

# **WARNING**

**CONTENTS OF THIS PSYCHOLOGICAL REPORT ARE GRAPHIC AND CAUTION SHOULD BE EXERCISED BY THOSE WHO ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO REVIEW THESE DOCUMENTS. IF YOU ARE AGE 21 OR BELOW YOU ARE REQUIRED TO EXIT THIS SITE IMMEDIATELY**

**Please note that the attached psychologist report was court ordered, and was paid by Vijayasree Voora (See page 5).**

# CAPITAL PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATES

*an association of independent practitioners*

4 Atrium Drive, Suite 240  
Albany, New York 12205  
Telephone (518) 453-9220  
Fax (518) 453-2326

— ♦ —

Elizabeth Critz Schockmel, Psy.D.  
Felicia Glenn Gerrol, Ph.D.  
Bruce F. Nelson, Ph.D.

September 15, 2007

Pinky Anand  
Advocate, Supreme Court of India  
A-126, Niti Bagh  
New Deli 110 049, India

**VIA FAX**

Re: Aditya Chandran (7/1/02) age 5  
Vijayasree (Artha) Voora (4/25/69) age 38  
V. Ravi Chandran (5/3/55) age 52

Dear Ms. Anand:

Please consider this an addendum to a court-ordered comprehensive custody evaluation, dated June 11, 2007, completed for the New York State Family Court in Albany County, regarding Artha Voora, V. Ravi Chandran, and their son Aditya (age five). (Your client, Mr. Chandran, was provided a copy of the report by the Court.) As I believe you are aware, since the submission of the report to the Court, and the finalization of a Custody Order (based on an agreement developed by the parents, with the assistance of counsel), Mr. Chandran holds that Ms. Voora abducted their son, refusing to return the child to him when her period of summer custodial time ended. It is my understanding (per information provided by Mr. Chandran and his attorney here in Albany), that Ms. Voora has conveyed to Mr. Chandran her intention to abandon her residence in Albany, and to intentionally defy the Court's Order of Custody, refusing him any and all forms of contact with their son. It is apparently her intention to remain in India, living with Aditya at a location undisclosed to the child's father.

Since the submission of the June 2007 report to the Albany Court, additional information was gathered regarding the overall functioning and mental health of Ms. Voora. As presented in the comprehensive evaluation, a host of concerns were raised regarding her psychiatric functioning. During the eight hours Ms. Voora was individually interviewed, she was observed to experience a marked degree of difficulty maintaining focus and formulating thoughts. The possibility existed that Ms. Voora was responding to distracting internal stimuli (i.e., auditory hallucinations). Certainly, Ms. Voora presented as highly suspicious; it is my view that her thinking was negatively impacted by paranoid content. Ms. Voora's manner in follow-up phone calls (initiated by her), and during two settlement conferences (attended by the parents, Ms. Voora's mother, and attorneys representing Mr. Chandran and the child [Ms. Voora had by that point abruptly terminated her relationship with her own lawyer]), lent further support to the position that this intelligent mother was experiencing psychiatric symptomatology that was profoundly—and negatively—impacting her judgment, decision-making and problem-solving abilities.

Re: Chandran/Voora  
September 15, 2007  
Page 2

It is my impression that Ms. Voora believes—although involved investigation revealed no evidence in support of her claim—that Mr. Chandran sexually molested their son and is at risk for hurting the child in the future. Again contrary to information gathered over the involved assessment, she presents herself as having been victimized by an abusive Mr. Chandran. Ms. Voora, in my opinion, is lacking insight into the fact that her functioning, both interpersonally and in general, is seriously compromised at this time. At the time of her evaluation appointment, to the exclusion of important material concerning her son, she maintained an intent focus on two points: a) avoiding her participation in the evaluation, and b) her leaving at the earliest possible time for an extended visit to India. To that end, Ms. Voora had discharged her attorney on the eve of the commencement of the evaluation, crafted a custodial plan that provided Mr. Chandran with primary custody of their son, and pleaded with Mr. Chandran and myself that the assessment be cancelled. Repeated attempts to explain that the evaluation was ordered by the Court and, as such, must be completed to remain in compliance with the Court's directives, were ignored by her. It was Ms. Voora's opinion—an incorrect view—that Mr. Chandran had the power to stop the assessment (and was refusing to do so.)

In an attempt to provide Ms. Voora every opportunity to present herself in her most healthy state, the decision was made to conduct her interview over two dates, with the second appointment scheduled to occur immediately upon her return from a visit with family in Chennai. The possibility existed, it was believed, that time spent with her parents, siblings and relatives, in what she described as the safe and secure surroundings of her parents' home, might improve Ms. Voora's psychiatric and psychological functioning. On her return, however, as she participated in four hours of consecutive interview, the same mental health concerns were raised. Ms. Voora's judgment and decision-making seem to be colored by suspicious and paranoid thinking. She appears to hold to false beliefs (delusional thoughts) even when faced with incontrovertible evidence to the contrary. Ms. Voora was found to project blame and responsibility for her life difficulties fully onto Mr. Chandran. She made clear that she has in the past and will continue into the future to refuse therapeutic assistance of any kind. Her opinion, she offered, was that she is able to address her mental health needs on her own, for example by pursuing, in India, educational opportunities and participation in a meditation program of some kind. In my assessment, Ms. Voora is in need of some form of psychiatric treatment, including but not necessarily limited to, psychotherapy with an experienced clinician.

It is my opinion that untreated psychiatric symptoms and maladaptive personality features are presently directing Ms. Voora on a course of action that is placing in jeopardy the well-being of the parties' five year old son. At the time of her first evaluation appointment, Ms. Voora made known her intention to abandon Aditya, leaving the child in his father's care for an indeterminate period such that she would be able to immediately return to India. She indicated that her need to be with her family in Chennai

Re: Chandran/Voora  
September 15, 2007  
Page 3

superceded her responsibility to care for her son—even though it was her expressed belief that Mr. Chandran was at significant risk of abusing the child. In conflict with her position that Mr. Chandran was a child abuser, she spoke of the positives that he would be able to bring to Aditya's life. After Ms. Voora actively participated in the development of a plan providing for shared custody—a plan that I believed would address Aditya's needs while providing for active involvement in the child's life by his mother and father, Ms. Voora has apparently absconded with Aditya. She has unilaterally decided that she will decide if and when Mr. Chandran will have contact with the child, denying Aditya the opportunity to continue his relationship with his father.

In conclusion, if it is the case that Ms. Voora is presently in India with the parties' son, she is there in willful violation of the Order of Albany County Family Court, and in opposition to the recommendations presented in the June 2007 court-ordered evaluation. It is my assessment that psychiatric symptoms have impacted Ms. Voora's thinking and decision-making, seriously clouding her judgment. She has demonstrated, in my opinion, that her ability to safely and effectively parent is notably compromised.

If I can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



Elizabeth Critz Schockmel, Psy.D.  
Clinical/Forensic Psychologist

ECS:bs/c

cc: Michelle Haskin, Esq.

\*021305001Y  
01/11/2007  
6556674543

This is a LEGAL COPY of  
the original check. If you  
use the original check,  
use the original check.

06/06/2007 02223704403  
000004280340465

WYANKEE VODRA  
LIVING ON 1218  
Dmt 06/06/07  
730

Ms. Elizabeth Schockmel  
The Husband Five Hundred and No/100ths of

Evergreen Bank  
102130258716 6240001816

102130258716 6240001816

4:02130258716 6240001816 0730 \*0000250000\*

Account: 6240001816  
Amount: 2,500.00  
DIN: 203005829  
Tran\_ID: 0

000004280340465  
06/06/2007 02223704403

1002016076  
KMY 527 JUN 08 2007

PROPORTIONATE  
REPRESENTATIVE PAYEE

82300027 06/06/2007  
0000017006650534  
0000017006650534  
\*021305001Y 06/11/2007  
6556674543

Account: 6240001816  
Amount: 2,500.00  
DIN: 203005829  
Tran\_ID: 0