

Gordon Stadnyck
P.O. Box 100157
Denver, Colorado 80250-0157

July 22, 2005

Mr. Paul E. Burczyk
State Board of Psychologist Examiners
1560 Broadway, Suite 880
Denver, Colorado 80202-5146

RE: Inquiry Concerning Charles Hazelhurst, Ph.D.
Case #2005-004793

Dear Mr. Burczyk:

I am in receipt of your correspondence dated July 12, 2005, which I received on July 15, 2005. Thank you for affording me the opportunity to provide a reply to Dr. Hazelhurst's response, dated July 5, 2005.

I would like to take this opportunity to point out that Dr. Hazelhurst's response did not substantively refute the *prima facie* claims raised by the initial grievance. His brief response contained inaccuracies, which I respectfully request this Board investigate in an evidentiary hearing.

Dr. Hazelhurst stated, in response to my allegation that he had read and reported on my psychological record[s] without my consent, that, "I read the psychological reports that his ex-wife brought with her to a session. She asked me to read the reports on both her and Mr. Stadnyck. After I read the reports, I returned both of them to her." Dr. Hazelhurst also claimed that, "I did not write a report or make a report regarding Mr. Stadnyck."

However, in Dr. Hazelhurst's August 14, 2001 letter to Dr. Brodbeck, he characterized me, based on information solely obtained from my ex-wife, as exercising, "extensive control," over my ex-wife, as, "limit testing," as providing a framework "agenda" for my ex-wife to comply with and, finally, as engaging in, "strong manipulation."

Dr. Hazelhurst used the adjective, "estranged," to describe me not less than six (6) times in a one-and-a-half page letter. To confirm the negative connotation that this adjective implied, I looked it up. The Dictionary of Psychology (Brunner Routledge, 2002) provides this definition:

See alienation. Alienation: a breakdown of sociological interpersonal or experimental relationships. Estrangement from self and others. In legal terms, insanity, mental disorder. See alienist, mental illness

Dr. Hazelhurst not only read the report[s] (as he conceded in his July 5, 2005 response), but he also offered quasi-psychoanalysis of me,¹ which was tailor-fit to facilitate Dr. Brodbeck's agenda of legal posturing to enable Sonya Stadnyck's (n/k/a Sonya Trimbath) stated objective of moving out of state with our daughter.² This prep-work on the part of Drs. Brodbeck and Hazelhurst was timed to transpire prior to and in support of the then-upcoming September 7, 2001 permanent orders hearing.

In preparation for this endeavor, Dr. Brodbeck solicited the "advice" of Dr. Lenore Walker on July 30, 2001. In her solicitation, she made statements about me that were lascivious, scurrilous and devoid of any reasonable objectivity that is expected of a special advocate and, which would not elicit a reasonably objective response (from anyone). Dr. Walker replied the following day, advising, "Try to get the label 'domestic violence' on the dad's behavior towards the mom. This gets a different handling in the courts." I obtained both Dr. Brodbeck's email solicitation and Dr. Walker's email reply through discovery.

Dr. Brodbeck testified at the November 7, 2002 hearing that she, "Never asked about relocation." After the hearing, she also stated in her October 2, 2002 letter to my former attorney, David Heckenbach, "*Now, if I had written a copy of the request I made of Dr. Walker, it would have been in my file. There is no copy. And I honestly can't remember if I left her a voicemail or emailed her. Any way, I cannot find a copy. If tricks were going to be played, why would I have left her response in the file and removed my request? That would not have been a smart trick.*" Indeed, it wasn't a very smart trick. Such a copy did exist and Dr. Brodbeck's dishonesty has been exposed.

Dr. Brodbeck sought not objective advice, but rather support specific to her foregone conclusion, asking, "What I need is to be pointed to the literature so I can explain to the Judge, using research quotes, that men who have dysfunctional relationships with the women in their lives are very very often dysfunctional fathers to their daughters as the child matures." [emphasis added] It is noteworthy that Dr. Brodbeck then already had knowledge of Sonya's background of acts of domestic

¹ The Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct 2002 states, "Except as noted in 9.01(c), psychologists provide opinions of the psychological characteristics of individuals only after they have conducted an examination of the individuals adequate to support their statements and conclusions. When, despite reasonable efforts, such an examination is not practical, psychologists document the efforts they made and the result of those efforts, clarify the probable impact of their limited information on the reliability and validity of their opinions, and appropriately limit the nature and extent of their conclusions and recommendations." *Id.* at § 9.01(b)

² In May of 2000, prior to separation, Sonya threatened me, "If you don't let me move to Maryland, I'm gonna make you pay."

violence towards Bill Elerbe and other men,³ yet chose to omit this from her findings and during her consultation with these other “experts.”

A special advocate’s primary duty is to make recommendations to the court. (*See*, generally, Chief Justice Directive 04-08). A special advocates statutory charter is to conduct an investigation (upon which the recommendations are made). A special advocate’s charter is not to craft a purely subjective agenda or conclusion and then seek out research data and colleague-experts who will validate the agenda or conclusion. Rather, that’s the sort of posturing expected by a litigant to an adversarial legal proceeding —not by a purportedly objective court-appointed expert. Yet, that is precisely the sort of posturing that Dr. Brodbeck engaged in when she hand-picked Dr. Hazelhurst to compliment her agenda and, therefore, she had abandoned her role as an impartial expert and took up the role as an advocate for one of the parties to the case.

Here, it’s worth noting Dr. Brodbeck’s importance in deciding custody. “[T]here is a risk of injury to a parent when a therapist expresses concern about poor parenting of one kind or another. The risks could include diminished parenting time, or in the extreme case, perhaps a change in custody. Those risks are real and potentially very damaging to the parent.” *Ryder v. Mitchell*, 54 P.3d 885 (Colo 2002).

As described above, Dr. Hazelhurst’s August 14, 2001 letter was devoid of reasonable objectivity. He concluded his letter by stating that Ms. Stadnyck is, "a competent woman who is a loving, caring mother and provider to her daughter," yet, he had already conceded on page one of that same letter that he had not met with or observed our daughter or her mother's interaction with her. Additionally, Dr. Hazelhurst’s oversight and omission of any mention of the extensive history of parental alienation, false allegations of sexual abuse and intentional obstruction of visitation were indicative of his evident partiality, of which I can provide many sources of evidentiary documentation, upon request.

I believe that the substance of Dr. Hazelhurst’s August 14, 2001 letter has effectively waived any patient-therapist privilege that might have predated it. Therefore, I respectfully request the Board to obtain the notes, billing records and underlying data from those therapy session[s].

I can proceed no further without calling attention to the fact that Dr. Brodbeck hand-picked Dr. Hazelhurst as my ex-wife’s therapist to fulfill the agenda I discussed, above. Dr. Brodbeck admitted as much during deposition and Dr. Hazelhurst, including his home phone, appears on her preferred vendor/referral list. Dr. Hazelhurst also withdrew from Rob Williams’s case, citing a conflict of interest based on his personal relationship with, “the Brodbecks.”

Dr. Hazelhurst, conversely, wrote in his July 5, 2005 response to this Board that, “I did not withdraw from the Williams matter, an unrelated case, because of a personal

³ This “background” first appeared on the radar in Sonya’s past, when she was expelled from high school for, “fighting with boys.”

relationship with the Brodbecks.” I spoke with Mr. Williams on Thursday, the 21st of July, and he not only confirmed his earlier account, but he also offered to make himself available to the Board for in-person testimony or affidavit (or both) to attest to the truth of the matter and also to provide the evidentiary emails.

The Brodbeck’s are not only “well-connected” with Dr. Hazelhurst, as above-noted, but also are personal friends with, “the Snow’s.” Rod Snow is the attorney for Sonya Trimbath. This relationship is evidenced by a copy of a personal letter from the Snow’s to the Brodbeck’s, a copy of which I have obtained and attached to this correspondence.

CONCLUSION

After further research, I was amazed to find how many cases that both Drs. Hazelhurst and Brodbeck have been involved in (together). This situation bears all the earmarks of conspiracy, which was accomplished through violations of professional conduct.

Sincerely,

Gordon Stadnyck