Court Statement: Addendum to Final Hearing Evidence

To: The Judge
From: Charles Willis
Date: 22-06-2025

**Introduction**

Following the hearing on 20 June 2025, and due to my diagnosis of Asperger's Syndrome and sensory integration issues, I respectfully request that the court consider this written addendum.

My neurodivergence affects the way I process complex emotional and institutional interactions. I may appear composed, unresponsive, anxious, or even challenging during proceedings. This is the result of being overwhelmed and needing to analyse all components logically. I process events and formulate responses after the fact, not in real time, due to sensory and emotional overload, walking out of court is due to this overload.

What may seem like detachment is actually neurological overwhelm. The aftermath of hearings always leads to mental exhaustion and shutdown. It is only in the days and weeks that follow that I can properly assess what occurred and respond with clarity and reasoned judgment.

**1. Bias in Safeguarding Application**

Throughout this process, I have observed a stark imbalance in the application of safeguarding principles. I, the biological father, have been subjected to disproportionate scrutiny, emotional suspicion, and institutional mistrust.

Meanwhile, the unrelated white male in my children's lives has been allowed to forge an emotional connection with them:

Without vetting

Without observation

Without professional curiosity

The only discernible difference between us is race and legal parenthood.

I do not believe the Section 7 report was written with overt or covert racist intent, but it is a clear example of unconscious racial bias shaped by structural inequality and ignoring recommendations set out in 25 years of government funded inquiries and studies carried out by reputable think-tanks and academic institutions. Once I raised this and professionals still upheld the recommendations, the bias transitioned from unconscious to conscious, and possibly overt.

**2. Shift in Focus onto My Alleged Non-Cooperation**

There was a strategic shift during proceedings to portray me as obstructive, as someone refusing contact out of pride. The suggestion that I do not have my children's wellbeing at heart because I will not agree to a contact centre is manipulative. It deflects from institutional failures and repositions my justified resistance as a character flaw. This is judicial gaslighting: "We're offering access, why won't you take it?"

But the offer is premised on a safeguarding framework that does not apply. There are no safeguarding concerns. Accepting supervised contact would mean submitting to a false label and undermining both my integrity and the law's.

**3. Rapport-Building as Pressure**

The court's approach felt emotionally coercive. I was praised for my intelligence and career in genetics engineering. Social services were mildly criticised for their clear lack of preparedness for the case and inability to answer basic questions about the section 7. But this was followed by an emotional appeal:

"What would your children think if they knew you turned this down?"

This wasn't judicial neutrality, it was persuasion designed to create guilt. It was almost car salesman-esque in nature.

I was also put under pressure and told I have only 20 minutes remaining and hurried to stop talking for the hearing to conclude.

**4. No Reasonable Adjustments for My Neurodivergence**

At no point were reasonable adjustments made for my Asperger's diagnosis. There was:

No slowing of pace

No structured communication

No invitation for delayed written input

No consideration for how delayed processing affects real-time responses

This is a clear breach of the Equality Act 2010, which requires public bodies to make accommodations for neurodivergent individuals.

**5. Procedural Failures by Social Services**

Social worker Gcinile Mkhwanazi had not read or brought the Section 7 report to court despite holding it since January 2025. She could not answer fundamental questions. A DBS

check on Sheena's partner was only carried out after I explicitly requested it via Melissa Simpako who is the author of the Section 7.

When questioned, Ms Mkhwanazi was visibly unaware of the check, until Caroline Lees interrupted proceedings to assert that it had been completed. The judge reprimanded her for this inappropriate intervention.

This revealed:

That safeguarding checks were not proactively managed

That the court was nearly misled about who initiated the check

That professional credibility was being reconstructed after the fact

This is procedurally unsound and undermines the entire recommendation.

**6. Discriminatory Application of Safeguarding**

Again, the only meaningful difference between the new male and me is race. Social services have ignored 25 years of state-funded recommendations from inquiries like the Laming Report.

If my children were ever harmed by this unassessed man, how would this hold up in an inquest? What would the public say when it's revealed that I, their father of colour, was scrutinised, while the unrelated white male was not even identified?

This is not just a missed step. It is sustained, conscious racial bias. Once that bias is brought to light and upheld regardless, it becomes not just conscious but potentially overt.

It then begs the question: are the professionals in this case now comfortable upholding racist recommendations now that they're consciously aware and knowing their impact?

**7. Misrepresentation of Events**

Social services stated that I used offensive language towards Sheena at my son's school. That is false. The incident occurred outside a

nursery, after Sheena blocked a theatre outing I had planned months in advance.

There was:

No violence

No threat

No criminal behaviour

No children present

Meanwhile, Sheena took our son out of ACTUAL school during term time to holiday for 5 days with her new partner, and that raised no concern. This is a selective and manipulative application of narrative and policy.

She then used our daughter's neurodivergance as a reason as to why she should be allowed to circumvent the rules she set for me albeit in a more serious scenario as Emré was at actual school, not nursery.

This is selective reasoning and frames her choice to take the children out of school as being a necessity rather than a choice while trying to allude to my request to take him out of NURSERY for 3 hours as being controversial and impacting his preparation for school which at that time was 4 months away.

**8. Unprofessional Conduct and Apparent Smirking**

When I questioned the supplementing of the Section 7 report, I observed Ms Mkhwanazi smirking when the judge expressed frustration at me. This came across as mocking and suggested a lack of impartiality. It gave the impression that professionals were emotionally invested in defending their position, not protecting children.

**9. The Caroline Lees Email – A Coercive Ultimatum**

Following the hearing, I received an email from Caroline Lees which stated:

> *"With regards to the supervised contact, we could have commenced this some time ago, but unfortunately you would not agree. The Judge has given 7 days for you to respond… otherwise it will be concluded with no order."*

This is coercive. It reframes systemic failure as non-cooperation and uses the threat of no contact to pressure me into accepting a false and stigmatizing condition, supervised contact, despite there being no safeguarding concerns.

**10. A Father's Duty Beyond Access**

My refusal is not ego-driven. I am resisting because my children are mixed-race, and they will grow up in a world where they must understand the systems that discriminate against them.

If I accept a process rooted in racial bias, I teach them to stay silent and accept that it is okay to be pressed, marginalised and treated unequally. I will not do that.

This case is already an example of the racism and prejudice they will face.

They need to learn how to challenge injustice. If I accept the current process, I teach them to stay quiet when treated unequally and accept that it is okay to be oppressed, marginalised and treated unequally. I will not do that.

Part of my role as a father of colour is to prepare my children of colour for life as an adult

**11. Exclusion from Education Decisions**

I was deliberately excluded from Remy's school placement process by Hampshire Council, despite holding full parental responsibility. I opposed her enrolment in a new, untested school and proposed a more stable, long-term alternative.

Not only was I ignored, Sheena's new partner, a man with no legal or parental standing, was allowed to visit the school and engage in planning. This is a breach of my rights under the Children Act 1989, and once again places institutional trust in an unrelated white male over the biological father of colour and also highlights how Sheena conducts herself and her lack of respect for me as a Father.

**12. Procedural Imbalance and Denial of Natural Justice**

During the hearing, the judge requested that I leave the courtroom after submitting my statement. My document was copied, yet no similar request was made of social workers or Sheena. This created a clear imbalance, and I am concerned that discussions may have taken place in my absence which I was not allowed to witness or respond to. This contributed to the growing sense that the court was seeking to coach or protect social services rather than assess matters impartially.

At the outset of the hearing, the judge asked if I had met the social workers. When I explained that I had not, they responded by framing me as "challenging" and cited the volume and tone of my emails. This characterisation ignores the fact that my correspondence has been driven by a refusal to answer lawful questions, and by their direct role in causing my prolonged absence from my children. I believe social services have been instructed to avoid acknowledging this, as doing so could expose them to legal liability.

What was framed as the final hearing has now become an opportunity for social services to regroup, a luxury I was never afforded. This strongly suggests that the court is unwilling to allow this challenge to proceed in full view, perhaps because doing so would set a precedent or reveal how decades of publicly funded safeguarding recommendations have been ignored, particularly in cases involving fathers, and fathers of colour.

**13. Professional Incompetence and Administrative Negligence**

During the hearing, it became evident that the social workers not only failed to read the Section 7 report in advance, they also failed to bring a copy to court. The judge himself had to provide it to them during proceedings. This report has been available since before January 2025, giving them ample time to prepare. The fact that they were unable to answer basic questions about its contents calls into serious question their professional preparedness and reliability.

How can a body that does not adhere to the most basic standards of documentation and procedural awareness be deemed competent to supervise or oversee the reestablishment of a long-standing parental relationship? If they cannot fulfil administrative duties, how can they claim authority over highly sensitive emotional and safeguarding dynamics involving my children? This level of negligence not only undermines their recommendations but also reveals a disregard for the seriousness of the role they've been assigned in this case.

**In Summary**

I have not refused contact, I have refused injustice.

I have not obstructed progress, I have resisted unequal treatment.

I have not prioritised ego, I have prioritised dignity, safety, and truth.

I respectfully ask the court to consider this statement in full, and to recognise that while my neurological profile may delay my responses, it does not dull my reasoning, my love for my children, or my commitment to justice.

**References**

The Laming Report – The Victoria Climbié Inquiry (2003)
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-victoria-climbie-inquiry-report-of-an-inquiry-by-lord-laming

The Munro Review of Child Protection (2011)
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/munro-review-of-child-protection-final-report-a-child-centred-system

Ministry of Justice Harm Panel Report (2020)
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/assessing-risk-of-harm-to-children-and-parents-in-private-law-children-cases

Engaging South Asian Fathers Report – Southampton (2017)
https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/417627/1/Engaging_South_Asian_Fathers_Southampton_Final_Report_2017.pdf

Children Act 1989
https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1989/41/contents

Equality Act 2010
https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents

Human Rights Act 1998, Article 8 – Right to Family Life
https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/42/contents