

**Subject:** Re: Annalise

**From:** Mark Cao <mark.cao@gmail.com>

**Date:** 5/1/2023, 8:53 AM

**To:** Hanh Cao Yu <hanh.cao.yu@stanfordalumni.org>

I think the way it works is that the public guardian does their work for free, but then they ("the public") become first in line to inherit the person's assets, or at least enough to pay for services rendered. So, if he has \$500K but incurred \$250K by the time of death, they would only take that much. But if he incurs \$700K in assets, he gets \$200K for free, but the \$500K is wiped out.

On Mon, May 1, 2023 at 8:10 AM Hanh Cao Yu <[hanh.cao.yu@stanfordalumni.org](mailto:hanh.cao.yu@stanfordalumni.org)> wrote:

On #2, if he runs out of resources, isn't he eligible for Medicaid for assisted living?

H.

On Mon, May 1, 2023, 7:50 AM Mark Cao <[mark.cao@gmail.com](mailto:mark.cao@gmail.com)> wrote:

Nope, I didn't talk to Dad at all about any restraining order on his behalf (against Ken and Annalise). But Annalise did talk a lot about her restraining order against Ken.

> if Dad doesn't care nor wants our help, why should we go through all this trouble?

This is the million dollar question. As I see it, here's the menu.

1. If he is making his own decisions, his incompetence (and anti-social tendencies) will keep getting him in trouble and misery. But this is the category he wants to stay in.
2. If a public guardian makes Dad's decisions, his resources will be drained fast (including his use of a lawyer) and he will be mad at the public guardian and his lawyer.
3. If we make decisions for him (forced through a conservatorship, since voluntary modification of his Living Will is not viable), the advantages are saving of his resources as well as less misery. But the disadvantage is that he will act up a lot against us.

Personally, I am willing to do #3 only if he asks for help. Then that will reduce his acting up, but I'm sure it will still be there.

Huy

On Mon, May 1, 2023 at 12:05 AM Hanh Cao Yu <[hanh.cao.yu@stanfordalumni.org](mailto:hanh.cao.yu@stanfordalumni.org)> wrote:

My take aways from your emails:

- 1) Dad's greed for money from A. seems to blind his judgment completely.
- 2) Dad doesn't seem to care about his health in any way. He knows his poor diet is a major contributor of his diabetes and other chronic conditions but isn't making any effort. His meds won't do him much good if he has nothing under control.

3) I'm wondering...if Dad doesn't care nor wants our help, why should we go through all this trouble?

FYI, I'm on travel this week, but will check texts and emails.

H.

On Sun, Apr 30, 2023 at 6:18 PM Mark Cao <[mark.cao@gmail.com](mailto:mark.cao@gmail.com)> wrote:

I explained things a bit out of order. Here's the chronology of Saturday:

\* I came to the house around 9:30 AM, but nobody was up. Finally around 10 AM, people started milling about.

\* Around 10:30 AM, the three of us (including Dad and Annalise) went to a locksmith to make a backup car key for Dad.

\* Major event #1, talking with Annalise and Dad. Then, we had breakfast at a Pho joint around 11:30 AM.

\* We came back to Chipper around 1 PM. Dad and I ditched Annalise so we could talk privately (we headed back to the locksmith). Her constant chattering had been very annoying.

\* We left her alone at the house for maybe around 30 minutes. Being "alone with Ken," she got very annoyed with Dad and apparently that's when both she and Ken called the police on each other. It was something about the cats, I guess.

\* Major event #2, the talk with the police around 2:15 PM. This was described in my other email.

\* Major event #3, talking with Dad separately (Luxe Buffet at Westminster Mall). Basically I already summarized this in another email. BTW, his diet is completely uncontrolled again. He has no problem wolfing down tons of carbs. And he insisted on eating at a buffet, just 3 hours after he already had breakfast. He claims he is still on his meds

So, I'll describe Major event #1 (Annalise) as that's the only major topic not covered. Think of this in terms of understanding Dad's psychology, since we aren't interested in her mental illness per se.

-----  
The three of us were having a pho brunch. I warmed Dad up around 15 minutes before finally talking about the public guardianship. I did not disclose to him that I knew about the Deputy Public Guardian business card left on his door. I asked him if they contacted him yet, he said no. I asked him if he knew Michelle's plan to recommend a public guardian and 24-

hour care for him, he said no. Basically, almost everything I said came as a surprise to him. He was mostly silent in response, although he did show some initial emotion (anger).

Annalise mostly either did not understand or completely misheard what I was telling Dad. Everything I said, she responded with some completely irrelevant anecdote from her life. Since she was so focused on herself, at one point, I asked her why she no longer owns a home. She never responded to the question, but she started saying that she and her husband used to own several homes. And then he got into a cocaine habit and got in trouble with the authorities. Maybe she was hinting at their losing their property because of his drug crimes.

She kept trying to talk about her latest restraining order request against Ken, which apparently was filed days ago. I asked her what was the basis of it. She didn't understand the question, I guess, so she said he stole \$150 from her this morning. Well, this was a surprise, since I was in the house since the time she woke up. I looked over at Dad, and he smiled and said nothing. (I read this as, he knows she is a nut but doesn't care.)

Annalise had gotten a retired lawyer, Mary, fresh from Texas (no California attorney license) to help her with her latest RO. She said she loved getting the help from a "powerhouse," but she didn't understand everything else the lawyer was asking her to do. She also did not like that Mary told her she needs to be in court to back up her accusations.

I asked Annalise if she intended to move up to NoCal with Dad. She said she'd be inclined to, but that she wants to visit first, perhaps by a train trip. Dad said she gets \$3,500+ in social security, perhaps Mark could rent out a room to her. So basically that is their thinking, that they want to be near each other.

Annalise being there was a big problem because Dad and I couldn't hear ourselves thinking with all her chattering. He initially accepted my framing of the issue, as public guardian vs. a family-based POA. He aimed most of his displeasure at Michelle, and he hinted he thought Mom might be involved, because of Michelle mentioning she knew our family (i.e., social workers in a personal network). He asked me how Michelle got involved. I said I didn't know, but maybe neighbors reported problems to the social agency.

My conclusion regarding Annalise is that Dad is acutely conscious of her big social-security check. They don't connect mentally at all, and in fact are annoyed with each other most of the time. He was silent most of the time when she was chattering. One possibility is that he is fairly calculating about using her, even with her jumbled mental functioning.

When his displeasure regarding 'public guardian' was aimed at Michelle, he accepted my framing of the issue. But as I shifted the focus more on accelerating a POA agreement, he got defensive and started making demands: a detailed plan was needed from Hanh, the POA needed to remain revocable, etc.

In summary, all of this confirms: (1) Dad and Annalise find each other useful. (2) Dad does want to keep Annalise around long-term.

Huy  
--  
Hanh