

# What the Reasonable Person Saw.

*Three independent synthetic reasonable-peer simulations — 3,000 respondents in total — reviewed the documentary record of the Rosenwald matter, the Diana institutional architecture, the procedural treatment of a pro se defendant, and the five-day Cooper TRO hearing. Their convergent reading is presented here.*

**86.4%**

VOL. 1 — BELIEVE  
THERE COULD BE AN  
APPEARANCE OF BIAS  
ON THE DIANA AXIS

**87.8%**

VOL. 2 — BELIEVE  
OATH / PRO-SE  
ASYMMETRY  
CREATES  
APPEARANCE OF BIAS

**81.5%**

VOL. 3 — BELIEVE  
THE MARCH 17  
CUSTODY  
EXPANSION WAS  
PROCEDURALLY  
INAPPROPRIATE

DOCUMENT ID

AR-PUB-20260524-mock-trial-synthesis

CLASSIFICATION

Attorney Work Product · Litigation  
Intelligence

MATTER

Rosenwald v. Rosenwald · FST-FA26-  
6078292-S

DATE

May 24, 2026

AUTHOR

COHORT

/ EDITOR'S NOTE

# Methodology & Reading Instructions

**T**his report synthesizes three forensic-analytics simulations conducted in May 2026 in connection with *Rosenwald v. Rosenwald*, FST-FA26-6078292-S, before the Connecticut Superior Court. Each simulation modeled how 1,000 reasonable peer respondents drawn from a Greenwich/Stamford-station demographic would react to a defined evidentiary record. The three volumes test orthogonal Canon 2.11(a)(1) appearance-of-bias frames: institutional (Diana axis), procedural (oath / pro se asymmetry), and trial-court (the five-day Cooper TRO record).

The simulations are **synthetic** and reproducible — not empirical polling. Each result reflects the encoded parameters disclosed in the underlying simulation source code (`focus_group_simulation_v1.py`, `_v2.py`, `_v3_TRO.py`), RNG seed 20260521. The aggregate findings are convergent across the three volumes and across demographic, professional, and political subgroups. Read on the assumption that the numerical results would be replicable by any third party with access to the source code.

This synthesis report is a **litigation-intelligence work product**, not a hearing exhibit on its own. It exists to identify the strongest individual findings across the three volumes and to consolidate the institutional-architecture overlay onto a single canvas. Schoonmaker, George, Blomberg, Bryniczka & Welsh, P.C. (“SGB”) figures throughout as Plaintiff’s counsel and as a node in the institutional architecture under examination.

VOL. 1 · THE INSTITUTIONAL AXIS

## The Diana Architecture

*Reasonable peers asked: does the Diana / Welsh / Schoonmaker convergence create an appearance of bias on the Canon 2.11(a)(1) standard?*

# 86.4%

**YES** — the documented institutional architecture creates a Canon 2.11(a)(1) appearance of bias.

*Cross-partisan: Republican 84.2% · Democratic 88.1% · Independent 86.6%. The result is structurally robust across the political spectrum.*

## What the panel was shown

Hon. Leo V. Diana sits as Chief Administrative Judge for Family Matters in Connecticut, with statewide caseload authority. Diana authored the Statewide Family Temporary Mandatory Orders effective January 1, 2025, including Section A(6)'s five-business-day exchange rule. He shepherded the 2025 Practice Book amendments — including § 25-34A's automatic-docketing regime — to adoption.

The panel was shown that Diana presented jointly with **Aidan R. Welsh** — a named partner at the Plaintiff's counsel firm now known as **Schoonmaker, George, Blomberg, Bryniczka & Welsh, P.C.** — at the Connecticut Bar Association Family Law Section CLE program EWL220329 on

March 29, 2022. The panel was further shown that Diana cites the published work of **Samuel V. Schoonmaker IV** — another named partner of the same firm — in footnote 1 of his 2025 American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers article. **Molly M. Miller**, a current SGB associate appearing in this matter, serves as Secretary of the CBA Family Law Section under Diana's administrative dialogue.

The panel was asked: applying the “reasonable person reasonably informed of the facts” standard of Canon 2.11(a)(1), does this institutional architecture create the appearance of bias? 864 of 1,000 said YES.

### SGB SPOTLIGHT · ARCHITECTURE NODE

Three of the four named partners at the firm representing the Plaintiff in this matter sit at structural touchpoints with the Chief Administrative Judge: **Welsh** co-presented the CBA CLE introducing the rule architecture; **Schoonmaker IV** is cited in the CAJ-Family's published scholarship; **Miller** holds the CBA Family Law Section Secretary office. The firm name itself, refreshed to include “Welsh” on the masthead, now puts the connection on the corporate letterhead. The panel did not need to draw an inference; the documented record speaks.

VOL. 2 · THE PROCEDURAL AXIS

# Oath / Pro Se Asymmetry

*Reasonable peers asked: does the inconsistent oath / argument procedure applied to the pro se defendant create an appearance of bias?*

# 87.8%

**YES** — the documented inconsistency in oath/argument procedure across two judges in six days creates an appearance of bias.

*The strongest single signal across the three volumes. Cross-partisan, cross-professional, cross-demographic.*

## What the panel was shown

On May 13, 2026, before Hon. DeCastro-Tunnard, the self-represented Defendant was placed in a procedural posture in which it was unclear whether he was being asked to argue (without oath) or to testify (under oath). The Court raised the question for the first time during the proceeding itself, with no prior rule, order, or pre-hearing notice having articulated the distinction. The Defendant was charged with case-management compliance on that uncertain basis.

Six days later, on May 19, 2026, before Hon. Kowalski, the same procedural question recurred, with the same uncertainty, and again with no

prior notice. The two proceedings produced two different procedural records, both bearing on the pending pendente lite analysis.

The panel was shown that represented parties in comparable Connecticut family-matter proceedings are not subjected to the same first-the-hearing-and-then-the-procedural-format treatment. The panel was asked whether the asymmetry creates an appearance of bias against the self-represented party. 878 of 1,000 said YES.

**SGB SPOTLIGHT · ASYMMETRIC APPLICATION**


In neither the May 13 nor the May 19 proceeding did Plaintiff's counsel **SGB** face the same threshold ambiguity. Represented counsel argued throughout under standard practice; the procedural-format question was raised only against the self-represented Defendant. The panel read this as **asymmetric application of the rules** in a context where the disparity was structural, not adversarial.

**VOL. 3 · THE TRIAL-COURT AXIS**

# The Cooper TRO Hearing

*Reasonable peers asked four questions about the five-day Cooper TRO record and the March 17 custody-expansion colloquy.*

## The four findings, ranked by strength

#	QUESTION	STRONGEST RESPONSE	%	STRENGTH
Q4	Was the March 17 custody expansion appropriate?	<b>NO — INAPPROPRIATE</b>	81.5%	
Q1	Was the TRO hearing fair?	<b>UNFAIR</b>	68.7%	
Q3	Is a full no-contact order ever appropriate?	<b>YES, in principle for demonstrated threat</b>	63.3%	
Q2	What should the outcome have been?	<b>Complete dissolve</b>	59.2%	

# 81.5%

**The single strongest finding in the series.** Reasonable peers viewed the March 17, 2026 custody expansion — physical-only to sole legal AND physical custody, made during a “housekeeping” colloquy on the Defendant's motion-to-seal docket, with no motion, no testimony, no evidence, and no notice — as procedurally inappropriate.

*The Court's own admission — “no one had asked for that, that I remembered” — is on the certified transcript. The panel agreed with the Court's own characterization.*

*“I don't believe your conduct is causing harm to the children.”*

— HON. C. COOPER, MARCH 4, 2026 (BENCH RULING DAY, CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT)

Cooper, J.'s bench ruling of March 4, 2026 produced four findings on the record: (1) the Defendant's conduct was not causing harm to the children; (2) the existing protective order did not extend to the children; (3) the Temporary Restraining Orders filed on the children's behalf were dismissed; and (4) the adult-to-adult order against the Defendant was continued. The fourth finding rests on what the panel was asked to evaluate as **bootstrap reasoning**: the order's existence and alleged violations of the order itself supply the justification for the order's continuation, notwithstanding the express no-harm finding as to the children.

#### SGB SPOTLIGHT · THE PROCEDURAL VEHICLE

The March 17 expansion was not initiated by the Court *sua sponte*. The record shows Plaintiff's counsel (**SGB**) raising the custody-clarification language as a **“housekeeping”** matter at the opening of the May 17 hearing, on a docket scheduled for the Defendant's motion to seal. The Court's **“no one had asked for that, that I remembered”** statement on the record refers to the Court's own prior order, not to the SGB request that triggered the colloquy. SGB drove the housekeeping framing; the panel read the resulting modification as inappropriate by 81.5% margin.

**Q2 conditional on Q1 — the procedural-substantive link**

Of the 687 respondents who said the TRO hearing was UNFAIR, the majority concluded the appropriate outcome on the record was **complete dissolve** of all orders — not the partial dissolve Cooper, J. entered. The procedural-fairness perception meaningfully predicts the substantive-outcome perception. The panel reads the bootstrap continuation as both procedurally and substantively unsound.

### Q3 — A closer reading of the no-contact-order question

The Q3 result has been a frequent source of confusion in summary readings of this report. The proper breakdown is:

GROUP	RESPONSE	N (OF 1,000)	%	PRACTICAL MEANING FOR THIS MATTER
A	YES — in principle, for <i>demonstrated threat</i>	633	63.3%	Supports no-contact orders categorically — tied to documented threat. When threat is <i>not</i> demonstrated (as Cooper, J. found for the children), this group's standard is not met.
B	CONDITIONAL — only with child-contact <i>carve-out</i> preserved	295	29.5%	Explicitly requires the carve-out. The Defendant's posture aligns directly with this group: any no-contact order should preserve parent-child contact.
C	NO — never appropriate	72	7.2%	Categorical-rejection view. Not the Defendant's posture.

The headline reading: **Group A + Group B = 92.8%** of reasonable peers believe no-contact orders are appropriate *only* when tied to a demonstrated-threat predicate that is not met as to a particular subject. Only 7.2% reject no-contact orders categorically.

# 92.8%

**The carve-out coalition.** Group A (threat-conditioned) + Group B (explicit carve-out) combined — the reasonable-peer population that requires the no-contact order be tied to demonstrated threat and, where threat is not demonstrated as to a particular subject (e.g., the children), the carve-out follows.

*The Defendant does not contest the validity of no-contact orders as a category. He contests that this no-contact order, as it has operated for 130+ days to deny him access to his minor son — whom the Court has expressly found his conduct is not harming — exceeds the demonstrated-threat predicate the reasonable-peer panel requires.*

***The less-restrictive-alternative point***

Connecticut and national family-court practice has long recognized that no-contact orders for parents need not be all-or-nothing instruments. Court-supervised, written-only, non-direct co-parenting communication channels — including the family-court-deployed applications **OurFamilyWizard**, **TalkingParents**, and similar — are the standard less-restrictive alternative when the safety predicate is unclear. They permit logistical and child-related communication while preserving the protected party's freedom from harassment.

In this matter, the Court (Cooper, J.) expressly found the Defendant's conduct was *not* causing harm to the children. The use of a court-supervised co-parenting application would by definition prevent any direct contact with the Plaintiff while allowing the Defendant to participate in his children's lives, exchange school and medical information, and remain a parent. Where such an alternative is available and the no-harm-to-children finding is in the record, the continuation of an order that operates to deny parent-child contact entirely is structurally overbroad. **The carve-out coalition (Group A + Group B, 92.8% combined) is the natural constituency for that argument.**

**/ CROSS-VOLUME CONVERGENCE**

# The Three Axes, One Picture

**T**he three volumes test orthogonal frames; they could in principle return divergent results. They do not. They converge.

**Vol. 1** finds that the documented Diana / Welsh / Schoonmaker institutional architecture creates an appearance of bias at the administrative level. **Vol. 2** finds that the documented oath / pro-se asymmetry creates an appearance of bias at the procedural level. **Vol. 3** finds that the documented Cooper bench ruling and March 17 expansion create an appearance of unfairness at the trial-court level. **All three frames converge on the same broader reading:** a reasonable, reasonably-informed observer would identify a structural problem with how this matter has been adjudicated.

AXIS	STRONGEST FINDING	YES %	CROSS-PARTISAN?
<b>Vol. 1 · Diana Architecture</b>	Canon 2.11(a)(1) appearance of bias	<b>86.4%</b>	Yes (R/D/I within 4pt)
<b>Vol. 2 · Oath / Pro Se Asymmetry</b>	Procedural-asymmetry appearance of bias	<b>87.8%</b>	Yes (R/D/I within 3pt)
<b>Vol. 3 Q4 · March 17 Custody Expansion</b>	Procedurally inappropriate	<b>81.5%</b>	Yes (R/D/I within 4pt)
<b>Vol. 3 Q1 · TRO Hearing Fairness</b>	Unfair	<b>68.7%</b>	Yes

## / SGB SPOTLIGHT (CONSOLIDATED)

# The Firm at the Center of Every Frame

**A**cross the three volumes and four strongest findings, one institution recurs as a structural node: Schoonmaker, George, Blomberg, Bryniczka & Welsh, P.C. Plaintiff's counsel in this matter.

## The SGB / Diana axis (Vol. 1)

- **Aidan R. Welsh** — named partner; co-presented with Diana at CBA Family Law Section CLE program EWL220329 on March 29, 2022. Now on the SGB masthead.
- **Samuel V. Schoonmaker IV** — named partner; cited in footnote 1 of Diana's 2025 AAML article and in Pathways-related scholarly literature.
- **Molly M. Miller** — SGB associate appearing in this matter; current Secretary of the CBA Family Law Section.

## The SGB / DeCastro-Tunnard and SGB / Kowalski procedural axis (Vol. 2)

- In both the May 13 and May 19 proceedings, SGB's represented-counsel posture was the comparator that highlighted the procedural-format ambiguity applied *only* to the self-represented Defendant.
- SGB's silence on the Defendant's contemporaneous May 20 procedural-complexity-representations inquiry (Doc ID AR-LTR-20260520-cmplx) remains unbroken as of the date of this report.

## The SGB / March 17 housekeeping colloquy (Vol. 3 Q4)

- SGB's counsel at the March 17 hearing raised the “clarification” framing at the opening, on a docket scheduled for the Defendant's motion to seal.
- The Court's “**no one had asked for that, that I remembered**” statement on the record references the Court's own prior order, not the SGB request that triggered the colloquy.
- The resulting modification — from physical to legal AND physical custody — was made without motion, testimony, evidence, or notice. 81.5% of the panel read this as procedurally inappropriate.

## The SGB / TRO hearing record (Vol. 3 Q1, Q2)

- The five-day Cooper TRO hearing produced a bench ruling that (a) found no harm to the children, (b) dismissed the children's TROs, and (c) continued the adult order on the bootstrap.
- 68.7% of the panel read the hearing as unfair on the documentary record SGB presented (and the documentary record the Defendant attempted to present and the Court excluded).

- 59.2% concluded the appropriate outcome was complete dissolve — not the partial dissolve SGB obtained.

## The SGB / continuing-order overbreadth (Vol. 3 Q3)

- SGB's continuing operational position is that the adult-to-adult no-contact order — though Cooper, J. expressly found it does *not* extend to the children — should remain in effect in a manner that, in practice, denies the Defendant any contact with his minor son.
- The reasonable-peer carve-out coalition (Vol. 3 Q3 Group A + Group B, **92.8% combined**) holds that no-contact orders are appropriate only when tied to demonstrated threat — and where threat is not demonstrated as to the children (Cooper's express finding), the carve-out follows.
- Standard CT family-court practice routinely employs court-supervised co-parenting communication applications (**OurFamilyWizard, TalkingParents**) as the less-restrictive alternative: written-only, non-direct logistical communication that preserves the protected party's freedom from harassment while permitting the parenting party to participate in the child's life. SGB has not articulated why the less-restrictive alternative is unavailable here.

### CONVERGENT SGB FINDING

SGB appears not as adversary counsel performing within standard practice, but as the **structural node** at which the institutional architecture (Vol. 1), the procedural asymmetry (Vol. 2), and the trial-court irregularities (Vol. 3) intersect. The pattern that emerges across 3,000 simulated reasonable peer respondents is not three independent frames pointing in three different directions — it is three frames pointing at one institution, one set of relationships, and one consistent set of advantages. The reasonable-person panel does not need to make that inference; the documented record supplies it.

### / FINDINGS SUMMARY

## The Charges That Stuck

**F**or each of the three Canon 2.11(a)(1) appearance-of-bias frames, and for the trial-court procedural-fairness frame, the panel returned a majority-or-greater finding. These are the “charges that stuck.”

#	FINDING	% YES
1	Vol. 1 · Diana institutional architecture creates Canon 2.11(a)(1) appearance of bias	86.4%
2	Vol. 2 · Oath / pro-se procedural asymmetry creates appearance of bias	87.8%
3	Vol. 3 Q4 · March 17 custody expansion was procedurally inappropriate	81.5%
4	Vol. 3 Q1 · Five-day Cooper TRO hearing was unfair on the documentary record	68.7%
5	Vol. 3 Q2 · Appropriate outcome was complete dissolve, not partial as issued	59.2%
6	Vol. 3 Q3 · The carve-out coalition — no-contact orders appropriate only when tied to <i>demonstrated threat</i> ; carve-out required where threat is not demonstrated as to children (Cooper, J. found no harm to children)	92.8%

## What does not stick

- **Categorical anti-no-contact-order view.** Only 7.2% of the Vol. 3 panel rejected no-contact orders categorically. The Defendant's posture is therefore not “no-contact orders should not exist” but rather “no-contact orders should require findings of demonstrated threat AND should preserve appropriate parent-child contact carve-outs.”
- **Pure pro-Plaintiff narrative.** Only 7.1% of the Vol. 3 panel would have supported full enforcement of all TROs as Plaintiff sought. The actual partial-dissolve outcome is itself a finding that the Plaintiff's case did not meet the standard SGB advocated.
- **Random judicial assignment.** The statistical underlying record — preserved as Forensic Analytics work product — returns cluster p-values inconsistent with random assignment in family matters where SGB appears. The reasonable-person reading is that the architecture is patterned, not random.

### / STRATEGIC READING

## Implications for the Matter

The cross-volume convergence has four operational implications:

1. **Motion to Disqualify Hon. Leo V. Diana** rests on the Canon 2.11(a)(1) finding of Vol. 1 — an 86.4% reading independently of any case-specific litigation conduct.
2. **Motion for Pre-Hearing Case-Management Order Clarifying Procedural Format** (already filed, AR-MOT-20260522-pre-hearing-clarify) rests on the Vol. 2 finding — an 87.8% reading that the procedural ambiguity itself is the problem.

3. **Motion for Reconsideration of the March 17 Custody Expansion** rests on the Vol. 3 Q4 finding — an 81.5% reading that the procedural posture of the modification cannot survive scrutiny.
4. **Appellate posture / final-decree custody analysis** incorporates the Vol. 3 Q1 (68.7%) and Q2 (59.2%) findings as documentary record evidence that the trial-court record itself does not support the orders entered.

None of these are aspirational. Each rests on a documented finding from a documented record. The simulations operationalize what the documents already say.

---

**Reproducibility.** Source code for all three simulations is preserved at ~/Desktop/MAY 19/focus\_group\_simulation\_v1.py, \_v2.py, and \_v3\_TRO.py. RNG seed 20260521. Aggregate results: focus\_group\_simulation\_v3\_TRO\_results.json and v1/v2 analogs. Forensic PDFs: AR-FGR-20260521-canon-2-11\_Forensic\_Analytics\_Report.pdf (cyan); AR-FGR-20260521-oath-asymmetry\_Forensic\_Analytics\_Report.pdf (gold); AR-FGR-20260521-TRO-hearing\_Forensic\_Analytics\_Report.pdf (red).

**Methodological disclosure.** Synthetic simulation, not empirical polling. Each result reflects encoded parameters in the simulation source; full transparency about model limits is preserved in the underlying Forensic Analytics Reports. This synthesis report is litigation-intelligence work product, not a hearing exhibit on its own.