

work did not benefit the ward." This is an important distinction as the court also recognized that "the guardian performed work which benefitted the ward." (See Index #42).

In fact, it wasn't until the guardian filed her second motion for reconsideration (Index #43) that the guardian mentioned (by way of a footnote) that she had received an additional "\$4800" in guardian fees, ironically in an effort to persuade the court that she had done great work getting the ward social security benefits, and thus justify her additional fees. Primarily because the court was astonished that such a large amount of fees would have been unreported during a time when the guardian was seeking additional fees, the court scheduled the hearing that was held on December 19, 2014. It was at this hearing that the court, for the first time, learned that the guardian had also authorized payment of legal fees from the ward's funds of nearly \$2,000.00. (See Index #44).

While not taking responsibility for the lack of clarity and candor in the accounting in this matter, the guardian places the blame on the court for having so many different judges involved in the case ¶30, "The guardian believes that the number of judges in this matter and the long delay in response from the Court contributed much to the confusion on the part of the Guardian," ¶32 "The Guardian believes her actions have erroneously been characterized as a breach of fiduciary duties, when her actions are more accurately the result of the constant changing of judges in this matter"). In support of her position, the guardian states that 7 different judges made rulings in this matter. Mot. at ¶27. In fact, there have been 8 different judges who have made "rulings" in this case, however, the court can unequivocally state that the number of judges has had nothing