

GR31.1 and Professional Guardians

12-18-2012

Honorable Chief Justice Madsen,

I am concerned that the Certified Professional Guardian Board's (CPGB) proposed disclosure rules, under GR31.1, section (L) (12), are not going to aid the public in distinguishing the good professional guardian from the bad. I think the CPGB needs to adopt the same rules as applies to other public service professionals as defined in the Uniform Disciplinary Act, RCW 18.130 (UDA).

My interest in this matter evolved from personal experience with a professional guardian. My father had dementia and was being exploited by a third party. Our family asked the court to appoint a professional guardian to protect him from abuse and safeguard family assets. We anticipated a cooperative relationship with the guardian. We got the opposite. I believe the guardian exploited our family financially and in the process allowed my dad to suffer mental and physical abuse. The guardian also caused my 90 year old mother considerable mental anguish. In three years, we paid the guardian \$747,000. We spent an additional \$94,000 on legal fees trying to ameliorate our grievances with the guardian. (I have a 12 page written summary with approximately 50 exhibits supporting the accuracy of the above claims.)

Well into the guardianship, I found out there were other people that had problems with our guardian. When I called the CPGB, there was no record of complaints having been made.

I have little confidence there would be a record of any complaint I might make regarding our guardian. Bias would be a factor because the guardian we had sits on the CPGB. Another factor is that guardians sit in a position where they can hide from the family, under the guise of confidentiality, information that might incriminate them. Only the most unsophisticated and dishonest of guardians will

be disciplined and exposed under the disclosure rules proposed by the CPGB. No information will be available to the public regarding professional guardians whose behavior pushes ethical limits and lacks common decency unless the guidelines in the UDA are adopted. The UDA has served the public interest with regard to other professionals and I think it would be appropriate for professional guardians as well.

Respectfully yours,

Stephen P. Bradley
810 17th St N.W.
Puyallup, WA 98371
sbradley801@yahoo.com