| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Maribel Jarzabek |
| **To:** | Carson, Julie K CIV (US) |
| **Subject:** | Re: Good afternoon |
| **Date:** | Thursday, February 05, 2015 8:17:39 AM |
| **Attachments:** | Request for SVC Responses - Jarzabek Copy.pdf |

Julie,

I received your email last week, but decided that in light of your program existing until 2017 to monitor the SVC program, that I want to provide you with a better product than just hastily sending you all the different stuff that I have that is somewhat unorganized right now. I also don't have a way to redact stuff in my pdf files, so I am going to have to do that by hand and then scan up, unless I can download a program that allows me to redact directly on my pdf files. The reason I say this is because a few people who wrote me emails were concerned who would see it - someone in DoD or the AF versus Congressional folks. A few wanted me to redact their name from the memo but leave it unredacted for Gillibrand's staff. So I need to work that out. I'm sitting down next week to finish this and now that I know that it won't likely make it in this report, I can take a little bit more time to send you what I have with proper redactions (I also wanted to send you a few emails from cases, but need to get client permission first and then redact).

But bottom-line - I believe SVC program needs to be taken out of the JA change and be placed in DoD (like your panel) and have civilian attorneys that are not ranked (ranked meaning not be captains, majors, etc.). Further, the way the actual performance of the SVC is evaluated should be changed, and this is why it's important to take the SVC program and civilianize it under DoD, because if a SVC gets a SJA or Commander mad, the SJA is calling our bosses to complain and our bosses are not even asking us for our take on the matter and why we did what we did and how that advances our clients interests or what they requested us to do. If the SVC program is justifying ranking SVCs not only in accordance with how they perform, but also in accordance to whether they are making the chain of command and their SJAs upset with what they are asking for on behalf of their clients and how they conduct their advocacy (e.g. appeal decisions, go directly to the Vice Wing CC due to retaliation issues and for the fact that the Group CC really has no role in expedited transfer issues), then that's not fair. Some might say that we SVCs are also officers and that should factor into our evaluation, but the SVC's role is to advocate the victim's voice and that is not a popular thing right now. Thus, SVCs should be brought under a separate office under DoD and they should be civilian positions, so that they could garner respect and not be disrespected as much as I was from Commanders, SJAs, and OSI agents and judges (I will provide examples of this when I send you stuff late this month).

Finally, there needs to be a uniform process with how (1) legal offices handle VWAP and (2) OSI agents handle issues relating to SVCs. Every office has different rules or policies and it gets frustrating to try to deal with all the different offices and with how they handle the right to consult, the right to provide victims with status information, providing victims charge sheets and Article 32 reports, evidence obtained from the victim, and allowing SVCs to have copies of videotaped interview statements (as we are generally going away from written statements). The more resistant the leader is to the SVC program, the worst it is for us to deal with that certain office. Providing uniform rules on what the right to obtain input and consult with victim mean, and the other issues I mentioned above, would assist in improving the process more and making it more fair.

This is what I submitted, hastily, in early October to my leadership for one of your Requests for Information. I was on PTDY status and I had to hastily do this, but see attached. My responses show my frustration with the lack of uniform policies, VWAP program, and the SVC program.

Will write you more later this month! Thanks for your patience. I am also writing and sending letters to the President, the new SECDEF, SECAF, etc., so that's why I'm trying to take my time and ensure things

are redacted, etc. I will provide you the copy of that...hopefully I can get this all done by the end of this month, but I also have a court-martial coming up (as a civilian SVC for a client who wanted to keep me), so I'm going to be busy with that as well.

Thanks!
Maribel

On Wed, Jan 28, 2015 at 3:33 PM, Carson, Julie K CIV (US) <[redacted] wrote:

Hi Maribel,

No problem. It is unlikely that anything new will make it into the February report at this point as it is in its final stages of review, but there will be subsequent reports - the JPP is in place through 2017, so we are still very interested in any information you have to share as the Panel continues to monitor the SVC program.

Thanks again,
Julie

-----Original Message-----
From: Maribel Jarzabek [mailto[redacted]]
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 2:21 AM
To: Carson, Julie K CIV (US)

Subject: Re: Good afternoon

Julie,

Can I provide you what I wanted to provide you by this Friday? Is there a timeline you need this by? I think I read your report is due soon - in February?

Thanks for being patient!

Maribel

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 5:59 PM, Carson, Julie K CIV (US) <[redacted] wrote:

Hi Maribel -

After Jan 19 works just fine. Just let me know when you get back and have time. Safe travels!

Best,
Julie

Julie K. Carson
Judicial Proceedings Panel
Attorney and Legislative Liaison
[redacted]
O: 703-693-3849

One Liberty Center
875 N. Randolph St., Suite 150

Arlington, Virginia 22203

-----Original Message-----
From: Maribel Jarzabek [mailto:[redacted]
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 12:58 PM
To: Carson, Julie K CIV (US)
Subject: Good afternoon

Julie,

Good afternoon. I'm writing you back after getting your Facebook message. I would be interested in speaking with you in the next week or two. Does that work for you? I will be visiting Porto, Portugal from 15 Jan to 19 Jan, so speaking after Martin Luther King Jr. Day (after 19 Jan) would work best for me. What do you think? Would that work for you?

Please let me know, Ma'am.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Maribel