No evidence. No reasons. Intent to harm.

The Bayle Luscher Therapeutic Architecture

The decision roles of the 2019 consent judgment and the 2022 proposals that followed, mapped from the record as the Institute's page *Without Accountability, Orleans Family Court Can Act Untethered from Reality* sets them out. Page references identify the cited testimony and judgment provisions; labels identify what the official court transcripts and the 2019 consent judgment record, what Neal's petition pleads, and what Neal concludes from them. The 2022 recommendations were not adopted. Intent to harm is Neal's conclusion from the transcripts; the map shows the structure they record. Paraphrase only: no quotation from the transcript and no counts appear on this sheet.

2019 consent judgment, in force

2022 recommendations, proposed and not adopted

Left undefined in the testimony

[Per the transcripts] [Per the 2019 judgment] [Neal's petition] [Neal's account] [Neal's conclusion] mark the basis of each statement

1. No evidence.

How the record was built, as Neal's petition describes it. A narrative supplied by paid professionals and placed in the record by counsel stood in for evidence that was never required. [Neal's petition]

The withholding

In 2018, Nagarajan began withholding the children without a court order, despite a divorce judgment that gave the parents equal shared custody with no domiciliary parent, and the court declined to enforce it.

Neal's petition

↓

The post hoc explanation

Privately paid professionals, including parenting coordinator Tim Kemery and custody evaluator Kristen Luscher, supplied justifications after the fact.

Neal's petition

↓

The insertion

Attorney Suzanne Bayle placed the disputed narrative into the court record and carried it through the 2022 trial.

Per the transcripts

↓

The ratification

Luscher repeated the narrative under professional authority while also serving as the privately paid enforcer of the 2019 stipulation.

Neal’s petition

↓

Judicial force

The Family Court and the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeal gave the resulting control judicial force: where Neal could live, whether she could have a home with her children in New Orleans, whether she could work.

Neal’s account

↓

Consequences that compound

Restrictions sustained under the broad best interest of the child standard, without the underlying claims meeting a threshold of competent evidence.

Neal’s account

The evaluator repeated a psychiatric narrative that Neal’s medical records and her treating psychiatrist’s testimony contradicted. The court relied on the statements without requiring competent supporting evidence. [Neal’s petition]

2. No reasons.

The 2022 proposal, as described in testimony by the same people. Where Neal stood when it was read: fifteen consecutive months without her children. [Neal's account] In her account, no condition came with a reason tied to a finding about her children; the red boxes are the points the testimony itself left undefined.

01

Temporary sole custody

Placed with Nagarajan, with supervised visitation after Neal began psychotherapy.

Tr. 88:14 to 24

↓

02

Twelve weekly sessions

Proposed before even supervised contact. Psychotherapy weekly or more often as recommended, for at least twelve months and longer if warranted.

Tr. 88:25 to 32; 89:29 to 32; 85:25 to 86:29

↓

?

Proof of gains

Gains to be demonstrated before any move to supervised visitation. The discussion did not identify who would receive the proof or how the monitoring would work.

Monitor: not identified. Method: not described.

Tr. 90:13 to 91:7

↓

03

Supervised contact, more therapy

Supervision by a paid mental health professional, who reports problematic behavior to Neal’s therapist; family therapy afterward.

Tr. 90:1 to 12; 91:8 to 94:1

↓

04

A possible return

A return to the existing schedule after appropriate therapeutic gains across twelve months, with the burden on Neal to show the court. Continued sole custody for Nagarajan if she did not participate.

Gains: no measure named.

Tr. 97:4 to 98:12

Not adopted. Neal explains that there was no workable way to monitor compliance. That the proposal was entertained at all, without evidence first, is her objection. [Neal's account]

3. Intent to harm. [Neal's conclusion]

Neal's conclusion from the official court transcripts and the 2019 consent judgment, and the claim in her civil petition: the architecture was built to be impossible and not survivable. [Neal's conclusion] The conduct she points to is below. Who held each decision under the 2019 consent judgment, which did govern; the loop she describes; and a route with no defined way back. Each decision belonged to a paid actor or to the other parent, and the recommendation for more restrictive custody bound before any court order.

Luscher and Nagarajan

A different provider

Jointly approved any alternative provider. Ending therapy after the initial twelve months involved the treating psychologist in consultation with Luscher.

2019 judgment, p. 9, ¶ a

Neal's providers and Luscher

More time with the children

Required written certification from Neal's treatment providers and Luscher, with the children's therapists in agreement.

2019 judgment, p. 10, ¶ d

Luscher

More restrictive custody

Luscher could recommend more restrictive custody, binding pending a court order.

2019 judgment, p. 10, ¶ e

Nagarajan; Luscher or the parenting coordinator

Payment and enforcement

Nagarajan approved therapy rates in writing and paid the providers directly. Neal's monthly payment could be reclassified or terminated after a material breach determination by Luscher or the parenting coordinator, binding pending court review.

2019 judgment, p. 10, ¶ c; pp. 12 to 13

Contact withheld

Paid professional ratification

Judicial enforcement

Further conditions on contact

Back to the start

Under the 2019 consent judgment, negative talk about the other parent in the children's hearing was a material breach (Guidelines d, g, j, n); negative behaviors let Luscher recommend more restrictive custody, binding pending court order (p. 10, ¶ e); negative talk could end the monthly payment on a binding decision by Luscher or the parenting coordinator (p. 13). [Per the 2019 judgment] In Neal's account, that is how telling her children she had not abandoned them was treated. [Neal's account] Restrictions accumulated instead of being reviewed; each consequence rested on the one before it, while the underlying evidentiary dispute stayed unresolved. [Neal's account]

Her petition pleads that the structure inflicted irreparable harm and created a foreseeable danger: it left no path she could survive. [Neal's petition] The map shows the structure. Intent to harm is Neal's conclusion from the transcripts. The cited testimony and judgment provisions, and the attribution labels, identify the basis for every statement above.

What answers each absence

The Institute’s three safeguards for the 2027 Regular Session, as published on its 2027 page.

Answers: no evidence

Evidence before separation

No order should restrict a parent’s contact with a child on an unsupported allegation alone.

Answers: no reasons, and no defined way back

A defined path back to contact

Conditions must identify the finding, the completion criteria, the decision maker, the deadline, and the contact that follows completion.

Answers: expert evidence that was never tested

A meaningful opportunity to challenge expert evidence

Regardless of means. Act 552 of 2024 applied the Code of Evidence standards to expert testimony and removed any presumption in favor of the evaluator’s findings; a law is only as good as its execution in the courtroom.

Sources and attribution

Paraphrased from the record with page cites: the 2022 trial transcript, pp. 85 to 98 (Exhibit H to Neal’s petition filed April 3, 2026), and the 2019 consent judgment, pp. 1 to 14. Tr. is a transcript page and line; judgment cites are page and paragraph. Statements tagged per the transcripts or per the 2019 judgment paraphrase those records; Neal’s petition restates what her petition pleads; Neal’s account and Neal’s conclusion state her position and the conclusions she draws from the record. The 2022 recommendations were not adopted. The Institute advocates reform; it is not a law firm.

Institute for Child Custody Advocacy
childcustodyadvocacy.org
Structure edition, v4