

12 CV 02858
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JACOB TEITELBAUM, individually and as father to
CHILD A and CHILD B,

PLAINTIFF

-against-

JUDA KATZ; CHAYA KATZ; JOEL TENNENBAUM;
BLUMA TENNENBAUM; DAVID RUBENSTEIN;
KIRYAS JOEL COMM AMBULANCE CRP; DISTRICT
FAMILY COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY 9th JUDICIAL
DISTRICT; HON. ANDREW P. BIVONA; ATTY. MARIA
PETRIZIO; CHILDREN'S RIGHTS SOCIETY OF ORANGE
COUNTY; ATTY. KIM PAVLOVIC; ATTY JOHN FRANCIS
X. BURKE; CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES OF ORANGE
COUNTY; DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES OF
ORANGE COUNTY; CHRISTINE BRUNET; ATTY.
STEPHANIE BAZILEOR; JOHN DOES 1 THROUGH 95;
JANE DOES 1 THROUGH 20,

DEFENDANTS

CIVIL ACTION NO.

COMPLAINT

**JURY TRIAL
DEMANDED**

Plaintiff JACOB TEITELBAUM, appearing Pro Se, by way of complaint against the
Defendants respectfully alleges as follows:

APR 11 2012
PRO SE OFFICE

RECEIVED
APR 11 2012
U.S.D.C.
WP

NATURE OF COMPLAINT

1. Plaintiff is a resident in a Hasidic, ultra-Orthodox, closely-knit community where it is unheard of to go “outside of the community” for most matters, and especially to report a member of the community to CPS for child abuse or neglect when both parents live together. For some odd reason, there was an exception in this case, and individuals in the community both conspired with false allegations and went out of the community to misinform Defendant CPS, all in an effort to take away the Plaintiff’s children. The cause of this harassment and intimidation from the community was the community’s disagreement with a religious campaign that the Plaintiff has been involved in. Those individuals were not satisfied with taking the children away, but continued to intimidate Plaintiff in many other ways. Furthermore, these individuals have harassed and intimidated Plaintiff’s wife numerous times. In this manner, the community has attempted to drive her to prevent Plaintiff from participating in his religious campaign, and even going so far as to force her to try to have Plaintiff removed from their home.
2. The Plaintiff, after considering his financial limitations, his limited comprehension of and ability to speak English, his limited knowledge of law, and his lack of political connections, believed that ignoring the situation would be the best option.
3. On or about August 2011, Plaintiff’s wife resumed living in peace with Plaintiff, discontinuing any and all efforts to stop Plaintiff from his campaign. Subsequently, Plaintiff’s wife once again became the target of both the previously mentioned individuals as well as Defendant DSS. In this light, Plaintiff notified through a motion the Defendant Family Court, stating that it was getting obvious that DSS had interests in

this matter other than the well-being of the children. Shortly after those aforementioned individuals and Defendant DSS stopped targeting Plaintiff's wife, they instead resumed their effort to convince her to join them in their efforts against the Plaintiff by offering her back her children if she would agree to separate from the Plaintiff. Defendant Family court denied Plaintiff's request to dismiss his attorney, who has refused Plaintiff's requests for denying charges and is instead fully compliant with DSS. This has left the Plaintiff with no other option than to seek remedy in this Court.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. Plaintiff Jacob Teitelbaum, Child A, and Child B are residents of the Town of Monroe, County of Orange, State of New York.
5. Upon information and belief all of the above named Defendants are residents of or conduct business in the County of Orange, State of New York.
6. This action is brought pursuant, but not limited to, Federal Question, 28 U.S.C. § 1331 for violations of the constitutional amendments, and state and federal statutes and pursuant the law.
7. This court also has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant but not limited to, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and § 1985.
8. Venue is a Southern district of the United States District Court of New York, since the Events alleged herein happened in Orange County, New York, and Plaintiff as well as defendants are residing or conducting business in Orange County, New York.

PARTIES IN THIS COMPLAINT

9. Plaintiff JACOB TEITELBAUM, is an individual over the age of 18 years, and is a citizen of the United States of America residing at 20 Getzel Berger Boulevard, Unit 104, Monroe, New York, 10950. Plaintiff is representing himself pro se, hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff".
 - a. Plaintiff Child "A", represented by Plaintiff, is an individual, a minor child, and a resident of the state of New York, hereinafter referred to as "Child 'A'".
 - b. Plaintiff Child "B", represented by Plaintiff, is an individual, a minor child, and a resident of the state of New York, hereinafter referred to as "Child 'B'".
10. Defendant Juda Katz is a New York state resident located at 22 Hayes Court, Unit 201, Kiryas Joel, New York. Defendant Juda Katz is the brother in law to Plaintiff's wife and was once a foster parent to "Child 'A'".
11. Defendant Chaya Katz is a New York State resident located at 22 Hayes Court, Unit 201, Kiryas Joel, New York. Defendant Chaya Katz is sister to Plaintiff's wife and was once a foster parent to "Child 'A'".
12. Defendant Joel Tennenbaum is a New York state resident located at 16 Lizensk Boulevard, Unit 102, Kiryas Joel, New York. Defendant Joel Tennenbaum is brother to Plaintiff's wife and foster parent to Plaintiff's children.
13. Defendant Bluma Tennenbaum is a New York state resident located at 16 Lizensk Boulevard, Unit 102, Kiryas Joel, New York. She is the wife of Joel Tennenbaum, sister-in-law to Plaintiff's wife, and foster parent to Plaintiff's children.

14. Defendant David Rubenstein is a New York state resident located at 4 Lamberg Ct., Unit 301, Kiryas Joel, New York. Defendant is a key member of Hatzalah, a volunteer Emergency Medical Service (EMS).
15. Defendant Kiryas Joel Comm Ambulance Corp. of Kiryas Joel, New York, upon information and belief is a New York state non-profit organization that operates at times interstate. Its primary location is 51 Forest Road, Village of Kiryas Joel, New York. Hereinafter, defendant will be referred to as "Hatzalah EMS".
16. Defendant Orange County Family Court of the 9th Judicial District is a New York government entity located at 285 Main Street, Goshen, New York, 10924. This Defendant acted through its agents Judge Andrew P. Bivona and court employees. Orange County Family Court may be served a summons through the clerk of the Family Court Orange County, Elizabeth C. Holbrook, at her place of business located at 285 Main Street, Goshen, New York, 10924. Hereinafter, Defendant Orange County Family Court will be referred to as "Family Court". The "Family Court" is sued for injunctive relief only.
17. Defendant attorney Maria Petrizio acted as attorney for Plaintiff's wife in the Family Court Proceedings. Defendant attorney Petrizio may be served a summons at her primary office, which is located at 210 Main Street, P.O. Box 328, Goshen, New York, 10924. Hereinafter, this Defendant will be referred to as "Attorney Petrizio".
18. Defendant Children's Rights Society Inc., has its primary place of business located at 213 West Main St., P.O. Box 1002, Goshen, New York, 10924. This Defendant acted through its agent Attorney Kim Pavlovic as the law guardian for Plaintiff's children. The Defendant may be served a summons at their primary place of business, 213 West Main

St., Goshen, New York, 10924. Hereinafter, Defendant will be referred to as “Attorney Pavlovic”.

19. Defendant Attorney John Francis X. Burke holds his primary office at 210 Main Street, P.O. Box 943, Goshen, New York, 10924. This Defendant acted as attorney for Plaintiff in the Family Court proceedings. Defendant Attorney Burke may be served a summons at the location listed above. Hereinafter, this Defendant will be referred to as “Attorney Burke”.
20. Defendant Child Protective Services of Orange County, New York, is a New York government entity located at 23 Hatfield Lane, Goshen, New York, 10924. This Defendant acted through its agents, including Christine Brunet, and may be served a summons at their primary place of business, which is 23 Hatfield Lane, Goshen, New York, 10924. Hereinafter, this Defendant will be referred to as “CPS”. CPS is sued for injunctive relief only.
21. Defendant Department of Social Services of Orange County, New York is a New York government entity located at Box Z, Quarry Road, Goshen, New York, 10924. This Defendant acted through its agent’s attorney Stephanie Bazileor and Social Caseworker John or Jane Does. The Defendant may be served a summons at the Orange County Law Department Family Law Division, which is located at 285 Main Street, Goshen, New York, 10924. Hereinafter, Defendant Department of Social Services of Orange County, N.Y., will be referred to as “Social Services” or “DSS”. DSS is sued for injunctive relief only.
22. Defendants John Doe 1 through 95 and Jane Doe 1 through 20 were at all times relevant herein as part of the conspiracy against Plaintiff as of about March 2010 until now.

Non Parties

23. Miriam Teitelbaum, the wife of Plaintiff, is a key non-party and is a subject of proceedings of Defendant Family Court. Hereinafter she will be referred to as "Plaintiff's wife".
24. Ben Friedman, a friend of Plaintiff, is a non-party who was witness to some of the events described in the Statement of Facts.
25. Meir Tennenbaum is the father of Plaintiff's wife.
26. Mrs. Tennenbaum is the mother of Plaintiff's wife.
27. Rabbi Dr. Price is the Plaintiff's psychiatrist.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

-----A

28. On or about March 2010, Plaintiff and his friend Mr. Ben Friedman got involved in a religious campaign against forced divorces that had been taking place through the use of illegal kidnapping in the community.
29. Upon information and belief, thereafter individuals in the community conspired to silence this campaign.

-----B

30. On or about April 14th, 2010, Defendant Chaya Katz arranged with Plaintiff's wife for the Defendant's children to visit Plaintiff's home in order to make an exchange of personal items. The exchange was to occur while the Plaintiff's wife was going to mikveh.

31. Defendant Chaya Katz's children came to the house as previously arranged in order to exchange the items.
32. Not suspecting anything, Plaintiff allowed Defendant Katz's children into the house.
33. Meanwhile, Plaintiff stepped outside the house with child 'A'. Child 'B' was sleeping in his crib and thus remained in the house with Defendant Katz's children.
34. Defendant Katz's children then abducted child 'B' from his crib.
35. Plaintiff re-entered the house once Defendant Katz's children left and noticed that child 'B' was missing from his crib.
36. Plaintiff then realized that Defendant Katz's children had abducted child 'B.'
37. Plaintiff and his wife [once back from mikveh] tried reaching Defendants Juda and Chaya Katz by calling them on the phone, but were unsuccessful.
38. Plaintiff and his wife then went to Defendants Juda and Chaya Katz's home to get the child back, and knocked at their door for about an hour.
39. Defendant Hatzalah EMS then arrived at Defendants Katzs' home.
40. Defendants Juda and Chaya Katz returned the child 'B' to Plaintiff and his wife.

-----C

41. On or about April 27th, 2010, Plaintiff's wife gave baby Tylenol to Child 'B.'
42. Soon thereafter, Plaintiff's wife found Child 'A' playing with the open baby Tylenol bottle.
43. Plaintiff's wife then called Defendant Hatzalah EMS so that they might determine whether Child 'A' had ingested the Tylenol.
44. Defendant David Rubenstein from Hatzalah EMS arrived at the home.

45. Defendant David Rubenstein said he would take Child 'A' to the hospital for a checkup. Plaintiff's wife would accompany Defendant Rubenstein and Child 'A' to the hospital.
46. Defendant David Rubenstein asked Plaintiff's wife to sign a consent that would allow Defendant Rubenstein to keep Child 'B' at his apartment until the Plaintiff's wife returned from the hospital the next day with Child 'A'.
47. Plaintiff's wife signed the consent for Defendant David Rubenstein.
48. Once the consent was signed, Defendant Rubenstein had another EMS member take the Child "B" to his apartment.
49. Defendant David Rubenstein then abducted Plaintiff's wife with an ambulance, taking her and committing her to a mental institution.
50. Defendant David Rubenstein then gave Child 'A' to Defendants Juda and Chaya Katz.
51. Defendant David Rubenstein did not inform Plaintiff of the abduction of Plaintiff's wife or of her placement in the hospital.
52. Neither Defendant David Rubenstein nor Defendants Juda or Chaya Katz informed Plaintiff or his wife of Child 'A's' whereabouts.
53. On about April 28th, 2010, Defendant CPS confronted Plaintiff at his home.
54. At that time, Defendant CPS officially informed Plaintiff that they had removed his children.
55. Defendant CPS served Plaintiff with charges in the evening.
56. Defendant CPS charged Plaintiff with Child Neglect.
57. Plaintiff was charged without proper investigation.
58. Plaintiff was charged without probable cause.
59. Defendant CPS removed the children without imminent danger.

-----D

60. On or about May 5th, 2010, Defendant Family Court assigned to Plaintiff Defendant attorney John F.X. Burke.
61. Thereafter, Plaintiff asked Defendant attorney Burke to both deny the charges and prove to the Defendant Family Court that the charges were false.
62. Defendant attorney Burke refused to fight for Plaintiff, claiming he had received a deal from DSS.
63. Defendant attorney Burke insisted that, because of his deal with DSS, Plaintiff must plead guilty to the charges.
64. Plaintiff was recently informed that Defendant attorney Burke had entered consent to all the charges without a fact finding hearing.
65. On the other hand, Plaintiff's wife received an ACD for the same charges.?

-----E

66. On or about August 2010, through several phone calls made to the Plaintiff's wife, people in the community incited and obliged Plaintiff's wife to stop Plaintiff from completing his religious campaign.

-----F

67. On or about September 7th, 2010, Defendant DSS returned the children to Plaintiff and his wife.

-----G

68. On or about September 15th, 2010, Plaintiff performed a peaceful demonstration in Kiryas Joel as part of his religious campaign.

-----H

69. On or about September 16th, 2010, Child 'B' did not wake from his usual daytime nap.

70. Plaintiff's wife called Defendant Hatzalah EMS.

71. Defendant Hatzalah EMS took Child 'B' to Westchester Medical Center.

72. Thereafter, Defendant DSS removed the children from the Plaintiff's home once again.

73. According to a Court Order dated February 8th, 2012, a petition alleging a violation of the terms and conditions of the Order of Disposition [which had ordered that Plaintiff was to secure his medication out of the children's reach] was filed on October 25th, 2010.

74. Defendant attorney Burke claims [in Feb 2012] that he does not have a copy of the petition.

a. According to the Court transcript dated Jan 12th, 2011, the matter was scheduled for trial on Jan 12th, 2011.

b. According to the Court transcript dated Jan 12th, 2011, petition was not read in Defendant Family Court.

75. According to the Court transcript dated Jan 26th, 2011, Defendant DSS stated they had not yet received the hospital records or the records from Defendant Hatzalah EMS regarding the September 16th, 2010, incident with child 'B' [the subpoena was served on January 21st, 2011].

76. Defendant attorney Burke told Plaintiff that in order to get his children back he would need to admit that he failed to secure his medication. However, Plaintiff had never taken

the medication. The medication bottle was unopened and contained within an unopened bag.

77. Meanwhile, Defendant Family Court adjourned Plaintiff's wife's trial to a later date of March 1^{0th}.
78. Defendant Family Court stated that this situation was an accident and that Plaintiff's wife could not be blamed for an accident.

-----I

79. On or about September 26th, 2010, Meir Tennenbaum, Plaintiff's wife's father, visited Plaintiff's house.
80. Meir Tennenbaum then verbally harassed and embarrassed Mr. Ben Friedman, who was present at the Plaintiff's house, for being involved in the religious campaign.
81. Meir Tennenbaum then harassed Plaintiff for having a friendly relationship with Mr. Ben Friedman.
82. Meir Tennenbaum then ordered Plaintiff's wife to not allow Mr. Ben Friedman into her house anymore.
83. Since this time, Plaintiff's wife has resisted each time Plaintiff has wanted Mr. Ben Friedman to visit their house.
84. Also since this time, Plaintiff's wife has blocked all calls from anyone who is associated with the religious campaign, effectively preventing Plaintiff from receiving calls from those involved with the campaign.

-----J

85. On or about October 2010, Defendant DSS agreed to allow the *Payos opsheren* celebration of Child 'A' to take place at Plaintiff's home on October 11th.
86. On or about October 9th, Defendant DSS informed Plaintiff that they were not sure about allowing the celebration to take place at Plaintiff's home.
87. On or about October 10th, Defendant DSS informed Plaintiff that the celebration would only be allowed to take place at the home of Meir Tennenbaum.
88. Defendant DSS gave no reason for the sudden change in required location.

-----K

89. On or about July 2011, Defendant DSS informed Plaintiff that the court had ordered Plaintiff to leave his house every Friday for 1-½ hours, during the time that his wife would have visitation with the children. (Exhibit 'A')

-----L

90. On or about July 2011, Plaintiff's psychiatrist, Rabbi Dr. Price, informed Plaintiff and his wife that he saw no real necessity for Plaintiff taking the psychotropic medication that had been prescribed to Plaintiff at an earlier time under the direction of the Plaintiff's family.
91. Dr. Price also informed Plaintiff that as long as he insisted on continuing the religious campaign, Plaintiff would not get his children back.
92. Plaintiff's wife disagreed with Dr. Price, insisting that Dr. Price tell Plaintiff that he must take medication.

93. Plaintiff's wife's request was an effort to stop Plaintiff from his religious campaign through the use of medication. This tactic is a common one used in the Hasidic ultra-Orthodox community in order to gain control over someone, and was in fact the tactic that had resulted in the prescribing of the psychotropic medication to Plaintiff in the first place.

-----M

94. On or about July 18th, 2011, Defendant David Rubenstein, in conjunction with other Hatzalah EMS members, organized the abduction of the Plaintiff, forcing him into a mental institution (Bellevue Hospital Center).
95. On or about July 19th, 2011, Plaintiff was signed out of the hospital and returned to Kiryas Joel through the assistance of his friend Mr. Ben Friedman.
96. Bellevue Hospital released Plaintiff only on the condition that Plaintiff would not return to his own home.
97. Once Plaintiff returned to Kiryas Joel, Defendant Rubenstein and other Hatzalah members chased Plaintiff in the street, attempting to abduct him again.
98. Plaintiff then took cover by fleeing in a friend's car to his friend Ben Friedman's house.
99. Defendant Rubenstein and other Hatzalah EMS members continued to chase Plaintiff to said house.
100. Defendant Rubenstein attempted to open the door of the house without asking permission to enter.

101. When he was denied entry, Defendant Rubenstein intruded through the window, threatening that he would kidnap both Plaintiff's friend and Plaintiff if Ben Friedman would not open the door for Defendant Hatzalah EMS immediately.
102. Plaintiff's friend immediately called the N.Y. State Police.
103. N.Y. State Police arrived and did not allow Defendant Rubenstein or other Hatzalah EMS members to abduct or institutionalize Plaintiff.
104. Defendant Rubenstein and the other Hatzalah EMS members then left the scene.
105. Plaintiff then went to Arden Hill Hospital to be evaluated in order to prove that the allegations Defendant Hatzalah EMS were making against Plaintiff were false.
106. On or about July 19th, 2011, Arden Hill Hospital confirmed that there was no reason to institutionalize Plaintiff.
107. Arden Hill Hospital released Plaintiff on the condition that Plaintiff would not return to his own home.
108. Plaintiff then returned to his home.
109. Plaintiff's wife then called Defendant Hatzalah EMS, asking them to remove Plaintiff from the home and to return him to a mental institution.
110. Defendant Hatzalah EMS did not respond to her request.
111. Plaintiff's wife then called the N.Y. State Police, asking them to remove Plaintiff from the home.
112. N.Y. State Police informed Plaintiff's wife that they could not remove Plaintiff, and advised her that she could only have him removed through the family court system.

-----N

113. On or about July 2011, individuals in the community contact Plaintiff's wife again via telephone, attempting to incite her to separate from Plaintiff by moving out of the home into another apartment of her own. However, Plaintiff's wife refused.
114. Acting under the instructions of certain individuals within the community, Plaintiff's wife seized Plaintiff's Shabbas clothing.
115. Plaintiff firmly demanded that his wife return the clothing.
116. On or about August 2011, Plaintiff's wife demanded that those individuals in the community who possessed Plaintiff's clothes must return the clothing to her. Once she received the clothing, she then gave the clothing back to her husband and resumed living in peace with Plaintiff.

-----O

117. On or about August 2011, through more telephone calls to Plaintiff's wife, individuals in the community threatened to abduct Plaintiff's wife and to force her into a mental institution because she had resumed living in peace with Plaintiff rather than attempting to deter Plaintiff from his religious campaign.
118. On or about September 8th, 2011, this threat was carried out. Defendant Hatzalah EMS abducted Plaintiff's wife from the street outside her home and forced her into a mental hospital (N.Y. Presbyterian, Westchester County).
119. Defendant Hatzalah EMS did not inform Plaintiff of abduction.
120. Defendant Hatzalah EMS [or the family] instructed the admitting hospital to not listen to Plaintiff or his agents whatsoever.

121. Plaintiff's wife was thus institutionalized for about two and a half weeks, lasting until late September 2011.
122. On or about September 12th, 2011, Plaintiff's wife called her mother Mrs. Tennenbaum to ask her why her mother had participated in said abduction.
123. Plaintiff's wife's father, Rabbi Meir Tennenbaum, interrupted the phone conversation, hysterically proclaiming that the Plaintiff's wife "...deserved it, because six weeks ago you told me that your husband is the problem, and now you are in peace with him and Mr. Friedman. I'm not afraid of your husband or Mr. Friedman."

-----P

124. On or about October 6th, 2011, after Plaintiff's wife had been released from the mental institution, Plaintiff's wife's parents -Meir and Mrs. Tennenbaum - had another heated discussion with Plaintiff's wife. During the conversation, they expressed their anger about her living in peace with Plaintiff as well as the fact that she was no longer trying to deter Plaintiff from his religious campaign.
125. Plaintiff's wife's parents then sent Defendant Hatzalah EMS to Plaintiff's home with the goal of once again abducting Plaintiff's wife and forcing her into a mental institution.
126. Plaintiff's wife then called the N.Y. state police.
127. Defendant Hatzalah EMS took Plaintiff's wife to Orange County Horton Medical Center, who released her the very same day once the Plaintiff contacted them to say that his wife was fine.

-----Q

128. On or about October 21st, 2011, Defendant DSS did not allow Plaintiff's children to visit Plaintiff in the men's section of the synagogue for *Simchas Torah* dancing with their father as all children do.
129. Defendant DSS then fought with Plaintiff's wife for having allowed the children to go into the men's section with Plaintiff for a mere few minutes.
130. Since that incident, Defendant DSS has prevented visitations from occurring at the Plaintiff's home; rather, visitations must occur at the office of DSS.

-----R

131. On or about November 4th, 2011, Defendant DSS shortened the length of Plaintiff's wife's scheduled visitation with her children without warning or explanation. When Plaintiff's wife inquired as to why the visitation was shortened and rightfully requested that she be granted the full agreed scheduled time, she was forcefully committed into Orange Regional Medical Center. Defendant DSS's justification for this action was that the Plaintiff's wife was "irritated."
132. In this case, Defendant DSS had hospitalized Plaintiff's wife on the eve of a weekend when no resident psychiatrist was there, requiring the hospital to keep her at the hospital until a doctor would be able to discharge her on Monday after verifying that there was no reason that she must stay there.

-----S

133. On or about Dec 27th, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion with Defendant Family Court to stop Defendant DSS's politically motivated actions.

134. Plaintiff asked Defendant Family Court to make a determination through a fact finding hearing that the underlying involvement of the Defendant DSS in this matter was based on political reasons.
135. Plaintiff stated that Plaintiff's wife was now being targeted by the Defendant DSS, Defendant Hatzalah EMS, and those in the community in an effort to stop Plaintiff from his religious campaign. By saying this, Plaintiff alleged that this clearly demonstrated that Defendant DSS's actions were politically motivated.
136. On or about January 3rd, 2012, Defendant attorney Maria Petrizio called Plaintiff's wife and stated that Plaintiff would never get custody of the children because:
- a. Plaintiff had filed a motion;
 - b. Plaintiff had a friendly relationship with Mr. Ben Friedman; and
 - c. Plaintiff had not cooperated with Defendant attorney Burke.
137. Defendant attorney Petrizio also stated that should the subject of the Plaintiff's motion be raised in court the next day, then Plaintiff would have to say in court that he did not file this motion.
138. Defendant attorney Petrizio also stated that Plaintiff's wife must choose between either separating from Plaintiff or giving up the right to her children forever.

-----T

139. On or about January 4th, 2012, Defendant DSS dropped the motion against Plaintiff's wife.
140. Plaintiff had attempted to obtain a transcript of the record of the court appearance for January 4th 2012.

141. Plaintiff was informed by Defendant Family Court that there was no record for any appearances on that day.

-----U

142. On or about January 4th, 2012, while in the Court building, Defendant attorney Petrizio suggested to Plaintiff's wife that she ignore and abandon Plaintiff because he had filed the above mentioned motion.

143. Defendant attorney Petrizio then demanded to know what Plaintiff's wife had chosen of the two options she had been given during the previous day's conversation: whether Plaintiff's wife would separate from Plaintiff or give up her right to her own children.

-----V

144. On or about January 9th, 2012, Defendant attorney Kim Pavlovic proposed in Court that the children be returned to Plaintiff's wife on the condition that Plaintiff would be evicted from the home.

145. Defendant attorney Pavlovic stated that the major issue that would prevent the return of the children was the Plaintiff and that the Plaintiff's wife had been complying all along. Defendant attorney Pavlovic also stated that only by evicting the Plaintiff could the situation be helped

146. Defendant attorney Burke did not object.

147. Defendant DSS did not object to Defendant attorney Pavlovic's proposal to return the children to Plaintiff's wife on the condition that Plaintiff was evicted from his home.

148. Defendant Family Court agreed and affirmed all of this.

149. As seen on the transcript, Defendant Family Court stated the following to the Plaintiff:
“You must realize that apparently the difficulty lies with you, unless you are more amenable to the recommendations of the Department of Social Services. You know, there's an old saying. If you go along, you get along. Sometimes it's easier to comply with the requests of the Department of Social Services than it is to buck up against them. Do you understand what I mean?”
150. As seen on the transcript, Defendant Family Court then stated to Defendant DSS: “In the meantime I expect something to be done.” In this case, Defendant Family Court was hinting that DSS should be keeping pressure on the Plaintiff.

-----W

151. After the Court session, Defendant attorneys Petrizio and Burke demanded that Plaintiff leave his home immediately and for good.
152. Defendant attorney Petrizio stated again to Plaintiff's wife that she would lose the children forever if she would not comply with their request to evict Plaintiff from the home.
153. On or about January 20th, 2012, Defendant attorney Petrizio called Plaintiff's wife to insist that she file a motion that would evict Plaintiff from the home for several months. Defendant attorney Petrizio said that this action would result in Plaintiff's wife getting the children back, and also stated again that Plaintiff's wife would lose her children forever if she did not file it. Defendant attorney Petrizio very strongly pressured Plaintiff's wife to file this motion.

154. Thereafter, Plaintiff sent a letter to Defendant Family Court informing the Court of the intimidation his wife was experiencing. The letter also asked why this was happening.
155. On or about January 26th, 2012, Defendant attorney Petrizio called Plaintiff's wife and asked what she had decided to do about evicting Plaintiff. In response, Plaintiff's wife said that she needed Plaintiff, especially if the kids were at home, and that it would be detrimental to her and to the well being of the children if the Plaintiff was not at home.
156. Defendant Attorney Petrizio continued to insist that Plaintiff's wife file a request to evict Plaintiff because the Defendant Family Court had already made up its mind not to return the children to Plaintiff. Defendant Attorney Petrizio also stated that the Court would not change its mind.
157. Thereafter, Defendant Attorney Maria Petrizio sent a letter to Plaintiff's wife dated February 9th, 2012, reiterating her previous warning that Plaintiff's wife should separate from Plaintiff to facilitate having the children returned to her custody. The letter further stated that if Plaintiff's wife decided to remain with Plaintiff, her parental rights could be terminated: that she would no longer be the legal parent of her own children and that the children could potentially be adopted by another party. (Exhibit 'B')

-----X

158. Plaintiff's first motion filed on or about December 27th, 2011, was returnable for January 17th, 2012.
159. As of January 17th, 2012, none of the Defendants had replied to the motion.
160. There is no document reflecting any written request for an extension to reply to this motion.

161. There is no record of any verbal request for an extension to reply to this motion.
162. On or about February 3rd, 2012, Plaintiff received a reply to his motion from Defendant DSS dated January 19th, 2012.
163. Plaintiff immediately wrote to Defendant Family Court asking if he could still reply to Defendant DSS's reply, as their reply was dated after the deadline had passed.
164. Defendant Family Court did not answer Plaintiff's question.
165. On or about February 10th, 2012, Plaintiff received Defendant Family Court's decision dated February 8th, 2012.
166. Defendant Family Court denied Plaintiff's motion, reasoning that it was frivolous.

-----Y

167. On or about January 17th, 2012, Plaintiff filed a 2nd motion requesting written clarification from Defendant DSS as to whether or not they wanted him to stop his involvement in the religious campaign for the interest of his children. Plaintiff also asked that, should Defendant DSS have no issue with his religious campaign, Defendant DSS give Plaintiff a written notification identifying the charges against him and explaining what Plaintiff would need to do in order to be compliant with those charges. This request was made with the ultimate goal of getting the children back.
168. On or about February 3rd, 2012, Plaintiff received the Defendant DSS's opposition papers for Plaintiff's 2nd motion.
169. Defendant DSS did not mention what requirements would need to be met in order for Plaintiff to get his children back.

170. On or about February 7th, 2012, Plaintiff replied to Defendant DSS's opposition papers to Plaintiff's 2nd motion. Plaintiff again requested an explanation of what the charges against him were and how he could comply with them. He also asked, again, about whether Defendant DSS required him to stop his involvement in the religious campaign.
171. On or about February 10th, 2012, Plaintiff received Defendant Court's decision in response to Plaintiff's 2nd motion dated February 8th, 2012.
172. Defendant Family Court stated that it would be advancing this motion and would render its decision immediately, although it was returnable by February 23rd, 2012.
173. Defendant Family Court further stated that Defendant DSS acted only to protect the children.
174. Defendant Family Court denied Plaintiff's 2nd motion, reasoning that it was frivolous.
175. Defendant Family Court failed to explain why Defendant DSS would not provide Plaintiff with what they required of him to comply with in order to get back the children.

-----Z

176. On or about Dec 27th, 2011, Plaintiff wrote to Defendant Family Court, dismissing the Court-assigned Defendant attorney Burke.
177. On or about January 3rd, 2012, Plaintiff wrote to Defendant Family Court requesting an interpreter.
178. Plaintiff informed the Defendant Family Court that his case was not being properly communicated to the Court through Defendant attorney Burke, and requested that an interpreter be allowed to help him present his side pro se.

180. Thereafter Plaintiff wrote once again to Defendant Family Court, unequivocally dismissing his attorney.
181. On or about January 17th, 2012, Plaintiff filed a 3rd motion that the Court should relieve Plaintiff's attorney, allowing Plaintiff to proceed Pro Se.
182. On or about February 10th, 2012, Plaintiff received Defendant Family Court's decision to Plaintiff's 3rd motion dated February 8th, 2012.
183. Defendant Family Court denied Plaintiff's motion to proceed Pro Se.
184. Defendant Family Court further directed Plaintiff not to send correspondence directly to the Court, and that Plaintiff may only communicate with the Court through his attorney.

-----AA

185. On or about January 25th, 2012, Defendant DSS filed a petition to terminate parental rights for Plaintiff and his wife based on mental illness.
186. Defendant DSS brought new claims of mental illness against Plaintiff.
187. On or about February 3rd, 2012, Plaintiff received Defendant DSS's motion dated January 25th, 2012, which stated that Plaintiff and his wife must be evaluated for mental illness.
188. On or about February 7th, 2012, Plaintiff filed opposition papers against both the Defendant DSS's motion for mental evaluation and their petition.
189. On or about February 17th, 2012, at the Defendant Family Court hearing on this matter, Defendant attorney Burke did not object to the motion for mental evaluation.

179. On or about January 9th, 2012, Defendant Family Court ordered that Defendant attorney

190. Defendant Family Court ordered that both Plaintiff and his wife must have a mental evaluation.

-----AB

191. On or about January 25th, 2012, during a scheduled visitation at Plaintiff's home, Defendant DSS's supervisor Mr. James screamed loudly and angrily at Plaintiff in the presence of Plaintiff's children.

192. Plaintiff's children became terrified and cried.

193. Thereafter, Plaintiff immediately wrote to Defendant Family Court about the visitation incident.

194. Plaintiff alleged that Defendant DSS was seeking to justify their new plan to return the children to only Plaintiff's wife [and not the Plaintiff] by creating a new theory that it would be harmful to the children for the Plaintiff to remain in the house.

195. Plaintiff also wrote to Defendant DSS about the incident.

196. Defendant DSS changed the Plaintiff's visitation supervisor.

197. Plaintiff is not currently having visitation because of the difficulties presented since this incident, as it regards his children.

198. Plaintiff is afraid a set up is being planned against him by Defendant DSS.

-----AC

199. On or about July 11th, 2011, Defendant attorney Burke requested an interpreter on Plaintiff's behalf.

200. Defendant Family Court denied the request.

201. On or about January 3rd, 2012, Plaintiff wrote to Defendant Family Court, again requesting an interpreter.
202. Plaintiff does not fully understand the English language, nor does he know how to properly speak the English language.
203. Despite these facts, Defendant Family Court did not grant an interpreter to the Plaintiff.

-----AD

204. On or about January 2011, Plaintiff's children 'A' and 'B' were moved and began to reside at Defendants Joel and Bluma Tennenbaum's house.
205. Thereafter, Plaintiff child 'A' began to call Plaintiff's wife [their mother] as "Mrs. Teitelbaum" and not "mommy."
206. Instead, Plaintiff child 'A' called Defendant Bluma Tennenbaum "mommy."
207. Plaintiff child 'A' since claims that Plaintiff is not his father.
208. Plaintiff child 'A' since claims that his family name is not Teitelbaum.
209. Instead, Plaintiff child 'A' claims that his family name is Tennenbaum.
210. Plaintiff child 'A' resists getting in the car to attend visitation with his true mother, Plaintiff's wife.
211. Plaintiff child 'A' constantly fights with Plaintiff during visitations, rebelling against any request made by Plaintiff and overall refusing to be friendly or to enjoy the visit.
212. On or about October 2011, Plaintiff and his wife found a family in the community who were willing and able to foster Plaintiff's children.
213. Thereafter, upon information and belief, Defendants Joel and Bluma Tennenbaum discouraged said family from fostering Plaintiff's children.

214. Defendant Joel Tennenbaum claimed G-d punished Plaintiff by removing his children because of Plaintiff's involvement in the religious campaign.

-----AE

215. Upon information and belief, Defendant DSS and certain individuals in the community involved in the matter agreed to return Plaintiff's children to Plaintiff and stop all intimidation and accusation if Plaintiff would willingly stop his religious campaign against forced divorces.

216. However, it is the Plaintiff's belief that it is his religious obligation, as someone who obeys the true Torah teachings and principles, to continue with his peaceful religious campaign. Jewish history is full of events where certain people have tried to change fundamental principles of the Torah and others have fought against that change. It is also documented that those people who have fought against changing the true principles of the Torah have met much resistance.

217. Our sages have foretold that before the redemption of exiles and the coming of the Messiah, there will be very strong movements to overthrow and reform the true teachings of and adherence to the Torah. Through this foretelling, we were forewarned to fight and resist such changes. Plaintiff is trying to uphold the true teachings of the Torah and believes that the opposition and intimidation he and his wife are facing are a fulfillment of this foretelling.

THE ABOVE CAPTIONED PLAINTIFF does, herewith, set forth as his Causes of Action the following claims, to wit;

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT ONE

DEFENDANT'S VIOLATION OF THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL RIGHTS PURSUANT TO 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

218. Plaintiff repeats and reaffirms each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 217, above, as it fully sets forth herein.
219. Defendants Kiryas Joel Community Ambulance Corp., Family Court of Orange County, Hon. Andrew P. Bivona, Child Protective Services of Orange County, Orange County Department of Social Services, David Rubenstein, Atty. Kim Pavlovic, Christine Brunet, Atty. Stephanie Bazileor, Atty. John F.X. Burke, Atty. Maria Petrizio, John Does 1 – 95, and Jane Does 1 - 20, in their capacities as State run entities and/or agents of the State of New York or the various political subdivisions contained therein, and acting under the Color of Law, did, both individually and in cooperation with one another, deprive the Plaintiff of his Constitutional Rights pursuant to 42 USC §1983 by and through the 14th Amendment to the United State Constitution.
220. The various defendants, acting jointly and severally, in violation of the Plaintiff's Civil Rights did deprive him of his freedom, without affording him Due Process under the law, at various times since, on or about April 14, 2010 continuing at this time in that they, without cause, facilitate and in fact confine the Plaintiff to Bellevue Hospital Center, contrary to the Plaintiff's rights and interests.
221. Defendants, acting jointly and severally, did deprive the Plaintiff of his unenumerated Constitutional Right to raise his children in a manner that he deems proper and in his children's best interests in that they sought to and have deprived the Plaintiff of custody and reasonable and unfettered access to his children.
222. The Defendants, in cooperation with religious interests, deprived the Plaintiff of his Constitutional Rights for reasons that are based in the tenants of the religious community prevalent in the area and contrary to the interests of the Plaintiff.

COUNT TWO

DEFENDANT'S VIOLATION OF THE PLAINTIFF'S RIGHTS PURSUANT TO 42 U.S.C. 1985 ACTED IN CONCERT TO DEPRIVE THE PLAINTIFF OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

223. Plaintiff repeats and reaffirms each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 222, above, as it fully sets forth herein.
224. Defendants Kiryas Joel Community Ambulance Corp., Family Court of Orange County, Hon. Andrew P. Bivona, Child Protective Services of Orange County, Orange County Department of Social Services, David Rubenstein, Atty. Kim Pavlovic, Christine Brunet, Atty. Stephanie Bazileor, Atty. John F.X. Burke, Atty. Maria Petrizio, John Does 1 – 95, and Jane Does 1 - 20, in their capacities as State run entities and/or agents of the State of New York or the various political subdivisions contained therein, and acting under Color of Law, did, both individually and in cooperation with one another, deprive the Plaintiff of his Constitutional Rights pursuant to 42 USC §1985.
225. The Defendants acted in concert to facilitate the deprivation of the Defendant's Constitutional Right to his freedom by acting to place him, on or about July 18, 2011 in Bellevue Hospital Center, a secure mental facility, thereby depriving the Plaintiff of his personal freedom.
226. The Defendants acted in concert to deprive the Plaintiff of his unenumerated Constitutional Right to raise his children in a manner that he sees fit and, further, have continued to deny him custody and reasonable, unfettered access to his children.
227. The Defendants, in cooperation with religious interests, deprived the Plaintiff of his Constitutional Rights for reasons that are based in the tenants of the religious community prevalent in the area and contrary to the interests of the Plaintiff.

COUNT THREE

THE DEFENDANTS HAVE CAUSED THE NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS ON THE DEFENDANT BY VIRTUE OF THEIR TORTUOUS ACTS TO THE DETRIMENT OF THE PLAINTIFF.

228. Plaintiff repeats and reaffirms each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 228, above, as it fully sets forth herein.
229. Defendants Kiryas Joel Community Ambulance Corp., Family Court of Orange County, Hon. Andrew P. Bivona, Child Protective Services of Orange County, Orange County Department of Social Services, David Rubenstein, Atty. Kim Pavlovic, Christine Brunet,

Atty. Stephanie Bazileor, Atty. John F.X. Burke, Atty. Maria Petrizio, John Does 1 – 95, and Jane Does 1 – 20, in their capacities as State run entities and/or agents of the State of New York and acting under the Color of Law, or the various political subdivisions contained therein, did, both individually and in cooperation with one another, willful disregard for the Plaintiff's and the Plaintiff's family's well being negligently acted in a manner designed to inflict emotional distress on the Plaintiff and to cause him harm to his spiritual, emotional, and physical well being.

230. The Defendants negligently inflicted emotional distress on the Plaintiff to further the ends of certain of the Defendants to remove the children of the Plaintiff from the custody and care of the Plaintiff and his wife.
231. The Defendants acted in concert to force a separation and potential divorce on the Plaintiff and his wife by offering to reunite the Plaintiff's wife with the children in exchange for her separating from and divorcing the Plaintiff. The negligent actions of the Defendants cause the Plaintiff to suffer emotional distress.
232. The Plaintiff continues to be separated from his family because of the negligent actions of the Defendants and continues to suffer ongoing emotional distress.

COUNT FOUR

BASED ON THEIR UNIQUE POSITION OF HAVING A FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PLAINTIFF THE DEFENDANTS BY VIRTUE OF THEIR TORTUOUS ACTIONS INTENTIONALLY INFLECTED EMOTIONAL DISTRESS ON THE PLAINTIFF.

233. Defendant's Juda Katz, Chaya Katz, Yoel Tennenbaum, and Bluma Tennenbaum, by virtue of their familial relationship to the Plaintiff conspired with one another to facilitate their own goals to separate the Plaintiff and his wife and children and in doing so Intentionally Inflicted Emotional Distress on the person of the Plaintiff.
234. Defendants, acting in concert with one another, took custody of the Plaintiff's children from the Plaintiff and his wife and caused those children to call others, not their mother and father, mommy and daddy, thereby intentionally inflicting emotional distress on the Plaintiff.
235. Defendants, acting in concert with one another, have sought to divide the Plaintiff from his wife by counseling her to divorce her husband and by using the Plaintiff's children as an incentive to do so.


236. Defendants have caused false and misleading information to be disseminated throughout the local and close knit Hasidic Community, attempting to bring dishonor and shame on the Plaintiff and thereby Intentionally Inflict Emotional Distress to the Plaintiff.
237. Defendants have acted in concert with one another to permanently deprive him of access to his children and in doing so have Intentionally Inflicted Emotional Distress on the Plaintiff.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for **consequential, compensatory, statutory damages** to adequately compensate Plaintiff for his damages, with attorney's fees, costs of suit, an award of damages as allowed under 42 U.S.C. § §1988, and all such other costs as this Honorable Court deems just and appropriate under the circumstances as may be deemed appropriate. Additionally, the Plaintiff seeks Injunctive relief barring the Defendants from interfering with the Plaintiff's peaceful enjoyment of his family and from continued interference in their lives as any and all injunctive relief that this Court deems just and equitable.

PLAINTIFF DEMANDS TRIAL BY JURY ON ALL COUNTS

Dated at Monroe, in the County of Orange and State of New York this 11th day of
April 2012.



Jacob Teitelbaum, Plaintiff ProSe
20 Getzel Berger Boulevard, Unit 104
Monroe, New York, 10950
Tel. No. 845-782-8995

Exhibit

'A'



Edward A. Diana
County Executive

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

David Jolly
Commissioner
Box Z, Quarry Road
Goshen, NY 10924

TEL (845) 291-4000 FAX (845) 291-4338
www.orangecountygov.com



Visitation Plan and Agreement

Visit days and times:

Wednesdays 3:30 to 5:00 for Mr. and Mrs. Teitelbaum
Fridays 9:30 to 11:30 Mrs. Teitelbaum ONLY

As per the court orders, Mrs. Teitelbaum has 3 1/2 hours of supervised visitation a week. Mr. Teitelbaum has 1 1/2 hours supervised visitation a week. Mr. Teitelbaum is not to participate in the Friday visits as this time is only for Mrs. Teitelbaum.

Transportation:

Start of visit: The Caseworker assistant will pick Miriam Teitelbaum up at her home at 3:15 on Wednesday and 9:15 on Fridays. They will go to the foster home and pick up the children and return to the home. Mrs. Teitelbaum must be ready to go when the CWA arrives at her home to pick her up.

End of visit: The children need to be packed up and ready to go prior the end time of the visit. The visit ends promptly at 5:00 on Wednesday and 11:30 on Fridays. The car should be leaving the residence at this time.

It is agreed that Mrs. Teitelbaum can ride to and from the foster home with the children both at the start and end of the visit. However, if Mrs. Teitelbaum is not ready to be picked up at the start of the visit the Caseworker Assistant will proceed to the foster home without Mrs. Teitelbaum to pick the children up. At the end of the visits if Mrs. Teitelbaum does not have the children ready to leave at the appropriate time the Caseworker Assistant will get the children ready to leave and take them to the foster home without Mrs. Teitelbaum.

I, Miriam Teitelbaum, agree to the above plan. I understand that if the plan is not followed I will no longer be allowed to ride to and from the foster home with my children.

Miriam Teitelbaum

Date

I, Jacob Teitelbaum, agree to the above plan. I understand that my visitation is on Wednesdays and that I am not to participate in the Friday visitations.

Jacob Teitelbaum

Date

Witness-Kati Gechern

Date

Exhibit

'B'

THE LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF ORANGE COUNTY, INC.

STEPHEN A. BALDINO
PRESIDENT

P.O. BOX 328
GOSHEN, NEW YORK 10924
(845) 291-2454
FAX (845) 294-2638

GARY ABRAMSON
CHIEF ATTORNEY

February 9, 2012

Miriam Teitelbaum
20 Getzel Berger Boulevard
(Unit 104)
Monroe, New York 10950

Re: DSS v. TEITELBAUM
FF# 55,083

Dear Ms. Teitelbaum:

As we have discussed several times, I have to advise you that it would be in your best legal interest to live in a separate home from your husband. It is my opinion that your chances of having your children returned to you would greatly increase if your husband were not in your household.

On the other hand, I am concerned that if you decide to continue living with your husband, your parental rights could be terminated. If your parental rights are terminated, you would no longer legally be the parent of Nussen and Yecheskel. Your children could then be adopted by someone else.

Please consider this matter carefully and let me know what you decide to do.

Sincerely,

Maria A. Patrizio

Maria A. Patrizio
Staff Attorney

MAP/ct