



The child snatchers

The Daily Chimpanzee

Do you reckon that a few arsehole's arseholes are beginning to pout a bit?

I mean, it is extremely strange for the Monkey Boys to report on the huge number of children that go missing from care homes every year:

Almost 5,000 children – including babies – have disappeared from council care in the past two years, new figures have revealed.

Nineteen babies have vanished for months at a time, and one infant – just a few months old – has still not been found two years later.

The figures have been unveiled under a freedom of information request.

They show that 4,852 looked-after children were reported missing between January 2012 and December 2013, the Sunday Times reports.

There were 24,320 cases logged – as many disappeared more than

once. The large majority were teenagers but dozens of those who disappeared were between four and nine years old.

The number includes a one-year-old girl missing since July 2013. [Source](#)

I would like to see that FOI request since it is readily agreed by the government that over 100,000 children go missing in ENGLAND every year alone, 10,000 of them from children's homes or foster care.

Never the less, according to Kent County Council Cabinet Minister Peter Oakford:

When a child goes missing, we work closely with the police to find the child but we also need the government and other authorities to help us to address these wider issues including breaking down international trafficking networks which can lead to vulnerable children going missing.

Really?

You see, according to the government:

It is impossible to know the true extent of the problem due to erratic data collection. The Department for Education (DfE) recorded 930 instances of children going missing from care, but police data shows an estimated 10,000.

There are various possible reasons for this discrepancy. Local authorities only have to report on children for whom they have parental responsibility, so this does not include children placed in their area from another authority. The DfE statistics only record children who went missing for more than 24 hours. There are also problems with the quality of data collected on trafficked children.

You don't actually work that closely with the odd bod plod squad then Peter?

And just so as we can be clear here Pete, just tell us again about those children who have been “trafficked”:

We also the government and other authorities to help us to address these wider issues including breaking down international trafficking networks which can lead to vulnerable children going missing.

Can it now?

You see, being as Peter Baby says that most trafficked children come through Kent, you would have thought that he would have been aware of the huge statistic of trafficked children who go missing from care every year – most never to be seen again:

Many (estimated 60%) disappear from care within 48 hours without being registered with children’s service, and the majority are never found. Many run back to their trafficker as they are scared of repercussions. [Source](#)

But its okay though, there is a perfectly reasonable explanation for all these children going missing according to the NSPCC:

Tom Rahilly, head of strategy for looked-after children at the NSPCC, told the paper: ‘When children and young people in care go missing it should be no different to when any other child disappears from home. This is very alarming.’

He said children may disappear because the parent decides to remove them without going through the proper channels, and often teenage mothers in care decide to leave with their child.

The good old NSPCC – if only I had the time to tell you about that paedophiles paradise.

Suffice to say that donating to the NSPCC is helping fund child rape.

Still, no need to worry.

I mean the kids may have vanished but they are safe being as they are with their mothers who have either snatched them or now left care taking their babies with them... Because they let the mothers in care keep their babies don't they???

I fucking hate nonces and I openly accuse Paul *Banana* Dacre of being at best a protector for the sick cunts..

Indeed, we all know where these young children are really disappearing and it is a whole fucking shed load more than the Monkey Boys would have you believe.

However, the nonce infested government will ensure that there is always a ready supply... Sick cunts, the fucking lot of them.

Remember, it could very well be your child next on the list to disappear.

Get angry for fucks sake.

Baby girl taken from her mother by a secret court: Family knew nothing of judge's decision to back social workers

- **First of its kind secret court decision meant mother was not told of plans**
- **Newborn was taken last month but decision was only made**

public today

- **Campaigners attack secrecy insisting other options should have been tried**

By [SAM MARSDEN](#)

PUBLISHED: 18:06, 6 June 2014 | **UPDATED:** 20:38, 7 June 2014



+4

High Court Judge Michael Joseph Keehan admitted the move was 'draconian' and 'at the extremity of what is permissible under the European Convention'

A mother had her newborn baby girl taken away by social workers without any warning following a secret court hearing.

A High Court judge made a 'draconian' ruling that council officials did not have to tell the 24-year-old woman of their

intention to remove her child just hours after she gave birth.

This meant that the mentally-ill mother and her family had no chance to instruct lawyers to fight the plans. Critics of behind-closed-doors justice condemned the judgment as an 'absolute scandal'.

The judge in the case, Mr Justice Keehan, admitted it was a 'highly exceptional' step that was 'at the extremity' of what the law allows.

But he ruled that North Somerset Council was not required to inform the heavily pregnant mother-to-be that it wanted to take away her baby at birth.

He said there was a 'very real risk' that the woman, who has schizophrenia and an IQ of just 63, could harm herself and her unborn child if she learned of social services' plans.

The judge also imposed a gagging order banning all reporting of his ruling, which was only lifted after the little girl was taken into care.

The baby, who cannot be named for legal reasons, was born by elective caesarean section at a hospital in Bristol on May 1.

Within hours of the birth the council had been granted an emergency protection order to remove the infant by a family court judge.

The woman was placed on a separate ward in the hospital from her baby, although she was allowed to see the child under supervision with the support of her mother and grandmother.

The new mother was discharged alone on May 2. Her mental state has deteriorated so much since then that she requires treatment from the 'crisis team' of her local mental health trust.

Foster carers took over looking after the baby when she left

hospital on May 6. North Somerset Council considered whether the baby's grandmother would be a suitable carer, but ruled that she would not.

The judge said it was not known whether the child's great-grandmother would put herself forward to look after her.



+4

The High Court ruled the woman should not be told of social workers plans to take her baby after birth

The man believed to be the baby's father did not express a view on whether or not she should be taken into care.

A spokesman for North Somerset Council said: 'Cases such as this are rarely straightforward, and the decision on whether it is best for a child to remain with its birth parents or be taken into care is never taken without extensive consideration. The care of a child only transfers to the council when all options have been considered and with the

court's agreement.'

Explaining his reasons for allowing the council to remove the child secretly from the mother, Mr Justice Keehan said he realised it was an 'extremely unusual' move.

He added: 'The order sought in this case by the local authority is at the extremity of what is permissible under the European Convention (on Human Rights). It is only in an extreme case that such a draconian and highly exceptional course of conduct will be permitted.

'I am satisfied that if the mother were to learn of the plan to remove her child at birth there is a very real risk she would harm herself and a very, very real risk that she would cause physical harm to her baby.'



+4

North Somerset Council refused to comment on the case but said such decisions were 'rarely straightforward'

But campaign group the Association for Improvements in the Maternity Services said the woman should have been given a chance to mount a legal defence.



President Jean Robinson said it was an 'absolute scandal', adding: 'The secret hearing does not give the mother any opportunity to instruct solicitors to prevent it, or even approach solicitors or even her own family member to create an alternative.'

'There may well have been no alternative, but the problem is that was never explored. The fact that the mother only found out the moment she had given birth, it's terrible.'

Lib Dem MP John Hemming, who has campaigned for open justice, said: 'It is very convenient as a way of doing things for the local authority that you have a court order which says you don't have to tell anyone what you're doing.'

'This case is particularly extreme in not giving the mother a chance to fight back, but even if she had been warned, it's very difficult when you've just given birth to build up an adequate case to challenge what the local authority says.'

This is the latest in a series of secretive High Court

rulings. In one case in 2012 a judge allowed doctors to sedate Italian mother-to-be Alessandra Pacchieri to perform a caesarean section without her consent. Her baby girl was then taken into care against her wishes.

THE MAIL'S CAMPAIGN...


Jailed in secret – for trying to rescue her father from care home

From the Mail, April 24, 2013

Let Press into family courts to uphold justice, says judge

November 12, 2013

**SECRET COURT
JAILS FATHER
FOR SENDING
SON GREETING
ON FACEBOOK**



June 1, 2013

Agony of mother whose baby girl was put up for adoption after secret court judge forced her to have a caesarean

**PLEASE DON'T
TAKE MY BABY**

December 2, 2013

Family hearings must be exposed to 'glare of publicity'

**TOP JUDGE'S WAR
ON SECRET COURTS**

September 6, 2013

**FATHER
WITH NO
RIGHTS**

December 9, 2013

Read

more: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2650787/Social-w>

[orkers-snatched-mothers-baby-minutes-birth-no-warning-secret-court-ruling.html#ixzz34J3ak7dJ](#)

Follow us: [@MailOnline on Twitter](#) | [DailyMail on Facebook](#)