
APPELLATE COURT
STATE OF CONNECTICUT

No. A.C. 34320

PAUL GREENAN
V.
SUZANNE GREENAN

REPLY BRIEF OF THE PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT
PAUL GREENAN
(INCLUSIVE OF APPENDIX)

To Be Argued By:

Paul Greenan, Esq.

Paul Greenan, Esq.,
The Greenan Law Firm LLC
2009 Summer Street, 2nd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Juris No. 405382
Tel: (203) 721-6001
Fax: (203) 721-6008
Email: paul@greenanlegal.com

And

David V. DeRosa
Law Offices of David V. DeRosa
42 Terrace Avenue
Naugatuck, CT 06770
Juris. 416704
Tel: (203) 729-4246
Fax : (203) 729-4249
Email: david.derosa1973@gmail.com

Filed: September 9, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
ARGUMENT – REPLY	1
CONCLUSION.....	13
APPENDIX.....	End

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page:

<u>Carrubba v. Moskowitz</u> , 274 Conn. 533, 977 A. 2d 773 (2005)	14
Connecticut House Bill No. 6685 (Special Act No. 13-24)	4
Connecticut Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 1.7.....	10
Connecticut State Police TIPS "Internet Safety For Parents"	13
<u>Michael J. Iulo v. Jean Collins Iulo</u> , FST-FA-06-4009265-S	9
<u>Susan Cunniffe v. Mark Cunniffe</u> (AC 34940)	6

ARGUMENT

I. THE AMC'S BRIEF CONTAINS STATEMENTS REQUIRING CORRECTION.

A. Melissa J. Needle never performed her responsibilities as AMC, and Eric J. Broder has not functioned as GAL since December 2010.

The claims that Melissa J. Needle fulfilled her obligations as AMC, and that Eric J. Broder "continues to serve" as GAL, are false. (AMC Brief, pp.1-2). Attorney Broder ceased all contact with the Greenan children in December 2010, approximately one year before the dissolution trial commenced, as admitted in his own testimony. (Tr. 10/28/11, p. 100). As for Melissa J. Needle, she had never met with, nor spoken to, either of the parties' children prior to trial. (Tr. 10/28/11, pp. 153-54).

Moreover, if Melissa J. Needle and Eric J. Broder were currently fulfilling their responsibilities as AMC and GAL – or had any contact with the children in *any* capacity -- by now they would have had the legal and ethical obligation to inform this Court of the following: 1) that since the public dissemination of the January 12, 2012 Memorandum of Decision ("MOD") in this case, the parties' son (age 14) has suffered from debilitating and uncontrollable anxiety and depression; 2) that said child has been unsuccessfully treated with over nine separate anti-anxiety and anti-depressant medications, including Zoloft, Abilify, Seroquel XR, Vyvanse, Ativan, Strattera and other psychotropic drugs; 3) that in June 2013 the child was unable to complete his education and graduate from Greenwich Catholic School which he had attended for 8 years; and 4) that over the course of the last 18 months, the child has been admitted to the emergency rooms of 3 separate hospitals, on 7 different occasions, for head injuries, broken bones, and a suspected prescription drug overdose.

- B. The AMC conveniently side-steps the overwhelming evidence that she and Eric J. Broder, the GAL, together with Attorney Gary I. Cohen, solicited a bribe from the Plaintiff in exchange for joint custody and the lifting of supervision.**

Paul Greenan testified that he refused to pay bribes to secure joint custody of his children. The Plaintiff testified for hours at trial, that his prior attorney, Gary I. Cohen, and Melissa J. Needle, who was then acting solely as the court-appointed attorney for the GAL, had together demanded that Paul Greenan make certain payments to Melissa J. Needle and Eric J. Broder, including additional retainers and monies to be disguised as drafting fees. (Tr. 9/19/11, pp. 39-118). These serious allegations were ignored by the trial court (Calmar, J.), and are not discussed in the MOD. As an attorney and a sworn officer of this Court, Paul Greenan described, under oath, the sickening behavior of Melissa J. Needle and others who brazenly run a 'cash-for-kids' operation within the halls of the Stamford Family Court:

Mr. Greenan: I refused to make payments for additional drafting fees and additional retainers in a quid pro quo agreement to lift supervision and receive joint custody of my children at what would then be the recommendation of the AMC and her client, the GAL.

Paul Greenan, Transcript 9/19/2011 p. 71

Mr. Greenan: In the hallway of Superior Court, I was standing there, she [Melissa J. Needle] entered a conference room with my attorney and my – with my attorney and Attorney Broder, and began screaming **“tell your guy to pay me my fucking money.”**

Paul Greenan, Transcript 9/19/2011 p. 99 (emphasis added).

So bold was Melissa J. Needle, that on June 9, 2010, shortly before she was terminated by Rutkin, Oldham (and while serving only as attorney for the GAL) she sent an email demanding an additional \$10,000 retainer for herself, and another \$10,000 retainer for Eric J. Broder. In exchange, she would purportedly draft a final custody agreement which would grant joint custody to the Plaintiff and immediately lift supervision – even though such an agreement had already been drafted by the GAL (and billed for) weeks before. This email memorialized the ‘cash-for-kids’ deal reached between Gary I. Cohen, Melissa J. Needle and Eric J. Broder just days before in the offices of Rutkin Oldham (a meeting which excluded the children’s mother):

From the June 9, 2010 email of Melissa J. Needle (Trial Exhibit #210)

“I will start drafting a parenting plan and hope to have a first draft completed by the end of this week or early next week for review. As of May 31, 2010, the outstanding balance owed to me is \$7,028.50. Eric is also owed money. Both Eric and I need to have the outstanding balances immediately paid and we need additional retainers of \$10,000 each. I have already suggested that the funds for our fees be paid from the escrow account, without prejudice. If not, I will mark my motions ready when they next appear on the court calendar. . .”

See, also, Appendix A-2 herein.

After consulting with other counsel, Paul Greenan refused to make the payments, and terminated Gary I. Cohen. True to their threats, Melissa J. Needle and Eric J. Broder marked their motions ready for additional fees; withdrew all support for joint custody; and objected to the lifting of supervision. Paul Greenan remained under supervision for an additional 17 months, until that supervision was lifted at trial. In the interim, Attorney Needle solicited the position of AMC for the parties’ children, and fees increased exponentially. See the following Section II, Part D.

C. The AMC's assertion that any "grievance" concerning her actions in this case have been fully resolved, is untrue.

The AMC's brief asserts that all grievances concerning her behavior in this matter have been dismissed, on both the "local" and "state" levels. (AMC Brief, p.2). This is incorrect. So offensive to the public was the behavior of this AMC and GAL, and other counsel associated with this and other recent custody cases, that investigations across all levels of government are only just beginning. In particular, it was the behavior of Melissa J. Needle and Eric J. Broder in this case, and the behavior of other court-appointed AMC's and GAL's which caught the attention of Connecticut legislators and Governor Dannel Malloy. Only recently, our State's legislature established a special task force to investigate proceedings in child custody cases, and more particularly the role and fees of court appointed GAL's and AMC's. For this intervention, our State can thank Melissa J. Needle and Eric J. Broder, Gary I. Cohen, and others. See Connecticut House Bill No. 6685 (Special Act No. 13-24).

D. The AMC's brief correctly points out that Melissa J. Needle was removed as attorney for the GAL by Judge Shay on October 5, 2010, but fails to mention that Melissa J. Needle ignored that order and continued to represent (and bill for representing) the GAL until she was removed a SECOND time by Judge Calmar on September 19, 2011, the first day of trial.

Melissa J. Needle was removed as attorney for the GAL, himself an attorney, by order of The Hon. Michael Shay on October 5, 2010. However, Melissa J. Needle ignored that order and continued to bill tens of thousands of dollars for representing the GAL until she had to be removed a second time by Judge Calmar on September 19, 2011, the first day of trial. Despite her assertions that she continued to be appointed as attorney for the GAL, and that she was also appointed sua sponte as AMC for the Greenan children, Judge

Calmar's review of the October 5, 2010 proceeding before Judge Shay concluded otherwise: Melissa J. Needle had long been removed as attorney for the GAL, and she had solicited the appointment as AMC:

J. Calmar: From your standpoint, do you still see yourself as functioning as attorney to the GAL as well as the AMC?

Atty Needle : Yes, Your Honor, because I do believe that this GAL is going to be called as a witness. And, I think it is my job to act as his attorney when that time comes.

(Tr. 9/19/2011, p. 62 – first day of trial)

J. Calmar: Then, let me just jump ahead and indicate over the course of the lunch break, I read – a number of times, Judge Shay's ruling on October 5, 2010, and it jumps out at me, frankly, that I agree with Mr. Rogan. I think Judge Shay terminated the appointment [of Melissa J. Needle] as attorney for the guardian ad litem. And, it seems fairly clear to me that the appointment was morphed, in his words (sic) the role as serving as the AMCAnd, then Ms. Needle, says, at the bottom of 31, I am **happy to also step in as the AMC.** (emphasis added).

(Tr. 9/19/2011, p. 111 – first day of trial -- Judge Calmar reviewing the October 5, 2010 transcript of the hearing which removed Melissa J. Needle – the first time – as attorney for the GAL).

E. Incredibly, the AMC's brief suggests that Melissa J. Needle, despite billing over \$110,000 for representing the children, did them a service by not meeting with them, not speaking to them, and not even writing them a letter, because Eric J. Broder (her other client) told her the children did not want to be contacted.

In her brief, the AMC claims that she failed to have *any* communication with the parties' children because her other client, Eric J. Broder, instructed her not to -- because *he* (who himself admitted to spending a total of 4.5 hours with the children over a nearly 2 year period) believed the children didn't need "another person poking and prodding at them."

¹(AMC Brief, p. 3) (Tr. 10/28/11, pp. 133-136). However, these two court-appointed professionals had no problem “poking and prodding” the parties’ bank accounts for a collective \$252,575.^{2 3}

At no time did Melissa J. Needle ever inform the court that she was not fulfilling her obligations as AMC. Instead, she unilaterally refashioned her responsibilities to encompass ministerial acts, such as claiming to read the children’s emails ⁴; filing approximately 8 *pendente lite* motions for fees and retainers for herself and the GAL; preparing Affidavits of Legal fees; and filing objections to the sealing of the internet-borne MOD which has left the parties’ son emotionally disabled. Most shocking, however, is that

¹ This 4.5 hours *included* a visit with the Greenan children inside a Friendly’s Restaurant near Attorney Broder’s Westport, Connecticut office. Attorney Broder requested that the children be brought from their North Stamford, Connecticut home, to meet with Attorney Broder. Eric J. Broder billed \$625 for the ice cream visit.

² Since the completion of trial, Melissa J. Needle has billed over \$30,000 more, and has moved the trial court (Emons, J.) to require Paul Greenan to pay her defense counsel, Horton & Shields, an additional \$20,000 retainer. That motion is pending and will be heard on January 22, 2014 before the Hon. Jane Emons. Hence, we now have the unprecedented situation of attorneys (Horton & Shields) representing an attorney (Melissa J. Needle) representing an attorney (Eric J. Broder).

³ Horton & Shields filed its appearance in this matter on the same date it filed an appearance opposite Paul Greenan and David V. DeRosa in the matter of Susan Cunniffe v. Mark Cunniffe, (AC 34940) in which Melissa J. Needle represents billionaire CT registered sex offender, Mark Cunniffe. Upon information, and before filing its appearance, Horton & Shields has assisted in drafting multiple motions in this present matter for AMC Melissa J. Needle’s signature. Disturbingly, these motions took a position directly opposite to the interests of the parties’ children and their parents, as well as the recommendations of the court-appointed custody evaluator and the minor child’s therapist, who have implored the AMC and GAL to join efforts to seal the MOD which contains damaging, personal and federally protected information about the children and their father. It is presently unclear whether Melissa J. Needle is paying Horton & Shields with her own funds, or if her defense fees are being covered by billionaire Mark Cunniffe.

⁴ A bold lie, given that neither child had an email account and that Melissa Needle – despite having access for more than a year – never once logged into the *Our Family Wizard* website, by which the parents communicated exclusively concerning child-related issues, medical developments, academics and scheduling. (Tr. 10/27/11, p.46).

MOD which has left the parties' son emotionally disabled. Most shocking, however, is that Melissa J. Needle believes she should be paid for attending an 11-day trial on behalf of clients with whom she had never communicated. And that the GAL, who testified for a total of 45 minutes at trial, should be paid nearly \$40,000 for driving to and from, and sitting in, a Middletown, Connecticut courtroom for 11 days "monitoring" court proceedings. (AMC Brief, pp.3-6).

And while Melissa J. Needle and Eric J. Broder repeatedly filed motions and appeared together to argue for more fees and retainers, they conspicuously failed to appear at the September 26, 2012 hearing before Judge Jane Emons in Stamford, Connecticut – a hearing scheduled solely to decide whether the MOD should be sealed for the sake of the children. That motion was simply not important enough for this AMC and GAL to attend, or even bother to brief. To put it bluntly, and as clearly illustrated by the AMC's own brief, the only concern of Melissa J. Needle was – and remains to this day -- her fees.

Melissa J. Needle has never admitted that she never communicated with the children until ordered by the Court. Accordingly, it took 10-days of painstaking trial testimony to solicit the truth by way of other witnesses. On October 27, 2011 (the 9th day of trial), the Plaintiff's attorney was still attempting to confirm everyone's suspicion that Melissa J. Needle never had never met with, nor spoken to, either of the Greenan children:

Attorney Rogan:	Do you know if Michael Greenan ever met the AMC in this case?
Suzanne Greenan:	He has not.
Attorney Rogan:	Do you know if Molly has ever met the AMC in this case?

Suzanne Greenan: No, she hasn't.

(Tr. 10/27/11, p. 46).

Finally, on the 10th day of an 11-day trial, the court could no longer ignore the elephant in the middle of the room, and Melissa J. Needle was ordered to meet her clients.⁵ At that point, one would think that Melissa J. Needle would have finally admitted the truth, but she remained defiantly silent:

J. Calmar: In light of the fact – and I know that counsel here are very familiar, you know, with the case law that the attorney for the minor child's primary role, particularly where there's a guardian ad litem, is to be an advocate for the strongly articulated preferences of the children and – where they're old enough to express a preference, and so we have a 12-year-old and 7-year-old here. And in light of the fact that there's been this testimony that there **has not been any contact or communication**, it might be appropriate to have contact before Tuesday [the last day of trial], so that base is covered from the standpoint of the record to the extent that it may or may not be different from the interest of the GAL.

Atty Needle: Thank you, your Honor.

(Tr. 10/28/2011, p. 153-54) (emphasis added).

- II. **Melissa J. Needle's brief fails to address another blatant conflict of interest which she concealed from the court and the Plaintiff – namely, her representation of Jeanne Collins Iulo, an adverse party witness who appeared in this very action.**

⁵ Melissa J. Needle met with and communicated with the Greenan children for the first and only time on Saturday, October 29, 2011, for 40 minutes inside a busy "Friendly's Restaurant" near Melissa J. Needle's Westport, Connecticut home. The children had to be driven from their home in North Stamford, Connecticut to accommodate Melissa J. Needle.

Melissa J. Needle concealed multiple conflicts of interests in her role as AMC, which have already been discussed in the Plaintiff's Brief and earlier in this Reply. But there is one other conflict raised in the Plaintiff's brief which also shocks the conscience and is tactically ignored in the AMC's brief: Melissa J. Needle accepted a referral from the Defendant, Suzanne Greenan, to represent Jeanne Collins Iulo -- another matrimonial defendant, friend, former employee and companion of Suzanne Greenan in Ms. Collins Iulo's own divorce proceeding. Worse still, Ms. Collins Iulo was an adverse party witness to Paul Greenan in this very matter.

Suzanne Greenan testified that she referred Jean Collins Iulo to Attorney Needle while she was serving as AMC. Tr 10/27/11, p. 47. Ms. Collins Iulo was also an adverse witness whom Paul Greenan deposed in preparation for the trial and whose deposition was marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 120. On September 12, 2011, *just days before* this dissolution trial began, and a week before she twice denied the existence of any conflicts of interest, Melissa J. Needle filed her appearance on behalf of Ms. Collins Iulo in the matter of Michael J. Iulo v. Jean Collins Iulo, FST-FA-06-4009265-S.

Attorney Rogan:	Have you recently referred a woman named Jeanne Collins Iulo to Attorney Needle's office?
Suzanne Greenan:	(No audible response.)
Attorney Rogan:	Huh?
Attorney Needle:	Object, Your Honor.
Judge Calmar:	I'm sorry. I, actually -- I was writing a note to myself. I'm sorry. Would you ask the question again, please?

Attorney Rogan:	Sure. I'll ask – I'll ask it again, Your Honor, then I'll let – I just asked Mrs. Greenan if she recently referred a client to Attorney Needle's office.
Attorney Roberts:	Yeah. I'll object on relevance too.
Judge Calmar:	What's the –
Attorney Rogan:	To go to bias or credibility of the AMC. Don't know. Just asking the question, Your Honor. I'll – whatever your ruling is, it is.
Judge Calmar:	All right. You can answer the question.
Suzanne Greenan:	Yes.

(Tr. 10/27/11, pp. 46-47)

The official commentary to Rule 1.7 to the Rules of Professional Conduct states:

“Even where there is no direct adverseness, a conflict of interest exists if there is a significant risk that a lawyer’s ability to consider, recommend, or carry out an appropriate course of action for the client will be materially limited as a result of the lawyer’s other responsibilities or interests.” It is reasonable to conclude that Melissa J. Needle’s acceptance of this referral and retainer represented a significant conflict of interest . Yet, when asked, point blank, about conflicts, Melissa J. Needle’s response was anything but candid:

Judge Calmar:	Assume ... assume that Judge Shay had terminated your relationship as the attorney for Mr. Broder and appointed you in the sole role as AMC of the minor children, is there anything about your responsibilities --- well, let's put it this way. I assume if there was anything about filling your responsibilities as the AMC that would have been in conflict with the guardian ad litem that you would have brought that to the attention of the parties or the court.
---------------	--

Attorney Needle: That's correct, Your Honor.

Judge Calamar: So, is it fair to say that in your capacity as AMC, there's nothing about that relationship that conflicts with the GAL's role at this point, as far as you know?

Attorney Needle: That is correct, Your Honor.

(Tr. 9/19/11, p. 110)

III. Melissa J. Needle's brief opposes sealing the MOD, which contains detailed information about the parties' children – an inexplicable position to be taken by an child advocate.

A. The court-appointed custody evaluator urged that the MOD be sealed, citing the risk of irreparable psychological harm to the children – a harm which has now, sadly, come to pass.

Melissa J. Needle offers no explanation for why she and Eric J. Broder opposed sealing the MOD, a position opposite to the recommendation of Dr. Eric Frazer, the court-appointed custody evaluator. In fact, in a letter dated November 30, 2011 to the GAL, Dr. Eric Frazer wrote: "The custody evaluation report that I will be submitting shortly contains very sensitive information about the parents that introduces a significant risk of psychological injury to the children if they were to gain access to the report. I strongly recommend a motion is filed with the court requesting that the report is sealed to the general public, and that neither party will show or discuss the report with the minor children" Letter of Dr. Eric Frazer, Plaintiff's Exhibit 226.

The MOD contains all of the damaging information contained in the custody evaluation, and the damage warned of by Dr. Frazer has come to pass. The parties' son has suffered significant emotional, psychological and physical harm. In 2012, the child stopped attending school on a regular basis, and was unable to graduate from Greenwich

Catholic School in June 2013. But for the wanton and reckless actions and omissions of this AMC and GAL, this child would otherwise be living the normal and happy life he previously enjoyed.

B. The parents implored the AMC, the GAL and the courts to seal the MOD – yet curiously, the AMC’s brief (and equally curiously, now the Defendant-Appellee’s brief) take positions against the children.

In addition to the custody evaluator, the children’s parents have each asked the GAL and AMC to join their efforts to seal the MOD. Those requests have been ignored. And, as previously set forth herein, neither Melissa J. Needle nor Eric J. Broder bothered to attend the September 26, 2012 hearing before Judge Emons where the Plaintiff-Appellant’s counsel pleaded with Judge Emons to take action to save the children from harm. The children’s mother was not present at that hearing, but has supported sealing the MOD. However, her attorney, Norman A. Roberts, II, argued otherwise, to the surprise of the children’s family.

On November 19, 2012, Suzanne Greenan sent an unsolicited email to the father’s Appellate counsel. It stated as follows:

“Dear Attorney DeRosa,

This is to inform you that I do not oppose your motion to seal dated October 12, 2012. I would like the trial court memorandum of decision, as well as pleadings to be sealed or redacted.

Regards, Suzanne Greenan”

See Appendix A-1 herein (Request by Suzanne Greenan to seal the MOD and pleadings).

C. Even the Connecticut State Police have warned that the dissemination of the children’s personal information over the internet has placed them at risk of harm and abuse.

The Connecticut State Police Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force specifically warns that any of the following information, if disseminated over the internet, places a child at serious risk of harm:

1. The child's real, full name, date of birth or age.
2. The child's address or phone number.
3. The location of the child's school or teacher's full name.
4. Any information about the parents.

See Connecticut State Police TIPS "Internet Safety For Parents brochure. (Appendix A-3 herein).

Almost all of this information is contained in the MOD or other orders released by the Connecticut Judiciary to FindLaw and other internet websites. As a result, the MOD appears as the first or second item following a "Google" search of the Greenan children's names, placing them squarely at the mercy of online predators, sex offenders, identity thieves and – unfortunately has made them the targets of bullying and ridicule – a result which should not be allowed to stand.

CONCLUSION

There is no defending the behavior and omissions of Melissa J. Needle and Eric J. Broder. The damage to the parties' child is irreparable, and the parents have now been rendered insolvent. However, with a modest amount of judicial activism, this Appellate Court can prevent other families and their children from suffering similar abuse.

This undersigned counsel and father, respectfully requests that the Appellate Court's opinion in this case set clear standards and responsibilities for court-appointed AMC's and GAL's, and establish guidelines which will ensure the privacy, health and safety of our

State's children. And that such decision send a clear an unequivocal message to those who sell children in the hallways of our State's courts, that the immunity granted by Carrubba v. Moskowitz, 274 Conn. 533, 977 A. 2d 773 (2005), does not protect those GAL's and AMC's who behave with wanton and reckless disregard for the well-being of the children they are appointed to protect.

PAUL GREENAN,
PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,

By:



Paul Greenan, Esq.
The Greenan Law Firm LLC
2009 Second Floor, 2nd Floor
Stamford, Connecticut 06905
Juris No. 405382
Tel: (203) 721-6001
Fax: (203) 721-6008

APPENDIX

Request by Suzanne Greenan to Seal the MOD and All Pleadings

NOVEMBER 19, 2012

VIA EMAIL to david-derosa@excite.com

David DeRosa, Esq.
42 Terrace Avenue
Naugatuck CT 06770

RE: GREENAN V. GREENAN

Dear Attorney DeRosa:

This is to inform you that I do not oppose your Motion to Seal dated October 12, 2012. I would like the trial court memorandum of decision, as well as pleadings, to be sealed or redacted.

Regards,


Suzanne Greenan

Copy furnished:

Norman A. Roberts, II
1266 East Main St Ste 700R
Stamford CT 06902

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Melissa Needle" <mneedle@rutkinoldham.com>
Date: June 9, 2010 9:54:47 AM EDT
To: "Norman Roberts" <NRoberts@marvinandferro.com>, <garv@giclaw.com>, "Marci" <Marci@giclaw.com>
Cc: "Alexander J. Cuda" <ACuda@rutkinoldham.com>, "Linda Chmura" <lchmura@rutkinoldham.com>, "Eric Broder" <ebroder@broderorland.com>, "MTG Capital LLC" <mtgcapitalllc@yahoo.com>, "Griffin, Sue" <GriffinS@valassis.com>
Subject: Parenting Plan

Dear All,

I will start to draft a parenting plan and hope to have a first draft completed by the end of this week or early next week for review.

As of May 31, 2010 the outstanding balance owed to me is \$7,028.50. Eric is also owed money. Both Eric and I need to have the outstanding balances immediately paid and we need additional retainers of \$10,000 each. I have already suggested that the funds for our fees be paid from the escrow account, without prejudice. If not, I will mark my motions ready when they next appear on the court calendar, but it seems to me it will be a waste of time and money for Paul and Sue.

Please contact me at your earliest convenience to discuss both the drafting (should I proceed?) and the issue of fees (both outstanding balance and retainers). I look forward to hearing from you,

Melissa J. Needle
Rutkin, Oldham & Needle
5 Imperial Avenue
Westport, CT 06880
(203)227-7301

Connecticut State Police

TIPS

Topics in Public Safety

INTERNET SAFETY FOR PARENTS

As a parent, you should always monitor your children's activity on the computer, especially when they are surfing the Internet. Keeping your children safe from online predators should be your top priority. The Connecticut State Police Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force recommend that you follow these tips for keeping your children safe online.

A-3

Be aware of what is happening in your own house:

- Put your child's online computer in a *common area* in the home.
- Ask your children frequently about what they do online and with whom they are communicating.
- Establish and enforce rules for Internet use.
- Supervise Internet use, especially "chat rooms."
- Review screen names and buddy lists with your children.
- No one aged 12 and under is allowed to post a personal profile. If your child is 13 or older, he or she may use an appropriate profile, if absolutely necessary.
- Do not allow your children to establish homepages or to set up web cams. These invite trouble.
- Supervise any picture swapping.
- Teach your children about online "stranger danger."
- Use a filtering program and/or parental controls available through your Internet service provider.



Signs your child may be at risk of online exploitation:

- Mail, gifts or packages arrive for your child from someone you do not know.
- Your child receives phone calls from adults (mostly men) you do not know.
- You find pornography on your child's computer.
- Your child spends a great deal of time online, especially at night or unsupervised.
- Your child becomes withdrawn or secretive about his or her online activities.



Internet resources for parents:

www.getnetwise.org

This site offers advice on filtering software or monitoring software for computers in your home.

www.safekids.com

A family guide to Internet and technology safety.

www.netparents.org

This Internet resource links to websites for families, for safety tips and for child protection.

www.ct.gov/despp

The Connecticut Sex Offender Registry on the State Police website can be searched by name or by location.

www.missingkids.com

The website of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children is an excellent resource for child safety and Internet safety.



Compliments of:
Connecticut State Police
Public Information Office
1111 Country Club Road
Middletown CT 06457
(860) 685-8230
www.ct.gov/despp

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing complies with the formatting requirements set forth in Practice Book § 67-2 and that the font is Arial 12.

I further certify that a copy of the foregoing has been mailed, postage paid, to the following judges and attorneys of record:

John Paul Thygerson, Esq.
8 Byington Place
Norwalk, CT 06850
Tel: (203) 810-4195
Fax: (203) 810-4196

Attorney Melissa Jill Needle
830 Post Road East, Suite 101
Westport, CT 06880
Tel: (203) 557-9500
Fax: (203) 557-9504

Eric Broder, Esq.
Broder & Orland LLC
1 Morningside Drive North
Westport, CT 06880
Tel: (203) 222-4149
Fax: (203) 227-0766

Day Pitney LLP
1 Canterbury Green
Stamford, CT 06901
Tel: (203) 977-7300
Fax: (203) 977-7301

Cacace Tusch & Santagata
777 Summer Street
Stamford, CT 06901
Tel: (203) 327-2000
Fax: (203) 353-3392


Neal Rogan, Esq.
315 Post Road West
Westport, CT 06880
Tel: (203) 341-8783
Fax: (203) 341-8560

Norman A. Roberts, II, Esq.
19 Old Kings Highway South, #210
Darien, CT 06820
Tel: (203) 590-1070
Fax: (203) 427-8980

David V. DeRosa, Esq.
42 Terrace Avenue
Naugatuck, CT 06770
Tel: (203) 729-4246
Fax: (203) 729-4249

The Hon. Harry E. Calmar
Superior Court
108 Valley Street
Willimantic, CT 06226

The Hon. Jane B. Emons
Superior Court
123 Hoyt Street
Stamford, CT 06905



Paul Greenan, Esq.
Commissioner of the Superior Court