J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

THE WITNESS: I can tell you.

25

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
BIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1 THE COURT: I -- I'm sure... 2 THE WITNESS: I -- I mean, I... 3 THE COURT: ...Ms. Lamaison can... 4 THE WITNESS: I... 5 THE COURT: ...answer that. 6 THE WITNESS: I can tell you, when I open the screen... 7 Q BY MR. ROZIER: Right. 8 Α ...and I look at Nellie... 9 0 Right. 10 Α ... (indiscernible) my -- my case opens. I look at her. I look in her file. What I see, is I see Nellie's name. 11 | 12 | I see there was a putative or potential father. And I... 13 Q Right. 14 Α ...see Esther. There is no mention or have any 15 history of other children in the case, like, that she had 16 other children in Clark County, that we had siblings. So 17 cases change and evolve. But, yes. The other thing is, is 18 now she's a legally free child. So technically... 19 Q Okay. 20 ...legally, there are no other relatives right now because her parents' rights were terminated, which kind of 22 terminates those relatives also. 23 Right. And going back to what Mr. McKay said, do you find it important for Esther to be around her siblings? 25 Yes or no?

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

23 24

25

It could be a benefit to her. Α It depends on what she considers siblings. I definitely think it could be a benefit to the -- if a new child came into the system being placed or be with their -- their siblings. If we're aware of siblings, we always want children to be with siblings.

Q Okay. All right. Thank you.

MS. ROZIER: I have one more question.

THE COURT: Yes.

FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. ROZIER:

Q Based on your experience and expertise, if Esther 12 was placed with the Riveras and, you know, she gets older, 13 | learns about the case and finds out that there was family who came forward and fought very hard for her, how would that affect her then?

Oh I don't really know. But I know that she will know because all children are given what's called a social summary. They have all that information of their families of Adoptive families here in Clark County, foster and origin. adoptive families, including the Rivier- Riveras were brought through a training program to understand the importance of those birth family connections and helping a child understand their sense of learning and their -- and their families of It helps them with their own identity. origin.

So my understanding from my interactions with this

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO RIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

family is that they do understand birth family connections are important; that they want to maintain those for the child so she really understands who she was, who she came from and who were the important people that were out there at the time that we removed her. And so they're gonna have that story. She gets that story, you know, because we give it to the family so that she has all of that information.

And it's really up to that child on how they want to have their relationship. You know, studies around adoption are adults that have been adopted. Some seek out birth family connections and some do not a pight? And then that's a

And it's really up to that child on how they want to have their relationship. You know, studies around adoption are adults that have been adopted. Some seek out birth family connections and some do not. Right? And then that's a personal choice on the adoptive child. But that family information is usually stored for those children to access if they choose to. So that's -- they should have that ability to access it.

MS. ROZIER: That's all I have.

THE COURT: Did you have follow-up?

MR. SHARP: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And did you have any follow-up?

MR. MCKAY: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Thank you.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SHARP: The State will call Ms. Regina Rivera.

THE COURT: Hi, Ms. Rivera.

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO

BIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES

601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1	A September 9th of 2016.	
2	Q So approximately how old was she at that time?	
3	A I believe 15 months.	
4	Q Okay. Before we get into Esther's life with you,	
5	you are married; correct?	
6	A That is correct.	
7	Q And is that to Philip Rivera?	
8	A Yes. It is.	
9	Q And how long have you been married?	
10	A For six-and-a-half years.	
11	Q And do you have any other children?	
12	A We do not.	
13	Q Okay. When Esther came into your home, can you	
14	describe Esther for us when she first arrived? Where was she	
15	at? Or how was she emotionally?	
16	A Esther was very clingy to her foster family her	
17	the previous foster family	
18	Q Okay.	
19	Ain the beginning. They came over to our house.	
20	I had purchased toys for her to see if maybe that would peak	
21	her interest or break the ice, in a sense, of of being in a	
22	a a different territory for her. I remember that we had	
23	breakfast and that she was very clingy to to Brandy (ph)	
24	and Abraham (ph), who were her foster parents at that time.	
25	Q Okay. How long of a process or how long of a	

1 trial period did you have for the -- the transition over to your home? 3 It was, I would guess, about three to four weeks. It was visits at their home. 4 5 Q Okay. 6 They would visit us at our home, as well. 7 How long did it take for Esther to -- to warm up to 8 you? 9 Α I don't know. I love that child. But about a 10 couple days maybe. 11 Okay. Where was -- where was Esther at developmentally? I understand that at that point she would 12 have been around 15 months. So was she initially verbal when 13 14 she came into the home at all? 15 A She said two words that we could recognize. 16 Q Okay. 17 A One was, more... 18 Q Okay. 19 A ... when she wanted more food. And the second one 20 was, uh-oh, when she would drop something. 21 Q Okay. 22 Α Other than that, she would babble. 23 Q Okay. 24 And we would try to interpret what she was asking 25 for or trying to communicate.

2

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

21 22

I was just concerned that she wasn't speaking more. Α I mean, you know, we would try to say, you know, short words, like, yes, no, please, thank you, you know, or something. she -- she wouldn't necessarily respond. So I was concerned that maybe she was developmentally delayed in -- in speaking.

Q Okay.

So that was just my concern. And I -- I noted that to Kristi when she came over for a visit.

And you have had Esther in your home since that Q time. Is that correct?

Α That is correct.

Q Okay. So walk -- walk us through. What is -what's a day like with -- with Esther? What are your routines? What do you generally do?

Α Esther -- I have a monitor. And so I can see her when she wakes up. And I see her standing in her crib. walk over to her crib. And she usually is standing there waiting for us to come in. And she'll jump up and down. she'll open her arms to me. And I will take her out of her crib.

We have our morning hugs and our morning kisses. I give her, her teddy bear because I take it out when she's asleep and I give her teddy bear to soothe her. I remove her pajamas. We go and we have breakfast, you know, oatmeal,

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

We get her ready for school. I change her clothes. I brush her hair. And then she helps me get ready in the So she's in the bathroom with me and playing in my makeup case and in our closet. And she's -- and then when -when I'm ready, then we -- I take her to day care. And then she's there having her second breakfast when she arrives there. And Philip picks her up when he's done for his day.

Q Okay.

3

4

10

11

13

14

18

19

20

22

23

Α Then we come home. She gets a bath because at day 12 cares there's a lot of germs.

> Mm-hm. Q

So we give her a bath immediately. Then we have dinner as a family. And then after dinner, it's -- it's playtime. Then after playtime, it is evening prayer. We read a book to her. And then we rock her to sleep.

Okay. Is -- you spoke a little bit before about when she initially came in, you -- you were worried that she may have been a little delayed as far as her speech. And you spoke with Kristi. Were you able to have her assessed for that?

Kristi said that she submitted the paperwork. 24 not sure what had transpired with that. I hadn't even told her two teachers at school that I didn't -- you know, that

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1 they -- I didn't feel that she was speaking as I think she should have. 2 3 0 Okay. And I think they had had us fill out a paper, as 4 5 well, for them to have someone from the State, as well, to come in and try to help her with that. 7 Help her with that. Now at 22 months, does she Q 8 appear to have a speech delay? 9 Α No. She does not. 10 Okay. Q 11 A So she fooled us. 12 Very good. In her -- in her actions with you and with Philip, does she call you mom? 14 She does. She calls me momma. Α 15 Q Momma. And does she call Philip, dad? 16 She calls him dadda. Α 17 Dadda. Okay. You talked about the -- the hugging Q 18 and kissing that you and -- you and Esther have. Does she 19 have that same kind of relationship with Philip? 20 A She's daddy's girl. Absolutely. She does. 21 Q Okay. Are you consistent in taking Esther to her 22 medical appointments? 23 Α Absolutely. She -- when she initially came into our care, we had ten days to take her for her wellness checkup, 24 which we had done, and then subsequent appointments. When she

1 reached 18 months in January, I took her. In between that time, as well as the present, she has had ear infections, eye infections. She hit her head at day care once -- one times. We have taken her to doctors appointments thereafter, as well. 5 Q Okay. And is she meeting her current milestones? 6 I believe so. I think she's excelling... 7 Q Okay. 8 ...in her current milestones. 9 Excellent. So aside from you and -- and your husband, does she have relationships with -- with your family 11 members? 12 My mother lives here. And she -- we see my mother Α 13 every weekend. So we go to grandma's house on the weekend. 14 We also have close friends and family who she sees. We keep in touch with the foster family before, Brandy and Abraham and 15 their boys... 16 17 Q 18 ...because, you know, they were part of her life, so 19 we see... 20 Q So I'm gonna back up just a little bit. And let's talk about your mom. 22 Α Yes. 23 Q What's her first name, just so I have a point of 24 | reference? 25 It's Teresita, T-E-R-E-S-I-T-A. Α

Okay.

did she appear to bond well with your family?

1	A	She did. Yes.
2	Q	Okay. You talked a little bit about she met some of
3	your sib	lings. When did that happen?
4	A	She met my brother and my sister in October.
5	Q	Okay. And what are their first names?
6	A	Richard is my brother, R-I-C-H-A-R-D.
7	Q	Okay.
8	A	And my sister's name is Rose, R-O-S-E.
9	· Q	Okay. And do they live here locally or out of
10	state?	
11	A	My sister lives in Tennessee. My brother lives in
12	California.	
13	Q	Okay. Very good. And did they come here to visit?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q.	Okay. And how did that visit go?
16	A	Very well. Of course, they bought toys and food.
17	So it we	nt very well.
18	Q	Okay. Have they kept any kind of consistent contact
19	with Est	her?
20	A	They have not
21	. Q	Oh.
22	A	since visiting.
23	Q	Since that visit?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	Okay. Let's talk a little bit about you stated that
	1	J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO

BIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES

601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

Is that correct?

That is correct.

Okay. And why did you do that?

We felt it was necessary. The family that she was Α with before had three boys, which she interacted all the time. And we felt being in -- in a single parent household that we 7 | felt that we didn't want her socialization skills to regress but rather we wanted it to progress.

> Mm-hm. 0

2

4

9

10

18

20

21

24

So that was our decision to have her into day care 11 where she would be around children her own age, as well as, we 12 | wanted to take advantage of the opportunities of her early 13 development stages. Philip and I -- I don't know if she'll 14 learn a lot from us. But we wanted her to -- to learn from 15 those who had the expertise in that field to teach her. 16 -- and further educate her. So we felt that that was best for 17 | her.

Okay. And what have -- I believe you submitted several letters. Is that correct?

Yes. I have.

Okay. And we have those letters ad- admitted as 22 Exhibit 4. What were some of the statements remarks that -that some of the faculty made about Esther?

Esther has shown progress with social and emotional Α development at is -- in -- as it is typical that her peers --

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO 04/14/2017 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

Okay. Q

13

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Another teacher also stated that ...day care. 14 Esther's learning experience has been progressive. 15 recognizes colors, shapes and numbers. She easily follows 16 one, two, three steps with verbal directions. This is my favorite line. Esther's a sweet girl and is usually the first one to give hugs to friends who are sad or if they get hurt.

> Q Okay.

Everyone here at Kiddie Academy loves her and are so Α proud of how much she has blossomed.

And for reference, who -- what faculty member wrote that letter?

Lindsay Busch, she's a lead teacher. Α

Have you observed Esther interacting with -- with Q

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

- And does Esther interact with them often? 0
- We usually try to meet up at least once a month.
- Once a month. Okay. And what -- what is Esther's Q 5 relationship like with those family friends and -- and their children?
 - A ´ She -- she likes the -- the children part. I think she interacts well with the little children.
 - Q Okay.

2

3

4

7

9

10

13

16

17

19

23

- But as far as the adults, she's still kind of a bit -- a bit leery. As long as Philip and I are -- are in the 12 room, she's -- she's fine.
- Let's go back just a little bit about talking about 14 how -- how you and -- and Philip would be able to provide for Esther. Are you employed?
 - I am. Α Yes.
 - Okay. And is Philip employed?
- 18 Yes. He is. Α
- Without going into specifics, once this adoption -- or should the adoption occur, would -- will you and -- and Philip be able to continue caring for -- for 22 II Esther?
 - Yes. We will.
- 24 Okay. Now, I believe that when we spoke earlier, Q 25 you had indicated that when Esther came into your home, you

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

he has never visited our home thereafter.

25

Q

Okay.

1 MR. SHARP: Court's indulgence. 2 THE COURT: No problem. 3 BY MR. SHARP: So in getting to know Esther over the Q last several months -- well, actually -- I'm sorry. Let's 5 first talk about what the -- the foster family. You stated that -- that you still have an ongoing relationship with the 7 -- the last foster family. Is that correct? 8 That is correct. 9 Q Okay. And so you allow -- and that foster family lives here in Las Vegas. Is that correct? 11 Α That is correct. 12 Okay. And so you allow them to -- to occasionally Q 13 see Esther. Is that right? 14 A Yes. We schedule visits. 15 Q Okay. 16 Well, we try to get together as much as possible. 17 Q Very good. 18 They have since then been placed with another child. Α So it's kind of difficult for them to be mobile. 20 So if -- if the adoption goes through and you are 21 able to adopt Esther, would you be willing to have the Roziers 22 to have similar visitation. 23 A Absolutely. I was born and raised in Hawaii. And 24 family's always welcome. 25 0 Now, with your -- with your experience with -- you

know what? Let me back up just a little bit. We -- we talked 1 a little bit about the weekly routines or the daily routines

3

5

6

7

8

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22 23

24

25

that you have with -- with Esther. Do you -- have you celebrated holidays, vacations, anything like that? We did trick-or-treating. So we took her around our neighborhood.

Q Okay.

Which was fun. And then we celebrated Thanksgiving Α at Father John's house. We had Christmas at our house. And then with the Easter weekend coming up, she has three Easter baskets, one from us, one from my mother and then one from the school.

Very good. We've talked a little bit about the potential of -- of trauma should Esther be removed. Based on your experience and your knowledge of -- of Esther, do you believe that it would cause long-term trauma for her to be removed from your care?

Α Yes. It would.

Do you believe that it would -- is in the best interest of Esther to be removed from your care?

She needs to stay with us. We are her family. I'm her mother. She knows nothing but love in our family. She knows nothing but playtime. And we've provided her with an environment where she's thriving now. I mean, it's evident in her -- in her learning abilities at school. I mean, you

1 know, she -- she's -- she's growing herself, which is remarkable. And Philip and I want nothing but the best for her.

3

4

5

7

11

12

13

15

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Do you have anything else that you would like the Court to know?

I -- I just feel that, you know, being a woman, you know, if -- if I may just be personal here, where I had struggled with -- with fertility, as a result, Philip and I struggled with that. Unfortunately, I got sick and it resulted in me having surgery, which I can't have children. Okay. Plan A didn't work.

And now we have plan B where we went through Catholic Charities to hopefully assist with the adoption process, with their training, the -- their extensive application process and a hefty fee, that they had wanted, that (indiscernible) was futile as they only had contacted us a few times for placements that we felt -- actually once, excuse me, for a placement that we did-didn't felt met our needs. So, okay. Plan B didn't work.

Then we go to plan C where we go to the Department of Family Services for assistance. And -- because I -- I've known several people who had adopted through the system. within us being approved for -- after the ten weeks of training and the extensive application process from the Department, you know, we had -- we were -- we were approved

1 for a home study. We opened our (indiscernible) and lo and behold, we had a resource.

3

8 |

10

13

17

18

19

21

23

We had a -- a placement, where it was an adoptive 4 | resource. And we're like, oh my gosh. How -- how beautiful 5 | is that? Where we have tried all these avenues, Philip and I over -- over all these years for -- for this family. 7 we have her in our lives. And, you know, and -- and I -- I understand your plight where you stated that, you know, you -you love her. And -- and -- and I understand that.

I've prayed for a child for years. Every day, I've 11 prayed for a child to be in my life. And now I have Esther. 12 We give everything to her. Our focus is to her. Our decisions -- we don't -- we don't even go to date nights 14 | because we wanna be with her. To -- to touch her cheek in the 15 morning, for her to hug my leg when -- when I'm leaving, for 16 me to step out of my position as a sacrifice for her, it's all worth it.

It was all worth it to see her smile, to see her -she's a daddy's girl, to see her interacting with Philip and imitating everything that he does and I get a chuckle. play Ring Around the Rosie over and over again because that's her favorite, it's worth it.

She's bonded with us. She's bonded with her teachers at school. She has friends. She's happy and healthy, you know. I just want what's best for her.

TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1 THE COURT: No. There's no need to apologize. 2 MR. SHARP: I have no further questions at this time. 3 THE COURT: Do you folks have questions for her? 4 MR. ROZIER: I don't. 5 THE COURT: Mr. McKay? 6 MR. MCKAY: No questions, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 Your next witness, please. 9 MR. SHARP: The State will call Philip Rivera. 10 THE COURT: It is 20 till 12. I want you guys as a group to make a decision. Do you want to just push through and try 12 to finish? Or do you want to... 13 MR. SHARP: So. . . 14 THE COURT: ...take a lunch break? I don't know how many 15 more witnesses we're going to have. I don't know how much 16 rebuttal time you're gonna wanna take. I hate to push 17 everyone out until say, 2:00, for lunch if we're gonna go that long. On the other hand, if we're a half hour away from 18 19 finishing, we might as well push through. I just don't have a feel for how much more time we're gonna need. 23

MR. SHARP: And, Your Honor, I can't speak for the other 22 | parties. But I do know -- my understanding is that Mr. Rivera $\|$ has a statement that he would like to read. My plan was just to have him -- allow him to read that statement. And then the -- the State will rest, so.

21

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

```
1
        THE COURT: Okay. And then -- and then, I don't know how
 2
   much time you folks want.
 3
        MR. ROZIER: Very little.
 4
        THE COURT: A little bit.
 5
        MR. ROZIER: Very little.
 6
        THE COURT: So is it everyone's desire to just push
 7
   through and finish this and then go to lunch afterwards?
 8
        MR. MCKAY: Yes, Your Honor, on my end.
 9
        MR. ROZIER:
                     Yes.
10
        THE COURT: Okay. All right. I just -- I wanted to make
   sure everyone was on board. And I wasn't, you know, gonna
   mess with anybody's lunch today. And...
13
        MR. SHARP:
                    If we're good to go through then we'll...
14
        THE COURT:
                    Rivera.
15
        MR. SHARP:
                    ...call Mr. Rivera.
16
        THE COURT: And the same sort of thing. I'm gonna have
17
   you sworn in.
18
        THE CLERK:
                    You do solemnly swear the testimony you're
19
   about to give in this action shall be the truth, the whole
20
   truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?
21
        MR. RIVERA:
                     I do.
22
        THE CLERK:
                    Thank you. Please state and spell your name
23
   for the record.
24
        MR. RIVERA: Philip Rivera, P-H-I-L-I-P, R-I-V-E-R-A.
25
        THE CLERK:
                    Thank you.
```

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

THE COURT: Go ahead and have a seat. And you wanted to read a statement under oath?

MR. RIVERA: If I may. Yes.

THE COURT: Certainly.

MR. RIVERA: I apologize, in -- in advance.

THE COURT: Not a problem.

PHILIP RIVERA,

having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. RIVERA:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11 |

18 I

19

At 8:20 -- at 8:29 tonight -- or tonight, Esther sleeps, feet fa- facing towards the floor, the body protected 12 | from the cool, windy night by the double-insulated pajamas that we have come to refer as her space suit. Esther's tiny 14 | hands clinching to the stuffed white bear that she has come to 15 refer to as my baby. Esther sleeps tonight, approximately 45 days from a bright uncertain future, 45 days from an absolute 17 new beginning, 45 days from making the first spark of her chaotic start to life mostly irrelevant.

She sleeps tonight, intentionally unaware that she 20 was the topic of the day and that her life and her future and 21 her happiness were being discussed by those mostly unfamiliar 22 with her, unfamiliar with her funny ways of hiding food in her 23 high chair that she does not want to eat, unfamiliar with her 24 | new or unique mannerisms and behaviors when excited and when 25 | happy and when sad, unfamiliar with her likes and her

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

dislikes, her favorite restaurants, her favorite types of food, her favorite toys.

1

3

4

5

6

8

11

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

We, the family, the -- the foster parents, are more than just a little familiar with all those things and every other part of Esther's life. In fact, we are the experts in the field of Es- of Esther's life.

We sat quiet and helpless in court as the protection and the certainty we built around Esther for the last 216 days started to be chipped away. We remembered our obligation to 10 Esther and knew she was depending on us to step up for her, like the other 260 days -- -16 days before, when we changed 12 | her and cleaned her nose and washed her face, the 216 days before when we would bathe her and feed her and cover her up at night, the 216 days before when we would sit with her and nurse her to health and provide her drops and medicine and ointments as she awoke in the middle of the night sick and congested and coughing, like the 216 days before when we were there for Esther day after day and night after night when no one else was.

We did this out of our love and our commitment to Esther and to ensure her safety in a bright uncertain future where all her needs would be met and where she would be provided a path to unlocking her real potential.

Esther is now 45 days away from that future we strived to create, 45 days from 100-percent permanency, 45

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1 days from 100-percent certainty. Esther is 45 days away from a forever, loving home.

3

10

11

12

14

18

21

22

We have turned our home into Esther's home, a home that she recognizes, a home that she knows as her own, a home that is always there for her and welcomes her in every room on every day. Esther's home is filled with laughter and joy and love as she playfully screams and dances from room to room by pushing her Frozen bike, like a shopping cart. Esther's home. It is her safety and her security and is void of any trauma. And this is not just our account. We have letters supporting this.

We have turned our lives into the lives of parents 13 | where Esther's needs come first, where every decision we make is centered on Esther's well-being and growth. We wince when 15 Esther bumps her head while playing. We scramble and rush her 16 to the doctor when she feels sick. We sit with her and rock 17 her when she cannot sleep. We have been there for her again and again and again. She is the center of our life. And we 19 love her. And we would not change it for anything. But we 20 would surrender everything.

As for the su- as for the subject of trauma, we speak -- we speak as if there is an acceptable level of trauma for this child. We contend that when the safety and the wellbeing of the child are not in question, that there is no acceptable level. And this is unreasonable, in this case, not

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1 | necessary and should be avoided.

2

8

11

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

We also believe that trauma can be cumulative and detrimental to Esther long term. For this child, it's not worth the risk. Esther is speaking now and is aware and would certainly know that the absence of the people she has grown to know as her mommy and daddy would certainly know that her home and her room has changed and the places that she keeps all her toys has changed.

She would know that her daily routine that she has 10 come to depend on has changed, that her school where she stands out amongst all others and her teachers who are always 12 praising her -- praising her has changed, that her weekend trips to the park and to the mall and to the church with the people she loves has changed and when she awakes in the middle of the night after having a nightmare, the people that she has come -- that has -- that has come to her with 100-percent certainty night after night has changed, that her friends and those she has known as relatives has changed.

It is not just one small trauma to remove Esther from her home now as there is no small trauma. Trauma by its very definition is catastrophic. And this is a complete uprooting of a life and she is familiar with and comfortable It is an avoidable trauma. And we have the ability and authority to eliminate the need for this trauma to Esther. And we must do it.

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

We are entrusted -- we were entrusted during placement to protect Esther and to provide her safety and protection and well-being -- and well-being short term and long. And this is non-negotiable.

1

5

7

11

14

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

Our plans for Esther are grand. We see much potential in her. She is in school now. And the thought was to ensure that she was socialized and prepared for magnet school at age 4. She would be there for -- we would be there for her when she struggled to assist her with all means possible, to allow her to continue to flourish. Esther would be encouraged to pursue her dreams and her passions, whether it be in academics or sports or in arts or in music. will be there to provide whatever support was needed.

We are raising Esther as a respectable lady with good character and who is proper and kind and humble. 16 raising Esther to be gracious, to work hard and to care about others. We are raising Esther to contribute every day.

As for our connection to Esther, she is part of our She gets so happy and excited when she wakes up in the morning and we walk into her room. She smiles and screams and claps her hands in -- in excitement. And she dances on She runs to us and grabs our legs when we return her bed. home. She reaches over -- reaches over and gives us kisses after kisses and hugs with her arms and her legs after her bath. She calls us momma and dadda. And she reaches out to

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1 be held. She lays between us on the weekend mornings, clinging to us. When we go out, she reaches to hold our hands for safety. She identifies with us and is comfortable with us in every way. We are that constant in her life that she is -that she has connected to.

3

5

7

11

12

13 |

14

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

We have nothing but respect for the family. We know that this is hard. And we are committed to an open adoption where Esther can get to know them and connect with them and learn from them. But we contend that there are still unknowns that we cannot chance. The uncertainty in this scenario is unnecessary uncertainty -- or the -- the certainty in this scenario is an unnecessary uncertainty. What happens in the event that she is uprooted and it does not work out for a dozen of reasons? What is Esther's future then? We are not an unknown, but proven resource committed to Esther, a family that has cared for Esther and provided her with an amazing life and one that she is thriving in.

We are 100-percent -- we are the 100-percent certainty, have been monitored and checked and endorsed by the State, that once found in Esther's best interest to remove her from her birth mother. Had the State not made that decision, we would not be here today. And the result would have been, at best, horrific.

We ask today that we be permitted to fulfill our commitment to Esther, that we be permitted to continue to

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO BIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

Thank you very -- thank you very much, sir.

MR. SHARP: The State has no further witnesses at this time.

All right. THE COURT:

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I told you I would give you each an opportunity. You remain under oath. Whether you want to stay there or come back up to the witness stand. There were things that were testified to today that you wanted to comment on. I -- I -- I -- I know that because we were talking about them during the -- the questioning. But this is your opportunity now to make any further statements you wanna make under oath or to give some evidence of testimony of your own to contradict anything that you might have heard today.

MS. ROZIER: Do you wanna go?

J-15-337398-P1 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO BIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

15

17

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

MR. ROZIER: I'll go first. You want me to come up there?

THE COURT: What -- whatever makes you -- you're under oath either way.

MR. ROZIER: I'll come up.

comes sees us. And we understand.

THE COURT: It -- it -- whatever makes you comfortable.

That was tough. What's unfortunate is I don't think

JOEY ROZIER,

having been previously duly sworn, testified as follows: STATEMENT BY MR. ROZIER:

it was necessary for the Riveras to go through what they've been going through. I just wanna state in the record, that had they known that the Roziers were in the wings, it would've been a lot easier to deal with than at the last minute. Okay? Now I'm bringing this home to you. We have a seven-16 month-old nephew. He has been visiting with us. bonded with him. We -- we feel your pain River- the Riveras. I've actually rocked him to sleep. And when you go through a few months, a few months is a lifetime it seems like because it just seems like yesterday the child was born. But then he's our nephew. And he's around. And we're bonded. And he

But it's unfortunate that people have to have their hearts broken because the system did not work and it failed them on a -- a notification stage of it. And with us, okay,

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

I because we don't fly all the way out here and -- and -- and do 2 what we're doin' for nothin'.

3

5

7

10.

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

You gotta understand, my wife has a Latin background. Okay? Riveras have an Asian background. -- that -- that's about the two most family-oriented ethnics that you're gonna find. And I can assure you they will fight to the death for -- for kids and family and -- and whatever comes across with -- with the -- with the issues that are -that are laid in front of 'em.

I can't help the west coast that do nothin'. I'm tellin' you the east coast has just as much to offer the 11 12 | child as they do here. And it's heartbreakin'. And I don't wanna see it. But at the end of the day, we're tryin' to keep siblin's together. And it's about Esther. And it's about Destiny. And it's about the child that's unborn. And that's what we're tryin' to do. And it's unfair to have three children in foster care when there's somethin' that can be done.

But somebody's heart's gonna get broke today. -- I -- prayers for everyone sittin' in this room. fun. But it -- it shouldn't have been this tough to begin with had the information been distributed the way it was supposed to be. And I apologize for that. And -- and -- and 24 | -- and it's -- I wish it could've been different. But it's not. But it's not fair for -- for what we're all gonna havin'

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIFT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1 to sit through and go through in the next few minutes.

If the child stays with the Riveras, God bless 'em. Prayers with ya. Hopefully, we can be a part of the life. If the child is chosen to come to us, you're more than welcome to come. We'll come out and visit. We'll do what we need to do to keep that bond there as much as possible. Okay? At the end of the day, we're not cold-hearted folks. It's just about the kids. And we're all grown adults and what's right for them. And I just hate the decision has to be made. And that's it. Thank you.

THE COURT: Did anyone have any questions of him while he...

MR. SHARP: No.

2

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. MCKAY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Rozier, did you wanna comment on any of these things? Did you want to comment on any -- again, on any of the testimony that was made earlier?

MS. ROZIER: I'll try to keep it together.

THE COURT: I understand.

STEPHANIE ROZIER,

having been previously duly sworn, testified as follows:

STATEMENT BY MS. ROZIER:

Those 216 days, that I long for, for Esther and her siblings. Like I said before, I have no doubt that they would be good parents. They've been good parents to her now leading

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

up to this. But since October 18th, we've been loving her from Georgia. We've been praying for her. Every decision that I make, although Esther's not there with us, has been for her. I'll wake up thinking of her. I go to sleep thinking of

her.

10

12

13

15

16

17

19

20

21

22 |

23

24

25

Like my husband said, it's not fair to either one of us, my husband and I or the Riveras. It's not fair to Esther. I have peace knowing what -- which -- however the outcome is. Whatever the outcome is that Esther will be loved and taken care of. I'm very glad that she's with a Christian family. That's very important to us. I know that's very important to God.

We can -- we can stand here all day and say what was done wrong, what could've been done right and all of what was not done and should've been done, how it's affecting us.

And we're willing to do anything to make the transition easy for Esther. We've talked about relocating here for a short period for that bonding. It's just very hard.

I don't know what else to say. So I'll end there.

THE COURT: Did you have any witnesses or anybody you would like me to talk to or -- no.

Mr. McKay, did you have any witnesses or anybody that you wanted...

MR. MCKAY: No, Your Honor.

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

THE COURT: ...to call?

So we're done as far as evidence is concerned today. Those actually sounded like closing arguments. But I'm still going to give you an opportunity to do closing arguments.

Mr. Sharp, would you like to start us out with closing arguments?

MR. SHARP: Sure.

CLOSING ARGUMENT

BY MR. SHARP:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 |

13

14

15

18

21

22

23

24

25

So, Your Honor, I think -- I think everybody's in agreement that this isn't an issue of -- I don't think the Roziers are bad people. I don't think that they're trying to do anything malicious here. I -- I think we -- we could all agree with that.

I -- I think there's an issue here if you had a mom, 16 \parallel a family member who has some serious issues, she's off and in 17 the wind, you don't quite know where the kids are, and I think, I know at least in my family, that, I think, we -- we all have those family members that you know are out there and you know that there's trouble, but you -- you don't know exactly what's goin' on. And -- and I fear that.

In this case, obviously, if the Roziers had come forward in the first year, I -- I -- there wouldn't be any question. And certainly, I think that -- that is the (indiscernible) ...

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

THE COURT:

1

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

THE COURT: There'd be no hearing today. You're right.

MR. SHARP: Exactly. There -- there wouldn't even be a hearing today.

A couple of things that I want to begin with and
first of all, when -- I need to preface -- preface this with,
I'm not saying that the Roziers are not related. But one of
the issues, depending on how this proceeds, is that we don't
have a pr- any proof of that relationship as far as...

THE COURT: Well, we have testimony by Ms. Rozier of the relationship.

MR. SHARP: We do. And that's all we have. Now...

THE COURT: That -- that's evidence. So to say we have no evidence would be inaccurate.

MR. SHARP: Okay. So let me -- let me...

THE COURT: We don't have evidence...

MR. SHARP: ...rephrase that.

THE COURT: ...that the DFS finds sufficient. How's that?

MR. SHARP: Aside -- that would be good.

So and that's exactly right. And again, we're not saying that they're not related. However, I think before -- especially for an adoption or before the Court looks at placing, we would have to verify that. So that's just something we -- we need to get out of the way. Again, I'm not saying they're not related. I think everybody agrees they

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

They're not likely going to show up if they're not 2 related.

The other issue I want to get to before my -- my main argument is I think it's important to recognize there's 5 -- there's been a lot of talk back and forth as to what happened in October and why wasn't placement made then? Well, we need to keep in mind that the Rozier family was in Georgia. And so, no matter what, in October when we started that ICPC, we were not going to move the child. We were not going to place the child with the Roziers until that ICPC was completed at that time.

THE COURT: We can't by law.

MR. SHARP: Yes.

3

11

12

13

14

15

19

20

21

22

24

THE COURT: Correct.

MR. SHARP: And that was not completed until March. 16 this isn't something where the Department could have placed the child with them and simply did not do it. It's a matter, because of the law that we have, we could not have placed either way. It just was not -- not an option.

We talked a little bit yesterday. And I know the Court's spew on this. I'd just kind of like to reiterate a couple of points. That the first hurdle in this is obvious that -- obviously that the family members must provide a reasonable excuse for the -- the delay if they do not come forward within that first year and they have a duty to come

J-15-337398-P1 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO RIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

forward.

1

2

11

13

15

16 |

17

18

20

21

23 |

24

We know that the Rozier family knew of the birth. We knew that the Rozier family was aware that mom was unstable, had mental-health issues, had drug issues. She had another sibling. We had two children that were removed from care. And so with that, coupled with the fact that Ms. Roz-Rozier stated that they're a close family, in addition to the fact that Ms. -- Ms. Rozier clearly demonstrated that she is 9 $\|$ able to make contact with her family -- back in October, she stated that it was an Uncle Tony (ph) that called her and said that the children had been removed. Well, the children had been removed for 16 months. And she'd been in contact with him. And so, if they're a close family why it took 16 months to get that information, I don't know.

But as soon as Ms. Rozier found out, she was able to, that same day, know exactly who to call. I understand she claims that she had a friend at the DA's office. But if mom's in the wind, certainly I have concerns as to, well, how did you know to call the Nevada Department of Family Services that That -- that would be one of the questions that I have.

In addition to that, when asking Ms. Rozier, well, how are you able to find mom last week? She's able to track She's able to get in touch with her. And so the mom down. thought in mind is -- is, if you were wondering how this child was doing, and if you had thought, well, I know this child is

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1 | in trouble. And I know if the child is in trouble, I want 2 placement. She knows how to track mom down. And she had done that previously.

3

4

11

15

17

18

19

24 I

In addition to that, while the ICPC was going on, I 5 know that there was some -- some statements made that, I $6 \parallel \text{believe}$, in February is when the Rozier family was told that, 7 you know, we're not even going to allow visitation at this 8 point. However, from October to February, they could have 9 visited. And in fact, Ms. Rozier stated that she needed to 10 complete -- or she wanted to complete the ICPC courses, I believe, before that visitation. However, that is an 12 opportunity for her to bond. That is an opportunity to kinda 13 get to know the -- the child. And she did not. She did not 14 come forward and make those efforts.

And certainly, our argument is -- our argument in this case, based on what Ms. Quinlan has testified to, is that they had told Ms. Rozier that this child was in an adoptive home, that you are going to be the contingency plan at this time. And they -- they were not told that they could not come to court, that they could not intervene or anything like that. 21 | But it's not Ms. Quinlan's duty to give them legal advice as to what they need to do at that point. And so, that they have 22 | that (indiscernible) duty, as it states in the supreme court to come forward. And like I say, as -- as you -- as we kind of talked about yesterday, I understand the Court's feeling on this.

Getting to the child's best interest argument, and I know that this is the crux of what's going to happen today, obviously we know that supreme court has said that the analysis should center in the child's best interest and that family placet- placement is a preference, not a presumption.

What I'd like to start off with is the trauma, the trauma that will likely occur to this child. Ms. Quinlan and especially Ms. Lamaison testified today of the serious potential for trauma that this child is going to have. It may affect her brain development. It may affect her other developmental areas. It may cause her anxiety, long-term anxiety. It may cause her to -- to have a reactive attachment disorder. It may cause her to have issues in bonding. And this is especially true when in this time, this is when Esther is beginning to form those bonds. And we have to remember that if the child were to be removed, this would be the fourth removal for this child.

And so up to this point, the child has made it to the Riveras. The Riveras have been able to begin to create those bonds. This child has been able to build that trust to begin to build those relationships and to overcome the trauma in her past. And so, it's not — it's not fair to this child to re-traumatize the child. And it's not in her best interest, especially when we don't know what's going to happen

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

| | in -- in the future. And I'll get to that in -- in a minute.

2

8

9

10

11

12

18

19

20

21

25 II

The second issue is, the Court has decided that permanency in this case is termination of parental rights and adoption. And that is in the best interest of the child. Right now we have a certain adoptive home that is due to adopt this child in 30 days. If the best interest of this child is adoption, we have that option. And we have it now. And we know that it's going to happen.

Again, I'm sure the Rozier family would be able to take Esther. I'm sure that -- I'm not saying that if they were placed with her anything bad would happen. But the truth is, is we don't know. And as Ms. Quinlan stated in her testimony, it's going to take at least a year. The child has 14 to be in her home for six months -- or in the Roziers' home for six months. You have to go through the ICPC, the adoptive ICPC, as well as all of the other checks. And so we're 17 | looking at delaying permanency for a year.

As the Court has already ord- ordered that adoption is in the best interest of this child, we -- we have that option now. And it's here.

As for the siblings, I know that this has been one 22 |of the major arguments for the Rozier family. There's -there's several issues here. And I appreciate the fact -- I -- I wish we had more family members that were coming forward fighting for all the siblings.

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGIES 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO BIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

But the truth of the matter is, is we have Destiny, a 12-year-old. She is in -- under the California jurisdiction. She is in an adoptive resource. Mom's rights have not been terminated. And the Rozier family does not have custody of her yet. And so to argue that, well, if we place Esther with them, Destiny will be with them, as well. -- that's not accurate because we don't know what's going to happen there.

1

5

7

9

10

11

13

15 |

17

18

19

20

21

As for the unborn child, as we stated before, unfortunately, Ms. Saez has -- has been Legal 2000'd. Apparently, she's still on drugs. We don't know if this child is going to be born. We don't know if the child is going to be taken into custody. And this -- this may be a situation that if the child does come into our custody, I'm certain that the Rozier's will be the first family that -- that we're going to look at contacting in a case like this. However, the child is not in our custody yet. So to argue that it's in the best interest of Esther based on her siblings, well, the siblings aren't in their care yet. And so that is a -- that's a great unknown that we can't answer at this point.

I think the other issue that we have is, the 22 standard is the best interest of the child. One of the issues 23 that we would potentially have in this case is obviously we're 24 looking for our children to have permanency in their lives. If we begin to remove children when they're 30 days away from

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

adoption from foster families, it is going to affect the best interest of all children in this situation because they're going to have families like the Riveras who aren't going to be willing to do this again.

2

5

6

7

10

15

16

18

19

24

25

I -- I understand that, you know, come the first year, foster parents understand this. When they get into the system they know, you know, family members come in early on and if mom and dad get everything together, then they understand that that's part of the -- the bargain. However, there comes a point when mom's rights have been terminated, when they've created this bond with the child, when they're set for adoption in 30 days, that it's simply -- it's going to 13 affect what the foster parents do. And in the end, it's going 14 | to affect the -- the best interest of -- of all children in this situation.

And I think the -- the final point is just, it comes 17 down to the best interest of the -- of Esther. The -- I -- I | believe -- I believe it was Mr. Rivera that -- that stated something to the effect of that Esther is -- is in a certain $20 \parallel \text{home}$, that she has certainty in her situation where she's at. 21 We don't know what's going to happen with the Roziers. And to 22 say we're willing to risk long-term trauma to Esther because this other situation may not work out is not in her best interest.

We know that right now for all intents and purposes,

TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO 04/14/2017 J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

Esther has a mom and dad. Mr. and Mrs. Rivera is -- are her parents at this point. That is who she looks to. We know 3 that she has a stable home. We know that they have stable income. We know that they're a loving home. We know that she 5 has emotional bonds and friends in the community, in her day care, in her church. We know that the Riveras are willing to 7 sacrifice everything for this child. We know that Ms. Rivera stepped down from her position at work in order to care for this child. In addition to that, we know that they are bonded to their own family members and that they are committed to Esther. 11

And in looking at this analysis when -- when you boil it down to the best interest of the child, it's clear that -- it's clear that Esther is in a good place. And to change that situation, A, it's very certain to cause trauma, and B, we don't know what the future is.

And so I would ask that, A, that Esther remain with the Riveras and that they -- the adoption proceed. Thanks.

THE COURT: I'm not sure who wants to go next.

MS. ROZIER: I'll stand.

THE COURT: Whatever makes you comfortable.

CLOSING ARGUMENT

23 BY MS. ROZIER:

12

13 |

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

With all due respect, he doesn't know our daily life. And our home study would not have been approved if the

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

-- the County, DFS, did not see that -- or did not feel that we were capable of caring for any child.

And I do wanna make a point that we -- before any of this came up, Joey and I were lookin' to be foster parents.

We knew what to expect. We went through the training as he stated that to be foster parents, things like this come up.

And you have to be able to let go.

One of my best friends, she is a foster parent in Utah. And she has two siblings right now. And she is somewhat in the same situation as we are. But as hard as -- as it is for her to be able to let go, she is doing so because it is for the best interest for the siblings to be back with family.

Back in October, yes, I have my aunt who worked for the DA in Augusta. But with the world that we live in now, it doesn't take much to figure out where to look for a child who's been removed from a home. So even if my aunt was not —you know, had that history of working with the DA, it would be common sense to look, you know, at the Department of Family Services. How did I know to look in Clark County? Well, because according to her Facebook page, this is where she was at the time she gave birth. I did ask in California, Riverside County, if she was there. They cannot locate her.

I wanna make sure that I say everything that I need to say.

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

THE COURT: All right.

1

2

3

10

11

12

19

21

22

24

25

MS. ROZIER: There was one thing that was said yesterday that would never, and never has, come out of my mouth, that Esther would get over it. I simply stated that she's 2 years old. And she would not remember it. Getting over it, people really never get over stuff. Okay? I lost my mom when I was 14, to cancer. You get by. But you don't get over it. for someone to put those words in my mouth, I take offense to it because I know -- you get over a fall. You know, you trip. You get over it. There's things -- you don't get over a move or death. So I don't appreciate that being said.

My husband picks that I'm like 50 First Dates 13 sometimes with my memory, that I choose to remember the things 14 that are important to me. And from what my aunt told me that I need to document everything from the very beginning. And that's exactly what I did. Every conversation that I had, I hung up the phone. And I documented because I knew that that was gonna be the only thing that would protect us and to help us. My phone records do not lie. I cannot fabricate that. That there shows the efforts that we made to keep in contact, to keep up with Esther and the process.

I didn't know we could come to court. If every- if things were confidential, I should not have known that there was a TPR hearing on January the 12th. I should not have received Mr. McKay's name. The day -- the weekend we were

TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO 04/14/2017 RODRIGUEZ J-15-337398-P1 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

I | ready to fly out to visit with Esther and we were told we 2 | weren't, that's when we -- we took the trip to Florida instead 3 for six hours alone in the car. I've called so many people. I've talked -- I've 4 5 spoken with the ICPC incoming for Nevada, with Ms. English. 6 You know, she reached out to me. I've spoken with Paula 7 Hammack's office, Erik Pappa's. I don't know who these people are. But I've called everyone that I know that I can call that can direct me. One person directed me to another. Twenty calls just to get to the right person. 10 We've made all efforts from the time that I've 11 called Kristi, she told me what we needed to do. And that's 12 | exactly what we did. And today, it seems like it hasn't been 13 enough, for them at least. If they knew... 14 THE COURT: You are aware that I did make the finding 15 yesterday already. 17 MS. ROZIER: Yes. But if... 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MS. ROZIER: ...if they knew that -- we'll just forget about that part but... 20 THE COURT: Well, no. I -- I didn't mean to cut you off. 21 22 I just... 23 MS. ROZIER: It -- it's okay. 24 THE COURT: I -- I... 25 MS. ROZIER: It's -- it's done. TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

THE COURT: I -- I understand Mr. Sharp made that argument on his side. He's -- he's making a record. But I did make a finding on this yesterday. And you -- but you're welcome to make...

MS. ROZIER: We should not have been led...

THE COURT: ...any record you wanna make.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

17

21

22

23

25

MS. ROZIER: ...on in both ways, when it seems like they have their minds set from the beginning. When Taryn spoke and said that most of the ICPCs were not approved, was she just assuming that ours wasn't? So we -- they just, you know threw us back there and said, well, they're not gonna get approved? 11 | So we're not even gonna entertain it? That -- that hurt everyone, Esther the most because Esther was placed in 13 September, September the 9th. We called October the 18th. So 15 much could have been done to avoid the hurt, the heartache, that both of the families are goin' through. 16 |

I was told that Esther was gonna be adopted the 18 first weeks of April. I don't know if that's just another ploy to make us back down or to lose hope and say, well, let's just let Esther be adopted. But there was so much that was told to us and was not true. And I just want you to know that we've done everything when we found out.

Yes. I do keep in touch with family. But we all have our own lives. And if I want someone to know where I'm at, I'm gonna make that available to them. If I'm homeless,

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

```
it's gonna be very hard for someone to find me. If I'm an
 2 addict, it's gonna be very hard for someone to find me
  especially if I'm homeless. Nobody in her state of mind wants
   to hear what she's doin' is wrong.
 5
              And as easy as it may seem to everyone else that I
   found her, it wasn't that easy. And just as quick as I found
   her, as everyone says, that's how quick I lost touch with her.
   If it's been reported that she's abusing drugs and she's
   pregnant, there's only so much that I can do.
10
              We'll respect your decision either way.
11
         THE COURT:
                     Thank you.
12
              Mr. Rozier?
13
         MR. ROZIER: I'll be short, sir.
14
         THE COURT:
                     I -- I don't want to pressure you.
15
        MR. ROZIER: Nah.
16
         THE COURT: You take as much...
17
        MR. ROZIER: It's okay.
18
        THE COURT:
                     ...time as you want.
19
        MR. ROZIER: I know.
20
        THE COURT:
                     This is an incredibly serious hearing today.
21
        MR. ROZIER: It is. It is.
                                       It is.
22
        THE COURT: And -- and -- and I would never cut you off
23
   at all. Please take as much time as you want.
24
   ////
25
   1111
            J-15-337398-P1
                         RODRIGUEZ
                                    04/14/2017
                                               TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
         EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
```

CLOSING ARGUMENT

BY MR. ROZIER:

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

15

19

20

22

23

24

I have not been in a family court ever, I believe. And I can tell you, I appreciate the generosity and the graciousness from everybody, Ray, the DA, Kristi, everybody, the Riveras. We just wanted to be heard. That's all. And we felt we were, you know? I think we proved our reasonable delay and then some. I think we've proven our best interest for the child and then some.

No. We do not have the 12-year-old. But I can assure ya. We're on that one just like we're on this one. And we'll be on the unborn just like we're on this one today.

I'm doin' my best to keep her -- to keep the unborn 14 child here in this county so we can immediately jump in and -and -- and -- and -- and get baby Isaiah. As far as baby 16 Esther goes, we have a great home. We have great family ties. 17 | We're willing to work it out if -- if -- with the one year with the -- with the six months with the foster and then the adoption study has to -- has to go through and -- and what we have to do. We'll still make trips out here. We'll -- we'll be as -- as part of the Riveras' lives as much as possible if you rule our way. And if it goes their way, we'll -- we expect the same. And I -- and I don't think that's an issue.

The issue on the table is, reasonable delay. Do we have best interest for Esther? I think we do. We got great

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

people in this room. And it's a tough decision. And we'll 2 respect whatever you -- whatever you give us. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. 4 MR. ROZIER: Okay. Thank you. 5 THE COURT: Mr. McKay? 6 MR. MCKAY: Thank you, Your Honor. 7 CLOSING ARGUMENT 8 BY MR. MCKAY: 9 This is a tough decision. I know you talked 10 |earlier. I think the first thing you said yesterday was, 11 you'd think that a termination of parental rights is the 12 hardest thing. But this is. I see that. 13 As I -- as you know, this is my first and only CAP I -- I actually did a termination of parental rights 15 early in my legal career. And I was sick from it. I 16 represented mom. And I actually said, I will never do that 17 again. So I understand that. And I can see how this is even 18 worse. I didn't sleep last night. 19 And I'm here, not representing either party. I'm 20 looking for Esther... 21 THE COURT: Right. 22 MR. MCKAY: ...and wondering what is in her best interest. And as I look that, you know, as a volunteer, as a 24 CAP attorney, you know, just give you a little bit of 25 background on me. I -- I've been active in this le- legal

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

field here quite a long time. I've won several pro bono awards, the lead award for most pro bono hours. I -- my -- my firm a couple years later won pro bono case of the year. I can't remember whose award that was for a pro -- a case I worked on. I've got 100-hour club, 50-hour club. I -- I volunteer on this -- on this ask a lawyer program. I've probably done it a dozen times over the last two years. Pro bono work and volunteer work's a big part of what I do. My goal was al- always give back.

And I bring this up in my closure, Your Honor, for a couple of reasons. One, is accepting this CAP case wasn't something I was comfortable doing. But we do it. We had -- I had one of the judges come in, speak, ask we'd take these cases. My group that I'm involved in, we decided to try to take some of these CAP cases. And I volunteered and -- and was honored to represent Esther in this one. They actually sent me a list of children. I got to look at them. And I sat. I prayed about these children. Didn't know -- and -- and something touched my heart for Esther. And -- and that -- that brought me to be a CAP attorney.

Again, I -- I don't know the system very well. And
-- and maybe a couple times that has cause a failure. And I
apologize to the families if in any way I was not the best
advocate for Esther. But I worked hard on it. I -- I could
-- I could not sleep last night, Your Honor. I read -- I read

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

those case studies. I read studies on siblings. I read -- I $2 \parallel --$ I looked at my e-mails from way back when. I tried to even check my voice mails. My voice mails only went back 90 days. But I was up all night. From midnight now, I've been up.

4 |

5

7

10

11 |

13

15 l

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

I could not -- there's no e-mails. I have no documentation ever of being -- written -- that -- of being advised of -- of the Roziers. I could've been -- there was some discussion about may- that I was maybe the -- advised or a call was given to me and not returned in December.

And just to clarify for the record, just in case that's an issue in any sort of way. My family is a partial caregiver to my father-in-law who had ALS. He died December For about the three weeks prior, my heck -- my life was 25th. -- was pretty crazy trying to juggle the death of my fatherin-law. And then we buried him on January 4th. And January 16 7th, I was in a two-week trial, Your Honor. So my life was crazy until coming into this meeting and first hearing about in Jan- I think it was January 26th or January 28th when I was advised by -- by the Family Services that the -- the minimum information I -- I was provided about the Roziers.

And at that point, again, based on the limited information I was given, at that point, that's -- I signed the termination of parental rights at that -- at -- at that day, based on, again, nobody's really come out. There's no reason. It's so minimum.

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

And while we're here for best interest, I -- I've I went there the first time. been to the Rozier's home. talked to them several...

MR. ROZIER: The Riveras.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

12

13

17

22

24 I

MR. MCKAY: ...occasions. I -- they are a great family, Your Honor. And I don't -- I don't want Esther to be taken Same deal here, though. How do I argue with away from them. the -- that the Roziers shouldn't have had an opportunity? It's -- and -- and to me, I've -- I truly believe -- and -and -- and I say this because I think something's gotta change. And if this is my opportunity, I've gotta do it.

I don't know if I'll ever take another CAP case And not because -- I -- I -- the part that it tore me again. up, listening to both families, I can live with that. That's, you know, as much as hard as it is and as hard it is for me to 16 be here right now going over all of this, but for me, I to me, the system fails when Family Services is not cooperating. And they -- if they're following the law, Your Honor, and the lack of cooperation, something has to change because these families, and my ch- my client, Esther, shouldn't be put up with that.

And again, I know -- I know this isn't my arena. 23 | But I can tell you. I know when there's an injustice, being an attorney for 15 years. And we could've been here, talked about it in October.

TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO 04/14/2017 RODRIGUEZ J-15-337398-P1 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

THE COURT: Right.

2

5

7

8

9

11

12

13

14 |

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

MR. MCKAY: To be honest, I wouldn't have signed the termination rights because that might have affected the family process had I know active family members were -- were participating at that time. And at that January hearing, I would've said, Judge, I don't know what the -- what we're supposed to do but -- but there's a problem.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. MCKAY: And, you know, maybe we're not here at this point in time. Or and maybe we could've been there earlier in this process.

You -- you have your work cut out. Again, I'm -- I -- I -- I like both families very much. And I've been to their home. Both families have tore my heart. And you've got 15 -- you've got your work cut out for ya. I -- I would've loved 16 to have had the opportunity to argue that -- to build -- to have Esther with siblings had I known, you know, had I had that opportunity many month's ago. And I think I would've acted differently had I -- had I had information I didn't have today. And if that -- my argument there, if -- if that's any part of your ruling is looking at the family and then there not be -- I -- I -- I think it's unfair the system to hold that against the parties or -- or -- or Esther at that -- for that - for those reasons, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

This is an incredibly difficult decision. On one hand, no matter what decision gets made today, Esther is going to grow up in a fabulous home.

12 |

Let me -- let me talk about some findings that are going to get made today and some findings that are gonna get made at -- with -- first I'm gonna talk about findings that are common to both parties, to both the Roziers and the Riveras.

Both are extremely good, dedicated parents, world class. I sit here. And I do this every day of the week. And you are both in the upper one-tenth of one percent in terms of -- of your -- of what I see every day of people coming into court.

The Riveras are -- you're among the best foster family I've ever seen. You're spectacularly good. I get family members coming in here asking for placement. And I almost never see anyone as qualified as the Roziers. I mean, I -- I can't actually remember anything in the last few years, any family being as qualified as you are to -- to raise a child. I -- I'm -- I'm -- Doth of you are incredible and -- and -- and -- and way beyond minimums. I mean, absolute rock star parents.

Both of you have good strong family connections. You're family oriented people. Both the Roziers and the Riveras would give Esther the opportunity to have a great

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
RIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

extended, large, involved family. That's gonna happen in 2 either placement.

3

9

10

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

24

Both families have well-thought out plans for how 4 Esther's education's going to go, how her moral upbringing is $5 \parallel \text{going to be addressed, how her social interaction is going to}$ be addressed. Both sets of -- of parents have thought all this through and have great plans for taking care of Esther. 8 Almost no one even comes in with those plans. Both of you came in with -- with well-thought out, great plans.

Both families have good community involvement. 11 That's a substantial benefit to Esther. Both are -- are very 12 | involved in church and other organizations that would have 13 tremendous positive influence on -- on Esther and her moral upbringing. Both of you have more than adequate resources to be able to take care of Esther's needs. Those are -- those are what's common.

Here's what's different. Here's what the Riveras bring to the table and here's what the Roziers bring to the table.

What the Riveras bring to the table is the bonding, is that time period from September 9th to today and the incredible bonding that has taken place and how difficult that 23 transition would be, the four -- it would be the fourth transition for Esther in the event of -- of a move. They also bring to the table a proven ability to care for Esther.

^{04/14/2017} TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

know for a fact that they can take care of Esther. They've been doing it and doing remarkably well.

What do the Roziers bring to the table that the Riveras do not? That biological family connection. And I believe it's highly likely that you will end up with one or both of the siblings. Certainly the DA has conceded that if Isaiah is born here in Clark County, you're going to be the first call. And under our one family, one judge rule, I would immediately initiate the placement process on your behalf. So I -- I think that that's likely. I don't wanna comment on what California is or is not gonna do with a 12-year-old, who's in an adoptive placement. But I suspect they're going to see very similar information to what I saw here today, which means you've gotta very good chance down in California.

Here's where this is incredibly tough because someone's gonna walk out of here really, really, really upset.

And -- and -- and I -- and I -- before I -- I believe the system has failed Esther. And I believe that DFS should have located you earlier.

It's funny how you sit here today, Ms. Rozier, and you defend yourself for being skilled at finding people and getting things done. And I think that that's sad that you feel it necessary to defend how skilled you are at taking care of these problems and -- and finding solutions and -- and -- and doing what's best for Esther. I think that if DFS had

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

done one-tenth of what you did to try to locate people, we would've tracked you down in a month.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

11

12

13

14

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I think that -- I'll connect the dots a little bit. DFS knew about the siblings. The siblings knew about you.

So you knew about -- I can't remember whether it was Carolina (ph) or Karissa (ph). But one of the adult siblings is listed on your -- in your -- in your system in -- in UNITY.

So, DFS knew about them. And they know about you. 10 || So it's just one level of connection for DFS to have gotten to you.

Or, from what I understand from your testimony, would be a huge number of also qualified family members on the east coast. I don't believe you're the lone member of your family that was willing to come forward and take placement of Esther. I suspect that if we manage to reach out to the rest of the family, we would have had a lot of volunteers. And this should have happened in the first few weeks of this case. It shouldn't have happened a year later.

The -- DFS fails Esther.

And DFS fails you by not getting a hold of you early And to somehow blame it on to you, I think is inappropriate.

The Riveras The system's also failed the Riveras. were led to believe when they got placement that this is it.

TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

236

This is permanency. This is what's gonna happen. Don't wor-2 need to worry about this family in Georgia. Most people fail ICPC. And so don't worry about it.

3

6

7

8

13

19

20

21

23

24

They knew about you, what five weeks, six weeks after placement? They should have been honest. Placement was the...

I'm sorry. Mr. Sharp is looking at me funny.

Placement is September 9th. They knew about you on 9 October 18th. So I'm sorry. Seven weeks. So at that point, there should have been a serious talk with the Riveras about 11 -- about what was going on and -- and -- and -- and -- and 12 | temper their expectations with -- with a bit of reality.

I -- I know that this is gonna be incredibly 14 emotionally hard for me. But legally, I think this is 15 ∥actually a fairly easy decision. When we're comparing bonding 16 versus family connection, United States Congress, our state 17 | legislature, courts around -- appellate courts around the country have recognized that family placement is where we're supposed to go.

I understand the trauma associated with the fourth move. I don't understand why DFS wasn't as concerned about 22 moves two and three which were completely within their control and suddenly four is the deal breaker.

But I am sick about this. I will -- you indicated 25 | you didn't sleep last night. I probably won't sleep all

> J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ. 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

I'm -- I'm sick about this. weekend.

2

9

13

16

The Riveras are phenomenal people. And I'm about to 3 make a recommendation to take Esther away from them. And that 4 is horrible for me to do. I don't wanna do this. I -- I -- I $5 \parallel --$ I -- I -- I pray that this will not discourage the Riveras from getting the child that they deserve and need and -- and -- and I -- I'm -- again, I'm just -- I'm -- I'm sick about this.

There are going to be two things that are going to 10 | have to happen with this recommendation. I will need you to 11 \parallel provide actual proof of the relationships. I think I'm 12 certain you're capable of doing. And you testified that you were in agreement with a full trauma-free or trauma 14 minimalization transition, which will be expensive and difficult and time-consuming.

Ms. Lamaison set out what that process really should 17 be. I don't know if we're capable of doing it completely. 18 did write it all down. But -- but -- but she testified as to 19 the -- the -- the stages that you would go through. And I 20 expect you to do that. If you cannot do that, then the 21 | recommendation will not be to place with you. I need to 22 minimize the trauma. And so I need you to do what you promised me that you would do and that is to -- to -- to go 24 through these steps and -- and -- and to transition her in a way that will minimize the trauma. It will be -- I -- I

> TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

couldn't just put her on a plane and send her back to Georgia 2 today. 3 MR. ROZIER: Yeah. THE COURT: That would be -- I would cause irreparable 4 damage to her if I did that. So you're going to have to hang tough here for weeks, if not months, to get this right. So I'm gonna... 7 I believe there will be an objection to this hearing 8 today, which means you're not done with the court system yet. 10 | I do not know who will handle the next stage of this process. 11 | It will be one of three district court judges who supervises 12 | in this area. It will be assigned randomly based on when the 13 | -- when the Department files their objection. But that will 14 be the next stage in this process. Were there any findings that you felt were -- needed 15 16 to be made based on the evidence today that the Court didn't, 17 or any issues, that you felt the Court didn't address, Mr. 18 | Sharp? I think the Court needs to make credibility 19 MR. SHARP: 20 findings. That is part of the -- in reading the supreme court 21 case... 22 THE COURT: Oh I'm sorry. 23 MR. SHARP: ...point. THE COURT: I -- I do find that -- I do find the 24 testimony -- I -- actually, I -- I didn't get a single untrue 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO J-15-337398-P1 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES

601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

```
statement from any party in this case. I believe -- I believe
  all of the statements made by both the Roziers and the Riveras
   were completely credible and accurate.
3
        MR. SHARP: And is that accurate for all of the witnesses
4
5
   then, as well?
        THE COURT: Some of the DFS stuff contradicted each
6
           So I'm not gonna necessarily be able to make that
7
8
   finding with regard to the DFS testimonies...
9
        MR. SHARP:
                    Okay.
        THE COURT:
                    ...today.
10
        MR. SHARP: And is that for Ms. Quinlan and Ms. Lamaison?
11
        THE COURT: Those were the people whose testimonies...
12
        MR. SHARP: Okay. I just want to make sure...
13
                    ...were inconsistent with...
14
        THE COURT:
15
        MR. SHARP:
                    Okay.
        THE COURT: ...each other. Yes.
16
        MR. SHARP: And then were you going to do the order?
17
18
   did you want me to draw up that order?
        THE COURT: I'm gonna have you prepare...
19
        MR. SHARP: Or recommendation. I'm sorry.
20
                    ...a recommendation.
21
        THE COURT:
22
        MR. SHARP:
                    Yes.
        THE COURT: You'll get notice of the -- of the hearing
23
   date on that after he prepares it. He's probably going to
24
25
   wanna brief it. I don't know. It -- it's...
            J-15-337398-P1
                                   04/14/2017
                                              TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
                         RODRIGUEZ
```

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

240

MR. SHARP: Yes. 1 It won't be required. But he -- he may want 2 THE COURT: 3 to do that. MR. SHARP: Yes. 4 Yes, sir? 5 THE COURT: MR. ROZIER: Can I say one thing? 6 THE COURT: 7 Yes, sir. 8 MR. ROZIER:

13 I

15

25.

I just want every- the Court to know, please $9 \parallel$ on future cases, that when we went to California and saw the 10 | list of the family that was listed, there were -- they were 11 | not even family on that side. And over here in Nevada, it's 12 | just important to make sure that that -- that web of connections gets spread out so we don't have to endure this 14 ever again.

Yeah.

THE COURT: I understand.

MR. ROZIER: And that's -- I'm -- I'm just -- just FYI. 16 17 California, same way. And that's why we're having to deal 18 | with what we're dealin' with. We did make it through to the TPR. We stopped that. We've got new caseworkers. And we're 20 | workin' on that. But as far as Nevada goes, I'm -- I'm 21 probably pretty sure it's the same because when these mothers come in and give -- give people, they're not gonna -- if they're estranged, they're not gonna give who they really need 23 24 to be givin'.

THE COURT: I go through this every single day...

TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO 04/14/2017 J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

241

```
MR. ROZIER: Yes, sir.
1
       THE COURT: ...trying to draw information out of
2
  reluctant parents. So I -- I -- I understand what California
3
  goes through, as well...
       MR. ROZIER: Yes, sir.
5
       THE COURT:
                    ...on...
6
       MR. ROZIER: I'm not blaming anybody.
7
       THE COURT: I -- I...
8
       MR. ROZIER: I'm just sayin'.
9
       THE COURT: It's -- but we should take a lesson from your
10
11 wife.
       MR. ROZIER: Yeah.
12
        THE COURT: Diligence, perseverance and hard work and we
13
14 perhaps find more of these people
        MR. ROZIER: She did do that. We drove that entire trip.
15
16 It was an entire afternoon. This is no lie. And I'm tellin'
17 you, she called and she called. She got -- she started
18 cryin'. And I said, hang on. Keep callin'. And keep
19 | findin' 'em. And finally she got to the correct people.
        THE COURT: Mr. McKay, are there any findings that you
20
   think need to be made on behalf of Esther that were not made?
21
        MR. MCKAY: I think you've done them all, Your Honor, so,
22
   my understanding.
23
        THE COURT: All right. Mr. Sharp is still looking
24
   through his notes making sure that I...
```

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
BIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

MR. SHARP: No. I just want to make sure. I know you made the... 2 ...making sure I... THE COURT: 3 MR. SHARP: ...findings yesterday. And so I think we're 4 good on -- on both prongs, so. 5 THE COURT: He's -- he's the one who has to draft the 6 order. So it's very important that he understands what needs to be in that. So I'll take as much time as you need. Is there 9 anything else you think that ... 10 I'll -- I'll get a copy of the hearing, 11 MR. SHARP: No. as well, just to make sure I got everything down, so. 12 13 THE COURT: Okay. MR. SHARP: We're good. 14 Thank you folks very much. THE COURT: 15 MR. ROZIER: Thank you. 16 Thank you. MR. SHARP: 17 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. MCKAY: 18 MR. ROZIER: Thank you. 19 (THE PROCEEDING ENDED AT 12:44:56.) 20 21 I do hereby certify that I have truly and 22 correctly transcribed the digital proceedings in the aboveentitled case to the best of my ability. 23 24 25 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO 04/14/2017 J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
BIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

243

needless to say she would be around family.

Um, like I said before, Nellie lives a different lifestyle. She's the only one in our family who has that issue. Um, and I do not plan for her to be -- I plan to keep up with her, have contact with her from a distance. Ah, it's not like I'm going to pack her up, move her to Georgia and let her disrupt our lives. Ah, she's an adult. She knows what she has to do to change her life, so, um.

Other than that, we do not have any children, Joey -together. Joey has two older sons who have their own lives.

One has a child already. Um, the other one, he works at the
medical center locally to us. And his granddaughter is -- she
is two-years-old.

Um, when we found out about Esther and Destiny, we were, at that time, trying to have children for ourselves. And we put that on hold to be able to provide them the life that they deserve.

Um, We made all efforts -- I'm emotional (cries).

THE COURT: It's okay.

THE WITNESS: Vegas is different (chuckle) than Georgia.

Um, you know, we live in a great town. We have great schools.

I'm sure there's great schools around here. I've enrolled her in a 2K program already, ah, because I was given the impression that she would be coming home with us. And that was mostly

from Bibb County. She says that there's no reason for her not to be able to come home, based on what we've done, the efforts that we've made.

We have her room ready. Now I have to get a little boy's room ready, and twelve-year-old's room ready. So, but we're prepared for all that. We knew going in that it wasn't going to be easy. Didn't know it was going to be this hard, but we knew that it was going to be an emotional roller coaster.

I've made efforts to visit with Esther. And back in November I asked if we could visit, and Kristi did tell me that we could. But I knew that our paperwork was in process, so I just assumed that it would probably be best that we had our ICPC completed. And after -- I have it on here, November, I said I like to crochet. Um, I sent Esther a blanket and a hat and a scarf. I wasn't sure how cold it got around here, but I know it gets windy, from my experience in the last two weeks. And Kristi did deliver that. She sent pictures. She said she loved the hat, put that one on immediately. (Indiscernible) sit still long enough to take a picture.

We've -- on the last hearing we brought a recordable book. It's a nighttime prayer we recorded for her so she would at least have a familiar voice when that time came that we got to visit with her. Um, she would probably think we sound

funny, too. My cousin's son said, Mom, they sound so funny, they talk weird. But we did that, and I just got her a little souvenir from the Atlanta Airport, a little purple monkey. So we gave that to Kristi last week when we were here. We put a lot of stuff on hold. I would do it all over again, a hundred times if I have to.

We actually didn't rent a car this time around, so we've been catching Uber and Lyft to dinner from where we're staying. And everybody asks, oh, you're here on vacation, no, oh, you're here for work, no. And so we tell them we're here to pursue an adoption of a family member, three family members. And everyone has their own story. And the one that stuck with me was, our last driver last night, um, from dinner, he's Korean. And his parents left him at a police station in Korea. They took him to an orphanage and an American family in California adopted him. And he thanked us for what we were doing (cries).

Of course he has no desire. We kind of try to pick a (indiscernible) a little bit to know his family. Because it is a big sea of people over there and it would be very hard. So it wouldn't be like the movie *Lion* where he tracks them down with Google Earth.

Um, I don't want Esther to have to wonder why nobody fought for her (cries). Destiny is twelve-years-old, and I can

only imagine the life experiences she's had. And I heard of some things that she had to experience. And I'm glad in a way that Esther was removed early for her not to have those experiences her sister has. She was diagnosed with RADD, and she's overcome that. And I think that's a very big thing. And I know that Esther's only two. She's not going to remember her move from the foster -- the adoptive family to us. That's one of the things I asked our Lyft driver, so, well, do you remember --at three-years-old he was adopted -- and he says that he doesn't. And I know that's a big thing of moving from one home to another. But this would be her last move, and she wouldn't have to move again.

And I joke around, I have several pets to help with the process. Georgia -- she's welcoming everybody and my cats

MR. SHARP: And, Your Honor, at this point, I understand that this is pro per, but I would move to object and strike this as all calling for speculation as far as the effect of a two-year-old. I understand the Uber driver experience, but I don't believe that that is --

THE COURT: I'm going to overrule the objection because I think it's important for her to understand that -- the potential trauma and --

MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

1 understands that moving is a trauma and what she thinks the 2 3 effect of the move would be on Esther and how she thinks she could overcome that effect on Esther. I think those are very 4 5 relevant topics. I know she not -- may not be saying it in the clinical terms that you might have -- if you were asking her 6 7 the questions you might have presented it. But that's 8 effectively what she's doing, she's recognizing that there's trauma associated with the move and telling me what it is that 9 she would do to overcome that trauma and why she thinks that 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE WITNESS: And that's what I'm presenting.

MR. SHARP: (Indiscernible.)

THE WITNESS: Um, so with that, um... THE COURT: Well, tell me a little bit about what do you

At least that's what I'm getting out of it.

guys do for a living, how often are you home, how often would you need childcare, who would provide that childcare. Sorry, I

don't mean to --

THE WITNESS: No, it's okay.

THE COURT: -- I don't mean to lead you, but I need to find out answers to these questions, so.

this move -- that this move is worth the trauma of the move.

THE COURT: -- and for her to show The Court that she

No, it's perfectly fine. THE WITNESS:

Um, we are business owners, so our schedules are very

flexible. Um, when we -- when I told my husband and -- about the whole situation with Esther and her sister Destiny, he didn't hesitate. He said, let's do this. Um, and, we work five minutes from home. Our plan is that I take a couple of months off from work, um, which would be the summer months. And her 2K program would start after that.

Um, we also have her set up for Mother's Morning Out for a few hours a day. I imagine she may get tired of seeing me twenty-four hours. There may be some things I need to get done, ah, so we do have her set up with that as well.

childcare would be the 2K program, which is from eight to twelve, for her age group. And from there I would be the one to pick her up. And once we transition me getting back into work, we do plan on daycare or having a nanny, which would be my sister. She has great experience with children. Um, so those are our plans. We -- everything is one step at a time.

But we do have, you know, things in place for Esther. As far as -- we don't work weekends. We're off Saturday, church on Sunday. Ah, a lot of times on Sundays after church we do spend time with his family, um, only because I'm the only one in Macon besides my sister. Um, so we go to dinner, we play games, we spend a lot of time together, not just because it's Sunday after church. We get together sometimes. They'll drop in, we drop in at their house. We plan game nights and

things like that. And his cousin actually is expecting, well, his wife. She's due in May with a little girl. I know that's an age difference, but once they get older that doesn't matter.

THE COURT: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

THE WITNESS: Um, so those are our plans with her as far as daycare, nanny, education. And it is at the -- the 2K program is at the church. We're believers, so I think it's very important for her to, um, learn academically and the Bible at the same time. Um, her morals.

What was your other question?

I think that was the questions. I think you actually hit on all of them. I asked about --

Ah, okay.

-- I asked about family, I asked about what you guys did,
I've asked you about how much time you'd have to take care of
the child, I asked you what you do when you weren't taking care
of the child, who was going to take care of Esther.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: And I think you went through all that.

THE WITNESS: We like to vacation. Um, with our schedule we're allowed to do that. We have a good support system at work. Theresa, our office manager, bless her heart through these last three weeks.

MR. ROZIER: Since October.

THE WITNESS: Well, October, yes. So, yeah, she deserves a raise.

But --

THE COURT: You said that under oath. You've got to be careful (chuckle).

THE WITNESS: (Chuckle.) Yeah, well, she -- she texted that to us the other day. Actually yesterday.

There's a little sign -- I know we're getting offtrack -- but a little sign says unattended children will be given energy drinks and a puppy. So we sent that to her as a joke and an energy drink and a puppy, (makes noise), so.

And -- but, you know, we've -- we plan on, you know, taking the time for Esther to bond, because we know, like I said, it's not a easy transition. We were trained for this in our adoption/foster classes to recognize different disorders.

And, um, they've provided us with a list of therapists and thing -- if she ever needed that. So we have that information, ah, if she needed.

And we've talked about, you know, if it ever -- if

Esther ever found out that I'm not Mom, I'm really cousin, and
how we would address that. We want -- we're an open book. Um,
we don't lie. We're very honest, so I think she deserves the
truth. And, as I said before, I don't -- she doesn't deserve
to -- to feel what Destiny feels and wonder why her Mom didn't

fight, her sisters didn't fight, nobody, um, and have to go through that emotionally. I think that would be very difficult. At least for me it would, so.

And I do want to say again, I don't doubt that they can love her. They've done that already. And I feel really bad (cries). I'm not a cold person. My fight is not against them. My fight is for Esther.

THE COURT: I understand.

THE WITNESS: And if you've ruled that you thought it was for the best interest for Esther to be with that family, I would -- in my heart I know she would be safe, and I would hope that they would want us as a part of her life, and -- at least the stable part of our family. There wouldn't be any worries of, is Mom going to show up. We have pictures. They don't know what -- she doesn't know what she looks like. I've thought about that. I don't put anything on Facebook. I don't want her to run into you and know that -- who Esther is. You know, we want to protect her. And I know that's what they're doing, too.

So, like I said, our fight is not against them. It's with them, because we're doing it for Esther. And although I haven't had the opportunity to hug her, to hold her, to read to her like they have, I have a love for her so grand it's -- I don't if everybody here are believers, but it's almost the

1 2 3

feeling of God when he knew you before he formed you. And that's the feeling that I have, that I love her that much (cries).

THE COURT: I'm going to turn you over to Mr. Sharp in just a second. I do want to ask you one more question.

If The Court were to determine that it's in Esther's best interest to be placed with you, how do you envision a transition taking place to minimize the trauma on Esther?

THE WITNESS: Oh, that question's for me?

THE COURT: That's for you.

THE WITNESS: Oh. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: If we were going -- if we end up placing with you guys, you've recognized when we were talking a few moments ago that that will be a traumatic thing for Esther, because she doesn't have that relationship with you yet. How would you envision being able to accomplish this to minimize the trauma?

THE WITNESS: Well, actually, my husband and I, we spoke about that this morning. And, you know, the what if's and -THE COURT: Well, let me direct you a little bit.

Are you in a position to be able to come out and make regular visits so that she can get to know you before we move her across country, if we were going to head in that direction?

THE WITNESS: Yes and yes. That's actually what we talked about. We didn't know how this process really works. You

know, walking out of here with us or -- wouldn't be ideal for us only because of the trauma for her.

THE COURT: We're not going to traumatize Esther.

THE WITNESS: I --

THE COURT: That's not going to happen.

THE WITNESS: -- I know that. I know that. I'm saying, you know --

THE COURT: Right.

THE WITNESS: -- we would want her to stay where she's at and let us -- let her get used to us, um, phone calls, voice, visiting, um, taking time.

THE COURT: And you would be comfortable --

THE WITNESS: And also for the --

THE COURT: -- you would be comfortable doing something like that, despite the fact it would be very inconvenient and very expensive? I mean --

THE WITNESS: Absolutely.

THE COURT: -- coming out here two or three times before and doing regular -- Esther would be slightly verbal at this point -- I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She's talking.

THE COURT: Okay. So you might be able to -- you know, to Facetime or Skype with her, but it's -- and are you committed to doing something like that?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely.

A lot of this was last minute for us, and so planned trips are a whole better than trying to find a flight.

THE COURT: Right.

THE WITNESS: We actually got stuck at the airport for seventeen hours when we left the last time, so -- because of the short notice and the storms that happened in Georgia. But coming back was a whole lot easier, besides gas trouble with the plane. Thank goodness they switched us.

So like I said, having a plan -- because we don't want to disrupt their lives either, just to say we want to come now. That's why I always ask Kristi, when is a good time for the family. We -- if they had plans with Esther or being out of town or with family, birthday, things, you know, life, we wanted to make sure it was okay with them first before we scheduled a date to work with their schedule.

So, yes, it would not be an issue to come back. As long as we're both on the same page of when, if a weekend is better or if a weekday, a week is better, um, how long do we need to stay, where do we need to go, do we need to go to a park or do we need to go to the Department of Family Services office, are they comfortable with us in their home. I -- I don't know. Those are things that I think communication is key. Um, and we didn't expect for us to disrupt her life and

-- a two-year-old who we've -- she's never met, on an airplane 1 for four-and-a-half hours is not ideal. So, um, yes, that's 2 3 our plan. THE COURT: Mr. Sharp, I'm going to give you an 4 opportunity to follow-up with any questions that you might 5 6 have. 7 MR. SHARP: Just one quick question. 8 STEPHANIE ROZIER 9 testifies as follows: 10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SHARP: 11 You stated, then, that part of your preparation is 12 you're aware that they're -- that Esther would experience some 13 trauma, is that correct, in the separation? 14 Ah, yes. Ah, I imagine we would all do the same. 15 Ah, my nephew, he's seven months old, and we've gone to church 16 with his aunt several times and his uncle, and they've held him 17 and held him, and then a few weeks went by --18 19 MR. SHARP: So I'm going to --20 THE WITNESS: -- he's grown --21 MR. SHARP: -- I --22 THE WITNESS: -- and he cried. He --23 MR. SHARP: I'm going to interject --

THE WITNESS: -- was separated.

24

```
MR. SHARP: -- because at this point, unless we're going
1
    to continue this tomorrow, which we may need to, we probably
2
3
    ought to continue.
                        Because we've got --
4
                     We are very unlikely to finish today.
         THE COURT:
5
                     That's --
         MR. SHARP:
6
         THE COURT:
                     I'm going to give the --
7
         MR. SHARP: -- my thought.
8
         THE COURT: -- same amount of time to the foster parents
9
10
         MR. SHARP:
                     I understand.
         THE COURT: -- to let them say whatever they want to say.
11
    So I believe your trial tomorrow has settled or resolved or
12
13
    continued or something?
14
                     I don't believe that is my trial.
         MR. SHARP:
              Is there another trial on for tomorrow?
15
         THE CLERK: (Indiscernible) trial at (indiscernible).
16
17
                     Oh, I'm sorry. It's not your trial.
         THE COURT:
18
         MR. SHARP:
                     Okay.
19
         THE COURT:
                     It's Mr. Cordes' trial.
20
         MR. SHARP:
                     So --
21
                     But it's going to come off.
         THE CLERK:
22
         THE COURT:
                     It's --
23
                     -- it is going to come off?
         MR. SHARP:
24
         THE CLERK: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).
```

```
1
         MR. SHARP:
                     Perfect.
 2
         THE COURT:
                     There's some --
 3
         MR. SHARP:
                     Okay.
 4
         THE COURT:
                     -- sort of stipulation sitting over here that
 5
    takes it off.
 6
         MR. SHARP:
                     Very good.
                                 Okay.
 7
         THE COURT:
                     I'm not sure what that is. I haven't read it
 8
    yet.
9
         MR. SHARP: That's perfect.
10
         THE COURT:
                     Yes, sir?
11
         MR. ROZIER: Am I allowed to speak?
12
         THE COURT: You will be.
13
         MR. ROZIER:
                      Okay.
14
         THE WITNESS: Okay.
15
         MR. ROZIER: I will only be two minutes when everybody's
16
    finished.
17
         THE COURT: You will be. You're going to have the same
18
    opportunity to come up, get sworn in, and say whatever you wish
19
    to say, sir.
20
         THE WITNESS: Okay.
21
         MR. ROZIER: All right. Thank you.
22
         THE WITNESS: And another thing is, to what you said, I've
23
    dropped his granddaughter off at daycare. I've dropped our
```

employee's kids at daycare. And they've been going for years.

24

```
1
    And every time it's a traumatic -- and I know it's not
2
    comparable to an extent -- but we go -- life happens and
3
    there's traumatic experiences that we all go through. And a
4
    child's -- you drop them off at daycare, they cry and they are
5
    okay.
6
              And with the time that they spent with Esther, I
7
    don't see why she couldn't bond with us as well.
8
         THE COURT: Is that your --
9
         MR. SHARP: I have no further questions.
10
         THE COURT: -- only question?
11
         MR. SHARP:
                     That was my only question.
12
         THE COURT: Okay.
13
         MR. SHARP:
                     Thank you.
14
         THE COURT: On -- all right.
15
              We're going to -- do you want to move onto Mr. Rozier
16
17
         MR. SHARP:
                     I --
18
         THE COURT:
                     -- or you want to --
19
         MR. SHARP:
                     Oh, actually yes --
20
         THE COURT:
                     -- do you want to get --
21
         MR. SHARP:
                     -- we'd like to do --
22
         THE COURT:
                     -- or --
23
         MR. SHARP:
                     -- Mr. Rozier.
```

24

THE COURT:

Okay.

1 MR. SHARP: That's just fine. 2 THE COURT: I'm going --3 THE WITNESS: Do you have any questions? 4 -- to have you and your husband trade places. THE COURT: 5 THE WITNESS: Okay. 6 MR. ROZIER: Okay. 7 THE COURT: Sir, I'm going to have you come up. 8 THE WITNESS: Should I leave this here for him if he needs 9 the records? 10 THE COURT: If it is helpful for -- if it'll help him 11 recall what he needs to call, dates and times and things like 12 that, that's fine. 13 Yeah, if I could have you remain standing, the 14 clerk's going to swear you in first. 15 THE CLERK: Do you solemnly swear the testimony you're 16 about to give in this action shall be the truth, the whole 17 truth and nothing but the truth so help you God? 18 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 19 THE COURT: The same sort of thing, I'm going to have you 20 either speak loudly or speak into the microphone --21 THE CLERK: Can you please state and spell --22 THE COURT: -- whatever your preference is. 23 THE CLERK: -- your name for the record.

THE COURT: And, I'm sorry.

24

1	Please state and spell your name for the record,			
2	please.			
3	THE WITNESS: Joey Rozier, J-o-e-y, R-o-z-i-e-r.			
4	THE COURT: Mr. Sharp.			
5	MR. SHARP: Thank you.			
6	JOEY ROZIER			
7	having been called as a witness by the State and being first			
8	duly sworn, testifies as follows:			
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION			
10	BY MR. SHARP:			
11	Q Actually, Mr. Rozier, I apologize, I don't have any			
12	questions for you. But do you have anything that you would			
13	like to add to your wife's testimony?			
14	A I will.			
15	JOEY ROZIER			
16	having been called as a witness by the State and being first			
17	duly sworn, testifies as follows:			
18	CROSS EXAMINATION			
19	THE WITNESS: Um, one thing you guys need to know, we've			
20	I've listen and it's hard to watch your wife cry on in			
21				
22	THE COURT: Yeah.			
23	THE WITNESS: with all the things that we've been			
24	through. And it's not against, like we said, anybody in here.			

And that's important.

And we're talking years from now. We're talking year, month, the birthdays, whatever, all the things that she would go to. And it's heartbreaking, because one of us is going to cry when we leave in the next couple of days. And it's not cool. It's not fair. Really isn't.

And we're not a bunch of crybabies. I'm just telling you, it's a bigger picture with the siblings. And what -- and I know we don't count siblings, I understand that. But at the end of the day, we're trying to keep a whole -- we're trying to keep brothers and sisters in one -- in one house. And that's important. And I was having fun trying to make a baby, too, let me tell you.

(LAUGHTER.)

Okay? But we didn't have a -- but we did put things on hold, and I know you guys have put things on hold, too. We all have, and we all pay the price. Okay? But at the end of the day, you get -- and I'd hate to have -- I don't want your job. I really don't. And I feel for you. And I mean that from the bottom of my heart.

THE COURT: Today is not a good --

THE WITNESS: It is not.

THE COURT: -- day to have my job.

THE WITNESS: I understand that.

But just know we'll be back. We can bond with Esther. If it takes four months, five months, whatever it takes for us to feel comfortable when she can go, that's fine, we understand that. Okay?

And I know we're coming out of left field and everybody's saying, well, who are these people. We understand that. Okay? We're human beings. We just -- I can't help things did not get streamlined when we -- when the baby was born.

Like I said, it's hard to keep up with an addict.

And if I had LoJack I'd probably be better. Okay? But I don't. So we're having to make contact with everybody across the country to keep up with one woman, and that's just nuts, and it's not fair. It's not fair for everybody sitting in here.

But we do have a good stable home. My family's from Georgia. I grew up in Georgia. She's got family in Augusta that -- the family part of the fit -- of the family is on the east coast with all the sisters, and we're trying to include the west coast people, too. And we've made that. So we've done nothing else. We win. And we might not get Esther, but we've got everybody together. And I've an unborn to go fight for. And that's the difference. (Indiscernible) --

THE COURT: Mr. Sharp --

1	Oops, I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you.
2	MR. SHARP: I have no further questions at this time, Your
3	Honor.
4	THE COURT: Mr. McKay, did you have any questions of
5	MR. MCKAY: No questions, Your Honor.
6	THE WITNESS: Okay.
7	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
8	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
9	THE COURT: Are we going to we've got an hour. We can
10	get Ms. Quinlan done.
11	MR. SHARP: I think that let's do Ms. Quinlan and then
12	we can continue till tomorrow, if
13	Will you guys be available tomorrow?
14	FOSTER PARENTS: (No audible response.)
15	MR. SHARP: Okay.
16	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
17	MR. SHARP: Very good.
18	MR. MCKAY: Do you know before we get started, if I
19	may, Your Honor, for since we may be meeting tomorrow, do
20	you know what time we would meet tomorrow?
21	THE COURT: That depends on you guys. I'm free
22	MR. MCKAY: You're free all day?
23	THE COURT: I had a I had a TPR trial scheduled all
24	day firm.

1	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.				
2	MR. MCKAY: Okay.				
3	THE COURT: Apparently firm isn't what firm used to be.				
4	MR. MCKAY: If The Court doesn't mind				
5	(LAUGHTER.)				
6	I'm going to I'm going to make a couple messages				
7	on my phone to check				
8	THE COURT: Sure. That's				
9	MR. MCKAY: my schedule for tomorrow.				
10	THE COURT: that's not a problem.				
11	MR. SHARP: And if we can just get like a				
12	THE COURT: And I'll work with everybody's schedule in				
13	terms of timing tomorrow.				
14	MR. SHARP: Can we just take like a five-minute recess?				
15	THE COURT: Sure.				
16	MR. SHARP: Okay. Thank you.				
17	(RECORDING STOPPED AT 16:00:55.)				
18	(RECORDING BEGAN AT 16:11:46.)				
19	THE CLERK: Okay. We're on.				
20	THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. We're back on the record on				
21	Case No. J337398, Nellie Saez.				
22	Can I get Ms. Quinlan sworn in, please?				
23	THE CLERK: Do you solemnly swear the testimony				
24	you're about to give in this action shall be the truth, the				

1	whole truth and nothing but the truth so help you God?			
2	THE WITNESS: Yes.			
3	THE CLERK: Thank you.			
4	Please state and spell your name for the record.			
5	THE WITNESS: Kristina Quinlan, K-r-i-s-t-i-n-a,			
6	Q-u-i-n-l-a-n.			
7	THE CLERK: Thank you.			
8	THE COURT: Thank you.			
9	MR. SHARP: Thank you.			
10	KRISTINA QUINLAN			
11	having been called as a witness by the State and being first			
12	duly sworn, testifies as follows:			
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION			
14	BY MR. SHARP:			
15	Q Ms. Quinlan, how are you employed?			
16	A I am a permanency specialist, Family Services			
17	Specialist II, with the Department of Family Services.			
17 18	Specialist II, with the Department of Family Services. Q Very good.			
18	Q Very good.			
18 19	Q Very good. And how long have you been with the Department?			
18 19 20	Q Very good. And how long have you been with the Department? A For almost two-and-a-half years.			
18 19 20 21	Q Very good. And how long have you been with the Department? A For almost two-and-a-half years. Q Okay. And were you assigned to the case involving			
18 19 20 21	Q Very good. And how long have you been with the Department? A For almost two-and-a-half years. Q Okay. And were you assigned to the case involving Esther Rodriguez?			

1	A	To the best of my recollection, towards the end of
2	September	, 2015.
3	Q	Okay. Would October 25th, 2015 sound accurate?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Very good.
6		Now just reviewing the history of the case, Esther
7	was remov	ed on July 29th, 2015; is that correct?
8	A	I thought it was the twenty-seventh, but, yes.
9	Q	Okay. So it was at
10	A	End of
11	Q	least July
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	of 2015?
14	A	End of July, 2015.
15	Q	Very good.
16		Now during the initial stages of the case, who was
17	the origin	nal investigator that was assigned to this case?
18	A	Martha Cardiel.
19	Q	And did Martha Cardiel perform a diligent search for
20	relatives	of Esther?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	And in that diligent search, it just identifies the
23	first deg	ree of relation, is that what it is?
24	А	Yes.

1 Q Okay. Very good. 2 And, in doing so, the name of Carolina came up. 3 fact, I believe that was provided by Nellie herself; is that correct? 5 Α Yes. 6 Okay. And, in fact, natural mom provided the names 7 of some of the older adult siblings as well; is that correct? 8 Α Um, I -- you mean to Martha? 9 I'm sorry, to Martha. 10 Do you recall -- have you had a chance to review the 11 notes? 12 I reviewed, um, some of the notes, and I was also told by Martha that she wasn't able to identify any relatives 13 14 at that time --15 Q Okay. 16 -- for placement. 17 So when you say, wasn't able to identify, she did a 18 diligent search; is that correct? 19 Α Yes. 20 Okay. And so did she seek to notify those relatives? Q To my knowledge, when a diligent search is done, the 21 A 22 diligent search sends -- their office sends letters to the

relatives asking them to contact the Department.

23

24

Q

Very good.

89

And then in October when you were assigned to the 1 2 case, did you perform a diligent search? I don't recall if I performed one at that time. 3 Α Okay. During the course of your time with the case, 4 Q 5 have you done a diligent search --Yes. 6 Α 7 -- and sent out the notifications? 0 8 Very good. And, to the best of your knowledge, the notifications 9 would have been sent to the half-siblings, Esther's adult half-10 siblings; is that correct? 11 12 Α Correct. Okay. Now in April of 2016, Carolina contacted you; 13 14 is that correct? 15 Α Yes. Okay. And did you discuss with her being a potential 16 Q 17 adoptive placement? 18 Α Yes. 19 Q How did that go? 20 She informed me that she was not able to be a Α placement for Esther, as she was working, going to school, and 21 had her own children. And I did inform her at that time that 22 23 we were looking for an adoptive placement for Esther.

Okay. And, aside from that, that was the only

24

Q

1 relative of Esther that made contact with the Department that 2 you're aware of? 3 Α There was a -- who we believed to be a paternal --Oh --0 -- aunt of -- of Esther, who --5 6 And that's correct. Let me correct that. 7 The -- that was the only maternal relative; is that 8 correct? 9 Α Yes. Okay. Because the paternal -- the punitive father in 10 11 this case was later determined not to be the father; is that 12 right? 13 Correct. Α 14 Okay. Very good. 15 And so on October 20th, 2016, is that when you contacted Ms. Rozier? 16 17 Α Yes. 18 Okay. Now how did that conversation go when you 19 contacted her, when you spoke with her? 20 She -- Ms. Rozier informed me that she had, um, Α learned that Esther was in care. I informed her that Esther 21 22 had been in care almost sixteen months at that point, that she 23 was in an adoptive placement. Um, we discussed possible ICPC. Did you ask Ms. Rozier why she had not come forward 24 Q

5

A I did, and the -- I didn't receive a clear answer. I can't remember the exact words of the conversation, but, um, at that time the answer wasn't really clear to me.

Q Okay. And you stated at that time as you said that Esther had been in care for sixteen months and that she was in an adoptive resource?

A Yes.

Q Did you advise them at that time or around that time that they would -- that they could have visits with Esther?

A I had -- around that time I had staffed with my supervisor, who, at the time, was Darryl Glover, who had -- and I believe that may have been in November --

Q Okay.

A -- of 2016. Um, and he had informed me he thought it was possible.

Q Okay. And so you advised them that they could do visitations; is that --

A Yes.

Q -- correct --

A Yes.

Q -- as pursuant to Ms. Rozier's testimony as well?

And then in February of this year, that's when the decision for visitations changed; is that correct?

So from October to February there was no

23

24

A

Q

I believe so.

mention that they couldn't attend the court hearings; is that right?

- A I don't -- I don't recall.
- Q Okay. Let's talk about Esther for just a minute.

 So Esther was initially placed in a temporary foster home for about the first six weeks of her life and then was moved to a second foster home; is that correct?
 - A Yes.

- Q Okay. Now that second foster home was not an adoptive placement; is that right?
- A The second foster home was hopeful that Mom would reunify with Esther. They're typically a foster home just to foster.
 - Q Okay.
- A Um, as Esther was in their home for a longer period of time, they seriously considered if they could be an adoptive placement, and they finally, yes, came to the decision that they could not.
- Q So approximately from July, 2015 until September 9th of 2016, the child was in the second adoptive home; is that correct -- or, I'm sorry, second --
 - A Foster home.
 - O -- foster home?
- 24 A Yes.

Q Thank you.

And then in September of that year is when the child was moved to the third foster home, the current foster home, correct?

- A Correct.
- Q Very good.

Now going back to Ms. Saez. I know that there has been some reference made to a couple of other siblings in care. Let's talk first about Destiny. Destiny is a twelve-year-old; is that correct?

- A Yes.
- Q And she is currently in an adoptive home; is that right?
- A Yes, it's my understanding that she has been in that adoptive home for approximately nine months.
 - Q Okay. So she's been in an adoptive home.

Do you know if Ms. Saez' parental rights have been terminated?

- A It's my understanding that she still has her parental rights.
- Q Okay. Now is it your understanding as well that Ms. Saez is again pregnant?
- A Yes. Ms. Rozier first made me aware of Ms. Saez being pregnant. I believe that was in October during their

first conversation. I put out -- I called in a hospital alert.

And then she -- as she's got more information about the pregnancy she provided that.

I was then informed, um, last week, that several calls came in about Ms. Saez being pregnant, possible dangers to the unborn child.

- Q And what were those dangers?
- A That she's still actively using methamphetamine while pregnant. And that her mental health, um, was unstable to the point where she was Legal 2000, I believe, last week.
 - Q So she was Legal 2000 last week.

 Do we have a due date for this child?
- A I was told by Ms. Rozier that it was approximately around Mother's Day.
- Q But at this time we obviously don't know if this child will be -- will come into our custody or even if the child is going to survive given Mom's actions; is that right?
 - A Correct.
- Q Okay. Just to get the Department's representation on this, I believe Ms. Rozier said that when she initially called and spoke with you, you said that the child had been out of care for ten months; is that right?
 - A That is what Ms. Rozier stated.
 - Q Okay. And -- but October of 2016 the child would

have been in care for sixteen months, correct?

- A Fifteen, almost sixteen months.
- Q Almost sixteen, okay.

Now did you inform Ms. Rozier about a requirement to attend any classes?

A I -- when I speak with people about the ICPC process
I always advise them, wait to hear from the ICPC workers,
because I'm -- I'm not familiar with each state's ICPC process
and can't speak for that process.

- Q How -- I assume you've had the opportunity to observe the child with the Rivera's, correct?
 - A Yes.

Q Okay. How was that relationship?

A If you didn't know that Esther was in fostercare you wouldn't know. She is extremely bonded to them. She is what I would describe as clingy to them. Um, she's very comfortable with them. She -- every time I visit she usually wants to be held by one of them, or if they're both there, by both of them. Um, she -- when she's showing me her toys or when she's playing with something, she wants one of them to play with her. She, um, says, you know, mom and -- and dad. She -- she adores them. And they adore her.

- Q Has Esther been meeting her developmental milestones?
- A Yes, they're -- I did do another referral to, um,

But now she NEIS, because she was a little slow in her speech. 1 seems to be catching. 3 0 Okay. 4 MR. SHARP: Court's indulgence? 5 THE COURT: No problem. 6 (PAUSE.) 7 BY MR. SHARP: During -- or have you received any kind of education, 8 Q through your work or otherwise, as to trauma that children of a 9 young age may experience with multiple removals? 10 Yes, both in my graduate school at UNLV and my 11 Α 12 training -- my four-and-a-half month training with the 13 Department of Family Services. 14 Q And at graduate school, what was that? The program -- at that time I was pursuing dual 15 degree in school in mental-health counseling, so I took all of 16 mental-health courses except for the last two, which were not 17 being offered again that year, and I graduated with my Master's 18 19 of Education in School Counseling. 20 Very good. Q 21 In 2014. Α And then when did you complete your training with the 22 23 Department? 24 My training with the Department started in December A

Court's indulgence just a moment?

No problem.

23 (PAUSE.)

21

22

24

BY MR. SHARP:

MR. SHARP:

THE COURT:

Q And so if Esther was again placed in another home, this would then be the fourth home; is that correct?

A Correct.

Q Ms. Quinlan, do you believe it would be in Esther's best interest for her to be placed with the Roziers --

A No.

Q -- at this time?
Why is that?

A Well, first it would, um, delay permanency for Esther for possibly up to a year. We are potentially within, ah, thirty to forty-five days of achieving permanency for Esther, which is within our ASPA timeline, which is, I believe, achieving permanency with adoption in two years.

Um, Esther would have to live in that home for six months before we could even request the adoption home study. At that point, the adoption home study itself could take several months. And then once that's approved, adoption finalization could take another several months. At that time we're looking at a year if, that's if placement works out, which is never guaranteed. Um, so for that reason I would say it's not in her best interest.

Additionally, she's been with the Rivera's for a little over seven months now, which although for an adult that is not a significant amount of time. For Esther, it's

approximately one-third of her life, which is a significant amount of time for a child of that age.

She is extremely bonded to them. When we transitioned from the last foster home to the Rivera's, it was approximately a three- to four-week transition in which the Rivera's went to that foster home, they brought Esther to their foster -- to the Rivera's home. They took their time with the transition, getting Esther comfortable. And they've maintained a relationship with the family. So Esther still has a relationship. She still sees them occasionally. She still has that bond as well. Um, and she thinks of -- by her -- by my observations of her behavior it appears that she thinks of the Riveras as her mom and dad.

She, um, is -- like I said, she's very bonded to them. Um, she's very clingy with them. She doesn't come even to me easily, and I've known her a significant amount of time of her life. She always wants to be held by them, be doing something with them.

She's, um -- she's got a wonderful daycare which is very academically oriented. She has friends there. She's very involved. They go to church, um, regularly. They're very friendly with their pastor. She's even -- she's so comfortable with him. They've had dinner in his home. Um, she -- they have family that she considers grandparents, aunt, uncles.

She's got a bond not only with them, but with others in their family and in the community.

Q So based on your training experience, do you think that a gradual processes, as was indicated earlier, where maybe the Roziers could come out two or three times and do visits and then make a transition then, do you think that would minimize the trauma at all?

A I -- I think it would have to be in a -- such an extremely gradual process that would continue to delay permanency for her. And we don't know if it would minimize the trauma. We can't -- we can't say that. She's not needed any kind of therapy yet to this point. I think it could cause her to need therapy depending on the trauma, um, which at this time is, um, an unknown.

I also know that in my conversations with the Riveras about the ICPC, which I've made them aware of, that they are open, they had expressed to me that they were open to Esther knowing her biological family, that they wanted her to know her biological family and know that there was family out there that loved her.

Q And have you expressed your worries as far as potential trauma to Esther to Ms. Rozier?

A I had spoken several times to Ms. Rozier. Most recently it was, I believe, March 31st about the trauma to

1	MS. ROZIER: Ah, no.
2	MR. MCKAY: I've got some questions.
3	THE WITNESS: Okay.
4	KRISTINA QUINLAN
5	testifies as follows:
6	CROSS EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. MCKAY:
8	Q When how old was Esther when she was taken from
9	her mother?
10	A I believe let's see, she was born June 15th. I
11	believe the date of removal was end of July, so maybe
12	approximately six weeks.
13	Q All right. An approximate what I'm going to ask
14	you I just need some approximates, all right.
15	So she's about six weeks old.
16	Do you when she was separated from her mom, based
17	on your experience, did she face was there trauma in her
18	life at that point? Did she face trauma?
19	A Every removal or every change would be a trauma.
20	Q Okay. So you'll admit that the three times so far
21	there has been trauma and at this point she's overcome it; is
22	that correct?
23	A Yes.
24	Q Okay. I know you briefly talked about your

1	education	.
2		Did you say you have a Master's Degree in School
3	A	Counseling.
4	Q	Counseling?
5		You're not a licensed psychologist; is that correct?
6	A	I am not.
7	Q	All right.
8		Or a psychiatrist?
9	A	No.
10	Q	You talked about her potential Esther's potential
11	for havin	g some problems in the future. You've based that on
12	some cour	ses that you took?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	What courses were can you how many courses did
15	you take	that dealt with child separation and trauma and that
16	anxiety?	
17	A	Um, I had courses in, um, mental-health counseling,
18	introduct	ory and advanced courses, um, family therapy. Um,
19	honestly,	at this time I can't remember how many courses
20	Q	Do you know how many
21	A	on that.
22	Q	studies you've read on that issue, on that
23	specific	issue?
24	A	Over the over the last three years?

Q Clinical studies.

A I can't recall an exact number. I would say maybe ten to twenty over the last three years.

- Q Let me ask you this -- and I -- this isn't my normal arena.
 - A Um-hmm (in the affirmative).
- Q I do a lot of -- my cases are civil. We -- like we might have different standards, so I'm going to -- I may be going above and beyond, but let me ask you this.

So in my arena, when I ask a doctor about somebody's future problems, they have to tell The Court within a reasonable degree of medical probability or a reasonable degree of psychological probability. Have you ever heard of that before?

- A I have.
- Q All right. And pretty much that means more than fifty percent, if that's your -- maybe that's your understanding. That's my understanding of what that rule is.

Are you testifying here today, should Esther go through a process of transitioning and be with the Roziers, that you believe it's the -- I think you talked about a couple different anxieties she could have (indiscernible) -- and are you saying within a reasonable degree of like psychological probability she will have those things if she's transferred?

1	A	I'm not a clinician so I can't state that. I can
2	only say	what
3	Q	It's just
4	A	it's a possibility. But, no, I'm not going to
5	I can't s	ay
6	Q	Do you in your opinion do you think it's a
7	possibili	ty those things occurring would be greater than fifty
8	percent?	
9	A	You know, every child is different. Every case is
10	different	. So I I can't
11	Q	So as you sit here today
12	A	I can't give a percentage.
13	Q	you're just speculating
14	A	I could say that it's possible.
15	Q	on that issue?
16		It's possible?
17	A	It's possible.
18	Q	You're not saying it's probable?
19	A	No, because every child is different.
20	Q	When as Esther's CAP Attorney, when did you advise
21	me of the	Roziers' existence?
22	A	(Sigh.) I can't remember. I know that I had emailed
23	and calle	d several times, um, and not gotten not heard back
24	from you.	I may have to the best of my recollection it

1	might have	e been at the around the time of the Permanency
2	Review.	
3	Q	Was that in the January
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	court at the end of January?
6	A	Um-hmm (in the affirmative).
7	Q	Do you recall what you told me at that point in time
8	about the	Roziers?
9	A	Um, I can't recall exactly. I believe it was about
10	the ICPC,	that they had asked about visits, but not asked again
11	about sche	eduling a visit. But I can't recall exactly.
12	Q	Do you recall that you let me know that they sent a
13	present?	$ \mathbf{w} _{\mathbf{F}} = e^{i t} = -\mathbf{g}$
14	A	(No audible response.)
15	Q	Do you recall that?
16	A	Yes, and I gave that to Esther, um
17	Q	Yeah, and I understand that. I'm just I'm trying
18	if you	remember
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	what you told me.
21	A	I remember some things but not the entirety of the
22	conversat:	ion.
23	Q .	All right.
24		Did you ever provide me with contact information for

1	the Roziers?
2	A I don't believe so because I don't believe you had
3	asked for it.
4	Q All right. Did you ever deny the Roziers my contact
5	information?
6	A If I recall correctly, my supervisor Taryn had
7	advised me, because they weren't a party to the case, they
8	couldn't have that.
9	Q Did they ask for it?
10	A I believe once in February or March.
11	MR. MCKAY: Okay. I don't have any further questions.
12	THE COURT: Do you want to do some ollow-up?
13	MR. SHARP: Just one quick follow-up.
14	KRISTINA QUINLAN
15	testifies as follows:
16	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. SHARP:
18	Q I understand that you're not a psychologist and I
19	understand that each the case with each child is different.
20	You had talked before that Esther appears to be very
21	bonded to the point of being clingy. You talked about that
22	this actually, I'm sorry, I believe this would be the fourth
,,	nomoval if you gount Mom

Given your experience with Esther, do you believe

```
1
                    I think at this point --
        MR. SHARP:
                    -- get a little bit of testimony in or?
2
         THE COURT:
                    -- we should just rest and we can go full
3
        MR. SHARP:
4
    scale tomorrow.
5
         THE COURT:
                     Okay.
                     (Indiscernible) tomorrow morning.
6
         MR. SHARP:
                     What works out -- we do have two PC's on
7
         THE COURT:
8
    tomorrow.
9
         MR. SHARP:
                    Okay.
10
         THE COURT:
                    So --
11
         MR. SHARP:
                    I think --
                    -- I could start as early as when those PC's
12
         THE COURT:
13
    are done.
         MR. SHARP: If we just go ten o'clock? I ca -- I don't
14
    know what the PC's look like. But --
15
16
         THE COURT: I haven't read them yet.
17
                     -- I think we schedule it for ten and then we
         MR. SHARP:
18
    can have a chance to talk, so.
19
         THE COURT: Does ten o'clock work for everyone?
20
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just a minute.
21
         THE CLERK: They're both (indiscernible).
         THE COURT: They are? Okay. I -- okay. See Lilly is way
22
23
    ahead of me.
24
         MR. SHARP: Okay. And --
```

- 1	
1	THE COURT: Does that work for the foster family? Is that
2	okay for tomorrow?
3	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (No audible response.)
4	THE COURT: All right. So we'll start back up at ten
5	o'clock tomorrow and we'll go until we finish.
6	MR. SHARP: Very good. Thank you.
7	MR. MCKAY: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	MR. ROZIER: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	MS. ROZIER: Thank you.
10	(THE PROCEEDING ENDED AT 16:44:27.)
11	
12	* * * *
13	
14	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and
15	correctly transcribed the digital proceedings in the above-
16	entitled case to the best of my ability.
17	
18	SHELLY ATOUB,
19	Transcriber II
20	,
21	
22	
23	

	· ·
1	PTRAN
2	
3	COPY
4	
5	EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
6	JUVENILE DIVISION
7	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
8	
9	In the Matter of:) CASE NO. J-15-33
10	ESTHER RODRIGUEZ,) COURTROOM NO. 14
11	Date of Birth: 06-15-2015,) APPEAL NO. 73272
12	A Minor(s).) SEALED
13	
14	BEFORE THE HONORADIE TON NORTHER TONES
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JON NORHEIM, HEARIN
16	TRANSCRIPT RE: PLACEMENT HEARING - D
17	FRIDAY, APRIL 14, 2017
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FILED JUN 27 2017 COURT 15-337398-P1 EARING MASTER IG - DAY TWO

i	INDEXO	F	r I W	NES	SES	
2		•				
3	THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2017	<u>DI</u>	RECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
4	STATE'S WITNESSES					
5	STEPHANIE ROZIER		20	51	76	
6	JOEY ROZIER		81	81	, •	
7	KRISTINA QUINLAN		87	104	109	
8			0,	101	109	
9						
10						
11	OPENING STATEMENTS					
12	By Mr. Sharp Page 11					
13	By Mr. Rozier Page 12,	14				
14						
15	*	* *	* *			
16						
17						
18		•				
19						
17						

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

20

21

22

23

24

INDEX OF

THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2017 STATE'S EXHIBITS ADMITTED GoFundMe page Facebook posting Various letters and documents Letters of recommendation

> J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1 INDEX OF WITNESSES 2 3 DIRECT CROSS RECROSS REDIRECT FRIDAY, APRIL 14, STATE'S WITNESSES 6 TARYN LAMAISON By Mr. Sharp 121 7 By Ms. Rozier 135 162 8 176 By Mr. McKay 141 9 By Mr. Rozier 169 10 REGINA RIVERA 11 By Mr. Sharp 178 12 PHILIP RIVERA 13 (Read a prepared statement into record.) Page 201 14 15 PARTICIPANTS/WITNESSES 16 JOEY ROZIER 17 (Made a statement on the record.) Page 208 18 STEPHANIE ROZIER 19 (Made a statement on the record.) Page 210 20 21 22 CLOSING ARGUMENTS 23 By Mr. Sharp Page 212 By Mr. Rozier Page 221

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

By Ms. Rozier Page 227 By Mr. McKay Page 228

24

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

FRIDAY, APRIL 14, 2017

STATE'S EXHIBITS

ADMITTED

Letters submitted by The Riveras

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

PROCEEDINGS

3

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25 (THE PROCEEDING BEGAN AT 10:17:10.)

THE COURT: All right. Case Number J337398, Nellie Saez. This is day two of our placement trial. I have the exact same people who were here yesterday. So I probably don't need to take appearances again.

Mr. Sharp, you indicated you had a preliminary matter you wanted to discuss.

MR. SHARP: I do. The Riveras have submitted several letters. They are, essentially, letters of recommendation 12 from different persons in the community. We have agreed and 13 stipulated to have these admitted as State's Exhibit 4. And so I would like to present -- actually you'll have the -- the exhibit there. And so you're certainly entitled to that copy.

THE COURT: They already up there?

MR. SHARP: I've provided copies of the exhibits to the other parties, as well.

(Whereupon State's Exhibit 4 was admitted.)

MR. SHARP: And then the State will call Ms. Lamaison as my next witness.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And if you could remain standing...

MS. LAMAISON: Sure.

THE COURT: ...the clerk will swear you in.

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1	THE CLERK: Do you solemnly swear the testimony you're
2	about to give in this action shall be the truth, the whole
3	truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?
4	MS. LAMAISON: I do.
5	THE CLERK: Thank you. Please state and spell your name
6	for the record.
7	MS. LAMAISON: Taryn, T-A-R-Y-N, Lamaison,
8	L-A-M-A-I-S-O-N.
9	THE COURT: Are we ready?
10	TARYN LAMAISON,
11	having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
12	DIRECT EXAMINATION
13	BY MR. SHARP:
14	Q Ms. Lamaison, how are you employed?
15	A I'm employed with the Department of Family Services
16	in Clark County.
17	Q And what's your position with the Department?
18	A I'm currently a supervisor of Family Services.
19	Q And how long have you been working for the
20	Department?
21	A I've worked for the Department for 11 years in
22	different capacities.
23	Q Very good. You stated that currently you are a
24	supervisor. Is that right?
25	A I am.
	Market and the state of the sta

Q Okay. Have you had any training or experience in the effects that removals have on -- on subject minors in care?

A Absolutely. Starting my career here 11 years ago, all employees are sent through a training curriculum that kind of addresses the general overall assumptions of the Adoptions and Safe Families Act around kind of moving of children, preferences in placement, as well as timeliness for permanency for children and the effects on their -- on their psyche, essentially, or their well-being -- emotional well-being.

From there, as I've kind of changed and flexed in my positions, I have been trained and -- and went through a program on 3-5-7, which is a grief and loss model here our Department kind of was advocating for, for years. It kind of looked on how we do adoption par- papra- preparedness and readiness activities for children, as well as caregivers, to ensure that we have successful adoptions and successful attachment and bonding with them.

From there, I've taken many courses in everything from reactive attachment disruption, as well as how to kind of minimize the trauma and the effects of children who are brought into foster care.

From there, I moved on to being a trainer. I was a management analyst initially. And then I was a training coordinator here at the Department of Family Services from

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

two-thousand -- let's see, probably '07 till about 2012.

During that time, I became the certified trainer in the foster parent curriculum that we brought here to Clark County, which is the MAPPs program. I'm one of 13 certified master trainers in the nation regarding that.

And much of what we teach in those foster and adoptive parents is how to prepare families for the trauma children experience and how they perceive coming into foster care, whether it be foster care adoptive homes and the importance of successful attachment, bonding, minimizing trauma and how we help support children through their grief and loss.

7

10

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

Q And it's my understanding, did you also work in the juvenile system, as well?

A I did. Prior to coming to Clark County, I was a juvenile probation officer for nine years in the state of Oregon. I worked both in closed-custody facilities with children who -- mainly, I worked with violent offenders, children who were sentenced to Measure 11 offenses.

Then from there, I moved on to working with kind of first-time offenders in the juvenile justice system to kinda help them. And through that, I also have, probably -- I would say my academy was six weeks, so 40 hours a week. But from there, we also did about 150 different hours, kind of understanding the abnormal psychology and development of

15

17

18

21

children who didn't have kind of normal and consistent relationships. It seems to be a contributing factor to criminal behavior in ju- in youth.

Q So can you describe for the Court throughout your training and experience, what you have learned as far as the effects of -- of multiple removals on a child who is around the age of 2?

A So our understanding of children who are removed from care, the basic building blocks are the first two years of a child's life, is really where they're setting the foundation for their secure attachments to caregivers.

It is imperative that we at all costs try to keep 13 those relationships with their birth parents, which is really kind of why we have our current safety models here, that they can stay at home as much as possible and that we put in the services we can so they can build that attachment to their parent.

A lot of the studies that were done were really 19 | looking at kind of children and their parents and how do they reunify children with parents after maybe two years of being removed. They kind of expand that and kind of looking at now, my understanding and through studies that we've -- and in trainings that I've been in, is that we've looked at kind of 24 how do we transition children? And what's in the best 25 | interest of children?

We talk about moving them and how really those first two years is their foundation for being able to build their loving, securing relationships, being able to have some self-efficacy and understanding, reducing behaviors in the children.

And actually we've seen that early tra- trauma -and trauma is considered movements of children, is -- is an
example of trauma, it actually changes their brain development
overall. And it kind of since enforced kind of the way they
use their brain from being kind of set in the now and then
their short-term versus their long-term memory ability. So at
all costs, the general consensus in -- in child welfare in
this -- in this study is that children shouldn't be moved.
Really, we need to reduce it down to no movement.

And children have the right to have, you know, immediate permanency, as well as having at least one and consistent loving caregiver who can meet their regular needs as they're building those building blocks. The first two years is probably the most essential for children.

- Q You stated before that when you worked in the juvenile system that there was some correlation between removal and -- and later, criminal activity. Is that correct?
- A Absolutely. When children are taken away, their -their ability to have, like, power or control over their
 situations -- and a lot of children are forced into changes,

1 | t 2 | t 3 | t 4 | 1

movements. They're exposed to environments that are beyond their control. But as they are placed into a place where things are outside of their control, they begin to have some kind of abnormal or a negative coping mechanisms that come into place.

We see a lot of changes in their, like I said, brain development that they can't really get back. But we see a lot of impulse control, increased anxiety disorders. We see children who start having maladaptive behaviors that are maybe not necessarily socially normal. And so that can lead children into criminal activities with the increase in numbers of moves on children.

So we see that most of the ch- juveniles I worked with, it -- it didn't necessarily mean they had absolutely been in foster care. But they had at least, when you got talking to them, lived with their parents, lived with their father, their older sisters, their aunts and uncles, their grandparents. They just had to move around a lot and lived with different types of people throughout their lives. Those inconsistent caregivers for them did contribute to a lot of their control issues and their aggression.

- Q So coming to the present case, have you met Esther?
- A I have.
- Q Okay. How long have you been familiar with -- with Esther?

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

I tried to come down on her level.

25

I said hello to

her. I smiled. I waved. It took a very long time. And I would say I was probably at the house for approximately an hour. And really, Esther never really warmed up to me, which is probably a normal, to some degree, experience with children in foster care. You know, she might show me things in her house. She showed me her bedroom. She showed me the toy she likes to play with, her dogs.

I tried to interact with her on her level. She doesn't have very strong verbal skills. But really, she wanted nothing to do with me. She wouldn't come over to me when I asked her. You know, if I brought my hand down, she was really much more attached and clinging to the caregivers and appeared to be just scared of me overall.

Q Okay. And what did you observe as far as the Rivera's interaction with -- with Esther?

A Oh I felt they were very appropriate. They did a lot of the -- the things you would see in -- in natural families. They -- you know, they comforted her by putting hands on her shoulder. They, you know, put their hand on her back. They held her hand. They showed her that I was their friend.

I also noticed that they had a lot to share about Esther. When I sat there with them, they had a tablet full of just photos of things that they had done with Esther. They had taught her to swim, that they -- where she went to her

child care. They showed me pictures of the day care and how they're able to watch her kind of online. And they get updates throughout the day while she's in day care.

They told me about her new little best friends. They told me about the toy she likes to use, which actually they taught me that she prefers just kind of like little things like bags with wash cloths in 'em and she likes to pound them. They knew a lot about her normal routines. told me about her and the dogs. And were very close to her 10 and very protective to her most of the time. Like, she never 11 wondered off, nor did they let her wonder off out of our 12 sight.

So based on your interactions with Esther and with the -- the knowledge that you have, do you feel that moving Esther a fourth time and placing her with the Roziers would -would be traumatic on her?

A Absolutely.

3

5

13

17

18

19

20

And are you talking about potential short-term Q trauma or long-term trauma?

I believe it would impact her long-term trauma. 21 | already has what appears to be some sorts of trauma when she 22 has to interact with our agency. I think she sees us as the 23 people movers in her life, that we just come and take her and 24 move her, even though the transition prior to the -- the family that she is currently with, was to the best of our

ability a thoughtful transition with overlapping caregivers, we did it in the best practice model that we could. She even still has interactions with her previous caregivers.

I think she has a lot of fear about the agency, in general, and what we mean to her, which is really kind of, I feel, further impacted by her inability to really have much -very strong verbal skills since she's still under the age of 2.

They do say in studies that, you know, basically, this child's still in her bonding period with the family. You I guess more than a know, she's been there seven months. third of her life she's actually spent there. But it's still in her normal bonding period. To disrupt that and put her into a new caregiving home would cause her a lot of trauma. Again, (indiscernible) issues.

I would expect her to regress. She may no longer be 17 potty trained. She probably will lose her verbal skills that she currently has. Her behaviors overall will probably increase to kind of long-term traumatic, like, kind of tantrums that are hard to soothe, really normal things that we see in -- in toddlers when we have to transition them.

> Very good. Q

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SHARP: Court's indulgence.

BY MR. SHARP: It was mentioned yesterday that one of the potential options is to do a long-term transition where I the Roziers would be able to come and visit Esther and get to know her over a period of -- of maybe a couple of weeks or a month or longer. Would that do anything to minimize that trauma?

Yeah, I mean, I think it could. What they say best Α practice for children that are kind of this, you know, maybe a year-and-a-half to two-and-a-half-year-old range, this young toddler range, is what they -- basically, best practice states that we should have children meet -- the new caregiver should meet in the current caregivers home ...

Q Mm-hm.

3

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

... for a period of 60 minutes every single day for about six to nine days. From there, they should begin to go outside of the home where they would then go with the caregivers, the two sets of caregivers, out into the community areas. They would spend longer periods of time, three to four hours, so they begin that relationship.

As we get into maybe about the third week, they say about three to four nights. So they would do one each night, like, one caregiver, then the other caregiver. They would be getting to spend the night and so that they could kind of see some of the same routines in both houses with that permission given from both families.

And then we would begin to do maybe two nights in a row and eventually transition. They say it takes between four

10

13

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

and six weeks to do that kind of process with the child and child transitioning into her new home, which could be a little problematic in this case because we have an out-of-state caregiver.

- Given that long-term transition would you still expect to see some of the -- the long-term trauma that you were referring to earlier...
 - Α Yes.
 - ...in Esther? Okay.
- I would say it would probably need to be coupled with a -- a therapist that -- that specializes in early childhood mental health.
- Okay. Based on your review of -- or your 14 | interaction with -- with the Riveras and Esther and your --15 your experience and training, do you believe that it is in the 16 best interest of -- of Esther to be removed and placed with the Roziers at this time?
 - No. I do not.
 - What do you believe is in her best interest?
 - I believe that Esther deserves the opportunity to have permanency with the family that she is with, that we can reduce her time in foster care, that we reduce the numbers of changes to her, that she doesn't have to restart how to communicate and get her needs met with the new family, which she already had to do. You know, in her short life, she's

12

14

13

16

19 20

21

23

already had to do that twice, actually, that I know of, prior to being placed with her current family. That we can help her with her emotional ability to attach to caregivers and build some bonding attachment and make sure that her brain development is appropriate for her age.

Very good.

MR. SHARP: Court's indulgence.

- Q BY MR. SHARP: It's my understanding from Ms. Quinlan that the adoption with the Riveras is set to finalize in approximately 30 days. Is that correct?
 - Yes. That's my understanding.
- And in regards to the ASFA deadlines, do you know when -- when that deadline would run?
- Α Well, all children should have the opportunity to 15 have permanency within -- within probably 15 to 22 months of being removed from their parents' care. I think right now we're right about 18 months for this child. So we are right within the guidelines if we allow her to be adopted by the current caregivers.
 - Q Okay.
 - My concern would be, also, the transition into Georgia. Although, we do have an approved home study, we can begin that, we can't even request an adoptive home study for six months after placement. So not only do we move through the transition, then six months of placement, then we would

1 | need to have another home study done on the family before we could finalize, which would probably prolong Esther's time in 3 foster care by about a year. Have you had a chance to talk to the -- the 5 Rozier family? I -- I -- well, not the family Α 6 7 (indiscernible) say. 8 0 I... 9 I spoke to the -- the -- the cousin, Stephanie. believe this is Stephanie. Yes. I spoke to her on the phone 11 on two occasions. 12 0 Okay. 13 One with my manager and one without. 14 What did you indicate to her was the plan as to -to Esther, the (indiscernible)? When I spoke to her, I think I didn't speak to her 16 A until probably March of this year. I don't have the exact date in front of me. At that time, I think she had been 19 communicating primarily with the initial -- or Kristi, the 20 actual caseworker assigned to the case. 21 When I talked to her about -- she had expressed some concerns that she didn't understand the permanency plan and --23 and felt that maybe she was a -- maybe a little misguided by our agency about what we were -- our plan was for Esther.

I explained very clearly that our plan and the

1	Court's plan was to have the child adopted by the current
2	caregiver. That was the current order in place. It was what
3	was written in the recommendations of the Court report that we
4	had initially submitted, most recently, even January, that the
5	Court was aware that they existed and that we had sent the
6	ICPC. But that, at this point, the permanency the primary
7	permanency goal for this child was to be adopted by her
8	current caregivers, the foster parents that she resides with.
9	Q Thank you.
0	MR. SHARP: Just a moment. Your Honor, I have no further
1	questions at this time.
2	THE COURT: Do you folks have any questions for Ms.
3	Lamaison?
4	MR. ROZIER: We do. We do, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: All right.
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION
7	BY MS. ROZIER:
8	Q Do you recall telling me that it wasn't your job to
9	tell Ray how to do his job as far as contacting me?
0.	A Who's Ray?
.1	Q The CAP attorney.
2	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) Ray McKay.
3	THE WITNESS: Oh yeah.
4	Q BY MS. ROZIER: Raymond.
5	A I I it is not my job to direct the CAP

A Mm-hm.

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

23

24

25

... none of that was gonna happen.

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

3

5 6

7

10 11

12

21

22 23

24

A Yeah. That is what I told you at this time because that's the primary goal for the child.

- Q And that we didn't matter as a family anymore.
- Α I didn't say you didn't matter as a family anymore.
- And you hate- you hated to be the bearer of bad news and some people just couldn't take that well.
- Α I did tell you I hate to be the bearer of bad news. It's hard to tell families that the goal is different than what they would like to see it to be.
- Q Do you think that Kristi took that role and told us the truth?
- I can't comment on what Kristi said to you. 13 | really can't. I'm sorry. But what I do know is that Kristi 14 has had more than one supervisor in the last eight, nine 15 months. And so as supervisors change, we do a lot of the 16 direction over what the decision making is for a child. And 17 so she may have gotten different information. The Court changes information. Even when we went into court, we had a 19 Court order that says that the permanency goal for the child 20 | is adoption by foster parents. So things change throughout the court time. I don't know if Kristi told you every change. I don't know that because I wasn't there during those conversations.
 - Q Once our ICPC was approved, what should we have gotten -- or able to visit with Esther?

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

I -- I don't know where that

```
1
   statement came from.
2
        Q
             Well, it came from Kristi. It was told to me...
3
        MR. SHARP: And, Your Honor, I'm going to object...
        0
             BY MS. ROZIER: ...early on...
5
        MR. SHARP:
                     ...at this time.
6
             BY MS. ROZIER:
                             ...that...
7
        MR. SHARP:
                    This is more argument as opposed to asking...
8
        MS. ROZIER: Well, no. I was asking her if...
9
        MR. SHARP:
                    ... Ms. Lamaison questions.
10
        MS. ROZIER: ...that should have been told to me.
11
        THE COURT:
                    The prob- the problem is that the response
12
   was a question, which then yielded a...
13
        MR. SHARP:
                    I -- I understand.
14
        THE COURT:
                    ...a -- an -- an argumentative interaction as
15
   opposed to a question, answer. But that's just as much Ms.
16
   Lamaison's fault for asking the question rather than
17
   responding...
18
        THE WITNESS:
                      That's fine.
19
        THE COURT:
                    ...as best as she could.
20
        MR. SHARP:
                    I'll object to...
21
        THE COURT:
                    So...
22
        MR. SHARP:
                    ...both then...
23
        THE COURT:
                    So we're...
24
        MR. SHARP:
                    ...if that's...
25
        THE COURT:
                    We're...
```

```
1
        THE WITNESS:
                      You can...
 2
        THE COURT:
                    I'm just trying to get you back on track...
                     That's fine.
 3
        MR. ROZIER:
 4
        MS. ROZIER:
                     Okay.
 5
        THE COURT:
                     ...a little bit.
 6
        MR. ROZIER: That's fine.
 7
        THE COURT: So you ask questions. She gives you answers.
 8
        MR. ROZIER:
                     Yeah.
 9
        THE COURT:
                    She doesn't give you questions. It -- it
   feels somewhat informal here today. But we -- we do have to
   kind of impose the rules...
12
        MR. ROZIER:
                     We do.
13
        MS. ROZIER:
                     Right.
14
        THE COURT: So...
15
        MS. ROZIER: Of course.
16
        THE COURT:
                    I'm sorry. Did you get an answer to your
17
   question?
18
        MS. ROZIER:
                    Yes.
19
        THE COURT: Or do you -- did you want to follow up a
20
  little on that?
21
        THE WITNESS: If -- if I remember the question was, should
22
   someone say that if an ICPC was initiated that -- that the
23
   child's adoption cannot go forward? Was that what your
24
   question for me?
25
             BY MS. ROZIER: Should I have been...
```

1	THE COURT: Yeah.
2	Q BY MS. ROZIER:told that?
3	A I'm gonna say, no, because you weren't a party to
4	the case. That would be my answer to that.
5	Q If our ICPC process had been done, that does not
6	make us a part of the case?
7	A A party to the case?
-8	Q A party to the
9	A No.
10	Qcase?
11	A It doesn't.
12	Q Okay.
13	A The Court would have to recognize you as a person
14	with special interest.
15	MS. ROZIER: That's all the questions that I have.
16	THE WITNESS: Okay.
17	THE COURT: Mr. McKay.
18	MR. MCKAY: Yeah. I just have a couple.
19	THE WITNESS: Sure.
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. MCKAY:
22	Q I'm Ray McKay, the CAP attorney.
23	A Nice to meet you.
24	Q You had a chance to review this file in this case?
25	A I have.

conversation.

1	A I wa- I don't believe I was standing at the table
2	Q Okay.
3	Aof (indiscernible).
4	Q All right. So you you didn't hear the
5	conversation. Is that fair?
6	A I was in the courtroom. Yes.
7	Q Okay. Did you hear the conversation that Kristi and
8	I had?
. 9	A No.
10	Q Okay. When when under the Department of
11	Family Services, is there a policy in place when a par- a
12	party of interest is that is that what you call them?
13	And I'm sorry. This is my first CAP
14	A That's okay.
15	Qcase.
16	A No, no.
17	Q So I may get the names and the terms wrong. But
18	we'll call them a party of interest or or when when
19	when somebody of that of nature a fa- a family member
20	at that time comes and and expresses a desire for adoption,
21	is there policy in place as to when the CAP attorney should be
22	notified of that information?
23	A No. My understanding from the CAP order is that we
24	notify the CAP attorney of any placement changes.
25	Q Okay.
	J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO

A Like, so we have, like, a three-day rule. Like, on the actual orders themselves, they talk about discovery of information, like, so we are -- we give you information as you request it. Typically, those requests go through our kind of records department. They don't come directly to the caseworker or supervisor. As well as, it talks about notification of placement changes; changes on, like, school

settings; those types of very specific.

It doesn't have anything in our policies nor on our orders that state if another party comes forward seeking placement of a child, we need to notify CAP within a certain amount of days. That doesn't exist.

Q Okay. Okay. Is it -- is -- for -- is -- is -- is -- is -- is -- I mean, for -- is a CAP attorney -- I mean, how does a CAP attorney become aware of -- of a -- of a -- of a new -- of a potential party of interest to come into the case if not through your department? Is there a way?

- A I guess they would make contact with a CAP attorney.
- Q Okay.

A I think that people who are diligently trying to seek out placement of children, regardless of who they are, they seem to have ways of contacting people. I -- I -- I can't say because I haven't been in that position, how these people search out CAP attorneys, DAs. But they have the ability. I think all that is public information when it comes

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

24

25

to, like, how to Google your name, for example, and get your contact information. Our job, you know, is -- is to give them information. We are not their attorneys. We don't necessarily represent them. We're there to look out kind of for the best -- safety and well-being and interest of a child.

Q Sure.

A So in general, we will just tell them what we know, which is, if you're not a party to the case, everything's confidential. And we can't really give you that information.

Q If -- if -- at that end of January when I was advised of the potential family, of the Roziers -- and I don't even think I was given their name. And I wasn't...

A (Indiscernible).

Q ...at that time.

A Okay.

Q Well, but at that point in time, when I'm advised of the information, do -- is the information that your department provides the CAP attorney, do you agree with me that that information should be accurate and truthful?

A Sure.

Q All right. Is -- would you agree with me that when talking at that -- I -- at that point, I should get -- have been provided a full -- for lack of a better term, full, just rundown of -- of -- of what Family Services was aware about with the Rozier family?

A Sure. If you had asked questions, then I'm sure that we would answer your questions about who we have out there and what we know about the permanency goals of this child. In general, my experience has been, CAP attorneys will call within a few -- at least a few weeks before court if they feel like they are missing out and they ask for any new information. And we're pretty open. And we'll tell whatever they ask.

Q Let me ask you a hypothetical. At the end of January of this year, if -- if your department advised me that -- that a -- a -- like a cousin from out of state made contact with -- with your department and they sent a gift...

A Yeah.

Q ...and didn't tell me anything else, do you think that was enough information that -- that the Department provided me as the CAP attorney?

A Well, I know for a fact that the Court re- report that I reviewed not only talked about the gift but that we had already referred the ICPC for the relative. And then that was our concurrent goal if -- if she couldn't be adopted by her caregiver. So to me there was more than just information about a gift in the Court report. So I -- I don't know how conversations between you and Kristi are because I wasn't there. I -- I've never spoke to you. If you called me, I can only tell you what I would tell you.

```
1
         Q
               And...
  2
         Α
              But we didn't ...
  3
         0
               I tried...
 4
         A
               ... have a conversation.
 5
         Q
              to get this company policy...
 6
         Α
              Uh-huh.
 7
              If I spoke to your department...
         Q
 8
         A
              Uh-huh.
 9
              ...on that day, your representative, and I said,
   well, if they've not -- if they'-- if they've not done
10
11
    anything else, at ...
12
         A
              Okay.
13
              Okay.
                     If they've not done anything else, then --
   other than make a phone call and provide -- provide a
   Christmas present, or something, and I said, well, that to me
   is not substantial enough to -- to warrant today's hearing...
16
17
        Α
              Okay.
18
             I -- I didn't feel it compelled me enough that a --
  a -- an oddball phone call and -- and maybe a -- a little gift
19
  -- and -- and I expressed that to your department, do -- do
20
   you feel that they were compelled at that time to tell me,
   well, actually, they have done more?
22
23
        MR. SHARP: Your -- Your Honor, I apologize.
24
   little confused as to the -- the question.
25
                    I know what he's getting at.
        THE COURT:
```

MR. SHARP: What are we getting to?

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20 I

25

THE COURT: And what he's -- what he's -- what's he's concerned about is that DFS is basically not giving him any information on this at all. And they're saying, well, we don't have to. He can read it in the report months later when it's too late for him to actually do anything about it. If Krystal Dixon were here right now, her head would be exploding.

MR. MCKAY: It's a hypothetical.

THE COURT: I'm -- I'm gonna have -- I'm gonna have --I'll have you streamline the question down a little bit more.

BY MR. MCKAY: You heard his -- you heard his explanation. You understand a hypothetical, correct? Do you 14 -- do you agree that that was enough information at that point when I specifically said, if that's all they've done, is there anything more...

If you said to me...

MR. SHARP: Your...

THE WITNESS: So if you'd asked -- if you'd called me on the phone and said, hey, I have a quick question. Taryn's the 21 | supervisor. If this family's only sent a gift and made a 22 | phone call, should we warrant a placement hearing? tell you, no, it doesn't sound like it warrants a placement hearing. If that's all you had as- had to give me.

MR. SHARP: And Your...

```
1
         THE WITNESS: Does that answer your question?
 2
        0
              BY MR. MCKAY: No.
                                  So...
 3
        MR. SHARP:
                     Your Honor, I would...
 4
             BY MR. MCKAY: ...the -- the question is, under this
 5
   hypothetical...
 6
        THE COURT:
                    The...
 7
        MR. SHARP:
                    Okay.
 8
        THE COURT:
                    Okay.
 9
             BY MR. MCKAY: I...
10
        THE COURT:
                    Go ahead.
11
                    Is he -- okay. So you (indiscernible)...
        MR. MCKAY:
12
        THE COURT:
                   No, no.
13
        MR. MCKAY:
                   I -- I'll let him make an...
14
        THE COURT:
                   Go ahead.
15
                    ... objection or whatever...
        MR. MCKAY:
16
        THE COURT:
                    He's not -- he's not objecting...
17
        MR. MCKAY:
                    ...he needs to do.
18
        THE COURT:
                    ...to your question. It's not out of your
19
   mouth yet. So when he -- so if you finish -- finish asking
20
   the question. Then -- then he'll decide whether he wishes to
21
   object.
22
             BY MR. MCKAY: I'm told a phone call -- this is a
        Q
   hypothetical. Family Services fails the CAP attorney.
   calls been made by a cousin out of state. They sent a gift.
25
   That's all that's been done. They've told no more
```

information. I say, well, if that's all that's been done, I don't care. That -- that's not enough for me, and you even 3 agree... Α Yeah. 5 ...to warrant having a hearing here, like, for Q today. 7 A Yeah. 8 At that moment, when I'm talking to Family Services, do you believe in your role as a super, is -- does that 10 caseworker have a duty to actually tell me, well, no, they are 11 | -- they -- since October, they've been actively wanting to 12 adopt. 13 MR. SHARP: So, Your... 14 Q BY MR. MCKAY: Since... 15 MR. SHARP: Your Honor, I am going to object at this 16 period. My recollection, and we can certainly go back and -and review it, is I believe Ms. Quinlan testified that during 17 | November and December, she did contact Mr. McKay. attempted to call him. And she sent him e-mails notifying him of the Rozier family. That is my... THE COURT: I thought... MR. SHARP: ... recollection of occurring yesterday. THE COURT: ... she testified -- my notes indicate she testified that the first time she knowed for sure that he was

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

aware of the Roziers was at the January hearing.

MR. SHARP: Okay.

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: What I -- what I got from her testimony was 18 \parallel that she wasn't sure when he would have been aware. But she knows that she put it in her report and that on the day of that hearing, he would have been aware. But as far as she knew, she had not conveyed that information to him prior to the creation of the report and sending the report to him.

MR. SHARP: And again, the -- the testimony...

THE COURT: I don't recall...

MR. SHARP: ... of Ms. Quinlan...

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

```
1
          THE COURT:
                      ...her saying that she was trying...
  2
         MR. SHARP:
                      ...was that she e-mailed...
  3
         THE COURT:
                      ...to tell Mr. McKay...
  4
         MR. SHARP:
                      ...and called.
 5
         THE COURT:
                      ...about the Roziers...
 6
         MR. SHARP:
                      And -- and that's why I...
 7
         THE COURT:
                      ...but she couldn't get...
 8
         MR. SHARP:
                      ...say, I don't know if we have that
    capability of...
10
         THE COURT:
                     I don't think she said anything along those
11
   lines.
12
         MR. SHARP:
                     If we can pull that up...
13
         THE COURT:
                     She...
14
        MR. SHARP:
                    ...we can certainly...
        THE COURT: She did -- she did talk about trying to reach
15
16 | him. But she didn't talk about, I was re- trying to reach him
17 | because I wanted to tell him about the Roziers.
                                                      I -- I'm
  pretty sure she didn't say that. That would have made it in
18
19
   my notes.
20
             BY MR. MCKAY: Well, and -- and my argument here is
        Q
   we're in January and I'm speaking -- my hypothetical is it's
21
   January twenty-something. And I'm specifically talking to...
22
23
        Α
             Yeah.
             ... Family Services regarding these people.
24
        Q
25
        Α
             Sure.
            J-15-337398-P1
                         RODRIGUEZ
                                   04/14/2017
                                              TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO
```

5 6

7

11 12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

Q And -- and I'm given very limited information at that time. And I ask, well, if that's it, then I'm not gonna do any more. And they know there's way more than that, more than -- than that's it. And I'm not provided that information. Do you -- do you believe that's a violation of your -- of the policies of Family Services?

A I don't know. I -- I can't comment if -- if information was withheld from you. I wonder if people understand a lot of the terminology by, you know, saying things like an ICPC was sent, if people who that information's going to understand that that means the family is doing things like meeting with licensing workers. They're allowing home studies to happen. They're fingerprinting. For people who are within the agency, anybody who hears, oh that we submitted an ICPC, knows there's a process and that the family on the other end is doing things in -- in their state.

And so I don't know if it was a withholding of information or a lack of understanding about what that means to us. And maybe the language wasn't the same or around that conversation.

Q I...

Α Saying if her family's doing an ICPC means they are taking steps and actions...

Q I...

... to take placement of a child.

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO BIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

1 Q Okay. 2 Α I -- I... 3 And I understand that. My -- my hypothetical didn't include that they were doing an IPCP [sic]. 4 | 5 Α Okay. 6 My hypothetical was, they reached out. They made a 0 phone call to -- to your department. And they -- and they sent a -- sent a gift. Yes. Okay. That would not warrant a placement Α 10 hearing... 11 You -- you -- you would... 12 ...at that time. 13 ...agree with me that the -- would you agree with me then, if that's a hypothetical, they should have told me, at 15 least, that there was an IPCP [sic]... 16 Yeah. And... 17 Q ...or... 18 ...that it was referred or -- okay. 19 Q I mean, if I'm -- if I need to know what that means, I can ask them what that means (indiscernible). 20 21 Α Sure. 22 But you would agree that they should -- something more should have been said than just that at that point in 23 24 time. 25 A Yes. J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO RIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES

601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

Q You agree?

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

16

17

18

19

20

22

24

A We -- we are in a weird position in the Department of Family Services of -- because we have an attorney that represents us also, there is -- you know, there is some conversations about what do we say and what don't we say without attorney representation.

There's different trainings that we've had around what are we allowed to share? We kind of -- with CAP attorneys, try to stay within the parameters of our Court order. And we -- caseworkers are directed, like Kristi or anybody, that at any point a conversation starts becoming a little uncomfortable for our caseworkers, that's when they 13 need to end the conversation with other attorney privileged people and kind of refer it back over to the DA. So I -- I -there's many different ways that conversation could've gone. I don't have -- I wasn't there. I wish I was.

What I do know about the family is that after January is when a lot more things were happening. That's when we started getting more phone calls from the family. We started to hear that they are almost done with classes. They've got rooms ready. They got fingerprinted. Some more That's when the vi- the visits they started to ask action. $\|$ for visits. It started to happen after the first of January.

And so in the beginning months when the referral 25 started, they maybe made some phone -- I don't know -- maybe

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

22

23

24

25

1 | a hospital for the first few days of, you know, depending if they need medical care. From there, we place them into foster 3 homes and usually the transition is back home. If it can't go 4 back home, then they go to an adoptive home of the caregiver. So we would like to have it be one, possibly two placements... Q Okay. ... of a child. That -- that is really best practice. That is what the majority of our children have the opportunity to have. Q Okay. Especially our single children or younger children. 12 So the majority of cases that it -- that occurs. Q The majority, they go back to the -- the natural parents. A Yes. Is that fair? Α More than half. So -- so let's -- let's remove them out of the 18 equation. And let's go to -- to the issue here where parents aren't being -- they're not able to go back to the parents. Are you telling me more than 50 percent of the time it's only a one transition? A Yeah. So basically we have about 3500 children in foster care in Clark County. Of those children, half of them 24 will go home, which brings us down to about 1700. Of the kids

6

7

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

19

21

22

23

25

that go -- don't go home, the initial placement is with

relatives here in the state of Nevada. Those relatives make up about 20 percent of our kids. So we're kind of breaking it down.

2

3

4

8

9

10

11 |

12

13

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We're down to our last 40 percent. Of those 40 percent, about 20 percent of children will age out because of their age when they came into care. They might have been 17 when we met them. And self-sufficiency is a more appropriate goal for them.

What we find is about 20 percent of our kids are adopted in Clark County. And of those children that are adopted, 70 percent are adopted by their current caregiver, they're foster parent. They are the people who've been providing the care and love and -- and nurturing for these children, have been able to build a bond and attachment with them. And they'll step up and be the foster parent.

Really when we look at our general recruitment, we're trying to find children to have un -- other adoptive 18 homes. We only actually see about 32 kids at any given time that we're looking for adoptive homes for. And most of those are large sibling groups, older children or kids with special needs or abil- or disabilities.

Perfect. The -- the -- as it relates to transitions Q to three to four times, that does happen in your office. that correct?

I can think of -- I oversee -- right now, currently,

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO BIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

- Q I spent some time last night reading some of the case studies ...
 - A Yeah.

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

23

25

- ...about this transitional thing. It's -- again, 10 | it's very new to me. You -- you did mention earlier in your testimony, there are steps...
 - Α Yeah.
 - Q ...to -- to limit any trauma. Is that correct?
 - Α Yes.
- And one of them, we talked about that transitioning 16 phase. And the studies show that that's pretty successful. 17 | Is that correct?

It can be. Although, like I said, it depends on the age of the child and kind of where they are in their bonding and attachment with their current caregiver. She's -- for this particular child, I have significant concerns about moving her again. She's still in her bonding and attachment phase with her current caregiver. She was not allowed the opportunity to stay with one ch- one family since removal. And she's only 18 months old. So I am really concerned about

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 potential adoptive resource for that child.

A Okay.

2

3

5

7

8

10

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

With that being said, let me ask you this. 4 those studies you've read about, some of these traumas -- and I know Esther doesn't have a bond with a -- with a sibling, 6 but would you agree with those -- with -- that the studies suggest that if Esther is with siblings during this transition period, that that would be -- also be -- help to -- to reduce any potential trauma?

I think that it would reduce the potential trauma Il for a unborn or new child if they were placed with a sibling who -- but Esther -- neither of these children would have a 13 | relationship with each other until they've met. biological connection might be there. I don't know who the 15 | father of this unborn child is and some other things. But I think it would reduce the impact of trauma on the new child coming into the system if they could be placed with their sibling, yes.

And you don't think it would have any effect -- you Q don't -- if you -- you found...

A I -- I -- I don't know at this point. I don't -- my understanding is Esther does not have a relationship with her siblings. And so she has -- I don't know if I had to weigh out to a relationship to her best friend down the street or her cousin more important than her relationship with the

biological sibling she just met. 1 We do know children who come into foster care 2 together -- siblings that come in together, should be placed together because they need that connection. It's one thing that they have that's consistent and reliable. So it gets a 5 6 little murky when children are born after already placed in the system. And it -- it -- the stays are a little more murky when children are coming in at different times with... 9 Q Would you agree ... 10 ...different (indiscernible). 11 ...with me, it's potentially helpful... 12 Α Yeah. 13 ...if there's another child? 14 Α Sure. 15 MR. MCKAY: I have no further questions. 16 THE WITNESS: Okay. 17

THE COURT: Did you -- follow-up?

MR. SHARP: Your Honor, no. I have no further questions 19 | at this time.

THE COURT: Do you folks have some follow-up questions?

MS. ROZIER: Yes, we do.

FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION

23 BY MS. ROZIER:

18

20

21

22

24

25

You said that since we are not a party of the case, everything is confidential.

Α Yes.

1

2

3

4

10

11

13

15

17 I

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Should we have been given Ray's name if it was confidential?

MR. SHARP: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I think at this point, we're kind of getting into a legal area. they may be considered by the Court at some point to be a special person of -- of interest in this case. However, as to whether Ms. Lamaison knows whether the Department should have provided her that information, I don't think she can talk to the legal side of things.

THE COURT: It does -- they are -- and Mr. McKay, are 12 | raising an important issue. And when we're dealing with trauma for Esther, could potentially that trauma have been 14 alleviated had Mr. McKay known actually what was going on back in October and set a placement hearing and brought these people in and we could have started a transition at that point. That -- that's the point that I believe they're trying to make is that DFS had an opportunity to set this all in motion beginning in late October at a time when Esther had only just been placed with the foster family.

> MR. SHARP: Mm-hm.

THE COURT: That...

MR. SHARP: And...

THE COURT: That ship has now sailed. We -- we -- we now -- that opportunity isn't there anymore. And I...

THE COURT: Well...

1

3

5

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

22

23

24

25

MR. SHARP: ... Ms. Lamaison stated.

THE COURT: It's a risky position to take if -- if -- if Il you decide that you're not going to involve everyone. You're 12 | not gonna involve -- you're not gonna let the Court know. You're not gonna let the CAP know.

> MR. SHARP: I understand.

THE COURT: You're not gonna let the family know that they could potentially come to court and start a transition process. I -- I'm -- I'm not sure it necessarily affects a 18 | best interest determination today. But it's disturbing.

MS. ROZIER: I have another question.

THE COURT: I -- I'm gonna go ahead and let you ask the questions. If the -- the objection at this point is relevance. And -- and I'm willing to stretch on a relevance objection. And we'll talk about later whether it should come into play in terms of a decision.

MS. ROZIER: Okay.

1

6

10

11

12

13

16

19

21 22

23

24

BY MS. ROZIER: We're all here for the best interest 3 of Esther. Do you believe that it would have been in the best interest for Esther, for her CAP attorney to know about us coming forward when we came forward?

Α Possibly. I don't have a definite answer on that. I have seen CAP attorneys not change. The CAP attorney is there to look out -- my -- this is my understanding of their job. And the only other person who could really attest to this would be them. But they're -- they're out there to look out for the wishes and the desires of the child.

The only way we can measure Esther's wishes and desires right now, because she's a nonverbal child and we can't ask her, is for -- observing her and seeing how she's attaching and bonding.

I don't know if by telling the CAP attorney there's 17 another relative that has seeked out placement and we've 18 submitted an ICPC, would it change his observations or that -that -- I don't know if it would've changed his opinion, if it would've put a placement hearing in -- in -- in order. can't tell you that. I'm not the CAP attorney. So I just don't know if it would have changed any piece of that income -- or outcome for this child. I -- I just don't.

I -- I've seen it go a lot of different ways in 11 Sometimes CAP attorneys really fight hard and say they years.

J-15-337398-P1 04/14/2017 RODRIGUEZ TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

- Do you think had he known about us coming forward, he would've had that opportunity to fight for Esther and her best interests and...
 - He always has ...

10

11

17 I

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

- ...present it to the Court?
- He always has the opportunity to f- to fight for 12 her, not best interest, 'cause that would be a CASA worker. But her wishes and desires. And that's becomes a very 14 difficult thing when a child's nonverbal. That's a -- it's a 15 hard place for a CAP attorney to be in. Best interest is actually argued by CAP attorney -- by CASA workers. And she doesn't have one of those. So at this point, we have to, as the agency, take over that role, also.
 - Were you aware that I called 26 times in October? Q
 - Α You didn't call me. No.
 - And I've called every month since October? Q
 - I do know that you've called us at least once a That part I do know. I know that I talked to you month. once. And then I called you back. And then we ended up talking with my supervisor.

24

25

THE COURT: And you can make me aware of that on...

MS. ROZIER: Okay.

THE COURT: You're gonna have more opportunity to talk and tell me what you wanna tell me. But for now I'm just gonna have you ask Ms. Lamaison questions. And then you can clarify through testimony or through argument. It will be your choice as to any other thing that you need to follow through on. Okay?

MS. ROZIER: I'm done with my questions.

MR. ROZIER: I -- I have two.

THE COURT: And I didn't mean to rush you through.

MS. ROZIER: Oh no. That actually was my last question.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROZIER: I have two.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROZIER:

Q How much effort do you need to see from an extended family to consider them placement and the best interest of a child?

A Well, unfortunately the guiding principles of our agency say that relatives need to step forward within the first 12 months. And they need to make the efforts to have an attachment or bond with the child or maintain the one that they have.

So that in general, relatives that I see who will

request placement, A, they come to visit the child. 2 to talk to the child on the phone. They send gifts and -- and -- and little presents to the kids. Usually, they are asking for visits 'cause they're local. So it makes it a little more difficult when you're out of state. But, you know, local ones, it's a little bit easier to define that active effort. So that's first.

3

4

5

7

8

11

13 |

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Our -- our obligations as a child welfare agency is to really look especially at the first degree of consanguinity 10 | relatives, which are like grandparents, first adult brothers and sisters. Then we kind of move into aunts. So we get 12 | further past the third degree, which you guys are the fourth degree of consanguinity. You're outside of that.

Our obligation is to kind of -- kind of find you, actively pursue you for placement. It just becomes a little more murky or a lot harder for us to find through diligent searches because those connections sometimes get severed as marriages happen. And so it's harder for us to find it through diligent search efforts.

My understanding is you guys never came forward on -- on our diligent search efforts because we have sought for relatives of Esther on a number of occasions, especially during the time when we thought she wasn't going to be -- be able to maintain in her first placement. So we -- we've never been able to know you existed. And the only other way we

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO BIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

Α Sure.

7

8

10

11

12

.15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Would there be any reason why we would not receive any phone calls back after 26 calls in October?

We have -- we have policies in place...

Q Mm-hm.

...that require that our workers call everybody 13 | back. We have to do that within 48 hours here at the agency. The one thing is though, is as a child welfare agency as a worker, we get a lot of people who...

> Q I'm sure you do.

... call us on the phone and tell us they're 18 | relatives especially. We get, this is my cousin. This is my This is my uncle. This is -- even parents will identify people who are not relatives. And so it's very difficult for us to maintain the confidentiality of our case and also try to sort out who are even relatives to children.

So sometimes when we get those initial phone calls, we're not even sure what these are about. And there can be a little bit more that has to go into calling you back because

J-15-337398-P1 RODRIGUEZ 04/14/2017 TRANSCRIPT-DAY TWO EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - JUVENILE DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 North Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 (702) 455-4977

we need to know more about -- is this even a patent message? So workers sometimes need to talk to supervisors and 3 managers... 4 Q Mm-hm. 5 ...before calling back. 6 Do you -- do you have any idea of the percentage of Q when you do receive those phone calls how many are from out of 8 state? 9 Actually we get a lot. Α 10 Q Okay. 11 Clark County is a very transient... 12 Q Right. 13 A ... community. 14 Q Okay. So most of our relatives are out of state. 15 my experience, unfortunately, most of my relatives don't get approved on ICPCs. And so we do send them. We submit them. 17 We try to be honest with families for -- right up front that, you know, we'll do this. We're gonna pursue this placement. 19 But sometimes this doesn't work out. 20 21 What percentage don't get approved? 22 I would say the majority of 'em, unfortunately. It can be everything from physical homes to backgrounds and 23 24 families. It's... 25 0 So...

PHILLIP R.; REGINA R.; STEPHANIE

R.; JOEY R.; AND E.R., A MINOR

Real Parties in Interest.

25

26

27

28

and

Supreme Court No. 73198 District Court Meetilenieany & Add Jul 17 2017 01:47 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

Supreme Court No. 73272 District Court No. J-15-337398-P1

PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENT TO APPENDIX1

RAYMOND E. MCKAY, ESQ. 7251 West Lake Mead Boulevard, Suite 250
Las Vegas. Nevada 89128
(702) 284-5919
Attorney for E.R. Rodriguez
raymond.mckay@libertymutual.com

JOHN BLACKMON, III, ESQ.
2200 Paseo Verde Parkway,
Suite 350
Henderson, NV 89052
702-476-2400
Attorney for Stephanie and Joe Rozier
iblackmon@fordfriedmanlaw.com

GREGORY MILLS, ESQ.
703 S. Eighth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(702) 386-0030
Attorney for Philip and Regina Rivera
gregor@millsnv.com
attorneys@millsnv.com
klivreri@millsnv.com

¹ The State hereby provides the Court and the parties with the supplement to its appendix to include the transcripts as ordered by the Court.

2	<u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING</u>		
3	I hereby certify that service of the PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENT TO		
4	APPENDIX was made this 17th day of July, 2017, by electronic mailing		
5	and/or depositing a copy in the U.S. Mail, postage pre-paid, and addressed to the		
6	following:		
7	RAYMOND E. MCKAY, ESQ. JOHN BLACKMON, III, ESQ.		
8	7251 West Lake Mead Boulevard, 2200 Paseo Verde Parkway,		
9	Suite 250 Suite 350 Las Vegas. Nevada 89128 Henderson, Nevada 89052		
10	(702) 284-5919 702-476-2400		
11	Attorney for E.R. Rodriguez Attorney for Stephanie and Joe Rozier raymond.mckay@libertymutual.com jblackmon@fordfriedmanlaw.com		
12			
13	GREGORY MILLS, ESQ.		
14	703 S. Eighth Street Las Vegas, NV 89101		
15	(702) 386-0030		
	Attorney for Philip and Regina Rivera		
16	gregor@millsnv.com attorneys@millsnv.com		
17	klivreri@millsnv.com		
18	HONORABLE JUDGE CYNTHIA GIULIANI		
19	Department K		
20	601 North Pecos Road		
21	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101		
22			
23	Politic C. P.		
24	Clark County District Attorney's Office,		
25	Juvenile Division		
26			
اصما			

FILED

JUN 27 2017

CLERK OF COURT

COPY

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT JUVENILE DIVISION

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

In the Matter of:

ESTHER BELLA RODRIGUEZ,

DOB 06/15/2015

A Minor.

CASE NO. J-15-337398-P1

DEPT. K

SUPREME COURT APPEAL 73272

BEFORE THE HONORABLE CYNTHIA N. GIULIANI,

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

TRANSCRIPT RE: OBJECTION

TUESDAY, MAY 23, 2017

- 1		
1	APPEARANCES:	
2	FOR THE STATE:	TANNER L. SHARP, ESQ.
3		Deputy District Attorney 601 North Pecos Road
4		Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
5	FOR THE MINOR:	AMY B. HONODEL, ESQ. CHILDREN'S ATTORNEY PROJECT 725 East Charleston Boulevard
6		Las Vegas, Nevada 89104
7	ALSO PRESENT:	KRISTINA QUINLAN Department of Family Services
8		JOE & ESTEPHANY ROZIER
9		Maternal Relatives JOHN R. BLACKMON III, ESQ.
10		Ford & Friedman
11		2200 Paseo Verde Parkway #350 Henderson, Nevada 89052
12		PHILIP & REGINA RIVERA
13		Foster Parents BYRON MILLS, ESQ.
14	Element V	Mills, Mills & Anderson Law Grp. 703 South Eighth Street
	·	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
15		GINA PEARL
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		

1

3

-

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

10

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

PROCEEDINGS

(THE PROCEEDING BEGAN AT 02:31:56.)

(AREAS INDISCERNIBLE DUE TO SIMULTANEOUS SPEAKING.)

MR. BLACKMON: ...on behalf of the Rozier family.

THE COURT: Okay.

And we have --

MR. MILLS: Byron Mills, 6745, for Gregory Mills, who represents the current placement foster parents.

THE COURT: Okay.

And we have Ms. Honodel who is the CAP Attorney for today.

MS. HONODEL: Right. I'm standing in for Raymond McKay.

My Bar No. is 7755.

THE COURT: Okay.

And do you want to just -- just because I don't think we were on the record quite, do you just want to state your appearance again, Mr. Blackmon?

MR. BLACKMON: Sure.

THE COURT: Just --

MR. BLACKMON: John Blackmon, Bar No. 13665, counsel for the Roziers, who were awarded placement --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BLACKMON: -- (indiscernible).

THE COURT: Gotcha.

All right. Are we ready to proceed?

MR. SHARP: I believe so.

THE COURT: All right.

So this is on -- this is the -- and you can all have a seat. There's a lot of people here and -- and we'll just begin.

This is the Department of Family Services Objection to the Hearing Master's findings and recommendations.

The Objection was mailed to the Department of Family Services and the Roziers on May 1st, 2017. We did receive CAP's response.

I know that there was a -- I just want us to put on the record how it was worded -- Mr. Mills filed, for the record --

MR. MILLS: A joinder.

THE COURT: -- a joinder, and it is titled as -- Joinder
-- specifically it is titled as, Joinder of Philip Rivera and
Regina Rivera and Clark County Department of Family Services
Objection to Hearing Master's Findings of Facts, Conclusions
of Law and Recommendations.

Okay. So I think we have everyone's paperwork that

was -- hopefully everyone got that.

All right. So let me just, on the record, this wasn't my -- okay, so let's start off. This is an Objection. So it's not my case. I didn't make the initial ruling. So my job is to determine Hearing Master Norheim's ruling.

So the Department's Objection states that DFS is arguing that the Hearing Master did not apply the correct standard for determining placement under NRS 432B.550.

DFS argues that since Mom's rights were terminated, the familiar relationship between Esther and the Roziers is severed, therefore, the familiar preference does not exist.

Was -- the Roziers who allege -- who allege that she is Mom's first cousin did not contact DFS until 2016. Rozier nees -- is Saez, Siaz?

MS. ROZIER: Saez.

THE COURT: Saez -- has substance abuse and mental-health issues. She knew that Saez had several children in the system and had been homeless at times. However, Rozier, according to her testimony, did not attempt to contact Saez about the child. Even that her family is close, as her family had information as to the removals, it is unreasonable to believe that she was not advised of the removal till sixteen months there.

Furthermore, it's noted in the DFS records on the

date of the call, and pursuant to Ms. Quinlan's testimony -That's you?

MS. QUINLAN: (Raises hand.)

THE COURT: Okay -- Ms. Saez not able to provide a clear response as to why she had waited to contact the Department she was aware -- sorry -- Rozier, as she was aware of or should have been aware of Esther's removal. Therefore, Saez did not provide a reasonable excuse for the delay.

Finally, after the Roziers made contact with Department, she failed to petition The Court, did not attend the TPR Review Hearing, did not visit Esther, as -- and has never filed a motion with The Court seeking placement. As such, Rozier failed to provide a reasonable excuse for the delay.

The Hearing Master found that DFS should have located Rozier, as DFS had contact with Ms. Tellez, who had contact with the Roziers.

And, by the way, I did review the tape. There was like two days of tape. So all the witnesses that were testifying, I saw the tape.

However, as Ms. Tellez did not disclose information about Rozier to DFS, DFS could not have known about Roziers' existence. Furthermore, this does not negate Rozier's duty to come forward in a timely manner. The Hearing Master found

that Ms. Quinlan and Ms. -- LaMaison?

MS. PEARL: Uh-huh. That was Ms. Quinlan's previous supervisor.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay.

Were inconsistent in their testimony with regard to the information relayed to Rozier regarding placement of Esther. As such, The Court did not find the Department's testimony credible as to that issue alone.

However, both the testimony of Ms. Quinlan -however, testimony of Ms. Quinlan and -- well, and Ms.

LaMaison and the DFS records make it clear that both DFS
employees informed Rozier that the plan was for Riveras to
adopt Esther. Rozier was to be a second option should the
adoption not occur. This was not consistent.

The Hearing Master found that the Roziers are likely to getting custody of one or -- of Esther's siblings.

However, at the time the Roziers did not have custody of either siblings. The older sibling is currently in an adoptive resource -- and that's Desiree?

MS. ROZIER: Destiny.

THE COURT: Destiny, sorry. I just remembered watching that. And she's twelve, that lives in California, right?

(NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: Okay. I apologize.

1 MR. BLACKMON: I think it's -- it is Wisconsin, Your 2 Honor. Wisconsin? Okay. I don't know why I thought 3 THE COURT: 4 California. 5 MS. PEARL: The jurisdiction --6 MR. SHARP: The CPS Case is out of California. 7 THE COURT: Okay. 8 MR. SHARP: However --9 THE COURT: Sorry. 10 -- Destiny lives in --MR. SHARP: 11 THE COURT: -- It's not my case. 12 MR. SHARP: -- Wisconsin. 13 THE COURT: I'm just reviewing what I re -- what I 14 watched. And have about a thousand cases in my head. 15 So, okay. So California does have some tie. 16 The older sibling is currently in an adoptive home 17 and Saez' parental rights are intact. Since the time of the 18 hearing, Saezes gave birth -- Saez gave birth. That child was 19 taken into Protective Custody, is currently residing with the 20 Riveras, although an ICPC is pending to Rozier. 21 Wasn't the lo -- wasn't she supposed to have a 22 little boy? 23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible.)

THE COURT: But it's a girl, right, Olivia?

24

MR. SHARP: It is a girl.

MS. ROZIER: We were under the impression --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SHARP: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. ROZIER: -- it was a boy.

THE COURT: Right.

However, wardship was not taken of that child and Saez' rights have not been terminated.

DFS argues that it's not in the child's best interest to place with Rozier. To Esther, the foster parents, Riveras, are her parents. She refers to them as Mama and Dada. The Hearing Master found that Esther is incredibly bonded to the Riveras, severing the relationship would not be in Esther's best interest.

All right. So then we have the CAP's response, which is Ms. Honodel who is filling in today. And he argues that DFS waited over five months to notify The Court of the Roziers. CAP argues that it was DFS that is at fault in this case. The Roziers inquired about visitation with the child, but DFS ignored the requests. DFS continually just played a preference for the foster family and failed to make an effort to place the child with the Roziers.

The Roziers contacted DFS as soon as they became

1 aware that the child was in protective custody. The minor 2 sibling, Olivia, who is not the boy but a girl, who was just 3 born, is going to be placed with the Roziers. Is that true? 4 Your Honor, there has been an update to that. MR. SHARP: 5 Ms. Saez has come forward again and has stated that she wants 6 the opportunity to raise this child. So apparently she's 7 currently with the sibling in California and so --8 MR. BLACKMON: That's not true. That's just not true. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 She -- we have text --MR. BLACKMON: 11 MR. SHARP: Miss -- Your --12 MR. BLACKMON: -- messages from today --13 MR. SHARP: -- Your Honor, if I may, I have spoke with 14 Ms. Quinlan. Ms. Quinlan spoke with Ms. Saez earlier. 15 Saez stated that she wishes to reunify, and so that is the 16 goal as of now. 17 THE COURT: Okay. The baby was born where? 18 MR. SHARP: The -- the child --19 MS. PEARL: Here. 20 -- born here in Nevada and was removed. MR. SHARP:

MR. SHARP: -- born here in Nevada and was removed. The child is currently with the Riveras with her half sibling.

21

22

23

24

In addition to that, as to Destiny, who is the child in California, her rights were recently terminated. But Ms.

Quinlan was informed there as well that because Destiny is in

4

6

5

7

9

8

11

12

10

13

. 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

21

23

24

an adoptive home, Destiny has no desire to reunify with the Roziers. And the California Court has informed the worker out of California that The Court will not consider the Roziers as a placement.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

And then it says NRS -- and this is according to the CAP -- 432B.3905 provides that DFS shall make all reasonable efforts to place siblings in the same location.

All right. So, let me ask this. So you're -- this -- let's just start by saying this, these are, I think --Hearing Master Norheim said on the record that in his case, when he heard the trial -- I'm just hearing the Objection -that these are harder than TPR cases, because, he said that these are two very good families, and he doesn't have anything bad to say about either family.

And so reviewing the tape, that this baby's going to be lucky wherever -- she's not a baby -- this two-year-old's going to be lucky wherever she is. And this is a situation that the adults in this case never asked for nor did the baby. This is just -- this happens, unfortunately, more frequently than not. And these are -- these are hard cases.

Now, Mr. Mills, on behalf of the Riveras, filed a joinder in this case. But they're not parties to this case. They're not parties as far as that goes, they're the foster

placement. But I -- you can't join a non-party.

MR. MILLS: Well, they're interested persons in that they are placement, an adoptive placement, so.

THE COURT: So that would be a special interest?

MR. SHARP: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. So -- but that's -- I'm just going over the -- my job is just to determine if the Hearing Master was incorrect.

MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

THE COURT: So I think what I need to do is this, I've read -- I've read everything. I'm thoroughly prepared. My job is to determine if the Hearing Master, who decided this case -- that it's his case, it's not assigned to me -- I'm just the person on objection duty this week. Next week I won't be on objection duty and the week after that I won't be, and then I'm on again.

Okay. So it appears that the Roziers -- I should say Roziers because it's husband and wife -- contacted the Department in October of 2016. Ms. Rozier, who resides in Georgia, alleges that she is Mom's first cousin. Ms. Rozier testified that she's not aware that Esther was placed into foster care until maternal Uncle Tony told her in October of 2016. She immediately contacted DFS. An ICPC replacement of the child with Ms. Rozier was approved in March.

1 2 H
3 1
4 y
5 s
6 t
7 r
8 p
9 m
10 p
11

The Court has to agree with Hearing Master Gibs -Hearing Master Norheim in that he didn't make the mistake. He
listened to the testimony. This, again, this is a case where
you can't -- Supreme Court -- there's two issues, the issue of
siblings together -- now you're saying the siblings aren't
together. I don't know. But it's the Department's
responsibility to have children stay with family. That's a
preference of the Supreme Court. It's not my preference. I
mean, I don't make the law, I interpret the law. It's the
preference that we go by.

This is a hard case. The Roziers had a reasonable excuse for not coming forward. They don't have the obligation to go find the childs (sic). It's the Department's job to try to find and ask the adult sibling, hey, do you have any other family out there -- I think his name was Tony -- and then go from there.

The Department should have located the Roziers earlier since the Department had contact with the child's half sibling. And I think that's -- is that the Tony person?

(NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.)

THE COURT: The Tony person.

So The Court can't find that Hearing Master was erroneous. He made a hard call on this. He looked in to best interests. He said they were both great people. These are

not easy cases. But there's clearly nothing erroneous about his decision. I think he was basically -- had a decision that was tough to make, but he had to make it based on the fact that -- and I think he took into consideration that the child was placed in September of 2016 and the Roziers came a month later, which is October, and were given, you know -- whether they were given visitation or not, that -- I guess that doesn't matter at this point.

But the Roziers -- the Supreme Court -- I'm just going to go by what it states, because I think this was a -- I think Mr. Sharp's argument -- or, no, maybe it was Mr. Mills'

MR. SHARP: No, Your Honor, it was my argument.

THE COURT: Okay. Was that -- and I don't think there's in -- there's definitely no -- this was a hard case -- as far as the facts -- well, it's a straight-forward case. It's just a hard -- it's a hard ending, because the trial was -- doesn't -- he's with people that love him, they're good people, they're a good placement.

But I need to make sure that we all understand that the law says -- and I just want to put it on the record -- I think it was in Mr. Mills' --

MR. MILLS: I do have it in mine, if you look on page -THE COURT: Thank you.

```
1
         MR. MILLS:
                     -- eleven.
2
          THE COURT:
                      Thank you.
3
         MR. MILLS:
                      It's the law.
4
                      It states that, once -- the whole-year issue
          THE COURT:
5
6
                     Well --
         MR. MILLS:
7
                     -- is -- I don't know if we're talking about
8
    the same thing, but it says part of the argument, in the DFS
9
    argument, was that you have a year to come in.
10
         MR. MILLS: Correct.
                                That's --
11
         MR. SHARP: Yes, Judge. The Supreme Court -- and I can
12
13
         MR. MILLS: Clark County District Attorney verse District
14
    Court --
15
         THE COURT: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).
16
         MR. MILLS:
                     -- 167 P.3d --
17
         MR. SHARP:
                     Yes.
18
         MR. MILLS: -- 922, that argument of mine in my brief was
19
    page nine -- eight, nine, ten, that aspect of it.
20
          THE COURT: So --
21
         MR. BLACKMON: I'm not sure if, Your Honor --
22
         MR. SHARP: That argument is also in mine --
23
         MR. BLACKMON: -- first off, I'm not sure that Mr. Mills
```

has --

MR. SHARP: -- it is in twelve.

MR. BLACKMON: -- has the right to file any type of response in this case. So I would ask that that be stricken or ask one of these attorneys that is actually a party in this case, ask that that be stricken. It's improper and I don't think that it should be considered.

MR. SHARP: And, Your Honor, I do not believe this gentleman has actually filed a notice of attorney in this case, so I don't know that he actually has the right to approach the bar.

THE COURT: Okay. So what I can say is this, the parties in this case are State of Nevada through the Depart -- DA's Office as well as the child, Esther. And, at this point, there's no -- you have to file a motion to get status as (indiscernible) best sole interest. But the joinder, they can't be joined because they can't be par -- they're not joining into as parties. It does state, though, it says, If a family member with knowledge that a child's been placed in protective custody, delay seeking custody of the child for more than one year, after the child's initial placement, the family members must demonstrate a reasonable excuse. That's assuming that the child -- that they had knowledge, which is the Department's -- you can't shift the burden on a family member to find out that there's kids out there that may or may

not be in care. That's the whole point of the comprehensive diligent search at the beginning of a case. The --

MR. SHARP: So, Your Honor -- and I apologize for interrupting -- the actual language of the case states that the family members have a concomitant duty, meaning a co-equal duty with the Department --

THE COURT: Where does it say that?

MR. SHARP: Just one moment and I'll give you the citation. It is in that case that we were just referring to, and that would be --

THE COURT: That's in your motion?

MR. SHARP: It is in my motion. It should be on page fourteen. Let's see, let me make sure.

Yes, fourteen, line -- lines three through five,
Additionally, The Court found that despite DFS's duty to
locate familial placements, the family member has a
concomitant duty to step forward and request custody. And in
looking in that case, Your Honor, it is similar to this case
in that The Court did have questions as far as, well, did the
Department do enough. In the --

THE COURT: I'm sorry, say that -- page fourteen -- what was it?

MR. SHARP: So page fourteen of my motion, and it would be lines three through five, it's the first paragraph.

THE COURT: Okay. Page fourteen on mine is the -- so -- okay. So, page fourteen, I don't think that's a -- I'm looking at the same page fourteen. So -- well, wait, maybe I am. Hold on. Page fourteen lines three through -- oh, no, this is --

MR. SHARP: Of my Objection.

THE COURT: Your Objection on 5/1, okay.

MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

THE COURT: Okay. Page fourteen.

MS. HONODEL: And, Your Honor, while you're looking at that, I'm actually looking at Clark County District Attorney versus the Eighth Judicial District, the case --

THE COURT: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

MS. HONODEL: -- cited in Mr. Tanner's Objection, and it does refer to a concomitant duty to set forth. But that is provided that the relatives had notice. So Your Honor was on the right track with this.

THE COURT: Right.

So we've had cases like this where you have to get -- they don't -- they don't --

MR. SHARP: However, Your Honor, our argument is that they knew or they should have known. Mrs. Rozier's testimony was that they knew that Mom was homeless, she knew she that she had prior kids in the system, she knew that there was drug

issues. And when she found out the kids were in care, she'd said well that wasn't really a surprise to us --

THE COURT: Right. I re --

MR. SHARP: -- knowing her lifestyle.

THE COURT: -- I saw her say that. But that's not an affirmative duty. She -- you can't pass the duty that she has to go out there and search fifty states to find out where this child was.

MR. SHARP: But she knew where the child was. As soon as she wanted to look for the child, she was able to find the child in Clark County within --

THE COURT: I think --

MR. SHARP: -- a day.

THE COURT: -- yeah, but I don't -- that is absolutely not what this -- the Supreme Court is saying, is that that they have to go out and do a diligence search to find out where family members are.

MR. SHARP: But, Your Honor, they didn't know. They had to do was contact the family member who knew where Mom was at.

THE COURT: Yeah, but that's -- there's no law that says that they have to do that.

MR. SHARP: There isn't a law, but The Court case says that there's a co-equal or concomitant duty for the family members to step forward. Concomitant --

THE COURT: Okay. But it says The Court found --

MR. SHARP: -- duty meaning co-equal.

THE COURT: -- that despite the (indiscernible) to locate at familiar placement, the family members has a concomitant duty to step forward and request custody.

MR. SHARP: And if I can describe for The Court, in that case that's cited --

THE COURT: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

MR. SHARP: -- basically what happened is, there was a father who was in prison who advised the Department that there was a mother and a sister who might be able to take placement. The Department contacted the mother. The mother said that she would not be able to take placement of the child and she said that the daughter, she did not believe the daughter would not be able to take placement of the child. The Department did not take the extra step of contacting the daughter. However, when the daughter came forward and then stopped placement, The Court said, well, we can't same -- basically The Court said that the Department should have contacted that daughter that they knew was out there. However, the daughter actually -- had a co-equal duty to step forward and indicate their desire to take the child.

THE COURT: Okay.

So the Objection has UNITY notes --

MR. SHARP: It does.

THE COURT: -- attached to it?

The UNITY notes don't say that DFS asked the adult sibling if there were other family placement options.

MR. SHARP: Your Honor, I have Ms. Quinlan here. If The Court would --

THE COURT: I'm not -- I'm not retrying the case, that's the thing.

The issue is is that Hearing Master Norheim looked into -- he basically said there was two good sets of families, parents, the placement as well as the cousin, that would be able to take care of this children (sic). What Hearing Master Gibson (sic) stated was that he believed that the Department basically didn't follow through with finding out other relatives, and that at that time when they knew about the child in October they came forward, so as soon as they knew about it. Had they waited a year or thirteen months after they knew about it, then you kind of, you snooze, you lose. But they came forward as soon as they knew, according --

MR. SHARP: However, that was --

THE COURT: -- to the testimony.

MR. SHARP: -- after the year period. And, again, our argument is that they should have known.

But, Your Honor, other than that, there's still two

more obstacles. First of all --

THE COURT: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

MR. SHARP: -- you have to determine whether the familial presumption exists. As I stated in my motion, once that TPR happened, once the termination of parental rights happened, that cut off all familial rights to the family members, as it stated --

THE COURT: They came forward before the TPR was --

MR. BLACKMON: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. SHARP: Once the TPR is --

MS. HONODEL: Well --

MR. SHARP: -- ordered that is final.

MS. HONODEL: -- well, Your Honor --

MR. SHARP: And so -- and hold on.

MS. HONODEL: Okay.

MR. SHARP: -- Your Honor, as I stated in my brief, the Supreme Court cited to -- I was -- I believe it was Lippo (sic), where they essentially stated that the parental rights -- or, I'm sorry, the familial rights extend through the parents, and once that right is cut-off then the rights to the relatives are cut-off. And unless there's a specific statute that provides an exception to the -- to that, then all familial rights are cut-off. And the exception that the Supreme Court notes is grandparents and siblings can ask for

visitation rights if they do so before adoption.

However, in this case there -- there is no such exception by statute. In addition to that, the other step and what's stated in the case is that the overarching -- the overarching goal of The Court must be to determine the best interest of the child.

When you look at Hearing Master Norheim's decisions, he did not make the best interest decision. This was clearly erroneous. He said that the child is extremely bonded to the Riveras but the child has biological ties to the Roziers and that The Courts and that the Legislature have stated that we have to look at the biological bonds first. And that just is not the case when you look at the Clark County versus Eighth Judicial District Court, it's the best interest of the child. And so he did not apply the correct standard in this case.

THE COURT: All right.

Ms. Honodel.

MS. HONODEL: I can assist The Court with this part.

NRS 128.110, at the end of the TPR statutes, still provides a preference for placement of child with relatives and siblings.

THE COURT: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

MS. HONODEL: So, you know, I think -- and I agree with what Mr. McKay set out. This is a dangerous precedent that

we're going to set. And the purpose of doing -- you know, of cutting his office to find them permanent homes, but we still have the familial preference even after termination of parental rights is granted.

THE COURT: And just for the record -- Ms. Honodel, I don't mean to cut you off -- is that the TPR was granted January 12th 2017.

MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

THE COURT: And the --

MS. HONODEL: In making --

THE COURT: -- Roziers came in for October of 2016.

MR. SHARP: But, Your Honor, those rights were still terminated. But not only that, when you look at the statute, it states that the best interest of the child overrides that familial preference. It's not the familial preference first, and then the best interest later. The overarching concern must be the best interest.

In fact, let me direct The Court --

THE COURT: Okay. I don't wa -- I think we're getting (indiscernible). The parents' rights were terminated after the Roziers came forward. They came forward, said, hi, I'm the -- I'm family, I didn't know my --

MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

THE COURT: -- this child was in care. And then January

of 2017 is when the rights were -- their rights were terminated. So they came --

MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

THE COURT: -- they came in before. So let that's --

MR. SHARP: And they did not file anything. They've -they did not ask to intervene in that TPR. They did not do
anything to stop that termination of parental rights.

THE COURT: They don't --

MR. SHARP: And I can represent to The Court, even in the issues wherein the analogous case where you have a grandparent who has sought visitation rights after an adoption is made, that right it cut-off because that statute has to --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHARP: -- be very specific. There is no statute on point that once a TPR Order is granted that family members can then come in and ask for the --

THE COURT: I'm just going to make this --

MR. SHARP: -- presumption to apply.

THE COURT: -- as simple as I can, because, again, I'm just the Objection person here.

NRS 542B, I told you about the facts provides that in determining the placement of a child it must be presumed to be in the best interest of the child to be placed together with siblings of the child. Here the child's adult sibling

,

indicated that she was not a placement option for the child.

Ms. Rozier -- or the Roziers are seeking placement of the child's other sibling who is presently in fostercare.

Whether or not Mom reunifies with this child, I have no idea. All I know is that right now they're probably looking into ICPC because they're not going to keep -- she has some work to be done.

MR. SHARP: So, Your Honor, as to that I can -- I can -- advise The Court that if Ms. Saez is looking at reunifying, which she is --

THE COURT: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

MR. SHARP: -- then we're not going to be able to move this kid to Georgia because Mom's not going to be able to reunify if the child is in Georgia.

In addition to that, if The Court wants to look at the sibling presumption --

THE COURT: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

MR. SHARP: -- the older sibling -- I'm sorry, Esther is currently with the Riveras and so is Olivia, the youngest child. So currently those siblings are placed together. If you move Esther, her sibling will then remain with the Riveras at this time. So if we're going to go off the presumption, then let's go with the presumption, and they're -- they're currently together.

THE COURT: Okay.

Any search for relative with whom to place a child must be from within one year after placement of the child outside the home. Here the child Esther was placed outside the home in July of 2015. The Department had contact with the child's adult sibling, but it doesn't appear the Department asked the child's adult sibling whether there were other relatives who could take placement of the child.

This Court agrees with Hearing Master's -- Norheim's finding that the Department should have located Ms. Rozier earlier since he had contact with the child's adult sibling. This Court finds that the familial preference does apply in this case. The Hearing Master appropriately found that Ms. Rozier has -- had a reasonable excuse for the delay in seeking placement of the child.

This is not a case where -- for a ye -- over a year, thirteen or more months, decided at that time to come forward. Further, he appropriately found that both the foster parents and the Roziers are good and dedicated parents. And I agree with that, both have good community involvement and both have more than adequate resources to care for the child. The Hearing Master appropriately determined suitability of the Roziers and considered the best interest of the child when making the decision.

MR. SHARP: And, Your Honor, I would --

THE COURT: The Court finds -- wait -- the Hearing
Master's findings are clearly not erroneous.

MR. SHARP: -- I would ask The Court where did he make that best-interest finding? Show me in that Recommendation where he made a best-interest finding.

THE COURT: Basically, he listened to a day-and-a-half of testimony -- because I think there was two days I watched or part of one day and part of another day -- and stated that both -- that at this point the child's been with the Rozier --

What he did find is this, this is what he said, he said: The Roziers came back or they came and -- they became involved a month after this child was placed within the fostercare and that they were basically, at that point, told to -- they'd be getting an ICPC and that they'd be getting something, some visitation, and they basically got nothing. And so time lapsed from October till the time of this hearing, and that he believed, that based on the time that the child was in care with the foster placement, that reunification -- or uni -- or unification with the Roziers could have happened, but the Departments didn't let that, for whatever reason, happen and that he believed that both parents were -- or both sets of families were equally dedicated to the child.

MR. SHARP: So --

THE COURT: Okay. So that's his -- that's his best interest.

MR. SHARP: But he didn't make that recommendation. He stated --

THE COURT: The -- the Objection's denied. He didn't -he was not erroneous. He made a hard call on this. He heard
the trial. He put into place what be believed was -- was
right, and he basically said the Department should have gotten
in contact with the Roziers much sooner. And they did not ask
the adult sibling anyone -- about anyone else that could have
taken preference.

MR. SHARP: Okay. So I would ask for a stay of that Order until we --

THE COURT: I'm not staying that Order.

MR. SHARP: -- until we're able to --

THE COURT: The child needs to go --

MR. BLACKMON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- the child needs --

MR. SHARP: -- to appeal.

THE COURT: -- the child -- you need to follow the

Judge's Order -- or the Hearing Master's Order. And you need
to make sure that -- that -- I think his Order was the Roziers
need some visitation with this little girl so that they can
start a bond that the Department hadn't let them start.

1 MR. MILLS: So, Your Honor, you're making a specific 2 finding that a familial preference -- a familial preference 3 exists? Because that's the first thing that had to happen and 4 the Judge didn't do that -- the Hearing Master didn't do that. 5 So I'm asking, are you making that preference? 6 Because contrary to the statutes, both 125C.050 and 127 --7 THE COURT: Um-hmm (in the affirmative). 8 MR. MILLS: -- which both say the moment the term --9 Counsel's right, the moment the termination happened --10 THE COURT: Um-hmm (in the affirmative). 11 MR. MILLS: -- and her parental rights are gone, then so 12 does the family -- there's no other family. So I need --13 THE COURT: There is because --14 MR. MILLS: -- that would be the issue on --15 THE COURT: -- they filed it --16 MR. MILLS: -- appeal would --17 THE COURT: Right. 18 MR. MILLS: -- be --19 THE COURT: Right. 20 MR. MILLS: -- that issue, so. 21 THE COURT: And the Supreme Court's going to say that the 22 Department should have found the family, should have gone out 23 of their way to find, through a comprehensive diligent search,

family for this child. Because the child got into a good

24

foster home recently, but was bumped around a couple times for the first year before they found the family, which is the Riveras, who'd done a extremely good job raising this child since they've had her.

What they're going to say is this, is they're going to say that the family, the Roziers, they're not obligated to come into a TPR case on their own and get an attorney and sit in a pub -- in a private hearing that, because they asked for placement with the Department in October and the TPR didn't happen until January, that their rights were still intact when they asked the Department for family placement. They don't have to hire an attorney to go do that. All they have to do is request placement, which they did.

It's the Department's job to put it on calendar, which they did do, because that's how you had this Adjudicatory -- or this Evidentiary Hearing on placement. But they're -- it's not -- you can't shift the burden to a non-party to go -- come to a TPR trial and say, halt, halt, don't let the trial go forward. They went and they talked to the Department of Family Services in October, and that's pretty much all that their obligation was. It's the Department's job to make sure that they notify any and all family to let this -- the family know that there's a child out there.

And as far as the -- the child and siblings. Mom

already has a TPR against her. The Department, according to Hearing Master Norheim, there ha -- there is -- should be an ICPC to Georgia --

MR. BLACKMON: It is completed.

THE COURT: -- with that baby.

MR. BLACKMON: It's completed.

THE COURT: Okay. Whether or not they don't -- they don't do it, that's up to Hearing Master Norheim as far as how he wants to handle that.

But right now, they're not going to have a child in fostercare when the child can be with -- with family, and especially not after all this. Because you can't keep children in fostercare. Whether or not Mom's reunifying, she's already lost her rights to one child. There's -- if the mom reunifies, then I think that's great, but they're not going to keep a child in fostercare if there's an ICPC that's granted.

MR. MILLS: So it's your findings the fact that they verbally requested to a caseworker that is sufficient to protect their rights and their --

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. MILLS: -- parental preference --

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MR. MILLS: -- contrary to 125C.050 --

```
1
          THE COURT: Absolutely.
 2
          MR. MILLS:
                      -- and 127.171?
 3
          THE COURT:
                      It's up to the Department of Family Services.
 4
     They're given -- that's their burden. It's up to them to find
 5
             It's not up to family to find them.
     family.
 6
          MR. MILLS: Well, I'm not asking about finding.
 7
          THE COURT:
                      Right.
 8
          MR. MILLS:
                      They were found well before the termination
 9
     occurred --
10
          THE COURT: Right.
11
          MR. MILLS:
                     -- in February.
12
          THE COURT: Correct.
13
         MR. MILLS: But they didn't file any formal petition
14
    that's stach -- like -- rel -- you know --
15
          THE COURT: Yeah. And I don't think --
16
         MR. MILLS: -- statutes like --
17
         THE COURT: -- I don't think --
18
         MR. MILLS: -- 125 --
19
         THE COURT: -- I don't --
20
         MR. MILLS: -- 2050.
21
         THE COURT: -- I don't believe that's necessary.
22
    Instead, Hearing Master Norheim had a hearing on it and they
23
    -- he decided at the April Evidentiary Hearing on April 13th
```

and April 14th.

Hearing Master Norheim found that the Department should have located Ms. Rozier earlier. He further found that Ms. Rozier demonstrated a reasonable excuse for the delay in coming forward, requesting placement of the child. It's highly likely that Ms. Rozier will end up with one of the siblings of the minor child, because the other baby's in protective custody, and we always go to family rather than straight fostercare.

The Hearing Master recommended the child be placed with Ms. Rozier so long as she provides proof of the relationship and complies with the trauma minimization transition as outlined by the Department.

The Court is not required to rely on the hearing -on the Master's findings. But if it chooses to rely on the
Master's findings, it may only do so if the findings are
supported by the evidence and not clearly erroneous.

I'll go backwards. The minor child is placed in protective custody on July 27th, 2015. That's when a comprehensive diligent search should have been done. An Order to (indiscernible) the Parental Rights of the Natural Parents was filed February 18th. The minor child Esther is residing in a current foster placement since September 9th. The current foster placement is an adoptive resource. The natural mother's cousin Stephanie Rozier contacted the Department

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

October of 2016 when she became aware the child was placed in protective custody. An ICPC replacement of the child with Ms. Rozier and her husband was approved in March.

At the Status Check Hearing on April 4th the Hearing Master set a Placement Hearing since the Department objected to the placement with Ms. Rozier. And it could have turned out -- it could have turned out differently based on the I don't see the evidence as being wrong.

MR. MILLS: The problem is that's what he hung his hat He ignored best interest. In fact, if you look at his report, he doesn't even mention those two words in his entire decision. In fact, he finds that it would be detrimental to the child to remove him -- remove her from the Riveras and send, because of the (indiscernible). There's no best interest finding, and that is clearly required under the case law and the statute.

THE COURT: Okay. I read -- how I -- when I read the rep -- watched the tapes and -- and reviewed the Motion or the Objection as well as the CAP's -- the CAP pretty much laid out how -- what was -- what didn't happen in this case is that he stated that the child's young and that both placements are good placements, and he did not say it was not in the best interest or it wasn't -- he didn't say it was not in the best interest of the child to go to --

5

6

8

7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23 24

MR. MILLS: I can quote you where he says it's detrimental to the child's --

THE COURT: And that's why he's having the -- having the men -- he wants a trauma minimization --

MR. BLACKMON: Despite the trauma that would --

THE COURT: Yeah, he wants --

MR. BLACKMON: -- despite the trauma it's in the best -and he didn't say best interest, but all the analysis is saying that both -- both families are good, all that, despite there possibly being trauma. This is what he wants, so.

THE COURT: He took into consideration the best I don't think this was a -interests.

MR. SHARP: So, Your Honor, because I -- I wasn't clear on Norheim -- or I'm sorry, Hearing Master Norheim's --

THE COURT: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

MR. SHARP: -- articulation of what -- what facts lead him to believe that it was in the best interest of the child be placed with the Rozier family.

Would The Court be able to articulate why it's in her best interest? Because Hearing Master Norheim said, well, when you take the family bond versus --

THE COURT: No, because my job is just to go -- to do the Objection. My job is to see if he was erroneous in making his findings. And based on the testimony of what he did, he made

his best-interest finding implicitly. He said both were good families, but due to the family preference he found that that prevailed.

MR. SHARP: So essentially it's not a best-interest analysis, it is a family-presumption analysis?

THE COURT: No. I think he --

MR. MILLS: Correct, that's what he --

MR. BLACKMON: No.

MR. MILLS: -- decided.

THE COURT: -- I think he tied them both together.

MR. BLACKMON: That's not what he said.

THE COURT: He said that it was that the child should have gone -- that should have been noticed in the beginning. It wasn't done. He was not happy with how this -- it -- what happened with not finding the Roziers, that nobody asked the adult sibling about any family members, wasn't in the UNITY notes, and that the CAP, as well, argued that when he questioned the Department as to placement, that the Roziers basically got ignored throughout the period of this case when they became parties. And --

MR. SHARP: So --

THE COURT: -- he --

MR. SHARP: -- so --

THE COURT: -- believed that, based on family and based

1 on the fact that -- hold on -- that there's another newborn 2 child that will ha -- that should be an ICPC -- now you're 3 saying that's not happening -- but I believe --4 MR. BLACKMON: It is. 5 THE COURT: -- under the law there has to be an ICPC 6 because you ha -- you can't keep kids in fostercare if there's 7 family that are able and ready to take care of them. 8 ICPC, and that the little baby Olivia will be going to Georgia 9 as well. 10 MR. SHARP: And, Your Honor, the plan is to actually have 11 that child go to a half sibling. It's my understanding that 12 one of Mom's adult siblings is willing to help Mom and take in 13 the -- the newborn child. 14 THE COURT: And that may or may not --15 MR. BLACKMON: And, again --16 THE COURT: -- be true. 17 MR. BLACKMON: -- I'm sorry. 18 THE COURT: I don't know. 19 MR. SHARP: But we don't actually --20 MR. BLACKMON: I hate --21. MR. SHARP: -- have that child yet. 22 THE COURT: But that's not what we heard and --

23

24

MR. BLACKMON:

I know.

THE COURT: -- that's not what was --

MR. BLACKMON: It's not.

THE COURT: -- heard at the -- on the record. This is all afterwards. This is all new information. I'm going --

MR. SHARP: But, again, that's all speculation --

THE COURT: -- but I'm going by --

MR. SHARP: -- as to whether they're going --

THE COURT: -- but I'm going by --

MR. SHARP: -- be together.

THE COURT: -- by what -- he was the Hearing Master that heard the removal for the -- Olivia?

MR. SHARP: Yes.

MS. PEARL: Yeah.

MR. SHARP: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: All right. So obviously he knew about that at the time he made his decision as well as -- or that the child was being born and that Mom had a TPR and that whether or not there's Motions (indiscernible) which should be interesting to see if that happens, that that child was going into the system at some point. Maybe the child won't stay in the system because Mom will reunify, and that's possible. But right now the child's not with Mom. He's -- she's in fostercare.

MR. SHARP: She's with her sibling.

THE COURT: Okay. Who's -- Mr. -- who Hearing Master

Norheim is having sent to Georgia. So I believe Hearing 1 2 Master Norheim, from reviewing that Evidentiary Hearing, is 3 that he wants minimization as to the trauma to the child so 4 she can go to Georgia as well as that new baby in ICPC to 5 Georgia as well, where both siblings will be, at that point --6 unless Mom reunifies with the younger child, whose rights are 7 still intact. 8 I'm not disputing her rights are not still intact. 9 But at this point I don't see how these were erroneous. I 10 think --11 MR. MILLS: And, again, Your Honor, I would request a 12 stay on any reunification --13 THE COURT: But you don't --14 MR. MILLS: -- pending the appeal. 15 -- you don't ha -- I mean, at this point, THE COURT: 16 there's no -- you're not a special-interest person. You can't 17 join in. 18 MR. SHARP: Well, and I would ask --MR. MILLS: I'm definitely --19 20 MR. SHARP: -- a stay. 21 MR. MILLS: -- special interest. But --

haven't filed special interest. 24

22

23

MR. SHARP: That's true, too, neither party --

THE COURT: Well, you ha -- no one's -- both parties

1	THE COURT: Parties
2	MR. SHARP: has filed a
3	THE COURT: Right.
4	MR. SHARP: special interest.
5	THE COURT: So it's just you and I mean, it's just
6	your mosh
7	MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).
8	THE COURT: your Objection and CAP, Mr. Raymo?
9	MR. SHARP: McKay.
10	·
	MS. HONODEL: Mr. McKay.
11	THE COURT: Mr. McKay, his Opposition to that Objection.
12	And that's where we're going.
13	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.
14	THE COURT: So from here on out, I guess you go in front
15	of Hearing Master Norheim and follow whatever Orders he has.
16	MR. BLACKMON: Thank you.
17	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.
18	
19	(THE RECORDING ENDED AT 03:10:09.)
20	* * * *
21	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and
22	correctly transcribed the digital proceedings in the above- entitled case to the best of my ability.
23	Minach
24	SHELLY AJOUB,
	Transcrib é r II

FILED
JUN 27 2017



EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT JUVENILE DIVISION CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

- 1	
11	In the Matter of:) CASE NO. J-15-337398-P1
12	ESTHER BELLA RODRIGUEZ,) DEPT. Dependency 1 DOB 06/15/2015)
13)
14	A Minor. SUPREME COURT APPEAL 73272
15	
16	
17	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JON NORHEIM,
18	HEARING MASTER
19	
20	TRANSCRIPT RE: PLACEMENT HEARING - DAY 1
21	TUIDGDAY ADDII 12 2017
22	THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2017
23	
24	

21

22

23

24

1	INDEX OF WITNESSES
2	<u>DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS</u>
3	APRIL 13, 2017
4	STATE'S WITNESSES:
5	STEPHANIE ROZIER 20 51 76
6	JOEY ROZIER 81 81
7	KRISTINA QUINLAN 87 104 109
8	
9	OPENING STATEMENTS
10	MR. SHARP Page 11
11	MR. ROZIER Pages 12, 14
12	
13	
14	INDEX OF EXHIBITS
15	<u>ADMITTED</u>
16	APRIL 13, 2017
17	STATE'S EXHIBITS:
18	A GOFUNDME PAGE 8
19	B FACEBOOK POSTING 8
20	C VARIOUS LETTERS AND DOCUMENTS 8
21	D LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION 8
22	
23	
24	

1 INDEX OF WITNESSES 2 DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS APRIL 14, 2017 3 4 STATE'S WITNESSES: 5 TARYN LAMAISON By Mr. Sharp 121 By Ms. Rozier 6 135/162/176 By Mr. McKay 141 7 By Mr. Rozier 169 8 REGINA RIVERA By Mr. Sharp 178 9 PHILLIP RIVERA 10 (Read prepared statement into record) Page 201 11 PARTICIPANTS/WITNESSES: 12 JOEY ROZIER (Made statement on record) Page 208 13 STEPHANIE ROZIER 14 (Made statement on record) Page 210 15 16 CLOSING ARGUMENTS 17 MR. SHARP Page 212 MR. ROZIER Page 221 18 MS. ROZIER Page 227 MR. MCKAY Page 228 19 20 INDEX OF EXHIBITS 21 ADMITTED 22 APRIL 14, 2017 23 STATE'S EXHIBIT 24 LETTERS SUBMITTED BY THE RIVERAS 120

PROCEEDINGS

(THE PROCEEDING BEGAN AT 14:14:56.)

THE COURT: All right. Case No. J337398, Nellie Saez.

Can I get appearances, please?

MS. QUINLAN: Kristi Quinlan, Department of Family Services.

MR. SHARP: Tanner Sharp with the District Attorney's Office here on behalf of The Department.

MR. MCKAY: Ray McKay, Your Honor, I'm the CAP Attorney.

THE COURT: All right, Sir.

And we have current placement present and we have family who is seeking placement present.

This is post-termination of parental rights. This is about where Esther's going to live for the rest of her life.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Is the State taking a position on this or is the State just going to present evidence or?

MR. SHARP: The State is taking a position on this. We believe that it is in the child's best interest for the child to remain with the foster parents, with the Riveras.

Given the fact that The Court -- or, I'm sorry, the

Supreme Court requires that the parents -- I'm sorry, that the relatives show reasonable delay within the first -- or if it's after the first year of removal and given the bonding that this child has had with the foster parents, we would argue that it's in her best interest to remain with the Riveras. That adoption is set to be finalized in about thirty days.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. McKay, are you taking a position on behalf of your client today?

MR. MCKAY: Your Honor, my position -- at this point I wasn't. My purpose here today was a couple-fold. When we had the meeting last week I did feel, based on the things that were presented by the potential family, the cousins in Georgia, when they came in, that there were some discussions about when they did start getting active and that sort of thing. I felt that it was important for me to have The Court be allowed to hear from both parties.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. MCKAY: I don't really know the others. I haven't taken --

THE COURT: You're in my position. We have to hear what they have to say and try to make the --

MR. MCKAY: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- best decision.

Okay. I completely understand.

I actually didn't think the State was going to take a position today either, but -- but legally, just so the family understands, it -- our Supreme Court has ruled on this issue. And they have told me that because of the time period that has elapsed, you will have to show good-faith reason for the delay and beyond that I would have to -- it would have to show that it's in the child's best interest to be placed with you. So that's what would have to happen. So you'd have to explain the delay in a way that is excusable, and then -- and you'd also have to show that this is the better placement for Esther.

So how did you want to proceed? They're not represented. Did you want to present all the evidence today? How do you want to run these people through?

MR. SHARP: I think that's probably the best way to do it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHARP: What I'd like to do to start off is, I have spoken with Ms. Rodriguez --

And, I'm sorry, do you go by Rodriguez or Rozier?

MR. ROZIER: Rozier.

MS. ROZIER: Rozier.

MR. SHARP: Rozier.

And I'm -- do you go by Rozier then, Ms. Rozier?

MS. ROZIER: Yes.

MR. SHARP: Okay. I apologize.

So Ms. Rozier and Mr. McKay and myself had an opportunity to vis -- to go through the different exhibits that I had as well as that Ms. Rozier has, and so we would -- we've agreed to have those admitted.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHARP: And so just --

THE COURT: Have you presented those to the clerk already?

MR. SHARP: I have not.

Just going through them quickly, and I can give her a copy of it. I have a GoFundMe page that I believe it is Ms.

Rozier's sister -- set up for her for the purpose of adopting the siblings. I have a Facebook posting that was dated -- I apologize -- that was retrieved today, and this is in regards to simply Ms. Rozier posting at the GoFundMe page for the adoption, as well as a post back near the time of Esther's birth on June 18, 2015, just when Ms. Rozier likes a comment -- or likes the posting made by Mom, in this case, Nellie Saez, or previously was Mom, indicating that Esther had been born.

In addition to that, Ms. Rozier has provided several documents. She's provided a letter from Bibb County DHS, a letter from Kerry Kitchen's Impact Training, that my understanding is that this is a letter from basically the training that they take for the foster classes.

a set.

```
1
         THE COURT:
                     Mike, can you make them a --
 2
         MR. MCKAY:
                     If we can do that.
 3
         THE COURT:
                    -- copy of that.
 4
         MR. SHARP: And I do not have --
 5
         THE COURT: I'm hoping there's no staples --
 6
         MR. SHARP: -- there's not a large amount --
 7
         THE COURT:
                     -- in anything.
 8
         MR. SHARP:
                    -- of pages to them, so.
 9
         MR. MCKAY:
                    Yeah, I don't -- it didn't seem like it was
10
    too many documents. But I think just so I'm looking at it --
11
         THE COURT:
                     It's actually not the number of pages, it's
12
    the number of staples that have to be removed.
13
         MR. MCKAY: Yeah.
14
    (LAUGHTER.)
15
         THE MARSHAL: It's not going to be any taller.
16
         MR. MCKAY: That's fine.
17
         THE COURT: And we don't have color copier down here.
18
         MR. MCKAY: That's fine.
19
         THE COURT:
                     Sorry.
20
         MR. MCKAY: I think --
21
         THE MARSHAL: Do you want three copies?
22
         MR. SHARP: If you'd like to make three that's fine.
23
         MR. MCKAY:
                     I presume the clerk needs one, they would want
```

one, I know I'd like a set for my records.

24

MR. SHARP: Okay.

MR. MCKAY: And to look through during kwe...

(RECORDING STOPPED AT 14:21:03.)

(RECORDING BEGAN AT 14:29:22.)

THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record on -Did anyone wish to make an opening statement?

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. SHARP

Your Honor, at this point in time I think I've already made a sufficient amount of opening. Again, the child was removed back in July. The goal was changed -- I'm sorry, in July of 2015 the goal was changed in August, 2016.

Ms. Rozier contacted the Department on October the 20th, 2016. That is well over a year past the removal date. Since that time she has not come forward through The Court. We're at adoption. This child is very bonded to her adoptive parents, and so we do not believe that they've overcome the requirements of -- or that they'll be able to meet the burden of showing that there's no reasonable excuse for the delay or that it's in the child's best interest at this time.

THE COURT: Okay. Just so -- I want to make sure that the dates are not in dispute, because I got them out of Ms.

Quinlan's report from back in -- whenever the last review was.

MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

THE COURT: So the removal is July 25th, 2015.

1 MR. SHARP: July --2 THE COURT: The family comes forward on October 20th, 3 2016. 4 MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative). 5 THE COURT: Current placement has been in effect since 6 September 6th, 2016. 7 MR. SHARP: I believe it's September 9th. 8 MS. QUINLAN: September 9th. 9 THE COURT: September -- September 9th? 10 MR. SHARP: Yes. 11 THE COURT: Oop. Okay. I'm sorry. September 9th, 2016. 12 Okay. All right. 13 And you folks wanted to make an opening statement? 14 MR. ROZIER: Should I go first? 15 MS. ROZIER: Yeah. 16 MR. ROZIER: Okay. 17 OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. ROZIER 18 Your Honor, we have, ever since October, is when we 19 found out about Esther. We do stay in contact with family, but 20 we have family from one side of the coast to the other side of 21 the coast. 22

With that being said, we have been through seven months of trying to contact, trying to stay in touch. We've asked for visitations. No, we didn't have representation and

23

24

and that's been the problem the entire time. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MR. ROZIER: We have --4 MS. ROZIER: And she's agreed to it. 5 THE COURT: It's actually a very important piece of 6 information. 7 MR. ROZIER: That's exactly right. 8 THE COURT: Thank you. 9 Okay. 10 MR. ROZIER: So I could go zero to three children in a 11 matter of three months. 12 OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. ROZIER (Continued) 13 Um, with that being said, I have no ill-will towards 14 The Court, towards Nevada, with CPS, or even the foster family, 15 because it takes a heart to do what we do. And we all 16 understand that and we are thankful for these people behind us. 17 THE COURT: I will tell you that this is the absolute 18 hardest thing that I do. 19 MR. ROZIER: I know. 20 THE COURT: You would think that the hardest thing I would 21 do --22 MR. ROZIER: Yeah. 23 THE COURT: -- would be terminating parental rights or --

24

MR. ROZIER: Right.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

THE COURT: The hardest thing I do is face a room full of really good people all trying to do the right thing, all wanting -- all good people. I'm not going to hear anything bad about anybody today.

MR. ROZIER: (Indiscernible.)

THE COURT: No one's going to say anything disparaging about anybody.

MR. ROZIER: No.

THE COURT: We're going to have, you know, four fantastic people here who all have the best interest of Esther at heart. And it becomes very tough to tell one group of people that -because you can't both have Esther, so something --

MR. ROZIER: That's right.

THE COURT: -- is going to have to give today.

So the Supreme Court gives me some guidelines. There is a presumption that works against you at this point --

MR. ROZIER: There is.

THE COURT: -- but there are two presumptions that work in favor of you at this point.

MR. ROZIER: Yes, sir.

So the presumption that works against you is the time that you will have to overcome. So the period of time between July 25th, 2015, and October 20th, 2016, you are going to have to explain that delay in a reasonable way.

23.

But what works in favor of your is we have a presumption for sibling placement and we have presumption for family placement. Both of those are part of our statutory scheme. Frankly, they're part of every state's statutory scheme --

MR. ROZIER: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- because, you know, it make sense and it's the right thing to do. But --

So we're going to spend a lot of time focusing on why -- on why you weren't aware or why you didn't come forward between July 25th, 2015, and October 20, 2016.

MR. ROZIER: I understand.

THE COURT: I don't want you to feel that -- that there's criticism coming from the Department or the DA because they are advocating for the foster family. They have been working with this foster family and know what a spectacular job this foster family has done, whereas you're the unknown --

MR. ROZIER: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

THE COURT: -- and they're the known.

MR. ROZIER: Right.

THE COURT: They're the situation which they know is a great situation for Esther. You they don't know about yet.

So I'm going to have the State -- I'm sorry, were you done with your opening? I didn't mean to cut you off.

THE COURT:

MR. ROZIER: I'm -- I'm almost.

I'm sorry.

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. ROZIER: I'm almost. It's okay. It's okay.

I know, um, I know that you -- even when you had the mom in the court, I know The Court, they're -- it's like any other state, they want the child to say with the mother.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. ROZIER: And sometimes the mother just doesn't get it.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. ROZIER: This is one of those cases where the mom just doesn't get it. And, trust me, we had the mother in the car for five hours last week. We dro -- we flew out to Vegas, we grabbed the mother up, we go all the way to California, and we've talked with that woman for ten days. And, as family, when we're talking and we're talking and we're listening and getting through the communication with her, all the way back here to Vegas, and at the end of the day some people have to help themselves. And that's the case here.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. ROZIER: And it's hard to keep up with an addict, especially when I'm on the other side of the -- other side of the country.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. ROZIER: Although we have family.

2

Now, the good news is, we reconnected with a lot of people in the last two states -- on these two states in the last seven days and now we got tabs. I'm almost got GPS on the (indiscernible). Okay? And I'm doing my best to save the child that's coming from entering into the system, so we can corral -- and his name's going to be Isaiah -- and corral him to put with Esther and get Destiny from -- from California and put all the children together. And we're doing our best.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. McKay, did you want to make an opening statement?

MR. MCKAY: No, Your Honor, I don't need to.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

Mr. Sharp, who would you like to call first?

MR. SHARP: The State will call Ms. Hosier (sic) first.

MS. ROZIER: Rozier.

THE COURT: Rozier.

MR. SHARP: Rozier. I'm sorry, what did I say?

MS. ROZIER: Hosier.

MR. SHARP: Hosier? I'm sorry. That's the name of a band.

MS. ROZIER: It is not a very common name so I understand.

MR. SHARP: (Indiscernible) I apologize (indiscernible).

MR. ROZIER: It's actually French.

THE COURT: I'm going to have you come up to the witness

1 stand. 2 MS. ROZIER: Okay. 3 THE COURT: Before you sit down, I'm going to have you 4 raise your right hand and the clerk is going to swear you in. 5 THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear the testimony you're about to give in this action shall be the truth, the whole 6 7 truth and nothing but the truth so help you God? 8 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 9 THE CLERK: Thank you. 10 Please state and spell your name for the record. 11 THE WITNESS: S-t-e-p-h-a-n-i-e, Rozier, R-o-z-i-e-r. 12 THE COURT: And you can go ahead and have seat. 13 There is a microphone in front of you. I need you to do one of two things to preserve our record. That is, either 14 speak loudly or lean forward into the microphone. 15 16 THE WITNESS: Okay. 17 THE COURT: Whichever makes you more comfortable. 18 Mr. Sharp, whenever you're ready. 19 MR. SHARP: Thank you. 20 21 22 23

24

STEPHANIE ROZIER

having been called as a witness by the State and being first duly sworn, testifies as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHARP:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q Ms. Rozier, how are you related to Nellie Saez?
- A We are first cousins. Our mothers are sisters.
- Q And so what is your mother's name?
- A Mildred Vega.
- Q And what is Ms. Saez' mother's name?
- A Nancy Vega. They're both deceased.
- Q Okay. This question is going to seem a little strange, but part of this hearing is to show that a family member's coming forward.

Do you have any proof to show that you are actually related to Ms. Saez and to Esther?

- A No.
- Q Okay.

Okay. So let's talk about Ms. Saez a little bit.

How long have you been familiar with her? I know you're related to her, but have you been -- known her for her whole life?

- A For my whole life? She's --
- Q Or for your whole life?

two.

```
1
         Α
               They're --
 2
          0
               -- how old are you?
 3
          Α
               I'm thirty-one.
 4
         Q
               Thirty-one. Okay.
 5
         A
               Oh, yeah. Well, I'm saying compared to the children
 6
    we're --
 7
         Q
               Okay.
 8
         A
               -- here for.
 9
              Very good. I understand. I was going to say.
         Q
10
         Α
               Yes.
11
               That was my understanding, so --
         Q
12.
         A
               Yes.
13
         Q
               -- I want to make --
14
         Α
              They are the oldest --
15
         Q
               -- sure I had that correct. Okay.
              -- of the ten.
16
         Α
17
         Q
              Okay.
18
              And I think they're (indiscernible) a year apart.
         A
19
    Ah, Kristine -- Kristi has all that information.
20
              So during that five-year period did you have any
         Q
21
    telephone contact with either Carissa or Carolina?
22
         A
              No.
23
         Q
              No? Okay.
24
              So it was all through Facebook with -- with Carolina;
```

- 1	is that correct?
2	A Ah, with both of them.
3	Q Okay.
4	A We live different lifestyles, so I'm not quite sure
5	that you know, with busy lives, that they were
6	Q I understand.
7	A in the age difference.
8	Q Now I showed you before court a couple of the
9	exhibits. One was a Facebook page and then the other was a
10	GoFundMe page that's been set up for you, correct?
11	A Yes.
12	Q Okay.
13	MR. SHARP: May I approach?
14	THE COURT: Yes.
15	MR. SHARP: I'm showing Ms. Rozier State's Exhibit B.
6	BY MR. SHARP:
17	Q So it's my understanding, based on what you stated,
8	that you were at least informed of Esther's birth on Facebook
9	when Mom posted something up, is that correct?
20	A Right.
21	Q Okay.
22	A Yes. And that is around the time that I liked it.
23	Q Okay.
24	A And then if you can see on her Facebook page that she

I	is not ac	tive on it and her last posting was in 2015.
2	Q	That's just what I was
3	A	On the day of her birth.
4	Q	So at the time of Esther's birth you knew that she
5	had been	born.
6		Did you have any further contact with Mom after that?
7	A	No.
8	Q	Okay.
9	A	No.
10	Q	When was
11	A	We ah, we never had contact since her mother's
12	funeral.	
13	Q	Okay. And that was
14	A	That was (indiscernible)
15	Q	about five years ago?
16	A	Roughly.
17	Q	So then how did you make contact again with Mom to
18	make the	visit to California a week or so ago?
19	A	Ah, well that wasn't very easy. Um, she does not
20	have a hor	me. She's actually registered homeless.
21	Q	Okay.
22		Um, we her daughter she pops in to see her
23	daughter e	every so often.
.4	Q	Okay.
- 11		

1	A	Nellie's brother that lives
2	Q	And when you say her daughter, which daughter would
3	that be?	
4	A	Um, Carolina.
5	Q	Carolina, okay.
6	А	Her brother Tony lives in Florida.
7	Q	Okay.
8	A	And he's the one we're pretty close.
9	Q	Okay.
10	, A	Ah, we talk a lot. Ah, I actually visit him a lot,
11	too. And	he called me. We were just in casual conversation on
12	my way to	work, and that's it lead into conversation about
13	his siste	r and Esther and that's how we became aware.
14	Q	Okay.
15	A	I'm not quite sure how he became aware of her
16	removal.	
17	Q	So let's let me go back just a little bit.
18		So
19	A	But I tracked her down through her brother
20	Q	Through Tony, okay.
21	A	Through Tony.
22		Um, her daughter Carolina lives with one of Tony's
23	friends he	ere
24	Q	Okay.
	·	

-- that kind of was not priority, juggling training.

24

Α

1	So towards the end of our training is when we found out exactly
2	where she was.
3	Q Okay. And that was through you contacting Tony and
4	Tony lead you to Caroline
5	A (Nodding in the affirmative).
6	Q and then through her, that's where you were able
7	to get Mom's phone number and make contact with her.
8	And so when you were able to make contact with Tony
9	and call Mom, eventually, would that have been about three
10	weeks ago? How long ago would that have been?
1,1	A I first spoke with Mom I believe it was a few days
12	before we flew out here
13	Q Okay.
14	A last week. I think it was a we came out on the
15	twenty-eighth. It was a Tuesday.
16	Q Okay.
17	A Court was on the thirtieth. So it was a few days
18	before we flew out
19	Q Okay.
20	A is when I called.
21	Q How were you made aware of the court hearing in
22	California?
23	A Ah, they sent a letter to Tony.
24	Q Okay.

Q

1

3

4

5 6

7

10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

8 9

-- that lives in California. But it's -- when he moved to Florida is when our relationship, you know --

years, and before then he was in California. Seems like it's

pretty had to keep in touch with the people that are family --

How long have you had a good relationship with Tony?

Ah, let's see...well, he's lived in Florida for six

- Q Okay.
- Α -- we got a lot closer.
- About how long ago was that? 0
- Α Six years.

Sure.

- Six years. Okay.
- Um-hmm (in the affirmative). Right. Six years. came to our wedding five years ago last Friday.
- And it sounds like he keeps in touch, at least with some of his nieces and nephews that are Nellie's kids if he's keeping in touch with Carolina; is that right?
 - Α Ah, he -- I'm not sure. I can't speak for him.
 - Q Okay.
- Α He has a lot of friends that, you know, have relationships with her children, so I imagine that maybe one of the reasons why he's able to keep up with his nieces. learned a lot about my family --

- 3
- 4

5

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

-- since October, how scattered we are. Α

So let's go back. In the State's Exhibit A, the Q GoFundMe page that was set up. I know that it was your sister that wrote it; is that correct?

Α That's correct.

So one of the things that she puts in there is that she is aware that your mom has had -- I'm sorry, I apologize, not your mom -- that your cousin, Ms. Saez, natural mom in this case, has had a drug use and mental health issues for several years and that she's had several children in the system, correct?

Α What's your question?

Q So that is what she put in the GoFundMe page, correct?

Α Yes.

Okay. So if you have that information as well, that Ms. Saez had a pretty consistent substance abuse --

Α That's been her --

Q -- issue --

-- lifestyle since I was old enough to know, off and on, you know, I don't -- never kept up with her, so.

Q Okay.

A It was news to me that her were removed.

1	I called	the eight hundred number for Clark County Department					
2	of Family Services to, ah, find out who the caseworker was to						
3	see what	see what we needed to do to adopt the children, both for					
4	Destiny a	and Esther.					
5		So when I made initial contact, that was our					
6	intention	ns from the very beginning.					
7	Q	Um-hmm (in the affirmative).					
8	A	I've spoken with both well, her previous					
9	superviso	or, Taryn LaMaison					
10	Q	Um-hmm (in the affirmative).					
11	A	and her supervisor Kechia English.					
12	Q	So I'm going to have you back up just a little bit.					
13	A	Sure.					
14	Q	Did you now Destiny is about twelve years old,					
15	correct?						
16	A	She is twelve years old.					
17	Q	And she is Esther's half sibling?					
18	A	Yes.					
19	Q	Okay. And do you know when she was removed from					
20	care?						
21	A	Um					
22	·Q	If you could give that information.					
23	A	I believe she was removed from her sister's					
24	care.						

No, we're -- not so close in age, but were close

24

Α

enough in age that things like that we didn't know about.

Q Okay. But you were aware of the mental-health issues and the drug issues.

So did you ever try and reach out and contact Nellie from the time that you found out about the birth until you contacted Tony or Tony contacted you back on October 18th?

A Actually, no, Bonnie had contact with her. There's no way to get in touch with her.

As I stated before, she is homeless. And keeping up with her is pretty hard. She actually lost her cell phone in the back of a cab after her daughter's appointment last Friday, so --

Q Okay.

A -- that, um, kind of threw me for a loop there. It's like we lost her again. But luckily the cab driver, um, called me and was trying to reach her. So he held her cell phone.

I'm not sure if she has it back, but she did use someone's phone to call me.

- Q Okay. So she did make contact with you then?
- A (No audible response.)
- Q Now, it's my understanding that you had previously told Ms. LaMaison that you were a fairly close family; is that right?
 - A Yes.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And Esther was removed from her care, from Nellie's care, the mother's care here in Las Vegas.

I found out about the court hearing for Destiny in

1	March, around March 25th or			
2	Q So did Tony tell you how he found out about Esther			
3	being removed from Nellie's care back in October?			
4	A He did not or I cannot recall.			
5	Q Okay. So how did you you then contacted Ms.			
6	Quinlan, correct?			
7	A Yes.			
8	Q Okay. And I believe it was immediately thereafter,			
9	right?			
10	A I called this very same day to the eight hundred			
11	number.			
12	Q Okay.			
13	A And the lady there, she passed on the information to			
14	Kristi, and Kristi called me on October the 20th.			
15	Q And how did you know to contact Ms. Quinlan? Who			
16	gave you that information or the			
17	A No, I did not			
18	Q Nevada DFS?			
19	A I didn't they when I called into the eight			
20	hundred number			
21	Q Um-hmm (in the affirmative).			
22	A I was trying to see where Esther was.			
23	Q Okay. So let me back up			
24	A So they gave her my contact information and she			

A October 20th.

Q And did she advise you that Nellie's rights had already been terminated?

A No, she told me that her rights have not been terminated and she told me that I came in at ten months and that I came in just in time, ah, to be considered and that I would need to start the ICPC process.

And we -- she submitted the paperwork. And I did my research on the timeline of how long it would take for the paperwork to receive, ah, for the receiving state to get that. And on -- in January -- I believe January the 6th, which you have all the timeline there, I received a call from our local Department that they received the ICPC paperwork. And at the time when I first made contact with Ms. Quinlan, I asked her if we needed to take foster classes or to prepare, and she told me, no, it wasn't necessary. And when we received the paperwork, it listed that it was mandatory, um, that we do take those classes.

And I just want to make a statement that had we known

Q So --

A -- we would have had those classes taken and been -- all this would not be taking place right now.

	Q	So	when	Christ	y s	poke	to yo	u in	Octob	er,	did	she	tell
you	that	the	goal	change		I'm	sorry	, the	e goal	for	Est	her'	ន
pern	naneno	y p	Laceme	ent had	be	en cl	nanged	to a	a term	inat	ion	of	
pare	ental	righ	nts ar	nd the	plaı	n was	s goin	g to	be to	hav	e he	er	
ador	ted?												

- A Ah, she told me that, um, that they were looking for permanent placement and that she was in an adoptive home.
 - Q Um-hmm (in the affirmative).
- A So I was aware of that. And that her -- actually, did not find out about the TPR Hearing until, I would say, a couple weeks before, which was on January the 12th.
- Q So when you spoke of Ms. Quinlan, did she explain to you that because the child was in an adoptive home that the plan was to have the current foster parents adopt her and if that fell through you could then be an adoptive resource?
 - A Actually, that was never said.
 - Q Okay.
- A Kristi did not say, um, that I was -- it was never told to me that I was the concurrent plan.
 - Q Okay.
- A And, which I've learned a lot of this, too, in our training --
 - Q Um-hmm (in the affirmative).
 - A -- for several weeks. So, um, Taryn, her previous

BY MR. SHARP:

7

18

19

20

21

23

24

Q So after talking to Ms. Quinlan, did you ever inquire

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

of Ms. Quinlan as to any of the court dates here or court hearings here?

Α Ah, no. They told me that I -- she told me about the TPR Hearing and that there would be a follow-up hearing afterwards --

Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

-- and that those were the only two hearings that were coming up. So I was not aware of anything else.

Now had I known, ah -- I don't know that it's different in California, but in California, um, the regional director there told me that if I brought, um, Nellie with me and she was in agreement for me to adopt her children, Destiny, that that could happen. Ah, had I known that before, I probably would have made more time, ah, an effort to track her down during the time of my training, ah, to be here for the TPR Hearing.

I was not aware that I can come to court for -- show up for anything. I was told --

MR. SHARP: Okay.

THE WITNESS: -- that I wasn't.

Ah, in the beginning I was told that I could visit Esther. And then when I asked, they told me I could not, that they needed my approved home study --

Q So let me --

l	A	and then when my approved home study
2	Q	let me slow you down just a little bit.
3	· ·	So when you you were initially told you could
4	visit. W	hen was that, was that around October when you inishi
5	den pro	
6	A	October.
7	Q	Okay.
8	A	I've spoken with Kristi every month
9	Q	And then when did they tell you you couldn't have
10	visits?	
11	A	Ah, on the very on the last day of our, um,
12	classes,	our training I told her we were ready to book our
13	flight	
14	Q	And when would that have been approximately?
15	A	That was it's in the timeline it's February is
16	the	
17	Q	Okay. So about February of this year?
18	A	It was towards the last it was a Tuesday
19	Q	Okay. That's okay, I don't need
20	A	or
21	Q	specific date.
22	A	Okay.
23	Q	February of this year is just fine. Okay.
24	A	Yes.
11		

1 So in February --2 So --Q 3 Α -- on that day I --4 Q Um-hmm (in the affirmative). 5 -- told her that we were ready to book our flight. Α 6 Q Okay. 7 A And she said she needed to get with the foster 8 parents, the adoptive parents, ah, to see when would be a good 9 time for us to do so. 10 Q Okay. And when she called me back, she told me that Taryn, 11 12 her then supervisor, said that we cannot visit unless we had an 13 approved home study. So once the home study was approved, then they told me that we still could not visit. So there's a lot 14 of things that we were told we could do and then it turned out 15 16 17 And that --Q -- was not true. 18 Α 19 -- and that was in February, correct, that --Q 20 Α February. 21 -- that you then stopped to visit --Q 22 Α Ah --23 -- and you were told all of these initial things? Q 24 A March 21st --

Q Okay.
A -- is
the timeline --

A -- is when Kristi -- and all of that, again, is in the timeline --

Q Okay.

A -- I believe it was March 21st is when Kristi said she would need to get with her supervisor.

Q Okay.

A And I do want to let you know, when I -- when Kristi first called me --

Q Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

A -- she, at that time, did tell me I was ten months in of when Esther was placed --

Q Okay.

A -- or removed from the home. And she had to ask her supervisor if it was -- if it was okay -- I don't know if that's the proper term -- or -- for the ICPC or was it just not even going to happen. So Taryn had to approve it and she approved it.

Q Okay.

A Now that to me was -- we were moving forward.

Q Um-hmm (in the affirmative).

A Um --

Q Okay. So let me -- let me ask you just a couple of basic questions.

1 MR. SHARP: And I am going to call her to testify and 2 we'll get into that as well, so. 3 THE COURT: Okay. I just --4 MR. SHARP: We can provide those answers on the record. 5 THE COURT: All right. So there's no -- we didn't make 6 any effort to try to find these people, the Roziers? 7 MR. SHARP: Um, I --8 THE COURT: If we didn't know who they --9 MR. SHARP: -- let's wait till we get her on the --10 THE COURT: -- if we didn't know who they were, then we 11 couldn't have made an effort to find them. 12 Okay. 13 MS. ROZIER: Correct. 14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So --15 MR. SHARP: Yeah. 16 THE COURT: All right. 17 THE WITNESS: Am I allowed to make a statement? 18 THE COURT: You are, and that's the next part of this. 19 And -- remember when I told you at the beginning, that because 20 the Department is taking a position and that position is 21 contrary to you folks, that you would be allowed to present

anything you wished in addition. I'm not going to -- I'm not

going to limit your testimony to what Mr. Sharp wants to ask

you about. So anything you want to tell me, and I'll remind

22

23

1 you remain under oath, and anything you want to tell me, please 2 feel free to tell me. 3 Also, if it will help you -- you get a timeline and 4 things like that -- if it will help you to refresh your 5 recollection as to dates and times, you can go ahead and look 6 at that. I don't have any problem with that at all. It's your 7 right to do so. 8 I'm assuming that timeline has been shared with the 9 other attorneys? 10 MR. MCKAY: Yes, Your Honor. 11 MR. SHARP: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Okay. So did you want to grab it or maybe 13 your husband will bring it over to you? 14 THE WITNESS: You can just bring the whole folder. 15 I thought that that -- you've referenced a few 16 times and I know that you went through a lot of effort to do 17 all this up. And if that'll --18 THE WITNESS: Yes. 19 THE COURT: -- help you and --20 21 22 23

STEPHANIE ROZIER

testifies as follows:

3

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24 CROSS EXAMINATION

THE WITNESS: Well, every conversation I have, I document as soon as I have the conversation. Um...

Now I do want to state that we're very honest people. Everything we say is honest and true. And as everybody in here, we all have our own professions that we know the ins and outs.

THE COURT: Right.

THE WITNESS: You know your job. I know my job.

Everybody in here knows how to do their job. So when I went to Kristi (phonetic herein), I expected to be told the truth, because I didn't know anything about the process.

THE COURT: Right.

THE WITNESS: So when I gathered --

THE COURT: Fair assumption.

THE WITNESS: -- so when I gathered this information from her I thought it was true. The more time that went by, we saw some discrepancies there, so.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: (Sigh.) When -- I do want to say that Nellie's mom was a big support system for her. When she died, I mean, you lose a mom.

```
1
         THE COURT:
                     Sure.
2
         THE WITNESS: So her life probably went worse to the worst
3
    after that.
                 Okay?
4
              As far as the --
5
         THE COURT: Actually, hold on just a second.
6
         THE WITNESS: Sure.
7
         THE COURT: If it will make this streamline a little more
8
    and --
9
              Does the State have anymore evidence on what the
10
    Roziers were doing in terms of involvement that --
11
         MR. SHARP:
                     Your --
12
         THE COURT:
                     -- prior to October 20th or is this -- because
13
    I don't think --
14
         MR. SHARP: No, I believe this is all after October 25th.
15
         THE COURT: All right. So --
16
         MR. SHARP: And the State -- we agree that ICPC was
17
    approved as to her --
18
         THE COURT: Um-hmm (in the affirmative).
19
         MR. SHARP: -- so there's no argument --
20
         THE COURT:
                     Right.
21
         MR. SHARP: -- as far as her completing the requisite.
22
         THE COURT: So, I mean, a lot of things are pretty well in
23
    at this point.
                    I know that Ms. Quinlan still wishes to testify
24
```

and she will.

But as far as The Court needing to make a decision on reasonable delay, you -- here's what you're aware of. You're aware -- in a general sense -- that Nellie has a lot of issues. You're aware that a child is born. You don't note anything else until Tony tells you on October 18th, 2016. And on that day you make efforts that I very -- I don't know if I've ever seen a family member figure all this system out that quickly and be able to get a hold of Ms. English.

I'm not sure how that's an unreasonable delay. I have to make a whole bunch of assumptions to cause -- to call this an unreasonable delay. And that is that they -- well, they should have -- they should have figured out, because she's had a lot of problems in her past, that she was having a problem now, and this child is somehow in custody and in custody here. The Department didn't know who these people are. They weren't reaching out to them.

This is a cousin who lives across the country who they have minimal contact with. I'm not sure how they should have known any earlier. And as soon --

MR. SHARP: So --

THE COURT: -- as they had actual knowledge they reached out.

I'm not sure how that's unreasonable delay. If they've known for a few weeks or a few months and done nothing,

1 then that would be a problem, and our Supreme Court says that 2 that's a problem. But if they don't know, and on the day they 3 know they make pretty --4 MR. SHARP: But --5 THE COURT: -- serious efforts, I don't know how that can be -- and we're still going to have to determine best interest. 6 7 MR. SHARP: Yes. 8 THE COURT: But I don't know how I call that an 9 unreasonable delay. 10 MR. SHARP: I understand. 11 So, Your Honor, a couple things. 12 First of all we need to have Ms. Quinlan testify 13 because there are some additional facts. 14 THE COURT: There will be as to post-October 20th --15 MR. SHARP: And as far as --16 THE COURT: -- 2016 facts. But --17 MR. SHARP: -- prior to that date, the issue that we have 18 is they were aware that Mom was homeless, they were aware that 19 Mom had these issues --20 THE COURT: I got that from the testimony. 21 MR. SHARP: They say that we don't -- we don't have 22 contact with her but we're a close family. And the issue that

I have is that as soon as they find out that this child is

removed they know exactly who to call. And that's --

23

THE COURT: It helps if you have a DA in your family, but okay.

MR. SHARP: -- that's a concern is that, well, you immediately know to contact the Clark County DA's Office or the Clark County Office of Child Protective Services, especially when this child has been removed for this long.

And so the parents have a -- in this state

(indiscernible) the court cases they have a concomitant duty to

come forward within that first year. They knew or reasonably

should have known that this child had been removed, especially

if they're claiming that they were a close family and they know

all of the issues that they -- that Mom has and there is

another child who has been removed. And so I would disagree

with the premise that there's a reasonable cause for delay.

In addition to that, I understand that they began taking the ICPC courses and went through and got all of those things done. The other issue that we have, though, is that they never came out and made visits. And as Ms. Quinlan will testify --

THE COURT: Those are going to go to best interests -MR. SHARP: -- to, this is going to be Plan B, so.

THE COURT: -- and those are going to go what's best for -- but here's the thing. You've got a really good argument, you just don't have facts to support that argument. The only

1 actual evidence that I have today --2 MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative). 3 THE COURT: -- would be, though the Department only knows 4 post-October 20, 2016 -- they don't, they didn't have contact 5 with these people --6 MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative). 7 THE COURT: -- so the only evidence that I have is the 8 evidence that you've submitted, that is, they knew about the 9 birth, the testimony that you've gotten --10 MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative). 11 THE COURT: -- that they knew that Mom had problems --12 MR. SHARP: Um-hmm (in the affirmative). 13 THE COURT: -- on the testimony that you got that they 14 thought, well, Mom appears to be married at this point and 15 maybe she's got her problems resolved, and so things are good. 16 And then the testimony you got that on October 18th I found out 17 this child was in custody and then took action that day. 18 That's the evidence that we have at this point. 19 MR. SHARP: And that was not --20 THE COURT: If there's no more evidence then --21 MR. SHARP: -- that was not within the year period. And 22 so --23 THE COURT: Was not within the year period, which is -- if

24

it was --

THE COURT: -- within the year period, then we're not

having this hearing today.

MR. SHARP: At all, yes. I understand that.

THE COURT: Because it's outside the period The Court has to determine whether or not the delay was unreasonable or reasonable.

Given the evidence, the only evidence that I have today, unless there's other evidence that's out there, this is what we've got. And this, based on the sworn testimony today, is a reasonable delay. That is, they did not know, the Department did not reach out to them, the family did not reach out to them. This, again, this is the only evidence that I have. They might have guessed that there was a problem and maybe should have started checking on it earlier. But that's a stretch.

MR. SHARP: And, Your Honor, I would just respectfully disagree, because I think they --

THE COURT: No.

MR. SHARP: -- did have that duty.

THE COURT: Well, I -- I know --

MR. SHARP: But that's certainly our argument, so.

THE COURT: -- you disagree, otherwise you --

MR. SHARP: I wouldn't be here, so.

1 THE COURT: -- you wouldn't be here today and we wouldn't 2 be having --3 MR. SHARP: Yes. 4 THE COURT: -- this hearing. But I believe that that's --5 MR. SHARP: Okay. 6 THE COURT: -- the evidence that compels me to make a 7 finding of today. 8 MR. SHARP: Okay. 9 Again, that takes us past hurdle number one. THE COURT: 10 But now ultimately we've got to determine what is in Esther's 11 best interest. 12 MR. SHARP: Okay. 13 THE COURT: And I know that there's going to be quite a 14 bit of evidence as to the bonding and things that have taken 15 place. And I've got reports on the foster family. I know that 16 they're exemplary. I know these are great people. 17 like to get some evidence from --18 Did you want to try to take the family through or do 19 you want me to have the family go through it themselves as to 20 why they think that they're in a better position to take care 21 of Esther at this point?

MR. SHARP: Certainly if you'd like to take them through that I think that --

THE COURT: I mean, I --

22

23

MR. SHARP: -- would be perfect.

THE COURT: -- I probably shouldn't be the one -- either

I'm going to let her do a narrative --

MR. SHARP: And that's what I seen you allow her to do.

Or I can certainly ask her, but I can --

THE COURT: And I'm going to try not to play attorney today.

So I'm going to either let --

MR. SHARP: Understood.

THE COURT: -- her do a narrative or I'll let you walk her through it. If you want to have her do a narrative, that's fine.

MR. SHARP: If we can allow her to do a narrative and then I can just ask questions if --

THE COURT: And then you can ask them questions about it?

MR. SHARP: -- as it comes along, so.

THE COURT: Okay. So, all right.

Where we're at, if this all made sense, is I have to make two determinations. All the evidence is in on one of the determinations. There isn't anything else for me to look at. There isn't another witness sitting in the courtroom who will have evidence of what was going through you guys' head and what you knew or didn't know prior to October 18, 2016. So that's it. So that's decision -- that decision is made.

1 Now The Court is going to have to balance -- you're 2 going to have to tell me what it is, why you think that Esther 3 would have a better life, better opportunities in your care 4 versus fostercare. 5 THE WITNESS: Okay. 6 THE COURT: Okay? So I don't know if you're prepared to 7 go in that direction yet or do -- did you want a few moments to 8 talk to your husband about how you --9 MR. ROZIER: Yes, please. 10 THE COURT: -- want to present that? 11 MR. ROZIER: Yes. 12 THE WITNESS: Okay. 13 THE COURT: I also promised my clerk I would take a 14 regular bathroom break today. 15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible.) 16 THE COURT: Something I'm not --17 THE WITNESS: Okay. 18 THE COURT: -- usually --19 THE WITNESS: Not a problem. 20 THE COURT: -- been doing lately, but. 21 MR. ROZIER: We just need five minutes. 22 THE COURT: Okay. So we'll --23 THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: -- take about five minutes, and you're going

to come back. You'll remain under oath and then we'll have you give me some information, and then both of the attorneys will have an opportunity to ask you questions about the information you give.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay?

THE WITNESS:

THE WITNESS: Sure.

(RECORDING STOPPED AT 15:19:44.)

(RECORDING BEGAN AT 15:25:54.)

THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record in Case No. J337398.

And at this point you were going to give me some information on what Esther's life would be like with you guys.

Right.

I first will say there's no doubt in my mind that they can provide her the same life. You know, we both went through the same process, we were both vetted, we -- you know, we've -- backgrounds, finances, everything. We can equally give her the same life, the same love, the same care. There's no doubt about that.

Yes, we are family. That to me is a big thing. Um I am close with my family, the ones who -- I'm able to be in contact with.

THE COURT: Well, let me guide you a little bit and so

that I can get the information I need.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Would you tell me -- if Esther is living with you --

THE WITNESS: Yes?

THE COURT: -- who do you expect her to have a relationship with? Describe the people that are going to be part of her life. Who are you in contact with with your family and how often is she going to see those people and do those people have kids her age, that sort of thing.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: What's -- what is Esther getting out of this deal?

THE WITNESS: Well, a whole lot because we are a big family.

Hopefully her siblings, first of all. Her brother, her unborn brother Isaiah, and her twelve-year-old sister. If, in the end, we do -- we're unable to adopt Destiny, that family wants her to have a relationship with Esther. So we've established that early on.

Like I said, we are a big family. So not only will she have my husband's family, his brother has a fifteen-month-old, her name is Reese. My sister, she has a seven-month-old. I know that's not close in age. But I do have a nephew who is

six, another one who is ten. A niece that is ten-years-old.

My cousins, they -- they're my aunt's -- our mothers' sister.

She's -- she lives about forty-five minutes north of us in

McDonough. That's near Atlanta. Her sons have daughters. Um

you know, they have children. We -- I see her often.

My sister and my brother, they both live in Augusta, Georgia, which is about two-and-a-half hours. Always have to, when I call, get my family fix, and go see my sisters.

And, um, my cousin, Esther's uncle, he lives in Florida, which -- and so does my other bro -- I have two sisters, um, if you count half then there's more, um, and two brothers, and we're all very close. And now my cousin, her uncle that lives in -- in Florida, he's in -- near Tampa, Clearwater. So, of course, we love to go down there. It's about a five-and-a-half hour drive. He has a son. He is married.

My grandmother actually moved from California to Florida as well, so she's there. Um, my uncle, which, you know, that's her uncle, he lives there as well. We have my uncle's kids, my cousins that live there. So we're really more towards the east coast. There's just a few left here on the west coast. But we -- we like to visit. We actually -- my cousin that lives here -- or, well, in California, she comes out to visit. We help her visit as often as she can. So