

THE CALL OUT



WAR

“EVEN ON THE PATH OF PEACE,
THE LAST DOOR IS WAR.”

— *Unknown*



THE CALL OUT

WAR

Institutional Cowardice Is Not Honorable.

Justin A. Tahai

Copyright © 2026 Justin A. Tahai.

This is a work of documentary criticism and the author's opinion. "War," "indictment," "racket," and "credibility finding" are rhetorical or editorial terms, not criminal charges or judicial determinations made by this book. The advocacy described is nonviolent.

Quoted passages and summarized records remain the work of their original speakers or authors. The source directory identifies transcriptions, party-authored materials, and secondary compilations. This edition is not a substitute for the operative orders or legal advice.

Private child information and unnecessary personal contact details are omitted or summarized. The existence of a document in an archive does not establish that unrestricted publication of the complete original is permitted.

Prepared with generative-AI drafting, editing, and cover-art assistance. The author is responsible for the published account.

September 2026 text. Proceedings and communications described here have date-specific cutoffs; later developments may alter the account.

For the children whose time cannot be returned.

And for every parent who wanted a life, not a filing cabinet.

Contents

READ THE FUCKING SOURCE	vi
PART I – DECLARATION OF WAR	1
Prologue: Declaration of War	2
1 NOT TODAY, YOUR DISHONOR	4
2 NOT TODAY; NOT ANY FUCKING DAY	6
3 THE GAL	8
4 THE SECOND AMERICAN REVOLUTION	10
5 THE PEOPLE ARE WATCHING	12
PART II – THE CREDIBILITY INDICTMENT	14
6 SELECTIVE CANDOR	15
7 THE DISAPPEARING CONTEXT	17
8 DEFINE “UNFOUNDED IN FACT”	19
9 THE PAPER VERSUS THE LIFE	21
10 “ZEALOUS” IS NOT A MAGIC WORD	24
11 MORSE, BEDARD, AND THE CLOCK	26
12 THE PROCEDURAL ORACLE	27
13 ACCESS DENIED SUCCESSFULLY	29
14 JUSTICE AT \$1,515.90 DOWN	32
15 THE CHILD AS INSTITUTIONAL ALIBI	35
16 “REPETITIVE”	37
17 THE CREDIBILITY ADJUDICATION	39
PART III – THE NETWORK IS REAL	40
18 DO NOT DRAW A CONSPIRACY CHART. DRAW A PROVENANCE MAP.	41
19 THE SJC AS STRUCTURAL HUB	42
20 ONE PHONE NUMBER, TWO OVERSIGHT SYSTEMS	43
21 MAINE LAW: A SMALL PROFESSIONAL WORLD	45
22 FIRM GENEALOGY	46

Contents / continued

23	BEDARD'S ACCOUNT; ANDERSON'S CORRECTION	47
24	THE RECORDS REQUEST CHAPTER	49
	PART IV – THE CHILDHOOD CLOCK	50
25	2010–2014: THE FIRST DOORS	51
26	2016: RECORDS, RELEASES, AND CONTEMPT	54
27	2018: THE GAL RETURNS	57
28	2019: THE SUMMER AND THE THERAPIST	59
29	2020–2023: THE YEARS BETWEEN FILINGS	62
30	2024: THE BREAK	65
31	2025: THERAPY-ONLY CONTACT BECOMES A SYSTEM	68
32	JANUARY 2026: THE RUN-UP TO THE HEARING	74
33	FEBRUARY 11: THE ORDER THAT CHANGED EVERYTHING	78
34	FEBRUARY 14–20: THE LOGISTICS DISPUTE	80
35	MARCH 2026: THE THIRTY-DAY CLOCK	84
36	APRIL 2026: “SOLE GATEKEEPER” AND THE DIGITAL COURTHOUSE	90
37	MAY 2026: SCHOOL, THERAPY, RULE 3(d), AND FM-218	97
38	JUNE 2026: THE ARCHIVE AND THE CHILD	103
39	JULY 2026: PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY MEETS THE MEDICAL PORTAL	107
40	AUGUST 2026: ROUTING IS NOT A RESPONSE	111
	PART V – THE PUBLIC HAS ARRIVED	113
41	THE PUBLIC INTERNET DID NOT ASK PERMISSION	114
42	DOCUMENTS, NOT MUSKETS	116
43	WHAT REFORM WOULD ACTUALLY LOOK LIKE	117
44	OPEN INVITATION	119
45	INSTITUTIONAL COWARDICE IS NOT HONORABLE	120
46	HERE IS YOUR SHOEHORN	121
47	ROTTEN APPLES	122
	SELECTED SOURCE DOCUMENTS	125
	SOURCE DIRECTORY	129
	SOURCE NOTES FOR THE NEW CHAPTERS	134
	APPENDIX A – CHOOSE A BETTER PATH	138
48	THE FINAL CALL OUT: RISE	146

READ THE FUCKING SOURCE

This book does not ask you to trust my anger. It asks you to compare the claim with the source. A title is not proof. Neither is a grievance. A court's findings, a party's allegations, a professional's response, and my assessment are different things. They remain different on these pages.

The named call-outs concern documented professional acts and institutional processes. They are not invitations to harass people, approach their homes, or expose children. Public scrutiny is the method. Accuracy is the condition.

Repeated administrative metadata has been removed. E-numbers preserve navigation to the earlier timeline; S-numbers identify sources in the directory. The numbered chronology entries are edited summaries of the supplied source compilations, not verbatim documents or newly authenticated findings. Where a source was incomplete, a date was disputed, or a later answer corrected an earlier account, that limitation stays visible.

A few documents are reproduced or excerpted once, in the selected-source appendix. Their job is to let you check the argument—not to make you read the same packet in six different chapters. The private archive can remain exhaustive while the public narrative remains readable.

I will be profane. I will not ask profanity to do the work of evidence.

The strongest criticism in this book is also its simplest demand: verify the institution as carefully as the institution verifies the citizen. Apply that demand to me too.

PART I

DECLARATION OF WAR

Not of violence. Of words.

DECLARATION OF WAR

Not of violence. Of words.

You want a public institution with a private vocabulary, a protected microphone, and a public too exhausted to follow the paperwork? Then stop acting surprised when somebody brings the paperwork into the light.

This book is my refusal to let a title finish an argument that the evidence has barely begun. Judge John Lucy's order, Patrick Bedard's advocacy, John A. McArdle III's Committee letter, the clerks' routing instructions, and the filing system's rejection notices do not become sacred texts because an institution produced them. They become documents that can be read, compared, and questioned.

The method is deliberately nonviolent: publication, criticism, research, and civic argument. No confrontation at anybody's home. No enlistment of a crowd to intimidate a person. No exposure of a child's private life as punishment for an adult. The fight is over the public account of public power.

A court can decide a case. An oversight body can dismiss a complaint. Neither event makes the underlying sequence disappear. A reader may agree with the institution. That reader still deserves the sequence rather than a slogan about it.

I am not seeking a public institution that always agrees with me. I am seeking one whose explanation survives being placed beside its documents. That should not be a revolutionary demand. The fact that it can feel like one is the subject of this book.

THE PUBLIC HAS ARRIVED.

The call-out

Mr. McArdle's letter, Judge Lucy's order, and my own compliance email will remain different kinds of documents. The first reports an oversight disposition. The second imposes obligations and records findings. The

third states a party's position. No amount of typography makes those categories interchangeable.

That is the revolution in miniature: the Public gets the categories and the sources. Not a demand to believe me because I am angry. Not a demand to believe the institution because it is an institution.

If this is a public institution, why should the Public need specialized professional fluency merely to understand how to get an ordinary request in front of the correct decision-maker?

What part of public accountability becomes illegitimate merely because the citizen can now publish the underlying document?

Assessment: The modern accountability imbalance is technological, not theoretical. The institution can no longer assume that complexity guarantees silence.

NOT TODAY, YOUR DISHONOR

Arrogance is not honorable. Speaking down to the Public is not honorable. Institutional cowardice is not honorable.

Honor is not a prefix. It is not sewn into a robe, printed on stationery, or issued with a parking space. Honor is what remains when a person with power has to explain an inconvenient decision to someone who cannot punish them for getting it wrong.

Judge John Lucy's February 11, 2026 order is the place to begin because it contains real authority and real adverse findings. The court found abuse, credited testimony against me, and imposed restrictions. I disputed those findings and pursued review. This book does not quietly erase the court's account and substitute my own. Readers must know the decision I am criticizing, not merely the adjectives I attach to it. [S01]

The order also created a framework for therapeutic contact, electronic contact, and conditional progression to in-person visits. Those provisions required people to coordinate. A telephone number, a session time, a release, and a transportation plan do not materialize because a judge signs the last page.

Here is the accountability question: once a court has prescribed a route toward a functioning relationship, how does it find out whether that route exists outside the courtroom?

That is not contempt for the idea of courts. It is contempt for the idea that a completed document necessarily represents completed work.

NOT TODAY, YOUR DISHONOR. The title does not win the argument.

The order's forward-looking framework

"Mr. Tahai shall be responsible for the costs of this therapy."

"Mr. Tahai shall have the opportunity for reasonable daily contact with the child," subject to the timing, manner, and other conditions specified in the provision. The in-person provision was likewise contingent on compliance.

S01, Contact and Visitation, paragraphs 1, 3–4. Quotation and accompanying editorial summary; see selected source appendix.

The record at issue

February 11, 2026 — Findings and Order entered.

The order made adverse findings, imposed obligations and restrictions, and provided for therapeutic and other conditional contact. The author disputed the findings and sought review. The order remains an adverse adjudication in this account; the author’s disagreement does not reverse it.

[S01; E125]

February 14, 2026, as reported on February 16 — Contact logistics requested.

The compliance email reports a 4:20 p.m. request for the child’s number and electronic-contact information, an office reply that it lacked the order, and follow-up concerning a share link and proposed contact time. These timestamps are reported within the later email; they are not independent header verification here.

[S02; E131]

February 20, 2026 — Consolidated implementation packet.

A scanned packet requested an expedited status conference, interim implementation directions, and clarification. The source review described its first pages and corroborating native draft. Docket acceptance and disposition are separate questions.

[S05; E146]

The call-out

Speaking down is not a rebuttal. It is an attempt to move the contest from the document to the social rank of the person asking about it.

Judge Lucy does not have to share my judgment of the order. Mr. Bedard does not have to endorse my account. But the reader can still compare the operative language, the subsequent requests, and the answers actually given. “The order exists” and “the order worked” are not the same sentence.

The first deserves acknowledgment. The second requires evidence.

NOT TODAY; NOT ANY FUCKING DAY

Take your tyrannical, coercive threats and shove them.

That sentence rejects coerced reverence, not the obligation to obey an operative order. Compliance and admiration are different acts. I can follow a ruling, challenge it through the available process, and still refuse to pretend that its reasoning is beyond criticism.

The February 11 order warned about contempt and possible sanctions. The State was not making a suggestion. It was exercising power that could affect money, liberty, and a family relationship. That is precisely why clarity matters. Coercion needs fewer poses and better explanations. [S01]

My February 16 email expressly said I would comply while pursuing an appeal. It then asked for the logistics I believed compliance required. That statement is not proof that I satisfied every condition. It is proof of what I said I would do, and it must be read beside the actual order and subsequent conduct. [S02]

An institution need not indulge every demand a litigant invents. It should be able to distinguish a demand for special treatment from a request to understand who must do what, by when, and through which lawful channel. The difference is not mysterious. Read the requested relief.

A sanction clause can be exquisitely specific while the practical path remains disputed. When that happens, telling the citizen to respect the institution does not complete the missing instructions.

NOT TODAY. NOT ANY FUCKING DAY.

The record at issue

February 16, 2026 — Compliance statement and disputed demands.

The author said he would comply pending appeal and requested practical information. The same email demanded half the reunification cost under a general expense allocation. The order expressly made the author responsible for reunification-therapy costs. The demand is therefore presented as his disputed position, not an established reimbursement obligation.

[S02; E135]

February 18, 2026 — Alternative hearing record requested.

The motion sought an electronic recording in lieu of a transcript or a settled-statement process. Its existence establishes the requested alternative. The motion is not itself proof that the court had to grant that alternative or that no later ruling occurred.

[S07; E137]

The call-out

The court's authority is not a personality trait. It belongs to an office operating through rules and review. That should make criticism less personal, not more forbidden.

I reject the demand for intellectual surrender. I do not confuse that rejection with a license to ignore conditions, intimidate participants, or manufacture facts. The book can be merciless about reasoning without becoming careless about conduct.

When the State threatens contempt, fines, or incarceration for noncompliance, what reciprocal duty does it have to make compliance pathways concrete?

If a parent seeks clarification before violating an ambiguous or contested implementation path, why is that not precisely the behavior the system should reward?

Assessment: Coercive authority strengthens the case for public scrutiny. It does not weaken it.

THE GAL

Glenn Anderson corrected the record.

The gall in this chapter is not Glenn Anderson's. His January 6, 2026 letter is an example of the candor this book demands: he identified what counsel got right, specified what counsel omitted, and stopped short of deciding a legal question that belonged to the court. [S15]

Anderson acknowledged that he had no appointment under the pending motions. He also acknowledged the older appointment described in Patrick S. Bedard's Motion in Limine. Then he supplied the missing history: another appointment in March 2018 and another beginning December 4, 2019, during which he served for an entire year. [S15]

Those are not interchangeable descriptions. "He was appointed over a decade ago" and "his involvement included later appointments" give a reader different accounts of the same professional history. Anderson made that difference visible.

Mr. Bedard, the factual criticism belongs at your desk. Your entitlement to argue that testimony should be excluded does not answer whether the history supporting your argument was complete. Anderson's letter says it was not. The motion, correction, and ruling are the comparison—not speculation about anybody's private motives.

A legal objection is not a permission slip to compress a witness's history until the inconvenient years disappear. If the later appointments did not change your evidentiary argument, explain why. Their significance can be disputed without pretending the appointments never occurred.

The correction came from Glenn. The question belongs to counsel.

The signed correction

Anderson wrote directly to the presiding judge on January 6. The retained email transmitted the letter to Bedard and me that afternoon. The letter fixes what he corrected before the final hearing. [S15]

What Anderson said was accurate

He had not been appointed under the pending motions, and the earlier appointment mentioned by Bedard was real. Anderson did not conceal either point.

What Anderson said was missing

He wrote that Bedard's motion repeated the old appointment "no less than four times" while failing to mention the March 2018 and December 2019 appointments. He said the court file should contain his reports documenting extensive involvement across several years. [S15]

What Anderson did not claim

"I take no position on whether any testimony I might have would be admissible or relevant."

He also stated that he had been subpoenaed and intended to appear on January 16 unless directed otherwise. The letter does not prove what he ultimately testified to or determine what the court should admit. [S15]

The call-out — Patrick S. Bedard

Argue relevance. Argue admissibility. But argue from the whole appointment history. A correction from the person who held those appointments deserves an answer about the description—not a detour into the author's tone.

What changed in counsel's account after Anderson supplied the later appointments?

Assessment: Anderson's letter is a model of bounded candor. The criticism here concerns the account he corrected, not the professional who corrected it.

THE SECOND AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Documents, not muskets.

The revolution proposed here does not need a battlefield. It needs an ordinary citizen to place a public claim beside a source and refuse to move the source out of frame. The contrast with the American Revolution is rhetorical, not a prediction or invitation to violence.

The procedural shoehorn began as the appropriate instrument for an absurd predicament: a public system so entangled in its own process that the people outside it are left performing the extraction.

Correct the caption. Configure the service contact. Separate the exhibits. Supply the form. Supply the proposed order. Resubmit. Seek assistance. Discover that the assistance link does not resolve. That sequence is not improved by putting the word enterprise in a sales presentation.

Tyler Technologies did not decide my family case. A rejection email bearing its system's name does not tell us whether a rule was applied by software, by a clerk, or through a combined workflow. Responsibility has to be traced, not guessed. But the citizen experiences the combined product as one public entrance. [S05, E216–E242]

That entrance has to do more than announce a defect. It has to make recovery intelligible. Otherwise the technology is excellent at documenting its own refusal and poor at serving the person for whom the service supposedly exists.

Here is the shoehorn. The suggestion is metaphorical. The need for a usable system is not.

The record at issue

April 24, 2026 — Private technical-support request.

The author emailed eCourts Help with rejection screenshots. This establishes an attempt to obtain private assistance before further public criticism. It does not establish that every rejection was a system error.

[S05; E216]

April 27, 2026 — The support link fails.

A preserved screenshot showed a DNS resolution error after the support link in a rejection notice was followed. It documents that failure at that point. It does not establish the duration or scope of an outage, or identify who caused it.

[S05; E226]

April 27, 2026 — Docket entry confirmed.

The clerk accepted envelope 210994 as a party letter. This is a successful entry, not an unending rejection. It does not by itself establish that the relief discussed in the letter was judicially granted.

[S05; E227]

The call-out

The black hole in the shoehorn joke is not a person. It is the familiar institutional habit of absorbing effort without returning an intelligible answer. The paperwork goes in. The rules come out. The family is left trying to determine whether anyone reached the substance.

No one needs to be harmed to expose that design. The rejection notice is already capable of doing the work.

When a public filing system rejects a submission, what level of technical support must exist before the resulting delay becomes an access problem rather than a user problem?

How many correction cycles can occur before "the litigant keeps filing" becomes an incomplete description of what happened?

Assessment: A digital courthouse is still a courthouse. Reliability and recoverability are access-to-justice characteristics, not customer-experience luxuries.

THE PEOPLE ARE WATCHING

The People are watching.

Cloudflare's April 6, 2026 email reported 27,075 pageviews for jtforme.com in the preceding month. That is the number the email actually reports. My description of later dashboard screenshots was that they showed unique visitors in the thousands. The screenshots, their dates, and their metric definitions must control any precise unique-visitor claim. [S10]

Pageviews are not people. Visitors are not votes. A traffic counter does not establish that a reader finished an article, agreed with it, or even arrived as a human rather than an automated client. Cloudflare itself distinguishes the metrics and warns that some traffic views include crawlers and threats. [S14]

None of that makes the Internet irrelevant. It makes accuracy about the Internet mandatory. I will not demand numerical discipline from a court and then invent an electorate out of a dashboard.

The important change is the opportunity for independent inspection. A document placed online can be read without my narration. A critic can compare it with my account. An institution can identify the omitted context. Publication makes disagreement more testable.

I do not doubt their fragile egos are sick of my shit. I am beyond sick of theirs. But an audience is not a verdict, and anger is not a census.

Read the source. Then decide what deserves your trust.

The call-out

A courthouse can control the order of argument in a proceeding. It does not thereby become the editor of every public discussion about the proceeding. My editorial commitment is to lawful, accurate publication with private material protected—not a claim that every item in an archive can be dumped online.

The People are watching is an invitation to read, not an invitation to follow a person. The difference should remain unmistakable.

What exactly is illegitimate about publishing primary-source public records and inviting correction?

What can the published source establish independently of the author's opinion?

Assessment: Attention is not proof. It is accountability pressure. The People are watching.

PART II

THE CREDIBILITY INDICTMENT

The claim. The source. The answer. What remains.

SELECTIVE CANDOR

Technically true is not the same thing as candid.

A statement can be literally accurate and still mislead by subtraction. "The filing was rejected for noncompliance" may be true. It says nothing about prior attempts to cure, the nature of the defect, the support path, the urgency of the underlying request, or whether the same document later reached the docket. "The transcript was cancelled for nonpayment" may be true. It says nothing about indigency, state-payment requests, audio alternatives, or the fact that the hearing record was central to appellate review.

Candor means enough context that the listener can understand the thing rather than merely admire the precision of the sentence.

The record at issue

January 27, 2026, 10:44 a.m. — OTO identifies the decision-maker.

Carrie Jordan said OTO and eScribers could not overrule a judge and directed the author back to the court. The reply locates the state-payment decision with the judiciary, not the vendor or supervisor.

[S06; E120]

April 30, 2026 — Pollack supplies materials.

The chronology records that Clerk Matthew Pollack emailed the March 2 order, cancellation material, docket sheet, and briefing schedule, while declining to mail those attachments. This later production corrects any blanket assertion that none of the documents was ever supplied. The separate dispute concerned service and practical access.

[S05; E235]

The call-out

The strongest version of an institutional answer belongs on the page. Carrie Jordan said she could not overrule a judge. Pollack supplied documents on April 30. A filing reached the docket after correction. Each of those facts narrows the accusation. None automatically resolves the separate question about practical access. [S05; S06]

This is how a credibility indictment should work: make the defense more complete, then identify precisely what it does not answer. A weak attack needs the other side edited down. A strong one can survive the full reply.

Technical accuracy is the floor. It is not a penthouse from which to sneer at everyone still asking about the missing context.

An institution should not need the context surgically removed before its explanation can survive public inspection.

What material context changes the meaning of each technically accurate institutional statement?

Which facts would a reasonable reader want before deciding whether the problem was user error, inability to pay, or system design?

Assessment: Credibility weakens when institutions insist on the narrow sentence and resist the surrounding record.

THE DISAPPEARING CONTEXT

One filing is never just one filing when the prior request is still unresolved.

The easiest way to portray a litigant as repetitive is to start counting after the unresolved problem has already been raised. Email number five looks excessive if emails one through four are omitted. Motion number three looks obsessive if the reader is never told that motion one was rejected for packaging and motion two was returned for a service-contact configuration issue.

The Registry itself proves why raw filing counts are dangerous. The public-accountability edition records 774 normalized Registry rows and expressly warns that those rows are not 774 independent motions or disputes. One filing event can generate separate rows for a motion, supporting document, affidavit, proposed order, notice, correction, or resubmission.

The record at issue

June 7, 2026 — The filing-artifact universe.

The same log reported 24,904 filing-universe records, a category including documents, service and entry notices, rejections, attachment crosswalks, duplicates, and generated review records. It must not be described as 24,904 separate filings.

[S05; E289]

The call-out

A counter has no theory of causation. It cannot tell a fresh motion from a corrected upload, a service notice from a judicial demand, or an exhibit from the issue it supports. Those distinctions require actual analysis.

If an institution uses volume to characterize a citizen, the method should be reproducible. Identify the units. Group the related submissions. Show which requests were answered. Then make the argument.

Anything less risks turning administrative exhaust into a personality diagnosis. I am not accepting that arithmetic simply because it wears a tie.

If the argument collapses when a service receipt stops being counted as a new motion, the problem is not the litigant. It is the fucking arithmetic.

How many "filings" were distinct demands for new relief, and how many were corrections, exhibits, service records, or resubmissions?

How should a fair reviewer normalize filing volume before using it as a credibility weapon against a pro se party?

Assessment: Raw volume without normalization is not analysis. It is rhetoric with a counter.

DEFINE "UNFOUNDED IN FACT"

Mr. McArdle, show the work.

The September 15, 2026 letter in Docket 26-321 says the Committee dismissed the delayed-recusal complaint because I had not shown a basis mandating earlier recusal. It used the phrase "unfounded in fact." It separately rejected the proposition that recusal without explanation was itself a Code violation and declined reconsideration. John A. McArdle III signed as Committee Counsel. Those are the Committee's positions, not findings for me. [S04]

The credibility question must be narrower than the earlier draft made it. "Unfounded" does not necessarily mean that every factual assertion was false. A complaint may fail because the showing does not establish the necessary basis for misconduct. Insufficiency and fabrication are not interchangeable. I do not get to make them interchangeable because the wording infuriates me.

Now the harder criticism can begin. What precise issue was decided, on what described record, and with what treatment of the other matters submitted? A short explanation can be accurate and still leave a complainant unable to understand the scope of the review. That is a question about explanatory sufficiency, not proof that no review occurred.

Mr. McArdle, your signature makes you the identified communicator of the Committee's disposition. It does not establish that you alone decided it. I want the institutional explanation, not a fantasy about a lone man secretly operating every lever.

The letter is reproduced once in the source appendix. It gets its full wording. My criticism does not get to trim away the sentence that explains the result and then complain that the Committee supplied no reason.

The public deserves more than an adjective war over the word unfounded. It deserves a visible boundary between the question asked and the question answered.

The actual disposition

The Committee said the showing did not establish a basis mandating earlier recusal; it dismissed that component as “unfounded in fact.” Its separate conclusions concerned an explanation for recusal and reconsideration.

S04. Complete public-safe transcription in the selected source appendix.

The call-out

The Committee’s rules also contemplate that matters from a dismissed complaint can remain relevant to a later properly presented pattern inquiry. The dismissal does not itself establish such a pattern, and that provision does not reopen my complaint automatically. It does defeat the rhetorical idea that a dismissal deletes history. [S11, Rule 1(B)(iv)]

My criticism is of how much the recipient can understand from the disposition and the record around it. I cannot infer concealed dishonesty from confidentiality or from a refusal to debate pending matters publicly. But I can insist that public confidence requires explanations that distinguish a failed showing from a discredited human being.

A letterhead is not an evidentiary argument. It is the place where one should begin.

The Public is not obligated to reverse-engineer an oversight letter and call the exercise transparency.

Which materials were reviewed before the complaint was called “unfounded in fact”?

Was the conclusion about a legal recusal standard, a factual assertion in the complaint, or both?

Assessment: An oversight conclusion gains credibility through disclosed reasoning, not through the authority of the letterhead.

THE PAPER VERSUS THE LIFE

The order was paper. The implementation problem was real life.

The February 11 order is detailed where state power is concerned. It describes parental rights, contact, therapy, communications, transportation, support, and sanctions. It is much less capable of doing the ordinary physical work necessary to make those provisions happen. That is not a criticism unique to this judge; it is a basic truth about family orders. Paper must be converted into adult behavior.

The credibility question begins when the institution treats the paper as proof that the life has been solved. The post-order record shows requests for phone information, platforms, contact windows, therapy scheduling, transportation, school access, medical access, insurance, releases, and in-person contact logistics. The existence of those requests does not itself prove obstruction. It proves implementation was not self-executing.

The controlling distinction

The order provided opportunities for contact while retaining conditions, schedule considerations, and allocated authority. The implementation emails are evidence of requests and competing interpretations, not proof that those conditions were satisfied or that every refusal was unlawful.

S01; S02. Editorial summary, not a quotation.

The record at issue

February 14, 2026, as reported on February 16 — Contact logistics requested.

The compliance email reports a 4:20 p.m. request for the child's number and electronic-contact information, an office reply that it lacked the order, and follow-up concerning a share link and proposed contact time. These timestamps are reported within the later email; they are not independent header verification here.

[S02; E131]

February 16, 2026 — Compliance statement and disputed demands.

The author said he would comply pending appeal and requested practical information. The same email demanded half the reunification cost under a general expense allocation. The order expressly made the author responsible for reunification-therapy costs. The demand is therefore presented as his disputed position, not an established reimbursement obligation.

[S02; E135]

February 18, 2026 — Interim logistics draft.

The draft requested specific contact information, transportation arrangements, school notice, and records or authorizations. Blank date and signature fields in a draft do not prove filing. The related February 20 signed or scanned packet supplies a separate transmission anchor.

[S05; E139]

The call-out

There is a practical difference between a right, a condition, a discretion, and a plan. The order contains the first three. The implementation dispute concerns how those terms become the fourth.

A reasonable plan can respect a teenager's wishes, clinical judgment, and safety conditions while still stating which adults will communicate, what happens to a cancelled session, and where a disagreement will be resolved. This is not an argument for physically forcing a child into contact. It is an argument against leaving the therapeutic route in a fog.

Judge Lucy's words deserve to be read exactly. The people required to live under them deserve a process for resolving an honest disagreement about their application.

A signature can close the document. It cannot do the parenting.

Which ordered provisions required follow-up logistics that the order did not itself define?

What mechanism existed for immediate clarification when the adults disagreed about implementation?

Assessment: The credibility of an order should be measured partly by whether ordinary people can implement it without generating a second litigation track.

"ZEALOUS" IS NOT A MAGIC WORD

Winning for the adult can still be losing for the child.

Patrick S. Bedard is opposing counsel. He is entitled to advocate. He is entitled to disagree with me. He is entitled to seek rulings I hate. The credibility indictment is not "opposing counsel opposed me, therefore misconduct." That would be childish.

The harder question is whether procedural permission ends the professional inquiry. My amended grievance in GCF-25-524 alleged unsupported assertions, procedural gamesmanship, implementation friction, and record-shaping through proposed orders. The complaint and its adverse review history belong together. Neither prevents the reader from testing the particular representation against the particular document. [S03; S05, E246]

The record at issue

December 8–9, 2025 — Counsel declines the proposal.

The chronology records Bedard confirming his continued representation and stating that a proposal was unacceptable, with court scheduled for January. The proposal and full response are needed to evaluate candor; brevity and opposition alone are not misconduct.

[S05; E094]

April 21, 2026 — Counsel states the implementation position.

The chronology records Bedard saying the client would not answer every message, directing records inquiries to providers and the school, and describing review of compliance material before in-person progression. Those are substantive positions, not silence. The author disputed their consistency with the order.

[S05; E207]

May 1, 2026 — An exposure concern and a denial.

The author raised concern that the child had been exposed to adult litigation commentary. Bedard replied that he had confirmed with the other parent that the child had not seen or been told the material. The child's private words are omitted. The exchange preserves competing accounts; it does not resolve causation or credibility.

[S05; E239]

May 8, 2026 — Review of a grievance dismissal.

A carried-forward timeline entry says Board Clerk Melinda F. Whelan referred the request for review of Bar Counsel's dismissal to a public non-attorney Grievance Commission member. The underlying letter was not present as a standalone source in that batch. Referral is not reversal and does not establish discipline.

[S05; E246]

The call-out

Mr. Bedard, a bar license is not a substitute for the missing sentence. An adversarial role does not make a factual description immune from comparison. Put the motion beside the later appointments Anderson identified. Put the implementation position beside the order. Let the reader see what survives.

The cleanest question is still documentary: here is the representation, here is the source it describes, here is the contrary material, and here is the substantive response. Reconcile them.

Winning is an outcome. Candor is a method. The fact that one occurred does not establish the other.

Mr. Bedard, "I represent the other side" explains why you opposed me. It does not answer whether the particular representation was complete.

*When counsel invokes a child's wishes, what adult implementation duties remain?
When a neutral former GAL identifies inaccuracies and omitted later appointments in a motion, what should candor require next?*

Assessment: "Advocacy" is a role. It is not a waiver of credibility review.

MORSE, BEDARD, AND THE CLOCK

The backlog is not vindication.

Ignorance and arrogance are a dangerous combination. The answer is not a louder assertion. It is a statement that survives comparison with the source.

On April 24, 2026, Amanda Morse described the child as the “sole gatekeeper” of contact. When I disputed that reading, she replied: “It is not my ‘interpretation’ / It is verbatim.” The contact provisions reproduced in this book do not contain “sole gatekeeper.” They address the child’s schedule and desires and conditions for contact. Interpretation and quotation are different claims. [S01; S16]

Saying “verbatim” does not put missing words in an order.

Morse also proposed Monday rescheduling, described late notice of the driving lesson, and accused me of disparagement. Those answers belong in the account. They do not turn a characterization into a quotation. [S16]

Bedard’s April 21 email asserted that proof of compliance was missing, said contact had been encouraged, and proposed review by himself and Morse. He also said a teenager could not be forced to visit. That is his stated position, not silence. It should be tested against the order and the compliance record. [S16]

A client’s certainty and counsel’s endorsement are not two independent sources. They are positions that still require support. Nor does a delayed hearing establish either side’s correctness. The question is what each adult did while the dispute remained unresolved.

Assessment: The scrutiny belongs on Morse’s assertions, Bedard’s representations, and the actual implementation record—not on Glenn Anderson or anyone’s surname.

THE PROCEDURAL ORACLE

Correct instructions can still describe an inaccessible system.

Clerks are not judges. They cannot adjudicate by email. They should not become targets merely because a citizen wants a ruling. That is exactly why the clerk communications are so useful: they let us separate individual professionalism from systemic usability.

Matthew Pollack and Julie Howard can each be procedurally correct while the overall pathway remains maddening. The credibility test is whether the institution can acknowledge that distinction instead of treating correct routing as proof of meaningful access.

The record at issue

April 30, 2026 — Pollack supplies materials.

The chronology records that Clerk Matthew Pollack emailed the March 2 order, cancellation material, docket sheet, and briefing schedule, while declining to mail those attachments. This later production corrects any blanket assertion that none of the documents was ever supplied. The separate dispute concerned service and practical access.

[S05; E235]

May 8–11, 2026 — Further records request declined as duplicative.

Pollack responded that the requested material duplicated the April 29–30 request, declined further email production, and identified in-person examination and paid copies. The earlier April 30 production is part of the same account. Whether the resulting access was adequate is distinct from whether anything was provided.

[S05; E250]

May 14, 2026 — Pollack explains the channel.

Pollack said the Court could not act on the demand email itself and that the corresponding motion would be docketed and presented in the usual way. This is procedural guidance and an identified next step, not a merits rejection.

[S05; E270]

The call-out

The clerk who cannot grant relief is not the appropriate substitute defendant for every delay in granting it. Pollack's and Howard's names belong because their communications explain a pathway, not because the author is entitled to turn every person at the counter into a villain.

The harder institutional question is who owns the complete pathway. If every office can describe its own segment but nobody can explain the route from submission to decision, the citizen inherits the integration problem.

A public service should not need its users to supply the missing systems architecture.

Correct routing is not a moral achievement when the institution cannot explain where the route ends.

What is the shortest lawful path from urgent implementation problem to judicial decision?

How does a self-represented litigant know the difference between transmitted, accepted, docketed, presented, considered, and ruled upon?

Assessment: A procedurally correct maze is still a maze.

ACCESS DENIED SUCCESSFULLY

The portal could reject the document. Could the process explain the cure?

The eFile record is absurd precisely because so many individual steps can be defended. The submission failed a service-contact rule. Another failed caption/designation requirements. Another required separate exhibits. Another required FM-218. Another required a proposed order. Relation-back instructions imposed a correction clock. Meanwhile, the support link embedded in the rejection notice itself failed to resolve.

None of that proves a conspiracy to deny access. It proves an access system that can consume enormous effort before the merits are even presented.

The record at issue

April 25, 2026 — Service-contact rejection.

Envelope 210756 was returned with an authorized-service-contact reason. The underlying relief was not adjudicated by that notice. The issue at this stage was intake compliance.

[S05; E219]

April 27, 2026 — The service-contact reason recurs.

Envelope 210987 was returned for the same described service-contact requirement. That is a separate submission event, but not necessarily a separate underlying dispute.

[S05; E223]

April 27, 2026 — The support link fails.

A preserved screenshot showed a DNS resolution error after the support link in a rejection notice was followed. It documents that failure at that point. It does not establish the duration or scope of an outage, or identify who caused it.

[S05; E226]

April 27, 2026 — Docket entry confirmed.

The clerk accepted envelope 210994 as a party letter. This is a successful entry, not an unending rejection. It does not by itself establish that the relief discussed in the letter was judicially granted.

[S05; E227]

May 4, 2026 — Separate documents required.

Envelope 213831 was returned with document-packaging and relation-back instructions. The notice describes the cure. The subsequent successful resubmission is material counter-context.

[S05; E241]

May 5, 2026 — Corrected submission accepted.

Envelope 215603, submitted the previous evening, was entered as a motion to modify or amend. The record shows prompt correction and successful intake, not the ultimate outcome of the motion.

[S05; E242]

May 14, 2026 — FM-218 required.

The rejection for envelope 220333 required the Motion for Expedited Hearing form and described a four-business-day relation-back process. That is a concrete correction instruction. The remaining question is what happened after the required cure and how the request reached substantive review.

[S05; E272]

The call-out

The April 27 acceptance is essential. So is the May correction that reached the docket. This was not a system that rejected every act forever. It was a system whose failures, cures, and successes needed to be reconstructed from separate notices.

Tyler Technologies, the Judicial Branch, and the intake workflow should be evaluated at their actual points of responsibility. A vendor label is not proof of who decided a rejection. But a public contract cannot outsource the citizen's need to understand the result.

Access denied successfully is a joke about a service metric. It is not a claim that the system's purpose was secretly to deny justice.

Your filing has failed. Please use the support link. The support link has also failed. That is a systems problem, not a personality defect in the person who reports it.

Which rejection rules protected substantive fairness, and which merely enforced packaging?

How many staff/user hours did correction cycles consume?

Assessment: Administrative validity and functional justice are separate questions.

JUSTICE AT \$1,515.90 DOWN

How much should it cost to obtain the record needed to challenge a hearing-based decision?

The transcript materials identify two different measurements: 326 minutes of hearing time and an estimate of 326 transcript pages. The estimate was 326 pages at \$4.65 per page, producing a requested deposit of \$1,515.90. Minutes and pages are not interchangeable, even when the estimate happens to use the same number. [S06, E112, E118–E121]

Carrie Jordan of the Office of Transcript Operations said that OTO and eScribers could not overrule the judge's state-payment decision. That matters. The vendor was not exercising judicial discretion over indigency merely because it sent the invoice. I sought reconsideration and then an electronic-recording or settled-statement alternative. [S06; S07]

The resulting criticism is stronger when responsibility is assigned correctly. The supervisor's answer may have accurately described her authority. It still sent the problem back to the decision-maker whose ruling had created the private-pay posture.

One office can be correct about its limits while the overall process remains inaccessible to a person without the money. That is the problem to examine. Not whether \$1,515.90 is a large number in the abstract, but whether an effective alternative existed in this appeal and how the requests for one were resolved.

A review system should not confuse the formal existence of an appeal with a litigant's practical ability to present the hearing-dependent issues. The file must show both.

The record at issue

January 27, 2026, 10:29 a.m. — Private-pay transcript posture.

The transcript-order confirmation for MEJB11138 identified the appeal purpose, the denied state-payment request, and a deposit required before work began. It was an estimate and payment instruction, not the completed transcript.

[S06; E118]

January 27, 2026, 10:44 a.m. — OTO identifies the decision-maker.

Carrie Jordan said OTO and eScribers could not overrule a judge and directed the author back to the court. The reply locates the state-payment decision with the judiciary, not the vendor or supervisor.

[S06; E120]

January 27, 2026, 12:36 p.m. — The estimate.

The estimated 326 transcript pages at \$4.65 per page produced a \$1,515.90 requested deposit. That is the estimated cost, not proof of the number of pages a completed transcript would ultimately contain.

[S06; E121]

February 18, 2026 — Alternative hearing record requested.

The motion sought an electronic recording in lieu of a transcript or a settled-statement process. Its existence establishes the requested alternative. The motion is not itself proof that the court had to grant that alternative or that no later ruling occurred.

[S07; E137]

April 30, 2026 — Pollack supplies materials.

The chronology records that Clerk Matthew Pollack emailed the March 2 order, cancellation material, docket sheet, and briefing schedule, while declining to mail those attachments. This later production corrects any blanket assertion that none of the documents was ever supplied. The separate dispute concerned service and practical access.

[S05; E235]

The call-out

I do not need to call an invoice extortion to describe the barrier. The number is sufficient. So are the requests for a substitute record and the rulings that followed.

A court reviewing its own access process should ask whether the available route was usable by this litigant with these means and these issues. Not whether a hypothetical person with money could have purchased the transcript.

The distinction between a door that exists and a door someone can open is not sentimental. It is operational.

The invoice did not need embellishment. It already contained the punch line: pay first, then obtain the hearing record.

What alternative hearing record was realistically available to an indigent appellant?

Why was the electronic recording not a sufficient substitute if it existed?

Assessment: A right that becomes unusable at the point of record creation deserves access scrutiny.

THE CHILD AS INSTITUTIONAL ALIBI

A teenager is a person, not a jurisdictional escape hatch.

Respecting an adolescent's preferences is not the same thing as making the adolescent responsible for adult implementation. The record repeatedly returns to the same contested fault line: when contact is ordered but the child resists, what must the adults actually do?

The other parent's April messages framed the child as the "sole gatekeeper" and described in-person contact as a decision the child could control. My filings disputed that reading and sought clarification. The legal merits of those positions belong to the court. The public-accountability question is more basic: did the adults preserve a therapeutic path toward relationship repair, or did "the child does not want to" become the endpoint?

The record at issue

April 24, 2026 — A claim about the order's wording.

The other parent described the child as the sole gatekeeper and then said the description was verbatim. The reproduced contact provisions do not use that phrase. A textual mismatch is not the same thing as a final ruling about implementation, but a claimed quotation can be checked against the words actually printed.

[S05; E212]

April 25, 2026 — A compliance position and proposed reporting.

The other parent said she would assist with scheduling if the child wanted contact, disputed the author's compliance, and stated that further non-emergency emails would be reported as protection-order violations. This establishes her position in the exchange; it does not decide which communications the operative orders allowed.

[S05; E218]

May 8, 2026 — A session-duration complaint.

The author reported late arrival and early departure and requested preservation of full session time. The provider's account and complete responses remain necessary. This edition does not treat the sender's account as an independent clinical finding.

[S05; E247]

The call-out

A teenager's resistance deserves to be heard as the teenager's experience, not dismissed as proof of somebody else's manipulation. The record does not permit a universal explanation of how every preference formed.

That makes the adult obligation more specific, not less important. Preserve the clinical route. Explain the schedule. Identify the conditions. Seek clarification through the proper process. Do not turn respect for the child's feelings into a claim that no adult decision remains to be made.

The child is neither an exhibit for my anger nor a convenient endpoint for institutional responsibility.

What does it mean to respect a teenager's wishes while still requiring adults to perform adult responsibilities?

What did the therapist actually recommend about expanding or preserving contact?

Assessment: Child autonomy cannot become an excuse for adult abdication.

"REPETITIVE"

Sometimes repetition is the sound of an unresolved problem bouncing off a closed door.

The word "repetitive" can be descriptive. It can also be a narrative weapon. If multiple filings ask substantially the same thing, the institution may reasonably need to manage them. But the credibility analysis cannot stop there. It must ask why the same request kept returning.

The timeline shows the same basic implementation themes - contact, therapy, records, school, medical access, transcript/audio, filing access - recurring across successive requests. Some were revised because circumstances changed. Some were corrected after rejection. Some were supplemental because a new event occurred. A fair review has to separate those categories.

The record at issue

February 20, 2026 – Consolidated implementation packet.

A scanned packet requested an expedited status conference, interim implementation directions, and clarification. The source review described its first pages and corroborating native draft. Docket acceptance and disposition are separate questions.

[S05; E146]

April 27–28, 2026 – A different packet is returned.

The targeted implementation packet was returned for service-contact and caption or designation defects. Its return should not erase the separate successful letter entry.

[S05; E228]

May 5, 2026 — Corrected submission accepted.

Envelope 215603, submitted the previous evening, was entered as a motion to modify or amend. The record shows prompt correction and successful intake, not the ultimate outcome of the motion.

[S05; E242]

The call-out

There are legitimate reasons to restrict duplicative filings and abusive communications. A parent does not gain an unlimited license by invoking urgency. That is the strongest counterargument, and it deserves to be faced rather than caricatured.

Now perform the actual sorting. Which submission repeated a decided request? Which corrected a returned packet? Which added a new event? Which sought the missing document cited by a decision? A fair description is capable of distinguishing those categories.

Do not call the record repetitive while refusing to count the repetitions the process required.

Which filings were genuinely duplicative, and which were changed by new facts or required procedural correction?

Which underlying requests remained unresolved when they were repeated?

Assessment: Repetition can be abuse. It can also be evidence of unresolved implementation. Credibility requires distinguishing the two.

THE CREDIBILITY ADJUDICATION

No presumption. Verify everybody.

I am not a court adjudicating professional misconduct. I do not get to convert accusation into fact by typing it in bold. But I absolutely get to assess credibility as a citizen and author, and the Public gets to do the same.

The adjudication standard in this book is brutally simple: consistency between the institutional claim and the underlying record. Where the record supports the institution, say so. Where it complicates the institution, show it. Where the source is incomplete, mark the limitation. Where the source flatly contradicts the summary, the source wins.

I HAVE MET CON ARTISTS WHO DISPLAYED GREATER CANDOR. AT LEAST THEY UNDERSTOOD THEY HAD TO SELL A COHERENT STORY.

NO SALE. SHOW THE FUCKING RECEIPTS.

The conspiracy is not proven. The institutional architecture is.

The call-out

The findings in this book are my editorial assessments, not judicial determinations. When I say an explanation is inadequate, the reader should be able to see why. When I say the evidence is insufficient to accuse someone, that belongs in the finding too.

My earlier cost assertion, the difference between minutes and pages, the later supply of record materials, and the limits of the network research all make the same demand of me: preserve the correction.

Credibility is not a trophy for having the loudest grievance. It is the willingness to let the source spoil your best line.

Assessment: Credibility is not hereditary. It is evidence.

PART III

THE NETWORK IS REAL

The institutional architecture is documented. Illicit coordination is not established.

DO NOT DRAW A CONSPIRACY CHART. DRAW A PROVENANCE MAP.

Structural overlap is enough to ask hard questions.

The deep-research report reached the most useful conclusion it could have reached: there is a dense institutional network, but no demonstrated secret or illicit personal network. That is stronger than conspiracy rhetoric because it gives the book a disciplined map of relationships that are actually documented.

The distinction matters. A shared school does not prove coordination. A shared telephone number does not prove shared adjudicative decision-making. A judge and lawyer appearing in the same case does not prove friendship. But formal governance links, administrative overlap, common infrastructure, and recurring professional ecosystems can still create legitimate questions about independence, conflicts, disclosure, and public confidence.

The call-out

The original research expressly did not establish a secret agreement, a shared firm among the principal trio, or criminal coordination. That negative result is not a disappointment to be concealed. It is part of the work.

Mark W. Lawrence and Justice Rick E. Lawrence must not be conflated. A shared surname is not a professional relationship, much less a conspiracy. That elementary distinction belongs here instead of consuming a separate theatrical chapter.

An institution's network can be ordinary and still deserve scrutiny. The accusation must concern a documented act or a defined design problem, not the mere existence of colleagues.

THE SJC AS STRUCTURAL HUB

Follow the formal authority before you speculate about informal influence.

The Maine Supreme Judicial Court is the strongest verified structural hub in the network map. The CJC exists pursuant to Supreme Judicial Court authority and the SJC retains final judicial-discipline authority. The Board of Overseers describes itself as an independent agency under SJC jurisdiction. In 2026, Justice Christopher Taub is identified as the SJC liaison to the CJC.

That is not scandal. It is governance. But governance architecture is exactly what public accountability should understand before accepting assurances of independence at face value.

The call-out

Chief Justice Stanfill, Justice Lawrence, Justice Taub, and the bodies connected to the SJC enter this discussion at different levels. The report identifies formal roles and affiliations. It does not establish personal participation by every person in every complaint decision. [S09]

A structural hub is not a mastermind. It is a place where authority converges. The legitimate question is whether the architecture includes adequate independence, conflicts procedures, and public explanations.

Governance is not an embarrassment to hide. An institution confident in its design should be able to draw it clearly.

How are the CJC and Board administratively separated from the SJC while remaining under its governance authority?

What conflict and recusal rules apply when oversight matters touch judges, lawyers, or institutions within the same professional ecosystem?

Assessment: Formal concentration of authority is a governance fact, not a conspiracy. It still deserves transparent safeguards.

ONE PHONE NUMBER, TWO OVERSIGHT SYSTEMS

One phone number is a fact. A conspiracy is not.

The CJC and Board of Overseers websites publish the same main telephone number. The Board identifies its Winthrop Street office; the research report also located a directory address for McArdle at that location. The first is an official contact overlap. The second is secondary directory evidence. Neither tells us that complaint decisions were coordinated. [S09; S12; S13]

There is also an important answer already in the rules: the CJC's establishing order provides for counsel, offices, assistance, and a judicial-branch budget. It permits information to be provided to the Board, Grievance Commission, and Bar Counsel for matters within their jurisdiction. Sharing is therefore not automatically an illicit discovery. [S11, establishing order, paragraphs 3–4 and 8(C)]

That does not finish the governance inquiry. It improves it. What services are actually shared? Which staff have access to which files? Who handles a conflict? What written arrangement describes those functions?

The useful demand is for the operating arrangement and safeguards, not for an institution to deny a conspiracy I have not established. A telephone number cannot testify about a private conversation.

Give the Public the boring explanation. The organization chart. The administrative agreement. The separation of duties. If the arrangement is ordinary and appropriate, ordinary documentation should make it intelligible.

Independence is not strengthened by leaving its plumbing mysterious. It is strengthened by showing how it works.

The call-out

A fair account must also acknowledge that confidentiality can protect complainants, witnesses, judges, and the integrity of an inquiry. The existence of confidential proceedings is not itself evidence of cover-up.

The demand is for the distinction between legitimate confidentiality and unnecessary obscurity. A confidential file need not make an administrative services arrangement unknowable. A public explanation of safeguards need not disclose a child's information.

Explain the boundary. Do not use the existence of one protected category as fog over every other question.

If independence is real, show the safeguards. Do not ask the Public to mistake a separate letterhead for a firewall.

What agreement explains the shared phone number?

Who owns or leases the office space used by Committee Counsel?

Assessment: Shared infrastructure warrants a precise question, not an invented verdict.

MAINE LAW: A SMALL PROFESSIONAL WORLD

Overlap is plausible. Personal relationship is unproven.

The research identifies a substantial University of Maine School of Law nexus. Bedard reports graduating in 1988. Maine Law material identifies John Lucy as Class of 1990. Chief Justice Valerie Stanfill is an alumna and later faculty member. Justice Rick Lawrence taught there as an adjunct from 2014 through 2020. McArdle's professional biography reports that he taught Trial Practice there.

The book will not convert those facts into "they all know each other." Maine is a small legal market. Schools create professional networks. That is ordinary. The accountability question is narrower: when the same educational institution recurs across judicial, advocacy, and oversight actors, what conflict, disclosure, and recusal norms reassure the public that professional familiarity does not substitute for independent judgment?

The call-out

No diploma proves a friendship. No friendship by itself proves a corrupt ruling. A school affiliation can be accurately reported without becoming an accusation.

The question worth asking is whether a particular relationship, if it exists and is material, should have been disclosed under the applicable standards. The relationship has to be established first. This report did not establish that Bedard and Lucy personally knew one another at law school.

The Public deserves an honest map, not a corkboard on which the author strings every name together and calls the string evidence.

Assessment: Shared institutional affiliation is not misconduct. Hidden material conflicts would be. The record presently establishes the former, not the latter.

FIRM GENEALOGY

Follow the resumes. Stop guessing.

The research reconstructs professional histories: Lucy at Richardson, Whitman, Large & Badger before the bench; McArdle through firms including Campbell & McArdle and Kelly, Remmel & Zimmerman; Bedard through Bedard & Bobrow and his current practice. It found no verified common firm among Bedard, Lucy, and McArdle.

That negative result is useful. Accountability research should eliminate hypotheses as aggressively as it generates them.

The call-out

The report's firm histories are distinct. Preserve that result. An investigator who only keeps connections and discards non-connections is not tracing a network; he is drawing the answer he arrived wanting.

The same discipline applies to the fee-arbitration reference involving Bedard. The reported disposition was an award to the respondent, not professional discipline. That record cannot be waved around as a sanction. [S09]

The institution may fail my test of candor in one document and still receive a favorable result in another. A documentary book has to survive both.

What historical firm affiliations can be established from reported cases and bar directories?

Did any firms share partners, office space, or successor relationships?

Assessment: A provenance map is strongest when it is willing to say "no connection found."

BEDARD'S ACCOUNT; ANDERSON'S CORRECTION

The witness corrected the history. That matters.

Glenn R. Anderson's January 6, 2026 letter addressed Patrick S. Bedard's Motion in Limine dated December 29, 2025. He sent the signed page to Bedard and me that afternoon, placing his correction before the January 16 hearing. [S15]

Anderson began by conceding a point favorable to the motion: he had no GAL appointment under the pending motions. He then identified what he called "inaccuracies contained in the Motion in Limine." His criticism was specific, not a denunciation of every argument Bedard made.

According to the letter, the motion described his older appointment at least four times but omitted later appointments in March 2018 and December 2019. Anderson said the latter lasted an entire year. He pointed to the court file and reports as the place to check his extensive involvement. [S15]

Mr. Bedard, that is a factual challenge from the professional whose history your motion described. It cannot be answered merely by repeating that the testimony should be excluded. The admissibility question and the accuracy of the supporting history are separate.

The full motion and subsequent ruling remain necessary to assess materiality and the court's reasoning. The letter alone does not establish deliberate deception. It establishes Anderson's specific correction—and his willingness to acknowledge the points he did not dispute.

Candor is not louder certainty. It is a checkable account.

The line Anderson drew

Anderson did not ask the court to accept every assertion I had made. He did not declare that he had the last word on admissibility. He distinguished his history from the legal question and stated his intention to comply with the subpoena unless the court directed otherwise. [S15]

That distinction earns credit. Anderson did not create the omission he described. He identified it. The criticism belongs on the account he corrected, not on him.

The call-out – counsel's description

A legal argument does not get to borrow an inaccurate history and return it after the ruling like office stationery. Dates are not decorative. A later appointment can change how recent, extensive, or relevant a witness's knowledge appears, even when the final evidentiary ruling remains debatable.

The question for Bedard is what his motion said in full, why the later appointments were not included in the account Anderson criticized, and what correction followed. The question for the court is what material it considered and what ground controlled its ruling. Neither question is an accusation against Glenn.

This is the model for the rest of the book: name the author of the challenged statement, preserve the actual correction, retain the strongest answer, and do not transfer blame to the person who supplied contrary information.

Did the subsequent record correct the appointment history before the evidentiary dispute was decided?

Assessment: Anderson's letter supports scrutiny of counsel's description. It does not support an attack on Anderson's candor or a blanket judgment about any family.

Source: S15, signed January 6, 2026 letter and transmitting email. S09 originally identified the letter. The complete motion and ruling remain necessary for the broader comparison.

THE RECORDS REQUEST CHAPTER

Ask the questions that can actually be answered.

The deep-research report ends in the right place: not with a verdict, but with investigative priorities. Administrative-services agreements. Appointment documents. Organization charts. Budget lines. Job descriptions. Office-space arrangements. Confidentiality rules. Historical CJC rosters. SJC liaison records. Alumni directories. Firm genealogy.

This is the model for public accountability after the first burst of outrage: convert suspicion into testable requests.

The record walks from 2010 through 2026. Children do not get remands of childhood.

The call-out

The records-first method has one unforgiving advantage: it can prove the author wrong. An agreement can explain the shared service. A roster can eliminate a supposed overlap. A ruling can show that a disputed point was considered.

Good. That is what research is for.

Public accountability is not a scavenger hunt for names to dislike. It is the discipline of turning an institutional claim into a question a document can answer.

What records explain CJC/Board administrative overlap?

Who supervises Committee Counsel administratively?

Assessment: Anger becomes useful when the next question can be answered by a document.

PART IV

THE CHILDHOOD CLOCK

One continuous life, not a succession of case-management events.

2010-2014: THE FIRST DOORS

The first doors were not digital.

The preserved chronology begins in 2010, when the family case opened. Its account and the later Registry transcription are not identical kinds of evidence: an author's timeline may describe why a case began; the Registry records procedural events. Keep the distinction. "A case opened" is not, by itself, a judicial finding about the conduct that caused it. [S05, E001]

Early entries describe shared parental rights and access to child-related information. That is why the later records disputes are not merely a technical side plot. They concern the practical content of a relationship the paperwork had already undertaken to define.

The challenge to the institution is not "you should have predicted every event sixteen years later." It is "what did your earlier orders require, what happened when access was disputed, and what did later decision-makers do with that history?" Hindsight cannot fairly impose clairvoyance. It can fairly ask whether an existing record was used.

A family does not restart when the next motion arrives. The docket number persists. So does the life behind it. A court that needs the history summarized should require a usable summary, not pretend the history became irrelevant because it is inconvenient to read.

The records below establish the early framework as represented in the preserved chronology. They are not a license to make every later allegation retroactively proven.

The dated record

October 2010 — The family case opens.

The preserved chronology places the initial family-court filing in October 2010 and attributes it to a dispute over access. The opening of the case is a procedural fact; the asserted reason is the author's account. The later Registry transcription supplies the more precise procedural sequence.

[S05; E001]

2011–2012 — The first GAL period.

The chronology describes an early GAL investigation and reports concerns about disparagement and information access. This is a summary of the earlier materials, not a newly verified finding. The original GAL report remains necessary to establish the precise observations and their context.

[S05; E002]

January 2011 — An early information-access framework.

The chronology identifies an interim or stipulated order addressing shared parental rights and records access. One layer dates it January 10; the Registry transcription records entry on January 11. Order date and docket-entry date should be distinguished rather than silently treated as identical.

[S05; E003]

November 28, 2011 — An evidentiary step.

A witness-subpoena hearing marker appears in the preserved chronology. It establishes a procedural step, not the outcome or the truth of testimony that may have been proposed.

[S05; E005]

January 23, 2012 — The earlier framework continues.

The chronology states that an existing parental-rights and information-access framework remained in place. The operative order, not this summary, controls its scope.

[S05; E006]

February 7, 2012 — Financial enforcement appears in the record.

The chronology identifies an income-withholding notice. It is evidence of an enforcement mechanism, not proof that every contested payment or support calculation was correct.

[S05; E007]

March 10, 2014 — Support and parental-rights records.

The preserved layer identifies a support worksheet and a continuing parental-rights framework. The distinct source documents should control any calculation or interpretation; this entry supplies chronology rather than a new determination.

[S05; E008]

The call-out

The earliest record cannot answer every later question. It can prevent a later account from pretending the history began with the last angry email. An institution that preserves a case number across years should be able to preserve the relevant reasoning across them too. Continuity should be more than the part of the database that remembers who pays.

What practical information access followed the early shared-rights framework?

Which later disputes can be tied to an identified obligation rather than a retrospective accusation?

2016: RECORDS, RELEASES, AND CONTEMPT

By 2016, the question was no longer whether information access belonged in the case. The question was why it still required litigation.

The chronology places requests, notes, subpoenas, and contempt-related activity around medical and insurance information. Those are different documents doing different jobs. A father's handwritten concern proves he recorded a concern. An issued subpoena proves a procedural step. Neither independently proves that the court made the finding he wanted. [S05, E009–E019]

That distinction matters because the institutional failure alleged here is persistence without practical resolution. It cannot be demonstrated simply by counting sheets of paper. It must be tested against the operative orders, the requests, the responses, and what changed afterward.

The payment entries are similarly concrete but limited. A transfer can establish money moved. It cannot establish, without the surrounding obligation and accounting, that every support allegation was wrong or every claimed debt was paid. The bank record gets its amount, date, and limited proposition. It does not get promoted into a universal acquittal.

Mr. Bedard, a recurring records dispute deserves an answer about the records. The court deserves the same precision from me. Neither side should be allowed to build a sweeping credibility story on a transaction that proves only one part of it.

Years of correspondence do not become meaningless because no single email contains the entire pattern. Equally, the word pattern does not relieve an author of proving the individual links.

The dated record

February 10–11, 2016 — Records access enters contempt-related correspondence.

Emails and motion materials are described as raising disputes over information and releases. They establish that the issue was raised. The contempt disposition and operative language are needed to determine whether a violation was found.

[S05; E009]

February 2016 — Contemporaneous notes preserve the complaint.

The author's handwritten notes recorded concerns about access to child-related information. They show contemporaneous documentation, not independent corroboration of every concern written in them.

[S05; E010]

February 16, 2016 — The dispute proceeds through formal process.

The chronology identifies subpoena or hearing procedure concerning insurance and records access. Its existence is not a merits finding.

[S05; E011]

March 2, 2016 — Scheduling and subpoena activity.

A further procedural entry concerns the same records-access dispute. It is retained to show the passage from correspondence toward a hearing, not to count the same issue as another independent wrong.

[S05; E012]

April 8, 2016 — Contempt hearing identified.

The chronology identifies a hearing concerning records, releases, and access. The hearing date does not establish its disposition. Any claim that relief was granted or denied must be tied to the actual ruling.

[S05; E015]

May 3–6, 2016 — A documented transfer, not a universal accounting.

The chronology describes a \$2,000 transfer, a following withdrawal entry, and an expected completion date. The entries support a transaction history. Without the relevant obligation and complete account, they do not establish whether every support or reimbursement issue was satisfied.

[S05; E016]

May 31, 2016 — Affidavit submission.

A cover letter identified an affidavit submitted in the family docket. It is a preservation and transmission record; the affidavit's assertions and any ruling on them remain distinct.

[S05; E019]

The call-out

A records-access order without a practical way to settle access disputes risks becoming ceremonial. A contempt allegation without its disposition risks becoming one-sided. The fair account needs both the obligation and what the court actually did with the alleged violation.

That is the question to carry forward: not how many times a father complained, but what became possible after the institution answered.

What did the 2016 court process decide about access, and what changed afterward?

What does the payment record establish—and what does it leave open?

2018: THE GAL RETURNS

The return of a GAL should interrupt the habit of treating a family as a stack of disconnected episodes.

The 2018 materials include counsel-payment records, counseling-related communications, and a later period of Anderson's involvement. I do not publish a child's clinical details to make the adult argument more dramatic. The public issue is that neutral involvement existed and later descriptions of that involvement needed to account for it. [S05, E020–E025; S09]

A retainer letter establishes a payment toward representation. It does not establish competence, incompetence, or the merits of the client's position. A counseling email establishes a professional communication. It should not be stretched into an assertion that no further concern could ever exist.

This is where institutional memory has practical value. A later observer can compare earlier circumstances with later changes. That does not make the observer infallible. It makes the record richer than the most recent adversarial summary.

The call-out is to anyone who invokes neutrality as a badge but discards the neutral's history when it complicates the current presentation. Either the history matters enough to investigate, or explain why the particular issue does not require it. Do not advertise independent assessment and then act as though continuity is an administrative nuisance.

The child is not a reset button. Neither should the file be.

The dated record

2018 – Later GAL involvement.

The preserved chronology identifies a later GAL period and related report material. The research report separately attributes a March 2018 appointment and a later 2019 appointment to Anderson's January 6, 2026 letter. Those later appointments are material to describing his actual history without reducing it to the first period.

[S05; E020]

January 16, 2018 — Representation funded.

A retainer-payment letter records a \$1,000 payment to Attorney Amanda Ramirez. The payment establishes an expenditure for representation, not a finding about any participant's conduct.

[S05; E021]

February 19, 2018 — Further retainer payment.

A second letter records a \$1,500 payment. The two letters document the cost of seeking assistance. They do not independently establish the merits of the requests that counsel handled.

[S05; E022]

February 28, 2018 — Counseling communication.

The chronology identifies an email about a professional meeting and a further scheduled session. Clinical details are omitted here. The institutional point is the existence of a contemporaneous professional communication, not a public diagnosis of the child.

[S05; E023]

The call-out

The return of a neutral does not prove that an earlier intervention failed. Circumstances change. It does prove that the later history cannot accurately be reduced to the first appointment alone.

The responsibility to get those dates right is not optional because the motion has a clever legal theory.

Which later GAL appointments belong in any complete account of Anderson's involvement?

What can the counseling communication establish without exposing the child's private care?

2019: THE SUMMER AND THE THERAPIST

The summer is a unit of childhood, not merely a gap between docket entries.

The 2019 chronology records state-agency contact, contemporaneous communications, hearing preparation, an alleged interruption of contact, and the beginning of a therapeutic service. An investigation is not a substantiated finding. A parent's account of withheld contact is not automatically a court's finding. Those distinctions survive my anger. [S05, E027–E033]

What the sequence does establish is that these concerns were being raised in that period. It is not fair to describe a later request for historical review as though its subject first appeared after an adverse ruling in 2026.

The stronger question is what the earlier process actually resolved. Did it determine a contested fact? Produce a practical arrangement? Identify an obligation? Or did the concern move into a different procedural container while the calendar kept advancing?

That inquiry does not require publication of another child's private circumstances. It requires the institution's dates, actions, and limits. A public account of a family case should be able to criticize adult administration without forcing children to donate their intimate lives as exhibits.

Summer ended. Therapy began. The record carried forward. A later court's task was not to accept my preferred explanation automatically, but to avoid mistaking a narrowed present-tense argument for the whole history.

The dated record

May 21, 2019 — State-agency contact.

The chronology records contact from a DHHS investigator concerning a household matter. Identifying and intimate details about children and unrelated individuals are omitted. Investigation contact is not a substantiated finding.

[S05; E027]

May 21–22, 2019 — Contemporaneous discussion preserved.

Email and message records were retained around the agency contact. They show the issue was discussed at the time; they do not substitute for the agency's findings or disposition.

[S05; E028]

June 4, 2019 — Investigation-related packet.

The author assembled the earlier communications and context. The packet documents what was preserved, not an independent adjudication of the concerns it contains.

[S05; E029]

June 5, 2019 — Representation-related payment record.

The chronology identifies a further counsel-payment letter. Its significance is the documented effort and cost of obtaining assistance, not proof that the author's substantive allegations were established.

[S05; E030]

June 27, 2019 — Hearing preparation.

A hearing-date packet was preserved in connection with the agency-related concerns. Preparation and a scheduled date should not be confused with a ruling.

[S05; E031]

Summer 2019 — A disputed interruption of contact.

The author's chronology states that contact was withheld during the summer. The account is preserved as an allegation. The operative orders, correspondence, and any adjudication are required to evaluate responsibility and justification.

[S05; E032]

September 12, 2019 – Therapeutic service begins.

The chronology records the beginning of a therapeutic service after the summer period. Private clinical information is not reproduced. Sequence alone does not prove that one event caused another.

[S05; E033]

The call-out

The agency contact must remain agency contact. The allegation must remain an allegation. The passage of the summer remains the passage of the summer.

Those propositions can stand together. A system that cannot explain how they were weighed should not expect a family to supply trust in place of the explanation.

What was the disposition of the agency and court concerns, as distinct from their existence?

Which practical arrangements followed the 2019 process?

2020–2023: THE YEARS BETWEEN FILINGS

Quiet years in a docket are not proof of a quiet family.

The chronology contains school, counseling, medical-notice, and appointment-coordination material between 2020 and 2023. Some entries are stronger than others. A dated school notice is different from an undifferentiated screenshot folder. The absence of a new court filing cannot tell us whether a problem stopped, became manageable, or simply remained outside court. [S05, E034–E052]

This edition removes unrelated safety-workflow material rather than using its mere presence in the archive to insinuate more family-case misconduct. A large corpus is not a permission slip to attach every grievance to every defendant. Relevance is part of candor.

The useful records show adults transmitting information, arranging appointments, reporting absences, and sometimes failing to reach one another. Where coordination worked, it belongs in the account. The October 2023 appointment acceptance is not an inconvenience to be edited out because a later chapter criticizes communication. [S05, E050–E052]

A credible pattern argument must survive its exceptions. Otherwise pattern is just the name an author gives to everything selected for the accusation.

I can believe the later system failed and still acknowledge a successful exchange. The institution ought to be capable of the same complexity when describing a parent.

The dated record

January 15, 2020 – Attendance material retained.

A generated school report appears in the chronology. The institutional question concerns information flow and adult support. Individual school-performance details are not reproduced as a public character judgment of the child.

[S05; E034]

March 12, 2020 – Notice concern.

The chronology identifies a school no-call/no-show concern. The original attendance and notification records remain necessary to establish the entry and any later correction.

[S05; E035]

April 7, 2020 – A treatment record exists.

The preserved chronology identifies a treatment plan. The public narrative does not reproduce the child's diagnosis or intimate clinical content. The record is relevant here as evidence that professional services and records existed.

[S05; E036]

May 1, 2020 – A concern raised through the GAL.

The author raised a vehicle-safety question to Anderson and received a response. The exchange shows use of a neutral channel; it does not establish that the concern resulted in a finding of wrongdoing.

[S05; E037]

June 8, 2020 – Provider communication retained.

The chronology identifies a message involving Tara Pullen, LCSW. This is a professional-communication marker, not a substitute for the message's precise content or a basis for profiling the provider.

[S05; E038]

July 8, 2020 – Further therapeutic record.

A later treatment review was retained. The presence of clinical records supports a history of professional involvement; it does not authorize public speculation about the child or establish a single cause for family difficulties.

[S05; E039]

July 22, 2023 — Parenting-time notice.

An email communicated a proposed summer-vacation week. It is an ordinary coordination record, useful as a counterweight to a narrative containing only disputes.

[S05; E049]

October 2–9, 2023 — Appointment coordination and acceptance.

The chronology records an appointment invitation, a later alert, and an acceptance by the other parent. The acceptance belongs in the account: some communication and coordination did occur. The entries do not establish the outcome of every appointment.

[S05; E050]

The call-out

The institutional call-out here is restraint in historical storytelling. Neither a quiet docket nor a noisy inbox proves the whole family dynamic.

An author who demands to be understood in context has no excuse for denying context to someone else. That includes the ordinary exchange that worked.

Where did coordination work, and where does the record show a specific unresolved problem?

Which claimed continuity rests on dated evidence rather than a folder name?

2024: THE BREAK

The break in 2024 did not occur in a vacuum. Neither did it occur in a world where my account is the only account.

The earlier months contain scheduling, school, medical, and communication exchanges. They show attempts to coordinate and responses that must be read together. A missed exchange accompanied by an explanation is not the same evidentiary object as a missed exchange with no explanation at all. [S05, E053–E062]

Late-2024 events later became central to the court’s adverse findings. The February 11 order credited testimony against me and found abuse. I challenged that account. Calling the events disputed from my perspective does not make the court’s findings vanish. The source appendix identifies the adverse posture expressly. [S01]

The public criticism therefore cannot be “nothing happened and everyone invented the rest” unless the evidence actually establishes that proposition. The argument in this book is about the handling of history, evidence, review, and the practical route forward. Those questions remain meaningful even when the reader takes the adverse findings seriously.

That is the uncomfortable discipline of a documentary book: the author has to leave the other account on the page. The reader gets to decide how much weight to give it.

What no one can do is return the child to the week before the rupture. From this point forward, time itself becomes part of the consequences every procedural decision has to carry.

The dated record

January 9, 2024 — School information forwarded.

The author sent permission-slip information to the other parent. This ordinary notice belongs in the record alongside later disputes.

[S05; E053]

May 12, 2024 — An exchange concern and a response.

The author reported difficulty coordinating a Mother's Day pickup. The other parent replied that she was working, proposed pickup at the house, and described phone problems. Both parts of the exchange matter. The explanation is not independently proven merely because it was given; it is not absent merely because it was unsatisfying.

[S05; E054]

May 15, 2024 — A stated interpretation of the communication problem.

The other parent said she had assumed the author was ignoring her or was angry. That is her interpretation in the exchange, not an established account of his state of mind.

[S05; E056]

May 15–20, 2024 — Summer dates discussed.

The exchange continued over summer scheduling, and the author later supplied August vacation dates. The complete thread supplies context for each participant's interpretation.

[S05; E057]

August 24–27, 2024 — Communication difficulties described.

The author reported missed or unreceived messages and described a continuing exchange about contact and phone functioning. The reports establish what he said was happening; technical fault and responsibility are not determined by those reports alone.

[S05; E059]

September 2, 2024 — School-trip information.

The author emailed the other parent about an upcoming school trip. Student-identifying details are omitted.

[S05; E061]

October 29, 2024 — Conference booking shared.

The author forwarded a parent-teacher conference booking and school-related information. This is a dated transmission record rather than a finding about either parent.

[S05; E062]

November 2024 — Contemporary message records.

Screenshots from the Thanksgiving period were preserved. The image dates, message timestamps, sequence, and complete conversation control. A screenshot collection is not an adjudication. The adverse findings later entered by the court are separately acknowledged in this book.

[S05; E064]

December 2, 2024 — Further messages preserved.

The chronology retains a follow-on message set. The court's account and the author's challenges must be tested against the complete records rather than an isolated screenshot.

[S05; E065]

December 7, 2024 — The message sequence continues.

Additional screenshots were retained. Their significance depends on content and context, not merely their presence in the archive.

[S05; E066]

December 12, 2024 — Scan set preserved.

A scan set documents an assembled packet. It is evidence of preservation, not proof that every document was filed, admitted, or accepted as true.

[S05; E067]

December 2024 — Protection-order and family proceedings overlap.

The chronology places the protection-order process alongside the family dispute. The later February 11 order describes the procedural history and adverse findings. Those details limit any claim that the proceedings can be understood from the author's timeline alone.

[S05; E068]

The call-out

My anger does not reverse a finding. A finding does not make the author's questions about the later process disappear. Those are separate statements.

The book is stronger when both remain visible. The reader is not being recruited to applaud my preferred version of an argument; the reader is being given an account to test.

2025: THERAPY-ONLY CONTACT BECOMES A SYSTEM

Therapy-only contact makes scheduling much more than scheduling.

When a therapeutic session is the permitted channel for a parent-child relationship, transportation, cancellations, replacements, and provider availability are part of the contact framework. That does not authorize a parent to bypass the restrictions. It means the restricted route needs adult administration capable of keeping it usable. [S01; S05, E083–E100]

The adverse order's procedural history also matters here. It describes continuances requested by different participants, including one at my request and another jointly requested. I cannot count all elapsed time and then attribute every day to an opposing lawyer or the court. A serious delay analysis identifies who requested what and why. [S01]

Mr. Bedard's written objection to proposed meetings must be read against the then-operative protection order and any therapeutic exception. A correct description of a restriction would not become misconduct merely because it frustrated me. The dispute is whether a lawful, workable alternative was identified and pursued.

The scheduling messages tell a smaller, more concrete story than a global allegation of bad faith. A time was proposed. A change was needed. A response was sought. A reminder followed. Each exchange needs its own account before it can support the larger one.

A child should not be asked to live inside an exception clause while adults treat the exception's logistics as optional housekeeping.

The dated record

April 2–8, 2025 — Therapeutic and mediation steps.

The author's handwritten chronology identifies an appointment-related entry and a mediation call. These are retrospective source-navigation notes; the original provider and mediation records would establish the precise events.

[S05; E069]

April 17, 2025 — School material retained.

Attendance records with this date were preserved. Their relevance here is the continuity of the adult information and support issue, not a public assessment of the child.

[S05; E071]

April 22, 2025 — Conditions of release.

The chronology identifies release conditions in *State of Maine v. Justin Tahai*, YRKCD-CR-2025-01242. Their existence is part of the adverse procedural context affecting communications. Conditions of release are not a conviction, and the operative document controls their scope.

[S05; E072]

May 19, 2025 — Mediation record identified.

The archive includes a mediation report. Its existence establishes a dispute-resolution step. Confidential discussions and any privileged material are not reproduced.

[S05; E073]

May–July 2025 — Provider-related entries.

The chronology identifies a counseling note and later clinical-summary or hearing material. Clinical details are omitted; the documents show a professional-services history that should be read in its original context.

[S05; E074]

August 4, 2025 — Note addressed to the court.

A note to the presiding judge appears in the archived review. The document's existence is not proof that it was accepted as a filing or considered on the merits.

[S05; E076]

August 18, 2025 — Further mediation.

The handwritten chronology identifies a remote mediation session. The entry is a procedural marker, not evidence of what confidential discussion occurred.

[S05; E077]

August 27, 2025 — Response to an objection.

The chronology identifies a written response. The filing and its disposition need to be distinguished; preserving an argument does not establish that the court accepted it.

[S05; E078]

September 3–4, 2025 — Case-management and hearing entries.

The chronology records a telephone conference and a protection-order proceeding before Judge Sutton. The later order provides a fuller procedural history and identifies agreements or requests for continuance.

[S05; E079]

September 11, 2025 — Subpoena correspondence with Bedard.

Bedard stated that the motion should accompany the subpoena and later acknowledged receipt. This is a substantive procedural response, not an example of silence.

[S05; E081]

September 22, 2025 — Scheduling and enforcement process.

The chronology identifies subpoena and scheduling materials associated with a contempt-related proceeding. The source establishes process, not the requested merits finding.

[S05; E082]

September 2025 — The therapy-only framework.

Order and agreement materials described weekly therapeutic contact, transportation, and continued restrictions. The February 11 order's later account supplies the procedural context, including continuances requested by different participants. The exact restrictions must be taken from the operative document.

[S05; E083]

September 22, 2025 — Counsel invokes the protection order.

Bedard said the order prevented meetings or communications between the adults. Whether that description was accurate requires the then-operative order and its exceptions. The email alone is not proof of improper gatekeeping.

[S05; E084]

September 22–24, 2025 — Therapeutic scheduling pursued.

Emails sought a scheduling path through Daniel Pierce. The actual order and provider arrangements control what could lawfully occur.

[S05; E085]

October 22, 2025 — School concern sent through counsel.

The author forwarded a school-attendance message to Bedard and expressed frustration at needing an intermediary. The email establishes the notice and the author’s complaint, not counsel’s responsibility for the school event.

[S05; E086]

November 3, 2025 — Witness designation.

A discovery or witness-designation email was sent to Bedard with Anderson copied. It documents notice of a proposed witness, not a ruling admitting the testimony.

[S05; E087]

November 14–18, 2025 — Rescheduling efforts.

Emails sought remote attendance or a make-up session, followed by further requests for a response. The complete thread and provider schedule would distinguish unanswered proposals from proposals that could not be accommodated.

[S05; E088]

November 24–25, 2025 — Further notices and service.

The author sent school-related concerns and motion materials through counsel. These communications continued the record; they do not become separate proven violations simply because each generated another email.

[S05; E091]

December 1, 2025 — Litigation-exposure concern raised.

After an objection was forwarded, the author expressed concern to the provider about exposure of the child to adult litigation. This is the author’s allegation. The later denial recorded in E239 is necessary counter-context.

[S05; E092]

December 7, 2025 — A resolution proposal.

The author sent a proposed resolution to Bedard. Counsel's following responses are preserved in E094. A proposal can be refused without that refusal itself establishing misconduct.

[S05; E093]

December 8–9, 2025 — Counsel declines the proposal.

The chronology records Bedard confirming his continued representation and stating that a proposal was unacceptable, with court scheduled for January. The proposal and full response are needed to evaluate candor; brevity and opposition alone are not misconduct.

[S05; E094]

December 10, 2025 — An objection transmitted by counsel's office.

Sydney Chen sent the defendant's objection. Staff transmission is not independently improper; the substance of the objection, rather than the job title of its sender, is the relevant evidence.

[S05; E096]

December 11, 2025 — Letter to Anderson.

The author included a letter to Anderson in a hearing-preparation packet. It documents an effort to obtain historical or neutral evidence. The court's later ruling determines admissibility.

[S05; E097]

December 15, 2025 — Disqualification theory presented.

A motion raised concerns about representation and referred to Anderson's earlier observations. The motion is a party's argument, not proof of disqualification or a professional violation.

[S05; E098]

December 16, 2025 — A provider appointment arranged.

The chronology identifies confirmation of a session during the following week. This is evidence that a scheduling step occurred.

[S05; E099]

December 17, 2025 — School documents forwarded.

The author transmitted school-related records to Bedard before the hearing-preparation period concluded. Their transmission is established separately from any merits determination.

[S05; E100]

The call-out

A hearing date is a scheduling decision, not an explanation of every month before it. A therapist's appointment is a service event, not proof that the relationship has healed. A continuance is not automatically misconduct.

The accountable question is what the adults did to keep the lawful route usable while they waited. That is where the dates acquire their human meaning.

Who requested each continuance, and for what reason?

What workable therapeutic-contact arrangement existed during the wait?

JANUARY 2026: THE RUN-UP TO THE HEARING

Before a hearing, the record is not finished. It is being assembled, disputed, and narrowed.

December and January contain witness designations, subpoenas, proposed evidence, motions in limine, objections, transcript requests, and the hearing itself. An attempt to exclude evidence is not automatically dishonest. An attempt to present it is not automatically meritorious. The evidentiary question and the accuracy of the description used to argue it must be kept separate. [S05, E101–E114]

Anderson's January 6 correction belongs in this interval. His signed letter and transmitting email place it before the January 16 hearing. The participants therefore had the correction before the hearing; the complete motion and ruling remain necessary to evaluate what the court decided. [S15]

The transcript question was active before the final written order. That chronology matters: a later inability to pay did not first arise as a rhetorical excuse after the appeal became difficult. The sequence contains requests and the private-pay response. [S06]

Judge Lucy, a court can exclude testimony for a sound reason. The public criticism must turn on the actual reason, the record presented, and the review available—not on my anger at exclusion alone. But a litigant cannot test a testimony-dependent account by magic. The means of preserving the hearing belong in the same story as the hearing.

The institution gets to make its decision. It does not get to insist that the conditions under which the decision can be reviewed are irrelevant.

The dated record

December 18, 2025 — State-paid transcript requested.

The motion referenced the January 16 hearing and was served on Bedard. It places the affordability request before the final hearing and written decision; it does not establish entitlement to payment.

[S05; E101]

December 22, 2025 — Witness-subpoena steps.

Materials concerned Daniel Pierce and Anderson as proposed witnesses. Bedard also forwarded subpoena-related material. The steps establish efforts to secure testimony rather than its eventual admission.

[S05; E102]

December 29, 2025 — Motion in Limine.

Bedard forwarded an evidentiary motion. Anderson's signed January 6 letter supplied a correction to the appointment history; the motion and ruling remain necessary to assess the full dispute. [S15]

[S05; E103]

January 2, 2026 — Hearing packet notice.

A cover letter described an affidavit, opening statement, exhibit list, and support-related material, and stated that material was sent to counsel. A preparation packet is not proof that every item became evidence.

[S05; E105]

January 5–6, 2026 — Witness and evidentiary positions.

Pre-hearing materials addressed the motion in limine and proposed witness testimony. The child's identifying and private information is omitted. A proposed witness is not necessarily a witness who testified.

[S05; E106]

January 6–7, 2026 — An earlier transcript estimate.

A separate transcript order for the September 22, 2025 hearing required a private-pay deposit after a state-payment request was denied. The estimate was 11 pages at \$4.65, or \$51.15. It is a separate order from the later \$1,515.90 estimate.

[S06; E107]

January 9, 2026 — Further pre-hearing response.

The archive identifies a response or hearing-preparation packet. Its existence preserves the argument; the final hearing record controls how it was treated.

[S05; E109]

January 12, 2026 — Board correspondence referenced.

Later filings identify a Board of Overseers letter in the disqualification or fairness history. This is a source reference, not a description of an independently reverified disciplinary disposition.

[S05; E110]

January 16, 2026 — Consolidated final hearing.

The hearing is the procedural hinge for the February 11 findings and the later appeal. The transcript materials separately identify hearing duration and an estimated page count. They are different measurements, even though both were recorded as 326.

[S06; E111]

January 20–21, 2026 — Post-hearing objections.

The archive identifies objections concerning proposed orders and related motion practice. These are the author's challenges, not findings that counsel's drafts were improper.

[S05; E113]

January 27, 2026 — Reconsideration sought.

The author sought reconsideration of the state-payment denial, citing financial circumstances and requesting state payment or a reduced or installment arrangement. The request followed the direction to seek judicial relief.

[S06; E116]

January 27, 2026, 10:29 a.m. — Private-pay transcript posture.

The transcript-order confirmation for MEJB11138 identified the appeal purpose, the denied state-payment request, and a deposit required before work began. It was an estimate and payment instruction, not the completed transcript.

[S06; E118]

January 27, 2026 — Transcript problem reported.

The author forwarded the issue to OTO and eScribers, with Bedard copied, and attached the reconsideration request. Transmission is the established event.

[S06; E119]

January 27, 2026, 10:44 a.m. — OTO identifies the decision-maker.

Carrie Jordan said OTO and eScribers could not overrule a judge and directed the author back to the court. The reply locates the state-payment decision with the judiciary, not the vendor or supervisor.

[S06; E120]

January 27, 2026, 12:36 p.m. — The estimate.

The estimated 326 transcript pages at \$4.65 per page produced a \$1,515.90 requested deposit. That is the estimated cost, not proof of the number of pages a completed transcript would ultimately contain.

[S06; E121]

Jan. 27, 2026, 12:38 PM - Justin forwarded transcript order / MEJB11138 material to Bedard and Amanda Ramirez with secondLetterToday.pdf.

Opposing counsel and counsel contact received transcript-access/financial-strain documentation.

[S06; E122]

February 4, 2026 — Status requested.

The author asked about the pending decision, noting the elapsed time since the hearing. The request establishes the concern raised. Elapsed time alone does not establish improper delay.

[S05; E123]

The call-out

The phrase the court heard the case can be true while questions remain about excluded evidence and the adequacy of the review record. The phrase evidence was offered can be true while the court properly rejects it.

The dispute deserves the actual ruling. The Public deserves the actual sequence. The manuscript does not need another adjective where a source should be.

FEBRUARY 11: THE ORDER THAT CHANGED EVERYTHING

A signed order changes obligations. It does not settle every argument about how the obligations work.

February 11 became the hinge between a contested hearing and two simultaneous responsibilities: compliance with the operative terms and preservation of challenges to them. My subsequent filings disputed findings and requested clarification. Their existence establishes those challenges; it does not establish that the challenges were correct. [S01; S05, E124–E130]

This is the point at which rhetoric most easily gets sloppy. A parent calls an order wrong. The institution hears refusal. An institution calls a motion repetitive. The parent hears indifference. Neither characterization can replace the actual words and acts.

The February 14 materials need to be separated by function. Motions to amend findings contest the account. Notices of appeal seek review. Fee and record requests concern the means of participating. Child-support requests concern a separate obligation. Calling all of them simply more filings erases the work each was intended to do.

The order's practical provisions also contain conditions and discretion. Electronic contact was not an unlimited demand for an immediate response on command. In-person progression was contingent on specified compliance. Those qualifications matter to any allegation that the order was violated. [S01]

A fair public review can criticize the design and implementation while still reading the conditions. Anything less would reproduce the selective candor this book condemns.

The dated record

February 11, 2026 — Findings and Order entered.

The order made adverse findings, imposed obligations and restrictions, and provided for therapeutic and other conditional contact. The author disputed the findings and sought review. The order remains an adverse adjudication in this account; the author's disagreement does not reverse it.

[S01; E125]

February 12, 2026 — Administrative complaint channel.

The chronology identifies a complaint to the Administrative Office of the Courts. This records escalation to another channel, not its jurisdiction or disposition.

[S05; E126]

February 14, 2026 — Challenges to findings prepared and submitted.

The preserved packet contains Rule 52(b) motions challenging particular findings and seeking record confirmation. A motion establishes the challenge presented, not its correctness or disposition. Native drafts and signed copies must be distinguished.

[S05; E128]

February 14, 2026 — Support-related amendment requested.

A proposed supplement added a child-support modification and interim-relief request based on asserted inability to pay. This is a distinct issue from contact logistics or the transcript estimate.

[S05; E129]

February 14, 2026 — Appeals and fee status.

Prepared notices and related materials challenged the order and asked about fee-waiver and hearing-record access. Draft blanks, signed packet dates, receipt, and actual docket entries are different evidence of preparation and filing.

[S05; E130]

The call-out

Paper can state a right. Only conduct can make the right function. Paper can state a condition. Only a usable decision path can settle a live dispute over whether the condition is met.

That is the work behind the signature. It deserves at least as much seriousness as the ceremony around it.

FEBRUARY 14–20: THE LOGISTICS DISPUTE

The first request was for the machinery of ordinary contact: a number, a platform, a time, a plan.

The February 16 email records earlier requests on February 14, an office response that it lacked the order, a proposed share-link cure, and renewed efforts to arrange contact. Those earlier timestamps are reported within the February 16 message; they should not be dressed up as independently inspected native headers. [S02]

There is a correction here that belongs to me. My email demanded that the other parent pay half the reunification cost by invoking the general uninsured-expense allocation. The contact provision expressly placed reunification-therapy costs on me. I can seek clarification of a perceived conflict, but I cannot present my reimbursement demand as an already established debt and use nonpayment alone as proof of obstruction. [S01; S02]

That correction does not answer the other logistics questions. It prevents the cost dispute from contaminating them. A valid request for a contact plan does not validate every assertion in the same email. An erroneous cost assertion does not make every accompanying request imaginary.

Mr. Bedard, the useful answer to a mixed communication is to identify the disputed proposition and address the remaining practical items. The useful answer from me is to preserve your substantive response rather than call the entire exchange silence.

By February 20, the chronology places implementation requests in a consolidated court packet. The public question is what was received, what was decided, and what practical difference followed. Filing is the beginning of that inquiry, not its conclusion.

The dated record

February 14, 2026, as reported on February 16 — Contact logistics requested.

The compliance email reports a 4:20 p.m. request for the child's number and electronic-contact information, an office reply that it lacked the order, and follow-up concerning a share link and proposed contact time. These timestamps are reported within the later email; they are not independent header verification here.

[S02; E131]

February 16, 2026 — Compliance statement and disputed demands.

The author said he would comply pending appeal and requested practical information. The same email demanded half the reunification cost under a general expense allocation. The order expressly made the author responsible for reunification-therapy costs. The demand is therefore presented as his disputed position, not an established reimbursement obligation.

[S02; E135]

February 18, 2026 — Expedition requested.

A motion sought expedited appellate consideration and stated that no response to an inquiry to opposing counsel had been received by filing. The motion establishes the request and the sender's report of nonresponse, not a merits finding.

[S05; E136]

February 18, 2026 — Alternative hearing record requested.

The motion sought an electronic recording in lieu of a transcript or a settled-statement process. Its existence establishes the requested alternative. The motion is not itself proof that the court had to grant that alternative or that no later ruling occurred.

[S07; E137]

February 18, 2026 — Allocation of authority disputed.

The author asked the court to clarify that allocated authority did not operate as a unilateral veto over conditional contact progression. The request preserves his interpretation; the order and any later ruling decide its legal effect.

[S05; E138]

February 18, 2026 — Interim logistics draft.

The draft requested specific contact information, transportation arrangements, school notice, and records or authorizations. Blank date and signature fields in a draft do not prove filing. The related February 20 signed or scanned packet supplies a separate transmission anchor.

[S05; E139]

February 19, 2026 — Follow-up to counsel.

The author renewed the logistics request and warned that he would interpret continued silence as refusal. That was the sender's proposed inference. This edition does not treat silence alone as a proven refusal or an admission.

[S05; E145]

February 20, 2026 — Consolidated implementation packet.

A scanned packet requested an expedited status conference, interim implementation directions, and clarification. The source review described its first pages and corroborating native draft. Docket acceptance and disposition are separate questions.

[S05; E146]

February 20, 2026 — Oversight supplements.

The author sent or prepared supplemental professional-conduct and judicial-conduct concerns about implementation and record access. These documents establish allegations submitted to oversight channels, not findings that those allegations were true. The Board receipt was not in the cited source batch.

[S05; E147]

February 2026 — Amended grievance structure.

The amended GCF-25-524 complaint organized allegations about assertions, procedure, implementation, and proposed-order practices, and requested consideration of Anderson’s historical perspective. The reviewed text did not establish a signed filing date. The allegations and requested investigation must not be described as disciplinary findings.

[S03; E148]

The call-out

The same expectation applies to everyone named here. Identify the proposition. Read the controlling language. Correct the account. Then address what remains.

The source wins even when it ruins my own sentence. I expect the same standard from the people paid to get this right.

Which parts of the February 16 email accurately reflected the order, and which required correction?

What happened to the practical logistics requests after the February 20 submission?

MARCH 2026: THE THIRTY-DAY CLOCK

Thirty days is not a magic spell. It is a date inside a conditional order.

The contact provision contemplated in-person visits beginning no later than thirty days, subject to specified compliance and other terms. The dispute in March concerned both implementation and whether the conditions had been satisfied. Bedard's March 18 response challenged proof of compliance and described the child's position. My later email disputed the absence of meaningful implementation. Both accounts belong here. [S01; S05, E165–E172]

Do not turn the date into an unconditional entitlement that the order did not state. Do not turn the conditions into an indefinite, unreviewable waiting room either. The practical question is who determines satisfaction, on which information, and how a contested determination reaches a judge.

The transcript chronology has a separate date problem. An earlier layer refers to a March 2 cancellation; later record-access material describes a March 19 cancellation letter. Those references should not be silently merged. They need the actual documents and service history. The later April 30 provision of materials is also part of the account, not something to omit in order to keep saying nothing was ever supplied. [S06; S05, E155–E167, E235]

That is what a fair timeline does. It records the conflict and the later production. It does not erase an unresolved historical question, and it does not pretend a later answer never arrived.

The childhood clock is real. So is the obligation to measure institutional delay honestly.

The dated record

February 28, 2026 — Appeal materials served.

The chronology records service of fee-waiver and appeal-related documents. These are service events, not new independent controversies.

[S05; E151]

March 2, 2026 — Fee-waiver application.

Photographs preserve an application stating inability to pay. The application documents what was represented to the court. The order on the application and the distinct transcript-payment decision determine the relief actually granted.

[S05; E152]

March 2026 — Conflicting cancellation references.

An earlier chronology describes a March 2 cancellation. Later appellate materials refer to a March 19 OTO cancellation letter. These are not silently treated as one event. The letters and their service history control reconciliation of the dates.

[S06; E155]

March 2, 2026 order, described later — Transcript/audio payment ruling.

The April 29 account says a March 2 trial-court order denied transcript/audio at state expense. The initial source search had not located that order; the chronology later records documents supplied on April 30. The earlier missing-source status does not mean the document remained permanently unavailable.

[S06; E156]

March 5, 2026 — Fee-waiver relief indicated.

The supplied chronology reads a photographed order as granting at least a filing-fee waiver. That is not automatically a transcript-payment order. The checked fields and actual ruling control the scope.

[S05; E157]

March 5, 2026 — Transcript-status notice.

An email submitted a notice about cancellation of a transcript order. The attachment was image-only in the cited review. Its date and the later cancellation references should not be conflated without the original documents.

[S06; E158]

March 12, 2026 – Parallel school and contact concerns.

The author sent a school-related inquiry while contact implementation remained disputed. The correspondence establishes concerns transmitted, not the cause of the underlying events.

[S05; E162]

March 15, 2026 – The other parent describes direct contact.

The other parent said the author could text or call if the child chose to speak. The statement belongs alongside the author's request for adult-supported implementation; it does not settle how the order should operate.

[S05; E163]

March 18, 2026 – Counsel challenges compliance.

Bedard stated that the child did not want the proposed in-person arrangement and that proof of the author's ordered compliance had not been supplied. The substantive response must be preserved. The order's conditions and actual compliance evidence are needed to evaluate it.

[S05; E165]

March 19, 2026 – Docketing and service notice.

The appellate notice described docketing, record transmission, transcript-payment timing, and a paper-service designation. It was not itself the OTO cancellation letter. The different documents serve different functions.

[S06; E166]

March 19, 2026 letter, described later – Cancellation for nonpayment.

The appellate account refers to an OTO cancellation letter dated March 19. It was not located in the initial searched set, but the later chronology records cancellation materials supplied April 30. Historical service and notice remain different questions from later access.

[S06; E167]

March 19–20, 2026 – Image-only orders identified.

The source review located scanned orders but could not extract their text in that pass. This is a review limitation, not an assertion about what the orders decided. The separately described March 20 order is addressed in E170.

[S05; E168]

March 20, 2026 – Contact follow-up.

The author reported that in-person progression remained disputed after a session. Private statements by the child are not reproduced. The provider record, conditions of the order, and responses are needed for a complete account.

[S05; E169]

March 20, 2026 – Expedition reconsideration denied.

The chronology describes a Law Court denial of reconsideration of expedition. This is an adverse procedural disposition, not proof that the appellate merits were decided or that every delay was improper.

[S05; E170]

March 22, 2026 – Scheduling follow-up.

The author renewed a scheduling request and stated he had received no response. The sender's report must be checked against the full thread and any other response channel.

[S05; E171]

March 23, 2026 – Implementation disputed beyond thirty days.

The author wrote that more than thirty days had passed without meaningful implementation. Bedard's compliance challenge and the order's conditions are material counter-context. The author's deadline argument is not a finding that all conditions were met.

[S05; E172]

March 24, 2026 – Objections forwarded.

Bedard sent objections for filing. The substance of the attachment is more informative than the terse forwarding line. A short transmittal is not independently evidence of misconduct.

[S05; E173]

March 26, 2026 – Further expedition request.

The author requested expedited appellate consideration. The source establishes another effort to obtain time-sensitive review, not that expedition was legally required.

[S05; E174]

April 1–2, 2026 — Information-access notices.

The author sent counsel a formal notice and supplemental account alleging failures in school and medical communication. These are notice and allegation records. Private medical details are omitted.

[S05; E178]

April 5, 2026 — Holiday-contact request.

The author requested holiday time. The actual order's holiday provision, the response, and the contemporaneous circumstances govern its significance.

[S05; E180]

April 6, 2026 — Enforcement and status requests.

The author renewed school and medical-access concerns and sought enforcement or a status conference. These documents show requested relief and its subject, not a proven violation.

[S05; E181]

April 6, 2026 — Counsel identifies other information channels.

Bedard directed the author to the school for records and offered an explanation for some lateness. Whether direct access functioned and whether the explanation addressed the concern are separate factual questions. A terse answer is not the same thing as no answer.

[S05; E182]

April 7, 2026 — Historical access issue raised again.

The author connected current records questions with earlier release and information-access disputes. That comparison is his argument. Each period still requires its own operative documents and responses.

[S05; E183]

April 8, 2026 — Counsel refers to eFiling.

Bedard referred the author to eFiling and a filing sent that day. The later rejection history supplies the relevant practical context; a reference to an available channel does not establish that every attempt through it would succeed.

[S05; E184]

April 9–13, 2026 — Multiple related packets.

The chronology identifies renewed appellate relief and consolidated or corrected record packets. Their components should be grouped by submission and requested relief rather than counted as independent motions.

[S05; E186]

April 11, 2026 — Electronic contact requested.

The author asked about availability for contact under the order. The request does not establish a right to demand an immediate reply irrespective of the order's timing and manner conditions.

[S05; E188]

April 11, 2026 — Filing returned for specified defects.

Envelope 204805 was returned with separate-exhibit, proposed-order, and service-contact requirements. The notice is evidence of an intake result, not a decision on the merits.

[S05; E189]

April 11, 2026 — Federal submission identified.

The chronology records a submission in the Stanfill federal matter. Filing a complaint does not establish its allegations. This reference preserves the parallel procedural history without treating it as a favorable judgment.

[S05; E190]

The call-out

The thirty-day controversy needs a decision record, not a contest in confidence. The cancellation chronology needs the letters, not an editor choosing whichever date sounds worse.

The family lived through the uncertainty. The reader should not have to inherit it as an unmarked error.

Who was to decide disputed compliance for contact progression?

How do the March 2 and March 19 transcript references reconcile with the actual letters?

APRIL 2026: "SOLE GATEKEEPER" AND THE DIGITAL COURTHOUSE

"It is verbatim" is a claim about words. It can be checked against words.

The April exchange contains a description of the child as the sole gatekeeper and a subsequent insistence that the description was verbatim. The contact provisions reproduced from the order use different language about the child's schedule and desires, and about conditions on progression. The distinction between a quotation and an interpretation is not pedantry when the interpretation controls a relationship. [S01; S05, E211–E218]

That textual comparison does not by itself decide the correct legal implementation. It does mean that a participant claiming to quote an order should be able to point to the quoted words. A paraphrase is not made literal by confidence.

Mr. Bedard's April 21 position, as recorded in the chronology, involved information from providers and a review of compliance material before in-person contact. My response asked him to identify the specific authority for that review. That was a concrete interpretive dispute. It needed a concrete resolution. [S05, E207–E208]

Meanwhile, the filing channel generated its own chain: private support requests, service-contact rejections, another submission, a failed support link, and an eventual docket entry. The entry matters as much as the rejections. A chronology that hides successful acceptance to preserve a total-exclusion story is not credible. [S05, E216–E242]

The absurdity is not that nothing ever worked. It is how much effort could be consumed before one knows which part worked and what, if anything, it accomplished.

The dated record

April 12, 2026 — A non-electronic alternative is identified.

The rejection notice for envelope 204846 stated that a self-represented litigant could bring documents to the courthouse rather than e-file. That alternative belongs in the account. Whether it was practically workable is a different question from whether it was offered.

[S05; E191]

April 13, 2026 — Earlier service of the access letter.

The chronology states that the access letter was sent to Bedard before the later April 27 docket entry. The earlier sent message remains the controlling proof of service. Creation, service, and docketing should not be assigned one date by convenience.

[S05; E192]

April 13, 2026 — Contact implementation revisited.

An email asked about daily electronic contact. The response confirming a number, and the author's remaining concern, are preserved in E195–E196.

[S05; E194]

April 13, 2026 — Contact number confirmed.

The other parent confirmed a telephone number and described limited restrictions. The number itself is omitted here. This was a substantive partial response and must appear beside the author's position that the broader contact issue remained unresolved.

[S05; E195]

April 13, 2026 — The author distinguishes the remaining issue.

After the number was supplied, the author said the concern was the functioning of reasonable contact rather than merely possession of a number. This is a stated disagreement after a partial answer, not a case of total nonresponse.

[S05; E196]

April 20, 2026 — A session is confirmed.

Daniel Pierce proposed a Friday time, the author agreed, and the provider confirmed the appointment. This supplies a scheduling baseline for the later discussion; it does not establish what every participant knew about later conflicts.

[S05; E205]

April 21, 2026 — Counsel states the implementation position.

The chronology records Bedard saying the client would not answer every message, directing records inquiries to providers and the school, and describing review of compliance material before in-person progression. Those are substantive positions, not silence. The author disputed their consistency with the order.

[S05; E207]

April 21, 2026 — Specific authority requested.

The author disputed counsel's stated approach and asked for the order language authorizing it. The question concerned compliance review, progression, and adult communications. A written challenge does not itself establish the preferred interpretation.

[S05; E208]

April 21, 2026 — Docket status requested.

A letter sought clarification of what had been received, docketed, returned, or remained pending. It establishes the questions asked; the clerk's response and Registry are needed to determine the status.

[S06; E209]

April 22, 2026 — Briefing schedule.

The appellate schedule described the record as complete and identified filing deadlines and a service designation. The procedural definition of a complete record is not necessarily the same as the author's preferred evidentiary record.

[S06; E210]

April 23–24, 2026 — A scheduled session and a competing activity.

The chronology describes a conflict with driver's education, proposed make-up arrangements, and a response that in-person contact would depend on the child's decision. The complete exchange and provider record are needed to evaluate the alternatives and the cause of any lost session.

[S05; E211]

April 24, 2026 – A claim about the order's wording.

The other parent described the child as the sole gatekeeper and then said the description was verbatim. The reproduced contact provisions do not use that phrase. A textual mismatch is not the same thing as a final ruling about implementation, but a claimed quotation can be checked against the words actually printed.

[S05; E212]

April 24, 2026 – Record-completion motion and correction.

The author sought clarification of the transcript, audio, or statement-in-lieu posture and filed a corrected motion later that day. The two submissions concern one core request and should not be counted as unrelated demands.

[S06; E214]

April 24, 2026 – Private technical-support request.

The author emailed eCourts Help with rejection screenshots. This establishes an attempt to obtain private assistance before further public criticism. It does not establish that every rejection was a system error.

[S05; E216]

April 25, 2026 – Replacement time requested.

The author asked whether the displaced session or contact opportunity would be preserved or replaced and referred to a provider recommendation. The original recommendation and full exchange control its scope.

[S05; E217]

April 25, 2026 – A compliance position and proposed reporting.

The other parent said she would assist with scheduling if the child wanted contact, disputed the author's compliance, and stated that further non-emergency emails would be reported as protection-order violations. This establishes her position in the exchange; it does not decide which communications the operative orders allowed.

[S05; E218]

April 25, 2026 – Service-contact rejection.

Envelope 210756 was returned with an authorized-service-contact reason. The underlying relief was not adjudicated by that notice. The issue at this stage was intake compliance.

[S05; E219]

April 27, 2026 — Public criticism follows support requests.

The author published an access-to-justice post after private outreach and repeated returns. The post is advocacy, not a technical incident finding. Its claims must be checked against the notices and support record.

[S05; E220]

April 27, 2026 — School record updated.

The school portal showed another attendance update. Course labels, detailed student totals, and private identifiers are omitted here. The record concerns adult notice and support, not a public verdict on the child.

[S05; E221]

April 27, 2026 — A direct supportive message.

The author sent a brief affectionate message to the child. It is a communication record, not proof of overall compliance or a measure of the child's response.

[S05; E222]

April 27, 2026 — The service-contact reason recurs.

Envelope 210987 was returned for the same described service-contact requirement. That is a separate submission event, but not necessarily a separate underlying dispute.

[S05; E223]

April 27, 2026 — Further private support outreach.

The author emailed the court help address and vendor support concerning the repeated returns. The response history must be reviewed separately from the act of sending the request.

[S05; E224]

April 27, 2026 — A letter is submitted.

Envelope 210994 carried the access letter as a party letter. The later acceptance is preserved in E227. Submission and acceptance are different events within one filing path.

[S05; E225]

April 27, 2026 — The support link fails.

A preserved screenshot showed a DNS resolution error after the support link in a rejection notice was followed. It documents that failure at that point. It does not establish the duration or scope of an outage, or identify who caused it.

[S05; E226]

April 27, 2026 — Docket entry confirmed.

The clerk accepted envelope 210994 as a party letter. This is a successful entry, not an unending rejection. It does not by itself establish that the relief discussed in the letter was judicially granted.

[S05; E227]

April 27–28, 2026 — A different packet is returned.

The targeted implementation packet was returned for service-contact and caption or designation defects. Its return should not erase the separate successful letter entry.

[S05; E228]

April 28, 2026 — School notice sent through counsel.

The author forwarded a school notice to Bedard. This establishes transmission of the concern, not counsel's responsibility for the reported attendance event.

[S05; E229]

April 29, 2026 — Record-completion relief denied.

The source addendum describes the Law Court's reliance on the March payment ruling, cancellation, and an April 22 record-complete date. The court's procedural account must remain visible. The author then requested the underlying materials and service history.

[S06; E230]

April 29, 2026 — No-transcript posture preserved.

The author submitted a notice concerning the absence of a transcript and review on the existing record. The notice states his appellate position; the court's orders determine the permitted record and procedure.

[S05; E231]

April 29, 2026 — Consolidated material served.

Bedard received a supplemental addendum and timeline materials. Service establishes an opportunity to receive the account; it does not establish agreement, actual reading, or misconduct.

[S05; E232]

April 29–30, 2026 — Another packet enters the docket.

Envelope 212684 was submitted and later entered. This successful entry must be preserved in any account of the portal. The substantive disposition is a separate event.

[S05; E233]

April 29, 2026 — The documents behind the order are requested.

The author requested the March order, cancellation letter, service information, docket entries, and statement-in-lieu material cited or implicated in the appellate account. The later April 30 production is recorded in E235.

[S06; E234]

April 30, 2026 — Pollack supplies materials.

The chronology records that Clerk Matthew Pollack emailed the March 2 order, cancellation material, docket sheet, and briefing schedule, while declining to mail those attachments. This later production corrects any blanket assertion that none of the documents was ever supplied. The separate dispute concerned service and practical access.

[S05; E235]

April 30, 2026 — Trial-court records request.

Envelope 212893 was entered as a party letter. This was a parallel effort to obtain record information. Entry is not a ruling on the request.

[S05; E236]

The call-out

This is where the two mazes meet: an interpretive dispute about contact and an administrative dispute about how to place that dispute before the court.

Neither maze proves the other was designed maliciously. Together they describe a burden that cannot be dismissed by reciting the rule at one doorway.

Where does the operative order use the words claimed to be verbatim?

What did the successful filing entries resolve beyond acceptance onto the docket?

MAY 2026: SCHOOL, THERAPY, RULE 3(d), AND FM-218

In May, separate clocks were running through the same family.

The chronology records school concerns, therapeutic scheduling disputes, the appellate brief and appendix, requests for limited trial-court action, and further filing requirements. These should not be collapsed into one undifferentiated claim that everyone refused to help. Each track has its own request, response, and decision-maker. [S05, E237–E280]

The school totals require particular care. Period-level absences and tardies are not necessarily full days missed. A large displayed total is not a license to change its unit. The adult question concerns punctuality, communication, and support; the child should not be publicly reduced to a disciplinary statistic.

A reported shortened session likewise needs the provider's account and the parties' responses. My email establishes that I raised the issue. It does not settle why the session ended or whose decision controlled it.

The FM-218 rejection is more specific. The notice required a particular form and supplied relation-back instructions. The criticism is not that a court can never require a form. It is whether the requirement, correction mechanism, and decision path were intelligible enough to serve the urgent purpose. [S05, E268–E273]

The institution should be able to say what happened without asking a parent to become a forensic analyst of five inboxes. And I should be able to describe the burden without converting every notification into a separate act of misconduct.

The dated record

May 1, 2026 — An exposure concern and a denial.

The author raised concern that the child had been exposed to adult litigation commentary. Bedard replied that he had confirmed with the other parent that the child had not seen or been told the material. The child's private words are omitted. The exchange preserves competing accounts; it does not resolve causation or credibility.

[S05; E239]

May 1-5, 2026 — A returned packet and a successful cure.

The author submitted envelope 213831. The return required separate documents or exhibits; a corrected submission, envelope 215603, later entered the docket. The sequence is one problem-and-cure history, not three independent merits disputes.

[S05; E240]

May 4, 2026 — Separate documents required.

Envelope 213831 was returned with document-packaging and relation-back instructions. The notice describes the cure. The subsequent successful resubmission is material counter-context.

[S05; E241]

May 5, 2026 — Corrected submission accepted.

Envelope 215603, submitted the previous evening, was entered as a motion to modify or amend. The record shows prompt correction and successful intake, not the ultimate outcome of the motion.

[S05; E242]

May 5, 2026 — Another school notice.

The author sent counsel a school-portal update. Student-specific academic and disciplinary details are omitted; the event documents adult notice.

[S05; E243]

May 5-8, 2026 — Direct school access requested.

The author asked about direct communications, records, portal functions, and the annual update. The school forwarded the request internally. This is evidence of a routing response, not proof of final resolution.

[S05; E244]

May 6–8, 2026 — Repeated school updates consolidated.

The author assembled several consecutive school-day entries and requested a position through counsel. The entries must retain their actual units. Geographic proximity alone does not determine responsibility for lateness.

[S05; E245]

May 8, 2026 — Review of a grievance dismissal.

A carried-forward timeline entry says Board Clerk Melinda F. Whelan referred the request for review of Bar Counsel's dismissal to a public non-attorney Grievance Commission member. The underlying letter was not present as a standalone source in that batch. Referral is not reversal and does not establish discipline.

[S05; E246]

May 8, 2026 — A session-duration complaint.

The author reported late arrival and early departure and requested preservation of full session time. The provider's account and complete responses remain necessary. This edition does not treat the sender's account as an independent clinical finding.

[S05; E247]

May 8, 2026 — Session-management relief requested.

A supplemental motion requested timely arrival, full-session availability subject to the provider's judgment, and notice of changes. It is a concrete requested plan, not proof that every alleged disruption occurred as described.

[S05; E248]

May 8–11, 2026 — Filing accepted with a reminder.

Envelope 217926 was entered, and the clerk provided a procedural reminder concerning filing in multiple cases. This combines successful intake with guidance; neither part should be omitted.

[S05; E249]

May 8–11, 2026 — Further records request declined as duplicative.

Pollack responded that the requested material duplicated the April 29–30 request, declined further email production, and identified in-person examination and paid copies. The earlier April 30 production is part of the same account. Whether the resulting access was adequate is distinct from whether anything was provided.

[S05; E250]

May 9, 2026 — Limited trial-court action requested during appeal.

The author sought appellate permission for limited implementation or enforcement proceedings. The request establishes the jurisdictional route he proposed, not that the route was required or granted.

[S05; E251]

May 10, 2026 — Related notice served.

A notice referred to the pending limited-action request and a provider-related proposal. Clinical details are not reproduced. The source establishes what was served.

[S05; E252]

May 11, 2026 — Brief and appendix submitted.

The author emailed the brief and appendix before the stated May 20 deadline and received an automatic acknowledgment. That proves transmission and receipt by the system, not acceptance of every appendix item or a merits decision.

[S05; E254]

May 14, 2026 — Implementation demand sent.

The author emailed a demand describing overlapping procedural and family-related burdens. It was a demand and notice, not an order or a finding. The separate formal submissions followed their own intake paths.

[S05; E260]

May 14, 2026 — Demand document submitted.

Envelope 220237 transmitted the demand as another document type. The entry confirmation in E264 belongs to the same submission event.

[S05; E262]

May 14, 2026 — Demand document entered.

The system confirmed entry of envelope 220237. Acceptance of the demand document did not necessarily resolve the separate motion for interim relief.

[S05; E264]

May 14, 2026 – Supplemental appellate request.

The author submitted a supplemental request for expedited action on limited trial-court relief, with supporting materials. The motion and its disposition are separate evidence.

[S05; E266]

May 14, 2026 – Interim motion submitted separately.

Envelope 220333 carried the interim implementation and status-conference motion. Its different filing path explains why entry of the demand document did not establish acceptance of this motion.

[S05; E268]

May 14, 2026 – Pollack explains the channel.

Pollack said the Court could not act on the demand email itself and that the corresponding motion would be docketed and presented in the usual way. This is procedural guidance and an identified next step, not a merits rejection.

[S05; E270]

May 14, 2026 – FM-218 required.

The rejection for envelope 220333 required the Motion for Expedited Hearing form and described a four-business-day relation-back process. That is a concrete correction instruction. The remaining question is what happened after the required cure and how the request reached substantive review.

[S05; E272]

May 14, 2026 – An appellate order is sent.

The Law Court transmitted an order with a time-sensitive notice. The operative order, not the warning alone, controls the obligations that followed.

[S05; E274]

May 14, 2026 – Receipt and requirements acknowledged.

The author acknowledged the order and described his understanding of the hard-copy appendix requirement and related posture. This is acknowledgment of a procedural instruction, not proof of later compliance.

[S05; E276]

May 14, 2026 — Clarification or limited remand requested.

The author sought relief concerning the trial court's jurisdiction order. The attached orders and appellate disposition govern the legal issue. The request itself does not resolve it.

[S05; E278]

May 2026 — Follow-through and status.

The chronology records continued efforts to distinguish the accepted demand document from the separate request for judicial relief. Acceptance, docketing, and a decision are different procedural events.

[S05; E280]

The call-out

School records are not campaign props. Session records are not character scores. Filing notices are not separate rulings. The task is to show what each can establish and then ask whether the adults' response was adequate.

That question is more demanding than calling everybody incompetent. It requires an institution to describe its work in units the family can recognize.

Do not lecture the citizen about administrative efficiency while making the citizen assemble the administrative history for you.

Are the attendance numbers periods, days, or another unit?

What substantive decision followed the corrected filings and limited-action requests?

JUNE 2026: THE ARCHIVE AND THE CHILD

The archive grew because preservation kept generating artifacts. That is not the same thing as discovering a new wrong on every page.

The June completion log reported a conservative legal-matter print-equivalent baseline of 108,080 pages. It also described email, attachment, PDF, image, and filing-artifact inventories. These are measures of an assembled corpus, not counts of independent incidents, admissible exhibits, or professional violations. [S05, E288–E290]

A serious book should say that plainly. So should an institution that wants to characterize the volume. If you count every submitted document, service receipt, rejection notice, corrected attachment, and generated review copy as a new demand, you are not measuring the litigation. You are measuring its exhaust.

The June school-access correspondence brings the scale back to something smaller: whether an adult could receive information and help a child. The source materials include the child's reactions. This edition does not need to reproduce those private words to establish that the adults had a difficult relationship and unresolved coordination issues.

The archive is mine to organize. The child's privacy is not a page-count filler. Public accountability belongs on the adults' decisions and the processes that carried them.

A hundred thousand pages will not give anyone a birthday back. At their best, they can make the next institutional explanation harder to bluff.

The dated record

June 7, 2026 — The print-equivalent count.

A completion log reported 108,080 conservative legal-matter print-equivalent pages and a broader range under other counting methods. These totals include record-processing artifacts and are not a count of unique incidents, court filings, proven wrongs, or material cleared for publication.

[S05; E288]

June 7, 2026 — The filing-artifact universe.

The same log reported 24,904 filing-universe records, a category including documents, service and entry notices, rejections, attachment crosswalks, duplicates, and generated review records. It must not be described as 24,904 separate filings.

[S05; E289]

June 7, 2026 — Search hits are not findings.

The completion log reported name and subject hits across the corpus. They are navigation measures, potentially counting multiple representations of the same event. They do not establish professional misconduct or the number of distinct underlying disputes.

[S05; E290]

June 7, 2026 — Local review packets produced.

The completion log reports subject-specific packets and a local research-tool refresh. A local output is not a cloud upload, a court filing, or independent verification of every indexed source.

[S05; E291]

June 22, 2026 — School-access meeting.

The author documented a meeting with Principal Dufort about attendance, information access, and support. The school's own notes were not separately included in the cited packet. The contemporaneous email establishes the author's account of the meeting.

[S05; E300]

June 22, 2026 — Attendance units require care.

The school-related compilation includes absence and tardy totals and a separate class-period tally. Those units must not be added together or recast as full days. Detailed child-specific counts are omitted from this edition; the institutional question is how the adults received and responded to the records.

[S05; E301]

June 22, 2026 — Information-routing concern.

The author reported that the school's displayed mailing information did not provide the direct access he expected. Private addresses are omitted. The account supports a request to check routing; it does not establish who caused any incorrect entry.

[S05; E302]

June 22, 2026 — Consolidated notice sent.

The author sent counsel, the provider, and the other parent a combined email about school information and access. The child's private messages and school details are not reproduced. Transmission establishes notice of the author's concerns, not recipient agreement.

[S05; E306]

June 22, 2026 — Supplemental notice prepared.

A signed supplemental notice used the consolidated email as an exhibit. A prepared or signed PDF is not, by itself, proof of docket acceptance. The receipt or Registry entry controls that separate proposition.

[S05; E307]

June 23, 2026 — The corrected appellate order.

The corrected chronology identifies the June 23 order as the relevant order, rather than treating the May 12 order as current. It records dismissal of a printed-copy waiver issue as moot, denial of other relief, and restrictions on further filings subject to the stated exception. The operative order controls the precise scope.

[S05; E309]

June 23, 2026 — The correction is retained.

The addendum corrected an earlier misidentification of the order governing the current posture. That is an example of source revision, not a new judicial event. The earlier mistake must not be carried forward as fact.

[S05; E310]

The call-out

The Public does not need all 108,080 print-equivalent pages to examine a particular claim. It needs the relevant source, the contrary source, and the reason they matter.

A readable packet is not a surrender of the archive. It is the courtesy that makes scrutiny possible. The same courtesy is owed by public institutions to the people they govern.

Which artifacts are duplicates or processing records rather than independent events?

Which small source packet would allow a reader to verify the issue without exposing the child?

JULY 2026: PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY MEETS THE MEDICAL PORTAL

A login screen can show a problem without identifying the person who caused it.

The July 27 portal attempt showed verification choices that did not provide the access I expected. My preservation request sought demographic, proxy-access, and audit information. The screenshot documents a display; it does not identify who changed anything or whether the cause was a policy, an account configuration, or an individual action. [S05, V21-018-V21-021]

The annual-physical notice and requests for time, place, and participation are separate records. They concern information and logistics. They do not independently establish an unrestricted right to attend every appointment or override adolescent confidentiality rules.

This is where a technology background is useful. A symptom is not a root-cause analysis. You preserve the relevant events, identify the system, request the audit trail, and resist the temptation to assign the fault to whoever already irritates you.

York Hospital's process is the subject of the call-out. What access was permitted, what was displayed, what was requested, and what explanation was returned? A genuine policy limitation should be explained as a policy limitation. An erroneous configuration should be corrected as an error. Neither needs to be converted into a personal conspiracy.

The Public can demand competent explanations while children retain privacy. Those commitments are not in conflict. They are the point.

The later record

July 27, 2026, 9:33 a.m. ET - Limited annual-physical notice received from Ms. Morse
Ms. Morse emailed: "the child is having his yearly physical scheduled 8/3 with Dr. Vinograd. Just fyi." The notice did not include the appointment time, office location, attendance arrangements, or direct-record access information.

[S08; V21-018]

July 27, 2026, 10:44 a.m. ET - Father requests time, location, attendance, and direct provider access

Father thanked Ms. Morse for the notice and requested the appointment time, office location, confirmation that he could attend, direct listing with the provider for future notices and records, and the after-visit summary.

[S08; V21-019]

July 27, 2026, approximately 11:03 a.m. ET - York Hospital portal displays only verification numbers ending in [digits omitted]

The portal displayed verification options that did not provide the access the author expected. The screenshot establishes the display. It does not identify the cause, the person responsible, or the effect of any adolescent-access policy.

[S08; V21-020]

July 27, 2026, 11:16 a.m. ET - York Hospital preservation and audit request sent with Bedard copied

Father emailed York Hospital Medical Records, copied the general hospital address and Bedard, and requested immediate preservation and review of demographic changes, eClinicalWorks/Healow proxy access, appointment notices, audit metadata, the August 3 physical, the 2025 provider communication, and any basis for limiting parental access. The time-stamped portal screenshot and July 21, 2025 email PDF were attached.

[S08; V21-021]

July 29, 2026 - Amended and supplemental contempt attachment adds July 27-29 medicalaccess events

The August 3 second supplemental motion states that the July 19 FM-068 Motion for Contempt remained the operative official form and that an amended and supplemental Attachment A was served on July 29 to add the July 27-29 medical-access events. Why it matters. This carries the July 27 annual-physical notice and portal-access issue into the existing contempt/enforcement lane without treating each later event as a new independent proceeding. Source support. Consolidated_Rejected_Filings_YORDC-FM-2010-00190_Envelopes_

257090_and_257100.pdf; procedural-posture section. Native July 29 service email and attachment control. Status / limitations. High for the content of the later sworn filing. Exact July 29 submission, service, and docket status require the native Gmail/Tyler records.

[S08; V22-001]

Before August 3, 2026 - Disputed position that the father could not attend the annual physical under the PFA

The verified supplemental attachment states that Ms. Morse wrote that the father "will not be able to attend per the current PFA order." It states that he disputed the categorical interpretation, proposed noncontact and provider-controlled logistics, and requested the exact operative language supporting exclusion. Why it matters. The dispute concerns adult-to-adult interpretation, healthcare participation, and safe logistics. It should be assessed against the complete email and operative orders rather than reduced to the child resolving the legal disagreement. Source support. Second Supplemental Attachment A within the consolidated rejected-filings packet, section II. Status / limitations. High for what the sworn filing asserts; the native email and full orders control. This entry does not decide whether attendance was legally permitted or prohibited.

[S08; V22-003]

July 28, 2026 - Daily Electronic Contact - July 27, 2026

The author reported unsuccessful contact attempts and requested adult facilitation. The child's date of birth and private messages are not reproduced. The email establishes the report, not every asserted cause.

[S08; V23-001]

July 28, 2026 - August 3 Physical - Time and Location

Requests the annual-physical time, location, participation logistics, and direct provider access.

[S08; V23-002]

The call-out

The audit trail may establish an ordinary technical explanation. It may establish an error. It may show why a restriction existed. Until then, accusation is not diagnosis.

But an institution can be asked to produce an intelligible explanation without first being accused of sabotage. That should be the normal service, not an extraordinary concession.

Which audit record explains the displayed portal-access condition?

What information could be provided while respecting applicable privacy limits?

Assessment: Do not infer the actor from the symptom. Preserve the audit trail and make the institution answer with records.

AUGUST 2026: ROUTING IS NOT A RESPONSE

“I forwarded it” tells me where the message went. It does not tell me whether the problem was resolved.

The August 29 addendum records an August 3 response from Jean Kolak saying the request had been forwarded. Its review did not locate a later substantive incoming answer from the relevant hospital channels through the stated cutoff. That is a bounded search result, not proof that no person anywhere acted or that no response could exist outside the reviewed material. [S08, V24-001]

The difference between acknowledgment and resolution is still worth confronting. A records request should not dissolve into the passive voice. Received by whom? Routed where? Awaiting what? Subject to which restriction? Answered on which date? These are ordinary service questions.

The August communication-platform exchange poses a related but separate issue. An AppClose invitation was sent, and I objected to a unilateral change while invoking the order’s communication language. An invitation is not an order. My objection is not a ruling. The controlling text and any agreement determine the next step. [S08, V23-044–V23-045]

Institutions and professionals do not owe me agreement. They do owe accurate descriptions of what they did and did not decide. If a department forwarded a message, call it forwarding. If it answered the request, identify the answer.

Public service should not require archaeological excavation of the word handled.

The later record

August 29, 2026 - York Hospital portal and medical-records access remain unresolved after preservation request, forwarding acknowledgment, and follow-up.

The August 29 compilation reports an unresolved access request after a July 27 preservation request, an August 3 forwarding acknowledgment, and follow-up. The review did not locate a later substantive response in the searched channels through its cutoff. That is not proof that no action or response existed outside the reviewed set.

[S08; V24-001]

August 27, 2026 - Public-review and accountability notices

Direct notices advise that public reviews were updated and discuss intergenerational harm and litigation impact.

[S08; V23-043]

August 27, 2026 20:24 ET - AppClose Invite

A reissued communication-platform invitation was sent. The invitation code is omitted. Sending an invitation does not establish an agreement or alter an order.

[S08; V23-044]

August 27, 2026 21:31 ET - Re: AppClose Invite

Father declines a unilateral change to AppClose, states the February 11 order permits email, text, or a parenting application, and requests continued email absent mutual agreement or court direction.

[S08; V23-045]

The call-out

Forwarded is a verb. Resolved is another. A public-facing service should know the difference.

Assessment: Administrative forwarding is a routing event. It is not substantive resolution.

PART V

THE PUBLIC HAS ARRIVED

No violence. No silence. No automatic credibility.

THE PUBLIC INTERNET DID NOT ASK PERMISSION

A searchable record does not need institutional applause.

For this project, the practical change is the ability to preserve a searchable archive rather than rely on memory. Native emails, screenshots, orders, and source indexes make specific comparisons possible. Public-safe extracts can let a reader test a claim without access to the entire private corpus.

The corpus itself became part of the record. By June 2026, the legal-matter-only count exceeded 108,000 conservative print-equivalent pages, with thousands of hits across school, counseling/provider, Bedard/Bobrow, GAL Anderson, and clerk/court/Tyler lanes. Those hit counts are not findings. They are a map showing that the evidence universe is too large for casual narrative shortcuts.

The record at issue

June 7, 2026 — The print-equivalent count.

A completion log reported 108,080 conservative legal-matter print-equivalent pages and a broader range under other counting methods. These totals include record-processing artifacts and are not a count of unique incidents, court filings, proven wrongs, or material cleared for publication.

[S05; E288]

June 7, 2026 — The filing-artifact universe.

The same log reported 24,904 filing-universe records, a category including documents, service and entry notices, rejections, attachment crosswalks, duplicates, and generated review records. It must not be described as 24,904 separate filings.

[S05; E289]

The call-out

A corpus should lower the cost of checking a claim. If it only increases the number of pages someone must read before finding the point, it has reproduced the bureaucracy it criticizes.

That is why this edition cuts duplicate record blocks. Preserve the full archive; publish the necessary comparison. The Public is entitled to a clear path through the evidence, not a second job as the author's research assistant.

How should courts and oversight bodies receive large source corpora without being overwhelmed?

What source-navigation standards let a reviewer verify a claim without printing the universe?

Assessment: The problem is no longer scarcity of records. It is designing legitimate ways to review them.

DOCUMENTS, NOT MUSKETS

The revolution is an audit trail.

This book uses revolutionary language because the governing relationship needs to be inverted back to its democratic baseline: public institutions answer to the Public. The method, however, is aggressively nonviolent. Publish. Archive. Request records. Attend meetings. Ask questions. Compare official explanations with the underlying source. Build tools ordinary people can use.

That puts a different kind of pressure on an institution: the question remains available after the anger has cooled. A searchable document survives the argument.

The call-out

The First Amendment is a commitment to public speech and argument, not a talisman that transforms every disclosure or communication into protected conduct. This book's method remains lawful publication and nonviolent civic criticism, with private information protected.

A good sentence can survive an angry evening. A preserved source can survive an author. That durability is the power worth building.

What information can be lawfully published without exposing children or unrelated private people?

Which accountability tools lower the cost of participation rather than merely escalating conflict?

Assessment: The strongest civic weapon in this book is a sourced sentence.

WHAT REFORM WOULD ACTUALLY LOOK LIKE

Stop designing family law for institutional convenience.

Reform cannot mean one more committee that produces one more report telling families that conflict is bad. The record points toward concrete design questions: immediate neutral investigation when material child-impact facts are disputed; faster implementation review; direct parent access to school and medical records; transcript/audio access that does not depend on liquidity; eFiling support with functioning fallback paths; normalized filing-volume analysis; transparent oversight architecture; and public explanations of administrative relationships that create apparent conflicts.

This book does not pretend every proposal belongs in statute exactly as phrased here. It insists that reform be measured against the childhood clock.

The call-out

Start with implementation design. A contact order should identify the relevant adult tasks, the process for documenting compliance with conditions, a cancellation-and-replacement route, and a prompt way to present a genuine dispute. Clinical judgment and the child's interests must remain central; a checklist cannot replace them.

Then fix process visibility. A litigant should be able to tell whether a submission is awaiting intake, returned for a defect, accepted, presented, or decided. A rejection should identify the cure in plain language and show any available fallback. A public software contract should be evaluated by successful access and recovery, not merely the volume of automated notices.

Then address hearing-record access. A process for unaffordable transcripts should explain what alternatives are available, which decision-maker controls them, and how to obtain a timely ruling. That is a design proposal, not an assertion that every appellant is entitled to a free transcript.

Oversight needs a similar discipline. Explain jurisdiction, the issue decided, the permissible level of disclosed reasoning, and the route for new information. Publish administrative safeguards where lawful. Do not make the Public infer an organizational chart from two matching telephone numbers.

None of this requires an institution to agree with my case. It requires it to be intelligible to the next family.

The reform is not another slogan about children. It is a process that stops making children wait while adults admire the slogan.

How quickly should a neutral investigation begin when parent-child contact is at risk?

What minimum implementation details should every family order contain?

What record-access alternatives should exist for indigent appeals?

Assessment: The reform test is simple: does it reduce preventable child-impact delay without sacrificing due process?

OPEN INVITATION

Bring your record. I will bring mine.

To Judge Lucy: explain the order and the sequence reflected in the public record. To John A. McArdle III: explain the Committee's stated basis for dismissal. To Patrick Bedard: reconcile the challenged representations with the sources they describe.

To Amanda Morse: the April contact statements will be examined beside the order and the scheduling exchange, including the alternatives and objections you actually supplied. The criticism concerns those statements and decisions—not a surname, a birth date, or a demand that you expose a child's private life. [S16]

To Matthew Pollack and Julie Howard: explain the routing pathways in ordinary language. To the Board and CJC: explain the administrative safeguards. To Tyler Technologies: explain the public-service reliability standard for court filing software.

Glenn Anderson is not among the targets of this invitation. His January 6 letter illustrates the careful factual correction this book values. [S15]

The public discussion

Participation is voluntary. Silence is not an admission. Judges, professionals, and private parties may have legitimate limits on what they can discuss. No one is being asked to violate an order, disclose protected information, or submit to a confrontation.

The book proceeds without requiring participation, agreement, or concessions. A public account is not a ransom note for a better ruling. The invitation is to address the record that can properly be discussed, not to turn a child's life into a public contest.

Assessment: Scrutinize the documented act. Preserve the answer. Keep the responsibility attached to the person who actually acted.

INSTITUTIONAL COWARDICE IS NOT HONORABLE

Honor is conduct, not costume.

Arrogance is not honorable. Speaking down to the Public is not honorable. Hiding behind jargon is not honorable. Hiding behind silence is not honorable. Demanding civility while refusing accountability is not honorable. Treating lost childhood as collateral procedure is not honorable. Protecting institutional dignity at the expense of institutional honesty is not honorable.

Neither is anger automatically honorable. Neither is profanity. Neither is being right. That is why the same standard applies to me: source it, label it, correct it, and stop pretending outrage can do the work of evidence.

The call-out

Institutional dignity should not be so brittle that it depends on citizens pretending not to notice a contradiction. It should be strong enough to tolerate an accurate correction, including a correction supplied by somebody who swears.

Honor is the work. The rest is wardrobe.

If institutional dignity requires inaccurate silence, it is not dignity. It is image management.

What would honor look like if the institution treated the citizen as a co-owner rather than a supplicant?

What would candor look like if the full context were included by default?

Assessment: Honor is not demanded. It is demonstrated.

HERE IS YOUR SHOEHORN

The Public is still here.

I do not want a revolution that burns courthouses. I want one that strips courthouses of unnecessary mystique. I want a justice system so legible that ordinary people can understand why they won or lost without a second career in procedural archaeology. I want lawyers who understand that children are not acceptable litigation externalities. I want GALs who are institutionally fearless. I want oversight bodies that can explain their own structure. I want vendors who understand that court software is civic infrastructure.

So here is the shoehorn. Take it. Use it. Pull. And when your head finally clears the institutional anatomy, look around.

ANSWER THE FUCKING QUESTION.

The call-out

The Public is still here. The People are watching. The children are still growing. The clock is still running.

Not every criticism in this book will persuade every reader. It should not have to. A credible public institution should be able to endure an informed disagreement without turning it into a referendum on whether the citizen has shown sufficient reverence.

I wanted to be a father. The filing cabinet was not the dream.

THE DEBAUCHERY RACKET IS OVER is the declaration I make against institutional mystique and self-protection, not a finding of a criminal enterprise. Here, war is the work of words and evidence.

Answer the fucking question.

ROTTEN APPLES

The pattern is not an inheritance we have to accept.

A family history is not a character verdict. A child is not born rotten. And nobody becomes incapable of responsible parenting because an adult once failed them.

The rotten thing is the permission structure: the excuse that familiar harm must be tolerated because it is familiar, that a family's preferred account is beyond examination, or that professional advocacy makes a disputed account immune to comparison with the source.

That is what I am calling out. Not a bloodline. A pattern I believe needs to be examined and interrupted.

August 2, 2026: what I actually recorded

At 1:08 p.m. Eastern on August 2, 2026, I emailed Daniel Pierce and Patrick Bedard under the subject “Fwd: Extended-Family Visit Is Not In-Person Contact With His Father.” In the message I requested consultation with a prior clinician and consideration of the earlier GAL record. I offered part of my next appointment for a compensated professional consultation and said I would execute appropriate releases. [S17]

In that email, I wrote: “Ms. Morse has stated that her father disappeared from her life when she was approximately four years old.” Those are my words recording what I recalled her telling me. They are not a direct quotation from an email she sent that day. The message does not establish when the childhood event occurred, why her father was absent, who caused the absence, or that parental alienation was the explanation. [S17]

I will not manufacture the missing history. The document establishes that I raised a concern and requested informed professional review. It does not turn my concern into a diagnosis or a finding about another generation.

A childhood wound is not a parenting plan.

My criticism is that the recurring dispute over my relationship with my son deserved more than a contest between the latest accusations. I wanted the history examined by people qualified to examine it, including the

professionals who already knew parts of that history. Glenn Anderson belongs in that account as a source of relevant historical perspective and a professional who corrected the appointment history—not as a target of this book. [S15; S17]

Their answers are in the record too

Amanda Morse's August 2 response attributed the circumstances to my actions toward our son. She urged me to apologize, take responsibility, and concentrate on counseling and understanding his feelings. In the preceding exchange, she denied that anybody had represented an extended-family outing as a visit with me. Those are substantive answers, not silence. They remain in the account. [S17]

Patrick Bedard's April 21, 2026 email also gave a substantive response. He said contact information had been provided, disputed whether I had demonstrated compliance with the order's treatment conditions, and recommended addressing contact with our son in therapy. He said Amanda had encouraged contact, while maintaining that she could not force it. I dispute parts of that framing, but the disagreement does not authorize me to erase the response. [S16]

The February 11 order contained findings against me and conditions on progression to in-person contact. Those conditions do not disappear from this book. Neither does my challenge to the findings. A general argument about fatherhood is not a ruling that my own conduct was beyond criticism. [S01]

Now put all of it on the table.

The conditions. The claimed compliance deficiencies. The offers to consult earlier professionals. The proposed schedules. The answers actually given. The child's experience, assessed privately and competently rather than conscripted into a public argument.

A client's certainty and counsel's repetition are not two independent examinations of the facts. Neither are my email and my book.

Mr. Bedard, the question is what the evidence supports and what practical, reviewable path remains. If a condition has not been satisfied, identify the condition and the relevant evidence. If it has, the analysis must move forward rather than merely repeat the accusation. Where the adults disagree, an intelligible decision is needed—not a permanent holding pattern disguised as an answer.

Ms. Morse, my objection is to making the relationship a contest between your account and mine without adequate examination of the underlying history. Your denials belong beside my allegations. The next step should be a competent evaluation of the disputed conduct, not an assumption that either parent's confidence has settled it.

The calendar is not a neutral investigator. Waiting longer does not authenticate a claim.

What must not be passed down

I am not using this chapter to label a child's future, publish another child's private circumstances, or attribute collective guilt to relatives who have not been tied to a documented act. "The family" cannot become a substitute for identifying who said or did what.

The point is responsibility that survives that precision. If a relative encourages disparagement, examine the evidence of that conduct. If a parent impedes safe, appropriate contact, examine that conduct. If counsel supplies a misleading history, compare it with the history. If my own conduct needs correction, the same rule applies to me.

No surname gets a presumption of guilt. No surname gets an exemption from scrutiny.

Ignorance and arrogance are a dangerous combination in the ordinary moral sense: not knowing is repairable; refusing to learn can make the mistake permanent. That is my assessment, not a psychological finding about every person in this dispute.

The accountability I want is not the right to have the last insult. It is the end of an arrangement in which adults can keep handing children the bill for disputes they will not resolve responsibly.

The pattern is not sacred because it is old. It is not acceptable because it is familiar. And a child does not owe it another generation.

That is where the personal history becomes a public question: what would a system look like if it helped adults interrupt harm before another child had to learn how to survive it?

SELECTED SOURCE DOCUMENTS

These selections let the reader check the principal comparisons without repeating entire filing packets. Editorial summaries are not quotations. Ellipses and bracketed omissions mark abridgment where relevant; the originals identified in the source directory control.

A. The September 15, 2026 Committee letter

S04. Recipient-created, public-safe transcription. Not a certified copy. Address omitted; layout normalized.

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT P.O. BOX 127 AUGUSTA, MAINE 04332
(207) 623-1121

September 15, 2026

Justin Tahai [Home mailing address redacted]

RE: Docket No. 26-321

Dear Mr. Tahai:

The Committee on Judicial Conduct considered your new complaint against Judge John Lucy at our most recent meeting.

1. You complain that Judge Lucy delayed in recusing himself from the case.

However, you have not shown that there was the basis for recusal that mandated his recusal earlier. As a result, the Committee dismissed this complaint as being unfounded in fact.

2. You complain that Judge Lucy recused himself without explanation implying that this was improper conduct.

Maine judges are not required to provide an explanation when they recuse themselves from a case. Accordingly, Judge Lucy did not violate the Code of Judicial Conduct by recusing without explanation. Thus, the Committee dismissed this complaint as concerning conduct which is not a violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

3. To the extent that your complaint might be deemed, in part, a Motion for Reconsideration of the Committee's prior dismissal of your first

complaint against Judge Lucy, the Committee took no action as there was no basis for reconsideration.

Sincerely,

John A. McArdle, III Committee Counsel

B. What the February 11 order actually required

The supplied transcription reports findings of abuse against the author and restrictions based on those findings. The author disputes the account. Nothing in this book purports to reverse the order. The following selections concern the forward-looking contact framework, not the entire factual or legal basis of the decision. [S01]

1. Therapeutic Visits: Mr. Tahai and the child shall continue to participate weekly in joint reunification therapy with Daniel Pierce, LCSW. Mr. Tahai shall follow all recommendations for further therapy with Mr. Pierce. Mr. Tahai shall be responsible for the costs of this therapy. Mr. Tahai shall provide a copy of this order to Mr. Pierce.

3. Electronic Contact: Mr. Tahai shall have the opportunity for reasonable daily contact with the child, by telephone, video conference, video gaming platform, or other electronic media, at all reasonable times convenient to the child. He shall be respectful of the child's schedule and desires regarding the timing and frequency of such contact. All such contact shall be polite, civil and respectful.

4. In Person Contact: Starting no later than thirty days from this order, and contingent on Mr. Tahai's compliance with paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 above, Mr. Tahai shall have the right and opportunity to visit with the child in person for at least two hours over lunch or dinner on at least two days each week, either in a public place or with another adult present who is well-known to the child. Mr. Tahai shall be respectful of the child's schedule and desires regarding the timing and frequency of such contact. Mr. Tahai shall understand that he cannot control the child's feelings and that it may take time for the child to become comfortable and cooperative with this new arrangement. After three months of such regular visitation, visitation shall be increased to at least three hours on three days each week. The parties are encouraged to reach agreements on in-person contact that work well for the child. Ms.

Morse is allocated the authority to decide that such contact need not be in a public place or with another adult present, or that it should be increased, if she determines that is in the child's best interests.

S01, Contact and Visitation, selected paragraphs 1, 3–4. Paragraph 2 contains additional compliance requirements and is not reproduced in full here. The in-person provision expressly incorporates those requirements; omission here does not remove them.

C. The February 16 email: compliance and the cost claim

“Notwithstanding the pending appeal, I will comply with the Order as written unless and until it is modified or reversed. My compliance is not a waiver of appellate rights.”

“Pursuant to the support order allocating 50/50 responsibility for uninsured medical-related expenses, your client's share is \$75 per session.”

The first excerpt is the author's stated compliance position. The second is his cost-allocation claim. The order's express reunification-cost provision placed responsibility on him. This edition does not treat the email's demand as proof that reimbursement was owed. Other logistics requests in the email must be assessed separately. [S01; S02]

D. The professional-conduct complaint

The amended GCF-25-524 complaint requested investigation of alleged unsupported assertions, procedural practices, implementation friction, and disputed narratives in proposed orders. It expressly disclaimed asking the Board to relitigate the family case and requested consideration of Anderson's historical perspective. These are the complainant's allegations and requests. The chronology records a dismissal followed by a request for review, not an established disciplinary violation. [S03; S05, E246]

E. The relationship map, without the insinuation

Direct case relationships. Bedard represented the opposing party; Lucy was the judge whose conduct was the subject of the CJC complaint; Anderson had prior GAL involvement; McArdle signed the Committee's response as counsel. These different roles do not prove a shared personal purpose.

Formal governance. The research identifies the SJC as the governance hub for judicial-conduct and lawyer-regulation structures. Formal authority is not proof of improper participation in a particular decision.

Administrative contact. The official CJC and Board sites publish the same main telephone number. The administrative arrangement and safeguards are legitimate questions; coordinated complaint outcomes are not established.

Educational and professional affiliations. The report identifies school and firm histories at different confidence levels. It does not establish a common firm among Bedard, Lucy, and McArdle or a personal Bedard-Lucy relationship from graduation dates.

Limits. The research did not establish bribery, racketeering, money laundering, fraud, or an unlawful agreement. It also did not independently search authenticated federal dockets or complete a live Gmail review in that research pass. A negative search means not located in that pass, not impossible.

S09, with the official administrative sources S11–S13. This is an edited map of the report's conclusions, not a new investigative finding.

SOURCE DIRECTORY

Source codes refer to the documents used for this editorial revision. Numbered E references preserve the earlier compilation's event identifiers, including gaps where duplicate or irrelevant entries were omitted. The references are navigation aids, not new exhibit numbers assigned by a court. A source can establish that an allegation was made without establishing the allegation itself.

S01 — Findings and Order, February 11, 2026

YORDC-FM-10-190 / BIDDC-PA-24-1285. Reviewed from the supplied text transcription of the image-only order. The signed order controls; no transcription is represented as a certified copy.

S02 — Implementation of February 11, 2026 Order — Compliance, Notice, and Documentation (Pending Appeal)

Justin Tahai email to Patrick S. Bedard, February 16, 2026, 2:42 p.m.; supplied as "1 - Compliance email chain start.pdf." Earlier timestamps are recounted in this message. The email's cost-sharing assertion is distinguished from the express therapy-cost provision in S01.

S03 — Amended / Supplemental Complaint — GCF-25-524

Supplied as "Amended Complaint GCF-25-524.pdf." Party-authored allegations and investigation requests, not findings. The reviewed text does not establish a signed filing date.

S04 — Committee on Judicial Conduct, Docket 26-321

Letter dated September 15, 2026; John A. McArdle III, Committee Counsel. Public-safe recipient transcription prepared September 18, 2026 from two photographs; home address omitted. This is a dismissal, not an adjudication in the author's favor.

S05 — Master Timeline v21, with v20 and earlier layers preserved

Compilation through July 27, 2026, with prior layers preserved. E-number references retain its numbered source-navigation entries. Registry transcription, native documents, and author significance notes are distinct. Confidence labels in the compilation are not independent authentication by this book.

S06 — Transcript / Audio / Record Completion Timeline Addendum

April 29, 2026 addendum for Yor-26-118. Distinguishes the 326-minute hearing reference from the estimated 326 transcript pages and describes the \$1,515.90 estimate. Later production and corrections in S05 qualify earlier missing-source statements.

S07 — Motion for electronic recording in lieu of transcript

February 18, 2026 motion in BIDD-PA-2024-01285. Requests an electronic recording or alternative settled-statement process. It establishes requested relief, not entitlement or disposition.

S08 — Later source-navigation updates, v22–v24

Master Timeline v22 through August 15, v23 through August 27, and v24 through August 29, 2026, each with earlier layers preserved. V21/V22/V23/V24 identifiers in the text retain the original entry numbers. Search cutoffs are historical, not assertions that no later response exists.

S09 — Maine Family-Law Accountability Network: Corpus and Public-Record Relationship Research

User-supplied research report distinguishing case relationships, governance links, biographies, and possible affiliations. It does not establish an illicit personal network. Its account of Anderson's letter led to retrieval of the signed primary document for this revision; see S15. Some bibliography links are broad landing pages rather than exact historical records.

S10 — Cloudflare pageview email and author-described dashboard material

Email dated April 6, 2026, subject “Congrats on passing 10,000 Pageviews”; reports 27,075 pageviews for the prior month. The previously retrieved body is preserved in the project conversation. The author described separate dashboard screenshots as showing thousands of unique visitors; this revision does not independently verify a particular screenshot’s date range or exact unique-visitor count.

S11 — Rules of the Committee on Judicial Conduct

Official published rules and establishing order; consulted September 18, 2026. <https://www.cjc.maine.gov/rules.html> . Relevant references are the establishing order, paragraphs 3–4 and 8(C), and Rule 1(B)(iv). Confidentiality provisions limit what the Committee may publish; an inability to discuss a matter publicly is not an admission.

S12 — Maine Judicial Branch — Committee on Judicial Conduct

Official committee page and CJC home page; consulted September 18, 2026. <https://www.courts.maine.gov/about/committees/cjrd.html> and <https://www.cjc.maine.gov/> . The pages describe the Committee’s role and identify counsel and the SJC liaison. The roster page contains inconsistent chair labels; no chair identification is used here.

S13 — Board of Overseers of the Bar — mission and contact information

Official site; consulted September 18, 2026. <https://www.mebaroverseers.org/> . Describes the Board as independent under SJC jurisdiction and publishes the contact number discussed in the text.

S14 — Cloudflare — Zone Analytics

Official technical documentation; consulted September 18, 2026. <https://developers.cloudflare.com/analytics/account-and-zone-analytics/zone-analytics/> . Metric definitions and traffic scope depend on the view. Traffic measures must not be presented as confirmed human readership or endorsement.

Research links retained from the supplied report

The research report contains further references for biographies, school affiliations, firm histories, and fee arbitration. The following exact URLs were retained where the report supplies them. These entries identify the research trail; they are not a claim that every historical page was independently reauthenticated for this print edition.

<https://www.patbedardlawoffice.com/attorneys/patrick-s-bedard-esq/>

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/mark-lawrence-37319841>

https://www.mebaroverseers.org/dah_schedule/fee.html?id=758459&utm_source=chatgpt.com

<https://www.courts.maine.gov/courts/district/judges.html>

<https://lawyers.justia.com/lawyer/john-a-mcardle-iii-1008567>

<https://law.justia.com/cases/maine/supreme-court/1978/393-a-2d-1329-0.html>

<https://www.courts.maine.gov/courts/sjc/justices.html>

<https://law.justia.com/cases/maine/supreme-court/1998/1998-me-147-0.html>

<https://content.govdelivery.com/>

<https://www.courts.maine.gov/about/reports/adtc-report-2019.pdf>

<https://www.avvo.com/attorneys/04112-me-john-mcardle-1319928.html>

<https://mebaroverseers.org/>

<https://digitalcommons.mainerlaw.maine.edu/>

<https://www.krz.com/news/>

<https://www.krz.com/2013/03/27/john-a-mcardle-iii-was-recently-recognized-for-completing-a-4-year-appointment-to-the-maine-trial-lawyers-association-executive-committee/>

<https://caselaw.findlaw.com/court/us-1st-circuit/1549287.html>

<https://case-law.vlex.com/vid/springer-v-springer-docket-893953706>

Limits of the publication record

The compilation includes legacy summaries, transcriptions, and party-authored filings. Some primary sources remain unreviewed. Anderson's signed letter was checked for this revision; the complete motion and ruling remain necessary for the broader comparison. This edition does not authenticate the full private archive. Later replies and decisions may change an account.

Additional primary sources used in this revision

S15 — Glenn R. Anderson, signed letter, January 6, 2026

“Tahai v Morse letter 01-06-2026.pdf,” one page, attached to Anderson’s January 6 email titled “Tahai v. Morse,” sent to Bedard and the author at 4:22 p.m. Eastern. The original attachment was retrieved and visually read for this revision. The letter identifies later GAL appointments, challenges the motion’s account, acknowledges no appointment under pending motions, and takes no position on admissibility or relevance.

Only relevant text is quoted. Letterhead contact information and the signature image are not reproduced. The December 29 motion and the court’s ruling remain separate sources necessary to assess the full evidentiary dispute.

S16 — Native April 2026 correspondence

Patrick S. Bedard, “RE: Fridays appointment,,” April 21, 2026; Amanda Morse, replies in “Failure to preserve scheduled counseling session and immediate corrective action required,” April 24, 2026 at 12:03 a.m. and 12:11 a.m. Eastern. The original messages were located; the first reply’s full thread was read, including the Monday-rescheduling proposal and the author’s replies. These are party and counsel positions, not rulings.

The comparison preserves Morse’s explanation that notice of the driving lesson arrived late, her request to reschedule, and her accusation of disparagement. Bedard’s compliance objections and statements that contact was encouraged are preserved as his stated answers. Neither side’s characterization is treated as proof merely because it was emailed.

Scope and privacy

This targeted revision does not authenticate the entire private archive. Publication review must still address restrictions, confidentiality, privilege, and source context. Birth dates, personal contact details, and attacks on uninvolved relatives were not added. Historical source references elsewhere retain their original scope.

SOURCE NOTES FOR THE NEW CHAPTERS

These notes supplement the preceding source directory. References [S01]–[S16] retain the meanings assigned there. [S17] identifies the additional correspondence. [R01]–[R13] identify outside research used in the closing chapter. Research findings, the author's interpretation, and the case record are distinct. No study listed here adjudicates any named person's conduct or establishes that a particular child will experience a predicted outcome.

[S17] August 2, 2026: request for historical consultation

Justin A. Tahai to Daniel Pierce and Patrick S. Bedard, “Fwd: Extended-Family Visit Is Not In-Person Contact With His Father,” August 2, 2026, 1:08:29 p.m. Eastern. Native Gmail message retained by the author; subject within the body: “Request for Prior Clinical Consultation and Review of Historical Records.” The forwarded exchange includes Amanda Morse's August 1–2 responses and denials. The statement about her father disappearing at approximately age four is Tahai's report of what she had told him, not her direct statement in that message. Cause and date of the childhood absence are not established.

[R01] Interparental conflict and child adjustment

Van Eldik, W. M., de Haan, A. D., Parry, L. Q., Davies, P. T., Luijk, M. P. C. M., Arends, L. R., & Prinzie, P. (2020). The interparental relationship: Meta-analytic associations with children's maladjustment and responses to interparental conflict. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(7), 553–594. DOI: 10.1037/bul0000233. PubMed: 32437177.

Meta-analysis of observational research, including longitudinal findings. It examines multiple dimensions of conflict. It does not establish the cause of a specific family's difficulties or equate separation with harmful conflict.

[R02] Economic pressure and family processes

Conger, R. D., Conger, K. J., & Martin, M. J. (2010). Socioeconomic status, family processes, and individual development. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 685–704. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00725.x. PubMed: 20676350.

Integrative review of economic conditions and family/developmental processes. Supports attention to mechanisms and competing explanations; not an estimate of litigation-caused harm. The chapter's discussion of legal-cost opportunity costs is the author's application.

[R03] An externally generated income change

Akee, R. K. Q., Copeland, W. E., Keeler, G., Angold, A., & Costello, E. J. (2010). Parents' incomes and children's outcomes: A quasi-experiment using transfer payments from casino profits. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2(1), 86–115. DOI: 10.1257/app.2.1.86.

Quasi-experimental evidence in a particular population. Income gains cannot be mechanically reversed to estimate the consequences of a legal bill. The \$10,000 illustration uses $10000 \times 1.04^{30} = \$32,433.98$; it is arithmetic with a stated assumption, not a return forecast or damages opinion.

[R04] Longitudinal father-involvement research

Sarkadi, A., Kristiansson, R., Oberklaid, F., & Bremberg, S. (2008). Fathers' involvement and children's developmental outcomes: A systematic review of longitudinal studies. *Acta Paediatrica*, 97(2), 153–158. DOI: 10.1111/j.1651-2227.2007.00572.x. PubMed: 18052995.

Observational longitudinal publications support constructive engagement. They do not justify automatic contact with an unsafe parent, one universal family arrangement, or a claim that only fathers provide beneficial care.

[R05] Nonresident fathering and well-being

Adamsons, K., & Johnson, S. K. (2013). An updated and expanded meta-analysis of nonresident fathering and child well-being. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(4), 589–599. DOI: 10.1037/a0033786. PubMed: 23978321.

Meta-analysis of 52 studies, reporting small overall associations and differences by involvement measure. Contact frequency alone is not an adequate proxy for relationship quality. Association does not establish the merits of a particular contact dispute.

[R06] Parenting style and externalizing behavior

Pinquart, M. (2017). Associations of parenting dimensions and styles with externalizing problems of children and adolescents: An updated meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 53(5), 873–932. DOI: 10.1037/dev0000295. PubMed: 28459276.

Large meta-analysis with generally small associations and bidirectional relationships. Behavioral structure and autonomy support are not the same as harshness or psychological control. It did not test whether an occasional stern lecture causes a favorable adult outcome.

[R07] Harsh verbal discipline

Wang, M.-T., & Kenny, S. (2014; online 2013). Longitudinal links between fathers' and mothers' harsh verbal discipline and adolescents' conduct problems and depressive symptoms. *Child Development*, 85(3), 908–923. DOI: 10.1111/cdev.12143. PMID: PMC3875601.

Longitudinal study of 976 families. Harsh verbal discipline included behavior different from a calm, firm boundary. Reciprocal associations do not establish a simple one-direction causal story. Warm intentions should not be treated as proof that humiliating conduct is harmless.

[R08] Childhood self-control and adult outcomes

Moffitt, T. E., et al. (2011). A gradient of childhood self-control predicts health, wealth, and public safety. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(7), 2693–2698. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1010076108. PubMed: 21262822.

Longitudinal prediction and a sibling-comparison analysis, not a parenting-treatment trial. Outcomes included offending; the chapter does not substitute incarceration for every justice-related measure or treat risk as destiny.

[R09] Self-efficacy

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191. PubMed: 847061.

Foundational theoretical and experimental work on perceived task capability. Used to distinguish practiced, supported competence from bravado. It is not a modern randomized study of fatherhood or an assurance that encouragement alone produces self-control.

[R10] Interventions supporting self-regulation

Pandey, A., Hale, D., Das, S., Goddings, A.-L., Blakemore, S.-J., & Viner, R. M. (2018). Effectiveness of universal self-regulation-based interventions in children and adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 172(6), 566–575. DOI: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2018.0232.

Review of randomized trials with heterogeneous programs and outcomes. Supports evaluated prevention and skill-building, not a guaranteed effect from any single school, parent, or court intervention.

[R11] Parenting and adolescent alcohol use

Ryan, S. M., Jorm, A. F., & Lubman, D. I. (2010). Parenting factors associated with reduced adolescent alcohol use: A systematic review of longitudinal studies. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 44(9), 774–783. DOI: 10.1080/00048674.2010.501759. PubMed: 20815663.

Longitudinal associations involving parenting and alcohol use. Multiple protective factors are relevant; the review is not proof that any one conversation prevents all substance-related harm.

[R12] New Beginnings: fifteen-year follow-up

Wolchik, S. A., et al. (2013). Fifteen-year follow-up of a randomized trial of a preventive intervention for divorced families: Effects on mental health and substance use outcomes in young adulthood. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 81(4), 660–673. DOI: 10.1037/a0033235. PubMed: 23750466.

Randomized preventive-program follow-up from 240 families. Effects differed by outcome and sex; the chapter preserves the unfavorable female alcohol-use measure rather than describing uniformly favorable results. Findings are not a guarantee for every family or every program with a similar name.

[R13] Oregon Divorce Study: nine-year follow-up

Forgatch, M. S., Patterson, G. R., DeGarmo, D. S., & Beldavs, Z. G. (2009). Testing the Oregon delinquency model with 9-year follow-up of the Oregon Divorce Study. *Development and Psychopathology*, 21(2), 637–660. DOI: 10.1017/S0954579409000340. PubMed: 19338702.

Randomized parent-training research involving single mothers and sons. Reported delinquency and arrest outcomes should not be relabeled as convictions or incarceration. The study also demonstrates why protective parenting cannot be treated as exclusively paternal.

Something I learned through professional experience, and feel compelled to share from personal, CPI requires constant vigilance and self-corrective course changes on the fly.

It also teaches that there will always be problems.

But, the problems of tomorrow should ALWAYS be lesser in severity than those of today.

State of Maine and Maine Judicial Branch —

NO.

Choose a better path.

And to the People of our state: rise.

Rise.JTforME.com

Reproduced below: the author's six-page open letter dated July 5, 2026, recovered from the attachment to his July 5 email. This preface is new. The letter is re-typeset without abridgment; original-page markers are retained. Only the author's personal contact block is redacted. Statements in the letter remain the author's statements, not findings made by this edition.

OPEN LETTER TO ALL PRESIDING JUDGES ACROSS THE FIVE COURT LANES IMPLICATED BY THIS RECORD

Re: Continuing Child-Impact Harm, Delay, Record Fragmentation, Judicial Accountability, and Need for Prompt Implementation

To the Presiding Judges and Judicial Officers entrusted with the administration of justice across the courts implicated by this record:

I respectfully submit this open letter for filing, service, notice, and public accountability regarding continuing child-impact harm, unresolved implementation issues, record fragmentation, and the urgent need for meaningful judicial action across the procedural lanes now touching this family.

This letter is direct because the dates are direct.

The harm is not abstract.

The delay is not abstract.

The child-impact consequences are not abstract.

As of July 5, 2026, the record reflects the following staggering timeframes:

November 27, 2024 to July 5, 2026: approximately 585 days from the Thanksgiving Eve deprivation/event lane.

December 6, 2024 to July 5, 2026: approximately 576 days from the PFA / temporary-order lane.

January 9, 2025 to July 5, 2026: approximately 542 days from the agreed amended temporary order allowing contact through therapy sessions.

April 17, 2025 to July 5, 2026: approximately 444 days from the email-only therapy-scheduling posture.

September 4, 2025 to July 5, 2026: approximately 304 days from consolidation and the continuing therapy-limited contact posture.

September 22, 2025 to July 5, 2026: approximately 286 days from the pretrial order setting the final hearing.

January 16, 2026 to July 5, 2026: approximately 170 days from the contested final hearing.

February 11, 2026 to July 5, 2026: approximately 144 days from the Court's order.

These are not just dates on a docket.

They are markers of time in a child's life.

ORIGINAL LETTER • PAGE 2 OF 6

They are missed opportunities for repair.

They are points at which adult systems could have acted with urgency and did not.

They are the measure of a parent-child relationship being left to drift inside procedure while the adults and institutions entrusted with authority continue to move at the speed of institutional comfort.

I further note that I have repeatedly attached, served, and identified as an exhibit the Law Court order stating that the trial court could act in the usual course while the appeal remained pending. If any later order, docket posture, or judicial action suggests that trial-court action was delayed, avoided, or misunderstood because of appeal-related posture, then fragmentation of the record continues to be the problem.

The issue has not been lack of notice.

The issue has been that the record has been split across trial-court filings, Law Court filings, service emails, implementation notices, exhibits, eFiling receipts, rejected envelopes, preservation packets, and related procedural lanes while the child-impact issues remain unresolved in real time.

I also respectfully note that the Law Court has characterized further filings as repetitive or an improper use of its time, while the underlying reality remains that a self-represented parent was plainly seeking help navigating urgent parent-child contact, implementation, record-access, and child-impact issues.

Respectfully, what wastes judicial time is not a parent reaching out for help when the available lanes fail to produce timely relief.

What wastes judicial time is the rework created by fragmented records, unclear routing, unresolved implementation questions, rejected or

redirected filings, appeal/trial-court confusion, and the absence of a clear case-management mechanism that tells a parent where to go, what will be heard, who can act, and when meaningful relief will be considered.

A parent asking for help is not the burden.

A system that forces the same urgent child-impact issues to be restated across multiple procedural lanes because no lane produces timely implementation is the burden.

Respectfully, that fragmentation should not continue to operate against the child or against meaningful implementation of existing orders. A record that is fragmented across dockets, courts, and procedural lanes is still a record. The courts have repeatedly been given the necessary context: the Law Court did not bar ordinary trial-court action, and trial-court implementation relief remains necessary to prevent continuing harm.

ORIGINAL LETTER • PAGE 3 OF 6

I understand judicial immunity. I understand that judges and magistrates must be able to make hard decisions without fear of personal retaliation. Judicial independence has a purpose.

But judicial independence is not the same thing as institutional unaccountability.

It cannot mean silence.

It cannot mean delay without remedy.

It cannot mean that a child-impact case is allowed to become a maze where every office has a limit, every process points somewhere else, every remedy requires more time, and no one is responsible in time to prevent the harm.

A child does not experience “pending motion practice.”

A child experiences absence.

A child experiences confusion.

A child experiences adult conflict as emotional weather.

A child experiences one parent becoming filtered, delayed, blocked, blamed, or transformed into a controversy.

A child experiences each missed holiday, each delayed visit, each displaced counseling session, each unanswered logistics request, and each institutional shrug as part of the reality adults have built around him.

Family court delay is not neutral.

Procedure is not justice.

An order that exists on paper but is not practically implemented does not protect a child.

It becomes paper.

And paper does not protect children.

For as long as the administration of justice allows opportunities to be selfish, there will always be those who take advantage without regard for harming others. If delay can be used as leverage, someone will use it. If ambiguity can be used as cover, someone will hide behind it. If procedure can exhaust the other parent, someone will weaponize it. If a child can be placed in the middle and called the “decision-maker,” someone will do it. If compliance can be treated as conditional, negotiated, delayed, or filtered through adult hostility, someone will exploit that opportunity unless the Court closes the gap.

That is why responsible systems require guardrails.

That is why child-impact cases require urgency.

ORIGINAL LETTER • PAGE 4 OF 6

That is why implementation cannot be left to silence, informal vetoes, or practical child-gatekeeper framing.

This matter needs prompt judicial action on basic implementation issues that should not require repeated filings, public accountability notices, or months of continued dispute. The courts entrusted with this record should ensure that the appropriate court promptly addresses daily electronic contact, in-person contact logistics, reunification therapy scheduling, transportation and make-up protocols, school punctuality and attendance issues, records and authorization access, medical/dental/therapy/insurance information flow, and clear protections against Parker being placed in the middle of adult litigation narratives.

I respectfully request that the appropriate presiding court promptly schedule a status conference and/or enter a practical implementation order addressing:

1. A specific daily electronic-contact platform, telephone number, and contact window;
2. Specific dates, times, locations, and exchange logistics for in-person contact;
3. Transportation and punctuality expectations for reunification therapy and contact;
4. Make-up procedures when therapy or contact is displaced;
5. School attendance, tardy, and same-day parent-notice requirements;
6. Direct parental access to school, medical, dental, therapy, insurance, and MaineCare records;
7. Any releases or authorizations necessary for direct access;
8. A prohibition on exposing Parker to adult filings, blame narratives, litigation strategy, disparagement, or relationship-undermining commentary; and
9. A clear directive that Parker is not responsible for deciding whether court-ordered parent-child contact occurs.

This is not a request for special treatment.

It is a request for meaningful implementation of what family court is supposed to protect.

The public justice system does not belong to judges, lawyers, clerks, committees, agencies, or appellate panels. It belongs to the public. Courts are entrusted with it. Lawyers are licensed to serve it. Legislators are elected to protect it. Agencies are created to administer it. But the people remain the source of legitimacy.

When a child-impact case reaches 585 days from the corrected Thanksgiving Eve deprivation/event lane, 170 days from final hearing, and 144 days from order without practical implementation sufficient to stop the continuing harm, the problem is no longer merely private conflict.

It is a public-accountability concern.

It is a systems concern.

It is an access-to-justice concern.

It is a child-impact concern.

Each court may have its own jurisdictional limits. Each court may have its own procedural rules. Each court may be able to say that some part of the problem belongs somewhere else.

But a child does not live inside those distinctions.

A child lives with the accumulated consequences of delay.

A parent-child relationship does not fracture according to docket number.

School instability does not wait for jurisdictional clarity.

Therapeutic harm does not pause while filings are redirected.

And public trust does not survive when every institution can explain why someone else should act while no one acts in time.

The appropriate court has the ability to act.

The appropriate court has the ability to define logistics.

The appropriate court has the ability to set a status conference.

The appropriate court has the ability to prevent continued ambiguity from becoming continued harm.

Respectfully, it should do so now.

Justice is not meant to serve only the professional class entrusted to protect it for the People.

It is not meant to serve procedure over human harm.

It is not meant to excuse the harming of children, or the destruction of a child's right to a meaningful relationship with both parents, for the sake of this abhorrent game of antiquity.

Through pride and reverence for the "professionalism" of lawyers, justice has become broken.

An older gentleman seated at the bench once asked a teenager, who had lost their way, to take the opportunity to turn their life around and choose a better path.

For some reason, I listened to him.

Out of respect for that small kindness, I now ask the same of his profession.

ORIGINAL LETTER • PAGE 6 OF 6

I respectfully remind those entrusted with it: justice does not belong to your profession.

It belongs to the public.

Restore it.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 5, 2026

/s/ Justin Tahai

Justin Tahai, pro se

[Personal contact details redacted for publication.]

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on July 5, 2026, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Open Letter to All Presiding Judges Across the Five Court Lanes Implicated by This Record upon counsel for Amanda Morse by email:

Patrick S. Bedard, Esq.

Bedard & Bobrow, P.C.

psbedlaw@bedardbobrow.com

/s/ Justin Tahai

Justin Tahai

THE FINAL CALL OUT

RISE

Research does not treat sustained conflict between parents as harmless background noise. Van Eldik and colleagues' 2020 meta-analysis examined 169 studies of children's adjustment and 61 studies of their responses to interparental conflict. Hostility was important, but disengagement and unconstructive conflict also mattered. Many associations persisted over time. These are research associations across families—not findings that one parent, one lawyer, or one court caused a particular child's difficulties. They are enough to make indifference indefensible. [R01]

This is where the book ends: not with another adjective for an attorney, but with what children may carry after the attorneys have closed their files.

I. THE COSTS THAT DO NOT FIT ON THE INVOICE

A case has a caption. A life has consequences outside it. My argument is that institutions responsible for families should account for those consequences before treating delay, financial depletion, and damaged relationships as somebody else's problem.

The research does not prove that private-practice attorneys collectively cause addiction, educational failure, or incarceration. I will not invent that result. It does establish that family relationships, economic conditions, parenting practices, and developing self-regulation matter. When professional conduct unnecessarily worsens those conditions, it deserves examination on that basis—not immunity because the invoice contains recognizable legal work.

The bill comes out of a family, not an abstraction

Conger, Conger, and Martin's 2010 review describes the connections between socioeconomic conditions, family relationships, and development. It evaluates both economic pressure on family functioning and the ways individual and family characteristics influence economic circumstances.

The relationship runs through processes, not a simple equation in which poverty determines character. [R02]

That should change how we discuss legal expense. A necessary protective proceeding may be worth its cost. An unnecessary escalation does not become harmless merely because the time was billable. The question is what the work accomplished, what alternatives were available, and which burdens the process imposed on the family it purported to serve.

The economic evidence is not confined to correlations. Akee and colleagues' 2010 quasi-experiment examined income changes from casino-profit transfers. In the poorest households studied, an additional \$4,000 a year was associated with approximately one additional year of education by age 21 and a 22 percent reduction in the probability of minor offending at ages 16 and 17. The authors used an externally generated income change to investigate causation; their result is not a dollar-for-dollar estimate of harm from legal fees. [R03]

It does make one complacent assumption difficult to defend: that money taken out of a stressed household is merely money, unrelated to a child's prospects.

Consider an illustration, not an allegation about this case. Suppose \$10,000 is spent on avoidable procedural conflict rather than retained by the household. At an assumed annual growth rate of 4 percent for thirty years, \$10,000 would become about \$32,434. That arithmetic is not an investment forecast, a promised return, or a damages calculation; it ignores taxes and assumes the money could remain invested. Often its more immediate alternative use would be rent, transport, childcare, or education.

Either way, the money has an opportunity cost. It cannot simultaneously finance needless conflict and remain available for the family's other needs. When I speak of generational wealth, I am asking about those foregone resources and opportunities—not claiming that a particular retainer can be traced to a descendant's future balance sheet.

An invoice records who was paid. It does not record everything the family went without.

Private practice is not itself predation. A good lawyer can secure protection, clarify obligations, and prevent expensive mistakes. I reserve my condemnation for conduct that exploits avoidable conflict or makes resolution harder without a defensible purpose. That conclusion must be earned from the record, actor by actor. The profession should be capable of asking the same question of itself.

Fatherhood is a relationship, not a ceremonial title

Sarkadi and colleagues' systematic review covered 24 longitudinal publications; 22 reported beneficial associations with father involvement. The evidence particularly supported active engagement rather than one uniquely effective paternal activity. Its observational studies cannot remove every alternative explanation, but the review gives serious weight to sustained, constructive fathering. [R04]

Adamsons and Johnson's 2013 meta-analysis of 52 studies of nonresident fathers found a small overall association between positive involvement and child well-being. Relationship quality and constructive involvement matter; a tally of contact alone is not a complete account of a relationship. [R05]

This is not an argument that every father is safe, every restriction is unjustified, or every child requires the same arrangement. It is an argument against treating a safe, engaged father as replaceable administrative scenery. The word “safe” is substantive. So is “engaged.” Both have to be assessed rather than presumed from either parent's preferred story.

Nor is this a declaration that mothers, grandparents, adoptive parents, or other caregivers cannot provide essential guidance. My insistence that fathers matter does not require pretending that only fathers matter. The point is to protect the particular healthy relationships a child has—not make children prove their loyalty by surrendering one of them.

A father should be able to know the teacher, help with the problem, celebrate the effort, hear the worry, and say something more useful than “see you whenever the adults finish arguing.” The same is true of every safe parent whose relationship is being unnecessarily obstructed.

The stern conversation worth defending

An occasional stern fatherly talking-to can mean something entirely different from frightening a child into submission. The version I defend is clear, proportionate, and grounded in care: identify the behavior, explain the consequence, listen, set the boundary, and help the child take the next responsible step. That is my practical interpretation of responsible parenting, not a claim that one speech has been proved to prevent addiction or crime.

Pinquart's 2017 meta-analysis of 1,435 studies found small beneficial associations for warmth, behavioral structure, autonomy support, and authoritative parenting. Harsh and psychological control showed adverse associations. Some relationships were bidirectional: children also influence

how parents behave. Firm guidance is not interchangeable with authoritarian domination. [R06]

A father can say: “Stop. Think about the consequence. You are capable of making a better decision. Tell me what happened, and then we will work out how you repair it.” He can require an apology, insist on a reasonable responsibility, or refuse an unsafe plan without telling the child that the child is worthless.

The distinction is not cosmetic. In Wang and Kenny's longitudinal study of 976 families, harsh verbal discipline predicted increases in adolescent conduct problems and depressive symptoms; adolescent misconduct also predicted more harsh discipline. Parental warmth did not remove the adverse association. A loving intention is not a blank check for humiliation. [R07]

I cannot condemn an official for substituting intimidation for reasoning and then call the same substitution healthy fatherhood at home. The standard has to survive the trip out of the courthouse.

The lesson is self-restraint. The adult has to demonstrate it too.

Composure does not mean never feeling anger. My standard is that the adult remains responsible for what is done with it. A child should be able to hear “that behavior must change” without hearing “you are beyond love.” A teenager should be able to disagree without being made responsible for an adult's pride.

Self-restraint is not surrender

Self-restraint is only reasonable to a point.

If a bear charged your child, would you exhibit self-restraint until government, again, failed to act?

To anyone who says any parent should:

GO TO HELL.

And it is not immediate danger only. Failing to act has long-term consequences that are repugnant. The obligation to protect also reaches the lessons a child is being taught today and the future those lessons may shape.

If the lessons being taught now are contrary to a child's long-term best interests, a father—or any parent—should absolutely get off their ass and immediately intervene.

“Immediately” describes when to act. It does not limit the concern to immediate physical danger. I am talking about prevention: substance-use risks, damaged educational prospects, manipulation, and lessons that undermine self-restraint, composure, or the belief that “I know I can.”

I will not stake my son's future on government responding in time. Intervention means active, nonviolent parenting: challenge the harmful lesson, set boundaries, stay engaged, work with the school, obtain appropriate help, and pursue accountability.

I will not sit on my ass while lowlives drag my son down in life. No parent should. Not ever.

There are worse fates than death.

Those words express my horror at severe, lasting harm. A child facing addiction or any other hardship is not beyond hope. Intervention should protect that child's life and future—preventing harm and helping repair it.

Self-restraint should govern how a parent intervenes. It must not become a demand that the parent fail to intervene.

“I know I can” must mean more than bravado

Moffitt and colleagues followed roughly 1,000 children to age 32 and also examined 500 sibling pairs. Childhood self-control predicted later health, substance dependence, finances, and offending, beyond measured intelligence and social background. This was longitudinal evidence, not proof that sternness caused self-control or that low self-control determines a child's future. [R08]

The point is to take the skill seriously without turning it into a moral caste system. Struggling is not an identity. It is a reason to provide appropriate support.

Bandura's foundational account of self-efficacy distinguishes believing oneself capable of a task from merely wanting a favorable outcome. It emphasizes mastery experiences, alongside modeling, encouragement, and the interpretation of one's reactions. This is a theoretical and experimental foundation, not a trial of a father's lecture. [R09]

For me, “I know I can” should mean: I have practiced. I have recovered from mistakes. I can ask for help. I can tolerate an ordinary frustration without surrendering my judgment. I can be corrected without collapsing into shame or turning the correction into a fight.

That is confidence I want to cultivate. Not “nobody can tell me anything.” Not “everyone who frustrates me is my enemy.” Not the performance of invulnerability.

Pandey and colleagues' 2018 review of 49 randomized trials found that self-regulation interventions can improve self-regulation in children and adolescents, with some favorable health, educational, and social outcomes also reported. Programs and results varied. The useful conclusion is that skills can be supported through evaluated interventions—not that one parenting slogan guarantees a life outcome. [R10]

Risk reduction is work, not prophecy

Ryan, Jorm, and Lubman's review of 77 longitudinal articles identified parenting practices associated with delayed alcohol initiation or lower subsequent drinking, including appropriate monitoring, relationship quality, communication, support, and limiting access. These are associations concerning alcohol outcomes, not proof that a particular household's rules will prevent every substance problem. [R11]

The contribution I ask institutions to protect is therefore practical: the ordinary opportunities for a responsible caregiver to notice, listen, set a boundary, model restraint, and follow through. None requires a child to idolize an adult. All require more than a symbolic place in an order.

The prospect of substance use, poor education, or criminal-justice involvement must not become a prediction aimed at my son or anybody else's child. A risk factor is not a verdict. Arrest is not conviction, and offending research is not automatically incarceration research. The point is prevention while the future remains open.

Intervention can change the story

Wolchik and colleagues' 15-year follow-up of the New Beginnings randomized trial began with 240 families after divorce. The parenting-focused program reduced later internalizing disorders and produced benefits on several substance-related outcomes for males. The findings were not uniformly favorable: women in the intervention group reported more recent alcohol use on one measure. A serious account keeps that result instead of advertising a miracle. [R12]

Forgatch and colleagues' nine-year Oregon Divorce Study followed 238 single mothers and their sons. Parent management training reduced teacher-reported delinquency and police arrests. These were concrete outcomes, not a study of fathers' superiority or guaranteed protection against imprisonment. [R13]

Those two trials belong in this ending because they offer something more useful than fatalism. Parenting support can be a substantive intervention. Improving an adult's practice can be worth more to a child than winning another argument about which adult already deserves to be called right.

That lesson includes me. It includes mothers. It includes fathers. It leaves room for recovery after separation and after mistakes. The evidence does not say a damaged relationship is easy to repair. It does not say every relationship should be restored without safeguards. It says there are things worth doing beyond allowing conflict to harden into an identity.

What I charge the institution with noticing

The specific responsibility of a lawyer or judge still has to be established from the applicable duties and the record. None of these studies adjudicates Patrick Bedard's conduct, Judge Lucy's findings, or the Committee's response. They supply the developmental and economic context in which those decisions should be evaluated.

My charge is a moral and institutional one: stop discussing families as if the effects of process end at the edge of a case file. Ask what a proposed tactic, delay, or expense does to the capacity to care. Ask what the child is actually experiencing. Require an explanation proportionate to the consequences.

Children do not owe the legal profession a generation in which to discover that prevention matters.

II. THE CALL TO ACTION

RISE

The People. Stand the fuck up.

With words. With evidence. With peaceful public action. Stand as citizens who refuse to confuse public service with permanent permission to avoid public accountability.

Stand up for a system worth having—not a vacuum in which the loudest person becomes the next unanswerable authority.

The judiciary as a self-protective hierarchy, answerable mainly to its own sense of importance, needs to end. The alternative is not the disappearance of fair hearings, protection from abuse, or independent decision-making. The alternative is a rebuilt public institution whose authority is bounded, whose reasoning can be checked, and whose failures can be corrected.

The impunity ends. Justice remains. For Everyone.

If the reform only helps people I like, it is not the reform I am asking for. If the process protects only fathers, only mothers, only represented people, or only people who speak in a pleasing tone, it has failed the test before it begins.

Rise for the child, not for possession of the child

Parents: stop asking a child to carry your case. Do not recruit a teenager as an ally against the other parent. Do not make affection a loyalty test. Do not call your own desire for vindication the child's voice without doing the difficult work of listening to the child independently.

Ask for the help that improves the relationship. Accept correction that improves your parenting. Preserve the evidence needed to address a real problem; protect the private information that does not belong in a public fight.

There is no contradiction between insisting that a father be taken seriously and insisting that he behave responsibly. There is no contradiction between

taking a mother's safety concerns seriously and examining whether her specific claims are supported. A neutral process should not require either parent to become an unquestionable symbol.

To the fathers who have been reduced to waiting: make your demand precise. What appropriate contact is proposed? What conditions apply? What has been done to satisfy them? What remains disputed? What prompt, independent decision is needed? Your child's future deserves more than a contest over who can write the angriest email.

To the mothers who have had to fight to make danger visible: this movement must not replace one dismissal of your experience with another. Safety is not negotiable for the sake of a tidy theory about family structure. The work is to establish the facts fairly and act on them competently.

To the children and adults who grew up inside these conflicts: you are not defective fruit. You are not a forecast. You do not owe either side the rest of your life as proof that its account was correct.

You are allowed to become somebody the conflict did not know how to imagine.

Rise inside the profession

Lawyers: do the difficult thing before you ask the Public to admire the easy title. Tell a client when an account is unsupported. Identify a genuine protective need without inflating it. Correct a material omission without requiring the other side to finance the discovery of your conscience.

Do not mistake my criticism of predatory practice for contempt toward every person who represents a client. A profession capable of protecting vulnerable people should be more offended by avoidable harm than by the person describing it.

Attorney Bedard, your April response belongs in the record, including your objections about compliance and your account of encouragement of contact. The call-out is to reconcile the disputed positions with the order, the relevant evidence, and a practical route to resolution. It is not to ask the reader to assume you are wrong because you represent the other side. [S16]

The standard is not whether advocacy was forceful. It is whether a claim survives inspection, whether a correction is made when warranted, and whether the proposed path serves something more defensible than continued conflict.

A billable action is not necessarily a useful action. Explain the difference before the family pays for it.

Glenn Anderson's correction illustrates the conduct I want acknowledged: identify the omitted history, state the limits of the correction, and do not claim more than the source supports. This is praise for that act, not an attempt to make him endorse this book or answer for everybody else's conduct. [S15]

Future lawyers: you do not have to inherit every professional habit you encounter. Learn the rules. Learn their purposes. Then learn to distinguish protecting a client from protecting a tactic that should never have become normal.

Rise above institutional image management

Judges: a finding should be supported by the evidence, a restriction should have an intelligible basis, and a review route should be more than a sequence of instructions nobody owns from beginning to end. Those are the standards I am demanding, not claims that every existing procedure meets them or that every adverse order is illegitimate.

Judge Lucy's order remains an order with findings I contest and conditions I have had to address. This book does not reverse it. My demand is that the exercise of public power be explainable beyond the fact that a person with power exercised it. [S01]

Mr. McArdle and the Committee: a dismissal can be reported accurately and still be examined critically. Legitimate confidentiality limits should be respected; the permissible explanation of scope, standards, and process should be as clear as those limits allow. A rule that prevents a particular disclosure is not an admission, but it is not an answer to every question about institutional design either. [S04; S11]

I want neither a judiciary bullied into favorable rulings nor a judiciary insulated from examination. I want independence from improper pressure joined to accountability for the work. Those are compatible aspirations. A public institution should not make citizens choose between impartiality and intelligibility.

Public confidence should be earned by the quality of the explanation, not extracted as an entrance fee.

Rise where budgets become childhood

Legislators and administrators: ask what the system is purchasing with the money and time it consumes. Do not let the number of processed documents become the only measure of success. Ask whether material

disputes were resolved, necessary protections were provided, and orders became workable arrangements outside the building.

Fund timely, independent assessment when material child-safety or relationship facts are genuinely disputed. Preserve rapid emergency protection where needed, then provide prompt review rather than allowing an interim arrangement to become permanent by inertia. Neither safety nor fairness should be used as an excuse to abandon the other.

Invest in accessible parenting support and clinically appropriate services. Evaluate the programs rather than treating a referral slip as a completed intervention. Ask who can actually attend, what it costs, what barriers prevent participation, and what outcomes are measured.

Require an intelligible path for checking compliance conditions and resolving implementation disagreements. A parent should not have to guess who is authorized to decide whether a condition has been satisfied while everybody else points toward somebody else's inbox.

Make hearing records realistically accessible, with appropriate privacy controls. Make digital intake recoverable when it fails. Require plain-language explanations of filing defects and clear status information. Review the contracts by whether people can successfully use the service—not merely by whether automated notices were generated.

Publish system-level information that can properly be disclosed: waiting periods, returned submissions, correction times, access failures, and the resources devoted to addressing them. Protect personal case information. Measure the institution without making children the exhibit.

I am describing a reform program, not pretending these pages are enacted law. The details deserve public testing, meaningful participation, and revision when evidence shows a better design.

Another committee is not progress unless something changes outside the committee room.

Rise with evidence, not a replacement mythology

Technologists: make records easier to preserve, compare, and inspect without exposing people who did not volunteer for publicity. Keep original material distinct from extracted text and machine-generated summaries. Make uncertainty visible. Give a reader a route back to the source.

Do not replace “trust the institution” with “trust my software.” An AI-generated allegation is still an allegation. A search result is not a finding. An impressive interface does not excuse an inaccurate quotation.

Journalists and readers: do not accept my interpretation merely because the story is compelling. Check the document. Read the adverse answer. Distinguish an unanswered question from a proven falsehood. Correct an error even when it weakens the passage you liked most.

And do not confuse thousands of visits with thousands of endorsements. Reach creates an opportunity for examination. It does not certify the conclusion. I want more people able to check the work, not a larger crowd instructed to believe it. [S10; S14]

The public record should become a place where an institution can answer accurately and a citizen can be wrong without being erased. Anything less merely changes who controls the microphone.

Turn anger into something that survives the evening

Begin with one issue you can explain and support. Preserve the relevant source. Write down the practical change being sought. Keep the request separate from the accusation. An organized demand gives other people something they can evaluate, improve, and carry forward.

Bring it to an open meeting, a newsroom, a professional association, or a legislative office through appropriate public channels. Organize a peaceful forum. Ask a clear question. Record a response only where recording is permitted. Do not turn a refusal to participate into proof of guilt, and do not turn advocacy into repeated unwanted personal contact.

Help somebody else navigate a form. Support a parent who needs transport to an appointment. Make a source directory readable. Pay attention to whether the proposed reform helps the next family rather than merely allowing the present dispute to grow louder.

Choose a demand small enough to measure and important enough to matter. A functioning support route. A published review standard. An accessible record. A documented response time. An independent audit of a recurring failure. A funded service people can actually use.

Then follow the public work. Was the change adopted? Does it work? Who remains excluded? What needs to change next? This is how refusal becomes responsibility instead of performance.

There is room here for anger. There is no requirement to keep it permanently at boiling point. A movement that exists only while everybody is furious will not be a reliable place for exhausted families to seek help.

Build something useful enough to remain when the adrenaline is gone.

The generation that refuses to pass it on

I want children to inherit more than an archive of what adults failed to prevent. I want them to inherit resources, opportunities, and relationships that were protected because adults were willing to examine themselves before defending themselves.

I want a teenager to hear a father say, “You can do this,” and understand that it includes preparation, support, a reasonable boundary, and the opportunity to try again. I want the adult saying it to be able to hear, “You got that wrong,” without treating correction as betrayal.

That is the confidence worth defending: not certainty without evidence, but the capacity to act, learn, repair, and continue. The same aspiration belongs in public service.

I am not asking the next generation to hate the people I criticize. I am asking it to demand better work, including better work from me. I am asking the present generation to stop protecting habits merely because we survived them.

The institution does not need our worship. It needs standards it can be held to. The legal profession does not need another excuse to confuse its own inconvenience with the public interest. It needs to make its claimed commitments visible in practice.

The judiciary as an unanswerable hierarchy must end—not the public's access to justice, but the presumption that power can decline to explain itself.

Replace what fails. Preserve what protects. Make the work answerable to the people whose lives it changes.

Not through violence. Not through collective humiliation. Not by making somebody else's child pay for an adult's conduct.

Through records, public scrutiny, peaceful organizing, tested reforms, and the stubborn insistence that another generation does not have to inherit the same avoidable harm.

I wanted to be a father.

I still do.

The public work is not a substitute for that relationship. It is a refusal to accept that the only thing left to give the next family is advice on how to endure the same machinery.

Let the inheritance be different.

Not a thicker file. A fair hearing.

Not a better-worded excuse. A childhood protected.

Not another generation taught to survive what adults could have had the courage to change.

Stand the fuck up.

For the child who needs protection. For the parent who needs a fair hearing. For the family whose savings should build a future. For the professional willing to correct the record. For the stranger whose dignity matters just as much as your own.

Not only for mine.

Not only for yours.

For Everyone.

When my son was born, I had earned a GED and taken a few college courses earlier in my twenties.

But the last full grade I had completed was the eighth.

I did not enter fatherhood with an impressive academic history. I entered it with a son.

I did not need a degree to love him. And my ability to protect that relationship should not have depended on learning an entire profession's language.

I have since come to understand that so much of what compels us is more complicated than we realize. We cannot always explain it to another person. Sometimes we cannot even explain it to ourselves.

For much of my life, I could not.

That is not an excuse for every word I have spoken or every decision I have made. It is an acknowledgment that understanding ourselves is work—and that becoming a parent does not mean we have finished it.

It means someone else now depends on our willingness to keep doing it.

Our children should not have to pay for what we refuse to learn.

There is a difference between struggling to express yourself and refusing to examine yourself. Between not yet having the words and deciding that nobody else deserves an explanation. Between making a mistake and recruiting everyone around you to defend it.

I know something about the first of those struggles.

My anger is directed at the refusal.

The refusal to listen. The refusal to learn. The refusal to acknowledge that a child's needs extend beyond an adult's preferred account of the conflict.

I have seen first-hand the harm I am describing: legal conflict prolonged, parental relationships damaged, and ordinary responsibilities displaced by arguments over who possesses the authority to decide.

I have seen why selfish parenting and predatory legal practice belong in the same examination.

A child can become the instrument of one adult's control and the source of another adult's income. Neither arrangement becomes respectable because the adults have explanations for it.

That is the primary call-out.

The parent who manipulates a child's love to settle an adult grievance. The grandparent who reinforces the division instead of helping the child remain free to love. The lawyer who recognizes an opportunity to prolong profitable conflict where the family needs a workable resolution.

Mother, father, grandparent, attorney—the title does not cleanse the conduct.

There is depravity in asking a child to carry your resentment. There is depravity in recognizing that burden and looking for another way to bill around it.

And there is nothing honorable about an institution that becomes more concerned with how respectfully the harm is described than with examining whether it is happening.

Children are not compensation for an adult's wounded pride. They are not proof that one household won. They are not a renewable source of leverage, loyalty, or legal fees.

They are people becoming themselves.

They deserve room to do that without being taught that loving one person requires betraying another.

They deserve adults who can say, "I was wrong," without immediately adding an accusation.

They deserve firm guidance without humiliation, responsibility without shame, and the confidence that comes from being expected to grow—not being told whom to hate.

None of that requires a perfect parent.

It requires an adult willing to learn.

I cannot change the education I had completed when my son was born. I cannot recover a year by explaining it more clearly now. I cannot put missed time back into his childhood by producing another document.

But I can refuse to make resignation the only thing this experience leaves behind.

I can keep learning. I can make my account answerable to its sources. I can insist that the same scrutiny applied to a parent also reach the professionals and institutions exercising power over that parent's family.

And I can ask that what we build next be easier for the next frightened, exhausted parent to understand.

Not because that parent will always be right.

Because being heard should not be a prize for already knowing how to survive the system.

The next parent may not have the words yet. That does not mean there is nothing worth hearing.

I wanted to be a father.

I still do.

Let that remain visible beneath every argument, every chapter, and every page of this record.

And let the next generation inherit something better than our ability to describe what hurt us.

Let them inherit adults who learned.

Institutions that corrected themselves.

Relationships protected before another year disappeared.

Stand the fuck up—not to make someone else small, but to stop asking children to carry what belongs to us.

For our children.

For their children.

For generations yet to come.

For Everyone.

RISE.