

To : Madeline Wilson
Fax # : 1-303-321-3196
Sender : Sean Harrington
Date : 07/20/2005
Re :



Number of pages (Including cover sheet): 11

Madeline:

I decided to reword the draft that I sent you, yesterday. This is the copy that's going out in the mail, today.

You should already know, Madeline, that contempt requires that there be an order. (You filed enough contempt citations against people (I know, I've already received voluminous feedback from your other cases)). You don't have an order and you haven't even alleged that I failed to comply with an order or that I've somehow offended the dignity of the court. Your only hope lies in the fact that Ms. Culberson-Smith shares, not only a professional fraternity with you, but also your disdain of me.

It is my sincere hope that your July 12, 2005 request will be properly regarded as frivolous and groundless and, itself, be grounds for discipline. I keep it as no secret that I believe that you are bring disrepute to the legal profession and need to be removed forthwith before you cause more harm to the lives of innocent children, families and the legal system. Can you imagine if your own two kids, J.F. & D.F., had been subjected to the same pain, grief and loss of my daughter and the countless other children whom you've alienated from the other parent? Really, how do you sleep at night? Did you grow up without a father or a father that abused you and, so, do you now want to "share" your misery with others? Or did you have a loving father and never gave a thought to what it might be like to a small child to be separated from the only father she ever knew? Or, are you just greedy? (It is well-settled that creating acrimony is the most certain way to accrue billable hours (Grotman and Thomas, 1990)).

I invite you to contemplate this passage from Doug Darnall, entitled "Parental Alienation: Not in the Best Interest of Children" (N.D.LAW REV., Vol. 75, 1999, p 323-64):

"Attorneys with an obsessed alienator as a client are in a difficult situation. They are ethically bound to represent the client's interest, and yet they are conscious that children's lives are involved. Once the attorney starts to lean away from the obsessed alienator's cause, the attorney will begin to see his or her client's rage and manipulation."

Your July 12, 2005 request indicates that you possess very little understanding the law beyond the child support statutes and parenting time & custody revocation statutes (esp. 14-10-129[4], most often used in your cases). My conclusion confirms the opinions of the opposing attorneys that I've spoken with in your cases. If Mr. Huff represents you (and I don't know that he does or doesn't, because you haven't indicated one way or the other --I only know that you copied him on an email to my attorney), you really should run these things by him, first.

Sean Harrington