

[https://www.kscourts.org/KSCourts/media/KsCourts/Opinions/121051\\_1.pdf?ext=.pdf](https://www.kscourts.org/KSCourts/media/KsCourts/Opinions/121051_1.pdf?ext=.pdf)

After granting the petition for review on February 25th, with the case scheduled for the May 5th docket, the mother's family (yes, you read that right) and I were anxiously waiting, week by week, for these wrongs to be righted. To our horror and dismay, Kansas Supreme Court performed at the same indolent and pompous level the Kansas Court of Appeals and District Court performed. They ignored case law, they ignored the very way their own statute reads, they ignored procedural law, to a very alarming degree. We don't even understand why they granted review, made us wait for months, and then lambasted my attorney (though they say "Father this, father that") for not following correct protocol even though they have the authority to waive such asinine rules. Then they affirmed the ruling, agreeing that I "failed" to provide the mother support and I "failed" to have a good reason for doing so. (Living with her boyfriend, rent and bill free? She was having "financial difficulties" somehow?) Just like the Court Of Appeals, they - or at least, Eric Rosen & Michael Ward - downplayed the support I -did- provide considerably, completely ignoring a majority of it while saying "his texts were at best insignificant support, and at worst, actively harmful to Mother." This clearly shows that the trend of not doing the jobs they were hired to do correctly is consistent. There are over 170 examples of non-monetary emotional and moral support in the text messages. That is NOT insignificant. My purchasing a house for my baby girl, keeping in mind to be able to provide shelter to the "precious" mother if she needed it, is NOT insignificant. Her rehearsed "feelings" and not-so-hidden agenda do not negate the efforts I put forth.

Bauer's attorney "skills" seem to work very well with those who aim to benefit from these "skills" working very well. My daughter is not a simple product that can be bought and sold to fill the pockets of these spineless monsters. I did exactly what I was supposed to do under the circumstances that we were in, but no one is comfortable enough to admit it to the point where irrational conclusion has ran rampant by those who are supposed to be our justice system. Try as they might, I will never fit into their twisted narrative. Stegall got it right in his dissent and I applaud him for even fathoming the idea that parental skills aren't somehow exclusive to the female.

The lies, the misconstruings, the inaccurate application of procedural law, the total blind eye to case law, the what-should-have-been-overwhelming evidence in my favor, the jaundiced eye in my direction from the very beginning, keeps piling up. I've documented each and every example of ALL of these "professionals" when it comes to be underhanded. That's not going to make me simply disappear, and the level at which they have violated my constitutional rights will not simply be swept under the rug. They even jumped on board the irrational train by backing up this outrageous "District court could've found you unfit, but he did you a favor" garbage.

I and we will not be deterred. Rather it be just indolent sexism or they are all ethically compromised, I will not be bullied into "giving up" on my child. How is this the same court that ruled on In re: Adoption of C.L. in October of 2018? It blows my mind. The courts keep dismissing me as some sort of simpleton who doesn't love his child. The machine keeps rolling, but we keep rolling too. I can never thank my friends and supporters enough. They have helped more than they know, they have PROVIDED SUPPORT in the manner that I did, in an actual beneficial way. Giving a mother cash for her own discretionary spending is NOT providing support in terms of prenatal care or how an unwed father should secure his parental rights. Making sure she had food, shelter, medical care and transportation, however, is.

The mother may have convinced herself that she's done the right thing, somehow, and she may have convinced herself that anything that has been said about me hasn't been false. She knows better. In no way, shape or form is this somehow "all about me." My daughter is in a prison, being held by wardens with zero integrity and she doesn't know it yet. She cried for me the last time I've seen her, as I walked away, right in front of the female adoptive resource. She'd deny it on the stand if she was ever actually ordered to take it, though, I'm sure.

**My daughter will be lied to about me, because these people have also convinced themselves that Bauer's tricks somehow exposed the truth. I have been vilified, I have been crucified, but I am still here, still fighting to save my child from the disasterous day she finds out the truth if their kidnapping continues to be erroneously justified and somehow ultimately prevails. With everything I have, as I have from the start, I vow I will stop that future from happening. Thank you for your continued support, prayers, and positive energy. We won't stop until Eliza is free and with her real family that loves her very much.**

**Humbly, Paul F.**

**\*\*\***

**"Law and court procedures that are 'fair on their faces' but administered 'with an evil eye or a heavy hand' was discriminatory and violates the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment." *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, (1886).**

**"Natural parents who have assumed their parental responsibilities have a fundamental right, protected by the United States Constitution and the Kansas Constitution, to raise their children." *In re Adoption of G.L.V.*, 286 Kan. 1034, 1057-58, 190 P.3d 245 (2008).**

**"We strictly construe adoption statutes in favor of maintaining the rights of natural parents in those cases where it is claimed that, by reason of a parent's failure to fulfill parental obligations as prescribed by statute, consent to the adoption is not required." *In re Adoption of G.L.V.*, 286 Kan. 1034, Syl. ¶ 6**

**"A natural parent's right to raise his or her child is tempered by the extent to which the parent has assumed his or her parental responsibilities. When a natural father has assumed a sufficient level of parental responsibility under Kansas law, his parental rights are entitled to constitutional protection." *In re Baby Girl B.* 261 P.3d 558 (Kan. Ct. App. 2011) .**

**"A petitioner in an adoption proceeding has the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that termination of parental rights is appropriate. A court is to consider all of the relevant surrounding circumstances in an action based on K.S.A. Supp. 59-2136." *In re Baby Girl B.* 261 P.3d 558 (Kan. Ct. App. 2011) .**

**"When applying K.S.A. Supp. 59-2136, Kansas appellate courts have strongly endorsed the parental preference doctrine, required strict compliance, and diligently enforced the clear and convincing evidence standard." *In re Baby Girl B.* 261 P.3d 558 (Kan. Ct. App. 2011) .**