Plight of a Parent – Check, Cash and Monies, Item #3

As my public defender commented, the world is messed-up…
- Public Defender (comments regarding the charge and evidence)

In October, following my release from jail, I received the contents of the evidence pertaining to my case; a summary of the evidence was provided in the previous writing, "Plight of a Parent – Aggravated Stalking". This next in a series is specifically about "Item #3" of the evidence described as follows:

3. Personal checks sent to the all four children for their birthdays; these checks were immediately cashed (presumably by my ex-wife) with copies included as evidence

The summary (from "Plight…Aggravated Staking") began as follows:

> …the personal checks or item #3 were cashed immediately – only to be used as evidence in this case. Oh, and the checks are not mentioned as part of the letters to the children; I guess that claiming the checks as malicious while cashing the check for money would seem like a conflict of interest.

Yes, I sent money to my children for their birthdays; but this was not first time I have done so and, as a parent, considered such behavior to be appropriate – at least for most parents. Evidently, my ex-wife did not object – as she immediately cashed the checks…and than submitted copies of the checks as part of the evidence for the charge of aggravated stalking.

As I initially addressed each area of evidence with my public defender (while in jail), the dilemma of the true nature of my actions was apparent. In the context of a conventional family, these actions would not be illegal or even questionable; but under the vise of an injunction, convention and good intentions are overshadowed by the powers of perversion and, in this case, of conflicting behavior. I was glad the checks were cashed, hopeful that my children actually received the monies, but appalled by the inclusion of the cashed checks in the evidence; but as my PD commented, the world is messed-up…

From my previous comment, other monies have been sent to my children – both from me and from other members of my family; and as far as we know, the monies have been accepted without our knowledge of whether the children ever received them. Not just monies, but gifts and other expressions of parental and grandparental love have been "attempted" in good conscience – or without any sense of violating the law. Plain reason and conventional family practices are two reasons why such actions were taken.

In the last writing, “Plight of a Parent – Phony Calls”, I presented an analogy using the imaginative proposal for the development of coastal property; here again:

> Imagine that Florida did not allow residents to construct (or live) on the coast because of the risks of hurricanes and similar foul weather; but also imagine that Florida had never had an actual storm or similar occurrence. One day, a group of investors goes to the governor with a request that the law be amended or abolished – such that development could occur. The governor, in response, orders a meteorological study with the costs billed to the investment group. The study concludes that Florida is <u>not</u> at risk – based on history and a professional, scientific study. Gleeful at the prospect of development, the investors return to the governor in anticipation of project approval; yet, they are met with the same resolute rationale – contrary to scientific evidence and history, but fixed on feelings, personal perspective, and the authority of the state.

I concluded the writing with the intention of explaining the application to this case…or to all the cases of this ordeal.

First, the developers had to fit-the-bill for the meteorological study. My case(s) have included three (3) mental evaluations – of which I was liable financially. As with the meteorological study that *fell on deaf ears*, the evaluations have never been formally considered by the courts or judge. Given the repetitive nature of this practice – of ordering evaluations and ignoring the results – I must conclude that the courts have no interest in or use for potential evidence that does support the predisposition…but maybe I’m just overlooking the point of the process. During my last court appearance for the case, I learned of yet another ordered mental-evaluation with the comment that such was required to *cover their...* Maybe the reason that these evaluations never get beyond the clinical-side (to the court-side) is because the point is *merely academic* – without any substantive or ultimate purpose, but for their own liability…

One other area of application has to do with the imaginative meteorological study which, when matched against realty, is not only imaginative but absurd. Though the aftermath of a hurricane may bring pause to the coastal dweller, the development continues while the risks are thrown to the wind. Not imaginative is the mental evaluation(s) that, for all practical purposes, have been about as valuable or worthwhile as a meteorological study would be. For the coastal regions, historical occurrences and actuarial data give record to the risks; but in my case(s), there is no historical occurrences and, as far as data, medical evidence seems to have no relevance; but instead, the courts give total singular focus to one testimony, to an injunction predicated on a lie, and the assignment of “assault” and “malicious” to conventional family practices.