

Social Worker in South Australia Could Face Torts of Defamation and Nonfeasance

A mother is taking legal action against her daughter's social worker for acting against the child's "best interests."

ADELAIDE, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, AUSTRALIA, December 20, 2019 /EINPresswire.com/ -- It's one thing if your neighbour shouts over the fence "You're a nutjob." And in the workplace, this kind of accusation could have extreme consequences on the accuser -- it might foreclose a career. But it is an entirely different matter when social workers make that [accusation against](#) a protective mother -- and then use that to justify court-ordered removal and then eventually guardianship. It can be life-destroying for both parent and child.



Government abuse out of sight from the public and the media

A mother in South Australia has been separated from her daughter for 20 months now for this reason.

“

Please mum help me, I want to come home so much”

Child

In January this year (2019), a social worker said to this mother that they, the Department for Child Protection (DCP), had privileged information that the mother suffered from “serious mental health” issues. And indicated that it was for this reason that her daughter was removed mid-2018 and could not be placed back in her care. But it

wasn't true -- the mother is mentally healthy.

Considering the mother had passed and had been cleared in numerous mental health assessments — two with a forensic psychiatrist, and several others, she challenged the social worker to produce anything contrary from a psychiatrist or medical professional that demonstrates serious or long-term mental health issues. The social worker declined and is now facing a [Tort of Defamation](#).

There are plenty of hearsay notifications in the file saying that she suffers delusions, etc. But these were only called in immediately after the child had spoken out about being sexually abused. Calling the mother a mental case is a known method of protecting pedophiles. And these accusations against a protective mother were used to justify court-ordered removal of her daughter, which ended up -- as is customary -- with the state getting Guardianship over the child.

Both lives are instantly changed. The child suffers humiliation and distress. As for the parent, well, no longer can she participate in their child's school, or at school plays, sports days, play dates or holidays. Protective parents of this type become ostracized from their own society and

world.

The repercussions of false claims of mental ill-health has potentially life-destroying consequences for both child and parent. Now, this mum is asking the court to order the social worker to reveal why she made these claims, and if anyone instructed her to do so.

The second claim against the social worker is for failing to execute or perform an act or Duty of Care and this resulting in distress and harm.

All the original social workers involved in this case knew that the child was exceptionally distressed when removed from her mother. The child was noted to be overwhelmed with grief, and often sobbed at the end of the one-hour supervised visitation allowed each week. (The DCP has also ignored the many 'good mother' affidavits provided by the mum.) However, as guardianship orders rolled out, the girl continued her pleas to her mum via scribbled notes. Law requires consideration of the child's wishes.

As the months stretched into more than a year, it seems that social workers "coached" the child into believing her mother was uncooperative or mentally unwell, or unstable so that she, the child, wouldn't be going home, and "groomed" the school and extended family to this end.

With regard to this case, there was a day earlier this year that a departmental worker asked the child whom she would like to live with: the kid replied 'with Mum'. She had said this many times. On this SAME day, a social worker asked the child to complete a 'My Care Questionnaire'. The questions are confusing and convoluted, and the child filled in much of the form on her own. The kid answered that there was nothing she wanted changed in her "family arrangements" -- most likely referring to whom she was placed at the time? Was this asking who she wanted to live with? No.

This questionnaire was put forward to the court as a claim by the social worker and the DCP that the child was happy in Kinship care — and okay with not going back to her mum.

There are huge consequences to the social worker supporting a further 12-month guardianship. In mid-2020, the child will have been under guardianship for two years. News laws allow the Chief Executive (no longer the minister) of the Department for Child Protection to do anything she likes — even change the surname of the child. Once the kid is into the "two-year" category, the mum can lose all contact.

The child also disclosed to a number of mandatory reporters, over a period of three to four years, a variety of abuses.

As trial day for further guardianship approached earlier this year, the mum finally got to see a police interview of her daughter in which various forms of horrific abuses are innocently and distressfully described. (The interview had been conducted 18 months before.) The mum immediately alerted the social worker and the department. The social worker in question said she probably should watch it before trial — but the team leader, her superior, said to the mum that they had absolutely no interest in watching the video.

In court, when the DCP sought the 12-month guardianship, the social worker claimed there was no evidence of abuse, and maintained her support for the reunification of the child with the very person the child claims abused and threatened her. No one ever viewed the police interview.

This is occurring all across Australia and the Western World. (In some cases, kids attempt to [escape from](#) their abusive situation, to get back to their protective parent.)

Dee McLachlan
Gumshoe News

+61 429 042 951
[email us here](#)

This press release can be viewed online at: <http://www.einpresswire.com>

Disclaimer: If you have any questions regarding information in this press release please contact the company listed in the press release. Please do not contact EIN Presswire. We will be unable to assist you with your inquiry. EIN Presswire disclaims any content contained in these releases. © 1995-2019 IPD Group, Inc. All Right Reserved.