

Loudoun County - Expert witnesses like Dr. Mary Lindahl in the Courtroom - The Keller Case

Junk science, what is it? it is alleged science that has no factual basis and it can't be tested; sounds a lot like the field of psychology. Psychologists and psychiatrists tend to be the most egregious purveyors of junk science. Junk science is at its most dangerous when it is used while an individual's liberty is at stake.

This was on display during the Keller Case. The Keller's were accused of abuse that was simply impossible to have occurred. Mistakes were made, tragic mistakes during the case. At the core of the case was the testimony of Dr. Randy Noblitt, a psychologist who was a strong believer in Satanic Cults and ritual abuse.

The Keller's spent decades in prison for a crime that wasn't committed and could not have been committed. It is interesting to note that the emergency room physician who testified in the original trial that there were signs of abuse recanted his testimony and has openly and publicly said he was wrong. Dr. Randy Noblitt, the psychologist who testified to the veracity of ritual abuse has not once recanted his testimony. In fact please take note of an Appellate Judge's concurrent [opinion](#).

Applicant's brief on appeal noted that Noblitt had parlayed his testimony into a business opportunity, giving lectures and writing a book on the evils of ritual abuse, and that pointed to "a Noblitt-sponsored 1995 conference as providing an eye-opening look into his world view." That conference included speakers who "revealed" the FBI's cover-up of a satanic cult in Nebraska that had White House ties, the existence of more than 500 satanic cults conducting eight sacrificial murders a year in New York City, and that then-President Bill Clinton was the anti-Christ.

Reading this quote, the reader gains insight into the twisted thinking of Dr. Randy Noblitt. It is obvious that he in no way should be allowed to qualify as an expert witness, It also represents a failure in our legal system that someone like Dr. Noblitt was allowed to testify. It also represents a complete failure of the profession of psychology and the boards that govern the practice of psychology in the individual states. No other profession, at least medical profession, has such loose controls on the practitioners. The field of psychology is poorly governed and the most fantastical claims are allowed to be made.

The Courts, especially in Loudoun County, are continuing to allow practitioners of junk science to testify in the Courtroom. Dr. Mary Lindahl holds very questionable views and tends to side with Sandra Glenney an amazing 100% of the time. Dr. William Ling of Reston, Virginia also testifies quite often for Sandra Glenney. This is a very serious matter, judges in Loudoun have a difficult time in keeping the unqualified experts off the stand.

Psychologists are an integral part of the strategy of Sandra Glenney, the professionals that she selects will share similar beliefs to that of Dr. Randy Noblitt; be aware that their testimony is junk science and not based on fact. You and your attorney need to adopt a scorched earth campaign to discredit the expert witness chosen by Sandra Glenney. Make an attempt to obtain any published

article are any other documentation that may provide insight into their background and practice.

Loudoun County - Judge Thomas D. Horne, Lorrie Sinclair, Christopher Zveare

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
MEMORANDUM

DATE: 14 February 2012
REPLY TO: *SMC*
ATTN OF: Sally M. Cowen
SUBJECT: Christopher Zveare

TO: WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Please be advised that Mr. Christopher Zveare has been selected for an assignment with the U.S. Government commencing in June 2012 to a U.S. embassy facility located in a metropolitan area in a Western European country.

Mr. Zveare and his family will be residing in U.S. Government provided housing which offers telephone and internet access. Mr. Zveare and his family will have access to medical and educational facilities also used by other U.S. Government personnel.

Please send any queries to the address listed below:

Verifications Center
Attn: Sally M. Cowen
P.O. Box 1012
Newington, VA 22122

The more you inquire and delve into the inner workings of a Loudoun County Courtroom, the more disturbed one becomes. Judge Horne once hailed as "**The epitome of fairness**" may not live up to that mantle, Lorrie Sinclair once considered to be a lock for a spot on the Loudoun County Circuit

bench has failed at least two times to attain that goal. It is a very small secluded world in Loudoun County as far as the Courts go. One has to remember that despite the claims of being the wealthiest county in the US, Loudoun County is still somewhat rural and is definitely Southern. In other words it still remains a very backwards and unsophisticated culture. The judicial system unfortunately shares in the lack of sophistication.

To this writer's utter dismay Lorrie Sinclair was selected as a substitute Judge in 2011, what a poor substitute judge she has made. Do not despair, it is only a six-year appointment. The citizens of Loudoun will be rid of her in 2017. More incredible was that she was actually recommended by the Loudoun Bar Association as a judicial candidate. Perhaps 2017 will usher in the end of her judicial aspirations and involvement.

How does one become a substitute judge in the backwoods of Loudoun County, it is quite simple. The below excerpt is taken from a 2011 [issue](#) of the Loudoun Bar Digest. .

SUBSTITUTE JUDGE VACANCY Applications are being sought for the position of Substitute Judge for the Twentieth Judicial Circuit. Although appointed in this Circuit, the Substitute Judge would be eligible (but not required) to serve in the General District and Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Courts throughout the Commonwealth. Interested parties should send a letter of candidacy as well as a current resume to The Honorable Thomas D. Horne, Chief Judge, Twentieth Judicial Circuit of Virginia, P.O. Box 727, Leesburg, Virginia 20178 by January 30, 2011.

As you can see it is as simple as mailing your resume to Judge Thomas D. Horne without any oversight or public scrutiny. Judge Horne made his decision without any oversight or public scrutiny. The plan for Ms. Sinclair was to serve as a substitute judge and simply wait for Judge Chamblin and Judge Horne to retire. After they retired, she felt she would get the nod to be a judge; joyfully this never happened.

The relationship between Judge Thomas D. Horne and Lorrie Sinclair can be explored further. This is where Christopher M. Zveare enters the picture. I will attempt to describe the story to the reader. In 2012, after Sinclair was selected as a substitute judge by Thomas D. Horne. She was acting as a Guardian Ad Litem in a custody case, acting being the key word, in which Judge Horne was presiding. She did very little to fulfill her obligations as an independent and impartial Guardian Ad Litem. She formed a biased opinion and neglected any evidence that contradicted her belief. This bias included overlooking very questionable evidence.

At some point during the case, Christopher Zveare of Loudoun County, submitted a very questionable document as evidence of a relocation that would separate a parent and child for years. The document pictured above could not be authenticated in any fashion, all fact-finding indicated that the document was fraudulent. All information was provided to Judge Horne and Lorrie Sinclair that proved that the document was more than likely a fraud. It didn't matter, Horne and Sinclair showed no interest in determining the truth of the matter.

A Circuit Court Judge (Horne) and an active substitute Judge (Sinclair) accepted the very

questionable memorandum at face value. Judge Horne also blocked any type of discovery, Lorrie Sinclair following Judge Horne's direction never inquired about the authenticity of the document. It was a setup, Judge Horne allowed the relocation while never allowing any type of formal discovery about the nature of the move. Sinclair as the Guardian Ad Litem, never inquired about the memorandum she simply went along with Judge Horne,

If you think for one fraction of a second, that truth and justice is the goal of a Courtroom in Loudoun County you are sadly mistaken.

[Loudoun CPS - Things to ask the psychologist that Sandra Glenney selects](#)

I will reiterate over and over again, Sandra Glenney calls the shots in a CPS investigation. She controls what information is provided to the defendant and their counsel. The relationship that you and your attorney will need to explore will be the relationship between Sandra Glenney and her hand-picked psychologist for the case. It is critical that you explore and debunk any and all facts that originate from the mouth of the therapist. They are working for Sandra Glenney, never forget that.

A key aspect of the testimony of Glenney's psychologist will be emotion as in, did the child emotions coincide what the child was disclosing. One aspect of the psychologists testimony and one that they will always use is the child's emotions. Glenney will specifically ask this question to the therapist, an example being "**Did the child display any emotions during the disclosure**". You need to be aware Glenney is trying to sell her case to the judge. Evidently she feels that if she can get her therapist to say that the child was very emotional during the disclosures, it will earn points with the Court, A disclosure is more credible if a child is visibly upset when making the statement.

To refute the testimony of Glenney's psychologists you and your attorney will need to critically review the original interview that CPS conducted with your child. To stack the deck more on her side, Glenney will prevent you and your attorney from gaining access to the tape. She will instead offer to allow your attorney to see it at the County Office. When you watch it, look for emotion or lack thereof. Pay attention to see if your child is crying or shows fear when answering questions

about you. It is best to annotate the time when the child makes statements such as " I have fun with my dad or mother".

More than likely Glenney's therapist , especially Dr. Lindahl or Dr. William Ling, will have no interest in the tape. If Glenney wants them to testify that abuse occurred, they will follow her lead like mindless puppets. This is good for you, your attorney needs to cross-examine them aggressively; with science.

Your attorney should ask them if they have seen the original interview tape.

Ask them if they are willing to watch the videotape.

Ask them what is the significance if the child is not showing any emotion while disclosing.

In the case of Dr. Lindahl, she is going to quote a study that says some are emotional, some are not. Ask her specifically the name of the study , who wrote and when it was published,

While in Court make a request to the Court that Dr. Lindahl or Dr. Ling be allowed to watch the tape and ask the Judge to order them to do so, Also ask if you can have a different professional watch the tape.
