

Loudoun CPS - Get the notes from Sandra Glenney and the psychologist (Dr. Mary Lindahl)



The importance of obtaining the notes from the psychologist chosen by Sandra Glenney cannot be stressed enough. In a case concerning false accusations the only evidence that Glenney can present is what the child allegedly said to the psychologist in the therapist's office. The sessions in therapist's office will not be taped, your only insight into what took place and what was said during the sessions will be the notes. Keep in mind, the therapist has been chosen by Sandra Glenney; get the notes.

The core component of CPS and Glenney's strategy is to shape the narrative in the Courtroom, this means controlling psychologist's testimony. I have to stress that the same goes for Glenney's hand-picked psychologist. The psychologist, sadly in some cases, is not there to find the truth but to find abuse. If the reader will google the term "CPS Corruption" you will learn the problem is rampant. If you do a simple search for a "psychological fraud", you will learn the field of mental health is troubled. The mental health profession is infamous for its lack of scientific credibility.

As you find yourself going through the circus like world of CPS and Sandra Glenney. It is important to stay grounded and deal with the facts. Keep in mind that CPS is a very low quality organization and the psychologist that Glenney chooses are typically not "top-shelf materia". The average worker for CPS is poorly trained and is on a mission to find abuse. You need to be prepared with the facts.

In a recent case involving Dr. Mary Lindahl, the importance of obtaining the notes is highlighted. One of the issues with psychology/psychiatry is that in a therapist's office anything goes. The field isn't regulated very well. There are so many competing theories on how to conduct treatment; the majority are simply non-sense.

The following [document](#) reflects the questioning of Dr. Mary Lindahl by Lorrie Sinclair, who was serving as the Guardian Ad Litem. The question, and I am paraphrasing, was **"has the child been consistent in his/her disclosures"**. Dr. Lindahl responds that the child has been consistent. Dr. Lindahl was allowed to say this because her notes were not obtained prior to the hearing. The notes were obtained approximately two years later, in the notes several instances of the child recanting were documented. Dr. Lindahl never told the Court about this.

Fast forward two years later at a deposition, after the notes were obtained Dr. Lindahl's testimony was somewhat different.

Q. For the very first time, you mention in your latest report, if I'm not correct, this is August the 15th of this year, that the child said that she denied the incident and that it was a joke. This is the very first time. Am I correct about that?

A. In what context?

Q. In any official context whatsoever.

A. I don't recall if I was ever asked in court if she has denied or retracted it. I would have said what happened. I mean, I consider it important to put in what she said and what happened.

Q. I'm not asking about what you said in court.

MR. BYRNES: You are. You just asked her.

BY MR. McLAUGHLIN:

Q. My initial question was, had you put anything in writing with respect to those contrary allegations before 8/15 -

A. It's in my notes.

Q. — 2011, in a formal sense? Have you ever done that?

A. I don't recall. It's in my notes.

As you can plainly see Dr. Lindahl is playing word games, she had every opportunity to tell the Court about the retractions in May 2009, when asked if the child was consistent, instead she chose not to. Get the notes, do not allow a psychologist to play word games during your hearing. If you don't the psychologist will be allowed to conceal a rather large amount of information.

Loudoun CPS - CPS workers are poorly trained part 3

This post will concern itself with what Loudoun CPS believes is problematic behavior for a child. Once you find yourself accused, you have to overcome the urge to become emotional but instead buckle down and become familiar with all of the documents of your case. It will be beneficial if you are familiar with the [documentation](#) that CPS's utilizes. Whether or not your abuse is substantiated


is simply the opinion of a CPS worker who has a bachelor's degree and who has taken a few required courses. More than likely CPS will substantiate the abuse, especially if you are a father. They have an inherent bias against fathers.

Keep in mind it is not you, it is CPS that is dysfunctional and dishonest. Once you are accused you will hear testimony from the accusing parent that your child was exhibiting troublesome behavior weeks or months before the accusations came to light. More than likely the topic of your child touching his or herself will arise as well as the subject of nightmares. Don't worry this is standard terminology that CPS is probably instructing the other parent to say. I have no doubt that CPS coaches the accusing parent as to what to say.

You combat this with the facts. The following [document](#) is from the required training of a CPS investigator. It details what is normal behavior for a child and what isn't. The chart specifically pertains to sexualized behavior. The way the case will precede is as follows, an investigator like the discredited Benjamin Smith will report the behavior of your child as being evidence of abuse. The accusing parent will testify to the same thing as well as the hand-picked psychologist; remember they are functioning as a team. You need the facts to combat their lies. Please read the attached document, for example children are curious about their bodies; this is typical. CPS will present this curiosity as evidence for abuse. The opposition will attribute any negative behavior that your child exhibits to abuse.

If your child is female they will attempt to argue that previous urinary tract infections (UTI's) are evidence of abuse. You have to get the testimony of your child's pediatrician to refute this. It is a good idea to get the pediatrician's notes as well. This is something the Guardian Ad Litem should be doing, however if your Guardian Ad Litem is Lorrie Sinclair do not expect too much. Also do not be shocked when Sandra Glenney attempts to prevent your attorney from calling the child's pediatrician. In a recent case Glenney attempted to block the admission of a pediatrician as an expert witness. Remember, Glenney wants to control the narrative; do not let her.

[Loudoun County - The trouble with Sandra Glenney and Loudoun CPS](#)



I cannot stress enough the negative consequences that occur when someone in a position of authority cuts corners and abuses their power. It is made worse when an entire agency has such skewed thinking such as Loudoun County Child Protective Services. The problems with Loudoun County CPS begin at the top. The workers and investigators are encouraged to take shortcuts. The influence of Sandra Glenney cannot be overlooked. She is the door through which all evidence flows. If Sandra Glenney doesn't want the accused to have exculpatory evidence, the accused and their attorney will not receive the exculpatory evidence. When someone like Glenney and CPS decides to cheat there are repercussions, severe repercussions. CPS destroys families and harms children; lives can be destroyed by very ignorant people who work for the Child Protection Agency.

The following [article](#) written in the Boston Globe describes the case of Bernard Baran who recently passed away. Mr. Baran (photo above at the time of his arrest and release) spent 21 years in prison for a crime he did not commit. He was a kid when the absurd accusations of sexual abuse were made against him. I encourage you to learn more about his case at <http://www.freebaran.org/>. More disturbing is the amount of prosecutorial misconduct that occurred in the case. Mr. Baran steadfastly maintained his innocence despite being offered a deal that would allow him to only serve five years. Mr. Baran was a victim of extreme prejudice and prosecutorial misconduct. His prime years were spent in prison due to an ignorant prosecutor and a biased criminal justice system. He was targeted mainly because he was gay and the prosecutor, now judge was an ignorant homophobic. The years that were taken from him and the abused he suffered in prison all because a prosecutor wanted to win his case. We have the same mentality in Loudoun with our Child Protection Services Agency.

In the Baran case, video tapes were withheld from the defense that was exculpatory in nature. The tapes clearly revealed that the children stated that nothing happened but yet social workers and investigators persisted until the children succumbed to the repeated questioning. This is strikingly similar to how Sandra Glenney conducts her cases; all recantations must be kept from the defense. The prosecutor in the case, Daniel A. Ford, who is currently a judge failed to turn over the tapes. There are currently many calls for his resignation. Mr. Baran was an easy target for prosecution, he

was a male and he was gay. When he was convicted, there was mass hysteria concerning Ritual Sexual Abuse. Reason and logic were not to be found in many Courtrooms throughout the country. The whole time period destroyed so many lives of innocent people.

In Loudoun, we have a problem and that problem has a name, Sandra Glenney. Sandra Glenney is a relic of the 80's and she conducts CPS cases in a very unethical manner. She is the ringleader for CPS. She controls the CPS investigator and the psychologist who testifies on behalf of CPS. With Glenney at the helm, it is the 80's all over again.

Loudoun CPS - CPS Workers are poorly trained and dishonest- part 2

The odds that CPS will substantiate abuse when they are involved in a case is 100 percent, the odds are even higher when the accused is the father. The title specifies Loudoun CPS but this applies to all Child Protective Agencies within Virginia. The culture and beliefs of Loudoun CPS are outdated and biased. They are biased against fathers and the possibility that abuse did not occur; this bias begins with their [training](#). The workers are trained to find sexual abuse, no matter what. The psychologists that are employed, hand-picked being the better word, by CPS will harass and question your child until your child capitulates and tells the psychologist what they want to hear. This same scenario was played out in the 80's and many of those cases have been overturned but in Virginia we are still stuck in the 80's. In Loudoun, we have Sandra Glenney who confronted with a lack of evidence depends heavily on her hand-picked psychologist to deal with the lack of evidence. Loudoun County CPS and its management are the absolute bottom of the barrel.

The mandatory [training](#) that a CPS worker and investigator receives eliminates any possibility that abuse did not occur and that the accused maybe innocent. Please remember abuse can be substantiated by a poorly trained and unethical investigator, this is done behind the scenes without the benefit of a jury. The hand-picked psychologist that CPS hires for \$150 per hour will share this view as well. It is sickening and disturbing than an alleged mental health professional will throw away their credibility for \$150 an hour.

A very difficult aspect of a sexual abuse investigation is the subject of retractions. In some cases the child will retract the allegations, for many reasons. The retraction could be due to fear or the child may feel guilty for making the accusations. In some cases the child will retract simply because the allegations are not true. The child may have been bullied by another parent into making accusations and simply wants to tell the truth. This possibility is not given an audience by CPS or their

psychologists. In their mind a retraction is evidence that abuse did in fact take place. The investigators do not even pause and reflect to think that a retraction may be valid.

Unfortunately, the required training for a CPS worker does not mention in the documentation that the reason for retractions could be that the accusations are not true, it is not even considered. Per their documentation, retractions are due to the failure of the various professionals to prevent retractions. In the mind of a CPS investigator retractions are indications of abuse. As an example please consider the following excerpt from required training CWS2031 "Sexual Abuse Investigation":

"Remembering the typical reasons for recantation, we as professionals should strive to prevent our child victims from recanting by keeping in mind the following guidelines"

One of the guidelines listed is "Access the Case for Recantation Risk Factors: **continued contact with the offender**". This statement is very telling and disturbing in that the accused is already called offender which indicates the accused is guilty until proven innocent and that CPS will attempt to stop all contact between the innocent parent and child. In other words the guilt of the accused is already declared by CPS no matter what. Sandra Glenney will go to any lengths to keep a parent from seeing their child.

"Highly publicized cases in which prosecutors were unable to prove allegations of child abuse beyond a reasonable doubt have contributed to a backlash against child protections efforts".

This statement is bizarre and just plain stupid, it ignores the Satanic Panic of the 80's and the mass hysteria surrounding daycare's during the same time frame. Take note of the language **"prosecutors failed to prove"**; it doesn't say the defendants were innocent but that the prosecutor failed to prove the allegations. In other words all allegations must be true; there is no possibility that an allegation may not be true.

Things to do:

1. When the Investigator takes the stand in Court have your attorney confront him or her with their [training](#) concerning recantations.
2. Ask the investigator specifically if the CPS hand-picked psychologist has reported any retractions to CPS; you want this answer under oath.
3. Ask the investigator if they are provided any information on the **"highly publicized cases"** that did not produce a conviction. Ask the investigator if they know any details of the more famous cases. This question is important to establish for the Judge that the investigator receives very biased training, if not just poorly trained.
4. When your attorney has the psychologist on the stand, they need to inquire if your child has recanted. In one case Dr. Mary Lindahl was presented with the question has the child ever been inconsistent? Asked in this manner, she was able to avoid stating under oath that there were several retractions. The question needs to be asked as **"Has the child ever recanted the accusation?"** The judge needs to hear that the child recanted; ideally your attorney should already have the notes of the psychologist prior to the psychologist testifying.

5. Get the psychologists notes, if you don't the psychologist will feel comfortable in suppressing evidence.
