

## CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES

P.O. Box 419064 Rancho Cordova, CA 95741-9064

## REQUEST FOR COMPLAINT RESOLUTION



COMPLAINANT'S NAME (Last)	(First)	(M.I.)	TELEPHONE NUMBER
Untershine	James	Douglas	(562) 439-2139
COMPLAINANT'S MAILING ADDRESS		E-MAIL ADDRESS	FAX NUMBER
3321 E 7 <sup>th</sup> St #1		<a href="mailto:gndzerosrv@pavenet.net">gndzerosrv@pavenet.net</a>	(562) 439-2130
CITY	COUNTY	STATE	ZIP CODE
Long Beach	Los Angeles	California	90804

## DESCRIBE YOUR COMPLAINT:

The State of California is running the risk of falling out of compliance with the Federal Mandate that allows them to exercise Child Support Enforcement (CSE) in this state.

It can be shown with overwhelming proof that the Los Angeles Department of Child Support Services has

- 1) Defied civil court orders.
- 2) Defied criminal court orders.
- 3) Ignored filings for enforcement by other CSE agencies.
- 4) Ignored court ordered transfers of money made directly to the custodial parent (CP).
- 5) Fraudulently added unsubstantiated amounts of money in their accounting of child support billing.
- 6) Elicited fraudulent amounts of money using the US Postal Service.
- 7) Made repeated attempts to commit consumer credit fraud.
- 6) Deprived rights and privileges under the color of law.

(Continued)

If you need more room, you may continue on another page and attach it to this form.

COMPLAINANT'S SIGNATURE	DATE
	03-15-02

To request complaint resolution, you can either mail this form to the local child support agency you are complaining about, or call the local child support agency to file your complaint verbally.

-THIS SECTION TO BE COMPLETED BY LCSA REPRESENTATIVE-

This request was taken (check one):  in person  by telephone  by letter

LCSA REPRESENTATIVE'S NAME (Print)	LCSA REPRESENTATIVE'S SIGNATURE	DATE

## **REQUEST FOR COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (Continued)**

LA DCSS has rendered the Officers of the Court powerless to seek justice while rendering the Judges powerless to administer justice within this State's civil and criminal courts.

USC 42 666 grants LA DCSS the power to garnish wages, intercept tax refunds, suspend licenses, revoke passports, track non-custodial parents (NCP) through the Unemployment Insurance Office (UIO), and act as the complainant in criminal non-support charges. USC 42 666 subparagraph b6d grants each state the power to impose a civil fine against employers who terminate or refuse to hire an NCP due to child support garnishments. The state law that seeks to comply with the federal mandate is found under the Unacceptable Practices category within the California Family Code (CAFC 5290). CAFC 5290 sets the maximum civil fine for the aforementioned offense at \$500. Under the current system CSE is not actively involved until the CP files for enforcement or files for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) which is obviously much too late to protect an NCP who is attempting to comply with civil court orders. This states inadequate system has rendered CAFC 5290 an unconscionable attempt to comply with a federal mandate and is completely ignored as a course of action in seeking restitution regarding child support and is not recognized as a lawful excuse by the court regarding a criminal non-support charge (CAPC 270).

The recent four-year review of the California Family Code that is required by federal mandate was conducted by Policy Studies Incorporated (PSI) on behalf of the Judicial Branch of this state. PSI failed to identify this obvious case of non-compliance with the federal mandate regarding CAFC 5290. The recent investigation into the accounting practices of LA DCSS was conducted by PSI on behalf of the Executive Branch of this state. PSI failed to identify this obvious case of double billing between LA DCSS and Monterey DCSS. PSI is an independent entity that provides sole source child support consultation to 49 states, Canada, Australia, Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. PSI aspires to "Do socially useful work, have fun, and make money" while attempting to "Create an environment where their employees can take risks without being punished for mistakes". This blatant conflict of interest involving the Executive and Judicial branches of this state may imply a conspiracy with PSI to deprive the rights and privileges under the color of law (USC 42 1985) regarding heterosexual taxpayers that dare to raise children in this state.

The Legislative Branch of this state must be made aware of the deception that exists at the state level that prevents them from having visibility into a state wide money machine that is designed to prey on the very constituents that they were empowered to represent. The Legislative Branch of this state must also be made aware of the deception that exists at the federal level regarding this state's child support guideline erroneously reported by the Institute of Family and Social Responsibility (FASR) in the US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, "Greenbook", Table 8-2 entitled "Interstate Child Support Guidelines". Table 8-2 reports the state of California demanding 18% of an NCP's income while the current California Child Support Guideline actually demands 40% (2 children and earning \$4,400 per month).

## REQUEST FOR COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (Continued)

The Legislative Branch of this state must be made aware that current legislation pending in Congress, to encourage CPs to start another marital relationship and encourage employers to give raises and advancements to CPs, will complete a positive feedback path to an already inherently unstable system. The sociological backlash will be felt strongest in California, as more NCPs will be created using recycled CPs. The NCPs, who are offered no salvation from productivity minded employers, will be cast into financial insolvency, they will stop paying taxes, and they will be imposed the "Family Law Stigmata". The misdirected anger from the persecuted will first be visited on the innocent, with retaliatory strikes being launched like "SKUDS" taking out well meaning NCPs desperately attempting to live up to the highest child support guideline in the nation. The federal government will then become aware of the fraudulent California system that saps the resources of the nation. Then detached from the nation, California will begin to slip into oblivion.

The following law is worth keeping, but the rest must be considered litter and discarded.

### California Family Code 4053e

The guideline seeks to place the interests of the children as the state's top priority.

I believe California is the tall pole in the tent, and it is time to exercise the elephants, and allow them to butt heads in mahogany row, or we should find us a new ringmaster, because this circus is making children weep.

On 07-04-01 a submittal was sent to the US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means entitled "Family Law Design Review". The submittal was sent in response to open invitation related to the Welfare and Marriage Hearings held 05-15-01. The submittal baselines the current Family Law system operating in the Los Angeles, California area and offers an overview of the system as well as proposed changes. The child support equations proposed in this submittal may allow California to be "Custody Free in 2003" and allow California to benchmark welfare reform.