Please consider the matters of Jurisprudence in Indigent defense in Michigan in the Juvenile Criminal Family Court Division of the [redacted] Circuit in the case of [redacted]

As much as not testing the veracity of a declarant's statement of hearsay is a travesty; shielding and or not stating the initial source of that information when it represents a falsehood is worse of an abuse. If it is in the American legal custom to avoid a defendant's being taken by surprise.

If a non-custodial parent obligor is party in a juvenile criminal case. Then, what proceeds is a judgement stating that he/or she must pay [redacted] for juvenile home fees. When that obligor has no income, and no means test has been made as to his ability to pay that relies on fact. Also, if the obligor must incessantly prove a negative (absence of income) despite due diligence in each attempt. Only to not prevail against an outright lie, and or heresay that is allowed to state that he has income in the range of [redacted] Wouldn't it be proper to allow a refutation and a test of the veracity of whatever "publicly available" lies exits?

Certainly one is indigent where the state already shields his spouse (as in federal "injured spousal protections") from his collections liabilities and he has no income of his own to speak of. If the juvenile child in subject is not said spouses liability, nothing either, construes that her resources are obligated. Then, certainly that man is indigent of an ability to pay. To forgo the obvious of what has arisen out of a criminal case is such an abuse as to incapacitate a defense for that individual who has no means to afford protection left at the whim and prejudices of the courts. This discretion leaves the door wide open for these types of rampant abuses. The net result of which, leaves said indigent obligor in a state of undue hardship without the common courtesy that Michigan affords all of her citizens. For the errors of the past, a levy against the first fruits of the future can in fact preclude gainful endeavors in our techno-mediated era, this we all know. This is too harsh and unfair and Michigan should force harmonization on the principle of fairness as it relates to civil liabilities for broke parents that proceed out of criminal liabilities for Juveniles, and encode fairness into the law. Even more so if it has already granted

[redacted]

Reference
Burton's Legal Thesaurus, 4E. Copyright © 2007 by William C. Burton. Used with permission of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

"(SURPRISE. This term is frequently used in courts of equity and by writers on equity jurisprude nce. Itsignifies the act by which a party who is entering into a contract is taken unawares, by whi ch suddenconfusion or perplexity is created, which renders it proper that a court of equity should relieve the partyso surprised. 2 Bro. Ch. R. 150; 1 Story, Eq. Jur. Sec. 120, note.[redacted] Jur. 366, seems tothink that the word surprise is a technical expression, and nearly synonymous. with fraud. Page 383,note. It is sometimes, used in this sense when it is deemed presumptive of, or approaching to fraud. 1Fonb. Eq. 123 3 Chan. Cas. 56, 74, 103, 114. Vide 6 Ves. R. 327, 338; 2 Bro. Ch. R. 826; 16 Ves. R.81, 86, 87; 1 Cox, R. 340; 2 Harr. Dig. 92.

2. In practice, by surprise is understood that situation in which a party is placed, without any d efaultof his own, which will be, injurious to his interest. 8 N. AS. 407. The courts always do ever ything in theirpower to relieve a party from the effects of a surprise, when he has been diligent in endeavouring toavoid it. 1 Clarke's R. 162; 3 Bouv. Inst. n. 3285.)"

Thank you for listening,

Sincerely,

Thomas Shaffer