

What Survivors Want Judges to Know

The Family Justice Center of Washington County

VOICES Survivor Committee

November 8, 2024



For more information or additional training, please contact Rachel@fjwc.org

Survivors with Mental Health in the Court System:

Buttercup's Story

Good afternoon, Your Honors. Thank you for allowing me to speak today. I am here to share a perspective that is both deeply personal and, unfortunately, far too common. For many survivors of domestic violence, mental health struggles are a natural and often unavoidable result of the trauma we've experienced. Yet, in custody cases, these struggles are sometimes used as a basis to justify removing children from the very parents who are fighting to protect them. As a survivor myself, I have seen firsthand how mental health is weaponized in courtrooms, transforming a protective parent into someone deemed 'unfit' in the eyes of the law.

While I was expecting my child, I was navigating a world of uncertainty and fear. My pregnancy was marked by intimate partner violence, which soon escalated to domestic abuse. At the time, I was receiving care and support through my doctor's office and their social worker, who ultimately connected me to resources that would help me begin planning a safe path forward. With their help, I was able to apply for the Domestic Violence grant to relocate, a critical step toward my safety. But even with this support, leaving wasn't a straightforward choice. The risks were immense, and leaving safely required planning, caution, and patience.

During my pregnancy, the father of my child had withdrawn, later claiming that the child wasn't his. He even expressed that if it had been up to him, our child wouldn't exist. After our child was born, he didn't step in to help, didn't support me in caring for our baby, and went so far as to accuse me of breastfeeding just to keep him from spending time with our child. But I was determined to find a way forward, and with the help of my family—especially my parents, who had been my main support—I finally found the strength to leave.

After I left, however, I was struck with an additional wave of fear. My child's father took to social media, spreading misinformation that I had fled the state and “kidnapped” our newborn, urging others to reach out to him or to share information about my whereabouts. You can't imagine what it feels like to already be fleeing danger, only to find that your location might be broadcast to the world. At that moment, mine and my baby's safety hung in a balance, threatened not just by the person I had left, but now by the judgment and actions of anyone who believed him.

In response, my child's father initiated legal action. My journey through the court was filled with constant threats, harassment, and manipulation, often coming from every direction. My mental health and ability to cope were tested daily, but my priority was my son's safety. Yet, despite everything I had endured, it was my mental health that was called into question once we were finally before a judge.

The judge overseeing my case had just started on the bench, with no prior experience in family law and minimal familiarity with the dynamics of intimate partner violence or domestic abuse. As someone with no legal experience myself, I didn't know what to expect, what to look for in an

attorney, or where to turn for help. Ultimately, after a year of trying to remain safe elsewhere I was forced to move back to Oregon or risk losing custody of my then infant child. Throughout the course of our case, in and out of the courtroom, father never presented any motions or reports of concern of child's wellbeing in my custody, no questions or presented evidence of concern towards my mental health again. That was until our very last trial when I motioned for a change due to concerns our child was expressing of the care they were receiving while at their dads. An evaluator becomes involved who would make a decision that would consequently lead to a devastating change. Suddenly my mental health was on trial again but this time, custody, that I held on to for almost a decade, was removed.

In Oregon alone, nearly 50% of custody cases involving domestic abuse survivors cite mental health as a factor for altering custody; often at the custodial parent's expense and to the detriment of the child. These cases frequently overlook the cause of trauma—abuse endured by the survivor. Instead, symptoms of PTSD, depression, and anxiety are viewed as disqualifying, without consideration for the origin of these conditions.

Primary caregivers, who are statistically more likely to be women, are disproportionately affected in custody cases where mental health is cited as a factor. Nationally, studies show mothers are nearly twice as likely as fathers to have their mental health used against them in court, despite these conditions often arising from surviving abuse. Fathers with similar mental health concerns face less scrutiny, creating an inherent gender bias that influences court decisions.

This dynamic is devastating, not only for the parents but for children, who face higher risks of emotional and behavioral issues when removed from a nurturing, protective parent. This separation compounds the trauma survivors, and their children have already endured and further disrupts their path to healing.

Adding to this challenge is the use of 'parental alienation' claims against survivors seeking to protect their children. Although Parental Alienation Syndrome is widely criticized and lacks scientific basis, it is still invoked in family courts. In Oregon, 60-70% of these accusations target mothers, and these claims are more likely to result in custody changes when made against women. This dynamic paints mothers as vindictive or manipulative for trying to protect their children, whereas fathers in similar circumstances are less likely to face such accusations.

The result is a system that leaves survivors defending both their mental health and their genuine intent to protect their children, often removing children from a nurturing environment, which is vital for their development and sense of safety. Children become at risk of being placed with an abusive parent. The mother-child bond is disrupted, causing further trauma and undermining the well-being of the child.

When mental health is weaponized in this way, it not only impacts individual cases but also deters survivors from seeking help. Survivors may deter from disclosing mental health struggles or seeking therapy fearing it could be used against them in court, they may avoid pursuing vital support altogether. This hesitation compounds trauma and limits recovery options, creating a cycle that can keep survivors trapped in silent suffering.

Ultimately, these practices erode trust in the judicial system, particularly for marginalized communities who may already face systemic challenges. Survivors may perceive the court as unsympathetic or biased against them. When people view the system as punitive or biased, it can discourage others from coming forward to report abuse, seek custody, or engage with the justice system at all.

The Courts often involve the use of custody evaluators which adds another layer of complexity in custody cases where mental health is already being weaponized.

In Oregon, custody or parenting plan evaluations are designed to be thorough forensic evaluations to inform custody decisions that prioritize the child's best interests. However, recent guidelines highlight a significant need for evaluators to possess specialized training in complex areas such as domestic violence (DV), intimate partner violence (IPV), coercive control, and child abuse. This shift follows growing concerns about inconsistent practices and the lack of binding standards for evaluators, despite the importance of informed, specialized assessments for accurate recommendations.

Data shows that when custody evaluators are involved, there can be significant disparities in the outcomes for mothers compared to fathers. A study conducted in Oregon indicated that over 60% of custody evaluators reported feeling more confident in recommending custody to fathers, even in cases where there were allegations of domestic abuse. This trend highlights a potential bias within the evaluation process that can disadvantage mothers and perpetuate the cycle of trauma for both parent and child.

Oregon law mandates that custody evaluations must consider the 'best interests of the child' as defined by ORS 107.137. While some evaluators may possess expertise in family dynamics and mental health, others may lack the necessary training to appropriately assess the complexities. ORS 107.425(3)(d) calls for incorporating expert assessments in custody decisions. This statute has often been underutilized, and counties still lack enforced standards for evaluator qualifications in these critical areas.

in 2010 The State Family Law Advisory Committee (SFLAC) of Oregon recommended enhanced guidelines emphasizing that evaluators should have both broad and specialized knowledge relevant to family dynamics, including IPV, child abuse, and mental health issues. The aim is to avoid unintended harm by ensuring evaluations are conducted by professionals who understand these nuances and can remain objective in complex cases. Additionally, under new guidelines adopted in 2022, evaluators are encouraged to seek supervision from qualified professionals if they lack experience in particular areas relevant to a case, and they must be trained to avoid potential role conflicts and biases, which are frequent challenges in DV-related custody disputes.

However, a gap remains in regulatory enforcement of these standards. Oregon courts are not mandated to appoint certified experts in Domestic Violence or Intimate Partner Violence for these roles, and evaluators' recommendations often carry substantial weight in judicial decisions. Consequently, without mandatory certification and a standardized credentialing process, there is a risk that evaluators may misinterpret behaviors resulting from trauma or coercive control, potentially disadvantaging the custodial parent, who in many cases is the mother.

Incorporating licensure or certification for custody evaluators in Oregon would ensure that they meet rigorous standards and operate under a regulated framework, benefiting both families and the judicial process. Licensing or certification means evaluators would need verified expertise and ongoing training in specialized areas such as domestic violence (DV), intimate partner violence (IPV), child abuse, and coercive control. This would create accountability structures that safeguard against unqualified assessments, providing consistency and reliability in evaluations that impact children's lives.

Recognizing these gaps is essential to ensure that custody evaluations are fair and evidence based. When evaluators lack regulation, there's no system to hold them accountable for such misjudgments, and families have limited recourse for challenging their findings.

Furthermore, regulation through licensure or certification would bring the profession into alignment with best practices in psychology and social work, where credentialed professionals are accountable to ethical guidelines, continuing education, and oversight by state licensing boards. This type of oversight is essential in family court settings, where decisions deeply affect children's well-being and safety. Requiring evaluators to meet these standards would ensure that all parties involved receive evaluations that are fair, informed, and protective of children's best interests.

My story reflects a systemic issue within our courts—where the experiences of survivors are minimized, and mental health becomes a weapon rather than a factor to consider. Your Honors, as we consider the complexities of custody cases, it is critical that our courts and judicial policies prioritize understanding and supporting mental health in context, rather than allowing it to be used as a weapon that does more harm than good.

To emphasize, implementing these standards would align with recommendations by Oregon's State Family Law Advisory Committee (SFLAC) and other advocacy groups, creating a safer, more trustworthy process that is better equipped to handle the complexities of cases involving DV and child abuse.

When Perpetrators Use the Court System as a Tool of Abuse:

Lisa's Story

Thank you for taking the time to hear from survivors about our experiences with the justice system. We appreciate your willingness to listen to our stories and the impact the justice system and courts have had on our lives. My hope is that you gain an understanding of the needs of survivors, including making decisions with compassion, believing our stories, and understanding the trauma we went through and often continue to live with.

Shortly after marrying my ex-husband, I realized that our marriage was in trouble after I lost my first child due to abuse. But I stayed hoping he would change. He was verbally abusive, had uncontrollable anger issues, tried to control the time I spent away from home, and used threats of

hiding our children and never letting me see them. He was an attorney and constantly let me know that because of this I would never get custody or joint custody if I filed for divorce, and if I filed, he would make sure that I would not see them. From the beginning, he used his position of power to manipulate me and keep me living in fear. I felt trapped and frightened.

There should have been resources for me to turn to, for legal help and for support. But I had little in the way of financial resources as my ex-husband closely monitored our bank account and went into a rage when anything was spent without his approval. Friends and others who knew what I was going through never offered any suggestions or advice other than to stick it out for the children's sake or just said don't take his threats seriously and just leave.

But after an abuse marriage that lasted less than four years, I filed for divorce, being put in a position which I felt left me no choice. I had an unplanned pregnancy and he kept saying he was going to take the children any day if I did not get an abortion, which for me, he knew was not an option. So I filed for divorce one day while he was at work, despite his threats because I was in a position that left me with no other choice, and this is where my nightmare with the court system began.

I found an attorney who reduced her fees for me, which a relative paid. I told her about the fear I was constantly living with and how I also feared for my two children and the one I was pregnant with. I let her know I wanted sole custody. But later that day when she called she said she believed joint custody is always best for the children so that is what she had asked for and gotten. I got primary custody and my ex had the children 3 days a week. He used his law partner, also a family court judge, as his attorney...someone he did not have to pay until later. I had to depend on the little income I had and limited family resources. When I went searching for a new attorney finances were a big barrier to getting someone who was willing to take a case against an attorney represented by a family court judge. Lack of money, and lack of a support system to turn to, often leaves survivors at the mercy of a system that appears to have little compassion for people who are trying to escape their abusers. And as in my case, often their abusers are allowed to continue their actions using the court system as a weapon.

For the next year leading up to our court date to determine custody, which he kept successfully postponing, he kept taking me to court for frivolous things. He took me to court when I sought emergency treatment for my daughter for a head wound. He took me to court when he picked up the children and one was crying not to let her go (and yes she went). It was an attempt to financially run me and my family out of funds, an attempt to wear me down, and an exercise of his power. He was only reprimanded once for using the system as a tool to continue his abusive behavior. Eleven days before the birth of our third child, the one he wanted me to abort, he took me to court to try to prevent me from breastfeeding her, saying it would interfere with his visitation. This should have been a clear sign that he did not have the best interests of the children in mind. He was severely admonished by the judge and told he should stop building his file against me but start doing what's best for the children. This did not stop him. And he was never called out on it again. And almost

every time I was ordered to pay his attorney fees, despite the fact the he did not prevail in his frivolous requests. His attorney and him knew the judges, and I often had to go without representation due to finances. A survivor of domestic violence should never have to go to court against their abuser without adequate legal assistance, regardless of financial situation.

During this time my ex continued to threaten me with not returning the children but instead hiding them if I continued the custody case, and continued reminding me that he was doing this because I had refused to do as he asked and have an abortion. My attorney let the court know this. His attorney said I was making it all up and the judges said nothing.

He was also returning the children filthy, without clothing, and often sick. I finally did take him to court over this, with pictures, and unable to pay an attorney represented myself. Me ex's attorney denied all the claims, despite the pictures, and the judge simply wrote it off as two people in a custody fight. When his attorney asked for attorney's fees, I had to pay, and was admonished for the court appearance.

After about a year I got custody of the 3 children. My ex fought child support, and was only required to pay \$60 per child a month. Despite the fact he was working as an attorney. I had three children under three and was working two part time jobs, requiring child care. His attorney argued that I should be able to earn enough to support the children and her client should not be required to pay the burden of much if any child support.

And the threats continued, I was again relentlessly dragged into court every few months, and he requested expensive custody evaluations about 2 or 3 times a year, which I was made to pay for although the evaluations always supported my retaining custody.

After I got a raise in child support to \$500 a month, my ex fled the country for two years. His attorney knew where he was. I got no child support during this time. When he returned, I was denied the two years of child support that he had not paid. And he was given his previous visitation back, despite the fact he had fled the country and I was afraid he was going to do so again with the children.

He again continued to return the children filthy and often without clothing. A few times they were returned with bruises, which appeared to be from negligence on his part, and attempts to report this to CPS were not successful as they failed to take any action. One child had recurring ear infections and my ex always refused to give her the medication I gave him when he picked them up. Upon the advice of my attorney, one weekend when she was sick, I did not let her go. He went to court, And he prevailed. And once again I was ordered to pay attorney's fees. His attorney argued that I had taken him to court on frivolous pretenses.

Although it was beyond obvious that the children were not a priority in his life, the court kept allowing him to use the system. Things never should have gotten as far as they did. My ex used his

position as an attorney, and his attorney used their position as a family court judge, The system failed me and my children. Judges need to listen to survivors, understand the power dynamics between survivors and their abusers, and understand how abusers use the justice system to perpetuate their abuse.

Finally in 1991, after my ex had moved to Las Vegas, he did what he had threatened to do and took the children. I had moved back east for a while with my attorney's support and approval, and he was notified. The move would not have affected his summer and holiday visitation schedule. He had arranged it so that his attorney in Washington County had a judge in Washington County grant him temporary custody when he picked them up. I had to move back to Portland for the hearing, and a year later he was given custody of the children, with the judge saying that the only reason he was given custody was because he was able to better support them. He was awarded no child support, as his income was quite a bit higher than mine, and he complained bitterly to the judge. He was then asked if the children or money was more important to him. He never answered that question.

I was given the right to arrange weekend visits when I was able to along with holiday and summer visits, but he made me go to court each time as he kept denying me any visits. This of course again cost quite a bit, although I prevailed, I was also ordered to pay his attorney fees. He threatened me about moving to Las Vegas, and although I had the letters with his threats saying I would never see the children if I moved, and how hard he would make it for me if I moved, it made no difference. He was never reprimanded about continuing to deny my visitation rights. My surprise is not just over how unjustly the court system treated me, but also about how his attorney kept representing him and going to court for him and was also allowed to perpetuate the injustice. The judges once again were turning their backs on my ex's manipulation of the system for power, revenge, and abuse.

I eventually moved to Las Vegas. My ex had the money to hire one of the top law firms to represent him, and I had a volunteer advocate representing me. When I went to court for visitation, he asked the court for the child support the Oregon court would not give him, and asked for back child support for the past 3 years. He was given both and I was ordered to pay him \$10,000 back child support and child support each month. Because he had been allowed to use and abuse the system in Washington County for 10 years, he continued to do so in Las Vegas. For the next several years he continued to take me to court for more money, stalk me, and threaten me with continued legal action, even after the children had graduated high school and college. He basically wiped me out of money.

In all my ex used the court system for about 23 years to seek his revenge, use his power, manipulate me, and do a lot of emotional damage to his children and myself. He kept telling me he was doing it because I refused to obey his orders and insisted on having our third child. At one point, when they were little, my children told me they were aware their dad did not really want them. I believe that if he had been stopped at any point he would have disappeared from our lives as he was basically living for what he saw the revenge he deserved. And the courts allowed this to

happen. My children were victims of a system that turned its backs as they were kept in the middle of a pursuit of revenge for most of their childhood.

This is why it is so important for judges to hear from survivors as part of their training, and listen to our experiences, and then join us in advocating for change to help survivors be heard become aware of the trauma we and often our children have been through and continue to go through, and use their position to make informed, compassionate decisions. The justice system is meant to serve all, and to be a fair system for all. But when survivors of domestic violence are faced with a system that has power over their lives, those that are in a position to make some of the most important decisions that will affect our lives should be using their position to listen, to believe, and to support them.

Thank you again for being here, and for listening to our stories.

When Survivors Are Treated Like the Perpetrator in the Court System:

Lavendar's Story

Good afternoon, your honors. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Lavender, and I am here as a survivor of domestic violence, a mother, and a passionate community advocate for change. Today, I want to address an urgent issue within our judicial system: **"When survivors are treated like the perpetrators in the court system."**

This theme has defined my experience and highlights the pressing need for reform in how we address cases involving survivors of domestic violence. While I speak today as part of a panel of survivors, I am addressing judges who have the power to influence the lives of survivors like me and ensure that justice is served.

Personal Experience:

In my journey through the court system, I was treated as a perpetrator rather than a victim seeking safety and support. This misguided perception forced me to defend myself against accusations, while my abuser remained unaccountable for his actions. The narrative around my circumstances overshadowed the real needs of my children and me, creating an environment where I felt the need to justify my choices.

The implications of this treatment were profound. I often heard sentiments such as, "There must be something wrong with you if you were willing to stay with someone like this," suggesting that I had mental health or addiction issues simply because I stayed with him. These words stung deeply, leaving me questioning my worth and fueling shame. I was villainized for my choices, grappling with

the confusion and pain of being treated as if my survival was a flaw rather than a testament to my resilience.

My abuser failed to participate in our case, leaving me to bear the weight of accusations alone. The court focused more on scrutinizing my actions than understanding the abuse I endured. This led to an experience where my attempts to advocate for my children's well-being were overshadowed by a narrative that painted me as unfit due to my status as a survivor.

The Role of CPS and Ongoing Allegations:

A critical aspect of my experience was the role of Child Protective Services (CPS), which often operates based on opinions rather than concrete facts. In my case, the judge heavily relied on these opinions, which did not accurately reflect my reality. Despite being a safe and loving parent, multiple allegations of abuse were made against me while my child was in foster care, adding to my distress

During my case, a devastating incident occurred when my mother, who had been my 24/7 Safety Service Provider, was hospitalized. My CPS worker assessed my situation and determined that I only needed a daily check-in with a Safety Service Provider moving forward, as I was doing everything within my power to keep my children safe. However, my mother's condition worsened, and I rushed to be by her side.

On that fateful day, my other Safety Service Providers picked up my children from daycare, allowing me to focus on my mother during her final moments. I made the heart-wrenching decision to take her off life-saving measures, understanding that the matriarch of my family was leaving us. Unfortunately, my children, ages 2.5 and 6 years old at the time, were not allowed in the Intensive Care Unit during this time.

In what felt like a cruel twist, I had been told by CPS up to this point, that as long as my children were not around their father, he and I could maintain contact. Desperate for support, I and everyone closest to me at the time, including my Safety Service Providers, called upon him to be by my side during this unimaginable time. Yet, less than 12 hours after my mother's death, CPS came and took my children under the uninvestigated assumption that they had been with their father. This unjust action left me grappling with the emotional fallout of losing both my mother and my children simultaneously.

My children were abruptly uprooted from the only source of stability they had—me—and thrust into an uncertain environment filled with strangers. The trauma of losing their grandmother, coupled with the sudden separation from me, created a whirlwind of confusion, fear, and sadness in their young hearts. They experienced profound emotional pain, manifesting as anxiety, nightmares, and withdrawal.

My son, only 2.5 years old at the time, who had once been a lively and cheerful child, became withdrawn and fearful, struggling to comprehend why he had been taken away from me. My daughter, at 6 years old, exhibited clear signs of distress, often asking when she could come home. The emotional and behavioral challenges stemming from this separation have left lasting scars, complicating their ability to trust and feel safe.

This situation was not just a legal issue; it was a family in crisis. The loss of my mother created extenuating circumstances that should have been considered. Families in crisis often need to see each other for support during such traumatic times. As long as safety is ensured, families should be allowed to come together to navigate their grief and challenges. My son was taken from me for two months due to this assumption, compounding my grief and trauma. Fortunately, my daughter was able to live with her biological father after just one week, but this stark contrast left me questioning the system's fairness.

To add complexity, unbeknownst to me, my abuser was facing criminal charges for the abuse he inflicted on me a year prior, in a different county from our CPS case. This created a significant disconnect between the two cases. Despite him residing in a different county and dealing with serious legal issues which led to his incarceration, then after, living in a halfway house, I was still denied custody of my son. This disparity highlights the inconsistencies that often leave survivors feeling powerless.

CPS assessments often reflect misunderstandings or incomplete information. The unrealistic expectations placed on survivors, such as the requirement for a 24/7 Safety Service Provider (SSP) after losing my primary support and 24/7 Safety Service Provider—my mother—were insurmountable. CPS took their time approving new SSPs, compounding my and my son's challenges when we desperately needed support.

It is critical to recognize that CPS often operates on opinions rather than concrete facts, leading to decisions that can have devastating consequences for families in crisis. A system that relies on assumptions undermines the safety and well-being of survivors and their children, complicating their journeys toward healing and stability.

How Training Could Have Changed My Case:

Reflecting on my experience, I believe my case could have unfolded differently had the judges and the justice system been trained in recognizing abuse, understanding survivors, and implementing trauma-informed care. With proper training, judges could have approached my situation with empathy and an understanding of the complexities involved in domestic violence cases.

Had the judicial system been better informed about the realities of abuse, my emotional state could have been viewed with greater compassion. Understanding that I was navigating the profound grief of losing my mother, along with the trauma of separation from my children, might

have led to a more supportive response from the court. A trauma-informed approach would have recognized the necessity of family support during such critical times, rather than making assumptions that further traumatized me and my children.

For instance, had there been a recognition of the extenuating circumstances surrounding my mother's hospitalization, judges might have been more inclined to allow flexibility in assessing my children's safety during that chaotic period. The reliance on unfounded assumptions, rather than a thorough investigation into the facts, contributed to the devastating outcomes we faced.

Judges have the power to make decisions that significantly impact the lives of survivors and their families. By embracing education and training in these critical areas, judges can create a more supportive environment that promotes healing rather than perpetuating harm. Ensuring that the court system understands the complexities of trauma can lead to better outcomes for families in crisis, allowing survivors like me to receive the justice and compassion we desperately need.

The Emotional Toll and Aftermath of Separation:

Survivors are often treated as perpetrators in these situations, and this reality took a significant toll on my self-esteem and mental health. My experience felt like a relentless cycle of victimization, leaving me feeling powerless in a system that should have been my ally.

When you see survivors like me, I urge you to look beyond the surface and recognize the profound aftermath of the harm inflicted upon us. We are not villains; we are individuals striving to overcome our pasts and provide safe, loving environments for our children.

My children and I endured profound emotional pain, anxiety, and depression. The very system designed to protect us became a source of distress. Instead of receiving support, I felt judged and marginalized. My emotions were weaponized against me—whether I showed emotion or not. If I expressed my feelings, it was seen as a sign of instability; if I remained composed, it was viewed as a lack of emotion. This constant scrutiny only intensified my stress and trauma.

The emotional toll of my experience did not end with my case; it extended far beyond the courtroom. Five years later, we continue to grapple with the effects of complex PTSD stemming from our involvement in this system. When my son was finally returned to me, I was devastated to find he was not the same joyful, carefree child I had lost. The separation took a significant toll on him, leading to his diagnosis of complex PTSD a year after his return. The trauma he experienced was evident, and he had changed in ways that even those closest to us could see. He became withdrawn and fearful, struggling to trust, feel safe, and express himself. This was not just a return; it felt like a painful reunion with a shadow of the child I had known.

As a mother, it is heartbreaking to witness my child's struggles with ongoing emotional and behavioral challenges, including anxiety, mood swings, and difficulties in social situations. He even struggles to make and maintain friendships, further isolating him during a critical time in his development. These issues complicate his ability to thrive in school and have contributed to learning difficulties that make it hard for him to focus and engage with classmates. I now find myself constantly advocating for proper supports for him, both in his school and within the healthcare system. Unfortunately, there are often long waitlists for the services he needs, and insurance frequently does not cover the therapies I believe would best support him.

The emotional toll of the system's decisions rippled through our lives, leaving us both to navigate the aftermath of a traumatic separation together.

This underscores the urgent need for a court system that recognizes the profound impact of its decisions on the lives of survivors and their children. We cannot afford to overlook the emotional consequences of these decisions. Our children deserve a system that acknowledges their needs and fosters healing, rather than perpetuating cycles of trauma.

This reality emphasizes the necessity and urgency of understanding the survivor experience and the need for a court system that prioritizes the well-being of both survivors and their children.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, I am here today advocating for a family court system that recognizes and supports survivors of domestic violence. It is essential that we implement **mandatory domestic violence training for judicial employees** in our state. My experiences, while painful, have ignited a passion for change that I hope resonates with each of you.

No survivor should ever feel that they are being treated as the perpetrator. We deserve a system that listens, understands, and empowers us to heal and thrive. Together, we can advocate for the necessary changes that will ensure justice, compassion, and support for all survivors navigating the family court system.

Thank you for your time and attention.

The Impact of the Court System on the Children of Survivors:

Daphne's Story

Honorable Justices, thank you for the opportunity to address you today. I want to emphasize the vital role you play in the lives of individuals who navigate the complexities of our legal system, particularly those who are escaping abuse and especially those like myself who couldn't afford

council to protect me. Survivors of abuse face unique challenges in court cases, especially in divorce situations where children are involved.

To suggest a victim can “just leave” an abusive situation is like telling a paralyzed person to just get up and walk. When a survivor is challenged by their abuser with legal action, they often find themselves in an uphill battle. The legal system, while designed to protect and pursue justice, can inadvertently empower the abuser in many ways. Contrary to common stereotypes, most abusers are not “scary people lingering in the dark woods or a van up the street”. The reality is that they are far more often the charming leaders in communities, schools, churches, and families. Abusers create a false image outside of the home, making it appear they are trustworthy and deserve admiration and respect. This fictional image also attends the attorney’s office and the courtroom, creating an imaginary narrative that portrays the survivor as the cause of every problem, and the abuser as a perfect parent.

I want to shine a light on survivors who have historically been rendered powerless, who were never the primary breadwinners in their families. These individuals find themselves at a significant disadvantage in legal proceedings. These parents, primarily moms, have surrendered their lives and their well-being to raise their children, and are then forced to prove their worth in a system that may not adequately recognize their contributions or the complexities of their situations. Additionally, they are being ridiculed by their abuser and dismissed as nothing but a problem who is too emotional and expects too much. To my abuser, I had no value. I was only in his way. Every decision he made treated me as sub-human, nothing more than an obstacle who bore his children.

A survivor’s financial reliance on their abuser to help support the children can create an environment of fear and uncertainty, making it even more challenging for them to leave the abuser, assert their rights, and advocate for their children. For these survivors, the stakes are incredibly high. The fear of losing financial support can effectively silence their voices when they need to be heard the most. It is crucial for you, as justices, to understand this dynamic and to recognize the need for equitable considerations in custody and support arrangements that prioritize providing for the children.

I tried to find assistance to help cover the costs, from Saint Andrew to the Oregon State Barr to MetLegal, and not only did I not find any assistance, many of the responses were dismissive and cruel, passing me off as someone else’s problem. Some never returned my calls. Saint Andrew said that unless I was being physically beaten, they couldn’t help.

I was working 2 jobs and delivering Door Dash just to keep a roof over our heads after I filed for divorce. I did everything I had to to provide for my children and keep our family afloat. Their father refused to help with anything, from school supplies to clothing and shoes to picking up a prescription or covering a co-pay. He claimed he had no money

for the children after he paid his own bills. He would even avoid feeding them and providing basics at his home such as Tylenol and toilet paper. There was no recourse, I just had to push through on my own. I packed a bag of essentials for my children for times they had to go over. It was really difficult for us, but we did it.

Even if we want to shelter our kids, they are incredibly observant, and they watch how things unfold. Children are acutely aware of the world around them, even before they can speak. They know where they feel safe, and they know who they can trust. My children saw how each parent cared for them, believed them, kept their word (or not), and provided for them.

After living over 20 years attempting to keep up the facade that everything was ok and justifying their father's behavior, I finally had the freedom to validate my children's feelings once he was gone. I was shamed by him and the attorneys for validating their fears and observations. I was told this wasn't ok, that I should be pretending everything was fine. I was accused of being too emotional, of turning my kids against their dad, and told I was the source of the problems in his relationships with them.

My kids' dad always had me to fix every situation and smooth things over when he hurt us. When we got divorced, that buffer was gone and he struggled big time. Once he got a girlfriend, he needed to uphold his image of the "perfect father". He blamed me for everything that wasn't going his way. Their joint response was to take control by taking me to court. He was unwilling to compromise or negotiate on anything, literally anything, in his proposed plan. To him, this wasn't a proposal, it was "the law", and he called it that, too, convinced that he would get everything he wanted.

The legal system, and specifically the abuser's attorneys, expect survivors and children to prove they are victims by speaking of their experiences outright, to complete strangers, without emotion as if they are reporting the news. This burden of proof is put on the survivors and the children to undo the web of lies told by the abuser. Often, they feel they have to first prove their worthiness and credibility, which can be retraumatizing, especially for the children. They are expected to divulge confusing, scary, and degrading experiences with their parent at the risk of judgement, punishment, not being believed, and getting either parent in trouble. My ex's attorney never once spoke to the children or asked if anything their dad claimed was true. They solely took his word as truth and disregarded all else. This scared my kids to death.

The impact of the legal process on my children was heartbreaking. I begged their father to stop the process and just listen to his kids, but he refused. He claimed he was actually enjoying the process because the attorneys were doing all the work, despite our children being caught in the crossfire. He didn't care how much it was crushing them. He just proceeded. Meanwhile, I was running interference at every moment, calming my children's fears the best I could and trying to reassure them that I would protect them at any cost. It took a huge toll on everyone's mental health except for the abuser.

Children bear the emotional burden of feeling responsible for conflict. To have an abusive parent drag them through court magnifies this pain. My children struggled with extreme social anxiety, suicidal thoughts and ideation, self harm, and even basic tasks such as sleeping, eating, and attending school. Their fear of being with their dad alone or relying on him for care made them literally physically ill. To this day, my daughter is afraid of men, police officers, and leaving home.

The topic of custody and parenting time becomes a battleground for the abuser to exert power and prove dominance. My abuser saw our children as objects. Leverage. Weapons that he could use to punish me. This misuse of my children placed them in a precarious position and put tremendous stress and pressure on them that they did not deserve. He was using our kids for power and control, and by doing so he forced them to get involved with the court process, and they feared his retaliation for months.

What children need most in these situations is stability and safety. They thrive in environments where they feel secure and loved. The legal system can fail to prioritize this need, leading to decisions that place children in jeopardy. My children's dad expected me to literally drag my children to his car to make them go to his house. They would be screaming in the front yard begging me not to make them go, and I would tell them I was so sorry, but it was their dad's time. However, I refused to shove them into his car, and because of this, he said I was alienating him from the children. He told his attorneys that I was keeping the children from him and wasn't supporting him as their father. I tried to tell them that my priority was supporting my children, and that based on previous events with their father they were afraid. Many times over the first years of my children's lives, their father had hit them repeatedly just because he was upset, thrown things in anger, pushed them on the floor, withheld food, refused medical care and medicine when they were sick and hurt, chased them down the street when they were scared of him, and even broke down a door to get to my son when he locked himself in the bathroom because he was scared.

When my kids told me they were scared to go to their dad's, I believed them; my abuser's response was that I was "spoiling them". My kids were not laying on the couch refusing to stop playing video games - they were hiding in closets, or at a neighbor's, or intentionally making plans to not be home if their dad was coming. Instead of seeing this as a sea of red flags, his attorneys told my children they were being unfair because they weren't trying to repair their relationship with their dad. They were told it was their responsibility to "try" because their dad was "trying". This confused my kids - how was bringing them to court and forcing them to his house repairing their relationship?

Their biggest fear was that he would "win" everything he wanted. Abusers claim they want what is best for the children, but the truth is that they want whatever gives them the most control and keeps up their facade. Abusers accuse survivors of being unfit parents, using their efforts to protect their children as ammunition. Abusers also seek to manipulate their children with guilt, fear, or loyalty, creating a toxic dynamic that can have serious implications for the children. My kids' dad withheld time, money, conversation, and basic needs from his children when he didn't get his way. He called them names and accused them of being flakey, disrespectful, and liars. He blatantly

avored the child who was compliant and ignored the child who ran and hid when he came to pick them up.

It is imperative that legal professionals, including judges and attorneys, receive training on the dynamics of abuse and the specific challenges that survivors face. The implementation of trauma-informed practices within the legal system is essential. This approach recognizes the impact of trauma on survivors of abuse, including children, and aims to create a supportive environment that minimizes re-traumatization.

Prioritizing the well-being of children in custody and parenting time decisions should come before finances, property division, and anything else that pertains to the parents. Judges and attorneys should strongly consider implementing mechanisms that allow children's voices to be heard in a safe and supportive manner, ensuring that their needs are placed at the forefront of legal proceedings.

I highly recommend that individuals involved with family law have a strong understanding of available Community Resources. I encourage collaboration with local organizations that support survivors of abuse, and even more so their children. These partnerships can provide valuable resources and support systems for survivors navigating the legal system while also attempting to heal, become self-sufficient, protect themselves from future abuse, and continue to be the best parent they can be. Survivors feel un- seen, silenced, and alone. Partnering with community resources could be the difference between safety and suicide.

In closing, I want to reiterate the profound impact that the legal system can have on the lives of abuse survivors and their children. As justices, you hold the power to influence change, to advocate for those who often feel marginalized and unheard in a system that should be their refuge. Your decisions can either reinforce the cycle of abuse or serve as a beacon of hope and healing for those who have endured unimaginable pain.

It is imperative to remember that survivors are not just statistics; they are human beings with stories, dreams, and aspirations that have been overshadowed by abuse, sometimes for decades. Each case that comes before you represents a unique journey filled with struggles and resilience. By approaching these cases with sensitivity, awareness, and a commitment to justice, you can help break the cycle of abuse and empower survivors to reclaim their lives.

Moreover, by prioritizing the needs and voices of children caught in these situations, you can help ensure they grow up in environments that foster safety, stability, and love. Your role is not merely to interpret the law but to embody the principles of justice and compassion that our legal system seeks to uphold.

We can create a legal environment that prioritizes the protection and dignity of survivors and their children, promoting healing and recovery rather than further trauma. I urge you to carry these

insights with you as you deliberate on cases involving abuse survivors, and to remember that your decisions can truly change lives for the better.

I'd like to close with a letter from my daughter, sharing the importance of education regarding experiences with domestic and sexual violence, abuse, and trauma:

“When I was 12 years old, my father decided he wanted to go to court for more power over me, my brothers, and my mom. My parents had been divorced for 3 years at that point, and my father wanted court orders to hold over me because he couldn't force me to go to his house anymore. He said it was my mom's fault, but she was just trying to protect us because we were scared to go there. My mom got me and my brother an attorney so we could have a voice. However, a scared 12-year-old in an attorney's office didn't improve much in a situation like that. I would sit in front of the attorney and beg her to not make me go to my dad's, and she said he was a good man for trying to spend time with me and that I wasn't being fair because I wasn't trying to fix my relationship with him. I did not know how to explain to her that what my dad was doing to me since I was 10 was sexual assault. Nobody would know till 3 years after court. If that attorney had received proper DVSA training, she could've helped me and listened to what I was trying to say, and maybe I wouldn't have had to spend years at my dad's house sleeping in his bed, and having him stare at my chest and touch my butt and talk to me constantly about showering at his house.”

Thank you.

The Call for Change:

For survivors, access to justice is feeling safe, heard, and understood.

Our experiences underscore the urgent need for our state to implement mandatory domestic violence training for judicial employees and all players in the justice system. Given these experiences, it is crucial for judges to actively improve their courtrooms to better support survivors of domestic violence. Judges have a unique opportunity to create an environment where survivors feel safe, heard, and understood.

Here are some ways judges can enact meaningful change in their courtrooms:

1. Understanding Trauma:

- Judges must undergo training that equips them to understand the profound impacts of trauma on survivors. By recognizing the psychological effects of domestic violence, judges can make more compassionate and informed decisions in their rulings.
- Incorporating trauma-informed practices into their proceedings is essential. This training will help court officials and legal advocates to appreciate the nuances of trauma, fostering an environment that reduces anxiety and promotes healing for survivors.

2. Compassionate Communication:

- Judges can improve their interactions with survivors by practicing compassionate communication. This means being mindful of the language used, recognizing the emotional weight of survivors' experiences, and validating their feelings.
- By fostering a supportive dialogue, judges can help survivors feel respected and understood, which is vital in a system that often leaves them feeling marginalized.

3. Victim-Centered Approaches:

- With proper training, judicial employees can adopt victim-centered practices that prioritize the safety and well-being of survivors, creating safe spaces for them to share their experiences without fear of retribution or bias.

4. Critical Evaluation of Outside Professionals:

- Judicial training must emphasize a rigorous evaluation process for outside professionals. Whether a CPS worker, Custody Evaluator, Attorney, or Mental Health Professional, every position brought into a case where abuse has occurred must be a professional who has received the appropriate licensure and DVSA training to understand the complexities of these cases. This ensures assessments are based on thorough investigations and factual evidence rather than biases. Key components include:
 - **Thorough Investigations:** Ensure assessments include comprehensive inquiries, such as interviews and site visits that understand the complex dynamics of domestic violence and child abuse.

- **Fact-Based Decisions:** Base rulings on objective facts rather than subjective opinions.
 - **Bias Awareness:** Recognize and mitigate personal or systemic biases in interpreting findings from outside professionals.
 - **Collaboration:** Foster teamwork between legal professionals, social workers, and mental health experts for a holistic view.
 - **Regular Reviews:** Implement ongoing evaluations of who is invited into a court room to comment on cases. If they do not meet rigorous training and licensure standards, they should be removed from the lists.
 - By adopting these practices, the judicial system can better protect the rights and well-being of survivors and their children.
- 5. Ongoing Education and Training:**
- Continued education on domestic violence, mental health, and the impact of trauma will equip judges to make more informed decisions. Understanding the complexities of each case can lead to more empathetic and just outcomes for survivors.
- 6. Accountability of Legal Representation:**
- Educated judges will be better equipped to hold attorneys accountable for advocating effectively for their clients. Survivors deserve strong representation that understands their unique challenges.
- 7. Consistent Support:**
- Training can also emphasize the importance of providing consistent access to vital resources such as counseling, peer support, DV advocates, support groups, and legal aid.
 - Providing information about available resources can empower survivors to seek the help they need.
- 8. Collaboration with Advocacy Groups:**
- By collaborating with domestic violence organizations and survivors, judges can create policies that reflect the realities faced by those affected. Listening to survivors' voices can lead to more effective and humane practices.
- 9. Advocacy for Systemic Change:**
- Judges can advocate for broader systemic changes within the judicial system that prioritize the rights and needs of survivors, ensuring their voices are considered in policy-making processes.

Research and Resources

- Joan S. Meier’s Research on Gender Bias and Parental Alienation in Custody Cases
 - Study: Meier, J. S., & Dickson, S. (2019). “Child Custody Outcomes in Cases Involving Parental Alienation and Abuse Allegations.” *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 41(4), 445-464.
 - Findings: This study highlights how mothers who report abuse are often discredited in court. It shows that courts tend to favor fathers in custody cases, especially when accusations of parental alienation are involved, and mothers are disproportionately affected when abuse allegations are dismissed.
 - Significance: This research supports the argument that a lack of understanding of IPV, DV, and coercive control can lead to harmful outcomes and that custody evaluators need specific expertise to avoid biases against protective parents.
- The American Psychological Association’s Guidelines on Custody Evaluations
 - Resource: APA (2010). *Guidelines for Child Custody Evaluations in Family Law Proceedings*.
 - Key Points: The APA guidelines stress the need for custody evaluators to have training in family violence, child abuse, and trauma. These guidelines also highlight the ethical need for evaluators to remain impartial and recognize signs of abuse, emphasizing that they should not base evaluations solely on accusations of alienation without considering abuse contexts.
 - Application: Citing APA standards can reinforce your argument that Oregon should mandate certifications in DV and IPV for custody evaluators to adhere to best practices.
- The Battered Women’s Justice Project (BWJP)
 - Resource: BWJP provides multiple publications and resources focusing on family court’s handling of domestic violence and coercive control. They advocate for trauma-informed custody evaluations.
 - Key Publication: “Custody Evaluators, Abuse, and the Need for Trauma-Informed Practices in Family Court.” This document reviews how non-expert evaluators can misinterpret trauma responses, leading to biased or unsafe custody recommendations.
 - Relevance: The BWJP’s resources can offer specific language and frameworks around trauma-informed practices, which can underscore why untrained evaluators may endanger abuse survivors.
- National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) on Judicial Handling of DV in Custody Cases
 - Report: NCJFCJ (2017). “A Judicial Guide to Child Safety in Custody Cases Involving Domestic Violence.”
 - Highlights: This guide encourages judges to consider the impact of domestic violence on parenting and child safety and highlights the dangers of ignoring coercive control and psychological abuse.

- o Usage: Use this resource to emphasize that without experts in DV, custody evaluators may overlook crucial factors in safety and wellbeing assessments for children in DV cases.
- Saunders, D. G., Faller, K. C., & Tolman, R. M. (2016) on Custody Evaluators' Understanding of DV
 - o Study: Saunders, D. G., Faller, K. C., & Tolman, R. M. (2016). "Beliefs and Recommendations Regarding Child Custody and Visitation in Cases Involving Domestic Violence: A Comparison of Professionals in Different Roles." *Violence Against Women*, 22(6), 722–744.
 - o Findings: This study found that custody evaluators who lack training in domestic violence are more likely to recommend joint custody, even in situations with documented abuse.
 - o Implications: Citing this study can support your assertion that inadequate training directly impacts custody recommendations, increasing risks for survivors and children when domestic violence is not properly understood.
- Oregon-Specific Resources and Reports on Custody and DV
 - o Report: Oregon Judicial Department (OJD) publications on "Family Law and Domestic Violence" guidelines often stress considering DV when determining custody, but they lack specific mandates for evaluator expertise.
 - o Relevant Law: ORS 107.137 - Best Interests of the Child statute in Oregon. While this statute requires courts to consider factors like emotional ties and abuse, it lacks detail on requiring expertise for evaluators in DV and IPV. Advocating for evaluator qualifications aligns with Oregon's own legislative intentions to protect the best interests of the child.
- The Gender Bias Report and Custody Bias Against Women
 - o Report: California NOW (2002). "The California Protective Parent Association (CPPA) and California NOW Family Court Report 2002."
 - o Highlights: This report provides data on how custody evaluators and family court professionals often disfavor women who report abuse, showing a pattern of bias where women's concerns about abuse are dismissed or pathologized.
 - o Significance: Although focused on California, this report highlights trends that are relevant nationally and can reinforce your argument about the need for specialized DV expertise to counteract bias against protective mothers in custody cases.
- American Bar Association (ABA) and Domestic Violence in Custody Evaluations
 - o Report: ABA (2006). "Custody Evaluations in Cases Involving Domestic Violence: Practical Realities and Recommendations."
 - o Recommendations: The ABA suggests that custody evaluators should be trained to understand the unique dynamics of domestic violence, including psychological and emotional abuse, rather than just focusing on physical harm.

- o Application: The ABA’s stance supports your argument that Oregon should mandate specific DV training for custody evaluators to ensure fair and informed custody decisions.
- National Domestic Violence Hotline and Mental Health Impact

 - o Report: National Domestic Violence Hotline (2015). “Who Will Help Me? Domestic Violence Survivors Speak Out About Law Enforcement Responses.”
 - o Findings: This report discusses how abusers often use mental health as a tactic in custody disputes, manipulating perceptions of the survivor’s mental state to undermine their credibility and fitness as a parent.
 - o Implications: Many survivors report feeling further traumatized by courts questioning their mental health. This report supports the argument that misinterpreting mental health in DV cases can harm survivors, emphasizing the need for evaluators who understand the impacts of trauma and abuse.
- American Psychological Association on Parental Alienation and Mental Health in Custody Cases
 - o Publication: Meier, J. S., & APA. (2020). “Parental Alienation in Custody Cases Involving Abuse Allegations.” American Psychological Association.
 - o Summary: This publication argues that mental health claims are frequently misused in custody cases, particularly through the concept of “parental alienation.” Abusers may claim that protective mothers are unstable or alienating, weaponizing mental health to turn the court against the custodial parent.
 - o Relevance: This study shows that the misuse of mental health in custody disputes often impacts women and is frequently used by abusers to shift blame. It supports the need for evaluators to have DV and mental health expertise to distinguish between true mental health issues and coercive tactics.
- Saunders’ Findings on Mental Health and Custody Evaluator Bias
 - o Study: Saunders, D. G., Tolman, R. M., & Faller, K. C. (2016). “Beliefs and Recommendations Regarding Child Custody and Visitation in Cases Involving Domestic Violence.” *Violence Against Women*, 22(6), 722–744.
 - o Findings: This research highlights that custody evaluators without training in domestic violence are more likely to misinterpret a survivor’s trauma-related mental health symptoms as signs of instability. This misunderstanding can lead to decisions that favor the abuser, especially in cases where the mother reports abuse.
 - o Significance: This study reinforces the need for certified evaluators in DV and mental health to prevent biases that could lead to unfair custody decisions against survivors.
- Battered Women’s Justice Project (BWJP) on Mental Health in Family Court
 - o Resource: BWJP’s “When Mental Health and Trauma Are Weaponized in Family Court.”
 - o Overview: This resource examines how mental health issues, such as anxiety or PTSD resulting from abuse, are often pathologized in family court, particularly against women. It also explains how trauma symptoms are frequently mistaken for parenting deficits.

- Application: Use this information to show that evaluators need training to differentiate between trauma responses and actual mental health conditions that would impact parenting ability, thereby reducing bias against DV survivors.
- Oregon Health Authority’s Behavioral Health Report
 - Report: Oregon Health Authority (2022). “Behavioral Health and Trauma in Domestic Violence Cases.”
 - Key Insights: This report acknowledges the high incidence of mental health challenges among DV survivors due to trauma and highlights the risk of these being weaponized in custody cases if not properly understood.
 - Application: The Oregon Health Authority recommends that professionals involved in family law receive specialized training in trauma and DV, which can strengthen your case for mandatory certification of custody evaluators in these areas.
- National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) and Trauma-Informed Court Practices
 - Report: NCJFCJ (2021). “Trauma-Informed Approaches in Family Court”.
 - Summary: This report provides guidance on trauma-informed practices in family court and emphasizes that understanding trauma is essential for fair adjudication in custody cases involving domestic violence. The NCJFCJ points out that misinterpreting trauma symptoms as mental health issues can lead to harmful rulings.
 - Significance: This document can support your argument that courts and evaluators need trauma-informed training to fairly assess survivors, as mental health symptoms stemming from trauma are often mistaken for parenting deficits.
- The American Psychiatric Association and Mental Health Weaponization in Custody
 - Study: APA. (2019). “The Impact of Trauma on Parenting in Domestic Violence Cases.”
 - Findings: This study details how trauma-related mental health issues, such as PTSD and anxiety, are often mischaracterized in custody evaluations. It warns that these issues, when weaponized, can disadvantage survivors, particularly women, in custody cases.
 - Application: This source underlines the need for evaluators with trauma expertise to recognize and differentiate between trauma responses and legitimate mental health concerns affecting parenting.
- Case Law Examples on Mental Health and Custody Bias
 - Example: Protective Parents vs. Custody Courts: Challenges in Abuse and Mental Health Cases (2017).
 - Overview: This case law analysis demonstrates patterns in which courts weaponize mental health claims against mothers in custody cases. Courts often view reports of abuse as signs of “instability” or “alienation,” leading to biased custody outcomes.
 - Application: This analysis can serve as a judicial perspective that showcases recurring issues in how courts handle mental health in DV cases, bolstering your argument for trained evaluators.
 - <https://vwllp.com/wp-content/uploads/SFLAC-PC-2010.pdf>

