

Appeal Letter Michelle Stanton

PO Box 6912,

Wyomissing PA 19610

August, 1992

The following information is regarding the involvement of a caseworker Bronche Necker from children and youth services and the manner in which the case has been handled. I hope it will help you understand how it affects the family when a parent is accused and charged without proof, examination of the child or questioning of family members or anyone who knows them. It will also show that Bronche Necker was unable to charge the same parent the second time with an other situation so Bronche Necker tried to charge the mother.

March 1992, my daughter Rebecca talked to me about a visit from Bronche Necker questioning her father subjecting her to any sexual behavior. Rebecca's answer

was no. Ursula my younger daughter also answered 'no.

The next visit was to Ursula's school. This time asking her if Ursula's father had hurt her arm because they had a report it was in a cast. I received a visit and told Brandi Needer the injury occurred on school property. I also proved Ursula's father was in South Carolina at that time.

I received a letter stating the injury was caused by me. When I signed a release for medical records, I later received a letter stating the abuse was unfounded.

The second visit from Brandi Needer was the same visit that informed me Ursula had told her about a question her father asked her while visiting him for the weekend. It was sexual in nature but nothing physical and was in fact the only time. When it occurred Ursula didn't talk to me about it and continued to stay for two weeks for Bible School. When Brandi Needer told me, Ursula had told me a week before and also told me it was a year ago. I felt there was no

danger to Ursula nor did she and I knew the situation of Ursula's father's residence and was able to put the situation together.

Bianche Needer talked to both Lloyd and me after the first visit to the children's school and at that time neither of us were told what was going to happen.

With no further contact Bianche Needer sent a letter to Harrisburg and then to both of us that Lloyd was charged with sexual abuse.

At that time I complied with Bianche Needer's forms, her demands and signed what I was told was a family plan. Ursula was sent to Dr. Hill's sexual therapy group which produced extra problems.

I was then told a new caseworker would be assigned for several months, with one upset & month.

Karen Esig came July 7, 92 and brought Holly Adams along. My family has known Holly and her daughter for three years. During that time Holly told Ursula, she didn't

want Ursula around Leg. Holly is a rescuer
ing alcohol and her daughter sexually
molested by her father, so her objectivity
is limited. During the visit Holly shook
her head at every statement I made. And
Holly and Leg had never kept confidential
information when Ursula first talked to
Leg about her father's drinking.

after July 7, 82 I received a letter from
Karen Esig that another visit the same
month was going to take place. I called
to inquire why and Karen told me another
family plan needed to be signed and we
would discuss discipline, sexual abuse
and counseling. I told her we'd been
through enough and it wasn't healthy
for Ursula to keep bringing it up. She
has to deal with it and all the other
problems a kid has and so on. She doesn't
need someone to pull her down. Ursula
would not talk to Karen alone, because
there a sentence was put in the records
that Ursula did not make.

If in fact Ursula's father needs further
treatment for alcohol, it can't be forced.
But he would not sexually molest his

children.

I also feel that something this serious that confronts an adult, no one should just be able to send a letter and put a family through this without the involvement of a judge, who is the only person qualified to make a judgement.

This is a serious charge and not to be left to a caseworker, who has no law degree and is not qualified in mental health. Because of these facts, when a person may be innocent, it's almost like being caught in a web.

I hope with all my heart guidelines will be set and followed up to insure no one else will ever have to go through this.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Enclosed find forms and letter pertaining to this case.

Sincerely
Michelle Stanton

JUVENILE COURT SUMMONS

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

COUNTY OF BERKS

IN THE INTEREST OF: URSULA STANTON

NO: 465-J-1992

TO MICHELLE STANTON
Parent (\$)/+/Guardian/+/Custodian

You are notified that Berks County Children and Youth Services of Reading, Pennsylvania has filed a Juvenile Petition of Dependency/~~ABUSE~~, a copy of which is attached hereto, alleging the dependency/~~ABUSE~~ of your child(ren).

You are commanded to appear and produce your above named child(~~ren~~) before the Juvenile Court on Wednesday, September 7, 1992 /6 at 9:00 ^{9:15} A.M., 10th floor of The Berks County Services Center, 633 Court Street, Reading, Pennsylvania, in Berks County, for a hearing upon the said allegations according to law, and if you fail to appear or fail to produce your child(~~ren~~) at the time and place mentioned, a warrant will be issued for your arrest.

Your child(ren) will be represented by a lawyer at this hearing and a copy of the Summons and Petition has been forwarded to: Attorney Wendie Ziegler appointed as guardian ad litem to represent the interests of the above minor child(~~ren~~).

You also have the right to be represented by an attorney at this hearing. If you can afford an attorney but do not know one to represent you, contact the Lawyer's Referral Service, 544 Court Street, Reading, Pennsylvania, telephone number 375-4591.

You must act promptly for no continuance or postponement of your case will be granted at the above scheduled hearing in the event you appear and want an attorney but do not have one present.

If you have any questions please contact your caseworker: KERIN ESSIG
telephone number 215-478-6795.

This 17th day of August 19 92 by the order of:

The Honorable Elizabeth Ehrlich
Judge of Court of Common Pleas
of Berks County, Pennsylvania

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS 23rd JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BERKS COUNTY
JUVENILE PETITION

AUG 11 1992

In the interest of URSULA STANTON Date of Birth 01/03/79 Juvenile No. 465-J-1992
A MINOR 465-J-1992

To The Honorable Judge of said Court
Petitioner Kerin Esig, Caseworker, respectfully represents that, the said child, Ursula Stanton
resides at Brookline Manor Apts. 12-C, Reading, PA 19611 and is alleged to be a ~~delinquent~~ dependent
child; if delinquency is alleged, the child is in need of treatment, supervision or rehabilitation. It is within the jurisdiction of the Court and in the best interest of
the child and the public that this proceeding be brought before the court for the following reason(s).

**THE FACTS IN SUPPORT OF ALLEGED DEPENDENCY ARE SET FORTH IN
EXHIBIT A ATTACHED HERETO AND MADE A PART HEREOF.**

**THE RECOMMENDATIONS TO ALLEVIATE THE ALLEGED DEPENDENCY ARE
SET FORTH IN EXHIBIT C ATTACHED HERETO AND MADE A PART HEREOF.**

PETITION FILED AUG 11 1992

FATHER'S NAME AND ADDRESS <u>Lloyd Stanton</u> <u>250 Penn Ave, Rm 121</u> <u>West Reading, PA 19611</u>		MOTHER'S NAME AND ADDRESS <u>Michelle Stanton</u> <u>Brookline Manor Apts. Apt. 12-C</u> <u>Reading, PA 19611</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> UNKNOWN		<input type="checkbox"/> UNKNOWN	
SPOUSES NAME AND ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)		GUARDIAN'S NAME AND ADDRESS	
		<input type="checkbox"/> UNKNOWN	
IF THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES IN ABOVE ITEMS ARE UNKNOWN OR DO NOT RESIDE WITHIN THIS COMMONWEALTH, GIVE NAME OF A KNOWN ADULT RELATIVE RESIDING NEAREST TO THE LOCATION OF THIS COURT.		RELATIONSHIP	
		ADDRESS	
DATE/TIME TAKEN INTO CUSTODY BY POLICE		DATE/TIME ADMITTED TO DETENTION	
AM PM		AM PM	
IS CHILD PRESENTLY DETAINED?	IF YES, WHERE?		
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO			

Wherefore, Petitioner prays your Honorable Court to inquire into the alleged ~~delinquency~~ dependency of the above juvenile and of the matters alleged, and to make such order as deemed appropriate.

Further, if said child is found to be a delinquent or dependent child and is to enter placement or commitment, or is otherwise removed from his/her home at disposition, your petitioner prays your Honorable Court, prior to entering such order of disposition, to determine whether reasonable efforts were made by the Berks County Children & Youth Services to prevent such removal of the child from his home, or if preventive services were not offered due to the emergency nature of the placement, whether such lack of services was reasonable. **as set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Exhibit B attached hereto and made a part hereof,**


If the Court has previously determined, pursuant to 42 Pa. C.S. §6332, that reasonable efforts were not made to prevent the initial removal of the child from his home, your petitioner prays your Honorable Court to determine whether reasonable efforts are underway to make it possible for the child to return home.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
COUNTY OF Berks

Kerin Esig, Caseworker

BEING DULY SWORN ACCORDING TO LAW DEPOSES AND SAYS THE FACTS SET FORTH ABOVE ARE TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF THE PETITIONER'S INFORMATION KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF. Caseworker

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED BEFORE ME
THIS 10th DAY OF August 19 92



Kerin Esig
Nancy L. Younker
NOTARIAL SEAL
NANCY L. YOUNKER, Notary Public
Reading, Berks County
My Commission Expires April 1, 1995

Michelle Stenton
Court Summons
no# 465-5-1992
Interest of Ursula Stenton

August 24, 1992

correct statements regarding Petition and Exhibits A+B.

3. When Brandy Neider asked the question during a visit from Lloyd and me I stated family member and further explained because I had an experience I would be more protective and would sooner see Segus and possibly prevent an incident.

5. Inaccurate. Someone attempted to sue me and fourteen months later in Judge Kellus court Dec 19, 91 it was dismissed as stated to me in those words by Mr. Paul Herlino RD.

7. Ursula and I stated the truth. Ursula hit a child who was taunting her on school property. The following Sun. while doing laundry, we were caught in the snow storm Ursula slipped braced herself against the car and thirty five minutes later while visiting my mother her hand swelled. I took her to ER and Dr. Sutherland put a cast on her arm to keep her from moving it.

put a cast on her arm,

Lloyd received a letter from BCCYS that he injured Ursula, I proved he was 635 in South Carolina when the second time occurred that a cast was needed.

Michelle then received a letter that she injured Ursula. I signed a release for medical records, and received a second letter it was sent Garibaldi.

8. Ursula did not tell caseworker she slept with her father. Ursula stated this when we went through Exhibit A.

Ursula stated she never told Branch Neider he - Lloyd slept naked.

Ursula stated her father asked her and after her answer told Ursula he knew if anyone touched her she would tell me.

no. # 7 + 8 contradict each other

10. I never told Brandy Needer I believed sexual abuse occurred. I stated if Ursula feels violated by the comment then I believe her and support her, I also stated I do not believe Lloyd did anything to violate her and if she took it as violated it needs to be addressed.

I never said he was drunk every day.

He already moved out. It was temporary.

12. Confrontation due to abrupt medicine change. Taken off the afternoon before and given a new medicine the following morning.

14. Information inaccurate. I stated to Michelle Olmew what Lloyd went through at 14 and stated he would never want any child including his own to ever go through that or any situation. And Lloyd would never cause any sexual situation. When the grandfather came from I don't know.

15. after I signed medical release I went to see Dr. Sutherland, he told me if he had suspected anything he would have had to report it, and he saw nothing suspicious.

16. Lloyd stopped in to give me insurance forms, I didn't think I had to explain each visit when the girls were not home.

18. It was productive and once aired a lot of tension seemed to be over. He talked to Ursula and told her he never would do anything wrong, he was concerned with some one trying to, and knew he needs it worry when she answered him.

20. I signed with hesitation and was not allowed to talk to anyone before I signed. Brandi Tucker told me it was part of the program.

28. I never said Lloyd slept at my apt, he didn't. He was often invited to dinner, especially when Rebecca cooked.

30. I was not angry, I resented Karen Esseg telling me "we have to see to Ursula's safety, because we don't live there." I told her I complied and now when went to the rules change and I'm suppose to just go along with it.

36. I signed one and regretted it, I would not put my name on anything else nor would I be told how to raise my children. Nor would I entertain one a month.

I requested court to put an end to the situation and clear their father (loyd) because I felt only a judge should be able to determine if someone is guilty, not someone who is not qualified.

38. I have no idea what's being referred.

42. Ursula stated 8-24-92 she never saw her father use cocaine or never saw him high. Ursula stated she never d. on 12. - 1 No. do. h. don't + out in.

The way #42 is stated. Ursetee never
told Kelly, McClannan anything ordered
years ago and has no idea where it
came from.

Michelle L. Benton 8-24-92

EXHIBIT A

1. That on March 3, 1992, Berks County Children and Youth Services (BCCYS) received a report of suspected sexual abuse regarding Ursula Stanton, D.O.B. January 3, 1979, citing Lloyd Stanton, child's father, as alleged perpetrator, alleging that Lloyd Stanton pulled down said child's covers and hugged her, making her feel uncomfortable.
2. That on March 6, 1992, said child stated to BCCYS' CPS investigator, Brandy Neider, that Lloyd Stanton drinks a lot and has a history of drug use and may be presently using. She stated she is involved with Juvenile Probation Office due to writing bad checks. At this time said child denied ever feeling uncomfortable when her father touched her.
3. That on March 9, 1992, caseworker, Brandy Neider, interviewed Lloyd and Michelle Stanton at BCCYS. Lloyd Stanton denied all sexual abuse allegations in regard to said child. Lloyd Stanton stated he had been in in-patient treatment at the Neumann Center for cocaine use but was no longer using this drug but drinks frequently. At this time Lloyd Stanton agreed to an evaluation at T.A.S.C. Michelle Stanton stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that she had been sexually abused by her stepfather as a child.
4. That on March 18, 1992, caseworker, Brandy Neider, spoke to Michelle Omlor, said child's Juvenile Probation Officer who stated Michelle Stanton stated Lloyd Stanton had touched said child in a way that made child feel uncomfortable.
5. That on March 19, 1992, Detective Dan Billings of Wyomissing Police Department, stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that Michelle Stanton is currently on A.R.D. for stealing money from an elderly neighbor.
6. That on March 23, 1992, caseworker, Brandy Neider, spoke to Tony Hubbard, principal at West Reading Elementary School, who stated that Michelle Stanton stated to her that said child would sleep in the same bed or room as Lloyd Stanton during visits when parents were separated.
7. That on March 30, 1992, Juvenile Probation Officer, Michelle Omlor, stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that said child had a cast on her arm. Further, that when Ms. Omlor asked how the injury occurred, mother and daughter simultaneously offered two different explanations; mother stated child must have picked something up wrong; child stated she had fallen on the ice.
8. That on March 30, 1992, said child stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that when she would visit father when he lived on Windsor street, they would sleep together. Said child stated Lloyd Stanton would be intoxicated and naked and would touch said child's buttocks and the back of her thigh. Father would ask child if she would tell her mother if he touched her private parts. Further, said child stated that cast was due to a thumb injury acquired after she punched some girl on the playground.
9. That on March 30, 1992, caseworker, Brandy Neider, spoke to guidance counselor, Kelly McClellan, at West Reading Elementary School, who stated that on this day said child at first did not want to talk with caseworker because, child stated, "I'm not supposed to tell her anything." Further, that she had heard said child's injuries was a result of falling down the steps.
10. That on April 1, 1992, Michelle Stanton told caseworker, Brandy Neider, that she believed the sexual abuse involving said child occurred during the summer of 1990.

She claimed Lloyd Stanton was drinking every day but was moving out of the apartment. At this time Michelle Stanton agreed to have said child evaluated at Reading Specialist.

11. That on April 2, 1992, the report of sexual abuse regarding said child was indicated with Lloyd Stanton indicated as the perpetrator.
12. That on April 3, 1992, juvenile probation officer, Michelle Omlor, and caseworker, Brandy Neider, went to the Stanton home after Michelle Stanton called stating she and said child were just involved in a serious physical confrontation. Further, that during the confrontation, child slammed mother's arm in the bathroom door and mother hit said child with a belt causing both minor injuries. Further, that both parties agreed to refrain from any physical fighting.
13. That on April 3, 1992, Michelle Stanton stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that she does believe said child in regard to the sexual abuse, that Lloyd Stanton had moved out, and she would comply with appointments at Reading Specialists.
14. That on April 3, 1992, Michelle Stanton stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that Lloyd Stanton told her approximately five years into their marriage that he had left home at age 14 and went to Los Angeles. He allegedly left because paternal grandfather attempted to sexually abuse his sister and grandfather would wake him up by burning his feet with a cigarette. In Los Angeles he would exchange sexual favors with older women for food and a place to stay.
15. That on April 22, 1992, Dr. Sutherland of Reading Hospital and Medical Center, stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that he had put a cast on said child's arm for purposes of immobilization as child had a lot of pain. Further, that the injury is consistent with a fall, but also could have been consistent with blocking someone's physical threat. Further, that on two occasions, Michelle Stanton and said child failed to show up at appointments to have the cast removed and said child had the cast on two weeks longer than was necessary.
16. That on April 24, 1992, Juvenile Probation Officer, Michelle Omlor, stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that Lloyd Stanton was at the residence of said child, although said child was at school.
17. That on April 24, 1992, caseworker, Brandy Neider, told Lloyd Stanton he is to have no contact with said child. He agreed to this and to meet with caseworker to discuss the Family Service Plan on April 28, 1992.
18. That on April 27, 1992, Michelle Stanton stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, and supervisor, Melissa Haydt, that she had said child confront Lloyd Stanton about the sexual abuse. Further, that she believed this was appropriate and productive and that said child and father should be allowed to have contact. Michelle Stanton did however agree to have child continue in treatment.
19. That on April 28, 1992, Lloyd Stanton again denied the sexual abuse to caseworker, Brandy Neider, stating it was "a misunderstanding." Further, he agreed to have a drug and alcohol evaluation at T.A.S.C. and an evaluation at Reading Specialist.
20. That on April 29, 1992, Michelle Stanton stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that she was in agreement with the provisions of the Family Service Plan.

21. That on May 15, 1992, Michelle Stanton and said child signed the Family Service Plan.
22. That on June 3, 1992, Lloyd Stanton did not show up to sign the Family Service Plan.
23. That on June 11, 1992, Dr. Robert Gill of Reading Specialists, stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that said child is regularly going to treatment and he would be willing to have Michelle Stanton join the non-offending parent group.
24. That on June 11, 1992, Donna, at T.A.S.C., stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that Lloyd Stanton still had not made an appointment.
25. That on June 12, 1992, Lloyd Stanton again did not show for scheduled time to sign Family Service Plan.
26. That on June 19, 1992, the Stanton case was transferred to Protective Services caseworker, Kerin Essig.
27. That on June 29, 1992, BCCYS caseworker, Kerin Essig, and your petitioner sent a letter to Michelle Stanton and Lloyd Stanton announcing case transfer to caseworker, Kerin Essig.
28. That on July 7, 1992, caseworker Kerin Essig, met with Michelle Stanton, daughter, Rebecca Stanton and said child. Michelle Stanton and said child claimed Lloyd Stanton had consistently been to the residence and had slept there at times. At times he would be intoxicated and pound on the apartment door. Michelle Stanton claimed she would support said child but was not convinced Lloyd Stanton had physically violated said child.
29. That on July 14, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, sent restricted delivery letter to Lloyd Stanton asking for his cooperation and that Family Service Plan had been developed and that caseworker wanted to review it with him.
30. That on July 17, 1992, caseworker, Kerin essig, received a call from Michelle Stanton who was angry caseworker wanted to see said child and herself twice in one month. Caseworker, Kerin Essig, attempted to explain the Family Service Plan and the need to review it with Michelle Stanton and said child.
31. At this time Michelle Stanton said she would no longer comply with agency services unless she was court ordered. Michelle Stanton refused to see or sign the Family Service Plan and was not interested in the appeal process. Michelle stanton claimed said child was not harmed because there had been no skin to skin contact.
32. That on July 17, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, received a receipt of registered delivery to Lloyd Stanton without his signature.
33. That on July 17, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, spoke to Mary Miller of the Penn View Motel, who claimed Lloyd Stanton had picked up said piece of mail.
34. That on July 22, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, sent letters to Michelle Stanton and Lloyd Stanton containing BCCYS new address and phone number.
35. That on July 29, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, sent a copy of the Family Service Plan to Michelle Stanton.

36. That on August 3, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, met with Michelle Stanton. Michelle Stanton claimed she had received a copy of the Family Service Plan but did not look at it. She once again said she would not comply with services and would not let caseworker see said child. Michelle Stanton claimed she had several job prospects and Lloyd Stanton would be with said child while she would be working. She requested court action be taken.
37. That on August 3, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, met with Lloyd Stanton at the residence of Michelle Stanton, Rebecca Stanton, and said child. Lloyd Stanton agreed to attend drug and alcohol counseling at the Neumann Center and admitted to having an alcohol problem. Lloyd Stanton refused to complete the evaluation at Reading Specialists.
38. That on August 3, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, spoke to Michelle Omlor, Juvenile Probation Office. She claimed she had seen Michelle Stanton and said child on July 29, 1991. Michelle Stanton and said child had a physical confrontation approximately the weekend of July 25, 1992.
39. That on August 4, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, spoke to Dr. Robert Gill of Reading Specialists, in regard to an evaluation of said child performed on April 8, 1992. Diagnostic impression of the evaluation was Attention Deficit Disorder with possible post-traumatic stress syndrome. Recommendations were intensive ongoing therapy as well as group treatment for victims of childhood sexual abuse.
40. That on August 4, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, spoke to Dr. Robert Gill of Reading Specialists in regard to an evaluation of Lloyd Stanton on May 7, 1992. Lloyd Stanton arrived late for his evaluation and paid only \$20. An appointment was scheduled to complete the evaluation on May 13, 1992, which Lloyd Stanton did not attend. He continues to owe \$130 to Reading Specialists. Dr. Gill's impression at this time was that said child is not safe if there is contact between said child and Lloyd Stanton.
41. That on August 5, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, mailed a copy of the Family Service Plan to Lloyd Stanton.
42. That on August 7, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, spoke to Kelly McClennan, guidance counselor at West Reading Elementary School. She stated said child told her in January 1992 that Lloyd Stanton was a heavy drinker and said child had seen him use cocaine. Further, that he would come home drunk and high and fight with Michelle Stanton. Kelly McClennan met with said child again in March 1992 at which time said child told her Lloyd Stanton had touched her years ago and it did not feel right. She claimed she was currently sleeping in the same room with her mother.

IN RE: URSULA STANTON

EXHIBIT B

Efforts made to prevent placement:

Initially Michelle Stanton and said child cooperated with services provided by caseworker, Brandy Neider; however, said child discontinued attendance in victims of childhood sexual abuse group at Reading Specialists. Michelle Stanton refused to prevent contact between Lloyd Stanton and said child. Michelle Stanton refused to see or read Family Service Plan. Caseworker, Kerin Essig, made home visit on August 3, 1992, at which time Michelle Stanton refused to comply with services or allow caseworker to see said child. Lloyd Stanton missed appointments with caseworker, Brandy Neider, on June 3, 1992 and June 12, 1992. Lloyd Stanton agreed to have a drug and alcohol evaluation at T.A.S.C. on April 28, 1992; however, he did not have an evaluation at T.A.S.C. Lloyd Stanton stated to caseworker, Kerin Essig, on August 3, 1992, that he would not attend T.A.S.C. for a drug and alcohol evaluation. Lloyd Stanton agreed to have an evaluation at Reading Specialists on April 28, 1992. He arrived late to his first appointment at Reading Specialist on May 7, 1992 and did not pay in full the amount for the evaluation. He did not attend a second appointment on May 13, 1992. He continues to owe \$130 for the evaluation. Lloyd Stanton made no attempt to contact caseworker, Kerin Essig, after several letters were sent to him. Michelle Stanton requested court action be taken.

IN RE: URSULA STANTON

EXHIBIT C

1. That said child be declared dependent and placed under the protective supervision of Berks County Children and Youth Services to ensure her safety.
2. That there be no visitation or contact between said child and Lloyd Stanton.
3. That Michelle Stanton participate in non-offending parents' group through Reading Specialists.
4. That Lloyd Stanton participate in a complete evaluation at Reading Specialists and follow the recommendations of the evaluation.
5. That said child participate in all recommended treatment through Reading Specialists.
6. That Lloyd Stanton participate in drug and alcohol treatment.
7. That Michelle Stanton, Lloyd Stanton, and said child sign all releases of information to/from all evaluators and treatment providers involved with the family.
8. That said child be made available to Berks County Children and Youth Services caseworker for casework visits.
9. That all members of this family cooperate with any and all services provided by or recommended by Berks County Children and Youth Services, including being available for casework visits.

8-24-92

App. 4:45 pm - Michelle Stantow called Karen Essig to confirm Court date change.

Karen Essig - changed due to witness not convenient to show 9-2-92.

Karen Essig - mother is not supportive to Ursula. That she is not dealing with her father sexually abusing her and "there are other things that happened to her that" she is too scared to talk about.

FAMILY SERVICE PLAN REVIEW

Case Name: Stanton Date: 6/12/92
Case No: 0995 Period: 4/27/92 - 6/12/92
Mother's Name: Michelle Stanton Father's Name: Lloyd Stanton
Address: Brookline Manor Apts. Address: 250 Penn Ave., Room 121
Apt. 12-C, Reading, PA West Reading, PA
Date of Birth: 7/24/51 Date of Birth: 2/14/55
Phone: None Phone: car phone 858-3618

Ib. REVIEW - ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS:

Michelle Stanton and Ursula Stanton met with caseworker on a monthly basis to discuss issues of appropriate discipline, sexual abuse, and counseling. Lloyd Stanton met with caseworker on a monthly basis to discuss sexual abuse, counseling and drug and alcohol issues. Ursula Stanton is participating in group treatment at Reading Specialists on a regular basis to date. Reading Specialists has not recommended mother be in treatment, but would accept her in the non-offending parent group if she agrees. Michelle, Lloyd and Ursula Stanton all cooperated in assessing Ursula and Lloyd did not have visits. However, Lloyd Stanton did not follow through with having a D & A evaluation. He completed the first part of the evaluation at Reading Specialists, but never returned for the second part.

CHILD/REN IS/ARE SAFE/UNSAFE IN THE HOME

II. REASON FOR CONTINUED SERVICE:

SEXUAL ABUSE (Moderate)

There is an indicated report of sexual abuse citing father as perpetrator. Father was drinking during this incident and continues to drink frequently. Father has not followed through with D & A evaluation or evaluation at Reading Specialists. Father currently has no access to child, however the sexual abuse could re-occur if father has access especially in light of his failure to cooperate with treatment.

DANGEROUS ACTS (Moderate)

In the past mother and child have fought physically. Since BCCYS involvement there has been one physical confrontation and one verbal argument between mother and child.

III. SERVICE OBJECTIVES:

1. Eliminate sexual abuse immediately.
2. Eliminate dangerous acts.
3. Address drug and alcohol issues with father over the next 6 months.

Brandy Neider/nmr

bn
mm
6/18/92

IV. SERVICE AND ACTIONS:

Michelle will:

1. Meet with BCCYS caseworker on a monthly basis to discuss appropriate discipline, sexual abuse, and counseling through 10/27/92.
2. Not allow visitation between Ursula and her father until deemed appropriate by Reading Specialists.
3. Participate in all recommended treatment through Reading Specialists through 10/27/92.

Lloyd will:

1. Meet with BCCYS caseworker on a monthly basis to discuss sexual abuse, counseling, and drug and alcohol issues through 10/27/92.
2. Participate in complete evaluation at Reading Specialists and follow all recommendations by 7/27/92.
3. Participate in a drug and alcohol evaluation at TASC and follow all recommendations by 8/27/92.
4. Not have visitation with Ursula until deemed appropriate by Reading Specialists.

Ursula will:

1. Meet with BCCYS caseworker on a monthly basis to discuss sexual abuse, counseling, and expressing feeling appropriately through 10/27/92.
2. Participate in all recommended treatment through Reading Specialists through 10/27/92.
3. Not have visitation with her father until deemed appropriate by Reading Specialists.

BCCYS Caseworker will:

1. Will meet with all family members to discuss sexual abuse, counseling, appropriate discipline, and drug and alcohol issues through 10/27/92.
2. Monitor Ursula's attendance and progress in counseling at Reading Specialists through 10/27/92.
3. Monitor Lloyd's attendance and progress in counseling at Reading Specialists, and drug and alcohol treatment through 10/27/92.

K. Essig/so
Caseworker

KE

V. PARTICIPATION IN PLAN:

I, the undersigned, have participated in the development of this plan and am in agreement with it. I have received a copy of my rights to appeal provision of this plan.

NOTICE OF PARENTS' RIGHT TO APPEAL

The Family Service Plan was developed to identify your family's needs, establish objectives for services, and to determine the actions which will be taken by your family and the agency to achieve these objectives. If you do not agree with the Plan, you may appeal to the Office of Hearings, Appeals, Department of Public Welfare, any part of the Plan, Plan Amendment or Plan Review which:

1. Results in a denial, reduction, or termination of a service.
2. Results in a determination that you or your child must participate in a service.
3. Fails to take into account your choice or your child's choice of service.
4. Fails to act upon your request for service with reasonable promptness.

If you wish to appeal to the Department of Public Welfare, you have 15 days from the date you receive this notice to notify Children and Youth Services in writing. The agency will forward your appeal to the Department of Public Welfare. While the appeal is being decided, the current Service Plan will remain in effect.

If you decide to appeal, you have the right to be represented by an attorney or other representative. If you wish to be represented by an attorney and you cannot afford one, you should contact:


Berks County Bar Association Lawyer Referral Service
544 Court Street, Reading, PA, - telephone number (215) 375-4591

You should understand that a ruling on an appeal by the Department of Public Welfare will not supercede any portion of a Service Plan, Plan Amendment, Plan Review specifically approved or ordered by the Court.

If the Court is involved with your case, you have the right to petition the Court regarding any action of Children and Youth Services affecting your child.

Please call if you have any questions about this notice.

_____	_____	_____	_____
MOTHER	DATE	FATHER	DATE
_____	_____	_____	_____
CHILD	DATE	CASEWORKER	DATE
_____	_____		
SUPERVISOR	DATE		



Berks County Children & Youth Services

Anthony J. Carabello, *Commissioner*
Ernie Miller, *Commissioner*
Glenn B. Reber, *Commissioner*

Berks County Courthouse
633 Court Street
Reading, PA 19601
(215) 378-8256

George M. Kovarie, *Executive Director*

*Michelle Stanton
Brookline Manor Apt. 12-C
Reading, PA*

April 1, 1992

Berks County Children and Youth Services has received a report of suspected child abuse of Vosola Stanton and you have been cited as the alleged perpetrator.

As the Public Child Welfare agency of Berks County, we are required by law to evaluate all reports of suspected child abuse. It is our desire to be of help to people who are experiencing problems, and our agency is prepared to provide services.

By law you have the following rights:

1. You will be informed by letter of the decision made about the reported suspected abuse, either that the agency determined that the child was abused or was not, or that Juvenile Court found that the child was abused or not. You will be informed by both Berks County Children and Youth Services and by Childline in Harrisburg.

You may request from us, in writing, the information we have on file. We are, however, by law, unable to give you the name of the individual who reported the suspected abuse.

You may request that the decision which is reached by Berks County Children & Youth Services about the suspected abuse be changed by writing to the Secretary of Public Welfare, P.O. Box 2685, Harrisburg, PA 17105.


2. The Child Protective Service workers must report to law enforcement officials reports of suspected abuse when the initial review gives evidence that the abuse is homicide, sexual abuse, or exploitation, or serious bodily injury perpetrated by persons whether related or not to the victim, or child abuse perpetrated by persons who are not family or household members. "Serious bodily injury" means injury which creates a substantial risk of death or which causes serious permanent disfigurement or protracted loss of impairment of the function of any bodily member or organ.

3. You have a right to an attorney. You may call the Lawyer Referral Service of Berks County Bar Association, 544 Court Street, Reading, PA. Their phone number is 375-4591.

If you have any questions concerning this letter, please speak to me about your concern. You may call me at 378-3085.

Sincerely,

Brandy Neider
Caseworker



Berks County Children & Youth Services

Glenn B. Reber, *Commissioner*
Michael F. Feeney, *Commissioner*
Anthony J. Carabello, *Commissioner*

Berks County Courthouse
33 North Sixth Street
Reading, PA 19601
(215) 378-8256

George M. Kovarie, *Executive Director*

April 3, 1992


Michelle Stanton
Brookline Manor Apartments
Apt. 12-C
Reading, PA 19611

This letter is to inform you that the report of suspected child abuse concerning Ursula Stanton received by this agency on 03/03/92 is indicated, and will remain on file in Harrisburg until the above-named child becomes 18 years of age.


You will be receiving a letter from ChildLine in Harrisburg, which will provide further information.

If you were listed as perpetrator, the fact that the report is indicated, by evidence or admission, would be noted if you seek future employment in child care service, according to recent legislation, Act 33 of 1985.

Sincerely,


Brandy Neider
Caseworker

BN/ke



Berks County Children & Youth Services

Glenn B. Reber, *Commissioner*
Michael F. Feeney, *Commissioner*
Anthony J. Carabello, *Commissioner*

Berks County Courthouse
33 North Sixth Street
Reading, PA 19601
(215) 378-8256

George M. Kovarie, *Executive Director*


April 3, 1992

Michelle Stanton
Brookline Manor Apartments
Apt. 12-C
Reading, PA 19611

This letter is to inform you that the report of suspected child abuse on Rebecca Stanton received by this agency on 03/03/92 is unfounded.

All material and information obtained as a result of this investigation and held at this agency will be destroyed as soon as we learn from ChildLine that the material is expunged at the Statewide Central Registry.

Sincerely,


Brandy Neider
Caseworker

BN/ke



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120

OFFICE OF
CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES

April 15, 1992

CHILDLINE & ABUSE REGISTRY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE
LANCO LODGE, 3RD FLOOR
P.O. BOX 2675
HARRISBURG, PA 17105-2675
TELEPHONE NO. (717) 783-1864

MR LLOYD STANTON
250 PENN AVE RM 121
WEST READING PA 19611

Child: Ursula Stanton

Report #: 06-09711

Dear Mr. Stanton:

A report of suspected abuse involving the above named child was investigated by the:
[] _____ Region Office of Children, Youth and Families.
[X] BERKS County Children and Youth Agency.

The status of the report is: [X] Indicated, [] Founded. If the status is Indicated, it means that the agency determined that the child was abused; if it is Founded, the court made the determination. The report will remain on file in the state and county offices until 18 years after the child's birth. If the child is reabused or a subject is involved in another Indicated/Founded report, it will remain on file for an additional five years. If the report is Indicated, at that time all information which identifies the subjects will be destroyed; if it is Founded, only the information which identifies the child will be removed from the report.

Your name's listed on the report as: (1)[XX] parent, (2)[] substitute caregiver, (3)[XX] abuser, added to the report as (4)[] _____ or deleted from the report as (5)[] _____.

THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPHS APPLY TO YOU ONLY IF BLOCKS 1, 2, 3 OR 4 HAVE BEEN CHECKED:

Persons named as abusers may not be hired in child-caring jobs under certain conditions according to Act 33 of 1985.

You have the right to receive services, which are intended to prevent further abuse or neglect, through the county children and youth agency. You also have the right to receive a copy of the report by writing to the investigating agency or this office. If you choose to do so, please refer to the report number listed above when making your request. Should your address change before the child becomes age 18, please inform this office.

If your name appears on this report as the abuser, and you believe the report is inaccurate or that it is not being maintained in accordance with the law, you may request that the report be amended, sealed, or destroyed by specifying the reasons in writing to: Secretary of Public Welfare, P.O. Box 2675, Harrisburg, PA 17105.

If you have questions about your rights, involvement in the report, or this letter; we suggest you contact the investigating agency named in the first paragraph, telephone (215) 378-8256.

Sincerely,

Scott Fries
Acting Director



Berks County Children & Youth Services

Anthony J. Carabello, *Commissioner*
Ernie Miller, *Commissioner*
Glenn B. Reber, *Commissioner*

Berks County Courthouse
633 Court Street
Reading, PA 19601
(215) 378-8256

George M. Kovarie, *Executive Director*

July 8, 1992

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL


Mr. Lloyd Stanton
250 Penn Avenue, Room 121
West Reading, PA 19611

Dear Mr. Stanton:

In speaking to Mrs. Stanton and the girls, I have learned that you continue to have contact with Ursula. Due to this, I once again must ask for your cooperation in evaluation and treatment for drug and alcohol issues. If you do not cooperate, I will be forced to petition the court to order you to cooperate with services.

I have developed a current Family Service Plan and wish to review it with you and give you the opportunity to sign it. I may be reached at 378-8197.

Respectfully,


Kerin J. Essig
Caseworker

KJE/so



Berks County Children & Youth Services

Anthony J. Carabello, *Commissioner*
Ernie Miller, *Commissioner*
Glenn B. Reber, *Commissioner*

Berks County Courthouse
633 Court Street
Reading, PA 19601
(215) 378-8256

George M. Kovarie, *Executive Director*

July 14, 1992


Mr. Lloyd Stanton
250 Penn Avenue, Room 121
West Reading, PA 19611

Dear Mr. Stanton:

In speaking to Mrs. Stanton and the girls, I have learned that you continue to have contact with Ursula. Due to this, I once again must ask for your cooperation in evaluation and treatment for drug and alcohol issues. If you do not cooperate, I will be forced to petition the court to order you to cooperate with services.

I have developed a current Family Service Plan and wish to review it with you and give you the opportunity to sign it. I may be reached at 378-8197.

Respectfully,


Kerin J. Essig
Caseworker

KJE/mu

READING SPECIALISTS

In Family and Children's Problems

142 North 11th Street

Reading, PA 19601

(215) 372-7960

(215) 372-8817

July 30, 1992

Mr. Lloyd Stanton
110 Corporate Drive
Reading, PA 19610


Dear Mr. Stanton:

This letter is in regard to the outstanding balance of \$130.00 to Reading Specialists.


This will be a final attempt by Reading Specialists to collect the full balance from you. If this account is not paid within ten days from the date of this letter, your account will be turned over to the Credit Bureau of Reading, 135 North Fifth Street, Reading, PA.

Please notify our office immediately if you believe a discrepancy exists.

Sincerely,


Robert W. Gill, Ed.D.

RWG:m



Berks County Children & Youth Services

Anthony J. Carabello, *Commissioner*
Ernie Miller, *Commissioner*
Glenn B. Reber, *Commissioner*


Berks County Courthouse
633 Court Street
Reading, PA 19601
(215) 378-8256

George M. Kovaric, *Executive Director*

Dear Mrs. Stanton,

I am planning to stop to see you on August 3
at 1:30 PM. If this time does not
suit you, please call me to reschedule (478-6795).

Respectfully,


Kerin Essig
Caseworker

KE/mu

Enclosed is a copy of the family service plan. Please have Wanda present on 8/3 in order to review the plan with both of you.

Aug 3, 1992

Dear Mrs. Stanton,

I was at your home at 1:30 on 8/3/92 for our scheduled appointment. Noises were heard inside your apartment but the door was not answered. Please contact me at 478-6795 to discuss Family Service Plan & to make further arrangements.

Kerri Sisk
BCYS caseworker

BERKS COUNTY CHILDREN & YOUTH SERVICES

FAMILY SERVICE PLAN REVIEW

Case Name: Stanton Date: 6/12/92
 Case No: 7995 Period: 4/27/92 - 6/12/92
 Mother's Name: Michelle Stanton Father's Name: Lloyd Stanton
 Address: Brookline Manor Apts. Address: 250 Penn Ave., Room 121
Apt. 12-C, Reading, PA West Reading, PA
 Date of Birth: 7/24/51 Date of Birth: 2/14/55
 Phone: None Phone: car phone 858-3618

Ib. REVIEW - ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS:

Michelle Stanton and Ursula Stanton met with caseworker on a monthly basis to discuss issues of appropriate discipline, sexual abuse, and counseling. Lloyd Stanton met with caseworker on a monthly basis to discuss sexual abuse, counseling and drug and alcohol issues. Ursula Stanton is participating in group treatment at Reading Specialists on a regular basis to date. Reading Specialists has not recommended mother be in treatment, but would accept her in the non-offending parent group if she agrees. Michelle, Lloyd and Ursula Stanton all cooperated in assessing Ursula and Lloyd did not have visits. However, Lloyd Stanton did not follow through with having a D & A evaluation. He completed the first part of the evaluation at Reading Specialists, but never returned for the second part.

CHILD/REN IS/ARE SAFE/UNSAFE IN THE HOME

II. REASON FOR CONTINUED SERVICE:

SEXUAL ABUSE (Moderate)

There is an indicated report of sexual abuse citing father as perpetrator. Father was drinking during this incident and continues to drink frequently. Father has not followed through with D & A evaluation or evaluation at Reading Specialists. Father currently has no access to child, however the sexual abuse could re-occur if father has access especially in light of his failure to cooperate with treatment.

DANGEROUS ACTS (Moderate)

In the past mother and child have fought physically. Since BCCYS involvement there has been one physical confrontation and one verbal argument between mother and child.

III. SERVICE OBJECTIVES:

1. Eliminate sexual abuse immediately.
2. Eliminate dangerous acts.
3. Address drug and alcohol issues with father over the next 6 months.

Brandy Neider/nmr

bw
mm
6/19/92

IV. SERVICE AND ACTIONS:

Michelle will:

1. Meet with BCCYS caseworker on a monthly basis to discuss appropriate discipline, sexual abuse, and counseling through 10/27/92.
2. Not allow visitation between Ursula and her father until deemed appropriate by Reading Specialists.
3. Participate in all recommended treatment through Reading Specialists through 10/27/92.

Lloyd will:

1. Meet with BCCYS caseworker on a monthly basis to discuss sexual abuse, counseling, and drug and alcohol issues through 10/27/92.
2. Participate in complete evaluation at Reading Specialists and follow all recommendations by 7/27/92.
3. Participate in a drug and alcohol evaluation at TASC and follow all recommendations by 8/27/92.
4. Not have visitation with Ursula until deemed appropriate by Reading Specialists.

Ursula will:

1. Meet with BCCYS caseworker on a monthly basis to discuss sexual abuse, counseling, and expressing feeling appropriately through 10/27/92.
2. Participate in all recommended treatment through Reading Specialists through 10/27/92.
3. Not have visitation with her father until deemed appropriate by Reading Specialists.

BCCYS Caseworker will:

1. Will meet with all family members to discuss sexual abuse, counseling, appropriate discipline, and drug and alcohol issues through 10/27/92.
2. Monitor Ursula's attendance and progress in counseling at Reading Specialists through 10/27/92.
3. Monitor Lloyd's attendance and progress in counseling at Reading Specialists, and drug and alcohol treatment through 10/27/92.

K. Essig/so
Caseworker

KE

V. PARTICIPATION IN PLAN:

I, the undersigned, have participated in the development of this plan and I am in agreement with it. I have received a copy of my rights to appeal the provision of this plan.

NOTICE OF PARENTS' RIGHT TO APPEAL

The Family Service Plan was developed to identify your family's needs, to establish objectives for services, and to determine the actions which will be taken by your family and the agency to achieve these objectives. If you do not agree with the Plan, you may appeal to the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Public Welfare, any part of the Plan, Plan Amendment, or Plan Review which:

1. Results in a denial, reduction, or termination of a service.
2. Results in a determination that you or your child must participate in a service.
3. Fails to take into account your choice or your child's choice of service.
4. Fails to act upon your request for service with reasonable promptness.

If you wish to appeal to the Department of Public Welfare, you have 15 days from the date you receive this notice to notify Children and Youth Services in writing. The agency will forward your appeal to the Department of Public Welfare. While the appeal is being decided, the current Service Plan will remain in effect.

If you decide to appeal, you have the right to be represented by an attorney or other representative. If you wish to be represented by an attorney and you cannot afford one, you should contact:


Berks County Bar Association Lawyer Referral Service
544 Court Street, Reading, PA, - telephone number (215) 375-4591

You should understand that a ruling on an appeal by the Department of Public Welfare will not supercede any portion of a Service Plan, Plan Amendment, or Plan Review specifically approved or ordered by the Court.

If the Court is involved with your case, you have the right to petition the Court regarding any action of Children and Youth Services affecting your child.

Please call if you have any questions about this notice.

_____	DATE	_____	DATE
MOTHER		FATHER	
_____	DATE	_____	DATE
CHILD		CASEWORKER	
_____	DATE		
SUPERVISOR			



Berks County Children & Youth Services

Anthony J. Carabello, *Commissioner*
Ernie Miller, *Commissioner*
Glenn B. Reber, *Commissioner*

Berks County Courthouse
633 Court Street
Reading, PA 19601
(215) 378-8256

George M. Kovarie, *Executive Director*

Dear Mrs. Stanton,

I am planning to stop to see you on August 3
at 1:30 PM. If this time does not
suit you, please call me to reschedule (478-6795)

Respectfully,

Kerin Essig
Kerin Essig
Caseworker

KE/mu

Enclosed is a copy of the family service
plan. Please have Wanda present on 8/3
in order to review the plan with both of
you.



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120

OFFICE OF
CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES

November 30, 1992

CHILDLINE & ABUSE REGISTRY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE
LANCO LODGE, 3RD FLOOR
P.O. BOX 2675
HARRISBURG, PA 17105-2675
TELEPHONE NO. (717) 783-1984

MS MICHELLE STANTON
PO BOX 6912
WYOMISSING PA 19610

Child: Ursula Stanton

Report Number: 06-09864

Dear Ms. Stanton:

Within the past few months the above named child was reported as a victim of suspected child abuse.

The _____ Regional Office of Children, Youth and Families

The BERKS County Children and Youth Agency

has investigated the report and determined it was "Unfounded" because of one of the following: (1) the incident did not occur, (2) the injury was not of a serious nature, or, (3) substantial evidence was not found. This letter is to notify you that the report has been destroyed at our office and by the investigating agency.

We are required to inform you that this action has been taken because your name was listed on the report as the person who allegedly abused the child. This pertains only to the report which is listed above.

Although we cannot answer any specific questions about the report since it has been destroyed, you may wish to contact the investigating agency at
(215) 378-8256.

Sincerely,

Scott Fries
Acting Director

SF:kb

CL-UCRL



Berks County Children & Youth Services

Anthony J. Carabello, *Commissioner*
Ernie Miller, *Commissioner*
Glenn B. Reber, *Commissioner*

Berks County Courthouse
633 Court Street
Reading, PA 19601
(215) 378-8256

George M. Kovarie, *Executive Director*

December 15, 1992

Dear Michelle Stanton

I am planning to stop to see you on December 21
at 10:00AM. If this time does not

suit you, please call me to reschedule (478-6795).

PS
unless Ursula
is in school
then I will see
her there.
KE/mu

Respectfully,

Kerin Essig
Kerin Essig
Caseworker



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120

OFFICE OF
CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES

November 30, 1992

CHILDLINE & ABUSE REGISTRY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE
LANCO LODGE, 3RD FLOOR
P.O. BOX 2675
HARRISBURG, PA 17105-2675
TELEPHONE NO. (717) 783-1864

MR LLOYD STANTON
BROOKLINE MANOR APTS APT 12C
READING PA 19611

Child: Rebecca Stanton

Report Number: 06-09712

Dear Mr. Stanton:

Within the past few months the above named child was reported as a victim of suspected child abuse.

The _____ Regional Office of Children, Youth and Families

The BERKS County Children and Youth Agency

has investigated the report and determined it was "Unfounded" because of one of the following: (1) the incident did not occur, (2) the injury was not of a serious nature, or, (3) substantial evidence was not found. This letter is to notify you that the report has been destroyed at our office and by the investigating agency.

We are required to inform you that this action has been taken because your name was listed on the report as the person who allegedly abused the child. This pertains only to the report which is listed above.

Although we cannot answer any specific questions about the report since it has been destroyed, you may wish to contact the investigating agency at (215) 378-8256.

Sincerely,

Scott Fries
Acting Director

SF:kb

CL-UCRL

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS 23rd JUDICIAL DISTRICT
BERKS COUNTY
JUVENILE PETITION**

FOR REHEARING

Juvenile No . 465-J-1992

In the interest of Ursula Stanton

Date of Birth 1/3/79

To The Honorable Judge of Said Court

PETITIONER Kerin Essig/caseworker, respectfully represents that, the said child, Ursula Stanton resides at P.O. Box 6912, Wyomissing, PA 19610 and is alleged to be a dependent child. It is within the jurisdiction of the Court and in the best interest of the child that this proceeding be brought before the Court for the following reason(s).

THE FACTS IN SUPPORT OF ALLEGED DEPENDENCY ARE SET FORTH IN EXHIBIT A ATTACHED HERETO AND MADE A PART HEREOF.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS TO ALLEVIATE THE ALLEGED DEPENDENCY ARE SET FORTH IN EXHIBIT C ATTACHED HERETO AND MADE A PART HEREOF.

FATHER'S NAME AND ADDRESS Lloyd Stanton 250 Penn Ave., Rm. 121 West Reading, PA 19611 () UNKNOWN	MOTHER'S NAME AND ADDRESS Michelle Stanton P.O. Box 6912 Wyomissing, PA 19610 () UNKNOWN
---	---

SPOUSES NAME AND ADDRESS (IF APPLICABLE)	GUARDIAN'S NAME AND ADDRESS () UNKNOWN
--	--

IF THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES IN ABOVE ITEMS ARE UNKNOWN OR DO NOT RESIDE WITHIN THIS COMMONWEALTH, GIVE NAME OF A KNOWN ADULT RELATIVE RESIDING NEAREST TO THE LOCATION OF THIS COURT	RELATIONSHIP ADDRESS
---	-------------------------

DATE/TIME TAKEN INTO CUSTODY BY POLICE/BCCYS 3/10/93 3:55 p.m.	DATE/TIME ADMITTED TO DETENTION 3/10/93 approx. 5 p.m.
---	---

IS CHILD PRESENTLY DETAINED? | IF YES, WHERE?
 YES NO Concern shelter care

Wherefore, Petitioner prays your Honorable Court to inquire into the alleged dependency of the above child and of the matters alleged, and to make such order as deemed appropriate.


Further, if said child is found to be a dependent child and is to enter placement, or is otherwise removed from his/her home at disposition, your petitioner prays your Honorable Court, prior to entering such order of disposition, to determine whether reasonable efforts were made by the Berks County Children and Youth Services to prevent such removal of the child from his home: or if preventive services were not offered due to the emergency nature of the placement, whether such lack of services was reasonable, as set forth in Exhibit B attached hereto and made a part hereof.

If the Court has previously determined, pursuant to 42 Pa. C.S. §6332, that reasonable efforts were not made to prevent the initial removal of the child from his home, your petitioner prays your Honorable Court to determine whether reasonable efforts are underway to make it possible for the child to return home.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, COUNTY OF BERKS

I verify that the statements made in this Juvenile Petition are true and correct. I understand that false statements herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S. section §4904, relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

Date 3/11/93


 Caseworker
 PETITIONER

ke/gjc
3/10/93



**WEST READING
POLICE DEPARTMENT**

3/10/93

I Chief Habecker told Michelle Stanton to respond to Berks County Court House and talk to Judge Erlich about her daughter . I told her that the Judge was the only one that could change the court order.

Chief Bill Habecker

JUVENILE DETENTION NOTICE

When a request for detention is approved by the Juvenile Probation Office, it will be necessary for the following form to be filled in completely in quadruplicate, with the original being filed at the Juvenile Probation Office, one copy given to the parent-custodian prior to or immediately following delivery of the child to detention, one copy to the juvenile, and one copy for police records.

JUVENILE URSULA STANTON ADDRESS 250 PENN. AVE Rm 121 WEST READING PA 19611 D.O.B. 1-3-79
PARENTS MICHELLE STANTON ADDRESS 250 PENN AVE. Rm 121 W. RDG 19611
LLOYD STANTON ADDRESS 250 PENN AVE. Rm 121 W. RDG 19611

ACTS CHARGED (BE SPECIFIC) DEPENDENCY

REASON FOR DETENTION SEXUAL ABUSE

TIME TAKEN INTO CUSTODY MARCH 10, 1993

PLACE OF DETENTION CONCERN SHELTER BY BCCYS

NOTICE

It will be necessary for you, MICHELLE STANTON, to appear 3/10, 19 93, at 1:30 P.M. for a detention hearing for said juvenile in the Berks County Juvenile Probation Office, 10th FL. SERVICES CENTER ~~COURTHOUSE~~, READING, PA. At this hearing it will be determined whether said juvenile should be continued in detention pending a full hearing on the charges stated above and possible additional charges. It is his or her right to be represented by counsel at this hearing if he or she so desires. If counsel is desired and he or she is without financial resources to employ a lawyer, please call the Public Defender's Office, 24 N. 6th St., Reading, Pa., Telephone 378-8820, which office will advise of the possibility of his or her being represented by a Public Defender without charge.

THIS NOTICE HANDED PERSONALLY TO MICHELLE STANTON ON 3/10, 19 93
AT 3:55 O'CLOCK P M AT Rm 121 PENNVIEW MOTEL W. RDG. 19611
(PARENT/CUSTODIAN) ADDRESS

UNABLE TO SERVE NOTICE. FOLLOWING ATTEMPTS MADE: _____

DATE 3/10/93 OFFICER Shirley J. Essig

ADDRESS BCCYS

RECEIVED NOTICE refused to sign
(PARENT/CUSTODIAN)

Distribution
White - Juvenile Probation
Canary - Parent/Custodian
Pink - Juvenile
Green - Police

March 12, 1993

Exhibit A - Petition Dependency of
Ursula Stanton

4. I never stated that comment.
Michelle Stanton

5. The statement is not true.

7. Injury occurred on W. Poly. School
playground.

Tony Hebbard displeased both
girls.

9. Ursula never fell down any
steps.

Ursula was not told she couldn't
talk to anyone.

10. I never made that comment.
Michelle Stanton

Also date is incorrect.

EXHIBIT A

1. That on March 3, 1992, Berks County Children and Youth Services (BCCYS) received a report of suspected sexual abuse regarding Ursula Stanton, D.O.B. January 3, 1979, citing Lloyd Stanton, child's father, as alleged perpetrator, alleging that Lloyd Stanton pulled down said child's covers and hugged her, making her feel uncomfortable.
2. That on March 6, 1992, said child stated to BCCYS' CPS investigator, Brandy Neider, that Lloyd Stanton drinks a lot and has a history of drug use and may be presently using. She stated she is involved with Juvenile Probation Office due to writing bad checks. At this time said child denied ever feeling uncomfortable when her father touched her.
3. That on March 9, 1992, caseworker, Brandy Neider, interviewed Lloyd and Michelle Stanton at BCCYS. Lloyd Stanton denied all sexual abuse allegations in regard to said child. Lloyd Stanton stated he had been in in-patient treatment at the Neumann Center for cocaine use but was no longer using this drug but drinks frequently. At this time Lloyd Stanton agreed to an evaluation at T.A.S.C. Michelle Stanton stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that she had been sexually abused by her stepfather as a child.
4. That on March 18, 1992, caseworker, Brandy Neider, spoke to Michelle Omlor, said child's Juvenile Probation Officer who stated Michelle Stanton stated Lloyd Stanton had touched said child in a way that made child feel uncomfortable.
5. That on March 19, 1992, Detective Dan Billings of Wyomissing Police Department, stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that Michelle Stanton is currently on A.R.D. for stealing money from an elderly neighbor.
6. That on March 23, 1992, caseworker, Brandy Neider, spoke to Tony Hubbard, principal at West Reading Elementary School, who stated that Michelle Stanton stated to her that said child would sleep in the same bed or room as Lloyd Stanton during visits when parents were separated.
- ✓ 7. That on March 30, 1992, Juvenile Probation Officer, Michelle Omlor, stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that said child had a cast on her arm. Further, that when Ms. Omlor asked how the injury occurred, mother and daughter simultaneously offered two different explanations; mother stated child must have picked something up wrong; child stated she had fallen on the ice.
- 8.) That on March 30, 1992, said child stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that when she would visit father when he lived on Windsor street, they would sleep together. Said child stated Lloyd Stanton would be intoxicated and naked and would touch said child's buttocks and the back of her thigh. Father would ask child if she would tell her mother if he touched her private parts. Further, said child stated that cast was due to a thumb injury acquired after she punched some girl on the playground.
9. That on March 30, 1992, caseworker, Brandy Neider, spoke to guidance counselor, Kelly McClennan, at West Reading Elementary School, who stated that on this day said child at first did not want to talk with caseworker because, child stated, "I'm not supposed to tell her anything." Further, that she had heard said child's injuries was a result of falling down the steps.
10. That on April 1, 1992, Michelle Stanton told caseworker, Brandy Neider, that she believed the sexual abuse involving said child occurred during the summer of 1990.

12. Ursula was taking Ritalin then put on Wellbutrin by Dr. Wilkins at Yonkers, her blood level was not level.

Michelle Palmer was called because I knew Ursula would listen to her, and possibly as he would get through to her.

13. In correct statement and date.

14. Inaccurate.

15. I (Michelle Stanton) talked with doctor on Dr. Sutherland's staff, he read Ursula's chart and stated to me that any thing suspected has to be reported.

Injury can be verified.

Appointments missed due to earlier appointment that went past the time and Ursula had cold and fever.

She claimed Lloyd Stanton was drinking every day but was moving out of the apartment. At this time Michelle Stanton agreed to have said child evaluated at Reading Specialist.

11. That on April 2, 1992, the report of sexual abuse regarding said child was indicated with Lloyd Stanton indicated as the perpetrator.
12. That on April 3, 1992, juvenile probation officer, Michelle Omlor, and caseworker, Brandy Neider, went to the Stanton home after Michelle Stanton called stating she and said child were just involved in a serious physical confrontation. Further, that during the confrontation, child slammed mother's arm in the bathroom door and mother hit said child with a belt causing both minor injuries. Further, that both parties agreed to refrain from any physical fighting.
13. That on April 3, 1992, Michelle Stanton stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that she does believe said child in regard to the sexual abuse, that Lloyd Stanton had moved out, and she would comply with appointments at Reading Specialists.
14. That on April 3, 1992, Michelle Stanton stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that Lloyd Stanton told her approximately five years into their marriage that he had left home at age 14 and went to Los Angeles. He allegedly left because paternal grandfather attempted to sexually abuse his sister and grandfather would wake him up by burning his feet with a cigarette. In Los Angeles he would exchange sexual favors with older women for food and a place to stay.
15. That on April 22, 1992, Dr. Sutherland of Reading Hospital and Medical Center, stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that he had put a cast on said child's arm for purposes of immobilization as child had a lot of pain. Further, that the injury is consistent with a fall, but also could have been consistent with blocking someone's physical threat. Further, that on two occasions, Michelle Stanton and said child failed to show up at appointments to have the cast removed and said child had the cast on two weeks longer than was necessary.
16. That on April 24, 1992, Juvenile Probation Officer, Michelle Omlor, stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that Lloyd Stanton was at the residence of said child, although said child was at school.
17. That on April 24, 1992, caseworker, Brandy Neider, told Lloyd Stanton he is to have no contact with said child. He agreed to this and to meet with caseworker to discuss the Family Service Plan on April 28, 1992.
18. That on April 27, 1992, Michelle Stanton stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, and supervisor, Melissa Haydt, that she had said child confront Lloyd Stanton about the sexual abuse. Further, that she believed this was appropriate and productive and that said child and father should be allowed to have contact. Michelle Stanton did however agree to have child continue in treatment.
19. That on April 28, 1992, Lloyd Stanton again denied the sexual abuse to caseworker, Brandy Neider, stating it was "a misunderstanding." Further, he agreed to have a drug and alcohol evaluation at T.A.S.C. and an evaluation at Reading Specialist.
20. That on April 29, 1992, Michelle Stanton stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that she was in agreement with the provisions of the Family Service Plan.

16. Michelle Olmstead had a chance
to talk to both of us.

17. Lloyd Stanton did not make
that agreement, I Michelle Stanton
was present, when demands were
made.

18. I (Michelle Stanton) talked to
Wesley and she had no objections.
Wesley did talk freely with
Lee father.

20. I stated nothing.

28. Lloyd Stanton did not sleep
there.

I made no statement.

21. That on May 15, 1992, Michelle Stanton and said child signed the Family Service Plan.
22. That on June 3, 1992, Lloyd Stanton did not show up to sign the Family Service Plan.
23. That on June 11, 1992, Dr. Robert Gill of Reading Specialists, stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that said child is regularly going to treatment and he would be willing to have Michelle Stanton join the non-offending parent group.
24. That on June 11, 1992, Donna, at T.A.S.C., stated to caseworker, Brandy Neider, that Lloyd Stanton still had not made an appointment.
25. That on June 12, 1992, Lloyd Stanton again did not show for scheduled time to sign Family Service Plan.
26. That on June 19, 1992, the Stanton case was transferred to Protective Services caseworker, Kerin Essig.
27. That on June 29, 1992, BCCYS caseworker, Kerin Essig, and your petitioner sent a letter to Michelle Stanton and Lloyd Stanton announcing case transfer to caseworker, Kerin Essig.
28. That on July 7, 1992, caseworker Kerin Essig, met with Michelle Stanton, daughter, Rebecca Stanton and said child. Michelle Stanton and said child claimed Lloyd Stanton had consistently been to the residence and had slept there at times. At times he would be intoxicated and pound on the apartment door. Michelle Stanton claimed she would support said child but was not convinced Lloyd Stanton had physically violated said child.
29. That on July 14, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, sent restricted delivery letter to Lloyd Stanton asking for his cooperation and that Family Service Plan had been developed and that caseworker wanted to review it with him.
30. That on July 17, 1992, caseworker, Kerin essig, received a call from Michelle Stanton who was angry caseworker wanted to see said child and herself twice in one month. Caseworker, Kerin Essig, attempted to explain the Family Service Plan and the need to review it with Michelle Stanton and said child.
31. At this time Michelle Stanton said she would no longer comply with agency services unless she was court ordered. Michelle Stanton refused to see or sign the Family Service Plan and was not interested in the appeal process. Michelle stanton claimed said child was not harmed because there had been no skin to skin contact.
32. That on July 17, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, received a receipt of registered delivery to Lloyd Stanton without his signature.
33. That on July 17, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, spoke to Mary Miller of the Penn View Motel, who claimed Lloyd Stanton had picked up said piece of mail.
34. That on July 22, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, sent letters to Michelle Stanton and Lloyd Stanton containing BCCYS new address and phone number.
35. That on July 29, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, sent a copy of the Family Service Plan to Michelle Stanton.

36. That on August 3, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, met with Michelle Stanton. Michelle Stanton claimed she had received a copy of the Family Service Plan but did not look at it. She once again said she would not comply with services and would not let caseworker see said child. Michelle Stanton claimed she had several job prospects and Lloyd Stanton would be with said child while she would be working. She requested court action be taken.
37. That on August 3, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, met with Lloyd Stanton at the residence of Michelle Stanton, Rebecca Stanton, and said child. Lloyd Stanton agreed to attend drug and alcohol counseling at the Neumann Center and admitted to having an alcohol problem. Lloyd Stanton refused to complete the evaluation at Reading Specialists.
38. That on August 3, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, spoke to Michelle Omlor, Juvenile Probation Office. She claimed she had seen Michelle Stanton and said child on July 29, 1991. Michelle Stanton and said child had a physical confrontation approximately the weekend of July 25, 1992.
39. That on August 4, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, spoke to Dr. Robert Gill of Reading Specialists, in regard to an evaluation of said child performed on April 8, 1992. Diagnostic impression of the evaluation was Attention Deficit Disorder with possible post-traumatic stress syndrome. Recommendations were intensive ongoing therapy as well as group treatment for victims of childhood sexual abuse.
40. That on August 4, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, spoke to Dr. Robert Gill of Reading Specialists in regard to an evaluation of Lloyd Stanton on May 7, 1992. Lloyd Stanton arrived late for his evaluation and paid only \$20. An appointment was scheduled to complete the evaluation on May 13, 1992, which Lloyd Stanton did not attend. He continues to owe \$130 to Reading Specialists. Dr. Gill's impression at this time was that said child is not safe if there is contact between said child and Lloyd Stanton.
41. That on August 5, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, mailed a copy of the Family Service Plan to Lloyd Stanton.
42. That on August 7, 1992, caseworker, Kerin Essig, spoke to Kelly McClennan, guidance counselor at West Reading Elementary School. She stated said child told her in January 1992 that Lloyd Stanton was a heavy drinker and said child had seen him use cocaine. Further, that he would come home drunk and high and fight with Michelle Stanton. Kelly McClennan met with said child again in March 1992 at which time said child told her Lloyd Stanton had touched her years ago and it did not feel right. She claimed she was currently sleeping in the same room with her mother.

March 13, 1993

Addendum to Exhibit A

5. Michelle Stanton has been through SAM, approved, denied by Rdj. Mental Health, directed to Family Mediation and awaiting assignment to therapist.

Michelle Stanton has Health Service and appointment verification to Mrs. Dunbar, then she forwards letter to Judge Eschelmann.

6. All can be verified.

7. All can be verified.

8. Unknown

9. This is Beck's County.
Child is not without her mother overnight.

10. Unknown

11. Unknown

Never made any threats to
or about anyone.

IN RE: URSULA STANTON

ADDENDUM TO EXHIBIT A

1. That on September 16, 1992 this matter was before the Court and continued pending the cooperation of parents, Michelle & Lloyd Stanton, and child, Ursula Stanton, in Court-ordered services.
2. That from September 16, 1992 to the present, Michelle Stanton, mother of Ursula Stanton, has not participated in individual therapy at Center for Mental Health.
3. That from September 16, 1992 to the present, said child has not participated in therapy at Reading Specialists.
4. That from September 16, 1992 to the present, Lloyd Stanton, father of said child, has not entered into drug & alcohol treatment.
5. That from September 16, 1992 to the present, neither Michelle Stanton, Lloyd Stanton, or said child have advised Berks County Children & Youth Services as to their compliance with their designated therapy programs.
6. That from September 14, 1992 to March 2, 1993, said child has been tardy from school three times, has had twenty excused absences & forty-nine unexcused absences.
7. That from September 16, 1992 - March 4, 1993, Rebecca Stanton, sibling of said child, has had seventeen excused absences, & twenty-six and one half unexcused absences.
8. That on March 5, 1993, Berks County Children and Youth Services supervisor Renee Long spoke to Michelle Onloe of Juvenile Probation who stated that said child refused to provide her with her current address.
9. That on March 9, 1993, Dave Frank, police officer from Auburn, Schuylkill County, reported to your petitioner that Michelle Stanton, Rebecca Stanton, & said child were evicted from their residence and were reportedly residing at the Penn View Motel room 121, which is the residence of Lloyd Stanton, which is also in contempt of the previous Court Order stating there is to be no overnight visits for said child with Lloyd Stanton.
10. That on March 9, 1993, it was further reported by Dave Frank that Michelle Stanton is drug & alcohol involved and has had sexual activity in front of Rebecca Stanton & said child.
11. That on March 10, 1993, your petitioner spoke with John Reber, at S.T.A.R. who confirmed that said child was in fact residing with her father in room 121 at the Penn View Motel.
12. That on March 10, 1993, Berks County Children and Youth Services obtained an emergency court order for the placement of said child.
13. That on March 10, 1993, Kerin Essig went to the Penn View Motel accompanied by four officers of the West Reading Police Department and found Michelle Stanton there with said child and Rebecca Stanton. Michelle Stanton made contradictory statements to the police and Kerin Essig, first denying that Lloyd Stanton resided there and then stating that he would be returning that

14. Chief Habekken W. D. police told me in room I would be able to see if I could talk with Judge Elich and Rebecca and I had on how to possibly get Ursula back that evening.

Michelle Stanton never made terrorist threats and was not removed.

Michelle Stanton and Rebecca Stanton were barred by three security guards from seeing Judge Elich's Secretary.

15. Penn View clerk would not release information to any one.

16. Ursula is safe and loved.

evening. Michelle Stanton threatened to the effect that she would "get" anyone who had anything to do with this situation.

14. That on March 10, 1993, Michelle Stanton and Rebecca Stanton appeared at both the Social Services Center and the Courthouse demanding to meet with Judge Erhlich or anyone who would return said child to her. In the process, security was summoned in both buildings on reports that Michelle Stanton made terrorist threats and pushed a security guard. Michelle Stanton was removed from the premises by security at approximately 5:30 p.m.

15. That on March 11, 1993, Kerin Essig contacted the Penn View Motel and verified that room 121 is rented to Lloyd Stanton.

16. That the aforesated circumstances continue to place said child at risk of further abuse and the agency believes that said child should be taken under the care of the Court as a dependent child and temporary custody for placement transferred to Berks County Children and Youth Services to assure her safety and well-being.

ke/gjc
3/10/93
cyplain/stanton.a/slp

IN RE: URSULA STANTON

EXHIBIT B

Efforts made to prevent placement:

Initially Michelle Stanton and said child cooperated with services provided by caseworker, Brandy Neider; however, said child discontinued attendance in victims of childhood sexual abuse group at Reading Specialists. Michelle Stanton refused to prevent contact between Lloyd Stanton and said child. Michelle Stanton refused to see or read Family Service Plan. Caseworker, Kerin Essig, made home visit on August 3, 1992, at which time Michelle Stanton refused to comply with services or allow caseworker to see said child. Lloyd Stanton missed appointments with caseworker, Brandy Neider, on June 3, 1992 and June 12, 1992. Lloyd Stanton agreed to have a drug and alcohol evaluation at T.A.S.C. on April 28, 1992; however, he did not have an evaluation at T.A.S.C. Lloyd Stanton stated to caseworker, Kerin Essig, on August 3, 1992, that he would not attend T.A.S.C. for a drug and alcohol evaluation. Lloyd Stanton agreed to have an evaluation at Reading Specialists on April 28, 1992. He arrived late to his first appointment at Reading Specialist on May 7, 1992 and did not pay in full the amount for the evaluation. He did not attend a second appointment on May 13, 1992. He continues to owe \$130 for the evaluation. Lloyd Stanton made no attempt to contact caseworker, Kerin Essig, after several letters were sent to him. Michelle Stanton requested court action be taken.

IN RE: URSULA STANTON

ADDENDUM TO EXHIBIT B

Efforts Made to Prevent Placement:

That since September 16, 1992, mental health counseling for Michelle Stanton, sexual abuse counseling for said child, & drug/alcohol counseling for Lloyd Stanton continue to be available; however, all parties fail to cooperate with these services. Additionally Berks County Children & Youth Services caseworker attempted to maintain contact with said child pursuant to Court Order, but was not allowed access to said child by Michelle Stanton for scheduled visits in the home or visits at school due to unattendance.

Reason for Placement:

There is an indicated sexual abuse report involving Ursula Stanton, citing Lloyd Stanton as the perpetrator. Berks County Children and Youth Services learned on March 10, 1993, that Ursula Stanton was residing with Lloyd Stanton in his room at the Penn View Motel.

ke/gjc
3/10/93
cyplain/stanton.b/slp

IN RE: URSULA STANTON

EXHIBIT C

1. That said child be declared dependent and placed under the protective supervision of Berks County Children and Youth Services to ensure her safety.
2. That there be no visitation or contact between said child and Lloyd Stanton.
3. That Michelle Stanton participate in non-offending parents' group through Reading Specialists.
4. That Lloyd Stanton participate in a complete evaluation at Reading Specialists and follow the recommendations of the evaluation.
5. That said child participate in all recommended treatment through Reading Specialists.
6. That Lloyd Stanton participate in drug and alcohol treatment.
7. That Michelle Stanton, Lloyd Stanton, and said child sign all releases of information to/from all evaluators and treatment providers involved with the family.
8. That said child be made available to Berks County Children and Youth Services caseworker for casework visits.
9. That all members of this family cooperate with any and all services provided by or recommended by Berks County Children and Youth Services, including being available for casework visits.

IN RE: URSULA STANTON

AMENDED EXHIBIT C

1. That said child be declared dependent & temporary custody for placement be transferred to Berks County Children & Youth Services to ensure her safety.
2. That there be no visitation or contact between said child and Lloyd Stanton.
3. That Michelle Stanton participate in non-offending parents group through Reading Specialists to address her own past sexual abuse and to help her understand how she can help Ursula.
4. That Lloyd Stanton participate in a complete evaluation at Reading Specialists and follow the recommendations of the evaluation.
5. That said child participate in all recommended treatment through Reading Specialists.
6. That Lloyd Stanton participate in drug & alcohol treatment.
7. That Michelle Stanton, Lloyd Stanton, & said child sign all releases of information to/from all evaluators & treatment providers involved with the family so that Berks County Children and Youth Services can monitor participation and progress.
8. That all family members be available to Berks County Children & Youth Services caseworker for casework visits in the home on a weekly to monthly basis as needed.
9. That all members of this family cooperate with any and all services provided by or recommended by Berks County Children & Youth Services, including being available for casework visits.

ke/gjc

3/10/93

cyplain/stanton.c/slp