

FRANKLIN MARSHALL  
Guardian ad litem  
#30222

In re: Matter of Pauline Williams  
Case Number: 13SO-PR00107

---

For Services Rendered:		Hours
08/06/13	Tel. call from Carla Williams re matter.	.35
08/09/13	Visit Pauline Williams and Ramona Burnett at her residence re matter.	1.00
08/13/13	Tel. call from Royal Eaton re matter.	.50
03/26/14	Visit with client at her residence re matter.	.75
03/27/14	Tel. conf. with Chuck Leible; tel. call to David Crader re matter.	.25
03/31/14	Attend guardianship hearing in Benton.	3.50
04/01/14	Corres. to court re recommdnation.	.35
04/02/14	Tel. call from Rebecca Adams re matter.	.25
04/03/14	Tel. call from Teala Mainzer re matter; rec'd and reviewed fax corres. from Dr. Rebecca Smith; call to Dr. Smith.	<u>.50</u>
TOTAL HOURS		7.45
ATTORNEY'S FEE (7.70 hrs @ \$125.00 per):		<u>\$931.25</u>

## FRANKLIN MARSHALL

Attorney at Law  
P. O. Box 1426  
**Sikeston, Missouri 63801-1426**

733 North Main  
Sikeston, MO

Telephone: (573) 471-2525  
Facsimile: (573) 472-1429

March 31, 2014

Hon. W. H. Winchester III  
Associate Circuit Judge  
P. O. Box 587  
Benton, MO 63736

Re: In the Matter of: Pauline Williams  
Case Number: 13SO-PR00107

Dear Judge Winchester:

I visited Ms. Pauline Williams on two occasions in her current residence at 220 West Gladys, in Sikeston. Both visits were unannounced, I just showed up at the residence and asked to visit. During my first visit in August of last year there were other people besides the Burnetts present, including Mona McReynolds, who were visiting with Ms. Williams and helping her "fix" her hair, and otherwise caring for her. The home was a little cramped, and there was some clutter, but nothing particularly alarming about the home.

I visited Ms. Williams again last week in the home. When I arrived the home health care worker was at the home, and Mr. and Mrs. Burnett arrived at the home a minute or two after I arrived. The care worker had just finished giving Ms. Williams a bath.

I know not everybody lives the way I do, or has a home like I may have, but my initial impression last week was that the home was not a good environment for Ms. Williams, and that she should probably be in a skilled care facility. The home was more cluttered and cramped than my first visit, and there was a strong odor of soured or spoiled food. I later realized the portable commode was in a side room, and there were at least a couple of cats in the home, that may account for the odor. Ms. Williams living area in the living room was very cluttered and cramped with very little area to move around, and several extension cords running across the floor to be stepped over. Her bed was more like a cot, and was folded in half.

I commend Ms. Williams' family for trying to abide by her wishes not to be placed in a nursing home, and for taking on the responsibility for her care in their home. And there is no certainty of the quality of care a person may receive in a nursing home. But in light of the testimony regarding multiple hospitalizations of Ms. Williams, the issues observed by Department of Senior Services workers, and observations of the home health worker of

serious conditions requiring medical care, I believe more skilled care would be in Ms. Williams best interest.

Should the court feel Ms. Williams may need a higher level of care, then because the petitioners/current care providers are opposed to a more skilled care environment, and disagreement among the family members as to how to provide for Ms. Williams, I believe the appointment of the public administrator as guardian and conservator of Ms. Williams would be necessary.

Very truly yours,



Franklin Marshall