

September 8, 2025

1. **Background: Context of the Fraud Involving Camille Reinhold, LPC**

Beginning in April 2022, I formally reported that St. Louis County Judge, Joseph L. Green, was creating materially fraudulent records in my sealed divorce matter involving my second husband, Attorney Richard A. Voytas. I escalated those concerns to St. Louis County administrative judges, providing audio recordings that unequivocally proved the record Judge Green entered was false in that matter ([see pages 14-15, Voytas Evidence](#)).

Just months later, a coordinated effort began in Judge Green's division to create a second record—this time public—involving my known domestic abuser, Victor A. Ojeda. **It was deliberately designed to distract from the crime I was actively reporting in my sealed divorce case and to undermine my credibility, ensuring my attempts to obtain criminal relief would not be taken seriously.** Unlike the sealed divorce matter, this record could be accessed by anyone. It was not a valid legal matter, but instead a series of misrepresentations of prior court judgments entered in other divisions related to Mr. Ojeda's ongoing harassment of my sons and me. Ms. Reinhold's role was crucial: by fabricating diagnoses of me, and claims about their alleged impact on my sons, she supplied the "evidence" needed to make that false record appear legitimate.

The strategy was simple but devastating: create two fraudulent records simultaneously, but make only one visible to the public — and ensure that record contained fabricated evidence portraying the victim they were trying to silence as mentally ill. That record, was built upon Ms. Reinhold's fraudulent claims about my mental health.

2. **MO Division of Professional Registration's Position On Camille Reinhold, LPC**

Missouri's Division of Professional Registration is in receipt of extensive evidence ([see 04/22/25 complaint](#)) that Ms. Reinhold's testimony was materially fraudulent, yet there has been no urgency. The fact that her testimony is memorialized in a public court record inherently affirms its legitimacy. The public trusts that a state agency in receipt of factual evidence

to the contrary, would not allow it to persist. **It would be bad enough for legitimate mental health records to be published. But in this case, the record is fabricated with the intent to harm.**

What follows are key points of evidence that illustrate the severity of the fraud, the subsequent harm it has caused, and the immediate risk posed to the public should Ms. Reinhold continue to practice considering her extensive role in committing it.

3. No Contact

- There has been *no contact of any kind* between Ms. Reinhold and my teenage sons, or with me. Likewise, Mr. Ojeda *has had no contact* with my sons or me for years as the result of The Court's increasingly restrictive orders and judgments ([see list of links to referenced records](#)).

4. Judge Green's Only Court Order Related to Camille Reinhold, LPC

- The only order naming Ms. Reinhold reflected in the court record resulted from a motion filed by Mr. Ojeda's attorney on February 16, 2024 for "Additional Therapeutic Visitation" which they specifically requested be facilitated by Ms. Reinhold ([see motion](#)). Of note, *there had been no prior therapeutic visitation*. The choice to title it, "Motion for Additional Therapeutic Visitation" is consistent with the cumulative efforts of the perpetrators to distort facts throughout the record.
- Judge Green's order of February 27, 2024, appointed Ms. Reinhold to facilitate "therapeutic visits" between Mr. Ojeda and the minors, with a supervisor present ([see order](#)). She was directed to generate a report based upon those therapeutic visits and her subsequent recommendations for visitation with Mr. Ojeda. **But no such visits ever occurred.** No such report could be generated, nor have I ever been in receipt of one.

- Despite the fact there was never “therapeutic visitation” or contact/participation of any kind by my sons and I, Judge Green tried to legitimize Ms. Reinhold’s testimony by affirming:

“Since as early as June 2023, Mother failed to appear for any hearings and ultimately chose to no longer participate in any of the court proceedings, although she did attend the therapeutic visits.” (see judgment, page 5, #43)

- Nothing in the court record remotely suggests that I was to be the subject of a psychological evaluation or clinical assessment by Ms. Reinhold. **Her fabricated assessment and diagnoses of me, and the impact she claimed those diagnoses have on my sons, were the foundation upon which she supported her testimony.** The fraudulent judgment entered by Judge Green on January 13, 2025, seven months after the trial he claims took place, affirmed that Ms. Reinhold testified:

“In her opinion, the children were severely alienated from Father because of the “obsessed alienation” and “parental alienation” of Mother. That because of these diagnoses, the boys should be separated from their mother for a minimum of 100 days. That such separation would include the oldest child be restricted from driving and both children be restricted from any ability to electronically communicate with anyone so they would have absolutely no opportunity to contact their mother for 100 days.” (see judgment, page 11, #1)

5. MO Law and Court Rules Govern Orders For Mental Health Evaluations

- **Missouri Court Rule 60.01** establishes strict requirements for a mental health evaluation for the purposes of litigation. It requires a motion, notice, order and consent -

Ms. Reinhold had none of these which is reflected in the court record itself ([see MO Rule 60.01](#)).

- There is no factual or lawful explanation for Ms. Reinhold's testimony regarding her fabricated mental health evaluation and diagnoses. No legal motion/order/hearing/consent existed to perform one. **No order even exists suggesting Ms. Reinhold would engage in contact with me.** There is no manner in which Ms. Reinhold can escape that truth. When fraud is based upon material misrepresentations in a legal record, the "fact-finding" isn't obscure.

6. Building A Fraudulent Record

- Prior to the materially fraudulent case record (16SL-DR03752-05) created by Judge Green, with the assistance of Ms. Reinhold, **there are six years of prior public court records that directly disprove the facts they asserted** ([see list of links to referenced records](#)). Those court records include:
 - ✓ In the Spring of 2017 Mr. Ojeda's custody was suspended as the results of TROs for both minors, resulting in a preliminary injunction which suspended his custody pending a final Modification Judgment ([see pages 1-5, Ojeda Evidence](#)).
 - ✓ A July 2018 Modification of Custody Judgment affirming Mr. Ojeda's loss of legal and physical custody, which included orders **preventing Mr. Ojeda from; having any contact with me; living within a specified radius of my residence; contacting the minors by telephone; having contact with the minors of any kind outside of highly restrictive supervised visitation; attending the minors' extracurricular activities; requesting information from their schools** ([see July 2018 judgment](#))

- ✓ A February 2019 Judgment for a Full Order of Protection against Mr. Ojeda, on my behalf, with findings of domestic violence r/t harassment ([see Feb. 2019 Full OP](#))
- ✓ A February 2020 Missouri Appellate Court Opinion affirming the judgment for the Full Order of Protection ([see Feb. 2020 Appellate Opinion](#))
- ✓ A November 2020 Judgment with Findings of Fact of Mr. Ojeda's *ongoing contempt of the court's orders*, and a consent renewal of the existing Full OP ([see Nov. 2020 judgment and OP renewal](#) and [pages 6-7 of Ojeda Evidence](#))
- ✓ A March 2022 judgment dismissing Mr. Ojeda's Motion for The Appointment of a Successor Supervisor (Karen Warren-Strong) and Motion to Modify Custody. ([see March 2022 Judgment](#) and [page 10 of Ojeda Evidence](#))
- ✓ An April 2022 judgment dismissing Mr. Ojeda's Motion to Vacate the judgment entered in March 2022. **In that motion, Mr. Ojeda's attorney affirmed that the cause for his loss of contact with the minors, including supervised visitation, was the "result of The Court's orders and judgments"** ([see page 1 of dismissed motion](#) and [record of dismissal](#))
- Despite that extensive record which precedes the case file created by Judge Green, **Ms. Reinhold testified to alternate material facts that complemented those being misrepresented by Judge Green as well, including:**
 - ✓ "... the children were severely alienated from Father because of the "obsessed alienation" and "parental alienation" of Mother." ([see judgment, page 11, #1](#))
 - ✓ "... the children's reasonings for not wanting to see their Father were unreasonable and had no rational basis, but are merely a reiteration of their Mother's irrational beliefs.." ([see judgment, page 11, #2](#))

✓ "... in the future the boys may suffer in their personal relationships with others and may isolate themselves.." ([see judgment, page 12, #3](#))

✓ "Both mother and father have mental health issues. Their behavior towards one another is not indicative of mature healthy adults." ([see judgment, page 12, #4 \(6\)](#))

7. Fraudulent Billing

- Ms. Reinhold generated a bill for over \$6,000 that was filed as an exhibit attached to a motion filed by Mr. Ojeda's attorney on 06/21/24, for which my wages were garnished to "reimburse" Mr. Ojeda. Those fees were filed with a motion which explicitly states they were attributed to Ms. Reinhold's "therapeutic visits". (see [motion for fees, page 2](#) and [attached fee bill](#))
- RSMo § 191.905 False Statements To Receive Health Care Payment ([see statute](#))

8. Violations of Missouri Law

Violations include, but are not limited to:

- **RSMo § 570.095 Filing False Documents** -includes when someone causes something materially fraudulent to be filed or recorded with The Court ([see statute](#))
- **RSMo § 575.040 Perjury** ([see statute](#))
- **RSMo § 565.090 Harassment** -Given the nature and materiality of the facts being misrepresented, it's evident why Ms. Reinhold's fabricated testimony, claims about our mental health and credibility, and recommendations based upon them, would inflict extreme emotional and psychological distress upon my sons and I. Let alone considering the fact that the testimony was for the purposes of a public court record. ([see statute](#))
- **RSMo § 191.905 False Statements To Receive Health Care Payment** ([see statute](#))

9. The MO Credentialing Board's Code of Ethical Practice and Conduct:

Violations include, but not limited to ([see referenced code](#)):

- **Principle 1: Responsibility to Clients-** *My sons and I were never Ms. Reinhold's clients which exemplifies just how blatant the fraud is.*
- **Principle 3: Legal and Moral Standards and Fraud Related Conduct**
- **Principle 5: Professional Competence and Integrity**
- **Principle 6: Compliance with The Law**

10. Conclusion

Addressing Ms. Reinhold's conduct requires not only professional licensure accountability, but also coordination with law enforcement. The fraud here is not nuanced—it is deliberate, well-documented, and dangerous. The Division's role is not to minimize or defer action, but to uphold the statutory and ethical standards that ensure the public is protected.

Because this crime depends on entrenched public corruption, I cannot rely solely on closed-door investigations. To safeguard my sons and me as this crime persists, I continue to maintain a transparent record. This ensures that should there be an attempt to conceal, minimize, or reframe this crime as anything other than fraud, the evidence is publicly accessible.