgt Williams would not put anything in writing. Instead he visited me unannounced on July 25th 2001; he again refused to give me a copy of the report, but he did read it out. [Luckily I have it, and more, secretly tape recorded.] PC Mailer's report states, "**On May 5th 2001** I was approached by a male who pointed out a young boy in the

market and claimed that the **boy had shot at him the previous week** and had hit the pushchair containing his young son. The male refused all details as he didn't want to get involved..." I told Sgt Williams that such a 'statement' was an afterthought because PC Mailer had told me [on 5/5/01] that the 'man' had **reported the 'shooting' on April 28<sup>th</sup> 2001**. If the 'allegation' was true it would've been reported on 28/4/01 and the police would've got the man's identity, even if they weren't prepared to divulge it to me. Please see Part 1 of my story showing how Sgt Williams and PC Mailer were in cahoots with GW to try and tarnish Andy's character.

On August 20<sup>th</sup> 2002 GW did not return my children after visitation. He made up a story that Andy had burned Jordan on the face with a cigarette. Please see details of what happened next in Part 2 of my story. Basically, even though two doctors did not think a mark on his forehead was a burn [Dr Thackray thought it was impetigo and prescribed Fucidin cream] a 3<sup>rd</sup> doctor [Dr Sue Roberts] felt that it could be a burn, even though four days had passed when she examined his **healed scab**, which she stated made it *more difficult to interpret*. Police officer Gay Waring of the Family Protection Unit was aggressive towards Andy, telling him Jordan had spent 20 minutes telling her that he'd been burned by Andy. She put him under great pressure to admit guilt. She said: "Just admit it and the investigation will be over a lot quicker; it'll be a lot easier for you and then they'll come back here." Yeah right! If she can be so overbearing with Andy, how has she behaved with a five year old? I was prevented from seeing my children and was told that the children would remain with their father until it could be sorted out in court.

Over the next few weeks I was fed information, such as that my children didn't want to come home, that Jordan was scared of Andy and that he didn't like him, that I was a bitch etc etc. There was confusion surrounding this 'burn' - first it was a cigarette burn, then it was caused by a blue lighter, it could even have been a scald. There was uncertainty as to who had burned Jordan - Andy or me. Yet somehow, according to social worker Angela Mattison, Jordan had spoken **articulately** and, according to Sue Roberts, he was clear that it had happened in my kitchen on Sunday [Jordan, then aged 5 didn't know the days of the week!] So, according to this lot on the 'child protection' team, Jordan knew details such as the colours of lighters and where and when he had been burned and yet he didn't know who had burned him!!!! THERE WAS NO BURN. Bare faced liars. How do this lot sleep soundly in their beds at night? Evil beyond belief. Of course I was not allowed to be present when Jordan was examined by Dr Sue Roberts.

Gay Waring actually showed me how Jordan had mimicked the using of a lighter and she made a point of pulling a nasty, hateful expression to stress that that was how Jordan had looked when he was showing her how to flick on a lighter. GW had told Dr Ratcliffe that Jordan doesn't know the difference between a cigarette and a lighter. Gay waring also stressed that Jordan was very sure he'd been burned by Andy and that he'd been burned on the arms too. THERE WERE NO BURN MARKS!

Social Services manager Ian Turner tried to contact GW several times, urging him to allow me contact and he wrote to my solicitor [now Mr Peter Brown of JW Hughes & Co] expressing his concern at the lack of contact and stating, "The situation as



presented to us would not automatically prevent his return to the family home." There was clear evidence of GW lying and of priming and emotionally abusing my children. Ian Turner said GW was in default, that he should've returned J & M and that there should've been a case conference. Why couldn't he call one? He couldn't even arrange for me to see my children with a social worker present in order to 'police' it, due to lack of resources. NO, but they had plenty of resources for the purposes of aiding and abetting the child abuser GW and for harassing me with their umpteen referrals from so-called 'anonymous' informants. There was talk of Gay Waring doing a video interview with Jordan. I asked to be present. That was swiftly shelved when Ian Turner informed me later that he'd just found out "in the interests of the child" it wouldn't be a good idea. He said he'd just found out that Jordan had commented to Gay Waring, "Please don't ask me any more questions." Ian Turner was concerned that it would be an abusive process. What about the **abuse of being denied their mummy?** Ian Turner stated in a letter, "Given Jordan's stated requests at the end of his medical examination of not wanting to be asked any further questions." But Dr Roberts wrote, "Jordan did not say this to me after the medical."

It would have been hilarious, had it not been so scandalous.

Numerous questions were asked of: Social Services managers Ian Turner and Terry James, Social Workers Angela Mattison, Maureen Catherall and Elaine Buckley by my solicitor Mr Brown, as directed by the Court. However, despite umpteen chasers for replies, they remain unanswered. No surprises there!!! These people can and do remain unanswerable and unaccountable. Numerous questions were asked of Amphletts solicitor Chris Hind and the response was the same 2-fingered salute! The umpteen chasers sent to him must also have found the shredder. The letter sent to Family Protection Police Officer Gay Waring did get a response, and it reveals that she was telling porkies. Please see Parts 2 and 3 of my story for details.

Two weeks after GW had been permitted by the Police and Social Services to keep my children [which was in breach of the Court Order] and prevent me having any contact with them whatsoever, I was asked to attend court. Peter Brown had not been able to attend and my stand-in solicitor had only the info on my case that I had provided during the half hour that we'd had beforehand. There was no medical evidence or doctor or any representative from Social Services in court. Why wasn't Ian Turner there?

The outcome was that Judge D L Hughes granted GW temporary residence, saying that the father had taken all the responsible steps contacting the Police and Social Services and that "no doctor is absolutely certain that it was a cigarette burn, if it was probably a burn; that is sufficient" and "the court doesn't insist on absolute certainty." Judge Hughes granted me supervised contact, but left it to the solicitors to arrange the details.

GW enrolled my children at Ysgol Cynfran, in Llysfaen, again in breach of the C/O. [Judge Elystan Morgan had twice given me permission to Home Educate them.] Headmaster Mr Geraint Williams also showed bias towards the abuser GW. He would not allow me even five minutes contact with my children at his school. He

steered me to one side so that I couldn't be seen by Jordan and Mel when they came out. He accused me of threatening him. I did not. When Jordan came out, GW deliberately placed himself in a position so Jordan couldn't see me. Shelly heard him hiss "smile Jordan smile." When I did get a glimpse of Jordan's face I was shocked. He looked as if he was about to burst into tears. He looked haunted, confused, terrified ... stifled. I wanted to run to him and cuddle him, but the Head was holding onto my arm, threatening me with the Police if I caused a scene. GW whisked J & M away. I followed and called their names. I repeatedly told them that I love them. Mel stared at me with the same lost, sorrowful and 'pleading' look. She too looked as if she was trying hard to contain her true emotions. Their fear-ridden eyes told the truth. In the car they looked shell-shocked. They wanted to cry but they weren't allowed to. Both J & M were clearly deeply traumatized. I asked Jordan if Andy had hurt him; I pointed to my forehead. He said "no" quietly. When GW alleged in a statement that the children ran away from me at the school, although Geraint Williams confirmed to my solicitor verbally that that wasn't true, he wouldn't state it in writing. My solicitor wrote him numerous letters, but he refused to answer. Over time, Jordan's teacher was concerned that Jordan was suffering abuse at his father's house, such that it was obviously affecting his ability to learn, and wanted to write a report which would've helped me in court, but she knew it would be blocked by the Headmaster. She could only inform social worker Elaine Buckley the difficult position she was in. [Please see Part 3 of my story for more on Mr Geraint Williams.]

I was awarded some supervised contact and then we had another child protection conference [on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2002]. But none of the 3 doctors who had examined Jordan were present. The meeting was biased and not based on fact. Andy and I were treated as suspected child abusers. The Panel were determined to make the *burn* allegation stick. Words like '*burn-like*' and "*somewhat suspicious*" were branded about. When I attempted to point out that the medical evidence was inconclusive, that there were inconsistencies in GW's story, that he had repeatedly lied on oath and was therefore guilty of perjury, that there was evidence of priming, that GW was persistently late bringing my children for contact and had frequently failed to bring them, I was repeatedly interrupted by the Child Protection Co-ordinator Mr Graham Seale and told to "save it for the court." Much of the meeting was spent listening to Dr Groves reading from years old reports and especially in relation to the kitchen curtain fire that we'd had, which she described as a "major house fire." Dr Groves reveals her lack of impartiality in her remarks in a 16/1/04 letter: "It is of great concern that apparently at former meetings, e.g. with Education, Mrs Kilby will be heard to be verbally abusive towards Mr Williams in front of other adults and professionals." If she had checked with School staff she would have known that GW was lying about that too. I have always conducted myself calmly and civilly at meetings and I only ever politely point out the facts to those present. Dr Groves has been involved in this case since the first child protection conference on 15<sup>th</sup> June 1999. She has never mentioned any concerns about Jordan and Melissa being emotionally abused by their father, despite the copious amount of evidence of this including the reports from Social Services. She is even aware that GW is a liar because she states in her letter that he told her that the Young Persons Health Advisor Bethan Lloyd *had* visited me to give advice [re his allegations]. She adds that Bethan told her that that wasn't true; in fact Bethan has not at any time mentioned any concerns to me re GW's allegations; which suggests that *she*

believes that GW behaves maliciously. The truth is Jordan would head bang at his father's house and soil and hide his underwear there because of his fear of his father. But those whose job it is to protect children all too often fail to do so and instead side with and protect the abuser. I was also excluded from two Speech and Language therapy assessments re Melissa that had resulted from a school referral. This was despite the school's assurances that I would be notified of my daughter's appointments.

Not surprisingly, over the next couple of years my children's mental and physical health suffered. Please see details of this in Part 2 of my story. Melissa developed Asthma and became so thin and frail.

On NOVEMBER 11<sup>th</sup> 2002 the NSPCC sent me copies of referrals that I had requested. On one of the reports it is stated: "Concerns: Child Sexual Abuse? Gareth, the father of Melissa and Jordan, had all four children with him one weekend. It is reported that he found these two children who were sharing the same room, naked with Andrew on top of Michelle [this has not been previously reported]." It hadn't been previously reported because it is just another lie. Where do such thoughts come from? Virtually everything that GW accuses me of, he is guilty of. Much of the information [including whole sheets] on the NSPCC reports has been blanked out. This shows that the NSPCC are more concerned about protecting paedophiles and child abusers rather than abused children. The identity of caller is of course blanked out. On one report it is stated: blank blank blank blank case conference last week, and feels the mother is suspected of causing the fire. It is obvious that the blanked bits read something like: "HE was at a..." It is obvious the 'concerned' caller is slanderer GW.

There was more delay in the Court Proceedings. CAF/CASS officer Ivor Hughes proved to be incompetent and after a few months had not produced a report and instead made a recommendation to the court that Social Services do an assessment. The social workers assigned to the case – Pat Williams and Elaine Buckley had never heard of such a thing. They said they tried their best to have the assessment shifted back to Cafcass as it is *their* job to deal with custody issues. Here you have a Welfare Officer whose job it is to ensure the welfare of children, knowing full well that GW was in continual blatant breach of the C/O, knowing that he lied about me taking J & M from the church contact venue, knowing the full history of GW's PROVEN lies and malicious intent as documented by other welfare officers and social workers, knowing the details of the present case, such as the lying on Oath and the priming, knowing that GW refuses to answer questions through his solicitor, knowing the strong bond of love between my children and I and especially between myself and J & M, despite all the attempts to keep us apart and knowing that it is his job to make recommendations on residence and contact.... and he decides to obstruct proceedings, thus furthering the abuse of my children. Mr Turner and Mr Seale also frustrated proceedings. They had enough evidence that GW is abusing J & M. These 3 men and Mr Hind are aiding and abetting child abuse.

On 27<sup>th</sup> March 2003 the tide finally began to turn. In court it was decided that I would have a build up of home contact including overnight stays until the final hearing in May. This is because the social workers Pat and Elaine turned out to be honest and decent and this was reflected in their report. They told the TRUTH, a rare

phenomenon. They stated that GW refuses to allow contact at my home and that he is obstructing contact between Jordan and Andy, and they reported that GW is uncooperative and frustrating their assessment and their efforts to move proceedings on. They stressed their concern about the priming and their worries that GW could be feeding my children negative images of us. They reported that J & M behave negatively – timid, subdued, shy.... in front of their father but that when he leaves, their whole demeanour changes; they become much more positive – at ease, lively, active, bubbly.... The social workers conclude that GW's behaviour is detrimental to the welfare of J & M and that since they have resided with him, their life has been unstable. Their recommendation is that J & M should return home to live and that contact should lead to the return of J & M to my care under a residence order with defined contact arrangements. [See more details of their 26/3/03 report in Part 3 of my story.]

Their second report, dated 6<sup>th</sup> May 2003 was just as supportive. It too carries the recommendation that the children should return home to me to live. They reported that they continue to have concerns re GW cooperating with them and also with the contact arrangements. They state: "**Gareth Williams was required to be directed by the court to comply with Social Services' repeated requests.**" They state that his reluctance demonstrates that he is not recognizing the needs and the wishes of the children. They add: "SK's level of powerlessness and frustration in being denied contact with her two younger children has, at times, caused her to act extremely. Given the circumstances, we would tend to be sympathetic to her circumstances." The social workers state that they do not support GW's belief that Jordan is frightened of Andy and that the behaviour of the children is not consistent with his claims. They say it is very apparent that Jordan does not manifest any fear of Andrew and that he actively seeks to play and spend time with Andy. They express their concerns about the priming. They are concerned that Melissa especially is being prompted by her father to state that she does not want to see me and they believe that what she says may not be her own views. They point out that her behaviour during contact suggests a close loving relationship with me. The social workers state that all my children share with each other and also with me a very loving, close and confident relationship. Nowhere is it stated in either report that GW has a loving or close relationship with the children. Neither is it stated by the social workers or by the judge that they believe him to be honest. In contrast it is stated in the judgment of 24/8/00 by Judge Elystan Morgan: "I regard Ms Kilby as a very honest person, a very candid person, priding herself in not overstating her case or in seeking to conceal her motivations in any way at all." The social workers state that I cooperate fully at all times with Social Services and they found me to be "open and frank" throughout their assessment. Of course Gareth Williams does not accept their findings. That is clear from his 30/4/03 statement.

Thank goodness that there are some decent people working within the area of child care/child protection. However within the **upper** levels of the hierarchy of Local Government and her Agencies, evil is flourishing. There was no way the trial was going to go ahead with such favourable reports from social workers and most importantly their strong recommendations that my children be returned. On 7/5/03 in court Judge Morgan agreed with the opposition that since I was challenging The Educational Psychologist Mr Barrett's report, he was needed in court. However since he was unable to attend, the judge ruled that the matter would be adjourned.

[Please see details of this in Part 2 of my story.]

It emerged that Barrett was available after all to attend on the 9th May so I asked why proceedings couldn't go ahead. My barrister Brendan Anderson told me that it was a question of whether psychologist Carol Moore [of Randle Associates] could come on that day also, which was unlikely because she was booked to attend on the 8th. I asked why we couldn't deal with her on the 8th and Barrett on the 9th. Brendan told me that they might want to listen to each other. The excuses got worse by the minute! Who involved Barrett anyway and why? Obviously GW and the Ysgol Cynfran Headmaster. Where's the neutrality in that? Why wasn't the Randle report enough? Even social worker Pat remarked that Barrett hadn't even spoken to J & M and had based his report on the findings of Randle. They used everything and anything to delay the process. There was talk of the assessment being shifted back to CAF/CASS. They didn't get away with that so they used Barrett as the excuse to procrastinate. The Judge later confirmed the obvious; that the longer this matter remained unresolved the greater the advantage to the opposition on the basis of the status quo. When I learned that it could take many months before we came before the court again I asked what the situation was if I conceded on the Education. Brendan told me that we could do away with both psychologists and the trial could go ahead immediately to decide residence. I agreed. After discussions with the other side Brendan told me that I had to accept the psychologists' reports, which meant that I had to *agree* with them and that in the doing I would be forfeiting the right to apply to Home Educate J & M at any time in the future. He said that the judge wanted to be sure that I'll fully support State Education and that I wasn't going to raise the H/E issue again in a year or so. I informed Brendan that I'd go along with their demands on the basis that a decision was made *that day* [7th May] about residence. I reminded him that my children are being abused and my priority is to get them back. Even though I wasn't the one disrespecting judges and breaking court orders and I'd fully supported State Ed during my older children's spells in school [unlike GW] and I'd made it clear that I'd do so again for my younger children, opposition barrister Robert Hornby insisted that it was important I *agree* with the Barrett report. He said that judging by my statement it was clear I had very different views though and therefore he required a new statement from me and stated that he'd need to cross examine me. Court was again adjourned.

On 14<sup>th</sup> June 2003 I received a letter from Chris Hind of Amphletts stating that Mr Mark Barrett was of the opinion that he could add very little to what he'd stated in his reports and that the Head Geraint W would be a more appropriate person to give evidence in court. [This would be because he'd obtained all his info solely from the Headmaster.] He applied to the court for a further directions appointment. Judge Morgan ruled that both Barrett and the Head Ger W were to attend court on the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> July 2003. Every opportunity was taken to obstruct, frustrate and delay the court proceedings. Social Services managers continued to allow the abuse of my children and they continued to enable GW to breach all court orders. [See details – schedule of contact [or rather, lack of it!]] Social Services manager Terry James advised GW that he should do what a **responsible parent would do and that if he has concerns he should NOT take the children for contact**. This is the very same Terry James who refuses to answer my questions and doesn't even acknowledge receipt of correspondence and who doesn't return my phone calls. He is also the guy who *advised me to request my social services files [which I'm still*

*waiting for!]* and encouraged me to have GW prosecuted for emotionally abusing my children.

Court proceedings were further delayed when GW claimed he was unable to attend court because he'd suffered an attack to the head by a metal bar. He hadn't. When my dad enquired with the police for more information, he was sunk in the usual sea of police Masonic obfuscation. Please see Pt 2 of my story regarding this and many more examples of underhanded practices. Remember, hundreds of hours expended maliciously by the parasites in the public service have to be paid for by the public. They pick on vulnerable people in order to justify their existence while pillars of society commit heinous sexual offences with impunity.

The tide turned again. The Social Workers' final report was along the familiar theme of NEUTRALITY. Social Workers Pat and Elaine played safe in their reporting and as a result appeared not that concerned about abused children but rather in protecting their jobs and of not rocking the boat. It would seem that they had been influenced by their Mafiosi managers or the Legal Mafia into watering down their report. It is illogical and contradictory; there are some untruths and it is in the main presenting a picture of a *pair of warring parents who refuse to work together for the sake of their children*. In short it is a complete U-turn to what they had already stated. Well such a report was bound to come sooner or later, wasn't it!!! They were now recommending **joint** residence. The social workers **neutralized** the situation by repeatedly stressing that the problem lies with both me and GW. It is astonishing that more than 5 years on and after all the harassment, stalking and intimidation I endured from GW, social workers were *still* making remarks such as: "We have spoken at length with both SK and GW pointing out that there has been virtually no change in their attitude towards each other or their dispute about their children since 1998 when Vera Nolan, Court Welfare compiled a comprehensive report. We have again advised both parents that they must put their differences to one side and begin to concentrate more upon the emotional needs of J & M." This is especially so since they wrote more fitting comments in their first two reports. The only conclusion I could draw is that they have been subjected to some pressure from their superiors or the Legal Dept to dumb down their remarks and neutralize the matter. They did tell me that both their other reports were edited by the Legal Dept as some of their wording was too explicit. They said that they have to be careful that they are not accused of bias and they were worried about writing something that the barristers might be able to "drag them over the coals" when giving evidence. **This is staggering. Child abuse is a crime and should not be played down or, worse, covered up. What is the point of social workers making an assessment if someone else changes what they report? Surely the social workers are qualified to report as they witness?** [For more details please see Part 3 of my story]

Finally a decision was made in court on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2003 about custody of my children. The High Court Judge Mark Hedley had prejudged the outcome before Pat [the first to testify] had finished giving evidence. He stated that he was inextricably linking the issues of education and residence. He said that if he gives me a residence order he will allow me to Home Educate. He also made it clear that he sides with the 'educational experts' and that he is obliged to follow the social workers' recommendations. He made it clear that he wasn't interested in the

history. He said that he **didn't feel that the findings of fact in relation to burns, priming or whatever** [obstruction of contact, breach of previous court orders, perjury...] were going to influence his decision: they had no relevance. He referred to GW and I as "point scoring" and said that the case was about the "here and now." To that end his only concerns were about the children being damaged by the acrimony between parents and he told us to stop battling with each other. He said social services are not to be used to 'police' the handover of the children, adding that they are not the "crutch for inadequate parents." [Here is the familiar **Neutrality** theme yet again.] He supported the status quo, saying that what the *children need most is the least amount of change possible*. Regarding my fears that GW will continue to deny me my children he said he can get around that by adding a penal notice to his order. He then made a joke about us *both* going to prison. The writing was on the wall, wasn't it? The best I could hope for was to try and persuade Judge Hedley to agree to a joint residence order by saying that school does have some benefits; one of which was that it would facilitate contact. It worked.

Joint Residence is not ideal, but it is a bucket load better than fleeting and sparse contact. Unfortunately it gave GW the opportunity to continue manipulating and behaving maliciously and it gave him carte blanche to continue to deny me my children and continue his stance of non-co-operation with social workers. [See examples in the latter part of Part 2 of my story, which also shows dubious dealings within the NSPCC and more Police fraud.] I was even forced to apply for a Specific Issue order for the return of my children when their father yet again in contravention of the order made by the Honorable Mr Justice Hedley only 2 months prior deliberately contravened that order by refusing to return the children to me during the week starting 7<sup>th</sup> June 2004. He claimed in his solicitor's letter dated 7<sup>th</sup> June 2004: "The authorities have advised [him] that he should not return the children to [my] care and that he does not return the children to school." Pat and Elaine confirmed that he lied about that. Keeping children off school without good reason is in itself a jailable offence.

During that week he refused to allow Pat and Elaine to interview the children, he would not co-operate with them at all - he failed to return their calls, he called them biased and requested that other social workers take over. His excuse for again denying me my children was because of *comments that he says I made to the children*. Pat told me on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2004 that GW had referred it to the police and NSPCC. One of his relatives phoned the NSPCC too because Mel *allegedly* repeated to someone else in GW's family that I'm going to kill the kids. Pat told me that the NSPCC also spoke to police. She read some of the NSPCC report out to me: "The police officer spoke to Gareth Williams and both the children and Melissa was adamant that she did not like mummy and that mummy hurt her..." She also read out a NSPCC report dated 29/4/04 re Mel's operation. On 10<sup>th</sup> June 2004 Pat told me that GW had again contacted the NSPCC to say that he will allow the children to be seen by her & E but that the children are not to be taken from his house because he said they are frightened that the social workers will return them to 'mum's'. Pat said that I was not allowed to see the reports and when I requested copies from the NSPCC, team manager Chris O'Marah wrote [14/7/04]: "I have had a search through our database and cannot locate any information recorded as the date you specify. The most recent report we have was following a call some months earlier." **Something is adrift!** I wrote back on 16/7/04 asking for a copy of their

most recent report. I sent a chaser on 15/8/04. On 25<sup>th</sup> August 2004 Mr O'Marah sent it. It is dated 20<sup>th</sup> January 2004! [Please see Part 3 of my story for more.] Pat told me that Police Officer Dinnis had interviewed the children in front of their father at his house on *Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2004*. The police sent their report to Social Services. I was refused a copy. My solicitor Peter Brown told me that they won't divulge it at 'this stage' because it could interfere with their *investigation against me!* Of course the Police fraternity won't release anything in writing. They are worried that I might find something contradictory in their reports, something that would expose their fraud. Why the secrecy if they have nothing to hide??? Pat told me that the police report states: "The children have hinted that mummy has talked about dying with them. Gareth Williams told the police that he was due to swap over the children **today** however due to his concerns he is going to see his solicitor to get an emergency order." **HANG ABOUT!** This Police Officer Dinnis is supposed to have spoken with GW and J & M on Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> of June 2004. GW was not due to hand the children over to me until Monday 7<sup>th</sup> June 2004. **WOOPS!** Here is a hint that this 'report' is fraudulent and must have been written by a lying Mason. No wonder the windbags wouldn't let me have a copy. My solicitor Peter Brown told me on 7/7/04 that he would request PC Dinnis' report. He wrote to PC Dinnis on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2004 and he sent a chaser on 19<sup>th</sup> August 2004 to the North Wales Police, Child Protection Unit. The wimps preferred not to respond in writing [of course] and instead PC Dinnis *telephoned* my solicitor to say that the information has simply been passed to the Child Protection Unit!!! [See Part 3 of ms for more details]

Joint Residence also gave GW the freedom to continue involving the courts. For example on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2004 District Judge O W Williams expressed his annoyance at our presence in court *yet again*. This was in relation to an operation Melissa had to undergo. Please see more of this in Part 2 of my story, which reveals more evidence of GW's abominable behaviour, this time in hospital, and how he was assisted by some other higher Authority than the law [the medical Masonic fraternity perhaps?] to continue in his nefarious ways. **But** rather than criticize and punish the culprit GW, the one who **repeatedly** instigates court action and then continually breaches court orders, continually refuses to co-operate with Social Services, wastes government agencies', Courts' and NHS resources, repeatedly makes malicious and unfounded allegations, continuously physically and mentally abuses his children, regularly prevents them seeing their mummy, habitually commits perjury.... Judge Williams **completely neutralized the situation [surprise surprise!]** and threatened *us both* that this case is now bordering **CARE PROCEEDINGS**. He said the kids are so exposed to the "**level of conflict** that it is so tragic." [That was his only concern.] This is despite the fact he hadn't read up any of the history! His threat is also despite the fact that social workers Pat and Elaine had outlined **GW's non-compliance with them** re his latest breach of court order in a letter dated 14/7/04 to court and also that they had stated: "The **social workers'** opinions were that the children had been **primed**." It amounted to the social workers' and welfare officers' extensive involvement being immaterial and obsolete, their previous numerous reports and those of the school being effectively disregarded. This is blatant bias; blatant judicial double standards. When it suits the Masonic mafia, the courts take



guidance from the professionals and when it doesn't suit them the Masonic judges/magistrates simply disregard the experts' opinions. The funny handshake brigade practice many underhanded diversions. They have all their men – Masonic stooges – in key positions, ready to produce all reports necessary. They have all the time and money to play with **[your money – all paid for by the taxpaying public.]** They don't care about delaying court proceedings and the suffering of little children.

The conspiratorial web of deceit, lies and falsehoods is a truly frightening and bewildering state of affairs. The obfuscation, contradictions and doublethink are mind blowing. Such is the foreboding and formidable strength of Secret Organizations such as Freemasonry that those of us on the receiving end of their venom are not believed – there aren't enough victims as yet - [even family and friends don't really want to believe] and we are made out to be the liars and fabricators and nutters. Their tactics are intimidation and mind games. They wear their prey down by relentless provocation, relentless legal actions in their kangaroo courts, relentless accusations leading to investigations, relentless perverting of justice, relentless mental torment, relentless fraudulent activity, relentless time wasting nonsense. The dirty brigade steal your time and money and anything else they want from you, especially your health and sanity; and if you've got kids, they'll take them too. Their silent, savage, supreme control is so all-powerful and successful that it *is* easy to become convinced that *they* are right after all. Sometimes I start wondering if I *am* going cuckoo.

However, thankfully, I have survived thus far intact and, as far as I am aware, sound in body and mind! I'm not so sure I can say the same for my children though. Although they are now old enough to see for themselves what is right and wrong and what is truth and lies, the suffering they endured throughout their childhood is affecting their health. They continue to suffer stress-related illness, Jord still head-bangs in his sleep and Mel is showing signs of an eating disorder. I hope and pray there will be no lasting damage. For the sake of all suffering children, for all victims of domestic violence and for all victims seeking justice; and in light of the drastic public funding cuts, something must be done about the Masonic Mafiosi and other Secret Societies. Their members consist of solicitors and their ilk, all of whom have their sucking straws slurping from the same spittoon as the high ranking Police, MPs, Royals, Social Services parasites and an array of other high ranking officials. Our courts and Authorities are now decayed, artificial, putrid, outlawed and obscene. Most officials are liars and thieves and the rest totally compromised.

God says we must challenge evil but it cannot be overcome by violence or force. To obtain the power necessary to win we must first conquer ourselves. To do that we must get rid of all hate in our hearts. We must be kind to our enemies and we must love most those whom we should hate the most [that's a tall order but it *does* make sense.] We must be patient and serve others and we must control our selfishness and our greed. Love, truth and goodness are the greatest powers of all and will

eventually triumph over evil.

We need to educate ourselves on what is really going on within the realms of power and then we need to educate others. Expose wrongdoing, name and shame the evildoers, engage in civil disobedience and peaceful protest. Do not be a 'sheeple', dare to be different and others will follow. Police states only rise when good people allow evil to continue unchecked. Together we can put an end to the New World Order slavery and look forward to a life of freedom and justice. The good news is that the systemic corruption is now sliming out of the huge cancer that has burst open. It is being exposed now like never before and the treacherous leeches are slowly destroying themselves on the sword of TRUTH.