

**The Center for Trauma Free Living
64 Gleneida Avenue
Carmel, NY 10512
845-225-6704**

Case Name: Kassenoff

Date: August 25, 2022

Treatment Summary/Update

This writer has been providing therapeutic visitation services to this mother and her three daughters since March of 2022. Prior reports detail the progression from zoom visitation to in-person visitation and also has included a standing recommendation to move forward to "sandwich" /unsupervised monitored visits which has not been approved. There have been issues in the three therapeutically visits that occurred since the last report was written less than two weeks ago. These have continued the issues noted in the last report which all began in early August. It is interesting to note that these observable changes began around the time that a CPS report was made and the girls began to have contact/speak about meeting with the forensic evaluator.

At that point both of the younger girls began to bring in electronics and now it has become clear that one or both girls began to either record or attempt to record parts of the visits. Mr. Kassenoff has been adamant that he will not abide by my request that electronics not be brought out of the car into the visits. The girls and their nanny have been clear that they have been told by their father or "employer" that it is the girls choice. This issue of choice has been discussed by this writer previously. I do not believe children of this age are developmentally ready to make choices about relationships with parents, access schedules, or abiding by rules about electronics. Adults need to make such decisions and it is the custodial parent's responsibility and duty to have children abide by such basic requests as to leave the electronics outside.

On August 2nd I was informed by Mr. Kassenoff that the girls had told their nanny that I attempted to enter the bathroom when they were inside. He did not want to schedule a call to discuss this any further. Now Mr. Kassenoff informs this writer that he has been told by his attorney that he should not communicate with this writer other than via email. It is unfortunate that this clinical service has become so burdensome and conflictual. This is a clinical service for the girls and shouldn't be so difficult. I am very concerned by this bathroom story as it is so far from the truth. Nothing remotely like that happened. For the kids to be making such false statements is alarming and something that needs to continue to be noted.

On August 22nd the girls were brought for a visit. Again there were issues that became much larger than they needed to be. This writer made a clinical request that Charlie come into the visit first. The Nanny refused to have that happen. I then did a joint text with the father and nanny to reiterate and minimize confusion that I would be getting Charlie first. I came downstairs to the street to find all the children and their nanny reading the adult text thread and literally Ally yelling "oh Shit she is here" and all of them jumped away from the phone. The kids then admitted to reading the texts but later said the nanny did not allow it and they read "over her shoulder" That again is simply not what happened and it is very concerning that the children continue to be dishonest in situations in what seems to be an attempt to either vilify their mother or protect their father/nanny. The nanny has been visibly rude to this writer in front of the children recently and seems to somehow involved herself in situations that are not appropriate. It is my clinical recommendation that if she can not be encouraging of the children following the rules of the visits and spending time with their mother that she not transport them to such visits. It is this writer's responsibility to make clinical decisions and recommendations on how to best conduct the visits not the responsibility of the Nanny.

More recently Charlie has spoken about this writer "working for" their mother as she "pays" me. She will quote statements from the visit reports or that she says she hears such things or has been told such things by her father. She cried in a recent visit and said "I just don't know what I am supposed to say". She has also said that her father says if I continue to say the visits go well she won't be allowed to live with him anymore and will have to live with their mother. I don't know if her statements are true but it is true she is saying them and seems to believe them. The pressure these poor children are under is tremendous. They need to be given the space and encouragement to enjoy the time with their mother, understand that following simple rules such as no electronics is not their "choice", and that the months of positive visitation was not a betrayal of their father or a choice they are making about where they live.

The scheduled visit on August 24th did not occur as the children were told that they could bring an electronic device (Charlie's phone upstairs). It is important to note that this writer was crystal clear for two days and throughout upward of 20 emails that no electronics would be allowed and again attempted to speak to Mr. Kassenoff about this to ensure that the girls would not be exposed to such confusion and conflict. The children did not come upstairs for their scheduled dinner visit and were supported in this decision by their nanny who was very rude and aggressive in her interactions. There were times when she was on the phone and had it on speaker so this writer heard a male voice speaking and there was yelling and chaos going on. JoJo was yelling

"adios" to this writer and not being directed to be respectful, which is concerning as she is a delightful third grade little girl who shouldn't be encouraged or allowed to be so disrespectful to adults.

It is important to note that there is no "compromise" or negotiation about the children bringing in electronics. They can not bring electronics into this office space/visitation going forward.

It is also important to note that anonymous reviews on unmonitored and unprofessional sites should not be used to determine a clinician's skills or expertise. Any lawyer or judge in this area could find their name being maligned by others on social media/websites/google reviews. A person's expertise should be determined by speaking to the Dutchess, Westchester, or Putnam family courts that utilize a clinician, the thirty years of experience a clinician might have, the schools and doctors and social service agencies that refer to a clinician. Unfortunately, having an expertise in and willingness to take extremely high conflict access and visitation cases means that typically one parent can become very angry and write untrue and unsubstantiated things all over the internet which they then don't have to sign. They can be written from drug treatment centers by parents angry that this writer will not allow someone who is actively using to visit with their child. It is important that such matters/random reviews not distract from what is important here. These little girls need to see their mother in a clinically supervised and consistent manner and need to have such visitation supported by all the adults around them.

Recordings are another distraction that this writer will not listen to or participate in. Any child with editing software on their phone can cut out or digitally alter any supposed "recording" and they can also carefully curate or choose snippets of time out of any sort of context. This whole issue has become a weapon or distraction that again moves the conversation away from what is important to remember. The girls need to engage in regularly scheduled and clinically supervised visits with their mother. They need to be told their are rules and expectations of behavior about electronics and behavior in visits and that they are expected to abide by such rules.

If there are any questions, or more information is needed, I can be reached at the above number.

Jennifer Culley, LCSW