

September 09, 2006

[REDACTED]

Re: *In Re San Diego Family Law Court Judicial Incompetency, Bias , Dismissal and Coverup*

Enclosed copy of June 25, 2006 attorney's correspondence, received by Superior Family Law Court which prompted the premature departure notification , dated July 26, 2006, of the Hon. Randa Trapp, newly elected Superior Court Judge, exactly one month later to the day

Dear [REDACTED]

Please note that this correspondence is being drafted on September 09, 2006, a Saturday, so not on *County time* nor by utilizing any County funds or other resources.

We, Superior Family Law Court employees, respectfully request your involvement and intervention as one incompetent Family Law Court judge is removed while being replaced with another justice of a similar reputation

We have enclosed copies of documents which are currently being quietly circulated around the Downtown Family Law Superior Court. Over the years, we and fellow co-workers have abided by the *Code of Ethics* of maintaining the confidentiality of what we have gained knowledge of during our employment with the Downtown San Diego Superior Family Law Court. Many of us have gained access to numerous improprieties that would have desecrated this Court's reputation but have remained silent, in obvious fear of losing our employment and also possible legal repercussions.

Many of us have, or are, contemplating requesting transfers as we are repentant of our silence maintained for so long a period of time. The Hon. Thomas Hendrix in Dept. F-1 has since requested that he depart Family Court at the end of the year to prevent his further involvement in this scandal.

The deception and coverup so rampant in San Diego Superior Family Law Court needs to ultimately be brought to light, and we felt that the media would have the available resources that we lack to bring this vital information to the public's attention.

We have been witness to the lives of too many, children and parents alike, being traumatized over the years by judicial ineptitude and biases with rulings which have resulted in the alienation of children from siblings and also competent and loving parents from their children.

Much research and documentation serves to substantiate that *Parental Alienation* will result in many of our youth of today, upon reaching their adult years, will increase the population of our Penal Systems due to the emotional desolation they faced in their younger years from disreputable and prejudicial judicial rulings. Permit us to recommend you research P.A.S. (*Parental Alienation Syndrome*) to gain an in depth perception of what desecration is caused to the lives of children by being inappropriately separated from both parents and siblings alike due to the *Abuse of Discretion* of Family Law Court justices.

Family Law Court personnel have recently been made aware of media interest and investigations into several Family Law Court cases so are compelled to bring the following to the attention of others at this time.

The Hon. Randa Trapp (we personally find the term *Honorable* for this woman repugnant) was elected to her seat in Family Law Court, Dept. F-6, in the Primary Election held on June 6, 2006. She has served in this capacity from October of 2003 until her August 7, 2006 departure. Her being elected was to the dismay of all in Family Court who were open and earnest enough to vent their viewpoints of Trapp.

Randa Trapp was able to obtain 74.61% of the vote. She was the only incumbent Superior Court judge who faced any challenge in this election with a total of fifty seats up for re-election. Her new term in office was to have begun on January 1, 2007.

In the May 19, 2006 **UNION-TRIBUNE EDITORIAL** was written:

“Two for the bench

Rubin, **Trapp best** for the Superior Court

Now, you get to be the judge.

Eight candidates for three Superior Court judgeships will appear on the primary election ballot next month. In two of those races there are only two candidates, meaning those contests are certain to be decided on June 6. With four candidates in the third contest, it will likely go to a runoff in the November general election.

Of the two races to be decided next month, **one is a slam dunk.**

In the Office 16 contest, **incumbent Judge Randa Trapp** is being challenged by attorney James Hairgrove, but there is really no contest here.

Trapp, also rated well qualified by the bar association, has been on the bench for three years, serving in Family Court. Hairgrove, who was rated as ““lacking qualification”” by the bar association, appeared before **Trapp** in a divorce case and, according to **Trapp**, was not happy with the outcome. That's hardly a legitimate reason to challenge a highly competent sitting judge.

One tough choice and one slam dunk. We recommend David Rubin and **Randa Trapp**."

However, we were unable to obtain any substantiation that Randa Trapp ever had the endorsement of the San Diego County Bar Association. Trapp's alleged endorsement by the *La Raza Lawyers Association*, a non-profit association, is of no substantial merit in comparison to the thousands of licensed attorneys in the county of San Diego who did not endorse Trapp. "Formed in 1979, with a handful of Latino attorneys, San Diego La Raza Lawyers Association (SDLRLA) has grown to represent over three hundred Latino and Latina lawyers practicing in San Diego County." It is well recognized that local lawyers had given Judge Trapp the nicknames of both "**Judge Crapp**" and "**Rat Trapp**" shortly ensuant to her taking the bench in Family Court.

UNION-TRIBUNE writer, Greg Moran, proceeded to write in his pre-election editorial, the following:

"The bar rated Trapp as well-qualified, and gave Hairgrove a rating of lacking qualifications."

Many attorneys would care to know what "Bar" Mr. Moran was referring to above.

In another **UNION-TRIBUNE EDITORIAL** was written:

"A sole practitioner in La Mesa, Hairgrove said the impetus to challenge Trapp came when she presided over hearings in his divorce case. He disliked several rulings she made regarding child custody and support issues. He said Trapp treated him unfairly and rudely. At one point, he said, the judge set his income level at a point he disagreed with, and when he complained, he said, Trapp told him to "get another job."

"So I have said, Judge Trapp, I'm going to get another job," Hairgrove said in an interview. **"I want your job."**

Despite this, Hairgrove insisted he is not a disgruntled litigant. He said the Family Law System has to be overhauled, adding that judges should spend more time reviewing the cases in front of them and reading case files.

"Going up against a sitting judge is practically an impossibility," he said. **"But if I don't win, and it makes her look a little closer on how she performs her job, then you know what, I've done something good."**

Regrettably, as Attorney Hairgrove would soon detect, his fate and the consequences faced by his clients subsequently appearing before Judge Trapp were then sealed due to his having not only spoken out against her rulings but his opposition to Trapp's election.

As claimed in the *County of San Diego Voter Information Pamphlet* provided by the *Registrar of Voters* for the Primary June 6, 2006 Election, Judge Trapp's election was:

"SUPPORTED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AND THE LEGAL COMMUNITY.

Judge Randa Trapp is endorsed by: "**Sheriff Bill Kolendar** . . . **District Attorney Bonnie Dumanis** . . . **San Diego Mayor/Former Police Chief Jerry Sanders** . . . Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC), representing law enforcement in San Diego County . . . **Deputy Sheriffs Association** . . . San Diego Police Officers Association . . . La Mesa Police Officers Association . . . National Latino Police Officers Association . . . La Raza Lawyers Association . . . Women Prosecutors of California . . . over 100 Superior Court Judges."

RECOGNIZED FOR HER HONEST AND INTEGRITY.

"Judge Trapp has a proven record of fairness, honest and integrity on the bench. I urge you to support her re-election." . . . **Sheriff Bill Kolender**

This pamphlet did not, however, contain that Judge Trapp's appointment to the San Diego County Superior Court on July 23, 2003 was by **California's later recalled Governor, Gray Davis**, who was removed from office on October 07, 2003, 3½ months later . . . that her prior primary qualification was being an attorney for the *Sempre Energy Law Dept. Commercial Law Section* . . . that numerous of her recent judicial rulings are currently before the *Appellate Court*, or how, in spite of her being the mother to two young sons, Langston and Lawrence, she was a strong advocate behind the *Boy Scouts of America* losing their lease to retain their boys' camp in San Diego's Balboa Park

Regrettably, as the voting public routinely has demonstrated, they lack the time necessary to thoroughly research the background of all candidates prior to elections. They are then left to rely on the *Registrar of Voters Pamphlets* and mailed circulars for 'accurate' information. Judge Trapp had the funding which Attorney James Hairgrove lacked to pay for publicized endorsements.

Trapp proceeded to pay for her pre-election endorsement in **Republican Party circulars**, misleading the voting community into believing that she is aligned with the Republican Party. However, she is a registered (Socialist Liberal) Democrat. As foreseen, these pamphlets further contained a disclaimer stating they could not be held liable for the accuracy of any information they had placed in print.

The Court has full awareness of numerous complaints having been filed against Judge Trapp with the *Commission of Judicial Performance*. However, in it's forty odd year existence, **this Review Board has NEVER removed even one family law judge, not even the judge whose rulings resulted in the death of a child.** Though we feel the public should have been made aware of these complaints lodged, we are realistically not optimistic in assistance being obtained from this agency by litigants who have unjustly been ruled against by Judge Trapp.

As further verified on the web site, <http://www.familylawcourts.com/judging.html>:

"The Commission on Judicial Performance continues its practice of ignoring *All family court judges who appear to operate in their own little world.* As such, the refusal of CJP to act, has caused the death of numerous children in California. For instance, not only did Trevor Nolan die needlessly, so have many other children, but the CJP NEVER removed the judges whose rulings demonstrated deliberate indifference to undisputed evidence."

Trapp took the bench in Superior Family Law Court in Dept. F-6 in October of 2003, replacing Judge Joan (Danielson) Lewis. **Judge Lewis' departure from Family Court in August of 2003 was equally controversial** as, following her Judge/spouse, David Danielson's publicized extramarital affair and their subsequent dissolution, **her rulings against women concerning family financial support and child custody were notorious.** She also was discreetly, **and unceremoniously**, transferred out of Family Law Court to the Criminal Division of East County Court.

View the web site writeup,
<http://www.familylawcourts.com/countysandiegojudge.html>:

"JUDGE JOAN LEWIS, (formerly Danielson)

Any number of women jurists who have a chair at the big boys table do anything to keep it warm. However; the word on Lewis is **she's just plain bad.** Most recently reversed in the Peregrine case, prior to that she was reversed for "Abuse of Discretion" for not rewarding attorney fees in the Wal-Mart case. Previously Lewis was a fan of Real Solutions (Hannah's House); **always** bad news for parents and children. Lewis, be she in family or civil court, inspires the most mail and ties Commissioner Clements for appellate reversals. However, as her decision in the Peregrine suit from last April proves, **she keep Trying.**

We recommend bouncing Lewis with pre-emptive challenge. If your attorney won't bounce this judge, we recommend new counsel."

The voting public evidently failed to acknowledge the writeup on the web site, <http://www.familylawcourts.com/ongoing.html>, preceding their voting to elect Randa Trapp. The following appears on this site:

"JUDGE RANDA TRAPP

Judge Trapp is married to law enforcement and a big fan of Hannah's House . . . never mind that Susan Griffin is still paying restitution to the County and was fined by the State for practicing psychology without a license. **The police won't prosecute Griffin and judges like Trapp line her pockets. Avoid.**

As such, we recommend those ordered to use their service, either appeal the order; or demand the services of a volunteer. Just look at their history. Problems continue, especially if Hannah's House is involved.

One would expect, because children are the marketing cog in an industry whose motto is "mo' business", judges would at the very least *appear* to care about children. But one would be wrong. And now the former DA who refused to prosecute, is running for judge. would be wrong. **And now the former DA who refused to prosecute, is running for judge.**

Susan Griffin's Hannah's House remains 'Exhibit A' as to **how little regard judges have for children**, and why judicial disregard, at least in the case of Susan Griffin, now approaches two decades of disinterest.

Judges like Howatt, and Randa Trapp, (married to a cop), routinely orders kids into harms way, while parents remain ignorant to Hannah's House history.

The long history of no police action in spite of magazine cover stories and evidence of fraud, including page one news stories is proof judges and law enforcement officials alike are behind the **"worst interests of the child."**

As such, Hannah's House is in a class by itself. But, courtesy of San Diego Police, it's a Protected class . . . in spite of magazine and newspaper headlines. Bonnie Russell could never understand why judges allowed **attorney Mark Barber** to continue harming their daughter, or why they wouldn't Enforce the restraining orders she'd obtained.

However, consider the former felon arms dealer, and owner of the Rancho Santa Fe mansion where 39 people committed suicide, who almost was registered as a Psychological Assistant and one wonders why judges value reports at all."

The *San Diego County Voting Pamphlet* additionally contained the following on Trapp:
"HIGHLY QUALIFIED TO CONTINUE SERVING AS JUDGE.
U.S. Navy Veteran during Vietnam era . . . Law school professor . . ."

Trapp was born in 1954, and is 51 years of age. We have our well warranted concerns about the accuracy of this above information. We have confirmed that she is a U.S. Navy Veteran . . . BUT A VIETNAM VETERAN???? This honor should be bestowed only on those who are so deserving.

HANNAH'S LAW was not acknowledged by Judge Trapp upon her recently leaving a six year old child in the care of a *Registered Sexual Offender/* step-mother, even at a time when the Marines Officer/ pilot father was told to the Court as being **deployed overseas.**

A reportedly competent school teacher mother, Rebecca Lou Jones-Etherton, had appeared before Judge Trapp seeking primary custody of their young daughter, and her request was **denied without cause**. Ms. Jones-Etherton is represented by counsel, Garrison "Bud" Klueck, who may be willing to converse with you concerning this case.

Superior Court has had recent contact with the *San Diego County Sheriff's Department* over concerns of their Law Enforcement Agency becoming involved. Documentation exists of a **long-term friendship and also allegations made of inappropriate *ex parte* communication** between the husband of Judge Trapp's, Lawrence Trapp, a San Diego County Sheriff's Deputy/ Criminal Court Bailiff in Department 34, and a petitioner appearing before Judge Trapp since December of 2003, San Diego County Sheriff's Sergeant Thomas Evans. (Family Law Court case no. D 447216)

Recommendations were made that both of these Sheriff's Department employees contact the Deputy Sheriff's Association's Legal Defense Program for their assistance should this inappropriate *ex parte communication* between the Judge Trapp's spouse and a friend/ fellow Law Enforcement Officer became publicized. We discovered that this apprehension further escalated upon the court gaining awareness of Judge Trapp's rulings having been shown to consistently have been made in this Sheriff's Sergeant's favor, **many of which resulted from this Sergeant's own requests made of Trapp.**

Further concern was then voiced upon the Court learning of a ***Child Abuse Investigation*** against Sheriff's Sergeant Evans having been conducted by this Law Enforcement's Detectives following Sheriff's Department personnel having responded to two incidents. It is documented that Mr. Evans' children had run away from his care twice, and then purportedly had been returned to him by fellow Sheriff's Department coworkers without question or any investigation. Per a Sheriff's court bailiff, the children had **alleged both physical and emotional abuse plus also neglect at their father's hands.**

Though made aware of this prior Investigation, Trapp had **refused** the mother's pleas to obtain and view these Child Abuse findings while ordering that **this Law Enforcement Officer's children remain in his primary care.** One of this Officer's children had already been removed from his home by the court following it having been documented that the **father had caused a neck injury to his eldest son upon striking him.**

The court was also aware that, upon Sergeant Evans' children having run away from his care twice, the concerned mother had approached Judge Trapp. Per the court transcript, no evidence was cited of the mother's involvement in her children's runaway attempts and, **contrary to the recommendation made of minors counsel**, Trapp proceeded to ordered that the mother be permitted **only supervised contact** with her children **at the request made of her by San Diego County Sheriff's Sergeant Thomas Evans.**

This case is regularly spoken of in Family Court by the **San Diego County Sheriff's Department bailiffs** present, among others. Bailiffs had been repeatedly overheard,

contending they knew **which judge they would want to appear before** should they file for dissolution so they could ***"Take my wife to the cleaners too."***

There is another case of Judge Trapp's being routinely discussed . . . Case number D 469738, *Kathy Snyder vs Philip L. Gagnon, Jr.* Mr. Gagnon is a DUI attorney with an unscrupulous reputation given him by his prior associates due to his actions of both thievery and deception. Ms. Snyder is appearing in Propria Persona, and had approached Judge Trapp over their three daughters' voiced **fearfulness** and refusal to visit with their estranged father. **Trapp proceeded to order the immediate removal of the girls from their mother's home, and that she be permitted only supervised contact with them.**

Allegations of *ex parte communication* were again submitted to the Court. It is known that both Judge Trapp's husband and Attorney Philip Gagnon are acquainted and closely aligned, both working in the Criminal Court Division. It is purported that Ms. Snyder possesses documentation of matters spoken of in Court by Judge Trapp that were never addressed during the course of their legal proceedings.

It is reported that Ms. Snyder then became a primary supporter of Attorney Hairgrove's campaign, opposing Judge Trapp's election. The transcript reflects that she approached the court over Trapp's recusal, and her request was **initially denied**. Trapp called for a recess, and then reappeared nearly an hour later granting her request, only after having been seen speaking with Judge Howatt. This case was then transferred over to the Hon. Thomas Hendrix's court, and it is reported that **Trapp talked to this judge at length** about her disregard for this mother prior to this case coming before his court. **No imagination is essential in speculating what the future outcome of hearings in this woman's case will be.**

The Court received the enclosed correspondence, dated June 25, 2006, from a Family Law counsel who prudently chose to maintain anonymous. Our interpretation of this correspondence is that this counsel has no intentions of sharing what he (or she) has knowledge of with anyone besides Judges Howatt and Sammartino. It appears that this individual is just further aiding in the coverup. **Exactly one month to the day of receipt of this correspondence, notice was sent out on July 26, 2006 to those in official capacities of Judge Trapp's departure from Family Court, effective August 7, 2006.** The general public has yet to be made aware of this.

The Hon. William J. Howatt, Jr., **Randa Trapp's supervisor**, made it known that this information was not to be publicized but maintained under the strictest of confidence. We were instructed that the court was in need of a persuasive explanation for Judge Trapp's premature departure. **Being that Trapp was elected on June 6, 2006, only two months prior, and had yet to serve one day in her newly elected capacity, we were cognizant of the dilemma being faced by the court.**

It is evident to us that Judge Howatt was aware that Randa Trapp's judicial incompetency

and incongruous actions witnessed in court could serve to place his judicial commission and reputation in peril. He both promptly and discreetly arranged for her transfer to the Criminal Division of Superior Court.

Being that Judge William J. Howatt, Jr. had faced prior controversy surrounding his involvement with both the highly publicized **Mark Barber and Betty Broderick** cases, his judicial reputation had previously faced extensive scrutiny. It was assumed that he would not chance having Judge Trapp remain under his supervision to possibly further impair his legal standing.

To better clarify the above, go the following web site,
<http://www.familylawcourts.com/countysandiegoattorneys.html>, where is written:

"Supervising Judge William Howatt, who decimated Betty Broderick financially, was eventually rewarded with the title of "Supervising Judge." His rulings regarding financial matters were overturned. Turns out, Betty was right, but by then, she was also driven crazy by the court system, which of course, protected her cheating, community looting former husband.

Mark Barber actions demonstrate how alienation is put into practice. First legally isolate the child from the protective parent: (as pointed out "Breaking the Silence" the recent PBS documentary); then rewrite history, by brainwashing the child. **Parental Alienation is much like the Stockholm Syndrome**, except on the home front. History has been re-written to such a degree, child now says she was never hurt. **Police photographs of her bruising demonstrate otherwise.**

Never-the-less, parental alienation means boom times for the legal community. No amount of time and expense is spared to prove claims for or against the existence of parental alienation. However, and assuming one even draws a judge with a clue about parental alienation, (not likely) defense tactics remain: Spend a fortune on "experts" and argue about whether it exists or not, thus no time is spent examining the behaviors of the abusive parent. **Add to the mix that judges don't want to talk to children, who frequently want to talk to them, and what you have is no access to justice for children.** Children don't realize Judges who talk to children, don't need to speak to Guardian Ad Litem, and **judges like to churn fees."**

Please further view the following web site,
http://www.familylawcourts.com/naming_names.html:

"Barber's three year history of team work with Lais is tolerated by judges. Birds of a feather know the State Bar takes about a decade to act. Barber's most recent effort to shield his acts of moral turpitude, comes with motions to designed to limit testimony in an upcoming hearing on parental alienation.

Although the Bar President assured action if Barber committed perjury, we're not holding our breath.

To date Barber has blown off mediation meetings, (probably through the advice of counsel, Jeffrey Fritz), and other, court appearances. **Supervising Judge William Howatt replaced Barton, and can barely keep from sniggering while on the bench, as he protects Barber, allowing his emotional abuse to continue, while ignoring documented evidence from court-appointed evaluators.**

Incoming Judge, **Jeffrey Bostwick**, has a comparable reputation as those of Family Law justices', Trapp and Howatt, so many were astounded by Bostwick being recommended to fill Judge Trapp's seat in Dept. F-6. Please view the following web site, **<http://www.Familylawcourts.com/vista.html>**:

"IN THE DEPARTMENT OF NO ONE CARES ABOUT THE CLIENTS

DETAILED information regarding how Paul Gavin ripped off clients, Gavin in trouble with the State Bar. Or, if close, drop by Vista Criminal Court and ask for records check. Beth Brown's case is just one example of Vista courts remaining unsafe for mothers: the letter published in The San Diego-Union Tribune, another.

"Judges keep churning business.

The San Diego Union Tribune, June 13, 2000, Titled:

Thank you to Vista Family Court

"I would like to thank the Vista family court for everything it has done for me:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to get a second job so I can pay for my kids living expenses when my ex-husband has in the past proven his ability to have better employment.

Thank you for acting like you cared when I was trying explain that my ex-husband was violating the court orders.

Thank you for taking child support away when our son is going to visit his father for a month.

Thank you for making me feel bad that I have to keep coming back to court to settle things because my ex-husband makes it difficult to work things out and hasn't and won't pay the court-ordered amounts.

Thank you for telling my ex-husband and I that we look like reasonable people and we could work this out. **This when he owes \$11,000 in arrears**, and I have to ask the court to order him to pay for the uncovered medical and dental for our kids which is not covered on my insurance. (This has been in the divorce since the beginning.)

Thank you for teaching me that our system is not for the good, honest people; **it's for the people who know how to work the system to their advantage.**

Thank you for letting me come to court 11 times since 1992, and nothing has changed. Arrears keep going up, and my ex-husband still doesn't pay what the court has ordered.

There are so many other things I would like to thank you for, but they are too long to list.

Kelly . . . Ramona, CA"

Editor's note: Kelly has been to court twice since writing her letter in June of 2000. She reports everything remained the same, and of course, her daughter turned eighteen, without any support. Kelly gave up . . . which was **the goal of a disinterested court.**

Seems like a good idea to bounce former family law speciality, Judge Jeffrey Bostwick, from ANY case involving women.

Judge Bostwick, new to judging was preparing to sentence, (yes, it's not just an "order" . . . it's a Sentence), **Beth Brown to no contact with her thirteen year old daughter for the next five years, against the wishes of both,** when Beth became upset.

No abuse allegations, Beth had merely received one of those routinely bad psych reports.

So Judge Bostwick's plan was Beth shouldn't have contact with her thirteen year old daughter for the next FIVE years. Just another day in family Court. However, as he was about to impose his sentence, Beth came unglued.

Bostwick, unable to bear watching his own torment, told the bailiff to remove her.

Beth and bailiff, (a woman), tussled with Beth on the losing end of a baton, and although arrested for assault, Beth is beaten to such an extent; **she's transported to the hospital instead of jail.**

Public Defender, **(naturally Beth depleted all her resources in Family Court of course)**, is Sherry Stone at 760.945-4005. Case number is CN 183253. (Felony assault on a peace officer). **It's not likely the the PD will be allowed to be helpful.**

(We received a rather moronic email from Julynn Suhs, claiming to be an assistant of his while in private practice. She blathered on to a point we were reminded of one of those legal-Stepford, "my boss can do no wrong" types. These people are seldom bothered by facts. But we saved the email for grins.)

Look for bad news, as the history of the PD is to plead out, or prove generally ineffective at trial. **And Vista Court continues to be as unsafe for women, as downtown San Diego."**

As concerned County employees with most of us being parents ourselves, we respectfully

request that you contemplate researching that which we have addressed. Our hope is that the exposure of **current Family Court's practices** will lead to the needed alterations to provide a betterment to our Family Law Court judicial system, and thus render increased protection of our youth.

Besides ourselves, countless others, including Sheriff's Department Bailiffs employed in the San Diego Superior Family Law Court, have voiced their intentions of contacting the media and/or those empowered who can lend assistance. However, this is pending obtaining the knowledge of what legal repercussions and loss of employment could be faced as a result. We feel that many will speak out once this legal contestation becomes more highly publicized.

We additionally are speculating that those with the greatest knowledge, who were present daily in Judge Trapp's courtroom, will eventually be swayed to share their observations and opinions with people besides ourselves, namely Judge Trapp's court reporter, Linda Uhuru, and her court clerk, Martha Martinez. If this were to occur, we anticipate that Judge Howatt's court reporter, Joanne Salaz, may then become amiable to doing the same.

Judge Trapp was as unscrupulous as any family court judge could conceivably be. Her misuse of her *Judicial Discretion* was both blatant and rampant by her habitually basing her rulings on personal biases towards Law Enforcement, Attorneys, and friends of hers and her Law Enforcement husband's. Attorney James Hairgrove may not have the same extent of legal experience but he also did not possess the contempt and disregard that fellow attorneys exhibited towards Randa Trapp. This could effortlessly have been established by standing outside Dept. F-6 for a brief period of time, and overhearing conversations about Trapp's inappropriate rulings, personal prejudices, and nicknames she derived from legal counsels.

Contained in **UNION-TRIBUNE STAFF WRITER, Greg Moran's** May 12, 2006 Editorial, concerning the upcoming June 5, 2006 Election, was written:

"Winners serve six-year terms and are paid \$149,160 per year. [Trapp was dismissed without having served a day in her elected capacity.]

Judicial campaigns are generally low-key affairs, closely watched inside the legal community but well off the radar for most voters. **This is partly due to the fact that the canons of judicial ethics limit what candidates can and cannot say.** Those rules say candidates can't make statements that commit them to a position on "cases, controversies or issues that could come before the court."

Most elections are for open seats when a judge has retired or otherwise left the bench. To run for judge, a candidate must have been a member of the state bar for at least 10 years.

That clause covers lots of ground. So candidates generally focus on their professional backgrounds, experience, endorsements and supporters to try to convince voters that they are best qualified for the bench.

Trapp said she did not recall Hairgrove until he filed to run against her.

She said she could not talk about the custody issues in his case, but said that, in general, custody matters go through a mediation process that ends with recommendations to the judge from a mediator. [We have knowledge of numerous cases in which Judge Trapp totally disregarded the recommendations and submitted Reports of mediators, children's therapists, psychologists, and also court-appointed minors counsels who possessed vast awareness of cases which far exceeded her limited knowledge.]

““We don't look at these cases cold,”” she said. ““Someone else has taken a look at it and made recommendations about what is in the best interests of the child. It is my practice to treat all litigants fairly.”” [Had Trapp demonstrated having genuinely heeded the submitted recommendations of others appointed by the court to investigate matters in greater depth so to offer their informed Reports, her rulings may have ultimately been viewed as 'fair' and impartial.]

Trapp was appointed to the bench in 2004. She said she enjoys the work in family law courts because “this is one place where as a judge you can really make a difference.” [Her discrepant rulings were regrettably and regularly determined to have made a disdainful 'difference' in the lives of many children.]

She said her judicial approach is restrained. “I follow the law, that is what I pledge to do, and I don't make law,” she said.

Trapp was surprised when she was challenged, but was gratified that she has received backing from across the bench, as is common when a sitting judge is challenged. She said she is taking the race seriously. [We were more surprised that other local attorneys who had voiced their intentions of running against Trapp's candidacy to assure she was removed from the Family Law Court did not follow through.]

“This is an issue of protecting the independence of the judiciary,” she said. “No judge should be afraid to make a decision out of fear that someone might come after their seat.”

Pursuant to June 6, it was corroborated by many, litigants, legal counsels and court staff alike, that Trapp had repeatedly made authoritative requests in her courtroom for a show of hands as to who in attendance had voted for her in the election. As a result, her reputation was furthered impaired (though it was voiced that this wasn't at all possible). Counsels were later hear to be laughing at Trapp's expense, claiming to have falsely

raised their hands to ensure the outcome of their cases being heard before her.

The current claver being circulated around Family Court is that, due to communication received from this anonymous 'Family Law' attorney, Judge Howatt is now reconsidering his initial decision of replacing Randa Trapp with Jeff Bostwick. **It is being voiced that he may be bringing in Janis Sammartino, the Assistant Presiding Judge**, over which he also currently supervises. As evidenced by the anonymous counsel's letter, she was also the recipient of a copy of this correspondence.

Speculation is that Judge Howatt has made this reconsideration in anticipation that he will be better able to contain the existing dilemma by appointing the only other justice that he knows of as being cognizant of this impending scandal. Regrettably, Janis Sammartino has a reputation of being Judge Howatt's '**henchman**', approaching Howatt for his counsel pertaining to all relevant decisions, and incessantly doing only as he instructs, whether ethical or otherwise. There is minimal doubt that her actions have served as a chief component behind the current concealment of the factual basis behind Randa Trapp's reassignment . . . at Howatt's advisement.

If Judge Howatt were only aware of how many others know of the current circumstances surrounding Trapp's family court dismissal, we speculate he might be inclined to reach a different conclusion on possibly recommending Janis Sammartino's appointment to this judicial position. He has some knowledge of the opinion many in the legal community have of her, providing her the nickname of "**Howatt's puppet on a string**".

By supplying others with Family Law Court information, we apprehensively fear being perceived as only disgruntled County employees seeking retribution towards judges we personally dislike. However, we hold tremendous regard for the majority of those we are associated with. **Ultimately, our goal is to offer any assistance plausible to regain the respect that our Family Law Court once justifiably had held.**

Reflect back to the times of segregation in the South in the 1950's. It had been a way of life for generations. If you were African American, you sat in the back of the bus, used a different bathroom, even drank out of a different water fountain. There were laws that enforced this . . . Appellate decisions that upheld it as good law. "That's how it is, just accept it and go on with your life." Today, parents are deprived of their children by family law courts due to the same type of senseless discrimination while being told by justices to just accept it and proceed on with their lives.

Legalized discrimination has not been eliminated . . . it's now just targeting different victims, and the greatest detriment sustained is to our youth.

Alterations require being made so children no longer have to wait years for a parent to be permitted to approach the Appellate Court over reprehensible child custody rulings. The routine practice of 'reassigning' inept family law judges to other legal divisions,

primarily criminal court, needs to come to an abrupt halt. The Judicial Review Committee needs to be prompted to better serve in their official capacity of overseeing justices and judicial complaints lodged. . .of acting in a more assertive manner when warranted, even if this were to dictate the permanent dismissal of family law judges.

Only with publicity and exposure will Family Law Court necessitate the changes so it once again serves to protect the young and innocent, and treat ALL litigants fairly . . . regardless of their status in the community or financial means. Assume the responsibility of disseminating this information, and you will presumptively be inundated with responses from numerous others who have faced similar judicial injustices. Deprive the public of this knowledge, and you plausibly condemn both parents and children to similar fates.

On the web site, <http://www.familylawcourts.com>, they summarized the current San Diego Family Law Court judicial quandary best when they wrote:

"That Judge Trapp was "endorsed" by the entire San Diego bench in a recent election, speaks volumes about "the best interests of the child." It's simply not possible for judges to care any less about children, and more about helping those operating in the industry."

"San Diego Family Court judges such as Randa Trapp and William Howatt best demonstrate why one should not entrust the care of one's family to a family court."

Some of you who have received this correspondence with accompanying documentation may feel as though you have received this in error . . . that this Legal quandary does not fall without your jurisdiction or boundaries, or you just don't view it as being worthy of your time and effort. If you cannot lend your support, we would appreciate your forwarding this along to those who can assist.

As either sworn officials, those empowered, high profile, celebrities, or media and journalists, if you cannot (or will not) cannot offer your assistance in resolving the Judicial desecration being confronted by families and children alike, our principal inquiry of you is this.

What DOES the future of our country hold as these children, whose childhoods have been tragically violated by unjust Family Law Court Rulings, reach their adult years as they hold contempt towards those in authority who were assigned to have protected them in their youth yet failed they and their parents miserably?

As written on the web site, <http://www.familylawcourts.com/ongoing.html>:

“JUDGES TO SPEAK WITH CHILDREN

Time and unnecessary heartache could be spared if judges performed their duties . . . while speaking to children might negatively impact the divorce industry.

Children's rights, and children themselves, sometimes desperate to be heard, are instead, shuffled away from judges and towards 'advocates', although the majority of professionals agree that **a child being heard, directly, without lawyers, is a child who feels his or her worth.**

A judge denying even one child that basic right, is a judge who should be removed from the case. If the attitude persists, it is reasonable to campaign for **that judge be transferred out of family court to another, more suitable, and adult arena.”**

The ‘**Basic Rights**’ of many have been denied them by Family Courts such as San Diego’s, and the shame felt should be by all. Voices have been stifled by Family Law Judges long enough, and it’s time for someone to speak out on their be halves.

cc: The White House
 Anthony M. Kennedy, Supreme Court Assoc. Justice
 Public Information Officer, Supreme Court of the U.S.
 Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor of California
 Carol C. Lam, U.S. Attorney, Southern District of CA
 General San Diego County Grand Jury/ Hall of Justice
 Dianne Feinstein, Senator
 John F. Kerry, United States Senator
 Dennis Hollingsworth, State Senator
 Christine Kehoe, Senator
 Susan A. Davis, Representative (D-CA 53rd)
 Jay LaSeur, Assemblyman
 Nancy Pelosi, Congresswoman
 Tom Lantos, Congressman
 Jerry Sanders, Mayor of San Diego
 Roger Hedgecock, Former San Diego Mayor and Show Host of KOGO/ AM 600
 Civil Rights & Civil Liberties Complaints
 Michael Aguirre, San Diego City Attorney
 Gloria Allred, High Profile Los Angeles Attorney

 PFJCI National Training Director, Attorney Casey Gwinn
 The State Bar of California
 CASA, National Court Appointed Special Advocate Assoc.
 Courtroom Television Network LLC
 Assignment Editor, c/o KNSD (NBC/Channel 7)
 Assignment Editor, c/o KUSI (Channel 9 News)
 Andrew Lack, President of NBC News
 ABC’s Nightline
 The Dr. Phil Show
 The Rush Limbaugh Show
 Legal Editor, c/o The Los Angeles Times
 Shari Delisle, Ph. D. , Founder & Executive Director of Kid’s Turn, San Diego
 Elisabeth “Betty” Broderick, Inmate, c/o Central California Women’s Facility

 The President's Family Justice Center Initiative
 Samuel Alito, Jr., Supreme Court Justice

 California First Lady, Maria Shriver
 U.S. Department of Justice/Office of the Inspector
 Mitch Dembin, Assistant United States Attorney
 Denise Moreno Ducheny, Senator
 U.S. Court of Appeals/ Judicial Misconduct
 Barbara Boxer, Senator
 Dianne Jacob, Supervisor, Second District
 Juan Vargas, Assembly Member
 Lori Saldana, Assembly Member
 Dan Lundgren, Congressman
 Duncan Hunter, Congressman, 52nd District
 William B. Kolender, Sheriff of San Diego

 The Hon. Lawrence W. Stirling , Retired
 Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, County of San Diego
 Jay Alan Sekulow, Chief Counsel for the American
 Center for Law and Justice
 The Commission on Judicial Performance
 The San Diego County Bar Association
 Dean Tong, Forensic Consultant
 Noah Oppenheim, Supervising Producer of MSNBC
 Assignment Editor, c/o KFMB (Channel 8 News)
 Assignment Editor, c/o KGTV (Channel 10 News)
 ABC’s News Show, 20/20
 The Oprah Winfrey Show
 The Montel Williams Show
 Legal Editor, c/o The San Diego Union-Tribune
 Juvenile Justice Commission

bc