

1 I said, I mean, I don't know that the reason the child  
2 says (inaudible) is because of toys. (Inaudible).  
3 But the fact that the child repeatedly at many, many  
4 different times said she was scared, that is not  
5 something that is about toys. That's not something -  
6 it could be about any number of things. I don't know  
7 what it's about. And right now everyone just wants to  
8 make the assumption that my client is just off base  
9 and he doesn't know, that he's misconstruing or  
10 doesn't have an interest in his kid's wellbeing and so  
11 that minimizes nothing and -

12 THE COURT: No, I am concerned based upon the  
13 skimming that I've done and has this child been  
14 independently evaluated?

15 MS. SERLIN: No, but it's my understanding  
16 that Ms. Ingoglia had wanted her to be evaluated for  
17 CPSE services because she appears to be speech  
18 delayed. She's very, it's very difficult to get her  
19 to focus. <sup>SHE IS TRAUMATIZED.</sup> She appears delayed to me, to the social  
20 worker in my office, to the educational evaluator, the  
21 educational attorney. <sup>GO TO 3/13/20 TRANSCRIPT</sup> But it's my understanding that  
22 - and our office and the preventive agency is working  
23 on trying to -

24 THE COURT: What child is this? This is a  
25 different child?

At a term of the Family Court of the State of New York, held in and for the County of Kings, at 330 Jay Street, Brooklyn, NY 11201, on January 18, 2019

**PRESENT:** Hon. Jacqueline D. Williams

In the Matter of

**Joe Palomino Ingoglia** (DOB: 3/15/2004),  
**Margaret Michelle Malek** (DOB: 10/29/2014),

Children under Eighteen Years of Age  
Alleged to be Neglected by

**File #:** 235429  
**Docket #:** NN-19411-18  
NN-19410-18

**CPS #:** 5236894

**ORDER**

**Robert Malek,**

Respondent.

PURSUANT TO SECTION 1113 OF THE FAMILY COURT ACT, AN APPEAL FROM THIS ORDER MUST BE TAKEN WITHIN 30 DAYS OF RECEIPT OF THE ORDER BY APPELLANT IN COURT, 35 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF MAILING OF THE ORDER TO APPELLANT BY THE CLERK OF COURT, OR 30 DAYS AFTER SERVICE BY A PARTY OR THE ATTORNEY FOR THE CHILD UPON THE APPELLANT, WHICHEVER IS EARLIEST.

IT IS ORDERED that :

- CFS visits to continue.
- All prior orders continued, including the previously court ordered Imminent Risk Assessment for the Subject Child
- Court orders the Subject Child to be independently evaluated by a psychiatrist or psychologist before the 3/4/2019 conference date. ACS to provide a report to all counsel by 3/1/2019

*NEVER DONE*

case adj. to 3/4/2019 at 9:30am in Part 6A for conf.

**Dated:** January 18, 2019

ENTER

2019011817132810WILLIAMS4ECC7497FCC45928643EC8A7A5B7809

Hon. Jacqueline D. Williams

**Check applicable box:**

- Order mailed on [specify date(s) and to whom mailed]: \_\_\_\_\_
- Order received in court on [specify date(s) and to whom given]: \_\_\_\_\_