

Our family courts do not protect victim parents or their child, because they fail to enforce the orders, they themselves have written in the child's 'best interests'.

Family courts charge £215 for C79 Enforcement Orders yet less than 1% of these are actually enforced, rendering the existing order worthless.

If the Ministry of Justice was a private corporation selling a service – in this instance an enforced order – and failed in 99% of all cases, Trading Standards would have shut it down years ago.

Section 7 reports may be instructed, which give victims hope of a resolution, only to be let down again by untrained Family Court Advisors who take the child's presentation at face-value, because they do not understand or recognise the counter-intuitive child presentation.

They disregard adult language expressed in their short interviews as 'evidence' that the child genuinely does not wish to see their parent again. Or that the child only wishes to do so on their terms.

In alienation cases, it is never their 'voice' nor their 'terms'. The 'expressed wishes' of an alienated child, are inevitably the expressed wishes of their alienating parent.

Section 7 reports where a child is adamant they do not wish to see their mother or father because they 'tell too many lies' or they 'do not pay the other parent sufficient money' should immediately flag up concerns. One child told the Child Psychologist appointed in their case that she didn't need to see her other parent because she had 'human rights under UNCRC legislation.' She was eight years old.

The Childrens Act 1989, made specific provision for this with the inclusion of 'ascertainable feelings'. So a child's genuine wishes could be uncovered and 'best interests', served. The only way to do this is **to see them with their other parent**. Many child psychologists state that when that occurs, it is often impossible to distinguish the child's behaviour between either parent. Even those who only a few minutes previously were vehement in their opposition to contact.

Adults who were alienated as children tell us they are angry that social workers had not taken the time to build up their confidence in them, so they could speak the truth without fear of repercussion.

The problem is there is 'no time'. The annual report's from CAF/CASS, show a 43% increase in cases going through the family courts since 2012. It is not surprising, therefore, many Family Court Advisors are struggling to keep up with their work load.

If Child Arrangement Orders were enforced first time, it is virtually guaranteed that their caseloads would reduce substantially, leaving valuable time for the more challenging cases.