On or about October 2008 I received a motion filed by Mr. Keith J Yonos as a pro se litigant regarding the former marital home.  Mr. Yonos complaint was about him wanting me to sell the house. Also a complaint about me removing my son to a non mandatory daycare when he had a living nanny and was attending a day care to socialize and using that to force me to keep him in day care when in the summertime I was taking vacation and wanted to spend time with our son. Mr. Yonos lied to the court that I was taking our son out of the country without his permission - as a flight-risk and demanded our son's passport to be removed from me.   I went to the court as a pro se litigant.  Ira Kaplan was representing Mr. Yonos.  I asked Judge Slomienski for a reschedule since I needed to hire an attorney and I was not able to defend myself alone, thus asked for an adjournment.  Mr. Yonos was to be pro se never was I informed Mr. Kaplan was to show up.  Judge Slomienski denied my petition and forced me to go thru this hearing violating my constitutional rights to have an attorney. I also pleaded the Fifth Amendment and Judge Slomienski forced me to respond to all of his questions and Ira Kaplan's questions.   During the hearing Judge Slomienski threatened to incarcerate me because I could not articulate out of fear of appearing without an attorney for his questioning and Ira Kaplan's intimidations, lies and terrorism during that hearing.  Motion regarding Halloween, the judge denied the fact Mr. Yonos knew and agreed before married and when we were married, we agreed that our son was only celebrating at school but not trick-or-treating because of my spiritual and traditional belief.   Judge Slomienski said that my ex husband was granted to celebrate all Halloween and denied my freedom of religion to be also considered or, even, alternate one year with his father and one with me.   We were already divorced. Judge Slomienski violated my rights as a mother and my right to practice religion.

I hired my former divorce attorney law firm Robert Corcoran, Esq. after that first horrible traumatic terrorizing hearing with Judge Slomienski and Ira Kaplan.  My divorce attorney was Brian McCann from Robert Corcoran Law firm. He took over that case. I went to his office crying that I was surprised with Ira Kaplan and denied to be repented by an attorney. Brian McCann took over.  During one of the hearings regarding the house settlement, which I ended up paying Mr. Keith Yonos the amount of $40, 000.00 for the house to be under my name only, and he was to sign the deed within 24 hours.  We paid him in court with a certified check.  Mr. Keith John Yonos did not sign the deed - never in four years - but kept taking me to court and demanding attorney’s fees that always were granted to Ira Kaplan, without a detailed bill ever provided.   Asked for but denied by Judge Slomienski.  This judge also kept entertaining the fact that I paid Mr. Yonos and put my house for sale several times per Ira Kaplan request; basically, harassing us, not taking into consideration the best interest off our child.   I was always punished to pay Ira Kaplan's fees.   It was as if I had never paid my ex husband for his share of the former marital home.  Ira Kaplan continued to take me to court because I was not able to re-finance the house.  But the house could never be refinanced if Mr. Yonos did not sign the deed.   No mortgage company would move forward.

On July 6th 2009 my son told me disclosed to me he had eaten his father's pee pees for breakfast, he also said his father had eaten his pee pee too and he did not wanted his father to do that any more. That it happened in the shower. I disclosed this information to New Jersey CPS former DFYS (today DCP&P) on July 9th, 2009.  I also told my attorney Brian McCann and he entered an OSC to suspend all visit with his father Keith John Yonos.  It was granted while DFYS investigated.   Dr. Nina Agrawal, Pediatrician at Audrey Hepburn Children's House said after medically examining my son (without my presence) she determined and called the DFYS (now DCP&P) caseworker the Yllini Torres and informed her and her supervisor Ruth Benson that all contact with his father was to be suspended.  She was 95% sure that my son was sexually abused by his father.

Mr. Yonos and Ira Kaplan entered a motion without DCP&P being present and requested for supervised visitation with our son's nanny, Margarita Lopez, but no overnights. Judge Slomienski, without the presence of DCP&P, granted it. Margarita complained that Mr. Yonos harassed her during the supervised visits and questioned her and there was a woman present always, Rose Vega that spoke Spanish and intimidated her.

I told DFYS and Judge Slomienski.  Nothing happened.  About 6 weeks later, Margarita resigned her position, as she felt threatened by Mr. Yonos.  She was a live-in nanny and she had to rent a room where Mr. Yonos and Rose Vega would not find her.   She was in fear.  She came to work and I would give her a ride at the end of the day somewhere where she could leave incognito to her home.   A friend of mine, Barbara Cambon, for supervised visitations, replaced Margarita.   She was also harassed and again,  Rose Vega was always present. Judge Somienski kept overruling what Audrey Hepburn Children’s House’s Dr. Nina Agrawal had said.  Case worker Yillini Torres and Ruth Benson said that Judge  had power over them. If he entered an order even if DCP&P wasn't present, it was to be obeyed.

Barbara Cambon only helped me for about 3 weeks until I found a baby sitter from a church that did the supervision and I had to pay out of my pocket $10 dollars an hour for the safety of my son.  Every supervisor I had in place said that they were harassed and intimidated by Rose Vega and Keith Yonos.  These two always wanted to know where they lived.  They never provided their address since they picked up my son at my home and dropped him off.  I told the judge and the caseworkers this was exhausting me financially.  Judge Slomienski granted visitations every other weekend, after pre-k school picks on Wednesdays until 8 pm Saturdays from 10 am till 7 pm and Sundays 10 am to 5 pm (verify needed).  I was paying the bill because I did to want my son with strangers and protected. CPS said they would not help or interfere.

Then Ira Kaplan entered a motion and requested for Rose Vega to be his supervisor, a stranger unknown to me. I opposed it.  He also requested Mr. Yonos' daughter Kelly Bunny who resided in Denver, Colorado. He had not raised that daughter, but met her when she was 3 years old and started visiting her when she was 5 years old.  He flew her to San Francisco where he lived for one week, every year.  He never spent more than two weeks a year with his daughter.  She was about 21 years old.  Since she lived in Denver, Colorado, how could she be a supervisor.?  It was actually Rose Vega, I told the Judge and CPS that my son had disclosed since he was 2 1/2 there was a woman at his fathers house by the name of Diana and Rose but it was not too clear to me and she would sleep in the same bed, the three of them and took showers together.  The judge disregarded my opposition and my attorney's opposition.  Rose was in the courtroom, and the judge told Mr. Yonos that he felt they had a relationship.  Mr. Yonos denied it and said she was "too old" as she was 53 years old and a grand mother.  Mr. Yonos denied it and said she was "too old" as she was 53 years old and a grand mother. The judge said you are not going to fool me but I will grant it.

During the fact finding trial with DCP&P in 2012 Rose Vega was interrogated by my then trial attorney Mark P. McAuliffe, Esq. Rose Vega testified while in the stand and under the oath, she had met Mr. Keith John Yonos at a bar "Las tapas" located in North Bergen, NJ, the same day he had left his marital home for good.

Rose Vega testified during trial "they started a romantic relationship that didn't last long because they then became "friends." Rose existed as my son Keith Alexander had said and complaint to his then nanny and me that there was a woman that lived at his fathers house referring to her as "Rose and Diana." Our son Keith-Alexander stated numerous times Rose pulled his hair and hit him, that his father, Mr. Keith J Yonos and Rose left him home alone and went out at nights and sometimes during day times while my son was parenting his father.

I argued this case before a judge in Hudson County and Mr. Keith J. Yonos turned the story around that there was no woman in his house ever. I told Judge Slomienski about the danger of allowing Rose Vega to ne a non-neutral supervisor for Mr. Yonos while having mandatory supervised visitation per Audrey Hepburn Children's House recommendation.

Judge Kenneth Slomienski called me a liar and threatened me with incarceration again.

Also our son had surgery for the removal of his tonsils and adenoids. Mr. Ira Kaplan entered another motion right before the scheduled surgery of our son. I requested for that motion to be rescheduled since I was a preparing my son for surgery. I needed family to fly into town and be with my son and I. Such request was denied and the hearing took place where again Judge Kenneth Slomienski was entertaining about the house going for sale.

I was humiliated, during moments of a mother's concern of taking her child to the doctor for preparation for surgery. Witness Ana Maria Rosales was present in court with me--who flew from Miami Florida to help me thru the surgery with my son. Ana Maria Rosales-my witness pointed at me that my ex husband Mr. Keith John Yonos was talking to the judge at the end of a hallway where his chamber was located. I went to take a peak and it was true.

I went to the chamber and spook with one of his male cleric or assistant and he told me that Mr. Yonos was constantly at their chamber filing motions and he was "charming" the staff. I explained all of this to my then representing attorney Jason Miller, Esq. and he told me that if Mr. Yonos was a Prose litigant maybe he was talking to the judge. This situation was always unclear to me since Mr. Yonos played being a "pro-se litigant" but Mr. Ira Kaplan always showed up the day of the hearings to represent him.

Then the judge was removed from trail court because there were many complaints about him damaging families lives as he was a real estate judge, never a family law judge

The judge said, “you are not going to fool me but I will grant it.”

Then the judge was removed from trail court because there were many complaints about him damaging families lives as he was a real estate judge, never a family law judge.

 In sum, Judge Kenneth Slomiesnki has violated the following Rules of Professional Conduct:

A. (1) A judge should be faithful to the law and maintain professional competence in it.

(2) A judge should maintain order and decorum in judicial proceedings.

(3) Adjudicative Responsibilities.

(4) A judge should be impartial and should not discriminate because of race, color, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, language, marital status, socioeconomic status, or disability.

(5) A judge shall require lawyers in proceedings before the judge to refrain from manifesting, by words or conduct, bias or prejudice based upon race, color, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, language, marital status, socioeconomic status or disability against parties, witnesses, counsel, or others. This section does not preclude legitimate advocacy when race, color, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, language, marital status, socioeconomic status or disability, or other similar factors are issues in the proceeding.

(6) A judge should accord to every person who is legally interested in a proceeding, or that person's lawyer, full right to be heard according to law, and, except as authorized by law, neither initiate nor consider ex parte or other communications concerning a pending or impending proceeding. A judge, however, may obtain the advice of a disinterested expert on the law applicable to or the subject matter of a proceeding if the judge gives notice to the parties of the person to be consulted and the nature of the advice, and affords the parties reasonable opportunity to participate and to respond.

(8) A judge should abstain from public comment about a pending or impending proceeding in any court and should require similar abstention on the part of court personnel subject to the judge's direction and control. This subsection does not prohibit judges from making public statements in the course of their official duties or from explaining for public information the procedures of the court.

B. Administrative Responsibilities.

(1) A judge should diligently discharge the administrative responsibilities of the office without bias or prejudice, maintain professional competence in judicial administration, and facilitate the performance of the administrative responsibilities of other judges and court officials.

(2) A judge should require staff, court officials, and others subject to the judge's direction and control to observe the standards of fidelity and diligence that apply (b) A judge who receives information indicating a substantial likelihood that a lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct should take appropriate action. A judge having knowledge that a lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question as to the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects shall inform the appropriate authority.

 (4)A judge should not make unnecessary appointments, should exercise the power of appointment only on the basis of merit, avoiding nepotism and favoritism, and should not approve compensation of appointees beyond the fair value of services rendered.

C. Disqualification. (see R. 1:12-1)

(1) A judge should disqualify himself or herself in a proceeding in which the judge’s impartiality might reasonably be questioned, including but not limited to instances where:

(a) the judge has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party or a party’s lawyer or has personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding;
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