

**Department of Public Health**

**Petition Form 1**

**Please fill out and return to:**

State of Connecticut

Department of Public Health

Practitioner Investigations Unit

410 Capitol Avenue, MS#12HSR

P.O. Box 340308

Hartford, CT 06134-0308

Cc:

APA - Office of Ethics 750 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20002-4242

Phone: 202-336-5930 FAX: 202-336-5997

**Petitioner/Complainant**

Susan Skipp DOB 08/16/1966

Mother of:

Gabrielle Tittle 08/08/2000, patient of Dr. Sidney Horowitz

Wyatt Tittle 09/04/2002, patient of Dr. Sidney Horowitz

Address: PO Box 1383, Litchfield CT 06759

Telephone Numbers: 203 509-1585

In August of 2010, my children began seeing Dr. Horowitz under the dictum of the Guardian Ad Litem, Mary Brigham. On March 28, 2011, Judge Resha in Waterbury Connecticut Superior Court appointed Dr. Sidney Horowitz to serve as a therapist to my son (Wyatt) and daughter (Gabrielle) during my divorce proceeding. Now that the office is clear on the legality that the Department of Health does not need

both parents to sign for medical records, perhaps that rumor began with Elizabeth Thayer Phd, who is also a high level AFCC member, the AFCC ran an illegal business among judges, lawyers, mental health practitioners for thirty years. Please regard this as an addendum to my earlier complaints on Horowitz. Please investigate this unethical person who abuses children with his nefarious business practices.

**MEMBER IN QUESTION:**

Sidney Horowitz

Connecticut Resource Group

113 Scovill Street

Waterbury, Connecticut 06706

203 573-9521

**PLEASE INDICATE NATURE OF YOUR COMPLAINT:**

☒ **Quality of care**

☐ **Unlicensed practice**

☐ **Unsanitary conditions**

☐ **Substance abuse**

☒ **Failure to release patient records**

☒ **Other**

☐ **Sexual contact with patient**

☒ **Insurance fraud**

**Department of Public Health**

**Petition Form 2**

**Describe your concerns below. Include as many specific details as possible (who, what, when, where, why). Attach additional sheets if necessary. Sidney Horowitz committed malpractice, negligence, perjury in a court or law, breach of confidentiality, failure to safeguard minors, and insurance fraud. Moreover, Dr. Horowitz exhibits gender bias: he teaches GAL training about domestic abuse (March 2012) he pathologized my daughter and ignored my requests, to help the children, and ridiculed and inflamed my PTSD when as a trained professional; he needed to accept in the totality of the violence the children experienced, especially when my daughter expressed suicide as a way to stop her life's problems- to which Horowitz is a direct contributor. Most notable in perjury is his mention of my motion in Limine, filed April 24, 2012 the email to the children's school being greatly upsetting and part of their session, yet, the email was not until April 4, 2012, these dates were way past the date of his recusal. Also, Horowitz does not have a contract with the state that would insure equal protection.**

**Sidney Horowitz is a member of AFCC.**

**1.) Failure to report allegations of abuse, failure to communicate doctor's specific role and responsibilities to the parents of a minor child.**

During our 11 years of marriage, my children and I were victims of physical, emotional, and mental abuse at the hands of my now ex-husband, Dr. Shawn Tittle. The continued abuse and concern for the safety of my children were some of the primary reasons why I most thankful for the divorcing Dr. Tittle after 12 years of marriage. As any Domestic Violence expert would expect, the divorce proceedings immediately became contentious. I was not expecting this as what I would have preferred would have been mediation.

Dr. Horowitz began seeing my children as a therapist in August of 2010, upon my desire to have their emotional well-being taken of in conjunction with a play therapist. Later per the recommendation of the court appointed Guardian ad Litem, Mary Brigham the children would not go to the play therapist, whom they liked very much. In March of 2011, the children's continued therapy with Dr. Horowitz was made part of the dissolution. I believed it was necessary to report the abuse (of which I was a victim and an eye witness) to Dr. Horowitz. In addition, I continued to suffer abuse, and I became even more concerned for the safety of my children and myself.

Throughout their period of therapy with Dr. Horowitz, the children continued to report to me that their father committed acts which, I believe, constitute abuse. Some examples of the acts which my children reported to me were: picking them up by their hair (not simply "hair pulling", as stated in an email authored by Dr. Horowitz on March 25, 2012 and included in this report), hitting them hard enough to cause marks and extended periods of pain, as well as threats and intimidation. Ten independent witnesses corroborated that this abuse occurred. Our child care provider testified, "To the children, the word 'trouble' means getting hit, pulled by the hair, hair ripped out of your head, or lifted up by your hair." I can provide this transcript if necessary.

The children told me that they reported these acts to Dr. Horowitz during their sessions. My children reported that he told them to forget the abuse. In addition, I provided Dr. Horowitz with pictures that Wyatt had drawn, depicting his father punching me in the head (as a side note, I did not have a face in these drawings). Another babysitter spoke with Dr. Horowitz regarding the fact that our son, Wyatt, began acting out in sexually inappropriate ways when he was court ordered to spend more time with his father.

Dr. Tittle also has a history of substance abuse, and was charged with Driving Under the Influence and evading responsibility after crashing his car into a Taco Bell late at night on May 8, 2011.

<http://www.newstimes.com/local/article/Danbury-man-charged-with-DUI-1371256.php>

I notified Dr. Horowitz of this history and provided documentation. Currently my former husband is on probation for DUI in which he tested positive for prescription medication that causes impairment.

In court testimony (see attached), Dr. Horowitz acknowledged that Gabrielle, Wyatt, and I reported these acts. Yet Dr. Horowitz testified that he did not report these allegations, despite his status as a mandated reporter.

Dr. Horowitz's explanations for his failure to report, in my opinion, are conflicting. At one point, he claimed that he did not believe the reported acts to be serious enough to constitute "abuse," yet he was unsure whether or not Dr. Tittle was or is capable of such acts. At other times, Dr. Horowitz states that he did not report the allegations because he did not believe that I, Susan Skipp, was a credible informant. Additionally, Dr. Horowitz suggests that the children's allegations were likely the result of me "brainwashing" the children. In addition, 2 DCF investigations of Dr. Shawn Tittle were conducted as a result of abuse allegations. Dr. Horowitz refused to talk to or cooperate with DCF investigators.

During a few exchanges with Dr. Horowitz, I inquired as to what actions were necessary in order to address the abuse. Dr. Horowitz informed me that a forensic evaluation was necessary in order to substantiate any abuse. As a result of these conversations, I believed that Dr. Horowitz would speak with the judge or Guardian ad Litem and recommend a forensic examination. I was prepared to fully cooperate with such an examination. However, when I attempted to follow up on this "recommendation" (or at least I was of the belief that this was a recommendation), I began receiving messages from Dr. Horowitz that were confusing. For example, the following email:

*Sidney Horowitz <sidneyhorowitz@comcast.net> Wed, Feb 8, 2012 at 7:53 PM*

*To: Susan Skipp <susanskipp@gmail.com>*

*Cc: Mary Brigham <marybrigham@sbcglobal.net>*

*I consult about what I think is in the best interests of the children; recommendations are made by the GAL and the court makes the decisions based on the totality of the evidence*

*Sidney*

*Sidney S. Horowitz, Ph.D.*

*Clinical & Forensic Psychologist*

*Connecticut Resource Group, LLC*

*133 Scovill Street - Suite 211*

*Waterbury, CT 06706*

*Ph. 203-573-9521*

*Fx. 203-573-8708*

On the date I received this email from Dr. Horowitz, February 8, 2012, the GAL filed an emergency motion that greatly reduced my access to my children. When the order was approved and signed by

the presiding judge, my role as the primary attachment figure and primary caretaker of Gabrielle and Wyatt since their births, was court ordered to essentially be severed. The order also fundamentally forbade me from discussing or reporting, what I believed (and continue to believe) is the past and continued abuse of my children by their father. This concept goes beyond my comprehension : we frequently see stories on the news of a child who was killed or severely injured by one parent. If it can be reasonably assumed that the other parent (or another involved adult) is aware of the abuse, yet does nothing to intervene, then the non-intervening parent or adult is typically judged as being equally responsible for the abuse as the person who inflicted the actual injuries. They are considered “accomplices” and often serve jail time or have other severe consequences, as punishment for their failure to protect. Yet I am court ordered to not report the child abuse which I have been eyewitness to? How could any decent parent listen to such accusations from his or her children, then simply ignore them? Am I being court ordered to commit illegal acts?

Although Dr. Horowitz held the position that there was no way to know if the abuse occurred (or was fabricated) without a forensic evaluation (as evidenced by his emails and further confirmed through court transcripts, which I will include in this document), no such evaluation was officially recommended or ordered by any professional involved in this process. However, this motion referred to the GAL’s collaboration with Dr. Horowitz. Instead of an order for a forensic evaluation to substantiate or disprove the abuse, I was declared to be a danger to my children because of my attempts to (at the very least) have a fair and impartial evaluation performed, which Dr. Horowitz had suggested was the ONLY way to address the abuse “issue.” I was ordered to undergo psychiatric evaluation. My ex-husband, from whom I had escaped in order to protect my children, was given nearly complete control of Gabrielle and Wyatt. Below is a copy of the motion filed by Ms. Brigham. The motion was approved by the presiding judge, except supervised visitation was not ordered. Under duress, and feeling that I had no other choice, I signed this document. I was suffering with symptoms of PTSD from 12 years of abuse, brought to great symptomatic behavior because my children were in danger and no one was listening. Even after leaving my abusive spouse, I continued to feel that Shawn was controlling and manipulating the events that were occurring. Moreover, I supplied Dr. Horowitz with extensive documents, letters to the GAL documenting abuse, letter from my daughter’s teacher, and private investigator interview with someone whom Gabrielle told in 2008 that her father” picked me up by my hair and threw me.” It is important to note her that the woman acting as GAL did not have any conversation with Horowitz on her billing for this time period. Moreover, this was a response to a second DCF investigation stemming from a mandated caller from a domestic violence shelter for which I was receiving help and my children were in the child care area and my son told of the abuse he suffered.

DOCKET NO.: FA- 1040922s SUPERIOR COURT

SHAWN TITTLE JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF WATERBURY

Vs. AT WATERBURY

SUSAN TITTLE FEBRUARY 8, 2012

EMERGENCY MOTION FOR CONTEMPT SEEKING IMMEDIATE RELIEF

The undersigned guardian ad litem respectfully seeks immediate relief for the Defendant's violation of the court order. In support of this motion the undersigned represents as follows:

1. Pursuant to the judgment of dissolution both parties were ordered not to speak to the children regarding adult issues.
2. In September, 2011 custody was modified by the court (Resha, J) in part, because of defendant mother's conduct in discussing issues relating to custody and visitation with the children
3. In December, 2011 the Plaintiff Father filed a second post judgment motion to modify which was scheduled for a hearing on February 7, 2012.
4. Based upon Mother's continued conduct in exposing the children to issues relating to this litigation the guardian ad litem recommended a further modification of the parenting schedule reducing mother's parenting time. The parties consented to the modified parenting plan.
5. Pursuant to Paragraph 14 of the February 7, 2012 Agreement, "If Mother violates any court order relating to legal custody, medical care, exposure of children to litigation or claims of abuse, overnight visitation shall be suspended and she shall have weekly supervised visitation at Thomaston Counseling, the cost of which shall be her sole responsibility."
6. Pursuant to Paragraph 19 of the Agreement "Father shall take the children to Dr. Horowitz who shall advise them of the change in schedule."
7. Prior to leaving the court room and in the presence of Mother's counsel, the guardian ad litem advised and confirmed with mother that she was not to speak to the children regarding the new schedule.
8. Approximately two hours after the court entered the Agreement as an order of the court, the undersigned received a call from Plaintiff Father who stated that when he arrived to pick the children up from school a teacher approached him and said "we have a situation">
9. Based upon information received from the children, Father, and the school, Mother went to the children's school (although it was not her scheduled parenting day), met with the children and advised them that she would only see them three days and every other Monday.
10. Mother's conduct, in addition to being a direct violation of the court order, caused the children great upset.
11. Mother's violation of the court order was willful.

WHEREFORE, the guardian ad litem requests:

- a. That Defendant Mother be adjudged in contempt of court;
- b. That the Defendant Mother be ordered to meet, on the earliest date all professionals are available, with her psychiatrist, Dr. Horowitz, Dr. Kreiger and the guardian ad litem together in order to effectuate an intervention that addresses her mental status and assists her and her mental health care provider in curbing her destructive behavior.
3. That Ms. Skipp undergo a psychiatric evaluation as defined by Dr. Horowitz.

4. That Ms. Skipp be responsible for payment in full for the time of the professionals referenced in paragraph 2 and that payment be made to each of them within two weeks of receiving a bill.
5. That Ms. Skipp be responsible for the cost of the psychiatric examination referenced in paragraph 3 and that she cooperate with the guardian ad litem and Dr. Horowitz in engaging a psychiatrist/psychologist who will provide the evaluation at a reduced rate if that can be arranged through Dr. Horowitz and the guardian.
6. That Ms. Skipp be responsible for the fees of the guardian incurred in the investigation of the facts giving rise to this motion, the drafting of this motion, and the attendance at court and that said fees be paid within two weeks.
7. That Ms. Skipp be ordered that if the children ask her any questions regarding the schedule, custody, the status of court proceedings, that she respond as recommended by Dr. Horowitz after he meets with the children and guardian on Thursday evening. The guardian shall advise her of the appropriate response.

Guardian ad Litem

BY \_\_\_\_\_  
Mary Piscatelli Brigham  
60 North Main St.  
Waterbury, CT 06702  
Juris No.: 305462

#### ORDER

The foregoing motion having been heard it is hereby:

GRANTED/DENIED

\_\_\_\_\_

#### CERTIFICATION

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing motion was had delivered to the court on February 8, 2012 and emailed and mailed, postage prepaid, to:

Attorney Rosemary Giuliano  
39 Sherman Hill Road  
Woodbury, CT 06798  
James Hirschfield  
Cramer and Anderson

46 West Street  
Litchfield

Two side notes:

1. The school "incident" mention in #8 of the motion was in reference to a visit I paid to the front office of the children's school in order to make an appointment for the school's "Parent Night."
2. I DID cooperate with a prior evaluation, performed by Dr. Kreiger, an associate of Dr. Horowitz. Dr. Kreiger refused to provide me with my own test results, refused to send them to my physician, and refused to send them to another psychologist without a court order. If you require documentation of this, I would be happy to sign any releases necessary so that you may obtain hard copies.

A week after I received the February 8, 2012 email from Dr. Horowitz and the court order, I followed up with Mary Brigham to inquire about having the forensic evaluation performed. I remained certain that the forensic evaluation would reveal the truth, and thus restore custody of my children to me. I sent Ms. Brigham the following email, cc'ing Dr. Horowitz. I wanted to make certain that everyone was "on the same page." I was becoming increasingly confused with the specific roles and responsibilities of the many court appointed professionals assigned to our case.

Also, the billing statement from the woman who was acting as GAL had no phone calls to Horowitz in this time period.

At this point, I felt as if I was screaming from a rooftop, begging someone to help my children. I continued inquiring about WHO was responsible for investigating the abuse. Yet no one (including Dr. Horowitz) seemed to be able to fully clarify WHO was responsible for what. I was questioning if, perhaps, my confusion, my children's apparent emotional decline since custody was granted to their father, along with my mounting frustration and desperation, were contributing to Ms. Brigham's insinuation that I was mentally unstable; in turn, severely restricting my ability to parent my children and leaving Gabrielle and Wyatt in the care of an abusive father.

The change in custody made no sense to me. I had given up my career and furthering my own education in order to care for my children while Dr. Tittle was essentially free to pursue his career goals. Before the separation, Dr. Tittle did very little day to day childcare for the children, and he was away a lot. Some weeks he work 100 hours, before the 80 week was the rule was established and he still violated it. Although I found out later he was not at work as much as he said. I have no criminal record, no history of substance abuse, and most people who knew me before everything collapsed would have said I was a good mom. So how did this happen? Maybe I needed to turn the mirror onto myself, in order to discover what it was that I was doing to alarm the court appointee or were we just not communicating effectively?



Susan Skipp< susanskipp@gmail.com>

Wed, Feb 15, 2012 at 10:51 AM

To: Mary Piscatelli Bringham <marybringham@sbcglobal.net>

Cc: "Sidney Horowitz, Ph.D." <sidneyhorowitz@comcast.net>, Jim Hirschfield <jhirschfield@cramer-anderson.com>

*This is the second time I have been told by gabby and wyatt's therapist that they should have a forensic evaluation.*

*Why has this not been ordered? I brought this to your attention, Motioned for it as well.*

*If dr. Horowitz, a professional, indicates that what would serve the kids' best interest why has this been ignored?*

*Sent from my iPhone*

I received the following reply from Dr.Horowitz:

Sidney Horowitz< sidneyhorowitz@comcast.net> Wed, Feb 15, 2012 at 10:56 AM

To: Susan Skipp <susanskipp@gmail.com>

Cc: Mary Piscatelli Bringham <marybringham@sbcglobal.net>, Jim Hirschfield <jhirschfield@cramer-anderson.com>

*Actually what I said was that I could not answer some of the questions you asked. Only someone who has conducted a forensic evaluation of ALL members of the family -- that is someone who has all the pieces of the puzzle-- can answer some of the questions. I did not suggest that the children should be evaluated by a forensic expert.*

*Sidney*

*Sidney S. Horowitz, Ph.D*

*Clinical & Forensic Psychologist*

*Connecticut Resource Group,LLC*

*133 Scovill Street - Suite 211*

*Waterbury, CT 06706*

*203-573-9521*

- As another side note, as a lay person, I believe that the areas of this email that I highlighted are quite confusing.....my children had multiple visits with Sidney S. Horowitz, PhD....under his name, it says "Clinical & FORENSIC Psychologist." At the time of this email, Dr. Horowitz had interviewed Gabrielle, Wyatt, my ex-husband, and me. In reference to the abuse allegations, Dr. Horowitz states that "only someone who has conducted a forensic evaluation of ALL members of the family" is able to determine the validity of abuse claims (thus, the "questions" he refers to). Then he states that he "did not suggest that the children should be evaluated by a forensic expert." But Dr. Horowitz HAD evaluated the children, and his title states "Forensic Psychologist." Since the time of this email, I have learned through my own research that a

"forensic" examination varies from more general therapy, and that Dr. Horowitz was only appointed as a counselor for the children. However, I do not believe that my confusion was unfounded. Based on past experiences with other doctors, they were able to easily communicate the differences in specialties, different types of testing, the reason for involvement of such specialties, and who was responsible for handling these recommendations and referrals. For my own future reference, do Psychologists operate under a different set of rules, in regards to their responsibility to fully disclose, explain, and verify that the patient understands such complex systems?

Susan Skipp <susanskip@gmail.com> Wed, Mar 21, 2012 at 6:56 AM

To: Mary Brigham <mary.brighamlaw@att.net>

Cc: Howard Krieger <howardcrg@sbcglobal.net>, sidneyhorowitz@comcast.net

Please respond to this. This is in violation of court order and certainly not in best interests of kids not to see the other parent and be willfully denied that. Wyatt has been very upset and I have not seen them in ten days.

*Are you aware Shawn has a new charge of reckless driving? I figured after all the hostile email that there was a cause as his normal behavior is to take out stress in his life aggressively on others, such as in may of 2010 when he was caught in affair and I had to get children out of the house for their own safety for two figuring he'd kill me but at least not kids.*

*This is why guns are a big issue - especially illegal ones and why it's part of divorce. I told you all along the guy would kill me and has told me such in no way of confusing it. When my accident happened, first thought everyone from boss to kids school thought shawn harmed me and that's why I wasny at work. Look back on Darlene odegard letter - she states that she is afraid of some retaliatory act just fir writing letter and testifying.*

*An earlier email- I have numerous emails pleading for help*

*Sent from my iPhone*

Susan Skipp susanskip@gmail.com 5/17/11

*to Mary, Howard, Sidney*

*Has Shawn provided serial numbers for the extensive gun collection and proof of legality? As you know, very well, Shawn is careless with firearms and ammunition.*

*Sent from my iPhone*

Susan Skipp susanskip@gmail.com 5/17/11

to Mary, Howard, Sidney

*I would think it's reasonable that would that would be under your scope and spectrum since it was ordered under your watch, was a serious concern of mine because of his carelessness- supported by the kids statements, I would think it's reasonable that would that would be under your scope and spectrum of guardian ad Litem since it was ordered under your watch, was a serious concern of mine because of his carelessness, supported by the kids statements, drafted into the agreement you wrote and in the best interest of the safety of kids in general. The order mandates that he provide you with serial numbers for all weapons. Clearly, the 4 or 5 are short. So that I may address it in court, which weapons has he provided serial numbers for?*

*Along with the sleeping arrangements: Wyatt doesn't like Sharing a bed.*

*Their fear of him.*

*The schedule of parenting time*

*His lack of cooperation of what is in best interest of kids*

*He failed his drug test at work*

*He drinks excessively*

*Please send me a corrected copy of the bill which would include me as payor on 5k+ 4/4 payment, not just Shawn.*

*I have emailed Shawn twice once last week and today inquiring about his payment to dr Krieger. He has not responded to this, among everything else.*

*Sent from my iPhone*

Regardless of his motivations, Dr. Horowitz did not report alleged child abuse, as mandated by the state of Connecticut. In addition, Dr. Horowitz, on 2 separate occasions, refused to speak with DCF workers who were investigating the abuse allegations. I will defer to the attached documents, so that your office may decide whether or not there is enough evidence to prove that Dr. Horowitz breached his obligations.

I am also attaching a hand written letter authored by my daughter, Gabrielle, where she states, "I told Mary Brigham, Linda Keeler, and Sidney Horowitz that I'm scared of my dad. They did not listen." I do not have copies of the DCF reports, as they are considered confidential in nature. But here is the copy of

the letter that Gabby wrote to give to adults at her school, in hopes that someone would step up and help her and her brother:

11-07-11; 03:31PM;

# 1/

To whom it may concern;  
The life I'm living right now is horrible. When I'm at my daddy's house Wyatt is a jerk. When I'm at mom's house, he's nice, friendly and relaxed. I told Mary Brigham, Linda Keeler, and Sydney Horrocks that I'm scared of my dad. They did not listen to me. The DC F guy said "Parents have their own methods of punishment" when I told him of the abuse my father did. I would like to have my schedule like this: 

mon.	Tue.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Sun.
mom	mom	mom	mom	mom	mom	mom

 People like Mary <sup>weekends</sup> ~~alternate~~ said she would help. She lied. Now after the scene when Laura kissed my dad, SHE MOVED IN! My dad says "She's just a friend." I would like to live with my mom. That means: ME LIVE WITH MOTHER, NO FATHER. My mom gives me the feeling of safety. I trust her. So please, please, please listen to this letter from Gabrielle Anderson (Skipp) Tittle.

P.S. Don't show this letter to my dad.

- Gabrielle

By March of this year, I had some serious concerns about Dr. Horowitz's billing practices. I will specifically address this issue in the next section, and you can refer back to this email. On March 24, 2012, I sent the following email to Dr. Horowitz:

*From: Susan Skipp <susanskip@gmail.com>*

*To: sidneyhorowitz@comcast.net*

*Subject: Billing*

*Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2012 13:00:00 -0400*

*Dr. Horowitz,*

*In addition to my children's records with your notes, please provide the diagnosis for which insurance agrees to provide long term therapy and an itemized billing since your involvement with our family.*

*Thank you*

*Susan*

*Sent from my iPhone*

Dr. Horowitz did not respond to me directly. Instead, he sent the following email to the Mary Brigham, recusing himself from being Gabrielle and Wyatt's therapist. I obtained this email because Mary Brigham forwarded it to me. I am including this particular email at this point because Dr. Horowitz describes his views regarding the allegations of abuse and some reasons for not reporting them:

*From: Sidney Horowitz <sidneyhorowitz@comcast.net>;*

*To: Mary Brigham <mary.brighamlaw@att.net>;*

*Subject: The Tittle Chidlren*

*Sent: Sun, Mar 25, 2012 12:32:17 AM*

*Dear Ms. Brigham,*

*After long and careful consideration I am writing to inform you that I need to recuse myself from treating Wyatt and Anderson Tittle.*

*As I communicated to you in the past, in order for me to maintain an unbiased and objective working relationship with these children I need to be free from the on-going, frequent and threatening emails from Ms. Skipp. I have worked hard to maintain a professional relationship with Ms. Skipp. I have invited her to come to my office to speak about my treatment and treatment plans) in working with her children. She has come in on a couple of occasions. However, she was not able to stay focused on either of these issues and perseverated on her allegations that the children have been repeatedly*

*victimized by Dr. Tittle and that you, me, the court and others are unwilling to assist her in protecting her "abused" children. I have tried to impart that I am a neutral and impartial psychologist who is trying to allow the children to have a safe place to express any/all of their thoughts and feelings (generated by the conflict between their parents). As a mandated reporter, if I had heard information that suggested that the children have been abused I would have passed that information on to you and the authorities. The worst I heard was "hair pulling" of Wyatt that may or may not have happened some years ago. In my opinion that did not rise to a level of reporting to DCF or to you. Gabby would frequently speak of how badly her father treated her mother (by drinking and driving; having an affair; etc) and would vacillate about her divided loyalties towards both of her parents. I never heard comments that suggested that she was abused by her father. That said, the children have been and continue to be at risk by the psychological noise in this family. I do not know who is the proximate cause of this upset: I have not been an evaluator. I have tried to maintain my neutrality to continue to be open and available to and for the children.*

*Despite my requests of her and your attempts (as the GAL) to assist me, Ms. Skipp continues to flood me with her emails. They have reached a level such that I fear that I cannot maintain my professional neutrality. If I continue to treat the children I worry that my feelings about their mother may be unconsciously and indirectly shared with them; they do not need that from a therapist.*

*I should add that this is the first time in my professional career that I have recused myself from treating a child; I do so with sadness.*

*I am willing to meet with the children to explain that because of "personal reasons having nothing to do with them" that I cannot continue to see them. I will be happy to assist in the transfer of these children to another therapist.*

*Please inform Ms. Skipp, Dr. Tittle and counsel of my decision.*

*Best regards,*

*Sidney S. Horowitz*

*Sidney S. Horowitz, Ph.D.  
Clinical & Forensic Psychologist  
Connecticut Resource Group, LLC  
133 Scovill Street - Suite 211  
Waterbury, CT 06706  
Ph. 203-573-9521  
Fx. 203-573-8708*

- If you need further elaboration regarding any of the allegations Dr. Horowitz made about me in this email, please do not hesitate to ask. I promise my full cooperation, and will provide any supporting documentation as needed. I was unsure if rebutting these allegations in this form was relevant because I only asked for billing and the diagnosis my daughter was given. This was the third time that I had requested this information from Dr. Horowitz.

## **2.) Billing insurance and receiving payment for an incorrect diagnosis**

From August 23, 2010 until December 2011, Dr. Horowitz was billing the children's insurance company (Aetna) with the diagnosis code of 296.22, which I discovered is a major depressive disorder. You will see Dr. Horowitz's testimony regarding this matter on the court transcripts that I am attaching to this document. I believe that much of this testimony speaks for itself: he is perjuring himself.

However, I believe it may be necessary to add a few relevant points in order to elaborate on the significance of this matter. First of all, as Dr. Horowitz testified, he never notified me or the children's father of any such diagnosis. In August of 2010, I was still the children's custodian. Next, Dr. Horowitz testified that the diagnosis code was a "clerical error," and that Gabrielle's actual diagnosis was an "Adjustment Disorder." Dr. Horowitz also testified that he had contacted Aetna and corrected the diagnosis code.

I am highly suspicious of Dr. Horowitz's claim that the false diagnosis code was a "clerical error," because on several occasions, I witnessed the manner in which Dr. Horowitz submitted his billing. At the end of each session with the children, Dr. Horowitz would fill out a billing statement, and hand write a diagnosis code onto each statement. He would then have me carry the statement to the office receptionist. At that point, I would pay the co-pay for the visit. As per Dr. Horowitz's own sworn testimony, he continued to bill the insurance company under the code of "Major Depressive Disorder" after every visit for a period of almost 16 months. This is also reflected on the billing statements. Also it was an ADA advocate who brought these insurance questions to AETNA as well as me in February. I know of two other individuals who have the same issue with Horowitz's refusal to release billing.

When I began to grow suspicious of Dr. Horowitz's billing practices, I requested itemized billing statements from both Dr. Horowitz himself and his office staff. In March, shortly before his recusal, I completed releases in order to receive the information I requested. Prior to March, I emailed Dr. Horowitz several times, requesting itemized billing information. It is my belief that, as a legal guardian to my children, and as a payer of services, it was Dr. Horowitz's professional responsibility to provide me with billing statements and the diagnosis, especially given the serious nature of the diagnosis. Dr. Horowitz and his office stated that I could not have access to the children's records or billing statements.

Please refer to the email in the previous section dated March 24, 2012. Below are other email exchanges between Dr. Horowitz and me, where I requested billing statements and records.

*On Sep 5, 2012, at 12:43 PM, susan skipp <susanskipp@gmail.com> wrote:*

*> Hi,*

*> Do you have a billing account of all the time you spent on the phone or met with the gal?*

*On Wed, Sep 5, 2012 at 12:52 PM, Sidney Horowitz <sidneyhorowitz@comcast.net> wrote:*

*No*

*I hope that Gabby and Wyatt are doing well.*

*Sidney S. Horowitz, Ph.D.*

*Clinical & Forensic Psychologist*

*133 Scovill Street - Suite 211*

*Waterbury, CT 06706*

*203-573-9521*

*On Sep 5, 2012, at 12:58 PM, susan skipp <susanskipp@gmail.com> wrote:*

*no they are not doing well. Gabby is miserable and we are awaiting a custody decison. Again, what disorder does my daughter have according to you? The trial was the first time I heard of it.*

*On Sep 5, 2012, at 1:06 PM, Sidney Horowitz <sidneyhorowitz@comcast.net> wrote:*

*I am sorry that they are not well.*

*Given that the trial is still under way it is probably best if we do not correspond about content areas.*

*Sidney S. Horowitz, Ph.D.*

*Clinical & Forensic Psychologist*



133 Scovill Street - Suite 211

Waterbury, CT 06706

203-573-9521

Susan Skipp< susanskip@gmail.com> Wed, Sep 5, 2012 at 2:23 PM

To: Sidney Horowitz <sidneyhorowitz@comcast.net>

*I am asking for billing. An account of the time you spend, cost incurred to speaking with brigham*

*Sent from my iPhone*

Dr. Horowitz did not respond to this request and has still not provided this information. In addition, I went to his office on or about March 21, and spoke with Shawna, an employee of Dr. Horowitz. She instructed me to fill out and sign a release. I asked if I would need to fill out a second release for Wyatt's records. Shawna replied, "We do not have a chart for him. We just have them both under one record." I understand that one record is often utilized in cases of family therapy. However, in this case, Dr. Horowitz was supposed to be providing therapy to the children on an individual basis; yet Dr. Horowitz was documenting and billing both children's care under Gabrielle's name, under the diagnosis of a major depressive disorder.

To this date, I still have not received any records or billing statements from Dr. Horowitz or his office. The billing statements that I have attached to this document are ones that I had in anticipation for a legal action as I paid the deductibles uncovered things like his reading email. In December in anticipation of legal action, I requested the billing to show the court what I paid as my ex-husband did not.

Additionally, under oath on August 15, 2012, Dr. Horowitz stated that another reason for his recusal from the case was the fact that I had filed a motion in limine. You can read this testimony in the attached court transcript. In fact, Dr. Horowitz recused himself from our case on March 25, 2012. I filed the motion in limine on April 24, 2012. As evidence, I will also attach a copy of an excerpt from the online file for my docket number. In reality, as referenced in the emails above, I asked Dr. Horowitz for billing statements and diagnosis codes (which turned out to be in error according to his testimony in the attached court transcripts). Dr. Horowitz recused himself from the case the following day, March 25, 2012.

Excerpt from Court Docket listing when motion in limine was filed in the Waterbury, Connecticut Court:

UWY-FA10-4022992-S TITTLE,SHAWN v. SKIPP-TITTLE,SUSAN

284.00 04/24/2012 D MOTION FOR INJUNCTION

285.00 04/24/2012 D MOTION IN LIMINE

286.0 04/25/2012 C ORDER

### **3. Failure to notify legal guardians of the diagnosis and treatment of a minor child**

As evidenced in the attached billing statements, Dr. Horowitz wrote a diagnosis of 296.22 or "major depressive disorder" for Gabrielle Tittle, a minor child, and billed insurance under this diagnosis from August 23, 2010 until at least March of 2012 (per Dr. Horowitz's sworn testimony, transcripts attached). Dr. Horowitz never notified me or the children's father of this diagnosis, the implications of such a diagnosis, or the treatment plans. In fact, prior to this court date, I was unaware of any diagnosis that had been given to my daughter aside from what I discovered from researching the diagnosis code myself. During the hearing, Dr. Horowitz testified that he had changed the diagnosis. This was the first time that I heard about the newest diagnosis. As far as I am aware, the children's father also first learned of this diagnosis during the same hearing.

When I found out about the seriousness of the diagnosis issued, as I emailed Horowitz many times to find out what he was treating my children for, he skirted the issue every time, it brought my serious panic because my daughter expressed suicidal urges- this would have been something to watch for- no one was helping my daughter or son!

As noted above, Dr. Horowitz testified in court that he had misdiagnosed Gabrielle, and re-diagnosed her with a less serious "adjustment disorder," approximately 19 months after he began treating the children. Dr. Horowitz claimed that he contacted the insurance company regarding the error in March of 2012, after he had recused himself from our case. Dr. Horowitz did not notify me or my ex-husband about this "error." An ADA advocate had been communicating extensively with Aetna regarding this issue in late February and early March of 2012. I can provide documentation of these communications upon your request. As well, I reported the fraud to the insurance fraud section of Connecticut's government.

### **4.) Falsification of Medical Records**

On or about March 21, 2012 I went to Dr. Horowitz's office to again request copies of my children's medical records and billing statements. During this visit, I signed a release in order to receive the children's records. Dr. Horowitz's receptionist, Shawna, informed me that Dr. Horowitz only utilized one chart for both children. Gabrielle and Wyatt's "records" were both contained in Gabrielle's chart, under Gabrielle's name. Although Dr. Horowitz had treated both children, all of the information that Dr. Horowitz had on both children was contained in one chart: Gabrielle's. Wyatt did not have a record in Dr. Horowitz's office. Dr. Horowitz also billed the insurance company for both children under Gabrielle's name.

Please refer to Dr. Horowitz's testimony contained in the court transcript, attached below. In this transcript, Dr. Horowitz admits to combining Gabrielle and Wyatt's medical records and billing.

## **5.) Breaches of Confidentiality**

Attorney Mary Brigham was appointed by Judge Buzzuto of Waterbury Superior court to serve as my children's Guardian Ad Litem on September 9, 2010. In August of 2010, Dr. Horowitz began to see my children and later appointed by Judge Resha to serve in the role of a counselor to my children. Between August 2010 and May 12, 2011, many emails, phone calls, and other communications were exchanged between myself, my attorney, Ms. Brigham, and Dr. Horowitz regarding the treatment of my children.

On May 12, 2011, I received the following email from Ms. Brigham, reminding me of her end of appointment herself as my children's GAL. As you can see, Dr. Horowitz was cc'd on this email, thus receiving notice that "I (Mary) am not continuing my investigation."

*From: Attorney Mary Brigham <marybrigham@sbcglobal.net>*

*Date: Thu, May 12, 2011 at 6:41 PM*

*Subject: Re: Re:*

*To: Susan Skipp <susanskipp@gmail.com>*

*Cc: Shawn Tittle <shawn.tittle@gmail.com>, "Sidney Horowitz <sidneyhorowitz@comcast.net>Howard Krieger" <howardcrg@sbcglobal.net>*

*Susan-*

*Unless and until there is a motion filed which would warrant my involvement beyond ensuring that coparent counseling is taking place, I am not continuing my investigation. I am monitoring things by virtue of being cc'd on emails,.Other than that ,issues relating to visitation and custody are governed by the agreement unless otherwise modified. Neither you nor Wyatt has EVER raised the alleged issue of Wyatt sharing a bed with his father ( other than for the short period before new furniture arrived for the children). I question why you are rasing that, as well as other issues- i.e. travel distance (when you moved further away) at a time when you and Shawn should be well into the mode of effective coparenting*

*I am disheartened to say the least that the children continue to be the victims of continued animosity and mistrust between you and Shawn. They are, and no doubt will continue, to be, harmed by what is happening.*

*Once again, I urge you and Shawn to move forward both in your personal lives and in your relationship as parents of two wonderful children.*

Mary

Mary Piscatelli Brigham

Attorney at Law

(203) 574-2404

fax (203) 755-6366

After this date, there was never “a motion filed which would warrant my (Ms. Brigham’s) involvement” as was Ms. Brigham’s condition for re-entering the investigations within our case. *In fact Ms. Brigham had not statutory standing to be involved. Horowitz violated HIPAA corresponding with Ms. Brigham.* Despite the fact that Ms. Brigham appointment ended March 28, 2011, Dr. Horowitz continued to share confidential information regarding my children with Ms. Brigham. If required, I would need to subpoena records in order to document the correspondence in which Dr. Horowitz shared privileged information with Ms. Brigham, after Ms. Brigham’s role as Guardian ad Litem terminated March 28, 2011. According to the State of Connecticut’s definition of the role of a Guardian Ad Litem, and several precedents: Cohen v Cohen Where the Gal role is stipulated in the dissolution and Ridgeway V Ridgeway finding parents are the most likely to advocate for their children’s best interest. In Fish v Fish, “Guardian ad litem may stay on at the discretion of the judge in high conflict custody cases.” We did not have a high conflict custody case, we reached dissolution via agreement. Ms. Brigham was never reappointed, but continued her attempts to intervene in our case, including her correspondence with Dr. Horowitz. He was aware of Ms. Brigham’s end of appointment, but he chose to continue sharing confidential information with her. Please let me know if you need these emails in order to conduct your investigation.

During Dr. Horowitz’s testimony (transcripts below), he also admits to discussing confidential details regarding my children and our court case, even after Dr. Horowitz had recused himself. One particularly disturbing example is Dr. Horowitz’s testimony that another reason for his recusal was that I had sent an email to the children’s school, and that email had greatly upset the children. Dr. Horowitz officially recused himself on March 25, 2012. The email to the school that Dr. Horowitz referred to in his testimony was dated April 2, 2012 (a full week after he had recused himself from the case) and is copied below.

My ex-husband entered the same email into evidence, thus suggesting that Dr. Horowitz and my ex-husband were exchanging information pertinent to an ongoing trial, well after Dr. Horowitz had recused himself. Keep in mind that Dr. Horowitz had claimed that he was a neutral third party whose sole responsibility was to provide the children a “safe haven” in which to express their distress during this prolonged, stressful ordeal. I do not know why Dr. Horowitz and my ex-husband were discussing an email I had sent to a third party...especially after Dr. Horowitz was no longer supposed to be my children’s therapist. Furthermore, I am unsure as to why my children would have been exposed to this

email, which was directed toward a faculty member of my children's school, and was never meant to have been seen by Gabrielle or Wyatt. Yet, in court testimony, Dr. Horowitz stated that that the children were greatly upset by an email I sent to the school.

I sent the following email to the school out of pure desperation, as none of the "professionals" assigned to our court case were taking any steps to intervene and stop the cycle of abuse. It seemed that every time I reached out to someone and reported the abuse, I was further punished by having more of my parental rights taken away. My daughter was expressing suicidal thoughts in a letter and the GAL dismissed it as unimportant, Horowitz did not discuss it. It was a nightmare. Also Horowitz further perjured himself as his recusal was March 23, 2012. How would he have discussed this in a session with the children as he said in the transcript?

*Susan Skipp< susanskipp@gmail.com> Mon, Apr 2, 2012 at 5:39 PM*

*To: Debby DeGuire <ddeguire@litchfieldmontessori.org>*

*You forward the things that show what harm my kids experience instead of help them.*

*Take analogy of holocaust- nobody wanted to believe a few crazy Jews talking about horrific things. Easier to be labeled crazy Jew, or in my case crazy bitter angry vindictive obsessed - - whatever other label- woman.*

*I am not asking for anything except safety for kids. You put them on train and say don't worry.*

*In the analogy I might be the crazy Jew saying, " look what is happening to my kids!"*

*You chose the calm Nazi.*

*In Connecticut abusers who seek custody get it 90% of time. You are complicit in their abuse, the entire school is.*

*I sent you a video so you will stop being complicit. Read about coercive control. Please watch the video I gave you- it's made by cptv! You are part of the problem.*

*Peaceful community is not ignoring human rights violations to keep peace in your community. If the school has real integrity behind that position, live it. Until then have integrity and say make it look nice and then problems dont exist.*

*How is my begging for help to stop harm that is coming to kids any different from the Jew saying look what they do in those camps!*

*I know it's easier to believe there is something wrong with me- propaganda.*

*How can you say you care about my children when you just put them on the train?*

*Sent from my iPhone*

### **Additional Information:**

Please read "Life Sentence" by Keith Harmon Snow (link below). I was investigated and interviewed for this article. Dr. Horowitz was mentioned in conjunction with many "questionable" cases, where he appears to utilize the same tactics that he used in my case. This article is long, but it places much of what I have written in this report into perspective. It documents other cases where Horowitz was involved in similar circumstances.

<http://www.consciousbeingalliance.com/2012/05/a-life-sentence-family-courts-sacrificing-mothers-and-children-in-america/>

Quotes from "A Life Sentence: Family Courts Sacrificing Mothers and Children in America" by Keith Harmon Snow:

In the Connecticut Court system the biggest offenders--showing up in one judicial abuse case after another - are Dr. Jerome (Jerry) Brodlie, Dr. Bruce Freedman, Dr. Donald J. Hiebel and Dr. Keith Roeder (Hiebel and Roeder) **Dr. Sidney Horowitz** and Dr. Howard Krieger (Connecticut Resource Group), Dr. James Black, Dr. Kenneth Robson and Dr. Donald Tolles. There are more, who appear less often, but the rotten core of the problem revolves around these above, where Dr. Kenneth Robson deserves special focus.

"So, women like Sunny and I have had our federal civil rights massively violated by labeling us with mental illnesses then taking our kids away," says Mrs. Wilson. Dr. Kenneth Robson, **Dr. Sidney Horowitz** and Dr. Bruce Freedman were the custody evaluators who persecuted this mother, and the Judge in her case was Lynda B. Munro.

"My daughter's father was arrested for molesting her," said Mrs. Donovan. "The jury was a hung jury and the state prosecutor told me the hung jury would protect her in the custody case. I am sure that would have been the case if the custody evaluators had not involved themselves in her case. My daughter's father's attorney arranged for Sidney Horowitz to do a custody evaluation, and all of the unethical things **Horowitz** did to my daughter are documented. **Dr. Horowitz** eventually said he didn't know whether or not my daughter's father molested her--and that he also 'understood' why her father would rage at her for 45 minutes in his office. He then told Judge Munro during the custody trial that since my daughter believed the abuse happened and because I believed it happened -- and even though **Horowitz** didn't know whether or not it happened -- my daughter should be taken from me and hospitalized and be given psychotropic

medication if she continued to resist visiting with her [sexually abusive] father unsupervised. The state of Connecticut spent at least a million dollars on my daughter's case."

Susan (Tittle) Skipp is just over half way through the process that Sunny Kelley and Linda Wiegand suffered, and she can see what is coming based on what happened to these others. Susan Skipp was assigned two of the most unscrupulous court-appointed custody evaluators, **Dr. Sidney Horowitz** and Dr. Howard Krieger, both from the Connecticut Resource Group, both adherents and advocates of Parental Alienation Syndrome. Distressed and outraged by their maliciousness, and slightly attuned to the fact that she is another candidate 'bitch' the system is out to screw, Susan Skipp requested that these 'experts' provide her with all billing and other records; soon after this the two PAS psychologists withdrew from her case.

Shawn Tittle is a thoracic surgeon at Danbury Hospital with a long history of domestic violence and substance abuse problems in at least two states. On May 9, 2011, Shawn Tittle crashed his car into the Taco Bell in Danbury, CT. Arrested for driving under the influence, a reckless driving charge was later added. On April 18, 2012, following a full year of court dates, Shawn Tittle pled guilty to driving under the influence; he starts probation on May 9. At no time did the court consider the D.U.I. or the two open DCF investigations on Dr. Tittle into account when deciding the custody of the children and the elimination of their mother. Susan Skipp has no arrest record, no history of violence or substance abuse.

"I was railroaded again by an abuser and his hired guns," said Susan Skipp after another day up against the mafia of Connecticut courts on April 20, 2012. "The GAL is supposed to protect my kids, but she is clearly working as my ex-husband's attorney. The judge ordered me to complete the custody evaluation right after court, flummoxed and all. I am just tired right now, physically and emotionally drained. They drag me back into court Monday to face five more motions from my ex-husband's lawyer, including one forcing me into supervised visitation. I feel minimized. My children are dehumanized and sad that they are so truly invisible in this process. They are only visible as numbers with dollar signs to the industry."

Susan Skipp is about eight months behind Sunny Kelley in the process to destroy her. She has documented a horror story of abuse and criminality at every stage of her involvement with the CT courts and their cabal of professional experts. Her documentation is beyond belief or description, and it is so clearly verifiable: a testimonial to fraud, manipulation, criminality and injustice.

**On April 26, 2012, the GAL Mary Brigham recommended Susan Skipp be forced into supervised visitation after receiving Drs. Horowitz and Krieger's complaints that she was asking for her records.** The ruse used against Susan Skipp was that she 'threatened' **Drs. Horowitz** and Krieger by requesting her billing records. The court also ordered that Susan Skipp -- a perfectly healthy, reasonable, loving mother -- must be subjected to a "Family Relations Report" -- another tool used (like a 'custody evaluation' by one of the professional court-appointed quacks) to frame a protective mother. Given the patterns of judicial abuse she has witnessed, Susan Skipp is certain that the Family Relations Report will favor her former husband and further distance her from her children. The writing is all over the wall. Meanwhile, the unofficial guardian ad litem, Mary Brigham, involved in terrorizing the children in Tittle v. Tittle, continues to bully Susan Skipp daily.

Dr. Howard Krieger required a retainer of \$2500 and \$250 per session from Susan Skipp, and he billed her insurance. However, Dr. Krieger committed insurance fraud by using the bill codes for domestic violence. Dr. Horowitz also committed insurance fraud and malpractice: he saw two of Susan Skipp's children, and made recommendations to the court on both of them, but he kept only one client chart. Moreover, for 19 months he diagnosed Susan Skipp's daughter with a severe depressive mood disorder. Susan Skipp has not received any medical record and she does not have legal ability to change her daughter's record. This diagnosis against the girl child is an example of the ritual pathologizing of women.

"I lost custody of my eleven year-old daughter and nine year-old boy to a man who was physically and emotionally abusive to his first wife and kid in Michigan and to me and our kids here in Connecticut." A strong and courageous woman, Susan Skipp weeps when she recounts her ordeal. "This man has written illegal prescriptions, taken illegal prescriptions, driven under the influence and plead guilty to it, and he has a lot of weapons, both legal and illegal, which my children have access to."

Judge Maureen Murphy is also part of the training program for Connecticut guardians ad litem. In fact, the state of Connecticut guardian ad litem training programs also rely on the 'expertise' of Dr. Kenneth Robson. In these training programs, developed with taxpayer's money, Maureen Murphy and Dr. Robson claim over and over that it is 'in the best interests of the child' to keep families together and to maintain joint custody, at least. In practice, they do exactly the opposite: Dr. Kenneth Robson and Dr. Sidney Horowitz almost always recommend sole custody, and most often it is with the abusive father.



**Billing Statement: Dr. Horowitz, 8/23/2010 to 8/17/2011**

Apr 15 12:03:21p Susan Skipp Tittle

203 5091585

p.1

01/03/12  
Oper: SL

Statement

Page: 1

IRS # 061513565

CONNECTICUT RESOURCE GROUP LLC  
133 SCOVILL STREET  
SUITE 211  
WATERBURY, CT 06706-1127  
Tel: 2035739521TITTLE, GABRIELLE  
147 HOOP HOLE HILL ROAD  
WOODBURY, CT 06798Acct: 10010879-1 /AE  
Pat : TITTLE, GABRIELLE 08/08/00  
Tel: 203/509-1585

Ins1: AETNA HEALTH CARE W173028088

Date	Diag	Ref	C.P.T	Qt	Reference	Procedure	AR	Plc	Prv	Amount
08/23/10	296.22		90801	1		PSYCH DIAG EVAL	VO	O	SH	180.00
08/23/10			CASH			CASH		O	SH	-10.00
10/06/10			VOCK			VALUE OPTIONS INS		O	SH	-125.00
10/06/10			VODA			VALUE OPTIONS DIS		O	SH	-45.00
11/22/10	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	VO	O	SH	165.00
12/09/10	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	VO	O	SH	165.00
01/06/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	VO	O	SH	165.00
01/18/11			VOCK			VALUE OPTIONS INS		O	SH	-150.00
01/18/11			VODA			VALUE OPTIONS DIS		O	SH	-180.00
02/17/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	VO	O	SH	165.00
02/24/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	VO	O	SH	165.00
03/01/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	VO	O	SH	165.00
03/17/11			VOCK			VALUE OPTIONS INS		O	SH	-170.00
03/17/11			VODA			VALUE OPTIONS DIS		O	SH	-140.00
03/17/11			VOCK			VALUE OPTIONS INS		O	SH	-85.00
03/17/11			VODA			VALUE OPTIONS DIS		O	SH	-70.00
03/22/11			VOCK			VALUE OPTIONS INS		O	SH	-85.00
03/22/11			VODA			VALUE OPTIONS DIS		O	SH	-70.00
03/24/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	VO	O	SH	165.00
03/29/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	VO	O	SH	165.00
04/12/11			AECK			AETNA CHECK		O	SH	-85.00
04/12/11			AEDA			AETNA DISALLOWED		O	SH	-70.00
04/15/11			AECK			AETNA CHECK		O	SH	-85.00
04/15/11			VODA			VALUE OPTIONS DIS		O	SH	-70.00
05/02/11			PTCK			PATIENT CHECK		O	SH	-35.00
DAD PAID \$35 4/28										
04/28/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	VO	O	SH	165.00
05/02/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	VO	O	SH	165.00
05/20/11			VOCK			VALUE OPTIONS INS		O	SH	-85.00
05/20/11			VODA			VALUE OPTIONS DIS		O	SH	-70.00
06/07/11			AECK			AETNA CHECK		O	SH	-85.00
06/07/11			AEDA			AETNA DISALLOWED		O	SH	-70.00
06/13/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	AE	O	SH	165.00
06/16/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	AE	O	SH	165.00
06/28/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	AE	O	SH	165.00
07/19/11			AECK			AETNA CHECK		O	SH	-85.00
07/19/11			AEDA			AETNA DISALLOWED		O	SH	-70.00
07/20/11			AECK			AETNA CHECK		O	SH	-85.00
07/20/11			AEDA			AETNA DISALLOWED		O	SH	-70.00
08/17/11			90899	1		UNLISTED PSYCH SE AE	O	O	SH	300.00
CUMALATIVE READING EMAIL										

Billing Statement: Dr. Horowitz 8/29/11 to 12/19/11

Apr 15 12:03:22p

Susan Skipp Tittle

203 5091585

p.2

01/03/12

Statement

Page: 2

Oper: SL

IRS # 061513565

CONNECTICUT RESOURCE GROUP LLC  
133 SCOVILL STREET  
SUITE 211  
WATERBURY, CT 06706-1127  
Tel: 2035739521

TITTLE, GABRIELLE  
147 HOOP HOLE HILL ROAD  
WOODBURY, CT 06798

Acct: 10010879-1 /AE  
Pat : TITTLE, GABRIELLE 08/08/00  
Tel: 203/509-1585

Ins1: AETNA HEALTH CARE W 73028088

Date	Diag	Ref	C.P.T	Qt	Reference	Procedure	AR	Plc	Prv	Amount
08/29/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	AE	O	SH	165.00
09/08/11			PTCK			PATIENT CHECK		O	SH	-300.00
09/26/11			AECK			AETNA CHECK		O	SH	-85.00
09/26/11			AEDA			AETNA DISALLOWED		O	SH	-70.00
10/03/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	AE	O	SH	165.00
10/11/11			VISA			VISA PAYMENT		O	SH	-105.00
10/11/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	AE	O	SH	165.00
10/12/11			AECK			AETNA CHECK		O	SH	-85.00
10/12/11			AEDA			AETNA DISALLOWED		O	SH	-70.00
10/26/11			AECK			AETNA CHECK		O	SH	-85.00
10/26/11			AEDA			AETNA DISALLOWED		O	SH	-70.00
10/26/11			AECK			AETNA CHECK		O	SH	-85.00
10/26/11			AEDA			AETNA DISALLOWED		O	SH	-70.00
11/10/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	AE	O	SH	165.00
11/28/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	AE	O	SH	165.00
11/28/11			CASH			CASH		O	SH	-10.00
12/07/11			AECK			AETNA CHECK		O	SH	-85.00
12/07/11			AEDA			AETNA DISALLOWED		O	SH	-70.00
12/13/11	296.22		90806	1		PSYCHOTHERAPY	AE	O	SH	165.00
12/13/11			CASH			CASH		O	SH	-20.00
12/19/11	296.22		MISS AP	1		MISSED APPOINTMENT	AE	O	SH	50.00
										-----
Regular Balance:										\$ 360.00

Court Transcript

August 15, 2012

NO: FA10-4022922-S : SUPERIOR COURT  
SHAWN TITTLE : JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
OF MIDDLESEX  
v. : AT MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT  
SUSAN SKIPP-TITTLE : AUGUST 15, 2012

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT

BEFORE THE HONORABLE LYNDIA B. MUNRO

A P P E A R A N C E S :

Representing the Plaintiff:

ATTORNEY ROSEMARY GIULIANO  
39 Sherman Hill Road  
Woodbury, CT 06798

Representing the Defendant:

ATTORNEY LISA VINCENT  
379 Prospect Street  
Torrington, CT 06790

Guardian Ad Litem:

ATTORNEY MARY BRIGHAM  
60 North Main Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Waterbury, CT 06702

Recorded and Transcribed by:

Nancy Gill-Rea  
Court Recording Monitor  
One Court Street  
Middletown, CT 06457

1           DR. SIDNEY HOROWITZ, called as a witness, having  
2           been first duly sworn in by Clerk, was examined and  
3           testified as follows:

4           CLERK: Please be seated. And, for the record,  
5           please state your name, spell your last name and give  
6           your business address.

7           WITNESS: My name is Sidney Horowitz, and my  
8           business address, well, H-o-r-o-w-i-t-z, and my  
9           business address is 133 Skovill Street, Waterbury,  
10          Connecticut.

11          THE COURT: Good morning.

12          WITNESS: Good morning, Your Honor.

13          ATTY. GIULIANO: Thank you, Your Honor.

14          Good morning, Dr. Horowitz.

15          WITNESS: Good morning.

16   DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY GIULIANO:

17          Q   In what profession or occupation are you engaged?

18          A   I'm a Clinical and Forensic Psychologist.

19          Q   And, for what period of time have you been a Clinical  
20          Psychologist?

21          A   I completed my training in 1982 from the Ohio State  
22          University, and became licensed in Connecticut in 1983.

23          Q   And, can you tell us, very briefly, what is your full  
24          educational background?

25          A   My undergraduate education was at what was then  
26          called Harper College, now called Binghamton University. I  
27          received a masters degree in -- that was in 1971, I received

1 a masters degree from Hunter College in social research. I  
2 received my doctorate in clinical psychology from the Ohio  
3 State University. My internship was at the West Haven VA  
4 Medical Center, 1979 to 1980. My post-doctoral fellowship  
5 was combined between the Waterbury Regional Department of  
6 Pediatrics and a program for -- called New Directions, which  
7 was for chronic and serious juvenile offenders in Waterbury.

8 Q And, are you here today pursuant to a subpoena that  
9 was served upon you?

10 A Yes.

11 ATTY. GIULIANO: And, if I may approach, Your  
12 Honor?

13 THE COURT: You may.

14 Q Dr. Horowitz, did you bring with you Curriculum  
15 Vitae?

16 A I did.

17 Q And, you recognize this document as that?

18 A I do.

19 ATTY. GIULIANO: Your Honor, I offer this, I  
20 don't have copies because Dr. Horowitz brought it  
21 with him this morning.

22 ATTY. VINCENT: No objection, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: Full exhibit. Go ahead.

24 ATTY. GIULIANO: Thank you, Your Honor.

25 Q Dr. Horowitz, have you been involved in court related  
26 custody matters in the State of Connecticut?

27 A Yes.

1 Q And, for what period of time have you been involved  
2 in such matters?

3 A I think my first divorce related matter was probably  
4 around 1987, with a low frequency then, and the past 15  
5 years or so with a much higher volume.

6 Q Okay. And, can you give us a sense of the volume  
7 within the last three years?

8 A I principally provide psychological consultations to  
9 the Court about custody and access, and I'm probably  
10 involved in around between 10 and 30 of those in any given  
11 year, as well as doing mediation and collaborative efforts  
12 involving court related matters for divorce.

13 Q And, have you participated, in the last three years,  
14 in any educational programs involving court custody matters?

15 A I have.

16 Q And, can you briefly describe those?

17 A I've made some presentations to Family Relations, to  
18 the Connecticut Judge's Institute to various aspects of the  
19 Connecticut Bar Association.

20 Q And, have you testified in the courts of the State of  
21 Connecticut in matters related to the custody of children?

22 A I have.

23 Q And, on how many occasions, Dr. Horowitz?

24 A I don't keep those statistics, but it's a rather  
25 large number.

26 Q And, would it be more than 100, less than 100?

27 A More than 100.

1 Q Did you serve as a counselor to the children of the  
2 parties, Gabrielle and Wyatt Tittle?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And, for what period of time?

5 A I believe my first meeting was mid to the end of  
6 August, 2010, and my last meeting was March 26, 2012.

7 Q Could you please briefly describe the children?

8 A Andersen, who wanted me to call her Gabby, is a tall,  
9 bright, engaging, verbal young woman who likes to  
10 overshadow, physically and verbally, her brother, Wyatt, but  
11 Wyatt still finds a way to make himself heard and seen.

12 He, too, appears to be bright, energetic, at times, I  
13 think Velcro would have helped to keep him seated. He has  
14 lots of energy and likes to do a lot of physical moves  
15 throughout my office.

16 Both were easy to engage with for the most part, but  
17 at various times, seemed anxious, overwhelmed and torn about  
18 what's going on between their parents.

19 Q Did there come a time when you recused yourself as a  
20 counselor for the children?

21 A Yes. On March 25, 2012, for the first time in my  
22 career, I recused myself from a clinical case by sending an  
23 email to the Guardian Ad Litem in this matter, Mary Brigham.

24 Q And, for what reason did you recuse yourself?

25 A If I may, in order to function as a neutral party, a  
26 psychologist really needs to feel neutral. And, as much as  
27 I wanted to be neutral to the children, I was afraid, given



1 that children have built-in radar and can pick up on all  
2 sorts of unintended tones in my voice, that I was  
3 increasingly becoming biased against Ms. Skipp, and I felt  
4 that I could unintentionally interfere with the therapeutic  
5 process that I was engaged in with these two children. And,  
6 I thought it would be best for them to have a potentially  
7 less biased, more neutral individual at that point, and for  
8 them to be transferred to a new treater.

9 Q And, for what reason did you feel that you were  
10 developing a bias against Ms. Skipp?

11 A Simply put, I was receiving volumes of emails from  
12 Ms. Skipp on a regular basis. Even after I had invited her  
13 in on a number of occasions to talk about my treatment  
14 plans, my treatment goals, my involvement with the children,  
15 and explained, yet again, for the umpteenth time, that I was  
16 not a forensic evaluator here, I did not evaluate either of  
17 the parents or the children formally.

18 She still did not understand that role, and shortly  
19 within leaving my office, I received two other emails  
20 talking about the horrible things that she believes that the  
21 father had done to affect the children.

22 Her speaking in hyperbole and her insistence on that  
23 was one part.

24 The second was that she also had filed a motion in  
25 limine that I had seen where she had said that I had  
26 previously been investigated for insurance fraud, not to my  
27 knowledge. She said that I was guilty of HIPAA violations,

1 not to my understanding, and that I felt agitated and  
2 defensive. And so, I thought that a continued working  
3 relationship with her, as the mother of the children, did  
4 not seem viable. And, again, I felt it was best for me to  
5 recuse myself from treatment with the children.

6 Q Did you request each of the parties to cooperate with  
7 you in the process of the children engaging in therapy with  
8 you?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And, did Dr. Tittle cooperate?

11 A Yes, he did.

12 Q And, in what way?

13 A Dr. Tittle requested information, names of books,  
14 articles that he could read. My treatment goal was to  
15 increase resilience and reduce vulnerability of both of  
16 these children, and he requested information and echoed back  
17 to me that he understood what that information was.

18 Q And, did the defendant, Ms. Skipp, cooperate?

19 A Not in that way, no.

20 Q And, can you tell in what specific ways was she  
21 uncooperative with respect to your therapy of children?

22 A At its most basic form, I don't believe that Ms.  
23 Tittle ever fully grasped what my role was, which was to  
24 maintain a neutral, safe location for these children to, in  
25 my language, "decaffect", or in English, be able to get  
26 their burdens off of them.

27 And, that she insisted on informing me, and it may

1 well be accurate, that Dr. Tittle was nothing less than evil  
2 in all of his behaviors.

3 And so, given that she was busy informing me of that  
4 information, again, I don't know its accuracy or not, I was  
5 unable to maintain my role in being a treater of the  
6 children, and so, she did not cooperate in the goals that I  
7 had set for treatment of the children.

8 Q Now, you made reference to the fact that she sent  
9 emails to you.

10 A Yes.

11 Q Can you give us a sense of the volume of emails that  
12 she was sending to you?

13 A Well, the majority of this record is emails, and a  
14 great majority of these are emails from Ms. Skipp.

15 Q And, when you say these, you're holding up --

16 A I'm holding up --

17 Q -- a file folder that is two inches in width,  
18 approximately?

19 A An inch and a half thick, approximately.

20 Q Okay. Now, did you, at one time, make an offer to  
21 Ms. Skipp to come to your office to discuss with you your  
22 treatment of the children and ways that she could learn  
23 about how to cooperate with that?

24 A I made that offer on a couple or a few occasions,  
25 yes.

26 Q And, did she come in and meet with you?

27 A On one occasion, she did. I actually met with her on

1 a couple of occasions, either at the beginning or the end of  
2 my involvement in seeing the children, but for a specific  
3 appointment, she came in on one occasion, and we didn't get  
4 to talking about my treatment of the children.

5 Q And, why is that?

6 A Ms. Skipp seemed eager to inform me about all the  
7 things that she believed Dr. Tittle had been engaged in and  
8 felt that I was missing that and should be reporting that  
9 the children were being abused by their father, or had been  
10 abused by their father.

11 Q Ms. Skipp has listed Gabrielle Tittle, her daughter,  
12 as a witness in this trial, Dr. Horowitz; do you think it's  
13 in the child's best interest to be a witness in this trial?

14 A Absolutely not.

15 ATTY. GIULIANO: I have no further questions,  
16 thank you.

17 THE COURT: You may inquire.

18 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY VINCENT:

19 Q Good morning, Dr. Horowitz.

20 A Good morning.

21 Q When did you meet the Tittle children?

22 A Initially, at the end of August, 2010.

23 Q At some point around the time you met the children,  
24 did you have any type of formal introduction to the parents?  
25 Did you formally introduce yourself and your role?

26 A Yes.

27 Q And, how did you do that?

1 A I met face-to-face with Ms. Skipp, and I had a  
2 meeting with Dr. Tittle.

3 Q At some point after meeting the children, did you  
4 diagnosis Gabrielle Tittle with a clinical condition?

5 A I did.

6 Q And, at what point did you diagnose the child with  
7 that condition?

8 A Initially, as required by insurance companies.

9 Q Did you diagnose the child with a clinical condition  
10 because she did, indeed, suffer from that condition?

11 A I diagnosed her as having an adjustment disorder  
12 because I believed she did have an adjustment disorder, yes.

13 Q Have you had an opportunity to look at the billing  
14 record that relates to Gabrielle Tittle?

15 A I have looked at it twice. The first time, when  
16 problems had emerged, and I noticed that there were two  
17 clerical errors in the billing record. Upon seeing the  
18 clinical errors, I contacted Aetna, who was the insurance  
19 company that was paying for these visits. I informed them  
20 in writing about these errors, because they did not reflect  
21 my chart notes. I don't know why it was on the bill. I  
22 don't look at billing records. And, asked them what I  
23 needed to and I resubmitted all of that.

24 The two errors were 1) that there was an incorrect  
25 diagnosis on the billing code, which reflected a more  
26 serious disorder. And, the correct diagnosis, which is  
27 throughout the record, is a much more benign diagnosis.

1           And, the second error was I had utilized what is  
2 referred to as an individual psychotherapy code, as opposed  
3 to family therapy without the presence of the parents.  
4 Aetna reviewed those, and even though I was entitled to  
5 receive more money had I billed it "correctly", I didn't  
6 receive the extra money, and that was just a routine matter.

7           I don't know why either of those clerical errors  
8 happened.

9           ATTY. VINCENT: I would like to share  
10 defendant's exhibit L with the witness.

11          THE COURT: L as in lady?

12          ATTY. VINCENT: Yes. May I approach?

13          THE COURT: Yes.

14          ATTY. VINCENT: Thank you.

15          Q Does that look like the bill --

16          THE COURT: Hang on a minute.

17          ATTY. VINCENT: Woops, sorry.

18          THE COURT: So, this should have been a sealed  
19 document because the diagnoses codes are generally  
20 available and it has to do with the treatment of the  
21 individual. So, unless there's an objection, the  
22 document should be sealed. Any objection?

23          ATTY. GIULIANO: No objection, Your Honor.

24          ATTY. VINCENT: No objection.

25          THE COURT: Go ahead.

26          Q Can you tell us the period of time that is covered by  
27 that bill?



1       A    The first date on here is August 23, 2010, and the  
2 last date appears to be 12/19/2011 on this -- these two  
3 sheets of paper.

4       Q    And, as you look at the first diagnostic code that  
5 appears, what date is that?

6       A    August 23, 2010.

7       Q    And, what is the diagnostic code that appears on that  
8 bill?

9       A    296.22.

10      Q    And, are you aware of what that diagnosis code means?

11      A    It's a significant major depressive illness.

12      Q    Are you familiar with the diagnostic criteria for a  
13 major depressive illness?

14      A    Yes.

15      Q    And, could you share with the Court what that would  
16 be?

17               ATTY. GIULIANO:  Objection, irrelevant, Your  
18 Honor.

19               THE COURT:  Sustained.

20      Q    Based on your professional knowledge, would an  
21 individual with that code be able to readily find the  
22 diagnostic criteria that are associated with the code?

23               ATTY. GIULIANO:  Objection, irrelevant.

24               THE COURT:  I'm not sure I understood the  
25 question.  Do you mean if I had a 296.22 code  
26 diagnosis, would I be able to find it somewhere?  Is  
27 that the question?

1           ATTY. Would you, as a lay person, be able to  
2           look that up and identify the physical  
3           characteristics.

4           THE COURT: I get the question now, sustained.

5           ATTY. VINCENT: Yes. Thank you.

6           Q   Is it your statement, at this point, that the child  
7           does not suffer from this diagnosis?

8           A   That's correct. As I mentioned before, that was a  
9           coding error.

10          Q   Thank you.

11          A   You're welcome.

12          Q   Are you familiar with when that coding error was  
13          corrected?

14          A   I believe it was some time in March past.

15          Q   March, 2012?

16          A   Yes, sorry.

17          Q   So, between August 23, 2010 and March of 2012, the  
18          bills were being submitted to insurance under this  
19          diagnosis, is that correct?

20          A   Apparently, yes, incorrectly.

21          Q   Is it your understanding that as bills like this are  
22          submitted to insurance, that that becomes, then, part of an  
23          individual's medical record?

24          A   Yes, which is why I contacted Aetna.

25          Q   Up until March of 2012, would it be fair to say that  
26          the child's medical record included a diagnosis of major  
27          depressive disorder?



1 A Yes, that's correct.

2 Q And, is it your professional opinion that your -- by  
3 correcting the clerical error, that you've been able to  
4 resolve that medical record issue?

5 A As I've been informed by a spokesperson for Aetna,  
6 they said that that has been fully corrected.

7 Q Earlier you testified that you did diagnose the child  
8 with an adjustment disorder, is that correct?

9 A That's correct, yes that is.

10 Q Could you describe for us, are there any physical  
11 manifestations or emotional manifestations that are required  
12 in order to reach a diagnosis of adjustment disorder?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Could you share those symptoms or the clinical nature  
15 of that diagnosis?

16 A Certainly.

17 ATTY. BRIGHAM: Well, Your Honor, I'm just gonna  
18 object to the extent that the answer would require  
19 privileged information.

20 THE COURT: Okay. You don't get to object.

21 ATTY. BRIGHAM: I'm sorry.

22 THE COURT: Thank you.

23 ATTY. GIULIANO: I'm gonna raise the same  
24 objection, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: The question doesn't require  
26 privileged information. He was asked to describe an  
27 adjustment disorder, how it manifests itself.

1 WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 A Typically, an adjustment disorder does not evidence  
3 itself with significant physical issues that are observable.  
4 More typically, an adjustment disorder is one where an  
5 individual shows varying degrees of anxiety or trepidation,  
6 sadness, irritability, perhaps some difficulty with  
7 attention and focus. The clinical symptomatology might be  
8 considered major issues light so that it's not a full  
9 depression, it's not a full blown generalized anxiety  
10 disorder, it's not a full blown attention deficit disorder  
11 and so on.

12 Q At the time you diagnosed the child with an  
13 adjustment disorder, did you share that information with the  
14 parents?

15 A I don't believe that I used the term adjustment  
16 disorder. If my memory serves me well, I said that they  
17 appeared to be fragile and unnerved, or probably descriptors  
18 along those lines.

19 Q And, in your professional opinion, would it be  
20 necessary for the child's welfare for the parents to have  
21 that diagnostic label given to them?

22 A No. I think that most lay people, and perhaps a  
23 number of professionals, misinterpret labels, diagnostic  
24 labels, but they understand better behavioral manifestations  
25 so that they can then parent better or parent differently to  
26 be able to assist their children in working through whatever  
27 the problems are.

1 Q Had the diagnosis of depression been the true  
2 diagnosis, would you have found it imperative to share that  
3 information with the parents?

4 ATTY. GIULIANO: Objection, irrelevant, Your  
5 Honor. It's speculative and it doesn't relate.

6 THE COURT: Sustained.

7 Q When you diagnosed the child with the adjustment  
8 disorder, did you share that information with the Guardian  
9 Ad Litem?

10 A I don't believe that I ever shared a formal  
11 diagnostic statement with the Guardian Ad Litem. I believe  
12 that I used behavioral descriptors of what the children were  
13 experiencing.

14 Q Were you seeing both children in unison?

15 A For the most part, yes. There were some occasions  
16 when I saw them separately, either at the same visit, and I  
17 think there were, perhaps, a couple of visits when I just  
18 saw Gabby.

19 Q Is there a billing record for Wyatt?

20 A It is imbedded, as I previously mentioned, in the  
21 same chart and the same billing code for Gabby.

22 Q Has Wyatt been diagnosed with an adjustment disorder?

23 A Clinically, I believe he has the same diagnosis.

24 Q And, in the medical records of the children, based on  
25 your professional knowledge, does one child's record show  
26 that mental health diagnoses, whereas Wyatt's record would  
27 not show that diagnoses?

1       A    In my records, I have both of their names on the top  
2 of the sheet as a heading, and I have a diagnosis, as  
3 required by insurance companies, on that same page. It is  
4 not listed separately for either of the children. If they  
5 had had different diagnoses, I might have done that  
6 differently.

7       Q    Did you have any knowledge that over the course of  
8 your treatment, the mother was making some allegations about  
9 the situation between dad and the children?

10      A    I'm sorry, can you say that differently?

11      Q    During the course of your treatment --

12      A    Yes.

13      Q    -- of the children --

14      A    Yeah.

15      Q    -- did you become aware that mom was making  
16 allegations against the father?

17      A    Yes.

18      Q    Was there any doubt to that?

19               THE COURT: Doubt of the truth of them or doubt  
20 that she was doing it?

21      Q    Doubt that she was doing it.

22      A    I heard them directly. There was no doubt.

23      Q    Okay. At any point in time, did you make a  
24 conclusion that those allegations were not truthful?

25      A    I was not in a position to be able to support or  
26 refute any of the statements that she -- that Ms. Skipp said  
27 were factual. I did, however, address those issues as best

1 I could with the children, and I reached conclusions about  
2 whether the children had the same or different experience  
3 than what Ms. Skipp had stated.

4 Q Do you have a professional understanding of the  
5 various roles for professionals in psychology to be involved  
6 in custody disputes?

7 THE COURT: I don't get that question. I don't  
8 understand that, I'm sorry.

9 ATTY. VINCENT: Okay.

10 Q As a professional treating children who are involved  
11 in a custody dispute, do you have a professional opinion as  
12 to what type of evaluation should occur for the parents?

13 A If I understand your question correctly, you want me  
14 to explain what the different roles a psychologist can have,  
15 vis-à-vis, a divorce matter?

16 Q On behalf of the parents, yes.

17 THE COURT: On behalf of, or?

18 Q Or, as involvement with the parents. The variety of  
19 clinical approaches to the parental relationship that would  
20 be associated with a custody dispute.

21 A I'm tempted to fill in the blanks, but I'm not fully  
22 understanding what you're saying. I don't want to  
23 conjecture.

24 Q Okay. Are you familiar with a forensic custody  
25 evaluation?

26 A Sure. Yes.

27 Q And, is it your understanding that a forensic custody

1 evaluation was completed in this matter?

2 A I'm not aware that a forensic evaluation was  
3 completed.

4 Q Based on your understanding of the children's  
5 situation, would you be in a position to recommend whether  
6 or not a forensic evaluation would have been appropriate in  
7 this case?

8 A I might have been, yes.

9 Q Do you have an opinion as to whether the parents  
10 would benefit or whether the children would benefit from a  
11 forensic custody study?

12 A I care less whether the parents would benefit from  
13 it, but it's my opinion that when there are significant  
14 allegations, it's also -- it's often times helpful to the  
15 attorneys and to the Court to have a forensic evaluation of  
16 the parents, the children and interactions of the parents  
17 and the children, yes.

18 ATTY. VINCENT: Okay. No further questions,  
19 Your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Sure.

21 **DIRECT EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY GIULIANO:**

22 Q Dr. Horowitz, you were asked on cross-examination as  
23 to whether or not the perceptions of Ms. Skipp were the  
24 perceptions of the children?

25 A Yes.

26 Q Were they?

27 A Not necessarily, no.



1                   ATTY. GIULIANO: I have no further questions.

2                   THE COURT: Anything?

3                   ATTY. VINCENT: No, Your Honor.

4                   THE COURT: In all of your communications, Dr.  
5 Horowitz, with Ms. Skipp, did you ever hear her  
6 reference, by analogy, to herself being the Jew, Dr.  
7 Tittle being the Nazi and the kids being on the  
8 train, or any form thereof?

9                   WITNESS: I never heard Ms. Skipp say that. I  
10 did hear Gabby make an oblique reference to that.

11                  THE COURT: Did it become a focus of your  
12 treatment in any significant way?

13                  WITNESS: It was before, and it stayed after,  
14 yes.

15                  THE COURT: Thank you. Any questions as a  
16 result of my questions?

17                  ATTY. GIULIANO: No thank you, Your Honor.

18                  ATTY. VINCENT: No, Your Honor.

19                  THE COURT: Okay. Is Dr. Horowitz released from  
20 his subpoena?

21                  ATTY. GIULIANO: Yes, Your Honor.

22                  WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

23 (Subsequent proceedings not requested for transcription.)  
24  
25  
26  
27

NO: FA10-4022922-S : SUPERIOR COURT  
SHAWN TITTLE : JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
OF MIDDLESEX  
v. : AT MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT  
SUSAN SKIPP-TITTLE : AUGUST 15, 2012

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I hereby certify the foregoing 20 pages are a true and correct transcription of the audio recording of the above-referenced case, heard in Superior Court, Judicial District of Middlesex, Middletown, Connecticut, before the Honorable Lynda B., Judge, on this 15<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2012.

Dated this 11<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2012 in Middletown, Connecticut.

  
Nancy Gill-Rea  
Court Recording Monitor



NO: FA10-4022992-S : SUPERIOR COURT  
SHAWN TITTLE : JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
OF WATERBURY  
V. : AT MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT  
SUSAN SKIPP-TITTLE : AUGUST 20, 2012

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I hereby certify the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcription of the audio recording of the above- referenced case, heard in Superior Court, Judicial District of Middlesex, Middletown, Connecticut, before the Honorable Lynda B. Munro, Judge, on the 20<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2012.

Dated this 11<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2012 in Middletown, Connecticut.

  
Carrie Bogdan  
Court Recording Monitor

Department of Public Health

Petition Form 3

Names of any prior and/or subsequent treating practitioners:

Attach copies of any supporting documents, such as photographs, records, correspondence etc.

April 18, 2013

Dear Attorney Klaskin,

I have become aware that this office is currently investigating the legitimacy of the business entity Connecticut Chapter of AFCC, Inc. I am a litigant in a family law case who, along with my children, has been harmed by the dealings of this organization, which was not registered with your office during the time of it's profitable transactions directly involving my case.

I'm also aware that in the course of your investigation you can refer the matter to the DOJ and to the CT Attorney General. I urge you to send this investigation to those offices to handle the criminal aspects of AFCC's business dealings.

Some of the AFCC members involved in my case are:

Judge Gerard Adelman

Judge Lynda Munro

Psychologist Sidney Horowitz

Psychologist Howard Krieger

Dr. Linda S. Smith

Visitation Solutions, Inc.

Bruce Loudon Law, my divorce attorneys

Guiliano and Richardson, my former husband's attorneys

Jim Hirschfield of Cramer and Anderson, an attorney who represented me post judgment

CSSD, family relations as AFCC programs were making the policy of family relations, earmarking high conflict cases. As your investigation continues, you will see a distinct pattern of abused women and children made further victims by AFCC policies to garner more federal grant

money.

There was never any disclosure by these participants of their illegal conflict of interest based on their participation in the profit-making business activities of CT Chapter of AFCC, Inc.

You can read more about my case in the following two links:

<http://communities.washingtontimes.com/neighborhood/heart-without-compromise-children-and-children-wit/2013/mar/1/immunity-guardian-ad-litem-destroys-connecticut-fa/>

<http://www.consciousbeingalliance.com/2012/05/a-life-sentence-family-courts-sacrificing-mothers-and-children-in-america/>

I'd like to demonstrate just a small handful of the illegal business practices committed by CT AFCC members under color of law in my case.

Dr. Sidney Horowitz, AFCC member and AFCC-funded GAL trainer, is currently under investigation by Aetna for fraudulent billing practices. Further Horowitz has no contract with the state thereby leaving the public unprotected by standard anti-discriminatory language in government contracts. In addition Horowitz perjured himself five times openly before the Hon. and AFCC-affiliated Munro, and this was to her knowledge as she had the record. She herself committed perjury, and later recused herself for cause.

Howard Krieger, AFCC Member, also committed insurance fraud in my case, billed me for services of co-parent coordinator. This role he charged 2500, plus 250 per session. He also billed Aetna using domestic violence codes. His fee was paid. A description of parent coordinator is "to handle all disputes immediately" what cannot be mediated is referred to court. Also during this time, Krieger performed illegal psychological evaluations on both parties; Krieger did not respond to my many pleas for a year to basic safety issues. This is in stark contrast of the contract he drew services. Although Krieger has a contract with the state, he never signed the anti-discriminatory portion of his contract, thus rendering my children and me unprotected.

Suspect appointment of GAL Mary Brigham was over strenuous objection. In fact there is no appointment on record. Brigham also demanded that my children use another AFCC affiliated therapist, Linda Smith after Horowitz recused himself from the case.

In February 2012, Jim Hirshfield, my attorney, did not represent me in the requests I made, in fact placed me in harm: allowing Brigham and Plaintiff's attorney to argue for my incarceration because of my inability to pay Brigham's fees, ordered to liquidate my federally-protected retirement account to pay her fees- (she was not appointed and had no right to such action) Hirshfield promoted my case to the bench of Lynda Munro without the criteria for such a referral, and Munro herself ignored her own standing orders in my case.

AFCC-trained Brigham claims to have billed over 107K, 70K post-judgment. No record of fees or an affidavit of fees was filed before Munro, Brigham, CT AFCC Member was not appointed. Therefore Horowitz Connecticut AFCCmember had no consent to speak to Brigham. The trial eventually severed all contact with my children and they with their mother, other siblings and extended family. I have not seen or heard from my children for over 7 months. Munro, CT AFCC member, ordered Brigham's fees based on her testimony alone. This violates federal law on debt collection and fair trade.

Family Relations in Waterbury Superior Court: did not follow protocol for restraining order, Laurie Anton did not follow orders May 23, 2011 from another non AFCC judge to suspend father's visitation for the safety of the children. Laurie Anton was assigned to perform custody study in December 2011. Laurie Anton's cousin was handling my former husband's criminal case for which he is on probation. Further, Anton spoke with both Horowitz and Krieger, though they had recused.

Horowitz and Krieger both recused themselves from my case on or about March 23, 2012 after I asked for billing and records, which are currently under investigation for fraud. It was represented in court that I was threatening them. I suppose asking for records for illegal activity could be perceived as a threat.

There were many referrals to AFCC or profit driven professionals such as Visitation Solutions, where I was only allowed to purchase 3 hours a month at \$150 per for therapeutic visitation services without an evaluation, diagnosis or other standard protocols to adjudicate therapy. Also, in order to see my children, again I was order to see Harry Adamakos Ph.D. who also serves a AFCC-trained GAL in many cases similar to mine, an hour from my home at \$175 per hour. Again, Munro's order is illegal in this instance as well. She was unable to articulate this as no statute provides for a federally illegal act in which she has no subject matter jurisdiction. I petitioned the court to have another, even more qualified non-AFCC supervisor for visitation, but was denied by AFCC-member Munro.

My case follows the same patterns as many other CT family cases, which ultimately put children in the custody of violent fathers. It is interesting that AFCC members procure fatherhood access and visitation grants, which pay the state commensurate to the amount of time that fathers have access to their children, and mothers don't.

Based on the requirements of these grants, AFCC-member psychologists recommend placing children in danger with violent men. AFCC-member judges order these profitable evaluations and the custody of children to violent male parents. They then order the constant involvement of AFCC-member treaters, who bill the state and CT families for fabricated diagnoses, to "treat" the damaged children.

It shocks the conscience that these same AFCC members are in positions to regulate and oversee their own organization's practices, and to field all complaints of their racketeering by captive consumers.

It is also a discriminatory practice, in violation of Title IX, as women over 21 are unable to access any grant money to assist them in access and visitation, yet fathers have hundreds of millions to access.

The trauma I have suffered at the hands of AFCC business operations, under the color of law, in the state of CT has left me disabled with severe PTSD.

Other national organizations exist that protect children in family court such as National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. Other such entities are unable to do business as the AFCC has created a monopoly of this market and franchised this section of the judiciary within their monopoly. As the directors of AFCC also decide which programing and trainings they use the organization violates anti-trust laws.

Again, this entity claims to be a non-profit in its recent filings; however has acted without certification or license by the state for thirty years. During the time this illegal enterprise operated, it significantly harmed me and my children, and the harm continues.

During this time of their illegal enterprise tax fraud occurred as no filings occurred. Also, per tax code, AFCC by its activity is precluded from a non-profit status, yet does so to procure federal funding.

Your office, as well as the offices CC'd on this letter and to whom it is forwarded have an ethical, moral and contractual obligation to investigate business practices that are illegal by violating civil rights, fair trade, and consumer and debt collection laws. Also allowing these practices to continue violates implicates state and federal statutes to the harm of abused women and children. AFCC members appointed to my case have not afforded equal protection to my children and me as they have not signed contracts with the state that hold them to regulation and prevent their discriminatory and harmful practices. Thank you for your time and attention to this serious matter.

Susan Skipp

Fill out the attached Consent for Release of Medical Records.

Sign and date below. Signature must be notarized.

\_\_\_\_\_ Dated      this day of    20

Petitioner's Signature

Signed and sworn before me this day    of 20 .

\_\_\_\_\_

Notary Public Commissioner of Superior Court

Department of Public Health

Petition Form 4

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

CONSENT FOR RELEASE OF MEDICAL RECORDS

Petition No.

Birth Date: 08/08/2000\_\_ Gabrielle Anderson Tittle\_\_\_\_\_

Patient's Address: \_\_c/o Susan Skipp PO Box 1383 Litchfield Connecticut 06759

This is to certify that I hereby give my consent to, and authorize:

Connecticut Resource Group LLC

to release a copy of all information and medical records in their possession, including psychiatric, psychological,

alcohol and/or drug related treatment records consisting of but not limited to the following:

1. Presence in treatment (dates of admission and discharge).
2. Diagnosis, brief description of progress and prognosis.
3. Medical history and physical.
4. Intake sheet.
5. Psychosocial assessment.
6. Treatment plan.
7. Discharge summary.
8. Aftercare plan.Of Gabrielle Tittle

9. Complete billing records and insurance billings if applicable

to the Practitioner Licensing and Investigations Section, of the State of Connecticut Department of Public Health, 410

Capitol Avenue, MS# 12HSR, P.O. Box 340308, Hartford, CT 06134-0308. This information is to be used in connection

with any investigation or hearing conducted by the Department of Public Health in accordance with Connecticut General

Statutes §19a-14(a)(10) and (11). I understand that I may revoke this consent at any time by notifying the above authorized

person in writing, except to the extent that action has been taken in reliance on my consent. I understand that the medical

record to be released may contain information pertaining to psychiatric, drug and/or alcohol abuse diagnosis and treatment,

and may also contain confidential HIV (AIDS) related information. Please honor a mechanically reproduced copy of this

release. This authorization expires one year from the date of the last signature.

---

Signature of Patient or Legal Representative Date Signed

mother

Relationship to Patient

---

Signature of Witness Date Signed

Department of Public Health

Petition Form 4

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

CONSENT FOR RELEASE OF MEDICAL RECORDS

Petition No.

Birth Date: 09/04/2002\_\_\_\_Wyatt Tittle\_\_\_\_\_

Patient's Address: \_\_c/o Susan Skipp PO Box 1383 Litchfield Ct. 06759

This is to certify that I hereby give my consent to, and authorize:

Connecticut Resource Group LLC

to release a copy of all information and medical records in their possession, including psychiatric, psychological,

alcohol and/or drug related treatment records consisting of but not limited to the following:

1. Presence in treatment (dates of admission and discharge).
2. Diagnosis, brief description of progress and prognosis.
3. Medical history and physical.
4. Intake sheet.
5. Psychosocial assessment.
6. Treatment plan.
7. Discharge summary.
8. Aftercare plan.Of Wyatt Tittle



9. Complete billing records and insurance billings if applicable

to the Practitioner Licensing and Investigations Section, of the State of Connecticut Department of Public Health, 410

Capitol Avenue, MS# 12HSR, P.O. Box 340308, Hartford, CT 06134-0308. This information is to be used in connection

with any investigation or hearing conducted by the Department of Public Health in accordance with Connecticut General

Statutes §19a-14(a)(10) and (11). I understand that I may revoke this consent at any time by notifying the above authorized

person in writing, except to the extent that action has been taken in reliance on my consent. I understand that the medical

record to be released may contain information pertaining to psychiatric, drug and/or alcohol abuse diagnosis and treatment,

and may also contain confidential HIV (AIDS) related information. Please honor a mechanically reproduced copy of this

release. This authorization expires one year from the date of the last signature.

---

Signature of Patient or Legal Representative Date Signed

Mother

Relationship to Patient

---

Signature of Witness Date Signed

**Conclusion:**

I have taken the time to gather and write this report because of the grave concerns I have regarding the conduct of your member, Dr. Sidney Horowitz. My experiences with him have caused considerable harm to my children and myself. Although there were other people involved in this destruction, I am primarily addressing Dr. Horowitz in this report. At this point, I am uncertain that the damage done can be fixed.

I am also concerned for the future patients that Dr. Horowitz may served. During the course of my research, I have learned that there is a definite pattern to Dr. Horowitz's behavior. These patterns are briefly outlined in the article exerpts that I included above. Horowitz violates HIPAA.

My belief is that Dr. Horowitz's apparent conviction that issues such as domestic violence, substance abuse, and criminal histories should have no consideration in the course of custody litigation set dangerous standards that are likely to place many more women and children in situations of grave physical and psychological danger. My belief has been solidified since reading multiple studies (many authored by APA professionals) that site these factors as MAJOR risk factors and predictors of mental illness in children. As I'm sure you are aware, these issues often times carry into adulthood.

I hope that you will thoroughly investigate my concerns and the issues presented in this report. Please feel free to contact me if you have any other questions or require additional documentation.

Thank You,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Susan Skipp", enclosed within a rectangular border.

Susan Skipp