

**Craig**


---

**From:** Craig Mills [craig.mills@cox.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 23, 2016 9:57 PM  
**To:** 'McAllister, Danny'  
**Cc:** 'christy.mills@cox.net'; 'accmills'; 'BoscoJ@ag.louisiana.gov'  
**Subject:** Mills - illegal adoption allegations

Danny,

Thank you again for taking time to speak to me about the documentation that we have. I have attached documentation for you, but I'd like to take just a minute to revisit what we have already shared with you.

1. The most basic element of our claim is alleged Theft by Deceit (R.S. 14:67).
  - a. We learned about R.S. 14:67 from our face to face meeting with you. We also shared the attached receipt from Value Place at that time.
  - b. The birth mother (Carol Griffin) contacted our adoption attorney (Todd Gaudin) who handled our first adoption with Carol (birth daughter's name is Morgan) soliciting support for another pregnancy. Carol agreed to an adoption plan with us asking that we keep the natural siblings together. She asked if we would provide support for them just as we did previously. We provided lodging (see Value Place receipt attached), food, medical, transportation and incurred legal expenses for the adoption totaling ~\$6,000.
  - c. Also in the attached documents from Lisa Harell (attorney for the Sibleys (family who have the baby now) she is also the Social Worker who performed our Adoption Home Study) responding to our complaints against her to the ODC and Louisiana Board of Social Work Examiners, Ms. Harell states she moved Carol and the birth father, Thomas Carlson, to New Orleans on April 19, 2014. We were not made aware of Carol's intent to discontinue our support and as a result have spent ~\$6,000 on an adoption where Carol misrepresented her intent. An additional resource we would like to provide you are the findings from the DCFS investigation (attached). You will see in all of these documents, it is noted that Carol "appears to have some documented issues with being truthful", was "purposely misleading" us, "the birth parents were not forthcoming" in their adoption plans and Carol deceived the adoption facilitator to further her actions as noted in the recorded phone call that you have in your possession.
  - d. Both Bossier and Tangipahoa Parish DAs successfully prosecuted birth mothers for Theft by Deceit within the past 3 years.
  - e. We also shared with you the AG's office Consent Agreement for Lisa Harell from 2005.
  - f. The solicitation, acceptance, misappropriation of funds and alleged misrepresentation of intent occurred between Oklahoma City, Baton Rouge and New Orleans.
  - g. When I first spoke with Molly Lancaster, she said that LSP could go and arrest the birth parents in New Orleans.
2. The second element that we discussed with you is the "double dipping" allegations:
  - a. We have been advised by a local adoption attorney that the solicitation and receipt of support from two or more people at the same time for the same adoption ("double dipping") makes the receipt of those expenses unreasonable. R.S. 14:286 (Selling of Minor Children) only allows for "reasonable" expenses as outlined in CHC 1200.
  - b. In Lisa's LaBSWE response, she admits to knowing the birth parents were working two adoption plans at the same time and confronted the birth parents on this revelation. Lisa also failed to report these activities to the proper authorities.
  - c. In the attached hotel receipt, you will notice that on April 11 and April 13, one or more AMEX cards were activated. Todd Gaudin gave information to LSP that this act (receiving additional financial support via AMEX card(s)) was in fact considered in kind cash payments. This was not part of our support and was solicited by the birth parents and received from another 3<sup>rd</sup> party.
  - d. In the attached hotel receipt, our payments for the hotel go through April 25, 2014. It is already noted that the birth parents took possession of the apartment in New Orleans on April 19, 2014

- without notifying us of their intent to discontinue support. They were in possession of two places of lodging at the same time for the same adoption.
- e. The birth parents also received two separate phones to communicate independently between the various support channels.
  - f. The solicitation, acceptance and use of multiple forms of support for a single adoption allegedly occurred between Baton Rouge, New Orleans, Denham Springs and quite likely California.
3. The third element that we discussed with you is the offer, procurement, payment and receipt of a 3-month lease in New Orleans:
- a. We are first-hand witnesses to the acquisition of the fully furnished apartment and 3 month lease in New Orleans. Lisa Harell told us, "If you want to keep the siblings together you will have to pay the Sibleys back for their expenses". When inquiring about the amount they incurred, we were told, unambiguously, that it was a 3 month lease that Thomas and Carol took possession on April 19, 2014, with furniture following on April 22, 2014. The information about the expected due date of April 22, 2014 (determined during the false labor visit to the ER on April 11, 2014 for which DCFS noted in their investigation and again confirmed during the April 16, 2014 visit) and text messages we have from Tia Sibley (attached) should give you the indication that each of the parties involved knew the delivery was imminent and the 3 month lease would fall outside of the legally defined 45 day limit on post-partum support (La R.S. 14:286).
  - b. The Attorney General's office is specifically mentioned in the Children's Code guidelines as someone who can question these events through further investigation of the expenses. Most specifically CHC 412 and CHC 1200.
4. The fourth element is also found in the petition that you have. I've also received information from a former Juvenile Court Judge who suggested that we are likely dealing with an alleged case of Human Trafficking. Here is how I believe we both came to that thought:
- a. The adoption agency uses various media outlets across the state to recruit birth mothers.
  - b. These advertisements are allegedly aimed directly at women who are currently pregnant and they allegedly solicit these mothers to give their children to families contracted (paying customers) with the agency. See one example attached.
  - c. The same adoption agency acknowledges this transaction is an "emotionally charged decision" and allegedly plays on these emotions by enticing these same birth mothers by saying to them "We will pay all your expenses" or will make sure "all of your financial, medical and emotional needs are met." See screen shots attached. Neither CHC 1200 nor R.S. 14:286 give anyone the ability to misrepresent to a birth mother that all financial expenses can be paid prior to a judge's approval of the adoption.
  - d. As we discussed with you previously, Todd Gaudin admitted to the LSP that Lisa Harell told Carol she would "try to keep Carol out of jail" by paying us back. If my memory serves me correctly, we learned from you that you cannot mention "jail" and money in the same sentence.
  - e. The question to the AG's office is now was Carol coerced to continue with the alleged duplicative adoption plan in order to stay out of jail? If there was nothing criminally wrong with this situation, why would Carol need to be kept out of jail?
  - f. I also discussed the general nature of the Revised Statutes with one of your AAGs and we both came to the same conclusion.

One last thought on these events: the only way that both Lisa and the adoption agency were to receive money through their legitimate businesses was to orchestrate the above alleged activities and finalize the adoption for their paying customer, while keeping us at bay and preventing us from contacting our daughter's birth mother.

- Lisa Harell - her "lawful fees" as admitted to in her testimony to the ODC and LaBSWE
- Adoption agency - fees "normally paid for an agency adoption" found in the DCFS investigation

These activities should be especially disconcerting for the AG's office since Carol's actions would ultimately result in one or more prospective adopting families being harmed financially and emotionally through her deception and the alleged activities of adoption professionals involved. I see no difference between an adoption scam and those people who scam families after a flood or hurricane. These families deserve the protection that goes with the responsibilities of the Attorney General's office, just like we do.

Finally, I realize there is a very distinct line between the criminal allegations and the civil nature of our own

losses. We will continue to pursue our legally available civil recourse, but please do not tell the East Baton Rouge Parish Sheriff's Office that our situation is only a civil issue.

Thank you,  
Craig

*Craig M. Mills*  
*craig.mills@cox.net*