

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ  
 BEFORE THE HONORABLE REBECCA CONNOLLY, JUDGE

[REDACTED] LAING, )  
 )  
 ) Petitioner, )  
 )  
 vs. ) Case No. [REDACTED]  
 )  
 [REDACTED] LAING, )  
 )  
 ) Respondent. )  
 )

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
 October 20, 2022

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner: DARLENE KEMP, ESQ.

For the Respondent: MADELEINE BORISS, ESQ.

For the Minors: BRIAN MYERS, ESQ. (Via Zoom)

Court Reporter: [REDACTED]  
 (Via Zoom)

INDEX OF EXAMINATION

1		
2	WITNESSES:	PAGE
3	█ LAING	
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. KEMP	13
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BORISS	32
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MYERS	48
7	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. KEMP	56
8	LYNN STEINBERG	
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. BORISS	69
10	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. KEMP	74
11	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MYERS	89
12	RE CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. KEMP	92
13	█	
14	█	
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. BORISS	95
16	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MYERS	101
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		





1           A.    Yes.  Sure.

2                    The four-day process is developed to address  
3 the kinds of issues that have developed over the years  
4 in terms of [REDACTED] being alienated from her children.

5                    So the first one would be overempowerment.  So  
6 the children would be instructed to divert their mom, to  
7 call her mom, to not interrupt her.  So in other words,  
8 to give the authority back to the mom.

9                    The second issue is empathy, because the  
10 children have forgotten how to empathize with the  
11 situation -- well, the alienated parent, and so we talk  
12 about that as well.  The next day we go into false  
13 accusations, and also memory.  So a lot of times the  
14 children claim to have remembered these things, so we  
15 introduce a memory game, so they can see that their  
16 memory isn't all that reliable, and talk about memory in  
17 general.  And then we go into false allegations.  And  
18 then understanding what the court order entails.

19                   The next day -- because by this time they're  
20 pretty well rebonded with the parent.  The next day we  
21 go into photographs, memorabilia, to establish the fact  
22 that the alienated parent did have a good relationship  
23 with the children at one point.

24                   And then the fourth day, we bring in people  
25 that the children have been alienated from, so that

1 would be the extended family. And on the fourth day we  
2 do talk about how their living situation is going to be  
3 from now on, what's going to happen. They can ask  
4 questions. Usually they have a lot of questions about,  
5 you know, their electronics more than anything else, and  
6 we go over that, what's going to happen.

7 So that's what the four days is.

8 Q. Can I ask how many of these intensive  
9 interventions you have personally conducted?

10 A. Probably around 50, maybe more.

11 Q. In the cases where you become involved,  
12 intensive intervention, are those cases the worst cases  
13 of parent-child contact problems?

14 A. Yes. Those are -- the referrals I get are the  
15 most severe alienation cases.

16 Q. With very, very resistant children, how do you  
17 protect and keep them safe?

18 A. Well, all of the children I see are very, very  
19 resistant, and they may be threatening with what they  
20 have been threatening. Like, for example, "I'm going to  
21 run away," or "I'm going to kill myself," or something  
22 like that. And some of them arrive, they won't eat,  
23 they won't drink, and so that's the very first thing I  
24 address with them, you know, what is this about; where  
25 are you going to run to if you run away? Do you know

1 what you're here for? This is what's going to happen in  
2 the next four days. And after the first hour or two,  
3 there's none of that occurring anymore.

4 Q. I know that there will be questions for you  
5 from my opposing counsel, as well as from the children's  
6 counsel, Mr. Myers. But do you have any special and  
7 particular training in this type of intensive  
8 intervention, and if so, what?

9 A. I think I have as much training as is available  
10 out there in these four-day interventions. I started  
11 off learning about, you know, the master's in parental  
12 alienation, and -- hold on just a second. Sorry. I got  
13 a call.

14 Okay. So I learned from them. They were  
15 around in the '80s, and they wrote extensively about  
16 what needs to happen in these interventions. And then I  
17 studied under many of the people who are considered  
18 experts in this field now, which is Linda Gottlieb,  
19 Karen Woodall from the UK.

20 Q. Linda Gottlieb is the one from Long Island?

21 A. Yes. Yes. She wrote a book. So I studied  
22 under her and got supervised for the initial  
23 interventions. I have worked closely with Family  
24 Bridges as well. I have read everything I can lay my  
25 hands on. So I think I'm very well trained.

1 Q. Have you worked with Assisted Interventions?

2 A. Where are they located? On the East Coast?

3 Q. The transport company. Sorry.

4 A. Oh, yes. Yes. Very good. I have.

5 Q. On approximately how many occasions have you  
6 worked with this particular transport company?

7 A. Around 20, I would say.

8 Q. And in your experience, are they able to get  
9 even very resistant children to your home or office and  
10 prevent them from either self-harming, running away or  
11 harming others?

12 A. Yes. I mean, I usually do that work. But  
13 Assisted Living [sic] can build a rapport with the  
14 children and transfer them to the intervention, help out  
15 with the night before, and then stay as long as we need  
16 them to. Usually they leave after about half of the  
17 first day, we don't need them anymore.

18 But yeah, they have been excellent, very  
19 professional, very easy to work with, just very, very  
20 helpful. And the children really like the counselors.

21 Q. Thank you.

22 MS. BORISS: I will not ask any more questions  
23 at this time, reserving further redirect after cross.

24 THE COURT: Okay. And Ms. Kemp.

25 MS. KEMP: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BY MS. KEMP:

Q. Dr. Steinberg, good afternoon. What are the ages of the children that you typically work with?

A. Good afternoon. Well, I wouldn't say there is any typical age, but I would say more frequently, they're adolescents. But like, for example, the last family I worked with, there were six children, and they were from age eight, and two of them had aged out, so they were 20 and 21, but they attended the reunification.

Q. Have any of the children who you have worked with made allegations that were of sexual molest against the parent that they didn't wish to see?

A. Yes. I investigate every single allegation in detail --

Q. And how --

A. -- before we move on.

Q. And how do you investigate allegations of sexual molest?

A. Well, before I started being an expert in parental alienation, I was an expert in sexual abuse. And specifically -- most specifically, determining false allegations, or if they were true allegations. So I know what to ask the children. I know what affect to



1 look for, I know how to look at all the details to  
2 ascertain whether this is a true accusation, what is  
3 sexual abuse and what isn't sexual abuse.

4 Q. And how often do you reach a conclusion that  
5 the allegations are true?

6 A. Well, they wouldn't be considered a parental  
7 alienation case if it was true. That would be  
8 considered a hybrid case, where sexual abuse actually  
9 took place.

10 So any case that I work with, it's probably --  
11 people have determined before I get the case that it's  
12 probably false allegations or whatever the accusation  
13 is, it wouldn't amount to sexual abuse.

14 Q. Okay. So you don't actually make a  
15 determination as to whether or not the allegations are  
16 true?

17 A. I do in my office. Once they're in my office,  
18 and I go through all the details with them, yes.

19 Q. And in your experience, how often do you reach  
20 a conclusion that the allegations are true? Or have you  
21 ever reached that conclusion in your practice?

22 A. I have not reached the conclusion that they're  
23 true.

24 Q. Okay.

25 A. In parental alienation cases, most often they

1 are not true.

2 Q. Is it correct that you believe that 86 percent  
3 of divorcing parents brainwash their children against  
4 the other parent at least once a week?

5 A. Well, I know what you're referring to. You're  
6 referring to a research study that was funded by the  
7 American Bar Association. And they wrote a book; it's  
8 called Children Held Hostage. And what that refers to  
9 is that 86 percent of the alienated children will not  
10 tell the truth if they testify, because they'll simply  
11 parrot whatever the alienator says.

12 Q. So it fair to say that when the children come  
13 to your office for the four-day treatment, that you have  
14 already concluded that their allegations are false?

15 A. No, that's not fair to say.

16 Q. But you believe that most of them have been  
17 brainwashed by the other parent; is that true?

18 A. I told you that that was my experience in  
19 alienation cases, otherwise, they wouldn't have been  
20 referred to me in the first place.

21 Q. And the experts that you mentioned that you  
22 received training from, those are all parental-  
23 alienation proponents; is that accurate?

24 A. I would say so, yes.

25 Q. Randy Rand, is that a name that you know?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Is that someone that you received any training  
3 from?

4 A. I didn't receive it directly from him. I  
5 received it from his associates.

6 Q. Is it correct that Randy Rand lost his license  
7 after conducting similar interventions?

8 A. That isn't why he lost his license.

9 Q. Why did he lose his license?

10 A. Because the alienator in a family made many  
11 accusations against him. And this was probably in '94,  
12 I think, when alienation was not recognized. And the  
13 board decided that he had acted inappropriately with the  
14 alienator. He was actually the special master in the  
15 case. And they suspended his license.

16 And recently, they have been, like, revisiting  
17 the issue of his license, now that there's so much  
18 information about parental alienation.

19 THE COURT: I'm sorry you phased out on the  
20 last word that you used, Dr. Steinberg.

21 THE WITNESS: The sentence that the board is  
22 reconsidering reinstating his license now that more  
23 information about parental alienation is available.

24 BY MS. KEMP:

25 Q. Who recognizes parental alienation now?

1           A.    Well, for example, the AFCC made a statement  
2 about parental alienation, considered a family dynamic.

3           THE COURT:   And I'm going to indicate that the  
4 Court is aware that alienation syndrome is different  
5 than the term "alienation," which actually is, I  
6 believe, and I mean, we can go into it in the DSM 5,  
7 that is my understanding.  And so there's the alienation  
8 syndrome, which is what has been not accepted by the  
9 community.

10           But I don't know, Dr. Steinberg, if you can  
11 answer that question or if you can elaborate on that.

12           THE WITNESS:  Yes.  The "syndrome" was dropped  
13 as a description of parental alienation.

14           Now, we use parental alienation or  
15 psychological abuse, coercive control, emotional abuse,  
16 resist refuse.  There's many words for it.  I think the  
17 most prevalent one is the parental alienation.

18           But in the DSM, you know, in the court they  
19 bring it up fairly often.  But it's really a misnomer,  
20 because the DSM wouldn't put parental alienation,  
21 because it's a dynamic, and they only use markers for  
22 individuals, not family systems.  And the way they  
23 describe parental alienation is that they say family  
24 relational issues in the back of the DSM.  It's a V  
25 code, I believe.

1 THE COURT: Thank you for that correction.

2 BY MS. KEMP:

3 Q. What occurs after the four days of intensive  
4 treatment with you? What is the next step in the  
5 process?

6 A. Well, I follow the family for a year before I  
7 decide -- before I conclude whether it's a success or  
8 not. The success being the alienated children and  
9 alienated parents are now functioning well and getting  
10 along well, and that there's no major issues. I am  
11 available for, you know, if somebody needs me on a  
12 crisis basis or to tell them how to handle a situation,  
13 I'm available for that. But basically, the family gets  
14 referred back to the community therapist. So in this  
15 case it would be Dr. Marshall, I believe.

16 Q. So is it considered -- how do you find success?  
17 Does that include the children having a relationship  
18 with both parents or just the parent that you consider  
19 to be alienated to begin with?

20 A. Well, the --

21 THE COURT: Can you start over. Your reception  
22 just cut out.

23 THE WITNESS: Is that better?

24 MS. KEMP: Yes.

25 THE WITNESS: So the idea is that during the

1 90-day no-contact period, the alienator would seek their  
2 own therapy with somebody who is familiar with parental  
3 alienation and/or the family dynamics. And they would  
4 be someone who would be checking on how they're doing.  
5 So a therapist, like Shawn McCall would oversee that and  
6 make sure that the therapy was going correctly and that  
7 the alienator would be able to verbalize and identify  
8 what they did to cause this parental alienation.

9           And usually alienators don't want to see that.  
10 And it takes a while for them to see that their behavior  
11 is directly responsible for what has happened in the  
12 family and for abusing their children in that way.

13           Q. I appreciate that but --

14           A. So the idea is that people would -- that the  
15 alienator would be able to work back into seeing the  
16 children with starting off with a step-up program, which  
17 would be monitored phone calls, then it would go to  
18 monitored visits. You know, there's a step-up program  
19 that's designed, which Mr. McCall very familiar with.

20           Q. So what do you consider your success rate to  
21 be?

22           A. Well, I was told by a lawyer to say that it was  
23 96 percent, although I have had 100 percent success rate  
24 so far.

25           Q. And again, I just want to clarify, so when you

1 call it "success," in your mind that means that the  
2 parent who was exhibiting the alienating behavior is no  
3 longer doing that and the children are involved again  
4 with both parents?

5 A. My program is to reunite the alienated parents  
6 and the alienated children. So if at the end of a year  
7 that is still occurring, then I consider it being a  
8 success.

9 As far as the alienating parent, I have seen it  
10 come full circle with the community therapists, where,  
11 you know, they handle working in the alienator into the  
12 children's lives again.

13 Q. So you --

14 A. So I don't do that therapy.

15 Q. But you consider it a success even if the  
16 alienator is not in the children's lives?

17 A. Well, that's what I do. I -- the reunification  
18 person. I don't, you know, I don't oversee what the  
19 alienator is doing once the children are reunified.  
20 That is usually given to somebody else. Like in this  
21 case, it would be Shawn McCall.

22 Q. Have you reviewed or are you familiar with  
23 Kayden's Law?

24 A. With what?

25 Q. Kayden's Law, a recently passed federal law by

1 the name of Kayden's Law, have you reviewed that at all?

2 A. I worked on that with a legislator, yeah.

3 Q. And is it correct that that law states or asks  
4 states to pass local laws that prevent cut-off contact  
5 from a bonded parent?

6 MS. BORISS: I'm going to object because that's  
7 not what the law says, number one.

8 And number two, the Court is perfectly capable  
9 of reading the law.

10 MS. KEMP: I'll restate the question.

11 THE COURT: Thank you.

12 BY MS. KEMP:

13 Q. What is your understanding of that law and do  
14 you apply it, at all, in your practice?

15 MS. BORISS: Objection. There is no indication  
16 that that law applies in the state of California. It's  
17 a federal renewal of the victims of the domestic  
18 violence act.

19 MS. KEMP: But she indicated that she worked on  
20 it.

21 THE COURT: Then can you specify to asking her  
22 what application does Kayden's Law have to the state of  
23 California.

24 BY MS. KEMP:

25 Q. What is your understanding, Dr. Steinberg, of



1 the law's applicability to the State of California?

2 A. Well, I actually have more of an understanding  
3 than most people because I recently worked on Kayden's  
4 Law here in California. It was renamed to be Piqui's  
5 Law. And the original law was written by the Violence  
6 Against Woman Act, by the people who wrote the law, that  
7 if a woman made an accusation of domestic violence, the  
8 man could not come back and claim parental alienation.  
9 So in other words, domestic violence was taken as the  
10 truth, instead of, you know, being able to investigate  
11 it.

12 So when it came to California, the group that  
13 was promoting this bill changed it to Piqui's Law and  
14 they added several things into it, which was a bit  
15 sneaky because they listed it as an educational bill, so  
16 the proponents of parental alienation actually didn't  
17 get wind of it until the last moment. But what that  
18 bill said was that judges would not be allowed to order  
19 any of these programs, and that judges had to have an  
20 initial 25 hours of training on domestic violence, and  
21 then every three years they would have to have 20 hours  
22 of training.

23 So my group joined with the judges in this  
24 case, and Senator Rubio withdrew the bill.

25 Q. How many conversations have you had with Mother

1 and/or Mother's counsel in this case?

2 A. I have had two recent conversations with  
3 [REDACTED]. And I believe I have met with the attorney, as  
4 well as [REDACTED], yeah.

5 Q. And when was the first time you heard from  
6 Ms. Laing?

7 A. I have no idea. It was a while ago, I believe.

8 Q. More than a month ago?

9 A. Oh, it was a few months ago, I think. And then  
10 most recently, we met to plan for this weekend. I  
11 answered [REDACTED]'s questions about it.

12 Q. So the first time she contacted you was, you  
13 said, a couple of months ago?

14 A. No, I said a number of months ago.

15 Q. More than two months ago?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And what did she tell you at that time?

18 A. She was inquiring about my program. I know  
19 nothing about this family. I only know that it's a  
20 referral to me for reunification.

21 Q. So you only spoke to her on those two  
22 occasions, once a few months ago, and then just  
23 recently?

24 A. No. I said that I spoke with her several  
25 months ago, and recently I've met with her twice.

1 Q. Okay. And what did she say to you on those  
2 recent discussions that you just had with her?

3 A. What did she say?

4 Q. Yes. What did she tell you?

5 A. Is that what you said?

6 Q. Yes, please.

7 A. I didn't hear your question. What did you say?

8 Q. Yes. What did Mother say to you about the  
9 particulars of this case when you spoke to her just  
10 recently on those two occasions?

11 A. Well, we talked about how long it has been  
12 since Mom saw her children, how angry the children are,  
13 what symptoms they have been having, because I'm  
14 interested in terms of my program to know these things.  
15 We talked about step-by-step plans, including the list  
16 of snacks the kids might enjoy, and where she might stay  
17 in L.A., and you know, how long we meet, and every day,  
18 and who would be included in the extended family for the  
19 reunion, you know, the nuts and bolts of my program.

20 Q. Were you aware that the children were involved  
21 in reunification therapy and that it was going well up  
22 until July of this year?

23 A. No.

24 Q. Did Mother tell you that it wasn't until after  
25 the children reported that there was [REDACTED] abuse by Mom

1 that the visitation then was becoming problematic?

2 MS. BORISS: Objection. Whether or not the  
3 children reported [REDACTED] abuse is one of the facts that  
4 the Court is going to have to decide. They reported  
5 some things. Whether or not they constitute [REDACTED]  
6 abuse is for the Court, not for Dr. Steinberg.

7 THE COURT: So I'm going to just allow you to  
8 rephrase the question.

9 BY MS. KEMP:

10 Q. Were you aware --

11 THE COURT: Actually, can I just ask a  
12 question.

13 You seem to know that Dr. Marshall was involved  
14 in the case. You said something about Dr. Marshall, who  
15 is present in the courtroom, and you can actually see  
16 her.

17 Have you reviewed any report or referral  
18 anything like that from Dr. Marshall?

19 THE WITNESS: Nothing. But I spoke to her  
20 briefly about the possibility of her joining us for the  
21 four-day intervention. But we didn't determine  
22 anything. We have to get together again to talk about  
23 it.

24 BY MS. KEMP:

25 Q. Did Mother contact you prior to July of this

1 year for the first time?

2 A. Let's see, I'm not sure what month it was. She  
3 called initially just to find out about my program. I  
4 don't even think it was an hour-long talk. I think it  
5 was like a 15-, 20-minute talk. And then I can't  
6 remember whether we got together with her counsel or  
7 not. But yeah, and then two times recently.

8 Q. And were you aware that it wasn't until the  
9 children made disclosures in July of this year of  
10 alleged abuse by Mom, that is when the problems started  
11 with the reunification process?

12 A. I'm not aware of any of that, and I prefer not  
13 to be aware of all that, because my goal is to reunite  
14 the children with their mom.

15 Q. But wouldn't you want to know if you're  
16 reuniting the children with someone that caused them  
17 harm?

18 A. I don't know if she has.

19 Q. But would that be an important factor for you?

20 A. I'm not saying she has.

21 MS. BORISS: I'm going to interpose an  
22 objection, because whether or not my client has caused,  
23 quote, harm, closed quote, in terms of the children's  
24 allegations, or really just Maya's allegations because  
25 Sebastian has not testified, is a matter for the Court

1 to decide. The Court will have decided it before these  
2 children seek --

3 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection.

4 And I just want to -- since we have a courtroom  
5 full of people, which is pretty unusual, and just again,  
6 this is such personal matters, it's pretty unusual, but  
7 I understand there's many family members, and in  
8 dependency court there would be family members. This is  
9 just so personal and private for this family, and I'm  
10 hoping everybody treats it with the care that should go  
11 along with these kind of personal, private matters for  
12 families. And I appreciate that you're all here in  
13 support of one side or the other, but I just wanted to  
14 raise that.

15 But essentially, in this case, the discussion  
16 of the family participating and signing consents  
17 happened almost more than a year ago, prior to your  
18 involvement in the case, Ms. Kemp. So the issue of this  
19 family, and hopefully with the consent of both parents  
20 participating in some kind of long-term kind of  
21 reunification program, has long been the discussion in  
22 this case. And so I just wanted to set that straight.

23 And then, of course, this Court is holding  
24 emergency hearings, the issue concerning whether or not  
25 the mother is engaged in harmful conduct, or if it's the

1 father that's engaged in harmful conduct, or what the  
2 purpose of this Court's hearing is today, I would be  
3 making findings about that. And certainly, I'm  
4 anticipating that Dr. Steinberg would read any findings  
5 that the Court made concerning the case prior to  
6 beginning with any family.

7 And so I actually allowed you to have much  
8 longer with Dr. Steinberg than Ms. Boriss. It's 2:00.  
9 And so I would allow you to ask a few more questions.  
10 And then I told the parties that it's really for this  
11 Court to wrap this emergency hearing up.

12 MS. KEMP: I have nothing further, Your Honor,  
13 for Dr. Steinberg.

14 THE COURT: Mr. Myers?

15 MR. MYERS: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. MYERS:

18 Q. In the roughly 50 or more of these four-day  
19 interventions that you have overseen, how many of those  
20 have been referrals from family court?

21 A. All of them.

22 Q. So is it safe to say that you require an order  
23 of the Court to conduct your four-day intensive?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. You spoke briefly about the high success rate

1 that you believe you enjoy with these four-day  
2 intensives. Can you address for us, not necessarily  
3 specifically to this case, but generally speaking, if an  
4 alienated parent is not reunited with the child, what  
5 are the potential risks to the child?

6 A. A lot, psychologically speaking. For example,  
7 these children have a lot of guilt and anxiety, and they  
8 have a lot of guilt about what they have accused their  
9 alienated parent of. They have a lot of anxiety because  
10 of the position that they have been put in. Many of  
11 them will say that they want to kill themselves because  
12 they're so depressed. And there's issues of substance  
13 abuse, eating disorders, failures in school, failures in  
14 personal relationships. There's so much that's  
15 connected to alienated children. And if it's not  
16 intervened on, you know, as quickly as possible, then  
17 it's going to get worse, because alienation is a  
18 progressive dynamic, and so the alienation will increase  
19 rather than decrease unless there is an intervention.  
20 And because I work with severely alienated children, I  
21 do require the Court support in this.

22 Q. If a child is extremely resistant to the point  
23 of threatening self-harm or harm to others, what  
24 protocols do you have in place to keep the child safe?

25 A. Well, somebody already asked that question.



1 I'll answer it again. One --

2 THE COURT: You froze on us. We need you to  
3 start again.

4 THE WITNESS: Okay. So I answered this  
5 question earlier, but I'll answer it in a different way.

6 There's no incident in terms -- reported by any  
7 of the therapists who do this kind of work, that the  
8 children have carried through on any of the threats that  
9 they have said to the Court or, you know, minor's  
10 counsel or therapists, and that is the very first thing  
11 I deal with when I see them. You know, like one kid,  
12 the therapist reported that he was going to go have a  
13 nervous breakdown. And I met with him first, and I  
14 said, what do you mean by that, you know, what do you  
15 mean by having a nervous break down. And we talked it  
16 through and he was fine.

17 You know, we're not throwing them into some  
18 kind of negative den. We introduce a parent that they  
19 loved and probably still love, and that's why there's  
20 such a high success rate, because they want to be with a  
21 parent that they were formerly with and they loved.

22 MR. MYERS: Thank you. I don't have anything  
23 further.

24 I just wanted to clarify one point for the  
25 record. I believe Dr. Steinberg thought that she and I

1 may have met previously. I don't have any recollection  
2 of that. I just wanted to make that clear. It may be  
3 not germane to anything, but I just wanted to clarify  
4 that.

5 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Myers.

6 All right. Anything further from Dr.  
7 Steinberg? I know it's 2:05.

8 MS. BORISS: No.

9 MS. KEMP: Just very, very briefly, a follow-up  
10 question to Mr. Myers.

11 RE CROSS-EXAMINATION

12 BY MS. KEMP:

13 Q. You mentioned some of the symptoms or signs of  
14 a child who is exhibiting or has been alienated from a  
15 parent. Is the absence of those signs an indication  
16 that they're not being alienated? In other words, if  
17 you have a child who is receiving high marks in school,  
18 doing well socially, successful academically, do you  
19 still believe that that child is being alienated from a  
20 parent?

21 A. Are you asking me?

22 Q. Yes.

23 A. Oh, I don't believe that those are indicators  
24 that alienation is not taking place, no.

25 Q. Are those factors relevant, at all, to you?

1 A. Are they relevant to me?

2 Q. In your treatment of the child or children.

3 A. What are you asking?

4 MS. BORISS: I'm sorry. Objection. Vague.

5 What factors?

6 BY MS. KEMP:

7 Q. Are the factors of how the children are doing  
8 in school academically, socially, are those factors that  
9 you consider, at all, in your four-day treatment  
10 program?

11 A. They are not measurements of parental  
12 alienation taking place. And what I was asked and what  
13 I answered are, what are the long-term effects of  
14 children being alienated. The fact that they're doing  
15 well in school, that's great, probably considering how  
16 much turmoil they have been exposed to.

17 MS. KEMP: Thank you. Nothing further.

18 THE COURT: Thank you so much for making  
19 yourself available on such short notice, Dr. Steinberg.

20 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

21 THE COURT: You are excused.

22 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

23 (Witness excused.)

24 THE COURT: Since we have Dr. Marshall here, we  
25 don't have the children here. I'm just wondering, I