

## PART 1 OF SHARON A KILBY'S STORY:

I am a victim of Domestic Violence and my children [Andrew, Michelle, Jordan and Melissa] are victims of child abuse, perpetrated by my ex-fiancé Mr Gareth Williams [of 'Bryn Tirion', Tan Y Graig Road, Llysfaen] the father of my two youngest children [J & M.] During my on/off relationship with my 'Jekyll & Hyde' ex-partner I was warned that I would suffer serious harm and the loss of my children if I left him. He said that he could destroy me and my family and that he had powerful contacts and that the police would never charge him as he "was one of them." The police *did* turn a blind eye to his - speeding, dangerous driving, drink-driving and illegal parking. He would be stopped by police on several occasions but after a short exchange of words, was inexplicably waved on!

On OCTOBER 5<sup>th</sup> 1998 I finally scraped up enough courage to leave him for good. For the next four months or so my children and I were subjected to constant stalking, harassment and intimidation by Mr Williams. He even swerved his car into my 10-year old son, causing him to fall off his bike and he did criminal damage to my property.

There was also a constant 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 Mr Williams not to waste their time.

Police refused to arrest my ex even though they once caught him at my door pestering me and neighbours could corroborate my statements. Police continued to insist that there was "not enough evidence" even when he'd been seen climbing over my gate which was newly painted in black gloss and would've smeared his clothes and himself. I learned from some officers, social workers and the welfare officer that he was making spurious allegations to police about my so-called harassment of him and my children's so-called criminal behavior on and around his property. It was obvious though that they believed that he was the liar and I the victim because police did not take his complaints seriously - I was never questioned and also because he had felt obliged to resign as a Special Constable even though he'd only been one for a handful of weeks. This was after having being advised: "The parties difficulties and continued involvement of the police in their differences was not compatible with the role." He was claiming that he had to resign as a "direct consequence" of my actions. But he couldn't substantiate any of his claims and many officers who attended my call-out requests stated that he was "untrustworthy, spiteful and a trouble-maker." Given all the evidence of his guilt, why were they trying to neutralize the situation and why wasn't he being charged with harassment?

I finally attempted to take out an injunction against Mr Williams but my solicitor Mr John Owens [previously of Howell Hughes & Co, Colwyn Bay and now of Hanover House, The Roe, St Asaph, Llanellwly] persuaded me to accept an undertaking. His reasoning was that if the injunction application failed, my stance regarding the more important issues of residence and contact would be much weakened. I was badly advised and also pressured by Mr Owens into signing an undertaking as well. He claimed it was "no big deal, just a formality" and that since my ex had also made

complaints to the authorities, it would prevent any further inflammation of the tensions between us. Yet my children and I were totally innocent. [I later learned from my new solicitor that I shouldn't have signed it.] So the legal Mafia had turned serious abuse of a woman and her four children into a domestic squabble between partners. The image of a feuding couple hating each other's guts and, both on an equal footing, hell bent on revenge in their "tit-for-tat" activities was portrayed in welfare reports and it was reported that we had both signed undertakings in relation to alleged harassment. I was to later realize that Mr Owens was deceiving me and that this was a deliberate ploy to get my ex off the hook and shift the onus onto me.

On FEBRUARY 5<sup>th</sup> 1999 I had to leave my 8-month old baby in hospital overnight because a doctor misdiagnosed a rash for a burn. The doctor called in Social Services saying that all cases of suspected child abuse need to be investigated. I explained the predicament I was in with my ex and begged her not to involve social services but she insisted she was "duty bound." She didn't seem to grasp the point that I was trying to protect my baby from a *real* child abuser - her father Gareth Williams.

Paediatricians and three GPs diagnosed common infantile eczema. They said there had been no need to refer Melissa to social services or admit her to hospital. Yet I had no apology from the clinic. Social workers still pestered me, did a "Section 47 Investigation" and held a "Strategy Meeting". Astonishingly all this appeared on a Court Welfare report where it was also stated that the "doctors had been unable to establish the cause of the mark." This was untrue since the doctors had stated it was eczema and Melissa was prescribed hydrocortisone cream, which she would not have been treated with if there had been any uncertainty. The report also stated that social workers would be making another unannounced visit before they could "close the case." It didn't make sense, why was *my* parenting under such scrutiny and under suspicion and what was the big deal about common eczema? I would later discover that this suspected 'burn' would crop up frequently in various reports and in court. Also that a health visitor would tell me that eczema is cause for concern and is taken into consideration when decisions are made about whether a child should be registered "at risk".

On FEBRUARY 25<sup>th</sup> 1999 I was threatened by Police that if I continued to call them out regarding Mr Williams, they would be seeking orders for a binding over. The Court Welfare Officer remarked that such threats were out of order. I was now beginning to suspect that something sinister was going on and that my abhorrent ex was being protected.

I spoke briefly on the phone to Mr Williams' ex-wife. As suspected, her story was much the same as mine. I learned that she is still terrified of him and that her son also still fears his father. She told me that she was devastated when she lost her children and that she never knew what hold he had over the Authorities. His influence quite clearly depended on an organization which had members in high places. Freemasonry perhaps? She said that GW had poisoned her children's minds towards her and that she'd lost her daughter completely although after all these years she never gives up trying to have contact. She said that her [adult] son does keep in touch but not often because his father has so much influence and does

everything possible to prevent it. [Her son had to correspond in secret and GW blocked all phone calls and gifts from his ex-wife to her children.]

I later learned that although many people were compassionate to my plight and could confirm everything I'd said about GW, virtually all were too afraid of him to support me publicly. Worse though was the fact that one family were so scared that they'd been pressured by him to sign a statement corroborating his "good character" and "sobriety" and "happy family" status although they did regret doing so afterwards and did wish to retract it. I was also shocked to discover that GW had managed to get one of the group leaders at Alcoholics Anonymous to state to the Court Welfare Officer that we had *both* sought help for *our* alcoholism. The truth is that he was attending the sessions, his name was on the books and I went with him once on the first night just to support him, otherwise he would never have gone. He did not stay long though and soon went back on the bottle. The welfare officer knew that he'd been drinking before one of his visits with her. She reported that he "did smell strongly of alcohol." My fears are real and genuine and I stressed that for the babies' safety, contact with their father should be supervised. I explained that alcohol was the trigger for most of Mr Williams' violence and his irresponsible behaviour. But the W/O retained her 'neutral' stance saying that we were "both looking for ways to denigrate each other in court." She even accused me of being hostile.

On MARCH 3<sup>rd</sup> 1999 I was interrogated by a Benefits Agency official Mr John Drew because of GW's malevolent allegations of benefit fraud. I explained our living arrangements and that we'd spent time in each other's houses for various reasons of which the agency was aware. I pointed out that it was GW's stated objective to incriminate me and cause trouble wherever possible and to try to have my children taken away from me. I told Mr Drew that he should be investigating GW for fraud because he was claiming incapacity benefit when he was clearly healthy enough to pass the police's fitness standards [and healthy enough to practice judo, go rally driving, hunting....] Incidentally GW also has a £200,000 home, various home improvements - courtesy of social services and a brand new family car - courtesy of mobility allowance. He's also had various County Court Judgments, a £2,500 debt with my dad and has been visited by bailiffs on numerous occasions. I was able to produce relevant documents to prove his lies in order to discredit him yet the B/A still prefer to target me and my ex remains above reproach. The CSA gave him immunity too.

On MARCH 5<sup>th</sup> 1999 police turned up to announce that I should be very grateful because they'd spotted my children [aged 10 and 9] on CCTV under the pier in grave danger from rough seas. Such was the urgency that they'd been ordered home and reprimanded and I was warned that if it happened again they'd be placed on "this at risk register." That did it. I knew that something powerful but ugly was lurking in the background somewhere. It just wasn't kosher. GW's ex-wife LOST her kids despite her love for them and her desperate attempts to keep them. The AUTHORITIES had denied her all contact to them. GW's words were no idle threat. He could pull strings. How?

I questioned the authenticity, pointing out that the kids were bone dry [which the PC agreed], that CCTV was supposed to be used for catching criminals, not spying on innocent kids playing and that the camera in question doesn't even focus under the

pier. I wasn't allowed to see the tape or the stills, the Control Room Official refused to reveal his identity, and the Council's story differed to the Police's version. Furthermore and without explanation the nameless official hastily cut short our conversation and for the next two/three hours I was unable to phone back in. In view of the police's panic reaction and considering that my kids were supposed to be in so much danger that they could've been "swept out to sea to their deaths," I think I was entitled to see the evidence so that I too could've chastised them. I observed that camera at different times of the day for long periods for a week and it didn't budge once. I know exactly when it was turned on - 13<sup>th</sup> March 1999. Coincidentally a photo of my kids on the promenade with the rough sea in the background appeared soon after in the Daily Post. This Kafkaesque scenario pointed to collaboration amongst GW, the police and the council to enable the Welfare Officer to submit that I was an unfit guardian of my children. Some months later, my ex brought up the event and told me that the police had been considering charging me with neglect. [I hadn't told him about the incident and therefore he wasn't supposed to know.] My solicitor Mr John Owens said there could not be an enquiry into the matter and he dismissed my conspiracy theories. The police told me I was being "paranoid".

I was so thankful when I gained the support of the Headmistress of the secondary school where GW's children had attended and I'd spoken to some of the people who live nearby. I learned that people had reason to believe that something in the Williams' household was seriously wrong. There had been "obvious neglect" and his ex-wife had been "beaten up by him and abused" yet police had failed to prosecute him and, astonishingly, *he* had been awarded custody of their children. GW once admitted to me that it was only the strength of a good character reference [which he showed me] from the police that had secured his residence application. This is despite his known motoring offences, violence towards women, children and dogs, financial irresponsibility and electricity fraud.... I learned that local people were also worried about his children's welfare and that they and the Head-teacher even "witnessed Mr Williams pulling a gun on his ex-wife", but when they alerted Social Services, they were effectively told to keep their noses out. Such was the concern however that an Educational Social Worker was called to GW's house to do an investigation. Later the Headmistress was to tell my new solicitor and Conwy Social Services and the Welfare Officer about her knowledge of GW and all the worries that she had and she warned that my babies "should not spend too much time in their father's company due to possible danger to them." She also told me that she was shocked that no action was ever taken by social services - there hadn't even been a meeting of child protection staff in an attempt to help GW's children. In her view his ex-wife "would have been the better parent for the children to be living with." She added that she was aware though of how rare it is for children to be registered "at risk" or removed from an abusive parent/guardian despite obvious appalling evidence of ill treatment and neglect, which many children suffer. Incidentally I also learned that social services had been called in to help GW's daughter at her Colwyn Bay school because of various problems.

Because of the genuine concerns from professional persons I felt that I had a right to know more in relation to GW's suspected abuse of his children considering the fact he is also the father of my children and he wants residence of them. Over the next fourteen months or so I tried to get hold of the Official Records. Curiously it appears that those documents have been destroyed and the Educational Welfare Officer

concerned does not remember the family. [Most people would remember them because not many men raise children {one of them a girl} alone and most people got lost trying to find his house which was in the middle of a forest.] Mr Owens repeatedly assured me that he was trying to get hold of the documents and said that he'd written to the W/O and to the Headmistress. He lied about that. The Court Welfare Officer and Social Workers also tried to fob me off insisting that such documents weren't relevant because they applied to GW's older children not to Jordan and Melissa. I find such wishy-washy attitude staggering. I would've thought that since the lives of two young children are at stake, welfare officials would do as many checks as possible on *both* parents for suitability. After all if you wish to foster a child you have to endure months of cross-examination and investigations by an army of child welfare experts. And anyway, don't *lawyers* have a moral duty to do everything possible to expose criminal behavior and elements of corruption in order to protect the vulnerable - the children, and not crooked clients? I later formed the conclusion that Mr Owens was working for the opposition and that his misleading counsel and refusal to request important documentation amounted to professional malpractice. It was only after much persuasion that the court W/O did finally contact the headmistress. Meanwhile GW contacted the Education Authority, threatening to sue the Head with defamation of character!

On MAY 20<sup>th</sup> 1999 we suffered a small kitchen fire. At first the Fire Service felt it had been caused by the kettle or washing machine but when I trustingly told one of the firemen, Brian, about some strange phenomena that we'd experienced and thus wondered if there was some bizarre connection, the fire department decided [after an 'investigation'] that the fire had been started maliciously. Almost immediately we were treated as dangerous criminals. My house began crawling with senior policemen. I had to surrender my keys for the night. I was not allowed to return to collect essential baby items even under police escort and they swiped Andrew's workbooks and a book that I'd started writing, which included my opinion of the authorities. A policeman stood guard outside my house. I was beginning to wish that I'd tried to tackle the fire myself to save being treated as an arsonist. Prior to the fire, for a few months, there had been some unexplained smells [some pleasantly flowery and some disturbing like stale fag ash] and other happenings, such as burnt tapers and evil messages. I could not blame Andrew or Shell because such occurrences sometimes happened when they were out or when we were all together. Since I could not, at the time, find any logical explanation I wondered if there was some supernatural influence. We began to wonder if we were experiencing messages from a higher unquantifiable power. It felt as if we were being given the strength and encouragement to fight malevolent Gareth Williams and his henchmen. It was as if God was making himself known to us and consequently I believed that he wanted us to help spread *his* word. I had previously been a devout atheist.

There could have been another explanation, which only dawned on me much later. It is possible that we might've been the victims of a cruel hoax because for some months we had been targeted by well-known troublesome youths in the neighbourhood. [I had wondered if GW was paying them to torment us because I'd never previously had problems with local gangs] and since the door key had been misplaced there was a good chance that it could've got into the wrong hands.

Detective Constable Chris Walsh accused Andrew of arson and he was interviewed under caution. The basis of the case against Andrew was his so-called "obsession" with evil, talk about "demons" and "he writes about the evils of the world" and "he writes about fires." In fact he'd write and talk about various things - good and bad as part of his home education and he was simply answering questions from a text which happened to be about a fire. The CID's report was misleading. D C Walsh was of the opinion that Andrew is a "very bright child" but was determined to find Andrew guilty despite the lack of proof. A Police Social Worker had "concerns as to whether Andrew should be referred to a Child Psychologist." I told them I'd rather they point the finger of blame at me rather than my totally innocent ten year old child. But they wouldn't have it. [I even learned later on that I too would be grilled by a Psychiatrist.] It was beyond my comprehension that they were making all this fuss when there is so much violent crime on the streets, so many children with "behavioural and anti-social problems", so much drug dealing.... and all of which the Police and Social Services fail to address.

Within days Social Workers came to question me about the fire. They seemed quite supportive and sympathetic and felt that the matter should go no further.

On JUNE 12<sup>th</sup> 1999 my neighbour's children and mine had an argument. Despite reports from the Education Authority, Welfare Officer and Educational Social Worker stating that my children are "intelligent, polite and well-behaved" and the fact that there had never been any genuine complaints regarding their behaviour, a police officer barged into my kitchen with a face like thunder declaring that my son was a well-known, unruly, undisciplined job and that he'd have to drag him down the Police Station for a "stern talking to." Andrew was aggressively warned that he'd be going on the "at risk register" and that he'd end up being taken into care. I acknowledged that Andrew had tried to help me shoo bothersome kids off our drive because no one else would but I made it clear that he was certainly no troublemaker and that the officer's spleen was misdirected as it was Andrew who was the victim of neighbourhood bullies. I also told him that the "at risk" threat had a familiar ring and that the joke was running a bit thin. But the PC ranted on regardless. By the time the Officer had finished accusing and threatening, Andrew was shaking, crying and in shock. The PC was also derogatory towards me and hissed "this will all end in tears" and he menacingly warned: "You will lose all of your children." On his departure he told us to expect a visit from Social Services. I was furious and frustrated. There was nowhere I could turn. All I could do was try to convince Andrew 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 15<sup>th</sup> 1999 I was hauled in front of a panel of Child Health and Welfare experts for a Conference about my children's future. Despite the Social Workers' opinion that no further action should be taken, the other members disagreed and decided that all four of my children were at risk of significant harm in the future and therefore should be registered "at risk". They even wanted to stop me taking my children home that evening until it was decided that a "very urgent core group should be set up to look at ways of offering protection and support" to me and my kids. I was incensed. *They'd* been plotting this and now they'd done it. I just *knew* that the Police were behind it. D C Walsh had been the first with his hand up when it was

time to vote for the demolition of my family. Everyone else [except the social workers] had followed his lead. It was outrageous; this had nothing whatsoever to do with whether my kids were at genuine risk from me or not. There wasn't even a Fire Representative at Conference or a Fire Report available and 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. 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 a victim of a vicious, vengeful, venomous man who happened to have 'friends in high places'. All they could do was nit-pick about trifling matters of which I had proved to be totally innocent. For example the 'burn' gave them "cause for concern." The fact that I successfully home-educate also bothered them despite their knowledge that the Education Authority had stated that they were pleased with my children's progress. My ex-partner with his scurrilous allegations coupled with the fact that there had been a small fire was all the ringleader needed to persuade the others not to rock the boat.

We were to be 'hanged' also just because we'd been candid about our 'paranormal' beliefs, God and the Devil. It was all so unreal. I felt as if I was losing my mind. Probably that was the plan. All the ominous predictions from my ex were coming true. History was repeating itself. My fate was becoming a carbon copy of GW's ex-wife. Predictably my protest fell on deaf ears and my outcry that the effect of all this would be devastating on the upcoming Court proceedings was disregarded. I just had to lump it and that was that. The council's legal mouthpiece recited the criteria for care/supervision order proceedings stating that we came very close to facing them. I wasn't even told that I was entitled to a lawyer only that I could appeal whereby I could have a solicitor as long as he/she remained a silent observer. Such is the Council's dictatorial regime that *they* were free to consult with and invite to all the conferences whoever they pleased [in fact there were up to fourteen of them, most of whom I'd never seen before, who'd been plucked out of a little box labeled 'Child welfare Expert' and deemed suitable to decide what was best for my children.] In comparison I am bound by 'confidentiality' laws on the pretext of the protection of children. *They* wanted to put my kids in their '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. Many of the abusers are men of high standing. Victims are labelled 'liars' if they dare to complain. Kids haven't got a hope in hell of justice because everyone with any clout closes ranks to cover up the sins of men - men who bask in positions of trust and authority. Since that is the truth it becomes *our* business to protect our children - ALL children - by whatever means necessary and if that means breaking such laws as 'confidentiality' and 'data protection' then we have a duty to ourselves, our kids and our God to do so.

The Child Protection Coordinator Mr Graham Seale assured me that the registration would not prevent me from resuming my job as a carer of 'special needs' children in the future. However, and just as I'd expected, this later proved not to be the case. After we were finally removed from the obscene register Mr Seale fed me a pack of lies about re-registering as a carer. He told me that the procedure for becoming registered as a child/foster/respice carer is more vigorous than it used to be and that there were "more hoops to jump through." He said that the pay for respice carers is half the amount that it was and he also said that if a carer has six months or more time off from 'caring', he/she has to go through the whole process again of

registering, i.e. all the various checks - Police, Social Services, Medical.... The Social Worker who deals with the application process told me that what he'd said was untrue. When Mr Seale told me that the final decision about whether an application is approved or not goes to panel, I asked him what he would say if he was asked for *his* opinion. Mr Seale said that he saw no reason why I should be refused and he gave me his word that *he* would look upon my application favourably. However, he did in fact retract.

I am now prevented from resuming my work with other children. This is in spite of having a good work record, good references and the fact that the kids and I had done everything that had been asked of us - we'd endured nine months of being under suspicion, scrutinized and at the mercy of core group gatherings, endless meetings and social workers' and psychiatrists' Comprehensive Risk Assessment. And after all that I was reported to be a "loving and capable mother," my children were reported to be "loved, contented, well cared for, happy, safe, polite, pleasant, intelligent and mature" and it was reported that Andrew and Shelly "receive a good education." Also 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! Incidentally it took eight months from my first phone conversation with the social worker in charge of fostering applications until I received my *application* form! During that time I frequently tried to contact her only to be told that she was ill/on leave/off for some other reason.... There was nobody else who could assist me. It took about a week to fill in their application 'booklet'. I then contacted my referees only to be told soon afterwards by the social worker not to bother with my application because a decision had already been taken to reject it. I wasn't told exactly why.

Two months after her message she still had not confirmed it in writing as promised. When I phoned, the excuse was that the social worker could not reply because she had been off caring for her sick mother. I received a letter on June 2nd 2001 from Mr Gwilym Roberts [family placement team manager] telling me that I do not now meet their "highest possible standards of safety for children due to the degree of uncertainty about events in 1999." Remember we are living in paedophile/child abuse country where policemen and Masons are above the law and luxuriate in perversion. I wrote back on the same day asking what more I could do to satisfy their "uncertainty". By September 2<sup>nd</sup> 2001 Mr Gwilym Roberts hadn't even had the courtesy to acknowledge my letter. [He replied after I published my story on the internet.]

The 'assessment' of the Social Workers from The Family Support Team amounted to little more than faintly entertaining useless gossip. I was interrogated on such matters as my brother and his family, my parents' marriage, my pregnancies, how Andrew [when he was 16 months old] reacted when Shelly was born – all sorts of irrelevant questions. There were endless hours every week for months and none of it to do with useful suggestions as to how I might reduce the risk that I was considered to be to my kids. It was all about digging around trying to find something, *anything* that they could 'hang' us with so that they could pretend to be "concerned". They even tried to get me to describe my children as "demanding" and "difficult". It didn't seem to matter that what *was* difficult and damaging emotionally for Andrew and Shelly was the unfair "subject" label that had been bestowed on them and the

“young offender” insinuation. Also, that they had to live with the fear of being taken from their mother and younger siblings. Plus they had to cope with the unjust encroachment of the Family Protection Social Workers, the Mental Health Social Worker and the intrusion of the Psychiatrists - a Consultant Psychiatrist and a Consultant in Child Adolescent Psychiatry. 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 Social Workers were not concerned with the fact that GW 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. They weren't bothered that he was still boasting about knowing my every move and having me watched. They weren't interested in my experiences of dubious police dealings and that there could be wrongdoing within the Authorities and they didn't care about GW's ex-wife's fate and all the implications generally. All they wanted to do was waste hours trying to discover who started the fire and why. And they wanted to brand Andrew and Shelly as needing help with *their* “emotional, social and behavioural problems.” Plus they too refused to believe the stark facts that GW was the one maliciously creating hardship and stress for us and that we were the ones suffering persecution, battling against all adversity for justice. In a report they stated: “It will be necessary for both adults to put aside their own difficulties with their relationship and focus on their children's needs as a priority.” I couldn't seem to get it through to them that they shouldn't be bothering me with all the referrals by “anonymous” persons and that *they* shouldn't take any of them seriously unless the caller is prepared to reveal his/her identity [they needn't disclose it to me.] I told them that it should then be easy to determine whether a call is genuine or just plain slander and that if the latter proves to be the case, the slanderer should be prosecuted. My protest fell on deaf ears. During every session with them I felt as if I was banging my head against a brick wall. Why couldn't they face the facts and help do something about the *real* problem? They did agree with me however [as did all the other officials and professional persons] that if *their* daughter was put under the intolerable strain that I am under because of a lying, evil-minded ex-partner, they would be fighting like fury for the truth to come out.

Fourteen highly qualified, high ranking, highly paid Child Welfare Professionals were assigned to my case and they gathered together periodically to determine my destiny and that of my children - all on the strength of one tiny, unexplained fire. When I was *asking* for psychiatric help [more than a year after the kids came off the register] because of Jordan's disturbing emotional behaviour – which began at the onset of visitation, I was told that there were no resources available for the kind of intervention needed. I was offered a chat with a psychiatrist and that was it. I was informed by the psychiatrist [Dr Andrew Knight] that even if a psychiatrist's report recommends that a child/children should *not* continue with visitation due to psychiatric problems, judges, in 99% of cases, disagree and contact continues! In contrast, all the referrals that GW made were investigated. No one cared that the referrals were made by just one poison filled compulsive liar and that he was being allowed [even encouraged] to continue on his wicked mission of revenge unchallenged because of venal officials. Neither did they care about GW's abusive

track record of raising children and that sincere serious concerns had been raised regarding his older children over a number of years by School Teachers. It was a scandalous waste of the public purse and a shameful refusal of the so-called 'protecting' agencies to safeguard the futures of my two babies. I have no doubt that if the boot was on the other foot and I had been guilty of even a morsel of my ex's offences, I'd have been prosecuted long ago and done my x months at her majesty's pleasure. Was *he* being protected by Masonic interests?

During the 'Comprehensive Risk Assessment' the court W/O continued with her 'assessment'. She continued to misrepresent the true picture and in the doing FAILED to serve Jordan's and Melissa's best interests. Although she mentioned the unhelpful trickle of fabricated referrals, in the main she concentrated on creating a false image of quarrelsome parents, who are equally bad and neither of whom, in her opinion, care about their children's needs. She used trickery and held facts supporting my case to be irrelevant. She reported, for example, that babies "will obviously be reluctant and upset at changeovers if the parents are arguing." The truth was that I would say very little at changeovers for fear of provoking my ex. Jordan and Mel would get upset because *he* would easily fly into a rage and would yell at, threaten or hit me or be rough with them. I tried to make the W/O aware that not only were there witnesses - myself, mutual friends and GW's neighbours - to his violence towards his children and oppression of them, but the Educational Welfare Officer had also been called in by worried teachers. Her answer was along the lines of: "So what, the EWO 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 painted a picture of a hostile couple playing sick games. For example, she 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. This is especially difficult as GW is so smarmy and therefore so plausible. 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 capability in car mechanics, his good DIY skills, good culinary skills.... and the fact that there had been good times. In all her reports she stressed such expressions as: "If they continue to maintain their antagonistic stance towards each other, Jordan's and Melissa's emotional needs will be severely hampered." This is totally and continually missing the point that Mr Williams is a liar, a dangerous evil-doer, criminally calling the Authorities out on me in an effort to trigger care proceedings whereas I am being victimized by him and by the agencies, struggling to defend myself and protect my children. You cannot mediate with someone who is unreasonable, irrational, constantly attacking you and hell-bent on destroying you, your children and your life. Six years on and GW continues to harass [with official help] and the evil continues to flourish. Whatever happened to the law that's supposed to protect children?

As a result of the 'registration' my stance in court was, predictably, seriously weakened. GW's solicitor Mr Chris Hind of Amphletts in Colwyn Bay jubilantly referred to it at every Court hearing and my solicitor Mr John Owens stated that there was now a real risk that I could lose my babies altogether to my ex and as such I'd be better off agreeing joint residence. His argument was that if my ex and I could agree on such arrangements out of court, it would mean that, despite the Council's

opinion that my children are “At Risk”, *Mr Williams* was acknowledging that *I am* a fit and proper parent and therefore there would be no grounds for a judge to award *him* sole custody! It was at this point that Mr Owens and I parted company. Prior to this though and part way through proceedings, a date had been set for a trial and the opportunity of cross-questioning. However, on the day, we were denied this and the JP Mr G Roberts forced me to hand my babies over for contact of four mornings per week [unsupervised] on the logic that “It is always in the child’s best interests to have contact with both parents” and “You are contradicting yourself by, on the one hand blocking contact and on the other agreeing to small increases. You are coming here every so often to play games. Therefore I see no reason why Mr Williams shouldn’t have substantial access to his children.” He had slyly focused the ‘blame’ onto me whereas it appeared that GW was, in the magistrate’s eyes, a perfect father and the innocent party! I had foolishly put my trust in Mr John Owens who had advised me to “agree to small periodic increases of contact rather than let the Court decide as it puts you in a less hostile light.” He convinced me that fathers always get awarded some contact regardless of their crimes and he kept insisting that we were “playing it the right way.” I was also bullied into giving GW Parental Responsibility because my solicitor assured me that it “doesn’t mean anything” and that it would be awarded anyway sooner or later and because “it looks better to agree than to have it imposed.” However it turned out to be very significant. It gave my ex the right to sit with his solicitor, Mr Chris Hind, in on the Child Protection Conferences and it gave him the opportunity to continue controlling and harassing on the pretence of being concerned about the babies, medically. At a later stage, and to my shock and disgust, I was threatened by a judge that I’d be sent to jail if I didn’t comply with the court order. Yet there was never any question of me not doing so.

My local MP wrote to the Chief Executive of Conwy Council in my favour asking that my kids be removed from the Register because of unfair stigmatization but the answer was “no”. The council rules because the council knows best! Almost daily we read of council failures leading to the injury of innocent children and no doubt the authorities involved hush up many cases.

On SEPTEMBER 22<sup>nd</sup> 1999 the Police accused Andrew and Shelly of bad behaviour and of causing criminal damage in GW’s neighbourhood [Llysfaen.] They were accused of: causing serious injury to one of wealthy businessman Mr Dewi Jones’ prize horses. Mr Dewi Jones [of D J Construction] also complained to the police that my kids had stolen things [although he wasn’t quite sure what] from his stables and that they’d chucked his bales of hay about. GW’s neighbours also complained to the police that Andrew and Shell had been seen in various gardens letting out rabbits and swinging on swings.... As a consequence of the ‘registration’ my kids were barely out of my sight so I knew immediately that this was another frame-up by the police. The police did not question me until the Wednesday, yet the ‘crimes’ were allegedly committed on the preceding weekend. They couldn’t tell me the day/time of occurrence, or what ‘feed’ my kids had supposedly fed to the horse, which had caused it to become injured and in need of fifteen stitches and they didn’t know if any officer had visited Mr Dewi Jones’ premises and seen the wounded animal. I visited Mr Dewi Jones’ stables and his premises that [surprise, surprise] back onto GW’s land and I interviewed Mr Dewi Jones’ wife. She told lies and was clearly flustered. When 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 that he’d visit the D J

family to find out more. Why didn't he check the police record? After a short while the PC returned to tell us that it was definitely not a case of mistaken identity. The officer then told *me* to visit the D J family to find out more details so that he could then 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!!!]

I spoke to D J and his wife and two of their employees. There were differences in their stories but all agreed emphatically: "This has nothing to do with Gareth, nothing whatsoever." They were clear that Andrew and Shell had fed their horse "*food that it shouldn't have had.*" This had resulted in the horse getting colic "*bolting into its stable*" and gashing its thigh. One employee, Mrs Cooper told me that she'd reported the offence to PC 1302 but *he'd* already stated that although a Mrs Cooper had phoned the police, *he* hadn't spoken to *her*. [P C 1302 was the only one who I felt was telling me the truth.] The D J group stressed that Andrew and Shell had been "coming and going all day Saturday and all day Sunday and Monday afternoon." If there was a scrap of legitimacy in any of it my kids would have been caught and questioned by the police AT THE TIME OF THE OFFENCES because there would've been plenty of time for the police to attend the scene and catch the culprits red-handed. Social Workers fronted up to question me about the matter. They said that GW had again been in their office with more of his 'concerns', one of which was the fact that his neighbours were irate because Andrew and Shell had again been up to no good and had been feeding *pellets* to his neighbours' extremely valuable horse.... After the Social Workers had seen the transcripts of the secret tape recordings that I'd made of the whole horsy story, they agreed that it was a bit fishy.

When my dad and I requested another investigation, Inspector Philip Hare showed up. I explained that it was important that I get to the bottom of it all because I feared GW was behind it and because I was constantly being harassed. I informed him that the W/O had stated that GW's behaviour is bordering harassment and that the Social Workers agreed that this latest incident was suspect and that GW was guilty of wasting Social Services and NSPCC resources with his umpteen trumped-up referrals. I gave Inspector Hare a few examples as follows: GW would state that friends of his and people he knows had 'witnessed' me hitting my kids with a broom handle, living with a convicted sex offender, going out drinking every night and leaving the babies home alone; he claimed that 'people' had seen my toddler son playing alone outside, virtually naked and that the gate was open; he said that 'many people' had seen my older two playing with matches, letting car tyres down and that they'd seen my elder son being battered and shaken violently by me.... The Inspector told us that if his findings are that D J and Co had collaborated with GW and involved the Police then that is very serious indeed and needs to be dealt with. But in the next breath he informed us that it would take him over five hours to get any answers, that he had no intentions of finding out who's been fibbing and why and that he wouldn't be questioning Cooper. Some investigation!

The result of Inspector Hare's 'inspection' was that there was no doubt over identity - it was unmistakably my kids. He informed me that the horse had been fed only *grass* but had still become ill and had *jumped a barbed wire fence* gashing its leg. [More variation in the plot!] He stressed that nothing had been stolen, only misplaced, and that the family want it all to stop now. It later transpired that his

'enquiries' had not included the questioning of the police officers or the D J household. He admitted that he didn't know if any officer had attended the crime scene and witnessed the poorly horse and he remarked that he wasn't aware that the horse was so valuable. He frequently emphasized that GW had no input at all on the whole saga, that there was nothing dubious going on and that nobody was lying. With regards to the stockpile of referrals made by the nameless GW, Inspector Hare declared that harassment need not be tolerated and that I should ask Social Services for the identities of the person[s] watching me and my children. But when I informed him that they won't divulge such information, he just shrugged. So much for the protection of women and children! 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. No wonder corruption is rife. 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.

In SEPTEMBER 1999 some of my mail began to be delivered open or otherwise tampered with. To date around 40 envelopes have arrived open or damaged. Royal Mail's Security Officer Mr Neil Roberts has assured me on various occasions that investigations have been done yet local postmen have told me that they have not been questioned. They confirmed that they have delivered opened letters, particularly A4 sized envelopes, which have been sent from Literary Agents. Mr Neil Roberts has been unable to discover who is responsible for interfering with my mail.

On OCTOBER 16<sup>th</sup> 1999 I received a letter from the B/A demanding the return of almost £17,000 'overpayment'. Incidentally it's amazing how the letter got delivered to me because my name/address was not visible at the window envelope! It is astonishing that they are still listening to and believing GW when I have provided more than enough evidence to prove that he is a most unreliable witness and because I have provided them with utilities statements to corroborate. Solicitor John Owens told me to appeal but strangely he would not allow me to see the transcript of my own interview with the B/A official Mr John Drew. It was becoming more evident that he wasn't really on my side at all. In the interim I was interviewed again by Mr 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 if 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.] Now, I'm told, it's too late to appeal, the B/A will not negotiate with me and there's nothing I can do about it. Meanwhile Mr John Owens is allowed to remain

unanswerable! There is no legal aid to take *him* to court. It is staggering to think that *they* are so all-powerful that they can dictate and destroy people's lives in this way and so easily - with few questions asked and with little resistance encountered.

I wrote to the Law Society but despite evidence incriminating both Mr Owens and Mr Hind, the Law Society sided with my solicitor. Now these two bent solicitors: Mr Owens and Mr Hind, are free to continue their corrupt practices at the expense of clients and the taxpaying public.

On JUNE 5<sup>th</sup> 2000 [Monday] I took my children for a short 'Butlins' break. I gave GW more than a week's notice and offered to let him see his children before we went - on a day of his choice. After much indecision he finally settled on seeing Jordan and Mel on Sunday June 4<sup>th</sup>, the day before our departure. Because we'd been urged to agree arrangements without the constant need for court intervention and on the advice of Social Workers and the W/O, I prepared a letter confirming our agreement and asked him to sign it. He refused. He then told me that he couldn't have the babies on the Sunday after all. On JUNE 6<sup>th</sup> 2000 [Tuesday] GW and his solicitor Mr Chris Hind of Amphletts went to court in Chester 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 the USA with the kids. Amphletts also wanted an undertaking from me that I surrender my American passport to the police. It wasn't until the Wednesday [June 7<sup>th</sup>] that GW [in his "great distress and upset"] contacted Social Services whereby it was suggested to him that I might be on holiday. Everyone [including the Court 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 has some explaining to do this time. Also they were surprised that Mr Chris Hind was taking such legal action particularly because his client had not made any effort to check my whereabouts beforehand - he hadn't even contacted the police. After a few days, however, I received a copy statement from him via my solicitor saying [amongst a pile of other lies and vicious allegations including references to *my* mental state] that he *had* in fact gone to the Police on the Monday [June 5<sup>th</sup>] but that they'd been "somewhat unhelpful." As we are talking about the whereabouts and well being 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 phone 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 it would've saved the taxpayer a lot of expense. Social Workers and my barrister stated that the reference to police was an after-thought 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 be so quick to take such action. Also surely questions should have been asked about Mr Hind's decision to rush off 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. Plus I had to make full-day nursery arrangements at a day care centre in a moment's notice. No one pays those fees and my travelling expenses. GW might think twice if *he* had to pay his children's fees.

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 how we must work together for the sake of our children. He then 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.” It is quite breathtaking. I have no doubt that had the tables been reversed, I’d have been hung, drawn and quartered long ago! Some local police officers have even commented that they can’t understand why nothing is being done for me. It would appear that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, our legal system is still biased towards men and has nothing whatsoever to do with the welfare of children. And why is it that, years after I thought I’d escaped from the clutches of GW, he still has the State’s permission to control my movements and those of my kids?

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 June 5<sup>th</sup> as it would be breaching “Mr Williams’ confidentiality” since such information is “subject to the Data Protection Act”!!!

Mr Gareth Williams continues to be problematic and Jordan and Melissa continue to suffer emotionally as a result of contact with him. In the past few years since I left him in 1998, he has made regular threats in front of the children. He has named hit men that are going to get my older two and me “sorted”. He has threatened: “Your throats will be slashed” and “A face full of stitches will improve your looks.” The first words he taught Jordan and Melissa to say were things like “Mummy hurt me.... Andrew hit me.... Andrew naughty.... Mummy drunk.... Mummy bitch....” GW often ‘forgot’ to return medicines. I had to get another prescription. Vaccinations fell on his contact day but he failed to keep appointments, so I had to make special arrangements. GPs and the H/V have told me I’m in a no-win situation. He sometimes cancelled his contact saying that he had to go away urgently, yet he was always seen driving repeatedly down my road. He tried this tactic when I made plans to go away, hoping to scupper them at the last minute. He would often return the children late [sometimes by up to 40 minutes and once, three hours.] No one in authority can [or will] force him to comply with the court order.

On JULY 25<sup>th</sup> 2000 I was informed by a Seaboard Inspector that a “concerned” woman by the name of “Williams” had made an emergency call to the Police [who had reported to the Coastguard] claiming to have seen Andrew and Shell drifting dangerously out to sea on rubber rings. This was another pack of lies. Andrew and Shell were under strict orders not to go deeper than the tops of their legs, and this day was no exception because two Seaboard Inspectors Tony Hodge and Rod Jarvis confirmed that my kids had not broken my rule. Interestingly, according to one of the Seaboard Inspectors, the ‘caller’ actually named my kids. The kids told me that earlier on they’d seen GW’s daughter spying on them [which isn’t an unusual occurrence - she is often seen loitering near A & S or near our house.] As the story goes, the Coastguard arranged to meet with the woman, he then rushed to the scene and on finding that A&S were in no danger, he then searched unsuccessfully for the woman on the Colwyn Bay promenade. Clearly this was another cock-and-bull story because of the vagueness and questionable circumstances surrounding it. For instance Emergency Services always obtain the identification of persons making

emergency calls. In this case the Coastguard and Police did not know the caller's full name and address. Also since it was clear that A & S were playing safely, why would anyone lie about them being in any danger? Therefore if the call was bone fide, it must've been ill natured. Plus it wouldn't be necessary for a Coastguard to race to any 'rescue' without first checking the validity. A swift phone call to the Seaboard Inspectors would have confirmed that the call was iffy. Furthermore the fact that the woman did not show her face when she had been requested to do so raises suspicions and lastly the evasive manner generally of Officials was suspect - I was told initially that Police had been called, then I learned that the call had gone directly to the Coastguard, also I was repeatedly fobbed off during my quest for information. If however there was such a call, then the probability of a connection with my sly ex partner is overwhelming. This is because of his history of stalking and malicious intent, the fact that his daughter had been seen earlier on watching A & S and because the caller was a woman named "Williams" who knew Andrew and Shell.

The plot thickened when, a month later in Court, GW's barrister - MP Elfyn Llwyd questioned me about the circumstances as to why A & S had been at such risk from the sea that the Coastguard had been called out to rescue them. I was also asked to explain the events regarding the injuring of Mr Dewi Jones' horse, the freeing of pet rabbits and my kids' alleged anti-social behavior generally, in and around Llysfaen. I had not mentioned the Coastguard tale to GW and when I asked the MP Mr Elfyn Llwyd how *he* knew, the silence was deafening!

In spite of all the twists, the police absolved GW from blame and insisted the call 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 of 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. This is another example of the diversions practiced by an organized faction. That is how Freemasonry works.

Are the Police corrupt, gullible or just plain stupid? It would appear that the Coastguard, the Seaboard Inspectors and probably even the MP are playing sick games. Are they part of a Masonic conspiracy with GW to cause my kids to go back on the Register with the next step being 'care'? Are they *really* trying to tarnish my kids' reputations and portray me as a negligent and unfit mother? [GW warned me that this was the plan.] *THEY* can carry on with their fairy tales until the grim reaper calls if they wish but I must warn them that their days are numbered and it won't be long before they have to face the full wrath of the people since the public will be very interested to learn what our esteemed Authorities *really* get up to. Telling lies, making up stories and framing innocents is not what the taxpayer pays for. Their biggest fear is EXPOSURE. What they're too self-absorbed and smug to realize is that there are massive numbers of 'us' on the 'outside' who are on a mission to unmask them and force them into the light. Interestingly, after going on Talk Sport

radio to air my views on corruption as being a cause for people committing suicide, and as I began to tell my story, I was swiftly cut off. Soon afterwards GW threatened that the Police Chiefs have *really* got it in for me now.

On SEPTEMBER 2<sup>nd</sup> 2000 Andrew suffered a fractured wrist when he was attacked by a gang known to locals and police as 'persistent young offenders'. There had been many more such incidences in the past which the Police and Social Services had failed to deal with, yet when I attempted to sort it out myself and frighten the youths away, police threatened *me* with criminal charges - of child abuse! Despite police transcripts and an admission from one of the boys of their involvement, the defendant was found not guilty. This is because there was a determined effort by the CPS and Magistrate to suppress the evidence. Now the gang have learned that beating up on other kids is acceptable and Andrew lives in much greater fear of them. The so-called Justice System is nothing to do with catching and punishing criminals and everything to do with protecting the lucrative lifestyles of the Top Brass.

I wrote to local papers - The North Wales Weekly News and The Pioneer and also to the Daily Mail hoping to expose this scandal but no one would publish although they agreed that it was of "considerable interest." For weeks I badgered the Pioneer. The Editor [an ex-mason] agreed that corruption is rife and is a criminal waste of taxpayer's cash. He told me that collusion is everywhere and that it is particularly bad in larger, city Masonic lodges. But despite agreeing that the answer is to name and shame and that ex-masons should show courage and expose the truth, he repeatedly fobbed me off with excuses such as that they were short staffed, that he'd have to spend ages researching my story and that he was worried that exposure might make things worse for Andrew. I informed him that Andrew had given me permission to write to the papers and that he is targeted regardless of what he does and that he does not like being, effectively, called a liar by a magistrate. I also said that Andrew shouldn't need a bodyguard to walk down his own street. All this is despite the Pioneer's previous detailed publications of increasing local crime, people up in arms and petitioning the Authorities to act and police failings.

From 23/10/00 until 19/8/02, and against my wishes GW had Jordan and Melissa 2 full days and nights per week, plus an extra 6 hours. It broke my heart because contact with their father was and is hindering their development and is mentally and physically damaging to them. Both of them showed signs of insecurity and distress after visitation. No one in authority cares. The reality is that those officials purporting to protect children actually assist in the spread of child abuse [and some even cause it.] And nobody is held accountable! Who's going to put *them* on trial? They even want you to lie to your children and pretend that their father is a good, honest man when he is a nasty, bad-tempered control-freak who causes them and their mummy pain and suffering. Many boys grow up thinking it's acceptable for a man to violate a woman and that it's ok to abuse children. After all, the Police, Social Services and the Courts say it is. It's no wonder many kids grow up feeling powerless, dispirited, depressed, uptight, confused, angry, destructive, bitter.... and it's no wonder that so many end up numbed [and killed] by drugs, alcohol, solvents.... and it's no wonder that so many end up uneducated, unemployable and locked away in prisons, in mental homes, in juvenile detention centres.... and it's no wonder that many of their mothers end up being driven to despair and dementia.... Is

any of it any wonder when the majority of us exist in an unjust, insane, evil, world? How is any kid supposed to make sense of it all and grow up 'normal'? And then they wonder why there is worldwide rioting....

On APRIL 30<sup>th</sup> 2001 GW announced [for the umpteenth time] that Police were watching my kids. He said that they've "got it in for Andrew." He told me that I'd soon find out what Andrew had been getting up to lately because he'd be getting a criminal record.... I discarded it as being just another one of his baleful threats. However on MAY 5<sup>th</sup> 2001 Andrew and I were hauled into the Police Station to hear more trumped-up charges by PC Robin Mailer and to be told that Andrew [not surprisingly] faced criminal charges. PC Mailer informed me that Andrew had been shooting at a newborn baby's pram last Saturday. Mr Mailer told me that he'd just been approached by a man who had pointed Andrew out to him and had said: "That's the lad with the gun." PC Mailer did not even know the mystery man's name! 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. I asked about witnesses, CCTV surveillance.... and I put it to Mr Mailer that most people would think it a little odd that a grown man wouldn't confront a twelve year old kid AT THE TIME OF THE OFFENCE and march him into the Police Station, considering the fact he's supposed to have just attacked the one thing most vulnerable and most precious to him - his own flesh and blood. PC Mailer didn't want to discuss his concocted story with me though, of course, his 'concern' was that Andrew was in possession of a loaded weapon in public. That bit was true although the 'weapon' was a Gat gun which Andrew explained was used for target practice at home and that he sometimes takes it to his friend's house and that most of the kids have such guns and sports guns of all types. He pointed out that he does not shoot at babies or anyone else and that in any case he didn't have the gun with him last Saturday. Despite our apologies, PC Mailer read Andrew his rights and gave him the choice of accepting a formal Police Caution or of being taken to court. Either way he was told he'd end up with a police record that would be with him until he was an adult. Since we know what this is *really* all about I dreaded to think what more evil games the Police were going to play. I asked PC Mailer what the Police were going to frame Andrew for next. Were they going to plant drugs on him, syringes, alcohol.... ? It was clear they were watching my kids' every move and were looking for any opportunity to pounce.

On JUNE 26<sup>th</sup> 2001 Andrew was formally reprimanded at the police station. Sergeant Williams dealt with the matter. I asked for a copy of PC Mailer's report on the 'shooting'. He refused, saying that it is confidential as the man wished to remain unidentified. I asked him to investigate GW for his possible involvement because I stated that one of GW's 'friends' could be the anonymous man. I also asked for details of the 'shooting'. Sergeant Williams would not respond in writing. Instead he visited me unannounced on July 25<sup>th</sup> 2001. He again told me that I couldn't have a copy of Mr Mailer's report but he did read it out. PC Mailer's 'report' stated that on May 5<sup>th</sup> 2001 "I was approached by a male [about 25 years of age.] The male 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 Sergeant 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. I also said that in any case it is staggering that police would have had the time to waste confronting

Andrew with this 'allegation' as they are supposedly so busy with more serious offences. 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.

On JANUARY 2<sup>nd</sup> 2002 I wrote to the European Court of Human Rights about my situation. On July 19<sup>th</sup> 2002 I was informed by the Court that my application was declared inadmissible. The Court found that there was no "violation of the rights and freedoms set out in the Convention or its Protocols." So there you have it – corrupt UK institutions condoned by Europe.

I have written to magazines, newspapers, politicians, TV and radio shows etc in an effort to raise publicity.... to no avail. Even women's magazines are not interested, yet my story is most certainly an issue for women.

Over the years, both children became more insecure and clingy and frequently returned from contact with their father hyped-up, tearful and destructive and would thrash about on the floor screaming and crying uncontrollably and throwing their toys in blind rage. Such behaviour would last for up to one hour, sometimes even longer. Jordan banged his head vigorously at night. Sometimes he would come in after contact, go onto all fours and head bang on the floor or living room carpet. He said he did it because he wanted to "be with mummy" but his dad tells him that he can't come home. At four years old Melissa had night-time toileting problems. Both children would cry out in their sleep things like: "Go to mummy, no dad, stay with mummy, love mummy." Melly would wake up screaming and crying because she thought "daddy is in the house" and "daddy is a monster. He's hiding in a hole." They both said that they are "scared of daddy" and "don't like daddy" because "he hits me. He hurts me." At pick up times they no longer cried and ran away because they knew that I'd just pick them up and force them to go. I'd even prise their little fingers off me if need be. They knew that if I kept them home, the judge would send me to jail. So they went – reluctantly and miserably - just like bullied children go to school to face more torment at the hands of their abusers. At such tender years, they somehow learned to cope with the harsh reality of the jungle. The experts think that all this is in the 'child's best interests'!

## [PART 2 OF SHARON A KILBY'S STORY:](#)

On AUGUST 20<sup>th</sup> 2002 Social Services manager of the out of hours Emergency Duty Team Terence James informed me that GW had told him that he had taken Jordan to see Dr Thackray this morning [Tuesday] because Jordan had told him that Andrew had burned him on the face with a cigarette. This was relayed by GW to Dr Thackray. I was told that my children would be staying with their father. I'd noticed the mark on the previous Saturday evening [17/8/02] after contact. I'd asked Jordan what the cut was on his forehead but I'd got no sense out of him. I'd presumed it was a spot, which he'd scratched [probably unknowingly.]

On 21/8/02 Dr Thackray informed me that Jordan had been seen by two doctors – himself on 19/8/02 [Monday] and Dr Ratcliffe on 20/8/02 [Tuesday]. **Why did GW tell Terry James that he'd taken Jordan to see Dr Thackray on Tuesday? Why**

**didn't he mention Dr Ratcliffe?** Dr Thackray told me that the mark looked typical of what he'd seen on both children before. He thought it was Impetigo. [He later told me on 2 further occasions on the 4<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> September that he felt that the mark on Jord's forehead was IMPETIGO.] He said that he'd treated Jordan for an infection. He prescribed Fucidin cream, which is the medication Jordan and Melissa always have for Impetigo. Dr Thackray asked Jordan questions but got no sense out of him. He said that he had been told by GW that Jordan had said that he had been burned by Andrew with a *cigarette*...

On Wednesday [21/8/02] Police officer Gay Waring of the Family Protection Unit and social worker Angela Mattison came to my house after interviewing Jordan. I was asked to leave the room. Gay Waring told Andrew that Jordan had spent 20 minutes repeatedly telling her that Andrew had burned him with a **blue lighter** and that he has a blue lighter. He repeatedly pointed to his head and arms, showing her how he'd been burned on the arms. She said that Jordan was very sure that he had been burned by Andy. Jordan told her that we were in the kitchen and I had ordered Andrew to stop doing so. Gay Waring also said that Jordan says he is scared of Andy and doesn't want to return home. [I was listening to all of this from outside the door.] Gay said that both Jordan and Melissa said that they didn't want to return home; that they wanted to stay with their dad. Gay showed me how Jordan had mimicked the using of a lighter. She pulled a nasty, hateful expression and said that that was how Jordan had looked when he was showing her how to flick on a lighter and how it had been used to burn him. She repeated to me everything she had said to Andy.

Police officer Gay Waring was aggressive towards 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 overpowering with Andy, how has she behaved with a five year old? She didn't seem concerned with trying to get to the truth. She was determined to pin the blame on Andy. [By now Jordy would have been scared and confused. He knows that he daren't make his father angry by saying the 'wrong' thing. He will have been wondering where his mummy is and what he has done wrong.]

On Thursday [22/8/02] Associate Specialist in Community Pediatrics Dr Sue Roberts examined Jordan. GW denied me my right to be present during the exam. [Ian Turner later told me on 28/8/02 that Angela had asked GW if he would allow me to be present. GW had said NO.] As the resident parent or even if I only had parental responsibility I had every right to be there. Surely social services should have insisted that I be there? Sue said the lesion was a "**healed scab** at least 4 days old and therefore **more difficult to interpret**." Jordan pointed to his head and said "a lighter" when she asked how he'd hurt his head. He mimicked the actions of using a lighter. She wrote: "Jordan was clear in that the mark had been caused by a lighter. The lesion would be consistent with a burn having been caused in this way." Also: "Jordan said this had happened in the kitchen at mummy's house on Sunday." Sue asked if he wanted to come home. He said "no no no." She asked why. Jord said: "Because she's a bitch." He told her he was "scared of Andrew" and that "Andrew doesn't like me." She asked why he would burn him. He didn't know.

On 23/8/02 Dr Ratcliffe told me that after listening to GW's allegations, she thought

that it *could* be a cigarette burn because it was the size and shape of one, although she couldn't be sure. She wrote: "Seen by Dr Thackray and child unable to say how the lesion occurred. Today Jordan has told his father it was caused by Andrew using a lighter. Jordan repeated this to me today." [She later told me that she didn't think that the mark was consistent with a lighter burn and she wrote {on 2/10/02} that she "would have assumed that a lighter burn would have caused a more diffuse burn."] She also wrote: "Father says that Jordan has also now told him it has happened before to his arms and that he does not want to go home today, *although Jordan did not repeat any of this directly to me.*" [There was no evidence of burn marks on Jordan's arms. If there had been burns there in the past, GW would've noticed and would've contacted social services IMMEDIATELY. Also Jordy would've told his dad AT THE TIME OF OCCURRENCE.] In the medical notes, she wrote: "Jordan now saying that Andrew burned him – **Sunday.**" [Jordan doesn't know the days of the week.] In the past all the doctors, including hospital paediatricians have told me that it is very difficult to tell the difference between Impetigo and a burn. Dr Ratcliffe said that because of the burn allegation she had to refer it. The referral was investigated under S47 CA 1989 and Conwy's Child Protection Procedures.

Social Services manager Ian Turner told me that social services cannot step in unless they think my children are at risk. He said that Andrew is under police investigation. He said social services have no powers to decide residence and contact issues. He said that GW is not in breach of the court order since he claims that he has to protect Jordan from Andrew and since he also has Parental Responsibility that is his right. My solicitor Peter Brown told me that we can only take it to court. Such proceedings could drag on. Meanwhile Gareth Williams has the freedom to continue brainwashing and abusing my children. No one had the power to even force him to allow me any contact with my children [even under supervision.] Ian Turner told me that he had left various long messages on GW's mobile phone since Friday [23/8/02] [over a period of several days] asking if he will allow me to see Jordan and Melissa, at a venue and date/time of his choice. He said that even if he does manage to persuade GW to allow contact, he cannot provide a social worker to 'police' it; not even for a very brief meeting. [No, but social services have plenty of resources for the purposes of aiding and abetting the crooked GW and for harassing me.] GW did not return any of Ian's calls. Ian wrote a letter to my solicitor [2/9/02] expressing his concerns at the lack of contact and he states: "The situation as presented to us **would not automatically prevent his return to the family home.**" I frequently screamed and cried down the phone, begging for just a brief encounter with my children. Ian said that he totally understood my distress. He told me that GW is in default and that by rights GW should've returned J & M and there should've been a case conference. He agreed that GW is brainwashing J & M and forcing them to repeat lies. There was talk of Gay Waring doing a video interview with Jordan. I was told that I could be present. Then Ian told me [on 30/8/02] that he has decided that "in the interests of the child" it wouldn't be a good idea. He said that he's *just found out* that Jordan made a comment to Gay along the lines of: "Please don't ask me any more questions." He feels this may be "an abusive process in itself." **What about the abuse of being denied their mummy? That's an abuse of their rights.** In his letter [2/9/02] he wrote: "given Jordan's stated requests at the end of his medical examination of not wanting to be asked any further questions." Yet Dr Roberts wrote in her letter [28/1/03]: "Jordan did not say

this to me after the medical.” And anyway, given the fact that there were court proceedings, he knew that there would be meetings with a Welfare Officer....

I repeatedly made the following points to all concerned, to no avail. I pointed out that Jordan had not said anything to Dr Thackray. Dr Ratcliffe had to question Jordan. She said there wasn't much response from him. By Wednesday, GW has had an abundance of hours to brainwash Jordan with the story that he was burned by Andy with a BLUE LIGHTER. GW even got Jordan to show Gay and Sue how to use a lighter. Jordan spends 20 minutes repeating the same lies. He spoke to Gay and Angie [in Angie's words] ARTICULATELY. Jordan would more likely speak so forcefully to the doctors whom he knows and trusts rather than two complete strangers. GW told Dr Ratcliffe that Jordan doesn't know the difference between a lighter and a cigarette. It is clear that HE DOES KNOW WHAT A LIGHTER IS. Also cigarettes aren't BLUE. Further Sue Roberts said that the lesion didn't "appear to be Impetigo **because of the lack of any surrounding infection.**" Jordan was treated by Dr Thackray for Impetigo with Fucidin medication. [Dr Ratcliffe told me that Fucidin is used for Impetigo and other open cuts to *prevent infection*]. So by the time Sue saw the, as she described it, **healed scab**, any infection that may or may not have been present would've cleared up anyway. Furthermore since it had healed in 4 days, it wasn't much of an injury in the first place. Regarding a previous bout of Impetigo that Melissa suffered, a doctor told me that since it had healed in a week, it was not a burn. Dr Roberts later acknowledged [28/1/03] that if she hadn't known about the burn allegation beforehand she would not have been able to say with any certainty that it was a burn. [The history had been provided by a man who has a record of lying and behaving maliciously.]

I repeatedly told everyone that GW is clearly putting words into Jordan's head. It is evident that GW is mentally abusing Jordan [and Mel.] Social Services and the Court welfare officer have files on myself and GW which prove that he has a history of malicious intent and of lying. The fact that he would not allow me to see my children speaks volumes. I repeatedly pointed out that the 'burn' is only an allegation. A five year old's testimony is unreliable [especially when the child is terrified and intimidated and already has behavioural problems, such as the head banging. That is, he is already emotionally disturbed.] Mentally abused children are too scared to tell the truth.

I have repeatedly said that until this is all sorted out J & M would've been better off staying in the care of a third party. That way they would not have been under the influence of either of us. But more importantly, they SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN STAYING WITH GARETH WILLIAMS since they are AT RISK with him. They would have been subject to the most appalling mental and probably physical abuse. My children would have been frightened and confused and crying for their mummy. I've repeatedly asked how can it be that the words of a FIVE YEAR OLD carry such clout that his mother is prevented from seeing her children??? Jordy doesn't know that by repeating his father's lies he might've sentenced himself and his little sister to a lifetime of abuse and that they might now end up motherless. And I have said that even if Andy was guilty, what was my crime? If I'd done what GW has done, Gareth Williams would've kicked my door down, kicked my head in and I would've been arrested.

On SEPTEMBER 3<sup>rd</sup> 2002 I attended court, just **one day** after being served with court papers on the 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2002. My solicitor Peter Brown had not been able to attend with me and I'd had to make do with a stand in solicitor who had not been able to read up on my case. The only information that she had was that which I provided her with during the ½ hour discussion that we had before going into court. She was totally unprepared and yet was expected to cross-examine GW and myself. There was no medical evidence or any representative from Social Services in court. Ian Turner should have been there. In giving evidence, GW pretended not to know Dr Thackray. [He had taken himself or the kids numerous times to see Dr Thackray.] He stated that **Jordan had told Dr Thackray** that Andrew had **scalded** him with **hot water**. He also said that Jordan told Sue Roberts that he'd been "**burnt by fire**." [Sue later told me that Jord had NOT said fire. He had said "lighter". Nowhere is it stated by any doctor or Gay or Angie that Jord said FIRE.] GW also said on oath that Sue was surprised that Jordan couldn't read/write. He said that Jord told her that he could count to 10 in Welsh but only 5 in English. [She told me {and confirms in her 28/1/03 letter} that neither numbers or Welsh were mentioned and that she would not expect Jordan to be reading or writing.] He also said that he'd "acted neutral" and "hadn't prompted Jordan." He said Jordan and Melissa are "frightened to go back" and that Jordan had repeatedly said that he "doesn't want to go home." He said that Jordan has marks on his arms, *which I explain as eczema*. Sue reported [on 22/8/02] that Jordan "does suffer with eczema, particularly elbows and behind the knees." [She later acknowledged {28/1/03} that this information came from Jordan's father. Jordan has NEVER had eczema and his medical records confirm that.] Chris Hind of Amphletts said that his client had previously told Vera Nolan, the welfare officer, that he'd been concerned about marks and he added that social services had been unable to corroborate such marks. The judge D L Hughes said: "No doctor is absolutely certain that it was a cigarette burn." He said that the "court doesn't insist that there is absolute certainty." He said that if it was "probably a burn" then that is sufficient. He said that the father had taken all the responsible steps: he'd contacted the police and social services. Judge Hughes then granted GW temporary residence as he "shares the same concerns as the father." He granted me supervised contact, **leaving it to the solicitors to arrange the details**. Later Peter Brown informed me that the courier services had lost my files [including Ian Turner's letter] on route to court.

On SEPTEMBER 4<sup>th</sup> 2002 Dr Thackray repeated to me that he felt Jordan had Impetigo. He then told me that Jordan had told GW that Andrew had "applied some heat source – it could've been water or burn of some sort." [Heat source is vague terminology. Sounds like Dr Thackray is speaking with caution.] He said there was "*no mention of a cigarette*." [He did say cigarette when I spoke to him on 21/8/02. Also how odd that he would mention water just after GW had mentioned scalded by hot water yesterday in court. And why say *water* when the mark looked nothing like a scald?]

On SEPTEMBER 5<sup>th</sup> 2002 Ian told me that Amphletts had written to him. They referred to Jordan's 'injury' which they say their "client alleges were *caused by Ms Kilby*." Ian was shocked and said that it was the first that he'd heard. Ian told me that he is concerned that the case is dragging on and that he recommends that J & M return home. I wrote to Ian requesting my social services files. Pete also wrote numerous times requesting them. On 20/12/02 Ian wrote to say that the job was in

hand. Amphletts wrote that the nursery and church are “inappropriate venues.” GW made no suggestions for contact venue. I learned that GW was putting J & M in school – Ysgol Cynfran, Llysfaen. [Judge Elystan Morgan had twice given me permission to home educate them.]

On SEPTEMBER 6<sup>th</sup> 2002 Ian learned from Amphletts that they are retracting their statement.... The allegations are still against Andy. Ian told me that he had got angry with Amphletts and had urged Amphletts to allow contact, telling them that two and a half weeks had gone by and that Jordan and Melissa are being heavily influenced and controlled by their client. Ian agreed that GW was doing everything possible to block all contact and that he has some explaining to do in court. Amphletts said: “The children do not want to see their mother.”

On SEPTEMBER 9<sup>th</sup> 2002 I received a letter from Angie [dated 7/9/02.] She said that she and Ian had had a meeting with GW urging him to allow contact. She enclosed his phone number so that I could arrange it. I telephoned him over 2 days but GW did not return any of my calls. Ian agreed that GW is in contempt of court and that GW’s behaviour does bring into question his motives and integrity.

On 9/9/02 I called at the children’s school hoping to see them briefly since I hadn’t seen them for 3 weeks. I wanted to tell them I love them. I wanted to give them a cuddly toy each and some chocolate buttons [the court had told me 6 days ago that it would expect for me to be having contact.] I hadn’t dared go to GW’s house. I thought the school would be safe. GW told me to “fuck off.” The headmaster Geraint Williams steered me to one side so that I couldn’t be seen by Jordan and Melissa when they came out of school. 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. Shell 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 headmaster was holding on to my arm, threatening me with the Police if I caused a scene. Why was he treating me and J & M so callously? Melly came out and GW took both their hands and whisked them 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. I asked Jordan if Andy had hurt him; I pointed to my forehead. He said “no” quietly.

On 9/9/02 Dr Thackray wrote a letter to Amphletts for court. He wrote nothing in support of me; his rather cautious letter supports the burn allegation. He wrote: “may have been caused by Andrew by burning him.” Then he mentioned Impetigo. [‘Burning’ is a bit vague. Burned by what? And why didn’t he state Impetigo FIRST? i.e. that *he* thought the mark was Impetigo.] He also wrote: “As a somewhat suspicious appearance of this lesion.” [Why write ‘suspicious’? He told me on three occasions that he thought the mark was IMPETIGO. Dr Ratcliffe had not even written that in her referral or her medical notes.] He also wrote: “Jordan was brought back to clinic the following day by his father. Mr Williams went on to say that he had noticed the lesion at 3pm on the *previous* day.” [I would’ve thought that GW would’ve mentioned to **Dr Thackray** that he had ‘noticed’ the lesion at 3pm.] He

also wrote: "and the story now given as to its cause..." [which sounds like the story had changed. **Why didn't Dr Thackray state what GW had said to him?** Dr Thackray is specific about times but wary about writing anything about what GW had said to him.] Pete wrote to Dr Thackray on 10/12/02 asking him to clarify exactly what GW had told him. On 22/1/03 he wrote: "I have nothing further to add to the paragraph written on 9 September 2002."

My solicitor then received a letter from Ian Turner. He reiterated his concerns about lack of contact but then wrote: "The situation has now changed however in that I have had concerning reports from the Headteacher that Ms Kilby turned up at the school and created a considerable stir. This involved making allegations against Mr Williams. [I had spoken civilly to the headmaster and I'd given him facts.] Mr Gareth Williams called at this office on Monday 9/9/02 and stated that the children are clearly saying that they do not wish to return to their mother. In the light of this, the position of this authority regarding the children's return would be that of the need to interview the children to **ascertain their wishes and feelings** about this." This would be after more than 3 weeks of being indoctrinated and forced to lie by their father. What happened to the statement that to interview Jordan would be "**an abusive process in itself?**" Why didn't Gay Waring do a more 'balanced' interview? The 'video interview' should have been done, in my presence, *at the time* of the so-called 'burn'. Jordan would've been under a lot less influence by his malignant father and some truth might have emerged. But truth is something the police and social services are not interested in. Angie later reported: "**Mr Williams requested that Jordan be interviewed.** [I find that very hard to believe when he is clearly being uncooperative, lying and hindering contact.] However Ian Turner and Gay Waring did not feel that it was in Jordan's best interest to proceed with a video interview."

Ian also wrote in response to Pete's letter that there was no report made by Social Services Manager Terry James. He writes: "I have not had sight of such a report and I spoke to Mr James on 10/9/02 about this. He confirms that he spoke to both parents independently on the evening when the children initially reviewed with their father and that general advice was given. I understand that his report was of a verbal nature to the duty officer on the following morning." I'd written in my notes that he told me that he *had* written out a report. He even gave me a police incident number: 246c/20/8/02. I tried to phone Terry James over several days. I left various messages but heard nothing from him. On 19/10/02 I wrote to him. Pete wrote to Ian on 15/11/02 and 10/12/02 asking for a response. We didn't hear a dickie bird until Ian wrote to us on 20/12/02. But in that letter there was no mention of Terry James.

By the 12<sup>th</sup> September 2002 I was still being denied my children despite the order on 3<sup>rd</sup> Sept to allow it. GW wouldn't even let me speak to my children on the phone.

In court on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2002 GW put in his statement that "the children ran away" from me and that I was "shouting and screaming at the teachers." My solicitor wrote to the Head asking him to confirm this. He wrote numerous letters but Geraint Williams refused to answer the questions. He told Pete on the phone [15/10/02] that they didn't run away from me but he wouldn't put it in writing and he wrote that I "started to shout loudly at everyone in the vicinity" which was untrue because I

shouted only to my children. GW states: "There have been other incidents at the home involving Andrew who he is extremely frightened of." [He didn't say what these 'incidents' are. Pete enquired with Amphetts but his numerous letters to them in this regard were ignored until 7/1/03 when we were told that Jordan had allegedly told his father "Andrew had bullied him, squeezed Jordan's fingers and put his arms behind his back..." I'm sure if there was any truth in that GW would've mentioned such to doctors and social services.] Also "I'm concerned as to the children's unwillingness" [to see me] and "their obvious distress when I discuss this with them although I will continue to make every effort to progress contact further." That is a clear lie. He is clearly obstructing contact. My **barrister Alex Hewitt commented that it was ridiculous that the video interview idea had been scrapped as there was now talk of J & M being interviewed by social services and also a welfare officer.** Judge Hughes decided that too many people were seeing J & M, which was too much for any 4 and 5 year old. He said that they are not at risk therefore only a **welfare officer** need do an assessment. The judge granted me supervised contact at a nursery on Friday 13<sup>th</sup> and also on Sunday morning [15/9/02] in church for 4 hours. He stated that Jordan and Melissa would be seen by a welfare officer on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> to ascertain who they wished to live with.

However when I got to nursery, GW insisted that he stay also on the grounds that Jordan and Melissa didn't want him to leave. He had coached them well. At first they refused to come to me but after a few minutes they invited me to play. Eventually I got kisses and cuddles from them but they remained tense and guarded. GW refused to leave. At one point Jordy seemed to want to open up to me. He said that Andy had hurt him on his head. I cuddled him and said: "No darling that's not true, Andy wouldn't hurt you. He loves you." At which point Gareth Williams yelled at me: "Oi, pack that kind of talk in." I didn't want an argument or a scene so I said nothing. At the end of the 2 hourly session, Jordan and Melissa politely said goodbye to me as if I was their school teacher. They were too scared to be *themselves*. I was heartbroken.

I briefly saw my children and GW in Safeways on Saturday 14/9/02. Initially they were tentative, but after some small talk, they warmed to me. They left waving and blowing kisses.

I did not see Jordan and Melissa on Sunday 15<sup>th</sup> September because GW phoned the church to leave a message that they were ill.

On SEPTEMBER 17<sup>th</sup> 2002 CAFCASS officer Jane Williams reported: "Melissa told me that her mother was a 'bitch'. I am concerned that this and other negative comments towards their mother made by the children were either in **response to direct priming** by an adult or comments which **responsible adults would have discouraged.**" She said: "**Jordan became a little upset talking about missing his mother**, he appeared to be **ambivalent** about Andrew." She also states: "It is worrying that they did not see her for a period of some three weeks prior to a contact session on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2002." She ends: "**The court will require an assessment from the Local Authority as to whether:**

- **They feel Ms Kilby is able to protect the children.**
- **Whether a protection plan for Jordan is necessary."**

That's not a bad report under the circumstances. Jordy and Melly came up trumps despite all the odds. Bless the little angels. They must have a guiding light telling them what to say and how to behave when it really matters.

I was awarded supervised contact of three 2-hourly sessions pw at a nursery and three Sundays out of four at church for three and a half hours duration. [Did GW help pay the nursery fees? Not on your nelly. My dad funded it. We tried to claim expenses from Legal Services. After many letters and many months later we finally did get some of it refunded. The rest eventually trickled in almost one year later.] An Educational Psychologist was ordered to prepare a report in respect of Jordan's educational needs and abilities. The matter was listed for a review of contact on 16/12/02 and a final hearing was listed for 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> February 2003 to decide on contact and residence and whether the children should attend school or be home educated. The court order of the 17/9/02 also states that "a **report** be prepared by a CAFCASS Officer in respect of the issues of Contact and Residence, such report to be filed and served by Friday 20 December 2002." **Why wasn't the report expected to be in before the 16<sup>th</sup> December?**

On OCTOBER 1<sup>st</sup> 2002 we attended a child protection conference. 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 [by up to 25 minutes] for contact and on 3 occasions had failed to bring my children, I was repeatedly interrupted by the Child Protection Co-ordinator Mr Graham Seale and told to "save it for the court." In the minutes it is stated that I "continue to contradict the medical opinions." That was not correct. I was attempting to get to the truth. It's a pity the 3 doctors weren't present, although Dr Ratcliffe did send her apologies. Rather than focusing on the present case, much of the time was spent listening to Dr Groves reading from years old reports regarding the kitchen curtain fire [which she described as a "major house fire."]

There was nothing mentioned in Angie Mattison's report for conference or in the minutes about the previous 4 years of GW's harassing, malevolence and lies or that social services had requested that he stop making nuisance referrals or that GW had been making malicious allegations to doctors since Melly was a baby in his attempts to have my children removed from me. On 31/8/02 I had sent Ian Turner information as stated in welfare reports, examples of which are: "Mr Williams makes referrals which are generally considered to be spurious and unfounded and his watching and apparent knowledge of Ms Kilby's every move is considered to be *approaching harassment*." And "Social Services visited Ms Kilby unannounced on a number of occasions. The referrals coincided with the first and then the final separation. Social Services took the view that they were *generally malicious* in nature. Mr Williams was invited to meet with a Social Worker and *requested not to persist in wasting Social Work time*." And "Further referrals were received in October 1998 *directly from Mr Williams and other members of his family*. Referrals were also received via the Health Visitor and NSPCC." And "His general behaviour gives some cause for concern. At interview he told me that he had had Ms Kilby 'watched'. *Mr Williams'*

*behaviour can only, in my opinion, be making matters worse and this may have a knock on effect on the children.” And “All of Mr Williams’ referrals have been investigated and no action has been taken on any of them.” And “The level of referral and investigation seems to have become so regular.” Also “There is an impression that at least some of the referrals from Mr Williams are more reflective of the hostile relationship between himself and Ms Kilby and the ongoing Court proceedings. Mr Williams has been advised to try to raise his concerns with Ms Kilby before triggering child protection procedures. His referrals have, to date, only resulted in a deepening of the rift and also due to the numerous investigations Social Services have been obliged to make, further alienated Ms Kilby from the system.”*

I had also provided Mr Turner with documentation given from the ex headmistress of GW’s older children in Dolgellau to Vera Nolan W/O. She said there were “major concerns about Mr Williams’ care and management” of his older children which were “over and above what in itself was a serious problem of non-school attendance” and “recalls that Educational Welfare Department were involved.” What reward did the Headmistress get for sticking her neck out in her attempts to protect my children from being abused by their father? She was contacted by the LEA and told that Gareth Williams was threatening her with defamation of character.

Nothing was mentioned in conference about Social Worker Maureen Catherall’s suspicions re GW especially regarding the Butlins incident where she “questioned his motives” and said that he “had some explaining to do this time.” Nor was it mentioned that she felt his behaviour was bordering at harassment. Neither was it mentioned that she and social worker Elaine Buckley said that GW would get angry when he realized nothing would come of his referrals. Maureen even told him to put in a formal complaint against her if he wasn’t satisfied. Also, she and H/V Alison Parry liased with the police to work out ways of dealing with GW and his constant referrals. But that wasn’t even mentioned in conference either.

Further examples of GW’s malicious intent are that he took Melissa to see Dr Thackray in emergency surgery about a nappy rash. He blamed me, yet she had been clear before going for contact. Dr Thackray said he had “over-reacted.” Another time he bullied me into taking Jordan to the GP about a lump, which he knew was harmless. He insisted on being there also. A church supervisor and other churchgoers witnessed him bullying me and had to intervene. Another time he took Mel to A&E complaining about a rash. He caused the hospital to make another unnecessary referral to S/S. 2 days after that he took Mel again to A&E and then contacted social services himself. On another occasion GW visited Dr Thackray about a 1cm red lesion on Jordan’s thigh. He said that *Jordan had told him that I had caused it.* On that occasion Dr Thackray told GW that he wouldn’t take action unless I agreed to a referral.

The above information is well documented and social services are fully aware yet it wasn’t mentioned in the conference. Instead it is stated in the minutes: “No concerns have been raised in relation to Mr Williams.” Previous referrals are referred to as being from “anonymous” callers only. It is stated that I had informed the social worker and police officer that Jordan does bang his head but it isn’t stated that I had consulted with Dr Knight about it [after repeatedly expressing my concerns to the doctors and H/V and S/S] and that I have been extremely worried over a

number of years about my children's disturbing behavioural changes due to increasing contact with their father.

At conference the 'suspected burn' that Melly had as a baby was again brought up. In the minutes it was referred to as "possibly a burn" and "the burn". In the minutes it is stated that I am of the view that the mark on Jordan's forehead was eczema. I have never said that as is evidenced in court. It is further stated in the minutes: "Based on past history there were concerns about the burns that have been reported." There were only 2 alleged burns – one on 5/2/99, which was eczema and this latest one [20/8/02] which was probably Impetigo.

The Head Geraint Williams presented himself at conference as being neutral. So why did he go to such lengths to stop me having a **brief** encounter with J & M on 9/9/02? All he had to do was usher me and GW and J & M into his room for a couple of minutes. Then there would not have been a 'scene'. Why didn't he question why GW was blocking contact, especially since his actions were in violation of judge Hughes' order? Why didn't he want to see for himself if my children wanted to come to me or not, rather than just listening to GW?

The Head likes to keep a tight rein on his ship. I was not allowed to speak with the teachers; he had ordered that I direct my enquiries through him. Just before Christmas I managed a meeting with them but the Head perched himself at a table just outside the little room that we occupied so that he could listen in. The room did not even have a door, only a curtain! Jordan's teacher seemed more sympathetic to our plight and said that although she wasn't supposed to discuss *other things* with me, she did want to hear my side. I gave her some documentation detailing the history but she was too terrified to take it from me. Talk about being ruled with an iron fist. **What kind of democracy is it when teachers aren't allowed free speech with parents?** We ended up whispering throughout the meeting and she managed to smuggle a statement of mine out. She asked for the rest of the papers to be hidden in a kid's tray so that she could retrieve it later. I wasn't convinced that she had managed to do so, so just to be on the safe side I copied it all out again for her and wrapped it up in Christmas wrapping to give to her at the school concert. But I wasn't allowed to speak briefly with her in private either. The Head watched me like a hawk and when I tried to give the teacher her 'present' he was there in a flash shadowing me!

Social Worker Angie Mattison also states in her report: "Jordan did at one point whisper into Gay's ear and said that his mother had burnt him. Then asked again he said it was Andrew." On 5/9/02 Ian Turner had expressed shock at this. Pete wrote to Ian and Chris Hind of Amphletts numerous times asking for *clarification* but his letters were ignored. In GW's 3/12/02 statement for court, he wrote that "It has always been my case that Andrew was responsible for this non-accidental injury but I am concerned to know that Jordan told the Child Protection Office of the Police that he thought it might have been mummy." **So, did he learn this just by what he read in Angie's report? It sounds like Jordan didn't tell his own father that he thought that I had burned him. Why would Jordan be confused about who [if anyone] had burned him when he was clear about other things such as that it was done with a blue lighter in the kitchen on Sunday?** Amphletts themselves admit in a letter of 9/12/02 "**OBVIOUSLY IT IS DIFFICULT TO DETERMINE HOW**

**THE INJURY OCCURRED.**” On 7/1/03 Amphletts finally responded to our question. The reply was inconsistent mumbo jumbo. It was obvious Mr Hind was *exercising caution*. He writes: “**Our client did make statements to the allegations which had been reported to him by Jordan** and confirms that they were later withdrawn. [Why were they?] However they stand in so far as they can do in that our client has stated in open correspondence that he was told via a social worker and the police family protection officer...” Then he says: “We also understand that it was **not our client who had made these allegations** but the above third parties.” Also Amphletts now state [7/1/03]: “Jordan then said to the **Doctor** that ‘**Mummy** had burnt him’.” This is new! No doctor has mentioned that Jordan told him or her that **I** caused the mark on his forehead. Pete wrote to Amphletts [16/1/03] asking for clarification. He asked: “Could you simply let us know if Jordan told his father that our client had caused the burn, and if so when.” The other side preferred not to answer our question. Instead the monkeys wrote [25/2/03]: “We would confirm once again that we have already canvassed this particular matter at length with yourselves. We would confirm that Jordan initially advised the Child Protection Unit and then our client that Andrew had caused the injury to his face. [If he’d been burned, wouldn’t Jordan tell his own father *before* telling any authority figure???] Jordan then stated that it was your client who had in fact caused the injury.” [Stated to *who?*]

Amphletts also wrote on 7/1/03 to say that they are including a letter, which was sent from the headmaster Geraint Williams to *my solicitor* on 14/10/02 in their bundle for a court directions hearing. How did they get hold of that letter? Is it normal practice for Heads to send copies of confidential correspondence to *opposing* solicitors?

Up until 10/11/02 I had on average less than four hours contact pw. [I was supposed to be having nine and a half including the Sunday session.] Up until then GW failed to bring J & M six times. He was in continual breach of the court order. On virtually all the other days he was late, quite often by between twenty and thirty five minutes. He refused to notify me and there were many times when he failed to notify church or nursery of his absences. He gave ludicrous excuses. Pete wrote to Mr Hind of Amphletts numerous times in this regard but his letters must have found the trashcan. On 7/1/03 the excuse was that GW did not arrive in Colwyn Bay until 3.30pm. [That would leave him half an hour to get to nursery. The journey is only a few minutes long.] Also in that letter Amphletts wrote: “Our client has no clear recollection” and “genuinely cannot remember.”

In front of GW J & M are mainly guarded and tense and too afraid to show me affection. During the first few sessions it was obvious that GW was brainwashing them. [For details of the sort of things my children used to say and how they behaved, see **more details of my story in part 3 {p1}**.] I was warned by Alex, Pete and June not to ‘coach’ my children but I made it clear that I will respond openly and honestly to their questions and comments. This is necessary for their sanity. It would be wrong of me and more confusing for them if I didn’t explain why they couldn’t come home, why I could only see them for short periods at nursery and church, why we couldn’t go out anywhere, why they couldn’t see Andy and why we are in this situation. I also made it clear that I couldn’t let them believe that Andy did burn Jordan and that Andy doesn’t like him.... To do so would have resulted in them

being even more disturbed.

During contact GW would sit on the wall outside and spy on us when we played in the garden. I didn't make a fuss because I didn't want June to have to play 'policewoman' or she might just have discontinued the contact arrangements. Sometimes he insisted on communicating with J & M. He would refuse to leave the TV room when we were in there. He would be abusive [even in front of other children] and always threatened not to bring J & M again. He even started to insist on one of the carers taking Melly to the loo.

On NOVEMBER 8<sup>th</sup> 2002 I went to the eye clinic to be with Jordan during his appointment to see if he needed glasses. GW was furious that I'd turned up. He shut the door on me so that he could have a word with a nurse in private, then he snarled at the receptionist: "She is not supposed to be here. I have custody. If she is here again I will call the police." He then barked at the Orthoptist: "Jordan doesn't take too kindly to being BURNED." He then threatened not to bring my children for contact later because I'd had about 20 minutes playing with Jordan in the waiting room. He carried out his threat. Later I was told by social services that in order to avoid any future conflict the clinic would prefer that only the resident parent attends appointments with Jordan. So the bully wins again. [When J & M lived at home, GW made medical issues an excuse to harass and cause me problems.] I had told GW about Jordan's previous eye appointment dated 11/10/02 and Pete had also notified Amphletts numerous times but despite saying he would take Jordan, he failed to do so. He cancelled Jordan's and Melissa's dental appointment too. It was months before Amphletts finally answered my question regarding the dentist. I still had PR but absolutely no say in the lives of my children whatsoever. GW did not care about the medical and dental needs of his older children either. They missed a lot of schooling due to a variety of ailments, which is well documented.

Since my children have resided with their father, their health has suffered. They lost many contact days due to illness and they have had a number of days off school due to "illness". When I see them, one or the other or both are nearly always ill. They've had diarrhoea, vomiting, bad coughs, colds and constant runny noses. Melissa is always coughing and when she runs about she breaks into a fit of coughing. It wasn't comfortable for them to be ill at nursery or church because they were surrounded by other kids and they couldn't just lie quietly on a couch or take a nap in bed. Also they infected others, which wasn't fair. Melly had a sore bottom for a while. I encouraged GW to check her after she uses the loo and that he should use sudocrem. Jord also complained that his "wee wee" hurt and he often has filthy ears. When I point such things out to GW I get verbal abuse. Melly went so thin too.

I am also very worried about my children's mental health as well. Just before Jordan was 3 he was assessed by Dr Groves as being *well within normal range for his age*. At this point J & M only had a relatively short amount of day contact with their father. They were also sociable and happy. However at nearly 6 years old, Jordan was assessed as functioning around the level of a nursery aged child. The psychologist reports [9/12/02] him as "demonstrating a clinically significant level of behavior difficulties which are internally expressed." He is described as "withdrawn, fearful of doing something wrong, worrying, acting like a younger child, appearing confused,

nervous, anxious/depressed.” This tells me that Jordan is suffering enormous pressure from his father to behave in a manner, which will please his father. Melissa [at 4] was also assessed as being on the level of a pre-schooler and described as being “withdrawn” and “demonstrating a clinically borderline level of behaviour difficulties which include thought and attention problems.” Both are reported to be “socially withdrawn” and their teachers told me that neither child had a friend and that they wouldn’t ask their teachers for or tell them anything. The truth is they simply don’t trust anyone, especially ‘important’ adults anymore because they know that no one is listening to *them*. Mel’s teacher told me that at 10 weeks on Mel was still standing in silence in total bewilderment, just watching while her class sat and got on with their work. Both are assessed as having “weakness in language skills” and Jordan has “difficulty in speech production.” The psychologist stated that “Jordan did not respond appropriately to questions such as ‘what do you like at school?’” and she said that he needed help to “engage in a simple conversation.” This shows that Jordan is being stifled by his father and is not being allowed the freedom to respond spontaneously when interacting with others. This is more proof that my children are being brainwashed and forced to repeat lies. **How could Jordan speak so articulately to Gay for so long unless his father had been force-feeding him over a good many hours?** The headmaster states: “They have to be told everything, they just stand there, the first impression was that they had missed out on education.” Doesn’t he mean that they had missed out on indoctrination? How can he jump to his conclusions? I think it is clear that my children’s problems stem from the fact that they are suffering [as Alex Hewitt put it] classic emotional abuse. How can they learn when they are suffering trauma? The answer is not the ‘special needs register’ as Geraint Williams states and Speech Therapy/additional learning support as the psychologist recommends but to be removed from their abusive and violent father and to be living and learning at home where they are loved, relaxed and happy. The psychologist might have drawn the same conclusion if she had been given the information that I had sent. [This included recent statements by GW and myself and information from welfare reports.] Instead she based her report on information provided by the school, some of which must have been passed on by GW. Such info included years old reports from the LEA regarding Andy’s and Shelly’s H/E inspection. The more recent [and more impressive] reports from the LEA that I had sent to the psychologist [Ros Randle] were disregarded. Labels will just stigmatize J & M and enforced learning and testing and assessing just leads to failure. Melly, at 4 hadn’t even reached statutory school age and Jord at 5 had only just reached it. In some EC countries school starts at 7 because it is believed that school for younger children is unnecessary and even a hindrance. GW didn’t give a fig for his older children’s education either. The Headmistress said that both were underachievers and both suffered emotionally when their mother was forced to flee due to the D/V. GW didn’t attend any school functions or parents’ evenings. The Head was always complaining by phone and letter. His older son did school vandalism and his reports at school and tech were abysmal.

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. This makes me wonder if he has been sexually interfering with his own children. It makes me wonder what he's getting up to with Jordan and Melissa. I have strong suspicions. Jordan told me that his father has taken Melly into his bed. Melissa said that her father wipes her "wee wee" and that he also dries her "wee wee" after she has had a bath. She cries and tells him not to but he won't stop. She says that he doesn't wipe her bottom though after she has been to the toilet. He expects her to do that herself. 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.

Chris Hind wrote to accuse me of breaching the court order by removing J & M from the church [on 10/11/02] and taking them to the beach, swimming and to my home. This is another blatant lie. Three people were witnesses to the fact that we did not leave the church and they signed statements to say so. [One witness [a magistrate] got into trouble with court colleagues and superiors for doing so!] According to one of the church leaders, GW formed this opinion from something J & M told him. The supervisor told me that GW had been to see him at 6.30pm on the evening of 10/11/02 to say that the children had told him that afternoon that I had taken them out. CAFCASS officer Ivor Hughes told me [on 14/11/02] that GW was stopping contact because he couldn't trust me anymore. He was also saying that he wanted to be in the same room as us in nursery to make sure that I didn't take J & M from there too. Ivor said that GW had called the police. He said he had an incident number but he wouldn't divulge it to me and he wouldn't give me the name of the police officer who he said he'd made enquiries with. Pete has asked Amphletts for clarification and information but is stonewalled by Mr Hind. Ivor told me that J & M are too young to give an opinion on who they want to live with. He said they have to be 8 or 9 to be listened to and about 11 or 12 to influence proceedings. **So why was Jordan listened to about the burn, especially when he is showing confusion and the burn story is full of inconsistencies? Also why did Ian say that regarding the children's return he would interview J & M to ascertain their wishes and feelings and why did judge Hughes order the welfare officer to ascertain who they wished to live with?**

For over a month GW blocked contact again and I did not see J & M until 12/12/02 in front of Ivor in the CAFCASS office. The session lasted 1 hour. J & M just fell into my and Shelly's arms and kissed and cuddled us, much to the chagrin I should imagine of GW and his conspirators in crime. You would not think that such a long time had passed without contact. Bless them. God's angels must be guiding and protecting them and giving them strength, courage and hope. Despite all the evil manipulation going on behind the scenes and the fact that they were cruelly snatched from their home and were only seeing their mummy for the odd hour or so here and there and in unnatural surroundings, J & M know the TRUTH and seem to understand the situation. Even at their tender ages of 4 and 5, they knew more than the men in power gave them credit for. They know the difference between truth and

lies, good and bad and they know that their father behaves badly. Amphletts told us that contact was to be reinstated but then GW immediately defaulted. On 2/12/02 they wrote: "We were with our client for a considerable period of time on 28/11/02. Our client has now specifically instructed us that contact will now be reinstated with accordance with the court order commencing 2/12/02 and obviously the weekend contact will be over the weekend of 6<sup>th</sup> December. Our client instructs us that the reason he considered that contact was inappropriate to continue was because of his fears that your client had taken the children away from the church." **If he genuinely believed that I had breached the c/o by taking J & M from church, why would he state in the letter that contact is to recommence on Sundays also?** As it happened I did not get any contact until the 12<sup>th</sup> December. Nor did I get an explanation. Pete could not get any sense out of Amphletts by phone or letter. In his statement of 3/12/02 GW states: "As a result of my belief that the children are at risk I stopped contact because and **know** that Sharon Kilby **took the children away from nursery** and she had taken the children away from the church." [Later in his 30/4/03 statement he admitted that he believed I had breached the court order by taking the children out of the church only because of what he said *Jordan* had told him.] June Flack of the nursery said that he was lying. She wrote [12/3/03]: "Mrs Kilby has never removed Jordan and Melissa Williams from the nursery. I have always been present when they have attended and it is not possible for them to have left the premise without my knowledge." Pete asked Amphletts [10/12/02] to tell us when I'm supposed to have taken J & M out of the nursery. The other side remain mute. Ivor tells me that he wrote to the church making enquiries but that after more than 3 weeks had not had a reply. The church leader told me that he had been trying to phone Ivor but had been unsuccessful. Ivor told me that he hadn't had any phone messages either from the church....

Also on 14/11/02 Ivor told me that he had been struggling to find out if social services would have any objection to me having unsupervised contact as he was trying to move the situation on [i.e. arrange for me to have some unsupervised contact starting at Christmas until the February 2003 final hearing so that hopefully I would be granted residence of J & M then.] Mr Seale told him that the question of unsupervised contact hadn't cropped up at conference and that they'd only discussed what would happen if J & M return home to *live*. [Well actually it had cropped up. I had asked what the situation was regarding me having J & M home for some of the Christmas holiday but I was ignored.] Mr Seale told Ivor that if I am to have home contact then a social worker should be making an assessment. He apparently informed Ivor that if Angie was still there the process would have been underway.... Ivor said that he'd written to social services urging them to get cracking.

Ivor also informed me on the 12<sup>th</sup> Dec 2002 that GW had said that the reason there had been no contact was because of Melissa's persistent cough. [She had not been absent from school for a month.] She was coughing a lot at CAF/CASS. No excuse was offered as to why Jordan had not been brought for contact. I later learned *from the psychologist's report* that Mel had been admitted to hospital because of this persistent cough.

On 12/12/02 Ivor told me that **Jordan** had told him that we had left the church and had gone to the beach and then swimming in the pool and then back to my house

where we had mashed potatoes and sausages with Andy. Here is more evidence of GW's lies and of forcing Jordan to repeat those lies. Why wasn't Ivor concerned about the emotional abuse of my children? Ivor told me that he was unable to move matters on as things had stagnated. He said he'd had replies from Graham Seale and Ian Turner but that neither had answered his question as to whether it was ok with social services for me to have unsupervised contact. He said that Mr Seale had said that he didn't know what the answer was; it was whatever was stated in the minutes. He said that Mr Turner was basically saying that if the *court* wanted social services to be involved, then they would be. He informed me that the only thing he can do now is make a **recommendation to the court that Social Services get involved and do a risk assessment**. 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, 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 have enough evidence that GW is abusing J & M. These 3 men and Mr Hind are aiding and abetting child abuse. If that's not true, Mr Hind should refuse to represent his client and they should all be shouting from the court room rafters and insisting on the immediate return home of my children. Then they should be assisting the police in prosecuting GW for: child abuse, harassment, slander, perjury, contempt of court, wasting authorities' resources.... If this isn't a conspiracy, I don't know what is.

On DECEMBER 16<sup>th</sup> 2002 my barrister Alex Hewitt summed up the farce saying that it was Ivor's job to make recommendations but that he **doesn't seem to want to take responsibility** and is passing it on to the Local Authority. She pointed out that **W/O Jane Williams had recommended on 17/9/02 the involvement of Social Services**, so she couldn't understand why they hadn't already been asked to do a risk assessment. She explained that a Section 37 social services report is for kids who are at serious risk of harm such that care proceedings are imminent. She agreed with judge Hughes that such an assessment would not have been necessary. After speaking to the other side Alex informed me that Barrister Hornby [who represented GW back on 17/9/02] had been calling for a section-37 risk assessment then. Really? Alex said that after reading my statement the judge's position had changed. He decided that we would need social services involvement and that he wanted a full and proper hearing. It was passed to a higher level – for circuit judge David Davies to take over. Alex told me that Ian Turner would take charge of doing a Section 7 risk assessment, which is basically along the same lines as what a welfare officer does! Which raises the question, **why hasn't Ivor done the risk assessment and made recommendations as to residence and contact? Also why isn't he expected to produce a report? He has had meetings with me and GW and J & M and A & S over 3 months, not to mention correspondence with church supervisors and June of the nursery but there is nothing to show for it.** Alex said that she feels Ian will be very helpful as he has a great deal of sympathy for me. But none of his letters so far have been supportive

and he hasn't yet given evidence in court. This is despite the fact my solicitor and Mr Hind agreed in court on 3/9/02 that a representative of the Local Authority should be served a witness summons. Neither has he answered questions that I have repeatedly asked him; nor has he produced my files yet. We were told that Ian's assessment would take at least 8 weeks and would consist of two sessions pw of one and a half hours duration each. It was stated that Ian's report would be filed by 26/2/03. There was more chance of me having tea with the Queen than that report being filed on time. It was decided that my only other contact would be a two-hourly supervised session in the Nursery. That meant *less* contact. Regarding GW's continual and blatant contempt of court, he didn't even get a slap on the wrist! The February final hearing was of course scrapped and the new date scheduled for around Easter. Well what a surprise.

On DECEMBER 20<sup>th</sup> 2002 Ian Turner wrote: "I understand that [Ivor] has recommended a comprehensive risk assessment and I **must express my surprise that this assessment was not undertaken by CAFCASS for the court.**" Also "The intention of this Authority would be to convene an initial Child Protection Conference in respect of the children, should **unsupervised contact commence** with their mother or should they return to her care and control." **What was Ivor saying about Ian not answering his question about the position of social services if I am to have unsupervised contact??? Someone's telling fibs. Why didn't Ian tell Alex in court the position re social services and unsupervised contact? Then we could've proceeded immediately with the unsupervised contact.** Judging from what Ian is saying Social Services don't need the court to order their involvement, the position regarding social services and unsupervised contact is clear and it was Ivor's job to do the assessment. So, IVOR had the authority to move things on. It would appear therefore that he should have recommended in court or in a report that some contact in between 16/12/02 and the February final hearing should be unsupervised and a child protection conference be convened immediately. Ian also stated in his letter that there would be about *four* observed contact sessions.

Talk about passing the buck and buying time. This is what you might call Masonic p..s taking! Since contact started I have been traipsing backwards and forwards to the contact venues and hanging around for hours not knowing if I'll have contact or not. The Masons are sending me round in so many circles that I'm going dizzy. They're hoping to send me to the funny farm. Either that or they want to see me pushing up the daisies. They enjoy playing pass the parcel with other people's lives. The problem is there is no one to make the music stop.

As directed by the court, Questions were sent out to the doctors, 5 social workers including the 2 managers Ian Turner and Terry James, DC Gay Waring and the Headmaster on 2/1/03. Social workers Elaine Buckley and Pat Williams told me that my questions to social services have to be addressed via the legal route. Yet Ian Turner answered other questions within days of our asking without having to refer to the legal dept. **To date I've had no replies from Social Services and they still haven't sent my Social Services files.** [See details of my questions to them on p1 of part 3.] Janet Hughes from the social services legal dept told Pete that the reason for the delay was that they were having a job chasing people up as some of the social workers had left. That was a lie. Only one – Angie Mattison has left and

even she hasn't left social services; she received a promotion in the same line of work and has transferred only a few miles away. DC Gay Waring told some porkies in her reply on 28/1/03. Amongst other things she states: "Jordan said that Mummy's lighter was orange." I don't have a lighter and I don't smoke. Presumably she is saying this because I made the point that cigarettes aren't blue!!! She also wrote: "Jordan did whisper on one occasion that his mother had burnt him" and that "Mrs Kilby was informed during the visit." I wasn't informed. **Isn't it odd that Jordan apparently knew details such as the colours of lighters and where and when he had been burned and yet he is confused about who had burned him! This is especially so since at 6 years old he still didn't know the days of the week. [I await answers from Ian Turner and Angie Mattison regarding the afterthought that I might have done it.]** The Headmaster is contradictory in his reply of 27/1/03 regarding dates of school absences.

In court 14/1/03 Judge Hughes said that the court order of contact sessions [2 days of an hour and a half a piece pw] had been arranged *after* the call between Alex and Ian on the 16/12/02, implying that Alex was at fault. That was not true. How would the judge know that anyway unless he and Ian Turner had had secret briefings? Why would Alex draw up a court order specifying contact arrangements which included social services unless **Ian** had already instructed her as to those arrangements? It would appear that both Judge Hughes *and* Ian Turner are lying. It was decided that I would have contact at nursery on Mondays and Fridays 4-6pm. Judge Hughes also told us that the legal department of Colwyn Borough Council hadn't received the order to commence the assessment and that he intended writing to them to make sure that they do get the order. It was decided that Ian Turner's assessment was to be done before the 27<sup>th</sup> March 2003. The final hearing was re-scheduled for the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> May and the matter was again shifted - for circuit Judge Elystan Morgan to preside over.

On 31/1/03 the Social Services legal dept wrote to inform me that the social services report would not be completed on time. They had to seek a directions hearing to amend the timetable.

Regarding my numerous outstanding questions with Amphletts, they finally responded in a letter dated 5/2/03 which I received on 17/2/03 as follows: "We would confirm having discussed the contents of the same with both our client and instructed Counsel and unless you can put forward appropriate representations and authorities to ourselves we consider it is inappropriate for our client to be cross examined in correspondence and that these matters should be dealt with by way of statements and cross examination at trial." Cowardly liars. Mr Hind and fellow rogue Amphletts solicitors are big and bold enough to lie, lie, lie in their antagonistic accusatory letters, yet they shy away from answering simple questions in return. These fork-tongued men have their sucking straws in the same spittoon. Judges, police, MPs and all sorts of officials too all have their snouts in the same stinking trough. They are treacherous, inhuman vipers.

After several months of school Jordan and Melissa were failing miserably. Mark Barrett, Specialist senior educational Psychologist put the blame squarely at my feet because I'd kept them out of school. [See details and his remarks on p3 of part 3.]

The social workers had intended to observe contact at my home but GW angrily made his objections clear to them despite the court order stating that it was up to them to decide when and where they observed contact. He was also insisting on there being another child conference before the start of home contact but the social workers put their foot down. He continued to be uncooperative regarding contact. For example he left it to the last minute before notifying nursery of his absences or he didn't bother to notify nursery or give a reason as to why he failed to bring J & M for contact. Or he simply lied about why he failed to bring them. He failed to keep an appointment at his house with the social workers. For the next few days they tried unsuccessfully to contact him. They left various messages, which he failed to return until finally they had to refer to their solicitor who had to write to Mr Hind urging their client to co-operate. [See confirmation in their 26/3/03 report p4 of part 3.] During their assessment he continued to attack Andrew and to try and cause trouble for us and in the doing he continued to waste the health profession's precious resources. He visited Dr Groves requesting a medical review "because he is concerned that Melissa appears to be excessively anxious about monsters." He told the doctor: "Andrew would often tease her about monsters and frighten her."

The children continue to be ill and contact sessions continue to be cancelled. On one occasion GW refused to abide by the court order and bring my children for contact and instead forced my 6-year old son to tell me over the phone that he didn't want to see me. I heard GW ordering Jordan to tell me why but my terrified but brave little boy remained silent. I then heard GW saying: "You're dropping me in it, Jordan." After I was cut off, God knows what punishment Jordan endured from his father for his courage and show of disloyalty. Since Christmas 2002 Melissa has had swollen glands, flu, constant coughing, sore throats and earache. Whilst living with her father she was steadily losing weight and she went so skinny. Also she has been diagnosed with Asthma. It is another sign of her inner torment, a symptom of the abuse. Jordan has had earache, sickness and colds and conjunctivitis. For many months I couldn't recall a day when they were both free of illness. They were both referred to an ENT Surgeon. I only discovered this via my children's medical notes. I was told by Melissa's teacher that she had been examined by a consultant and is booked in to have an operation. She has enlarged and inflamed tonsils and adenoids. One of the common causes of this is repeated infection of the ENT area. I believe that her constant illnesses are mainly stress related due to the abuse. Jordan chewed so much on his fingernails that they were almost completely bitten away. When contact progressed to overnight stays I discovered that Jordan was still head banging in bed. His father had claimed that since living with him Jordan had stopped doing so, saying that it resumed because of overnight stays with me. The truth is Jordan has never stopped head banging. GW also stated [30/4/03] that Jordan had become quite violent. That would not surprise me. Powerlessness, injustice and lies turn the best of us incandescent with rage. J & M displayed all the signs of unhappiness and anxiety. Both of them say that their father is always smacking them. For more than 7 months J & M had not been home, their larger Christmas presents and Jordan's birthday present had remained unopened and Andy had still not been allowed to see his little brother and sister.

GW continues to be irresponsible and controlling. He wouldn't bring Melissa's asthma inhaler or the children's uniforms. He continues to try and prevent me attending my children's medical appointments. During Jordan's hospital appointment

GW lied to hospital staff about Jordan wanting me to leave and he tried to have me removed. Staff had to intervene on my behalf. Jordan was anxious and subdued because his father would not allow him to come to me.

It would appear that I am on the receiving end of the full wrath of the Masonic Mafia. I can cry, scream, swear, punch anything in my sight.... But it won't get my children back. The only thing I can do I tell the people what's going on. If this can happen to me, it can happen to anyone. At the end of the day, the only court that matters is the 'people's court'. The *people* will eventually bring the perpetrators of evil to justice.

On 27/3/03 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 on **p4 of part 3.**]

In his second report [dated 13/3/03 but sent to me by my solicitors on 6/5/03] the Specialist Senior Educational Psychologist Mr Mark Barrett continues to show bias and present a distorted picture. He states: "Jordan's father confirms Jordan's self-confidence and his enjoyment of school" and "Jordan continues to talk more at home particularly about school." Regarding Jordan's 'independence skills' Mr Barrett reports: "Jordan has yet to separate from his father in the morning and still needs him there to be taken to class. This is an area on which school are currently focusing." Yet in his first report dated 17/1/03 Mr Barrett wrote: "There has been a noticeable development in Jordan's independence skills. For example, he will now separate from his father in the mornings." Oops!!! Mr Barrett goes on: "In terms of literacy and numeracy skills Jordan is once again making progress. He can now write his first name and his letter formation is developing." Cobblers. Every time I saw him write his name it was unreadable and even his teacher told me that his letter formation is poor. She showed me some of his work. It is clear that he gets confused about which way round quite a few letters and numbers go. [See more details of the Barrett report on **p4 of part 3.**] Mr Barrett reports: "Melissa's father notes that Melissa is now back 'on track' and will once again leave him at the door on coming into school." Hang about. What about Mother's input? I wasn't even asked if I wanted Barrett's involvement. Come to think of it neither was I asked if I wanted the psychologist R Randle to assess the children. I was told by my solicitor Pete that the involvement by an independent psychologist was needed to help settle the issue of Home Education or school. Barrett's input was arranged rather slyly by GW and

the Headmaster Mr Geraint Williams. I didn't get an invitation to either of the meetings. I didn't even know they'd been and gone and I wasn't even sent a copy of the reports. According to Mr Barrett I don't even have an address. I only have a c/o CAF/CASS address! I only got to see the second Barrett report on the day before we were due in court on 7/5/03. Wouldn't it have been a bit fairer if I'd been allowed to get a representative from Education Otherwise to assess my children too? Oddly nothing is mentioned in the Barrett report regarding academic achievement such as Melissa's literacy and numeracy skills or either child's reading skills. I suppose that just consolidates the view that the real purpose of school is not to educate kids but to tame and mould them for their future adult role as slaves. It is stated in the Barrett report that two further meetings are planned for reviewing Melissa's progress. I learned that there was also another review planned for Jordan. Jesus wept. Melissa at four wasn't even at statutory school age! Why all this attention and fussing over my kids? It's a pity the school authorities aren't this conscientious with all children; if they were maybe they would all get an education. Commonsense would suggest that both my children would be making more progress and would be much happier and settled if they weren't being emotionally abused by their father. Further my experience tells me that if they were being Home Educated [and their father was not permitted to thwart my attempts to teach them] both my children would be more advanced academically.

During a review on 20/5/03 it was decided that one of the targets for Melissa is to get her to communicate with her peers and her teacher and to talk confidently. Mrs Wregglesworth and other educational 'experts' fail to accept that Melissa isn't able to do any of that whilst she is being forced by her father against her will to speak and behave in a way which will please him but which she knows is wrong. She cannot possibly trust the people in school when no one in authority can see why she is unhappy and they don't help her. All she knows is that 'important people' are listening to her father and siding with him. She and Jordan saw that the Headmaster prevented me from speaking with my children and giving them a cuddle on their first day in school and that no one else tried to help. My children were and are terrified and traumatised and they saw that I was deeply distressed. Jordan's teacher reports a great deal about his progress regarding confidence. She states things like: "Jordan joins the class now without showing any signs of distress" and "He has learnt to trust his Class Teachers and no longer gets over-anxious." Also "Considerable extra time has been spent with Jordan to provide him with emotional support or reassurance. He is gradually becoming less hesitant and nervous if asked to provide an explanation, for example, how/where he hurt himself." **No one asked why my children were/are so distrustful and anxious. Why weren't school staff concerned that maybe marks on Jordan had not been caused by innocently playing in the playground but were/are inflicted by his father?** Jordan and Melissa are too scared to speak the truth and they know that no one is listening to them anyway. They have learned that at school you are spoken to and given orders and that in order to survive you have to shut up, be *good* and obey. [For more details of this review see p5 of part 3.]

The social workers' second report [dated 6/5/03] was just as supportive as their previous one and 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 and they refer to Melissa's behavior in particular in school. The school reported that Melissa was crying in school and saying that she didn't want to go to "Mummy's house." She could not say why. She just "wanted her daddy." The social workers stated that Melissa was very anxious and not spontaneous. 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. They report [6/5/03]: "Once her father left Melissa was very close and loving towards her mother seeking and receiving a very close and loving relationship. Melissa eagerly sought to be close to her mother, sitting on her knee and cuddling her closely." 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. It is clear from his 30/4/03 statement that he is challenging their authority. He says that he does not accept what they say and he denies that he failed to cooperate with them or the contact arrangements. He also accuses them of being biased because they told him that it is their view that the children should return to live with me.

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. The Masonic Mafia would see to that. On 7/5/03 in court Judge Morgan agreed with the opposition that since I was challenging 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. My barrister Brendan Anderson informed me that the judge needs to do a full risk assessment as there is the question of the physical abuse of Jordan by Andrew. He said that the judge needs to know where J & M will be educated so that he can assess the level of risk. I was told that if the children are going to be Home Educated the risk to them is potentially greater than if they are at school all day. [It didn't seem to matter that I'd had substantial contact over Easter including overnight stays! This was a point which Elaine later made too. She said to me on 27/6/03 that

if it has been assessed that a child is safe having overnight contact, what puts them at risk on the other nights? Neither did it matter that all the evidence points to perjury and priming by GW....] In recent months my solicitor Pete had repeatedly said that it didn't matter so much now what had caused the lesion on Jordan's forehead or who [if anyone] had done it. What was more important was the social workers' recommendations. [Somehow I think that their reports would have sufficed had they been in support of GW.] I protested that residence and education are two separate issues and I asked why residence couldn't be decided immediately and the education issue left for another day. Judge Morgan said that other matters had been raised in the report which needed to be addressed i.e. he "considered the Barrett report in a peripheral way could assist me in coming to a conclusion on the residence issue." This is the judge who had said in March that the matter had gone on long enough and needed to be resolved with some urgency. I was beginning to feel like throwing up again. Brendan had told me back on 11/4/03 that Barrett wouldn't be able to attend on the 7th and 8th May, the dates scheduled for the final hearing. He had said that we didn't need him as the other psychologist Carol Moore of Randle associates was coming and he had agreed with me that it shouldn't be adjourned. Why didn't Brendan warn me that the other side could use Barrett as the excuse to adjourn? Why didn't Pete? Pete waited until 23/4/03 before writing to Amphletts to state: "We understand that Mr Barrett may not be able to attend court on the 7th and 8th May. We are making enquiries to see if the 9th May is a possibility. In the meantime, for the record, we do not accept the contents of his report but in the event that we are not able to accommodate him on the 9th May we would not wish for any further delay which we do not believe to be in the best interests of the children and are happy to simply include those reports within the Court Bundle. Please confirm that you are content with that." Well, knowing what a truly despicable creature GW is, of course he wasn't going to be content. Pete and Brendan must've known this was going to happen. Of course Brendan acted surprised and denied knowing that it might. Pete said that Amphletts had accepted our letter. Trainee solicitor Emma said that we couldn't know unless the other side had disclosed that they were going to make the application on the 7th May.

It emerged that Barrett was available after all to attend on the 9th May, so I asked why proceedings couldn't go ahead. Brendan told me that it was a question of whether Carol Moore 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. Jesus, the excuses get worse by the minute. And this isn't a conspiracy??? How do these men sleep at night? Where are their consciences? 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. Presumably the dirty brigade didn't like my analysis of the Randle report and they needed reinforcements. Obviously the Rat pack had plotted this way back in September. They have 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 use Barrett as the excuse to procrastinate. What next? The Judge later confirmed the obvious; that the longer this matter remains unresolved the greater the advantage to the opposition on the basis of the status quo. When I learned that it might take many months before we come before the

court again I asked what the situation was if I conceded on the Education. Brendan told me that that was a different ball game and that if I gave up on the idea of Home Education then we could do away with both psychologists and the trial could go ahead immediately to decide residence. "Fine," I said, "Go ahead. Leave them in school. Time is of the essence." I added that I could always raise the issue again when J & M are older. After discussions with the other side Brendan told me that I have to accept the psychologists' reports which means that I have to *agree* with them and that in the doing I will be forfeiting the right to apply to Home Educate J & M at any time in the future. He said that the judge wants to be sure that I'll fully support State Education. I argued that it wasn't fair to put such demands on me or the kids because situations change; what if J & M really hate school and become school phobic? What if they are failing miserably there? Brendan said that I can always apply x years down the track but that I'm unlikely to be successful because I will have agreed with the Barrett report. In any case, he told me, the judge wanted to be sure that I wasn't going to raise the H/E issue again in a year or so. I informed Brendan that I'll go along with their demands on the basis that a decision is made *today* [7th May] about residence. I reminded him that my children are being abused and my priority is to get them back. I had to say that I couldn't exactly agree with Barrett though because that would be hypocritical of me. However I was prepared to fully support school. Brendan said that if the judge finds that I don't agree with the psychologists that might go against me when he makes his decision about residence. I reminded Brendan that I'm not the one who disrespects judges and breaks court orders.... I also assured him that during my older children's spells in school I fully supported State Ed then, unlike GW. Brendan asked me what I agree with in the Barrett report. I had to be perfectly blunt and say: "Not a lot." Well, I couldn't lie; could I? That went against me. The opposition barrister Robert Hornby declared to judge Morgan that it was important that I agree the Barrett report but that judging by my statement it was perfectly clear that I had very different views. He stated that he wanted a statement from me outlining my plans [my what!!!!] and he told the judge that he will need to cross examine me to find out why I now agree with Barrett.... In the end Judge Morgan decided that everything was going to have to be heard *come what may* within 2 months.

He also decided that he wanted Dr Roberts to attend court. He ruled that a letter needed to be sent out to her first asking specific questions, one of which was: "Could the application of Fucidin cream have reduced the infection to such a state that it resembled a healing burn?" That was very telling. Brendan had already wanted to send such a question to her but I'd been reluctant and Pete had agreed that we were better off not asking any more questions as she might just send a reply which could inadvertently [or maybe intentionally] support the opposition. I didn't have much faith in Dr Roberts anyway; not when she'd supported the burn allegation by writing [after examining the healed scab]: "Jordan was clear in that the mark had been caused by a lighter. The lesion would be consistent with a burn having been caused in this way." Brendan had also reminded me that she didn't think it was impetigo because of the lack of crusting. Why would the judge now insist on asking her that *very same* question; almost word for word? Obviously he had been prompted to do so by my very own Judas, Brendan Anderson. I asked why, if it was so important that we have Dr Roberts, why not Dr Thackray too? Why not the 5 social workers that I haven't yet received one answer from? Why aren't they, especially managers Ian Turner and Terry James and social worker Angela Mattison being subpoenaed? Brendan

said that if I wanted everyone to attend then we'd need a 5-day hearing and that would take quite a long time to come to court. Emma informed me that we'd had a letter back from the Chief Legal Officer of the social services legal dept. They stated [23/4/03]: "I would be grateful if you could confirm the nature of the outstanding queries as the solicitor dealing with this matter is currently on sick leave." Good Lord, what kind of excuse is that? And anyway why hadn't I seen this letter? After 2 or 3 hours of being in the Kangaroo court my head was fuzzy with the insanity of it all. The stench of corruption was choking me. God, it is so hard to keep level headed and sane when all around you, people are feeding you bullsh..t. Judge Morgan did acknowledge that GW was frustrating contact and he declared that if it happens once more the matter will be up before the court immediately. Yeah right. Pigs might fly! Eventually it was decided that the final hearing would be on the 3rd and 4th of July in Chester. The matter shifted yet again to a new judge. Judge Stephen Clark was scheduled to preside.

The Freemasons use any means to obstruct, frustrate and delay in the courts. They regularly commit Common Law offences, which carry long prison sentences, even up to life imprisonment. The people are slowly but surely waking up to their crimes. The whole criminal operation is just below the surface, barely covered now, stinking and putrid.

Chasers were sent to the Social Services legal dept on: 16/1/03, 13/2/03, 4/4/03, 12/5/03 and 19/6/03. The Chief Legal Officer wrote on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2003: "Thank you for your letter dated 12<sup>th</sup> May 2003. I confirm I will revert to you when I receive instructions." This was received by my solicitors J W Hughes & Co on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2003 but not sent out to me until 4<sup>th</sup> June 2003. On 27<sup>th</sup> June 2003 the Chief Legal Officer wrote: "Thank you for your letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> June 2003. With regard to the outstanding queries, I have again requested instructions and will revert to you as soon as this information is available."

I repeatedly asked Pete since 11<sup>th</sup> March 2003 to send letters to Drs Ratcliffe and Roberts simply asking them to confirm if they were told by Jordan that I had caused the 'burn' on his forehead. Despite assuring me that he would, it wasn't until 24<sup>th</sup> April that Pete finally sent the letters. Neither doctor responded and I repeatedly asked my solicitor to send chasers. Pete assured me that he would do so. He didn't. On 4<sup>th</sup> June 2003 my solicitor wrote: "We cannot chase the doctors for their answers now because they would have to be jointly instructed to do so since all of their reports are now before the court."

Gareth Williams is turning my children into robots. [See details on p5 of part 3.] Also he continues to breach the court order. After a holiday GW had been due to deliver my children for contact. He failed to do so. [He didn't even go on holiday. He lied about that too.] On another occasion he parked his car near my house, he got out, opened the back door and pretended to speak to my children; he then closed the door, got back in and drove off. I had no contact with my children that weekend, I had no explanation and he was non-contactable. He later stated that Melissa had deliberately caused her nose to bleed and was saying that she didn't want to see me. Social worker Elaine Buckley informed me on 27/6/03 that he had contacted social services manager Terry James who had **advised him 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 and encouraged me to have GW prosecuted for emotionally abusing my children.* Elaine also informed me that GW said that he had reported me to the police about allegedly grabbing at Melissa. Elaine was unable to get hold of the police report and she wanted to know *why the police didn't refer the incident to social services.* [On 14/7/03 she told me that she had now seen the police report; it wasn't reported through on what they call a CIV16 and that **it isn't entirely clear what GW is saying to the police.** She said that I'm not allowed a copy of the police report or to even have sight of it. Why ever not?] She also told me that he had taken Melissa to A&E where she was diagnosed with tonsillitis. He told the hospital that I had injured Melissa. Elaine said that it is stated in the medical records: "query – social services are aware." Yet they hadn't reported anything to SS. On school sports day when I was due for contact, he failed to take the children to school; the excuse was that they were both sick. They were both well and in school on the preceding and following day though. He later stated via his solicitor that the children became hysterical when they became aware that I'd be attending. Elaine told me that my children were not ill on sports day and that my children told her that they didn't love me and didn't want to live with me. When asked for a reason Jordan said: "We were burned." On the following weekend I had no contact either. This was despite Elaine telling Gareth Williams about the emotional effects this was having on the children and that he has a responsibility to allow/*encourage* contact with me and that to do anything else is VERY VERY WRONG. She also told him that the children should be encouraged to forget all about the alleged burn; that he shouldn't keep on talking to the children about burns and making allegations. [Melissa has also now been primed to say that I burned her when she was a baby.] Elaine said that she *believes her talk fell on deaf ears.* She and Pat then tried to contact him via letter and phone calls over a period of days but he was not contactable.

Jordan is still guarded at school but not as mistrusting as Melissa and he could trust teacher Miss Baker. She wanted to write a report/letter documenting what Jordan had confided in her, which would have reflected the extent of the priming by his father and the fear and despair of the children. However she knew that it wouldn't be sanctioned by the Headmaster Geraint Williams, she was unable to go behind his back and divulge to the social workers Pat and Elaine, she could only explain to them on 6/10/03 the difficult position she is in.

On 14<sup>th</sup> June 2003 I received a letter from Mr Chris Hind of Amphletts dated 9<sup>th</sup> June 2003. He writes: "With further reference to this matter the writer would confirm having spoken to Mr Mark Barrett who is of the opinion that he can add very little to what he has incorporated in his reports which are before the Court and who has **suggested that Mr Geraint Williams the headmaster** of Ysgol Cynfran would be a more appropriate person to call to give evidence at the hearing. On this basis we have made an application to the Court for a further directions appointment to be listed before his Honour Judge E Morgan with a view to considering this matter and possibly amending the previous directions order and will advise you of the hearing when we are notified of the same." Pete stated that Mark Barrett is unwilling to give evidence because since he obtained information solely from the Headmaster he

feels that only the Head need do so. Jesus wept! Judge Morgan ruled on 13<sup>th</sup> June that both Mr Barrett and the Head are to attend court on 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> July.

On 21/6/03 I received a letter dated 6/6/03 from Conwy County Council Education Department addressed to Amphletts regarding "clarification of the information he [Mark Barrett] may be able to provide for the Court." It is stated that Mr Barrett's documents "have a specific social/education focus and are not psychological reports as such." Also "We understand detailed psychological reports for the children have been prepared by Psychologists Randle and Associates. Mr Barrett would not be in a position to comment on these independent reports." It is concluded: "Any issues relating to children being educated out of school by parents are the responsibility of other LEA officers and are not within the role of an educational psychologist, such as Mr Barrett." Which all confirms that it was a waste of time involving Barrett; i.e. **there was never any need to adjourn the final hearing to secure his attendance.** How do these slippery, cowardly creatures sleep at night? How do they stop themselves tripping up over their rapidly extending Pinocchio noses? The dirty brigade will happily sell their souls for 30 pieces of silver. [Incidentally the social workers told me that Mr Barrett did finally talk with the children on the 2/7/03, *just before the scheduled final court hearing!*]

Doctor Roberts responded on 9/6/03 to the questions posed by the court. In addition to information already provided she states: "It is possible that the injury is due to some other form of trauma" and "There was no evidence of blistering as seen in the early [her underlining] stages of a burn, the injury having healed *considerably* [my italics] over those few days." Remember Dr Roberts had been asked to report on a healed scab. The alleged 'burn' had allegedly happened on Sunday 18<sup>th</sup> August '02, Dr Roberts had examined the healed scab on the following Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup>, so the injury had therefore healed in a matter of 4 days or less. Regarding the question re the Fucidin cream, Amphletts attempted to further delay proceedings by referring to the Fucidin medication as 'Sudafed' cream. Dr Roberts had presumed that to mean 'Sudocrem' and based her answer on that presumption. Ms Carol A Roberts of Amphletts attempted to make the correction and wrote back to Dr Roberts saying that the medication in question was 'Felicidian'! Oh God! It beggars belief.

The Headmaster Geraint Williams reveals his bias in his 30/6/03 report for court. He played his part in denying the children their mummy and denying them the truth. The Headmaster aided and abetted the abuse of my children. [See details on **p6 of part 3.**]

On 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2003 at Chester county court word came back that GW was unable to attend because he had been beaten up. Bit by bit we learned that he had been hit twice by a metal bar on the front and back of his head such that he fell unconscious. It happened so quickly that he didn't know who it was. This allegedly happened at 6am on the first morning of the latest 'final' hearing. The police investigated and advised him to go to hospital for a check up. Amphletts were unable to find out any names of officers. A friend drove him in. Dr Roberts [who had turned up to give evidence] used her clout to move him up the queue. Glan Clwyd hospital at first said that protocol states that he would need to be kept in overnight for observations because it was an attack. Amphletts then informed us that he had been fitted with a neck collar and had been discharged in the early afternoon. Also that he has been

assessed fit enough to attend court in the morning [4/7/03] and listen to the proceedings. Witnesses were sent home and the case adjourned. I was told that the judge had now decided that 3 days are going to be required. [The case was scheduled for 2.] There was apparently a problem with fitting the barristers in with Judge Stephen Clarke's timetable to hear the remainder. Dates were mooted. GW's barrister Sian Morris said that she could make herself available for 2 days in July but my barrister Alex had no further dates free until August. Such dates didn't tally with the Judge's though. Eventually I decided to be a LIP [litigant in person] and represent myself. I instructed Alex to tell Sian Morris that we will go ahead 'tomorrow' as planned and that we can finish it in July on the 2 dates that she is available. I was then told that Sian Morris doesn't want to do the case in July because of her other case. It was finally decided that the matter would be transferred to Mr Justice Hedley and that it would be heard on 24<sup>th</sup>, 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup>, 30<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> October 2003. Gareth Williams turned up in court the next day [4<sup>th</sup> July] with barely a scratch on him. If he had been walloped with a metal bar he would have had at the very least severe bruising and probably a lump or two. Alex said that he didn't look as if he'd been attacked. Amphletts declared concerns that I had published my story on the Vomit website. I have now been asked not to publish anything else about the case on Vomit or any other site pending the final hearing. Judge Clarke said my article "is not helpful." Alex told me that if I refuse I will have an injunction slapped on me. I am also 'asked' to try and remove the existing article. I am now GAGGED. Whatever happened to free speech? Isn't that what our soldiers liberated Iraq for? I had wanted to take the children to Butlins in September as it was the only time we could afford. I was denied this because it would be during term time and "the children are behind in their school work and have lost too much schooling already." Perhaps it is just as well as I know GW would've thwarted our plans at the last minute and no doubt one of the kids [probably Mel] would've been ill anyway.

Melissa was so pitifully thin, had no energy and was constantly ailing. She was often feverish at night. She only picked at her food. In her sleep she'd cry: "Want mummy, want mummy." I was so worried about her. If she lost any more weight I feared that she'd end up in hospital. It broke my heart to see her so pitifully thin and fragile. Before she and her brother were so cruelly snatched from us in August 2002 she was healthy, happy, confident and carefree. But she became so troubled and so sickly.

Dad enquired with the police for more information re the alleged attack. He was sunk in the usual sea of Masonic obfuscation. He was finally directed to PC Roberts who said that investigations are ongoing. He asked dad questions like: "What's it got to do with you?" and "Why are you so worried?" It has everything to do with dad since the finger of blame is being pointed at him. Dad also believes that there was no attack, that there is no investigation and that the police are lying.

On 15/7/03 Amphletts solicitors complained that I had not adhered to the C/O re the removal of my articles from the Vomit site. [See p9 of part 3 for details.]

The court ordered medical report signed by Mr S R Burney, Associate Specialist and dated 16/7/03 states that records "confirm that Mr Williams attended the department at 10.31 hrs. On examination his Glasgow Coma Scale was 15 [normal]. There

were contusions over the right parietal region and mid frontal area. He had a reduced range of cervical spine movements with tenderness over C1-2-3. There was a bruise, approximately 8cm by 6cm, over his left upper arm. There was no focal neurological deficit.” Spoken like a Mason. Hells bells, why write 10.31 hrs? Most normal people would write at approx 10.30 hrs.... Why the fancy words? In my dictionary, contusion means bruise. Mr Burney is obviously lying when he says there was bruising over the right parietal [which means skull] area.... If that was the case then there would have been visible bruising to Gareth Williams’ head also. There wasn’t. And if GW had bruising over his upper arm, why didn’t he mention it? He said he had been hit over the head only. I didn’t bother pointing any of this out to the legal Mafia though; it would’ve just given them another excuse to adjourn on the basis that Mr Burney would be needed to testify because I am challenging him. This is the way freemasonry works. These are the many underhanded diversions they practice. They have all their men in key positions ready to produce all reports necessary. The same would happen with the court ordered police report. A police Masonic stooge would come up with the goods. This is how easily and successfully they fool the public and the honest and decent workers in the judiciary and public services.

GW continues to fail to address the children’s medical needs and he continues to waste NHS resources. He failed to keep Jordan’s ENT hospital appointment on 9/9/03 and he failed to notify the hospital. He failed to keep Jordan’s appointment at the Eye Clinic on 23/9/03 and he failed to notify the clinic.

The tide turned again. The social workers’ third report dated 9/10/03 reveals that Pat and Elaine appear to be not that concerned about abused children but rather in protecting their jobs and of not rocking the boat. It would seem that they have 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 have already stated. Well such a report was bound to come sooner or later, wasn’t it!!! They now recommend **joint** residence. The social workers have neutralised the situation by repeatedly stressing that the problem lies with both me and GW i.e. that we are both as bad as each other. It is astonishing that more than 5 years on and after all the harassment, stalking and intimidation I have endured from GW, social workers *still* make 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 can 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. I find this 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 **p9 of part 3.**]

I was told [4 days before the final hearing] that my barrister Alex Hewitt wouldn't be able to represent me because her present case would overlap mine. She is the only person who I had any confidence in. More Masonic maneuvers?

Re the alleged assault on GW, the Police report finally landed in my lap on 21/10/03. It was dated 18/8/03. David Hill, Force solicitor writes to Amphletts: "We write to confirm that your client reported an assault that is alleged to have taken place at 6am on 3/7/03. It was alleged that your client was assaulted at his home address, on the doorstep, by an unnamed male person in his garden. He alleges that he was struck to the forehead and fell to the floor, sustaining a swelling and bruising to his head. Unfortunately the crime has been marked as undetected, notwithstanding house to house and other enquiries." Why write "allege"? Didn't the attending police officer witness his injuries???

A report from the fire service was sent on 23/10/03. [It had been ordered in court on 7/5/03 but not mentioned on 3/7/03 in court.] It is dated 21/5/99. At the time of the fire there was no report or social services at least would already have a copy. I know there was no report because one of the things I kicked up about was the fact that my children were registered 'At Risk' rather abruptly despite the fact there was no fire report or fire representative at the child protection conference. Social services stated in a letter dated 26/9/03 that there was no such report in my files. Little clues that this report is fake is in the statement: "Child with lighted paper ignited paper and washing powder carton." It has never been stated that a child was responsible, confirmed in the case conference notes of 29/6/99, which states that the fire official concluded that the fire was started by a *person or persons unknown*. It is also stated that the time of the call to brigade to the time of arrival was 7 minutes! Two sets of neighbours were witnesses to the fact that it took twenty odd, maybe thirty minutes for them to arrive. The chief fire officer is S A Smith DMS MIFireE, the person in charge at first attendance was R McGrath LFF and the person in charge of the fire was A S Hughes, Station Officer.

In court in Chester on 24/10/03 under cross-examination social worker Pat Williams presented a picture of warring parents as much as she possibly could. She said it was a case of 'tit for tat' and said that she didn't believe that GW abuses the children or that they fear him. [Isn't priming abuse? and if it isn't fear then what else makes the children behave in a way that totally contradicts what they say?] When questioned about CAF/CASS official Ivor Hughes' contribution, she said that he didn't have much to say, his notes were one-line sentences, which were ineligible; they weren't in any proper format. Pat also stated that she and Elaine want nothing more to do with our case. She was, of course, under orders from her Mafiosi bosses and undoubtedly told to say that because they had reported some truth about Gareth Williams' criminality, albeit only the tip of the iceberg.

The High Court Judge Mark Hedley 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 "hear 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." He supported the status quo, saying that what the *children need most is the least amount of change possible*. When my barrister Fiona Jamieson told him that I would fully support State education if court decides my children are to remain in school, he said that he wasn't interested in that. He said that he wasn't going to let me have that safety net now; his attitude being: if you live by the sword, you die by the sword. He hinted that he would not give the non-resident parent generous contact in his comment that there is obvious unfairness if one parent has every weekend with the children. Regarding fears that GW will continue to deny contact 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. The problem is that I was unable to move the children to a closer school and now that social services have walked away, the only 3<sup>rd</sup> party witnesses I have are schoolteachers who are headed by a biased headmaster who suppresses the truth.

It costs £6.60 per day [£33.00 pw] to take the children to school and back. I get no transportation assistance.

My mail continues to be tampered with. Anything other than bills or other official mail continues to arrive opened.

I still await my social services files. According to Team Manager Ian Turner in his 20<sup>th</sup> December 2002 letter, the social services department have a "policy of open access to files." **However numerous chasers have been sent to social services to no avail.**

Amphletts solicitors continue to send letters of provocation. For example on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2004 they wrote that their client had said that I had "breached the Court Order which was made by failing to return the children to him at the conclusion of the Christmas holidays." They "trust this will not happen in the future and must ask for an explanation as to why this occurred." If they'd thought to check the court order they would've noticed [and would've been able to tell their client] that I was expected to return the children to *school* [which I did] and not to him.

I am still being excluded from some of my children's health-related appointments and still being denied information. I did not get sight of a letter dated 16<sup>th</sup> January 2004 from the Senior Community Pediatrician Dr Lindsay Groves re Jordan until 13<sup>th</sup> March 2004 despite it stating that a copy had been sent to me. Neither did I get

sight of a Memo dated 13<sup>th</sup> January 2004 from Dr Groves re Mel until 17<sup>th</sup> March 2004. The letter contained details of more of GW's malicious allegations and his disgraceful scheming. It also reveals Dr Groves' bias towards GW. [See **p14 of part 3.**]

Letters of harassment continue to arrive from Amphletts solicitors. On 24<sup>th</sup> March 2004 they wrote asking for documentary evidence confirming my current employment, saying that they understand that I now work every morning. What business is that of theirs?

In Cardiff County Court on 5/4/04 I asked if the court order could be changed slightly to allow both myself and GW to attend the children's medically related appointments. At the moment it states that only the parent whom the children are residing with is to take them, which means that if an appointment happens to fall on a date when the children are with their father I am not allowed to attend also. I pointed out that animosity issues are no excuse because GW is able to behave himself better in front of 3<sup>rd</sup> parties; also that health professionals have been able to manage any problems that GW has caused in the past. Judge Hedley refused on the grounds that we are too hostile towards each other. Judge Hedley shows blatant bias. All the evidence, including numerous professional witnesses, proves that GW is the bully and the troublemaker and I the victim; also that he is the one who wastes NHS resources. As a result Judge Hedley ruled that I could not stay with my 5-year old daughter when she was scheduled to go into hospital to have her tonsils removed. He forced me into a verbal 'agreement' that I would have only 2 hours with her after her operation. That meant that I could not stay overnight with her. I was heartbroken and outraged. Melissa wants her mummy at her side whilst she is in hospital, not her violent and abusive drunken father who she is terrified of. I am without doubt that if the date of her admission to hospital had fallen on a day when J & M were living with me, Judge Hedley would have granted the father unlimited hospital contact citing 'special circumstances' which would have meant that there would've been nothing to prevent him staying overnight too if he so wished. In fact, I have no doubt that if I had behaved as GW has done at numerous medically-related appointments over previous months/years, there would have been letters or reports by health professionals documenting events, condemning my behaviour, which **would** have gone against me long before now in the court proceedings. There has never been any such letter written in condemnation of Gareth Williams' behaviour.

After discussions with hospital staff however, including 2 consultants during my attendance at the hospital on 16/4/04 for Mel's pre-op check up, it was decided that for the sake of Melissa's welfare the op should be cancelled and rebooked for a time when the children are living with me because I gave consent that I would not restrict GW's visitation. This also made sense because I was the parent who had signed the consent form for the surgery and I was the one at Mel's pre-op consultation and who had discussed the pre-op hospital procedures. The consultants felt that both parents should be with Melissa and one consultant phoned GW in a bid to sort it out and **avoid a legal wrangle**. However GW voiced his objections saying that there is a court order in place, which allows me only *one*-hour visitation. Hospital staff also informed me that there are facilities for **both** parents to stay overnight. Yet Amphletts had told us in court on 5/4/04 after they had allegedly phoned the hospital that their policy is that only one parent can stay! The consultants obviously cared

about what was best for Melissa or they would not have cancelled the op and instead would have told me there was a court order in place and nothing they could do about it. On 17/4/04 I received a copy of the C/O which states that “in the event of either child being admitted to hospital for treatment, each party will be at liberty to visit the child.” There are no restrictions there so why did Hedley bind me to a *verbal* agreement? On 19/4/04, after discussions with the hospital’s legal dept, it was decided that the op should remain postponed until Mel’s surgeon Mr Zeitoun had spoken with me and GW. But Amphletts show more malice by threatening me with a prohibited steps order in a letter dated 27<sup>th</sup> April 2004. [Yet only 7 days earlier in their 20<sup>th</sup> April 2004 letter, Amphletts had stated that they recommend that their client accepts the offer of Dr Zeitoun to mediate in order to resolve matters. They stated that they were *reluctant* to suggest to their client that the matter be resolved by way of a specific issue application though would have no option **if** the mediation was not successful.] Amphletts sent another threatening letter [dated 25/5/04] *directly* to me telling me that I have 7 days to respond to their client’s statement. They also reveal more malice in their accusation that I again breached the court order. I hadn’t. It had taken them more than 3 weeks to tell me that I hadn’t returned the children to their client on the 3<sup>rd</sup> May. I wasn’t supposed to return them to him; I was supposed to return them to *school* on the following day. Their delight in antagonising know no bounds. Victims of the Masonic Mafia are constantly swimming against the time-consuming tide of malice, oppression and destruction. Freemasons may think they are above the Law and that they have life-long protection from the brotherhood but they sell their souls to the Devil and are in debt bondage forever. Little do they realise that they are, in fact, the most enslaved of all.

Mr Zeitoun was also of the view that visiting times should be equal and he saw no reason why both parents could not stay overnight. He informed me during our meeting on 25/5/04 that he had spoken with GW on 24/5/04 but that GW was making it clear that he wasn’t interested in mediation. I had hoped that Mr Z could have persuaded GW to be more reasonable about my visitation and I had written down my proposals with the vague hope that we could come to an agreement with the help of Mr Z so as to **avoid yet another court hearing**. [One of the things that needed clearing up was that any time I did have with Melissa would be alone because {and witnessed and recorded by social services} she is too stressed – fearful, anxious ... whilst her father is also present.] However Judge Hedley ruled in the meantime [on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2004] that GW “do have leave to apply for a specific issue order in respect of a proposed tonsillectomy.” It should not have gone to court. He should’ve struck out such an application and ordered GW to sort it out through mediation. He should’ve made it clear to GW that as Mr Zeitoun was kindly offering to mediate he must accept and he should’ve threatened that if the matter ended up in court again GW would be the one having to accept restricted or even *no* visitation. [This was the kind of tone my barrister Fiona Jamieson was using on me on 5/4/04.] This is especially so because it is a High Cost case. Hedley should’ve also chastised Amphletts for **fraud of the public purse** on the grounds that they were acting prematurely.

The matter was finally resolved on 15<sup>th</sup> July 2004 with District Judge O W Williams presiding. GW and I both signed undertakings that we would comply with the court order of 5<sup>th</sup> April 2004 where “each party will be at liberty to visit the child” whilst Melissa is in hospital. Judge Williams also expressed his annoyance at our presence in court *yet again*. **But** rather than criticise 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 neutralised the situation** 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. [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. {See another example of this on p**10 of part 1** re Dr Knight's comments.} This is blatant bias; blatant judicial double standards.]

I was 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 Honourable 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. It was due to be heard in court on 15/7/04. GW had admitted keeping them off school for a week to prevent me picking them up there in accordance to the C/O. Keeping children off school without good reason is in itself a jailable offence. 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. During that week he refused to allow Pat and Elaine to interview the children; he would not co-operate with them, 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*. He states via his solicitor that both children have "been indicating that they 'do not want to die' and that as a result they 'do not want to go back to mam's house'." 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 **p20 of part 3** 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: "Whilst Gareth Williams was talking to Melissa, she stated that she didn't want to die. Dad asked her what she meant. She said mummy had told her that she was going to die as she was sick." Pat said the report also mentions the tonsillectomy and that the PC had reassured her about being ill and getting better [Oh God, give me strength!] It also says: "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 won'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 **p15 of part 3** for more details.] In court I was told that my application re GW's latest breach of C/O had been thrown out because the matter had resolved itself. GW of course did not even get the slightest of rebukes from Judge Williams, never mind a threat of incarceration. I was warned by my barrister not to rake up any history or make any applications to the court for a penal notice to be attached to the court order or I would be "committing parental suicide." She said Judge O W Williams will "go completely ballistic." So much for His Lordship Hedley's threat of prison when we were in court in October 2003! Then he had stated "he'll only do it once" when my barrister Fiona Jamieson asked Pat if GW will revert to obstructing contact again if social services' involvement discontinues. Justice Hedley also said: "Then change residence" in response to Pat stating that GW may continue to frustrate contact. And he said that he wasn't "keen on the social services being used as a body for parents to complain to." No wonder judge Hedley swiftly shifted the case onto another Judge.

There were devastating developments on 26<sup>th</sup> June 2004. Whilst I was at work, Shelly took J & M to the park. When it was time to return home again Jordan somehow got separated from the group. He had been trailing a short distance behind and when the girls disappeared around the back of a hut Jordan just disappeared, in a matter of seconds. Shelly spent around 20 mins searching for him in that area, to no avail. She then headed for home to look for him there. I arrived home not long after she had and immediately raced back to the park in a blind panic trying to find him. I immediately raised the alarm and within no time various leisure centre attendants and members of the public were helping in the search. After an hour and a quarter of frenzied searching at the park and around local roads I called

police. After a few minutes the police told me to go to the leisure centre where PC 1895 Williams was sitting in his police van just outside, waiting to speak to me. He informed me that Jordan had walked home to my house, found the doors locked and had walked to his father's. PC Williams told me that GW had phoned police to say that Jordan had turned up at his house. I asked what time. He said he couldn't tell me as it was *subject to the data protection act*. I asked roughly what time. He said it was about an hour before I did. During our conversation he changed that to "about half an hour" and later again to "about a quarter of an hour" before I had phoned. I asked him to confirm the time I had phoned police. I was told it was 3.24pm. That's odd because according to Shelly's mobile I had made that emergency call at 3.15pm. [Perhaps the control room had given the time that the *police* had called me back.] I later learned from GW's solicitors in a letter [dated 28<sup>th</sup> June 2004] that the police had told him the time that I had phoned police. [That wasn't subject to the data protection act!] It would be impossible for Jordan to walk to his father's in the time suggested. 2 leisure centre attendants saw all 3 kids, 2 scooters and the dog walking around the boating lake at 1.30pm. They knew the time because of their dinner break. According to PC1895's story, they went to the park and J was left in 'the tunnel'. He was frightened. Shelly said they were playing in the tunnel [a cylindrical part of the climbing frame] but that she didn't leave him there. Pat and Elaine later told me that J told them that he had "looked for Shelly in the jungle" [a wooded area of the park that we pass through on our way out of the park]. By the time J had allegedly done all this and then got himself to my house it would've been getting on for almost 2pm. Amphletts confirmed [28/6/04] what PC 1895 told me i.e. that J arrived at his father's at 2.55pm. For J [aged 7] to be able to get to his father's in approx 1 hour, he would have had to run flat out *all* the way. The route is mainly up hill; up very steep hills and the distance is 3.7 miles. PC 1895 Williams told me that the way **Jordan had described the journey to him had been perfect**. The social workers said that **Jordan was unable to tell them the route**; he could only say that he took "a quick route, but it didn't seem that much quicker." PC 1895 told me that on receiving GW's call, **he had gone to the park to look for me**. Why didn't he call in at the leisure centre to tell them that he was looking for me? Why didn't he call at my house first or attempt to phone me? Shelly was at home and could contact me. The Leisure centre manageress told me that what she came to understand from her brief chat with PC 1895 just before I spoke to him was that J had rang his father. When I asked her where he had phoned from, she said that's what she couldn't find out; that was **where the story went a bit muffled**.

PC 1895 Williams later came to my house. He did not jot down one word of what Shelly or I said, let alone take a statement from either of us. If he had he might've been able to figure out the truth for himself. Instead he was more concerned about protecting himself from being exposed as a liar and of aiding and abetting a child abuser. He was easily provoked; he kept on springing to his feet and ranting on that he didn't need to "justify times or nothing" to me just because I was asking for information. He kept telling me it was all *data protection* [more like Freemasonry protection] and that all the info would be in his report, which will go to 'Family Protection'. P & E told me that the police report was extremely brief. [Wonder why!] My solicitor Peter Brown wrote to PC1895 asking for a copy. He sent chasers on July 20<sup>th</sup> 2004 and August 19<sup>th</sup> 2004. Finally PC Williams *telephoned* my solicitor to say that the information has simply been passed to the Child Protection Unit! PC1895's story is clearly a blatant fabrication. PC 1895 is clearly collaborating with

GW. Pete wrote on July 21<sup>st</sup> 2004 requesting the 'Out of Hours' Social Services report. He sent a chaser on August 19<sup>th</sup> 2004.

I give my heartfelt thanks to all those wonderful members of the public who helped me search for Jordan. I don't know who you are but I know that one day you'll read this message. My special thanks goes to the lovely Julie Lee who was there for me when I needed her most. My deep felt thanks also to Margaret [manageress of Colwyn Leisure Centre] and her team of dedicated staff.

My solicitor Peter Brown wrote to me on 19<sup>th</sup> August 2004 telling me that he'd subsequently had verbal responses from PCs Williams and Dinnis and yet his letter to them is dated 19<sup>th</sup> August 2004 also! He states: "We enclose copies of all those letters for your records." He didn't. Instead his copy letter, dated 19<sup>th</sup> August 2004, and addressed to North Wales Police, Child Protection Unit states: "We refer to our letter dated 20<sup>th</sup> July 2004 and we would be grateful to hear from you. We also enclose a copy letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> July 2004, which we sent to PC Dinnis and understand that a brief referral report was also sent to you. Perhaps you could let us have a copy of this by return." Pete's copy letter, dated 19<sup>th</sup> August 2004, addressed to Social Services also states: "We refer to our letter dated 21<sup>st</sup> July 2004 and we would be grateful for a response." It seems as if those dates were just plucked out of a hat. I would be amazed if such letters even existed. I had specifically asked Pete for copies of *all* the letters that he sent out. My solicitor certainly seems to be communicating with *some caution*. Is he, like all the other solicitors with their sucking straws, slurping from the same spittoon as the high-ranking police and social services parasites?

Gareth Williams continued to breach the Court Order. On 6<sup>th</sup> December 2004 he sent a message via school that he would not be bringing Melissa for the changeover because she had tonsillitis. The GP Dr Bisarya would not give me any information; he wouldn't even confirm that Melissa had been diagnosed with tonsillitis. He said that I had to contact the father [even though he acknowledged that he is aware that I have problems with the father.] He would only confirm that Melissa had been seen by a doctor at his practice but that he didn't know which one. He said that the "other person" was not there. There are only 2 doctors there – himself and his wife! Dr Bisarya was certainly speaking with *caution*. Could he be just another dirty collaborator? When I wrote requesting the medical notes as asked, I was informed that there was a £10 charge, just to SEE the records! I was told that this was due to the "Data Protection Act". Now there's a familiar Masonic sound bite!!! I couldn't help thinking that only days earlier I had done the decent thing when I found Mr Bisarya's keys in his door as I was delivering his newspaper – I'd alerted him. It's a pity that he, especially considering his position, doesn't recognise the word 'DECENT'. [My solicitor told me that if a client orders medical records via a solicitor, doctors charge anywhere between £25 and £50. WHY??? Obviously, because doctors know that individuals can't/won't fork out that much and that they are allowed to *steal* it from the **public purse** instead, knowing that they don't have to worry about being caught with/accused of having their paws in the till because they can claim it is perfectly legal. Maybe, but it certainly aint moral. Good God; how low can you get. The fraud within the legal aid system by the slime pit of snakes – our 'pillars of society' is so blatant, it is mind blowing. There is a deep spiritual and moral malaise

and decay amongst so many professional persons, public servants and other leading figures in society.]

The c/o states that in the case of illness, changeover is still to take place on school premises at 3pm. Illness is no excuse for preventing the children going to the other parent, unless the child is so ill that he/she is hospitalised. GW didn't take Mel to the doctor on the Thursday or even Friday of the previous week when she was off school, he left it until Monday – CHANGEOVER DAY. According to her medical records, she was seen again by the GP on Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> December. It is recorded that she "is much improved now." So why didn't GW arrange for me to collect her at 3pm at school on Thursday or even on Friday so that she could have been with us for at least the weekend? He of course kept her off school until Monday 13/12/04 when it was his week to have the kids again. My solicitor wrote to Amphletts on 14<sup>th</sup> December requesting an explanation. They continue to give us their usual 2-fingered salute - they didn't even bother to reply.

On 27<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2005, Melissa had her tonsillectomy. It had been rescheduled for a date when she and J were staying with their father [of course.] She was discharged the next day. During the whole time that I was at the hospital, Mel's father behaved abominably. He refused to call a truce just for one day, despite telling Mel that he would. He did the opposite – he threatened me and made various abusive and sarcastic comments and was constantly provoking. He was forever scurrying off to snitch on me to nurses – any would do. The doting father was not concerned about being with his daughter, he was too busy telling lies to all and sundry, stirring up trouble for me and being a right pain in the neck for the hospital staff [even during the time Mel was in theatre.] In contrast, I had been genuinely friendly towards him - I'd tried to discuss Mel's health with him, I'd asked him to join us in the playroom; I'd even invited him to play Snakes & Ladders with us.... I'd done everything in my power to avoid a confrontation to keep Mel and the atmosphere happy and relaxed and to prevent GW finding an excuse to have me thrown out.

However, despite the C/O stating that I was at liberty to visit my child in hospital and the fact that GW had signed an undertaking allowing me reasonable contact with Mel, he managed to ensure that I only got ½ hour with her after her op and 1 ½ hours with her the next day. I was ordered to leave and not to return until 9.30am the next day. I was totally distraught. Mel wanted me to stay with her and was even more traumatised as a result of being denied that. I was also prevented from being with my 6 year old daughter as she was being taken to theatre. [After pressure from GW the ward sister told me that only one parent could go with her. Why couldn't that parent be her mummy - the parent who Melly loves and is relaxed with and who **Melly** wants holding her hand? Anyway, there was no reason why we both could not have gone with her. If problems had arisen, the staff could easily have thrown out whichever parent was causing the trouble.]

This all resulted because surgeon Mr Zeitoun went back on his word. During our consultation last May [2004], he had said that visitation for the parents should be equal and that there was no reason why both GW and I could not stay overnight. He had even suggested to GW [who was the awkward one, **refusing** mediation] that Mel could stay longer in hospital than is normally the case, to recover, and that I could have 4/5 hours visitation with her on one day and he 4/5 hours with her the

next day... [Not that such a rule would ever have been enforced for GW; he doesn't have to abide by any rules. He is *above* the law.] However on the day it was evident that Mr Zeitoun [just like all the rest] had been forced to kowtow to some other authority – the medical Masonic fraternity? **I was stunned and furious when he said that he had just asked Mel [who had only just come out of theatre and was feeling groggy and vomiting under the effects of the anaesthetic and morphine, and breathing from her oxygen mask] which parent she wanted with her as she couldn't have both of us.** [It didn't seem to matter that I had made sure that GW and I were getting along reasonably well when he was actually sat with us and not tale-telling during the period prior to her op. In fact Mr Z had been monitoring us.] What the hell is a registrar doing asking a child of 6 years of age – an abused and terrified child – to choose between her mother and her father? Melissa **knew** that she had to choose him, for one reason she was staying with him that week and for another she is being **forced** by **him** to repeat to 'important' people what he tells her to say. She dare not disobey him and speak the truth. [She later told me that she wanted me to stay with her but that she was scared of what her dad would say. My children frequently tell me that when they are at their father's they *have to pretend* - all the time [that they like him, that they dislike me...] In any case, didn't Mr Z realise that she couldn't possibly have been thinking straight so soon after an operation? **How could a man of Mr Zeitoun's stature ask a child of Melissa's age such a question? His behaviour was breathtakingly stupid and irresponsible. This is especially so because he knows the history – in detail.** When I reminded Mr Z that he has more than ample court documentation showing that my children have suffered more than 6 years of abuse by their father, that the social workers have reported widely their fears that my children are being primed [not to mention that they have reported repeatedly that GW fails to co-operate with them, that I am a taboo subject etc etc, also that GW **constantly** breaches court orders...] he declared that GW had not been present when he had spoken with Mel. I informed him that Mel would have been thoroughly coached by her father in what to say *before* she arrived at hospital; not that he needs to do that anymore, my kids are well versed by now in how to behave and what to say to people such as doctors, nurses, teachers, social workers, welfare officers... I also reminded Mr Z that GW has made constant **malicious** allegations to all sorts of child welfare agencies over several years and **all** have been unfounded. Has Mr Zeitoun no idea about the torment, fear and suffering of abused kids? He *should've* been concerned about Melissa's welfare, about the fact that she is being abused and he *should've* been concerned about the harassment of the nurses by GW. They did not have the time to waste pandering to his pathetic, irresponsible and despicable behaviour [whose ill-will towards me knows no bounds], they were too busy saving children's lives.

More than 6 years on after giving GW the elbow and he is still a nasty control freak and a bully. He behaved more despicably and pathetically than I could ever have imagined - he was like a 3 year old, constantly scuttling off telling tales to mammy. Didn't any kid ever tell him off for that sort of behaviour when he was in the school playground? Why couldn't he drop it for just one day, on a day when Mel faced a life or death situation? [since anything can happen during an operation, no matter how routine it may be.] What is his problem and why does *everyone* in positions of authority give him free reign to continue in his nefarious ways??? Why will no one stand up to him??? Why do they *support* him, which, in the doing, is to the severe detriment of Jordan and Melissa??? **Does nobody care about the SUFFERING of**

**little children???** Even the social workers [helpful as they have been to some degree] only skimmed the surface in their reporting and for the large part preferred the safe option of sitting on the fence. Gareth Williams was verbally abusive towards them too, yet that wasn't reported. I can only assume that they too are intimidated by him. The Headmaster Mr Geraint Williams went one further – he blatantly sided with the child abuser GW and threatened *me* – with an injunction, just because I had been telling mothers at his school the **truth**. Mr Zeitoun, who is in a position to prevent the abuse of children and who has a *duty* to do so, has in fact shown himself to be just another member of the medical establishment who is actually aiding and abetting a child abuser.

Senior Staff nurse Carol Dowling [the same nurse I had spoken at length with last April at Mel's pre-op consultation] with back up from the ward sister remained extremely sympathetic and supportive and had tried her best to persuade GW to agree to equal visitation on a rota basis. Carol had even tried to persuade Mr Z that this was the best solution under the circumstances. It was she who pointed out that GW did at first agree to me staying overnight, then he'd changed his mind and had offered me 4 hours with Mel, which he later retracted such that it was evident that no matter what he had initially agreed or suggested, he was always going to go back on his word - such were the cruel games that he loved to play. She was aware that GW was objecting to anything I did or said. He was constantly opposing me, just for the hell of it. For example Mel said she was cold and wanted to get into bed, I was just about to help her when her father ordered her not to. I had to compromise and suggest she wear her gown. I asked him to shut the window because of the draught but he made an excuse as to why it should stay open. I had to back down. He did not care about Melissa's comfort or well being. I'd been the mature, responsible, caring parent; I was even genuinely nice and pleasant towards him on the following day - asking him how Mel had been during the night and I was even cracking little jokes but GW had refused to reciprocate; he had been hell bent on **war**. Of course, it didn't matter what Carol knew or what she thought or what she said. Lovely as she is, she is only a relatively low grade female, with **no power and no influence**. Someone like her, no matter how good she is at her job, would never in a million years get to be in such a position. Those positions are reserved for the liars and deceivers amongst us; the ones [usually men] who get there with a lot of help from organised criminals, such as the **Masonic fraternity**.

As regards the tonsillectomy, I never wanted Mel to have an op and she would almost certainly not have needed one if she hadn't been subjected to years of abuse by her father, which caused her constant stress, resulting in repeated illnesses. The anaesthetist confirmed my belief that enlarged adenoids and/or enlarged or infected tonsils are the result of repeated infection, and that the main cause of that is stress.

So what now for the evil plotters of the Old Boys Network? Will I be dragged back into another one of their kangaroo courts yet again? [GW threatened repeatedly that this is the plan.] Is there going to be a letter from Mr Z in support of the despicable GW, saying something along the lines that '**mother**' was argumentative and wouldn't accept his decision? [There has *never* been a letter of criticism directed at GW from any member of staff in the medical field who have witnessed countless times his vile behaviour.] Incidentally, and as advised by senior staff nurse Carol Dowling, I asked for a letter from Mr Z or another registrar confirming that Mel was well enough to

come to me on the following Monday as per the C/O. This request was refused, even though the surgeon who performed the op, Mr Usanov, had said that GW should hand her over to me, which meant that if GW did not comply, he would again be in breach of the order.

Neutrality being the theme throughout, in July 2004 District Judge O W Williams warned that 'this constant warring of parents is doing the kids no good whatsoever' and that the next step would be that J & M would be taken into 'care'. Are the legal fraternity now plotting that one of their members [some biased Judge] will now be able to award GW full residence of my children on the grounds of this latest incident, which resulted in Mr Zeitoun's intervention? The organised criminals of the judicial system will [as is always the case] bury the truth and will twist and turn the facts so that the next Judge will be able to rule with a clear conscience that 'mother' should be the one forced to accept much reduced contact with her children [which will eventually lead to no contact, as was the case for GW's battered ex wife when she was eventually forced to run for her life from her marital home.] He will be able to reason something along the lines of: "It was the final straw that these parents couldn't even get along with each other when their young daughter was in *hospital*; a **registrar** had to intervene and he threatened that he might have to hail security and turf them both out. Finally it was **mother** who was ordered to leave, only minutes after her daughter had just awoken from an operation."

Mr Z granted me only ½ hour with Mel; that was significantly *less* than Judge Hedley had made me verbally agree to last April [2004.] Is Mr Z punishing me because I was able to use him to gain a small victory [an overruling of Judge Hedley's order] in court last July? It would seem that the funny handshake brigade are reminding me that no matter what the *appearance* of normality, fair play, uprightness and what's right for the kids, *they* are telling me that they are still evil-minded, still up to their dirty tricks and still in control. They seem determined to engineer my biggest dread – the removal of my children from me. To achieve this they won't allow me public sympathy of being denied my children through imprisonment for contempt of a **gagging** order; instead they will continue to work slyly and deviously, as they do with all their targets. They do this because they know they can; they know there aren't enough victims [as yet] who would believe people like me. They wear their prey down by relentless provocation, relentless legal actions, relentless accusations leading to investigations, relentless perverting of justice, relentless mental torment, relentless fraudulent activity, relentless time wasting nonsense... It is the only way they can work; they cannot face the glare of public scrutiny. Our courts and authorities are now decayed, artificial, putrid, outlawed and obscene. Most officials are liars and thieves and the rest totally compromised.

But, no matter what the brotherhood do, they can't pin anything on me because I have **TRUTH** on my side and **God's** guiding light. All they have is a mountain of **LIES** and the **Devil's** deceptive ways. Despite the extremely taxing circumstances, I have been able to be whiter than white and ten steps ahead of my persecutors. God gave me the tools to be able to do that. They know now that no matter how much provoking they do, or how many challenges they give me, I am not going to buckle under and give them an excuse to deny me my kids. I think they know now that I am just going to ride it out, come what may. They must realise that in the end I will find justice and the kids and I will get the protection we need. All I have to do is carry on

doing what I have for the past 6 years and bide my time. All I have to do is trust in God to give me guidance and the strength to continue. He hasn't let me down yet. I'm certainly not going to slip up on a banana skin and do something stupid that would give the fraternity what they want. I must admit though there are times when I do lose heart and what materialised in hospital was one of those times. I was so close to losing it; so close to erupting in absolute rage. But something made me keep my composure. I really was beginning to wonder though how I was going to carry on and cope with all this cr..p – such unbelievable underhandedness; such falsehoods; such secretiveness and evil manipulations; such jiggery-pokery and such serious dereliction of duty.... and I was losing faith. But when I look back I notice that whenever things got really bad, it wasn't long after and good things started to happen – such things always totally took me by surprise. It just tells me that there is something or someone [God or whoever] that is so much bigger and more powerful than me and everyone else, directing things. All I have to do is give my best - speak **truth**, seek **justice**, do the **right** thing by others, listen to my **conscience**... and I can't go far wrong. If things don't go the way I expect them to, then I know that something is happening for a reason and the time isn't right for certain things. Good things come to us eventually. We have to be patient. I've come to realise that I just have to **persevere**, no matter how tired or ill or weary or stressed or frustrated or disheartened I feel. I know that **God won't test me beyond my limitations. He is true to his word.** I truly believe now that the parasites in public office and the court vipers are worried sick about exposure. The whole fetid pool must now be torched with the truth and light of full disclosure. Full exposure is all that is needed - total eradication of all Secret Societies with their merry band of crooks, and with that - all corruption - will soon follow. It cannot be far away now.

Never in the history of the world has there been the monopolization that we see today or the massive unrest, poverty and degradation or the destructive weather patterns or the increasing arms race or the global warming and environmental threat to our planet or the obsession with sex and pornography. This is the result of the actions of a minority of self-important, self-indulgent, self-effacing men. Those very men who control the SECRET SOCIETIES and therefore the future of the WORLD. THEY are our SATANIC RULERS and THIS is the final conflict that the bible predicts. My family live in a spiral of never-ending nightmares. How many other unseen shattered lives are out there because of our Authorities' unlawful and abhorrent dirty tricks? My prayers are FOR and TO all of you, whoever and wherever you are, who suffer injustice, oppression and slavery. Fight for your speech. Let the world know about your pain. Name and shame the evildoers. Hand deliver your story if need be. Erect posters, protest.... Fight for the right to be heard. It might take a while but never give up. WE hear you and WE care and WE will win. Collectively we are a force to be reckoned with. Daily I live in fear for my babies - all four of them. I live in fear of being locked away in a loony bin somewhere. But it gives me some satisfaction to understand that *they* live in fear of exposure and that they are endlessly looking over their shoulders and covering up their sins. *They* would like to keep their murky business behind darkened windows and closed lodge doors. They think they can shut up and lock up those who trouble them. They think they can hide behind their libel laws and their clever, wealthy lawyers. They are wrong. Satan cannot sneak about in the dark forever. 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. Everyone can be saved, it just depends on which master you choose to serve - there are only two. Thank God for the people who publish the truth. God bless all the people who expose corruption, all the women who fight male dominance and who fight for equality and all the decent Masons who do have the courage to fight the poison within their organization. God bless also the men who, for moral reasons, choose to go to jail rather than join the army. God bless the women of opposing war-torn countries who unite to preach peace. God bless the police officers who leave the force, rather than serve their bent bosses. [The war-profiteering ruling elite cannot continue with their lies, greed, corruption and wars unless thousands or millions are willing to be used as cannon fodder. If the politicians want war, let *them* kit up in combat gear and face the enemy's angry gun.] And God bless the 'flower power' protesters. We must all do everything possible to fight for a just world, a peaceful, loving and giving world - GOD'S WORLD. Thank you for reading. Good luck and God bless.

### [PART 3 OF SHARON A KILBY'S STORY \[MORE DETAIL OF MY STORY AND QUOTATIONS FROM PROFESSIONAL WITNESSES\]:](#)

During contact at nursery [starting Sept 2002], Jordan would say things like: "Don't like you or Andrew" whilst he was climbing onto my knee and smothering me with hugs and kisses. Then in the next breath he'd say: "I love my mummy. I want to come home." Out of the blue [and often when we were in the loo] they both said things like: "I love you. I want to go home but daddy won't let me." They said things like: "daddy's nasty because he says I can't see mummy ever again." They call him "a liar" and they make remarks such as: "I don't like daddy" and "daddy's horrible" or "I wish we could go on holiday then we won't have to see daddy." Mel told me that she cries at her dad's because he won't let her come home. She said that he gets cross when she tells him that she wants to come home. She told the nursery carers that she wanted to come home and she cried and clung on to me because she didn't want to get into her father's car. Jordan is so terrified of his father that he was worried sick because he had a toileting accident at nursery and was unable to wear his school trousers. He said his father hits him whenever he does anything wrong. He also gets hit when he tries to stand up for me i.e. whenever GW says nasty things about me, he tells his father that he is a liar. On one occasion his dad hit him so hard that he ran crying to his room, picked up something of his father's and smashed it over and over again until it was in bits because of his sheer anger and frustration. Melissa is so scared of her father that in order to please him she had to pretend that she didn't really like me and didn't want to see me. He'd even managed to get her to hit out

at me. Jordan says that his dad drinks all the time and that he likes it when he drinks because he is "nice". They said that their father ripped up the family photos that I gave them and that the fluffy toys that I gave them got thrown away by GW. It got to the stage where Jordan was sad because he was too scared to accept photos even though they were only of our cat. He said that the photos made his dad angry.

**The following are my solicitor Peter Brown's questions to the Director of Social Services dated 2/1/03 as directed by the Court. [To date, despite numerous chasers, none of these questions have been answered by any social worker or manager.]**

**Questions for Terry James, Social Services manager:**

1. Did Gareth Williams indicate that he had taken Jordan to see Dr Thackray on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> August 2002?
2. Did Gareth Williams say that Jordan had told him that Andrew had burnt him with a cigarette?
3. If yes, is it his understanding that this was relayed by Gareth Williams to Dr Thackray?
4. Could he confirm that 246C/20/8/02 is the Police incident number and that he also made out a written report? Could he also confirm that when our client asked for a copy of that report he indicated that it would be in her file and that she was encouraged by him to request her files from the department?
5. Did he receive our client's letter dated the 19<sup>th</sup> October 2002? If so, could she have a response?

**Questions for Ian Turner, Social Services manager:**

1. Please respond to all outstanding correspondence.
2. Please respond to our client's letter dated the 5<sup>th</sup> September 2002 requesting files. Please let us know when she can expect to receive them?
3. Please confirm that during a telephone conversation on the 5<sup>th</sup> September our client was told that a letter had been received from Amphletts alleging that our client had caused the mark on Jordan's forehead? Was this the first time he had heard about this or did he already know about that allegation?
4. Could he confirm that he informed our client that Amphletts subsequently told him that they had made a mistake and were retracting the allegation.
5. Did Angela Mattison indicate to him what was in her report of the 1<sup>st</sup> October 2002 i.e. that Jordan had whispered into Gay Waring's ear saying that our client had burnt him.
6. We enclose copy of our client's statement dated the 10 December 2002. You will see that in the statement she has reported her recollections of telephone conversations with him. Could he please let us know if there is anything in that which he disagrees with?

**Questions for Angela Mattison, Social Worker:**

1. Could she confirm that she told our client on 21<sup>st</sup> August 2002 with Gay

Waring that Jordan had whispered into Gay Waring's ear indicating that our client had burned him?

2. Did she inform Mr Turner of the same?
3. Could she confirm that Jordan spoke articulately to her and Gay Waring for 20 minutes on the 21<sup>st</sup> August 2002?
4. Could she confirm that Gareth Williams had requested that Jordan be interviewed?
5. Did Jordan tell her where and when he had been burned by Andrew before [her report 1<sup>st</sup> October 2002]?

**Questions for Maureen Catherall, Social Worker:**

1. Could she confirm that she was visited on an almost weekly basis by Gareth Williams when the children were on the At Risk Register during her assessment?
2. Could she confirm that during a visit to our client on the 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2000 concerning Mr Williams' allegation that she was living with a sex offender that she said she would be contacting him to discuss with him the amount of nuisance referrals he was making?
3. Could she confirm that on the 4<sup>th</sup> March 2000 during her visit with Alison Parry that she discouraged Gareth Williams from visiting with her and that she didn't feel that he was putting the children's welfare first, rather he was looking for excuses to attack our client? Could she also confirm that he was advised that he could complain in writing if he was not satisfied with that? Could she also confirm that she and Mrs Parry advised that she would be liaising with the Police to work out ways of dealing with him and his constant referrals which she anticipated at that time would continue?
4. Could she confirm Gareth Williams' response when told that Social Services wouldn't be taking action against our client?
5. Could she confirm that following the June 2000 Butlins incident she questioned Gareth Williams' motives at that time?
6. Could she confirm that on one occasion Gareth Williams waited three weeks after an alleged incident before making a complaint to her?
7. Did she think at that time that his behaviour was harassing?

**Questions for Elaine Buckley, Social Worker:**

1. Could she confirm that she visited Gareth Williams and requested that he stop making unnecessary referrals?
2. Could she confirm that Gareth Williams became angry when nothing came of his referrals at that time?

After 7 months of being in school Melissa couldn't read one word and Jordan was only just starting to read. Jordan could only write 2 letters of his name and even the bottom bit of the letter "J" was pointing the wrong way. Both he and Melissa attempted letter formation which was totally incorrect. For example they would start writing "r" from the bottom up and "o" in a clockwise direction. Before they went to school they could write some letters and numbers the correct way. After a few months of being in school Jordan couldn't even recognize numbers higher

than 5. Since being at school both J & M cannot speak properly. Their language is abysmal. For example they say "them" instead of "those" and they use double negatives, for example: "I don't never...." They say "lend" when they should say "borrow". Jordan says things like: "My dad learned me to ride my bike.... I didn't saw you.... I sawed him." Melly says things like: "I caught the ball." Her teacher Mrs Price told me that the majority of the pupils cannot speak properly. Mark Barrett, Specialist senior educational Psychologist bangs on about the need for various education plans, targets, codes of practice, helping agencies and even therapeutic involvement, saying that they will develop my children's confidence and social and emotional development. They will achieve quite the opposite. They will succeed in turning my children off learning altogether and will just turn them into bored and destructive rebels. J & M are not parrots. Mr Barrett reports [17/1/03] that Jordan is "just beginning to understand how to participate in school, relate to other children and take some responsibility for aspects of his learning." Presumably it took some months for Jordan to achieve this stage. Such comments just reinforce my belief that school is not a good place for children, especially young ones to be. He speaks about "Jordan's independence skills" saying that it had taken him a whole term for Jordan to develop these. That is quite staggering. When Jordan lived at home he had no problems with such 'skills'. He [and Mel] were quite competent, confident and independent when attending the social settings that I took them to, such as: nursery, youth club, crèche, friends' houses.... There has never been a problem with socialization and the last thing they need is an army of 'experts' or professionals giving them extra 'support'. Mr Barrett describes Jordan as being at a "critical stage in his social and learning development." How can he compartmentalize 'learning' and 'socializing' in this way? Schools tend to do this and that is why they set children up for failure. Learning is an ongoing, natural process and for young children is achieved [without them even realizing it] through play and by being involved with family life. Mr Barrett goes on: "Jordan has begun to make progress within school... the flexible use of support has been crucially important." Such rigidity, with targets, grading and assessing and comparing with others will give my son an inferiority complex and will hinder his development. He will be even more psychologically damaged. Mr Barrett says that Jordan is benefiting from high levels of support and he will benefit from a focused education plan with specific target areas, such as: literacy and numeracy skills and listening and focusing skills. If school have found that my son has problems with listening and focusing then that is because he simply isn't interested and no amount of extra tuition will 'solve the problem'. As for the literacy and numeracy skills, Jordan's standard has dropped considerably since he has been in school. Mr Barrett's comment that Jordan "has the ability to learn given appropriate support" is an insult to his intelligence. The sooner my children are removed from the oppressive school regime the better. Jesus wept! The Barrett report just reinforces my belief that the purpose of school is to indoctrinate kids [from the age of 3 when they can

barely talk and are only just out of nappies] so that they will be subservient to authority. Get them young when they are fresh faced and innocent and brainwash and mould them. School is not the place for children who believe in human rights and justice. School is designed to knock out any rebellion that any child has within and to keep that child uneducated and ignorant – easy to control and a slave to society. The last thing the Stage stooges want is kids to grow up being happy, healthy, intelligent and challenging – which they know is quite often the result when children are spared the evils of school.

The social workers reported [26/3/03] that for almost a month GW repeatedly ignored their attempts to contact him even though he had been instructed to cooperate by his solicitor. They stated that they'd been unable to speak with his older children. They made reference to an occasion when in her father's presence Melissa was too scared to come to me; she had pushed me away and had tried to hit out at me saying she didn't like me [yet days earlier, in front of the social workers, once her father had left the room she had spent much of the contact time just cuddling up close to me.] On that day the social workers had planned to transport us to my house to observe the children's natural reactions. They reported that it did not take place and they felt that this contact was for the most part frustrated by GW. They also made reference to the repeated allegations about me abusing or neglecting my children, stating that there have been seventeen referrals/reports to S/S directly or via other agencies. Pat and Elaine also mention the significant number of Section 47 Investigations following allegations of physical abuse or neglect issues. And they state that the majority of these allegations have been made by GW; that all have been investigated and that all have been unfounded. They also state that he takes every opportunity to restate his allegations to other professionals and that he has been spoken to on two separate occasions about making unfounded referrals. They point out that as a result I have never had the opportunity to rebuild my life.

I was told by teachers that GW was encouraged on at least two occasions to let Jordan come into school like all the others do. But GW refused and insisted on escorting Jordan to his class. The Specialist Senior Educational Psychologist, Mr Barrett [in his 13/3/03 report] speaks of Jordan's "communication skills" saying "Jordan is now volunteering information and showing considerable more confidence EG he talked at length about his birthday." Jordan needs months in school and extra support to achieve that? He naturally gained such 'skills' long before he started school. But he soon lost his confidence and became very guarded because he was removed from his home against his will, denied his mummy, forced to repeat lies by his father and thrust into school. Of course, such facts are not acknowledged in the Barrett report. Why didn't Mr Barrett question why Jordan [and Mel] were so lacking in confidence and so distrusting??? If the problem was Andy and not GW, Jordan and Melissa would've been happy and

contented and oozing confidence because they did not see Andrew for nearly 8 months. The social workers state that the evidence does not back up GW's claims. It is pretty clear that the problem is the children's abusive father. Jordan's teacher told me that both J & M were very insecure and very wary of adults for a long time. She said Jordan is opening up and is ok now but Melissa is still distrustful. The social workers report: "The school have noted Jordan is less clingy to his father since he has had staying contact with his mother." Regarding Melissa, Mr Barrett reports that she is "Making progress, showing initiative, for example she is beginning to organize others and she plays with others in a more sophisticated way." Why doesn't he just say she is now indoctrinated to the system and is able to perform to expectations? He says: "Melissa continues to benefit from the structured and consistent school and home environment." [The social workers report that the children's lives whilst living with their father has been unstable!] He also says: "A careful note will be made of any changes in Melissa's social and emotional well being but currently she is well settled." [No doubt now that I'm having more contact with my children he will next report that he has concerns about Melissa being unsettled and about her general well-being....]

During a review at school on 20/5/03 I learned that the school 'experts' were pleased that Melissa is now able to write her name. I had taught her to write it apart from the 'a' which she had almost grasped *before* she started school. School taught her to write the 'e' the wrong way round and to even start her name by writing the 'e' first. It is reported by her teacher that she copies letters of words in the wrong order. EG she will start at the right hand side and work backwards. Also even her copied letters are the wrong way round or unreadable. Another strategy for Melissa in class is re her attention. The 'experts' fail to see that Mel's 'problem' is that she simply isn't interested in school. Jordan is reported to have a short concentration span and that he is easily distracted. That means he is bored in school. He won't learn if he isn't interested. At home he can spend hours just building with his lego blocks and meccano. He's even happy spending time just doing maths with Shelly or myself. It is also reported that he is struggling with his reading i.e. he tends to memorise whole sentences rather than learn individual words. This is reported to be the case with Melissa too. Yet when I got J & M to read *Peter and Jane* and other books, they were able to read the words separately and even managed to read virtually whole books. They were both keen to move on to higher levels too. There is something seriously wrong with the school's methods of teaching my children to read. When I pointed such things out and also the fact that since being in school both J & M now write letters and numbers incorrectly I was given short shrift by Mrs Wregglesworth at Ysgol Cynfran and informed that my children are making progress. Incidentally it is clear that GW doesn't bother to help the children with their reading books because Melissa's teacher wrote down the words that she was supposed to learn in

February/March 2003. She did not learn those words until *Shelly and I taught her* a couple of months later.

It isn't fair or wise to try to compare Home Educated children with their school peers. A Home Educated child might be considered to be 'behind' his/her school counterpart according to a school's assessment and yet the child might be far more advanced in other [perhaps more important] areas.

During June 2003, on the instructions from his father, Jordan began behaving violently with his toys and household items and doors as soon as his father brought him for contact. Jordan is now too controlled and intimidated by his father to disobey him. Melissa also is too scared to be herself in front of her father and she would run back to him on cue crying. Yet as soon as he leaves both J & M are totally different, completely relaxed and loving and 'normal' and wanting to come home. Mel cried often at night in her sleep and she coughs constantly. I hear her saying to herself things like: "I don't like daddy. He hurts me." She makes recordings in her toy tape recorder and says things like: "I love my mummy." She and Jordan say that their daddy is nasty and a liar and that they love me and A & S. Yet in school, in front of their father, they treat me as if I'm a stranger and I heard them both excitedly telling him that they cried for him "at mummy's" and Jordan happily told his smirking father that he was "angry at mummy's" and that he'd thrown his toys around the lounge and had "slammed mummy's doors."

After a meeting at school I was promised copies of my children's work including comments and reports by their teachers. After a few weeks of enquiring, the Headmaster refused me the copies saying that it would cost too much and that he was under resourced. I asked if I could leaf through my children's work and select just a *few* for copying. This was important because of the court proceedings and because at the end of term the resident parent, GW, was to receive the children's school work, not me. I offered to do the copying myself and even pay for the copies. He then sent me some sample pages of *his* choosing.

The Head Geraint Williams states in his 30/6/03 report: "All cases are referred to the Educational Psychologist, namely Mr Mark Barrett and all reports sent to him. Mr Barrett also reached the same conclusion as myself and all other professionals assisting the children." Barrett obtained ALL his info from the Head! He stresses his fear that should J & M return to home tuition they will "once again become isolated and withdrawn from society." He fears they will become "social outcasts." The Head has a narrow interpretation of 'socialization'. It is the ability to mix freely and comfortably with different people. A lot of socialization learned in

schools is highly undesirable. The world is full of socially inadequate folk; all of whom have been to school. No home educated child is socially lacking. Jordan's and Melissa's problems are caused by their abusive father and by school. The Headmaster also refers to the first day of school when he and GW prevented me from having any contact with my children. The Head physically restrained me and GW held my children firmly by their hands. The Head states that his main concern at this time was: "They showed no emotion whatsoever. This was not the actions of children living in a normal living environment and because of this it was clear that they were not developing as normal children should." [During the October 2002 Child Protection Conference Geraint Williams had not mentioned such concerns. On the contrary, he stated: "There are no concerns about their behaviour."] How does he think abused children behave? Did he expect them to try and run to me crying and did he expect them to punch and kick anyone who tried to stop them? The children were not allowed to show 'normal' emotion. They existed in a climate of fear, being ruled by an iron fist [at their father's house and at school], too terrified to disobey their father. They were being brainwashed and ordered to 'smile'. They were in a state of confusion and shell shock and had been stripped of all normal emotion by their father. Why wasn't the Head concerned about that? Why did the Head treat me with such utter contempt and why did he go to such lengths to keep me away from my children? If he had told GW to let my children come to me, instead of *encouraging* GW's vile behaviour, then he might've seen some 'normal' emotion.

Melissa and Jordan do not like school. Mel became so anxious and subdued when her teacher Mrs Helen Price tried to take her hand to lead her into class. At a review meeting on 9/7/03 Mrs Price said that Melissa often gives a blank expression when spoken to and that she is still very very quiet and **very careful about what she says**. I was told that she is still slow in speech and language development and needs to visit a speech therapist. I again explained that the answer is to remove her from the maligning influence of her father because until she can live free from fear and secure with the knowledge that she can speak her mind freely, she will continue to be hampered in this area and no amount of 'therapy' will do any good. Her mind is elsewhere. She cannot relax and benefit from anything in school while she is so troubled. Mrs Laura Smith [SENCO] was sympathetic but the Headmaster Mr Geraint Williams refused to listen. He even ignored me when I said that the new contact arrangements [Tuesday to the following Monday every other week, pick up/drop off at school] were better. I told him that the judge had remarked that it is much better for children to settle with one parent for a few days or so rather than be passed around after a day here or there. I added that the children won't have to witness any problems relating to the handover which is obviously a good thing. And I said that hopefully the court order will now be respected; all of which has to be beneficial to the children as it

will help them gain more confidence and will enable them to concentrate better at school. Mrs Smith agreed. The Headmaster said nothing. I again asked if I could be given my children's work at the end of term. GW and the Headmaster said nothing. They just looked at each other. I then asked if I could just borrow their work for a few days or so instead. The Headmaster said he would discuss it with GW and would let me know. Why didn't he ask GW for an answer during the meeting? Why the secrecy? It is not surprising that I do not believe that the Headmaster is as impartial as he tries to have me believe. When I again raised concerns about my children learning incorrect letter formation at school, the Headmaster disagreed, yet the evidence speaks for itself and the teachers had agreed that their letter formation is poor. I gave a couple of examples such as Jordan writing 'e' starting at the bottom until he has a 'c' which then turns into 'e' but the straight bit ends up curved. Also Melly writing a '6' completely the wrong way, starting with the circular bit and finishing at the top of the number. Jordan writes a 'd' as a 'b' and his 'p' turns out to be a number '9'. Teachers and social workers try to tell you that most kids make such mistakes and that they soon learn the correct way. What nonsense. How can they learn the correct way when they are allowed/encouraged to write incorrectly? The Head and others at the meeting couldn't seem to grasp the point that there is a correct way of writing and that there is a reason for this. For example, both J & M would write many letters starting from the bottom, working upwards; thus 'n' ends up looking like a 'c' which has fallen over i.e. it has no straight edge. Likewise 'r' and 'm' do not have straight edges. Also both J & M have no idea which letters drop below the line and which ones don't. Thus 'p' and 'y' end up looking like capital letters. Another problem with school methods is that my children have now learned that all letters are the same size. I have had to teach them that some letters are tall and some are half as tall. And after one year in school, neither J or M could write any letter from memory except for those which made up their names, and even they were formed incorrectly and thus looked untidy and 'babyish'. This is of great concern to me because I have noticed that when I try to correct them now, they so easily go back to writing the way the school taught them. For the purposes of damage limitation I would rather the teachers just let my children **play** during their incarceration at school. At the meeting much fuss was *again* made about Melissa being able to write her name neatly although she did miss out the 'a'. I again repeated that I had taught her to write these letters long before she started school. I was ignored. J & M were not learning to read at school. They were unable to read individual words. Mrs Price said that school concentrate instead on discussing the story. It was reported that both J & M say the whole sentences in their reading books rather than recognising and learning individual words. What have my children been doing at school? The evidence is that they have been learning a lot of bad habits, which will be very hard for them to break. [During the summer holidays of 2004 both J & M were *still* making many mistakes with letter and number formation.] 2 years out of their lives has been wasted

educationally and instead much damage has been done, educationally and otherwise. The only words that J & M learned to read were the ones that they learned by reading the first 'Read it Yourself' books with Shelly and I during contact. Mrs Wreglesworth is more concerned with labelling than learning. She reports [9/7/03] that both J & M will "remain at School Action on the Code of Practice" and that they will both be "monitored by school in line with their Special Needs Policy." She also points out that both children are over learning things – Melissa is stated to be "still over learning" some letters and Jordan is stated to have "over learnt the key vocabulary for sight reading at Level 2 of the school scheme." How can a child over learn anything? And why be criticised for it?

Jordan and Melissa constantly come up to me and Andy and Shelly and tell us that they love us and want to live with us. They both want constant cuddling and continual reassurance. Shell tells me that if I'm missing for just a minute Melissa gets very anxious and repeatedly says: "Where's mummy? Want mummy. Want to be with mummy. Want to go to mummy." They also say that they don't want to go to school and want to learn at home. They say that they don't like daddy. I tell them that they must tell the social workers how they feel and what *they* want because Pat and Elaine get to talk to the judge. I tell them that they must not tell the social workers what their daddy tells them to say; only what *they* want. They said that they can't because they are scared of daddy. They said that he will be angry and will smack them. Jordan said that he tells his father that he likes him more than me, but that he's only pretending. He says that he will be smacked if he doesn't. I tell them that they can whisper into Pat's or Elaine's ear and say that they are scared of their dad. I said that Pat and Elaine won't tell their father but I know that it is pointless saying such things because my children *know* that their father will find out what they have been saying to the people that matter. Mel asks things like: "And then he'll stop?" Jordan says things like: "Can I stay here with you forever? If I tell the social workers that I want to live here, then I don't have to see daddy ever again?" He knows that he has to go to his father so there is no way he is going to say what is in his heart. Only my two defenceless young children know what goes on in their father's house behind closed doors. They daren't speak the truth. They will not do that until they are confident that they never have to see him again. And even if they did spill the beans it would make little difference because the truth is ignored and suppressed by the child abusing legal mafia. There will come a point when my children will feel that they cannot trust me either because I am forever telling them that the judge decides when they come home, yet we have been before the judge so many times now and they are still not allowed to come home. The freemasons were forever adjourning undoubtedly hoping that one day we wouldn't get such a good report from Pat and Elaine i.e. when the likes of their boss Ian Turner had managed to totally discredit

me. How do you explain to a 5 and 6 year old that hidden evil forces control their fate, which even the social workers [the very people with the supposed power to have children removed from or returned to their parents] are oblivious to? Pat does agree that some things are odd and don't add up. She said that she and Elaine couldn't for the life of them understand why CAFCASS hadn't managed to complete their assessment and write a report. She said they tried their best to have the assessment shifted back to them as they are the people who deal with custody issues. She said the idea of CAFCASS transferring an assessment to social services is just unheard of. She said that they have never been asked to write 3 reports as they have been asked to do in our case. Yet she doesn't want to believe that there are secret and sordid manipulations going on in high places. She and Elaine have obviously been persuaded by their crooked bosses that they should put pressure on me not to publish my story on the grounds that the very people I am attacking are the ones making decisions about my children. A gagging order was slapped on me on 3/7/03 in court. But it is odd that it took the Masons so long to request that I don't publish. My story began being published on the VOMIT site in September 2001 and I had told social service managers Ian Turner and Terry James this in August 2002; I had even sent them my story in the naïve hope that they were honest and trustworthy and not Masons or beholden to the murky business of Masonry.

I wrote to my solicitor Peter Brown to inform him that I had written to James Todd of Vomit regarding Amphletts' complaint on 15/7/03 that I hadn't adhered to the C/O re the removal of my articles. I explained that Mr Todd's reply is that there is no Web page to which he now contributes and that this has been the case for over a year. He suggests that Amphletts write to him and specify the inaccuracies. Also that he should contact Mr Ian Johnston who once administered the site. Peter then sent me a rather threatening letter: "You have given an undertaking to the Court to remove the articles and if you don't use your best endeavours to do so you will be in contempt of Court." Isn't that the kind of letter the *opposition solicitors* are supposed to write, not my own solicitor? Solicitors acting for rebels do not risk their careers for their clients; they collude with the dirty brigade to crush their clients instead. On 10/10/03 Pete sent me another threatening letter after he had received a response from Mr Johnston. He writes: "We suggest you contact Mr Johnston. As you are aware, with the articles, it is your responsibility to get them removed and that will assist the forthcoming court hearing. If you do not do it, then it is likely that it will be used against you in the hearing by Mr Williams' barrister." Actually the court order states that I am to use *my best endeavours*.

Much of what Social Workers Pat and Elaine say in their 3<sup>rd</sup> report [dated 9/10/03] could have been taken from Welfare Officer Vera Nolan's reports. For example: "Pat and Elaine have repeatedly stated to both Ms K and Mr W that their ongoing animosity towards each other will continue to cause emotional harm to J & M. We have repeatedly sought to point out to both parents that they must endeavour to conduct themselves appropriately when in the company of their children." Vera took the easy option of reporting in neutral terms and failed to acknowledge that the children and I are being bullied relentlessly by GW. If GW won't co-operate with social workers and blatantly breaches court orders, what chance have I got?

The social workers and school state that the children are happier now that they are having more and consistent contact with me, which exposes GW's lies about them not wanting to see me. They state: "Jordan's teacher reports that he now speaks openly and positively about his contact with his mother." Similar comments are made about Melissa. Pat and Miss Baker told me that I was a taboo subject for a long time. It is clear that the children have been too fearful of mentioning their mummy in school because of the influence of their father. However the social workers' remarks regarding school staff not experiencing problems relating to anxiety is not quite correct. Quite often, teachers had to physically remove Melissa from me. Miss Baker has witnessed her extreme reluctance to part from me. This is despite the fact that I'd be encouraging her to go in and had to prise her fingers off me and push her in. She is worried that I won't be there at the end of the day to collect her and that her father is there instead. Once I kiss my children goodbye they never know when they will see me again. They have distressing memories of having sparse and irregular contact with me. Their father has caused them to be very insecure. It is heartbreaking and all the more reason why home education would be much better for them.

The social workers continue to stress their fears of priming; also that the evidence does not support GW's allegations and thus that they believe he is the liar [one of us has to be], which is why they should not be in favour of shared care. They state: "*We continue to have some reservations that GW may be encouraging the children to deny that they love or wish to live with their mother. This is not borne out by our observations of contact between J & M and their mother and half siblings which can only be described as very positive experiences.*" They report: "On 6<sup>th</sup> October at school Jordan talked enthusiastically about his contact with his mother, Andy and Shelly, relating activities which they enjoyed together. However when asked directly where he wished to live *he became subdued* and then stated that he wished to live with Dad." Also "When we asked Jordan if Daddy ever told him what to say to us, he became *subdued and stated that he did not know.*" That

is very revealing. They also state: "Jordan stated clearly that he loved his father, Andy and Shelly but that he did not love his mother. This was *totally contrary to his accounts of contact* with his mother, which always appeared to be *very positive and rewarding* experiences. The level of confidence and demands for attention which Jordan exhibits in the company of his mother, A & S confirms that *he has a close bond with his family.*" Regarding Melissa, they report: "Contact is now a very positive experience for Melissa. *She clearly values the time* which she spends with her mother, Andy and Shelly." Also "When we spoke with Melissa in school on 6<sup>th</sup> Oct it was apparent that she *continually looked to Jordan for his responses to our questions before answering.*" And "Although she spoke excitedly about activities undertaken with her mother, Andy and Shelly she would only say that she loved Daddy, Andy and Shelly and that she wished to live with Daddy. This *did not seem to be consistent with her recounts of events during contact with her mother. The closeness which Melissa shares with her mother is very evident during contact.*" They further report: "Both J & M are very talkative, speaking in an animated way about their time spent with their father and time spent with their mother, A & S. However both J & M – though it was observed that Melissa does defer to Jordan – became *quite reticent* when asked about their feelings towards their respective parents or where they would like to live." [Incidentally I'm surprised the children were asked this as Pat said that they never ask such direct questions of kids as young as J & M.] The social workers repeatedly stress such things as: "From our observations and opportunities to speak with both children, their contact with their mother and half siblings is a very rewarding experience for them both" and "J & M have demonstrated a close and enjoyable relationship with Andy." It is obvious that my children are far too scared of their father to say what is in their hearts and what it is **they** want. It is obvious that they are being forced to say things which aren't true. All the evidence is there. Why is this allowed to continue? Why don't Social Services remove the children from their abusive father immediately? Social Services manager Terry James told me to have GW prosecuted for emotional abuse. When GW first took my children from me Social Services manager Ian Turner told me that social services cannot intervene *unless there is evidence of a child/children being abused.* How much evidence do they need? If they're not going to do that then they should at the very least be strongly recommending the **immediate** return of my children and that the father should have much reduced contact. Joint care would enable him to continue to deny me contact and continue to emotionally abuse the children. How can the social workers be in favour of that?

Wherever possible, the social workers have tried to present our case neutrally but in the doing they do not reveal the true picture. On the one hand they say: "Each

parent blames the other for inciting any conflict” and “because of the difficulties which the adults have in acting reasonably together in the best interests of the children....” then they back up what I am saying which **shows** that I am telling the truth and that GW is the liar. For example, they report: “*Mr W has made what we believe to be malicious referrals* with regard to Ms Kilby.” Regarding the allegation that J & M had head lice and flea bites, they state: “We were concerned about this allegation because, in our view, it was *completely unfounded.*” Also “He reported the children to be ill on sports day knowing that their mother would be attending school on that day.” And “GW has also failed to attend a hospital appointment for Jordan’s hearing to be assessed and two Ophthalmic appointments. It is felt that *this is because he is aware that SK may well be present.*” They further expose GW to be the liar when they state that the evidence does not back up his allegations. For example: “We have not observed anything which might cause us to believe that Jordan is in any way wary or frightened of Andy.” Their 3<sup>rd</sup> report is full of comments like they have repeatedly “stated to both Ms Kilby and Mr W that their ongoing animosity towards each other will continue to cause emotional harm to J & M. We have repeatedly sought to point out to both parents that they must endeavour to conduct themselves appropriately when in the company of their children. To do otherwise will cause J & M emotional distress.” Since the court order of July 4<sup>th</sup> 2003 until we attended court on 24<sup>th</sup> Oct 2003 I had no direct contact with GW yet **he** still caused them emotional distress and he was still able to deny contact. For example, he told school that he was keeping Melissa off school [14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Oct] because she had a cold. This was during my contact time. By rights I should have been able to go to his house and collect her and nurse her back to health in my own home. But if I had done that GW would have assaulted me and swiftly thrown me off his property. At such times not only does my child miss out on contact but he/she is also separated from his/her sibling. This is a further blow because they both look to each other for comfort. When I saw her in school on 16/10/03 Melissa was very upset and choking back tears in class. Teacher Mrs Ventri witnessed this. In front of her father she was too scared to run to me; she didn’t dare to even look at me. He insisted on taking her into class. When the children lived with me GPs told me that illness wasn’t an excuse to prevent contact. The social workers are missing the point and they have watered down the reality of the situation when they state things like: “In focusing on the best interests of the children, the *main* aim should be the reduction of opportunities for dispute.” The main aim should be reducing the opportunity for GW to abuse the children and behave malignantly. You don’t achieve that by giving in to the aggressor. Social services shirk their responsibility as so-called protectors of children when they don’t focus on the real problem. They fail children when their reporting presents a distorted picture.

The report contains some untruths and it isn't altogether factual or just. They state that since their last Addendum provided for court in May 2003, GW has fully cooperated with the contact arrangements. Social services themselves have documented that this isn't true. They also state that I agreed to carefully consider shared care as a serious option. I said that such arrangements are obviously better than 3 nights pw contact, but in order to stop GW denying me contact and to protect my children from abuse, residence to me is the only option, preferably with much reduced contact for GW. The social workers report: "They also drew pictures of their families which included all family members." Actually I saw both pictures and Melissa did not draw her father or her older half-brother [GW's son, L] and neither of them drew their older half-sister [GW's daughter, K]. Why weren't these facts reported? Pat had commented about the drawings on the phone on 5<sup>th</sup> August 03 and had said that she firmly believes that Melissa wants to come home to me to live and that she had told them that she "loves mummy to bits." Pat said that Jordan had said that he wants to live with "mum and dad." She told me that their pictures reflected that. I had overheard some of the things that J & M said to Pat and Elaine on 1<sup>st</sup> August. I heard Melissa telling Pat that she doesn't want to live with her dad because she doesn't like him. When Pat asked her if her dad gets cross, she said "yes" and that he punches things and hits her and throws her in bed. I also heard Jordan telling Pat that he wants to live with "both". Melissa even told Pat in front of me that she is scared of her father. Yet none of these remarks are in the social workers' report. WHY??? [Later when giving evidence, Pat said she didn't recall that conversation. All she said was a safe *neutral* "they want mum when they are with her and dad when they are with him." Yet even that wasn't stated in the report.] Further examples of the social workers reporting inaccurately are: "We anticipate that when Social Services withdraw there may well be problems with the non caring parent having regular and consistent contact." Presented in such a way they are suggesting that I too did not and would not support contact. They know that this is not the case and acknowledge so in their statement: "Following her separation from GW, SK demonstrated her willingness to promote contact between J & M and their father." Why didn't they report accurately and state that there would only be continuing problems re contact if the children continue to live with **their father**? Also, they "have continued throughout the assessment to point out the importance of Ms K and Mr W reaching an agreement to be civil towards each other in front of the children. Although Ms Kilby acknowledged the benefit of this action for the children she sees this course of action as being conceding to Mr W." That is not quite correct and is again woefully missing the point. Being civil towards each other is not the issue because when we do have direct contact we *are* civil; we barely say anything to each other. The issue is the behind the scenes, secret and sly behaviour of GW. It is not about 'winning' either. This is about my two children being abused by their father and about my struggle to protect *them*. This is about my struggle to have regular contact with them, in fact. We are constantly

under attack by GW. My children are intimidated by their father. He is ordering them to turn against me. If they dare disobey him and dare show their love for me, he bullies them. I have continually explained that it is simply not possible for us to work together without 3<sup>rd</sup> party witnesses. GW refuses to keep his side of the agreement. He refuses to comply with court orders. He lies and manipulates at will. It is all documented by the welfare agencies. I am in a damned position. You cannot work with someone who is an evil-minded, compulsive, habitual, barefaced liar. The police should have dealt with GW and his criminal behaviour years ago. The Dolgellau police should have dealt with him when he was abusing his ex wife and his older children. The courts should have dealt with him long before now.

The social services 3<sup>rd</sup> report contains illogical statements and flawed recommendations. The social workers state: "Only by giving each parent equal rights, roles and responsibilities, the likelihood of future acrimony may be diminished." Also, "*Although we had previously felt that the children should return to the care of their mother, we are now conscious that this may likely lead to ongoing acrimony.*" Such reporting leaves me dumbfounded. Do the social workers seriously suppose that by having everything shared that GW will miraculously start behaving himself and start to consider the welfare of the children?!!! They have now given GW carte blanche to continue in his heinous ways. I have repeatedly told the social workers that whilst GW has residence or joint residence, he will deny me contact and manipulate to his heart's content. In so doing, the children suffer. He can also continue to prevent J & M attending important medical appointments. Is this right? When the children lived with me he did not have the same opportunities. Reporting such as: "The only possible fair outcome for them as parents would be a shared care arrangement" is downright shameful. This isn't about what is *fair* for us parents, this is supposed to be about the protection and welfare of **children** and what's best for **them**.

The reporting is contradictory. For example, on the one hand P & E say: "*We continue to be concerned for the emotional well-being of both J & M whilst they are in the sole care of Mr W*" and they report widely of their fears of priming, yet on the other they state that "to reduce contact between the children and *either* parent could prove to be detrimental." It is evident that reduced contact with their father would be beneficial to J & M. Why didn't the social workers stick to their original recommendations? Why have they backed down? What has changed? NOTHING. The evidence is that GW has continued with his criminal behaviour and that he will continue to do so because the relevant agencies condone it. It doesn't seem to matter that the children are being harmed by their father. The

social workers have even reported *their fears* that GW will not change his ill-willed ways. It would appear that pressure has been brought to bear on the social workers to *not* report truthfully, accurately and clearly and make recommendations which would serve the children's best interests. GW's aim ever since I left him in 1998 has been to cause me as much pain and hardship as possible. He achieves this through my children in exactly the same way as he did with his ex wife and her children. He succeeded where she was concerned. It is acknowledged in welfare reports that GW is working to cause all of my children to be removed from me by triggering child protection procedures against me. That is a crime. His malicious referrals are relentless. Pat and Elaine report that there have been 17 referrals requiring investigation, but that didn't include the almost weekly malicious referrals to social workers Maureen Catherall and Debra Curbishley during their 9-month comprehensive risk assessment when my children were on the At Risk register. Many men have been locked up for cases of harassment of a far less serious nature. When are the law enforcement bodies going to protect domestic violence victims – the vulnerable women and children - from violent and vindictive men like GW?

Pat and Elaine state: "We have suggested that a neutral third party should be agreed to execute transfer of the children until such time as the parents can communicate civilly in the presence of J & M." That should read "*as the father*", not parents because *he* is the one who is doing the bullying and the threatening and *he* is the one who refuses to give the children emotional permission to come to me and instead tells them *not* to do so and to run back to him. But that statement is again dodging the issue and is a misrepresentation of the situation. GW can quite often be civil towards me when we are in direct contact with each other, in fact, he can be very nice towards me. But he is fork tongued and full of treachery. The issue is the importance of changing the *behind-the-scenes* sly and thuggish behaviour of the father. The evidence shows that GW has bullied, lied and schemed, brainwashed, primed and controlled the kids in a negative and harmful way throughout. The evidence shows that he will continue to do so unless and until the law enforcement and child protection bodies stop him. Until then there will always be a need for 3<sup>rd</sup> party witnesses.

On the matter of the burn, the only thing that the social workers report is that Andy denied the allegation. There is an abundance of evidence that GW has repeatedly committed perjury in this regard. This is further backed up by the fact that many questions addressed to his solicitor Mr Hind of Amphletts remain unanswered.

Unbelievably the social services report ends with the suggestion that it might be an idea to refer the matter back to CAFCASS - simply because GW has refused to cooperate with the social workers. Talk about giving in to the bully! It is one thing that the children and I are intimidated by GW, but why are social services intimidated by him? Are they capable of doing their job or not? They cannot be concerned about the children's welfare. If they were they would be protesting strongly and reporting in the same tone if they heard a suggestion from GW or anyone else which would lead to further delay in court proceedings. They would most certainly not be encouraging it. The social workers "have real doubts about Mr W's ability to co-operate with us further" and "would suggest that consideration be given to referring the matter to CAFCASS for a report regarding residence if further report is required." They say: "We appreciate that there may be some delay but it may mean that Mr W will be more co-operative with a CAFCASS officer." Most staggeringly of all is their mention of Ivor Hughes. He is the incompetent official who passed the assessment to them in the first place!

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. This is clearly emotionally very abusive to the children should they be aware of it or hear it." If she had checked with School staff she would have known that GW is 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 regarding 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 are that because of contact with me, Jordan's confidence is declining, he soils his underpants and hides his heavily soiled undies, his head banging has increased and that contact with me is unsettling for both Jordan and Melissa....] which suggests that *she* believes that GW behaves maliciously. The truth is Jordan head bangs at his father's house and he soils and then hides his underwear there because he is terrified 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.

The children [especially Mel] are often reluctant to come to me when changeover is at H/Q. On one occasion GW pushed Mel towards me telling her to "go to your mother." It was nauseous. There he was playing 'Mr Nice Guy', doing what all the welfare professionals tell estranged parents to do i.e. he was seemingly giving Mel *emotional permission* to come to me; this after he'd spent the previous week brainwashing my kids and telling them NOT to come to me; NOT to show me affection. If they dare tell him they love me, he threatens that he will take them away and that they will never see me again. They are so terrified of him that they sit almost emotionless in his car. Mel wanted to wave to me and blow kisses through her father's car window but when he saw what she was doing, she immediately clammed up and just stared at me; her big beautiful eyes haunted, sorrowful, sullen.... GW poisons my kids' minds on a regular basis; telling them that Andy and I burned them when they were babies....

Pat's and Elaine's manager David Hynes tried unsuccessfully to contact GW during the week beginning 7/6/04 when GW breached the c/o *yet again*. GW even hung up on Pat when she did finally get through. He made excuses as to why they could not see the children, even saying that he had a hospital outpatient appointment [they didn't check that out though.] He told more blatant lies when he accused one of them of having an affair with my dad. It got to the stage where P & E *again* had to refer to their legal dept in an effort to secure his compliance. I can imagine the reaction if I'd contacted the Authorities complaining that the children are frightened to return to their father's because of something he was saying. I'd be considered a laughing stock, told to stop wasting their time and ordered to hand the kids over. I'd probably even be arrested; my door would be kicked in if I didn't answer it and I'd be prosecuted. I can imagine the reaction of Social Services if I refused to allow them to speak to J & M. They would step in almost immediately and snatch the kids. They wouldn't give me 5 minutes if I was trying to dictate terms, never mind days or months on end of non-cooperation. Then they'd follow that with a heavily damning report against me. Why are the Child Welfare agencies allowing Gareth Williams to *continue* to play games with them? Why are they letting him make complete and utter fools out of them??? When I tell the social workers that GW is forcing my children to repeat lies, they say I'm probably right but that priming is difficult to prove. They said they have to *hear it from J & M*. I begged Elaine to somehow try and urge the kids to open up and tell the truth about what is happening, what their father is doing. I suggested she say something like: "If I told you that you don't have to see daddy again, how would you feel?" She said that is exactly what she wants to do but there are ways

they can go about it and ways they can't; not without leaving themselves wide open to having **complaints made**. It is up to P & E how they interview the kids. Surely the important thing is to GET J & M TO REVEAL THE TRUTH. DO SOCIAL SERVICES WANT TRUTH OR NOT??? **What terrified child is going to squeal on his/her violent and abusive father, especially when the child knows he/she has to go to that abuser again?** I asked the social workers to do a video interview *in my presence*. I was told that they need to talk to the children first; also that they would *need* GW's consent too. Jesus! It beggars belief. It is no wonder that so many children in society are being abused. There is absolutely no protection for them but plenty for their abusers. In any case, why interview the children at all? Haven't they had enough of that already? Why do they have to suffer any more trauma? Pat said on oath [24/10/03] that the assessments cause J & M distress. Aren't 3 explicit social services reports and numerous welfare reports sufficient to show that **GW is priming the children and that HE is full of malice and has ulterior motives?** [Pat and Elaine stated in their 14/7/04 letter to Court that they are "concerned regarding the effect of numerous investigations on the children."]

Look how it is one rule for Gareth Williams and one rule for me. By joves if I made referrals to the child welfare agencies I could bet my life that the rules would swiftly change. If I and/or some of my friends and relatives phoned all the agencies, playing the same sort of dirty games as GW & co, the kids would be asked if I'd put words into their mouths. J & M are not scared of me so they would simply tell the truth and say "yes". Even if they didn't repeat things that I'd given them permission to say and even encouraged them to say, social services would trick them into saying what they want to hear. Then I'd be accused of priming which I am without doubt WOULD GO AGAINST ME IMMEDIATELY. And if that didn't work, social services would simply be economical with the truth. They are experts at that. They can report what they like because interviews with kids are done in secret. It's obvious why S/S managers are not so keen on doing a video interview. They daren't risk a bit of truth emerging. When I told Pat that I wouldn't put it to the test, she said she knows and said that I *can't lower myself to that level*. Jesus wept, over the years all I've ever been told by all the child protection agencies, including doctors and psychiatrists, is to hand my children over to their abusive father for contact, even if they were ill. Social worker Maureen Catherall told *me* to put my screaming, crying babies into their father's car. A judge threatened *me* with prison, even though I'd never once blocked contact. No one EVER gave me permission to deny contact.

When I asked Pat if she could see now why I was begging her and Elaine NOT to

recommend Joint Residence last October [2003], she told me that they felt that if GW didn't get some of what he wanted, he would just make my life as miserable as hell. Well it is clear that he will do that, regardless. Why are the social workers allowing him to make the kids' lives miserable too? I told P that I knew this was going to happen sooner or later, that's why I really wanted her and E to stick to their guns with the residence bit and HIM to be forced to accept just contact. She said: "Elaine and I battled and battled and battled and it would've started even earlier if you'd had the most custody as he would still have had the contact." She said she was amazed that he had left it this long. She said she is as frustrated as me that this hasn't been sorted and that Gareth Williams has got to answer for all this. Why don't they *report* in such strong tones then??? If they did, maybe he *would* have to answer for his crimes and maybe Jordan and Melissa would get the protection they need. Until then, Gareth Williams and men like him will continue to abuse their children and cock a snook at authority. It is high time that social and welfare workers raise issue with those at the top of their chain of command for the sake of the children. It is **not** ok to take the safe, easy option of sitting on the fence; not where children's lives are concerned.

Pete said this is tantamount to ABUSE. Of course it is, my children are being abused by their father and [worse] by ALL the child protection authorities due to incompetence, inaction and corrupt practices. Further all my children and I are suffering a gross violation of Article 3 [mental torture] in the European Court of Human Rights. I also suffer a gross violation of my Article 6 rights – a right to a fair hearing before an independent and impartial judge; and also the right to free expression.

Pat and Elaine finally managed to speak with Jordan and Melissa at school on Monday 14<sup>th</sup> June 2004. Elaine told me that J & M speak positively about their time with me, Andrew and Shelly but that Melissa is "**stuck with this little primed phrase**" of not liking me and that I am going to hurt her. [In their 14/7/04 letter to Court, they state that Melissa was "unable to describe the context of the circumstances leading up to [her] statement" and "there was insufficient evidence to conclude they were at risk from their mother."] She said they are delightful kids. Elaine told me that the teachers are pleased with both J & M. They have no problems at all with their schooling; there is nothing negative in their behaviour at school; nothing being picked up by the teachers that is of any concern whatsoever. Both are doing very well at their work, both have bags more confidence and both have lots of friends. The teachers say that the children know which parent is collecting them and there is certainly no reticence at the end of the school day. Many people, including teachers, parents, local Llysfaen residents and folk who use the same busses as us have all told me what big changes they have noticed in J & M over recent months. They all say that J & M are so much

more happier now and relaxed and confident. That is more **proof** if it were needed that J & M have been deeply affected; deeply traumatised by the abuse inflicted on them by their father. As regards GW's referral, Elaine told me **they have no concerns**; they have no evidence to support his allegations. As a result they arranged for me to see the children at school [Elaine didn't specify a day so as to avoid giving GW the opportunity of keeping them off again.] Shelly and I saw J & M at school on 16/6/04. The children were, after initial surprise and slight anxiety about whether they were 'allowed' to show us affection, very happy to see us. They were both openly loving and close towards me and Shelly. Melissa was very close to tears. During our time on the school playing field afterwards, Melissa spent most of the time lying on top of me and cuddling up close to me. She kissed me and whispered that she loved me. [She was too afraid to say the words in front of other children and teachers.] Shelly asked Jordan if his dad had told him and Melissa to say that I'm going to kill them. He said "yes". She encouraged him to tell the social workers the truth. He told us that he can't because he is scared of his dad; he said his dad shouts at him, hits him and throws him in bed. He said he doesn't like his dad. He said when he is older he will tell Pat and Elaine everything; that his dad makes him say things.... Anyway, putting priming aside, what happened to social services' *concerns* about children needing the *emotional permission* of a parent to go to the other? GW is clearly not giving that. Elaine visited me [15/6/04] regarding more of GARETH WILLIAMS' never ending list of so-called 'concerns'. Her visit revealed that he is still stalking me and my kids. I asked Elaine if she and Pat would now write a supportive report for court, which would help in my application for full residence, but she said they wouldn't do that unless asked by the court and she added **there is no reason why the court would ask them for one**. Pete said if social services had real concerns they'd be talking about having a case conference and taking action. He said that since that is not the case, I do not have strong enough grounds to apply for residence. [I recall my barrister once telling me *a few years ago* that if GW continues to make malicious allegations that would be reason enough to *stop his contact!*] I shouldn't have to apply for the protection of my children. The Judge should've automatically ruled residence to me and prison for Gareth Williams. The social workers should be in full support of that. No child on earth is safe whilst we have stinking, evil Masonic infested agencies and courts.

Re the allegation that Jordan walked to his father's [26/6/04], I later walked there with J out of curiosity. It took us 1¾ hours and he was walking quickly; even running at times. J initially told me that he'd walked to his father's but the next day he said that he hadn't. He said he'd been sitting on our driveway waiting for Shelly and his father drove up and told him to get in the car. I asked him to tell P & E or his teacher what really happened but he said he can't because he is

scared of his dad. I told him that his dad won't know cos I won't tell anyone. He said his dad finds out everything. He said when he's older he won't care if his dad puts him in bed early without his tea cos he will jump out of his window and run to my house. He said that he wants to die. He has made comments about wanting to kill himself before.

It has been widely reported in welfare reports that GW is stalking us; he knows my movements and he is having me watched. Therefore I am extra careful about not letting J & M out of my sight but it is impossible and unrealistic to watch both kids at the same time every second of the day. There are times when I've asked them to wait outside public toilets for me or when I am playing in the park with one child and the other is playing on something else. There are plenty of opportunities for GW to snatch the kids or one of them and that has been one of my biggest dreads. He regularly drives down my road and is often seen in the local area. His daughter K and her husband are also often seen at the places we frequent. P & E said that I run the risk of smothering and over protecting the kids though; after all they are 6 and 7 years old and 8 year olds are considered old enough to be unaccompanied in a swimming pool.

GW regularly keeps J & M off school for no other reason than 'illness'. He is never more specific. He was guilty of the same re his older children. Welfare officer Vera Nolan documented that the Headmistress of Dolgellau High School [where his older children attended] told her: "There were major concerns about Mr Williams' care and management of L & K. These were over and above what in itself was a serious problem of non-school attendance." So much for his concern [and that of the LEA, child protection and law enforcement agencies] about the children receiving an education! J's and M's school reports [July 2004] state that in the last year M was absent 35 days i.e. 7 weeks and J absent 15 days i.e. 3 weeks. I had kept Mel off school for 2 of those days and Jordan off for only 1 of those days. GW did not take Jordan to school until mid morning on the Monday after the weekend when J went missing [28/6/04] because he knew I'd be there dropping Melissa off and that I would speak to him. Neither did he allow J to go to school on Tuesday 29/6/04 because it was Sports day and GW knew I'd be there. His excuse was that J had a 'cold'. He was making sure that I didn't get a chance to reassure and comfort J and ask him to tell me the TRUTH.

In court on 15/7/04 Judge Williams threatened *both* GW and I with Care Proceedings and prison. Why such strong tones? Could it have something to do

with the surprising result of *me* gaining a small court victory!

Jordan in particular is so controlled by his father now that he does not realise the consequences of his actions. On one occasion [23/7/04] he stormed off in a huff and headed towards his father's house just because Shelly wouldn't allow him to play on her game cube. Luckily he was spotted by a kindly school teacher [Barbara Jones] who recognised him and stopped him. He lied when he told her that Shelly was hurting him because he couldn't say what she'd done. He later admitted that he'd lied. This is very dangerous because kids Jordan's age [7] act on impulse; they just don't think. He felt he'd suffered an injustice and so he did what his dad is constantly telling him to do. He ran off. Jordan does what his father tells him to do because he is so **screwed up and is too scared to do otherwise**. He has been programmed by his irresponsible father to run away and to lie about us if I or anyone else in our family tries to discipline him. Gareth Williams obviously doesn't care that he is encouraging the kids to walk into danger - next time Jordan might be found by a murderer. What chance now have I got of disciplining the children? What a nightmare now for Shelly to baby-sit the kids or for any future baby sitter that I might employ. I have not punished J for walking off. He knows now he can get away with whatever he wants because if I so much as raise my voice to him or refuse him something, he will just be off. The kids are constantly being told by their father that this is what they're *supposed to do*. The schoolteacher contacted social services but thankfully Elaine was sympathetic towards me and brought him straight back. Jordan has no idea that this could however lead to me never seeing him or Melly again. J & M told me on 16<sup>th</sup> August 2004 when they returned to me after their two weeks summer hol with their father that he had made Jordan **PROMISE** to leave 'mum's' and walk to 'dad's'. Jordan is being **FORCED** to walk to his father's. There doesn't have to be a reason. What if he gets run over by a car if he attempts it another time or what if he gets stopped by 'Jack the Ripper'. Now I have to lock the doors and shut the windows to prevent him walking off and I have to watch him like a hawk when we go out anywhere. We shouldn't have to live like this. It is a never-ending nightmare.

I used to think, rather naively, that J & M will grow up knowing the truth about their father and that it wouldn't be too long before they would be telling welfare officers that they don't want anything to do with him. Little did I realise that evil men like him have such a hatred for the mothers of their children that they will never stop punishing them for refusing to be controlled anymore, for finally standing up to their abusers, for daring to leave them and for holding them to account. Little did I realise that monsters like him have such a hold over the weak and vulnerable and

that it is easier for kids to go along with what they are being bullied to say and do by their bad parent rather than standing up to evil and choosing the good parent. Little did I realise that men like him are protected by our paedophilic-polluted, misogynistic child welfare agencies, law enforcement bodies and courts.

On 25/8/04 the NSPCC sent me their most recent report. There was no mention of the reports that Pat had **read out to me** i.e. the 29/4/04 report re Melissa's operation or the 3/6/04 report re me allegedly telling the kids that I'm going to kill them. [Referrals had been made to the NSPCC by GW and one of his relatives.] There was no mention of GW's call on or around the 10<sup>th</sup> June to the NSPCC re his request that P & E do not take J & M from his house because of the children's supposed fear that P & E will return them to me either. It would seem that Mr O'Marah or someone else at NSPCC is either lying or has somehow misplaced them and if the latter is the case, then why didn't Mr O'Marah simply contact Pat and ask for copies of hers? The report that NSPCC did send me is dated January 20<sup>th</sup> 2004. As usual the identity of the caller is protected *in compliance with the Data Protection Act!!!* The only bit of truth contained in the NSPCC report is on the last page re their call to Pat. It states: "The call was terminated due to another worker pressing panic alarm and *in danger at Conwy Social Services.*" Social services pose a grave danger; not just to its workers, but to society at large whilst its higher echelons remain infected by Freemasonry. The NSPCC counsellor KS advised the caller that if the situation failed to improve, to call the Helpline again. Her name and telephone number was provided to the caller. It's a shame she didn't give her details to me. I would have been able to tell her that she was supporting and encouraging a child abuser and that she was working for a Masonic/paedophilia contaminated agency. It is high time that those well meaning but naïve and brainwashed workers at NSPCC and similar agencies realised that they are furthering the suffering of little children. The detail included in the 6 page report reveals that the caller could be no other than the father himself – the child abusing slanderer Gareth Williams or a close member of *his* family [possibly his sister Cheryl Whittingham, who is reported as being a *significant other.*] There is no evidence to substantiate any of the allegations but plenty to disprove them. Everything that is reported [except for a new allegation {that incidentally took GW several years to mention!!!} that I'm supposed to have told GW that my dad abused me when I was a little girl, that J has "openly said he does not like his grandfather" and consequently the NSPCC state "It is of serious concern that the children are having continued contact with their maternal grandfather"] has been stated numerous times before in various referrals/reports/statements. As a result, the recommendation of the NSPCC's KS is that "CAFCASS be involved, so that the *children can have their say.*" This, of course, has been Gareth Williams' plan all along. His ultimate aim is to have my

kids removed from me and for me to be denied all contact with them. Pat informed the NSPCC that all the information received in the referral was known to social services. Pat and Elaine have helped ensure that his dirty scheming has not worked so far. However there will come a day when it does go back to CAFCASS. Jordan is now 7 years old, Melissa 6. God knows at what age they will be able to influence court proceedings. Going on the pattern of events thus far, that eventuality is not too far away. My children will of course be obliged to continue to repeat to the 'important' people everything that their father forces them to say. If nothing changes, I will ultimately lose contact with my children altogether. My fate and that of my children will be sealed, just like it was for GW's ex wife and her children. My biggest dread is looming. Will anyone help us?

The Masonic Mafia are probably hoping that I'm gonna give up the fight, throw in the towel and leave my kids to their fate. Failing that, no doubt they are hoping that I will suffer the final straw which tips me over the edge. They're probably hoping I'll flip my lid and do something in haste that I'll live to regret. They probably want me to hire a 'cleaner' [which will be another scum Mason] to duff up the devil's advocate or they think I might snatch the kids and run. Either would give them the excuse to lock me up for a very long time and deny me my kids once and for all. The dirty brigade will do anything to silence their critics and steal from the public purse. They engineer long drawn out proceedings in their Kangaroo courts; they concoct anything to keep their victims floundering in a sea of evil. They steal your time, money, health and your sanity. And if you've got kids, they'll take them too. Freemasonry is a festering sore on society.

Be very suspicious of those who occupy positions of trust. They are occupied by criminals, paedophiles and money priests dressed as judges and lawyers and officers of the State. They are a monstrous con job - a den of vipers and thieves. But the systemic corruption is sliming out of the huge cancer that has now burst open. It is being exposed now like never before and the treacherous leeches are slowly destroying themselves on the sword of TRUTH. Police states only rise when good people allow evil to continue unchecked. The Bible says to rebuke evil; it doesn't say to keep quiet. The Lord is your Shield. Trust in HIM. Stand up and shout out for what's right.

[sharonzaki@gmail.com](mailto:sharonzaki@gmail.com)

## A VISITOR FROM THE PAST

By Thelan Paulk, 1986

P O Box 437

Watervliet, MI 49098-0437

I had a dream the other night, I didn't understand.

A figure walking through the mist, with flintlock in his hand.

His clothes were torn and dirty, as he stood beside my bed.

He took off his three-cornered hat, and speaking low, he said:

"We fought a revolution, to secure our liberty.

We wrote the Constitution, as a shield from tyranny.

For future generations, this legacy we gave,

In this, the land of the free and the home of the brave.

"The freedom we secured for you, we hoped you'd always keep,

But tyrants laboured endlessly while your parents were asleep.

Your freedom gone – your courage lost – you're no more than a slave,

In this, the land of the free and the home of the brave.

"You buy permits to travel, and permits to own a gun.

Permits to start a business, or to build a place for one.

On land that you believe you own, you pay a yearly rent.

Although you have no voice in choosing, how the money's spent.

"Your children must attend a school, that doesn't educate.

Your Christian values can't be taught, according to the state.

You read about the current news, in a very biased press.

You pay a tax you do not owe, to please the I.R.S.

"Your money is no longer made of Silver, or of Gold.

You trade your wealth for paper, so your life can be controlled.

You pay for crimes that make our Nation, turn from God in shame.

You've taken Satan's number, as you've traded in your name.

"You've given government control, to those who do you harm.

So they can padlock churches, and steal the family farm.

And keep our country deep in debt, put men of God in jail.

Harass your fellow countrymen, while corrupted courts prevail.

"Your public servants don't uphold, the solemn oath they've sworn.

Your daughters visit doctors, so their children won't be born.

Your leaders, ship artillery and guns to foreign shores.

And send your sons to slaughter, fighting other people's wars.

"Can you regain the freedom for which we fought and died?

Or don't you have the courage, or the faith to stand with pride?

Are there no more values, for which you'll fight to save?

Or do you wish your children, to live in fear and be a slave?

"Sons of the Republic, arise and take a stand!

Defend the Constitution, the Supreme Law of the Land!

Preserve our great Republic, and each God-given Right!  
And pray to GOD to keep the torch, of Freedom burning bright!”

As I awoke he vanished, in the mist from whence he came.  
His words were true, we are not free, we have ourselves to blame.  
For even now as tyrants, trample each God-given Right.  
We only watch and tremble, too afraid to stand and fight.

If he stood by your bedside, in a dream, while you're asleep.  
And wondered what remains of our Rights he fought to keep.  
What would be your answer, if he called out from the Grave:  
IS THIS STILL THE LAND OF THE FREE, AND THE HOME OF THE BRAVE???