### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JESUS FAZ, JR,	)			Electronically Filed May 22 2015 01:49 p.m Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court
Appellant,	)	Case No.	67063	
	)			
vs.	)			
WASHOE COUNTY DEPT OF SOCIAL SERVICES,	) ) )			
Respondent.	) )			

Appeal from Order Terminating Parental Rights from the Family Division of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada

The Honorable Deborah Schumacher

### JOINT APPENDIX - VOLUME IV

JENNIFER LUNT Washoe County Alternate Public Defender	CHRISTOPHER HICKS, ESQ. Washoe County District Attorney
CARL WILLIAM HART Deputy Alternate Public Defender	JEFFREY MARTIN, ESQ. Chief Deputy District Attorney
POST OFFICE BOX 11130 RENO NV 89520	POST OFFICE BOX 11130 RENO NV 89520
ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT	ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## VOLUME I

1.	Order for Protective Custody (Filed 01/15/2010)	1
2.	Petition for Hearing (Filed 01/25/2010)	.2
3.	Order upon Petition (Filed 01/26/2010)	7
4.	Order for Continuance (Filed 02/24/2010)	9
5.	Order After Continued Adjudicatory/Disposition Hearing	
	(Filed 03/10/2010)	12
6.	Washoe County Child Support Order (Filed 03/10/2010)	16
7.	Washoe County Child Support Order (Filed 03/10/2010)1	9
8.	Order after Semi-Annual Review Hearing (Filed 07/14/2010)	22
9.	Order after Permanency Hearing (Filed 01/12/2011)	26
10.	Child Welfare Case Plan Report (Dated 02/11/2011	31
11.	Order after Continued 15-Month Permanency Hearing	
	(Filed 04/20/2011)	35
12.	Petition to Terminate Parental Rights (Filed 07/06/2011)	39
13.	Order after 24-Month Permanency Hearing (Filed 01/25/2012)4	19
14.	Order after 30-Month Semi-Annual Review Hearing	
	(Filed 07/11/2012)	53

15.	Order after 33-Month Review Hearing (Filed 10/17/2012)57
16.	Order for Continuance (Filed 01/09/2013)62
17.	Order after Continued Permanency Hearing (Filed 01/23/2013)65
18.	Order after 60-Day Review Hearing (Filed 03/20/2013)70
19.	Order Rescheduling Hearing (Filed 04/02/2013)74
20.	Order after 60-Day Review Hearing (Filed 05/15/2013)76
21.	Order after 42-Month Permanency Hearing Concerning Maria
	Faz, Michael Faz and Nathaniel Faz (Filed 07/10/2013)80
22.	Amended Petition to Terminate Parental Rights (Filed 10/03/2013)85
23.	Order after 48-Month Review Hearing Concerning Maria
	Faz, Michael Faz and Nathaniel Faz (Filed 01/08/2014)94
24.	Demand for Jury Trial (Filed 07/03/2014)99
25.	Order After 54-Month Semi-Annual review Hearing Concerning
	Maria Faz, Michael Faz and Nathaniel Faz (Filed 07/09/2014)103
26.	Order Denying Jury Trial (Filed 07/24/2014)107
	VOLUME II
27.	Transcript of Proceedings, Bench Trial (Dated 08/11/2014)110

## VOLUME III

28.	Transcript of Proceedings, Bench Trial (Dated 08/12/2014)	314
29.	Transcript of Proceedings, Bench Trial (Dated 08/13/2014)	421
	VOLUME IV	
30.	Transcript of Proceedings, Bench Trial (Dated 08/14/2014)	506
31.	Order Terminating Parental Rights (Filed 9/24/2014)	618
32.	Notice of Entry of Order (Filed 09/24/2014)	630
33.	Notice of Appeal (Filed 10/16/2014)	644

	,			
1	IN THE FAMILY DIVISION OF THE			
2	SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE			
3	STATE OF NEVADA, COUNTY OF WASHOE			
4	THE HONORABLE DEBORAH SCHUMACHER, DISTRICT JUDGE			
5				
6	<pre>In the matter of parental  ) rights as to:</pre>			
7	Case No. FV11-02393			
8	MARIA FAZ, ) MICHAEL FAZ, and ) Dept. No. 2 NATHANIEL FAZ, )			
9	) Minor Children. )			
10	)			
11	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS			
12				
13	BENCH TRIAL			
14	AUGUST 14, 2014			
15				
16	APPEARANCES:			
17	For the Petitioner: JEFFREY MARTIN, ESQ. Deputy District Attorney			
18	One South Sierra St., 4th Floor Reno, Nevada 89501			
19				
20	For the Respondent: MICHAEL V. ROTH, ESQ. <u>Attorney</u> at Law			
21	2750 Manzanita Lane Reno, Nevada 89509			
22				
23	Transcribed By: ROMONA MCGINNIS, CCR #269			
24	(775) 303–6288			

	RENO, NEVADA, THURSDAY, AUGUST 14, 2014, 9:00 A.M.
2	000
3	
4	THE COURT: We are on the final day in the Faz
5	matter, FV11-02393. I have the same counsel and same
6	representatives and the same party, Mr. Faz, as before.
7	At this point, Mr. Martin had rested, and I
8	would be turning to Mr. Roth for how you wish to proceed.
9	MR. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. This morning,
10	I would like to present a witness. I would like to have
11.	Mr. Jessie Faz sworn in.
12	THE COURT: Good morning. If you'd follow the
13	deputy. I know you know where to go, but he'll escort you
14	where you need to be.
15	(Witness sworn.)
16	THE COURT: Please be seated, sir.
17	DIRECT EXAMINATION
18	BY MR. ROTH:
19	Q Good morning, Mr. Faz. Please give us your full
20	name and spell your well, first and last.
21	A My name is Jesus Faz, Jr. First name is
22	J-E-S-U-S, the last name is F-A-Z.
23	Q Where were you born, Mr. Faz?
24	A El Paso, Texas.

1 Now, are you living in Nevada at the present 0 2 time? Yes, sir. 3 Α And where do you reside? 4 Q I reside at 1084 Rock Boulevard, in Sparks, 5 Α Nevada. How long have you been there? 7 Q Sixteen months. 8 Α How long have you lived in the state of Nevada 9 0 as a resident? 10 Twenty-two years. 11 Α Are you presently employed? 12 0 Yes, sir. 13 Α And how long have you been employed in this 14 Q particular --15 I've been with Whittlesee Taxi for over 22 16 I currently am considered a four-month employee, 17 since I had to leave my position and then come back. 18 And I didn't ask you, but what is your job? 19 Q I'm a taxi driver. 20 Α And you've had that for about 22 years, that 21 Q same job? 22 Yes, sir. 23 Α

And your duties are?

24

Q

Simply transport people from Point A to Point B, 1 work with the wheelchair cab, helping special needs people. I've got several personals that call me asking me to take them places. 4 Do you have any other source of income, other 5 0 sources other than that job? Besides the job? Personal income, no, but we do 7 Α get SSI for Logan and Angel. what is your income on the job that you have? Q On the job, I make anywhere from a hundred to two hundred dollars a week.

> THE COURT: And is that net after expenses? THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

BY MR. ROTH:

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Does the job provide any kind of benefits, such 0 as health insurance?
  - No. sir. Α
    - No other kind of benefits? Q
  - No, sir. Α
- Now, do you have health insurance? Q
- Yes, sir. Α
  - And how do you happen to have that? Q
- I got it through Nevada Health Checkup, part of Α the Obama Care thing.

Q At this time, do you receive any kind of help, such as food stamps?

A No, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q Are you going to be seeking to qualify for food stamps?

A I'll be seeking to see if I can qualify.

Q At one time, apparently, you did obtain food stamps when you and Penny, your wife, and the children were living together?

A Yes, sir.

Q And do you recall the amount of the food stamps, the money value?

A About \$960 a month.

of the food stamps that you receive would increase to another figure; maybe not that high, but a substantial amount.

A Yes, sir.

Q would you describe the residence that you now have, how many bedrooms?

A I have a two-bedroom apartment, two bathrooms, two baths. The master bedroom has its own bath. The smaller bedroom has access to a larger bathroom. It has a kitchen, a couple walk-in closets.

Q Is it accessible to schools?

1

2

3 |

4 |

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21.

22

23

24

- A Accessible to schools? Yes. I got Sparks High School directly behind me, about a block and a half away. You've got Dilworth less than a mile away. You've got Robert Mitchell approximately six blocks away.
- Q Are you going to be looking into seeing whether you qualify for low-income housing of some sort?
  - A Yes, I'll be looking into that.
- Q At one time, did somebody with Washoe County Social Services help you look into that?
- A Katie Erickson, she brought up a grant that would help me get the deposit and first month's rent into a home or an apartment. The only problem with that was that when I did secure well, I got a line on a house. When I got the line on the house, that's when she gave me the application. The thing was that the house was rented two weeks later, and the grant would take anywhere up to six to eight weeks for it to be approved or not approved.
- Q Did you get any further assistance from Washoe County Social Services in obtaining housing?
  - A No, sir.
  - Q You have two adult children, do you not?
  - A I have three adult children.
  - Q Who are they? What are their names and ages?

- A That would be Victor Faz, he is 25. I have Cory Faz, who is 21, and I have Sara Faz, who's 19.
  - Q Do they live here in Washoe County?
  - A Yes, they do.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q In previous testimony, we've heard the name of Tim as a sibling of your children. Is he your child?
  - A No. He is Penny's child by her first marriage.
  - Q And does he reside with you at this time or --
- A No, sir. I haven't seen Timothy in two, three years.
  - Q You know, of course, who Penny Faz is.
  - A Pardon?
  - Q Penny Faz, is that --
- A Penny Faz is still my wife. I've spoken to her on the phone earlier this week. I don't see her. I saw her -- well, actually that's not true. I saw her last month sometime, trying to fill out divorce papers.
- Q All right. Now, Penny is the mother of your six children. Is that correct?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q And who are your children? Can you give us their names and ages?
- A I've got J.C. Faz, his name is Jesus Carliso. He is 14. I've got Logan, Logan Ryan Faz. He is 12.

I've got Angel Gabriel Faz; he is 12. Maria Dolores
Delcarmen, she is now 10 years old. I've got Michael Faz,
who is nine, and I've got Nathaniel Faz, who is seven.

Q Thank you.

We have heard that you've been reunited with Logan, Angel, and J.C. Faz.

A Yes, sir.

Q And you are now apparently providing a home for these three children.

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you have any assistance in providing help with the care of these children?

A I got their grandmother, Delores Johnson. She is helping me watch them five days out of the week. She's there 24 hours a day for those five days. And I just go to work for a few hours, make sure I'm there in time for them to go to school. I take them to school, make sure they're medicated; then I go back to work and be home before they get back from school.

Q Are Sara and Victor available also to help?

A Sara and Victor are available. Victor, right now, is in California taking classes to become a Kia specialist. My daughter Sara's available any time I ask her to be.

Q All right. We have heard from various witnesses that the children each have special needs, and I'm sure that you're fully aware of them, but would you tell me what you are aware of as J.C.'s special needs, what they are and how you're dealing with those now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

J.C. has anger issues, which we've been dealing Α with with -- he was seeing Dr. Hargrove. He and I were seeing him together weekly while he was at the Reach program, and then CVS. When he was returned to me, those services were ended, because his Medicaid ran out at that time and the insurance that I obtained wasn't good enough for that. He sees Dr. Darrell McClintock up at CVS still. That's where we get his medication; he is on 20 milligrams of vyvanse twice a day. He had the issues with sexually assaulting my daughter, Maria. We talked to Dr. Hargrove about that for a little bit. He was talking to Paula Schroeder about it as well; that's a doctor up at CVS. He and I have discussed it. He's still having a hard time, due to his embarrassment and shame, but we have discussed it and discussed limits as to what can actually happen with his daughter -- or his sister. We've discussed it. He understands where he went wrong and he understands what's going on. He's just having a hard time opening up. He's built up a pretty good shell.

5

1

2

3

7

8

10 11

12

13 14

1.5

16

17 18

19

21

22

20

23

24

You said, I believe, just a few minutes ago that Q Dr. Hargrove was treating J.C., but when the Medicare ran out, he stopped treating him.

Α Correct.

Now, you mentioned this a minute ago too, that 0 you obtained insurance. Would that insurance now cover the cost of Dr. Hargrove continuing with therapy for J.C.?

I believe it would cover it or cover most of it. Since he still sees Dr. McClintock up at CVS -- they're both psychiatrists -- it would have to be either family or group therapy with Dr. Hargrove, which still makes it a little bit harder for J.C. to open up. Or it might cover part of it, where I would cover the rest and he could see Dr. Hargrove individually.

Do you know that J.C. was making some progress 0 with Dr. Hargrove?

I thought he was making very good progress with Dr. Hargrove. He was opening up to him.

How is J.C. doing now in school? 0

He had -- he finished up pretty rough last year. He got a little bad advice at school, because they told him that all he needed was a D to pass, and therefore he stopped working as hard as he really should be. He did pass into the minth grade. I've signed him up for the

football program at Sparks High School, where he's a freshman. He seems to be a bit happier. He's made quite a few friends. Before, when he walked down the hallway or went to school, some kids — well, most kids ignored him; a couple just barely glanced at him.

Q Did you go to your son's orientation for the football team recently?

A Not for the football team, for the school. Last night we went to meet all his teachers, and while we were in the gymnasium he had five, six guys high-five him -- "Hi, how you doing?" A couple of them were members of the football team. A couple of girls gave him their little winky thing.

Q And he seems to be adjusting now?

A Oh, he's adjusting. Yes, he's adjusting. He's starting to fit in more with the group. He's starting to fit in with the kids.

O How does he behave at home?

A At home, he's actually pretty good. He enjoys helping the twins. Unfortunately, he is 14 and knows everything, but he's willing to help the twins out. Yesterday, I had a visit with the three little ones, and while I was at that visit, he help set up a -- I bought a second laptop for the boys to do their homework. He

helped set that up with the printer for the twins to be able to do their homework; especially Angel, so he can get everything set up, printed out, and turned in for today.

Q All right. Let's talk a little bit about Logan and Angel, the twins. Logan has had some issues as well. We've heard that Michael and Nathaniel seem to be line-of-sight children and have some outbursts that seem to be out of the ordinary.

A Yes.

Q Was Logan like that too for a while?

A Logan was worse than Michael and Nathaniel. When he was at Robert Mitchell Middle School, he would run up and down the hallways, throw chairs down. When he ended up going to Kids Cottage, he got sent to West Hills Hospital, because he — they were told as a group not to do certain things. There was a child who started doing his own thing and started messing around, and Logan took offense to that. He threw a chair, he kicked one of the workers there, and he got highly upset, highly irritated. So —

Q Is there any kind of therapy that was recommended, that you're aware of, for Logan to remedy those things?

A We started with medication to try to control his

4 5

1.1

15 <sup>1</sup>

impulsivity, his anger. They put him on Tenex, of course; then they put him on Intuniv. Right now, they've got him on a combination of Vyvanse in the morning and Intuniv in the evening.

Q Did you have a problem originally with the prescription of Tenex for him?

A I had a problem with them — the way that they were talking about it, and it started with Dr. Sorensen. She was talking about they might need three or four medications, and the cocktail's the thing that I really objected to. I wanted to know which medication they were prescribing; I wanted to read up on it. Initially, they were trying to do Adderall and Ritalin, and those are stimulants. I mean, a kid who's been exposed to narcotics and methamphetamines and they're trying to give him more of the same stuff, it didn't make sense to me.

Q How is Logan doing today in school -- or not today, but generally at this time?

A He's doing pretty good. He finished out the year. He had a really hard time when Angel went to Palo Alto for the second surgery. He went from level four down to level one on his SIP. Well, level one is just extreme care. Somebody's there with him; he has to be in a little special room and be brought back up.

when Angel came back, I was home the entire time to help Angel recover and Logan just soared. He went from level one to level five in six weeks, six and a half weeks. He was doing — he's doing most of his homework himself. If he had a problem, he'd ask me or he'd ask J.C. and we'd answer it and he goes right back to it. He was having a little problem with his math, and unfortunately, the math they're doing now, I did 35 years ago. So I'm not quite up to it, especially the way that they ask for it. So I allowed him to use his calculator. Every now and again we had to go online, so I could figure out exactly what the teacher was talking about.

Q Is he progressing at school, moving at grade level?

A Oh, yeah. He's reading just below grade level. His writing is atrocious, but, then again, so is mine. He could probably use a little bit more of the fine motor skills, but as far as knowing the material, he knows it. He's at grade level, functioning at grade level.

Q Is he presently on any medication?

A Medication, yes. He's taking 30 milligrams of Vyvanse in the morning, 5 milligrams of Intuniv in the evening. And that's daily.

Q How do you obtain that medication for him?

A Through his SSI. He's got Medicaid that covers that, through pretty much his life.

Q All right. And how does he function at home with his two brothers?

1.6

A They get on each other's nerves every now and again, but they've got really black and white rules. If I tell them 8 o'clock is bedtime, 8 o'clock is bedtime. If I tell them — right now, the rule is, as soon as you walk in, you change out of your school clothes, put on regular clothes, and you start your homework. You're allowed to take a snack. We've got fruit, we've got yogurt, we've got chips, and they can do their homework doing that. They've been acting very well.

whenever they misbehave, whenever they do something improper or they start yelling at each other, calling each other names, there's different penalties for it. They lose video games, they lose computer time, they lose -- J.C. loses his personal phone, I shut off his Facebook account. Different penalties for different actions.

Q The other twin is Angel and he has probably more serious medical problems than psychological problems, would you say? Or you answer that question. I don't know.

He is legally blind. He had a pituitary tumor Α three years ago, was operated on in Palo Alto. we figured out that it had come back and it had come back in a big way. So we went back and operated again. He has about 10 percent vision in his right eye. He can detect light in his left eye. He is an amazing kid. years he's learned how to read Braille at a fourth grade He can run around with the best of them. He's got a great attitude. It's hard to put him down, it really He takes medication to help with the reduction of the tumor. He takes 100 milligrams of synthroid, and that's because the pituitary tumor is still affecting his growth. So he's staying rather short, compared to his brothers. So that's helping him with his growth, and hopefully, as he enters puberty -- the doctors are hopeful because he's still producing some hormones on his own.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q Excuse me. Is he going to a regular school now?

A He's going to regular school. They are providing special — they're giving him special stuff. Like, he doesn't have a combination locker; they provide him with a locker with a key lock on it. He gets to leave class five minutes early, to make sure he makes it all the way across. He uses his cane. He also has glasses. He has goggles when he goes outside for his PE class. But,

all in all, he's just doing great on his own.

1.1

Q Who furnishes these things for him?

I offered to pay for them for three months, till they were finally done, until they got the grant, and then they had to do a couple of things. By that time, the prescription had expired. I had to go back and get a new one, and I had to get it from Eye Care Associates, and it had to be specially written out, so I could deliver it to J.C. Palmer, so they could take that to Wal-Mart; and then they could send the social worker with the credit card to pay for it, when I had the money all along to pay for them and they just said no, or at least Ms. Palmer said that.

Q How is Angel behaving in school?

A Angel's doing well in school. He's nursing his surgery. When he returned back from Palo Alto, he had some really great, devoted teachers at Miguel Sepulveda. Right now, he's at Dilworth. He's moved on to the seventh grade. He's got a couple of really nice teachers he's working with. He's got a new vision teacher, who's teaching him Braille. He's got the same assistant, Jessica — I don't remember her last name; I apologize. She sits with him in class, helping him to try and write things down when possible.

Q I understand that last year he was pretty popular at school.

A They took him from class to class to introduce him, show the kids about the Braille stuff. He talked to the kindergarteners. He had — they call him his boyfriend, and he goes, "They're not my girlfriends, they're just my friends. They're girls." Yeah, he was very popular. The kids liked him, everybody knew him. He could walk down the hallway and you got about 10, 20 kids saying "Hey Angel."

- Q Did you go to his school orientation this year?
- A Yes, I did.

Q And did he receive a pretty good welcome at that time?

redo his schedule -- well, we had to redo Logan's schedule three times, because they didn't understand where he was coming in on his IEP, or his SIP. And with Angel, we just went ahead and redid it one time, 'cause there was one class that he just wasn't prepared for at this time. That was one of the science classes, and they're gonna take him next semester.

Q Does Angel have homework like regular children do?

A Yes, he does.

Q And how does he handle that, being that he doesn't see very well?

A Last year when he was doing his reading, I read it to him, he took notes. This year, I'm picking up the Dragon program for him. I went through the Reno Lions Club, but they haven't gotten back to me on that, and I've ordered it through Best Buy.

Q What's the Dragon Club?

A The Dragon Program, what it is is you speak into a microphone and it puts your words on the screen and --

THE COURT: A software program?

THE WITNESS: A software program.

BY MR. ROTH:

Q Now, how does that help him? I think I know the answer, but it's something to do with the size of the print, isn't it?

A Well, he can change the size of the print, so he can read his words and adjust them as he wishes. Also, when everything is done and said, it is his words going on paper, and this way, they know that it is his work. Last year they allowed me to write certain things down for him. Because when we're talking about the Spartans and their way of life, it took three, four paragraphs to put down

what he wanted, and the way he writes — to write legibly, he has to write about the size of an inch, inch and a half, for him to be able to get it down on paper, and that took too long. So they allowed me to put down his words on paper, and it was hard for me to — it's hard for me not to put in my own thoughts and then I had to go back and redo it, because he didn't want, like, my thoughts.

1.1

Q Do you feel that he is adjusting to your home and the family that you have there at this time?

A oh, he's having a blast. He knows pretty much where we're at, where we stand. He asks how we're doing with the little ones. He wishes to see them and we take him when we can. Sometimes he has too much homework and that would interfere with the visit, with the younger children.

Q would that be putting him in harm's way, as was sort of indicated earlier regarding the scooter?

A All the doctors have signed off. He can ride scooters. He's got a helmet. He takes judo classes. Everything was signed off on that a couple years — last year and he's doing great. He's a yellow belt at the Proshudo class in Sparks on Ninth and C Street.

THE COURT: Excuse me, Mr. Roth. But he had surgery this summer?

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: And that did not change that, even though he was signed off previously?

THE WITNESS: He took four months off.

THE COURT: So there was a change after his surgery and he's been signed off again?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, we haven't had four months since the summer, though.

THE WITNESS: The surgery was in March.

THE COURT: In March, not in the summer.

Mr. Roth, go ahead.

#### BY MR. ROTH:

Q Tell us about the surgery that Angel had. He's had more than one surgery, hasn't he?

A He's had two. The first one was in September of 2011. I was incarcerated when they told me about the tumor. I was incarcerated because of the child support. They told me about it and I was a bit upset. I was released three days later, when Angel was being transported. He went up there with his stepmother, Sandy Lorenz, and I followed a day or two later. I was up there, spent a few days with Angel. I was there when he went in; I was there when he came out.

Q Excuse me. When you say "up there," what are you referring to?

A We were up in Palo Alto, at the Lucille Packard Children's Hospital.

Q Is that part of the Stanford University?

A It's part of the Stanford University, at the Stanford University Hospital.

Q Then he had a second surgery and you said that was -- did you say March of this year?

A March 14th of this year.

Q And were you there with him during that time?

A Yes, I drove him down. We got to spend a couple of days beforehand. We even spent one night at the Ronald McDonald House, where we got some really nice pictures of him as a boxer, 'cause he's gonna beat whatever is wrong with him. We got pictures of him with his -- he calls it his squishy. It's a blue penguin Pokemon-type thing, 'cause Pokemon are his thing, what he's into. And his teachers bought that for him.

Q His last-year school teacher?

A Yes. I apologize, it's just that he has two teachers named Cheryl, Cheryl Enzler and Cheryl Kriegle. They purchased that for him. I spent --

Q Who did the surgery? Do you recall the doctor?

A Dr. Edwards.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q And he did the first surgery, as I understand.
- A He did the first surgery as well. He's been monitoring Angel the entire time.
- Q When the surgery was completed, did the doctor discuss with you treatment or prognosis or what he'd done?

Pretty much what happened is that they used the Α ENT specialist up there, Dr. Guinn. They went through his septum and the sinus cavity to access the pituitary gland. They drained the tumor and it was left in two different sections. One was really close to the carotid artery at the base of the brain; the other one was up by the optic nerve. They didn't want to take any more chances of scarring the nerve any further or possibly rupturing the optic nerve. They got into two small sections and started treating the -- started treating the tumor with cabergoline. They give him that, eight milligrams twice a week -- excuse me -- four milligrams twice a week, eight milligrams for the week, and they figure that it's going The last treatment -- or the last checkup we went to, his prolactin levels -- which is what tells whether the tumor is up or down -- are down to around 145, which is very high for a normal person, but for Angel, that is outstanding, considering for the first surgery, they were

2 |

6

7 8

10

16 **17** |

15 l

18 19 |

20

21 22

23

24

up over 3,000. For the second surgery, they got him up to about a thousand. So right now he's at about 145. sees Dr. Eckert next month and Dr. Edwards two weeks after he sees Dr. Eckert. They got an MRI coming up and they're just gonna see where he sits.

Have the doctors ever told you don't let Angel Q do certain kinds of exercise, keep him quiet, anything like that?

After the first surgery, Dr. Eckert, Dr. Edwards, Dr. Burtz were all in favor of him getting out, doing exercise. Dr. Hershewe was saying, "Just be extra careful." His thing was that Angel only has one good eye and it's only a partial good eye. He wanted protection on it at all times. But after February, he signed off on him doing anything. That was February after the surgery. He's saying he needs exercise, because he is starting to put on a little too much weight.

The incident with the scooter that he was using -- you had purchased him a scooter and this was a year or two ago, wasn't it?

Yeah, I purchased it -- I believe it was about three years ago.

- That was before either of the surgeries? Q
- No, it was after the first surgery. Α

Q After the first surgery, okay.

And this wasn't the first time he had used his scooter, was it?

A No. He was riding scooters over at the Kids Cottage, and him and Logan asked me to get him one. J.C. was riding scooters there as well, but he wanted a rip board and a bicycle. So everybody got something different.

Q But, apparently, the Kids Cottage allowed him to ride the scooter.

A I kept him on the sidewalk. As long as he stayed on the sidewalk, not on the parking lot area. The other kids got to go in the parking lot area. Angel just stayed straight up and down the sidewalk.

Q At one time — and I'm not sure I can remember the details — you explained to me what you believe Angel's sight was and that he has sight on the peripheral side, but not straight ahead. Am I remembering that right?

A That's correct. Pretty much the way Dr.

Hershewe explains it — he's the neuroophthalmologist —
on his left eye, after the surgery, he has light
perception. He can tell light; the pupil response opens
and closes. On his right eye, he has 10 percent

peripheral vision. The center of the eye isn't dead, but it's just blocked off, 'cause he can't see. The best way he explained it to me was, if you take a piece of paper, put the corners down --

Q Who explained it?

2 |

3 i

1.7

A Dr. Hershewe. You take it and block off the right eye just right here, the little half moon thing on the bottom, that's pretty much what Angel sees.

At a distance of about five to six feet, he isn't great, but he's not bad. He can see posts, he can see certain things here and there. The larger items at a bigger distance, he can see as well, but — like I took him to see Guardians Of The Galaxy last weekend and we sit in the front row and he can see the movie. It's just he leans way back and the movie's right there, so he can see and enjoy the movie, but if we sit about the tenth row back, he doesn't enjoy it at all.

Q Mr. Faz, do you know a lady by the name of Jennifer McKiernan?

A Jennifer McKiernan works with CPS and she was the caseworker for the twins.

Q Did she visit your home within the last six months while you were living at this residence that you're now living in?

- A Yeah, she visited two or three times.
- Q Are you aware that she made a report and a recommendation for a 54-month review hearing?
  - A Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

20

21

22

23

24

- Q And have you had a chance to look at that?
- A Yes, sir. I was just reading it when I was sitting over there.
- Q You're aware that she approved the reunification of Angel and Logan with you.
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q And did she prepare this, to the best of your knowledge, pursuant to her job with the Washoe County Social Services?
- 14 A Yes, sir.
  - MR. ROTH: Your Honor, I would ask that it be admitted into evidence.
- THE COURT: Is it already marked, sir?
- MR. ROTH: It is not marked. I do have copies

  19 for --
  - THE COURT: All right. Please hand one to counsel and hand one to the clerk. And is this something that you'll be objecting to?
  - MR. MARTIN: Yes. I would object on the basis of hearsay at this point.

THE COURT: All right. Let's go ahead and have it marked to make the record. And for the record, this is a court report. Is that right?

MR. MARTIN: It is, your Honor.

THE COURT: And the objection is hearsay, as the author is not with us. Do you have a response to that?

MR. ROTH: Your Honor, yes. The document is more of the history of another case and not involved in this case. So, therefore, (inaudible) and I feel it has some relevance as far as my client's ability to parent. I believe, as far as the hearsay rule, it's something that shows Ms. McKiernan's frame of mind at the time that this was written, at the time that she viewed the home, at the time that she made a decision on what to recommend to the court.

THE COURT: I have not allowed either the agency or other parties in termination trials to admit court reports absent the author being here to answer; and sometimes that's even problematic, because they can be double and triple hearsay. Hearsay is allowed by statute in 432(b) cases. It is not allowed by statute in termination of parental rights cases, because the due process and the procedural protections are different, because what's at stake here is greater.

So the objection — you've made your record and it will remain part of the record if there's an appeal in this matter, but I will not be admitting it. I will be accepting the hearsay objection, because court reports often include not only what Ms. McKiernan knew but what other people told her. I mean, it's two and three levels of hearsay sometimes in those reports. So I'm just going to hold to that consistent position that I've taken generally in these cases, is that those court reports are not admissible. Perhaps they could be if the author were called, but she has not been called.

So we'll make it part of the record, and your objection is noted. And please go on, sir.

#### BY MR. ROTH:

Q Mr. Faz, you've told us about three of your children, but the three that are involved in this case are -- who are those children?

## A Sorry?

Q The three children involved in this particular matter that we're seeking to determine whether there's going to be a termination or not, that would be Maria, Michael, and Nathaniel?

- A Yes, sir.
- Q We've heard that Maria has at one time indicated

that she would like to be treated more specially and she's not real happy being the only girl in this. Are you aware of that?

A Yes, sir.

1.8

Q If she were to be returned to you, how would you try to make her feel different about that?

A I've always told her she's a princess. I've always bought her the girly stuff, the pink dresses, the little blouses, the things that she likes. I try to do things specially for her. Last February was Nathaniel's seventh birthday. Maria was not allowed to participate because J.C. would be there, and it was a birthday we did over at Chuck E. Cheese. I picked up the kids, dropped them off. We had a great time. Maria couldn't be part of it. At the time, I was told that I was gonna be able to take her out for her own special dinner. Get dressed up, go out and have some fun, just go get dinner, whatever she wanted.

Q What happened?

A Julia Bauer figured this was — as soon as I got back from Palo Alto, Julia Bauer said that it would not be possible to do, because the circumstances of the visitation had changed because of a air soft gun incident.

THE COURT: Because of an air soft gun? Just to

make sure I heard you correctly.

THE WITNESS: Yes, air soft gun.

BY MR. ROTH:

1.5

- Q Are you referring to what other people may have referred to as a pellet gun incident?
  - A Yes.
- Q And that gun incident, was there only one gun or several guns?

A There were several guns. They're called Zombie Killers. We purchased them at Wal-Mart, two for 20 bucks. It's a air soft handgun that shoots little rubber BBs. And one of them bounced back and hit Maria on the finger; one of them bounced back and hit Michael on the cheek, and they said I was not paying my due diligence with the children, because I was inside the truck. I was inside the truck loading them for the children.

Q Now, do these guns make a lot of noise?

A No, they don't. You cock it back, a pocket of air forms, you pull the trigger, and it's a spring that comes out and it makes a little clapping sound, a little bit louder than that.

Q It was not your intent to have anybody harmed by these guns.

A No, sir.

Q In hindsight, maybe you would not have done that, if you had the opportunity?

A In hindsight, no, I wouldn't have done that. But at the time that it was going on, everybody was having a lot of fun. Michael got hit on the face. He came up, he told me, and I said, "That's gonna look really good, it's gonna be a real nice red mark for you." He laughed. Maria got hit a second time. She was wearing a sweatshirt at the time — this was in February — and it just bounced off the sweatshirt. Beyond that, they had a good time shooting at cans. They had an old paper mache mask that they were shooting at. They were shooting at a plaster of Paris mask that the twins had made the year before in one of their classes, and it was fun.

Q I was just going to say that probably, in your opinion, would not have been -- that was not a good idea.

A At the time, no. They did not have enough experience around the guns to be able to do that.

Q Getting back to Maria, did you recently have a visit with Maria?

A Yes, sir.

Q When was that?

A I have one every week, every Wednesday. The last one was yesterday.

Q And was Maria excited about going to Girl Scouts?

A Yes. The thing was, Tuesday she had a doctor's appointment with Dr. Burtz, a well-baby check. Monday was to be her first Girl Scout meeting. Tuesday, she was kind of upset because she told me that Tamara forgot to take her and she didn't get to go. The next one isn't for another two weeks.

Q So she didn't get to go to this week's --

A No. She hasn't been in Girl Scouts for over three months now.

Q At one time, you had unsupervised visitation with the children. Is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q But now that J.C. is back in your home, does that kind of restrict the visitation, especially with Maria?

A In a way, yes, but the thing was that I had unsupervised visitation at my home with J.C. there. They knew that J.C. was living with me. They knew J.C. had his own bedroom. Maria just really enjoyed coming home with me. We baked our first cake together. It was the first cake she ever baked. She would go into my bedroom and say that was her perfect bedroom, and she loved the big

bathtub in the apartment, 'cause it was gonna be her perfect bathtub. At that point in time, she had illusions of coming home.

Q But with J.C. living at the house now, that presents a big barrier to that, does it not?

1.7

A I don't think it's a huge barrier, but it presents a little bit of a barrier, yes, especially with the allegations. I mean, the second allegations. Apparently, Maria talking with Danielle Osier-Tatar brought up a lot of memories and resentment. If I was to get unsupervised again -- J.C. is 14 years old. I pay for him to be in the Boys and Girls Club, he's on the football team, he's got a bunch of new friends. He's got plenty of places to go play.

Q Let's look at it from Maria's point of view, though, her side. She's had some incidents outside of the relationship with J.C. It would seem that maybe she needs some help and therapy as well.

Maria needs help, yes, she does. She started with -- this is about the seventh therapist she's been with. She started with Shirley Luke immediately when we found out; then they moved her to Maple Star; then they moved her to No Child Left Behind. After No Child Left Behind, she had two or three therapists; then they had her

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 with Paula Schroeder; then they put her on the Koinonia thing, and now she's with Danielle Osier-Tatar. been moved around, seen a lot of different therapists. And as soon as she got to Danielle Osier-Tatar, it seemed like -- I don't know if they hit it right off the bat, 'cause in less than two months, apparently she told Danielle a lot of different things. A lot of things have opened up that led to them considering new charges against J.C., against my son J.C. And apparently, at that point in time, they brought in an older boy's name that was an adopted son of the foster family where he lived, the Lorenzes.

There was some suggestion that there had been an 0 inappropriate incident between Maria and J.C. at the Is that correct? Lorenz home.

And the way that it was approached to me Α by J.C. Palmer, they were gonna come after J.C. with criminal charges. I took a bit of offense, because J.C. -- things had been brought up two years before, three years beforehand. We went through the social psych evals, we went through a bunch of different things, and they found out there was no way they could prove criminal charges at that point in time.

I'm going to interrupt you, and I apologize, but 0

I would like to sort of concentrate on Maria at this point.

A I apologize. And with Maria, with all the therapists she's been through, and the fact that she opened up so quickly with Danielle Osier-Tatar, I had my suspicions. She didn't open up very much with the other ones. She started talking to the original one, Shirley Luke.

Q But let me ask you this question: If something like this occurred, is it not a good idea to have a therapist discuss it with the child?

A Yes.

Q And do you have any objections to Maria continuing with any kind of psychologist or psychiatrist, a clinical person to help her?

A No, not at all. As long as she's getting help, as long as she is venting, getting it out, trying to find a way to get stronger and get past it. No, no objection at all.

Q From what she has said, that I've heard from the evidence, about not liking her brothers or not liking you and all kinds of things, it sounds like a little girl just needing attention. Would you agree with that?

A In a way, yes, but at the same time, I can see

1 her being upset. I mean, extremely upset. She saw J.C. come home. She saw the apartment. She claimed my bedroom as hers. She got to be home. We got to bake cakes, we got to make cupcakes. We got to interact as a family and she gets pulled out of it again.

- So you believe she is frustrated? O
- Frustrated, upset, disappointed. Α

2 |

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

**17** |

18

19

20 l

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Excuse me, counsel. When you said you were suspicious because of the way she opened up to Danielle Osier-Tatar, can you tell me what you mean?

Maria's always been a very closed THE WITNESS: It's not that she built a shell around her; it's just that it took her awhile to get to know somebody. with Danielle Osier-Tatar, it just seemed almost like an immediate click and everything was coming out. Danielle Osier-Tatar was saying that Maria was telling her everything going on with J.C., but she couldn't tell me. Whenever I asked, whenever I got any permission from anybody in authority to duplicate any reports from them, Danielle Osier-Tatar would give me a paragraph, a couple of sentences, but she couldn't tell me anything because of a doctor-patient privilege. Apparently, CPS could know. Apparently, the foster parent could know, but I wasn't allowed to know.

THE COURT: You were suspicious of what?

THE WITNESS: I was just suspicious how quickly it all came about.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Roth, go ahead.
BY MR. ROTH:

Q You said that Ms. Osier-Tatar didn't tell you anything?

A Not really. Very, very little. She did provide reports, but, like I said, they were a six-month report condensed to two, three sentences, maybe a full paragraph. And all it was was, "Well, we're doing great work. She has opened up well," and that was it, and that's pretty much all I got from her. Whenever I tried to ask questions, I was shut down. I was shut down by Kim Graves, one of the people at Koinonia. There was another lady named Kim, who helps run — who's supervising the entire thing. Kim Keitano, I believe is the lady from CPS, she steps in and shuts me down. I cannot ask any questions.

Q How would you provide a home for Maria, if you needed to?

A Maria would have to have her own room. It'd be to the opposite side from the boys's. She would have her own bathroom. There'd have to be at least two, three

bathrooms in the home. She would have her own privacy, her own little deal. If she needed therapy every week, I'd be there. I've made it to every single one. I've made myself available to all the children's therapies. I've made myself available to just about everywhere, every time.

Q Would she and J.C. go to different schools?

A Yeah. J.C.'s in high school; she'd still be in elementary school.

Q And when they got out of school and came home, would you have somebody there to have sight of them and watch them?

A I would be there. I am there right now. I quit working around noon, one o'clock to make sure that I pick them up from school. I make sure that I'm there first thing in the morning. I mean, the way it works out right now, we get up, I make the boys breakfast, I take the twins to school. J.C. goes to school on his own; he has to ride his skateboard two blocks. I drive the twins to school, I pick them up from school. I drop off their medication. Whatever needs to be done at school, I'm there. I'm there except during the school hour. The time that I wasn't there during the summer, Delores has been helping out, because they weren't in school.

Q And you believe that you can offer this same attention to Maria if she were to reside with you?

A I believe I can. I mean, as far as getting her to her appointments, to get her -- yes.

Q The other two children, Nathaniel and Michael, I'd like to talk about them a little bit. Nathaniel seems to be quite a more serious problem, or at least a more intense problem. Can you describe what you feel his problem is?

A Nathaniel is very hyper. He is a ball of energy, just needs to keep going. With him, we just keep track of where he's at and what he's doing, keep him doing his homework, keep him doing his reading, which he does enjoy, keep his mind busy. If you keep his mind busy, you can keep his hands busy. He likes to go out to the park, and he's been telling me he hasn't had the chance to do so.

Q Why not?

A Apparently the Reids, which is the foster family that he's with now, don't take him out to the park. He complains that his bike's had a flat tire since the last time we rode it together at the park.

Q When was that?

A I believe it was January of last year.

- Q January 2013?
- A Yeah.

1.7

- Q He's had a bicycle all this time with a flat tire?
  - A Pretty close, yes.
  - Q And his bicycle's at the Reid house?

A It's at the Reid house. I bought all three of the kids a bicycle for their birthday. I bought Maria's first and they sent it home, they sent it home with me, because the foster family didn't feel that they could watch it or take care of it. I made a few complaints. They took the bicycle home with them, but the only time she got to ride it was when they brought the bicycle to me at the visit, then she got to ride it. The same thing for Michael's bicycle, and then they couldn't transport all three bicycles, because apparently there wasn't enough room in their —

Q Let's stick with Nathaniel for a moment, if we could. What are the issues with Nathaniel, as you see them?

A Other than his hyperactivity and his problems at school? That's a lot of them right there. I see it as him not getting enough -- well, one of the things that I see is that I don't believe he gets enough consequences

for his actions. The way they're being treated right now is only positive rewards. If one of my boys at home yells at — if Logan yells at J.C. or calls him a name, he loses his DS for the day. That's a 24-hour period. He messes up at 5 o'clock, he can't talk about DS until 5 o'clock the next day. When Nathaniel does something wrong, there might be a timeout, but then they just go back and talk to him and try to use it as a teaching moment. And all he has to say is "I'm sorry" and he gets rewarded for saying "I'm sorry" and realizing that he did something wrong.

1.6

Q Now, he has been known to shut down, and so a timeout for him might not -- how would that affect him?

A He gets one minute for every year of his age. So that's a seven-minute timeout. For him, it might be seven minutes of frustration sitting in a corner, sitting at a desk, but that is it. After that, he gets back up, he gets to go play, he gets to do what he was doing before.

Q Do you know if he's taking any medication or --

A They're trying to get the proper medication to him. They've been making a bunch of different changes to it. They started him on Tenex; then they tried the Intuniv; then they had him on an Adderall-type medication. They put him on Vyvanse. Now they're trying to do Vyvanse

and Intuniv in a combination. My objection is they just keep throwing stuff to the wall, hoping to see what sticks. On the Adderall medication, he was actually performing quite well, until they took the visitation away in March, Well, everybody took a big fall in behavior at that point in time. Since they've got him on all these medications, he was okay in the morning and he was doing okay during school for a period, but then he wasn't calm enough in the evening when he went home. So they give him a second dose, and since they gave him a second dose, he was having a hard time sleeping. They started giving him Benadryl to sleep. They've given him three different sleep medications to try to keep him asleep. He gets up too early in the morning; therefore, that's his sleep problem, and it's -- I just don't understand why so many pills, why so many different combinations. I understand they're trying to find the right one. I really do understand that, but I also understand that if you keep giving a kid speed in the morning, speed in the evening, he's not gonna get to sleep at night. So give him speed, give him a little more speed, then give him sleep medication; it may or may not work.

2

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q You said the Adderall was doing fairly well, in your opinion.

- A Yes, he was doing fairly well.
- Q What changes and improvements did you see?
- A I'm sorry?
- Q Did you see any changes or improvements in Nathaniel?
- A Yeah. Everybody was actually quite happy when he was on the Adderall medication. His grades started going up, his behavior in school was actually turning pretty good, and then they started they even took him off the Benadryl at night, because they said since he was going to sleep all right, he really didn't need it anymore. But then they had bumped the dosage quite a bit at one point in time; so they figured that he had built up a tolerance for it as well. So they just keep going back and forth on it.
- Q There was a setback, you said, when the visitation was taken away. It wasn't. It was restricted to supervised visitation, wasn't it?
- A Yes. That was in March, when I got back from the surgery with Angel. That was when they brought up the incident with the pellet guns.
- Q Yes. And you say that that -- even though he was taking the Adderall, that things regressed somewhat?
  - A Yeah, he regressed considerably. That's when

they went from the Adderall to the Vyvanse, and then they did a double dosage on the Vyvanse. They tried to get him on two 10-milligram doses -- excuse me, they went to two 5-milligram doses, then they went up to two 10-milligram doses, then they went to a 10 and a 5.

- Q The supervised visitation, where do they occur?
- A They occur at the CPS building.

Q And can you describe the room in which they were occurring?

A We initially were on the second floor, Room 1, which was not a big room, but we had a few toys, but the toys were for younger children. They had a few books, but half the books, the pages were missing or torn or colored. So we had one of the CFT's, and after the CFT they said I should bring different games and they said that Uno was one of their favorite games and I should sit there and play Uno. So we tried to sit and play Uno for two hours. That is one boring game, especially for two hours when you've got three children that want to run around and do other things. I brought them different toys. I brought them Captain America dolls, I brought Maria regular dolls, I brought Playdo stuff.

Q I could see that that was frustrating for you. Was it frustrating for the children?

A Yes, very frustrating. And then we start getting a little bit loud, because we start playing, we start wrestling, and it upsets the people in the offices who are directly behind us.

Q Who all was in the room with you? Name the children for me.

A It's Maria, Michael, and Nathaniel and myself. Every now and again it's Logan and Angel. They come and visit as well.

Q And was anybody supervising?

A They say that the Winco people walking by through the open door, those are the people supervising. Or since their office is in the back, the people that walk back, 'cause there's a window through the door, they're probably the people supervising. But sitting in the room, there's nobody supervising. Yesterday's visit, we had the door closed. Maria closed the door, because we have kids that come into our visits and been upsetting Michael, been upsetting Maria.

Q Other children, you mean?

A Children that are in other visits that are walking the hall. Maria asked me to buy her the movie Frozen. So I bought it for her and showed the movie. Michael asked me to start bringing different movies. So

we do that and we get popcorn, pop ring candy, fruit, snacks, cheese. Yesterday was hot wings and fries. And we're just sitting there playing and we got these kids that just keep barging in, and their parents hope that we don't mind. I'm just trying to be gracious, and yeah, they can have some chips, they can have a little bit of the stuff we bring.

- Q well, you didn't mind that, did you?
- A I don't mind it that much at all.

3 I

Q But do you see it frustrating the children at all?

A It's frustrating Michael. He feels that they shouldn't be at our visit, at our time. And the parents, they come in and they sit and join. And the people supervising, I guess they think it's okay, because they just keep walking on past.

Q And let's talk about Michael. Well, before we leave Nathaniel, if he were to be returned to your home, do you think you would be able to appropriately and correctly — not only supervise him, but help him mature and improve in his bad habits?

A I believe I could, yes. Everybody keeps saying that he needs a firm -- "firm" might not be the proper word -- a more stricter regimen, without being terribly

strict, is the way that I understand it. My home is run in a very simple way. You are asked to do things and there is a time limit to do things in, and you accomplish that task. If you don't, you ask for help. If you can't finish at that time, we'll work on it later. If it's something that just steps out of line — you're yelling, you say a curse word, you call your brother a name — there's penalties for that, you lose privileges.

- Q Have you ever used a belt on these children?
- A On the younger ones? No
- o Maria?

A Maria, no. She was too young and she's the princess. I never did spank her.

Q Michael has issues also and is considered to be a line-of-sight child. What is your understanding of what that means?

A Line of sight means that — at least to me, it means you are in the room when he's in the room, period. If he steps outside, you gotta be in a closed-off area where you can keep an eye on him outside the window, at least that's the way it was explained to me when he was in the CVS home. That's pretty much the definition I was told.

Q How would you describe his personality?

1 p a 4 h 5 c 7 g 8 h 9 j 10 p 11 c

A Michael's personality? He's got a really good personality. He's bubbly, he likes to have fun. We run around, he wants to go play. He's complained that he hasn't been taken out to do his things, his bike or his scooter, even though his bike is actually in working condition. When we play, he wants to act out — they've got these little tents in the visitation room. So he hides in there. Him and Maria — Maria pretends to be the jaguar girl or the cheetah girl or the wolf girl. Michael pretends to be the hunter or the wolf and they just start chasing each other. They have a good time playing. We start wrestling.

Q Excuse me for interrupting you, but would you say that Michael has more of a outlook on life in a black-and-white manner, rather than -- I guess I'm not explaining that well. Does he like control and restriction?

A He accepts restriction; he doesn't like control. If things don't go his way, he will shut down. He will sit there and he will pout. Not this Wednesday, the Wednesday before, we had those little kids come in and he got upset and he went to sit in the hallway.

I asked him, "what's wrong?"
He said, "Them."

I said, "Are you gonna join us?" He said, "No."

"Well, you gotta join us, 'cause it's not appropriate for you to sit out here. So I'm gonna have to give them your snack."

It took him about two minutes. He got up, took his snack from my hand, sat down, and we started playing again.

Q Would you agree that Michael and Nathaniel both need some psychological and mental health help?

A Michael, yes. Nathaniel, some, yes. The thing is that I would like to find something that -- we found something that worked, like the Adderall medication.

Q And that was for Nathaniel.

A That was for Nathaniel. What upset me is that what happened was more of an emotional-type thing that caused the outburst, and instead of looking at what caused the outburst or what might've affected him, they just started changing medications.

Q I think you've told us that about Nathaniel, but let's restrict our discussion to Michael now, if we could.

A With Michael, what it was is that he was having a hard time concentrating at school. He still does. They've got him on -- I believe it is five milligrams of

19

20

21

22

23

24

Intuniv once a day. They give it to him in the morning and he does well in school. The thing is, if he gets frustrated or confused on a problem, he will not ask for help. He'll just sit there. Where I had problems with him as far as school goes and it was -- I don't know if it was right or wrong, but when he was living with me, we were teaching J.C. and the twins their times table. I had Michael going up to 12 times 12, and he knew it by heart. And now they automatically give him a calculator to get his work done. They say that he can get his work done only if he uses the calculator. Apparently, the last time that we talked at the school, that has improved. But then again, they've changed his IEP two different times. was supposed to happen in February. It didn't happen in February. It was supposed to happen right before school ended, but they figured since the school was ending, we don't need to worry about it. Now it's sometime in October.

Q Do you feel that the use of a calculator will actually slow him down or is it helping him get through the --

A I just don't think that it'll help him develop mentally. Certain problems should be a snap decision. Four times four should automatically be 16, 12 times 12 should automatically be 144. It should just be something you see and know, and they're not teaching that anymore. They're allowing him to use a calculator, and to me, that's depriving him of — I don't know. It's not necessarily depriving him of education, but it's depriving him of something that is a necessary tool.

Q Well, how does this fit into his mental health and the therapy that might help him?

A I have a hard time answering that question. He needs something to help him -- he's, again, another angry child. He wants to be -- on the visits, he wants to be with me. He wants to jump on my lap, he wants me to hold him. I'm trying to play with Nathaniel and Maria at the same time. We're in a really tiny room, 'cause they changed us from Room 1 to Room 2, which is about --

- Q Didn't you describe Michael to me as a baby?
- A Yeah, he likes to be babied.
- o what did you mean by that?

A He likes the attention. He likes to be held, he likes to be bounced on the knee, he wants to be cuddled. Whenever he's not getting his way and it's something real simple and real easy, I pick him up, I give him hugs, I snuggle him. I usually have a two to three-day growth on my face and I just tickle him on the neck or just chew on

his neck, nibble on his ear, and it's just playful stuff.
He responds and wants to keep playing.

- Q He responds well to one on one --
- A Yes.

- Q If you were to have Michael back in your home, would you continue to want him to receive psychological help?
- A Yes. He needs to find a way to get past that anger.
- Q Do you have any ideas on how you would accomplish getting this type of assistance to these children?
- A Start going by the numbers. I could start with asking for assistance from the government, apply for TANAF or HUD. Section 8 housing, they might be able to help.
- Q Have you recently called the University of Nevada and checked on --
- A I called the University of Nevada to talk to the psychology department, to see if there were programs available to be able to counsel and put Michael through. But right now the department is closed, because the school is closed until next month. That's when everybody comes back.
  - Q Any other explorations that you've --

I called Children's Cabinet and I have to go 1 Α down there in person to find out if there's any classes 2 that I can take, if possible. I talked to -- what's the 3 lady's name? I believe Graves something or other. sorry, I'm trying to remember the lady's name. to her to see if there might be any counseling available 6 for us as a group. Dr. Hargrove mentioned that he would be available for group or family counseling if I need it. 8 when did you speak to him about that? 9 Q That was actually two weeks ago. 10 Α I don't have any further questions of

Mr. Faz. THE COURT: Would you wish to begin or take a

five-minute break?

MR. MARTIN: Could we take just a five-minute It'll be brief. break?

THE COURT: Absolutely.

You may step down. And everyone let the deputy know when you're ready.

(Recess taken.)

MR. ROTH:

THE COURT: Please come on back.

When you're ready.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, your Honor.

24

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY MR. MARTIN:

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q Good morning.
- A Good morning, sir.
- Q Just briefly. You discussed your new residence, which is a two-bedroom, two-bath. Is that correct?
  - A Yes, sir.
  - Q And you got this residence on May 1st, 2013?
  - A Yes, sir.
  - Q That's when you signed the lease.
  - A Yes, sir.
    - Q And the residence was approved for two people?
- A Initially, that's what I was told to the landlord, and I told him that I'm working on trying to get my kids back. When I went to apply, I had all six kids with me.
  - Q So you were approved for seven people?
- A No. He said that would be depending -- 'cause I said, "I'm getting one of my sons back." We were working on getting J.C. back at that time, and then I was told that I might have the chance to get more of the children back.
- That was a starter residence, 'cause I've had a really difficult time obtaining residence anywhere. My

criminal record; back then, I was living in motels. That had a big reflection on whether I could keep a residence or not.

Q So this was designed as a starter residence to have J.C. back.

A To have J.C. In February, I got the twins. That was approved, no problem. And we're looking forward to see if — we're gonna keep moving forward to try and get the little ones back, and now that I have a year residence, then I can start applying at different places, and it shows that I have a rental background, that I'm starting to be stable.

Q So you feel, at this point, you can start moving forward on looking for other residences at this point.

A Yes, sir.

14 i

Q And you indicated you were looking for a residence through HUD housing?

A I was asked if I would — if there was different ways I could find low-income housing. HUD would be one of them. I checked with them before, as far as government housing. You have to put yourself on the list. The list could be as much as anywhere from 6 to 18 months.

Q Are you on the list?

A Sir?

Q Are you on the list?

A No, sir, I'm not, because I was not approved at the time before this, and I was still a felon, considered a felon, and they would not accept me onto that list. Right now, I'm looking at three and four-bedroom housing at the Boulders up there at El Rancho and — that'd be 4005 Marapar Court. I've checked with them. I've checked on a three-bedroom residence down on — I forget the name of those apartments. They are right off of Pyramid and — I take it back — Silverada and York. They have townhouses over there, and it's three bedrooms.

Q So one of the initial barriers was the felony, but you got that lifted.

A Yes.

Q was that a pretty significant impediment at that point?

A At that point, yes.

Q So getting that lifted gave you a lot more opportunities at that point.

A Getting that lifted got me an apartment within a few months.

Q And that was lifted on -- there's an exhibit, EEE. That was lifted on July 1st, 2011. Do you recall the date?

7 8

6

1

3

9

10 11

12

14

13

15 16

17

19

20

18

21

22

23

24

I don't recall the date, but I believe it was summer of '11. Yeah, it was final then, and I didn't get the paperwork on that till August of '11. And then after that, it was just overcoming or letting the evictions go back farther.

So, basically, what you're looking at is 0 eventually moving into a bigger place to kind of accommodate the --

Α Yes.

-- the needs, understanding that Maria would Q need her own space from J.C.

Yes, sir. Α

And Michael as well, space from J.C. Q

I'm sorry, Michael and who? Α

J.C. Q

Michael away from J.C., yes, sir. Α

Nathaniel and Michael would share a room, as they do now. Maria would have to have her own room.

J.C., right now, shares a room with the twins.

And that would be what you're currently looking Q at --

Α Yes.

-- where you are at. Q

And you also indicated there were certain folks

that were going to help you out with the children. Victor, though, he's in California. Correct? He'll be back Saturday. 3 Does he live here or --Q 4 He lives here in Reno. 5 Α He lives with a girlfriend and her children, or 6 0 did he? 7 No children. Girlfriend. 8 Α Does she have children? 9 Q No. Α 10 And then you also mentioned Delores -- sorry, 11 Ö what's her last name? 12 Delores Johnson. Α 13 Delores Johnson. And she's Mrs. Faz's mother, 0 14 your mother-in-law? 15 Yes. Α 16 And do these folks visit regularly with the 17 Q 18 kids? Victor yes Delores is there five days a week, 19 Α yes. 20 I'm sorry I think I the question I asked was a 21 little vague do they regularly visit with Michael 22 Nathaniel and Maria? 23

THE COURT: Do they or does she.

MR. MARTIN: I'm sorry I'll re-ask the question.
BY MR. MARTIN:

Q Does Ms. Johnson regularly visit with Michael Nathaniel and Maria?

A Julia Bauer said that would be too confusing that she did not approve of that.

Q So Ms. Johnson actually requested visits but they were denied by the Department?

A Correct cause right now there's still T PR and adoption so therefore she said it'd be too confusing for the children for Delores to come to one of the visits.

Q Okay. But you're certain that Ms. Johnson contacted Ms. Bauer, to your knowledge?

I don't know if Ms. Johnson contacted Ms. Bauer. I asked Ms. Bauer, because Ms. Johnson had asked me. And she had just moved back into town. This was back in November — November, December, and we had a court date about that time, and I asked her about it, 'cause Ms. Johnson said she wants to see them. Since I was the only one able to see the kids at the time, I asked Julia Bauer, and she said, "No, it'd just be too much of a turmoil" or — I'm trying to find the right word — "too much trauma for the children."

Q where did she live before she moved back to

Reno?

1

2

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Whitten, California. That was her original -she moved here with Penny around October, November last year.

- How long was she in Whitten? Q
- Over 15 years. Α
- Okay. And Victor, does he spend a lot of time Q with the three youngest?

with the three little ones, no. He works at Reno Mazda Kia, he's a mechanic there. So while he's at work -- our visit goes from 3:00 to 5:00, which is apparently changing here shortly. So he's at work while the visit's going on. Before then, when I had them on the weekends, he'd see them twice a month.

And to your knowledge, has he ever contacted Q Ms. Bauer for visitation or anything like that?

No, he didn't. He contacted J.C. Palmer. got approved through her to be able to see the kids and spend time with the kids. With Julia Bauer, when she came onto the case, it was just a totally different thing. We thought everything was gonna be okay, since everybody was still approved.

And do you think these folks have a sense of the 24 younger kids' clinical needs?

1.8

A My son Victor, yes. I think he does. We talk about it. I have few friends and I like it that way. So he and I get to talk, we spend time discussing what's going on.

Q So he has a good idea in terms of Maria's sexual abuse issues?

A Yes.

O And Michael's sexual abuse?

A He has an idea. He knows what's going on. He knows what's been told to me, and what's been told to me has been very limited.

Q Now, J.C. had a psychosexual evaluation back in early 2011. Do you recall that?

A Yes.

Q And the evaluator, Mr. Stuyvesant, talked to you about the allegations at that time, correct, for purposes of the evaluation?

A Yes.

Q And he reviewed some of the things that Maria was saying at that time?

A Yes.

Q And then at a later time, Ms. Palmer took that evaluation and kind of reviewed the recommendations of the report with you again. Correct?

A Much later, yes.

1.5

Q So when Ms. Osier-Tatar was talking to you about these allegations, they weren't exactly new at that point. You were aware of the allegations -- or some of the allegations as related by Maria.

A I was aware of the allegations of Maria. The allegations that Ms. Osier-Tatar talked to me about were the allegations that — as she phrased it, if I remember this properly, "There are new allegations against J.C. It was more than was told before and on the report, and there was also another boy involved, a boy named Jason, and we have to look into these things." And J.C. Palmer said that they were looking and talking about talking to the washoe County Sheriff's Department and they might be coming down to talk to J.C. at school.

Q Did they ever relate to you that Social Services actually has a policy of being required to report sexual abuse allegations to the authorities?

A Yes.

Q Did it surprise you that more issues would come out in Maria's therapeutic relationship with Ms.
Osier-Tatar?

A It didn't surprise me that more were coming out.
What surprised me was how they came out -- not how the

issues came out, it's how CPS came to me with it. They said, "There's more stuff out. We're going to talk to the sheriff's department about J.C. right now and somebody's gonna go talk to him at school." And the way they presented it, they presented it as an attack, as an attack on J.C. and what might happen to J.C. If that's not the way they presented it, that's the way I perceived it.

Q And wouldn't it be difficult not to perceive it as an attack, because the allegations are sexual abuse? I mean, it's not something that's --

A Well, we did a year of allegations, the psychosexual eval, talking to Washoe County, going up to Parr, going to all these people and talking, and it was determined that the allegations were too vague, that the time schedule was not properly aligned. They really couldn't determine when, where, or how it had happened, and then they come back and all of a sudden present it as, "we're reopening the case and coming after you."

Q But you were also aware, when Mr. Stuyvesant was speaking to you, that J.C. had made certain admissions.

A Yes.

1.2

- Q Were you surprised by those admissions?
- A A little.
- Q Were you surprised when you learned of

allegations regarding J.C. and Michael?

- A Yes, very surprised.
- Q At some point, did you refer to those allegations as psychobabble?

A No.

1.2

MR. MARTIN: I'm sorry, your Honor. The Court's indulgence for just a moment.

THE COURT: Certainly.

## BY MR. MARTIN:

Q And J.C. is not currently in counseling?

A No, he's not currently in counseling. Like I said, we've had to stop things with Dr. Hargrove. We got him enrolled at CVS with Dr. McClintock in order to get him his medication. Since we've re-established insurance and gotten back up, he's been — the issues with Angel came about, which kept me in Palo Alto, kept me in Reno, kept me a little busy with that — I talked to Dr. Hargrove about seeing him again and he said, "Just give me a call and we'll work it out." I got J.C. through school, through summer, and got him into the weight-lifting, football program. His attitude towards people in general, women, has changed considerably. Would he still benefit from it? Yes. The thing is, now, I'm just trying to find a way to get him to the point — without messing with his

school, without messing with his program -- that's actually building his self-esteem.

Q I almost get the sense, when you talk about that, you're indicating that keeping J.C. occupied seems to be helping that situation. Am I hearing that right?

Am I perhaps --

THE COURT: Helping what situation?

MR. MARTIN: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: When you say "helping that situation," that's too vague. Be more specific, please.

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

## BY MR. MARTIN:

Q I get the sense -- you talked about filling up J.C.'s time and that that is helping in terms of the concerns about his sexual acting out. Is that part of the reason, some of the reason, or is that just unrelated and I'm just hearing it incorrectly?

A That's part of the reason. The thing is that I feel that J.C. doesn't feel he belongs anywhere. He was extremely, extremely upset at the Reach program. When he was at the Kids Cottage, he was being bullied. They moved him to the Reach program. They moved the person that was bullying him right next-door to him, and they stuck him in the same Reach program with Jason Lorenz. So he was

having a very hard time at the Reach program.

2

31

4 |

5

7

10

11 |

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I was there every day to help him with his homework, and the people at Reach got upset that I was bringing him hamburgers and sandwiches, so we could sit down and eat and do his homework and communicate. They told me I had to stop that, that I had to stop the visits. Instead of being able to be there every day, they said I could only be there twice a week. Then they put him up to CVS, and at CVS I had very limited access to him there as well. And they had him with a psychologist, Paula Schroeder, and Paula was -- I don't know her techniques very well, but she seemed to be pushing pretty hard for J.C. to take -- to admit what he did wrong, to take responsibility, which I appreciate and I think that he should, but his self-esteem was nothing. He didn't feel like he belonged to a family, he didn't belong to anybody. People were picking on him, people were bullying him.

One evening, I believe that Jacinta Palmer said they caught us yelling at each other. It was J.C. venting. I sat there and took 30, 45 minutes of him airing out what I've done wrong, how a terrible dad I am, and then we walked back to his thing. I figure that, right now he is finding his self-worth. If he finds his self-worth, gets a little confidence, he'll be able to own

up to everything that he's done. I'm helping build him up.

Q So what I hear you saying is — I mean, the purpose of filling up his time is not necessarily therapeutic but partially to help his self-esteem, and then you believe that helping his self-esteem will help him address his responsibility in the sexual abuse allegations.

A If he starts feeling more confident -- my belief is, if he starts feeling more confident, starts building self-esteem, taking responsibility for everything he's done, yes, it would help him.

- Q And when did you get your insurance?
- A I got that March of this year.
- Q So, at this point, what he's getting is the medication management?

A Yeah, getting the medication management. And the thing is that since Dr. McClintock is a psychiatrist, we had to figure out how to be able to work it in so that J.C. could fall under the plan, to be able to see Dr. Hargrove as well, because they only allow certain people to see certain things. You're allowed a psychologist if it's deemed by the psychiatrist or if it's deemed by the program. It's worded very, very weirdly.

Q And -- I'm sorry, I'm just trying to look back at my notes. What medication was he on?

A Right now, he's on 40 milligrams of Vyvanse. He takes one in the morning, one in the afternoon.

- Q And what is that designed to treat, as far as you know?
  - A ADHD.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q And the medications that Logan is on?
- A The medication is 30 milligrams of Vyvanse in the morning, 5 milligrams of Intuniv in the evening.
  - Q And what are those medications for?
  - A ADHD and impulsivity.
- Q And then you indicated Angel is on some things to help address his medical condition, nothing psychotropic --
  - A No, nothing psychotropic.
  - Q -- or mood-altering or anything.
- A He's on 100 milligrams of synthroid every day, and then twice a week he takes four milligrams of cabergoline.
- Q Do you have a sense of why Maria would be reluctant to go into the same home as J.C.?
- A Yes. She'd be afraid, she'd be scared. She'd be around boys all the time again. She'd be -- I don't

know if it'd be fear or that — I'm not exactly sure how to phrase it, but she had hopes of coming home at one point in time. She got to see the home, she got to be part of it, and apparently I let her down on that. So I don't know if it's gonna be completely J.C. that she's afraid of or she's afraid that I'm not gonna be able to keep her or she's afraid that I'm not gonna be there.

Q So you're not sure if it's actually fear of J.C. You feel it might be just a fear -- or she's concerned because her other siblings have gone home and she's not gone home.

A Yes. I think it's all of it.

Q Do you think that some of her issues are related to the post-traumatic stress disorder?

A Yes.

Q And do you think it's related to some of the things related by Ms. Osier-Tatar, such as sexual abuse, witnessing domestic violence --

A Yes.

Q -- her mom getting arrested?

A Maria never saw her mom get arrested. She knows about it. Her mom got arrested in court. Maria was never in court. She got arrested for the DUI, or the driving under the influence -- yeah, DUI. She was not staying at

1 home at that time, because she'd been using drugs and I kicked her out of the house for doing so. And she got arrested at Rail City for driving somebody else's truck at Rail City.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 l

20

21

22

23

Has she seen people arrested in your home? Q

I believe she saw me get arrested once, but that was outside the home. I was walked out to a police car and got arrested at that point in time.

Now, the current housing that you have, didn't you get assistance from Children's Cabinet to help you with the housing?

They gave me -- they paid back power bills, Α I had told them that they really didn't need to, I'd have it the following week, but they said that that's what they're there for and they insisted on it.

So you were going to pay it, but Children's Q Cabinet said, "We'll pay for it anyway"?

Nancy Noonan for the Children's Cabinet -it's like first they wanted to see if I needed help with the deposit for the apartment. I had it, I already paid it. They wanted to know if I needed help with the first month's rent. I said I'd have that in two weeks and I had it there by the 1st when it was due. I paid that. The only thing that I was following up was the power bill, and 2

3

5

6

7

8

10 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

the power company would wait till the 15th to pay it, but Nancy Noonan said that they had the funds, that's what they're there for, and she went ahead and paid it.

- Q But the Department paid some back rent for you as well. Isn't that correct?
  - A I don't know where.
  - Q Isn't it true that they paid your rent in March? THE COURT: Of what year?

MR. MARTIN: Of this year.

THE WITNESS: That was not back rent, that was forward rent, 'cause I was going to California for the surgery for Angel. They said that in order to facilitate me going to Angel and being out of work for those two, three months — it turned out to be four months — that they would take care of it at that time.

# BY MR. MARTIN:

- Q Did you come to the Department and ever indicate that you owed late fees or back rent?
- A No back rent. And it was gonna be late fees, because they said they were gonna pay it in March and it took them till April to pay it. There were late fees, which I paid for.
  - Q And a request was also made for food, correct? THE COURT: Can we get a time frame for this?

MR. MARTIN: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: And a request to the Department?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

### BY MR. MARTIN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11 |

12

13 |

14

15 l

16

17

18

19

20 |

21

22

23

24

Q In the last six months, has there been a request from you or anyone in your household that Social Services needed to assist you in getting food?

A There was one request by me, and that was in March when I was in California. My mother-in-law had run out of milk. I requested milk and juice. They gave her a gift certificate for a hundred dollars to get juice and milk. And the thing is, if they give you one gift certificate for a hundred bucks, you gotta spend the whole thing or the rest gets returned or the store gets to keep it.

Q So you didn't make other requests for hamburgers, buns, hotdogs?

A I did not. If my mother-in-law did at that time, 'cause that's what she was gonna feed the kids, that's what it was. All I requested was milk and juice, because that's what I was told they were out. Jennifer McKiernan was the one that handled it all.

Q But the Department was providing this assistance to you to maintain, obviously, the other three kids in

your home, as far as you know?

- A Just two kids at the time. It was J.C. and Logan.
  - Q And then when was Angel placed back with you?
- A Angel was placed with me on February 2nd of this year. Angel was in California having surgery when this occurred.
- Q I understand. I think I didn't quite get the timeline.
- MR. MARTIN: If I may have the Court's indulgence for just a moment.
- BY MR. MARTIN:

- Q And you were intending to restart some therapy with J.C. Is that correct?
  - A We're looking into it, yes, sir.
  - Q But J.C. is not currently in therapy.
- A No, sir.
- Q Was he in therapy when the Department of Social Services had custody of him?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q So your plan, in terms of providing for these children's basic needs at this point, is asking for government assistance, you're going to go on the list for housing with HUD, you also talked about mental health

treatment through UNR. Anything else?

2

3 |

5 |

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

A UNR is just one of the options. We're looking into different ways to find it. HUD is also just one of the options. I have money for a deposit to put down on a four-bedroom apartment right now. I'm still gonna keep working part-time, as I am now. These are just options to try to provide more things for the kids.

- Q And are you familiar with Project Restart?
- A Yes, it was mentioned to me.
- Q And are you on any waiting list for Project Restart?

A No, sir. Project Restart would not talk to me when I first talked to them because of my felony and Penny's drug abuse issues at that point in time.

Q But that was in 2011, correct? The felony was lifted --

A Since then, yes, I have not talked to them. Since 2011, I've been working on my own to try to get everything done.

Q Or Reno Housing Authority?

A Reno Housing Authority was the same thing. Since 2011, I have not talked to them. I was asked to put an application in with them. I never got a response back to them -- or back from them. And that's been at my P.O.

box that I've had for two, three years now.

1.3

14 |

Q So what do you see as these children's therapeutic needs, to be placed back in your home?

A Maria's still working on the sexual -- with her sexuality mostly. Knowing that she still has concerns, still acts out a little. Apparently, they've told me -- I haven't seen it -- that she has been acting promiscuously around other men. Apparently, this has been in the Koinonia offices. When I've been there, I haven't seen it, but then again, I'm not there the entire time. So she does need some help with that, help her resolve her anger issues, help her resolve the issues that she does have around J.C. and her sexual trauma. I don't know what they intend to do about Lorenz, if she gets to face him or not.

with Michael, help with his anger, help him be able to speak out more, be able to communicate. If there's something he doesn't want, he'll let you know. If you're doing something he doesn't like or doesn't approve of, he will let you know. The only thing is that where he comes down, he gets upset and he shuts down. I can get him to respond, I can get him to play, I can get him to do a couple of other things to get him out of it. But at the same time, if I don't do the right thing or if I do not understand what has him upset, it takes a lot longer and

1 it takes a while for him to be able to tell me what's going on. Once he shuts down, it's a barrier that's harder to breach.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Do you think these children are going to need ongoing therapeutic services, therapy?
  - For a while, yes. They got a lot of issues.
- But you don't see their behavior as being any 0 sort of barrier.

Their behavior is part of it, yes. The thing is that, everybody has a way of dealing with different behaviors. Me, I prefer to take my kids out to the park and run, have a good time, get a lot of that pent-up energy out, ride a bike, go swimming, go play. If it's anger or if it's something that needs to be dealt with in that way, you can deal with it that way. If it's doing your homework, finding ways to get it done is fine, but at the same time, I also believe that they should be able to try to do it themselves, mentally. Be able to read a book, instead of having somebody read a book to you three or four times before you're asked to even glance at the book, which is something they've been doing for Michael. If you can sit down with the kid -- I've sat with Michael in that room and we've tried to read. He reads part of the words, I read the other words. I make him sound out a couple, I'll read a couple and he reads a couple. I don't read the whole book and hope he retains it, and then read the whole story at him again and hope he retains that.

Q Do you understand the reasons why Social Services at certain points pulled back visitation?

1.7

A The last time was because of — they call it the pellet gun incident. That's what the reason was told to me. The time before that was because I allowed Maria to ride her bike, since nobody was allowing her at her home after I just purchased the bike. J.C. was following her from the sidewalk. He was behind her on his skateboard. She was on her bike. I'm watching her through my living room window, but that wasn't good enough.

The time before that was because there was an allegation of me choking on J.C. J.C.'s had two different times I've taken him to the hospital for the same thing. They don't know what it is. He had a seizure, a blackout seizure at the Grand Sierra. He's had another one where he had — it wasn't a seizure, he had a blackout moment. He just came walking in the room and just — I took him to see Dr. Bergs on that one as well. There was another one, he just got up and just — they can't figure out what it is.

Q Was he ever diagnosed with a seizure disorder?

A No. It was only one seizure and two blackouts. Well, one blackout and one very dizzy spell.

Q And the doctors indicate that these blackout episodes occur for unknown reasons.

A At this point, they're still unknown. They've done a CAT scan and they've scheduled him for an MRI and they didn't find anything wrong with him.

MR. MARTIN: I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Redirect, sir.

MR. ROTH: Thank you very much. I would like to ask just a few questions.

### REDIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. ROTH:

1

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q Mr. Martin was asking you about J.C. and the self-esteem problem that he has, and I think there's more -- you realize there's more than just a self-esteem problem. Is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you realize that some of these problems that J.C. has should be corrected by a professional?

A Yes, sir.

Q And did you, in fact, talk with Dr. Hargrove about helping in this regard with J.C.?

A Yes, sir.

1.0

Q You have been able to get help from Washoe County Social Services in a few areas. Is that not correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q And one that Mr. Martin brought up today was that they paid your rent while you were down in Palo Alto with Angel and then when he was recuperating.

A Yes, sir.

Q And could you tell us how many months that was?

A I asked for two months and they gave me four.

Q Now, did you request that?

A No.

Q They volunteered it?

A They volunteered it.

Q And what about the request in March for -- I'm not sure what it was for, but milk was purchased.

A What it was is that I was to be home —— I was scheduled to come home sooner than I actually did, and I requested —— my mother—in—law told me that they'd run out of milk and juice, and I called Jennifer McKiernan and she said, "Don't worry about it, we'll take care of it." She contacted my mother—in—law and apparently my mother—in—law gave her a list, and they gave her a gift certificate for

a hundred dollars.

1

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q When you were down in Palo Alto attending to Angel, did you have a place to stay?

A I was paying for a Motel 6 in Hayward, 'cause the hotel rooms in Palo Alto were well over \$200. Motel 6 in Hayward is a hundred dollars a night.

- Q How many nights did you stay there?
- A Two.
- Q How many nights did you stay at the Ronald McDonald House?

A I spent one night at the Ronald McDonald House the night before the surgery.

- Q where did you spend the rest of the time?
- A The rest of the time, I was sleeping next to his bed. They had a chair that -- it's kinda like a recliner chair. I slept on that for --
  - Q How many days did you do that?

A In the ICU, I did that for 10 days. Then they put me in his room and they had a small bench that I slept on for three days.

- Q And did you sleep in other places at the hospital?
  - A Sir?
  - Q Did you also sleep in other places at the

#### hospital? 1 I slept a couple times on the benches outside. 2 Α Did you ever sleep in the back of your pickup? 3 0 I sleep in the front seat of the pickup. 4 Α But you did. 5 Q Yes. 6 Α And was that because you didn't have money for a 7 Q room? 8 The rooms were just way too expensive at that 9 time. 10 And it wasn't mismanagement of money that caused 11 Q your mother-in-law to request help. 12 No, it wasn't mismanagement. I stocked the 13 house up with plenty of foods, plenty of nonperishable --14 So you were out of money at that time. 15 Q All the money that I had was going toward my 16 trip in Palo Alto. 17 Now, what is the Project Restart? 18 Q Sorry, sir? 1.9 Α Tell me what the Project Restart is about. 20 0

A Project Restart can help you find a place to live, help you with deposits, down payments. If you need medical assistance, they can help you with that. They can help you with clothing, if you need to get a job. They

21

22

23

24

can help you with a bunch of different stuff.

Q Is that something you believe could help you, a project like that?

A When I first got -- when the kids were taken away from me, a few months after that, I went to talk to Project Restart and just wasn't eligible at that time. I had a job, which kind of didn't help out.

- Q would you be eligible today for that?
- A No.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q And why not?

A Because I have a residence, I have a job, and I have income coming in, including the kids's SSI.

MR. ROTH: I have no further questions. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Martin?

MR. MARTIN: No recross, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may step down.

Do you have any additional witnesses, sir?

MR. ROTH: No, I don't, your Honor. We would submit our case.

THE COURT: All right. Do you have any rebuttal witnesses?

MR. MARTIN: We have no rebuttal witnesses, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then, given the time, I'd prefer to move into closings, but if all of you need a few minutes, you can tell me that.

MR. ROTH: May I inquire as to the amount of

17 I

MR. ROTH: May I inquire as to the amount of time we may have?

THE COURT: You have until noon, or 45 minutes. It's a quarter after.

MR. ROTH: Do we have any other available time, either during the day or another day?

THE COURT: It would have to be scheduled. I went back and told my administrative assistant — it's possible there will be time, but I told her, based on what was said yesterday, that we believe we would finish today. So I'd have to put you at her mercy. She did have a couple trials that she was hoping might go off, but I sort of said to her, "It doesn't look like you'll need to be worrying about that."

So is 45 minutes not going to be sufficient, if we split it in half?

MR. ROTH: I would think that I could be done, yes. Less than that, half an hour maybe. With argument, is that what you're --

THE COURT: Yes, as to argument.

MR. ROTH: I'll leave it up to Mr. Martin.

THE COURT: Is 20 minutes sufficient, Mr.

Martin?

MR. MARTIN: I think 20 minutes is sufficient.

THE COURT: And Mr. Roth, is 20 minutes plus a

few -- is 20 minutes sufficient?

MR. ROTH: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let's go, then.

MR. ROTH: I'm sorry, may I take a --

THE COURT: Absolutely, absolutely. And we'll be just at 20 minutes.

(Recess taken.)

THE COURT: Mr. Martin, when you're ready.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, your Honor.

We've been through a lot of evidence in this case. While this termination case only pertains to Maria, Michael, and Nathaniel, we've addressed all six children in this case, because, obviously, the needs of all six children are relevant to the Court's adjudication of this petition for termination of parental rights. I guess the theme I have in this case is the length of time these children have been in foster care. If you look at the evidence, it's demonstrating as 55 months. When we started this case — and we've got the exhibits indicating that these children were removed on July 26th, 2005,

adjudicated as children in need of protection, understanding the finding of neglect was against their mother, Ms. Faz, but these children were in the legal system for over 20 months, from July 26th, 2005, to 2007. Allegations were sustained, alleging lack of supervision, methamphetamine use by Mrs. Faz. Again, we understand the petition was sustained as to Mrs. Faz. These children are found in need of protection into 2007.

1.8

Now we've got Ms. Crutcher coming in and she's involved with this family in 2005. Maria was sexually abused by her half-brother, Timothy Lee. She has concerns about the cleanliness of the home, the mother's meth use, methamphetamine use, concerns about the parents having appropriate supervision arrangements, with Timothy having molested Maria at that point. We have the parents indicating, "Well, we felt that the supervision was appropriate at that time." But the end result was that Timothy was in violation of his probation and Maria was touched in an inappropriate way.

Later in 2009, Ms. Crutcher — there's another report received. Granted, it's information only. Ms. Crutcher again works with the family. There's allegations of domestic violence, again Mrs. Faz's methamphetamine use, and again, Ms. Crutcher is working with the family on

a voluntary case and assisting the family with substance abuse treatment, financial issues, reaching out for those voluntary services.

Now on January 13th, 2010, Ms. Crutcher and Ms. Erickson respond to the home yet again, but this time it results in removal of the children again. Except this time, we now have Nathaniel, who's been born since the initial removal in 2005. And again, Mrs. Faz was arrested yet again in Sparks Municipal Court, due to her methamphetamine use. Rent's not paid, the power's being shut off, there's nobody appropriate that can watch these high special needs kids. Part of the petition that was adjudicated was Mr. Faz leaving the kids with Mrs. Faz, despite knowing that she was using methamphetamine. Those allegations were sustained by this court and found these children to be children in need of protection due to neglect by Mr. and Mrs. Faz.

and Nathaniel was about to turn three. Now, Katie Erickson is assigned as a permanency worker almost immediately. She actually went out on the removal. And Ms. Erickson is the case worker for approximately 15 months. She's attending review hearings — a six-month review hearing, 12-month review hearing, 15-month review

hearing.

we've got the older kids coming into care, showing some violent and aggressive behaviors, and that's demonstrated by Ms. Erickson's testimony, and the younger kids are starting to imitate the behavior of the older kids, and this was when the kids were initially coming into care. Now, J.C. is referred to Bob Stuyvesant for a psychosexual evaluation, due to his sexual behavior with Maria, and that was just the beginning of the case.

Now it turns to the case plan. Mr. Faz did attend the Effects of Domestic Violence in the Home class. There was a parenting class; Ms. Erickson testified he did not attend at that point. And then in August of 2010, which is almost seven months after the children were in care, the visits again had to be pulled back to supervised. Again, in the fall of 2010, Mr. Faz was incarcerated for failure to pay child support at that point. Ms. Erickson testified Mr. Faz was homeless for a time and he was residing in this one-room motel room at the Desert Rose Inn -- certainly not adequate for six children and one adult, certainly not adequate for the special needs of his kids, and not adequate for Maria and J.C. due to those sexual issues behind them. Mr. Faz was at the Desert Rose Inn almost the entire time Ms. Erickson

1 was the case worker. And even at the hearing 12-month, Ms. Erickson recommended a concurrent plan of termination of parental rights and reunification, and there was talk of the Life Grant to assist in housing.

4

5

7 1

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now we're at 15 months. Fifteen months under federal law, requiring the filing of a termination petition under the Adoption and Safe Families Act, and state law requires that, unless there is compelling reasons, that termination of parental rights and adoption has to be in the permanency plan. And at that point, the Court did adopt the permanency plan of termination of parental rights and adoption.

At that point, the children's behaviors were declining. J.C. --

THE COURT: "Declining" meaning bad behaviors or problematic behavior is declining? I'm not sure if you're saying they're decompensating or the problematic behaviors are declining.

MR. MARTIN: The problematic behaviors that were progressing at that time. J.C., Logan, and Angel did have mental health needs, although Angel was more physical in terms of his tumor and his eyesight impairment. Maria --I'm sorry, let me back up.

So after 15 months we're still not close to

reunification. The Court says, "Okay, let's move forward with termination." Now, Jacinta Palmer is assigned to the case in May of 2011. Maria is exhibiting sexualized behaviors around January, February of 2012. She's found kissing J.C. at the foster home, using kind of sexualized language towards others. Nathaniel is growing in his impulsivity and they're starting to look for medication for him. Michael is blowing up at school, running into the street. They're exploring social intervention programs. At one point he is placed at West Hills and then placed in the CVS learning home. The children were at the Lorenz home, they were removed, and I think the testimony supports that some of the things that went on in the Lorenz home were not good. And this is not the forum for Social Services to hide things. The system is what it is, and those children were removed from the Lorenz home.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

1.2

13

7.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So what we have is older children going to the CVS learning home. We have Maria and Nathaniel going to Koinonia and Michael eventually joining them at Koinonia, which is line-of-sight supervision and a treatment level foster home. They're getting psychiatric services, they're getting Koinonia. It would seem from the testimony — particularly Ms. Osier-Tatar and Ms. Bauer — that the children's therapeutic needs were being met a

little bit more consistently, in terms of the turnover of therapists, and Ms. Osier-Tatar did establish that those 2 | therapeutic relationships would follow the kids. Mr. Faz 3 was still at the Desert Rose. Ms. Palmer testified he resided there for a year. In April of 2012, the arrest 5 for another child support violation. Housing is still a barrier. Maria needs supervision, she needs -- I believe 7 when they were in the Lorenz room, the rooms were alarmed, which was supported by -- well, I'll skip that. But we're 1.0 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

point had to pull back the visits from unsupervised to supervised. Ms. Palmer does give Mr. Faz a copy of the psychosexual evaluation performed by Mr. Stuyvesant, reviews that report with him. And again, Nathaniel and Maria go to the Koinonia foster home; Michael later joins them at the Koinonia foster home, and these children join the Reid foster home.

still stuck in the same situation -- no progress, no

appropriate housing, children whose special needs are

still escalating. Ms. Palmer has to revert to supervised

visitation, based on some of the things that Mr. Faz was

doing at the visits. And the interesting thing is, the

workers that have been assigned to this case -- from Ms.

Erickson to Ms. Palmer to Ms. Bauer -- have all at some

And so what do we look at when we look at the foster parents? Maria felt fearful of her father, fearful of her father's ability to protect her, fearful of her brother, J.C. Initially, she goes in with very aggressive behaviors, growling, going to her room, throwing furniture, pulling curtains down. Maria, however, is much improved the longer she's been in this home. Michael would kind of shut down, stiffen his body, couldn't use his words, the expressive language disorder. Now he's using his words, and he's not only using his words, he's disclosed this history of sexual abuse by J.C. We've got the odd behavior of Michael and Nathaniel hiding sharp objects under their bed. Nathaniel is extremely impulsive. All three children require line-of-sight supervision, calm and consistent parenting, intervention necessary to prevent things from turning into a physical altercation. What was described by the foster mother is, these children were returning from visits physically and emotionally hurt.

1

2

3

5

7

9 |

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now Ms. Bauer inherits this case in May of 2013. Maria, Michael, and Nathaniel are still in therapeutic foster care, with psychiatric services, weekly counseling with their counselor, special parenting needed for all three of these children. Is Mr. Faz any closer at this

point to resolving the housing issue? Well, what we're hearing is a lot of promissory. "I will get a three-bedroom, I'll get a four-bedroom. I recognize that Maria needs her own space. I recognize that Michael might need his own space. I will do this, I will do that." The problem is, we don't have anything now. We have nothing now. We have J.C. who's not getting therapeutic services, despite the fact that Mr. Faz has had insurance in place. We have three younger children that desperately need these therapeutic services in place.

1.0

And I think the testimony supported that Mr. Faz truly did not appreciate the level of supervision that these children need. Ms. Osier-Tatar testified Maria is still provocative with older men, definitely needs the line of sight. She's been diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder, sexual abuse. The sexual abuse and the post-traumatic stress disorder based on the abuse and witnessing the domestic violence, and yet, she's making significant improvement in the foster home. And Ms. Osier-Tatar testified that she needs to feel safe and secure and nurtured and protected. And one thing that the adoption workers were noting was that these kids had bonded with their current foster parents, and that is definitely a plus in terms of finding that forever home.

Maria was fearful of J.C. due to physical and sexual aggression. She feels guilt and shame, confused. She wants to be part of a family. She fears that Mr. Faz can't protect her. What Ms. Osier-Tatar testified is that she needs a permanent healthy attachment as soon as possible; she still perseverates over sexual issues. But I think the testimony was strong that these kids need a Michael still has his expressive language home now. disorder, which they're working on, adjustment disorder. He's got some emotional disregulation. He has expressed that J.C. did sexually abuse him in the home. He's also angry and fearful of J.C. He needs continued trauma-focused cognitive therapy, a stable home and attachment. Nathaniel has been diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder and reactive attachment He's demonstrated some behaviors -- it's not disorder. clear to me whether they were impulsive or sexualized or both. Ms. Osier-Tatar testified he was grabbing her breast, and I'll just let that behavior speak for itself.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So now we're at a length of time where we're four times the length of time which creates a legal presumption that termination of parental rights is in the child's best interests and that the father has made -- or that the parents have made token efforts to improve their

does need financial assistance, or did need financial assistance. And I understood his testimony — "Gosh, I could've paid my power bill, but Children's Cabinet said they were gonna do it, even though I could've paid it. Or I needed assistance with rent, but Social Services came in and said, 'we're gonna pay for more rent than you need.'" But now we're at a point where, in this court, can we say that these children are going to reunify within a predictable period of time? We have therapists that say these kids — or a therapist that says these children need permanency now. They desire permanency, they desire a family, and quite frankly, they need a forever family.

1.5

1.7

I don't know that the children have been well-served in their lives. I don't know if they've been well-served by the system. I don't think they were well-served by their parents. Social Services' position is, at this point these children need to be free for adoption. There are plenty of interested families out there. Social Services regularly finds families for children that have special needs. I think that, at this point, these children have been in care because of the parents' inability to provide basic needs, to provide for their special needs, the trauma that they face, the trauma

that Maria faces based on being a sexual abuse victim, and the trauma of the domestic violence witnessed in the home, watching people arrested in their home. These are tough, tough things. And it's difficult to say, gosh, the kids have all these needs, but we can find a home, but Social services is confident that they can find a home, and both of their adoption folks testified that these are adoptable children.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I think the fault grounds, any number of them usually reference failure to maintain proper care. well, these children have been in foster care. They have not had proper parental care and they have not had proper parental care for the last 55 months, if not longer. And then you look at things like failure of parental adjustment, and one of the key things is failure to correct circumstances within a reasonable period of time. Well, what's a reasonable period of time? Twelve months, 15 months, 18 months, 50 months? At this point, these children need a family and they need a family that can adapt to their needs. They need a home where they can be nurtured. They need a family where they feel safe and protected, and Social Services is confident they can provide such a home for these kids, but right now a substantial barrier to that is the parental rights of the father.

1.

1.7

I'm not saying what -- I can't say what the children's relationship with their father might look like in the future. That wasn't something that was before the Court. That's something that's dictated by the children's best interests, not by judicial proceedings at this point. And you might differ and that's okay; you're certainly entitled to do so, but at this point, your Honor, Social Services feels it's time.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Roth, please.

MR. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor.

The closing arguments in a bench case seems to be maybe not necessary, because you're well aware of what the witnesses have said today and you're also aware of the law, but I have an obligation to my client to go ahead and I intend to do that. Our argument is going to be based on the failure of the State to show clear and convincing evidence in several areas. One, that Washoe County Social Services has not met the standard of reasonable effort when it comes to Mr. Faz's hopeful reunification or attempt to reunify with the children. There's certainly no question that Washoe County Social Services has worked really diligently and hard to find out what the issues

with the children are and to correct those issues and to help the children, but I don't believe that there's been a showing by clear and convincing evidence that their efforts to help Mr. Faz rectify the conditions that led to the children being taken from his home in the first place meets the standard of reasonable effort. That's one issue.

Number two, we have a jurisdictional basis and then dispositional grounds that need to be considered, and I don't believe that the jurisdictional issue has been shown beyond clear and convincing evidence, and I'll try to explain that later.

Number three, I believe there is case law that says that if there has been reasonable time to remedy the condition which led to the children being taken from the home, that that then satisfies the situation and termination should not occur, if these changes have been made. In the case at hand, I would point out that Mr. Faz had the children taken away for various reasons, including the home not being clean, another person there who was using drugs, and you know all the reasons, but if you look at the record, you'll see that, today, those conditions do not exist. Those conditions have been remedied and those are the conditions that led to the children being taken

out of the home and, therefore, no termination should result, because he's corrected those.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

NRS 128.090 states Nevada's strong policy favoring the preservation of families, as it commands the Court to require the petitioner to establish by facts clear and convincing evidence, after a full and careful consideration to all of the evidence presented. apparently that's the standard, clear and convincing evidence that needs to be presented, with the dominant purpose, of course, being looking at what is in the best interests of the children. Termination of parental rights is recognized as tantamount to the imposition of a civil death penalty, as was stated in the Durrey versus Lyon case, 105 Nevada 430, and it must be invoked only under the strictest conditions. In Champagne versus Walther, 100 Nevada 640, it was stated that there's a fundamental liberty interest in the natural parents and in the care, custody, and management of their children, and that does not evaporate simply because the parent has not been a I believe that in the Smith case, Smith model parent. versus Smith, 102 Nevada 263, that was also reinforced. Furthermore, in NRS 128.105, which provides certain grounds upon which termination would be appropriate, it pretty well gives the list in requiring a finding that the conduct of the parent demonstrates one of the following, then it lists there — and you know that list as well as I do, but I see abandonment, I see neglect, I see unfitness, I see failure of parental adjustment, risk of serious physical or mental harm, and token efforts.

1.2

I think we can scratch out the abandonment of the child. I don't think we can say that Mr. Faz abandoned his children. I don't think we can do that.

Did he neglect the children? Perhaps he did at the beginning, but those neglect issues were remedied by him when he took interest in doing what was asked of him regarding the children and being attentive to their needs by going to their medical appointments, their psychological appointments, and also their school programs.

Is he unfit as a parent? I don't believe so.

I think if we say that he's an unfit parent, it contrasts with what the Division has said in regard to the three children that were returned to him. He does have the ability. He does know how to be a parent. He's not an unfit parent.

Has he failed to make parental adjustments?
Well, perhaps you can argue that, but has it been shown by clear and convincing evidence that that is the case? I

think if there has been a failure, it's not what I would call a real failure, but I think more a misunderstanding, that he has his own ideas and has imposed them or wishes to, that he would like to have those be the adjustments made. But he has not failed in them. He has not failed.

1.0

1.2

1.7

The fifth one is the risk of serious physical, mental, or emotional injury to the child if he or she were to be returned. And I think that is really the primary issue that we have to look at today, because Maria is such a lovely little girl, who has a lot of demands and needs, and yet she is the only girl out of these five boys and it must be tough. I can imagine that it would be very tough, but I think Mr. Faz has recognized what her needs are. He doesn't treat her as a bad person. He calls her his princess. He wanted to have more time with her; he requested more time, and apparently that didn't work out. It wasn't his fault, but he wasn't granted that permission.

There is a risk, there certainly is a risk of her being hurt if she's returned to Mr. Faz, and that is because of the issue between -- well, there may be two issues. It may be J.C.'s issue with the sexual problem, and then also maybe a deeper emotional issue that Maria has concerning her feeling of femininity, her wanting to

be part of a group of women, and being recognized as an individual person. Those are the two, I think, big things that have to be considered. As far as the issue with the sexuality, I think that Mr. Faz realizes that has to be addressed very seriously. He's definitely trying to get J.C. to see Dr. Hargrove and to try to improve that situation. I think it's something that can be shown that he is working on and it is something that can be overcome. And incidentally, any new home that Maria would go to would face a lot of those issues too, in trying to determine whether she can adjust to the family and is she going to be outgrowing these incidents where she does things inappropriately at school. And I don't think that any damage -- "damage" is not the word, but any degree of lack of interest or showing that there is a big risk has been shown by clear and convincing evidence.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, only token efforts — I'm sure that I don't need to go into that, but my client certainly has shown more than token efforts. He's communicated with the children, he's tried to avoid being an unfit parent, and he is willing to take into consideration all the special needs of the children, to work with them and work with any therapist that would need to be employed to do that.

The Supreme Court in Nevada has pretty carefully

defined the appropriate analysis in determining whether an individual's parental rights should be terminated and they have specifically said there must be jurisdictional grounds. That means there must be some specific condition or fault directly related to the parent. And then dispositional grounds, those are to be considered concerning what is in the best interests of the children in this case. And all this should be considered when terminating parental rights and it must be determined by clear and convincing evidence. And, again, I'm citing the Champagne versus Walther case, 100 Nevada 640. If it can be shown that the biological parent has done things to not fall within the five or six listed categories in NRS 128.105, then there is no violation of the standard and the parent should be reunited with their child, and that's our position as far as Mr. Faz is concerned.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

It seems like the petitioner has to bear the burden of proof, both as to the jurisdictional and the dispositional grounds. As far as we go here — if we go to the dispositional grounds, we have to consider the prospect of success in the new adoptive home versus returning to Mr. Faz's home, where there are people who have worked with the children, who know the children, where the children are returned to their siblings and will

be working in the school system that they're used to and doing things that they're familiar with, versus being sent off someplace else and, again, maybe the chance of a — quote, unquote — forever home not turning out properly.

The Nevada Supreme Court has indicated the considerations set forth in NRS 128.105, including abandonment, unfitness of the parent, abuse, and a rather hazy and redundant consideration, the phrase "only token efforts by the parent to avoid abandonment, neglect, unfitness, or abuse," and that is the one that says "token efforts." And, again, I believe that Mr. Faz throughout this whole lengthy period has tried to help and he has done so to the best of his ability. He's done so with the best of his background and his knowledge and the income that he has. He is willing to continue to do that and even promote that in a faster manner, if he were reunited with his children.

The issues that I have mentioned certainly are -- well, they've been brought out over a long period of time, the 55 months that Mr. Martin spoke of, but you know what, we have six children here that we're dealing with. Six of them, not just one or two, and they each have a complicated, complex personality, with issues that are -- you know, they're beyond what the normal kid would

have. These are complex children, and certainly it's taken a great deal of time, but for the amount of children and amount of problems that they've had, I think the work has been justified, the work has been reasonable, the work has been helpful to the children and even to Mr. Faz. I don't think that the amount of time is a reason to terminate. It's not a reason to terminate. Time may be a reason to move forward to address the issue of termination, but it certainly can't be an issue for termination, and the statute doesn't say that it is either.

1.1

There are other things that I guess I could go into and rehash the history of this matter, but I know that you know them as well as I do. I know that you'll look at the facts of this case and see that the clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Faz has failed and that he is not using his efforts to reunify with his children just aren't there. They're not there, and we would ask you to dismiss the petition, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Final word, if you wish?

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, your Honor. Yes, I do.

I believe that the Supreme Court, in terms of the jurisdictional and dispositional argument, has done away with that distinction, at least in regard to parental fault and best interests. And why would that be? Because the Nevada Supreme Court has found that best interests and parental fault are not easily separated. Philosophically, you try to, but they just tend to bleed together, because, ultimately, if the purpose is best interests, yes, you do have to show parental fault, but ultimately the primary purpose of this proceeding is best interests. So it's not a question of you have to answer Question A to get to Question B.

5

THE COURT: That used to be the case in Nevada, until Champagne was overruled.

MR. MARTIN: That is correct, your Honor. And I'm aware that you know that, but I need to --

THE COURT: Make your own record.

MR. MARTIN: I need to make my own record. Thank you, your Honor.

One of the things I wanted to address — and I'll be brief, your Honor — is when they talk about the failure of Social Services to provide reasonable efforts, but if you look at NRS 128.109, which discusses the presumptions, it indicates that those presumptions are not overcome by the State's failure to provide services. Now, in fact, this case went to termination at 15 months. I

think Ms. Bauer testified that in the process of a case, it involves continual reassessment of merit to determine viability for reunification, but that allegation that "government agencies weren't cooperating with me, Social Services wasn't cooperating with me," as a matter of law, does not overcome the best interest presumption and it does not overcome the token efforts presumption.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I think one of the primary importance, no matter how much we say, "Well, gosh, we're close. We're gonna get this three, four-bedroom house, we're gonna get this apartment, we're gonna get -- you know, things are going to happen in the future that's gonna fall together," but at this moment, can Mr. Faz provide a safe and appropriate place for his children? Now, his children -all of his children have pretty extensive special needs, and some of them may be not related to their home environment, but some of them are. Some of them involve Maria being sexually abused; going back to the beginning, inappropriate supervision and Timothy sexually acted out on Maria, or we have a child witnessing domestic violence in the home, or, as stated in the petition, Mr. Faz has had Ms. Faz care for the children, despite that awareness of using methamphetamine. So, yes, these children all have extraordinary needs, and I think the evidence has

demonstrated that they've led pretty chaotic lives and I think the system owes it to them to do the best we can to get them into the best home, into a forever home. And I would submit to the Court that that forever home is closer at this point than the home with Mr. Faz, a safe and appropriate home where children feel safe, where children feel protected.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I haven't even looked at the exhibits. So, obviously, this has to be subject of a written order. A couple things: I will be considering only the grounds that were pled in the petition. Abandonment, for instance, as you said, couldn't be shown. Well, it wasn't even pled. So the order will cover only the grounds that the county actually pled and the others will not be covered by me in that written order. I feel myself limited to that.

This is my third termination trial in four weeks. I'm finishing the second order. I have to finish that before I start on this one. So it's been a pretty busy time, and I have to go to St. Paul at the beginning of next week. I know, though — I can't imagine sitting in your shoes. I've only been away on one case, and it was probably very insightful to realize how anxious it is

while you're waiting for the answer. So I appreciate that Mr. Faz is waiting for the answer. I will get it done as soon as humanly possible, with the care that it deserves, given what's at stake here. In no event will it ever go beyond 30 days. Can I make it a whole lot shorter than that? I'll try, but I promise you, it will not go beyond 30 days, no matter what the other circumstances are that are happening.

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I will also just say -- I have a little colloguy just a little bit about the Champagne case. Even though the Nevada Supreme Court has said, "We don't do it exactly that way," fault has got to be shown. I just don't want to lose that point, because I think constitutionally you have a right to parent your children under the U.S. constitution. My reading of that law, even though the Nevada Supreme Court said these things meld together, it doesn't mean that either one of them is eliminated. They've both got to be shown, or else, constitutionally, there's no basis to interfere in someone's parental relationship. So fault's got to be found, even though it's a more -- it's probably more politically correct to say complicated analysis. I think it's a little more muddy, the way it's put together in the law now, but both of those things have to be part of the

analysis and will be. So I will be answering the allegations that were pled, which are most of the grounds in the statute, but not all, and the ones that I don't talk about, it's because they actually weren't pled by Social Services. And, again, I'll do so as quickly as I can.

1.0

I would like to thank you all. This is extremely difficult. I think you have been quite civil and appropriate in your presentation. I can't necessarily say that about the other trials I've had over the last couple months, which were much more difficult in the way the courtroom was handled. I appreciate both of you handling it as you did, and unless either of you have anything else you need to say, it will be under submission and we'll go off the record.

MR. ROTH: I'd just like to thank you for your patience, your Honor.

THE COURT: I found it easy to be patient in this trial because of the way you presented yourselves. Actually, in one of the trials I had to apologize, because I thought I had been not as patient as I usually am, and I actually said so as we ended. The two of you have made it easy to be so. So thank you for that.

We'll be in recess.

STATE OF NEVADA ) SS. COUNTY OF WASHOE )

I, ROMONA McGINNIS, official reporter of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of Washoe, do hereby certify:

That as such reporter, I transcribed the bench trial that occurred before the Honorable Deborah Schumacher on Thursday, August 14, 2014, at 9:00 a.m. of said day, and I then and there took verbatim stenotype notes of the proceedings had and testimony given therein in the Matter of Parental Rights as to MARIA FAZ, MICHAEL FAZ, and NATHANIEL FAZ, Minor Children, Case No. FV11-02393.

That the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages numbered 1 to 111, both inclusive, is a full, true and correct transcript of my said stenotype notes and is a full, true and correct statement of the proceedings had and testimony given upon the Bench Trial in the above-entitled action to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

DATED: At Reno, Nevada, this 15th day of April, 2015.

Romona McGinnis

ROMONA McGINNIS, CCR #269

1	CODE
2	
3	
4	
5	IN THE FAMILY DIVISION
6	IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
7	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE
8	
9	
10	IN RE PARENTAL RIGHTS AS TO Case. No.: FV11-02393
11	MARIA FAZ, MICHAEL FAZ &
12	NATHANIEL FAZ, Dept. 5
13	Minor Children.
[4	
15	
	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS
15	
15 16	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS
15 16 17	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS  On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe
15 16 17 18	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS  On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus
15 16 17 18 19	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS  On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus  Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's  Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to
15 16 17 18 19	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS  On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus  Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's  Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to  relinquishing her parental rights. Ms. Faz was represented by Michael Mahaffey, Esq.
15 16 17 18 19	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS  On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus  Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's  Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to  relinquishing her parental rights. Ms. Faz was represented by Michael Mahaffey, Esq.  during the stipulation process. This trial proceeded against the Father only.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS  On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus  Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's  Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to  relinquishing her parental rights. Ms. Faz was represented by Michael Mahaffey, Esq.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS  On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus  Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's  Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to  relinquishing her parental rights. Ms. Faz was represented by Michael Mahaffey, Esq.  during the stipulation process. This trial proceeded against the Father only.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS  On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus  Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's  Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to  relinquishing her parental rights. Ms. Faz was represented by Michael Mahaffey, Esq.  during the stipulation process. This trial proceeded against the Father only.  WCDSS appeared through social worker Julia Bauer and was represented by Chief  Deputy District Attorney Jeffrey Martin. Mr. Faz appeared personally and through Michael
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS  On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus  Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's  Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to  relinquishing her parental rights. Ms. Faz was represented by Michael Mahaffey, Esq.  during the stipulation process. This trial proceeded against the Father only.  WCDSS appeared through social worker Julia Bauer and was represented by Chief

Van Ness Roth, Esq. The children's Court Appointed Special Advocate ("CASA"), Katie
Sullivan, was required by family emergency to be absent from the court but provided
testimony via telephone.

This case is unusual and difficult. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel have three older siblings with whom Mr. Faz successfully reunified after the older children had a lengthy stay in foster care. Mr. Faz and the three older boys live in a 2 bedroom apartment that Mr. Faz obtained in 2013. Despite this successful reunification, WCDSS argues that Mr. Faz cannot successfully reunify with the three youngest children. This is a position rarely taken and perhaps even more rarely sustained.

The five eldest Faz children had previously been in foster care between 2005 and 2007. With the addition of the after-born Nathaniel, the Faz children returned to foster care in January 2010. The reasons for the 2010 removal of the children were Ms. Faz's incarceration and ongoing methamphetamine use, the unsafe condition of the home due to clutter, garbage and old food, the loss of power to the home and imminent eviction, and Mr. Faz's inability to articulate a long-term plan for the children's supervision and care.

Ms. Faz was unable to ameliorate the substance abuse and other issues that made her an unfit parent. Mr. and Ms. Faz separated after the children's second removal by child protective services. Although reunification efforts were initially extended to both parents, over time WCDSS looked only to Mr. Faz as the parent with whom the children might be reunified successfully.

The children's foster care case dragged on through many review hearings and many years with minimal positive progress. Mr. Faz struggled with the same basic needs issues

that had been one of the reasons for the children's removal from his care. More
specifically, Mr. Faz struggled to obtain minimally adequate income and appropriate
housing for his children. Mr. Faz resided in a motel room for two years of the case, which
was a residence unsuitable for the children due to size and lack of privacy. The children
lingered with an uncertain future. The Court appreciated the difficulties but questioned Mr.
Faz's diligence and/or capacity to truly solve these problems.

The Court, however, never questioned Mr. Faz's love for his children. Mr. Faz was regular and constant in his contact and visitation with his children. The size of the sibling group and the bond that Mr. Faz nurtured through his constancy led the children's advocate, for years, to recommend against termination of parental rights. The same facts led the Court to extend reunification opportunities to Mr. Faz far longer than the approximate year that is provided for by the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act and parallel Nevada law in Nevada Revised Statutes ("NRS"), Chapter 432B. At the time of trial, Maria, Michael and Nathaniel had been in foster care for 54 of the last 54 months.

NRS 128.105 provides that the primary consideration in a termination of parental rights case is whether severing the parents' rights serves the children's best interest. Further, by statute grounded in Constitutional principles, it is necessary that parental fault be shown before a person's fundamental right to parent can be stripped away. NRS 128.105(2).

The Petitioner must carry its burden of proof regarding parental fault and children's best interest by clear and convincing evidence. NRS 128.105 through 128.109, inclusive, state mandatory considerations in a termination action.

ኃዩ

Pursuant to NRS 128.109, the fact that Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz have been in foster care for 54 consecutive months creates the following applicable presumptions: (1) that Mr. Faz has made only token efforts under NRS 125.105(f), and (2) that it is in the children's best interest that Mr. Faz's rights be terminated. These presumptions are rebuttable.

I

Mr. Faz did not rebut the presumption that it is in Maria's, Nathaniel's and Michael's best interest that his rights be terminated. Most fundamentally, Mr. Faz failed to show that there is a reasonable prospect, in a reasonable and foreseeable period of time, that he could provide for the basic needs of any number of additional children. As discussed above, more than three years elapsed between the inception of the most recent foster care case and Mr. Faz obtaining minimally appropriate housing within which to reunify with his three eldest children. In response to his counsel's questioning about potential housing to accommodate three more children, he testified that he "will look into" low income housing. He receives social security disability payments for two of the children now in his custody, but stated that he does not receive but "will check" on the availability of food stamps. This testimony is vague, insubstantial and not reassuring, in the context of the glacial pace of progress of the juvenile dependency case.

The evidence established that Mr. Faz is maintaining the reunified older children's basic food and shelter needs, but that the household situation is tenuous when any additional strain or need occurs. Specifically, he testified that one of his reunified sons was not receiving recommended therapeutic care due to lack of funds. Further, the evidence established that, when another of his sons had a medical procedure which caused Mr. Faz

to have reduced work hours, the Faz household utilized financial assistance from WCDSS.

Given the extraordinary length of this case, Maria, Michael and Nathaniel regrettably have been assigned numerous social workers, at least three of whom have gone on to different positions either in or out of WCDSS, and a variety of other adults have come and gone in their lives. Formerly and presently assigned social workers, foster parents and clinical providers all provided testimony regarding the special needs, diagnoses and behavioral issues of Maria, Michael and Nathaniel. The most comprehensive testimony was provided by Danielle Osier-Tater, a Marriage and Family Therapist who has been licensed for over twenty years. Ms. Osier-Tater provided services to these children from April 2012 to July 2014, when she left the Koinania organization, through which she had been providing services to the Faz children.

Per Ms. Osier-Tater, Maria initially received diagnoses of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder ("PTSD"), depressive disorder NOS (not otherwise specified), sexual abuse of a child and reactive attachment disorder ("RAD"). Among the causes of Maria's psychiatric issues, according to her therapist, was Maria's sexual abuse by her older brother, who is one of her older siblings who has been reunified with Mr. Faz. Ms. Osier-Tater testified that Maria needs safety, validation of her perceptions and emotions, nurturing and protective caregivers. Maria's therapist testified that Maria is confused regarding her relationship with Mr. Faz; she both wants a family but fears he would not protect her and is afraid of his anger. Ms. Osier-Tater stated that Maria needs a healthy attachment to a permanent caregiver as soon as possible. Ms. Osier-Tater conveyed strongly her fear for Maria's long-term emotional and mental health if these conditions were not met promptly.

More specifically, Ms. Osier-Tater is concerned about how Maria's "anger and self-loathing"
will play out across her life and about a re-emergence of age-inappropriate sexual conduct.

Ms. Osier-Tater indicated that Maria struggles with guilt and shame related to her sexual
victimization.

Per Ms. Osier-Tater, Michael had received the following diagnoses in a neuropsychological assessment performed by Dr. Suzanne Aberasturri (who also testified): Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, adjustment disorder, expressive language disorder, and learning disorder, NOS. At the time of her first contact with Michael, he demonstrated aggressiveness to siblings and others, irritability and temper tantrums apparently related to inability to communicate effectively. Ms. Osier-Tater stated that he had "extreme" difficulty in "self-advocating". He disclosed in therapy that he also had been sexually molested by his older brother, who presently lives with Mr. Faz. Ms. Osier-Tater testified that Michael needs patient, stable and predictable caregivers and a home in which learning disabilities are understood and educational advocacy provided. His therapist stated that Michael has made slow progress.

Per Ms. Osier-Tater, Nathaniel had been given the following diagnoses by Dr.

Aberasturri: Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, adjustment disorder, and

(provisionally) Reactive Attachment Disorder. She stated that she added the diagnosis of

Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. At the beginning of her work with him, Ms. Osier-Tater

stated Nathaniel showed impulsivity, high distractibility, physical aggression, liable and

explosive moods, some sexual behaviors and safety issues, such as darting into traffic. He

also had hurt animals in the foster home. Ms. Osier-Tater testified that Nathaniel needs a

home where he will receive line-of-sight supervision and low stimulation (i.e., not a large number of other children). The home must be very structured and the routine predictable, and his sense of safety must be fostered. Ms. Osier-Tater stated that she is also deeply worried about his future if his needs are not met.

As outlined above, the evidence at trial established that each of the three children has significant special needs. To rebut the presumption that termination of his rights serves the children's best interest, the evidence would have had to show some likelihood (in a reasonable time) that Mr. Faz could meet the basic needs and special needs of these three children. Mr. Faz did not provide evidence sufficient to show either kind of need would be met seasonably. To the contrary, multiple witnesses testified to their belief that Mr. Faz minimized Maria's and Michael's sexual victimization and failed to provide or understand the need for close supervision of the children during visitation. The evidence established that Ms. Faz had termed Maria's concerns as "psychobabble".

As previously stated, the evidence established that Mr. Faz was not currently meeting the therapeutic needs of one of the children in his home. This failure leads to the reasonable concern that he would not or could not meet the very serious special needs of these children.

Mr. Faz proposes to reunify all of his children (in a physical location not presently obtained.) He provided no plausible plan for assuring the safety of sexual abuse victims from the perpetrator, all of whom would reside together. It is important to note that this is a discussion of safety only in the most superficial way, i.e., whether there would be opportunities for additional physical victimization. It does not encompass the children's

ኃዩ

need for emotional and psychological safety. Mr. Faz presently no evidence that Maria
and Michael would not be harmed emotionally or psychologically by sharing a home with
the brother who sexually assaulted them. According to her Court Appointed Special
Advocate, Maria wishes to not even see this brother. According to Ms. Osier-Tater, Maria
doubts her Father's willingness or ability to keep her safe and, further, that personal safety
is one of Maria's deepest needs.

Lindsey Maurins, an adoption recruitment worker with WCDSS, testified that the children's legal status, i.e., their parents' rights being intact, is a significant barrier to the successful recruitment of a prospective adoptive home for Maria, Michael and Nathaniel. Put plainly, the Court has been told that most prospective adoptive parents prefer to be matched with children where the legal issue of their availability to be adopted has been settled.

The Court Appointed Special Advocate recommended that the children be freed for adoption. She stated that her opinion was based partly on the children's great need for individual attention. She testified that she doubted that there was sufficient physical space or adequate resources for their needs to be met in Mr. Faz's home, where he would then be parenting six children. She also raised the issue of safety.

Based on the foregoing described evidence, and all evidence presented at trial, the Court finds the following with respect to parental fault.

Clear and convincing evidence demonstrates that there has been a failure of parental adjustment (NRS 128.105(2)(d)) by Jesus Faz. He has no demonstrated current or future ability to meet either the basic needs or special needs of Maria, Michael or

N:	ath	hai	nie	ə١
131	чи		111	

Clear and convincing evidence establishes that there is a risk of serious injury to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel if they were returned to Jesus Faz's home (NRS 128.105(2)(e)) because it is the home of a sibling who is a sexual perpetrator and there is no viable plan to assure their safety, and, further, that this perpetrator is presently not receiving therapeutic services because Mr. Faz stated he cannot afford to obtain them.

Clear and convincing evidence establishes that Jesus Faz is an unfit parent (NRS 128.105(2)(c)) because he has failed, over a period of three years, to provide Maria, Michael and Nathaniel with proper care and support. Even as late as the days of trial, Mr. Faz's testimony was that he was looking into housing and food stamps. This is too little too late and not the effort and advocacy these children need to assure their basic and special needs are met.

Clear and convincing evidence establishes that Jesus Faz has neglected Maria, Michael and Nathaniel. NRS 128.105(b). Mr. Faz has neglected or refused to provide the necessary subsistence for his children, either through private employment or securing public benefits. See also NRS 128.106(8).

Jesus Faz's weak efforts to stabilize his circumstances over a very long foster case provided no basis for the Court to find that he had rebutted the presumption applicable under NRS 128.109, that he has made only token efforts to care for these children pursuant to NRS 128.105(2)(f).

Therefore, the Court finds that multiple grounds of parental fault were established by clear and convincing evidence. The Court also finds that clear and convincing evidence

*Z |* 

establishes that the best interest of Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz will be served by
termination of Mr. Faz's rights, so that they may obtain a permanent home that will meet
their needs and give them the best chance to obtain healthy lives.

It is ordered that Jesus Faz's parental rights are terminated as to Maria Faz, Michael Faz, and Nathaniel Faz.

Upon the extinction of Pennie Faz's rights, Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz's custody is vested with Washoe County Department of Social Services, which has the authority to place the children for, and consent to, their adoption.

10 NOTICE

PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF ORDER: THE ABDUCTION, CONCEALMENT OR DETENTION OF A CHILD IN VIOLATION OF THIS ORDER IS PUNISHABLE AS A CATEGORY D FELONY AS PROVIDED IN NRS 193.130. NRS 200.359 provides that every person having a limited right of custody to a child or any parent having no right of custody to the child who willfully detains, conceals or removes the child from a parent, guardian or other person having lawful custody or a right of visitation of the child in violation of an order of this court, or removes the child from the jurisdiction of the court without the consent of either the court or all persons who have the right to custody or visitation is subject to being punished for a category D felony as provided in NRS 193.130.

Pursuant to NRS 125.510(7) the terms of the Hague Convention of October 25, 1980, adopted by the 14th Session of the Hague Conference on Private International Law, apply if a

ኃዩ

1	parent abducts or wrongfully retains a child in a	foreign country.
2	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
3		
4		
5	Dated: Aug. 24, 2014	$\sim$
6	7 0 1, 20.1	() M
7		DISTRICT JUDGE
8		•
9		
10		
11		
12 13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26	11	
27	£ 1	
28		

# I certify that I am an employee of the Second Judicial District Court and that on the day of Aphroder, 2014, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court system which will send a notice of electronic filing to following: Jeffrey Martin, Chief Deputy District Attorney Michael Roth, Esq. Michael Mahaffey, Esq.

ļ

2540 1 Jeffrey Martin Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar No. 7080 P.O. Box 11130 3 Reno, Nevada 89520 (775) 337-5700 4 Attorneys for Petitioner 5 б IN THE FAMILY DIVISION 7 OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 8 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE 9 IN THE MATTER OF PARENTAL RIGHTS: ) 10 as to, Case No. FV11-02393 11 MARIA FAZ, MICHAEL FAZ and Dept. No. 5 12 NATHANIEL FAZ, 13 MINOR CHILDREN. 14 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER 15 16 Pennie Faz; Mike Mahaffey, Esq., for Ms. Faz; Jesus Faz; Michael Roth, Esq., for Mr. Faz: 17 YOU AND EACH OF YOU WILL PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an ORDER 18 TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS was entered in the above entitled matter 19 on the 24th day of September, 2014, a copy of which is attached hereto. 20 Dated this 24th day of September, 2014. 21 RICHARD A, GAMMICK 22 Washoe County District Attorney 23 Ву:\_ /s/ Jeffrey Martin 24 Jeffrey Martin Chief Deputy District Attorney 25 Attorney for Petitioner 26

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of the Office of the District Attorney of Washoe County, over the age of 21 years and not a party to nor interested in the within action. On the 24<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2014, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court system which will send a notice of electronic filing to following: Mike Mahaffey, Esq.

Michael Roth, Esq.

θ

AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239b.030

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the social security number of any person.

/s/ L. Todd L. Todd

FILE D
Electronically
2014-09-24 11:55:20 AM
Joey Orduna Hasilings
Clerk of the Court
Transaction # 4621766

1	CODE
2	
3	
4	
5	IN THE FAMILY DIVISION
6	IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
7	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE
8	
9	
10	IN RE PARENTAL RIGHTS AS TO Case. No.: FV11-02393
11	MARIA FAZ, MICHAEL FAZ &
12	NATHANIEL FAZ, Dept. 5
13	Minor Children.
14	
15	ODDED TEDMINATING DABENTAL DIGUTE
15 16	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS
	ORDER TERMINATING PARENTAL RIGHTS  On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe
16	
16 17	On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe
16 17 18 19 20	On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus
16 17 18 19 20 21	On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus  Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's  Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to relinquishing her parental rights. Ms. Faz was represented by Michael Mahaffey, Esq.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus  Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's  Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to  relinquishing her parental rights. Ms. Faz was represented by Michael Mahaffey, Esq.  during the stipulation process. This trial proceeded against the Father only.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to relinquishing her parental rights. Ms. Faz was represented by Michael Mahaffey, Esq. during the stipulation process. This trial proceeded against the Father only. WCDSS appeared through social worker Julia Bauer and was represented by Chief
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus  Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's  Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to  relinquishing her parental rights. Ms. Faz was represented by Michael Mahaffey, Esq.  during the stipulation process. This trial proceeded against the Father only.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to relinquishing her parental rights. Ms. Faz was represented by Michael Mahaffey, Esq. during the stipulation process. This trial proceeded against the Father only. WCDSS appeared through social worker Julia Bauer and was represented by Chief
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	On August 11, 12, 13 and 14, 2014, a trial occurred on the Petition of Washoe  County Department of Social Services (WCDSS) to terminate the parental rights of Jesus  Faz (Mr. Faz) to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel's  Mother, Penny Faz, stipulated to a default being entered against her in this action and to  relinquishing her parental rights. Ms. Faz was represented by Michael Mahaffey, Esq.  during the stipulation process. This trial proceeded against the Father only.  WCDSS appeared through social worker Julia Bauer and was represented by Chief  Deputy District Attorney Jeffrey Martin. Mr. Faz appeared personally and through Michael

Van Ness Roth, Esq. The children's Court Appointed Special Advocate ("CASA"), Katie Sullivan, was required by family emergency to be absent from the court but provided 2 testimony via telephone. This case is unusual and difficult. Maria, Michael and Nathaniel have three older siblings with whom Mr. Faz successfully reunified after the older children had a lengthy stay in foster care. Mr. Faz and the three older boys live in a 2 bedroom apartment that Mr. Faz obtained in 2013. Despite this successful reunification, WCDSS argues that Mr. Faz cannot successfully reunify with the three youngest children. This is a position rarely 9 10 taken and perhaps even more rarely sustained. 11 The five eldest Faz children had previously been in foster care between 2005 and 12 2007. With the addition of the after-born Nathaniel, the Faz children returned to foster care 13 in January 2010. The reasons for the 2010 removal of the children were Ms. Faz's 14 incarceration and ongoing methamphetamine use, the unsafe condition of the home due to 1.5 16 clutter, garbage and old food, the loss of power to the home and imminent eviction, and 17 Mr. Faz's inability to articulate a long-term plan for the children's supervision and care.

Ms. Faz was unable to ameliorate the substance abuse and other issues that made her an unfit parent. Mr. and Ms. Faz separated after the children's second removal by child protective services. Although reunification efforts were initially extended to both parents, over time WCDSS looked only to Mr. Faz as the parent with whom the children might be reunified successfully.

The children's foster care case dragged on through many review hearings and many years with minimal positive progress. Mr. Faz struggled with the same basic needs issues

27

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

that had been one of the reasons for the children's removal from his care. More 1 specifically, Mr. Faz struggled to obtain minimally adequate income and appropriate 2 housing for his children. Mr. Faz resided in a motel room for two years of the case, which was a residence unsultable for the children due to size and lack of privacy. The children lingered with an uncertain future. The Court appreciated the difficulties but questioned Mr. Faz's diligence and/or capacity to truly solve these problems. The Court, however, never questioned Mr. Faz's love for his children. Mr. Faz was regular and constant in his contact and visitation with his children. The size of the sibling group and the bond that Mr. Faz nurtured through his constancy led the children's advocate, for years, to recommend against termination of parental rights. The same facts

led the Court to extend reunification opportunities to Mr. Faz far longer than the

approximate year that is provided for by the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act and

parallel Nevada law in Nevada Revised Statutes ("NRS"), Chapter 432B. At the time of

trial, Maria, Michael and Nathaniel had been in foster care for 54 of the last 54 months.

NRS 128.105 provides that the primary consideration in a termination of parental rights case is whether severing the parents' rights serves the children's best interest. Further, by statute grounded in Constitutional principles, it is necessary that parental fault be shown before a person's fundamental right to parent can be stripped away. NRS 128.105(2).

The Petitioner must carry its burden of proof regarding parental fault and children's best interest by clear and convincing evidence. NRS 128.105 through 128.109, inclusive, state mandatory considerations in a termination action.

26

8

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

つ章

Pursuant to NRS 128.109, the fact that Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz have been in foster care for 54 consecutive months creates the following applicable presumptions: (1) that Mr. Faz has made only token efforts under NRS 125.105(f), and (2) that it is in the children's best interest that Mr. Faz's rights be terminated. These presumptions are rebuttable.

Mr. Faz did not rebut the presumption that it is in Maria's, Nathaniel's and Michael's best interest that his rights be terminated. Most fundamentally, Mr. Faz failed to show that there is a reasonable prospect, in a reasonable and foreseeable period of time, that he could provide for the basic needs of any number of additional children. As discussed above, more than three years elapsed between the inception of the most recent foster care case and Mr. Faz obtaining minimally appropriate housing within which to reunify with his three eldest children. In response to his counsel's questioning about potential housing to accommodate three more children, he testified that he "will look into" low income housing. He receives social security disability payments for two of the children now in his custody, but stated that he does not receive but "will check" on the availability of food stamps. This testimony is vague, insubstantial and not reassuring, in the context of the glacial pace of progress of the juvenile dependency case.

The evidence established that Mr. Faz is maintaining the reunified older children's basic food and shelter needs, but that the household situation is tenuous when any additional strain or need occurs. Specifically, he testified that one of his reunified sons was not receiving recommended therapeutic care due to lack of funds. Further, the evidence

established that, when another of his sons had a medical procedure which caused Mr. Faz

\_\_\_\_

ንጀ

to have reduced work hours, the Faz household utilized financial assistance from WCDSS.

Given the extraordinary length of this case, Maria, Michael and Nathaniel regrettably have been assigned numerous social workers, at least three of whom have gone on to different positions either in or out of WCDSS, and a variety of other adults have come and gone in their lives. Formerly and presently assigned social workers, foster parents and clinical providers all provided testimony regarding the special needs, diagnoses and behavioral issues of Maria, Michael and Nathaniel. The most comprehensive testimony was provided by Danielle Osier-Tater, a Marriage and Family Therapist who has been licensed for over twenty years. Ms. Osler-Tater provided services to these children from April 2012 to July 2014, when she left the Koinania organization, through which she had been providing services to the Faz children.

Per Ms. Osier-Tater, Maria initially received diagnoses of Post Traumatic Stress
Disorder ("PTSD"), depressive disorder NOS (not otherwise specified), sexual abuse of a
child and reactive attachment disorder ("RAD"). Among the causes of Maria's psychiatric
issues, according to her therapist, was Maria's sexual abuse by her older brother, who is
one of her older siblings who has been reunified with Mr. Faz. Ms. Osier-Tater testified
that Maria needs safety, validation of her perceptions and emotions, nurturing and
protective caregivers. Maria's therapist testified that Maria is confused regarding her
relationship with Mr. Faz; she both wants a family but fears he would not protect her and is
afraid of his anger. Ms. Osier-Tater stated that Maria needs a healthy attachment to a
permanent caregiver as soon as possible. Ms. Osier-Tater conveyed strongly her fear for
Maria's long-term emotional and mental health if these conditions were not met promptly.

. 16

ጋዩ

More specifically, Ms. Osier-Tater is concerned about how Maria's "anger and self-loathing" ı will play out across her life and about a re-emergence of age-inappropriate sexual conduct. 2 3 Ms. Osier-Tater indicated that Maria struggles with guilt and shame related to her sexual 4 victimization. Per Ms. Osier-Tater, Michael had received the following diagnoses in a neuropsychological assessment performed by Dr. Suzanne Aberasturri (who also testified): 7 Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, adjustment disorder, expressive language disorder, and learning disorder, NOS. At the time of her first contact with Michael, he 10 demonstrated aggressiveness to siblings and others, irritability and temper tantrums 11 apparently related to inability to communicate effectively. Ms. Osier-Tater stated that he 12 had "extreme" difficulty in "self-advocating". He disclosed in therapy that he also had been 13 sexually molested by his older brother, who presently lives with Mr. Faz. Ms. Osier-Tater testified that Michael needs patient, stable and predictable caregivers and a home in which 15 learning disabilities are understood and educational advocacy provided. His therapist 17 stated that Michael has made slow progress. 18 Per Ms. Osier-Tater, Nathaniel had been given the following diagnoses by Dr. 19 Aberasturri: Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, adjustment disorder, and 20 (provisionally) Reactive Attachment Disorder. She stated that she added the diagnosis of 21 Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. At the beginning of her work with him, Ms. Osier-Tater 22 23 stated Nathaniel showed impulsivity, high distractibility, physical aggression, liable and

6

explosive moods, some sexual behaviors and safety issues, such as darting into traffic. He

also had hurt animals in the foster home. Ms. Osier-Tater testified that Nathaniel needs a

27 วห

24

25

home where he will receive line-of-sight supervision and low stimulation (i.e., not a large number of other children). The home must be very structured and the routine predictable, and his sense of safety must be fostered. Ms. Osier-Tater stated that she is also deeply worried about his future if his needs are not met.

As outlined above, the evidence at trial established that each of the three children has significant special needs. To rebut the presumption that termination of his rights serves the children's best interest, the evidence would have had to show some likelihood (in a reasonable time) that Mr. Faz could meet the basic needs and special needs of these three children. Mr. Faz did not provide evidence sufficient to show either kind of need would be met seasonably. To the contrary, multiple witnesses testified to their belief that

Mr. Faz minimized Maria's and Michael's sexual victimization and failed to provide or understand the need for close supervision of the children during visitation. The evidence established that Ms. Faz had termed Maria's concerns as "psychobabble".

As previously stated, the evidence established that Mr. Faz was not currently meeting the therapeutic needs of one of the children in his home. This failure leads to the reasonable concern that he would not or could not meet the very serious special needs of these children.

Mr. Faz proposes to reunify all of his children (in a physical location not presently obtained.) He provided no plausible plan for assuring the safety of sexual abuse victims from the perpetrator, all of whom would reside together. It is important to note that this is a discussion of safety only in the most superficial way, i.e., whether there would be opportunities for additional physical victimization. It does not encompass the children's

need for emotional and psychological safety. Mr. Faz presently no evidence that Maria and Michael would not be harmed emotionally or psychologically by sharing a home with the brother who sexually assaulted them. According to her Court Appointed Special Advocate, Maria wishes to not even see this brother. According to Ms. Osler-Tater, Maria doubts her Father's willingness or ability to keep her safe and, further, that personal safety is one of Maria's deepest needs.

Lindsey Maurins, an adoption recruitment worker with WCDSS, testified that the children's legal status, i.e., their parents' rights being intact, is a significant barrier to the successful recruitment of a prospective adoptive home for Maria, Michael and Nathaniel. Put plainly, the Court has been told that most prospective adoptive parents prefer to be matched with children where the legal issue of their availability to be adopted has been settled.

The Court Appointed Special Advocate recommended that the children be freed for adoption. She stated that her opinion was based partly on the children's great need for individual attention. She testified that she doubted that there was sufficient physical space or adequate resources for their needs to be met in Mr. Faz's home, where he would then be parenting six children. She also raised the issue of safety.

Based on the foregoing described evidence, and all evidence presented at trial, the Court finds the following with respect to parental fault.

Clear and convincing evidence demonstrates that there has been a failure of parental adjustment (NRS 128.105(2)(d)) by Jesus Faz. He has no demonstrated current or future ability to meet either the basic needs or special needs of Maria, Michael or

į

ኃይ

NI.	oth	-	riel
114		-11	

Clear and convincing evidence establishes that there is a risk of serious injury to Maria, Michael and Nathaniel if they were returned to Jesus Faz's home (NRS 128.105(2)(e)) because it is the home of a sibling who is a sexual perpetrator and there is no viable plan to assure their safety, and, further, that this perpetrator is presently not receiving therapeutic services because Mr. Faz stated he cannot afford to obtain them.

Clear and convincing evidence establishes that Jesus Faz is an unfit parent (NRS 128.105(2)(c)) because he has failed, over a period of three years, to provide Maria, Michael and Nathaniel with proper care and support. Even as late as the days of trial, Mr. Faz's testimony was that he was looking into housing and food stamps. This is too little too late and not the effort and advocacy these children need to assure their basic and special needs are met.

Clear and convincing evidence establishes that Jesus Faz has neglected Maria, Michael and Nathaniel. NRS 128.105(b). Mr. Faz has neglected or refused to provide the necessary subsistence for his children, either through private employment or securing public benefits. See also NRS 128.106(8).

Jesus Faz's weak efforts to stabilize his circumstances over a very long foster case provided no basis for the Court to find that he had rebutted the presumption applicable under NRS 128.109, that he has made only token efforts to care for these children pursuant to NRS 128.105(2)(f).

Therefore, the Court finds that multiple grounds of parental fault were established by clear and convincing evidence. The Court also finds that clear and convincing evidence

establishes that the best interest of Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz will be served by termination of Mr. Faz's rights, so that they may obtain a permanent home that will meet their needs and give them the best chance to obtain healthy lives.

It is ordered that Jesus Faz's parental rights are terminated as to Maria Faz, Michael Faz, and Nathaniel Faz.

Upon the extinction of

Upon the extinction of Pennie Faz's rights, Maria, Michael and Nathaniel Faz's custody is vested with Washoe County Department of Social Services, which has the authority to place the children for, and consent to, their adoption.

10 NOTICE

PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF ORDER: THE ABDUCTION, CONCEALMENT OR DETENTION OF A CHILD IN VIOLATION OF THIS ORDER IS PUNISHABLE AS A CATEGORY D FELONY AS PROVIDED IN NRS 193.130. NRS 200.359 provides that every person having a limited right of custody to a child or any parent having no right of custody to the child who willfully detains, conceals or removes the child from a parent, guardian or other person having lawful custody or a right of visitation of the child in violation of an order of this court, or removes the child from the jurisdiction of the court without the consent of either the court or all persons who have the right to custody or visitation is subject to being punished for a category D felony as provided in NRS 193.130.

Pursuant to NRS 125.510(7) the terms of the Hague Convention of October 25, 1980, adopted by the 14th Session of the Hague Conference on Private International Law, apply if a

1	parent abducts or wrongfully retains a child in a foreign country.	
2	2 IT IS SO ORDERED.	
3	3	
4	4	
5	5 Dated: Levs. 24, 2014 Du	
6	6 10 12 W	CTREET OF CTREET WAS ASSESSED.
7	7 DISTRICT JUDGE	
8	8	
9	9	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18 19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	5	
26		
27	7	
28	<b>&amp;</b>	

ī	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	l certify that I am an employee of the Second Judicial District Court and that on the
3	day of <u>September</u> , 2014, I electronically filed the foregoing with the
4	Clerk of the Court system which will send a notice of electronic filing to following:
5	Jeffrey Martin, Chief Deputy District Attorney
6	Michael Roth, Esq.
7	Michael Mahaffey, Esq.
8	· ····································
9	
10	GB100 kr
11	· ·
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	ļ
27	
28	
Į,	

# ORIGINAL



Į0

Code COO Name: Jesus Faz Ta. Address: 1074 Rock BS Spans NV 9943. Telephone: 775: 379.3892 Acting In Proper Person 2014 OCT 16 AM 10: 36
CTING CLEAR CHTHE COURT
BY

### IN THE FAMILY DIVISION

OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

IN The N	DATION OF PERENTAL	
RIGHTI	Plaintiff/Petitioner	Case No. FV11-023 93
<del>4.2</del>		Dept. No.
MANIA Attacher  Ac ATTO	FAZ NOTICE OF APPE	APPEAL and A request for
Dated:_	10-16-14	
		(Signature)  1084 Rock #B  SPARIS, N. 99431  775-379-3892  (Telephone)

IN THE FAMILY DIVISION
IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE
STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
WASHOE

IN THE MATTER OF PARENTAL RIGHTS AS TO, MARIA FAZ, MICHAEL FAZAND NATHANIEL FAZ, MINOR CHILDREN.

Case No. FV 11-02393 Dept. No. 5

### NOTICE OF APPEAL

Notice is hereby given that I, Jesus Faz Jz, the natural father of Maria, Michael, and Nathaniel Faz, heraby appeal to the Supreme Court of Nevada From the Final order terminating my parental rights as To my Children, Maria, Michael and NAThaniel Faz which was entered in This action of Seplember 24, 2014.

Jesus FRIL Jr. JUST 1084 ROCK #B 5 PARKS, NV. 89431 10-16-14

### REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF ATTORNEY

I Jesus Faz JR, State that I am indigent and can not afford to hire an attorney for my appeal, I request that an attorney to e appointed for me.

JAF-G-1084 ROCK # B SPARK, NV. 89431

## SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT COUNTY OF WASHOE, STATE OF NEVADA

2	COUNTY OF WASHOE, STATE OF NEVADA
3	AFFIRMATION Pursuant to NRS 239B,030
4	The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document, NOTICE OF  Appeal And Request For An ATTOURNEY,  CASE IS F.V. 11-02393  (Title of Document)
5	
6	Appeal And Request For An Allourney,
7	CASE # FV. 11-02393
8	
9	filed in case number:
10	Document does not contain the social security number of any person
11	-OR -
12	Document contains the social security number of a person as required by:
13	
14	A specific state or federal law, to wit:
15	(State specific state or federal law)
16	- or -
17	For the administration of a public program
18	- or -
19	For an application for a federal or state grant
20	- or -
21	Confidential Family Court Information Sheet
22	(NRS 123.130, NRS 125,230, and NRS 125B.055)
23	Date: 10-16-14
24	(Signaturé)
25	Desus FA2 Dx. (Print Name)
26	A thu country
	(Attorney for)

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Washoc County Alternate

Public Defender's Office and that on this date I served a copy of the JOINT

APPENDIX – VOLUME IV to the following:

WASHOE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Jeff Martin

Via Inner Office Mail

ADAM LAXALT
ATTORNEY GENERAL STATE OF NEVADA
100 N. CARSON STREET
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701
Via U.S. Mail

DATED this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of May, 2015.

/s/Shannon Hambright SHANNON HAMBRIGHT