


18-8809 ORIGINAL

No. _____



IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BRENDA CAMBRON — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

DEPT. OF CHILDREN + — RESPONDENT(S)
FAMILIES "ET AL"
ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA #SC 18-1987
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

BRENDA CAMBRON
(Your Name)

3341 OAK HILL RD
(Address)

MOUNT DORA, FL 32757
(City, State, Zip Code)

(352) 210-6256
(Phone Number)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

DID THE COURT BELOW COMMIT AN ERROR SO IMPORTANT THAT IT MUST BE CORRECTED IMMEDIATELY?

AS LAW AND FACTS SHOULD COMPELL JUDGES. THE DAMAGING ERROR OF THE COURTS DECISION ULTIMATELY HAS LEFT THE CHILDREN THINKING THEY ARE ABANDONED BY FAMILY. WITH TOTAL ISOLATION FROM ANY RELATIVE FOR 1 1/2 YEARS. 3 YEARS IN STATE CUSTODY WHILE THEIR BROTHER HAWK CAMBROW MD. HAS BEEN CERTIFIED FOR ADOPTING THE CHILDREN IN LOUISIANA. TO AVOID THE CONTINUED ENDANGERMENT OF THE CHILDREN, THEY SHOULD BE RELEASED TO THEIR BROTHER WHILE COURT MATTERS ARE PENDING.

THE DCF HAS TO SHOW BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE TO THE GROUND OF CASE PLAN COMPLIANCE. THE DEPARTMENT FAILED TO DO THIS. THERE WAS NO EVIDENCE THAT THE CHILDREN SUFFERED HARM, INJURY OR PHYSICAL, MENTAL OR EMOTIONAL HARM BY THE PARENTS.

QUESTIONS

WILL THIS COURT ALLOW A
DISTRAUGHT MOTHER TO FILE
THIS WRIT OF CERTIORARI THAT MOST
LIKELY NOT CORRECT ACCORDING
TO THE FILING STANDARD?

THE IMPORTANCE TO THESE CHILDREN
AND TO OTHER CHILDREN TO BE IN A
SAFE AND LOVING HOME SHOULD BE
THE FOCUS OF GRANTING THE PETITION.

LET US LOOK AT THE TRUTH +
FACT. THERE ARE DRASTIC CHANGES
THAT NEED TO BE MADE TO: DCF
LAW ENFORCEMENT, D.O.J.

THIS IS SOMETHING THIS COURT
HAS THE ABILITY TO DO. THESE AGENCIES
THAT ARE IN A POSITION OF PUBLIC TRUST
WILL CONTINUE TO BREAK THE LAW
IF THIS IS NOT ADDRESSED IMMEDIATELY.

THIS CASE PRESENTS ISSUES OF
IMPORTANCE BEYOND PARTICULAR FACTS
AND PARTIES INVOLVED.

QUESTIONS

WAS A FALSE FUSION EXCHANGE INTELLIGENCE BULLETIN, SLANDERING THE PARENTS USED TO INFLUENCE A COURT PROCEEDING?

THE ALERT CODES THAT POLICE OFFICERS KEEP ON AMERICANS THAT HAVE THAT MAY HAVE NO CRIMINAL RECORD,

CLEARLY HAS CAUSED AN HYSTERIA IN THE LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMUNITY WHILE USING IT TO ATTACK AMERICAN FAMILIES. IT IS UNLAWFUL FOR DISSEMINATION TO ANY OTHER PERSON OTHER THAN LAW ENFORCEMENT.

THE JUDGES THAT MADE DECISIONS ON THESE CASES WERE INFLUENCED BY A BULLETIN THIS IS A FELONY

QUESTIONS

DID THE DISTRICT COURT ERROR SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE THE PROBABILITY OF THE CHILDREN BEING HARMED?

TO TERMINATE THE RIGHTS OF PARENTS WHO HAVE HOMESCHOOLED 3 OF THEIR 5 CHILDREN TO BE DOCTORS GRADUATING THE TOP OF THEIR CLASS IS A CLEAR ERROR. THEIR CHILDHOOD NOW GONE, AS WELL AS THEIR HAPPY LUXURIOUS HOME.

NOW TREATED WORSE THAN PRISONERS FROM THE FIRST DAY DCF ALONG WITH CROOKED SHERIFF + HIS DEPUTIES THAT THREATENED THE CHILDREN TO OPEN THE DOOR OR THEY WOULD BUST IT IN. SLAMMING CHILD'S LAPTOP SHUT, CHILDREN CRYING, AND STRIPPED NAKED. THEN ABDUCTED. TRAUMATICALLY TAKEN AND SEPERATED FROM EACH OTHER.

THE HARM THE CHILDREN REPORTED + WAS RECORDED IN CUSTODY OF THE DEPT, WAS NOT ADDRESSED AT ALL THROUGHOUT THE CASE OR AT TRIAL.

PHYSICAL AS WELL AS MENTAL ABUSE + DANGEROUS LIVING CONDITIONS WITH STRANGERS...

QUESTIONS

REPORTS OF A MAN IN THE BEDROOM OF
AN AUTISTIC GIRL, REPORTS FROM BOY
BEING PUNCHED ON THE BUS.

SHOWING THE PARENTS BLOODY FOOT
WITH DIRTY WET SOCKS BEING MADE TO
SLEEP IN THEIR OWN VOMIT. SCRATCHES,
BRUISES, BURNS, HAIR PULLED OUT. THIS ON
VISITATION RECORDINGS.

ANY REASONABLE PERSON WOULD KNOW
A CHILD SHOULD NOT BE PUT IN A
NEGLECTED PLACEMENT. WHEN RELATIVES
ARE AVAILABLE TO TAKE THE CHILDREN
ON APRIL 5, 2016 THE CHILDRENS
BROTHER WAS AT COURT PREPARED TO
TAKE THE CHILDREN INTO HIS CARE,
THOUGH THEY WOULDN'T ALLOW HIM TO
EVEN SEE THE CHILDREN.

QUESTIONS

WILL THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, ALLOW AN INJUNCTION TO RELEASE THE CHILDREN FROM STATE CUSTODY (SAVE THE CHILDREN)?

BECAUSE OF THE OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE OF PERMANENT DAMAGES TO THE CHILDRENS WELL BEING. THE MANY VIOLATIONS OF THE LAW WHEN TAKING + KEEPING THE CHILDREN. NO REASONABLE PERSON WOULD BELIEVE THE CONDITIONS THE CHILDREN ARE BEING FORCED TO LIVE IN WOULD BE IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE CHILDREN.

TO LOOK AT THE HISTORY OF THE PARENTS, EVEN BEFORE THIS CASE. RECORD WOULD SHOW, PARENTS HAVE HAD A CONSTANT CONCERN FOR THE CHILDRENS WELL BEING. THIS EXTENDS TO LOVE AND CONCERN FOR PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY. ADVISING HOW TO HELP SAVE LIVES. IS CRITISIM OF PUBLIC SERVANTS A CRIME? NO BUT ABDUCTING AND HARMING CHILDREN IS,

QUESTIONS

WAS A FALSE FUSION EXCHANGE INTELLIGENCE BULLETIN, SLANDERING THE PARENTS USED TO INFLUENCE A COURT PROCEEDING?

THE ALERT CODES THAT POLICE OFFICERS KEEP ON AMERICANS THAT HAVE THAT MAY HAVE NO CRIMINAL RECORD,

CLEARLY HAS CAUSED AN HYSTERIA IN THE LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMUNITY WHILE USING IT TO ATTACK AMERICAN FAMILIES. IT IS UNLAWFUL FOR DISSEMINATION TO ANY OTHER PERSON OTHER THAN LAW ENFORCEMENT.

THE JUDGES THAT MADE DECISIONS ON THESE CASES WERE INFLUENCED BY A BULLETIN THIS IS A FELONY

LIST OF PARTIES

☐ All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

☒ All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

CHRISTOPHER CAMBROW, FATHER
3341 OAK HILL RD
MOUNT DORA FL 32757
SC AND C.C. MINOR CHILDREN

RESPONDENTS,

- 1) WARD METZGER, ESQ. CHILDRENS LEGAL SERVICES
921 N DAVIS ST. BLDG B SUITE 360
JACKSONVILLE FL 32209
- 2) DAVID KRUPSKI ESQ, GUARDIAN AL
101 ESLINGER WAY SUITE 3238
SANFORD FL 32773
- 3) DIXIE COUNTY SHERIFF DEWEY HATCHER + DEPT.
P.O. BOX 470
CROSS CITY FL. 32628

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A *NO. 1D18-485*

APPENDIX B *CASE 15-2016-DP-0006*

APPENDIX C *SC 18-1987*

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
M.A. V. DCF, 866 SO. 2d, 220, FIRST DCA 2004	8, 10, 17, 20, 21
CC-V- DCF SERVICES 812 SO. 2d. 520, FLORIDA FIRST DCA, 2002.	19
IN Re. C.W.W. 788 SO. 2d 1020, FL 2ND DCA, 2001	20
F.L.-V- DCF SERVICES, 849 SO. 2d 1114, FLORIDA, 4 th DCA, 2003	20
H.D. V. DEPT OF CHILDREN + FAMILIES SERV. 993 SO. 2d. 1071 (FLA. 1 st DCA 2008)	24

STATUTES AND RULES

§ 39.806.(1)(e)	7, 16
§ 39.806 (1)(e)(3)	7, 10, 16
§ 39.806 (1)(c), FLA STAT. 2016	7, 16, 19
SUPREME COURT RULE 9.030 (a)(2)	9

OTHER

SUPREME COURT RULE 9.030 (a)(1), AND FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW FL SUPREME COURT RULE 9.030(a)(2)	18 18
N. FLORIDA FUSION EXCHANGE INTELLIGENCE BULLETIN ISSUED MARCH 20, 2015 PRODUCT # 15-03. # 875	21

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A ____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was Nov 29, 2018
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☒ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including April 28, 2019 (date) on March 5, 2019 (date) in Application No. 18 A 883.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

THE FIRST AMENDMENT

CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW RESPECTING AN ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION, OR PROHIBITING THE FREE EXERCISE THEREOF; OR ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH OR OF THE PRESS; OR THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE PEACEABLY TO ASSEMBLE AND TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES.

AMENDMENT XIV

SECTION 1. ALL PERSONS BORN OR NATURALIZED IN THE UNITED STATES, AND SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION THERE OF, ARE CITIZENS OF THE U.S. AND OF THE STATE WHEREIN THEY RESIDE. NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF THE U.S.; NOR SHALL ANY STATE DEPRIVE ANY PERSON OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW, NOR DENY TO ANY PERSON WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS.

STATEMENT OF CASE

ON APRIL 4, 2016 MINOR CHILDREN S.C. AND C.C. WERE FORCIBLY REMOVED FROM THEIR HOME. THIS WAS AFTER THE SHERIFF DEPT. POUNDED ON THE DOOR FOR AN HOUR THREATENED TO BUST THE DOOR OPEN, SLAMMED CHILD'S LAPTOP SHUT, STRIP THEM NAKED, MAKE THEM TAKE SHOWERS AND KIDNAP THEM FROM THEIR LUXURIOUS HAPPY HOME. THEY WERE BOTH PUT INTO DANGEROUS SITUATIONS, CONSTANTLY REPORTED HARM TO THEM IN THE CONTROL OF DEPARTMENT. THE CHILDREN CONTINUE TO THIS DAY TO CRY AND WANT TO BE WITH THEIR FAMILY WHO LOVE THEM. AFTER 3 YEARS OF MISTREATMENT BY THE STATE. NO LAWYER OR JUDGE ACKNOWLEDGED THE PSYCHOLOGICAL HARM AND DISTRESS THAT HAS COME TO THESE CHILDREN. THOUGH NO FAULT OF THE PARENTS, IT IS CLEAR THAT EVEN THOUGH THE DEPARTMENT BOUGHT NO EVIDENCE TO THE MANY HORRIBLE ACCUSATIONS. THE JUDGE SIGNED PETITION FROM THE DEPARTMENT TO TERMINATE THE PARENTS RIGHTS.

AS THIS DOES NOT MAKE SENSE THE
MORE WE LOOK BACK AT THIS CASE,
REALIZING, NO REASONABLE JUDGE WOULD
TERMINATE THE RIGHTS OF OUTSTANDING
PARENTS WHO HOMESCHOOLED 3 DOCTORS
WHO GRADUATED TOP OF THEIR CLASS.

WHAT DOES MAKE SENSE IS WHEN
WE RECOGNIZE THAT THE DOJ
REPORTS THAT SHOW IN 2015 THE FAMILY
COURT SYSTEM IN FLORIDA RANKS #1
IN PUBLIC CORRUPTION, PEOPLE ARE
SUFFERING IN AND BY OUR COURTS, IN-
CLUDING LAWLESSNESS IN OUR COURTS,
UNCONSTITUTIONAL, UNLAWFUL, AND ILLEGAL
DECISIONS BY JUDGES PROSECUTORS, BREACHES
OF THE CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT.
THERE IS A SERIOUS JUDICIAL BREACH OF
PUBLIC TRUST.

I REALIZE THAT THE US SUPREME
COURT IS NOT A CUSTOM TO ACCEPTING
A CASE THAT ATTEMPTS TO PUT THE
BLAME ON JUDGES, AND THEIR DECISIONS
UNDERSTAND THOUGH THE IMPORTANCE TO
THE PUBLIC OF THIS ISSUE. THE MERITS
OF THIS CASE ARE OVERWHELMING CONSIDER-
ING.

THE NATIONAL IMPACT THIS WOULD HAVE TO FAMILIES ACROSS THIS UNITED STATES. AS DEPENDANCY CASES FROM STATE TO STATE ARE NOT ABIDING BY THE CONSTITUTION. WITH DIFFERENT RULES THAT HAVE COME TO BE ACCEPTED, IN FAMILY COURT. WOULD NOT BE ACCEPTED IN A CIVIL OR CRIMINAL MANNER. FOR INSTANCE THESE DECISIONS ARE LEFT TO THE JUDGE ALONE WITH NO OPPORTUNITY FOR A JURY. THIS WILL BRING US TO THE NEXT MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE.

IF A FUSION EXCHANGE BULLETIN OR AN ALERT CODE IS USED AGAINST ITS INTENDED PURPOSE. WHICH IS: A GOAL OF MAXIMIZING LE ABILITY TO DETECT, PREVENT, INVESTIGATE AND RESPOND TO CRIMINAL AND TERRORIST ACTIVITY. THOUGH IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, IT CAN BE REALIZED THAT A LAW ENFORCEMENT INTELLIGENCE BULLETIN IS NOT INTELLIGENT AT ALL. AS THE WORDS IN THE BULLETIN HAS CAUSED A HYSTERIA. THIS AS WELL AS WELL AS ALERT CODE DISCOVERED IN 2012 THAT STATES OFFICER SAFETY *** ANTI LE + GOVT. DATED 7/23/11.

THIS, AS POLICE BODY CAM FOOTAGE
SHOWS ON YOUTUBE (LEVI SEWALL
ATTACKS NATIONAL HERO CHRISTOPHER CROMBIE)
ADDD REVEALING THAT THIS ALERT CODE
CAUSED LE TO BELIEVE SOMEONE IN OUR CAR
WITH 3 CHILDREN WAS A TERRORIST 7/8/12. STATING
CLEARLY HE HAS A TERRORIST HIT ON HIM. THIS
ATTACK ON FAMILY A YEAR AFTER NOTE
OF CONSPIRACY WAS DATED. THIS BEING THE
REASON THE WHOLE FAMILY WAS TORTURED
ON THE ROAD SIDE.

THIS IS RELEVANT TO THE FACT THAT
MAINE STATE POLICE PROVIDED THE INFORM-
ATION TO DIXIE CO. POLICE IN THE FORM
OF THE FLORIDA FUSION EXCHANGE LE SENS-
ITIVE BULLETIN, WITH THE INTENT TO
HARM. THIS SLANDER CREATING A TARGET
ON OUR BACK.

AS WELL AS SECURITY MEASURE ORDER-
ED BY JUDGE ELLISON 4/15/16 DURING
DEPENDENCY CASE 15-2016-DP-0006

ALL THESE NOTES OF CONSPIRACY
VIOLATE FEDERAL AND STATE LAW TO
BE TREATED EQUALLY UNDER THE
LAW. ANY ONE BELIEVING A FILM ON

MAINE

BANGOR DISTRICT COURT

THE FIRST WE BECAME AWARE
ON A CONSPIRATORIAL NOTE AGAINST
US WAS JAN. 2013 THIS NOTE DATED
JULY 23, 2011. THIS WAS IN THE
DISCOVERIES WE OBTAINED WHEN WE
ENDED UP IN COURT IN BANGOR ME. FOR AN
EXCHANGE OF A VIDEO CAMERA AT WALMART
GONE WRONG.

AFTER WE SAW THIS NOTE AND RE-
VIEWED FOOTAGE FROM THE INCIDENT
WHEN WE WERE PULLED OVER BY BREWER,
MAINE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

UNDERSTANDING NOW THAT THE
OFFICER BELIEVED FROM THIS NOTE
OF CONSPIRACY THAT WE WERE TERROR-
IST. WHICH WAS THE REASON THE
WHOLE FAMILY WAS TORTURED ON
THE ROAD SIDE. CHRIS CAMBRON PUT
IN AN ILLEGAL CHOKE HOLD, POUNCED
ON HIS BACK BY POLICE. TWISTING
BRENDA CAMBRON'S WRIST. CHILDREN
WITH HANDS UP IN HOT CAR FOR HOURS
NOT ALLOWING THE WINDOWS TO BE
ROLLED DOWN. THIS INCIDENT
JULY 8, 2012.

Drivers License Type:
Driver License Class
Seq Class Description
1.C Class C

Miscellaneous comments:

OFFICER SAFETY*** ANTI LE & GOVT all Calls For Service 10-90 and any LE response should be two officers with the second officer being discrete so as not to give away our posture with them.

reaffirmed with D/S Goodspeed Sat Jul 23 12:14:45 EDT 2011 (twh)

BANGOR MAINE DISTRICT COURT

BRENDA CAMBRON CR-12-3170

CHRISTOPHER CAMBRON CR-12-2823

THIS, AS POLICE BODY CAM FOOTAGE
SHOWS ON YOUTUBE (LEVI SEWALL
ATTACKS NATIONAL HERO CHRISTOPHER CAMBROW)
AUDIO REVEALING THAT THIS ALERT CODE
CAUSED LE TO BELIEVE SOMEONE IN OUR CAR
WITH 3 CHILDREN WAS A TERRORIST 7/8/12. STATING
CLEARLY HE HAS A TERRORIST HIT ON HIM. THIS
ATTACK ON FAMILY A YEAR AFTER NOTE
OF CONSPIRACY WAS DATED. THIS BEING THE
REASON THE WHOLE FAMILY WAS TORTURED
ON THE ROAD SIDE.

THIS IS RELEVANT TO THE FACT THAT
MAINE STATE POLICE PROVIDED THE INFORM-
ATION TO DIXIE CO. POLICE IN THE FORM
OF THE FLORIDA FUSION EXCHANGE LE SENS-
ITIVE BULLETIN, WITH THE INTENT TO
HARM. THIS SLANDER CREATING A TARGET
ON OUR BACK.

AS WELL AS SECURITY MEASURES ORDER-
ED BY JUDGE ELLISON 4/15/16 DURING
DEPENDENCY CASE 15-2016-DP-0006

ALL THESE NOTES OF CONSPIRACY
VIOLATE FEDERAL AND STATE LAW TO
BE TREATED EQUALLY UNDER THE
LAW.

STATEMENT OF CASE AND FACTS

BC SUBMITS THIS APPEAL ON THE AFFIRMED DECISION OF THE FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL, STATE OF FLORIDA DATED: OCT 15, 2018 BY: ROWE, BILBERY, AND WINDSOR, J.T. ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR REHEARING DATED NOV 15, 2018

THE APPELLATE COURT RULED AGAINST PETITIONER, B.C. MOTHER OF S.O. AND C.C. AFFIRMING THE DECISION OF THE LOWER TRIBUNAL CASE # 15-2016-0006 DP. CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR DIXIE CO. GRANTING FAVOR OF TERMINATING THE PARENTAL RIGHTS OF MOTHER, B.C. AS PETITIONED BY D.C.F. AND G.A.L.

THE DEPARTMENT FILED A PETITION FOR T.P.R. ON SEPT 18, 2017 ALLEGING § 39.806 (1)(e)(1), § 39.806 (1)(e)(3) AND § 39.806 (1)(c), FLA STAT. 2016. (R 1006-1035)

THE TERMINATION OF PARENTAL RIGHTS ADJUDICATORY HEARING OCCURED ON DEC 8, 2017 AND DECEMBER 11, 2017. A FINAL JUDGEMENT WAS RENDERED ON JAN 4, 2018. (R 1231-1245)

DURING TRIAL AND THROUGH OUT THIS CASE THE DEPT. FAILED TO PROVE WITH CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT TERMINATION IS THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE MEANS OF PROTECTING THE CHILDREN FROM SERIOUS HARM.

THE PARENTS MARRIED 36 YEARS HAVE PRODUCED 3 DOCTORS. THIS SHOWS ARE METHOD OF HOMESCHOOLING AND RAISING CHILDREN, A 300 % SUCCESS RATE: B.C. + C.C. ABILITY TO RAISE CHILDREN IS UNMATCHED ACROSS THE COUNTRY, MOST LIKELY BEYOND. THIS IS A PROVEN FACT. THERE IS LIVING PROOF OF THIS. AS ALSO, THE REGISTRATION CERTIFYING THE CHILDREN AND PARENTS COMPLIED WITH THE RULES WITH D.O.E., SUPERINTENDANT RAINES IN CROSS CITY. THIS PAPER PROVIDED TO 1ST D.C.A.

IT IS ALSO A FACT, D.C.F HAS NOT PROVEN (NO EVIDENCE) THE MOTHER ENGAGED IN A CONTINUED COURSE OF CONDUCT THAT WOULD ENDANGER OR HARM OR THREATEN THE LIFE OF HER CHILDREN (T 112). CITE TO: M.H.V. DCF, 866 SO 2d 220, FIRST DCA 2004.

THE DEPARTMENT NO CLEAR REASON WHY THEY TOOK AND KEEP THE CHILDREN IN THEIR CUSTODY

MOTHER WAS DENIED HER FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS. THE DECISION, OF JUDGE SLAUGHTER IN THE LOWER TRIBUNAL, AND THE FIRST D.C.A FUNDAMENTALLY DESTROYED THE FAIRNESS OF THE WHOLE CASE. NO REASONABLE JUDGE WOULD HAVE MADE THIS SAME DECISION UNDER LAW AND FACTS. IT IS AN UNLAWFUL DECISION THAT BRINGS HARM TO CHILDREN. TO TAKE CHILDREN FROM A HAPPY FAMILY HOME, TO BE PUT IN A HIGH CRIME AREA, WITH STRANGERS TO TERMINATE PARENTS RIGHTS LACKS LEGAL SUFFICIENCY AND IS GREATLY UNSOUND, COMPLETELY UNREASONABLE.

CITE: SUPREME COURT RULE 9.030 (a)(2). TPR IS NOT SUPPORTED BY COMPETENT, SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE. THE OBVIOUS INCONSISTANCIES IN THE DCF'S CASE SHOULD HAVE RENDERED A DECISION IN THE MOTHER, FATHERS FAVOR. DCF BROUGHT NO EVIDENCE TO SUBSTATIATE THEIR ALLEGATIONS. THE COURT ERRED WHEN TERMINATING PARENTS RIGHTS

ARGUMENT

THE DEPARTMENT FAILED TO PROVE BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT B.C. FAILED TO SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLY WITH HER CASE PLAN WITHIN A 12-MONTH PERIOD. THERE WAS NO CREDIBLE TESTIMONY SHOWN THAT B.C. FAILED TO IMPROVE AFTER HER PARTICIPATION IN THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT.

THERE IS NO CREDIBLE EVIDENCE THAT THE CHILDREN WOULD BE AT RISK IF RETURNED TO THEIR MOTHER.

THE CASE AND LAW IS CLEAR, UNDER MH V. DCF 866, SO. 2d 220 (FLA. 1ST DCA 2004) TO TERMINATE PARENTAL RIGHTS PURSUANT TO 39.806 (1)(C) 3 SEQUENTIAL EVIDENTIARY REQUIREMENTS MUST BE MET:

1) TRIAL COURT MUST FIND THAT THE CHILDRENS HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELL BEING WOULD BE THREATENED BY CONTINUED INTERACTION WITH THE PARENT REGARDLESS OF THE PROVISION OF SERVICES, AND THAT ANY PROVISION OF SERVICES WOULD BE FUTILE OR THAT CHILDREN WOULD BE THREATENED WITH

HARM DESPITE ANY SERVICES PROVIDED TO THE PARENT

2) IF THE COURT FINDS THE CHILDREN WOULD BE THREATENED WITH HARM, DESPITE PROVISION OF SERVICES DEPT. MUST PROVE THERE IS NO REASONABLE BASIS TO BELIEVE THE PARENT WILL IMPROVE

3) THE DEPT. MUST SHOW TERMINATION IS THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE MEANS OF PROTECTING THE CHILDREN FROM SERIOUS HARM.

THE DEPARTMENT FAILED TO SHOW BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT S.C. AND C.C. WOULD BE THREATENED BY CONTINUED INTERACTION WITH THEIR MOTHER

HOWEVER, THE MOTHER HAS SHOWN BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT THE TRIAL COURT ERRED, WHEN TERMINATING MOTHERS RIGHTS. THE FIRST D.C.A. ALSO ERRED IN THEIR OPINION TO CONFIRM TRIAL COURTS DECISION. THE DCF HAS DOZENS OF INCONSISTANCIES IN THEIR PETITION, WHICH B.C. HAS STATED AND WELL AS

COUNSEL TIME AND TIME AGAIN. THIS IS CLEAR TO ANY REASONABLE PERSON OR JUDGE. THE DEPARTMENT WITNESS'S ARE NOT CREDIBLE. THE WITNESS'S HAVE NO CARE OR CONCERN FOR THE CHILDREN OR WHAT IS BEST FOR THEM. S.C AND C.C. HAVE SUFFERED IRREVERSABLE DAMAGES.

IF THIS SUPREME COURT LACKS JURISDICTION TO REVIEW AN UNELABORATED DECISION FROM A DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL THAT IS ISSUED WITHOUT OPINION OR EXPLANATION OR THAT MERELY CITES TO AN AUTHORITY... IT IS THEN B.C.'S OPINION THAT THE SYSTEM ITSELF IS FLAWED AND COMPLETELY UNJUST. ARE THE HIGHER COURTS LACKING JURISDICTION BECAUSE THIS IS A DEPENDANCY CASE? IF SO, B.C. WOULD NO CHANCE OF A FAVORABLE DECISION. THIS IS UNFORTUNATE, FOR THE CHILDREN ESPECIALLY. IN THIS CASE IT IS OBVIOUS THERE SHOULD BE CHANGES TO THE FAMILY COURT SYSTEM. A PARENT MAY HAVE A GRIEVANCE WITH DCF OR WITH LOWER TRIBUNAL THE SYSTEM THE WAY IT IS DOES NOT ALLOW ANY GRIEVANCE, CONCERN, OR EVEN THE PARENTS DEFENSE. BE APART OF THE RECORD AT ALL. AS SEEN, DIXIE CO COURT ONLY CONSID-

ERED THE DEPARTMENTS PETITIONS. THIS ONE SIDED SYSTEM. TREATING FAMILIES AS JUST A CASE NUMBER, NOT AS A HUMAN BEING. NO REASONABLE JUDGE WOULD HAVE SIGNED THIS DEPARTMENTS DECISION TO TERMINATE PARENTAL RIGHTS. IF THEY CAREFULLY REVIEWED THE DEFENSE ON THIS CASE.

THIS IS THE TIME WHICH IS LONG OVER DUE THIS SUPREME COURT TO MAKE NECESSARY CHANGES. IT IS OF GREAT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE.

THIS CASE COULD BE OVERTURNED AND SET AS AN EXAMPLE: TO DCF AND FLORIDA FAMILY COURT SYSTEM AND THE STATE. THIS DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES IS NOT ABOVE THE LAW, THEY CAN'T CONTINUE TO PURSUE THEMSELVES IN A COURT OF LAW. NO LONGER ALLOW THIS DEPARTMENT TO POLICE THEMSELVES.

AS IT IS NOW DCF REALIZES HOW EASY IT IS TO MANIPULATE THE COURTS INTO DOING EXACTLY WHAT THEY WANT. ALONG WITH PROVIDERS WHO'S MAJORITY OF CLIENTS ARE THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT.

THIS IS A BREAK DOWN OF A JUST COURT SYSTEM, THAT WOULD ALLOW CHILDREN

TO SUFFER. AMERICAN CHILDREN WHO HAVE DONE NOTHING WRONG. IN TIME BEING CONDITIONED BY THE DEPARTMENT THAT IS HOLDING THEM CAPTIVE. TELLING THEM THAT THEIR PARENTS ARE HORRIBLE PEOPLE, PARENTS ARE THE ENEMY, CONTINUED TO ISOLATE THESE CHILDREN FROM FAMILY. TREATING THEM WORSE THAN PRISONERS.

THERE IS A PRIVILEGE AND HONOR THAT THE LORD GOD HAS GIVEN ME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO COME BEFORE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THIS UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

THIS CASE OF URGENCY OF NATIONAL PUBLIC IMPORTANCE. CHILDREN

THE CLEAR ERROR IN THE LOWER COURTS DECISION TO LEAVE CHILDREN IN DANGER AND ISOLATED FROM FAMILY. ANY REASONABLE PERSON WOULD SEE THIS AS CRUEL AND UNLAWFUL. COURT DECISIONS SHOULD BE MADE UNDER LAW AND FACT, UNDER THE CONSTITUTION. FLORIDA COURTS ALLOWED DCF TO CONTINUE TO PRESENT TO THE COURT CASE AFTER CASE

BROUGHT BEFORE THE COURT THAT
ARE FILLED WITH FALSE UNPROVEN
ALLEGATIONS. DEPARTMENT LAWYERS DISRESPECTING JUDGES AND NOT FOLLOWING THEIR
ORDERS.

B.C. AND C.C. CONFIDED IN THEIR COUNSEL
TO BRING FORWARD TO TRIAL TRUTH +
FACTS. FATHERS COUNSEL KIM GARNER STATED
USING TRUTH + FACTS WILL NOT WORK
HERE. THE ATTORNEYS APPOINTED BY THE
COURT SAID "YOU HAVE TO PLAY THEIR GAME"

B.C. DID NOT "PLAY THE GAME" BECAUSE
THE GAME WAS TO LIE, THIS WOULD BE
PURGURY. ALL OF PARENTS MOTIONS TO
THE COURTS HAVE FACT AND TRUTH. I
DONT BELIEVE THE BEST INTEREST OF THE
CHILDREN IS A GAME. AS WE BELIEVE
THIS U.S. COURT CARES FOR THE WELL
BEING OF CHILDREN. THE CHILDREN HAVE
WAITED 3 YEARS CRYING FOR THE DEPART-
MENT TO RELEASE THEM. DCF HAS
DONE NOTHING, BUT CAUSE CONTINUED
HARM TO THE CHILDREN.

STATEMENT OF CASE AND FACTS

C.C. SUBMITS THIS APPEAL ON THE AFFIRMED
DECISION OF THE FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF AP-
PEAL, STATE OF FLORIDA DATED: AUGUST 22, 2018.

By JUDGES; ROBERTS, MAKAR, AND BILLBREY, JJ.,
CONCUR.

IN WHICH THE APPELLATE COURT RULED AGAINST
PETITIONER, C.C. FATHER OF S.C. AND C.C.

AFFIRMING THE DECISION OF THE LOWER TRIB-

UNAL CASE. # 15-2016-0006 DP. CIRCUIT COURT

FOR THE THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF THE STATE

OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR DIXIE CO.

GRANTING FAVOR OF TERMINATING THE PARENTAL

RIGHTS OF FATHER, C.C. AS PETITIONED BY D.C.F.

AND G.A.L.

THE DEPARTMENT FILED A PETITION FOR T.P.R.

ON SEPT 18, 2017 ALLEGING § 39.806(1)(e)

(1), § 39.806(1)(e)(3) AND § 39.806(1)(c),

FLA. STAT. 2016. (R 1006-10.35). THE TERM-

INATION OF PARENTAL RIGHTS ADJUDICATORY HEAR-

ING OCCURED ON DECEMBER 8, 2017 AND DECEMBER

ER 11, 2017. A FINAL JUDGMENT WAS RENDERED ON

JAN 4, 2018. (R 1231-1245)

DURING TRIAL AND THROUGH OUT THIS CASE THE DEPARTMENT FAILED TO PROVE WITH CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT TERMINATION IS THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE MEANS OF PROTECTING THE CHILDREN FROM SERIOUS HARM. THE PARENTS HAVE RAISED THREE OTHER CHILDREN WHO ALL WENT TO MEDICAL SCHOOL, ALL GRADUATED WITH HONORS, WHO ALL WENT ON TO BE DOCTORS. DCF HAS NOT PROVEN THAT THE THE FATHER ENGAGED IN A CONTINUED COURSE OF CONDUCT THAT WOULD ENDANGER OR HARM OR THREATEN THE LIFE OF HIS CHILDREN. (T 112). CITE TO: M.H. V. DCF, 866 SO. 2d 220, FIRST DCA 2004.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

FATHER WAS DENIED HIS FUNDAMENTAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT. THE DECISION, OF JUDGE SLAUGHTER IN THE LOWER TRIBUNAL AND THE FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL JUDGES, FUNDAMENTALLY DESTROYED THE FAIRNESS OF THE WHOLE CASE. NO REASONABLE JUDGE WOULD HAVE MADE THE SAME DECISION UNDER LAW AND FACTS. THE LAW AND THE CONSTITUTION SHOULD COMPEL THE JUDGES, THE DECISION TO TERMINATE FATHERS RIGHTS LACKS LEGAL SUFFICIENCY. IT IS GREATLY UNSOUND

AND COMPLETELY UNREASONABLE, CITE SUPREME COURT RULE 9.030(a)(1), AND FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW FL SUPREME COURT RULE 9.030(a)(2). THE DECISION TO TERMINATE THE FATHERS PARENTAL RIGHTS IS NOT SUPPORTED BY COMPETENT, SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE. THE DEPARTMENT FAILED TO PROVE BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT THE APPELLANT FAILED TO COMPLY WITH HIS CASE PLAN OR THAT THE CHILDREN WOULD BE ENDANGERED IF RETURNED TO THE FATHER. THE DEPARTMENT DID NOT MAKE REASONABLE EFFORTS TO ASSIST THE FATHER WITH REUNIFICATION. RECORD DOES NOT SHOW DATES REFERRALS WERE PROVIDED TO FATHER. THE CASE MANAGER COULD NOT IDENTIFY ANY DATES WHEN SHE MET OR HAD ANY CONTACT WITH FATHER. THIS LACK OF REASONABLE EFFORTS, SUPPORTS THAT THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE MEANS TEST WAS NOT MET BECAUSE THE DEPARTMENT DID NOT MAKE A GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT AT ACHIEVING REUNIFICATION. THE TRIAL COURT ERRED WHEN TERMINATING FATHERS PARENTAL RIGHTS.

ARGUMENT

IT WAS WELL SETTLED THAT PARENTS SUBSTANCE ABUSE, WHICH WAS NEVER PROVEN BECAUSE ALL DRUG SCREENS WERE NEGATIVE, STANDING ALONE IS INSUFFIG-

IENT GROUNDS UPON WHICH TO TERMINATE PAR-
ENTAL RIGHTS. THAT IS CASE? C.G.-V. DCF
SERVICES, 812 S.D. 2 d 520, FLORIDA FIRST
DCA, 2002. (T 106)

THERE IS NO SUBSTANTIAL OR COMPETENT EVI-
DENCE THAT EITHER PARENT FAILED TO MEET
THE CHILDS NEEDS WHILE IN THEIR CARE. NO EV-
IDENCE IN COURT TESTIMONY THAT S.C. AND C.C.
SUFFERED HARM, INJURY PHYSICAL, MENTAL, OR
EMOTIONAL AS A CONSEQUENCE OF C.C.'S INTER-
ACTION. DCF DID NOT PROVIDE ANY VERIFIED FIND-
INGS THAT S.C. OR C.C. (CHILDREN) THAT THERE WAS
ANY SEXUAL ABUSE. DCF DID NOT HAVE ANY EXPERT
COME TO COURT AND TESTIFY THAT THE FATHER IS VIOLENT
OR A DANGER TO SOCIETY, THE COURT, I.E., JUDGES,
PROSECUTERS OR A DANGER TO THE CHILDREN. (T 107)

FDLE WERE NOT PRESENT AT HEARING. THEIR INVEST-
IGATION WAS CLOSED AND NOTHING WAS FOUND THAT
THE FATHER HAD DONE ANYTHING WRONG, OR CRIMINAL.
(T 110) DEPARTMENT HAS NOT PROVEN THAT THE FATHER
CANNOT MAKE IMPROVEMENTS. LACK OF EVIDENCE TO SUP-
PORT A TERMINATION OF APPELLANTS RIGHTS PURSUANT
TO 39 806 SUBSECTION (1)(C) HAS EVIDENTIAL REQ-
UIRMENTS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN MET IN THIS CASE. (T 111)

IN RE C.W.W., 788 SO. 2d 1020, FL, 2nd
DCA, 2001. THE DEPARTMENT HAS NOT BEEN
ABLE TO PROVE THAT ANY PROVISION OF SERVICES
WOULD BE FUTILE OR THAT WOULD THREATEN HARM
TO THE CHILDREN. (T 111)

CASE LAW, F.L.V- DCF SERVICES, 849 SO.
2d 1114, FLORIDA, 4th DCA, 2003 THE RE-
CORD IN FATHERS CASE HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED
THAT CONDITIONS CANNOT BE IMPROVED; THERE-
FORE, PARENTAL RIGHTS CANNOT BE TERMINATED. THE
DEPARTMENT DID NOT PROVE PROSPECTIVE NEGLECT OR
ABUSE UPON THE CHILD BY THE FATHER. (T 112)

FINALLY THE DEPARTMENT MUST SHOW TERMINA-
TION IS THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE MEANS OF PROT-
ECTING THE CHILDREN FROM SERIOUS HARM. CITE
M.H. VERSUS DCF, 866 SO. 2d 220, FIRST DCA 2004,
(T 112). NO REASONABLE JUDGE WOULD HAVE T.P.R. FOR
FATHER DECIDING UNDER LAW AND FACT NO REASON-
ABLE JUDGE WOULD HAVE DENIED THE CHILDRENS FUND-
AMENTAL RIGHT TO VOICE THEIR WISHES TO THE JUDGE
OR DURING COURT HEARINGS, WHILE JUDGE BLUE WAS
PRECIDING. PETITIONER ARGUES THAT AT THREE HEAR-

INGS WHILE JUDGE ELLISON PRECDED, THE CHILDREN
RELAYED THAT THEY LOVE AND MISS THEIR PARENTS
AND EACHOTHER AND WANT TO COME HOME. IN APRIL
2017 ONE YEAR LATER THIS TRIAL JUDGE RECUSED
HERSELF, THIS JUDGE THAT WANTED MORE VISITS,
PHONE CALLS, SKYPE, SAFETY PLAN THROUGH THE DEP-
ARTMENT. HER J.A., JAIME NESSMITH STATED THIS
JUDGE RECUSED HERSELF BECAUSE "SOMEONE" WAS
TRYING TO SWAY HER DECISION ON THIS CASE SEE-
ING THAT THIS JUDGE WAS PERSUADED BY L.E. TO
ORDER A SECURITY MEASURE ON THE FATHER (R 1168)
ALTHOUGH FATHER NEVER THREATENED ANYONE AND
HAD NO CRIMINAL RECORD. THIS WAS NOT DECIDED IN A
COURT OF LAW. BASING THIS ACCUSATION ON AN ACTOR
IN A FILM. THIS CLEARLY INFLUENCED THE JUDGES
DECISION TO TERMINATE PARENTAL RIGHTS. VIOLATING
C.C.'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WHEN USING ALSO, INFORM-
ATION FROM: N. FLORIDA FUSION EXCHANGE - INTELLIGENCE
BULLETIN ISSUED MARCH 20, 2015. THIS BULLETIN TAKES
QUOTES FROM FILMS ACTING AS JOKER. AS IF, THIS IS REALITY.
PAGE 2 OF THIS UNCLASSIFIED/L.E SENSITIVE BRIEF STATES
"THE ABOVE INFORMATION DESCRIBES FIRST AMENDMENT PRO-
TECTED ACTIVITIES NFFX RECOGNIZES AMERICANS HAVE
CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS... NFFX SAFEGUARDS
THESE RIGHTS." PRODUCT #: 15-03 # 875.

Q THIS OFFICER SAFETY CONCERN BULLETIN, THE ACTIONS OF: THE DEPARTMENT, PROVIDERS, SHERIFF DEPT, IN DIXIE CO. JUDGE BLUE, FEAGLE AND JUDGE SLAUGHTER. CLEARLY SHOWS A BIAS TOWARD FATHER. CLEARLY HAVE SHOWN THEY WERE THE ONES AFRAID OF FATHER. NOT THE CHILDREN BECAUSE THE VISITATION TAPES WOULD SHOW A LOVE AND BOND BETWEEN THE CHILDREN AND THEIR FATHER. THE DEPARTMENT AND THEIR COUNSELOR EMPLOYEES FOR THE CHILDREN ARE NOT CREDIBLE TO SPEAK FOR THE CHILDREN. THE CHILDREN HAVE BEEN BE HELD CAPTIVE FOR 2 YEARS AND 5 MONTHS AGAINST THEIR WILL KEPT FROM ANY COMMUNICATION FROM FATHER FOR TWO YEARS, FROM THE ENTIRE FAMILY FOR 9 MONTHS. SIMILAR TO A CULT, SEE ATTACHED E-MAIL AS THEIR BROTHER ATTEMPTED TO TAKE CUSTODY OF THE CHILDREN ON APRIL 5, 2016. THE DEPARTMENT HAS CLEARLY NEVER INTENDED ON REUNIFICATION WITH PARENTS. DCF WISHES TO KEEP THE CHILDREN IN STATES CARE. ANY REASONABLE JUDGE WOULD SEE THIS IS NOT IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE CHILDREN. AS THE HISTORY OF THE FAMILY COURT ISSUES IN DIXIE CO., FLORIDA IS DOCUMENTED WITH MANY PROBLEMS. ITS CLERK DANA JOHNSON, REMOVED OFFICIAL COUNTY RECORDS. THIS PRESENTED IN A MEETING BEFORE A 3 JUDGE PANEL, JUDGES PARKER, GERBER AND JOHNSON, ON MARCH 21, 2015. RECIEVED INPUT

FOR THE FLORIDA SUPREME COURT. WHEREAS THERE IS OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE OF A SERIOUS JUDICIAL BREACH OF THE PUBLIC TRUST. PEOPLE ARE SUFFERING IN AND BY OUR COURTS, INCLUDING LAWLESSNESS, UNCONSTITUTIONAL, UNLAWFUL, AND ILLEGAL DECISIONS BY JUDGES AND PROSECUTORS, BREACHES OF CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT WHERE AS THE RAMPANT CORRUPTION IN OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM IS WELL DOCUMENTED IN THE REPORT BY THE U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE WHICH RANKS FLORIDA NUMBER 1 IN PUBLIC CORRUPTION.

THIS SAID, FATHER C.C. WOULD REQUEST THE FLORIDA SUPREME COURT TO QUICKLY FORWARD THIS APPEAL TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT WHERE JUSTICE MAY PREVAIL. THE CASE LAW IS CLEAR IN THE FOREGOING CASE AND UNDER MH V. DCF 866 SO, 2d 220 (FLA 1ST DCA 2004) TO TERMINATE PARENTAL RIGHTS PURSUANT TO 39.806(1) (c) 3 SEQUENTIAL EVIDENTIARY REQUIREMENTS MUST BE MET. THE DEPARTMENT FAILED TO PROVE THIS BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE SEEING TO THAT THE "LEAST RESTRICTIVE MEANS" TEST ALSO FAILS. APPELLATE COURTS HAVE OVERTURNED LOWER COURTS' RULINGS TO T.P.R. WHEN THE DEPT. HAS NOT MADE REASONABLE EFFORTS.

1ST DCA COURT HAS REVERSED A LOWER
COURTS RULING FOR T.P.R. WHEN DEPART. FAILED
TO MAKE "DILIGENT" REASONABLE EFFORTS TO ASS-
1ST PARENTS WITH ACHIEVING REUNIFICATION. H.D.
V. DEP'T OF CHILDREN+ FAMILY SERVICES, 993 SO.
2d 1071 (FLA. 1ST DCA 2008) CITING T.H. V.
DEP'T OF C+FS, 979 SO. 2d 1075, 1083 (FLA.
2nd DCA 2008).

TO CLARIFY THE KEY FACT IN THIS CASE.
CHILDREN S.C. AND C.C. WERE TAKEN FROM TH-
EIR PARENTS. THE DEPARTMENT BROUGHT NO COMPE-
TENT EVIDENCE TO TRIAL, AND MANY UNFOUNDED ALLEG-
ATIONS. PARENTS THAT HAVE BEEN MARRIED 36 1/2 YEARS
AND HAVE HOMESCHOoled 3 DOCTORS. THIS CASE IS OF
EXCEPTIONAL IMPORTANCE NOT ONLY TO C.C.'S MINOR
CHILDREN, BUT TO ALL THE CHILDREN IN THE STATE OF
FLORIDA. CHILDREN THAT HAVE BEEN IN FOSTER CARE
STATS SHOW RESULTING IN; UNEMPLOYMENT, HOME
LESS, 60% CONVICTED A CRIME, DROP OUTS, PROSTITUTION
DRUG ADDICTS. STUDY OF PARTNERS FOR OUR CHILD-
REN THAT FOLLOWED PROGRESS OF MORE THAN 600
FOSTER KIDS, AT UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON.

THIS IS OF GREAT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE. IF
THIS STATE AND COURT ARE INTERESTED IN PROTECTING
THE CHILDREN OF FLORIDA, COINCIDING WITH THE FACT THAT
THERE HAS BEEN OVER 14 SCHOOL SHOOTINGS IN FLORIDA
SINCE 2012. ON FEB 14, 2018 AT PARKLAND 17 STUDENTS
DEAD WHILE AN EX-DEPUTY STOOD OUTSIDE. BESIDES THE
MASS SHOOTER IN LAS VEGAS WAS FROM FLORIDA. NOT TO MEN-
TION THE NIGHT CLUB SHOOTING IN ORLANDO. AUG 2018
SHOOTING AT RAINE'S FOOTBALL GAME. DAYS LATER. SHOOTER
DAVID KATZ SHOTS 3 DEAD AT GAMING TOURNAMENT BOTH
IN JACKSONVILLE. THIS SHOOTER CAME FROM A BROKEN FAMILY.
MOST ATTACKERS ARE A RESULT OF INVOLVEMENT WITH THE
DEPT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES. THESE INCIDENTS OCCUR-
ING CLOSE TO WHERE THE CHILDREN ARE BEING HELD. 4
1/2 HOURS AWAY FROM EACH OTHER. OTHER PROBLEMS WITH
WHERE THE CHILDREN STAY WOULD BE HURRICANE AREAS
RIKA VIRUS FROM MOSQUITO'S, HIGH CRIME AREA'S. THROW-
ING CHILD ON BUS, CHILD C.C. REPORTS BEING PUNCHED. PUT-
TING CHILD IN DAYCARE AS A PRETEEN. WHILE FOSTER PARENT
WORKS. C.C. FATHER DEDICATED ALL OF HIS TIME TO
HIS CHILDREN. PROVEN TO BE AN EXCEPTIONAL FATH-
ER. SOMETHING IS WRONG FOR THIS DEPARTMENT TO
TAKE THE CHILDREN AWAY FROM A LOVING HOME
THE ONLY LOGICAL REASON TO KEEP THESE

CHILDREN, AND KEEP THEM FROM CONTACTING ANY FAMILY MEMBER, WOULD BE THE DEPT. AND THE JUDGES ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR MOLESTING THESE CHILDREN. THIS IS WORSE THAN THE CATHOLIC PRIEST SEXUAL MOLESTATION RING. DR. BENTON OF FAMILY MEDICINE IN CROSS CITY FL. STATED IF YOUR CHILDREN ARE IN FOSTER CARE SURELY THEY ARE BEING MOLESTED. ANY JUDGE MAKING A LOGICAL SOUND DECISION, WOULD UNDERSTAND THAT THE DEPARTMENT AND THEIR WITNESS'S ARE NOT CREDIBLE, WOULD DO WHAT'S BEST FOR THESE CHILDREN AND RETURN THEM TO THEIR PARENTS. THEY HAVE ALREADY SUFFERED IRREVERSABLE DAMAGES. CLEARLY, NO REASONABLE JUDGE WOULD HAVE MADE THE DECISION TO TERMINATE FATHERS PARENTAL RIGHTS UNDER LAW AND FACTS. IT IS OF GREAT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE FOR THIS COURT TO STEP UP AND OVERTURN THIS DECISION. HELPING THE CHILDREN OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA. CHILDREN WHO ARE VIOLENTLY TAKEN FROM THEIR FAMILIES WILL IN RETURN ACT OUT VIOLENTLY AS ADULTS. VIOLENCE BREEDS VIOLENCE. THE LOWER TRIBUNAL ERRED IN TERMINATING FATHERS RIGHTS.

INCLUDING SYNOPSIS

IT IS WITH COMPLETE MALICE
AND HATRED FOR FATHER THAT
THEY CONTINUE TO HARM CHILDREN
+ TERMINATE OUR RIGHTS.

I CAN TRULY SAY I AM COMPLETELY
OUT OF MY MIND WITH WORRY FOR THE
CHILDREN. UNFORTUNATELY NO ONE TO
HELP ME WITH PETITION. PLEASE EX-
CUSE THE INCONSISTANCIES OF PETITION
FOCUS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS
CASE TO BE ACCEPTED TO HELP OTHER
FAMILIES AS WELL RECEIVE JUSTICE IN
DEPENDANCY CASES AS WELL AS WHISTLE
BLOWER.

PSALMS 31:13

FOR I HAVE HEARD THE SLANDER OF
MANY: FEAR WAS ON EVERY SIDE: WHILE
THEY TOOK COUNSEL TOGETHER AGAINST
ME, THEY DEVISED TO TAKE AWAY MY
LIFE. 14: BUT I TRUST IN THEE O LORD:
I SAID, THOU ART MY GOD.

15 MY TIMES ARE IN THY HAND: DELIVER
ME FROM THE HAND OF MINE ENEMIES,
AND FROM THEM THAT PERSECUTE ME.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE LAW AND THE CONSTITUTION SHOULD COMPELL THE JUDGES. THIS CASE BRINGS FORTH SEVERAL MATTERS OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE.

1.) THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IS INTERESTED IN PROTECTING CHILDREN.

THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN + FAMILIES ARE IN AN ENTRUSTED POSITION TO PROTECT CHILDREN FROM VIOLENCE. THOUGH THE DCF ARE THE PEOPLE WHO SEEK TO ENTICE AND COMPROMISE OUR CHILDREN. THIS CASE PRESENTS FACTS CHILDREN THAT WERE IN A HAPPY LOVING HOME WERE TAKEN AND PUT IN TO DANGEROUS SITUATION. FAMILIES ACROSS THE COUNTRY ARE BEING ABUSED BY THEIR STATE DCF AGENCIES. WE FIND THERE IS NO AGENCY THAT OVERSEES THIS DEPARTMENT OR THAT HOLDS THEM ACCOUNTABLE. PEOPLE IN DCF ARE BREAKING THE LAW, DONOT CARE ABOUT THE CHILDREN AND WHATS BEST FOR THEM, LIE ABOUT PARENTS WITH ONLY CONCERN IS FOR THEMSELVES. THE PROBLEM OF ADOPTION TRAFFICKING, SCHEMES HAVE BEEN GOING ON SINCE TO 1800'S "FOSTER SERVITUDE" SELLABLE CHILDREN ADOPTED FOR CASH. IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT ADDRESSED BY THE HONORABLE JUDGES IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. THERE WILL BE NO FUTURE FOR AMERICAN CHILDREN.

REASONS FOR GRANTING PETITION

THIS CASE BRINGS FORTH SEVERAL MATTERS OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

- 1) FAMILIES ACROSS THIS COUNTRY ARE BEING ABUSED BY STATE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES. BEING DENIED THEIR FUNDAMENTAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT FAMILIES HAVE THEIR CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATED AND MANIPULATED BY FAMILY COURT SYSTEM. THE STANDARDS OF PROOF DO NOT EXIST IN OUR CASE AND ARE VERY LOW IN OTHER DCF CASES, LESS THAN ANY OTHER KNOWN AND ESTABLISHED LEGAL STANDARD FOR EVIDENCE. IN EACH STATE THE FIRST PROBLEM IS DCF, NO ONE OVER SEES THE AGENCY AND HOLDS THEM ACCOUNTABLE. IN SHORT IF DCF CAN TAKE CHILDREN FROM PARENTS THAT HOMESCHOOLED 3 DOCTORS IT SHOWS THE DEPARTMENT CAN DO WHAT EVER THEY WANT WITH NO BEPERCUSSIONS. THIS PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE THIS COURT IS INTERESTED IN PROTECTING CHILDREN.

CONTINUES REASONS FOR GRANTING PETITION

3)

FAMILY COURT SYSTEM ARE DENYING FAMILIES THEIR FUNDAMENTAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT. FAMILIES HAVE THEIR CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATED AND MANIPULATED BY THE FAMILY COURT SYSTEM. THE STANDARDS OF PROOF DO NOT EXIST IN THIS CASE AND ARE VERY LOW IN OTHER D.C.F. CASES, LESS THAN ANY OTHER KNOWN AND ESTABLISHED LEGAL STANDARD FOR EVIDENCE.

IF DCF CAN TAKE AND KEEP CHILDREN FROM PARENTS THAT HOMESCHOOLED 3 DOCTORS AND ISOLATE THEM FROM ALL FAMILY MEMBERS BASED ON LIES WITH NO EVIDENCE. THIS IS A SYSTEM THAT IS CORRUPTED AND IS HARMING CHILDREN FOR THEIR OWN GAIN. FLORIDA ALONE SPENDS MILLIONS TO REPAIR CHILDREN THAT ARE NEGATIVELY AFFECTED BY PARENTAL ALIENATION.

THE PUBLIC AS A WHOLE DESERVES CONSISTENCY WITHIN OUR COURTS AND IS ENTITLED TO CONFEDENCE IN THE JUDICIARY. TO ABIDE BY THE GOVERNING CONSTITUTIONAL & STATE LAWS THERE IS A URGENT

NEED FOR FAMILY COURT REFORM.

FAMILIES ARE BEING ABUSED BY
STATE CPS AND FAMILY COURTS THROUGH
OUT THE U.S. THIS MAJOR ISSUE NEEDS
TO BE ADDRESSED. JUDGES ARE LOOKING
AT SUMMARY'S NOT CASE AND FACTS

4)

THIS LEADS TO ANOTHER MATTER OF
PUBLIC IMPORTANCE, SCHOOL SHOOTINGS
IN 2018 WAS THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF
VICTIMS KILLED IN ONE YEAR. 82 INCIDENTS
REPORTED OF SCHOOL SHOOTINGS. SINCE
1970 THERE HAS BEEN 1,300 SHOOTINGS
691 OF THOSE WERE CURRENT STUDENTS.
WITH A MAJORITY OF THOSE FROM BROKEN
FAMILIES AND VICTIMS THEMSELVES OF DCF.
REALITY SHOWS A CHILD GROWING UP
IN FOSTER CARE IS MORE LIKELY TO
HAVE A LIFE OF CRIME, HARMING THEM
SELVES AND OTHERS, BESIDES OTHERS
ABUSING THEM.

57) THE SEVERE INJUSTICE THAT A COURT DID AND CAN USE FALSE INFORMATION IN THE FORM OF A SLANDERIST BULLETIN .. USED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT TO INFLUENCE A PROCEEDING.

THE GOAL OF A FUSION EXCHANGE BULLETIN AND ITS CENTER IS TO MAXIMIZE THEIR ABILITY TO DETECT, PREVENT, INVESTIGATE AND RESPOND TO CRIMINAL AND TERRORIST ACTIVITY.

IT IS UNKNOWN HOW MANY AMERICANS MAY HAVE A SECRETIVE ALERT CODE AGAINST THEM, ALTHOUGH THEY HAVE NO CRIMINAL RECORD. ACLU RESEARCH SHOWS THIS DEPT. OF HOMELAND SECURITY FEDERALLY BACKED OPERATION ENCOURAGE LAW ENFORCEMENT TO MONITOR ACTIVITIES OF POLITICAL ACTIVIST, RACIAL + RELIGIOUS MINORITIES.

BELIEVING THAT NOTE TAKING, DRAWING, COLLECTING MONEY FOR A CHARITY ARE ARE WARNING SIGNS FOR TERRORISM.

ORDER REGARDING SECURITY MEASURES. SEE ATTACHED.

THIS ORDER PUT AGAINST CHRISTOPHER IS CLEARLY UNLAWFUL NOT ESTABLISHED IN A COURT OF LAW. JUST A SENTENCE WITH NO MERIT. THE FIRST THING THAT WAS PRESENTED AT FIRST IN COURT HEARING ON CHILDRENS CASE # 2016-0006-DP SIGNED BY JUDGE JENNIFER ELLISON, NOW JOHNSON.

STATING SHE WAS MADE AWARE OF SPECIFIC THREATS BY THE FATHER TOWARD PUBLIC SERVANTS, INCLUDING JUDGES. CLEARLY THIS IMPACTED THE RESULT OF THE DEPENDANCY CASE OUR PARENTAL RIGHTS TERMINATED IN JAN 2018. WHICH AGAIN GOES BACK TO THE BULLETIN. THIS DESTROYING A PERFECTLY GOOD AMERICAN FAMILY OF PARENTS WHO HOMESCHOOLED THREE OF FIVE CHILDREN TO BE DOCTORS ALL GRADUATING WITH HONORS

THERE ARE SEVERAL CASES
ASSOCIATED WITH THIS
ALL IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
THE THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
DIXIE COUNTY FLORIDA

2015-66-SP
A) SMALL CLAIM 2016-12-SP
HATCHER CONSTRUCTION GROUP
JUDGE ELISON/JOHNSON
FILED DEC 1 2015

B) 2 FALSE TRESPASS ORDERS
DEPUTIES CAME TO HOME. NO PAPERS
VERBAL NOTIFICATION

C) CRIMINAL, POSSESSION OF MARI-
JUANA. 1ST ARREST 4/4/16
#5-2016-CF 000065

D) DEPENDANCY CASE # 15-2016-0006 DP
CHILDREN VIOLENTLY TAKEN FROM
HOME 4/4/16. TERMINATION OF PARENTAL
RIGHTS JANUARY 2018.
TRIAL DEC 8TH AND 11TH 2017

0

E JULY 13, 2016 IN COURT FOR
HEARING OF CRIMINAL CASE.
JUDGE M. FEAGLE, ORDERED
CHRIS CAMBRON TO BE TAKEN
INTO CUSTODY FOR CONTEMPT OF
COURT HELD IN JAIL FOR FIVE DAYS.

0

F SEPT. 16, 2016. FDLE + DCSS
RAID ON HOME. MORNING OF HEARING
FOR CHILDREN. WHEN ATTORNEY'S WERE
FILING MOTION FOR REUNIFICATION

G NOVEMBER 8 ELECTION NIGHT 2016
READY TO WATCH RESULTS BANGING ON
DOOR DCS (DIXIE CO. SHERIFF) DEPT
ARRESTED FOR EAVESDROPPING.
BAILED OUT TO BE WITH DR. SON FOR
THANKSGIVING. THEY DINT REALIZE
WE HAD THE MONEY TO BAIL OUT A 1st
OR A SECOND TIME. HOPING WE WOULD
ROT IN JAIL.

0

ILLEGAL INTERCEPTION OF COM-
MUNICATION. ALACHUA CO.
01 2016 CF 003743 A

0

H. ON NOV 25, 2016 BANGING AT THE DOOR DURING SONS VISIT. JUDGE FEAGLE REVOKED OUR BOND. WHICH WOULDN'T NORMALLY HAPPEN. ESP FOR SUCH A RIDICULOUS ACCUSATION. KNOWN, THIS WOULD HOLD US IN JAIL UNTIL PRE TRIAL FOR CRIMINAL CASE ON DEC 14, 2016 THE BLACK FRIDAY ARREST WAS THE ONLY INCIDENT THAT WAS N'T PLASTERED IN THE D.C. ADVOCATE NEWSPAPER THEY HAVE BEEN SLANDERING US JULY 2015 APRIL 19, 2016

0

I. CASE # 5-2016-CF000065 SEIZURE OF JEEP PATRIOT. THIS WAS SUPPOSE TO GO TO PRE-TRIAL NOV 16, 2016 THIS DID NOT HAPPEN. JURY TRIAL SET FOR JURY TRIAL 12/12/16 WHILE INCARCERATED IT WAS CONTINUED, BECAUSE DEA Brenning's DAD WAS SICK. THIS CASE ALSO FEAGLE PRESIDING.

0

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Cambren

Date: April 5, 2019