

FILED

JUN 09 2016

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *Tracie K. Lindeman*
DEPUTY CLERK

Form 13. Pro Se Child Custody Fast Track Response

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Javier Ramirez Rivas

No. 69823

Appellant,

vs.

Mayra Arreguin

Respondent,

PRO SE FAST TRACK RESPONSE

1. Name of party filing this fast track response:

Mayra E. Arreguin

2. Name, law firm, address, and telephone number of attorney

or proper person respondent submitting this fast track response:

No legal representation.

3. Proceedings raising same issues. If you are aware of any

other appeal or original proceeding presently pending before this court,

which

raise the same legal issue(s) you intend to raise in this appeal, list the case

name(s) and docket number(s) of those proceedings:

Not aware of other proceedings.

4. Procedural history. Briefly describe the procedural history

of the case only if dissatisfied with the history set forth in the fast track

RECEIVED

JUN 08 2016

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
DEPUTY CLERK

16-17985

statement (provide citations for every assertion of fact to the appendix or record, if any, or to the transcript or rough draft transcript):

Judge has the education and preparation to be capable of making decisions based on our testimonies. Judge makes determinations based on facts not favoritism. Appellants assertions are irrelevant.

5. Statement of facts. Briefly set forth the facts material to the issues on appeal only if dissatisfied with the statement set forth in the fast track statement (provide citations for every assertion of fact to the appendix or record, if any, or to the transcript or rough draft transcript):

Mr. Ramirez was arrested on August 10, 2014 and charged with child abuse for hitting our son Eduardo Ramirez because he was not obeying his father (ccso case# 14.4653, Carson City Justice & Municipal court) case # 14.CR01226 1C.

A TPO was filed after this incident (Case # 14 PO 000391003113 Dept. No. 1 Pro No. 190144) which only lasted a month and then he was reinstated to see our son Adrian Ramirez. Our son Eduardo lasted more time without seen his father because his emotional state was affected; he reinstated after a few weeks with supervised visitation. After Eduardo was reinstated his

stress level and fear to be hit by his father increased, the encopresis and incontinence got a lot worse.

The 2nd TPO that I requested was for me, for my protection as I felt threatened and intimidated by Mr. Ramirez. The main reason for the TPO was for precaution, the way he reacts is unpredictable and worried me.

The motions and other requests to be involved with our son's health and activities made by Mr. Ramirez were denied due to his behavior. It is true that Mr. Diego Arreguin was not called to testify while in court but an investigation was made and if Judge Russell had seen it necessary then I do believe that he would had called Mr. Diego to testify. There is an allegation from Mr. Ramirez that Mrs. Evelyn an employee at the court has favoritism and sympathy towards me because she was my teacher, this is a false. I have never in my life attended school in the State of Nevada. I am not sure what he is trying to achieve by using false statements.

6. Issues on appeal. State concisely your response to the principal issue(s) in this appeal:

Mr. Ramirez states that prolonged alienation of our children will only increase their lack of interest at school but I disagree. Our son Adrian Ramirez is in summer school not due to a lack of interest. It was a

suggestion by an Empire Elementary School teacher so that his learning capabilities do not decrease while he is in vacation.

I have not been asked to attend anger management or parenting classes but I have been assisting therapy with our children for about 3 years with Kristopher Komarek and if were to be necessary I believe that the therapist would had order classes for me long time ago. We work with Eduardo and Adrian Ramirez to have discipline, communication and respect outside and within our home and to manage our emotional states.

The statement that Mr. Ramirez made, by writing on paper that he served me a copy on April 16th 2016 of the Pro Se Child Custody Fast Track is a false statement. I was served by a man while I was at work; he was the one who gave me a copy of the Pro se Fast Track. My job is able to provide evidence of this occurrence.

7. Legal argument, including authorities:

VERIFICATION

1. I hereby certify that this fast track response complies with the formatting requirements of NRAP 32(a)(4), the typeface requirements of NRAP 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of NRAP 32(a)(6) because:

☐ This fast track response has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using [state name and version of word processing program] in [state font size and name of type style]; or

☒ This fast track response has been prepared in a monospaced typeface using [state name and version of word processing program] with [state number of characters per inch and name of type style].

2. I further certify that this fast track response complies with the page- or type-volume limitations of NRAP 3E(e)(2) because it is either:

☒ Proportionately spaced, has a typeface of 14 points or more, and contains 994 words; or

☐ Monospaced, has 10.5 or fewer characters per inch, and contains ____ words or ____ lines of text; or

☒ Does not exceed _6_ pages.

3. Finally, I recognize that under NRAP 3E I am responsible for timely filing a fast track response and that the Supreme Court of Nevada may impose sanctions for failing to timely file a fast track response. I therefore certify that the information provided in this fast track response is true and complete to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Dated this9th..... day ofJune.....2016.,

.....

(Signature of Respondent)

...Mayra...E...Arreguin.....

(Print Name of Respondent)

...Mayra...Arreguin.....

(Address)

...1756 Russell Wx Apt. E.....

(City/State/Zip)

...Carson City Nu. 89706.....

(Telephone Number)

(775) 241-7138