Electronically Filed Jan 10 2022 11:39 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

The Court confirmed that the parties had started using Our Family Wizard for communications. The Court noted that neither party had filed an updated Financial Disclosure Form (FDF) and counsel represented that the parties had agreed on the child support matters, to include child support going forward as well as any allegation of child support arrears for the previous year. Counsel

Following oral argument, the Court stated its Findings and Ordered the

THE COURT HEREBY FINDS that pursuant to NRS 125.130(1) a

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that Dr. Paglini's report was delivered on or about January of 2020 and that there was a hearing several days later in front

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that despite the fact that it appears that Judge Gentile wanted the parties to enter a decree resolving all other issues and then go forward with custody, it is troublesome to the Court. Because the decree is a final order, there is not a mechanism under Nevada law to pretend the parties are not resolving all the issues under a final decree, despite the paragraph in the decree

Page 2 of 6

that proports to be a savings clause that would allow Defendant to relitigate the issue of custody. [2:01:18]

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that the proper procedure would have been to resolve the issues pursuant to a marital settlement agreement and incorporate that into a final decree one the issue of custody was addressed in a custody decree that addressed the concerns by Dr. Paglini and Judge Gentile, but that did not happen. [2:01:39]

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that upon review of the Defendant's Motion, the Court shall clarity its position. Contrary to the Defendant's motion, the Court's position is that it would not consider any evidence of domestic violence that occurred prior to the decree of divorce as a basis for modifying custody after the decree was entered. [2:02:58]

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that Plaintiff's language towards Defendant on Our Family Wizard was not appropriate. Although the Plaintiff had concerns, his language escalated the conflict and was not acceptable to the Court. [2:27:17]

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that upon review of the current schedule pursuant to the decree and after hearing from the parties, the current schedule is not in the best interests of the children. There are too many exchanges between the parties, it is a ridiculous and terrible schedule that increases the conflict between the parties, puts the parties in each other's business too much, and is contrary to the best interests of the children. [2:15:30-2:36:10]

THE COURT FURTHER FINDS that after hearing from the Defendant, vacation time with each parent is in the best interests of the children and there is no

they are both present at a function, they shall avoid one another. Dad is responsible for himself and mom is responsible for ensuring that maternal grandfather stays away from dad.

Maternal grandfather may attend sports games, recitals, school plays, and school performances.

Maternal grandfather may NOT attend custody exchanges, doctor appointments for the minor children, or parent-teacher conferences. [2:41:33]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion regarding vacation time is granted in part. Each party shall have an additional week (seven days) of vacation time with the children each summer. The parties are required to give each other 30 days notice of their intent to exercise vacation, provide the other parent an itinerary, and allow the children to communicate with the other parent. [2:45:10]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that during vacation the parties shall allow the children to communicate with the other parent for 15 minutes each Sunday, Tuesday, and Thursday. As the children are too young for their own phones, the parents are ordered to cooperate and communicate to ensure that the video calls take place in a peaceful and orderly manner. The parties are admonished to be reasonable, communication with each other, to not call each other names, not to make accusations against each other, and to avoid escalating any conflicts. [2:50:20]

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that each party shall submit the information required in NRS 125B.055, NRS 125.130 and NRS 125.230 on a separate form to the Court and the Welfare Division of the Department of Human Resources within ten days from the date this Decree is filed. Such information shall be maintained by the Clerk in a confidential manner and not part of the public record. The parties shall update the information filed with the Court and the Welfare Division of the Department of Human

Resources within ten days should any of that information become inaccurate.

THE PARTIES ARE ON NOTICE of the following provision of NRS 125C.0045(6):

PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF ORDER: THE ABDUCTION, CONCEALMENT OR DETENTION OF A CHILD IN VIOLATION OF THIS ORDER IS PUNISHABLE AS A CATEGORY D FELONY AS PROVIDED IN NRS 193.130.

NRS 200.359 provides that every person having a limited right of custody to a child or any parent having no right of custody to the child who willfully detains, conceals or removes the child from a parent, guardian or other person having lawful custody or a right of visitation of the child in violation of an order of this court, or removes the child from the jurisdiction of the court without the consent of either the court or all persons who have the right to custody or visitation is subject to being punished for a category D felony as provided in NRS 193.130.

THE PARTIES ARE ON NOTICE that the terms of the Hague Convention of October 25, 1980, adopted by the 14th Session of the Hague Conference on Private International Law, apply if a parent abducts or wrongfully retains a child in a foreign country. The parties are also put on notice of the following provision of NRS 125C.0045(8):

If a parent of the child lives in a foreign country or has significant commitments in a foreign country:

27

28

(a) The parties may agree, and the court shall include in the order for custody of the child, that the United States is the country of habitual residence of the child for the purposes of applying the terms of the Hague Convention as set forth in subsection 7.

(b) Upon motion of one of the parties, the court may order the parent to post a bond if the court determines that the parent poses an imminent risk of wrongfully removing or concealing the child outside the country of habitual residence. The bond must be in an amount determined by the court and may be used only to pay for the cost of locating the child and returning him to his habitual residence if the child is wrongfully removed from or concealed outside the country of habitual residence. The fact that a parent has significant commitments in a foreign country does not create a presumption that the parent poses an imminent risk of wrongfully removing or concealing the child.

THE PARTIES ARE ON NOTICE that the parties are subject to the relocation requirements of NRS 125C.006 & NRS 125C.0065. If joint or primary physical custody has been established pursuant to an order, judgment or decree of a court and one parent intends to relocate his or her residence to a place outside of this State or to a place within this State that is at such a distance that would substantially impair the ability of the other parent to maintain a meaningful relationship with the child, and the relocating parent desires to take the child with him or her, the relocating parent shall, before relocating: (a) attempt to obtain the written consent of the nonrelocating parent to relocate with the child; and (b) if the non-relocating parent refuses to give that consent, petition the court for permission to move and/or for primary physical custody for the purpose of relocating. A parent who desires to relocate with a child has the burden of proving that relocating with the child is in the best interest of the child. The court may award reasonable attorney's fees and costs to the relocating parent if the court finds that the non-relocating parent refused to consent to the relocating parent's relocation with the child without having reasonable grounds for such refusal, or for the purpose of harassing the relocating parent. A parent who relocates with a child pursuant to this section without the written consent of the other parent or the permission of the court is subject to the provisions of NRS 200.359.

THE PARTIES ARE ON NOTICE that if this order includes a child support order and you want to adjust the amount of child support established in this order, you must file a motion to modify the order with or submit a stipulation to the court. If a motion to modify the order is not filed or a stipulation is not submitted, the child support obligation established in this order will continue until such time as all children who are the subject of this order reach 18 years of age or, if the youngest child who is subject to this order is still in high school when he or she reaches 18 years of age, when the child graduates from high school or reaches 19 years of age, whichever comes first. Unless the parties agree otherwise in a stipulation, any modification made pursuant to a motion to modify the order will be effective as of the date the motion was filed.

THE PARTIES ARE ON NOTICE that the parties are subject to the provisions of NRS 31A and 125.007 regarding the collection of delinquent child support payments.

THE PARTIES ARE ON NOTICE that either party may request a review of child support every three years pursuant to NRS 125B.145.

CSERV

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Devin Bryson Reed, Plaintiff

CASE NO: D-18-568055-D

VS.

DEPT. NO. Department Z

Amanda Raelene Reed, Defendant.

10

24

25

26

27

28

AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District Court. The foregoing Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system to all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:

Service Date: 7/21/2021

e File

efile@naimicerceo.com

Alex Ghibaudo

alex@glawvegas.com

Michancy Cramer

michancy@glawvegas.com

Electronically Filed 8/12/2021 3:19 PM Steven D. Grierson

COS RACHEAL H. MASTEL, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 11646 KAINEN LAW GROUP, PLLC 3303 Novat Street, Suite 200 Telephone: (702) 823-4900 Facsimile: (702) 823-4488 service@KainenLawGroup.com Attorney for Defendant

> DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

DEVIN REED,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO: D-18-586055-D DEPT NO: Z

VS.

8

9

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

KAINEN LAW GROUP, PLLC

Las Vegas, Nevada 89129 702.823.4900 • Fax 702.823.4488 3303 Novat Street, Suite 200

AMANDA REED.

Defendant.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the Land of August, 2021, I caused to be served the following documents:

Notice of Filing Cost Bond (Received by Court 8.5.21)

BY MAIL: Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I caused a true copy thereof to be placed in the U.S. Mail, enclosed in a sealed envelope, postage fully prepaid thereon, addressed as follows:

BY CERTIFIED MAIL: I caused a true copy thereof to be placed in the U.S. Mail, enclosed in a sealed envelope, certified mail, return receipt requested, postage fully paid thereon, addressed as follows:

27

24

28

APPX1339

1	DV FACSIMUE, Down and EDOD ZOC I
2	BY FACSIMILE: Pursuant to EDCR 7.26, I caused a true copy thereof to be transmitted, via facsimile, to the following number(s):
3	· 图1000 - 1000
	X BY ELECTRONIC MAIL: Pursuant to EDCR 7.26 and NEFCR Rule 9, I
4	caused a true copy thereof to be served via electronic mail, via Wiznet, to the following
- 5	e-mail address(es):
6	Michancy@glawvegas.com
7	Alex@glawvegas.com
8	Efile@naimicerceo.com
9	14/1/
10	1 act lettage
11	An Employee of KAINEN LAW ROUP, PLLC
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
79.4	
20	
21	Bernetan properties and the commence of the co
22	
23	
24	
25	BOTONIO TRANSPORTATION OF THE CONTRACT OF THE
26	
27	
28	

Page 2 of 2

Electronically Filed 8/12/2021 3:19 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

NTC RACHEAL H. MASTEL, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 11646 KAINEN LAW GROUP, PLLC 3303 Novat Street, Suite 200 Las Vegas, Nevada 89129 Telephone: (702) 823-4900 Facsimile: (702) 823-4488 service@KainenLawGroup.com Attorney for Defendant

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

DEVIN REED,

Plaintiff,

VS.

AMANDA REED,

Defendant.

CASE NO: D-18-586055-D DEPT NO: Z

NOTICE OF FILING COST BOND

Please take notice that Defendant, AMANDA REED, has posted cash (check or credit card) in the amount of \$500 for the costs on appeal, pursuant to NRAP7.

Dated this 4 day of August, 2021.

KAINEN LAW GROUP, PLLC

By:

RACHEAL H. MASTEL, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 11646 3303 Novat Street, Suite 200 Las Vegas, Nevada 89129 Attorney for Defendant

RECEIVED

AUG 0 5 2021 CLERK OF THE COURT

APPX1341

28

94-77/1224

PAY TO THE ORDER OF

8/5/2021

**500.00

Clark County District Court

DOLLARS

Clark County District Court

MEMO

Cost of Bond Appeal - Reed

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS HEAT SEASITIVE INK. TOUCH OR PRESS HERE. RED MAGE DISARPEARS WITH HEA 1100709611 # 1 2 24 00 7 7 9 # O 6 1 2 0 6 7 4 6 2 m

KAINEN LAW GROUP, PLLC Las Vegas, NV 89129

7096

8/5/2021

Clark County District Court

Check # 7096

Date

Type Bill

Reference

Description

Original Amount

Balance Due

Payment

8/5/2021

08042021

Cost of Bond Appeal - ...

500.00

500.00

500.00

NSB Operating 7462

500.00

FILE COPY FILED

TRANS

DEC 15 2021

COPY

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT FAMILY DIVISION

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

8

10

11

12

13

2

3

4

5

6

7

DEVIN BRYSON REED, Plaintiff,

vs.

AMANDA RAELENE REED,

Defendant.

CASE NO. D-18-568055-D

APPEAL NO. 83354, 79095

DEPT. Z

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

BEFORE THE HONORABLE DENISE GENTILE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

TRANSCRIPT RE: ALL PENDING MOTIONS

TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 2019

D-8-568055-D REED 08/27/2019 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

1	APPEARANG	CES:	
2		Plaintiff: the Plaintiff:	DEVIN BRYSON REED LOUIS SCHNEIDER, ESQ. 430 S. 7th Street
4			Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 435-2121
5		Defendant: the Defendant:	AMANDA RAELENE REED KARI HANRATTY, ESQ.
6			1815 Village Ctr. Dr. #140
7			Las Vegas, Nevada 89134 (702) 821-1379
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14 15			
16	•		
17			
18			
19			
20			
2 1 22			
23			
24			
	1		

D-8-568055-D REED 08/27/2019 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

1

PROCEEDINGS

3

(THE PROCEEDINGS BEGAN AT 4:17:38)

4

5

6

THE COURT: We're on the record in the Reed matter, case D-568055. Counsel?

7

8

MR. SCHNEIDER: Your Honor, good afternoon. Louis Schneider, 9683, on behalf of Devin Reed. Devin is the father. He is present, Your Honor.

Amanda Reed, who is present. This is my assistant, Carrie

9

THE COURT: That he is. Okay.

10

MS. HANRATTY: Kari Hanratty, 7677, on behalf of

12

13

Coles (ph).

14

THE COURT: Okay. Did you say your name was Kari?

15

MS. HANRATTY: We have four Karis, all family law.

16

MR. SCHNEIDER: It's a nightmare when you're calling

17 her.

18

MS. HANRATTY: She's -- you can call her Casey (ph).

19

She's been with me for almost 15 years.

2021

THE COURT: Yeah, because it -- I mean -- I'm not going to say any more.

22

MS. HANRATTY: Yeah. Well, try it --

23

THE COURT: The other Kari --

24

MS. HANRATTY: -- when we all -- when you're trying

D-8-568055-D REED 08/27/2019 TRANSCRIPT
VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

to -- when I had Holly (ph) and Carrie, and you're going to meet the brown haired girl with like, a bob. 3 THE COURT: Everybody looks the same. MS. HANRATTY: Yeah. Our office has always been a little confusing. MR. SCHNEIDER: This is my Mindy (ph), Your Honor. 7 She's my legal secretary. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MR. SCHNEIDER: She wants to go to law school. I'm trying to dissuade her. THE COURT: And maybe --11 MS. HANRATTY: And she's a bet -- she'll be a better 12 lawyer than Louis. 13 14 MR. SCHNEIDER: Oh, that's nice. So -- and we were 15 getting along so nicely. THE COURT: All right. 16 17 MS. HANRATTY: Okay. THE COURT: So -- so you all want to put --18 19 MS. HANRATTY: Yes. You want --20 THE COURT: -- what we're going to do --21 MS. HANRATTY: -- me to this? 22 THE COURT: -- on the record? 23 MS. HANRATTY: And you tell -- correct me if I'm 24 wrong?

> D-8-568055-D REED 08/27/2019 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

MR. SCHNEIDER: Take a shot at it.

MS. HANRATTY: Okay. So, Your Honor, we are going to dismiss the appeal. I will have Peter James (ph) do that immediately. We are going to vacate the hearing, if your Madam Clerk would be willing to vacate the hearing for the motion to compel for tomorrow. That is going to be vacated. Louis will answer discovery within 30 days. I'm assuming if there's any issues, we will deal with that issue when it arises. We are going to work diligently on settling the financial issues. We are having Scott Dugan (ph) do a joint appraisal, which -- of the house, which we will both stipulate is the price. At that point, we will negotiate final settlement on the house. We have 60 days to do that. If that doesn't happen, then Louis can file a motion to sell the house.

THE COURT: Really? I thought you were just going to put it on the market. Remember, I said three people -- three people, one -- three Realtors, one pick? No?

MS. HANRATTY: Well, my only issue with that is if we don't agree on -- are you going to agree on just Malmquist straight up?

MR. SCHNEIDER: As long as it's --

THE COURT: What do you mean? I don't understand. Why would we have to file a motion? I -- I'm not trying to

D-8-568055-D REED 08/27/2019 TRANSCRIPT
VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

1	throw a wrench in any of it
2	MS. HANRATTY: No
3	THE COURT: I just don't understand.
4	MS. HANRATTY: Well, no. If if it doesn't get
5	settled by then, he would file a motion for the sale, and the
6	reason being is I want to use Malmquist straight up. And I
7	don't know if Louis is going to want to use Malmquist straight
8	up.
9	THE COURT: What do you mean? Versus what?
10	MS. HANRATTY: I don't know.
11	MR. SCHNEIDER: Your Honor
12	THE COURT: But what is the motion I I'm
13	trying to figure out why you need a motion versus just list
14	it, and then we can always deal with
15	MR. SCHNEIDER: I prefer to just have it sold.
16	THE COURT: what the calculation is in terms of
17	pardon?
18	MR. SCHNEIDER: I prefer to just have the house sold
19	
20	THE COURT: Yeah.
21	MR. SCHNEIDER: after 60 days, if we don't come
22	to an agreement.
23	THE COURT: Yeah, yeah. Because
24	MS. HANRATTY: If there are issues

D-8-568055-D REED 08/27/2019 TRANSCRIPT VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

2	MS. HANRATTY: if there's I'll put it this
3	way. If there's an issue with the amount that he's entitled
4	to, I will file the motion.
5	THE COURT: But you don't have to know how much he's
6	entitled to. You get it sold, and we can deal
7	MS. HANRATTY: No, no, no. She's buying him out.
8	MR. SCHNEIDER: And we hold it in trust. We hold it
9	we hold the
10	THE COURT: No, no, no
11	MR. SCHNEIDER: disputed amount in trust.
12	THE COURT: Stop, stop, stop, stop. Hold on.
13	MS. HANRATTY: Okay. Sorry.
14	THE COURT: What I'm saying is, within 60 days, if
15	she she's going to buy him out, right?
16	MS. HANRATTY: Yes.
17	THE COURT: If there's an issue as to how much he's
18	entitled to
19	MS. HANRATTY: Yes.
20	THE COURT: within that 60 days, then that is
21	really what needs to be addressed with the Court, not that you
22	do a motion for sale. I think they need to then then put
23	the money, whatever she thinks he's entitled to, or whatever

THE COURT: -- it just delays it --

24 they disagree on, maybe put that in --

1	MS. HANRATTY: Oh, we can do that.
2	THE COURT: in trust in trust, so that it's
3	there, and it's paid
4	MS. HANRATTY: Uh-huh.
5	MR. SCHNEIDER: Right.
6	THE COURT: and he knows he's paid up to the
7	total amount
8	MS. HANRATTY: Uh-huh.
9	THE COURT: that is in dispute, right?
10	MR. SCHNEIDER: Just the disputed amount in trust.
11	THE COURT: Yeah.
12	MS. HANRATTY: Just the disputed amount in trust
13	MR. SCHNEIDER: The rest will be divided.
14	MS. HANRATTY: Yeah. I don't that I think
15	that's great. I don't yeah. I'm good with that.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Yeah, that makes sense.
17	MS. HANRATTY: So he would she
18	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yeah.
19	THE COURT: So if she says
20	MS. HANRATTY: We would we each get the agreed
21	upon share
22	THE COURT: Right. So let's just say she's
23	buying okay, I'm going to be thinking out loud again, but

let's just say that she's buying -- she thinks he's entitled

```
1
  to 30,000 --
 2
             MS. HANRATTY: Uh-huh.
 3
            THE COURT: -- and he thinks he's entitled to
    40,000. She would pay him 30, and put 10 in the trust --
 5
             MS. HANRATTY: Yes.
 6
             THE COURT: -- and we would determine whether the 10
 7
   goes --
 8
             MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
 9
             MS. HANRATTY: Yes.
           THE COURT: -- to him.
10
             MS. HANRATTY: That sounds --
11
12
             THE COURT: Okay. Makes total sense. Okay.
13
             MS. HANRATTY: And I don't think we have a problem
14
   with it going in trust?
15
             THE COURT: So then that way --
16
           MR. SCHNEIDER: No.
             THE COURT: -- you don't slow the -- that
17
18
   down. Okay?
19
             MS. HANRATTY: Great resolution.
20
             THE COURT: If she's not going to buy him out in 60
   days, then it needs to immediately just go for sale.
21
22
            MS. HANRATTY: Uh-huh.
23
            MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.
24
             MS. HANRATTY: And we will --
```

D-8-568055-D REED 08/27/2019 TRANSCRIPT
VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

THE COURT: On that --MS. HANRATTY: -- contact Scott Dugan immediately, 3 because we need the appraisal done very quickly.

1

2

4

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Okay. So if by chance you know, let's say in 50 days that it's not going to happen, she's decided, I can't do it, it's not worth it, or whatever, then -- within -before that 60-day time frame hits --

MS. HANRATTY: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: -- I want somebody to pick three names for a Realtor and the other person to pick the one name, so that you can get on it on that sixty-first day --

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MS. HANRATTY: We'll pick the three names, you pick the person from the list.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Sure. We'll talk.

THE COURT: Perfect.

MS. HANRATTY: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay. So that way on the sixtieth day, you can pull the trigger on the name, and they can call the Realtor, and you want to get that house listed. I just want to kind of set parameters --

MS. HANRATTY: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- within that next 10 days.

TRANSCRIPT D-8-568055-D REED 08/27/2019 VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION, LLC (520) 303-7356

1	MS. HANRATTY: Yeah.
2	THE COURT: Okay?
3	MS. HANRATTY: Absolutely.
4	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
5	THE COURT: So that way, you've got the cont
6	everybody meets to get the contract signed and all that kind
7	of stuff, and the Realtor would make recommendations as to
8	what the price would be.
9	MR. SCHNEIDER: And, Your Honor, I don't want to
10	again, I don't want to try and throw a wrench in this, either,
11	but just based on past experiences, I want the Court to order
12	whoever's in the home, that they cooperate with the sale of
13	the house
14	THE COURT: Right.
15	MS. HANRATTY: Oh, absolutely.
16	MR. SCHNEIDER: and they let the Realtor in, and
17	
18	THE COURT: Cooperate with the sale, the
19	MS. HANRATTY: Keep it in sellable condition
20	THE COURT: Make sure it looks in sellable
21	condition.
22	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
23	MS. HANRATTY: and so on.
24	THE COURT: And you can include all that in your

order. 2 MS. HANRATTY: Uh-huh. 3 MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you. 4 MS. HANRATTY: I think we're also agreeing to take the arrears out of the -- we'll determine what the arrears are and take them out of the sale. 7 MR. SCHNEIDER: There's a child support arrears, Your Honor, and we're in agreement that the -- that Mom will 8 be paid that child support arrears out of the sale of the 10 house. 11 THE COURT: Okay. MS. HANRATTY: Yeah. 12 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MS. HANRATTY: The -- we've agreed to use 15 Dr. Paglini as a custody evaluator. 16 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 17 MS. HANRATTY: My client will pay for Dr. Paglini. 18 Obviously, the Plaintiff will participate, and the children. 19 There will be psychologicals and everything at that time. 20 We'll come back. I'm assuming it's going to take Dr. Paglini 21 90 days to do this eval --22 THE COURT: Probably. 23 MS. HANRATTY: -- is my thought. We'll have a

1

24

return date at that time, and the Court will make a decision

2 custody trial. 3 THE COURT: I think -- and the way we talked about 4 this, I know we talked about this off the record, if the recommendation from Dr. Paglini is there's no need to change 5 6 what's there, right? 7 MS. HANRATTY: Right. 8 THE COURT: That I think that the parties should 9 continue doing what they're doing, or some modified version 10 thereof that doesn't change -- upend everything, right? 11 MS. HANRATTY: Right. 12 THE COURT: Then I think everybody -- we've agreed 13 that that will just be what happens. 14 MS. HANRATTY: Yeah. 1.5 THE COURT: Then -- then if in fact, there is an 16 issue that is raised by Dr. Paglini and potential 17 recommendations that change things, then at that point, parties can either stipulate or I am then -- I will then make 18 19 a determination to -- to proceed --20 MS. HANRATTY: Okay. 21 THE COURT: -- on -- on a trial because then there 22 would be adequate cause. 23 MS. HANRATTY: Right. 24 THE COURT: So we're doing -- like, we're doing this

on whether there's enough to proceed to a modification of

1 1

1	a little differently, but I think it makes the most sense
2	MS. HANRATTY: Oh, it absolutely
3	THE COURT: to keep them from having to
4	MS. HANRATTY: it makes great sense
5	THE COURT: litigate something that they may not
6	really have to litigate, and it gives them some closure and
7	some understanding, and some additional input, and all of
8	those things that will help them get to the end of this thing.
9	MS. HANRATTY: Can
10	THE COURT: In the meantime, though, I want a
11	decree. I want a decree that has we already because
12	remember, we're doing we got to make sure we keep the
13	the case clean, so we have if they they've reached a
14	deal on the financials, we need to put a decree in place.
15	MS. HANRATTY: Once we
16	THE COURT: Make sense?
1.7	MS. HANRATTY: have the deal.
18	THE COURT: Yeah. Right.
19	MS. HANRATTY: Oh. Okay. I'm like, I'm not going
20	to do that right now.
21	THE COURT: Yeah, I know. Once we have a deal.
22	MS. HANRATTY: Right. Okay.
23	THE COURT: I want a decree. Once you know what
24	your deal is, put it in a decree, we can

1	MS. HANRATTY: Absolutely.
2	THE COURT: finalize that, and then we're just
3	reopening
4	MS. HANRATTY: Uh-huh.
5	THE COURT: on the custody issue with regard to
6	the eval, reopening only for purposes of the eval, and then
7	determining do we go forward?
8	MS. HANRATTY: Right.
9	THE COURT: Okay?
10	MS. HANRATTY: The only issue that may seem to be is
11	the medical, because she's supplying it. We can deal with all
12	those. If those issues do come back, because they're
13	they're related to financials, if we I think we can settle
14	it all
15	MR. SCHNEIDER: What do you mean, the medical?
16	MS. HANRATTY: He she's providing medical. We
17	just need him to pay half of it, or things like that.
18	MR. SCHNEIDER: That's easy.
19	MS. HANRATTY: We can all resolve that. If not,
20	we'll resolve it at the return hearing if there's any issues
21	that come up like that.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm confident we can resolve it.
24	MS. HANRATTY: I agree with

MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct, Judge.

24