

MARY E. CHAPPELLE
Attorney at Law
1604 San Pedro NE
Albuquerque, N.M. 87110

*Recognized Specialist
in Family Law*

Phone: 505 266 0656
Fax: 505 275 1001
E Mail: mchappelle@mindspring.com

RECEIVED

JUL 22 2003

July 21, 2003

Joyce Gentry
Attorney at Law
1100 Tijeras NW
Albuquerque NM 87102 2912

Via Fax

Stephen Eaton, Esq.
6400 Uptown NE
Suite 380W
Albuquerque, NM 87110

Via Fax

Re: [REDACTED]

Dear Counsel:

I am really feeling misused and abused as guardian ad litem in this matter.

When we were in court last April, the following issues needed to be handled: a) written report by Dr. Reed; b) reallocation of his fees; and c) reallocation of my fees. To date these matters have not been addressed.

However, despite not giving me the specific information via a report from Dr. Reed, I am being asked to make decisions about time sharing, particularly for extended time during the summer. I was also asked to increase time sharing to 50/50.

Apparently some additional information has been provided to Dr. Reed, since he left me a voice mail last week about this issue of additional time. However, such a message, without any ability to discuss the matter with him, is certainly not a written report. While I agree that it is not appropriate for [REDACTED] to pay for all of Dr. Reed or myself, I am concerned that the attempt to save money is being done at my expense – to make a decision without full information.

At the end of the April hearing I also made it clear that the parties needed to start to

communicate. I strongly urged that they communicate via email. It is my understanding that this has not been done. At one point I was told that [REDACTED] did not have an email set up. Today she advised that [REDACTED] did not wish to do email, and wanted to discuss matters with her. Mr. Eaton advised that the parties had been working out the personal property, and this was confirmed by Ms. Gentry.

While I have no problem with the parties talking in lieu of email if they were both willing to do so, it does leave me with limited information. According to [REDACTED] she has given [REDACTED] additional time, in particular with the boys, to [REDACTED] at his request. [REDACTED] is spending additional time with him starting Wednesday to go on a trip to Colorado with the church group. No.

If this is the case, then I am unclear why the request for extended summer time sharing was not first discussed between the parties, and why it was brought to me first? Please explain.

I believe at this point that [REDACTED] needs to provide directly to [REDACTED] a proposed extended summer visit with all three children, for approximately seven to ten days. [REDACTED] should be prepared with a response by this Sunday after [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] return from Colorado. If there is no resolution between the two of them, then I will make the decision.

[REDACTED] was out of town - to Mexico until July 31

It would be very helpful if I had a copy of the settlement agreement for my files. It appears that certain expenses of the children may have been allocated 16/84 and so I see no reason why my on going fees, from the point of the settlement, as well as the Reed report fees, should not be allocated the same way.

Finally, these children continue to be too involved in this case. This was an issue I addressed early on in this case. The children should not be grilled about what's going on in the other parent's house, timesharing issues should not be discussed them, etc.

Truly yours,


MARY E. CHAPPELLE