IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JENNIFER ELISE GORDON,

Appellant,

Electronically Filed
Apr 11 2016 02:40 p.m.
Supreme Court Case Nacie 1/45 Lindeman
Dist. Court Case No. Clerkout Supreme Court

v.

MATTHEW ROBERT GEIGER,

Respondent.

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME 2 OF 2 PAGES APP0074-APP0282

Tami D. Cowden, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 8994 Moorea L. Katz, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 12007

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

3773 Howard Hughes Parkway Suite 400 North Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 E-mail: cowdent@gtlaw.com katzmo@gtlaw.com Attorneys for Appellant

CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

VOL.	PAGES	DATE	DOCUMENT
1	APP0001-0073	8/28/14	Transcript re: All Pending Motions in the matter Geiger v. Gordon, Case No. D-10-430639 filed in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada
II	APP0074-0265	10/9/14	Transcript re: All Pending Motions in the matter Geiger v. Gordon, Case No. D-10-430639 filed in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada
II	APP0266-0282	3/24/15	Transcript re: All Pending Motions in the matter Geiger v. Gordon, Case No. D-10-430639 filed in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada

ALPHABETICAL INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

VOL.	PAGES	DATE	DOCUMENT
1	APP0001-0073	8/28/14	Transcript re: All Pending Motions in the matter Geiger v. Gordon, Case No. D-10-430639 filed in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada
II	APP0074-0265	10/9/14	Transcript re: All Pending Motions in the matter Geiger v. Gordon, Case No. D-10-430639 filed in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada
II	APP0266-0282	3/24/15	Transcript re: All Pending Motions in the matter Geiger v. Gordon, Case No. D-10-430639 filed in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, Nevada

TRANS

FILED

FEB 2 5 2016

CLERK OF COURT

COPY

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT FAMILY DIVISION

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

MATTHEW	ROBERT	GEIGER,)	CASE NO. D-10-430639-D DEPT. T
	Plair	ntiff,)	APPEAL NO. 67955
VS.)	
JENNIFE	R ELISE	GORDON,)	
	Defe	ndant.))	

BEFORE THE HONORABLE GAYLE NATHAN TRANSCRIPT RE: ALL PENDING MOTIONS THURSDAY, OCTOBER 09, 2014

APPEARANCES:

	Plaintiff: the Plaintiff:	MATTHEW ROBERT GEIGER PETER J. BELLON, ESQ. Bellon & Maningo, Ltd. 732 S. Sixth St., #102 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 452-6299
2110	Defendant: the Defendant:	JENNIFER ELISE GORDON GARY M. ZERNICH, ESQ. Zernich Law Office 600 Whitney Ranch Dr., #A-5A Henderson, Nevada 89014 (702) 616-9838

D-10-430639-D GEIGER/GORDON 10/09/2014 TRANSCRIPT
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - FAMILY DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 N. Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 455-4977

1	INDEX) F W I	TNES	SES	
2		DIDECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
3		DINECT	CITODD	MDIMOI	111011000
4	THURSDAY, OCTOBER 09, 2014				
5	PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES				
6	(None offered.)				
7					
8	<u>DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES</u>				
9	MIKE LAPUTT By Mr. Zernich	7	77		
10	By Mr. Bellon		33		58
11					
12	JENNIFER GORDON By Mr. Zernich	64			
13	By Mr. Bellon		95		
14					
15	MATTHEW GEIGER By Mr. Zernich	123			
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					

D-10-430639-D GEIGER/GORDON 10/09/2014 TRANSCRIPT
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - FAMILY DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 N. Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 455-4977

23

24

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

1	<u></u>		
2	THURSDAY, OCTOBER 09, 2	<u>2014</u>	
3	PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
5	(None offered.)		
6	DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS		
7	D-B	Document; Text messages given to Officer Laputt	
9	D-C	Document; Child support arrears, NCP financial transaction	22
10		history, income verificat	
12	D-F	Document; Phone records/text records 7/26/14	88
13			00
14	D-K	Document; Register of Actions:	
15 16		bench warrant issue date and probation violation report date	16
17	D-L	Document; Bench warrant issue date	
18		and probation violation	date 16
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

D-10-430639-D GEIGER/GORDON 10/09/2014 TRANSCRIPT

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - FAMILY DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES

601 N. Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 455-4977

PROCEEDINGS

3

(THE PROCEEDING BEGAN AT 14:21:19.)

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. This is Geiger v Gordon, D-10-430639.

Counsel, your appearances.

MR. BELLON: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, Your Honor. Attorney Pete Bellon, Bar Number 4528, present with the plaintiff in this mat -- matter, Matthew Geiger.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ZERNICH: Thank you, Your Honor. Gary Zernich, Bar Number 7963. I'm here with the defendant, Jennifer Gordon.

THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon.

All right. So we're on today for testimony from the probation officers on -- on -- this is actually defendant's motion to reduce dad's time, plaintiff's time, based on his being in jail for 23 years, the warrant being issued --

MR. GEIGER: Days.

THE COURT: -- him being an absconder. That's kind of the essence of it. So I asked for a -- an evidentiary hearing to hear from the probation officers as to exactly what transacted. I'm gonna call you by your first names. You've been in here so often.

So, Jennifer, I saw your supplement. Thank you. I

```
OFFICER LAPUTT: Yes.
1
2
         THE CLERK: Name?
3
         OFFICER LAPUTT: Mike Laputt, L-A-P-U-T-T.
4
         THE COURT: Okay.
         UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Officer --
5
         MR. BELLON: The court actually just asked me as a
6
    courtesy to -- to subpoena Officer Laputt.
7
8
         THE COURT: Okay.
         MR. BELLON: He basically wasn't our witness, but you had
9
    asked me to do it. And I think the court wanted him. So I
10
    think he's the court's witness; but --
11
         MR. ZERNICH: Oh, I overreached. I'm sorry.
12
         MR. BELLON: -- however, the case in chief --
13
         MR. ZERNICH: Excuse me.
14
         MR. BELLON: No, no, no. It's yours. It's -- it's your
15
16
    case in chief.
17
         THE COURT: No, the clerk had just asked whose witness he
    was. So it's -- it's --
18
         MR. BELLON: (Indiscernible.)
19
20
         MR. ZERNICH: (Indiscernible.)
         THE COURT: -- sort of a strange procedural question
21
    because -- not a question, but a strange procedural situation
22
    because I had asked for the evidentiary hearing.
23
```

Well, the defendant had brought the motion, and I

1	had said we need an evidentiary hearing. So it's it's
2	technically defendant's witness; although, because defendant
3	was in proper person at the time, plaintiff was kind enough to
4	extend the courtesy of doing the subpoena for the witness. So
5	it's defendant's witness.
6	MR. ZERNICH: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
7	THE CLERK: Thank you.
8	THE COURT: Whenever you're ready, Gary.
9	MIKE LAPUTT,
10	having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
11	DIRECT EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. ZERNICH:
13	Q For the record, Mike, can you state your name?
14	A Officer Mike Laputt, M-I-K-E, L-A-P-U-T-T.
15	Q Okay. Do you know this gentleman sitting over here
16	to my right?
17	A Yes.
18	Q Can you identify him by name?
19	A Mr. Geiger.
20	Q Okay. And how do you know him?
21	A He is was on my caseload as a probationer.
22	Q Okay. Is he no longer in your caseload?
23	A Yes, he is no longer on my caseload.
24	Q Okay. And when did when did that take place?

24

says, oddly enough Matthew even left numerous voice mails for

Okay. I'm gonna get back to those questions. It

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

the probation department?

A Other than us meeting when we met in court, I think when he was reinstated, no, he has not contacted me as his probation officer. I have not received any telephone calls or office visits from Mr. Geiger.

Q Okay. Well, I'm sorry. I'm gonna have to clarify and or clear up your answer to my -- the --the initial question in that regard. It says, while there was apparently a warrant out for him, Matthew was continuing to communicate with the probation department. Is that --

A No.

- Q -- portion of the statement true or false?
- A That would be false.
- Q Okay.

THE COURT: Can I get testimony on the warrant issued and when? Are we gonna go there? Are you gonna ask that question?

MR. ZERNICH: (Indiscernible) chance to get around to it.

I was just --

- Q BY MR. ZERNICH: When did the warrant issue?
- A The violation report for the requested warrant was sent out October 11th. As far as the exact date of the warrant, it should have been shortly after that.

 Unfortunately, I don't have a copy of the warrant with me

21

22

23

24

right now; but it should have been after October 11, 2013.

Q Okay. So from October 11^{th} , or so, of 2013, until July of 2014, there was an active warrant for Matthew.

A Yes, some -- some -- sometime after October two -- October 11, 2013, the warrant was issued, yes.

Q Okay. If it wasn't exactly on -- in -- in -- on the $11^{\rm th}$, would it be your understanding that it was closer to that date or closer to a more recent date such as --

A Oh, it would be closer to --

Q -- (indiscernible)?

A -- October 11, 2013.

Q Okay. You have some warrant conditions of his probation, I -- I -- I understand, in the -- in the report that you have in front of you.

A Yes.

Q Can you tell the court which of those conditions that Matthew was in violation of?

A Reporting; residence; intoxicants; directives and conduct; weapons was withdrawn; special conditions, no use, possession, control of alcohol; employment; special condition number 4, 16 hours of community service each month; maintain full-time employment; out-of-state travel.

THE COURT: Can you -- can you start from the top? I -- I'm taking notes. So you have to --

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

THE WITNESS: My apologies, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- you have to talk a little slower, so I can get my notes in here. I got reporting.

THE WITNESS: Reporting.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Residence.

THE COURT: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Intoxicants; directives and conduct; special condition number 3, no use of alcohol, no use, possession, control of alcohol; employment/program; special condition number 4, 16 hours of community service each month of probation; special condition 5, maintain employment; and out-of-state travel.

THE COURT: And -- and I heard you say that firearms was stricken --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: -- as a condition. Why is that?

THE WITNESS: It -- sometime shortly after -- shortly before the reinstatement, Ms. Gordon provided me with text messages as far as the subject going to Utah on a hunting trip. Later did I realize it was a fishing trip, which was why it was withdrawn.

THE COURT: Okay. What you just told -- what you just testified to were the things he was violated on?

```
MR. ZERNICH: Okay. Well, I -- I --
1
2
         MR. BELLON: I appreciate it.
3
         MR. ZERNICH: -- I know. But you didn't have tabs so --
         MR. BELLON: That's all right.
         MR. ZERNICH: -- at least it leads you to the right blue
5
6
    page.
7
         MR. BELLON: I appreciate it.
              BY MR. ZERNICH: And Exhibit B is page 9 through 16.
8
         MR. ZERNICH: Oh, by the way, Your Honor, I move to -- I
9
    move to enter --
10
11
              Oh, you already stipulated, too.
         MR. BELLON: Yes.
12
13
         MR. ZERNICH: I'm sorry.
         THE CLERK: I'm sorry. I missed. What did you stipulate
14
15
    to?
         MR. BELLON: K -- K and L is stipulated to admission.
16
17
         THE COURT: We're now on D, which --
              BY MR. ZERNICH: On -- on B, can you identify what
18
19
    -- what Exhibit B is?
20
         A
              This seems to be the text message where Mr. Geiger
    was telling Ms. Gordon that he was going to go to California
21
    UC Davis Medical Center, which I'm thinking was in California.
22
              Okay. Was Exhibit B, was this -- was this something
23
24
    that you had received from Ms. Gordon?
```

you'll have to forgive me. You'll have to be more clear as far as which --

Q Okay. How are you -- I'm just trying -- you said that you had first contacted Jennifer on June $23^{\rm rd}$.

A She contact -- she -- I think she called us. Yes, she notified us on the twenty -- June $23^{\rm rd}$. She contact -- made contact with me.

Q Okay. Do you recall talking to her on the $23^{\rm rd}$ or was that just -- was that just a message that was left?

A You'll have to forgive me. It's been so long. I'm

-- it's either a message or else me returning a phone call.

Q Okay.

A We either talked, or I either returned a phone call.

 $\,$ Q $\,$ If I were to tell you that Jennifer informed me that the first time that she had talked to you was in --

MS. GORDON: August 14th.

Q BY MR. ZERNICH: -- on August 14th, would you be able to look through your records and verify whether that's an accurate statement or not?

THE WITNESS: Court's indulgence.

Unfortunately, I have no -- I do not have record of any contact August 14th. Oh, my apologies. Yes, August 14th at approximately 11:25, a phone call received -- was received from Ms. Gordon.

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

20

2122

23

24

Q BY MR. ZERNICH: Okay. Do you recall talking to her. Was there any indication of whether you actually talked to her on that date or not?

A She actually -- from -- from what I'm looking at, she actually talked to somebody named N. Medina.

Q Okay.

A Which I'm thinking is the Norma Medina you were -- you're talking about.

Q These -- these texts that you received that we just referenced, these are Exhibit B.

MR. ZERNICH: Oh, by the way, Your Honor, move to exhibit
-- admit Exhibit B into evidence.

MR. BELLON: I would object, Your Honor, improper foundation. He not only testified that he's not familiar with them completely, but they're not his text messages. He doesn't know how they originated or he can't authenticate those messages. Even if he read them, he doesn't know that they came from the defendant. She'd have to take the stand and testify as to text messages she received or sent.

MR. ZERNICH: Well --

THE COURT: Mr. Zernich.

MR. ZERNICH: -- Your Honor, we're -- we're not -- we're not trying to admit these for the truth of the allegation, in other words as a hearsay. We're just trying to admit them as

what he said he received from her. And -- and then I'm going to ask him what day he received these.

THE COURT: All right. On that basis, they're admitted.

(Whereupon Defendant's Exhibit B was admitted.)

- Q BY MR. ZERNICH: Do you recall the date that you received these -- the -- the text messages or the -- or the packet? (Indiscernible) we'll just refer to them as the --
 - A I think --
 - Q -- (indiscernible).
- A -- it was -- it was shortly before -- shortly before the reinstatement date of Mr. Geiger.
 - Q What was the reinstatement date?
 - MR. BELLON: August 14th, (indiscernible) trouble.
- THE WITNESS: 'Cause I'm -- you'll have to forgive me, my memory of -- of -- because of my caseload, it's very difficult to remember details.
- Q BY MR. ZERNICH: Jenn -- Jenn -- Jennifer alleges, and maybe you could find something (indiscernible) that she provided you with this package on August 18th, which she believes was the reinstatement date.
- A Yes, I think that was about the time she -- she -- the day she dropped it off. It was shortly before Mr. Geiger was reinstated.
 - Q Okay. So -- so he was -- he was put into jail on

24

July 23rd --

MR. BELLON: Sixth.

Q BY MR. ZERNICH: -- and you didn't --

MR. ZERNICH: Twenty --

MR. BELLON: 26th.

Q BY MR. ZERNICH: July 26th, and you didn't receive these until shortly before the reinstatement date. Did — did this package have anything to do with his going to jail?

A No.

THE COURT: Mr. Zernich, I have a question.

MR. ZERNICH: Yes, please, Your Honor, because I --

THE COURT: I'm a little confused.

MR. ZERNICH: -- I -- I'm not sure that I have much more for (indiscernible).

THE COURT: Okay. You had a -- a litany of violations that led to the request for a bench warrant in 2013, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. How did those violations come to your attention?

THE WITNESS: When I did -- initially what -- initially we got a report of police contact with Mr. Geiger. I think it was a traffic stop on October $4^{\rm th}$, 2013. That prompted me to check all local detention centers whether he was in custody or not.

THE COURT: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE WITNESS: Because there was a report from highway patrol and that the subject had a knife in the vehicle. A hold was requested; but unfortunately, a hold wasn't placed on. So with me not knowing where he is, I tried to make contact with him. I think I -- oh, I did go to his house a couple -- shortly after on October 9th, 2013; and I left a note for him to report and come to the off -- report and contact me.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: When I got no response, I did the violation report October $11^{\rm th}$, 2013.

THE COURT: And what happened with that traffic charge?

THE WITNESS: Nothing came about of it.

THE COURT: Was there a traffic offense that he was cited with?

THE WITNESS: I couldn't figure out -- there was nothing that I could find.

THE COURT: And so how did it come to your attention that he had been stopped?

THE WITNESS: When a traffic stop is conducted on a probationer, if they call our office, typically an entry is made that the traffic stop was conducted.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

67

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

THE WITNESS: So that came out -- that came up as a tickler on my case file which prompted me to start making contact with Mr. Geiger.

THE COURT: Okay. So let me just look at these items.

So -- all right. So it came to your attention there was a traffic stop. And you went to put a hold, but he was already out of custody.

THE WITNESS: I couldn't find -- I couldn't determine if he was in custody or not, and that was October $4^{\rm th}$. I checked custody October $7^{\rm th}$. I could not find Mr. Geiger in custody.

THE COURT: Okay. So you went to his place, and you left a --

THE WITNESS: On October 10th.

THE COURT: -- you left -- on October 10th. You left a card. He -- and you didn't have any evidence that he responded to your contact, right?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. And so then, what else did you do? Like, did you check to see if he had -- was doing his community service every month?

THE WITNESS: He was supposed to provide us with proof of community service on a monthly basis.

THE COURT: Okay. And -- and so did you look for that proof?

8

9

1011

12

13

15

14

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

THE WITNESS: Yes, I found two times that he reported. He provided us proof of community service --

THE COURT: This is before the warrant, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, before the warrant. He provided us proof of community service October $20^{\rm th}$ of 2011 for 48 hours and then prior to that, March $30^{\rm th}$ of 2011 for 18 hours.

THE COURT: Okay. And so that was the basis for the violation?

THE WITNESS: Since we hadn't had contact with him --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE WITNESS: -- yes, it was part of the basis for --

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: -- the violation.

THE COURT: And what about the violation of intoxicant?

THE WITNESS: Intoxicants, on September 28th, 2012, Mr. Geiger was arrested by Metro officers and charged with a probation violation.

According to the police report -- my apologies, Your Honor. I'm just reading off my violation report. Officers were doing a perimeter check at the Stage Door Bar on 4000 Audrey, Las Vegas, Nevada. A record check was conducted on a vehicle that was parked there. Officers observed a male, later identified as Mr. Geiger, enter the bar. A record check revealed the vehicle to be reg -- to be -- revealed him to be

on probation with a no alcohol clause.

An officer entered the bar and observed Mr. Geiger sitting on the bar with an empty Budweiser bottle in front of him. A second bottle was in his hand as the officer approached. The officer observed the subject take a drink from the beer bottle in his hand. Officers identified themselves to Mr. Geiger. They con — the probation was contacted and a hold was requested.

As a matter of reference, Your Honor, after reviewing the matter, the division decided to release its — its — our hold and allow Mr. Geiger another chance at probation. So he was not violated on September 28th of 2012 for that particular violation.

THE COURT: Okay. And what about conduct?

THE WITNESS: That would be -- well, you're expected to behave a certain way while you're on probation, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE WITNESS: With him having the alcohol with him -- well, with him having the alcohol, the directive was violated; and his conduct was unbecoming of somebody on probation.

THE COURT: Okay. And then the spec -- special condition that was also violated --

THE WITNESS: Special condition --

THE COURT: -- by the alcohol?

D-10-430639-D GEIGER/GORDON 10/09/2014 TRANSCRIPT
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - FAMILY DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 N. Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 455-4977

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

THE WITNESS: -- number 3, no use, possession or control of alcohol.

THE COURT: Okay. And then the employment?

THE WITNESS: The employment, I contacted his last reported employer, Lally Steel. That was done October 11th, 2013. They said that he no longer works with them. Unfortunately, it's been so long, they -- they couldn't even tell me, which is why I left that bit of information out. They just said he hasn't worked for them for quite some time.

THE COURT: All right. And the plaintiff had not updated you on his employment?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

THE COURT: And he --

THE WITNESS: Failed to report his change in employment status.

THE COURT: -- and he had a duty to do that?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. As part of his special -as part of his probation agreement, he was -- he is supposed to notify us of any change in employment, contact information, medications received, residence, contact information. There's a detailed report that he has to fill out, what we call a monthly report. That was not received.

THE COURT: All right. And did you have anything else under intoxicant to violate him on in October of 2013?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE WITNESS: That would be it, Your Honor, from the prior -- from the prior incident.

THE COURT: All right. And so that was the basis for asking for the warrant be issued for his violation of probation?

THE WITNESS: That is correct, Your Honor. And also because he has -- he hasn't paid any of his supervision fees or court fees, the financial obligation. He's supposed to pay \$30 every month. At that time, at that date, October 11th, he was 18 months in arrears or \$540 behind. And he also hasn't paid his court fees of \$235.

THE COURT: All right. So once the warrant issued, was he notified that the warrant had issued on him?

THE WITNESS: Had he contacted me, Your Honor, he -- it -- he would have been notified.

THE COURT: Okay. But a notice doesn't go to his home?
THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And then -- okay. All right. That satisfied the court's questions.

MR. ZERNICH: Actually, I have a couple of other questions.

Q BY MR. ZERNICH: Is there a -- a condition about probation about using drugs?

A Yes.

22

23

24

A That would be condition number 4, controlled substance. You shall not use, purchase, possess any illegal drugs or any prescription medication unless first prescribed by a licensed medical professional. You shall immediately notify the division of parole or probation — Parole and Probation of any prescription received. You shall submit to drug testing as required by the division or its agents.

Q In the -- in the last 12 months has he made any reports in that regard?

A No.

Q Has he submitted to any of the drug tests in that regard?

A If I can't make contact with him, I coul -- can't really do a drug test.

Q Very good. The -- and you read it, and you went sort of quick. It included prescription drugs?

A Yes.

Q Hypothetically, what would the department think about a prescription for THC?

MR. BELLON: This question calls for speculation with the department, we think, Your Honor.

THE COURT: He -- if the witness can answer it, I'd like to hear the answer.

someone to a hunter's safety course and weapons are being used?

A The requirement is pretty -- pretty definite.

Probation agreement number 5, weapons, you shall not possess, have access to or have under your control any type of weapon.

I have a copy of the probation agreement, both of -- both of -- both of them.

- Q And you said you also had a out-of-state travel restriction?
 - A Yes.
- Q Meaning no out-of-state travel at all or just no out-of-state travel without notice and -- and approval?
- A As far as that particular condition, out-of-state travel, the probationer shall not leave the state without first obtaining written permission from the Division of Parole and Probation.
- MR. ZERNICH: Your Honor, I don't think I have any further questions in regards of what I think the -- the purpose of this.
 - THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Zernich.
 - MR. ZERNICH: Thank you.
 - MR. BELLON: May I examine the witness, Your Honor?
- THE COURT: You may.
 - MR. BELLON: Thank you very much.

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q Officer Laputt, I think I'm more confused than the judge. There were just so many contradictive answers, and I know you're going back a ways. But let me start with this.

Mr. Zernich asked you when you said that my client indicated he no longer had to report on a monthly basis, and you said that was correct. He didn't have to. Correct? Do you remember that testimony?

A Yes.

BY MR. BELLON:

Q Then he indicated that Mr. Geiger was under the impression that he only had to contact the department if there was a change in his information, his phone number, his address, his employment; and you said that's partly correct.

A Yes.

You said then, and I quote you, my requirements are such; and then you went on to say this is what you expect from your --

A Yes, he's --

Q -- client.

A -- to call every other month.

 $\,$ Q $\,$ Did you ever have an opportunity to tell Mr. Geiger what your requirements were --

A No.

Q		at lea	ast to d	contact?	Okay.	In fact	, you,	after
you sw:	itched	and to	ook ove	r his case	e, had n	ever had	d cont	act
with M:	r. Gei	ger to	tell h	im anythir	ng until	he was	arres	ted;
correc	t?							

- A That is correct.
- Q Okay. So there's no proof that he was aware of these new conditions or your requirements and what was expected of him from you?
 - A Yes.
- Q There was -- do you have proof that somebody contacted -- that you contacted -- you just said you never contacted him. So how did he know what your requirements were?
 - A Oh, no, I've never contacted. He --
 - Q Okay.
 - A -- I've never talked to him.
- Q Did -- do you have any proof or evidence that Mr. Geiger was ever aware that you were assigned to his case?
 - A No.
- Q Okay. Now we started to talk more specifics; and this is where I got confused, too. I'm gonna go over those same conditions that the judge went over in a minute.

But when you first started talking about Ms. Gordon, you said that she contacted you on June $24^{\rm th}$, 2014 -- June $23^{\rm rd}$,

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

I apologize. That was your testimony. And when asked what about, you said with evidence of out-of-state travel.

A Yes.

Q Okay. But then later you went on to say that you believed, or maybe it was just the text messages that you received on August $18^{\rm th}$ or August $14^{\rm th}$, on or about there; correct?

A Yes.

Q But you did have a conversation with Ms. Gordon about my client traveling out of state prior to his arrest?

A Yes.

Q Okay. So when you testified that the out-of-state information that you listed as one of the conditions for his violations came after his arrest, the truth is that Ms. Gordon had provided you with that information before his arrest; correct? He was arrested on July 26th. You indicated June 23rd is when you had a conversation with Ms. Gordon.

A Yes.

Q So she told you that, and she was giving you information about him traveling out of state; correct?

A Yes.

- Q Now she didn't provide you with any evidence that he actually traveled out of state. Did -- did she?
 - A Until the reinstatement, the August 18th, I think.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

use, possession or control of alcohol.

Q And I guess it matters how we interpret that, whether he used it, he possessed it or he was in control of it. But I just want — for your record, does your records indicate anything about him being tested for alcohol?

A No.

Q Okay. So they didn't put that in there. Okay. I want to talk a little bit about the employment because you indicated that you contacted his employer in October 2013, and he was no longer working there; correct?

A Yes.

Q Do you know who -- or isn't true that Matthew listed the Iron Workers, 433 Iron Workers --

MR. BELLON: Is that correct?

MR. GEIGER: Yes.

Q BY MR. BELLON: -- as his employer?

A As far as union, typically they are sent to an employer. We would consider the employer, not the Iron Workers because he would not be receiving a paycheck from the Iron Workers. He would be receiving a paycheck from the employer.

Q Okay. And I know you didn't have any contact with him, but it would be unusual that -- for somebody to do what Matthew did, to list the Iron Workers because he changed his

job sites so much that the contact information was through the Iron Workers and that he might have thought that that was sufficient?

A Typically when I contact the Iron — the union, as far as employment, they will typically say they are not employed by them. They are employed by the employer not the union.

- O Did you contact the union on this --
- A No.
- Q -- case, though? Okay. Going back just a little bit to those conditions. Reporting, we understand. He didn't report. You -- you issued a bench warrant. It said residences was the second one. My understanding is Matthew's lived at the same address.
 - MR. BELLON: For how many years now?
 - MR. GEIGER: Four, I believe.
 - MR. BELLON: Okay.
- MR. GEIGER: Four to five.
 - Q BY MR. BELLON: And the note that you left on his door was the address that you had for him, and he received that note. He submitted it as evidence to the court. So I'm not sure what I understand. Are you saying he changed residences and didn't report it?
 - A I could not verify his residence because he did not

think just based on the conversation that you and I had, we can say that there was quite some confusion about the community service aspect of this probation. Wasn't there?

A That's correct.

Q And would it be fair to say, and I don't want to put words in your mouth, but I can kind of do that on cross-examination, that you would understand his confusion as to why he wouldn't have been reporting these community service when he was full-time employed? You can say it.

A Yes.

Q Okay. And -- and what I'm getting at and that you and I had discussed is that the condition is usually that if you're full -- if you're employed full time, you don't have to do the 16 hours; however, his -- and we agree, his report doesn't require that; but that it was kind of shocking even to you when you found that out today; and you had made a mistake calculating a number of less hours, now realizing he owes over 600 hours in community service because nobody caught that until today; correct?

A That is correct.

Q All right. So that's not the most serious of the violations on there, correct?

A No.

Q And with regards to the monies that my client owed,

isn't it true that as of today, he's paid in full?

A That is correct. He paid fairly recently here.

Q Okay. And Mr. Zernich also asked you about some drugs. I believe it was condition four. And you talked about prescription medications, this -- a number of other things. Do your records reflect that prior to you becoming the officer on Mr. Geiger's case, that he reported his prescriptions to the -- I think it was Officer Wright (ph) that had the case prior to you. Is officer -- do you have any of Officer Wright's notes?

A No, unfortun -- un -- I can look through the notes as far as what's done. But it was not in the violation as far as prescription medications. It was -- he was not violated on it.

Q Right. So there's no issue of any drug use that he -- that was the basis of this?

A No.

Q Okay. And as far as weapons are concerned, again, you indicated that weapons was removed because you found out it was a fishing trip and not a hunting trip.

A That is correct.

Q And you've never -- other than a pocketknife, which he's required for work, you've never had any issue of weapons

21

22

23

24

leave you a message, it's understandable that they'd have to call back. It's his responsibility. But it's understandable that they'd have to call back again and again until they're able to leave you a message, correct?

That is correct. Α

And in fact, you're not even in the office that often. Most of your -- would it be fair to say that most of your contact is by messages, and then you'll call back, or they'll call you back because you are out in the field most of the time?

That is correct. I would be out in the field.

MR. BELLON: Okay. I have no other questions. Thank you very much. I appreciate it, Officer.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm -- I'm still unclear. Starting from the date of June 23^{rd} , 2014, until the date that Matt was picked up on the warrant, could you tell me what your contact was with Jennifer, if any?

THE WITNESS: I think it was a few phone calls and eventually an office visit right -- a few phone calls during that period and an office visit when she dropped off copies of the images of the text messages.

THE COURT: Okay. Can your notes -- do your notes reflect how many phone calls were -- and what the dates were?

THE WITNESS: Unfortunately, no, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I see. And do you recall the nature of those phone calls?

THE WITNESS: Typically, it's the Mr. Geiger stating that he was going to go to California, like this, and then the -- the fishing trip.

THE COURT: Did she tell you that it was a fishing trip or a hunting trip?

THE WITNESS: Event -- she told me it was a hunting trip, which is why I initially put on the violation report. But as soon as I saw the -- the text message, I withdrew the weapons charge because I came -- come to realize it's a -- it's a fishing trip. So there would be -- I -- I don't think a fishing rod would be a weapon.

THE COURT: But she told you it was a hunting trip?
THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And what other statements did she make to you regarding this warrant and her interest in the warrant?

THE WITNESS: Pretty much it was just that Mr. Geiger was taking his children to Utah for that hunting trip. That he was helping his -- taking his wife to the Califor -- to the California hospital for her medical treatment.

Court's indulgence.

That would be it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And on -- at what point did you -- had 1 2 -- withdrawn. How did it come to be that the plaintiff here was 3 4 picked up on the warrant? Tell me what that process was, 5 please. THE WITNESS: I don't really recall this -- I -- I wasn't 6 7 there when he was arrested, Your Honor. But from what I 8 remember, they -- I think somebody showed up -- they went to 9 his house. THE COURT: Who's the "they"? 10 THE WITNESS: I'm thinking Henderson Police. 11 THE COURT: Okay. And would you have asked Henderson 12 13 Police to pick him up on the warrant? 14 THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor. The warrant was already 15 outstanding. THE COURT: Okay. But how, after almost a year, would 16 17 Henderson Police have know to go to his home to pick him up on 18 a warrant? THE WITNESS: Good question, Your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: You don't have an answer to that question? 2.1 THE WITNESS: I have no an -- I don't know, Your Honor. 22 I'm speculating that -- no. I'm thinking they probably have a 23 -- what's called -- what we call an FAU, Fugitive Apprehension

Unit, who seek out the people that have absconded.

24

THE COURT: Uh-huh. 1 THE WITNESS: So I'm thinking that they prob -- that 2 they'd have this warrant. 3 MR. BELLON: Your Honor, I'm gonna object. 4 5 THE COURT: Yeah. MR. BELLON: Excuse me, Officer. 6 THE COURT: It's speculation. It's sustained. 7 MR. BELLON: Correct, Your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: Uh-huh. MR. BELLON: And -- and especially 'cause --10 THE COURT: It's sustained. 11 MR. BELLON: -- it's facts not even in evidence that he 12 wasn't arrested by Henderson Police it was by the probation 13 officer. So, I mean, as an offer -- as an offer of proof, 14 just so we don't go down the wrong the path, Parole and 15 Probation arrested him. Officers from Parole and Probation 16 17 came, not Henderson Police. 18 Correct? THE COURT: Yeah, your file doesn't reflect who actually 19 took him into custody? 20 THE WITNESS: My apologies. I -- I -- I didn't, Your 2.1 22 Honor.

THE WITNESS: And all my concern was, he was arrested.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

23

24

22

23

24

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE WITNESS: And the violation report was -- well, a revocation hearing was in process. I didn't -- it's not typical of me to figure out who arrested him. All I know is he's in custody.

THE COURT: How within your department is it decided who -- who gets picked up on a warrant because obviously this had been outstanding for, what, almost ten months before he was picked up or --

THE WITNESS: Unfortunately, Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- maybe nine months, maybe?

THE WITNESS: -- I don't know. I don't know how they -- how they decide who gets picked up and who doesn't.

THE COURT: How long have you been with the department?

THE WITNESS: 2008, February.

THE COURT: And -- and you don't know what the protocol is for deciding who gets picked up on the warrant?

THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor. That's specifically handled by our FAU, Fugitive Apprehension Unit.

THE COURT: Uh-huh. Did you convey that information to the defendant here, Jennifer?

THE WITNESS: I may have mentioned that there was a warrant for his arrest, prior --

THE COURT: No, the question was, did you discuss with

her what department within probation and parole is responsible 1 for picking a probationer up on a warrant? 2 THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 THE WITNESS: That would not be discussed. 5 THE COURT: All right. 6 Anything else, Mr. --7 MR. ZERNICH: Yes. 8 THE COURT: -- Zernich? 9 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 10 BY MR. ZERNICH: 11 When you're talking about the -- the phone calls you 12 had with Jennifer, do you recall if you personally talked to 13 Jennifer in June? 14 I re -- I do recall personally talking to Ms. 15 Gordon, yes. 16 Do you recall personally talking to her in June? 17 Yes, I -- June? Yes, I -- I -- yes. Let me -- let 18 me make sure I have an exact date for you. You'll have to for 19 -- forgive me. My notes are not as clear as I'd like them to 20 be right now. But I do recall talking to Ms. Gordon. I just 21 can't pin down the date right now. 22 Okay. Well, you did -- you said you recalled 23

talking to her about the -- the trip to Utah.

24

Q Okay. And you -- if you could refer back to your Exhibit B, and I want you to go to page 15. (Indiscernible) right (indiscernible). Usually one of the -- this is one of the exhibits that you received from her wherein on page 15 you see right here it says, I was sitting right next to him when he called, you know, that we went fishing in Utah with grandpa and grandma. That was a -- an alleged text from one to the other, right?

A Yes.

Q Well, the -- can you turn back one page, the start of that line of communication, and tell the judge the date of the communication between the two, alleged two, of them?

A There is a text here on July $14^{\rm th}$, 2014, from Ms. Gordon and then from Matthew Geiger responding to it.

Q Okay. You can stop there. If -- if she didn't have this communication until July $14^{\rm th}$, how could she tell it to you by -- on June $23^{\rm rd}$ -- $24^{\rm th}$ or whatever day you're referencing?

MR. BELLON: Objection, Your Honor, it calls for facts not in evidence. The witness never testified that he -- or actually he did testify that he didn't get these text messages between August 14th and the 18th. He testified the conversation he had in June, she told him about the trip already. So it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

_

24

wasn't a question that it couldn't have been supplied to him. He's -- that was his testimony that he received --

THE COURT: He -- no, he did --

MR. BELLON: -- these in August.

THE COURT: -- testify that -- well, he testified that --

MR. BELLON: He talked to her.

THE COURT: -- the court's understanding -- let's put it this way 'cause this is what counts. The court's understanding of the testimony is that he had been -- he had understood it was a hunting trip; and -- and then when he saw the text, he understood it to be a fishing trip. And he made a change in his notate -- his violation.

MR. BELLON: Which actually verifies my account of the situation, which means when they talked in June, she said it was hunting. When he got these in August, he saw it was fishing.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. BELLON: So he did testify earlier, and the recording will show, that he didn't receive these till August; but the conversation where she talked about the out-of-state travel was in June, June 23rd, my recollection from the testimony.

THE COURT: I -- I think my notes align with Mr. Bellon's representation.

O BY MR. ZERNICH: I -- I just -- as you were

Q

So she didn't tell you anything about him leaving

22

23

24

She also sta -- stated that her two boys informed her that they had gone hunting during the last two weeks that he had visitation with them and have traveled to Utah. She stated that she is not current -- that he is not currently employed and is scheduled to pick up the kids again on Friday at 6:00 p.m.

She was advised that she -- that she would send an ATL, attempt to request -- attempt to locate request to the officer in the P&P office. So I guess that's how it was generated. They were able to get an address.

- Q Okay. And they got an address from him?
- A From her, from Ms. Gordon.
- Q What address, by the way, do you have as his address?
 - A 8659 Horizon Wind Avenue, Apartment 102.
- Q Does -- did you ever have this address? Could you read what the ad -- the address is?

MR. BELLON: We --

- Q BY MR. ZERNICH: And tell the court -- I'm sorry.
- MR. BELLON: Yeah, we (indiscernible) --
- MR. ZERNICH: (Indiscernible) see what we're --

Your Honor, we're reading from the order of December $14^{\rm th}$, 2010. He has his -- an address on there that does not match that address.

THE WITNESS: My notes -- Norma Medina -- N. Medina listed 8659 Horizon Wind. This is 8669. The apartment is also different. We have 102. This says 103.

Q BY MR. ZERNICH: Okay.

THE COURT: Can you just go over the testimony again that in your notes that you just read into the record between

22

23

24

Jennifer Gordon and Norma Medina that ended with, she sent a request to locate? What does that mean? Who's -- what she, because we have two females that we're talking about here? THE WITNESS: Norma -- Nor -- Ms. Medina would -- if we get an address -- I'm thinking Norma Medina would send the FAU officer the address for him to go out to see if the sub -- if Mr. Geiger was actually there. THE COURT: So the she is -- so Norma sent a request to locate to the FAU and that's the fugitive unit? THE WITNESS: Fugitive Apprehension Unit. THE COURT: Based on the address that defendant gave her. Is that right? THE WITNESS: Actually, based on the address that Ms.

Gordon provided.

THE COURT: Yeah, I know. Okay. Okay. Okay. Anything else, Mr. Zernich?

Q BY MR. ZERNICH: Do you have an -- did -- did -- can you inform the court or not whether Ms. Gordon specifically asked for him to be picked up on a probation revocation?

No, because we -- I requested the bench warrant back in 2013.

- In -- in -- now we've moved forward to June 2014.
- Uh-huh. Α
- Do you recall is there anything that specifically 0

23

24

said that she was asking for him to be picked up and thrown back into jail?

A No, I don't see anything of that nature. I don't see any statement -- notes of that nature.

MR. ZERNICH: Thank you.

I -- I have no further questions, Your Honor.

MR. BELLON: And I just have one question, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure.

RECROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. BELLON:

Q It's with regards to that last question you were just asked. You've been on this force for six-and-a-half -- or in the department for six-and-a-half years.

Drawing off your expertise and your experience, if somebody comes in and provides that type of information to the FAU, telling them that he's on a hunting trip, he's in possession of guns, he's traveling out of the state, what do you think the logical conclusion that the FAU would do? Would they ignore it, or would they go pick him up?

A We would go pick him up.

MR. BELLON: Thank you.

I have no other questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okeydoke.

MR. BELLON: Thank you very much, Officer.

THE COURT: This is --

MR. BELLON: We (indiscernible) --

MR. ZERNICH: -- I don't know if they had a counter motion or not. The -- the --

MR. BELLON: -- child support modification.

MR. ZERNICH: Child support modification. And -- and -- this I'm not -- this was part of their opposition; although, not so much in the form of a -- of a -- a counter motion. But I know that the court wanted to talk to the probation officer. Jennifer explained to me your feelings or what it is she -- she thought you wanted to speak to him about.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. ZERNICH: Basically, I'd like to call Jennifer. I -- I don't want to limit my case here and then have to call her back for something else.

THE COURT: All right. Let me --

MR. ZERNICH: Just so -- so I'd like to know where to go 'cause I don't want to say, okay, I conclude but then realize that I -- I left -- left a whole lot out what I -- that I had planned for today.

THE COURT: Okay. The evidentiary hearing was set, my
Odyssey register reflects, order to show cause, defendant
filed; and then why the warrant was issued for plaintiff; and
probation department communication with defendant; child

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

support. The court just thought — the court believed that it was necessary to clear up that whole issue for a lot of different reasons in this case.

And I had -- let me see the motions. I had defendant's motion for change of custody. She was seeking sole legal custody based on defendant's warrant and his conduct, vis-à-vis probation is helped summary -- summy -- summarizing that up; and to put him on supervised visitation.

And then we had plaintiff's opposition and his counter motion to modify child support, for attorney fees, and related relief.

And so if you wish to put her on the stand just to testify as to her -- her interaction with the probation officer, you may do so. I'm not requiring it of course. It's your case.

MR. ZERNICH: Okay.

THE COURT: But if you want to do some limited testimony on that, you are free to do so.

MR. ZERNICH: I -- I -- I do. And I have questions all ready to go in that regard. I just have to find --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ZERNICH: -- a place (indiscernible).

THE COURT: That would be the next step on the issue of the probation.

•

MR. ZERNICH: Okay.

THE COURT: And then the other thing would -- the other thing -- legal --

MR. BELLON: Small little legal issue.

THE COURT: -- in the legal sense of the matter here, would be on the issue of contempt on Matt for his failure to pay child support. I know -- I -- I saw that he's on disability. But -- and you're asking to modify. I'd like to know, you know, when he was disabled. And I -- I don't know that I saw a schedule of arrears, but there's a lot of filings here. So just give me a schedule of arrears. I hope that one was filed.

THE CLERK: (Indiscernible) an order to show cause here (indiscernible) on my calendar.

THE COURT: Right. An order to show cause for his failure to pay child support. So I need to --

THE CLERK: (Indiscernible) says violate -- violated by -- violation of those orders (indiscernible).

THE COURT: I think it all has to do with child support, Mr. Zernich; but it's your client's motion, order to show cause. So maybe you just need to make sure I understand what you're asking me to hold him in contempt for.

MR. ZERNICH: Okay. Well, we're -- I'll start with Officer Laputt, since that's all fresh.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ZERNICH: And then I'll go sort of in reverse, in --

THE COURT: You bet.

MR. ZERNICH: -- reverse order.

So, Jennifer, you can --

MS. GORDON: Oh.

MR. ZERNICH: -- go up there. You got -- you got the witness book again?

MS. GORDON: Yes.

THE CLERK: Before you sit down --

MS. GORDON: Oh.

THE CLERK: -- raise your right hand.

You do solemnly swear the testimony you're about to give in this action shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MS. GORDON: Yes.

THE CLERK: Thank you.

MR. ZERNICH: I'm gonna apologize to the court in advance if I bounce around a little bit because I see he maybe answered a lot of questions that I had set for her, and then I realize that they were -- that it -- that it would be redundant and have to skip through, but -- let -- let's just start.

1///

21

22

23

24

67

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ZERNICH:

- Q For the -- for the record could you state your name?
- A Jennifer Gordon.
- Q Okay. Jennifer, did -- did -- did you have anything to do with Matthew's incarceration?
 - A No.
 - Q What role did you have to do otherwise?
- A I -- I didn't have any role. I spoke -- I spoke with Norma Medina in the absconsion department, or I don't know what they call it, in the state department the tail end of June. But I didn't speak to Officer Laputt till August 14th. But nothing -- nothing I spoke with him about was in regards to his incarceration. It was for the kids. I didn't want the kids to get picked up while they were with -- with Matt.
- Q Let me ask you this. Did -- did you initiate a call to one of those departments?
 - A No.
- Q Did you initiate a call to parole/probation, to Norma Medina?
 - A No -- I -- I did after I received a phone call

looking for Matthew.

Q Okay. So you initiated a call to one of the departments.

- A Ye -- well, yes.
- Q Okay. Well, tell the court why you initiated that call. How did that all come about?

A I -- because I got -- I got a phone call. Somebody was looking for Matthew. I said they had the wrong number. I -- I didn't know if it was Officer Wright in the past had contacted me for -- I didn't know if that was the same person. I told them, we're not married anymore; that, you know, I don't have anything to do with that.

So I called -- or I -- well, first I looked up in the register of actions and I saw that it showed that he had a warrant. So I called the probation office to find out what was going on with this warrant because this -- the warrant was from back in -- in October.

And he currently had the kids for extended visitations during the summer. And I totally freaked. I totally freaked out. I was worried that if this ac -- this warrant was active, he was gonna get picked up with the kids and then nobody would call me and I wouldn't know where the kids were.

Q Okay. Well, was that the first that you had known

And you found out what?

24

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

Uh-huh. Α

So you called the probation department, you're saying, because you were worried?

A Yes, uh-huh.

You were worried that he might get picked up while he had the kids?

Yes. Α

Okay. What -- what was your worry there?

I wasn't sure if what I was reading on line was Α current, if he -- if he -- if the warrant was active, what was going on because it showed October; and here we'd been coming in and out of court for so long, I was -- I didn't know -- I didn't know if that was legitimate or not. I was really confused; and I wanted to know, you know --

Well, I -- I -- I don't want to be dense or anything; but I asked you a blunt question. What do you care if he gets picked up while the kids are --

Because --Α

-- with him? 0

-- because he won't call me. Nobody will call me. And that's exactly what happened. Nobody called me. I didn't know where the kids were.

What do you think is going to happen to your kids?

They're gonna get stuck in Child Haven or somewhere. Α

was because I didn't know what that meant; that he hadn't reported in ten months. She asked if I knew of his whereabouts. I said, no. She asked me if the address they had on file was correct. I --

- Q Do you recall was it correct or not correct?
- A It was missing the -- the apartment number.
- Q Okay.

A And then I -- I told her -- I stressed to her that, you know, he has extended custody. We'd just been in court. He was given extended visitations with the kids over the summer, and I was really worried that something was gonna happen. And so she asked for my address. And I told her, no, because I --

Q Why wouldn't you give her your address?

A Because I didn't want -- she was going off our visitation schedule. I didn't want the kids getting picked up and seeing their dad go to jail from my house.

And so I told -- I had told her what -- what had happened over the last year since January since Matthew was granted his -- his visitations. And -- but nothing -- nothing was said in that phone call about going out of state. I didn't know at that point that the kids had left the state. I didn't find out until -- till July till we left for Kansas City.

course on his own time?

24

```
Α
              Yes.
1
              Which was actually in violation of his probation?
2
         0
3
              Yes.
         Α
         MR. BELLON: Objection --
4
5
         THE WITNESS: I --
         MR. BELLON: -- objection --
6
         THE WITNESS: -- I didn't know.
7
         MR. BELLON: -- objection, Your Honor, how does she know
8
    if that's a violation of a probation? She's speculating.
9
         THE COURT: Well, now we know because the PO just
10
11
    testified to it.
         MR. BELLON: No, because once facts come into play, there
12
    are no guns at a hunter's safety course, Your Honor. There's
13
    no evidence been sub --
14
         THE COURT: Well, I don't know that.
15
         MR. BELLON: Right. There's no --
16
         THE COURT: Okay.
17
         MR. BELLON: -- evidence been submitted.
18
         THE COURT: Sus -- sustained. Okay. Your --
19
         MR. BELLON: So --
20
         THE COURT: -- objection's sustained.
21
               BY MR. ZERNICH: Do you know if there's guns at a
22
    hunter safety course or not?
23
24
          Α
               No.
```

A Yes, that and -- and there was different questions.

There -- we talked about everything that's happened in court.

She -- that's -- she told me he's not supposed to be around any firearms.

And I said, well, the kids tell me they go shooting all the time. There -- there wasn't -- I never said anything about hunting, but I said shooting because the kids -- the kids tell us all the time they go shooting with him and -- him and -- they say him and grandpa.

MR. BELLON: I'm gonna object as to hearsay, Your Honor, the same ought to apply to children.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. BELLON: Thank you.

MR. ZERNICH: Your Honor, again, it's -- it's not as for the truth of the -- of the matter, but the state of mind of why she would be calling and talking to this Norma Medina.

MR. BELLON: That's an easy answer to everything, Your Honor. If it's not being offered for the truth --

MR. ZERNICH: Well, no, because it's -- it -- if you have six objections, all the exact same thing, I'm gonna make it six times. It's not the easy answer. As a matter of fact, in ten years, I don't know that I've ever used it before.

THE COURT: State of mind?

MR. ZERNICH: Maybe I have, you know, I'm sure at some point; but it's not like everything is a state of mind. I understand hearsay. In this case, we're trying to get the why she talked to Norma -- Norma Medina and why she told Norma Medina what she told her; not whether, you -- you know, what she believes to be true is -- is different from what maybe actually is true. And that's why she would talk, you know, to a person and -- and -- and be so upset and make this report.

MR. BELLON: And I'm confused --

MR. ZERNICH: So I'm not -- so -- so I'm --

THE COURT: Well --

MR. ZERNICH: -- I'm just lodging, saying that I'm not offering it for the truth of the matter to say that the kids go shooting with Matthew. I'm just trying to get to why that she called Norma Medina and why she told her that.

MR. BELLON: She's -- she's --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BELLON: Okay.

THE COURT: I -- I'll allow it for state of mind. I -- I'll allow the testimony, Mr. Bellon.

MR. BELLON: Thank you.

Q BY MR. ZERNICH: Okay. So you say you refuse to give her your address because you -- you -- you are afraid at some point if he's violating his probation that he might get

picked up? 1 2 Α Yes. And you didn't want him to get picked up while he 3 had the kids? 4 No, yes, exactly, no. 5 Okay. 6 Q THE COURT: Did you give them the correct apartment? 7 THE WITNESS: I did. 8 BY MR. ZERNICH: Did you have any further 9 conversations with her? 10 Just about the visitations and she -- she told me 11 she would make sure that they didn't get picked --12 That's a yes or no question. 13 0 Yeah, yes. 14 Α Okay. So the -- I'm gonna just lay a little 15 foundation first. 16 Okay. 17 A Do -- do you recall when the next conversation with 18 her was? 19 It -- it wasn't un -- until sometime after -- after 20 his arrest until I --21 Did you understand what capacity Norma Medina worked 22 23 in? No, I thought she was probation. 24 A

24

with the kids?

- A June 13^{th} through the 22^{nd} .
- Q Okay. And you -- as it turns out, you know that he took the kids out of state.
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay. But at the time, did you know he was out of the state with the kids?
 - A No.
 - Q Okay. When did you -- when did you find that out?
- A It wasn't until the beginning of July when we were leaving for Kansas City.
 - Q Okay. And -- and how did you find that out?
- A Because the kids were complaining they didn't want to go on a long -- another long road trip.
- Q Okay. Well, tell -- I mean, tell the court your story as can -- you can -- you can be -- you can elaborate your answers a little bit more. You can speak with the judge.
- A When -- when we were leaving for Kansas City, they were complaining, specifically Chevy, because he didn't want to get sick again. They were complaining about the long road trip. We don't wanna go on another one.
- MR. BELLON: Objection, I'm going to object as to child hearsay, Your Honor, and it's not state of mind.

THE COURT: I'm gonna hear -- you know, I've talked to

the kids. So I'm gonna hear a little bit --1 2 MR. BELLON: Okay. THE COURT: -- about this. 3 THE WITNESS: I -- I asked them, what -- what do you mean 4 long road trip? We haven't gone on any other road trips. 5 They're like, when we're with dad. I said, what do you mean 6 when you were with dad? Where did you go? They said, we went 7 to Utah when Chevy got sick. And I was -- that was pretty 8 much the gist of it. I didn't -- I was blown away. 9 THE COURT: Yeah, but this is the trip where Matt's 10 saying that he had Weston call you that Chevy got sick in the 11 car --12 13 THE WITNESS: Yes. THE COURT: -- correct? 14 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. 15 THE COURT: Did Weston call you to tell you that Chevy 16 got sick in the car? 17 THE WITNESS: He did. 18 THE COURT: Okay. And you didn't know where they were 19 coming from? 20 THE WITNESS: No, no. 21 THE COURT: You just knew that he got sick in the car? 22 THE WITNESS: I just knew that he got sick. Weston 23 called. I missed his call. I called him back. And he told 24

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

me he had been worried. He called me because Chevy got sick.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE WITNESS: But he was fine now. I asked, did you give him any -- did dad give him any Motrin? No, but he's okay now. I was just worried when he -- when I called. So there wasn't -- I said make sure he drinks lots of water. You -- the -- the normal stuff I say to Chevy. There wasn't any -- any extra questions about -- there was no reason for me to ask, where are you at? What are you doing?

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: You know, are you out of state? I mean, that's -- that -- there was no reason for me to ask that --

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: -- at the time.

THE COURT: And this is the trip where Matt told the court that when he went to pick up the kids, his father or grandfather was --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: -- present. And he told you he was taking the kids on a fishing trip.

THE WITNESS: Right. That's what he -- that's what he says.

THE COURT: But you deny that that happened?

THE WITNESS: That never happened. His -- his father has

never been to our house during a visitation pickup, not ever.

THE COURT: Or a grandfather?

THE WITNESS: No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Nobody?

THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: Okay.

Q BY MR. ZERNICH: And as part of his -- as part of Matthew's opposition, they claim that -- that you were notified -- that you were notified immediately upon his being arrested; and that you were there to -- to pick up the boys almost immediately thereafter.

A No.

Q All right. It was al -- almost -- there's an inference that you orchestrated the whole thing.

A That's what they are saying, but that's absolutely not true. That's not even close to the truth.

Q Okay.

MR. BELLON: And if it helps, Your Honor, I know this isn't an objection; but as an offer of proof, I can tell the court that the -- those statements were made by his wife, Debbie, who realizes that she made a mistake; and I've called her here to testify; and Ms. Jennifer is testifying correctly. She thought it was the same day, but it was the next day that they actually had the conversation. And she told me that, and

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

she's gonna testify to that so (indiscernible).

THE COURT: Yeah, I want to hear from her as to what happened there --

MR. BELLON: Okay.

THE COURT: -- because this is my understanding; and if this is what actually happened, then we can really cut out a lot. My understanding is that Matt got arrested. The kids thought he was at work. Debbie just decided to let the kids sleep at the house; and first thing the next morning, she called Jennifer to come and get the kids.

MR. BELLON: Close, up to the point, I think Jennifer actually called -- when she found out, called her --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BELLON: And then Debbie returned her phone calls because Debbie was -- she would testify as an offer of proof that she thought it was still their time. She didn't know if Matt was gonna be out the next day, like it's hap -- happened once before.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. BELLON: And so she wanted to see what was gonna happen before. And so they still had a couple of days, I think, left on their visitation.

MR. GEIGER: A week.

MR. BELLON: That's when Debbie called and was upset and

then found out through an officer at the jail. And then they made arrangements to meet and return the children. It was the next day but not the same day.

THE COURT: What time the next -- what time did you get the children and what date?

THE WITNESS: It was almost 4:00 on June -- July 27th,
4:00 in the afternoon. I -- I sent a text at 2:00 that
afternoon. I heard back from Debbie, the first time, around,
I think, 2:35. I have the phone records.

MR. BELLON: That's about our understanding, as well, Your Honor.

O BY MR. ZERNICH: So you --

MR. BELLON: Before you continue --

O BY MR. ZERNICH: -- so you -- you had no --

MR. BELLON: (Indiscernible) I apologize. Is it possible to take (indiscernible) recess or at least excuse my client? He doesn't have to be present for this testimony.

THE COURT: For who?

MR. BELLON: My client needs to jump to the men's room very quickly, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah, if he wants to --

MR. BELLON: Okay.

THE COURT: -- be excused, yeah.

MR. BELLON: Okay.

```
Thank you.
1
         MR. GEIGER:
2
         MR. BELLON: Thank you, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Okay.
3
              All right. I'm sorry. Mr. Zernich.
4
         THE COURT: Okay. I quess I'm still --
5
              BY MR. ZERNICH: So we -- we all --
6
7
         THE COURT: Wait.
              BY MR. ZERNICH: -- we all --
8
         THE COURT: Wait.
9
             BY MR. ZERNICH: It -- it -- it's clear Matthew was
10
11
    arrested --
         THE COURT: I'm still unclear. How did it come to your
12
    attention that Matt was incarcerated?
13
14
         THE WITNESS: I got a --
         MR. ZERNICH: That was my -- my next question.
15
         THE COURT: Somebody called you from the jail to say Matt
16
17
    was in custody?
         THE WITNESS: That was the second phone call. No, I got
18
19
    a pho -- I got a ph --
         MR. ZERNICH: You're gonna have to let her explain this
20
    one. She --
21
         THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
22
         THE WITNESS: I apologize.
23
24
         THE COURT: Go ahead.
```

THE WITNESS: I have a friend that monitors everything because of the history.

Q BY MR. ZERNICH: Who --

A She lives in Texas. She called me and said, hey, I notice that Matthew's at Clark County Detention Center. I said, what? She asked me, she goes, are you guys — are you guys back from Kansas yet? I said, yeah. She goes, where's the boys? I said, they're with Matt. And she said, no, he's in jail. And I freaked out, and I called my friend at CCDC —

 $\ensuremath{\mathbb{Q}}$ BY MR. ZERNICH: Hold -- hold on. Can we stop right there?

A Okay.

Q Because we'll get -- all right. 'Cause --

MR. BELLON: Or we can just stop because it's all based on hearsay, Your Honor. I don't know how much I have to object to. She's talking about a conversation she had with a girl in Texas that hasn't even been identified. I mean, and never even been identified through the course of this entire action. I haven't even got a chance to even look into that, but it's hearsay nonetheless.

MR. ZERNICH: But it's not hearsay. It's just a basis of how she's saying that she came to learn the information.

MR. BELLON: Well, then that's what she can say as long as she doesn't say what the person told her on the phone.

Based on a phone call I received from my friend in Texas, I learned that he was in jail. Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. So what did -- what did you do after you learned that he was in jail?

THE WITNESS: I -- I started calling -- I called all his family first. I called Debbie. She didn't answer. I called his mom and dad. They didn't answer. I called the house phone. I called their cell phones. I left voice mails.

His -- Matthew's father called me back right away.

He said he didn't know anything about Matt being in jail, but that the kids were with Debbie. So I -- I tried calling

Debbie again, voice mail again. I didn't leave a voice mail.

But I got -- I kept getting her voice mail.

So I called a friend of ours, who works at CCDC, and to see if he would check and see if Matthew was there --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE WITNESS: -- and if he knew where the boys were; and he said he would call me back. He got back to me. He said, yes, he is there; and he told him that he was with family.

THE COURT: Uh-huh. Okay.

THE WITNESS: And then --

- Q BY MR. ZERNICH: All right. No --
- A -- I -- I got --
- Q Can you -- can you reference Exhibit F?

20

21

22

23

24

A Yes.

Q Okay. So that's the first -- so that's the first attempt to try to find out where he was and where the kids were?

A Where -- where the kids were, yes.

MR. BELLON: Can you show me 2:04? I don't see 2:04 here. I'm sorry.

MR. ZERNICH: Okay. (Indiscernible.)

MR. BELLON: July 27th, 2:04?

MR. ZERNICH: Numbers --

THE COURT: 2:04 p.m.

MR. ZERNICH: Oh, you're on the wrong page.

MR. BELLON: Oh, I (indiscernible).

MR. ZERNICH: Right there. See this was the July $26^{\rm th}$, but there was some text (indiscernible) some (indiscernible). All right. So that's the first July $27^{\rm th}$.

MR. BELLON: (Indiscernible.)

MR. ZERNICH: That's going in a reverse order.

MR. BELLON: Going back to -- I'm a little confused because the first page goes from August $1^{\rm st}$ to July $25^{\rm th}$, but then the second page starts on July $31^{\rm st}$ again.

THE WITNESS: It -- the first page -- the first page is the text messages.

MR. BELLON: Okay.

Oh, okay. So that's when you were notified. 1 Q No, the friend in Texas didn't --2 Α No, from CCDC? 3 0 C -- from CCDC, yes. 4 A 5 Right. I'm sorry, from D --0 I'm sorry. 6 Α All right. And you said Debbie's phone number's 7 449-3506? 8 9 Α Yes. Okay. And I see, is the first one there made at 10 11 2:30 p.m.? That -- yeah, that's the phone call, yes. 12 Α Do you have an idea of when Debbie called you back? 13 0 At 2:35 p.m. 14 Okay. And that's just four or five of 'em. 15 heard from Debbie 2:35 p.m. What transpired after that? 16 I left to go pick up the boys. 17 Α Okay. I'd just like to clear up a little bit this 18 -- the -- the -- this friend you have in Texas. You say she 19 20 monitors stuff? 21 A Yes. All right. I'm just guessing the judge is thinking 22 23 24 Α She --

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

Q -- what -- what's that all about? What --

A — she is a friend I met through Matt. When we started 13, 14 years ago, she was Matt's best friend. His whole life she grew up with him. And then through our marriage and all the stuff that happened, she's — she's the one that stuck to my — by my side. And she continues to check up on us and make sure that we're okay.

THE COURT: How does she monitor him?

THE WITNESS: On line, just checking, kind of like I do with checking my family court stuff.

THE COURT: She just happenstance went on line to see that he was incarcerated at CCDC on the particular day he got

THE WITNESS: No, she -- we had -- we had talked before when I -- when I had found out that he had an active warrant.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

THE WITNESS: And so she had kind of been checking up on -- on that, I guess. I don't -- I don't know. It was a fluke phone call when she called me, and she let me know. But I know she checks. She checks up on that stuff all the time.

THE COURT: Okay. So you found out at what time on what day that he was incarcerated?

THE WITNESS: It was around -- it was around 2:00 on the $27^{\rm th}$ of July.

8

9

10

11 12

13

15

14

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

THE COURT: And you had your kids back at what time?

THE WITNESS: By about 4:30, 5:00.

THE COURT: Okay.

Q BY MR. ZERNICH: Did anybody -- did anybody try -- I guess you wouldn't know. Never mind. Strike the question.

What -- what -- what is the first date that you recall talking to Officer Laputt?

- A August 14th. It was a Thursday.
- Q Okay. Why'd you contact him?
- A For a report for family courts.
- Q And did he respond?
- A Yes.
- Q Can you tell the court about that conversation?
- A He basically just -- just told me that I was welcome to come to the hearing on August 18th, and we had the same discussion that I had with Norma regarding the -- the issues that had happened this last year and my concerns for the kids' involvement in everything and -- and being with him.

And then he asked me if I had any evidence to show that Matthew had been leaving the state. And I said, yes.

And he asked me what that was. I told him it was text messages. And he asked me if I would provide him with copies of that. And I said, yes. But I wasn't able to make it there to him till Monday the 18th.

Okay. So what's the first time that you met him? 1 0 Met him personally? 2 Α Uh-huh. 3 Q Monday, August eight -- August 18th. 4 A And you met him where? 5 0 Α At the probation office. 6 Okay. Did you provide him with anything? 7 0 Yes. 8 Α What did you provide him? 9 Q All the -- the text conversations that are -- I'm Α 10 thinking, ex -- Exhibit B. 11 Can you look over Exhibit B? 12 0 Pardon me? 13 Α Can you look over Exhibit B? 14 Q Uh-huh. 15 Α Can you identify Exhibit B? 16 0 Yes, these are the -- this is exactly what I gave Α 17 Officer Laputt. 18 Okay. Now, Matthew alleges in his -- in his 19 opposition that you had provided dozens -- that you gave 20 dozens of e-mails and texts to the probation officer. Did you 21 give -- did you give the probation officer any e-mails? 22 23 Α No. Okay. And so did you give Laputt -- Officer Laputt

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

anything other than what's contained in -- in Exhibit B?

A No.

MR. ZERNICH: Your Honor, re -- regarding this issue of our hearing today, I -- I have no further questions regarding this particular issue. I don't know if we wanna take it piecemeal and let Mr. Bellon cross-examine on this or move straight into something else. I --

THE COURT: No, let Mr. Bellon just cross-examine. It's 4:00. We need to finish everything we have up today.

MR. ZERNICH: Okay. Great.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BELLON:

Q Jennifer, a lot of what I say is going to be recapping; but I'm gonna re-ask the questions with regards to what Gary just talked to you about so I have a better understanding and I can understand -- look at 'em from my perspective.

You initiated the call to Norma Medina on June $23^{\rm rd}$, correct?

- A Yes.
- Q Okay. Officer Laputt, you were here for his testimony; correct?
 - A Uh-huh.
 - Q Officer Laputt sat here and testified, and according

to his notes, that you spoke to Medina on the 23^{rd} regarding a 1 hunting trip, as well as out-of-state travel to California. 2 Do you recall him saying that? 3 That --4 Α 5 0 Okay. -- yes, I do. 6 A So wasn't it your testimony now that contradicted 7 that, and you indicated that you did not talk to Ms. Medina 8 about the out-of-state Utah trip because you didn't know about 9 it on --10 Yeah, I didn't --11 Α -- June 23rd? 12 0 -- talk about the out-of-state --13 Α So --14 0 -- Utah trip. 15 Α -- Officer Laputt would either be lying or mistaken 16 with his testimony, correct? 17 Correct. 18 Α 19 Okay. Q You talked about the out-of-state travel to 20 California, similar to the ones that are in Exhibit B --21 22 A Yes. -- correct? Okay. And you discovered all of this 23 in June, sometime before June 23rd, I would imagine; correct? 24

to be at your house when Matt was arrested, correct?

A Because she said that they would only come if I okayed them to come to my address on the exchanges. And I said it can't be during any exchanges if -- if -- that's why I'm not going to give my address. There's no other time that he's at my house except for the exchanges with the boys. And the boys do not need to be involved in that for any reason.

Q But you realize, though, that they would have to pick him up at his house; and there was a chance the boys could be with him and --

A But they -- but -- but she assured me that because I gave her the visitation schedule that that wouldn't happen.

That's why I reached out and called them.

Q Okay. So you learn about the bench warrant. You called the probation department. You called your friend in Texas, correct?

A Yes.

Q You know who you didn't call? You didn't bother to call Matt, did you?

A No.

Q No, of course it's not your responsibility. But if you're so worried about your children and Matt being picked up, don't you think it would have been a good idea to call him and let him know that there's a warrant; and he can take care

of it, so your boys wouldn't be with him when he was picked 1 2 up? No. 3 A Never dawned on you to call him and tell him there 4 5 was --No. 6 Α -- a bench warrant? And to your knowledge, you had 7 no reason to believe that Matt knew there was a bench warrant. 8 9 Did you? Α No. 10 Okay. Now when you spoke to -- I'm gonna call her 11 Officer Medina. I -- I -- I think that's correct. You gave 12 her information with regards to Matt going on -- according to 13 Officer Laputt, going on a hunting trip, having weapons, 14 traveling out of state. Did you think this was information 15 that was going to help Matt? 16 I didn't say anything about having weapons. I was 17 Α talking about what happened here in court and my concerns for 18 the children. 19 Okay. 20 Q A And if he --21 22 Q Okay. -- wasn't following --23 A Sorry. 24 Q

23

24

be picked up while talking to the -- I can't remember that abbreviation, FAU, the fugitive absconsion unit, you -- it didn't occur to you that they were going to go pick up Matthew on this warrant?

A No, because they said they'd been looking for him for months.

- Q And do -- so you think it's just a coincidence that the bench warrant was issued in October of 2013. He wasn't picked up. You speak to them in June. Within a month they pick him up. Coincidence?
 - A They'd been looking for him for --
 - Q Okay. You answered my question. Thank you.
 - A -- ten months, yeah.
 - Q Now, I find this very ironic.
- MR. BELLON: And, Your Honor, if I overstep my boundaries here, let me know. And we -- because I don't know if we're going into this area right now.
- Q BY MR. BELLON: But I find it very ironic that you're breaking down in tears and you're telling the court that you're pry -- trying to protect your children because you didn't know where they would go if Matt was picked up but you don't find the need to protect your children from your

boyfriend? 1 There's nothing to protect from my boyfriend. 2 So according to you, there's nothing wrong with the 3 way your boyfriend treats these two boys? 4 5 Α No. Okay. 6 Q 7 Absolutely not. Α Are you aware of a CPS investigation that's --8 0 9 Yeah, there's --Α -- ongoing? 10 Q -- a lot going on with that. 11 Α 12 Okay. 0 13 Uh-huh. Α And you're basically saying that that's all false? 14 Q I -- I don't -- I don't know what's come of that 15 except that it's unsubstantiated, which is the fourth -- like 16 17 the third or fourth time --18 Okay. -- due to false allegations. There's -- there's 19 criminal reports that have been brought up and charges in the 20 state of Indiana where this orient -- oriented from. 21 Okay. 22 0 There's a lot --23 Α So to your knowledge --24 Q

1 A -- going on. -- your boys aren't being physically abused by your 2 3 boyfriend? 4 Α No, absolutely not. He's -- they're not -- he's not disciplining them? 5 0 6 Α No. He's not punching them? 7 8 No. Α He's not hitting them with any foreign object? 9 0 10 No. Α Okay. And if this was going on inside your house 11 without your knowledge, do you think that would make you a 12 13 very neglectful parent? Yes. 14 Α Okay. Thank you. 15 Q Probably. If -- if --16 Α Thank you very much. 17 0 Yeah. 18 Α (Indiscernible.) All right. Again, coincidence 19 0 that your friend in Texas just happened to monitor the 20 situation the day when Matthew got arrested -- or the day 21 after Matthew got arrested; correct? 22 No, she monitors it all the time. It wasn't just 23 the day that he got arrested. She calls me a lot with

24

boys were well-provided for? 1 Not with her. Well, it's Matt's visitation; and they're with their stepmother; correct? 4 They're --5 Α Is there any provision that requires Matt to be 6 physically present at the time the boys are in his --7 8 Α No. -- visitation? Okay. So he didn't violate any 9 court order by doing that --10 А That --11 -- to your knowledge? 12 Q. -- somebody should've communicated with me. 13 A 14 0 Okay. He violated that --15 A But my question was, he didn't --16 0 -- court order. 17 Α -- violate a court order? Well, of course, he 18 couldn't communicate with you because he was in jail; correct? 19 20 Well, somebody should've --Α 21 Q. Okay. -- communicated with me. 22 MR. BELLON: With regards to this limited issue, Your 23 Honor, I don't think I have any other questions. Can I, 24

before I stop, just check my notes? No more, Your Honor. 1 THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Zernich? 2 MR. ZERNICH: Just -- just argument, you know, closing. 3 4 THE COURT: Yeah. MR. ZERNICH: Closing argument, nothing that I'm going to 5 6 ask. 7 THE COURT: All right. Did you file a schedule of arrears on child support, 8 or is there one filed --9 THE WITNESS: I -- I did. 10 THE COURT: -- in the D.A.'s office? 11 THE WITNESS: It's in the -- it's in the exhibits; but 12 it's only current as of August 26th, two days before our last 13 hearing. 14 MR. BELLON: I think it's just the D.A.'s form. I don't 15 think it's one of our court ordered. 16 THE WITNESS: I didn't -- I didn't file one through the 17 18 family courts, no. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 MR. ZERNICH: It's Exhibit C. THE COURT: C. 21 MR. BELLON: It's just an accounting, I think, through 22 the D.A., which unfortunately is not a certified or custodian 23 24 of records copy.

2.2

23

24

THE COURT: All right. And do you have any personal knowledge as to where Matt last worked?

THE WITNESS: No, except for what he's presented the courts, no.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. You can go sit with Mr. Zernich.

MR. ZERNICH: Should we move on to the other -- other issue?

THE COURT: The other issue -- well -- You can go sit with Mr. Zernich.

MR. ZERNICH: Oh, oh, I (indiscernible) --

THE COURT: Yeah.

And --

MR. ZERNICH: -- thought that you said I can proceed. I thought you said, you can proceed --

THE COURT: No, no.

MR. ZERNICH: -- Mr. Zernich.

THE COURT: Mr. Bellon, do you -- did you want to put Matt on the stand at all about the probation violation?

MR. BELLON: Well, it -- it depends if the court feels if it's serious enough, if there's anything there. I know the court's concern was whether or not the violations or the confusion around this whole situation rose to the level that you would have problems giving him any time with the children

or modifying that time. If the court is willing -- is the court -- if the court's able to proceed without that for the purposes of time --

THE COURT: Yeah, I don't think I need to hear from Matt on it.

MR. BELLON: Okay. I didn't think so, Your Honor, no.

THE COURT: Okay. Now on the issue of child support, though, I do want to hear from Matt on that because I want to know if he has any payments beyond -- I'm admitting C.

(Whereupon Defendant's Exhibit C was admitted.)

MR. BELLON: Okay.

THE COURT: Certification or not.

MR. BELLON: I'll make an offer of proof to the court,
Your Honor; and then if you want direct testimony, no problem.

THE COURT: C's admitted.

MR. BELLON: The offer of proof is that there are arrears from previous orders. The new arrears would have started in May of this year, 2014. My client was — was hurt on the job in January of 2014, collected workmen's compensation where they took out the full 1,346 through April. In April, his benefits stopped. He did not make a payment, and this offer of proof —

Stop me if I'm wrong.

-- there was no payment in May 2014, no payment in

20

21

22

23

24

June 2014. There was a \$1,300 payment in July that they made on their own to the -- to the department.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. BELLON: And then there's been no payments in August, September or October. And my client still remains unemployed with a workmen's compensation legal case, represented by Kemp & Kemp, and under doctor's care at the time.

What our motion had been was basically -- then our -- and there was some confusion, as there has been in this case about every issue. My client has never filed with the D.A.'s office to modify. As a matter of fact, there's an exhibit presented by the defendant. The D.A.'s office filed in the D.A.'s case.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. BELLON: He knows he has to file here. He just did what they told him to do.

THE COURT: I --

MR. BELLON: If there's a change of job --

THE COURT: And -- and I'm pretty sure I --

MR. BELLON: -- report it to us.

THE COURT: -- took jurisdiction over the R case because this is such a high-conflict case that I don't want anyone else --

MR. BELLON: Correct. Your order is clear.

THE COURT: -- going into this case. I don't know what's gonna happen after December; but up until December, I'm hearing this case.

MR. BELLON: And we don't dispute that. Your order is very clear that if there was going to be any modification to child support, it would come through this office.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BELLON: He did what was required. The D.A.'s office said, if there's any change of income, you have to report to us. If you lose your job, change. He reported to them. They took it upon themselves to file that motion, you can see as her exhibit; and I think it was attached to the pleadings.

They filed a motion to modify child support in the UIFSA case

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BELLON: -- not in your court. He didn't know they were gonna do that. Then when they saw that, they took it off calendar and instead filed an order to show cause because he hadn't paid. That's when we had to come through your court and file our motion to modify.

So we'll defer to the court if the court's gonna grant a modification based on his inability to work, whether it should start in May, June, July, August, September, when it should start because he's been unemployed without benefits

MR. BELLON: May, June --

24

MR. ZERNICH: May, June --1 MR. BELLON: -- August, September, October. 2 MR. ZERNICH: Yeah. 3 MR. BELLON: Five -- five months. 4 THE COURT: When did -- when did -- when was any action 5 taken to modify his support? 6 MR. BELLON: Well, it depends, he notified the D.A.'s 7 office in May about his loss of job, hoping that they would 8 9 handle it through you. 10 THE COURT: Okay. MR. BELLON: When that didn't happen, the D.A.s filed 11 that motion. It had to be withdrawn. It was set to heard in 12 13 -- in --14 MR. GEIGER: August --MR. BELLON: -- August. 15 MR. GEIGER: -- 26th, I think. 16 MR. BELLON: And then that's when he came to me and said, 17 we have to file through you because --18 19 THE COURT: Uh-huh. MR. BELLON: -- the D.A.'s office didn't do it right. 20 (Indiscernible) --21 MR. GEIGER: (Indiscernible) --22 MR. BELLON: And so it's either May, or it's either 23 August. Well, it's confusing, Your Honor; but --24

-- it is going to happen tomorrow. All right.

24

But once

MR. BELLON: It's in our exhibits, Your Honor.

MR. ZERNICH: —— second, Your Honor, he's already been held in contempt and sentenced to ten days in jail if he missed a payment. Any requests for another contempt is for a second contempt not the past contempt because the past contempt was already a ten-day sentence. That's been violated by missed payment in May and missed payment in June; the May missed payment; in June, missed payment; the three other missed payments. They —— they are issue for perhaps a second contempt; but they are also a basis for throwing him in jail for ten days, which Your Honor already ordered.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ZERNICH: If he -- if he was undergoing worker's comp issues, like he said, and didn't think he could go back to work, he should have made sure to come back to court, this court, to say, here's my problem, before we're all stuck here paying attorneys' fees, trying to figure it all out; but -- but compounded by the fact that here we are today and he did not comply with this court's order, which is, from what I could tell, maybe about the -- I'm not gonna put a number on it, so many times, that it may be hard to put a number to the last 18 hearings; and here we are today, incurring fees.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

2223

24

MR. ZERNICH: So in regards to that, that's the basis that we wanted to talk about -- about a new contempt; plus, we want Your Honor to enforce your past order that has already been made. Any noncompliance, he's going to go in jail for ten days. That's why I would like to be heard.

And -- and I'd certainly like you to consider that he did not provide any medical records to show that he can't work. He's claimed on his financial disclosure form that he filed, that he's disabled. Well, you know what? If you're disabled, that means a doctor said you're disabled. They are medical records.

THE COURT: Uh-huh, uh-huh.

MR. ZERNICH: You know what? You don't want to go to jail? You don't want to have another contempt? That's a pretty simple thing to resolve.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ZERNICH: Go to the doctor. Get the medical records. Provide them. Voila, you're off the hook.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. --

MR. ZERNICH: That's all I'm saying.

THE COURT: -- Mr. Bellon, he's -- Matt's on the bubble here because I did order medical records because we have a little problem with credibility in this case.

MR. BELLON: Correct, Your Honor. And -- and I can tell

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the court two things. First of all, I don't think there's been any willful contempt. And it's not a question of whether or not he didn't pay.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. BELLON: The court has to find that he's willfully in contempt, that he had the money and he has no source of income. The rest of it, Your Honor, and I -- I may have to fall into sort, I don't think -- I don't know if I was supposed to provide things prior; but these are part of our exhibits, Your Honor, that we presented to in court as far as his workmen's compensation claim and his medical records. And I provided them to the defendant prior to the hearing, too. So I don't know if I was supposed to, but we only had about four weeks to provide this. And so I do know we --

THE COURT: Have worker's comp records --

MR. BELLON: -- how much we could get together.

THE COURT: -- been provided?

MR. BELLON: They're part of the exhibits, Your Honor, today.

MR. ZERNICH: Well --

MR. BELLON: It's -- you can see the --

MR. ZERNICH: -- the workman's comp records, one, are not the medical records. They're just his attempt to get workman's comp.

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

THE COURT: Right.

MR. ZERNICH: Which a lot of people do, you know, fraudulently also.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ZERNICH: They're the records that show that he's been denied, other than his initial collection, on a couple of occasions and he's into at least his third appeal. You know, so those aren't the medical records.

MR. BELLON: This is his first appeal, Your Honor. That's it. But, Your Honor, I don't know exactly what Kemp and Kemp gave us. The quickest way to do that was to get the documents with -- through them, but --

THE COURT: Yeah --

MR. BELLON: -- so I can provide any of that post hearing to counsel or to the court. There's a stack of medical records. We just weren't able to get 'em all. If there's some way, we can get them tomorrow for the court. But --

MR. ZERNICH: I don't want 'em post hearing. I don't want them tomorrow. We're here today.

MR. BELLON: Well, I guess --

MR. ZERNICH: I mean, how many times we have to come back? How many times we have to hear, I can do this tomorrow, from Mr. Geiger? And not only that, when Mr. Bellon's saying that, you know, when he's talking about the contempt, there's

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

been no contempt order, he -- he might be -- I think maybe he's confusing the fact that I said that you issued a contempt at the last hearing. Today is the order to show cause of whether he should be held in contempt --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ZERNICH: -- again because you've already held him in contempt at a prior hearing that Mr. Bellon was not present at.

MR. BELLON: Right. I --

MR. ZERNICH: And I -- I'm --

MR. BELLON: -- understand all that.

MR. ZERNICH: -- I'm -- I'm -- I'm looking --

MR. BELLON: But the question is --

MR. ZERNICH: -- I'm looking --

MR. BELLON: -- whether or not he made it willful.

MR. ZERNICH: -- through that.

MR. BELLON: Whether he had the money and he said, I'm not paying anymore. He -- the person -- this is not debtor prison anymore. He has no job. He has no source of income. He paid more than his share -- his workman's comp from January to April was not the same as his pay; but he still paid the entire -- it was almost 50 percent of his income during those months that went to her completely, the 1,346. He has no income coming in. He's -- he's selling assets. He's doing

1 whatever he can. THE COURT: Okay. Get up on the witness stand, Matt. 2 THE CLERK: You do solemnly swear the testimony you're 3 about to give in this action shall be the truth, the whole 4 truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God? 5 MR. GEIGER: Yes, ma'am. 6 MR. BELLON: I have no problem with the court inquiring, 7 specifically, if that's what you want to do to narrow it down 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. BELLON: -- to suit what you want. 11 MATTHEW GEIGER, 12 having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 13 THE COURT: All right. 14 All right. So, Matt, your attorney made offers of 15 proof, is what we call it, that you were injured in January of 16 2014. Is that correct? 17 THE WITNESS: January of 17 -- the 17th of January of this 18 19 year. 20 THE COURT: Of this year. THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. 21 THE COURT: Okay. And that was an on-the-job injur --22 THE WITNESS: Yes. 23

24

THE COURT: -- injury?

24

THE WITNESS: Yes. THE COURT: What happened? THE WITNESS: A herniated disc, a bulged disc, an annular tear; and I think a cyst is startin' to form where the annular tear was. THE COURT: What were you doing when it happened? THE WITNESS: Breaking decking, metal decking. Each -there's bundles of deck, and each sheet is 290 pounds, and I was shaking it out on the building --THE COURT: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: -- at the South Point bowling alley. THE COURT: Were you brought to the hospital immediately? THE WITNESS: Yeah, we -- I went to Concentra; and after a few visits there, they sent me to a so-called specialist. THE COURT: Were you out of work immediately? THE WITNESS: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. So they put you on disability right away? THE WITNESS: Yes. THE COURT: And you received payments January, February, March and April?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, up to the last date of payment was 4/22.

THE COURT: All right. And your full amount of child

support was taken out of each payment? 1 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. 2 THE COURT: All right. And then -- so you didn't make 3 any payments at all May or June? 4 THE WITNESS: Not until July 30th, of \$1,300. 5 THE COURT: And was that an IRS intercept, the 1,300? 6 THE WITNESS: I don't understand --7 THE COURT: Was that your IRS --8 THE WITNESS: -- what that means. 9 THE COURT: -- refund? 10 THE WITNESS: No. 11 THE COURT: You just made a payment of 1,300? 12 THE WITNESS: Well, they were gonna suspend my license. 13 So I borrowed some money to just make sure I had a license and 14 15 THE COURT: I see. And -- okay. You put in your papers 16 that you've been selling your personal property? 17 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I've sold two trucks and a quad, a 18 bunch of different stuff really, a welder, a lot of -- a lot 19 20 of things. THE COURT: All right. Have you had any employment at 21 22 all? THE WITNESS: None. None since -- I'm actually itching 23 to go back to work. I just need this litigation thing to 24

1 finish. THE COURT: This litigation here? 2 THE WITNESS: No, for my workman's comp. Kemp and Kemp 3 is representing me. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 All right, Mr. Zernich? 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7 8 BY MR. ZERNICH: Yeah, Matthew, you -- you make reference to medical 9 records. 10 Yeah. 11 A Yes? You say you --12 13 Α Yes. -- say you went immediately. You -- you -- you had 14 15 an injury? Α 16 Yes. You went immediately to the hospital. Did you --17 was that an injury -- was that a preexisting injury? 18 19 A No. No. Do you recall where you went to the doctor? 20 Q Concentra. 21 A Do -- do you -- do -- have they moved? 22 Q I don't think so. 23 A Are you under disability that you can't re -- you 24

know, get your own medical records? Do you need -- do you 1 2 need somebody else --I -- I --A 3 O -- to sign the form for you? 4 -- I made a mistake. Yeah. I -- I didn't realize I 5 was supposed to bring all the medical records. I thought I 6 was just supposed to provide proof that I was on workman's 7 comp, and I -- I made a mistake. It's my fault. 8 Okay. Is work -- worker's comp -- a worker's comp 9 claim, do you -- you -- you're trying to tell us that in your 10 opinion that's the same thing as medical records? 11 Yes, I -- I -- I made a mistake, yes. I do have a 12 whole folder at home of the medical records, every paper they 13 give me; but I didn't supply it. 14 Okay. So --15 I made a mistake. Α 16 -- so they were -- it was even easier to provide 17 those than going to the doctor's office and picking them up 18 because you have them at home? 19 Yes, or Kemp and --20 You just chose to --21 -- Kemp, my lawyer has --22 A -- not provide them today? 23 Yes, I -- I messed up, yeah. 24 Α

Is this whole — is this hearing a joke to you? That -- that you think that --MR. BELLON: Objection, Your Honor, argumentative. BY MR. ZERNICH: I mean -- all right. Well --MR. ZERNICH: I've got no further questions. You know All right, Matt, you can go back to the table. MR. BELLON: And forthwith on that one issue, Your Honor. I -- I wouldn't do this unless it was completely honest. My candor with the court, I think, is unquestionable. I actually remember reading that order because my secretary came to me and said, the court order requires us to file a new affidavit of financial conditions. And I said, I filed one. I even remember this, without even looking at the file. I want to say August 25th. I think we were in court on August 28th. I MR. BELLON: There was no conversation in my office about the medical records. And I did not know that we were supposed to provide a full -- a full accounting of that.

THE COURT: All right.

24

MR. BELLON: Absolutely my fault. I know Matthew's 1 2 saying he made a mistake --3 THE COURT: Uh-huh. MR. BELLON: -- and he could have brought them into me. 4 But I never instructed him that he was to bring those into me. 5 THE COURT: All right. 6 MR. BELLON: My apologies. 7 THE COURT: You have fallen on your sword. 8 Okay. As to Exhibit C, which is -- I've admitted. 9 It looks like there -- the arrears through August of 2014 are 10 \$28,879.69. Those are reduced to judgment. 11 MR. BELLON: Your Honor, before -- before you enter an 12 order, can I just be clear? I think everything has been 13 reduced to judgment prior to May, and that's what the D.A. is 14 already collecting. That's why they have this schedule. I 15 16 think --THE COURT: I know. I'm just -- I'm just bringing it up 17 18 to a current judgment. MR. BELLON: Okay. So it's not another \$28,000? It's --19 20 THE COURT: No, no. 21 MR. BELLON: Okay. THE COURT: This is through to now. 22 MR. BELLON: Just through. Okay. 23

THE COURT: Through to now.

24

him in contempt at this time for not paying if he's not working.

MR. ZERNICH: Your Honor, may -- may I request a finding, on what basis you're finding he can't work because we don't have any medical records.

MR. BELLON: You have testimony, Your Honor. You also have exhibits. Obviously we have legal actions and the fact that the government agency paid him workman's compensation for four -- for three months. Obviously they recognize the injury; and he didn't work. They wouldn't have paid him if he was working.

MR. ZERNICH: I don't --

MR. BELLON: So obviously they felt he couldn't work and so --

MR. ZERNICH: -- I don't arg -- I don't dispute that, but they stopped paying him. And they -- and -- and everything that I've seen, he's made multiple appeals.

MR. BELLON: He's made one appeal. There's one appeal that hasn't been heard yet.

It's gonna be heard when, this week, next week, is your first appeal?

MR. GEIGER: October 13th, I believe.

THE COURT: Do you get an immediate decision when it's appealed or they do -- do they send you a letter?

MR. GEIGER: I -- I -- I really don't know. 1 2 MR. BELLON: 3 4 5 3:00. 6 7 8 9 10 work. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 your disability? 18 19 20 21 22 23 here, Mr. Zernich. I -- I'm --24

I don't either. MR. GEIGER: I'm gonna actually go in to talk to Kemp and Kemp tomorrow. I have an appointment with them tomorrow at THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Zernich, as to the findings, plaintiff testified that he was injured in January. He immediately sought medical attention, was not able to work after that time. That's the basis for finding that he can't He received disability benefits through April of 2014. Mr. Bellon made offers of proof and what Mr. Bellon said was correct, that your -- and what you told me before you were sworn, but that was the truth, that your injury has been challenged that it was a prior existing injury? MR. GEIGER: Yeah, that's what they're trying to say. THE COURT: Okay. And that's the basis of them stopping MR. GEIGER: Yes, yes. THE COURT: And you are challenging that in court? MR. GEIGER: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. So, you know, I -- I -- I'm doing the best I can

21

22

23

24

MR. ZERNICH: I -- I -- I understand. I was just trying to create a record.

THE COURT: It's -- this case continues to have moving parts every time I pick it up.

So that's my finding for today. And it's 200 a month.

Matt, you are under an affirmative duty, as soon as you are cleared for work and you're working, you are to notify Jennifer so that your child support can be recalculated. If you fail to do so, this is a self-affecting order, you are in contempt.

MR. GEIGER: I contact her or you via this courtroom?

THE COURT: You contact Jennifer --

MR. GEIGER: Okay.

MR. BELLON: In -- in writing so there's a paper trail.

THE COURT: -- with a copy of your first pay stub so that child support can be recalculated.

MR. GEIGER: Okay.

THE COURT: Failure to do so is a contempt, period, punishable by five days in jail.

MR. GEIGER: Understood.

THE COURT: When you receive your disability, your child support is twenty -- if it goes back into effect, your child support is 25 percent of your disability pay per month.

MR. GEIGER: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: When it goes back into effect, you are under an affirmative duty to immediately notify Jennifer and to make a payment to her.

MR. GEIGER: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: See some of these orders are difficult for the D.A.'s office to put into place. So I have to rely on the litigants to monitor them themselves. All right. I think that takes care of child support.

Try to make -- Matt -- Mr. Zernich, try to make as clear an order as possible on these different triggers here.

All right. As to Jennifer's motion to modify custody to get sole legal custody, the court finds that based on the testimony of this probation officer, there's no — there's no evidence that Matt was on notice that a warrant ever issued. There's no evidence that he was on notice that he was not complying with the terms of his probation.

MR. ZERNICH: Your Honor, may I make a -- a short argument in that regard?

MR. BELLON: Your Honor, the time for argument --

MR. ZERNICH: Just like -- I mean a closing -- it's just a closing --

MR. BELLON: -- time for argument is done.

MR. ZERNICH: -- argument. It's just a --

22

23

24

THE COURT: You want to make a closing argument. All right.

MR. BELLON: Well, it's --

THE COURT: Mr. Zernich first and then Mr. Bellon.

MR. BELLON: -- kind of unfair to make a closing argument after you hear the decision, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah. All right.

MR. BELLON: You -- (indiscernible) submitted this to the court on these issues, and you're making your ruling. Let him appeal it or let him file a reconsideration. I'd ask the court to just continue with your order.

THE COURT: I'll hear from Mr. Zernich. Maybe he has something to offer --

MR. BELLON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- that I missed.

MR. ZERNICH: Thank you, Your Honor. The -- when you say he had no understanding that he was in violation of the probation, according to the probation officer, the -- the -- those probation terms, they -- they were -- they were set years prior. They weren't -- they weren't set on the date that he violated the probation, whatever it was, October of 2013. That was just -- that was just the date that they said, okay. Now we're issuing the bench warrant.

He was issued a new probation officer, which this

officer said he never had a chance to talk to him; but why would he have to talk to him, explaining the terms that were explained to him years prior? He already knew those terms. That's like -- that's like saying it's not a -- it's not a basis to say he violated probation when he went out of -- when he went out of state with the -- with the -- with the kids because he didn't know about it; but, you know, it's like saying when -- when at that time you didn't know about it in February, in January when you --

THE COURT: Okay. Instead of arguing --

MR. ZERNICH: -- when you issued orders (indiscernible)

THE COURT: -- instead of arguing with what I might be about to order, how about you just make your closing statement.

MR. ZERNICH: Okay. I -- I'm trying to wrap it around. I'm sorry I frustrated you.

THE COURT: You're not frustrating me. I just want you to make your closing argument.

MR. ZERNICH: Okay. The issue of the probation officer being called, I think, was all about my client in that regard. She filed motions for -- to hold him in contempt in other regards.

And the probation officer was called, I believe, in

1 2 3

direct -- directly as a result of the opposition that was filed that said that my client intentionally was -- had something to do with lying to the court and lying to the probation department to have Matthew arrested.

And I think there's no testimony in that regard today that shows that she should be held responsible in that regard. She made a call, yes, to the probation department when she found out that he was still on probation, something that the court did not know either, back in January, when they reinstated his non-supervised visitation.

For -- for him to say that he didn't know that he violated his probation, is something entirely different than him to say, I didn't know that I was still on probation because his probation term was a four- or five-year term that had not yet ended. It was all represented to this court and my understanding that everything was going fine. When the fact is, he had stopped communication with his probation officer.

The probation officer said, well, when I took over, he didn't have to call me every month. It only had to be every other month. Well, that just lessens the restriction. It doesn't remove the restriction. So if he was under the same terms, then he would have violated it every other month instead of every other month.

I think in that regard, Matthew was clearly in violation of his probation on a number of — on a number of issues of which perhaps Jennifer ultimately did bring to the attention of the department because she was afraid that if he got picked up while on probation, what's going to happen to my children. Right?

They're obviously going to take the children and try to call Jennifer. If they can't reach her, they're going to perhaps take the children down to Child Haven. One of them, who has recently had a very traumatic brain injury and surgery, that somebody down there may be totally unqualified to monitor his care, even the amount of time it takes to return him to mother and or to someone else who could do so.

I think she had a legitimate worry in that regard about him being -- have a bench warrant, continue to be on probation and was in violation of the probation, to say, you know what, even if I did want him to be picked up, it's because I want this resolved.

And when you say, why didn't she call him? Well, I think the court knows through the 18 different hearings, that's because he never returns the phone call. All right. He's very difficult to get ahold of or he just — or he just ignores her phone call. And not only that, she doesn't have an obligation to call him. All right. But if you say, why?

That's probably the reason why.

You know, the sooner he gets picked up, the safer her children are so that he can get that big monkey off his back so that we don't have to worry about it anymore.

Sorry, Mr. Geiger, you violated the probation; not Jennifer. All right. Sorry, Mr. Geiger, that you have to spend 23 days in jail or whatever it turned out to be; but that's not because of Jennifer. Jennifer was just looking out for the kids, who happen to be your kids, as well, his kids. I'm not talk -- talking to -- directly to him.

So -- so when all these allegations about her making false allegations, providing dozens of false e-mails, there's not a single e-mail or text message that was shown to be false. They were all accurate.

Now maybe there was some confusion about whether she talked to Officer Laputt, you know, in June or Norma Medina in June. Obviously, his notes weren't exactly perfect in that regard from the standpoint that he himself corrected himself that he did -- his notes weren't very good in that regard.

And for him to say, well, she told him about some out of trip -- state trip and some, you know, she informed on some hunting trip. Well, she cleared that up. There was no hunting trip. It was a hunter's safety course, which I -- I know Mr. Bellon said they don't use guns at hunter safety

courses. I don't know whether they do or not either.

22.

I have a hunting license from the state of
Pennsylvania, 20 years ago; but I don't know what they're
doing now. All right? But for somebody that's never hunted
in her life, it would be safe and logical to assume that she
might think that guns are used in a hunter safety course. And
if the kids are telling her that she's going shooting with
him, regardless of whether they had or not, she would be under
the belief that perhaps they have.

And you know what? And when they ask her questions, I don't think that it would be prudent for us to tell her that she should lie to the probation department to protect Matthew. She calls them. They ask questions. She answered. He got arrested. It's not her fault. It's only his fault. That's trying to pass the buck.

So in that regard, she -- well, I know that we're on sole legal custody. We didn't -- we didn't have much -- we -- you just said based upon the testimony of officer -- of the probation officer that -- that -- I didn't even know we got into the legal custody issue. But I don't want her to be held a --

THE COURT: It was just about legal custody and she wanted him on $-\!\!\!\!-$ on supervised visits.

MR. ZERNICH: Right. I can tell you, that request came

at a time when he was in jail, at a time she had no idea how long she was going to be there. He's obviously out now.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ZERNICH: Right? But she still thinks if we -- and if we had more time, the -- the legal custody request at this point would be more about the medical care of Chevy; but we didn't have -- we didn't put that before the court today. If we want to come back another day in that regard, I would be happy to because I had lots of information to present to the court. The court, we -- we did present the medical records of Chevy that the court asked for. I think the court is well aware of the severity --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ZERNICH: -- of the condition, or what it was; but it's also a condition that can reoccur. And her request in -- in this regard, he was arrested. She just felt that he's -- that he's acting -- it was -- you know, she didn't -- she didn't know when he was coming out of jail.

But it also has to do with her -- with her fear of the -- of the issues of -- of Chevy and things that went on in the hospital after the surgery. And I just don't think it's appropriate for me to start giving the testimony. I could -- I can give an offer of proof if the -- if Your Honor would like in that regard. Some simple examples.

THE COURT: That was two years ago, right? 1 2 MR. BELLON: Yes. THE COURT: That was two years ago? 3 MS. GORDON: Last year. 4 MR. ZERNICH: It was last -- it was -- it was last year. 5 MR. BELLON: 18 -- 16 months ago, and there's been two 6 7 hearings since. THE COURT: Uh-huh. 8 MR. ZERNICH: Right. And there has been two hearings --9 MR. BELLON: And you extended his visitation. 10 MR. ZERNICH: -- since but never -- but never an 11 evidentiary hearing at a time to present evidence. And -- and 12 -- and we certainly -- it comes full-scale circle when we 13 start talking about this log, you know, that the -- that the 14 doctor wants to be kept. We're talking about a brain injury. 15 You know, one that's not going away. 16 MR. BELLON: Your Honor, this is far -- can I object? 17 This is far exceeding the testimony that we were 18 19 (indiscernible). THE COURT: No, it -- it goes -- no, it goes to her 20 motion asking for --21 MR. BELLON: Okay. 22 THE COURT: -- sole legal custody. 23 MR. BELLON: I thought we were just talking about the 24

1 testimony today.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: She -- I have the pa -- I have her motion in front of me where --

MR. BELLON: Okay.

THE COURT: -- she -- she argues where he does not properly treat her son's brain condition.

MR. BELLON: Correct.

THE COURT: And we talked a lil -- a little bit about this at the last hearing, as well.

All right. Anything else, Mr. Zernich?

MR. ZERNICH: No, Your Honor, except for perhaps I would -- I would ask for a second day we could come in for testimony regarding his actions in the hospital and his inability to properly care for the son to a -- to a degree that jeopardizes the -- the boy's life.

THE COURT: What other --

MR. BELLON: Objection, objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- what other -- what's your offer of proof on that other than his ridiculous behavior at the hospital?

What is your -- what is your -- what is your offer of proof that he doesn't properly care for the child?

MR. ZERNICH: Well, the offer -- our offer of proof is that he just -- that he just doesn't properly understand the seriousness of the brain injury. When I say he didn't pro --

when -- when -- when I talk about the hospital, I'm not just talking about they got into arguments.

I'm talking about when the boy had a brain tube in, he wasn't supposed to be moved except by staff because if they move him too far back, all the brain fluid would drain out; and he -- and he could die. If they move him too far forward, you know, all the brain fluid swell up and swell the brain; right? The boy was in pain. The boy moved around a lot. But he would constantly move the boy --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ZERNICH: -- until she -- and then she would call the staff.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ZERNICH: And then the staff would come in, and they reposition him to -- it was called a level, to the machine; right? But he would -- he would do it. And she would say, look, how many times you have to do this? And this is -- goes to sole legal custody. Can't you just ask him to leave? Well, we don't have any court orders in that regard to allow that. Okay. Eventually by the third day, they escorted him out of the hospital. All right? He went back --

THE COURT: Okay. So fast-forward --

MR. ZERNICH: -- in with a MRSA infection. He went back in with a MRSA infection on his brain stem and they were put

into quarantine. When he would show up in his -- in his stuff, gown, mask, he'd take it off when he got in there because he would mad -- be mad because she didn't have hers on; but she was part of the quarantine.

So he was subjecting a -- a child that has MRSA infection right next to his brain. And he gave the child the phone, his phone, to play with, without any understanding of the risks. All right. So now we take that one step forward. Now the child is out of that condition but -- out of that present danger of the surgery but not out of danger all together.

And we have this log that the doctor says should be kept, and he refuses to do it. All right. So of course at some point we could come in and we could give him another chance and another chance; but we're just hoping that one more chance isn't going to be, you know, too late.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ZERNICH: She's asking for sole legal custody, even if it's just in a limited capacity, to say, I want to be responsible for the medical care and treatment; and I'm happy to give him notice. All right.

We had a -- we had an issue of some school stuff going on, too; but that's expanding everything. But as you

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

know this case is not small.

THE COURT: I'm not hearing about school. It's not before me.

MR. BELLON: Your Honor --

MR. ZERNICH: It's about traveling requirements of the of the one child that's in the specialty band on the -- the -the -- the state's top band for the middle school, that you have to try out, that he's made --

MR. BELLON: Thought we weren't hearing anything about school?

MR. ZERNICH: -- but to do it you have to be able to travel. And he refuses to give any compliance and or even a yes or no about whether the kid can leave the state with the band, which is an honor to be in. And it's just gonna force her to come back to court over and over and over, this time to say, well, you know --

THE COURT: All right. That's enough, Mr. Zernich.

MR. ZERNICH: All right. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Bellon.

MR. BELLON: I don't even know where to start, Your Honor, because that was all over the place. It -- it went into things that my client denies 99 percent of; but let's look at the big picture. I'm gonna try to narrow this down.

She's filed one motion, one step under a termination

of parental rights.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. BELLON: Sole legal custody, sole physical custody, no visitation, no holidays; but keep paying me child support.

She has the burden of proof. The only testimony you heard here today was scattered, at best. They even just said that the officer's testimony was not very accurate and that his notes may not have been correct. Why? Because her testimony contradicts it.

She took the stand and basically said that Officer Laputt either lied or he's confused.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. BELLON: So that's the confusion that I'm talking about with regards to my client's lack of notice.

Officer Laputt stood -- stood there and he said that
-- that it was correct. The statement was correct that Mr.

Zernich asked, that he was no longer having to report monthly.

He then asked about the only having to give the house and the change of jobs, et cetera; and he said that was partly true.

Then he talked about his requirements and what he would require Matt to do, but testified he never told Matt of those requirements --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. BELLON: -- because he never had contact with him.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. BELLON: So my client was under the impression from his last pro -- probation officer this is what he has to do. He never denied - I don't know where this came up - that he was off probation. He knew probation hadn't stopped yet. He just thought the requirements were different, that they weren't the same that they were on day one because they changed. They changed to the point where he can even be released from probation, but that's another whole story.

So we heard testimony from Officer Laputt; and you know what, it's not a big issue whether or not the defendant motivated them to go pick him up. He had a warrant. He accepts responsibility. It's his job to do that. The question is whether anything here rises to a level that he shouldn't have any contact with his children or he shouldn't make any decisions.

The reality of the situation is, you can believe it was a coincidence -- or she could - I apologize, Your Honor - that this warrant was in effect for almost ten months and then he gets picked up on it within 30 days or approximately 30 days after she makes her first contact with the -- the FAU, the fugitive absconsion unit; but she didn't know that's what they did.

She notifies them. She tells them, according to

Officer Laputt, that he's -- has weapons; and he's on hunting trips. He's going out of state. And then all of a sudden they pick him up.

Now she may not have meant it. Maybe she didn't go down there and say arrest him; but I think it's -- it's disingenuous at best to say, I don't understand what my actions would have resulted in.

And does she have an obligation to call him up and say that? No. But if you're worried about your children being picked up and where they're gonna go and what's gonna happen to them, then you let him know. Take care of this bench warrant. Go down to your officer, you know; and report; and get it taken care of. We wouldn't have been here, Your Honor.

But she did what she did. She made two phone calls, to the department and to her friend in Texas. She didn't -- that's all she cared about. And all she was thinking about is, he's gonna get picked up. I'll protect my kids.

Then I thought it was very disingenuous when she talks about, and breaks down in tears, about how she wants to protect his -- his kids from exactly what happened because of her actions. They got picked up while they were in his custody; and exactly what she feared, happened, because of her own actions.

But then she doesn't do anything to stop it, or she doesn't do anything to stop it in her own home, and she doesn't even know what's going on in her own home based on the information that we have from the CPS interviews.

She -- you heard her testify herself, and I'll defer this to the court, that if anything was going on, if any discipline -- she denied the boyfriend disciplines these two boys. She's so worried and protective of 'em that she doesn't know what's going on in her own house, and she wants you to take the rights away from my client based on the fact that he failed to report. Because all the rest of it is just smoke and mirrors.

Intoxicants, two years ago he supposedly had a beer in his hand; but he had no beer in his body (indiscernible).

They didn't even violate him on it. They just put him back on probation. Even this, they put -- reinstated him back on probation.

The pu -- punishment has to fit the crime, Your Honor. There is nothing that we heard here today that even remotely rises to the level of taking any time away from my client. Contrary to that, Your Honor, what we have been made aware of is there are serious concerns in the defendant's home. She wants to point fingers, and she wants to throw stones. But I think this court has to entertain the most

serious issue.

So I'm going to cut my statement very short and not go into all the details about the testimony and my client itching to tell me that none of what they say happened at the hospital happened. There's been no evidence, no third party, no testimony. He understands that.

But I'll leave the court with this, a little

Shakespearian quote; and this is the proper quote, even though

it's been kind of messed over the years. The proof of the

pudding is in the eating, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. BELLON: It's not, the proof is in the pudding. The proof of the pudding is in the eating.

What problems have we had? Has Chevy had any problems? Has he had to been re-hospitalized? He's had visitation now for months and months, with this little few months -- or few weeks in between. What is happening?

Could she come to court and say, oh, he doesn't know how to care for his son; every time he comes back, he's malnourished; or he's sick; or he's got brain injuries,; et cetera, so forth? There's been nothing wrong.

The only thing that prompted this was his arrest on a warrant that she spoke to the department 30 days before he was arrested. I think the -- I think it's clear. I think I'm

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

gonna sit down and shut up and let the court continue with the ruling.

THE COURT: Is your client maintaining the log when Chevy now gets sick?

MR. BELLON: He is, Your Honor. And to that extent, you remember even in court, the defendant testified, she never provided him with that and never told him about it.

She sent me actually a great e-mail, a very nice email, saying, thank you for requesting. Here it is. Here's how it works. I gave it to my client immediately. Not only is it as an exhibit, Your Honor, on our -- before all the visitations he's had since that court, he also took it upon himself to text her, the one time that he did vomit or have headaches. And -- and they had a nice conversation about, well, this is what I do. I give him Motrin or something like that, and they went back and forth.

He also has contacted a doctor. He has an appointment with the doctor on October 26^{th} , if I'm correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GEIGER: The 29^{th} at 10:00 a.m.

MR. BELLON: The 29th. I apologize. And so he's following up now that he understands, you know, the more -the severity of this --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BELLON: -- situation. Thank you. 1 THE COURT: Does Weston want to be in the marching band 2 3 or whatever that is? MR. GEIGER: Oh, yeah, I have no problems with him doing 4 any band stuff. 5 THE COURT: Well, why is she saying that you do? 6 MR. GEIGER: I -- I have no idea. He actually practiced 7 -- he brings his instrument over to my house; and every Sunday 8 afternoon, he does his exercises; and I e-mail her his 9 recordings. I have no problem with him being in band, none, 10 none at all. I never have. 11 THE COURT: Has he told you he couldn't have permission 12 13 to travel? MS. GORDON: No, he just doesn't reply. He doesn't 14 15 communicate. MR. GEIGER: That's not true. 16 MS. GORDON: I don't -- I don't have any communication 17 with him. That's what -- that's what stinks is I --18 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I -- I'm gonna make a --19 MR. BELLON: Family Wizard, Your Honor. 20 MR. ZERNICH: So she -- so she -- she's forced to --21 THE COURT: -- I'm gonna make a finding. So now you'll 22 have the court order that he has permission to be in the 23 24 marching band.

23

24

MR. ZERNICH: Okay. She — she's forced to make decisions without his input, which forces her to subject herself to a — a complaint that she's violating joint legal custody because she asks; and he doesn't respond —

MR. BELLON: He never complained about that.

MR. ZERNICH: -- and she doesn't respond. Then she signs him up for the band. He goes, you know --

MR. BELLON: We haven't filed --

THE COURT: Well, I can -- I can fix that, too.

Matt, if you're not gonna cooperate -- if you're not gonna not cooperate, if you're not gonna communicate in a timely fashion, I have a solution for that.

MR. GEIGER: We always group message between my phone, my wife's phone and her phone.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. GEIGER: My wife responds immediately to her. I don't ever respond. I let my wife handle it because she doesn't talk to my wife like she talks to me.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. GEIGER: There's no, you know, they play nice guy, nice guy to each other.

THE COURT: But you're the dad. So you at least need to say --

MR. GEIGER: I get --

THE COURT: -- okay with what Debbie says.

MR. BELLON: Can we do Family Wizard, Your Honor? The -- is the court a fan of that or not?

THE COURT: I -- I think they're -- they're starting to communicate.

MR. BELLON: Well, they are.

THE COURT: I mean, I understand that Jennifer talks to Debbie at least.

MS. GORDON: I -- I try.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MS. GORDON: But when I -- my main problem is, is I try things; but if I -- if I -- if it comes from me, it's a no. It's -- it's a constant no or a no reply; or thank you. We got your response; or I'm like --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. GORDON: -- and then I'm left trying to figure stuff out. It's --

THE COURT: All right. Let me -- let me address some of that and maybe save you a trip in here in the next few months.

All right. Jennifer, as to your motion for sole legal custody, that's denied. I -- I understand he had a warrant out for him and -- you know, I'm torn as to the findings I want to make today.

You know, it's clear this Probation Officer Laputt

never told Matt what his requirements were when he took over the caseload. Of course, it's clear in -- in the record that Matt had certain probation requirements. But it's clear from his te -- from -- from the PO's testimony, he never had conversation with Matt as to new requirements. It was a two-year-old --

MR. ZERNICH: We'll -- Your Honor, we'll -- we'll waive findings of fact in that regard to your denial of the sole legal custody if it's -- if it pleases the court.

MR. BELLON: I don't think anybody's gonna be appealing any of that.

THE COURT: You -- you're okay with that?

MR. ZERNICH: Yeah, we value -- I understand you're making your ruling and -- and -- and -- and I know you -- I know that you have your findings and we --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. ZERNICH: -- and that's --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ZERNICH: -- it -- it's -- it -- it's so complicated and confu -- and confusing. I mean --

THE COURT: It is complicated. And, you know --

MR. ZERNICH: -- we're fine with that.

THE COURT: -- part of why I wanted this today was so that each of them -- each of these parents, Matt and Jennifer,

would know exactly what happened. So it would be out.

So Matt would know what happened, and Jennifer would know what happened. And there would be a record of this, you know, as costly as it may have been for each of them. And so there wouldn't be any mystery or misunderstanding as to what happened. And so the court would know, as well.

So that aspersions weren't being cast on Jennifer that she, you know, turned over 100 e-mails that weren't true or whatever was going on there.

It is -- you know, I won't make the finding. But, Jennifer, just talking to you at this point, it certainly would have avoided a lot if you'd simply called Matt and said, you know, dude, you got a warrant out for you. It's not your job to clean up his act. But as the father of your children and your concern to negotiate something, how about I keep the kids until you get the warrant cleared up, would have gone very far toward continuing to heal what's been going on around here.

All right. I'm gonna make this ruling based on parties' continuing failures to communicate effectively. If —— Jennifer has primary custody.

Matt, if she communicates a request to you having to do with a medical issue or an educational issue and you, yourself, don't personally respond to her in writing by text

3

4

5

67

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

or e-mail, in a fashion that she will get, like responding to however she communicated to you, within 48 hours, then she has permission to go ahead with what she asked you. Okay?

And this means that if Debbie says to Jennifer, yeah, that sounds okay. Let me check with Matt. You need to say, yeah, it's okay. And not just be relying on your wife's dis -- communication. Okay? You're the dad. And I understand that Debbie's a good cushion for you. But you're still the dad. So you need to say, it's okay, Jennifer; or, I'm okay with that; or, I'm not okay with that. Let's talk about this some more. It has to be some sort of statement, responding to Jennifer's e-mail.

If there's no communication at all, Jennifer, within 48 hours of your request, you have permission to go forward with what you've requested. If there is a communication, if Matt says, I'm not okay with that. We need to talk about it. Then you don't have permission to go forward with it. Is that clear?

I'm trying to --

MS. GORDON: (Indiscernible) yes.

THE COURT: -- move you forward in some --

MS. GORDON: I know.

THE COURT: -- fashion.

MS. GORDON: I understand.

THE COURT: Okay?

MR. ZERNICH: What -- what if he just says no?

THE COURT: If he says no, then --

MR. ZERNICH: Just, no. No, why? No.

MR. BELLON: Then they consult and cooperate.

MR. ZERNICH: I -- I dealt with one once. It was a similar issue.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. ZERNICH: The kid was -- the kid had Down's syndrome.

THE COURT: Matt, you have to have --

MR. ZERNICH: (Indiscernible) --

THE COURT: -- a reasonable basis for saying no. If it's -- Weston has an out-of-state traveling trip with the band on your weekend and you're, like, no; you can't say no. The kid's enrolled in traveling. He has to go.

MR. GEIGER: Understood. Completely understood.

THE COURT: I'm making that a rule -- a -- a finding. Weston is now involved with the traveling band. If the band is traveling on dad's time, the boy goes. Period. Sorry.

MR. GEIGER: Understood, yeah.

THE COURT: It's a great experience for them.

MR. GEIGER: Yeah, of course.

THE COURT: Okay. That takes care of one big issue, right? Okay.

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Same thing with medical. You make the doctors appointment. You put Matt on notice as to when it is.

Matt, you're not allowed to change -- I'm making this rule -- finding an order.

Dad is not allowed to change medical appointments that mom makes for Chevy.

But you give him the information in a reasonable -when you make the appointment, that's when you notice him as
to when the appointment is. You don't wait till that morning.
Understand?

MS. GORDON: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

All right. Matt, the next time you take these kids out of town without notifying Jennifer of your itinerary, there will be a court order that you are not allowed to ever take them out of town again.

MR. GEIGER: That's understood.

THE COURT: It's really easy.

MR. GEIGER: It's understood.

THE COURT: That is really easy. And as long as you're on probation, you need to give Jennifer proof that you have permission from your PO to leave town.

MR. GEIGER: Understood.

THE COURT: By town, I mean, whatever your restriction

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is, the state of Nevada --

MR. GEIGER: Can I have —— I have just quick question about that. Is, like, Laughlin out of town? Is —— is Caliente out of town? Or do you mean out of state? Like, can I take them to Eagle Valley fishing, which is in Nevada not far from here?

THE COURT: You know what? You'll have to get legal counsel. I'm not gonna give you --

MR. GEIGER: Oh, okay.

THE COURT: -- judicial counsel on that. I don't know.

MR. BELLON: And I would just make a record. It's whether or not it's legal. We're just talking about notice, not permission. So why don't you guys just start giving each other notice of everything. You don't need permission. But if you're going fishing, what does it matter if you just say, we're going fishing in Laughlin? If you're going up to the Mount Charleston, you can do it. It just -- you guys will stop feeding off each other if you start doing it.

THE COURT: It's not permission. It's notice.

MR. BELLON: Right.

THE COURT: It's notice.

MR. GEIGER: So, okay.

MR. BELLON: Always err on the safe side and you'll feel good about it. And then the next time she's going out of

town, she'll tell you. And who knows? Maybe we can make this snowball move in a forward position or forward path for a change.

THE COURT: Yeah, all right. I'm gonna go over the kids' interview. I interviewed these children, Weston and Chevy, on 9/3/14. They didn't have too much to say. They were very polite of course.

I asked what, you know, Chevy, what does he do at home? He plays on the iPad, watches movies, goes to Wet'n'Wild, went to Kansas to see the maternal side of the family during the summer. I said, what did you do with dad? He could only say he went on a fishing trip. He didn't really have much to say. He's a really quiet and reserved child.

Weston was a little bit more forthcoming. He's in middle school. So we sort of shared that my daughter's in middle school. So I kind of understand middle school.

And then I guess I had -- I -- I -- I knew about it after I remembered -- I thought about it a little bit, but he had made a comment. And then I was like, what do you mean?

And he was like, well, there's four other kids in the house.

Matzi's children, your boyfriend's children.

There's 16, 18, 10 and 5; and then there's your baby. So you have a very busy household there.

And he said at dad's, they go swimming. It's not as

busy at dad's house because there's just the two boys, and there's less kids there. They stay with paternal grandparents if dad has to take Debbie to California, which makes the court infer that dad does not take the children out of town on the weekends to California because they were very clear. We stay with the grandparents if dad has to take Debbie to California.

Debbie told -- and he volunteered -- I didn't ask this question. He just volunteered that Debbie had told him dad was in jail a couple of hours after he woke up; that he wasn't home when he went to bed the night before.

He said the hunting -- I did ask about hunting. Do you go hunting with your dad? He said, no, it stopped about three or four years ago, which is consistent with probation officer -- or consistent with what Matt has told this court.

He did tell that -- Weston did tell the court that -- even though I ordered no wrestling in 2011, that he is wrestling; and he said he's okay with wrestling.

He likes the schedule just the way it is at this time. Weston is not stressed or -- my finding is that Weston is not stressed or de -- distressed by the current schedule. He likes it just the way it is. Chevy had nothing to offer.

Hunting has stopped when plaintiff couldn't have guns anymore. That's a finding.

Weston informed me that Matzi punches him in the

stomach and in the arm when he disobeys. The court is extremely distressed by that, Jennifer, because in 2011 I made an order, amongst many orders.

I made two specifically, that Weston is not to be engaged in any wrestling activities any longer because the kid fell apart when I was talking to him. I interviewed him. And he just fell apart. He didn't want to wrestle. So I made that order.

MS. GORDON: Right.

THE COURT: And he's in wrestling anyway.

I also made an order that Matzi, aka Baron, is not to physically discipline Weston and Chevy in any way.

MS. GORDON: Right.

THE COURT: So your children tell me, and the reason I believe Weston, is this, I said -- because I always have to look for coaching. And I said, well, when's the last time that happened? And he's like, last week. He's like, I dissed my mother in the kitchen; and he punched me in the stomach; and then he punched me in the arm; but it's okay. I deserved it. What child deserves to be punched in the stomach?

THE COURT: I believed your son because the next question I asked him was, how did that make you feel? He's like, it makes me feel sad when that happens. He's like, but it

MS. GORDON: Nobody gets punched at the house.

doesn't happen to the little kids. He doesn't do that to the little kids. There's enough little details there, Jennifer for me to believe your son. If nobody else in the whole world believes him, this judge believes him.

And then because CPS was mentioned, I got the CPS records; and because there are other children mentioned in these records because you've got a passel full of them in that house there, I didn't allow -- allow both parties to look at them. I just let counsel look at them; and they were allowed to take notes if they wanted to. That's why we were back there for a little bit.

And the children were consistent with physical punishment in the house.

MS. GORDON: Yes.

THE COURT: They were consistent that -- Weston would not -- not elaborate -- and -- and this is on September 3rd, 2014. Weston would not elaborate but did state that "blank" does punch him and his older brother in the stomach, arms and legs when they get in trouble. He also stated that the younger children in the home get stank -- spankings by his stepdad, your boyfriend, with only an open hand. Again, consistent with what the children told me when I interviewed them.

And then when the kids were interviewed at school, the CPS worker and the detective believed that the ch -- this

was a different child, but they -- they believe that all the children had been coached in their interviewing in some respects because they were reserved in their discussions.

I'm gonna tell you something. I was ready to take those boys away from you today. I was gonna take custody away from you because you do not follow my court orders. I told Mr. Zernich, I was ready to change custody up today because not only do I have a child interview, which I was weighing, well, how much — how much weight do I give the child interview when it's just me interviewing them?

And then I have a CPS report where the kids give the same information to a CPS investigator, who I do rely upon, let me tell you, where you're living with a man you're not even married to who is physically abu -- don't tell me no.

MS. GORDON: There -- there's so much more to this.

THE COURT: Don't tell me no.

MS. GORDON: It's --

THE COURT: He's punching them, and he's disciplining them --

MS. GORDON: This all --

THE COURT: -- physically.

MS. GORDON: -- this all came from Indiana when the children --

THE COURT: No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

CPS.

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

little kids. He just hits them with an open hand. It has the ring of truth because not only did they tell me, they told

MS. GORDON: I understand that.

MS. GORDON: -- the two children --

MS. GORDON: It -- it was moved out here.

THE COURT: Jennifer, don't even argue with me 'cause

this is a losing battle on your part. CPS investigators are

your boyfriend is punching them in the stomach and the arms

and legs. They are verifying that. And it has the ring of

truth because they told them that he doesn't do it to the

talking to your children, and your children are verifying that

MS. GORDON: -- were kidnapped.

THE COURT: -- this all --

THE COURT: This --

THE COURT: You -- you cannot go through life not believing your children when they're telling you that they're being abused or when your -- when a third party's telling you they're being abused. You can't disregard that. And honestly, I don't know what to do at this point because I'm -- I'm bound to protect your children if you can't protect them.

Don't tell me that there's an investigation there; and so and so is doing this; and maybe it's Matt's fault today, too. Maybe this is Matt's fault that your boyfriend is

punching your children. And you're sitting here telling me, I'm so concerned about Chevy and his brain injury. And your boyfriend is punching your children or at least one child.

What happens the day when he hauls back and gives

Chevy a punch and Chevy hits a piece of furniture on the way

down? What happens on that day? And Judge Nathan did nothing

about it. What happens on that day? What is my

responsibility, even if it happens on a day after I leave the

bench?

This is what I've been thinkin' about -- thinkin' about since September 3rd. I've been thinkin' about this since September 3rd. What's my responsibility today? What am I supposed to do today? And instead of telling me, no, my boys lied not just to you Judge Nathan but to CPS investigators and a detective. Other than your children lying to three different people --

MS. GORDON: It's --

THE COURT: -- what else do you have to say? And you're under oath still.

MS. GORDON: I -- that's -- there's so much that's been going on. When we came into court on the 28th, I'd been on the phone with the police departments, four to be exact, in Indiana. If you'll just hear me --

THE COURT: No, the --

```
MS. GORDON: -- for two seconds.
1
2
         THE COURT: -- only -- the only --
3
         MS. GORDON: This came from --
         THE COURT: -- thing --
4
         MS. GORDON: -- Baron's --
5
         THE COURT: Jennifer --
6
         MS. GORDON: -- ex. She filed two false --
7
         THE COURT: -- Jennifer --
8
         MS. GORDON: -- police reports. She's under --
9
         THE COURT: -- the only thing I am laser focused on is
10
    your boyfriend's conduct with your two boys.
11
         MS. GORDON: And that's not true. I'm in those reports,
12
    too. I -- they're saying that I punch the kids in the face,
13
    and I make their nose bleed, and I hit them with sticks. This
14
    is the fourth time that this has come up with CPS.
15
               I gave them Matthew's number. I gave them his ex's
16
    phone number. I've given them the court's phone number. I
17
    gave them everybody's number so they could get as much
18
    information on this. This isn't the first time this has been
19
20
    investigated.
               You have to understand what Matthew and what Baron's
21
    ex puts us through in regards --
22
         MR. BELLON: Matthew?
23
         MS. GORDON: -- to the children. They pull the --
24
```

INE COURT

THE COURT: And so what?

_

_

MS. GORDON: -- kids out of school.

THE COURT: Did Baron's ex tell your children to tell Judge Nathan, a detective and a CPS investigator that Matzi punches us in the stomach?

MS. GORDON: They've all been sitting -- all the kids have been sitting, telling stories since the girls were kidnapped this summer. They were kidnapped on August 22^{nd} . We didn't get them back until September 4^{th} .

All the conversations that went on were with the two oldest daughters in the house. And they have been kicked out of the house because of the things they were saying. The 18-year-old, you're -- you've talked about in the report, has been removed from the home because she was a -- a (indiscernible) issue with all this, with Matzi's -- Baron's ex-wife.

There is so much to this that we have gone through. And I've been under great stress to protect the kids from all this crap that we have -- we have Baron's youngest girls that are at -- at the foot of this CPS investigation that was unsubstantiated in -- in Indiana. It was transferred out here. Henderson Police and CPS out here immediately got in contact with us, interviewed all the kids, pulled them out of school, intermu -- interviewed the girls when we got them

1

3

4

5

6

7

/

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Yeah, I know what happened. I read the report.

MS. GORDON: It's the same thing. There's so many things said. There's so many things said. And all this stuff happened right around my court hearing.

THE COURT: So you expect me to believe --

MS. GORDON: I got in a fight with --

THE COURT: -- that because you have --

MS. GORDON: -- Weston that day.

THE COURT: -- other things going on, your children are gonna lie to me about your boyfriend punching them in the stomach?

MR. BELLON: I'm concerned about her ability to protect these children, Your Honor, if you don't make an order removing them from the home.

If -- if she would stand up and say, we've had problems. I'm talking to him about it. We're getting counseling. She's basically sitting there saying, you -- my boys are lying to you. My boys are just fine.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. BELLON: I know what's going on in my house, and you don't.

And the boys, it's even worse now because they're

going to go back to the house; and they're going to have deal with these boys who just talked to CPS; and now they know what they said.

What's Matzi's response going to be to this when he finds out what happened here today in court? I'm concerned. It wasn't our plan. We — we never petitioned this court for custody, not even for joint custody at this time. My client has a road to climb — to walk and a mountain to climb. But I don't know what you can do to protect these children. I think they're in more danger today than they were yesterday.

MS. GORDON: I -- I hear --

MR. BELLON: And she refuses to acknowledge it.

MS. GORDON: -- what you're saying. I'm sorry all this is going on. I -- I hear what you're saying. I hear your concerns.

THE COURT: Chevy said -- Chevy said on September 3rd,

Chevy was -- I don't know why these kids were interviewed by

CPS on the same day I talked to them.

Did you know that?

MS. GORDON: I'm sorry. Could you repeat what you said?

THE COURT: That they were talked to by CPS at school --

MS. GORDON: Yes.

THE COURT: -- on the same day I interviewed them?

MS. GORDON: Yes, they were -- they were spoken to -- the

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

whole week prior to that, they were spoken to twice. They were pulled out of school for several hours.

THE COURT: Chevy didn't tell me this. He stated that everyone in the home gets spankings when they get in trouble. Mainly it's just with the hand. It used to be with the belt. But that hasn't happened in a long time.

MS. GORDON: Yes, and that was prior to your orders.

THE COURT: So you deny that you admitted that you'll use a belt with the children?

MS. GORDON: I do not -- yeah -- yeah, it -- I deny that. I don't --

THE COURT: You didn't tell the CPS investigator that you -- I'm sorry. That --

MS. GORDON: No.

THE COURT: -- I guess your boyfriend said that you stated that your -- Matzi will use a belt with the children; and it's generally for more serious misbehaving, like when they've been suspended from school for fighting or stealing.

MS. GORDON: Not -- not with -- not with Weston and Chevy, no.

MR. BELLON: He only hits some of the kids, the younger ones. This -- nothing happens with Weston and Chevy. just immune to all of this, Your Honor. This -- how much more can she deny? Who else is going to lie? Now her boyfriend's

lying, too, according to her.

THE COURT: Then you have another child in the house who talked about being spanked by the father and stepmom, you, with a flip-flop, belt or a hand. And sometimes there have been marks, but that was a long time ago. And Matt basically -- Matt and Debbie basically had nice things to say about you, except she thought there was -- they thought it was a little too strict over there.

The paragraph the court's most concerned about was from --

I'm keeping my staff here. I apologize.

Was from September 8th, 2014, this worker along with Detective Melcher from Henderson P.D. made contact with "blank's" daughter and Jennifer's stepdaughter at her school. She was appropriately dressed, appeared to be of average height and weight for her age, was open and friendly. Wait a second. This is — okay.

Well, going on, she reports similar inc -- incidents as the other children who have been interviewed, that the children were spanked as a form of discipline with a belt and that at times marks have been left on them. She reported the last time a mark was left on her was over a year ago and that Weston and another child were punched in the stomach, but that was also over a year ago. She feels safe at her mother's home

and only feels safe at her father's when he's not -- not grouchy or mean.

What I would like is a brief-focused evaluation on Jennifer's protective capacity because I seriously have serious questions as to her ability to protect these children.

MR. BELLON: I ask the court to consider if you're not going to change custody at this time, Your Honor, to issue some kind of order with regards to protecting them from the boyfriend, either he not be present or that he not be left unsuper --

THE COURT: He lives in the house.

MR. BELLON: Correct, Your Honor; but he's an adult; and he can take care of himself. These children can't take care of themselves. And he (indiscernible) --

THE COURT: His four children live in that house, five with -- and one with her.

MR. BELLON: And does Jennifer have a place --

THE COURT: All the children live in the house.

MR. BELLON: -- does Jennifer have a place that she can go with her three children or -- or can, at least, he never be left unsupervised with these children, even though I'm concerned that Jennifer won't protect them?

MR. ZERNICH: There's -- there's --

THE COURT: I'll make that order.

MR. ZERNICH: I don't know that we have -- that there's any money for a bri -- even a -- for a brief-focused evaluation.

MR. BELLON: Well, if there's no money --

MR. ZERNICH: I mean, the one thing --

MR. BELLON: -- then we'll --

MR. ZERNICH: -- Chevy --

MR. BELLON: -- then we'll take custody --

MR. ZERNICH: -- did confirm to you is --

MR. BELLON: -- of the kids.

MR. ZERNICH: — that he was happy where he was. I mean, we could take care of it just the same way we take care of other stuff with the orders. The — the — I mean, that last order was from 2011, with three years later, where we can reissue the order, same way that we re-issued orders to him that he's no longer to continue to do stuff you've already ordered him not to do; and tell her that she understands the severity of this. And you have — we have some conversation —

THE COURT: Why don't we --

MR. ZERNICH: -- now some legal talk with -- with the boyfriend. He can get --

MR. BELLON: How --

MR. ZERNICH: -- that advice --

MR. BELLON: -- how dare --

```
MR. ZERNICH: -- (indiscernible).
1
         MR. BELLON: -- they, Your Honor --
2
         THE COURT: Not when --
3
         MR. BELLON: -- apples and oranges.
4
         THE COURT: -- children are in danger, Mr. Zernich.
5
         MR. BELLON: We forgot to report to our parole officer --
6
    or probation officer. She's allowing her children to be beat
7
    in her house, Your Honor. This is apples and oranges.
8
         THE COURT: Oh, and he got punished.
9
         MR. ZERNICH: Oh, you're --
10
         THE COURT: He got put in jail --
11
         MR. ZERNICH: -- you're -- you --
12
         THE COURT: -- for 23 days.
13
         MR. ZERNICH: -- I'm -- I'm not trying to --
14
         MR. BELLON: Correct. So how about it's --
15
         MR. ZERNICH: -- downplay it, but you're --
16
         MR. BELLON: -- it's her turn.
17
         MR. ZERNICH: -- exaggerating it.
18
19
         MR. BELLON:
                      What --
         MR. ZERNICH: I mean, there's a --
20
         MR. BELLON: -- what am I exaggerating?
21
         MR. ZERNICH: -- there's a --
22
23
         MR. BELLON: Did you read --
         MR. ZERNICH: -- there's a difference.
24
```

MR. BELLON: -- those reports? 1 MR. ZERNICH: There's a same as downplaying the 2 3 exaggeration. MR. BELLON: I'm not going to sleep tonight very well if 4 they go in and get hurt and I sat there and argued for 5 Jennifer --6 THE COURT: Mr. Zernich --7 MR. BELLON: -- to go ahead and --8 THE COURT: -- I've thought --9 MR. BELLON: -- (indiscernible). 10 THE COURT: -- of this case every day for a month. I 11 mean, I'm not kidding. I have wondered what to do. And I'm 12 not the one who reported this by the way. I don't know who 13 the reporter was. It doesn't -- and it wasn't Matt either. 14 MS. GORDON: No, it was --15 THE COURT: It wasn't Matt or Debbie. 16 MS. GORDON: -- Baron's ex-wife, who kidnapped the 17 children --18 THE COURT: I -- I don't believe that it --19 MS. GORDON: -- on August 22nd. 20 THE COURT: -- was because it says in --21 MR. BELLON: It said it was a mandatory. 22 THE COURT: -- here, it was a mandatory reporter. I 23 24 don't believe it was --

MR. BELLON: Teacher or --1 THE COURT: -- anybody in Indiana. 2 MS. GORDON: It was. Her name is Libby from CPS in 3 Indiana. 4 MR. ZERNICH: It was a mandatory --5 THE COURT: Mr. Zernich --6 7 MR. ZERNICH: -- order. THE COURT: -- you know, my -- my vision is of this 8 boyfriend taking a punch at Chevy and Chevy hittin' a piece of 9 furniture on the way down. I mean, that's what I'm 10 visualizing; and that could easily happen. 11 MR. BELLON: He's outside, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Or just hittin' the ground and hittin' that 13 fragile little head of his. 14 MR. BELLON: He's outside --15 MR. ZERNICH: Not --16 MR. BELLON: -- Your Honor. 17 MR. ZERNICH: Not so --18 MR. BELLON: He's here. 19 MR. ZERNICH: -- well, not so easy, when she understands 20 the situation of the judge's standpoint of view and what 21 appropriate discipline is versus not appropriate discipline. 22 And you're punching the arm. Do you really punch or are you 23

just hittin' the arm and the kids say they get punched in the

24

```
arm? You know, but she said -- you said, look, don't touch
1
     'em. No punching. No touching. No --
2
         THE COURT: Punching in the stomach. A man punching a --
3
         MR. BELLON: Flip-flops, belts --
4
5
         THE COURT: -- little boy --
6
         MR. BELLON: -- candlesticks.
         THE COURT: -- in the stomach. He's a man.
7
         MR. ZERNICH: The -- the candlestick comes from Indiana.
8
9
         THE COURT: Okay.
10
         MR. ZERNICH: That --
         THE COURT: I'm not even talking about --
11
         MR. ZERNICH: -- that's a --
12
         THE COURT: -- I'm not --
13
         MR. ZERNICH: -- that's a complete--
14
         THE COURT: -- the candlestick is not an issue --
15
         MR. ZERNICH: -- false allegation --
16
         THE COURT: -- for this court.
17
18
         MR. ZERNICH: -- a lie.
19
         THE COURT: It's punching a little boy --
         MS. GORDON: I -- I --
20
         THE COURT: -- in the stomach.
21
         MS. GORDON: -- understand that. I hear --
22
         THE COURT: And I believe --
23
24
         MS. GORDON: -- everything you're saying.
```

1.00

THE COURT: -- I believe your children. I believe Weston. I don't believe you that it doesn't happen. I believe Weston. And if nobody in his whole world believes him, I want him to know that Judge Nathan believes him. MR. ZERNICH: She has the capacity to protect him. -- the --MR. BELLON: She doesn't --MR. ZERNICH: Weston -- Weston --MR. BELLON: -- believe it's happening. MR. ZERNICH: -- in his own interview to you said that he's satisfied and happy. And with your -- with your orders and some strict orders, you know, I think that -- that -- that this could all be resolved. THE COURT: Okay. What are you suggesting as the strict MR. ZERNICH: And you could set it for a status check. THE COURT: -- orders, Mr. Zernich? What orders are you suggesting? MR. ZERNICH: I'm suggesting that -- that there's to be no physical discipline in the house. THE COURT: I already did that, and she ignored it. MR. ZERNICH: But -- but that was 2011. THE COURT: When they were littler, too. They were really little then, and Chevy's brain condition was even more serious

then. And she ignored that order. 1 MR. ZERNICH: Well, all -- if we're gonna talk about --2 if we're gonna look at the brain condition and her 3 extraordinary effort to not leave his side for a month at a 4 time in -- in the hospital -- I mean, obviously she has -- she 5 has --6 THE COURT: No, we're talking about --7 MR. ZERNICH: -- she has a --8 THE COURT: -- the boyfriend --9 MR. ZERNICH: -- desire to protect the -- the children. 10 THE COURT: -- we're talking about the boyfriend laying 11 hands on her children when I ordered her to make sure that 12 doesn't happen, and she ignored it. 13 MR. ZERNICH: Well, and she's gonna need to address that 14 with the boyfriend; and I think that she can with this court's 15 16 order. THE COURT: I hope you understand how serious --17 18 MS. GORDON: I --THE COURT: -- this is. 19 MS. GORDON: -- you -- (indiscernible) --20 THE COURT: Did I make it clear? 21 MS. GORDON: Yeah, it's very clear. I -- you're very 22 clear. I understand it. Like, my boys are my world. 23

24

D-10-430639-D GEIGER/GORDON 10/09/2014 TRANSCRIPT
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - FAMILY DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES
601 N. Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 455-4977 APP0252

APP0252

THE COURT: They're his world, too.

MR. BELLON: She doesn't think it's happening. It's clear, but she -- if you asked her right now whether she believes the boys are being punched -- how do you convince somebody not to abuse them if you're gonna go back and say, I know you're not abusing them; but don't do it?

THE COURT: You don't believe this is happening. That's what concerns the court. You're in total denial, or you're just lying to me. I don't know which is which.

MR. BELLON: My client can testify to the violent capacity that he's witnessed Matzi in other situations.

MR. GEIGER: I've worked with Matzi for years. He - I've seen him fight carpenters on the job. I've know he's been violent. And I cannot --

MR. ZERNICH: This is coming --

MR. GEIGER: -- I cannot believe that --

THE COURT: You know what, Matt, the --

MR. ZERNICH: -- this is coming from the same guy --

THE COURT: -- C --

MR. ZERNICH: -- that doused a car --

THE COURT: -- the CP --

MR. ZERNICH: -- with gasoline --

MR. GEIGER: That's --

MR. ZERNICH: -- and tried to burn it.

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. GEIGER: -- yeah, whatever.

MR. ZERNICH: Mean -- I mean --

THE COURT: The --

MR. ZERNICH: -- the -- the options are not that great here.

MR. BELLON: Sure, sure --

THE COURT: -- the C -- the CPS --

MR. BELLON: -- that's a good way to deflect.

THE COURT: -- report also said that you didn't really see the kids coming over with anything that raised concerns.

I mean, bruises were attributable to wrestling. So I --

UNIDENTIFIABLE SPEAKER: Hopefully.

THE COURT: All right. So I'm finding that the court has serious concerns based on the CPS report and the court's own report about the kids. I think the -- the court's interview with the children, the court believes Weston when he tells the court that mom's boyfriend, Matzi, is -- M-A-T-Z-I, is punching him in the stomach and the arm as a form of discipline.

The court is ordering mom not to leave her two children, these two boys, alone in the care of her boyfriend, Matzi. If there's credible evidence that she has left these two boys alone with Matzi, that could be the basis for change in custody.

Do you understand that, Jennifer? 1 2 MS. GORDON: Yes. THE COURT: And again, I'm ordering he is not to 3 discipline your children. Do you understand that? 4 MS. GORDON: I do. 5 THE COURT: You are not to use any object on your 6 children, do you understand that, as a form of discipline? 7 MS. GORDON: Yes, I do. 8 THE COURT: Does the ABCs of Parenting. I want both 9 10 these parents --Have you taken that class yet, Matt, the ABCs of 11 Parenting? 12 13 MR. GEIGER: Yes. 14 THE COURT: You took it? MR. BELLON: Was that the UNLV one? 15 MR. GEIGER: No, that was -- I'll take it again. 16 THE COURT: You took -- you took COPE. 17 MR. GEIGER: It -- it's okay. 18 THE COURT: Both parents are to take -- take - it's a 19 discipline class - ABCs of Parenting to learn how to better 20 discipline your children. 21 I don't have jurisdiction over your boyfriend, but 22 it would be a good idea if he went to the class also. 23

MR. BELLON: Your Honor, is there a way that the boys can

24

be told? I -- we know we don't usually discuss these types of things with them, but at least that they be aware that they're not to be in their stepfather's -- well, they're -- not stepfather, the boyfriend's control. There's no way for us to really find this out. We don't want to interrogate them every time they come back.

But they could be -- and it would give them a sense of peace, too, knowing, hey, hey, obviously what I said got through to the judge; and we don't have to worry being -- about being alone with Matzi again and him punishing us. I mean, I'm still concerned. He --

THE COURT: I'm -- I'm gonna give Matt permission to have a discussion, an unemotional discussion with his boys that if they ever feel that they are being abused that they're to tell somebody at school.

Because I don't want you, Matt, to get caught up in this cycle and then not being believed.

MR. GEIGER: Right.

THE COURT: So if your children think they're being hurt

-- and don't -- don't just say at mom's house. Just have a

general conversation, boys, you're old enough to know, if you

ever think you're being hurt by anybody, physically hurt, then

tell somebody at school; and something will get done about it.

Don't point to mom. Don't point to the boyfriend --

MR. GEIGER: I won't. 1 THE COURT: -- 'cause it could be anywhere. It could be 2 at your grandparents' house. Maybe somebody comes in and --3 and does some -- it could be anyplace. Okay? 4 MR. GEIGER: Yes, ma'am. 5 THE COURT: I want you to really hear what I'm saying. 6 7 MR. GEIGER: I hear you. THE COURT: Make it neutral. Do you under -- you got 8 9 that? MR. GEIGER: I -- I understand --10 THE COURT: Neutral. 11 MR. GEIGER: -- what you're saying. 12 THE COURT: So that if something does happen at anybody's 13 house, even a friend's house, and somebody touches them, 14 somebody hurts them, they know to go to somebody at school. 15 It would be fair, I think, for you to have a safety word for 16 the kids, that if you're having a phone conversation and 17 something bad is happening at the house and they use the 18 19 safety word --MR. GEIGER: Yeah. 20 THE COURT: -- you can decide what to do. 21 MR. GEIGER: I understand. 22 THE COURT: I'm not really satisfied. 23

24

I hope I can sleep at night, quite frankly, Mr.

23

24

But I hope that these orders will protect the

MR. ZERNICH: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. BELLON: Your Honor, would the court --

MR. ZERNICH: Understand --

MR. BELLON: -- at least consider a little bit expansion of the time. I mean, we -- we were on the verge of giving him primary. He only has three weekends a month, 48 hours at a time. They're gonna be over there 24 hours -- or excuse me, 24 days a month with the five other children and with this thing exploding. He punches them for dissing his mother. What's gonna happen when he finds out what happened here in court and then he's got to be talked to and Weston said this to the court? I'm concerned.

THE COURT: I've been -- I mean --

MR. BELLON: Even if we just expand his visitation to --he's out of work now, too.

THE COURT: What does he have, every other weekend?

MR. BELLON: No, first, second and fourth weekends --

MR. GEIGER: I have the first --

MR. BELLON: -- Friday to Sunday.

MR. GEIGER: -- third -- three weekends.

MR. BELLON: First three weekends.

THE COURT: Friday to Sunday. MR. GEIGER: -- at 6:00 to Sunday at 6:00. MR. BELLON: And he's out of work. So he's available all the time. So even if we balance out -- we're not even asking for a change in custody. We never came in -- but even a temporary, just a time share change, until they go to these classes, until we do a focus eval, until we find out if these MR. ZERNICH: (Indiscernible.) MR. BELLON: -- the least we can do is we move them out of the home a little bit more. THE COURT: No, I'll give him -- I'll give him the four weekends a month; and Jennifer can have every fifth weekend, when there's a fifth weekend. MR. GEIGER: When there's five weekends? THE COURT: When there's five weekends. There's like five weekends five times a year. MR. ZERNICH: So you're gonna take -- you're gonna take away -- she's gonna have only four weekends a year? THE COURT: Five weekends, right. MR. ZERNICH: The fifth weekend comes four times a year. THE COURT: I thought it came five times a year.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

MR. ZERNICH: Once a quarter. Once every thirteen weeks.

THE COURT: Well, you know what, my understanding right now is that neither her or her boyfriend are working. They have no money. I don't -- I don't know what they're doing on weekends if there's no money to do anything with. They can't even have every kid shower every day is what the CPS report says because there's so many people in the house. know --

MS. GORDON: What?

THE COURT: Okay. It will be fair that, Jennifer, if you want to plan a trip with the kids, that you're allowed to give Matt two-weeks notice that you'd like to have a weekend. And you can do that four times a year. So that will give you seven weekends out of the year.

Did I just do that math right?

MR. ZERNICH: There -- there's four fifth weekends of the -- of the year. And --

THE COURT: Four.

MR. BELLON: Four fifth, and she can do it how many times a year?

MS. GORDON: Three times.

MR. BELLON: Three times, so that's seven.

I said three? Okay. Wait a second. THE COURT:

22

23

24

MR. ZERNICH: Your Honor, would you consider that -- they don't do much over at his house eith -- either on the weekends. They're -- they're -- they're just -- they're over there. Mr. Bellon is just now trying to wrestle what little extra time away --

THE COURT: No.

MR. ZERNICH: -- based upon the circumstances.

MR. BELLON: Yeah, that's what I'm trying to do.

MR. ZERNICH: Without being here --

THE COURT: Okay. Mom can --

MR. ZERNICH: -- for the last 17 hearings --

THE COURT: -- mom can have an additional four weekends with notice to dad, if she's doing something, okay, there's an activity that she's engaged in, you know, she's gonna go out of town or there's something going on. So she has to give dad two-weeks notice of the activity and that she's gonna have the kids for the weekend. So that's eight weekends out of the year. The rest of the time is dad's.

MR. ZERNICH: You stated that was a temporary order or that's $\ensuremath{^{--}}$

THE COURT: No, this is a permanent order.

MR. ZERNICH: And we're not going forward with the brieffocus evaluation based upon (indiscernible)?

THE COURT: No, I won't do that; but if they come back

here, that's probably what they're looking at. 1 MR. BELLON: So it's just basically Jennifer's word that 2 3 she's gonna protect her kids? THE COURT: I expect both parents --4 MR. ZERNICH: Well, we've -- we've took him on his word 5 6 THE COURT: -- to protect their children. 7 MR. ZERNICH: -- a lot through -- throughout most of this 8 9 -- through --MR. BELLON: Your Honor, I have to say --10 MR. ZERNICH: -- through the years --11 MR. BELLON: -- I have to say something. 12 MR. ZERNICH: -- when the kids were a lot younger --13 MR. BELLON: Please. I -- I don't even know how to say 14 this without being disingenuous. 15 Please stop deflecting this back on us. We -- we 16 paid our prices, and we've done -- and we defended our case in 17 court. And you denied her motion. 18 19 This is about what goes on in her house. And all their responses, well, he did this; and he did that; and now 20 he's starting to get more time. No. This is about protecting 21 the children. I -- we never asked this court for anything but 22 to keep what we have so we can build a relationship. This is 23 24 all new --

THE COURT: This -- this --

2

MR. BELLON: -- new information --

MR. BELLON: -- that we were just given hours ago.

court based on the children's interview, which was supported

the court, quite frankly, doesn't care if it's unsubstantiated

by the CPS record, as far as the court's concerned, an

investigation with the detective and a CPS investigator.

because CPS has its own guidelines; and the court looks at

So -- because once -- once CPS, you know,

substantiates something, they have to take other steps. And

sort of leave it in the judge's hands to take further action.

if they know it's before a district court judge, then they

So I -- I have taken the action I think is appropriate. I

want that -- those ABCs of Parenting done within the next 60

MR. BELLON: I'll prepare. I know Mr. Zernich is

to sign the order or if he's gonna stay on after that.

unbundled. I don't know if he's gonna stay on at least maybe

THE COURT: -- this -- this order was sua sponte from the

THE COURT: -- this --

that investigation from a different light.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Just let me know.

days. That's all I have for today.

Who's preparing the order?

THE COURT: You want to sign the order, Mr. Zernich?

10/09/2014

D-10-430639-D GEIGER/GORDON EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - FAMILY DIVISION - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES 601 N. Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 455-4977

```
MR. BELLON: I -- I'll be glad to deal with it.
1
         MR. ZERNICH: I'm gonna have to. I'm not -= I'm not
2
    unbundled. I -- I'm pro bono.
3
         MR. BELLON: Oh, I apologize. I thought --
4
         THE COURT: You're pro bono?
5
         MR. ZERNICH: Yeah.
6
7
         THE COURT: Okay.
         MR. BELLON: The notice -- did the notice we get say
8
9
    unbundled?
         THE COURT: I appreciate your service.
10
         MR. ZERNICH: What's that?
11
         MR. BELLON: Did the notice we get say unbundled?
12
         MR. ZERNICH: I don't --
13
14
         MR. BELLON: (Indiscernible.)
         MR. ZERNICH: I don't know. Did it?
15
         MR. BELLON: Yeah, it does say unbundled, notice of
16
17
    unbundled appearance.
         MR. ZERNICH: I -- probably 'cause I thought --
18
19
         MR. BELLON: (Indiscernible.)
         MR. ZERNICH: -- 'cause I thought that this was going to
20
    be the only hearing. But e -- even then, I'm -- I'm happy to
21
     sign off on.
22
23
         MR. BELLON: Okay. Cool.
24
          MR. ZERNICH: And -- and --
```

1	THE COURT: Okay.
2	MR. BELLON: And just let me know.
3	THE COURT: This case is closed
4	MR. ZERNICH: And I'm
5	THE COURT: upon filing of the order.
6	All right. Thank you very much.
7	(THE PROCEEDING ENDED AT 17:27:28.)
8	
9	* * * *
10	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the digital proceedings in the above-
11	entitled case to the best of my ability.
12	Sonn Justice
13	SHERRY JUSTICE, Transcriber II
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

23

24

FILED

FEB 2 5 2316

CLERK OF COURT

TRANS

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

FAMILY DIVISION

MATTHEW ROBERT GEIGER,

) CASE NO. D-10-430639-D

DEPT. T

Plaintiff,

) APPEAL NO. 67955

vs.

JENNIFER ELISE GORDON,

Defendant.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE LISA M. BROWN TRANSCRIPT RE: ALL PENDING MOTIONS TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 2015

<u>APPEARANCES</u>:

The Plaintiff: MATTHEW ROBERT GEIGER
For the Plaintiff: PETER J. BELLON, ESQ.
Bellon & Maningo, Ltd.
732 S. Sixth St., #102
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
(702) 452-6299

The Defendant: JENNIFER ELISE GORDON For the Defendant: Pro se

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

PROCEEDINGS

(THE PROCEEDING BEGAN AT 09:13:57.)

THE CLERK: We're on the record.

THE COURT: Good morning. All right. We're on the record, if you could please state your appearances.

MR. BELLON: Thank you very much. Good morning, Your Honor. Attorney Pete Bellon, Bar Number 4528, present with the plaintiff in this matter, Matthew Geiger.

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning.

MR. GEIGER: Good morning.

MS. GORDON: I'm Jennifer Gordon. I'm self-represented.

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning to you. All right. It's your motion, I believe, ma'am. I've read everything.

Although, we did just get a reply and opposition that was just

MS. GORDON: Yes, on Friday.

THE COURT: It just showed up on Friday.

Did you get that Mr. --

MR. BELLON: I did.

filed recently.

THE COURT: -- Bellon?

MR. BELLON: I think I got it yesterday, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

All right. Ma'am, what would you like to say?

MS. GORDON: That was my first question, if you had a chance to read the reply.

THE COURT: I haven't had a chance. My law clerk just handed it to me this morning.

MS. GORDON: Okay. It's -- that was kind --

THE COURT: But you can -- you can tell me --

MS. GORDON: Yeah, that --

THE COURT: -- what you need to tell me.

MS. GORDON: -- that was kind of a -- a big portion of, you know, the opposition and counter motion. I -- I do believe that my motion was very clear in the case law that was laid out as to why it should be reconsidered and a new trial be granted. Relief from judgment, I -- I don't know how much more clear I could get with -- it's basically just torn our family apart with the orders that were made against myself and -- and my -- my fiancé.

It -- I -- I don't know where to start. In my reply, I referred to the Wallace versus Wallace case where Mr. Bellon went off of the fact that we -- you know, we're talking about custodial rights; but parental rights falls under custodial rights.

And in the Wallace versus Wallace case that I laid out in my reply, the parental rights were sorely violated, as in the other cases that I laid out in my motion, where

visitations were changed that were detrimental to the childrens without proper evidence being heard and -- and due process.

That's basically what happened in our trial. When we showed up, the attorneys met shortly off record. My attorney at the time told me that the CPS files were over an inch thick. The CPS records and the interviews were -- were nothing that was presented to us prior to October 9th. There was no time for review, were completely misinterpreted.

The person that filed this specific set, it has been brought up on criminal charges in the state of Indiana; and she lost full custody of her children to Matzi. Matzi has 100-percent sole legal and primary physical custody of the children here in Nevada now because of this.

So it's -- it's crazy that that happened, and she lost complete custody, and then the -- the case is transferred out here, and it's so sorely misread. I -- I don't know where to continue to go but try to stay on why we're here today, the motions and -- I don't know.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you want to let counsel argue, and then you can respond?

MS. GORDON: Sure.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BELLON: Thank you, Your Honor. And I'll be brief

because I -- I think we did lay it out pretty well in our opposition and our counter motion.

First, I will point out to the court that the reason you probably didn't get an opportunity to read that reply is because I believe it's untimely. It's supposed to be filed and served five days before the motion.

Our opposition and counter motion was filed right on the exact date. If I remember correctly, the certificate of mailing was February 24th. We received it, and we're counting down from February 27th. Our opposition and counter motion was due on March 13th. It was filed on March 13th.

The defendant had until five days prior to file and serve. As you indicated, she filed on Friday and -- which wasn't five days before; and it wasn't served on us until yesterday. Certificate of mailing, I said, I think put it in the mail on March $20^{\rm th}$, which would have served it on us March $23^{\rm rd}$, which Monday was the day we got it.

So the -- the court doesn't even need to really consider that or feel at a loss because you haven't had the opportunity. That's defendant's own doing. But it doesn't really matter because it doesn't change much, Your Honor.

This isn't about -- you know, the defendant said something. It's torn our family apart. Well, first of all, this is the family, Your Honor. This is the father. That is

the mother. And they have two boys. She has a boyfriend.

He's not part of the family. He has children. Now that's an extended family. I'll give you that. But that's what this is about.

It's not about due process or justice or about the words of her own sons talking about how they're being beaten by her boyfriend on two occasions, that Judge Nathan personally entered CPS in -- investigators.

And for her to sit there -- or she did. I wish you had an opportunity to watch the videotape. But to sit there and watch her deny every allegation, as she's done in her motions and every pleading that I can remember reading, everything is this man's fault. She wants to rehash the past. And she wants to tell the court what an awful human being this man is.

He has done everything this court has asked of him. Yes, he was in a position where he wasn't father of the year. He wasn't taking care of his responsibilities as a parent. And he's moved in the right direction to the point where he kept getting more and more and more. And that just makes her madder and madder and madder.

This is about her convenience. This isn't about -- and I'll quote out of her own motion, about a change of custody, about a significant change in parental rights. It's

not a paren -- loss of parental rights. It's not a relocation case as the Wallace case that she cites. She hasn't lost any significant parental rights, Your Honor.

The judge made a decision based on the evidence presented to her from a stipulation for her to interview the children. Under Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure 15(b), that's implied consent that whatever comes out of that in — interview, gives the judge the right to act on that evidence, regardless of whether or not it conforms with the pleadings.

15(b) allows the pleadings to conform.

So basically, in her own motion, it basically asks for a change of legal custody, physical custody and my client's visitation. So she was on notice that those issues were before the court.

It's not like we came in here for a child support modification and all of a sudden we have these orders entered. Orders were entered for the protections of this — of these children, that they sat there and Judge Nathan looked at 'em and the boys said the same thing to her and she believed them that they had said to CPS investigators about her boyfriend beating them.

And so that's why -- the judge didn't change custody. He -- he didn't -- she didn't even do any substantial modification of visitation. I think my client got

a couple extra hours. She put protections in place.

Mat -- Matzi, the boyfriend, is not to be alone with these children. He's not to discipline these children.

Chevy, the one with the brain injury that she argued about, isn't to wrestle.

And she's just ignoring your orders and basically moving forward and doing what she wants because now it's inconvenient because Matzi's not able to watch the children when she's unavailable. So and I understand now that -- I mean, Matzi is working out of state; but, you know, that's just something new and -- and recent. I'm not sure. We'll have to investigate that.

But it comes down to the law in this case, Your

Honor. We came here for an evidentiary hearing. The evidence
was put on in front of the court. We did an interview.

The CPS records -- and that's why NRCP 16.25 that she cites in her motion is irrelevant and moot, Your Honor. That's between the exchange of information between the parties prior to trial. This was basically the court's own record by stipulation that allowed for the interview. And the CPS records are confidentials. So my client had no access to them either. They were revealed because of what the judge found out in that interview.

So this is nothing more than a second bite of the

apple. It's just a bad taste in her mouth. It's not a violation of due process. She had the right to be here. The evidence came up. And, like I said, there's no effect on, substantially, on her parental rights. She still has legal cus -- joint legal custody. She still has primary physical custody. There's been nothing changed.

If you look at the history of this case, I had to print out the register of actions. I came new to the case last year, Your Honor. But this is a long history. She denies filing motion after motion. But I have at least six order to show causes and motions filed since 2013, less than two years, Your Honor. This has just been going on and on and on.

And every time my client does anything that she dislikes, then she just finds a way to drag him back into court and do exactly what she did. What was the relevance, Your Honor, of her going into her background? And you didn't read it. This was her reply. Her reply spent three pages on, I think, on telling you what an awful human being he is and how he had no custodial rights and he violated this and he was in contempt of that. And that's the past.

We moved forward on October $9^{\rm th}$, and we moved forward to where dad's gonna be a substantial part. But you know what the problem is? That tear -- tores her family apart because

her family is her Matzi and these two children. She has to accept that he is the father. He has rights. I'm gonna ask the court to deny the motion in the entirety, address the issue of enforcing the order in our counterclaim.

And then we have a sub -- tangential issue that we may or may not be able to address, technically not before the court; but I'll leave it to the court's discretion and maybe even by stipulation.

I believe this week the defendant is exercising her spring break right. And every year, almost without fail, sometimes there were issues, my client and his father and the two boys go to Monster Jam. I don't know what that is; but it's something with trucks, I imagine; but — and it falls this weekend on Friday and Saturday on her spring break time.

She actually got mad at my client because the boys are so disappointed because mom won't let them go; and she's blaming my client for disappointing the boys, when this is something they do every year; and they didn't realize it was on her spring break.

I've cited in my op -- in my opposition and counter motion a number of times where she's basically denied him his visitation because she's taking them to wrestling or otherwise wasn't available. I would ask the court to consider compensatory time for this weekend, for Friday and Saturday.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Which is your normal weekend, right?

He has his weekend time. Just to allow that -- him to take 'em for those two nights or for the 24- or 36-hour period to allow them to attend Monster Jam together.

And then I'll defer to the court on attorney fees, depending on your decision, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you still asking for a child interview? MR. BELLON: Well, Your Honor, it -- it depends with the court. If the court's gonna move forward, if the case is -her motion is denied and the court's not going to move forward, then, no, because we really want this to end. And we want -- we want to just go to the task of raising the boys.

If -- if you think that for some reason she's entitled to anything, Your Honor, then I think it's -- it's crucial because the evidence that came out was the -- you know, the -- the domestic abuse in the house; and she had made allegations of coaching and things of that nature.

I'll let you know that I don't think -- she keeps raising this issue with CPS and Indiana and that's between Matzi. This CPS report, although it -- it referenced some other issues, talking about domestic violence, this is about these children. It's not about Matzi and his girlfriend or ex-wife in Indiana. This is about these boys saying they've been beaten, so. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

Do you have something?

MS. GORDON: As far as his opposition and counter motion is concerned, it was filed four days late after the date. So if you're going to consider his opposition and counter motion, then I believe my reply should be -- should be considered, as well. I received it on Tuesday, although I know that he had filed it on Friday of last week. And I filed it -- within a couple of days of that, I filed it on Friday, as well. He was also, him and his secretary, Dawn, were e-served, as well as me putting it in the mailbox for him. So they were both served on Friday.

As far as everything that I put in my reply, if you look at the history of this case, I've only been to court a couple times on my motions.

The rest of the time has been status checks on dad because he was under supervised visitation for years, working on getting -- getting his rights back slowly but surely. And only last year did he start to gain his rights back. So when he refers to Monster Jam being a family tradition, he just barely started getting visitations back 2014.

There -- there was -- there -- there's been several issues. I'm not gonna go back and forth because there's plenty of things to show in the court orders; and I'd be happy

to refer to any of them that you would like, to show that the majority of the orders in this court have been made against Matthew.

In his opposition and counter motion, they keep complaining about Chevy wrestling. Chevy is the one in my original motion that I filed on August 4th that I brought to this court's attention that has a -- a medical condition, it's called Chiari malformation type 1.

It's where his -- the cerebellum in the back of your head right here, protrudes into his -- into his spinal column. He had decompression surgery in July of 2013, and it went really bad so they had to remove the cerebral tonsils and part of his skull and part of his -- his neck bone.

He hasn't wrestled in years; however, they'd like to be -- you believe that -- that he was ordered to not wrestle. Chevy has never been ordered by this court not to wrestle. Weston, the older son, was ordered back in 2011 not to participate in any wrestling activities. And I can tell you where that's at. March 29th, 2011, is where the order's at for that. And that's Weston only.

Since then, the boys -- because Matthew and his mother filed CPS reports back in 2011, those were the ones where they were deemed parental alienation and coaching on Matthew's part. They -- since then, Judge Nathan had the --

the children go to Dr. Stinsler (ph), a child psychologist.

That was again back in 2011, prior to Matth -- Matthew having any unsupervised visitations.

Since -- since then, she had changed her orders because everything that was -- was deemed unsubstantiated when the reports came back and that the children had been coached, if the children felt that they wanted to wrestle, at the time specifically Weston, that they could con -- continue to do so with the psychologist's recommendation.

So when we were having problems and we came back on a status check after Matthew filed a motion to enforce his child visitation when he hadn't seen the children in two years and didn't -- never exercised the supervised visitation, we came back on November 7th; and the minutes were filed.

And Judge Nathan ordered if there are any scheduled wrestling tournaments for the children while they are in father's custody, father is to make sure they get there. And that's because whenever Matthew does have any time, he doesn't take them. He doesn't want to follow any of that.

Then she -- she made another order on February 11th, 2014, just this last year, if the children have wrestling clinics on dad's time, dad shall pick up the children after the clinics are done. This has been an ongoing problem. And this really doesn't have anything to do with my motions today,

but that was in the opposition and counter motion, and there's several things.

Mr. Bellon continuously files these misleading papers with nothing but falsities in -- in the entirety where I can document everything that they say and then they come in here to the courtroom and say, well, we didn't know about this and we -- and they make apologies.

Like -- like Matzi being out of town, he's been out of state for almost four months now. And in his opposition and counter motion, he claims that he's still beating the children. This is how far this has gone. This is -- this is horrible what they're putting us through and that it continues.

And these are being filed, I believe, with malicious intent from both parties, from him and my spouse's ex. All we're trying to be is the stable parents here. That's all we've ever tried to be. We built structure; and then since both of them came back into the children's lives, it's been nothing but spite.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BELLON: The only thing I'll --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. BELLON: -- I'll mention, Your Honor, is that we're not filing motions. We're filing responses. She's filing

motions to put us in this court. And of course everything we say is a lie, and we're the awful human beings, and she's the great parent, and she doesn't -- I think it speaks for itself, Your Honor. I don't even want to go into it. I'll defer to the court.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, really what's in front of me is mo -- mom's request to reconsider and for a new trial and to have relief from what the prior judge --

MS. GORDON: Yes.

THE COURT: -- did.

I've looked at the record, and I don't think that there was anything inappropriate. So I'm denying your motion. And I think -- and as far as this weekend and Monster Truck, that's something you're gonna have to work out between yourselves because that's not properly in front of me today. So I'm denying the motion.

MR. BELLON: And I'll just ask the court with regards for attorney fees. (Indiscernible) here, my clients been 25 or 35

THE COURT: I think -- I think that there -- that mom had a good faith belief that there was a problem. So I'm not gonna grant attorney's fees.

But, legally, I -- I can't grant your -- your request.

1	So, Mr. Bellon, could you prepare the order?
2	MR. BELLON: I will, Your Honor, for your court's
3	signature.
4	THE COURT: All right. We're adjourned.
5	MR. BELLON: Thank you very much.
6	(THE PROCEEDING ENDED AT 09:30:33.)
7	
8	* * * *
9	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and
10	correctly transcribed the digital proceedings in the above- entitled case to the best of my ability.
11	Thenny Justice
12	SHERRY JUSTICE
13	Transcriber II
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	