

Chair, Vice Chair, and members of the Committee—thank you for allowing me to testify today.

There are 17 members on this committee.

What if I told you that 6 of you would lose all access to your kids?

Six of you would leave court without your children.

Six of you would be told when—or if—you could see them again.

Six of you would spend years and tens of thousands of dollars trying to fight your way back into their lives.

That is the reality many Kansas parents are facing right now.

And I know this because I am one of those parents.

Based on the data I have collected from families in Kansas going through custody cases, one out of every three parents loses custody of their children.

On January 29, 2024, my five children were taken from me through an emergency process by Keven O'Grady, the same Judge that is chair of the Family law committee. I did not receive a trial before losing custody, and I was not even questioned if the lies were true, before being separated from my children.

Today marks 766 days since I have had any access to my kids.

I have been stuck in Kansas Family court since 2017, 9 years in this system, and before that I was in MO court since 2013.

After spending \$350,000 and 3.5 years in MO court, I received a 30-page divorce decree, but Judges and GAL ignored it.

But I want to ask this committee a serious question.

What is the point of a decree that contains detailed findings about credibility, parenting, and custody—if a judge or guardian ad litem later refuses to even acknowledge it or review it?

Parents are told to trust the legal process.

We are told the court record matters.

When this first happened, I believed it was just my case.

But after I began speaking publicly, parents from across Kansas—and across the country—started reaching out to me with stories that looked almost identical to mine.

That is why I created the ADD MINE – Family Rights Survey, collecting real data from parents navigating custody courts.

Chair, Vice Chair, and members of the Committee—thank you for allowing me to testify today.

There are **17 members** on this committee.

So I want to start with a question:

What if I told you that six of you would lose all access to your kids?

Six of you would walk out of court without your children.

Six of you would be told *when—or if—you could see them again*.

Six of you would spend years—and tens of thousands of dollars—trying to fight your way back into their lives.

That is not a hypothetical. That is the reality many Kansas parents are facing right now.

And I know this because **I am one of those parents**.

Based on the Kansas data I have collected from families going through custody cases, **about one out of every three parents reports “no contact”—meaning they do not have their kids**.

On **January 29, 2024**, my five children were taken from me through an emergency process by **Judge Kevin O’Grady**, the same judge who serves as Chair of the family law committee. I did not receive a trial before losing custody, and I was not questioned to determine whether the allegations were true before being separated from my children.

Today marks **766 days** since I have had any access to my kids. I still cant get Judge O’Grady to give me a hearing.

I have been stuck in Kansas family court since **2017—nine years** in this system. Before Kansas, I was in Missouri court since **2013**.

After spending approximately **\$350,000** and **3.5 years** in Missouri court, I received a **30-page divorce decree** containing detailed findings. But later, those findings were ignored.

And that raises a serious question for this committee:

What is the point of a decree—containing detailed findings about credibility, parenting, and custody—if a judge or a guardian ad litem can later refuse to even acknowledge it or review it?

Parents are told to trust the legal process.

We are told the record matters.

When this first happened, I believed it was just my case. But once I started speaking publicly, parents from across Kansas—and across the country—began reaching out to me with stories that looked almost identical to mine.

That is why I created the **ADD MINE — Family Rights Survey**, to collect real data from parents navigating custody courts.

And what that data shows is alarming.

Parents in **every state** are filling it out. Kansas is not unique. But Kansas can lead the way in fixing the worst failures.

Today, I run one of the largest grassroots platforms in the country exposing family court and DCF failures—**over 200,000 followers in about two years**—because families were desperate for answers, desperate for accountability, and desperate for someone to put the patterns into words.

Now I want to give you Kansas-specific data—because this is not just emotion. This is measurable.

Kansas custody outcomes (Kansas survey; custody outcome provided n = 82)

In the Kansas survey data where a custody outcome was provided, I treated a response of “**No**” as **no contact**, because that is what families mean when they answer that way.

Here is what Kansas parents reported:

- **No contact / total loss of access: 32.9%**
- **Visitation only: 15.9%**
- **50/50 custody: 15.9%**
- **Children in foster care: 7.3%**
- **Foster care / TPR: 6.1%**
- **Adopted out (rights terminated): 8.5%**
- **Full custody (to the reporting parent): 7.3%**

So in this Kansas sample, **nearly one in three report no contact**, and **over one in five** report outcomes involving **foster care, termination of parental rights, or adoption**.

Kansas financial impact (Kansas submissions; cost data n = 85)

These are Kansas-only numbers from my survey. Categories are not mutually exclusive; families often report costs in more than one category.

- **Attorney fees: 41 submissions (48.2%)**
Total: **\$2,654,500** | Avg among those: **\$64,743.90**
- **GAL / Child Representative fees: 26 submissions (30.6%)**
Total: **\$241,675** | Avg: **\$9,295.19**
- **Therapy / Evaluations: 27 submissions (31.8%)**
Total: **\$167,000** | Avg: **\$6,185.19**
- **Reunification services: 15 submissions (17.6%)**
Total: **\$75,125** | Avg: **\$5,008.33**

- **Other court actors:** 16 submissions (18.8%)
Total: **\$118,660** | Avg: **\$7,416.25**
- **Lost wages:** 33 submissions (38.8%)
Total: **\$1,561,450** | Avg: **\$47,316.67**
- **Asset liquidation / property loss:** 30 submissions (35.3%)
Total: **\$6,971,212.58** | Avg: **\$232,373.75**

Across these tracked categories alone, Kansas families reported **\$11.79 million** in combined losses and case-related costs.

That is not just “expensive litigation.”

That is the system producing **predictable financial collapse**, often alongside loss of parenting time.

The “pay-to-parent” pattern (custody outcomes by cost category)

Here’s the key point:

When you look at categories tied to paid services and gatekeeping, **the rates of no-contact outcomes rise.**

- **Among Kansas families reporting reunification service fees (n = 15):**
46.7% report **no contact**, and **33.3%** report **visitation only**.
- **Among families reporting “other court actor” fees (n = 16):**
43.8% report **no contact**, and **37.5%** report **visitation only**.
- **Among families reporting GAL fees (n = 26):**
30.8% report **no contact**, **30.8%** report **visitation only**, and **30.8%** report **50/50**.

The more a case depends on paid services, third-party professionals, and private-market compliance, the more often families report outcomes where contact is limited or eliminated.

That is what I mean by **pay-to-parent**.

The procedural failures that drive these outcomes

And here is where this becomes legislative.

Child support becomes chaos when changes occur without a signed, filed order—because families cannot enforce or appeal what is not properly entered.

In my case, child support was verbally terminated on **February 26, 2024** without a hearing, without findings, and without a written, filed order—while **K.S.A. 60-258** requires signed and filed judgments.

Court-appointed actors become outcome-drivers without oversight when exculpatory information does not change restrictions and is not transparently addressed on the record.

In my case, DCF later determined the allegations against me were **unsubstantiated** and documented concerns of possible coaching, yet contact remained suspended. And I allege the record shows the GAL knew this and did not disclose it while pursuing continued restrictions.

Delay becomes a weapon when a parent is kept from a full evidentiary hearing on the merits.

In my case, I have been deprived of a meaningful evidentiary hearing where I can present evidence, confront witnesses, and receive notice of evidence with a fair chance to respond on the record.

Discretion replaces law when statutory safeguards can be declared “not applicable” instead of followed as written.

In my case, the court ruled: “**The fifteen-day rule of K.S.A. 23-3218(a) does not apply.**”

Enforcement becomes meaningless when hearings required by statute are not set in time.

In my case, Kansas law requires a hearing within **21 days** under **K.S.A. 23-3401(a)**, yet a hearing was not scheduled within that timeframe after my enforcement filing.

And finally—

Pay-to-participate is not due process when courts condition trials and parent-child contact on prepayment.

In my case, the record summary I provided states the court canceled a four-day custody trial unless I prepaid **\$13,531.25** in GAL fees, and continued to condition parent-child contact on paid supervised visitation costs despite documented indigence.

Closing

What happened to me is why I'm here. But what brought thousands of families to my platform is this:

They are living in a system where **delay becomes the decision, procedure becomes the barrier, and money becomes the gate.**

Kansas families are reporting major financial losses and significant no-contact outcomes. I'm asking you to treat custody and child support as linked systems—and to fix the points where **time, procedure, provider scarcity, and cost** replace timely, merits-based decision-making.

When judges and court actors don't have to follow Kansas statutes, family court stops being rule of law and becomes rule of opinion.

Thank you.