

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA**

**\* \* \***

ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER,

Appellant,

vs.

CHALESE MARIE SOLINGER,

Respondent.

---

) Case No.: 84832-COA

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

Electronically Filed  
Nov 22 2022 08:20 AM  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

**APPELLANT'S APPENDIX  
VOLUME 18**

Vincent Mayo, Esq.  
Nevada State Bar Number: 8564  
The Abrams & Mayo Law Firm  
6252 South Rainbow Blvd., Suite 100  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89118  
Tel.: (702) 222-4021  
Attorney for Appellant

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing *Appellant's Appendix* was filed electronically with the Clerk of the Court of Appeals of Nevada in the above-entitled matters on Monday, November 21, 2022. Electronic service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List, pursuant to NEFCR 9, as follows:

Alex Ghibaud, Esq.  
Michancy Cramer, Esq.  
Attorneys for Respondent

/s/ David J. Schoen, IV, ACP  
An employee of The Abrams & Mayo Law Firm

## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
01/04/2019	Complaint For Divorce	1	1 - 6
01/04/2019	Request For Issuance Of Joint Preliminary Injunction	1	7
01/09/2019	Summons	1	8 - 9
01/09/2019	Proof Of Service	1	10
01/11/2019	Joint Preliminary Injunction	1	11 - 12
01/29/2019	Default	1	13
01/31/2019	Affidavit Of Resident Witness	1	14 - 15
02/01/2019	Certificate Of Completion COPE Class	1	16 - 18
02/01/2019	General Financial Disclosure Form	1	19 - 25
02/04/2019	Answer And Counterclaim	1	26 - 34
02/05/2019	Ex Parte Motion To Vacate Or Continue Hearing	1	35 - 39
02/07/2019	Amended Answer And Counterclaim	1	40 - 47
02/07/2019	Defendant's Motion To Set Aside Default; For Exclusive Possession Of The Marital Residence And Order Plaintiff To Assist In Making Mortgage Payments; For Medical Legal Custody Of The Minor Children, For An Order Referring The Parties To Mediation Pursuant To EDCR 5.70, For An Order Awarding Plaintiff Child Support; For An Order Awarding Plaintiff Alimony; And For Attorney Fees And Costs	1	48 - 61
02/07/2019	Amended Motion To Set Aside Default; For Exclusive Possession Of The Marital Residence And Ordering Plaintiff To Assist In Making Mortgage Payments; For Medical Legal Custody Of The Minor Children, For An Order Referring The Parties To Mediation Pursuant To EDCR 5.70, For An Order Awarding Defendant Child Support For An Order Awarding Defendant Alimony; And For Attorney Fees And Costs	1	62 - 75
02/07/2019	Order Setting Case Management Conference And Directing Compliance With NRCP 16.2	1	76 - 85
02/07/2019	Order For Family Mediation Center Services	1	86
02/14/2019	Notice Of Appearance Of Attorney	1	87 - 88
02/14/2019	Petition To Seal Records Pursuant To NRS 125.110(2)	1	89 - 90
02/21/2019	Notice Of 16.2 Early Case Conference	1	91 - 92
02/25/2019	Reply To Counterclaim For Divorce	1	93 - 96

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
02/26/2019	Plaintiff's Opposition To Amended Motion To Set Aside Default; For Exclusive Possession Of The Marital Residence And Ordering Plaintiff To Assist In Making Mortgage Payments; For Medical Legal Custody Of The Minor Children; For An Order Referring The Parties To Mediation Pursuant To EDCR 5.70, For An Order Awarding Plaintiff Child Support; For An Order Awarding Defendant Alimony; And For Attorney's Fees And Costs Primary Physical Custody, Child Support, And Attorney's Fees And Costs And Countermotion For Joint Legal Custody; Primary Physical Custody To Plaintiff And Supervised Visitation To Defendant; To Establish Child Support; To Establish Payment Of Marital Expenses; For An Order Protecting The Parties Community Property; Defendant To Obtain Employment And To Cooperate In A Vocational Assessment	1	97 - 125
02/26/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits To Plaintiff's Opposition To Amended Motion To Set Aside Default; For Exclusive Possession Of The Marital Residence And Ordering Plaintiff To Assist In Making Mortgage Payments; For Medical Legal Custody Of The Minor Children; For An Order Referring The Parties To Mediation Pursuant To EDCR 5.70, For An Order Awarding Plaintiff Child Support; For An Order Awarding Defendant Alimony; And For Attorney's Fees And Costs Primary Physical Custody, Child Support, And Attorney's Fees And Costs And Countermotion For Joint Legal Custody; Primary Physical Custody To Plaintiff And Supervised Visitation To Defendant; To Establish Child Support; To Establish Payment Of Marital Expenses; For An Order Protecting The Parties Community Property; Defendant To Obtain Employment And To Cooperate In A Vocational Assessment	1	126 - 173
02/26/2019	General Financial Disclosure Form	1	174 - 184
03/12/2019	Order To Seal Records Pursuant To NRS 125.110(2)	1	185 - 186
03/13/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order To Seal Records	1	187 - 191
03/18/2019	Reply To Opposition And Countermotion	1	192 - 195

## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
03/18/2019	Appendix Of Supplemental Exhibits To Plaintiff's Opposition To Amended Motion To Set Aside Default; For Exclusive Possession Of The Marital Residence And Ordering Plaintiff To Assist In Making Mortgage Payments; For Medical Legal Custody Of The Minor Children; For An Order Referring The Parties To Mediation Pursuant To EDCR 5.70, For An Order Awarding Plaintiff Child Support; For An Order Awarding Defendant Alimony; And For Attorney's Fees And Costs Primary Physical Custody, Child Support, And Attorney's Fees And Costs And Countermotion For Joint Legal Custody; Primary Physical Custody To Plaintiff And Supervised Visitation To Defendant; To Establish Child Support; To Establish Payment Of Marital Expenses; For An Order Protecting The Parties Community Property; Defendant To Obtain Employment And To Cooperate In A Vocational Assessment	1	196 - 215
03/19/2019	Case And Non-Jury Trial Management Order	1	216 - 219
03/19/2019	Behavior Order	1	220 - 224
03/20/2019	Notice Of Association Of Counsel	1	225 - 226
04/22/2019	Stipulation And Order Modifying Timeshare	1	227 - 229
04/23/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order Modifying Timeshare	1	230 - 235
05/03/2019	Order After Hearing Of March 19, 2019	1	236 - 250
05/03/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of March 19, 2019	2	251 - 268
05/14/2019	Emergency Motion For A Change Of Custody; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief	2	269 - 299
05/14/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Emergency Motion For A Change Of Custody; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief	2	300 - 391
05/15/2019	Plaintiff's Initial Expert Witness List	2	392 - 400
05/24/2019	Appendix Of Supplemental Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Emergency Motion For A Change Of Custody; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief	2	401 - 404
05/28/2019	Opposition To Plaintiff's Emergency Motion For A Change Of Custody/Spousal Support/Child Support, For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief. Counter Motion For Change Of Custody For Primary Physical And Sole Legal Custody, Psychological Evaluation Of The Plaintiff	2	405 - 419
06/05/2019	Ex Parte Motion For An Order Shortening Time	2	420 - 429
06/11/2019	Reply In Support Of Emergency Motion For A Change Of Custody; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For Change Of Custody For Primary Physical And Sole Legal Custody, Psychological Evaluation Of The Plaintiff	2	430 - 453

## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
06/11/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Reply In Support Of Emergency Motion For A Change Of Custody; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For Change Of Custody For Primary Physical And Sole Legal Custody, Psychological Evaluation Of The Plaintiff	2	454 - 471
06/13/2019	Motion For An Order To Show Cause	2	472 - 484
06/29/2019	Opposition To Motion For An Order To Show Cause And Countermotion	2	485 - 500
07/15/2019	General Fiancial Disclosure Form	3	501 - 511
07/23/2019	Minute Order	3	512 - 514
07/25/2019	Motion For Division Of The Proceeds From The Sale Of The Marital Home, And For Attorney's Fees	3	515 - 520
07/26/2019	Notice Of Entry Of July 23, 2019 Minute Order	3	521 - 524
08/21/2019	Order After Hearing Of June 17, 2019	3	525 - 531
08/22/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of June 17, 2019	3	532 - 541
08/23/2019	Motion To Withdraw And Adjudicate Attorney's Lien	3	542 - 561
08/23/2019	Notice Of Attorney's Lien	3	562 - 564
08/28/2019	Minute Order - No Hearing Held	3	565 - 567
08/28/2019	Substitution Of Attorneys	3	568 - 570
08/28/2019	Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines (First Request)	3	571 - 583
08/28/2019	Exhibits To Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines (First Request)	3	584 - 598
08/28/2019	Notice Of Entry Of August 28, 2019 Minute Order	3	599 - 603
08/29/2019	Ex Parte Motion For Order Shortening Time To Hear Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines (First Request)	3	604 - 608
08/30/2019	Opposition To Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines (First Request); And Countermotion To Strike The Substitution Of Attorneys	3	609 - 624
09/04/2019	Order Shortening Time	3	625 - 626
09/06/2019	Case And Non-Jury Trial Management Order	3	627 - 630
09/09/2019	Defendant, Chalese Solinger's List Of Witnesses For Trial	3	631 - 636
09/09/2019	Notice Of Intent To File Opposition To Prior Counsel's Motion To Adjudicate Attorney's Lien	3	637 - 639
09/13/2019	Opposition To Louis C. Schneider's Motion To Adjudicate Attorney's Lien	3	640 - 650
09/16/2019	Order Setting Case Management Conference And Directing Compliance With NRCp 16.2	3	651 - 652
09/17/2019	Notice Of Seminar Completion	3	653 - 654

## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
09/20/2019	Defendant's Notice Of UNLV Seminar Completion EDCR 5.07	3	655 - 656
09/20/2019	Affidavit Of Resident Witness	3	657 - 658
09/24/2019	General Financial Disclosure Form	3	659 - 669
09/30/2019	Re-Notice Of Hearing For Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines	3	670 - 671
09/30/2019	Defendant's Notice Of Seminar Completion - EDCR 5.302	3	672 - 674
09/30/2019	Ex Parte Motion For Order Shortening Time To Hear Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines	3	675 - 678
10/01/2019	Order Shortening Time	3	679 - 680
10/02/2019	Opposition To Defendant's Renoticed Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines	3	681 - 692
10/02/2019	Defendant's Reply To Opposition To Defendant's Renoticed Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines	3	693 - 702
10/03/2019	Order After Hearing Of August 1, 2019	3	703 - 707
10/04/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of August 1, 2019	3	708 - 715
10/09/2019	Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Attorney's Fees	3	716 - 731
10/09/2019	Exhibits To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Attorney's Fees	4	732 - 803
10/09/2019	Financial Disclosure Form	4	804 - 814
10/23/2019	Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Attorney's Fees And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	4	815 - 842
10/24/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Attorney's Fees And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	4	843 - 850
10/24/2019	Plaintiff's Motion To Compel Discovery Responses And For Attorney's Fees	4	851 - 868
11/04/2019	Reply To Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Attorney's Fees And Opposition To Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	4	869 - 888
11/04/2019	Exhibits To Reply To Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Attorney's Fees And Opposition To Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	4	889 - 930
11/07/2019	Defendant's Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Compel Discovery Responses And For Attorney's Fees	4	931 - 939
11/08/2019	Errata To Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Compel Discovery Responses And For Attorney's Fees	4	940 - 943
11/12/2019	Response In Support Of Opposition	4	944 - 971

## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
11/12/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Response In Support Of Opposition	5	972 - 1038
11/14/2019	Ex Parte Motion For An Order To Release Electronics To Adam's Agent Or, In The Alternative, For An Order Barring The Release Of Electronics Until Further Court Order	5	1039 - 1053
11/15/2019	Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	5	1054 - 1072
11/15/2019	Exhibits To Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	5	1073 - 1109
11/15/2019	Errata To Exhibits To Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	5	1110 - 1112
11/18/2019	Defendant's Response To Plaintiff's Response In Support Of Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Fees And Costs	5	1113 - 1128
11/18/2019	Exhibits To Defendant's Response To Plaintiff's Response In Support Of Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Fees And Costs	5	1129 - 1163
11/19/2019	Motion For Protective Order	5	1164 - 1176
11/20/2019	Application For Order Shortening Time	5	1177 - 1179
11/21/2019	Order Shortening Time	5	1180 - 1181
11/21/2019	Supplemental Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Response In Support Of Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Fees And Costs	5	1182 - 1192
11/21/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order Shortening Time	5	1193 - 1197
11/21/2019	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	5	1198 - 1200
11/22/2019	Defendant's Joinder To Joshua Lloyd's Motion For Protective Order And Countermotion For Fees From Plaintiff To Defendant	5	1201 - 1212
11/22/2019	Exhibits To Defendant's Joinder To Joshua Lloyd's Motion For Protective Order And Countermotion For Fees From Plaintiff To Defendant	5	1213 - 1222
11/22/2019	Order After Hearing Of September 6, 2019	6	1223 - 1225
11/22/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of September 6, 2019	6	1226 - 1231
11/26/2019	Objection To Discovery Commissioners Report And Recommendations Filed November 12, 2019	6	1232 - 1244
11/26/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Objection To Discovery Commissioners Report And Recommendations Filed November 12, 2019	6	1245 - 1280
11/26/2019	Opposition To Mr. Lloyd's Motion For Protective Order And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	6	1281 - 1296
11/26/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Opposition To Mr. Lloyd's Motion For Protective Order And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	6	1297 - 1332



## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
11/29/2019	Plaintiff's Reply In Support Of Motion To Compel Discovery Responses And For Attorney's Fees	6	1333 - 1345
12/02/2019	Reply To Plaintiff's Opposition To Mr. Lloyd's Motion For Protective Order And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	6	1346 - 1373
12/04/2019	Opposition To Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees And Related Relief And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	6	1374 - 1405
12/06/2019	Reply To Opposition To Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	6	1406 - 1415
12/06/2019	Exhibits To Reply To Opposition To Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	7	1416 - 1495
12/06/2019	Second Supplemental Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Response In Support Of Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Fees And Costs	7	1496 - 1536
12/06/2019	Supplemental Declaration To Reply To Opposition To Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	7	1537 - 1539
12/09/2019	Referral Order For Outsourced Evaluation Services	7	1540
12/09/2019	Case And Non Jury Trial Management Order	7	1541 - 1544
12/12/2019	Order After Hearing Of October 3, 2019	7	1545 - 1548
12/12/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of October 3, 2019	7	1549 - 1555
12/12/2019	Plaintiff's Notice Of UNLV Seminar Completion EDCR 5.07	7	1556
12/27/2019	Motion For Reconsideration Of The Court's December 9, 2019 Decision; For Proof Of Chalese's Auto Insurance For The Last Year; And Related Relief	7	1557 - 1575
12/30/2019	Discovery Commissioners Report And Recommendations From 12/06/19 Hearing	7	1576 - 1580
12/31/2019	Plaintiff's Brunzell Affidavit For Attorney's Fees And Costs	7	1581 - 1629
01/02/2020	Defendant's Objection To Plaintiff's Brunzell Affidavit For Attorney's Fees And Costs	7	1630 - 1636
01/03/2020	Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion For Reconsideration Of The Court's December 9, 2019 Decision; For Proof Of Chalese's Auto Insurance For The Last Year; And Related Relief; And Countermotion To Restore Joint Physical Custody And For Attorney's Fees	7	1637 - 1660
01/06/2020	Receipt Of Check	7	1661
01/06/2020	Receipt Of Check	7	1662
01/22/2020	Order On Discovery Commissioner's Report And Recommendations	7	1663 - 1664
01/22/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order	8	1665 - 1668
01/23/2020	Notice Of Withdrawal Of Attorney Of Record	8	1669 - 1671

## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
01/23/2020	Plaintiff's Reply In Support Of Plaintiff's Motion For Reconsideration Of The Court's December 9, 2019 Decision; For Proof Of Chalese's Auto Insurance For The Last Year; And Related Relief; And Opposition To Defendant's Countermotion To Restore Joint Physical Custody And For Attorney's Fees	8	1672 - 1704
01/23/2020	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Reply In Support Of Plaintiff's Motion For Reconsideration Of The Court's December 9, 2019 Decision; For Proof Of Chalese's Auto Insurance For The Last Year; And Related Relief; And Opposition To Defendant's Countermotion To Restore Joint Physical Custody And For Attorney's Fees	8	1705 - 1739
01/23/2020	Discovery Cmmissioner's Report And Recommendations From 12/06/19 Hearing	8	1740 - 1744
01/27/2020	Motion To Withdraw As Attorney Of Record For Defendant	8	1745 - 1753
02/04/2020	Ex Parte Motion For An Order Shortening Time	8	1754 - 1757
02/06/2020	No Contact Order	8	1758 - 1760
02/06/2020	Notice Of Entry Of No Contact Order	8	1761 - 1766
02/06/2020	Order From December 9, 2019 Hearing	8	1767 - 1774
02/06/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order	8	1775 - 1784
02/12/2020	Request For Submission Of Motion To Withdraw As Counsel Of Record	8	1785 - 1786
02/12/2020	Notice Of Non-Opposition To Motion To Withdraw As Attorney Of Record For Defendant	8	1787 - 1788
02/13/2020	Minute Order	8	1789 - 1791
02/19/2020	Order On Discovery Commissioner's Report And Recommendations	8	1792 - 1799
02/20/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order On Discovery Commissioner's Report And Recommendations	8	1800 - 1809
02/20/2020	Order To Withdraw As Counsel Of Record	8	1810 - 1811
02/20/2020	Substituttion Of Attorney	8	1812 - 1814
02/21/2020	Motion For An Order To Show Cause And To Hold Defendant In Contempt Of Court For Violation Of The March 19, 2019 Order, The June 17, 2019 Order, And The Behavior Order Filed March 19, 2019; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief	8	1815 - 1832
02/24/2020	Supplemental Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Motion For Reconsideration Of The Court's December 9, 2019 Decision; For Proof Of Chalese's Auto Insurance For The Last Year; And Related Relief	8	1833 - 1849
02/25/2020	Defendant's Objection To Plaintiff's Supplemental Appendix	8	1850 - 1852
02/26/2020	Request For Child Protection Service Appearance And Records	8	1853
02/26/2020	Order Referring To Judicial Settlement Program	8	1854 - 1855
02/28/2020	Receipt Of Check	8	1856

## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
03/16/2020	Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion For An Order To Show Cause And To Hold Defendant In Contempt Of Court For Violation Of The March 19, 2019 Order, The June 17, 2019 Order, And The Behavior Order Filed March 19, 2019; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Counter Motion To Enforce Phone Contact With The Minor Children And For Attorney's Fees	8	1857 - 1878
03/16/2020	Exhibit Appendix To Plaintiff's Motion For An Order To Show Cause And To Hold Defendant In Contempt Of Court For Violation Of The March 19, 2019 Order, The June 17, 2019 Order, And The Behavior Order Filed March 19, 2019; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Counter Motion To Enforce Phone Contact With The Minor Children And For Attorney's Fees	8	1879 - 1892
03/20/2020	Receipt Of Check	8	1893
03/25/2020	Notice Of Seminar Completion EDCR 5.302	8	1894 - 1896
03/30/2020	Reply In Support Of Motion For An Order To Show Cause And To Hold Defendant In Contempt Of Court For Violation Of The March 19, 2019 Order, The June 17, 2019 Order, And The Behavior Order Filed March 19, 2019; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Partial Opposition To Countermotion To Enforce Phone Contact With The Minor Children And For Attorney's Fees	9	1897 - 1918
03/30/2020	Supplemental Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Reply In Support Of Motion For An Order To Show Cause And To Hold Defendant In Contempt Of Court For Violation Of The March 19, 2019 Order, The June 17, 2019 Order, And The Behavior Order Filed March 19, 2019; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Partial Opposition To Countermotion To Enforce Phone Contact With The Minor Children And For Attorney's Fees	9	1919 - 1959
03/31/2020	Motion For A Change Of Custody Based On Defendant's Endangerment Of The Minor Children; For Marie's Birth Certificate; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief	9	1960 - 1983
03/31/2020	Ex Parte Motion For An Order Shortening Time	9	1984 - 1987
03/31/2020	Stipulation And Order To Provide CPS Records And Drug Test Results To The Child Custody Evaluator	9	1988 - 1990
04/01/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order To Provide CPS Records And Drug Test Results To The Child Custody Evaluator	9	1991 - 1996
04/01/2020	Order Shortening Time	9	1997 - 1998
04/02/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order Shortening Time	9	1999 - 2003
04/02/2020	Substitution Of Attorneys	9	2004 - 2006
04/02/2020	Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion For A Change Of Custody Based On Defendant's Endangerment Of The Minor Children; For Marie's Birth Certificate; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Countermotion For An Order To Show Cause, Compensatory Visitation Time, And Attorney's Fees	9	2007 - 2028

## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
04/03/2020	Reply In Support Of Motion For A Change Of Custody Based On Defendant's Endangerment Of The Minor Children; For Marie's Birth Certificate; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For An Order To Show Cause, Compensatory Visitation Time, And Attorney's Fees	9	2029 - 2045
04/09/2020	Appendix Of Supplemental Exhibits To Plaintiff's Motion For A Change Of Custody Based On Defendant's Endangerment Of The Minor Children; For Marie's Birth Certificate And Related Relief	9	2046 - 2074
04/22/2020	Order From April 6, 2020 Hearing	9	2075 - 2078
04/22/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of April 6, 2020	9	2079 - 2085
04/26/2020	Plaintiff's Motion For An Order To Permit Plaintiff To Retain The Sick Minor Children Pursuant To Their Pediatrician's Directive, For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief	9	2086 - 2099
04/27/2020	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Motion For An Order To Permit Plaintiff To Retain The Sick Minor Children Pursuant To Their Pediatrician's Directive; For Attorney's Fees And Costs Related Relief	9	2100 - 2129
04/28/2020	Opposition To Motion For An Order To Permit Plaintiff To Retain The Sick Minor Children Pursuant To Their Pediatrician's Directive; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Countermotion For Make-Up Visitation Time; To Admonish Plaintiff To Abide By Joint Legal Custody Standards; For Attorney's Fees; And Related Relief	10	2130 - 2162
04/28/2020	Exhibits To Opposition To Motion For An Order To Permit Plaintiff To Retain The Sick Minor Children Pursuant To Their Pediatrician's Directive; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Countermotion For Make-Up Visitation Time; To Admonish Plaintiff To Abide By Joint Legal Custody Standards; For Attorney's Fees; And Related Relief	10	2163 - 2203
05/13/2020	Order After Hearing February 26, 2020	10	2204 - 2211
05/14/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of February 26, 2020	10	2212 - 2222
05/19/2020	Reply In Support Of Motion For An Order To Permit Plaintiff To Retain The Sick Minor Children Pursuant To Their Pediatrician S Directives; For Attorney S Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For Make-Up Visitation Time; To Admonish Plaintiff To Abide By Joint Legal Custody Standards; For Attorney S Fees; And Related Relief	10	2223 - 2242
05/22/2020	Defendant's Motion For An Order To Show Cause As To Why Plaintiff Should Not Be Held In Contempt, For Orders Regarding Health Insurance And Spousal Support, For Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	10	2243 - 2272
05/22/2020	Exhibits To Defendant's Motion For An Order To Show Cause As To Why Plaintiff Should Not Be Held In Contempt, For Order Regarding Health Insurance And Spousal Support, For Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	10	2273 - 2307

## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
05/22/2020	General Financial Disclosure Form	10	2308 - 2317
05/27/2020	Order To Show Cause	10	2318 - 2320
05/27/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order	10	2321 - 2325
06/03/2020	Ex Parte Application For An Order To Show Cause	10	2326 - 2362
06/07/2020	Schedule Of Arrearages	10	2363 - 2366
06/19/2020	Plaintiff's Motion To Address Upcoming Trial Date And Findings In Regard To Chalese's Refusal To Timely Facilitate The Completion Of The Child Custody Evaluation	10	2367 - 2380
06/22/2020	Ex Parte Motion For An Order Shortening Time	11	2381 - 2384
06/22/2020	Order Shortening Time	11	2385 - 2386
06/22/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order Shortening Time	11	2387 - 2391
06/26/2020	Opposition To Motion To Address Upcoming Trial Date And Findings In Regard To Chalese's Refusal To Timely Facilitate The Completion Of The Child Custody Evaluation And Countermotion For Plaintiff To File An Updated Fdf, For Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	11	2392 - 2417
06/26/2020	Exhibits To Opposition To Motion To Address Upcoming Trial Date And Findings In Regard To Chalese's Refusal To Timely Facilitate The Completion Of The Child Custody Evaluation And Countermotion For Plaintiff To File An Updated Fdf, For Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	11	2418 - 2434
06/29/2020	Stipulation And Order Regarding Orders To Show Cause	11	2435 - 2437
06/29/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order Regarding The Orders To Show Cause	11	2438 - 2443
06/30/2020	General Financial Disclosure Form	11	2444 - 2454
07/06/2020	Order From June 1, 2020 Hearing	11	2455 - 2462
07/06/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order	11	2463 - 2472
07/20/2020	Defendant's Motion To Extend Rebuttal Expert Deadline And For Attorney's Fees	11	2473 - 2484
07/21/2020	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Defendant's Motion To Extend Rebuttal Expert Deadline And For Attorney's Fees	11	2485 - 2487
07/21/2020	Stipulation And Order To Withdraw	11	2488 - 2490
07/21/2020	Notice Of Entry Of The Stipulation And Order To Withdraw	11	2491 - 2496
07/24/2020	Defendant's Motion To Extend Rebuttal Expert Deadline And For Attorney's Fees	11	2497 - 2508
07/29/2020	Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial (Second Request)	11	2509 - 2525
07/31/2020	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial (Second Request)	11	2526 - 2529
08/03/2020	Non-Opposition To Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial And Countermotion For Sanctions	11	2530 - 2543
08/05/2020	Reply To Plaintiff's Non-Opposition To Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial And Opposition To Plaintiff's Countermotion For Sanctions	11	2544 - 2552
08/10/2020	Order To Continue Trial	11	2553 - 2556

## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
08/10/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order To Continue Trial	11	2557 - 2562
08/19/2020	Order From The Hearing Held October 9, 2019	11	2563 - 2565
09/02/2020	Notice Of Appeal	11	2566 - 2568
09/02/2020	Case Appeal Statement	11	2569 - 2574
09/10/2020	Order From June 30, 2020 Hearing	11	2575 - 2578
09/10/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order	11	2579 - 2584
09/21/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order From October 9, 2019 Hearing	11	2585 - 2589
10/07/2020	Plaintiff's Motion To Clarify Courts June 30th Order After Hearing	11	2590 - 2595
10/07/2020	Defendant's Motion For Clarification And Modification Of Court Release Regarding Custody Evaluation And For Sanctions And Fees Against Plaintiff	11	2596 - 2608
10/07/2020	Exhibits To Motion For Clarification And Modification Of Court Release Regarding Custody Evaluation And For Sanctions And Fees Against Plaintiff	11	2609 - 2628
10/07/2020	Amended Motion For Clarification And Modification Of Court Release Regarding Custody Evaluation And For Sanctions And Fees Against Plaintiff	12	2629 - 2642
10/12/2020	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Defendant's Amended Motion For Clarification And Modification Of Court Release Regarding Custody Evaluation And For Sanctions And Fees Against Plaintiff	12	2643 - 2646
10/20/2020	Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Clarify Court's June 30th Order After Hearing	12	2647 - 2657
10/20/2020	Plaintiff's Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Clarification And Modification Of Court Release Regarding Custody Evaluation And For Sanctions And Fees Against Plaintiff	12	2658 - 2676
10/21/2020	Order Shortening Time	12	2677 - 2679
10/21/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order Shortening Time	12	2680 - 2684
10/29/2020	Minute Order	12	2685 - 2687
11/06/2020	Defendant's Brief Regarding Confidentiality Agreement	12	2688 - 2694
11/09/2020	Reply To Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Clarify Court's June 30th Order After Hearing	12	2695 - 2702
11/10/2020	Minute Order	12	2703 - 2704
11/13/2020	Plaintiff's Brief Regarding Confidentiality Agreement	12	2705 - 2710
11/13/2020	Stipulation And Order Regarding Confidentiality Agreement	12	2711 - 2717
11/16/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order	12	2718 - 2726
12/14/2020	Plaintiff's Motion To Terminate Temporary Spousal Support	12	2727 - 2733
12/28/2020	Opposition To Motion To Terminate Temporary Spousal Support And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees	12	2734 - 2746
01/04/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiff's Motion To Terminate Temporary Spousal Support.	12	2747 - 2753
01/04/2021	Reply To Opposition To Motion To Terminate Temporary Spousal Support And Opposition To Countermotion	12	2754 - 2765
01/05/2021	Plaintiff's Motion To Reassign	12	2766 - 2732

## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
01/05/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiff's Motion To Reassign	12	2733 - 2779
01/08/2021	Minute Order	12	2780 - 2781
01/12/2021	Notice Of Department Reassignment	12	2782 - 2784
03/09/2021	Order From February 18, 2021 Hearing	13	2785 - 2789
03/09/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order	13	2790 - 2796
03/12/2021	Plaintiff's List Of Contested Art In His Possession And Art Believed To Be In Defendant's Possession	13	2797 - 2798
03/18/2021	Motion To Modify Temporary Physical Custody Pending Trial	13	2799 - 2808
03/19/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiff's Motion Modify Temporary Physical Custody Pending Trial	13	2809 - 2815
03/23/2021	Order Shortening Time	13	2816 - 2818
03/28/2021	Defendant's Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Modify Temporary Physical Custody Pending Trial And Countermotion For Sanctions And Attorney's Fees	13	2819 - 2832
03/28/2021	Exhibits To Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Modify Temporary Physical Custody Pending Trial And Countermotion For Sanctions And Attorney's Fees	13	2833 - 2846
04/22/2021	Defendant's Emergency Motion To Allow Witness To Appear Virtually	13	2847 - 2859
04/22/2021	Exhibits To Emergency Motion To Allow Witness To Appear Virtually	13	2860 - 2871
04/22/2021	Motion In Limine To Recognize Dr. Paglini As Neutral Expert	13	2872 - 2877
04/27/2021	Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion In Limine	13	2878 - 2884
04/29/2021	Plaintiff's Opposition To Defendant's Emergency Motion To Allow Witness To Appear Virtually	13	2885 - 2891
05/03/2021	General Financial Disclosure Form	13	2892 - 2899
05/03/2021	Defendant's Pre-Trial Memorandum	13	2900 - 2919
05/03/2021	Plaintiff's Pre-Trial Memorandum	13	2920 - 2945
05/04/2021	Order From March 30, 2021 Hearing	13	2946 - 2949
05/04/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order	13	2950 - 2955
05/07/2021	Defendant's EDCR 7.17 Trial Brief	13	2956 - 2999
05/07/2021	Notice Of Association Of Co-Counsel In An Unbundled Capacity	13	3000 - 3001
05/13/2021	Plaintiff's Motion To Disqualify	13	3002 - 3016
05/14/2021	Opposition To Motion To Disqualify And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Sanctions	14	3017 - 3047
05/24/2021	Response To Defendant's Motion To Disqualify Judge	14	3048 - 3051
05/27/2021	Minute Order	14	3052 - 3053
06/02/2021	Reply To Opposition To Motion To Disqualify And Opposition To Countermotion For Fees And Sanctions	14	3054 - 3069
06/03/2021	Emergency Motion Regarding Summer Custodial Timeshare	14	3070 - 3092
06/03/2021	Exhibits To Emergency Motion Regarding Summer Custodial Timeshare	14	3093 - 3112

## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
06/03/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Hearing For Plaintiff's Motion To Disqualify	14	3113 - 3118
06/04/2021	Order Shortening Time On Hearing For Plaintiff's Motion To Disqualify	14	3119 - 3121
06/04/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order	14	3122 - 3126
06/09/2021	Minute Order	14	3127 - 3128
06/18/2021	Opposition To Defendant's Emergency Motion Regarding Custodial Timeshare	14	3129 - 3135
06/23/2021	Ex Parte Motion For Leave To File Reply To Opposition To Countermotion	14	3136 - 3140
06/23/2021	Amended Reply To Opposition To Motion To Disqualify And Opposition To Countermotion For Fees And Sanctions	14	3141 - 3157
06/24/2021	Decision And Order	14	3158 - 3165
06/24/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Hearing On Emergency Motion Regarding Summer Custodial Timeshare	14	3166 - 3170
06/25/2021	Reply To Opposition To Emergency Motion Regarding Summer Custodial Timeshare	14	3171 - 3176
06/26/2021	Motion For Sanctions	14	3177 - 3186
06/27/2021	Opposition To Motion For Sanctions And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Sanctions	14	3187 - 3207
06/28/2021	Order Shortening Time	14	3208 - 3210
06/28/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order	14	3211 - 3215
07/04/2021	Order (April 30, 2021 Hearing)	14	3216 - 3219
07/04/2021	Order From May 10, 2021	14	3220 - 3225
07/06/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order	14	3226 - 3231
07/06/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order	14	3232 - 3239
07/08/2021	Plaintiff's Financial Disclosure Form	14	3240 - 3250
07/22/2021	Minute Order	14	3251 - 3252
08/04/2021	Emergency Motion To Address Defendant's Intent To Withhold The Minor Children	14	3253 - 3261
08/04/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiff's Emergency Motion To Address Defendant's Intent To Withhold The Minor Children	15	3262 - 3269
08/05/2021	Minute Order	15	3270 - 3271
08/06/2021	Opposition To Emergency Motion To Address Defendant's Intent To Withhold The Minor Children And Countermotion For Compensatory Time, Fees And Sanctions	15	3272 - 3284
08/06/2021	Errata To Defendant's Opposition To Emergency To Address Defendant's Intent To Withhold The Minor Children And Countermotion For Compensatory Time, Fees And Sanctions	15	3285 - 3287
08/08/2021	Order (July 8, 2021 Hearing)	15	3288 - 3292
08/23/2021	Reply In Support Of Emergency Motion To Address Defendant S Intent To Withhold The Minor Children	15	3293 - 3302
08/26/2021	Minute Order	15	3303 - 3305



## CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
09/01/2021	General Financial Disclosure Form	15	3306 - 3317
09/16/2021	Association Of Counsel For Plaintiff	15	3318 - 3320
09/21/2021	Emergency Motion For Immediate Withdrawal Of Attorney	15	3321 - 3329
09/22/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Defendant's Emergency Motion For Immediate Withdrawal Of Attorney	15	3330 - 3337
09/22/2021	Non-Opposition To Request For Order Shortening Time; Opposition To Facts Contained Within Request For Order Shortening Time	15	3338 - 3356
09/22/2021	Order Shortening Time	15	3357 - 3359
09/24/2021	Order To Withdraw As Counsel Of Record	15	3360 - 3363
09/27/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order To Withdraw As Counsel Of Record	15	3364 - 3369
10/20/2021	Order (September 27, 2021)	15	3370 - 3373
12/21/2021	Motion To Expand Discovery To Include Up To Date Appclose Messges And Other Messages Sent By The Defendant	15	3374 - 3381
12/21/2021	Exhibits To Motion To Expand Discovery To Include Up To Date Appclose Messages And Other Messages Sent By The Defendant	15	3382 - 3394
12/27/2021	Notice Of Appearance	15	3395 - 3397
12/27/2021	Request And Order To Release Records	15	3398 - 3400
01/11/2022	Defendant's Opposition	15	3401 - 3406
01/19/2022	Reply In Support Of Motion To Expand Discovery To Include Up To Date Appclose Messages And Other Messages Sent By The Defendant	15	3407 - 3415
01/25/2022	Transcript from May 10, 2021 Evidentiary Hearing (Trial Day 1)	16	3416 - 3574
01/25/2022	Receipt of Copy of Transcript	16	3575
01/25/2022	Certification of Transcripts Notice of Completion	16	3576
01/25/2022	Final Billing of Transctips	16	3577
02/08/2022	Order From January 21, 2022 Trial	16	3578 - 3581
03/03/2022	Defendant's Financial Disclosure Form	16	3582 - 3592
03/04/2022	Plaintiff's Financial Disclosure Form	16	3593 - 3603
03/07/2022	Minute Order	16	3604 - 3605
03/16/2022	Defendant's Motion To Place On Calendar And Take Testimony	16	3606 - 3615
03/16/2022	Motion For Order Shortening Time	16	3616 - 3622
03/16/2022	Order Shortening Time	16	3623 - 3625
03/17/2022	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Defendant's Motion To Place On Calendar And Take Testimony	16	3626 - 3633
03/18/2022	Pecos Law Group's Memorandum Of Fees And Costs Per Court's Instruction On March 4, 2022	17	3634 - 3742
05/09/2022	Order From April 14, 2022 Motion Hearing	17	3743 - 3746
05/12/2022	Memorandum Of Fees And Costs	17	3747 - 3752
05/13/2022	Motion To Reconsider Decision After Defendant's Motion To Place On Calendar And Take Testimony	17	3753 - 3764
05/18/2022	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiff's Motion To Reconsider Decision After Defendant's Motion To Place On Calendar And Take Testimony	17	3765 - 3771
05/18/2022	Defendant's Closing Brief	17	3772 - 3791

**CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
05/19/2022	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiff's Motion To Reconsider Decision After Defendant's Motion To Place On Calendar And Take Testimony	17	3792 - 3798
05/24/2022	Defendant's Opposition	17	3799 - 3813
05/25/2022	Decree Of Divorce	17	3814 - 3869
05/26/2022	Notice Of Entry	18	3870 - 3926
05/27/2022	Emergency Motion To Stay Judgement Pending Appeal	18	3927 - 3946
05/27/2022	Emergency Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiffs Emergency Motion To Stay Judgement Pending Appeal	18	3947 - 3953
05/27/2022	Notice Of Appeal	18	3954 - 3955
05/27/2022	Opposition And Countermotion	18	3956 - 3972
05/31/2022	Order Re: Stay	18	3973 - 3977
05/31/2022	Notice Of Entry	18	3978 - 3983
06/06/2022	Case Appeal Statement	18	3984 - 3987
09/08/2022	Request For Rough Draft Transcript	18	3988 - 3990
09/13/2022	Estimate Of Rough Draft Transcripts	18	3991 - 3992
11/02/2022	Certification of Transcripts Notice of Completion	18	3993
11/02/2022	Transcript from January 21, 2022 Evidentiary Hearing (Trial Day 2)	19	3994 - 4155
11/02/2022	Transcript from March 1, 2022 Evidentiary Hearing (Trial Day 3)	20	4156 - 4402
11/02/2022	Transcript from March 2, 2022 Evidentiary Hearing (Trial Day 4)	21	4403 - 4669
11/02/2022	Transcript from March 3, 2022 Evidentiary Hearing (Trial Day 5)	22	4670 - 4770
11/02/2022	Transcript from April 14, 2022 Hearing (Trial Decision)	22	4771 - 4791

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
01/31/2019	Affidavit Of Resident Witness	1	14 - 15
09/20/2019	Affidavit Of Resident Witness	3	657 - 658
02/07/2019	Amended Answer And Counterclaim	1	40 - 47
10/07/2020	Amended Motion For Clarification And Modification Of Court Release Regarding Custody Evaluation And For Sanctions And Fees Against Plaintiff	12	2629 - 2642
02/07/2019	Amended Motion To Set Aside Default; For Exclusive Possession Of The Marital Residence And Ordering Plaintiff To Assist In Making Mortgage Payments; For Medical Legal Custody Of The Minor Children, For An Order Referring The Parties To Mediation Pursuant To EDCR 5.70, For An Order Awarding Defendant Child Support For An Order Awarding Defendant Alimony; And For Attorney Fees And Costs	1	62 - 75
06/23/2021	Amended Reply To Opposition To Motion To Disqualify And Opposition To Countermotion For Fees And Sanctions	14	3141 - 3157
02/04/2019	Answer And Counterclaim	1	26 - 34
04/27/2020	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Motion For An Order To Permit Plaintiff To Retain The Sick Minor Children Pursuant To Their Pediatrician's Directive; For Attorney's Fees And Costs Related Relief	9	2100 - 2129
11/26/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Objection To Discovery Commissioners Report And Recommendations Filed November 12, 2019	6	1245 - 1280
05/14/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Emergency Motion For A Change Of Custody; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief	2	300 - 391
10/24/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Attorney's Fees And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	4	843 - 850
11/26/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Opposition To Mr. Lloyd's Motion For Protective Order And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	6	1297 - 1332
06/11/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Reply In Support Of Emergency Motion For A Change Of Custody; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For Change Of Custody For Primary Physical And Sole Legal Custody, Psychological Evaluation Of The Plaintiff	2	454 - 471
01/23/2020	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Reply In Support Of Plaintiff's Motion For Reconsideration Of The Court's December 9, 2019 Decision; For Proof Of Chalese's Auto Insurance For The Last Year; And Related Relief; And Opposition To Defendant's Countermotion To Restore Joint Physical Custody And For Attorney's Fees	8	1705 - 1739
11/12/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Response In Support Of Opposition	5	972 - 1038

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
02/26/2019	Appendix Of Exhibits To Plaintiff's Opposition To Amended Motion To Set Aside Default; For Exclusive Possession Of The Marital Residence And Ordering Plaintiff To Assist In Making Mortgage Payments; For Medical Legal Custody Of The Minor Children; For An Order Referring The Parties To Mediation Pursuant To EDCR 5.70, For An Order Awarding Plaintiff Child Support; For An Order Awarding Defendant Alimony; And For Attorney's Fees And Costs Primary Physical Custody, Child Support, And Attorney's Fees And Costs And Countermotion For Joint Legal Custody; Primary Physical Custody To Plaintiff And Supervised Visitation To Defendant; To Establish Child Support; To Establish Payment Of Marital Expenses; For An Order Protecting The Parties Community Property; Defendant To Obtain Employment And To Cooperate In A Vocational Assessment	1	126 - 173
05/24/2019	Appendix Of Supplemental Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Emergency Motion For A Change Of Custody; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief	2	401 - 404
04/09/2020	Appendix Of Supplemental Exhibits To Plaintiff's Motion For A Change Of Custody Based On Defendant's Endangerment Of The Minor Children; For Marie's Birth Certificate And Related Relief	9	2046 - 2074
03/18/2019	Appendix Of Supplemental Exhibits To Plaintiff's Opposition To Amended Motion To Set Aside Default; For Exclusive Possession Of The Marital Residence And Ordering Plaintiff To Assist In Making Mortgage Payments; For Medical Legal Custody Of The Minor Children; For An Order Referring The Parties To Mediation Pursuant To EDCR 5.70, For An Order Awarding Plaintiff Child Support; For An Order Awarding Defendant Alimony; And For Attorney's Fees And Costs Primary Physical Custody, Child Support, And Attorney's Fees And Costs And Countermotion For Joint Legal Custody; Primary Physical Custody To Plaintiff And Supervised Visitation To Defendant; To Establish Child Support; To Establish Payment Of Marital Expenses; For An Order Protecting The Parties Community Property; Defendant To Obtain Employment And To Cooperate In A Vocational Assessment	1	196 - 215
11/20/2019	Application For Order Shortening Time	5	1177 - 1179
09/16/2021	Association Of Counsel For Plaintiff	15	3318 - 3320
03/19/2019	Behavior Order	1	220 - 224
12/09/2019	Case And Non Jury Trial Management Order	7	1541 - 1544
03/19/2019	Case And Non-Jury Trial Management Order	1	216 - 219
09/06/2019	Case And Non-Jury Trial Management Order	3	627 - 630
09/02/2020	Case Appeal Statement	11	2569 - 2574
06/06/2022	Case Appeal Statement	18	3984 - 3987
02/01/2019	Certificate Of Completion COPE Class	1	16 - 18
01/25/2022	Certification of Transcripts Notice of Completion	16	3576

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
11/02/2022	Certification of Transcripts Notice of Completion	18	3993
01/04/2019	Complaint For Divorce	1	1 - 6
06/24/2021	Decision And Order	14	3158 - 3165
05/25/2022	Decree Of Divorce	17	3814 - 3869
01/29/2019	Default	1	13
09/09/2019	Defendant, Chalese Solinger's List Of Witnesses For Trial	3	631 - 636
11/06/2020	Defendant's Brief Regarding Confidentiality Agreement	12	2688 - 2694
05/18/2022	Defendant's Closing Brief	17	3772 - 3791
05/07/2021	Defendant's EDCR 7.17 Trial Brief	13	2956 - 2999
04/22/2021	Defendant's Emergency Motion To Allow Witness To Appear Virtually	13	2847 - 2859
03/03/2022	Defendant's Financial Disclosure Form	16	3582 - 3592
11/22/2019	Defendant's Joinder To Joshua Lloyd's Motion For Protective Order And Countermotion For Fees From Plaintiff To Defendant	5	1201 - 1212
11/15/2019	Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	5	1054 - 1072
05/22/2020	Defendant's Motion For An Order To Show Cause As To Why Plaintiff Should Not Be Held In Contempt, For Orders Regarding Health Insurance And Spousal Support, For Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	10	2243 - 2272
10/07/2020	Defendant's Motion For Clarification And Modification Of Court Release Regarding Custody Evaluation And For Sanctions And Fees Against Plaintiff	11	2596 - 2608
10/09/2019	Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Attorney's Fees	3	716 - 731
07/29/2020	Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial (Second Request)	11	2509 - 2525
08/28/2019	Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines (First Request)	3	571 - 583
07/20/2020	Defendant's Motion To Extend Rebuttal Expert Deadline And For Attorney's Fees	11	2473 - 2484
07/24/2020	Defendant's Motion To Extend Rebuttal Expert Deadline And For Attorney's Fees	11	2497 - 2508
03/16/2022	Defendant's Motion To Place On Calendar And Take Testimony	16	3606 - 3615
02/07/2019	Defendant's Motion To Set Aside Default; For Exclusive Possession Of The Marital Residence And Order Plaintiff To Assist In Making Mortgage Payments; For Medical Legal Custody Of The Minor Children, For An Order Referring The Parties To Mediation Pursuant To EDCR 5.70, For An Order Awarding Plaintiff Child Support; For An Order Awarding Plaintiff Alimony; And For Attorney Fees And Costs	1	48 - 61
09/30/2019	Defendant's Notice Of Seminar Completion - EDCR 5.302	3	672 - 674
09/20/2019	Defendant's Notice Of UNLV Seminar Completion EDCR 5.07	3	655 - 656

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
01/02/2020	Defendant's Objection To Plaintiff's Brunzell Affidavit For Attorney's Fees And Costs	7	1630 - 1636
02/25/2020	Defendant's Objection To Plaintiff's Supplemental Appendix	8	1850 - 1852
01/11/2022	Defendant's Opposition	15	3401 - 3406
05/24/2022	Defendant's Opposition	17	3799 - 3813
11/07/2019	Defendant's Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Compel Discovery Responses And For Attorney's Fees	4	931 - 939
03/28/2021	Defendant's Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Modify Temporary Physical Custody Pending Trial And Countermotion For Sanctions And Attorney's Fees	13	2819 - 2832
05/03/2021	Defendant's Pre-Trial Memorandum	13	2900 - 2919
10/02/2019	Defendant's Reply To Opposition To Defendant's Renoticed Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines	3	693 - 702
11/18/2019	Defendant's Response To Plaintiff's Response In Support Of Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Fees And Costs	5	1113 - 1128
01/23/2020	Discovery Cmmissioner's Report And Recommendations From 12/06/19 Hearing	8	1740 - 1744
12/30/2019	Discovery Commissioners Report And Recommendations From 12/06/19 Hearing	7	1576 - 1580
05/27/2022	Emergency Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiffs Emergency Motion To Stay Judgement Pending Appeal	18	3947 - 3953
05/14/2019	Emergency Motion For A Change Of Custody; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief	2	269 - 299
09/21/2021	Emergency Motion For Immediate Withdrawal Of Attorney	15	3321 - 3329
06/03/2021	Emergency Motion Regarding Summer Custodial Timeshare	14	3070 - 3092
08/04/2021	Emergency Motion To Address Defendant's Intent To Withhold The Minor Children	14	3253 - 3261
05/27/2022	Emergency Motion To Stay Judgement Pending Appeal	18	3927 - 3946
08/06/2021	Errata To Defendant's Opposition To Emergency To Address Defendant's Intent To Withhold The Minor Children And Countermotion For Compensatory Time, Fees And Sanctions	15	3285 - 3287
11/15/2019	Errata To Exhibits To Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	5	1110 - 1112
11/08/2019	Errata To Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Compel Discovery Responses And For Attorney's Fees	4	940 - 943
09/13/2022	Estimate Of Rough Draft Transcripts	18	3991 - 3992
10/12/2020	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Defendant's Amended Motion For Clarification And Modification Of Court Release Regarding Custody Evaluation And For Sanctions And Fees Against Plaintiff	12	2643 - 2646
09/22/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Defendant's Emergency Motion For Immediate Withdrawal Of Attorney	15	3330 - 3337

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
11/21/2019	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	5	1198 - 1200
07/31/2020	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial (Second Request)	11	2526 - 2529
07/21/2020	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Defendant's Motion To Extend Rebuttal Expert Deadline And For Attorney's Fees	11	2485 - 2487
03/17/2022	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Defendant's Motion To Place On Calendar And Take Testimony	16	3626 - 3633
06/03/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Hearing For Plaintiff's Motion To Disqualify	14	3113 - 3118
06/24/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Hearing On Emergency Motion Regarding Summer Custodial Timeshare	14	3166 - 3170
03/19/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiff's Motion Modify Temporary Physical Custody Pending Trial	13	2809 - 2815
08/04/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiff's Emergency Motion To Address Defendant's Intent To Withhold The Minor Children	15	3262 - 3269
01/05/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiff's Motion To Reassign	12	2733 - 2779
05/18/2022	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiff's Motion To Reconsider Decision After Defendant's Motion To Place On Calendar And Take Testimony	17	3765 - 3771
05/19/2022	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiff's Motion To Reconsider Decision After Defendant's Motion To Place On Calendar And Take Testimony	17	3792 - 3798
01/04/2021	Ex Parte Application For An Order Shortening Time On Plaintiff's Motion To Terminate Temporary Spousal Support.	12	2747 - 2753
06/03/2020	Ex Parte Application For An Order To Show Cause	10	2326 - 2362
06/05/2019	Ex Parte Motion For An Order Shortening Time	2	420 - 429
02/04/2020	Ex Parte Motion For An Order Shortening Time	8	1754 - 1757
03/31/2020	Ex Parte Motion For An Order Shortening Time	9	1984 - 1987
06/22/2020	Ex Parte Motion For An Order Shortening Time	11	2381 - 2384
11/14/2019	Ex Parte Motion For An Order To Release Electronics To Adam's Agent Or, In The Alternative, For An Order Barring The Release Of Electronics Until Further Court Order	5	1039 - 1053
06/23/2021	Ex Parte Motion For Leave To File Reply To Opposition To Countermotion	14	3136 - 3140
09/30/2019	Ex Parte Motion For Order Shortening Time To Hear Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines	3	675 - 678

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
08/29/2019	Ex Parte Motion For Order Shortening Time To Hear Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines (First Request)	3	604 - 608
02/05/2019	Ex Parte Motion To Vacate Or Continue Hearing	1	35 - 39
03/16/2020	Exhibit Appendix To Plaintiff's Motion For An Order To Show Cause And To Hold Defendant In Contempt Of Court For Violation Of The March 19, 2019 Order, The June 17, 2019 Order, And The Behavior Order Filed March 19, 2019; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Counter Motion To Enforce Phone Contact With The Minor Children And For Attorney's Fees	8	1879 - 1892
11/22/2019	Exhibits To Defendant's Joinder To Joshua Lloyd's Motion For Protective Order And Countermotion For Fees From Plaintiff To Defendant	5	1213 - 1222
11/15/2019	Exhibits To Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	5	1073 - 1109
05/22/2020	Exhibits To Defendant's Motion For An Order To Show Cause As To Why Plaintiff Should Not Be Held In Contempt, For Order Regarding Health Insurance And Spousal Support, For Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	10	2273 - 2307
10/09/2019	Exhibits To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Attorney's Fees	4	732 - 803
08/28/2019	Exhibits To Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines (First Request)	3	584 - 598
11/18/2019	Exhibits To Defendant's Response To Plaintiff's Response In Support Of Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Fees And Costs	5	1129 - 1163
06/03/2021	Exhibits To Emergency Motion Regarding Summer Custodial Timeshare	14	3093 - 3112
04/22/2021	Exhibits To Emergency Motion To Allow Witness To Appear Virtually	13	2860 - 2871
10/07/2020	Exhibits To Motion For Clarification And Modification Of Court Release Regarding Custody Evaluation And For Sanctions And Fees Against Plaintiff	11	2609 - 2628
12/21/2021	Exhibits To Motion To Expand Discovery To Include Up To Date Appclose Messages And Other Messages Sent By The Defendant	15	3382 - 3394
04/28/2020	Exhibits To Opposition To Motion For An Order To Permit Plaintiff To Retain The Sick Minor Children Pursuant To Their Pediatrician's Directive; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Countermotion For Make-Up Visitation Time; To Admonish Plaintiff To Abide By Joint Legal Custody Standards; For Attorney's Fees; And Related Relief	10	2163 - 2203



**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
06/26/2020	Exhibits To Opposition To Motion To Address Upcoming Trial Date And Findings In Regard To Chalese's Refusal To Timely Facilitate The Completion Of The Child Custody Evaluation And Countermotion For Plaintiff To File An Updated Fdf, For Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	11	2418 - 2434
03/28/2021	Exhibits To Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Modify Temporary Physical Custody Pending Trial And Countermotion For Sanctions And Attorney's Fees	13	2833 - 2846
12/06/2019	Exhibits To Reply To Opposition To Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	7	1416 - 1495
11/04/2019	Exhibits To Reply To Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Attorney's Fees And Opposition To Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	4	889 - 930
01/25/2022	Final Billing of Transcripts	16	3577
10/09/2019	Financial Disclosure Form	4	804 - 814
07/15/2019	General Fiancial Disclosure Form	3	501 - 511
02/01/2019	General Financial Disclosure Form	1	19 - 25
02/26/2019	General Financial Disclosure Form	1	174 - 184
09/24/2019	General Financial Disclosure Form	3	659 - 669
05/22/2020	General Financial Disclosure Form	10	2308 - 2317
06/30/2020	General Financial Disclosure Form	11	2444 - 2454
05/03/2021	General Financial Disclosure Form	13	2892 - 2899
09/01/2021	General Financial Disclosure Form	15	3306 - 3317
01/11/2019	Joint Preliminary Injunction	1	11 - 12
05/12/2022	Memorandum Of Fees And Costs	17	3747 - 3752
07/23/2019	Minute Order	3	512 - 514
02/13/2020	Minute Order	8	1789 - 1791
10/29/2020	Minute Order	12	2685 - 2687
11/10/2020	Minute Order	12	2703 - 2704
01/08/2021	Minute Order	12	2780 - 2781
05/27/2021	Minute Order	14	3052 - 3053
06/09/2021	Minute Order	14	3127 - 3128
07/22/2021	Minute Order	14	3251 - 3252
08/05/2021	Minute Order	15	3270 - 3271
08/26/2021	Minute Order	15	3303 - 3305
03/07/2022	Minute Order	16	3604 - 3605
08/28/2019	Minute Order - No Hearing Held	3	565 - 567
03/31/2020	Motion For A Change Of Custody Based On Defendant's Endangerment Of The Minor Children; For Marie's Birth Certificate; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief	9	1960 - 1983
06/13/2019	Motion For An Order To Show Cause	2	472 - 484

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
02/21/2020	Motion For An Order To Show Cause And To Hold Defendant In Contempt Of Court For Violation Of The March 19, 2019 Order, The June 17, 2019 Order, And The Behavior Order Filed March 19, 2019; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief	8	1815 - 1832
07/25/2019	Motion For Division Of The Proceeds From The Sale Of The Marital Home, And For Attorney's Fees	3	515 - 520
03/16/2022	Motion For Order Shortening Time	16	3616 - 3622
11/19/2019	Motion For Protective Order	5	1164 - 1176
12/27/2019	Motion For Reconsideration Of The Court's December 9, 2019 Decision; For Proof Of Chalese's Auto Insurance For The Last Year; And Related Relief	7	1557 - 1575
06/26/2021	Motion For Sanctions	14	3177 - 3186
04/22/2021	Motion In Limine To Recognize Dr. Paglini As Neutral Expert	13	2872 - 2877
12/21/2021	Motion To Expand Discovery To Include Up To Date Appclose Messges And Other Messages Sent By The Defendant	15	3374 - 3381
03/18/2021	Motion To Modify Temporary Physical Custody Pending Trial	13	2799 - 2808
05/13/2022	Motion To Reconsider Decision After Defendant's Motion To Place On Calendar And Take Testimony	17	3753 - 3764
08/23/2019	Motion To Withdraw And Adjudicate Attorney's Lien	3	542 - 561
01/27/2020	Motion To Withdraw As Attorney Of Record For Defendant	8	1745 - 1753
02/06/2020	No Contact Order	8	1758 - 1760
08/03/2020	Non-Opposition To Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial And Countermotion For Sanctions	11	2530 - 2543
09/22/2021	Non-Opposition To Request For Order Shortening Time; Opposition To Facts Contained Within Request For Order Shortening Time	15	3338 - 3356
02/21/2019	Notice Of 16.2 Early Case Conference	1	91 - 92
09/02/2020	Notice Of Appeal	11	2566 - 2568
05/27/2022	Notice Of Appeal	18	3954 - 3955
12/27/2021	Notice Of Appearance	15	3395 - 3397
02/14/2019	Notice Of Appearance Of Attorney	1	87 - 88
05/07/2021	Notice Of Association Of Co-Counsel In An Unbundled Capacity	13	3000 - 3001
03/20/2019	Notice Of Association Of Counsel	1	225 - 226
08/23/2019	Notice Of Attorney's Lien	3	562 - 564
01/12/2021	Notice Of Department Reassignment	12	2782 - 2784
05/26/2022	Notice Of Entry	18	3870 - 3926
05/31/2022	Notice Of Entry	18	3978 - 3983
08/28/2019	Notice Of Entry Of August 28, 2019 Minute Order	3	599 - 603
07/26/2019	Notice Of Entry Of July 23, 2019 Minute Order	3	521 - 524
02/06/2020	Notice Of Entry Of No Contact Order	8	1761 - 1766
01/22/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order	8	1665 - 1668
02/06/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order	8	1775 - 1784
05/27/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order	10	2321 - 2325
07/06/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order	11	2463 - 2472
09/10/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order	11	2579 - 2584

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
03/09/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order	13	2790 - 2796
05/04/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order	13	2950 - 2955
06/04/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order	14	3122 - 3126
06/28/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order	14	3211 - 3215
07/06/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order	14	3226 - 3231
07/06/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order	14	3232 - 3239
04/22/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of April 6, 2020	9	2079 - 2085
10/04/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of August 1, 2019	3	708 - 715
05/14/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of February 26, 2020	10	2212 - 2222
08/22/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of June 17, 2019	3	532 - 541
05/03/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of March 19, 2019	2	251 - 268
12/12/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of October 3, 2019	7	1549 - 1555
11/22/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order After Hearing Of September 6, 2019	6	1226 - 1231
09/21/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order From October 9, 2019 Hearing	11	2585 - 2589
02/20/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order On Discovery Commissioner's Report And Recommendations	8	1800 - 1809
11/21/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order Shortening Time	5	1193 - 1197
04/02/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order Shortening Time	9	1999 - 2003
06/22/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order Shortening Time	11	2387 - 2391
10/21/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order Shortening Time	12	2680 - 2684
08/10/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Order To Continue Trial	11	2557 - 2562
03/13/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Order To Seal Records	1	187 - 191
09/27/2021	Notice Of Entry Of Order To Withdraw As Counsel Of Record	15	3364 - 3369
11/16/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order	12	2718 - 2726
04/23/2019	Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order Modifying Timeshare	1	230 - 235
06/29/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order Regarding The Orders To Show Cause	11	2438 - 2443
04/01/2020	Notice Of Entry Of Stipulation And Order To Provide CPS Records And Drug Test Results To The Child Custody Evaluator	9	1991 - 1996
07/21/2020	Notice Of Entry Of The Stipulation And Order To Withdraw	11	2491 - 2496
09/09/2019	Notice Of Intent To File Opposition To Prior Counsel's Motion To Adjudicate Attorney's Lien	3	637 - 639
02/12/2020	Notice Of Non-Opposition To Motion To Withdraw As Attorney Of Record For Defendant	8	1787 - 1788
09/17/2019	Notice Of Seminar Completion	3	653 - 654
03/25/2020	Notice Of Seminar Completion EDCR 5.302	8	1894 - 1896
01/23/2020	Notice Of Withdrawal Of Attorney Of Record	8	1669 - 1671
11/26/2019	Objection To Discovery Commissioners Report And Recommendations Filed November 12, 2019	6	1232 - 1244
05/27/2022	Opposition And Countermotion	18	3956 - 3972
06/18/2021	Opposition To Defendant's Emergency Motion Regarding Custodial Timeshare	14	3129 - 3135

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
12/04/2019	Opposition To Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees And Related Relief And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	6	1374 - 1405
10/23/2019	Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Attorney's Fees And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	4	815 - 842
08/30/2019	Opposition To Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines (First Request); And Countermotion To Strike The Substitution Of Attorneys	3	609 - 624
10/02/2019	Opposition To Defendant's Renoticed Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines	3	681 - 692
08/06/2021	Opposition To Emergency Motion To Address Defendant's Intent To Withhold The Minor Children And Countermotion For Compensatory Time, Fees And Sanctions	15	3272 - 3284
09/13/2019	Opposition To Louis C. Schneider's Motion To Adjudicate Attorney's Lien	3	640 - 650
04/28/2020	Opposition To Motion For An Order To Permit Plaintiff To Retain The Sick Minor Children Pursuant To Their Pediatrician's Directive; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Countermotion For Make-Up Visitation Time; To Admonish Plaintiff To Abide By Joint Legal Custody Standards; For Attorney's Fees; And Related Relief	10	2130 - 2162
06/29/2019	Opposition To Motion For An Order To Show Cause And Countermotion	2	485 - 500
06/27/2021	Opposition To Motion For Sanctions And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Sanctions	14	3187 - 3207
06/26/2020	Opposition To Motion To Address Upcoming Trial Date And Findings In Regard To Chalese's Refusal To Timely Facilitate The Completion Of The Child Custody Evaluation And Countermotion For Plaintiff To File An Updated Fdf, For Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief	11	2392 - 2417
05/14/2021	Opposition To Motion To Disqualify And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Sanctions	14	3017 - 3047
12/28/2020	Opposition To Motion To Terminate Temporary Spousal Support And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees	12	2734 - 2746
11/26/2019	Opposition To Mr. Lloyd's Motion For Protective Order And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	6	1281 - 1296
05/28/2019	Opposition To Plaintiff's Emergency Motion For A Change Of Custody/Spousal Support/Child Support, For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief. Counter Motion For Change Of Custody For Primary Physical And Sole Legal Custody, Psychological Evaluation Of The Plaintiff	2	405 - 419

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
04/02/2020	Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion For A Change Of Custody Based On Defendant's Endangerment Of The Minor Children; For Marie's Birth Certificate; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Countermotion For An Order To Show Cause, Compensatory Visitation Time, And Attorney's Fees	9	2007 - 2028
03/16/2020	Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion For An Order To Show Cause And To Hold Defendant In Contempt Of Court For Violation Of The March 19, 2019 Order, The June 17, 2019 Order, And The Behavior Order Filed March 19, 2019; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Counter Motion To Enforce Phone Contact With The Minor Children And For Attorney's Fees	8	1857 - 1878
01/03/2020	Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion For Reconsideration Of The Court's December 9, 2019 Decision; For Proof Of Chalese's Auto Insurance For The Last Year; And Related Relief; And Countermotion To Restore Joint Physical Custody And For Attorney's Fees	7	1637 - 1660
04/27/2021	Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion In Limine	13	2878 - 2884
10/20/2020	Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Clarify Court's June 30th Order After Hearing	12	2647 - 2657
07/04/2021	Order (April 30, 2021 Hearing)	14	3216 - 3219
08/08/2021	Order (July 8, 2021 Hearing)	15	3288 - 3292
10/20/2021	Order (September 27, 2021)	15	3370 - 3373
05/13/2020	Order After Hearing February 26, 2020	10	2204 - 2211
10/03/2019	Order After Hearing Of August 1, 2019	3	703 - 707
08/21/2019	Order After Hearing Of June 17, 2019	3	525 - 531
05/03/2019	Order After Hearing Of March 19, 2019	1	236 - 250
12/12/2019	Order After Hearing Of October 3, 2019	7	1545 - 1548
11/22/2019	Order After Hearing Of September 6, 2019	6	1223 - 1225
02/07/2019	Order For Family Mediation Center Services	1	86
05/09/2022	Order From April 14, 2022 Motion Hearing	17	3743 - 3746
04/22/2020	Order From April 6, 2020 Hearing	9	2075 - 2078
02/06/2020	Order From December 9, 2019 Hearing	8	1767 - 1774
03/09/2021	Order From February 18, 2021 Hearing	13	2785 - 2789
02/08/2022	Order From January 21, 2022 Trial	16	3578 - 3581
07/06/2020	Order From June 1, 2020 Hearing	11	2455 - 2462
09/10/2020	Order From June 30, 2020 Hearing	11	2575 - 2578
05/04/2021	Order From March 30, 2021 Hearing	13	2946 - 2949
07/04/2021	Order From May 10, 2021	14	3220 - 3225
08/19/2020	Order From The Hearing Held October 9, 2019	11	2563 - 2565
01/22/2020	Order On Discovery Commissioner's Report And Recommendations	7	1663 - 1664
02/19/2020	Order On Discovery Commissioner's Report And Recommendations	8	1792 - 1799
05/31/2022	Order Re: Stay	18	3973 - 3977
02/26/2020	Order Referring To Judicial Settlement Program	8	1854 - 1855
02/07/2019	Order Setting Case Management Conference And Directing Compliance With NRCPC 16.2	1	76 - 85

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
09/16/2019	Order Setting Case Management Conference And Directing Compliance With NRCP 16.2	3	651 - 652
09/04/2019	Order Shortening Time	3	625 - 626
10/01/2019	Order Shortening Time	3	679 - 680
11/21/2019	Order Shortening Time	5	1180 - 1181
04/01/2020	Order Shortening Time	9	1997 - 1998
06/22/2020	Order Shortening Time	11	2385 - 2386
10/21/2020	Order Shortening Time	12	2677 - 2679
03/23/2021	Order Shortening Time	13	2816 - 2818
06/28/2021	Order Shortening Time	14	3208 - 3210
09/22/2021	Order Shortening Time	15	3357 - 3359
03/16/2022	Order Shortening Time	16	3623 - 3625
06/04/2021	Order Shortening Time On Hearing For Plaintiff's Motion To Disqualify	14	3119 - 3121
08/10/2020	Order To Continue Trial	11	2553 - 2556
03/12/2019	Order To Seal Records Pursuant To NRS 125.110(2)	1	185 - 186
05/27/2020	Order To Show Cause	10	2318 - 2320
02/20/2020	Order To Withdraw As Counsel Of Record	8	1810 - 1811
09/24/2021	Order To Withdraw As Counsel Of Record	15	3360 - 3363
03/18/2022	Pecos Law Group's Memorandum Of Fees And Costs Per Court's Instruction On March 4, 2022	17	3634 - 3742
02/14/2019	Petition To Seal Records Pursuant To NRS 125.110(2)	1	89 - 90
11/13/2020	Plaintiff's Brief Regarding Confidentiality Agreement	12	2705 - 2710
12/31/2019	Plaintiff's Brunzell Affidavit For Attorney's Fees And Costs	7	1581 - 1629
07/08/2021	Plaintiff's Financial Disclosure Form	14	3240 - 3250
03/04/2022	Plaintiff's Financial Disclosure Form	16	3593 - 3603
05/15/2019	Plaintiff's Initial Expert Witness List	2	392 - 400
03/12/2021	Plaintiff's List Of Contested Art In His Possession And Art Believed To Be In Defendant's Possession	13	2797 - 2798
04/26/2020	Plaintiff's Motion For An Order To Permit Plaintiff To Retain The Sick Minor Children Pursuant To Their Pediatrician's Directive, For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief	9	2086 - 2099
06/19/2020	Plaintiff's Motion To Address Upcoming Trial Date And Findings In Regard To Chalese's Refusal To Timely Facilitate The Completion Of The Child Custody Evaluation	10	2367 - 2380
10/07/2020	Plaintiff's Motion To Clarify Courts June 30th Order After Hearing	11	2590 - 2595
10/24/2019	Plaintiff's Motion To Compel Discovery Responses And For Attorney's Fees	4	851 - 868
05/13/2021	Plaintiff's Motion To Disqualify	13	3002 - 3016
01/05/2021	Plaintiff's Motion To Reassign	12	2766 - 2732
12/14/2020	Plaintiff's Motion To Terminate Temporary Spousal Support	12	2727 - 2733
12/12/2019	Plaintiff's Notice Of UNLV Seminar Completion EDCR 5.07	7	1556

**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
02/26/2019	Plaintiff's Opposition To Amended Motion To Set Aside Default; For Exclusive Possession Of The Marital Residence And Ordering Plaintiff To Assist In Making Mortgage Payments; For Medical Legal Custody Of The Minor Children; For An Order Referring The Parties To Mediation Pursuant To EDCR 5.70, For An Order Awarding Plaintiff Child Support; For An Order Awarding Defendant Alimony; And For Attorney's Fees And Costs Primary Physical Custody, Child Support, And Attorney's Fees And Costs And Countermotion For Joint Legal Custody; Primary Physical Custody To Plaintiff And Supervised Visitation To Defendant; To Establish Child Support; To Establish Payment Of Marital Expenses; For An Order Protecting The Parties Community Property; Defendant To Obtain Employment And To Cooperate In A Vocational Assessment	1	97 - 125
04/29/2021	Plaintiff's Opposition To Defendant's Emergency Motion To Allow Witness To Appear Virtually	13	2885 - 2891
10/20/2020	Plaintiff's Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Clarification And Modification Of Court Release Regarding Custody Evaluation And For Sanctions And Fees Against Plaintiff	12	2658 - 2676
05/03/2021	Plaintiff's Pre-Trial Memorandum	13	2920 - 2945
11/29/2019	Plaintiff's Reply In Support Of Motion To Compel Discovery Responses And For Attorney's Fees	6	1333 - 1345
01/23/2020	Plaintiff's Reply In Support Of Plaintiff's Motion For Reconsideration Of The Court's December 9, 2019 Decision; For Proof Of Chalese's Auto Insurance For The Last Year; And Related Relief; And Opposition To Defendant's Countermotion To Restore Joint Physical Custody And For Attorney's Fees	8	1672 - 1704
01/09/2019	Proof Of Service	1	10
09/30/2019	Re-Notice Of Hearing For Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial, And For Issuance Of New Trial Management Order, Or In The Alternative To Extend Discovery Deadlines	3	670 - 671
01/06/2020	Receipt Of Check	7	1661
01/06/2020	Receipt Of Check	7	1662
02/28/2020	Receipt Of Check	8	1856
03/20/2020	Receipt Of Check	8	1893
01/25/2022	Receipt of Copy of Transcript	16	3575
12/09/2019	Referral Order For Outsourced Evaluation Services	7	1540
06/11/2019	Reply In Support Of Emergency Motion For A Change Of Custody; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For Change Of Custody For Primary Physical And Sole Legal Custody, Psychological Evaluation Of The Plaintiff	2	430 - 453
08/23/2021	Reply In Support Of Emergency Motion To Address Defendant S Intent To Withhold The Minor Children	15	3293 - 3302


**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
04/03/2020	Reply In Support Of Motion For A Change Of Custody Based On Defendant's Endangerment Of The Minor Children; For Marie's Birth Certificate; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For An Order To Show Cause, Compensatory Visitation Time, And Attorney's Fees	9	2029 - 2045
05/19/2020	Reply In Support Of Motion For An Order To Permit Plaintiff To Retain The Sick Minor Children Pursuant To Their Pediatrician S Directives; For Attorney S Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For Make-Up Visitation Time; To Admonish Plaintiff To Abide By Joint Legal Custody Standards; For Attorney S Fees; And Related Relief	10	2223 - 2242
03/30/2020	Reply In Support Of Motion For An Order To Show Cause And To Hold Defendant In Contempt Of Court For Violation Of The March 19, 2019 Order, The June 17, 2019 Order, And The Behavior Order Filed March 19, 2019; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Partial Opposition To Countermotion To Enforce Phone Contact With The Minor Children And For Attorney's Fees	9	1897 - 1918
01/19/2022	Reply In Support Of Motion To Expand Discovery To Include Up To Date Appclose Messages And Other Messages Sent By The Defendant	15	3407 - 3415
02/25/2019	Reply To Counterclaim For Divorce	1	93 - 96
03/18/2019	Reply To Opposition And Countermotion	1	192 - 195
12/06/2019	Reply To Opposition To Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	6	1406 - 1415
11/04/2019	Reply To Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Attorney's Fees And Opposition To Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	4	869 - 888
06/25/2021	Reply To Opposition To Emergency Motion Regarding Summer Custodial Timeshare	14	3171 - 3176
06/02/2021	Reply To Opposition To Motion To Disqualify And Opposition To Countermotion For Fees And Sanctions	14	3054 - 3069
01/04/2021	Reply To Opposition To Motion To Terminate Temporary Spousal Support And Opposition To Countermotion	12	2754 - 2765
11/09/2020	Reply To Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion To Clarify Court's June 30th Order After Hearing	12	2695 - 2702
08/05/2020	Reply To Plaintiff's Non-Opposition To Defendant's Motion To Continue Trial And Opposition To Plaintiff's Countermotion For Sanctions	11	2544 - 2552
12/02/2019	Reply To Plaintiff's Opposition To Mr. Lloyd's Motion For Protective Order And Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	6	1346 - 1373
12/27/2021	Request And Order To Release Records	15	3398 - 3400
02/26/2020	Request For Child Protection Service Appearance And Records	8	1853
01/04/2019	Request For Issuance Of Joint Preliminary Injunction	1	7



**ALPHABETICAL INDEX**

<b>FILED</b>	<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>VOL.</b>	<b>PAGES</b>
09/08/2022	Request For Rough Draft Transcript	18	3988 - 3990
02/12/2020	Request For Submission Of Motion To Withdraw As Counsel Of Record	8	1785 - 1786
11/12/2019	Response In Support Of Opposition	4	944 - 971
05/24/2021	Response To Defendant's Motion To Disqualify Judge	14	3048 - 3051
06/07/2020	Schedule Of Arrearages	10	2363 - 2366
12/06/2019	Second Supplemental Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Response In Support Of Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Fees And Costs	7	1496 - 1536
04/22/2019	Stipulation And Order Modifying Timeshare	1	227 - 229
11/13/2020	Stipulation And Order Regarding Confidentiality Agreement	12	2711 - 2717
06/29/2020	Stipulation And Order Regarding Orders To Show Cause	11	2435 - 2437
03/31/2020	Stipulation And Order To Provide CPS Records And Drug Test Results To The Child Custody Evaluator	9	1988 - 1990
07/21/2020	Stipulation And Order To Withdraw	11	2488 - 2490
08/28/2019	Substitution Of Attorneys	3	568 - 570
04/02/2020	Substitution Of Attorneys	9	2004 - 2006
02/20/2020	Substitution Of Attorney	8	1812 - 1814
01/09/2019	Summons	1	8 - 9
02/24/2020	Supplemental Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Motion For Reconsideration Of The Court's December 9, 2019 Decision; For Proof Of Chalese's Auto Insurance For The Last Year; And Related Relief	8	1833 - 1849
03/30/2020	Supplemental Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Reply In Support Of Motion For An Order To Show Cause And To Hold Defendant In Contempt Of Court For Violation Of The March 19, 2019 Order, The June 17, 2019 Order, And The Behavior Order Filed March 19, 2019; For Attorney's Fees And Costs And Related Relief And Partial Opposition To Countermotion To Enforce Phone Contact With The Minor Children And For Attorney's Fees	9	1919 - 1959
11/21/2019	Supplemental Appendix Of Exhibits In Support Of Plaintiff's Response In Support Of Opposition To Defendant's Motion For Temporary Spousal Support And Preliminary Fees And Costs	5	1182 - 1192
12/06/2019	Supplemental Declaration To Reply To Opposition To Defendant's Motion For A Custody Evaluation, Attorney's Fees, And Related Relief And Opposition To Countermotion For Attorney's Fees And Costs	7	1537 - 1539
11/02/2022	Transcript from April 14, 2022 Hearing (Trial Decision)	22	4771 - 4791
11/02/2022	Transcript from January 21, 2022 Evidentiary Hearing (Trial Day 2)	19	3994 - 4155
11/02/2022	Transcript from March 1, 2022 Evidentiary Hearing (Trial Day 3)	20	4156 - 4402
11/02/2022	Transcript from March 2, 2022 Evidentiary Hearing (Trial Day 4)	21	4403 - 4669
11/02/2022	Transcript from March 3, 2022 Evidentiary Hearing (Trial Day 5)	22	4670 - 4770
01/25/2022	Transcript from May 10, 2021 Evidentiary Hearing (Trial Day 1)	16	3416 - 3574



1 NEO

2  
3 DISTRICT COURT; FAMILY DIVISION  
4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

5 \* \* \* \* \*

6 Adam Michael Solinger ) Case No.: D-19-582245-D  
7 Plaintiff, ) Dept. P  
8 -vs.- )  
9 Chalese Marie Solinger )  
10 Defendant. ) **NOTICE OF ENTRY**

11 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that a Decree of Divorce, a copy of which is  
12 attached hereto, was entered by the Court on May 26, 2022.  
13

14 Date: May 26, 2022 /s/ Marj Arena  
15 Marj Arena  
16 Judicial Executive Assistant- Dept. P


17 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

18 I hereby certify that pursuant to Rule 9(b) of the Nevada Electronic  
19 Filing and Conversion Rules a copy of this Notice of Hearing was electronically  
20 served, on the date filed, to all registered users on this case in the Eighth Judicial  
21 District Court Electronic Filing System; or via US Mail or regular email to the  
last known mail/email addresses on file with the court.

22 Adam Solinger -- attorneyadamsolinger@gmail.com  
23 Michancy Cramer, Esq. ----- michancy@glawvegas.com

24 Louis C. Schneider, Esq. --- lcsllawllc@yahoo.com  
25 Jack Fleeman, Esq. --email@pecoslawgroup.com  
26 Vincent Mayo, Esq. --- VMgroup@theabramslawfirm.com

27 /s/ Marj Arena  
28 Marj Arena  
Judicial Executive Assistant- Dept. P

  
CLERK OF THE COURT

1 **DECD**

2  
3 **DISTRICT COURT; FAMILY DIVISION**  
4 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

5 \* \* \* \* \*

6 Adam Michael Solinger, ) Case No.: D-19-582245-D  
7 Plaintiff, ) Dept. P  
8 -vs.- )  
9 Chalese Marie Solinger, ) Date EHT: multiple  
Defendant. ) Time: 9:30 am

10 **DECREE OF DIVORCE**

11 This matter having come before the Court upon the scheduled Evidentiary  
12 Hearing held on May 10, 2021, January 21, 2022, March 1, 2022, March 2, 2022  
13 March 3, 2022; held in person; and the Plaintiff appeared personally, self-  
14 represented; and the Defendant appeared personally, being represented by Michancy  
15 Cramer, Esq.; and the Court having read and reviewed all the papers and pleadings  
16 on file, heard and considered any testimony, exhibits and any prior rulings in this  
17 matter, and good cause appearing therefore, makes the following Findings of Fact,  
18 Conclusions of Law and Decree and Orders.

19 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

20 ***Jurisdiction:***

21 1. Both parties are residents of the State of Nevada, County of Clark, and  
22 the Court finds it has personal and subject matter jurisdiction over the parties, the  
23 minor children and the parties' property.

24 2. The minor children have resided in Nevada at all times relevant herein,  
25 including a period more than 6 months preceding the filing of this action, and Nevada  
26 is the Home State of the minor children, and pursuant to NRS 125A et. seq. this Court  
27 has initial, exclusive and continuing jurisdiction to make custodial determinations.  
28

1           3. Plaintiff is and has been a bona-fide resident of Clark County, Nevada for  
2 the requisite six weeks prior to filing for divorce, and has continued to reside in Clark  
3 County ever since.

4           4. That the issues of custody (NRS 125C.0035(4))- the sole consideration is  
5 the best interests of the children; child support and other financial issues are to be  
6 adjudicated by the Court.

7           5. That there are separate and/or community property and/or debts to be  
8 adjudicated by the Court (NRS 125.150)

9           6. That there is the issue of attorney's fees to be adjudicated by the Court.

10 ***Personal:***

11           4. The parties were married May 12, 2012 in Las Vegas, Clark County,  
12 Nevada.

13           5. That the parties are the biological parents of two (2) minor child, to  
14 wit: Michael Adam Solinger (dob 6/16/15-currently just shy of age 7) and Marie  
15 Leona Solinger (dob 8/28/17- currently age 4 ).

16 ***Pleadings:***

17           6. Plaintiff (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff ", "Adam" or "Father")  
18 filed the Complaint for Divorce on January 4, 2019 (Doc. 1), with claims regarding  
19 custody, child support, other child related issues, community property and/or debts  
20 to be adjudicated, separate property.

21           7. That the Summons and Complaint were personally served on the  
22 Defendant on January 7, 2019, per the Affidavit of Service (Doc. 5).

23           8. Plaintiff filed Default (1/29/19 - Doc. 7).

24           9. Defendant (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant", "Chalese" or  
25 "Mother") filed an Answer and Counterclaim (2/4/19 - Doc. 12) and an Amended  
26 Answer and Counterclaim (2/7/19 - Doc. 15).

1           10. Defendant filed a Motion to Set Aside Default (2/7/19 - Doc. 16;  
2 Amended Motion Doc. 18).

3           11. The Court finds that as the parties moved forward it was presumed  
4 that the Default was set aside to hear the matter on its merits, but not reduced to  
5 writing in the Order following the motion hearing (3/19/19 -Doc. 47).

6           12. That in her Amended Counterclaim (2/7/19 - Doc. 15), Defendant  
7 with claims for custody, child support, other child related issues, community  
8 property and/or debts to be adjudicated, separate property, alimony/spousal  
9 support, attorney's fees, and requested that she be permitted to return to the use of  
10 her former name to wit: Chalese Marie Anderson, or maintain her present name, at  
11 her sole discretion.

12 ***Procedural History:***

13           13. This matter was originally assigned to the Hon. Judge Cheryl Moss  
14 (Dept. I-Retired), and after the 2020 elections, was reassigned to Dept. U -  
15 challenged by Plaintiff and was reassigned Dept. P., on January 12, 2021.

16 ***Dept. I Matters:***

17           14. That this Court finds that a complete review of the case file has been  
18 necessary to understand and/or determine why the prior orders in this matter had been  
19 made.

20           15. While both parties filed numerous motions in this matter, almost all of  
21 Adam's motions were filed requesting to take more and more time away from  
22 Chalese.

23           (a) At the initial hearing (3/19/19) the parties were awarded Joint Legal and  
24 Joint Physical Custody with a 4-3/3-4 timeshare;

25           (b) 6/17/19 hearing- Adam's Emergency Motion for Change of Custody  
26 (Doc. 49) - Adam's CPS inclusion regarding a chipped tooth was unsubstantiated;  
27 prior judge orders random testing of Chalese over minimal marijuana use (extremely  
28 low level in urine and nothing in hair); Adam unilaterally withholding the children;

1 Adam then brings up Chalese's prescription for Xanax to use as needed for diagnosed  
2 anxiety and insisted on random drug test that includes Xanax; Adam and/or his agent  
3 (private investigator) following Chalese basically 24/7, including a GPS monitor as  
4 well as trespassing at her residence to take photos of the backyard; Chalese's attorney  
5 seeks to cancel this as it creates anxiety; Adam brings up Chalese's boyfriend's  
6 (Josh) custody case motions to use in this case, which the prior judge gets herself  
7 involved in, which this Court finds inappropriate; due to Josh driving the children to  
8 drinking a beer, prior judge shortens Chalese's custody to Adam having Primary  
9 Physical Custody with right of first refusal with Chalese's timeshare shortened to 2  
10 days per week; prior judge stating that "I'm shortening her time to send a  
11 message...".

12 (c) 10/3/19 hearing - Motion to Continue Trial (Doc. 87); Plaintiff, who is an  
13 attorney, tried to refer a case to the prior judge in her gambling court in front of  
14 Defendant. Prior judge had to leave the courtroom due to how inappropriate it was.  
15 This occurred while the attorneys were in the hallway off record. Further, there was  
16 discussion regarding the Plaintiff threatening the District Court with a Writ.

17 (d) 12/6/19 - hearing on Chalese's Motion re Spousal Support, Attorney's  
18 Fees (Doc. 130). For the first time it was pointed out to the Court regarding  
19 Plaintiff's live in girlfriend, Jessica, and the issues of the Plaintiff having the children  
20 look to Jessica as their mother. This issue will be discussed further in these Findings  
21 at the appropriate time. (Continued to 12/9/19)

22 (e) 12/9/19 - Adam's Motion for Custody Evaluation was granted and was  
23 to include Plaintiff's girlfriend. Chalese's counsel pointed out to the Court that:  
24 "Custody is not an appropriate method to punish a parent you have to look at the best  
25 interest of the children. So she violates a court order you sanction her, give her  
26 warnings, but custody is not to be used as a sword that case law is clear." The Court  
27 orders Defendant preliminary attorney's fees,  
28

1 (f) 2/26/20 hearing- Adam's Motion to Reconsider (Doc. 232); Chalese's  
2 Countermotion to Restore Joint Physical Custody (Doc.239) Adam argues that a  
3 Custody Evaluation will show that now Chalese suffers from mental illness and that  
4 the timing was a way to "resuscitate her case". The issue of the Court using custody  
5 time to punish Chalese; and that the income of a non-spouse should be considered so  
6 he could avoid paying his spousal support. Chalese argues that she has complied with  
7 all of the Court's requests; the prior judge ignored Chalese's argument and still only  
8 relief upon Josh (boyfriend) prior alleged acts to not provide Chalese her legal rights.  
9

10 (g) 4/6-13/20 hearing- Adam's Motion for Change of Custody based upon  
11 Emergency Circumstances (Doc. 286); Chalese's Opposition and countermotion  
12 (Doc. 295), which included Adam's interrogation of children as to what goes on at  
13 Chalese's home; the prior judge solely used the issues of Josh to maintain the status  
14 quo.

15 *Dept. P Matters (1/12/21 forward):*

16 (1) 2/18/21 hearing - Adam's Motion to Terminate Spousal Support (Doc.  
17 392); Chalese's Opposition and Countermotion (Doc. 394); Court modified spousal  
18 support and set trial dates.

19 (2) 3/18/21 hearing on Adam's Motion to Modify Physical Custody  
20 Pending Trial (Doc. 404); Chalese's Opposition and Countermotion (Doc. 408);  
21 Modify Custody denied, Attorneys Fees deferred to trial.

22 (3) 4/30/21- hearing on Chalese's Motion for Witness to Appear Virtually  
23 (Doc 410); Adam's Opposition (Doc 418) and Adam's Motion in Limine (Doc. 412);  
24 Chalese's Opposition (Doc. 414); Dr. Paglini and rebuttal witness allowed to appear  
25 via BlueJeans application; Dr.Paglini is the parties witness and not the Courts.

26 (4) *Trial- Day 1:* 5/10/21: The Court heard testimony of Dr. John Paglini.  
27  
28

1 (5) Plaintiff filed a Motion to Disqualify Judge (5/13/21 - Doc. 427);  
2 Defendant filed Opposition (5/14/21 - Doc. 428); Judge filed Response (5/24/21-  
3 Doc. 429); Chief Judge Linda Bell heard the Motion on the pleadings; Decision &  
4 Order (6/24/21 - Doc. 444) denying the Motion to Disqualify.

5 (6) 7/8/21- hearing on Chalese's Motion Regarding Summer Custodial  
6 Time (Doc. 433); Adam's Opposition (Doc. 440); Based upon Adam's allegations of  
7 marijuana use, Court modified the custodial timeshare and time, as well as Chalese's  
8 phone calls with children; all other issues deferred to trial.

9 (7) 9/17/21 - Trial - Day 2 -continued as Defendant's Counsel was ill. Was  
10 also the scheduled hearing on Adam's Motion re Intent to Withhold Children (Doc  
11 458); Chalese's Opposition and Countermotion (Doc 461) and Errata (Doc. 462);  
12 Adam's Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 448) Motions continued to 9/27/21.

13 (8) 9/27/21 hearing: trial dates reset- issues re Covid resolved. Spousal  
14 Support to end as of November 1, 2021.

15 (9) 1/22/22 Trial - Day 2- the Court heard testimony of Dr. Paglini,  
16 Investigator Curtis Doyal; the Court, made temporary orders pending finalization of  
17 trial: Joint Legal Custody, Joint Physical Custody, week on/week off schedule  
18 exchange on Wednesdays, third party pickup permitted, vacation time only in the  
19 summer; no right of first refusal, no withholding of children. Set trial date for Day 3.

20 (10) 3/1/22 - Trial Day 3 - Court heard testimony of William Donahue,  
21 Joshua Lloyd and Jessica Sellers. All exhibits admitted with the exception of Adam's  
22 video exhibits which were not admitted.

23 (11) 3/2/22 - Trial Day 4 - Court heard testimony of Jessica Sellers, the  
24 Plaintiff and Defendant.  
25  
26  
27  
28



1 (12) 3/3/22 - Trial Day 5 - Court heard remainder of Defendant's  
2 testimony. Ordered closing argument briefs by March 17, 2022; set return date for  
3 Decision for April 14, 2022<sup>1</sup>.  
4

5 (13) Chalese filed Motion to Place Back on Calendar for further Testimony  
6 (Doc. 494) set on Order Shortening Time to April 14, 2022, regarding incident  
7 between Chalese and Josh. No formal Opposition was filed by the Plaintiff. Motion  
8 was discussed but the Court did not reopen trial for new testimony. The Court moved  
9 the decision date forward to 5/26/22. Plaintiff sought to cautiously inquire of the  
10 Court on the amount of time had been taken regarding the issuance of the Final  
11 Decree.  
12

13 ***SPECIFIC FINDINGS -- WITNESSES***

14 ***Dr. John Paglini:***

15 The Court ordered a Custody Evaluation, and Dr. Paglini was agreed to by  
16 the parties to provide same.

17 At the outset Dr. Paglini should have disclosed when he was retained that  
18 Adam referred a criminal case to Dr. Paglini, as it could create a conflict, which was  
19 not disclosed until later.

20 In his testimony at trial, Dr. Paglini stated that though Chalese had mild  
21 issues with stress related decision making, there was nothing that concerned him. He  
22 saw no psychosis so the elevated scores did not cause him concern, and stated that  
23 Chalese being in a high stress situation and with the problems with her pregnancy that  
24 she would react in a different way than normal. He was more concerned over dog  
25 feces in the backyard.  
26  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> Judge Perry contracted Covid-19 and thereafter acute pancreatitis and pneumonia, including  
hospitalization, between March 8 and April 9, 2022.

1 One of the issues the Court specifically wanted explored and so stated at the  
2 hearing when the evaluation was ordered, which was not explored by Dr. Paglini was  
3 that of “gate keeping”.

4 This court finds that on certain subjects Dr. Paglini was degrading of  
5 Chalese’s personal situation, basically centered on her financial situation, or lack  
6 thereof, while at the same time praising how wonderful Adam’s father was in  
7 providing Adam with access to funds, as well as purchasing him a new home.

8 What became clear from Dr. Paglini’s report and testimony, is that he  
9 focused on Chalese, and not much at all regarding Adam other than lack of proper  
10 pool security. The court finds it troubling that Adam had to have someone point out  
11 to him the dangers of the unfenced pool with small children around; yet, nevertheless,  
12 Adam believes that he can dictate other people’s living habits in their own residence.

13 This Court finds that Dr. Paglini failed to fully follow what the Court  
14 ordered. Dr. Paglini seemed to solely focus on Chalese, and not the parties equally,  
15 as if he only performed the equivalent of a brief focus assessment on Chalese, as  
16 Adam had requested of the court, but was denied in favor of the full custody  
17 evaluation of both parties as was ordered.

18 Ultimately, upon review, the Court finds Dr. Paglini’s report is incomplete,  
19 and while the Court may agree with certain aspects of the report and the testimony  
20 that dovetail with other testimony, the Court simply cannot accept same it in its  
21 entirety as completely credible.

22  
23 ***Dr. William O’Donohue (Defendant Rebuttal Expert):***

24 Dr. O’Donohue’s credentials are extensive and so is his work in the area  
25 of custody, evaluations, both preparing and being a rebuttal witness. He has  
26 testified as an expert a minimum of 200 times, and about a dozen as a rebuttal  
27 witness. That the Court finds and holds that Dr. O’Donohue is qualified to testify  
28 as an expert witness.

1 His testimony was based upon those facts that were placed in Dr.  
2 Paglini's report. His testimony was based only upon a review of what had  
3 occurred which was contained in Dr. Paglini's report, yet the Court finds his  
4 testimony enlightening.

5 Dr. O'Donohue testified that after listing multiple factors to be looked at  
6 in Dr. Paglini's report, he added his own factors as well as part of his testimony.

7 Dr. O'Donohue questioned Dr. Paglini's methodology in arriving at the  
8 various statements, failed to cover various subjects, and the like in Dr. Paglini's  
9 report. One example is Adam simply going into Chalese's residence without  
10 permission. Dr. Paglini did not explore how this could have affected Chalese, or  
11 consider Adam's motivation and the need to break into the other parent's home.  
12 Another is Chalese being in the hospital during hard labor for one of the children  
13 of the parties, and Adam was not there, but was out riding his bike and studying for  
14 the bar. Adam showed lack of displaying any priority as to child care and concern  
15 for his wife was noted.

16 Another would be Dr. Paglini's lack of any observation of emotional  
17 maturity; yet Dr. Paglini made a determination of Josh's emotional maturity and  
18 finances without ever speaking with Josh. There were other items of mere  
19 statement but without any exploration by Dr. Paglini (night-time medication; only  
20 Chalese's violation of Court orders with no mention of Adam's).

21 Dr. O'Donohue testified that Dr. Paglini's report is full of mere  
22 statements, without exploring the validity of such statements. In various  
23 circumstances, Dr. Paglini only reported Adam's side of various issues, and clearly  
24 accepted Adam's interpretation of matters, including downplaying Adam's own  
25 drug use, but failed to explore further as to mom's issues regarding each subject.  
26  
27  
28

1           That Dr. Paglini did not fully investigate as to the various stressors that  
2           having a private investigator follow her would have on Chalese, who already had  
3           an anxiety and PTSD issues; that pressuring her could create Chalese's  
4           unwillingness to deal with Adam.

5           Dr. O'Donohue did take notice of Chalese's working with children, her  
6           being a child's Hairstylist and nanny shows an affinity to children and being with  
7           them, and commented: "Skilled as primary care giver, show affinity toward it, and  
8           liking it, shows best interest to the children". Dr. O'Donohue also noted that pre-  
9           separation, Chalese was a stay-at-home mother and primary caregiver of the  
10          children.

11          The Court finds this a reasonable questioning of Dr. Paglini's report since  
12          many things were never addressed (noted above). Chalese was in the hospital  
13          during hard labor for one of the children of the parties, and Adam was not there,  
14          but was out riding his bike and studying for the bar. There was a lack of  
15          displaying priority as to child care and concern for his wife. No exploring of this,  
16          but just a statement. No conclusions, yet it shows Dad's interests other than  
17          family.

18          Ultimately, the Court finds that Dr. O'Donohue's testimony and report to  
19          be very credible and useful and lends further credence to the Court's findings  
20          regarding Dr. Paglini's report/testimony.

21  
22          ***Investigator Curtis Doyal:***

23          Mr. Doyal was hired by Adam to surveil Chalese. He testified that he did  
24          not recognize anyone in the courtroom, even though Chalese was in the courtroom.

25          The predominant occasion surrounding his report/testimony that Chalese  
26          drove recklessly. Testimony included the fact that it was very dark when he did  
27          the surveillance. That he saw a GMC pick-up truck and female drive up in that  
28          truck and went inside then came out with a child; that he lost sight of the initial

1 GMC, that he himself drove 90 miles an hour or more in attempting to catch the  
2 person in the truck, as he had no specified equipment to properly note how fast his  
3 subjects were traveling, and could not even be sure it was the same vehicle.

4 The Court finds that there is no showing by any sort of evidentiary value  
5 that this was, in fact, Chalese.

6 The Court finds that there was no evidentiary value to Mr. Doyle's  
7 testimony and cannot to be relied upon.

8  
9 ***Joshua Lloyd (Defendant's significant other):***

10 Mr. Lloyd, while having difficulties with when something occurred,  
11 definitely remembered what occurred, in detail. The Court finds that there is  
12 blame to go around to all of the interconnected parties on this particular issue.

13 Overall, the Court does find Mr. Lloyd to be credible, as to those events in  
14 this matter, after he became comfortable and expanded his answers.

15 The court finds that there was no reason that Josh could not be a  
16 babysitter. He had joint custody of his own children.

17  
18 ***Jessica Sellers (Plaintiff's significant other):***

19 The major issue with Jessica Sellers, is that she believes, together with the  
20 Plaintiff, with their testimony, that she is a better mother. They both testified as to  
21 Jessica's parenting abilities versus Chalese's, which is troublesome and cause for  
22 some concern. They both testified that Chalese could never be replaced but actions  
23 speak louder than words.

24 One example of Jessica's intentional interference is when Jessica picked  
25 up the children on exchange day at about 1:30 pm, knowing that Chalese would be  
26 picking them up after she got out of work, solely because Jessica promised  
27 swimming time to the children. She did not return the children to the day care prior  
28 to Chalese arriving to pick them up, causing further turmoil.

1 Jessica is not credible when she says she does not want take the place of  
2 Chalese, even though she stated she picks up the children, goes to the parent  
3 teacher conference, doctor's appointments, child exchanges, and that she is the  
4 better mother. Her excuse was that if Chalese did then she wouldn't need to. The  
5 Court believes that if Jessica did not seek to usurp her place, Chalese would be  
6 comfortable going, as she was previously used to doing.

7 Jessica was the proximate cause of the driveway incident. Despite the fact  
8 that she had a Justice Court TPO against Josh and ordered that Josh was to remain  
9 inside the residence during child exchange, she chose to violate her own TPO by  
10 arriving at Josh's home, and parking across his driveway, creating the incident,  
11 knowing that Chalese/Josh and the children were not home but on their way, and  
12 required the driveway. Adam could have picked up the children to avoid this type  
13 of issue or Jessica parking across the street to avoid being on Josh's residential  
14 property.

15 What is clear is the Adam's intent to systematically demean Chalese on  
16 many levels, as a parent.

17 The Court finds that Ms. Sellers' (and the Plaintiff) attitude, testimony  
18 and/or opinion of their intent to undercut Chalese with Jessica in this regard is  
19 completely reprehensible.

20  
21 ***Adam Solinger (Plaintiff):***

22 Adam Solinger is an attorney, and as such, when it came to following the  
23 law/rules, etc., there was a higher expectation from him as a self-represented  
24 individual in this matter (after January 2021).

25 Throughout this case, both pre and post Dept. P assignment, he conducted  
26 himself with some of the worse type of behavior the Court has seen to date, in the  
27 deliberate manner he treated the mother of his children, in deliberately seeking to  
28 actually demean and/or undercut her altogether.

1           His legal strategic approach leaves much to be desired and created  
2 unnecessary and unwarranted litigation.

3           Mr. Solinger, over the course of this case, has been the proximate cause of  
4 various issues that this Court was required to deal with.

5           These issues include but are not limited to:

6           (a) Admits that hiring a PI to follow Chalese around or to place a tracking  
7 device on her vehicle to see if she was adhering to orders; this is not consistent  
8 with co-parenting.

9           (b) Does not believe that it is abusive behavior to have strange men  
10 following Mom around in grocery stores, parking lots, chasing her in the streets or  
11 even her home. (Trial Video 3/2/22 timestamp 2:00 to 2:10)

12           (c) Dad violated joint legal custodial provisions and picked, without  
13 consulting Chalese, schools, day cares, speech therapy, cutting daughter's hair  
14 (even though Chalese is a child hairdresser), etc. He tried to mislead by saying he  
15 consulted with Chalese then stating that CCSD chooses the school children go to.

16           (d) That Adam exercised vacation time, usually reserved for the  
17 summer, in between Thanksgiving and Christmas 2020 and 2021, leaving Chalese  
18 with only two days of visitation with the children over the holidays, all due to the  
19 Christianity dinners on Sundays during this period of time. All of a sudden, Dad  
20 recognizes Christianity practices when he was always an atheist. The Court does  
21 not find Adam credible when he testified that he was not looking to "take time  
22 away from Chalese", but rather to celebrate Christian "dinners" with his girlfriend.

23           (e) The Court finds that Adam lacks candor to the Court in situations  
24 when it benefits him not to do so.

25           (f) The Court does not find the Plaintiff credible on many issues as to his  
26 intent. Ultimately with a combination of testimony, Adam's and Jessica's actions  
27 speak louder than words.  
28

1 ***Micro Managing***

2 THE COURT HEREBY FINDS:

3 That after vacating the community residence, and moving in with his  
4 girlfriend, Adam, without Chalese's knowledge and/or consent, entered Chalese's  
5 residence, taking video and still photos of the residence, causing heightened  
6 anxiety for Chalese. Chalese has also seen him sitting outside of her home when  
7 she saw the videos on the Ring doorbell video. There is also Adam's admitting to  
8 placaiing a tracking device on Chalese's vehicle. The court finds Chalese credible  
9 on these issues. Once Adam moved out, he should not have entered the residence  
10 without Chalese's knowledge and consent or an absolute emergency.

11 That Adam trying to force Chalese to take the children to preschool or a  
12 particular day care on Mom's time is an attempt to micromanage Chalese and her  
13 ability to parent on her own time.

14 Adam attempted to take Chalese's boyfriend's deposition twice, against  
15 Nevada's rules, rather than only once.

16 Adam complained about Chalese picking the children up early from  
17 daycare, from which she was going to pick them up from daycare anyway as it was  
18 her time commencing when school let out, and she could pick them up at any time  
19 after that. This is another example of Adam's micro-managing.

20 Though agreeing to phone calls at 7 pm, calls did not take place. The  
21 Court finds Chalese's testimony more credible that she did try to call the children,  
22 but Adam would not answer the phone versus Adam's testimony that she never  
23 called.

24 That Adam mentioned in his Motion to change custody filed March 31,  
25 2020 that he told Chalese that she needed to bathe the children every day to ensure  
26 the children are as clean as possible. He also ordered Chalese that the children had  
27 to be in bed by a certain time during her custodial timeshare. These are further  
28 examples of Adam's micro-managing.



1           That in the same motion, Adam complained that he did not know the  
2 social distancing protocols of Chalese's chosen babysitter, when Chalese had an  
3 appointment she could not cancel. The Court finds that whomever Chalese would  
4 have left the children with, Adam would have complained about that as well.

5           Adam objected to when Chalese brought her boyfriend into the picture,  
6 yet he had a girlfriend.

7           These attempts to micro-manage Chalese and the children, clearly shows  
8 Adam's inability or unwillingness to co-parent and that there is no pleasing him.  
9 No matter what happens, Adam will always take an adverse position to Chalese's  
10 choices, even during a pandemic.

11           Adam complained that Chalese has chickens at her house, which could  
12 spread Covid.

13           During the pandemic, Adam complained that Josh and his children went  
14 grocery shopping. Like everyone else in Las Vegas during the pandemic, going  
15 grocery shopping, was and is, a necessity. This Court finds this complaint from  
16 Adam was frivolous and without merit.

17           That there have been no reports that Chalese has allowed Josh to be alone  
18 with the children or has allowed him to drive with the children, since 2020, and  
19 there was no evidence presented at trial. Chalese testified that she left one of the  
20 children with Josh in the middle of the night, as she had to take a trip the  
21 emergency room

22           The Court does not find that Adam is credible when he testified that he  
23 did not take time away from Chalese to celebrate "Christian" dinners with his  
24 girlfriend. It should be noted that both parties testified, that neither of them were  
25 religious per se, or celebrated holidays as a religious time as such. Adam testified  
26 that he is an atheist.

At the beginning of COVID Pandemic, Adam withheld the children because of his “I know better than you” attitude on more than one occasion. Adam withheld all but 24 hours in April 2020, and even had the audacity to request Chalese clean her home daily to his specifications and that he be permitted to randomly inspect same, which the Court finds is overstepping the boundaries, and intolerable.

\* \* \* \* \*

Further, despite being an attorney, and having a legal researcher (girlfriend) to assist him for most of this case, Adam violated the Joint Preliminary Injunction when he decided to take mom off of health insurance when he changed jobs, even though no one gave him permission to do so.

The major issues the Court has with the Plaintiff is the controlling nature, micro management that he shown, as well as the complete disrespect he has for the mother of his children, blatantly inserting his current girlfriend into the “mother’s role.

As an attorney, Adam’s use and portrayal of an excuse of “ignorance” of the Family Court law, rules, etc. on multiple occasions is disingenuous. A pro per litigant cannot avoid proper application of the law on grounds that he lacked knowledge of procedural rules. See Rodriguez v. Fiesta Palms, LLC, 134 Nev. 654, 659, 428 P.3d 255, 259 (2018) (noting that a "litigant cannot use his alleged ignorance as a shield to protect him from the consequences of failing to comply with basic procedural requirements); Sengel v. IGT, 116 Nev. 565, 572, 2 P.3d 258, 262 (2000) (recognizing that the public has constructive knowledge of state law).

The Court finds that Adam engaged in bad faith and unreasonable conduct that “permeated the entirety of the litigation”. Adam’s behavior and actions taken in this matter can be categorized as misconduct so egregious that it raises concerns over integrity and fundamental fairness.

1 ***Chalese M. Solinger (Defendant):***

2 That until this matter commenced, Chalese was the primary caregiver  
3 with all issues surrounding the children. Once this matter commenced, Chalese did  
4 not participate in the son's speech therapy, parent-teacher conferences, etc.  
5 Chalese was the primary caregiver and even Adam's testimony was that being the  
6 care giver was her role in the marriage. However, much of Chalese's  
7 responsiveness more than likely was stemming from Adam's controlling attitude  
8 and his insistence on having it his way only, including his insistence that his  
9 girlfriend, Jessica, be included in everything. Chalese's minimal income prohibits  
10 her ability to be involved during her work hours.

11 Chalese testified regarding the issue with Michael's birth, how difficult it  
12 was and how Adam could not be bothered. Apparently, Chalese and the children,  
13 when Michael was a newborn had to leave the home and go to Idaho for 1 ½ years  
14 because Adam had to deal with his studies.

15 Chalese testified as to Adam and Jessica's constant repeat of Marie  
16 having diaper rash, but they never brought her to a doctor. Chalese took her to the  
17 doctor and it turned out to be a yeast infection.

18 The Court finds that Chalese is credible in that she does work with Minor  
19 child at home practicing his speech therapy with a mirror.

20 The Court finds that Chalese did not take vacation time for two years  
21 because she could not afford to take the time off from work.

22 The Court finds that there was no testimony as there being any issues with  
23 the medication that Chalese was prescribed to take, and finds that there was no  
24 testimony that Chalese was abusing these medications.

25 The Court finds that Chalese's "paranoia" was justified in the way Adam,  
26 Jessica, and private investigators seemed to be always following her.  
27  
28

The Court finds Chalese credible in her rendition of what happened at the day care when Jessica decided to take the children home to go swimming, so close to Chalese's time share that Jessica did not return the children until Chalese had already arrived. Once school let out, it was on Chalese's timeshare, whether she picked the children up literally when school let out, or sometime during the school after-care program.

Overall, the Court finds Chalese to be very credible, including but not limited to her PTSD and anxiety, medication usage, and the like, as well as her testimony as to all of the issues that went on during this litigation.

## ***SPECIFIC FINDINGS - OVERALL***

THE COURT HEREBY FINDS:

The Court Finds that the way Chalese was treated by the prior Court was abhorrent. Without so much as an offer of proof she has been accused of doing multiple things which were absolutely legal to do. There were multiple allegations predominately against the boyfriend, Josh, and not against Chalese herself, for which the prior judge on various occasions reduced Chalese's custody. *It was argued at the time, that the prior Court, more than once,* reduced Chalese's custodial timeshare and/or actual time as a punishment, and this Court agrees. This Court considers the prior Court's so using custody as a punishment are improper, even to "get Chalese's attention". *Sims v. Sims*, 109 Nev. 1146, 1149, 865 P.2d 328, 330 (1993), *Wiese v. Granata*, 110 Nev. 1410, 1412, 887 P.2d 744, 746 (1994) (quoting *Dagher v. Dagher*, 103 Nev. 26, 28 n.3, 731 P.2d 1329, 1330 n.3 (1987)) "A court may not use changes of custody as a sword to punish parental misconduct."

The Court Finds that but for the above actions by the prior judge affirming Adam's actions (either directly or indirectly), Chalese would be awarded primary physical custody.

1 Further, the Court also Finds that Adam's behavior in having Chalese  
2 followed, a tracker on her car, the game-playing, and ultimately the false  
3 allegations and actions taken "minimize" Chalese, despite all the prior years of his  
4 working long hours leaving the children in Chalese's sole care, was proof that  
5 Chalese was a great mother, until he chose to replace his wife with another woman.  
6 His actions speak volumes.

7  
8 In this matter Adam has had an issue with the Court disagreeing with his  
9 point of view. This is shown on multiple hearings, one of which was after the  
10 Court awarded spousal support. While it is true that the Court can consider a  
11 remarried party's new spouse's income under *Rodgers v. Rodgers*, 110 Nev. 1370,  
12 887 P.2d 269 (Nev., 1994): "Although the narrow statutory definition of gross  
13 monthly income does not encompass community income, an examination of a  
14 remarried parent's "relative income" may properly include consideration of his or  
15 her one half interest in the new spouse's income. This theory does not necessarily  
16 hold true when litigants are not remarried. Adam wanted the Court to rely on the  
17 boyfriend's income, but not to do the same with Plaintiff and his live in girlfriend.

18 Further, after day 1 of trial, with other days pending, Adam apparently  
19 believed that the undersigned would not give him what he wanted, and sought to  
20 disqualify the undersigned by way of his Motion to Disqualify, which was  
21 ultimately denied.

22 A recurring theme in this case is Adam's perceived superiority over  
23 Mother when it comes to parenting. During the parties' marriage, Chalese  
24 provided nearly all of the child-rearing duties, supporting Adam so he could  
25 establish his career as an attorney, etc.

26 The Court finds that during this time period, Adam was working 60 +  
27 hours a week and leaving the children with mom. He had no problems with  
28 Chalese's ability to care for the children then, it is only after he has moved on that  
he now has problems with mom's ability to parent.

1           The Court finds that Chalese from birth to the date of the commencement  
2 of this action was the sole/primary custodian and caregiver of the children, and that  
3 demeaning her abilities as a parent are unjustifiable.

4           Conversely, Adam preferred to perform virtually no parenting during the  
5 parties' marriage, and has admitted that was the "division of labor" as defined by  
6 him; this Court defines as Chalese does all the work with the children, as it pertains  
7 to school, doctors, etc., and Adam does nothing in this regard and was happy to  
8 delegate the responsibility. Adam started making negative allegations about  
9 Chalese's parenting, all for the purpose to again displace Chalese, and provide him  
10 with the majority of custodial timeshare, and then have Jessica, who already  
11 appears at functions such as parent-teacher meetings and the like in Adam's place.

12           In fact, at trial Jessica admitted on the stand that she is a better mother  
13 than Chalese. This avenue of thinking first appeared in this matter in December  
14 2019 hearing.

15           Adam has shown that he believes that his opinions as to Chalese's  
16 "horrible judgment and reckless behavior" are true because Adam says they are  
17 true, none of which he was able to prove at trial. Adam did not attend a single  
18 speech therapy session with Michael prior to the separation. Adam refused to pay  
19 support to Chalese absent a Court order and insisted she get a job, and now accuses  
20 her of "refusing" to take Michael to speech therapy because she cannot get Michael  
21 across town with her work schedule and be able to take time off.

22           In this matter, we have both parties violating Court orders; but Adam's  
23 withholding the children from Chalese provides further impetus as to Adam's true  
24 motives - simply to undercut Chalese and cut her out of children's lives. The prior  
25 Judge did get Chalese's attention. Since that hearing, Chalese changed counsel,  
26 took the UNLV parenting class, took the COPE class, but he made it impossible  
27 for her to deal with him.  
28

1 Adam conducted himself in this divorce matter, which started out as a  
2 routine type matter, by way of scorched earth litigation. One definition of  
3 “scorched earth litigation” is conduct whose goal is to wear down the other side,  
4 create excessive amounts of work, and act relentless. This definition applies to  
5 Adam throughout this case. He persistently adopted a “war mentality”, to “push the  
6 envelope”, without much thought, if any, to economics or good faith.  
7

8 Early on in this litigation, Adam used allegations about Chalese (abusing  
9 drugs), which turned out not to be true, in an attempt to withhold access, actually  
10 withholding access, and in some of those occurrences stated it was his “vacation  
11 time”.

12 The Court finds that Adam believes he should be able to use CPS as his  
13 personal “go to” to investigate what he considers issues to be investigated.

14 Adam’s continued bad faith and unreasonable conduct permeated the  
15 entirety of the litigation.

#### 16 **FACTORS PURSUANT TO NRS 125C.0025**

17 NRS 125C.0025 states that: When a court is making a determination  
18 regarding physical custody of children, there is a preference that joint physical  
19 custody would be in the best interest of a minor child. The Sole consideration is the  
20 best interest of the child. The minimum factors a court must consider is spelled out in  
21 NRS 125C.0035(4) as follows:

22 (a) *Wishes of the child if of sufficient age and capacity to inform an intelligent*  
23 *preference.* This factor is neutral since neither child is of sufficient age and capacity  
24 to form an intelligent preference.

25 (b) *Nomination by parent/guardian.* This factor is neutral due to there being no  
26 nomination by a parent or guardian.  
27  
28

1           (c) Which more likely to allow frequent associations and continuing associations  
2           and continuing relationship with other parent.

3           This case has been fraught with Adam's attempts to cut Chalese out of the  
4           children's lives, and replace her with his girlfriend. He would take vacation time  
5           during weekends throughout December, which was Chalese's regular timeshare,  
6           where she would end up having only have a couple of days during the month of  
7           December. Adam withheld the children from Chalese in April 2020 to the point  
8           where Chalese only received 24 hours with the children during that month. This  
9           occurred again at Christmas time (2020 and 2021).

10           Dr. Paglini stated that Chalese started counseling in order to deal with  
11           Adam.

12           Given that Adam continually filed motions which sought to reduce  
13           Chalese's timeshare, all based upon Adam's opinion of how Chalese should be  
14           parenting the children (see also micro managing herein).

15           When Chalese sought to switch days so the children could attend their  
16           cousin's birthday party, Adam refused to cooperate. This indicates Adam's inability  
17           and/or unwillingness to co-parent with Chalese.

18           Adam's attitude needs to change as the parties move into the future, and  
19           must actually co-parent with Chalese. For now, this factor favors Chalese.

20  
21           (d) Level of Conflict between parents

22           This is a very high conflict case. The court believes that both parents' have  
23           some fault to a degree, but moreso Adam with his constantly seeking to micro-  
24           manage Chalese's life, her residence, her boyfriend, etc., keeping her passive, as  
25           such passivity is simply easier on Chalese due to her anxiety disorder, as testified by  
26           both Dr. Paglini and Dr. O'Donohue.



1                   (e) *Ability of parents to cooperate to meet the needs of the child.*

2  
3                   As noted above, Adam tends to be extremely micro-managing of the  
4 children and their lives, to the point where he sought to have Chalese follow his  
5 orders when he demanded that he set bathing schedule and bedtimes for the  
6 children at Chalese's home, handed down a cleaning schedule for Chalese to  
7 follow in her home and the like.

8                   Adam made sole decisions regarding the children as to school, medical  
9 issues and the like, without discussing same with Chalese, and only telling her later  
10 on.

11                  Chalese is credible in her explanation of Marie's teeth issue for a  
12 procedure to rectify a problem before it became a necessity, and Adam not wanting  
13 to spend the money at that time as the procedure was not necessary at that moment,  
14 but within a couple of weeks it became necessary, and unfortunately Marie had to  
15 deal with a lack of her two front teeth much sooner than usual.

16                  On the other hand, it is understandable that Chalese has backed off  
17 matters with Jessica's appearance into the scene, and the treatment she has  
18 received from Adam and Jessica and Chalese being pushed away.

19                  Adam's attitude in all respects is that he is superior to Chalese as a parent,  
20 that her wishes and ideas should not be considered, and that it is "his way or the  
21 highway." Such attitudes demonstrate that Adam has impeded the parties' ability  
22 to cooperate to meet the children's needs.

23                  For now, this renders this factor favors Chalese.

24                  (f) *Mental and physical health of parents*

25                  There was no evidence of either party having uncontrollable mental health  
26 issues. Chalese has depression and anxiety, and she has stated she suffers from  
27 PTSD. Adam has had Chalese followed to the point where it made her feel like  
28 she was being followed everywhere. Adam sought to make it appear that mom  
was being paranoid. This was not paranoia. This was Adam seeking to instigate

1 an issue to make Chalese look bad. The intensity of the stressors of this divorce  
2 surely have triggered Chalese's anxiety.

3 Dr. Paglini noted that he believes that Adam has Mild Narcissistic  
4 tendencies, and a problem with control issues, and this Court agrees.

5 This Court believes that Chalese's passiveness with Adam's controlling  
6 history or narcissistic personality could be a reason for her to more likely  
7 disengage with Adam.

8 This factor is neutral but slightly favors Adam.

9 *(g) Physical, developmental, emotional needs of child*

10 Up until January 2019, Chalese was involved with the children and their  
11 health appointments, school, etc. Chalese was the primary care taker and had a  
12 difficult pregnancy (not Plaintiff's child) during this case and was on bed rest so  
13 being able to participate became difficult. The parties' son has a speech impediment,  
14 but no other physical, developmental and/or emotional needs. Both parties know  
15 what needs to be done, leaving this factor as neutral.

16 *(h) Nature of relationship of child with each parent*

17 There was No testimony that showed the children have anything but a  
18 good loving relationship with each parent. This factor is Neutral.

19 *(i) Ability of the child(ren) to maintain a relationship with siblings.*

20 Adam has no other children. Chalese has another child, and the subject  
21 children have the right to their relationship with their sibling. Any minimization of  
22 Chalese's time interferes with this relationship and is not in the children's best  
23 interests. This factor favors Chalese.

24 *(j) History of abuse or neglect.*

25 There was no testimony regarding abuse or neglect of the children. Even  
26 though Jessica tried to claim it was neglect for the children to have dirty  
27 fingernails, this does not rise to neglect. This factor is neutral.

1           (k) *Engaged in act of DV against child, parent or any other*  
2 *person residing with the child.*

3           Adam's use of the children in an attempt to control Chalese is borderline  
4 domestic abuse and/or violence. This is one of the reasons why it is a rebuttable  
5 presumption that perpetrators of domestic violence should not have primary  
6 physical or joint physical custody of minor children.

7           Adam's stalking Chalese through private investigators sitting across from  
8 her home, Jessica sitting in her vehicle across from Chalese's home, Adam's  
9 invading Chalese's home after he moved out could also be deemed domestic abuse  
10 and/or violence.

11           This factor favors Chalese.

12           (l) *Engage in act of abduction.*

13           This has not been raised as an issue, therefore this factor is neutral.

14           (m) *Other.*

15           Prior to the testimony of Mr. O'Donohue, The Court had various  
16 impressions regarding Dr. Paglini's report due to the lack of exploring very important  
17 facts: Adam's withholding the children, taking his vacation time just on Chalese's  
18 weekends to keep Chalese from seeing the children for long periods of time. Adam's  
19 use of drugs, Adam's actions bordering domestic abuse and/or violence, Adam's  
20 entering Chalese's home uninvited. Mr. O'Donohue testimony mirrors the Court's  
21 thoughts that Dr. Paglini overall appeared biased in favor of Adam and against  
22 Chalese.

23           As to these factors and it appearing that Chalese receiving the majority of  
24 the factors, Chalese should be awarded primary physical custody; however, it is  
25 unfortunate that the prior judge, whether intentionally or overtly, enabled and/or  
26 endorsed these actions causing these stunts to continue.

The Court finds that Adam has repeatedly expressed hostility and animus towards Chalese, making derogatory comments that he was generally combative and unwilling to co-parent or confer with Chalese in any effective manner. The Court is concerned that Adam's denigration of Chalese affects the relationship in front of the child.

At the present time, this Court is willing to provide Adam the opportunity to show he can properly co-parent without the behavior he has already shown.

### Post-Trial Motion

That after the final day of trial in this matter, Chalese and her boyfriend, Josh, became involved in an incident/ argument which proceeded to, inter alia, Josh breaking the television. Josh was arrested at that time and charged with domestic violence. The Court finds that Chalese acted properly and appropriately in removing the children and calling the police.

\* \* \* \* \*

That should any Finding be more properly construed as a Conclusions of Law, the same shall be so construed.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. That the Court has jurisdiction pursuant to NRS 125.020, 125.120, 125.130, and to make orders as to the parties' legal status;
2. That the Court has the authority to make orders as it pertains to the marital estate, separate and/or community property/debts (NRS 125.150);
3. Legal custody involves having basic legal responsibility for a child and making major decisions regarding the child, including the child's health, education, and religious upbringing. *Rivero v. Rivero*, 125 Nev. 420-421, 216 P.3d 213, 221 (2009) (citing, *Mack v. Ashlock*, 112 Nev. 1062, 1067, 921 P.2d 1258, 1262 (1996)). Joint legal custody requires that the parents be able to cooperate, communicate, and compromise to act in the best interest of the child. *Id.* (citing, *Mosely v. Figliuzzi*, 113 Nev. 51, 60-61, 930 P.2d 1110, 1116 (1997)). In a joint legal custody situation, the

1 parents must consult with each other to make major decisions regarding the child's  
2 upbringing, while the parent with whom the child is residing at that time usually  
3 makes minor day-to-day decisions. *Id.* (citing, *Mack*, 112 Nev. at 1076, 921 P.2d at  
4 1262).

5 4. That the Court has the authority to make orders as it pertains to Custody  
6 (NRS 125C, et.seq., *Rivero -v- Rivero*, 216, P.3d 213 (2009); 125 Nev. Adv. Op.  
7 No. 34 (August 27, 2009), *Wallace v. Wallace*, 112 Nev. 1015, 1019, 922 P.2d 541,  
8 543 (1996) ("Matters of custody and support of minor children rest in the sound  
9 discretion of the trial court"); *Bluestein v. Bluestein*, 131 Nev., Adv. Op. 14, 345 P.3d  
10 1044, 1048 (2015) reiterating that "in custody matters, the child's best interest is  
11 paramount");

12 5. When making a custody determination, the sole consideration is the  
13 best interests of the child. NRS 125C.0035(1); *Davis v. Ewalefo*, 131 Nev. 445, 451,  
14 352 P.3d 1139, 1143 (2015). Moreover, the district court's order "must tie the child's  
15 best interest, as informed by specific, relevant findings respecting the [best interest  
16 factors<sup>1</sup> and any other relevant factors, to the custody determination made." *Davis*,  
17 131 Nev. at 451, 352 P.3d at 1143.

18 6. That the Court has the authority to make orders as it pertains to Child  
19 Support (NAC Chapter 425; NRS 125B et.seq., *Barbagallo v. Barbagallo*, 105 Nev.  
20 546, 779 P.2d 532 (1989) ), *Wright v Osburne*, 114 Nev. 1367, 970 P.2d 1071,  
21 (1998);

22 7. When one party complains of an error that that party caused, the invited  
23 error doctrine bars appellate relief. *Pearson v. Pearson*, 110 Nev. 293, 297, 871 P.2d  
24 343, 345 (1994). This doctrine applies to both "affirmative conduct and a "failure to  
25 act to prevent the error. *Id.* (internal quotations omitted). When Adam commenced  
26 his wrongful behavior by what appears to be his surveillance, accusations of drug  
27 and/or alcohol abuse, his claim she has mental health issues, combined with at the  
28 time, Chalese's pregnancy and other issues, he created the very issues he brought

1 forth to the Court in order to obtain his own agenda. In the end after all of his  
2 bullying tactics, the only real (but misguided) statement he could make is that the  
3 children had dirty fingernails.

4 \* \* \* \* \*

5 That should any Conclusions of Law be more properly construed as a  
6 Finding, the same shall be so construed.

7 **DECREE & ORDERS**

8 *NOW THEREFORE*, and good cause appearing; It Is Hereby  
9

10 ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that this Court has personal  
11 and subject matter jurisdiction over the parties and the marital estate. The parties  
12 are incompatible in marriage, thus the bonds of matrimony now existing between  
13 the parties are wholly dissolved, and an absolute Decree of Divorce is hereby  
14 granted to the parties, and each of the parties is hereby returned to the status of a  
15 single, unmarried person. NRS 125.020 and NRS 125.120. This is a final and  
16 absolute Decree of Divorce, wholly and completely dissolving the marriage and  
17 dividing the assets and liabilities of the parties. NRS 125.130; and it is further  
18

19 ORDERED that the Plaintiff has requested a name change, and she may  
20 resume the use of her prior surname of Chalese Anderson, or any other surname  
21 she has legally used at her sole discretion; and it is further

22 ORDERED that as this marriage was a short term marriage, and as both  
23 parties are in good physical condition, have the ability to work, and as temporary  
24 spousal support was ordered during the pendency of this matter, neither party is  
25 entitled to receive alimony/spousal support from the other; and it is further

26 **PERMANENT BEHAVIORAL ORDER**

27 ORDERED as set forth in this Behavior Order, the use of the pronoun  
28 “You” applies to BOTH the Plaintiff and the Defendant in this matter. Specifically,  
the parties are hereby ORDERED to comply with the following:

1  
2 1. You shall not engage in any abusive contact (foul language,  
3 name calling, etc.) with the other party or children, including telephone  
4 calls, letters, e-mail, etc.

5 2. You shall avoid any unnecessary contact with the other party's  
6 family, friends, associates, neighbors, co-workers, "significant other",  
7 etc., and you shall not initiate conflicts with them.

8 3. You shall maintain respect toward the other party's friends,  
9 relatives, "significant other", etc.

10 4. You shall not contact any persons associated with the other party  
11 (including but not limited to: "significant others", friends, relatives,  
12 neighbors, employers, co-workers, business associates, and customers) for  
13 purposes of discussing court proceedings or making negative/disparaging  
14 allegations about the other party (this includes all forms of social media).

15 5. You will advise all your friends, relatives, and "significant  
16 others" if they express an intent or otherwise disparage, criticize, or harass  
17 the other party, that such behavior is disallowed, and that you could have  
18 your parenting time limited if you are unable to stop their negative  
19 behavior, and that you may be sanctioned if the Court finds that you  
20 knowingly allowed them, and/or did not take sufficient effort to prevent,  
21 them to violate the terms and intent of this Behavior Order.

22 6. Pursuant to EDCR 5.304 (eff. 6/11/22, formerly 5.301), you will  
23 **NOT**, nor shall anyone on your behalf, communicate, discuss, or provide  
24 any information concerning court issues or proceedings with the minor  
25 children; this includes audio and video thereto, and will take every  
26 precaution to secure copies of pleadings safely away from the eyes of the  
27 children at all times (including evidence or documentation from your side  
28 or the opposing party's side), unless authorized by the Court.

7. You shall focus on your children and keep in mind what is in the  
children's best interest.

8. You shall not, either directly or through third parties, including  
significant others, inappropriately question or interrogate your children  
about what occurs in the other parent's household, etc., and shall try to  
respect and not interfere with the children's privacy and relationship with  
the other parent; do not place your children in a loyalty bind between  
yourself and the other parent; your children need to be able to love both of  
you freely in both of your homes for healthy child development.

1  
2 9. You shall not provide, either directly or through third parties,  
3 copies of any unsolicited documents (personal letters, court pleadings,  
4 etc.) to anyone associated with a party (family members, neighbors,  
5 employers, etc.) for the intended purpose of casting the other party in a  
6 negative light.

7 10. There shall be no harassment at the other party's place(s) of  
8 employment, including contacting the employer to make negative or  
9 disparaging allegations, to send or drop off evidence as it relates to these  
10 court proceedings that appears reasonably designed to put them, or likely  
11 to put them, in a bad light or to get them fired, or to have them suffer  
12 negative consequences as a result.

13 11. Neither party shall post, nor shall you allow significant others  
14 or family members on social media to post, including, but not limited to,  
15 Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram, LinkedIn, Tumblr, and Google+,  
16 or any other social media platform, any negative or disparaging allegation  
17 against or negative image of the other party or anyone associated with the  
18 other party.

19 12. Neither party shall interfere with the other party's contact with  
20 the minor children, including but not limited to telephone calls, e-mail,  
21 social networking, etc.

22 13. Neither party shall threaten to commit, or actually commit an  
23 act of violence upon the other party or upon the minor children, or upon  
24 the significant other, friend, relative, employer, employee, neighbor, etc.  
25 of a party.

26 14. All child custody exchanges, visitations, etc., shall be done in a  
27 civil, law-abiding manner and reasonably close to the times specified by  
28 the Court. In the event of an emergency or unforeseen circumstance that  
could affect an exchange of the children or the time of the exchange, the  
party experiencing the difficulty shall call or contact the other party via  
text messaging as soon as reasonably possible.

15 15. There shall be no invasion of the electronic devices, email  
16 accounts, social media accounts, separate bank accounts, safe deposit  
17 boxes, separate residences or separate vehicles, etc. of the other party.

18 16. That Plaintiff's current and/or future significant other shall not  
19 perform any duties rightfully belonging to the Defendant, including but  
20 not limited to meetings/events at school, doctor's appointments and the



1 like. The two parents shall be listed at all schools as such, and they come  
2 before all others as emergency contacts.

3 17. Both parties are under a continuing obligation to provide to the  
4 other party any change in their cell phone numbers and/or e-mail address  
5 within forty-eight (48) hours of any change.

6 18. Both parties are to ensure that the other parent receive the  
7 proper parental respect i.e. children do not call their parents by their first  
8 name.

9 19. This Behavior Order shall remain in full force and effect unless  
10 and until otherwise ordered by this Court.

11 *Contempt and Possible Sanctions:* The parties are HEREBY PUT ON NOTICE  
12 THAT EACH AND EVERY VIOLATION of this Behavioral Order, if admitted  
13 to, or if found after evidentiary hearing to have committed an act that violates this  
14 Order, may result in the party being held in contempt of court pursuant to NRS  
15 Chapter 22, which could result in a fine of \$500, 25 days in jail, and/or attorney's  
16 fees for EACH VIOLATION (e.g., 4 separate violations could be 100 days in jail  
17 and/or \$2,000.00 in sanctions); it is further

18 THE PARTIES ARE HEREBY PUT ON NOTICE that if it is found by  
19 the Court, that if, in the future, one of the parents provides false information in an  
20 effort to sway the Court's decision in their favor, or slanders the opposing party in  
21 an untrue manner without significant evidence, that party may be sanctioned by the  
22 Court. The consequences may include requiring the party who knowingly made  
23 false statements or provided false evidence to pay for the other parent's Court costs  
24 and legal fees; additional fines and automatic removal of falsified document;  
25 modification of the decision making and physical custody in the other parent's  
26 favor; make-up visitation time; and may also include a referral to the appropriate  
27 authority as it relates to any potential criminal matter. If the Court determines that  
28 a party has unjustifiably denied or interfered with visitation granted by an order,  
the Court may take certain additional remedial measures to provide make-up time  
or to ensure future compliance; and it is further

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## COMMUNICATION

ORDERED that all primary communications between the parties, except for emergencies affecting the children, shall be by Our Family Wizard program, for which any and all fees for use shall be borne by Adam (for both parties). ALL COMMUNICATION is to be polite, respectful, business like regarding child issues only, without swearing, criticizing, disparaging the other parent, or telling the other parent how to parent, or how to conduct their household. If an emergency arises regarding the minor children, Parties may contact the other Parent directly; and it is further

ORDERED that Each parent shall respond to postings on OurFamilyWizard (Talking Parents or other texting app, collectively called "OurFamilyWizard") within 24 hours of posting. If a parent fails to respond to a posting on OurFamilyWizard within 24 hours, that parent's lack of response is deemed consent and approval to the information posted (i.e., vacation dates, medical appointments etc.). If a parent is going to be unavailable to check OurFamilyWizard for a period of time, the unavailable parent must post dates of unavailability to OurFamilyWizard at the beginning or prior to the period of unavailability. If a parent is unavailable for purposes of communications via OurFamilyWizard, the unavailable parent shall respond to the other parent within 24 hours of his/her becoming available/ the end of the notified period of unavailability; and it is further

ORDERED that Each party shall file proof that he activated an account with OurFamilyWizard within three (3) days of issuance of this Order; and it is further

ORDERED that Each parent shall keep their password to their OurFamilyWizard account private and shall not share their password or login information with anyone else except their attorney if needed for litigation. Neither

1 party shall permit any third party to communicate through his/her  
2 OurFamilyWizard account on his/her behalf.  
3

#### 4 **CHILD CUSTODY**

5 ORDERED that the Court believes the it is in the best interests of the  
6 children, despite the trial testimony, factors and the within findings of the Court,  
7 herein that the parties are awarded **Joint Legal Custody** over the two minor  
8 children, to wit: Michael Adam Solinger (dob 6/16/15-currently age 6<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>), and  
9 Marie Leona Solinger (dob 8/28/17- currently age 5<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>).  
10

#### 11 *Joint Legal Custody Orders:*

12 1. That each party shall consult and cooperate with the other in substantial  
13 questions relating to religious upbringing, educational programs, significant changes  
14 in social environment, and healthcare of the child(ren).

15 2. That each party shall have access to healthcare and school records pertaining  
16 to the child(ren) and be permitted to independently consult with any and all  
17 professionals involved with the child(ren).

18 3. That all schools, healthcare providers, and regular daycare providers for the  
19 child(ren) shall be selected jointly by the parties. Each party is to ensure that the other  
20 party has full contact information of any and all providers. In the case of healthcare  
21 providers, both parties are to ensure that the healthcare providers have copies of all  
22 health insurance information.

23 4. That each party shall be empowered to obtain emergency healthcare for the  
24 child(ren) without the consent of the other party. Healthcare includes treatment for  
25 mental health, therapy and counseling. Each party shall notify the other party as soon  
26 as reasonably possible of any illness requiring medical attention, or any emergency  
27 involving the child(ren). Neither party may obtain non-emergency healthcare for the  
28 children without advance notice to the other party of the time and date of the  
appointment so that the other party may attend.

5. That each party shall have access to any information concerning the well-  
being of the child(ren), including, but not limited to, copies of report cards; school  
meeting notices; vacation schedules; class programs; requests for conferences; results  
of standardized or diagnostic tests; notices of activities involving the child(ren);  
samples of school work; order forms for school pictures; all communications from  
schools, healthcare providers, and regular daycare providers for the child(ren) to  
include the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of all such schools, healthcare  
providers, and regular daycare providers.

6. That each party shall advise the other party, if not communicated by the  
event originator (school, athletic association, etc.), within 24 hours of receipt of any  
such communication, of all school, athletic, church, and social events in which the  
child(ren) participate(s), and each agrees to notify the other party within a reasonable  
time after first learning of the future occurrence of any such event so as to allow the

1 other party to make arrangements to attend the event if he or she chooses to do so.  
2 Both parties may participate with the child(ren) in all such events, including but not  
3 limited to, attendance at school events, athletic events, church events, social events,  
4 open house, school plays, graduation ceremonies, school carnivals, etc.

5 7. That each party shall be prohibited from enrolling the child(ren) in  
6 extracurricular activities which infringes upon the other party's parenting time without  
7 advance authorization from the other party.

8 8. That each party shall provide the other party with the address and telephone  
9 number at which the minor child(ren) reside(s), and to notify the other party within  
10 seven (7) days after any change of address and provide the telephone number if said  
11 number changes.

12 9. That each party shall provide the other party with a travel itinerary to  
13 include destination, departure and return times whenever the child(ren) will be away  
14 from that party's home for a period of two (2) nights or more.

15 10. That the parties are to remember the they are both parents to the children,  
16 and that neither party shall disparage the other in the presence of the child(ren), nor  
17 shall either party make any comment of any kind that would demean the other party in  
18 the eyes of the child(ren).

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that specifically, as there has been during  
20 the pendency of this matter by Plaintiff/Dad, there will be no unilateral decisions  
21 on matters that are under the joint legal custody mandate (medical, school, etc.) in  
22 the future. If the parties do not agree, then they will need to find an alternative  
23 resolution to the issue or bring it before the court; and it is further

24 ORDERED that again, that the Court believes the it is in the best interests  
25 of the children, despite the trial testimony, factors and the within findings of the  
26 Court, herein the parties are awarded **Joint Physical Custody** of the minor  
27 children, to wit: Michael Adam Solinger (dob 6/16/15-currently age 6<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>), and  
28 Marie Leona Solinger (dob 8/28/17- currently age 5<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>), and it is further

ORDERED, that in order to minimize parental contact, the parties shall  
follow the week on week off timeshare schedule with the Minor Children, with the  
exchanges taking place every Wednesday after school; with pickup allowed at after  
school day care; if there is no school, at 6:00 pm, at the location which the parties  
are currently using, or at some other designated location that the parties may agree,  
should either party move or the existing location become inconvenient, any new

1 location is to be reasonably central to both parties. Should a third party, or non-  
2 family member be meeting the other parent for child exchanges, then that parent is  
3 responsible to communicate the name and telephone number to the other parent;  
4 and it is further

5 ORDERED, that the receiving parent will provide transportation (pickup)  
6 the children; and it is further

### 7 **HOLIDAYS**

8 ORDERED, that the parties shall utilize the following schedule as and for  
9 Holiday time:

10 1. *Monday Holidays*: Martin Luther King Day (3'd Monday in January),  
11 President's Day (3<sup>rd</sup> Monday in February) and the like. The parties shall keep the  
12 regular weekly schedule, in that when a Monday holiday falls on their respective  
13 time, that party will have the Monday holiday, with the following exceptions:

14	Memorial Day	Dad every year
15	Labor Day	Mom every year

16  
17 2. *Other Holidays*. 4<sup>TH</sup> of July (when it falls), Nevada Day (last Friday in  
18 October), Halloween, Veterans Day, etc. The parties shall keep the weekly  
19 schedule, in that when a holiday falls on their respective time, that party will have  
20 the holiday.

21 3. *Mother's Day (second Sunday in May), every year*: If the holiday falls  
22 on Mother's usual weekly timeshare, there is no adjustment. If the holiday falls on  
23 Father's weekly timeshare, then Mother is entitled to have the child from 9:00am  
24 on the Saturday before Mother's Day, until drop off at school on Monday.

25 4. *Father's Day (third Sunday in June), every year*: If the holiday falls on  
26 Father's usual weekly timeshare, there is no adjustment. If the holiday falls on  
27 Mother's weekly timeshare, then Father is entitled to have the child from 9:00am  
28 on the Saturday before Father's Day, until 9:00 pm (as there is no school).

1                   5. *Children's birthday:* (Michael - June 16<sup>th</sup>, and Marie -August 28<sup>th</sup>)  
2 Mom - odd years, Dad - even years. If the child's birthday falls on a parent's usual  
3 weekly timeshare, there is no adjustment. If the holiday falls on the other parent's  
4 weekly timeshare, then that parent is entitled to have the child from 9:00 pm the  
5 evening prior (if no school) or after school if school is in session, until drop off at  
6 school the next morning, or if no school, 9:00 pm that birthday evening. The  
7 receiving parent will ensure that the children speak with the other parent for their  
8 birthday.

9                   6. *Parent's birthday, every year:* (Adam - July 1 and Chalese -  
10 November 17<sup>th</sup>) If the parent's birthday falls on that parent's usual weekly  
11 timeshare, there is no adjustment. If the parent's birthday falls on the other parent's  
12 weekly timeshare, then the birthday parent is entitled to have the child from 9:00  
13 am that day (if no school) or after school if school is in session, until that evening  
14 at 9:00 pm.

15                   7. *Spring Break or other school breaks - every year:* The parties shall  
16 utilize the regular weekly schedule.

17                   8. *Thanksgiving School Break:* Overall, the parties shall keep the usual  
18 weekly schedule, with the exception for Thanksgiving Day as stated below.

19                   9. *Thanksgiving Day:* Dad - even years, Mom odd years: If Thanksgiving  
20 Break/Day falls during that parent's usual weekly timeshare, there is no adjustment.  
21 If Thanksgiving Day falls on the other parent's weekly timeshare, then that parent  
22 is entitled to have the Children from 6:00 pm on the Wednesday before  
23 Thanksgiving Day until 9:00 am on the Friday immediately following  
24 Thanksgiving Day.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1                   10. *Christmas - New Years/Winter Break:* As neither parent has stated  
2 they celebrate the traditional Christmas holiday, the Winter Break shall be divided  
3 in half, with Mom having the first period every year- defined as from close of  
4 school to the midway point, and Dad having the midway point to the day prior to  
5 school resuming.

6                   11. The parties are to understand that maintaining the weekly schedule as  
7 it relates to some of the holidays may appear unequal in any given year, but that  
8 over the course of time and the calendar, ultimately will equal out for both parties  
9 and is in the minor child's best interests, as well as to limit the parents' contact,  
10 since this is a high-conflict case.

11                   12. *Vacations:* Given the weekly timeshare, each parent is entitled to take  
12 the minor child on a vacation during their respective timeshare, without further  
13 specialized times for vacations, so long as school is not interrupted.

14                   Vacations shall otherwise be taken during the summer and/or when the  
15 children do not have school.

16                   Each parent is permitted one (1) separate seven (7) day period allotted as  
17 vacation time (which would provide a one-time three weeks for vacation during the  
18 summer). As such, if a parent indicates an extended vacation, which would  
19 necessitate their utilizing their 7 day period during the other parent's regular time  
20 during the summer, they must, in writing, notify the other parent no later than May  
21 30<sup>th</sup> of that year, and provide an itinerary within 14 days prior to exercising said  
22 time.

23                   Under no circumstances is vacation time to be utilized to take the other  
24 parent's regular weekly timeshare, when the children are in school or during a  
25 "holiday" period.

26                   Any use of the "vacation time" that is less than the seven (7) day period of  
27 time shall be construed as using their entire seven (7) days.  
28

1 If either parent is taking a vacation outside the State of Nevada, they are  
2 to provide notice to the other parent of the trip, fourteen (14) days in advance for  
3 vacations within the United States and thirty (30) days' notice in advance for any  
4 vacations outside the United States, and provide an itinerary of said trip, which  
5 includes but is not limited to: destination, departure and return dates/times, etc.  
6 Each parent will ensure that the children are able to speak with the other parent  
7 prior to departure and upon return home, and usual telephone calls are suspended  
8 for the vacation period. Should a parent fail to notify or provide an itinerary within  
9 the time period allotted, they will forfeit the vacation time.

10 Should an uncontrollable event (airline delay due to weather, and the like)  
11 cause a delay in return the vacationing parent shall notify the other parent  
12 immediately. Such a delay will not be held against either parent, and no  
13 compensatory time is assumed or granted in such a situation, or for extenuating  
14 circumstances, may allow for makeup time, or for extenuating circumstances, may  
15 allow for makeup time.

16  
17 *13. School Events:* School events which the minor child wishes to  
18 participate, is the responsibility of each parent, on their custodial time, to ensure  
19 the child's participation. Either/both parent(s) may participate and/or volunteer in a  
20 school event.

21 *14. Educational:* Parent/teacher conferences may be scheduled by each  
22 parent separately, if possible. While any and all communications should be sent to  
23 both parents, should any communication(s) from school be sent to only one parent  
24 (i.e. via email), same shall be forwarded to the other parent immediately. Any  
25 situation at school (i.e. discipline event) may be attended by either or both parents.  
26 Should the child be required to leave school, whether due to illness or discipline, if  
27 the custodial parent, or designated alternate, is not reachable by the school, the  
28 noncustodial parent may pick up the child, but deliver the child to the custodial  
parent as soon as possible **that day**.



1 Under no circumstances may a parent delegate any conference (for  
2 whatever reason) to a significant other. These conferences are for the parents only.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that the parties may, on their allotted  
4 weekly timeshare, take the minor child on a vacation, outing, visiting family, etc.,  
5 which may or may not be outside the State of Nevada, without the other parent's  
6 permission; but, the parties **shall** simply notify the other parent of the trip, and  
7 contact information of where the children are to be in the case of emergency; and it  
8 is further

9 ORDERED that it is in the best interests of the children, due to the high  
10 conflict of the parties, that should the children desire to speak with the other  
11 parent, the parties will encourage the minor children to do so. Each child shall  
12 have unfettered access to the other parent to call the other parent at any time. Each  
13 parent is entitled to two (2) parent initiated telephone calls with the minor children  
14 during the other parent's timeshare, to be on Thursdays and Mondays at 7:00 pm.  
15 The custodial parent shall make the children available at those times; and it is  
16 further

17 ORDERED, that each parent is entitled to obtain daycare/babysitting  
18 providers of their choice during their custodial timeshare and there shall be NO  
19 Right of First Refusal; and it is further

20 ORDERED that various Miscellaneous Provisions are as follows:

21 1. Each parent to provide and maintain their own clothing, etc. for  
22 the minor child in their respective homes;

23 2. Should the child be on medication for an illness, each parent  
24 shall ensure that the other parent is provided with the medication at the  
25 time of custodial exchange;

26 3. Each parent shall ensure that the other parent is provided with  
27 the any extracurricular equipment the child may require at the time of  
28 custodial exchange;

4. Each parent to provide daycare/babysitting as necessary on their  
respective timeshare;

5. Neither parent may dictate whom the other parent utilizes for  
daycare/babysitting, or directly or indirectly interfere in any manner;

1  
2 6. Neither parent is to make demands or seek to dictate how the  
3 other parent is to parent; however the parties are encouraged to discuss  
4 and work together regarding important topics, forward important and  
5 pertinent information (i.e. education, social, health concerns, etc.).

6 7. Each party shall ensure that both the child's biological parents  
7 are to be included on the child's forms (school, medical, etc.) Each parent  
8 may include other family members/relatives on any such forms, with all  
9 such notations as to relationship clearly stated on forms.

10 8. Each party shall ensure that both the child's biological parents are  
11 to be the only included individuals on the child's forms (school, medical,  
12 etc.) Each parent may include other family members/relatives on any such  
13 forms with all such notations as to relationship clearly stated on forms for  
14 emergency/pickup use only if both parents cannot be reached.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Court reiterates its prior order that  
16 the children should go to school every day and the school supplies that are needed  
17 should, regardless of who purchased it, go with the child. Court further noted, the  
18 clothes that are purchased belong to the child and that it is either party's duty to  
19 return the clothes when the children goes with the other parent; and it is further

20 ORDERED that none of the shenanigans which occurred during the  
21 pendency of this action (following Chalese, false accusations of drug use/abuse,  
22 etc. or otherwise) should occur in the future, and are prohibited; and it is further

23 ORDERED that should any of the specific behavioral provisions,  
24 additional custodial provisions in the Decree be violated that upon a motion  
25 presented to the Court, it may be considered under the factors required for a  
26 modification of custody; and it is further

### 27 **CHILD SUPPORT, TAX ALLOCATION & MEDICAL EXPENSES**

28 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that child support is dictated by statute  
and/or precedent, and pursuant to NRS Chapter 125 and/or NAC. As the parties  
share joint physical custody, child support is set pursuant to the formula provided  
in *Wright v Osburne*, 114 Nev. 1367, 970 P.2d 1071, (1998), and the amounts  
determined by the percentages provided under NAC Chapter 425; and it is further

1 ORDERED that there are two (2) children for which child support applies  
2 pursuant to the following formula pursuant to NAC 425.140:

3 2. For two children, the sum of:

4 (a) For the first \$6,000 of an obligor's monthly gross income, 22 percent of  
5 such income;

6 (b) For any portion of an obligor's monthly gross income that is greater than  
\$6,000 and equal to or less than \$10,000, 11 percent of such a portion; and

7 (c) For any portion of an obligor's monthly gross income that is greater than  
\$10,000, 6 percent of such a portion.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that based upon either filed Financial  
9 Disclosure Forms and/or the representations of the parties, both parties gross  
10 monthly income (GMI) are as follows:

11 Plaintiff/Dad GMI = \$9,799

12  $6,000 \times 22\% = \$1,320.00$

13  $3,799 \times 11\% = \underline{\$ 417.89}$

14  $\$1,737.89$

15 Defendant/Mom GMI =  $\$2,377 \times 22\% = \$ 523.14$

16  $\$1,737.89 - \$523.14 = \$1,214.75$  (rounded to \$1,215.00)

17 Plaintiff /Dad is obligated to pay Defendant/Mom \$1,215.00 per month,  
18 payable on or before the 1<sup>st</sup> of each month, commencing June 1, 2022; and it is  
19 further

20 ORDERED that while there were various deferrals of various sums in this  
21 action that became so overlapped, the Court orders that there are no arrears in child  
22 support as of the date of this Decree as to either party; and it is further

23 ORDERED that pursuant to NAC 425.160(1), any award of Child  
24 Support, except as otherwise provided by law, terminates when the child reaches  
25 18 years of age or, if the child is still in high school, when the child graduates from  
26 high school or reaches 19 years of age, whichever comes first; and it is further

27 ORDERED that the parties shall share the tax return deduction for the  
28 minor children as follows:

1 Plaintiff/Dad shall receive the tax deduction for Michael Adam  
2 Solinger in all tax years, commencing with tax year 2022;

3 Defendant/Mom shall receive the tax deduction for Marie Leona  
4 Solinger in all tax years, commencing with tax year 2022;

5 ORDERED that Plaintiff/Dad shall obtain, pay for, and maintain health  
6 insurance for the children without offset due to the disparity of income of the  
7 parties; and it is further

8 ORDERED that any unreimbursed medical, dental, optical, orthodontic or  
9 other health related expense incurred for the benefit of the minor child is to be  
10 divided between the parties at the rate of 65% paid by the Plaintiff and 35% paid  
11 by the Defendant due to the disparity in income, pursuant to the 30/30 Rule: either  
12 party incurring an out of pocket medical expense for the child shall provide a copy  
13 of the paid invoice/receipt to the other party within thirty days of incurring such  
14 expense, if not tendered within the thirty day period, the Court may consider it as a  
15 waiver of reimbursement. The other party will then have thirty days from receipt  
16 within which to dispute the expense in writing or reimburse the incurring party for  
17 one-half of the out of pocket expense, if not disputed or paid within the thirty day  
18 period, the party may be subject to a finding of contempt and appropriate  
19 sanctions; and it is further

20  
21 **OTHER MISCELLANEOUS CHILD EXPENSES**

22 ORDERED that the parties shall follow the following provisions as it  
23 pertains to any other child expenses:

24 1. Educational expenses include annual registration/enrollment fees,  
25 divided Adam- 65% and Mom- 35%.

26 2. Annual school supplies - Father shall cover the annual cost for Michael  
27 and Mother shall cover the annual cost for Marie. Once Michael ages out, the  
28 parties shall split the costs for Marie.

1           3. School related expenses (field trips, lunches, etc.) will be divided  
2 Adam- 65% and Mom- 35%.

3           4. School supplies that require specialized equipment which retail over  
4 \$50 or more individually, shall be divided Adam- 65% and Mom- 35% between  
5 the parties (or as otherwise agreed upon), upon proof of comparison shopping for  
6 the most inexpensive cost for that item.

7           5. Extracurricular educational programs shall be discussed between the  
8 parents, including costs and agreed upon in writing.

9           6. Extracurricular activities (sports, lessons, etc.) shall be discussed  
10 between the parents, including costs. Each activity is a separate and distinct  
11 activity, not to be incorporated or associated with other activities. Either parent  
12 may enroll the child in an activity that exclusively falls on their timeshare at that  
13 parent's cost. Should the activity, i.e. team sports with a game schedule, with fall  
14 into both parents' timeshares, and the parties agree on the activity, then the cost  
15 shall be divided Adam- 65% and Mom- 35%, and each parent will ensure the child  
16 arrives for the activity on their timeshare. Activities shall not interfere with regards  
17 to the other parent's availability unless agreed upon, and shall not cause any  
18 financial hardship for a parent. Should the activity fall into both parents  
19 timeshares, but one parent cannot afford to pay for the activity on their own  
20 timeshare, the other parent may have the child attend the activity on only their own  
21 timeshare at their cost. Each parent shall ensure that the child gets to his activity  
22 during their timeshare in a but one parent cannot afford to pay for the activity on  
23 their own timeshare, the other parent may have the child attend the activity on only  
24 their own timeshare at their cost. Each parent shall ensure that the child gets to his  
25 activity during their timeshare in a timely manner.

26           7. Discussions must respect consideration of the other parent's monetary  
27 situation, and discussion of extra -curricular educational or activity programs is not  
28 to be an assumed agreement.

1                   **SEPARATE AND/OR COMMUNITY PROPERTY & DEBTS**

2                   ORDERED that the prior marital community property residence has been  
3 sold, with each party having received \$50,000 from the net proceeds of sale, said  
4 distribution is the respective party's sole and separate property, and it is further

5                   ORDERED that Chalese's interest in the real property located at 2256  
6 Grand Clover Lane, Las Vegas, NV 89156 is her sole and separate property; and it  
7 is further

8                   ORDERED that as to the issue of Adam's separate property interest in  
9 the proceeds of the sale of the former marital residence, Adam's father testified  
10 during Day 1 of Trial that he gave Adam a gift of equity when he sold the home to  
11 Adam, which evidenced by gift of equity letter provided by the mortgage lender  
12 and it was a part of the mortgage. The intent of the gift of equity was to give  
13 Adam a gift, not Chalese. Thus, Adam has a separate property interest in the  
14 proceeds from the sale of the home in the amount of \$85,000. The Abrams and  
15 Mayo Client Trust Account is holding a total amount of \$92,599.99 and any  
16 amount being held higher than the \$85,000, is \$7,599.99 which is community  
17 property (\$3,799.99 each), distribution of which is outlined herein; and it us further

18                   ORDERED that Chalese Solinger's remaining community property share  
19 over the \$85,000 (\$3,799.99) shall be paid to her within five (5) days upon receipt  
20 by The Abrams and Mayo Law Firm of Notice of Entry of this Decree; and it is  
21 further

22                   ORDERED that during the course of the litigation, there was an issue  
23 regarding an "art collection"; there was no testimony during Trial and the Court  
24 orders that this issue is moot; and it is further

25                   ORDERED that the Plaintiff's 401k from the LV Defense Group, 401K  
26 Plan (employee #100126) in the approximate amount of \$46,325.19 (as of  
27 statement dated 12/31/2020-last provided into evidence) is to be divided equally  
28 between the parties (\$23,162.60 each) and said distribution is the respective party's

1 sole and separate property. That should it be necessary, a Qualified Domestic  
2 Relations Order (QDRO) will be obtained through QDRO Masters with the fee for  
3 same divided equally between the parties, and both parties are to fully cooperate  
4 with QDRO Masters in the preparation of same; and it is further

5 ORDERED that the Plaintiff is earning retirement (PERS) through his  
6 employment with the Attorney General's Office. At such time said pension  
7 becomes vested, the Defendant would be entitled to her community property share  
8 from the commencement of employment through November 2021 under the time  
9 rule pursuant to Gemma v. Gemma, 778 P.2d 429, 105 Nev. 458 (Nev., 1989) and  
10 Fondi v. Fondi, 802 P.2d 1264, 106 Nev. 856 (Nev., 1990) and to select Option 2,  
11 with regard to his PERS survivorship benefit; and that a Qualified Domestic  
12 Relations Order (QDRO) will be obtained through QDRO Masters with the fee for  
13 same divided equally between the parties, and both parties are to fully cooperate  
14 with QDRO Masters in the preparation of same; and it is further

15 ORDERED that the Court confirms that both parties are in possession of  
16 various other separate and/or community personal property, not mentioned herein,  
17 and the property in each respective party's possession is their sole and separate  
18 property; and it is further

19 ORDERED that in the event any property has been omitted from this  
20 Decree that would have been community property or otherwise jointly held  
21 property under the law applicable as of the date hereof the concealing or  
22 possessory party will transfer or convey to the other party, at the other party's  
23 election: 1) the full market value of the other party's interest on the date of this  
24 Decree, plus statutory interest through and including the date of transfer or  
25 conveyance; or 2) the full market value of the other party's interest at the time that  
26 party discovers that he or she has an interest in such property, plus statutory  
27 interest through and including the date of transfer or conveyance; or 3) an amount  
28

1 of the omitted property equal to the other party's interest therein, if it is reasonably  
2 susceptible to division; and it is further

### 3 **ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS**

4 In this matter, there was a large disparity of income. Adam Solinger is an  
5 attorney working at the Attorney General's Office and Chalese is a childrens'  
6 hairdresser, after spending the majority of the marriage as a stay-at-home mother.

7 This would indicate the necessity of an award of attorney's fees to  
8 Chalese, from the beginning of this action. See Sargeant -v- Sargeant, 88 Nev.  
9 223, 495 P.2d 618 (1972), wherein the Nevada Supreme Court stated that a spouse  
10 must be afforded their day in court without destroying their financial position. This  
11 would imply that they should be able to meet their adversary in the courtroom on  
12 an equal basis.

13 See Albios v. Horizon Crntys., Inc., 122 Nev. 409, 417, 132 P.3d 1022,  
14 1028 (2006) (explaining that the district court generally may not award attorney  
15 fees absent authority under a statute, rule, or contract).

16 See Brunzell v. Golden Gate National Bank, 85 Nev. 345, 455 P.2d 31  
17 (1969) factors. See Miller v. Wilfong, 121 Nev. 619, 623, 119 P.3d 727, 730 (2005)  
18 (providing that the district court must consider the Brunzell factors when awarding  
19 attorney fees).

20 See Brunzell v Golden Gate National Bank, 85 Nev. 345, 349, 455 P.2d  
21 31, 33 (1969)- factors for attorney's fees: (a) Qualifications of Counsel; (b)  
22 Character of work to be done; (c) Actual work performed; (d) Result. See also:  
23 NRS 125.150(3) (giving the district court authority to grant attorney fees in divorce  
24 proceedings); Miller v. Wilfong, 121 Nev. 619, 624-25, 119 P.3d 727, 731 (2005)  
25 (finding attorney provided in the record on appeal is presumed to support the  
26 district court's decision. Cuzze v. Univ. & Cmty. Coll. Sys. of Nev., 123 Nev. 598,  
27 603, 172 P.3d 131, 135 (2007), fee awards reasonable when the record supported  
28 the Brunzell factors and the district court found an income disparity); Wright v.



1 Osburn, 114 Nev. 1367, 1370, 970 P.2d 1071, 1073 (1998) (finding disparity of  
2 income a factor of consideration when awarding attorney fees).

3 Further, the district court is required to make such findings in awarding  
4 attorney fees; see Stubbs v. Strickland, 129 Nev. 146, 152 n.1, 297 P.3d 326, 330  
5 n.1 (2013) (explaining that a district court must "make findings regarding the basis  
6 for awarding attorney fees and the reasonableness of an award of attorney fees").

7 EDCR 7.60 allows attorneys' fees as sanctions when a party "presents to  
8 the court a motion or an opposition to a motion which is obviously frivolous,  
9 unnecessary or unwarranted," "[s]o multiplies the proceedings in a case as to  
10 increase costs unreasonably and vexatiously," or "[f]ails or refuses to comply with  
11 [the Eighth Judicial District Court's] rules." The plain language of EDCR 7.60  
12 makes no exception and instead can apply to any motion, regardless of the  
13 underlying case.

14 NRS 18.010(2)(b) provides for attorneys' fees "[w]ithout regard to the  
15 recovery sought," and therefore an award of a money judgment is not a  
16 prerequisite when seeking fees under NRS 18.010(2)(b). See, e.g., Trs. of the  
17 Plumbers & Pipefitters Union Local 525 Health & Welfare Trust Plan v.  
18 Developers Sur. & Indem. Co., 120 Nev. 56, 63, 84 P.3d 59, 63 (2004) ("In 1985,  
19 the Legislature authorized the district court to award attorney fees 'without regard  
20 to the recovery sought, when the court finds that the claim, counterclaim,  
21 cross-claim or third-party complaint or defense of the opposing party was brought  
22 without reasonable ground or to harass the prevailing party.'").

23 See, Cuzze v. Univ. & Cmty. Coll. Sys. of Nev., 123 Nev. 598, 603, 172  
24 P.3d 131, 135 (2007), fee awards reasonable when the record supported the  
25 Brunzell factors and the district court found an income disparity); Wright v.  
26 Osburn, 114 Nev. 1367, 1370, 970 P.2d 1071, 1073 (1998) (finding disparity of  
27 income a factor of consideration when awarding attorney fees).

1                   See, Logan v. Abe, 131 Nev. Adv. Op. 31, 350 P.3d 1139, (Nev., 2015),  
2 fees are appropriate even if third parties paid the fees on litigant's behalf.  
3

4                   \* \* \* \* \*

5                   This Court's findings herein and a review of this matter reveals the level  
6 at which Adam prosecuted this divorce case, persistent emergency motions on  
7 Order Shortening Time, basically all seeking to have the Court reduce Chalese's  
8 time share on some false claim/complaint by Adam. This Court considers this  
9 level of prosecution was intended to harass, was frivolous and unnecessarily  
10 extending litigation, causing unnecessary delay, and to increase the cost of  
11 litigation, and when added to the previously found the level at which Adam  
12 prosecuted this matter in a scorched earth litigation tactic, requires fees to be  
13 awarded due to Adam's unwarranted behavior and his bad faith tactics.

14                  In this matter there has been an extremely large disparity in the income of  
15 the parties. Adam is an attorney, who also benefits the financial generosity of his  
16 parents. Conversely, Chalese spent her time during the parties marriage as a stay-  
17 at-home mother, supporting Adam's quest to become an attorney. Chalese works  
18 as a hairdresser for children, without further training anywhere near that of Adam.

19                  Throughout this litigation, Adam has been in the superior financial  
20 position, as well as authoring his own motions (since he is an attorney), leaving  
21 Chalese in a position of seeking counsel to properly represent her rights, preparing  
22 Oppositions, etc., without sufficient funds, as she was unable to author her  
23 documents herself. She truly was left without choice in that she required her own  
24 attorney to represent her.

1 Chalese has had to retain three different attorneys/firms in this matter.

2 1. Louis C. Schneider, Esq. - filed and properly adjudicated an  
3 Attorney's Lien-- the prior judge reduced an award of attorney's fees in the amount  
4 of \$10,875.00, to judgment in its Order filed August 19, 2020, but stayed  
5 enforcement until the Court's final determination. This left Chalese without funds  
6 for an attorney, and then the payment of the earned (but reduced) fees was stayed.  
7

8 2. Pecos Law Group - multiple attorneys and staff involved -  
9 submitted a Memorandum of Fees and Costs with Brunzell factors on March 22,  
10 2022 for a total amount of Attorney's Fees & Costs requested of \$204,760.12. This  
11 Firm's involvement in this matter was for the majority of the persistent litigation  
12 (1999-2001) instituted by Adam, discovery, multiple Court hearings, etc., and the  
13 first day of trial.

14 3. Alex Ghibaud, P.C. - Michancy Cramer, Esq. submitted a  
15 Memorandum of Fees and Costs with Brunzell factors on May 12, 2022 for a total  
16 amount of Attorney's Fees & Costs requested of \$10,000 charged as a flat fee. This  
17 Firm appeared for Chalise as of December 2021 and adequately conducted the  
18 remaining trial days, and post-trial matters.

#### 19 EXPERT WITNESS FEES

20 NRS 18.005(5) states: Reasonable fees of not more than five expert  
21 witnesses in an amount of not more than \$1,500 for each witness, unless the court  
22 allows a larger fee after determining that the circumstances surrounding the  
23 expert's testimony were of such necessity as to require the larger fee.

24 The Pecos Law Group billing statements indicates that Chalese's expert  
25 witness, Dr. William O'Donohue's fee, which was paid, was in the amount of  
26 \$4,750.00.  
27  
28

1 Pursuant to the factors as enumerated in *Frazier v. Drake*, 131 Nev. 632,  
2 650-51, 357 P.3d 365, 377-78 (Ct. App. 2015) (listing factors the court should  
3 consider when determining whether to award more than \$1500 under NRS  
4 18.005(5)): including "the importance of the expert's testimony to the prevailing  
5 party, the degree to which the expert's opinion aided the trier of fact in deciding the  
6 case[,] the extent and nature of the work performed by the expert," and the  
7 reasonableness of the expert's fees.

8 The Court finds that Dr. O'Donohue's testimony was crucial as his  
9 testimony in some ways agreed with, coincided with, provided further insight to,  
10 and/or was opposite to that of the only other expert, Dr. John Paglini, in his scope  
11 of reviewing/rebutting Dr. Paglini. Given that the Court has already noted herein  
12 that Dr. Paglini's report/testimony was missing some crucial situational facts,  
13 which were covered, in part, by Dr. O'Donohue, and provided the Court with a  
14 more complete picture of the situation in this matter. The excess of approximately  
15 \$3,200 over the limit in 18.005(5) is not excessive under the circumstances, and  
16 the Court is allowing the entire expert witness fee of \$4,750.00.

#### 17 ATTORNEYS FEES AND COSTS

18 THEREFORE, given all of the Memorandums of Fees and Costs, Brunzell  
19 factors, pertinent statute(s) and/or case precedent, It Is Hereby  
20

21 ORDERED this Court confirms the previously adjudicated \$10,875  
22 attorney's fees award to Louis Schneider, Esq., and hereby lifts the stay of  
23 execution; and that the Abrams and Mayo Law Firm holding proceeds in their  
24 Client Trust account is instructed to distribute the \$10,875 to Louis Schneider,  
25 Esq., within five (5) days upon receipt of this Notice of Entry of this Decree to  
26 satisfy his judgment; and it is further  
27  
28

1           ORDERED that the Court has reviewed the Brunzell factors in the  
2 Memorandum of Fees and Costs from the law firm of Alex Ghibaud, PC  
3 (Michancy Cramer, Esq.) and find them appropriate and acceptable in light of the  
4 preparedness and performance at trial of counsel. That the amount of \$10,000.00  
5 was paid in full was a flat fee to the firm, and that reimbursement is due to Chalese  
6 Solinger. That the Abrams and Mayo Law Firm are holding proceeds in their  
7 Client Trust account is instructed to distribute the amount of \$10,000 to Chalese  
8 Sollinger as and for reimbursement of attorney's fees paid within five (5) days  
9 upon receipt of Notice of Entry of this Decree; and it is further

10           ORDERED that that the Court has reviewed the Brunzell factors in the  
11 Memorandum of Fees and Costs from the law firm of Pecos Law Group. The  
12 Pecos Law Group represented Chalese during the bulk of the litigation, motion  
13 practice, etc. leading up to the trial in this matter, and amassed the largest bill of  
14 attorney's fees and costs of the three firms representing Chalese in this matter, at  
15 \$204,000 inclusive. The Court has reviewed the Brunzell factors from this firm  
16 and finds them appropriate and acceptable, especially in light of the level of  
17 litigation from the Plaintiff for the two years of their representation of Chalese.

18           The amount of costs expended are the usual and customary costs  
19 associated with litigation, i.e.: filing fees, witness fees (subpoena), document fees  
20 (subpoena) and the like, and all are approved in the total amount of \$15,309.69  
21 (inclusive of expert fee).

22           The Pecos Law Group gave courtesy credits of \$27,010.72, and provided  
23 a "no Charge" in the amount of \$38,447.50, which was gracious of them, and same  
24 is so acknowledged by the Court.

25           When added together, the total amount of fees and costs actually charged  
26 in this matter was \$204,760.72, of which there is no amount due and owing to the  
27 The Pecos Law Group, and are all reimbursable to Chalese Solinger.  
28

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that Chalese Solinger is to be reimbursed  
2 her attorney's fees and costs in the total amount of \$180,000.00 (inclusive of fees  
3 and costs) of the total amount requested by The Pecos Law Group. That the  
4 Abrams and Mayo Law Firm are holding proceeds in their Client Trust account  
5 and is instructed to distribute the balance, after the payment to Louis Schneider,  
6 Esq. (\$10,875), and Chalese Solinger (\$10,000 + \$3,799.99 community property  
7 share) with a grand total of \$24,674.99, are to distribute the remaining balance of  
8 the funds held in their CTA (\$67,835.00) to Chalese Sollinger as and for  
9 reimbursement (as against the total to be paid of the Pecos Law Group fees) of  
10 attorney's fees paid within five (5) days upon receipt of Notice of Entry of this  
11 Decree. That the Abrams and Mayo Law Firm are to provide an "accounting" of  
12 the funds held in trust and the disbursements thereunder within ten (10) days of the  
13 disbursement deadline, same to be filed with the Court and served upon all  
14 parties/counsel; and it is further

15 ORDERED that all remaining attorney's fees due and owing to Chalese  
16 Solinger after the payments from the Abrams and Mayo CTA, in the approximate  
17 amount of \$112,165.00, are owed by Adam Solinger, personally. Chalese Solinger  
18 shall have judgment against Adam Solinger in said balance amount of  
19 \$112,165.00, and same is reduced to judgment, with interest at the legal rate until  
20 paid in full, collectable by any legal means, including a wage assignment, and it is  
21 further

22 ORDERED, that once the distribution is filed by The Abrams and Mayo  
23 Law Firm, this Court will also issue a separate order for judgment with the actual  
24 balance due and owing; and it is further  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**STATUTORY PROVISIONS**

ORDERED that Both parties are required to provide their Social Security numbers on a separate form to the Court and to the Welfare Division of the Department of Human Resources pursuant to NRS 125.30. Such information shall be maintained by the Clerk in a confidential manner and not part of the public record; and it is further

ORDERED that:

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** 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 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.

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the terms of the Hague Convention of October 25, 1980, adopted by the 14<sup>th</sup> 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 provisions in NRS 125C.0045(8):

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

(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

1 does not create a presumption that the parent poses an imminent risk of wrongfully  
2 removing or concealing the child.

3  
4 **NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the parties are placed on notice of  
5 the following provisions in NRS 125C.0065:

6 1. If joint physical custody has been established pursuant to an order, judgment or  
7 decree of a court and one parent intends to relocate his or her residence to a place  
8 outside of this State or to a place within this State that is at such a distance that  
9 would substantially impair the ability of the other parent to maintain a meaningful  
10 relationship with the child, and the relocating parent desires to take the child with  
11 him or her, the relocating parent shall, before relocating:

12 (a) Attempt to obtain the written consent of the non-relocating parent to  
13 relocate with the child;

14 (b) If the non-relocating parent refuses to give that consent, petition the  
15 court for primary physical custody for the purpose of relocating.

16 2. The court may award reasonable attorney's fees and costs to the relocating  
17 parent if the court finds that the non-relocating parent refused to consent to the  
18 relocating parent's relocation with the child:

19 (a) Without having reasonable grounds for such refusal; or

20 (b) For the purposes of harassing the relocating parent.

21 3. A parent who relocates with a child pursuant to this section before the court enters  
22 an order granting the parent primary physical custody of the child and permission to  
23 relocate with the child is subject to the provisions of NRS 200.359

24 This provision does not apply to vacations outside Nevada planned by either party.

25  
26 **NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that they are subject to the provisions of  
27 NRS 31A.025 to 31A.240, inclusive, the parent obligated to pay child support shall  
28 be subject to wage assignment by that parent's employer should that parent  
become more than thirty days delinquent in said child support payments.

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that either party may request a review of  
child support pursuant to NRS 125B.145 at least every three years to determine  
whether the order should be modified or adjusted.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**OTHER PROVISIONS**

ORDERED that the parties herein sign any and all documents that are reasonably necessary and appropriate to facilitate, as well as to effectuate the transfer of the property herein awarded, and that should any party fail to execute the necessary documents within sixty (60) days after the Notice of the Entry of the Decree of Divorce to comply with the terms herein, either party may apply to the Court, through ex-parte application, properly served on the other party, a request pursuant to NRCP 70(a) for appointment as attorney in fact to execute any and all documentation necessary to effectuate the terms of this Decree; and it is further

ORDERED that the terms set forth in this Decree of Custody may not be changed, modified, or terminated orally, and any such change, modification, or termination may only be made by a written instrument executed by the parties, or by further Order of the Court.

**THIS IS A FINAL DECREE**

Dated this 25th day of May, 2022

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'MP', written over a horizontal line.

**449 FAA A35D 2301  
Mary Perry  
District Court Judge**

1 **CSERV**

2  
3 DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA


4  
5  
6 Adam Michael Solinger, Plaintiff | CASE NO: D-19-582245-D  
7 vs. | DEPT. NO. Department P  
8 Chalese Marie Solinger,  
9 Defendant.

10  
11 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

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

14 Service Date: 5/25/2022

15 Jack Fleeman	jack@pecoslawgroup.com
16 Alicia Exley	alicia@pecoslawgroup.com
17 Adam Solinger	adam@702defense.com
18 Louis Schneider	lcsllawllc@gmail.com
19 Alex Ghibaudo	alex@glawvegas.com
20 Michancy Cramer	michancy@glawvegas.com
21 Adam Solinger	attorneyadamsolinger@gmail.com
22 Alex Ghibaudo	alex@glawvegas.com



**MOT**

Adam M. Solinger  
7290 Sea Anchor Ct  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89131  
Tel: (702) 222-4021  
Email: attorneyadamsolinger@gmail.com

Eighth Judicial District Court  
Family Division  
Clark County, Nevada

ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER,	)	Case No.: D-19-582245-D
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Department: P
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
CHALESE MARIE SOLINGER,	)	<b>Hearing Requested</b>
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY JUDGEMENT PENDING  
APPEAL**

**NOW INTO COURT** comes Plaintiff, ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER, and hereby submits his motion to stay the judgement of this Court ordering the immediate disbursal of money held in trust to satisfy the award of attorney's fees until after an appeal is decided.

This Motion is made and based upon the attached Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Plaintiff attached hereto, and all papers and pleadings on file herein.

Dated Friday, May 27, 2022.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Adam M. Solinger

Adam M. Solinger

1 NOTICE: YOU MAY FILE A WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THIS  
2 MOTION WITH THE CLERK OF THE COURT AND PROVIDE THE  
3 UNDERSIGNED WITH A COPY OF YOUR RESPONSE WITHIN 14 DAYS  
4 OF YOUR RECEIPT OF THIS MOTION. FAILURE TO FILE A WRITTEN  
5 RESPONSE WITH THE CLERK OF THE COURT WITHIN 14 DAYS OF  
6 YOUR RECEIPT OF THIS MOTION MAY RESULT IN THE REQUESTED  
7 RELIEF BEING GRANTED BY THE COURT WITHOUT A HEARING  
8 PRIOR TO THE SCHEDULED HEARING DATE.

1                   **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2                   **INTRODUCTION**

3           On May 25, 2022, this Court issued a final divorce decree. A notice  
4 of entry of order was filed by the Court's JEA on May 26, 2022. In that  
5 decree, the Court made several findings. As relevant to this motion to  
6 stay enforcement of the disbursement of the attorney's fees provision,  
7 this Court awarded Chalese attorneys' fees in the amount of  
8 approximately \$200,875. As part of that award, this Court ordered  
9 Adam's former attorney to immediately distribute the entirety of the  
10 money being held in trust to the benefit of Chalese with just over  
11 \$10,000 going to one of her former attorney's directly and the balance  
12 going to Chalese.

13           To be very clear, Adam does not dispute that Chalese is entitled to  
14 her portion of the remaining community property proceeds which total  
15 \$3,799.99. This motion merely seeks a stay of the balance that remains  
16 after that disbursal.

17           **I.     STATEMENT OF FACTS**

18           This Court's decree is incorporated by refence as though fully set  
19 forth here. The following are highlights as relevant to this motion to stay  
20 and not an exhaustive list of all the facts that will be litigated on appeal.

1 As it relates to the procedural history section, this Court attempts to  
2 summarize the procedural history going by the docket entries. Curiously,  
3 this Court completely neglected to mention that Adam was awarded  
4 attorney's fees by Judge Moss twice. Specifically, Adam was awarded fees  
5 as a discovery sanction for Chalese's failure to respond to discovery in the  
6 amount of \$3,888.50. *See* February 19, 2019 Order. Judge Moss likewise  
7 ordered that she would normally award attorney's fees for Adam  
8 defending Chalese's countermotion to restore joint custody but deferred  
9 the issue to the time of trial. The decree is silent as to this deferral.

10 This Court also failed to note that Judge Bell denied Chalese's  
11 request for attorney's fees for Chalese's opposition to Adam's motion to  
12 disqualify because Chalese was not entitled to fees as she did not have to  
13 respond. It is unclear whether the Court's award of fees takes this denial  
14 into account.

15 Chalese was previously represented by Louis Schiender. Schiender  
16 filed an attorney's lien that was reduced to a judgment against Chalese by  
17 Judge Moss. Chalese sought to appeal that award of attorney's fees  
18 through Pecos as she believed that the award was unjustified given the  
19 work that he has done. That appeal was dismissed by the Nevada Supreme  
20 Court as the Court found the order awarding attorney's fees was not an  
21

1 appealable order. *See Solinger v. Schneider, Esq.*, No. 81787, 2021 WL  
2 1326846 (Nev. April 8, 2021).

3 Finally, throughout the procedural history section, the issue of  
4 whether attorney's fees are deferred is only noted twice and both of those  
5 deferrals were by this Court. It appears this is due to the fact that Judge  
6 Moss did not award Chalese attorney's fees. Indeed, the only fees that  
7 Judge Moss deferred was an award of \$10,000 under *Sargeant* for  
8 purposes of Chalese going to trial.

9 As is relates to the decree awarding attorney's fees specifically, this  
10 Court found a "large disparity of income" that necessitated an award of  
11 attorney's fees. The Court then proceeds to attempt to justify the award of  
12 attorney's fees on the basis that the Court did not like how Adam litigated  
13 this case. However, this appears to potentially retroactively sanction  
14 Adam which is grossly inappropriate. The Court never mentions the  
15 filings by Chalese, nor does the Court even acknowledge that Chalese had  
16 not been granted fees by Judge Moss.

17 The Court notes that Adam benefited from "the financial generosity  
18 of his parents." The Court makes no mention of the financial generosity of  
19 Chalese's mother. This crucial, unstated premise, is necessary to  
20 understand how Chalese was able to pay her legal fees that were generated  
21 by her own actions. For example, the Court can disagree with Judge Moss

1 modifying custody in June of 2019, but the Court cannot go back in time  
2 and change that. Adam was the prevailing party, not Chalese. Chalese's in  
3 ability to put the safety of the children first is what caused Judge Moss to  
4 change custody. Custody was not changed to punish Chalese, but to  
5 protect the children. This Court's repeated contention otherwise is not  
6 support by anything other than this Court's prejudice and bias against  
7 Judge Moss and, frankly, Adam.

8 The Court also does not mention that Chalese necessitated the  
9 withdrawal of her prior attorneys due to actions that were so prejudicial,  
10 this Court could not even hear them as it would forever taint Chalese in  
11 the Court's eyes. Thus, it appears that the Court takes every opportunity  
12 to blame Adam while never mentioning anything related to Chalese and  
13 her blame in this litigation.

## 14 **II. LAW AND ARGUMENT**

15 NRCP 62(d)(2) provides that "[i]f an appeal is taken, a party is  
16 entitled to a stay by providing a bond or other security." In deciding  
17 whether to grant a stay, the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure examine  
18 four factors. First, the Court considers (1) whether the object of the appeal  
19 will be defeated in the absence of a stay, (2) whether the appellant will  
20 suffer irreparable or substantial harm in the absence of a stay, (3) whether  
21 the respondent will suffer irreparable or substantial harm if a stay is



1 granted, and (4) whether the appellant is likely to prevail on the merits of  
2 the appeal. NRAP 8(c).

3 **a. Whether The Object Of The Appeal Will Be Defeated In**  
4 **The Absence Of A Stay.**

5 The appeal of the decree will involve several issues of law. As  
6 relevant to this motion to stay, Adam is seeking to stay the order that  
7 Vince Mayo turn over all of the money being held in his trust account to  
8 Chalese and one of her former attorneys while Adam appeals the award of  
9 attorney's fees.

10 An appeal in this matter will not likely be resolved until  
11 approximately eighteen months after it begins. During that timeframe, it  
12 is unclear what Chalese intends to do with the money if it is immediately  
13 transferred.

14 The object of the appeal, as it relates to this motion is to reverse the  
15 award of attorney's fees. If Adam prevails on appeal and Chalese has spent  
16 the money, then Adam would get a judgment in his favor for the amount  
17 of money wrongly disbursed from Mayo's trust account. As noted by this  
18 Court in granting Chalese attorney's fees, the Court believes Chalese has  
19 very little ability to earn more money and is a children's hair stylist. Thus,  
20 Adam would have no way to collect on any judgment he receives if he is  
21 successful and his appeal would be illusory. Thus, this factor favors a stay.

1 **b. Whether The Appellant Will Suffer Irreparable Or**  
2 **Substantial Harm In The Absence Of A Stay.**

3 If Adam is successful, he would suffer irreparable harm if Chalese is  
4 transferred all of the money that is disputed and then spends it. This  
5 factor favors a stay to the extent that it's unclear what Chalese would do  
6 with the money if given it immediately instead of post appeal.

7 **c. Whether The Respondent Will Suffer Irreparable Or**  
8 **Substantial Harm If A Stay Is Granted.**

9 Chalese will suffer no harm if a stay is granted. As it stands, Adam  
10 will be paying her child support. Chalese never asked for child support  
11 after this Court suddenly, and *sua sponte*, granted Chalese joint custody.  
12 Additionally, Chalese's attorney's fees have been paid in full, with the  
13 exception of Louis Schneider. However, as discussed in more detail below,  
14 this Court's unilateral grant of attorney's fees completely abridges  
15 Chalese's desire to contest this fee and Adam is in no position to appeal  
16 the grant of fees. Thus, part of this request would be to stay the award of  
17 fees to Schiender until such time as Chalese appeals the award as part of  
18 the underlying appeal.

19 ///

20 ///

21

**d. Whether The Appellant Is Likely To Prevail On The Merits Of The Appeal.**

Adam will prevail on appeal. This Court's order awarding attorney's fees is facially and fatally deficient to the point that it must be set aside for the reasons set forth below.

This Court makes no reference to the fact that Chalese's mother paid her attorney's fees. Chalese's fees to Pecos and Cramer/Ghibauda have been paid in full and this Court went to great lengths to describe the income disparity between the parties. The Court does however mention that Adam's parents paid for his attorney's fees. It's unclear how the Court can use Adam's parents' generosity against him while remaining silent on Chalese's mother's generosity.

The Court cites to *Logan v. Abe* for the proposition that a party can recover attorney's fees despite a third party's payment of those fees. However, that case is distinguishable in several regards. First, that case involved an insurance's company paying the fees for its insured which was required under the terms of the insurance contract and not a gesture of goodwill. Additionally, the case had to do with a grant of fees because the Plaintiff did not beat the offer of judgment made by the Defendant. Neither of those facts are present here. Additionally, it does not account for Chalese's choice of one of the most expensive family law firms in town.

1 The Court makes no attempt to distinguish what fees Chalese incurred  
2 that she was “required” to incur.

3 For example, Chalese was required to seek new counsel after her  
4 actions caused Pecos to withdraw, but to award her those fees seems to be  
5 completely devoid of logic to the point that it gives the appearance of  
6 impropriety. It literally shocks the conscious and cannot be defended.

7 Additionally, Adam was not the only one that filed motions in this  
8 case. Chalese filed several herself. One example, when Chalese was  
9 represented by Schiender, she filed a motion to get money from the trust  
10 account after the sale of the former martial house in order to buy a new  
11 house for herself with Josh that she bought in violation of the joint  
12 preliminary injunction. Why should Adam pay for Chalese’s attorney’s  
13 fees for violating a court ordered injunction?

14 This Court cannot just categorize all attorney’s fees as necessary  
15 expenses without an examination as to who is relatively responsible for  
16 the fees. To hold otherwise is just absurd. If the roles were reversed and  
17 Chalese filed every single motion in this case and Adam merely opposed  
18 them, then this Court’s blanket grant of fees would require the spouse in  
19 the worse financial position to accede to every single demand or have to  
20 pay the other side’s fees for their actions.

1        Thus, this Court cannot do a blanket grant of fees without an  
2 analysis of the necessity of those fees. The Court is well aware of this  
3 requirement as the Court laid out the *Brunzell* factors, but the Court  
4 utterly failed to conduct an analysis under *Brunzell*. Once again, this  
5 omission leads to more than just the appearance of impropriety. Indeed,  
6 this failure alone will result in the award being overturned on appeal as  
7 the Court knows how to conduct this type of analysis as it did so for  
8 Chalese's expert witness.

9        Additionally, this Court cannot effectively use a time machine to go  
10 against the law of the case. Judge Moss did not award Chalese attorney's  
11 fees. She even deferred the \$10,000 grant of *Sargeant* fees until the time  
12 of trial because Chalese's mother was paying her expenses. By blanket  
13 granting Chalese fees for every single thing her attorneys did, this Court  
14 is effectively going back in time and retroactively awarding fees over what  
15 the previous judge did in this case. This is a direct violation of the law of  
16 the case doctrine. Previous decisions must be respected. This is the  
17 district court, not the appellate court. Additionally, and just as troubling,  
18 this Court's decree gives the impression that fees are being awarded as a  
19 litigation sanction. Surely, this Court knows that sanctions are to be done  
20 on a graduated scale and not done retroactively. This unjust punitive  
21 measure really cements the impropriety and cannot be explained given

1 the Court's previous ruling when Chalese's attorney asked that Adam be  
2 declared a vexatious litigant.

3       On the same topic of a blanket award of fees and law of the case,  
4 Pecos opposed Adam's request to disqualify this Court and asked for fees  
5 for responding. Judge Bell denied the request for fees as Chalese was not  
6 required to respond to the motion to disqualify. The memorandum of  
7 costs submitted by Pecos shows that Chalese was billed for the time spent  
8 preparing the opposition. Adam acknowledges that this Court awarded  
9 Chalese \$180,000 for Pecos' representation while the actual fees billed  
10 were just over \$207,000. However, this underscores the likelihood of  
11 success on appeal as this Court has not delineated its thinking in this  
12 regard. This Court cannot overrule Judge Bell's denial of fees.

13       Additionally, Adam will prevail on ordering him to pay Schiender's  
14 attorney's fees. Chalese objected to his fee, believed it was unwarranted  
15 and appealed Judge Moss' order. But for it being dismissed for  
16 jurisdiction and not being a final order, her position would be that the fees  
17 awarded were unreasonable. Adam is in no position to appeal that award  
18 of fees because Chalese has the information necessary for appeal. Yet, in  
19 a display of brazen bias, this Court shortcuts everything and ordered  
20 Adam to pay that fee in full with zero analysis under *Brunzell*. Chalese has  
21 no incentive to appeal this fee now as she is not responsible for it and

1 Adam is no position to be able to effectively prosecute the appeal in that  
2 regard.

3 In sum, this Court erroneously awarded Chalese the entirety of her  
4 legal fees without any attempt to justify awarding the entire amount. It  
5 quite literally shocks the conscious to see that the Court did not even  
6 attempt to cover up its naked bias in favor of Chalese. Chalese's fees were  
7 paid by her mother. As a result, attorney's fees were inappropriate and  
8 should not be considered in this case.

9 Even assuming *arguendo* that the *Logan* decision is extended to  
10 cover this situation, this Court cannot square the facial bias of holding  
11 Adam's parents' financial help against him, but not accounting for  
12 Chalese's mother's help. Additionally, *Logan* allows for the recovery of  
13 **reasonable** attorney's fees.

14 This Court has taken no steps to justify the reasonableness of  
15 Chalese's fees other than a blanket statement about the reasonableness of  
16 the work performed. One example is Adam's award of attorney's fees for  
17 Chalese's discovery violation in the amount of \$3,888.50, which is not  
18 mentioned anywhere in the decree. Chalese obviously incurred fees  
19 defending against that motion. Yet Adam has to now pay those fees? That  
20 perverts the very grant of fees.

21

1       The motion to disburse disputed funds held in trust in July and  
2 August of 2019 was likewise necessitated by Chalese violating the joint  
3 preliminary injunction and buying a house without court permission. Yet,  
4 Adam now has to pay for Chalese's attorney's fees.

5       The grant of attorney's fees in this case is substantively incorrect  
6 because the fees were paid by Chalese's mother as a gift to her, not a loan.  
7 Therefore, Chalese cannot recover those fees. Even if that were not the  
8 case, this Court's failure to analyze the reasonableness of Chalese's  
9 attorney's fees is fatal to the award and will be overturned on appeal. This  
10 Court is well aware of how to actually analyze the reasonableness of fees  
11 because it did so for Chalese's rebuttal expert. Indeed, the Court writes  
12 nearly a page of the decree justifying the award of Dr. O'Donohue's legal  
13 fees. Yet, the Court devotes no time to analyzing what were Chalese's  
14 reasonable attorney's fees that were occasioned and necessary in order to  
15 meet Adam in the courtroom on an equal basis and that is why Adam will  
16 prevail on appeal as it relates to fees.

17 **e.    The Stay Should Be Granted**

18       As set forth above, NRCP 62(d)(2) requires a stay pending appeal if  
19 a bond or other security is posted. Indeed, if the Court approves the bond  
20 or other security, the stay immediately takes effect.



1 Here, the Court has ordered that all of the money in Mayo's trust  
2 account be disbursed in the next five days. This request to stay seeks to  
3 stop the disbursement pending appeal. Thus, the other security that  
4 maintains the status quo is to keep the money in Mayo's trust account and  
5 order the stay as required under NRCP 62(d)(2).

6 Alternatively, Adam does not have the money to post the entirety of  
7 the award. Indeed, Adam only has what is in Mayo's trust account, minus  
8 Chalese's interest in the remaining community proceeds that he is not  
9 disputing. But, in *Nelson v. Heer*, the Nevada Supreme Court held that in  
10 determining what security is necessary for a stay pending appeal, the  
11 focus should be on what security will maintain the status quo and protect  
12 the judgment creditor pending appeal. 121 Nev. 832, 835 (2005) (the  
13 version of NRCP 62 in effect at the time of the decision made stays  
14 discretionary rather than mandatory and thus invited the district court to  
15 allow for other security that was not a bond for the entire amount of the  
16 judgment).

17 Thus, because Adam cannot post the entire judgment as a bond,  
18 Adam asks this Court to maintain the status quo and stay the  
19 disbursement while keeping the money in Mayo's trust account as  
20 security.

21

1 This Court should stay the disbursement order, with the exception  
2 of Chalese's remaining share of the community proceeds, as the stay  
3 factors set forth in NRCP 62 and NRAP 8 favor Adam.

4 **III. ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE PURSUANT TO 5.501**

5 The notice of entry of order for the decree was filed yesterday May  
6 26, 2022. Adam immediately began drafting this request to stay and  
7 emailed opposing counsel at 5:21 P.M. asking for the defense's position  
8 on a stay. Given the very short timeframe before action must occur, Adam  
9 is filing this motion now. If the defense agrees to the stay, they can file a  
10 notice of non-opposition.

11 **IV. NOTICE OF INTENT PURSUANT TO NRAP 27 TO SEEK**  
12 **EMERGENCY RELIEF.**

13 Please be advised that Adam intends to file an emergency writ  
14 compelling a stay of the decree as outlined above in the event that this  
15 Court refuses to act before the deadline or otherwise denies the request to  
16 stay.

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

1 **V. CONCLUSION**

2 Based upon the foregoing, Adam respectfully requests that this  
3 Court stay the order that the money in Mayo's trust account be disbursed  
4 immediately with the exception of Chalese's share of the remaining  
5 community proceeds.

6 Dated Friday, May 27, 2022.

7  
8 Respectfully Submitted:

9 /s/ Adam M. Solinger  
10 Adam M. Solinger  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**DECLARATION OF ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER**

I, ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER, provide this Declaration pursuant to NRS 53.045 and states the following:

1. I am the Plaintiff in the above-entitled action, and I am above the age of majority and am competent to testify to the facts contained in this affidavit.

2. I make this affidavit in support of the foregoing **EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY JUDGEMENT PENDING APPEAL**

3. I have read said *Motion* and hereby certify that the facts set forth in the Points and Authorities attached thereto are true of my own knowledge, except for those matters therein contained stated upon information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

4. I declare under the penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of Nevada that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated Friday, May 27, 2022.

/s/ Adam M. Solinger  
ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing **EMERGENCY MOTION TO  
STAY JUDGEMENT PENDING APPEAL**

was filed electronically with the Eighth Judicial District Court in the  
above-entitled manner, on May 13, 2022. Electronic service of the  
foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service  
List, pursuant to NEFCR 9, as follows:

Michancy Cramer, Esq.  
Attorney for Defendant

/s/ Adam M. Solinger  
ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER

MOFI

DISTRICT COURT  
FAMILY DIVISION  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER

Plaintiff/Petitioner

v.

CHALESE MARIE SOLINGER

Defendant/Respondent

Case No. D-19-582245-D

Dept. 1

**MOTION/OPPOSITION  
FEE INFORMATION SHEET**

**Notice:** Motions and Oppositions filed after entry of a final order issued pursuant to NRS 125, 125B or 125C are subject to the reopen filing fee of \$25, unless specifically excluded by NRS 19.0312. Additionally, Motions and Oppositions filed in cases initiated by joint petition may be subject to an additional filing fee of \$129 or \$57 in accordance with Senate Bill 388 of the 2015 Legislative Session.

**Step 1.** Select either the \$25 or \$0 filing fee in the box below.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>\$25</b>	The Motion/Opposition being filed with this form is subject to the \$25 reopen fee.
-OR-		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>\$0</b>	The Motion/Opposition being filed with this form is not subject to the \$25 reopen fee because:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		The Motion/Opposition is being filed before a Divorce/Custody Decree has been entered.
<input type="checkbox"/>		The Motion/Opposition is being filed solely to adjust the amount of child support established in a final order.
<input type="checkbox"/>		The Motion/Opposition is for reconsideration or for a new trial, and is being filed within 10 days after a final judgment or decree was entered. The final order was entered on _____.
<input type="checkbox"/>		Other Excluded Motion (must specify) _____.

**Step 2.** Select the \$0, \$129 or \$57 filing fee in the box below.


<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>\$0</b>	The Motion/Opposition being filed with this form is not subject to the \$129 or the \$57 fee because:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		The Motion/Opposition is being filed in a case that was not initiated by joint petition.
<input type="checkbox"/>		The party filing the Motion/Opposition previously paid a fee of \$129 or \$57.
-OR-		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>\$129</b>	The Motion being filed with this form is subject to the \$129 fee because it is a motion to modify, adjust or enforce a final order.
-OR-		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>\$57</b>	The Motion/Opposition being filed with this form is subject to the \$57 fee because it is an opposition to a motion to modify, adjust or enforce a final order, or it is a motion and the opposing party has already paid a fee of \$129.

**Step 3.** Add the filing fees from Step 1 and Step 2.

The total filing fee for the motion/opposition I am filing with this form is:							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$0	\$25	\$57	\$82	\$129	\$154		

Party filing Motion/Opposition: Adam M. Solinger Date 10/7/2020

Signature of Party or Preparer /s/ Adam M. Solinger



**EPAP**

Adam M. Solinger  
7290 Sea Anchor Ct  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89131  
Tel: (702) 222-4021  
Email: attorneyadamsolinger@gmail.com

Eighth Judicial District Court  
Family Division  
Clark County, Nevada

ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER,	)	Case No.: D-19-582245-D
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Department: P
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
CHALESE MARIE SOLINGER,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**EMERGENCY EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR AN ORDER  
SHORTENING TIME ON PLAINTIFF'S EMERGENCY MOTION  
TO STAY JUDGEMENT PENDING APPEAL**

**NOW INTO COURT** comes Plaintiff, ADAM MICHAEL  
SOLINGER, and respectfully moves that, pursuant to EDCR 5.513, the  
Court shorten time in which to hear Plaintiff's EMERGENCY MOTION  
TO STAY JUDGEMENT PENDING APPEAL

///

///

///

1        This application is made and based on all the papers and pleadings  
2 on file herein and the declaration of counsel attached hereto. Attached as  
3 an exhibit is the proposed order shortening time.

4        Dated Friday, May 27, 2022.

5                                Respectfully Submitted,

6                                /s/ Adam M. Solinger

7                                Adam M. Solinger  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21



1                   **DECLARATION OF ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER**

2           I, ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER, ESQ, provide this Declaration  
3 pursuant to NRS 53.045 and states the following:

4           1.     I am the Plaintiff in the above-entitled action, and I am above  
5 the age of majority and am competent to testify to the facts contained in  
6 this declaration.

7           2.     Concurrently with the filing of this OST, I am filing an  
8 emergency motion to stay the disbursement of funds ordered by the  
9 divorce decree that was entered on May 26, 2022.

10          3.     As more fully set forth in the underlying motion, this Court  
11 ordered that funds be disbursed within a five day time frame.  
12 Traditionally, this time frame is 30 days. It is unclear why the time frame  
13 has been artificially shortened.

14          4.     As a result, unless this Court takes action on the request to  
15 stay disbursement before the 5 days runs, the very request will become  
16 moot.

17                 ///

18                 ///

19                 ///

20

21

5. In the event that this Court refuses to grant the order shortening time and/or grant the stay, I will seek relief in the Nevada Supreme Court on an emergency basis pursuant to NRAP 27.

6. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this Friday, May 27, 2022.

/s/ Adam M. Solinger  
ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

# EXHIBIT A

1 **OST**

Adam M. Solinger  
2 7290 Sea Anchor Ct  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89131  
3 Tel: (702) 222-4021  
Email: attorneyadamsolinger@gmail.com

4 Eighth Judicial District Court  
5 Family Division  
Clark County, Nevada

6 ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER, ) Case No.: D-19-582245-D  
7 )  
Plaintiff, ) Department: P  
8 vs. )  
9 CHALESE MARIE SOLINGER, )  
Defendant. )

11 **ORDER SHORTENING TIME ON PLAINTIFF'S EMERGENCY**  
12 **MOTION TO STAY JUDGEMENT PENDING APPEAL**

13 ///

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

1           Upon application of Plaintiff and good cause appearing therefore:  
2           **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the time for hearing on  
3           **EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY JUDGEMENT PENDING**  
4           **APPEAL**


5           is hereby shortened and shall be heard on the \_\_\_\_ day of  
6           \_\_\_\_\_, 2022 at the hour of \_\_\_\_\_ in Department P  
7           (Courtroom #13)/(via Video Conference (Bluejeans)) of the Family Court,  
8           located at 601 N. Pecos Rd., Las Vegas, NV 89101.

9  
10  
11 \_\_\_\_\_

12           Respectfully Submitted by:  
13           Plaintiff

14  
15           /s/ Adam M. Solinger  
16           Adam Solinger

17  
18  
19  
20  
21



**NOAS**

Adam M. Solinger  
7290 Sea Anchor Ct  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89131  
Tel: (702) 222-4021  
Email: attorneyadamsolinger@gmail.com

Eighth Judicial District Court  
Family Division  
Clark County, Nevada

ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER,	)	Case No.: D-19-582245-D
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Department: P
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
CHALESE MARIE SOLINGER,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

NOTICE is hereby given that Plaintiff, Adam Michael Solinger, hereby appeals to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada from the *Decree of Divorce* entered in this action on the 26th day of May, 2022.

Dated Friday, May 27, 2022.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Adam M. Solinger

Adam M. Solinger

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**


I hereby certify that the foregoing **NOTICE OF APPEAL** was filed electronically with the Eighth Judicial District Court in the above-entitled manner, on May 27th, 2022. Electronic service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List, pursuant to NEFCR 9, as follows:

Michancy Cramer, Esq.  
michancy@glawvegas.com

Alex Ghibaud, Esq.  
alex@glawvegas.com

Attorneys for Defendant

/s/ Adam M. Solinger  
ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER



1 **OPPC**

2 Alex B. Ghibaud, Esq.

3 Nevada Bar Number: 10592

4 Michancy M. Cramer

5 Nevada Bar Number: 11545

6 **ALEX GHIBAUDO, PC**

7 197 E California Ave Suite 250

8 Las Vegas, Nevada 89104

9 T: (702) 462-5888

10 F: (702) 924-6553

11 E: alex@glawvegas.com

12 *Attorney for Defendant*

13 **EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**  
14 **FAMILY DIVISION**  
15 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

16 ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER,

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 CHALESE MARIE SOLINGER,

20 Defendant.

Case Number: D-19-582245-D

Department P

21 **DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION**

22 **COMES NOW**, Defendant, CHALESE SOLINGER ("Chalese"), by and  
23 through her attorney of record, MICHANCY M. CRAMER, ESQ., of ALEX  
24 GHIBAUDO, P.C., and hereby files this *Opposition*.

25 This *Opposition* is based upon the attached Memorandum of Points and  
26 Authorities, any supporting exhibits provided in on file herein, any/all pleadings  
27 and papers on file herein, and any further evidence or argument presented to the  
28



1 Court at the hearing of this matter.

2 As set forth herein, Chalese respectfully requests that the Court:

- 3 1. Enter an Order denying Plaintiff's Motion in its entirety;  
4  
5 2. Award Chalese any other relief this Court deems just and appropriate.

6 **DATED** this 27<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2022.

7 Respectfully Submitted,

8 *//s//Michancy M. Cramer*

9 **Michancy M. Cramer, Esq.**  
10 *Attorney for Defendant*  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1                                   **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2                                   **I.**  
3                                   **FACTS**

4           After over three (3) years of baseless litigation, Plaintiff, ADAM  
5 SOLINGER (“Adam”) completely failed to make his case before this Court. His  
6 exhibits were admitted fully and without objection pursuant to stipulation by  
7 Defendant, CHALESE SOLINGER (“Chalese”) and her counsel. This Court  
8 repeatedly advised Adam that nothing he had presented amounted to grounds that  
9 would overcome this State’s preference for joint custody and yet he persisted.  
10 We’re now in a position to be finally done with this case and, in a move that  
11 surprises no one, Adam is trying to prevent dispersal of funds that were awarded to  
12 Chalese while also threatening an appeal.  
13

14  
15           Adam’s motion indicates that he has, yet again, failed to understand the  
16 laws, rules, and precedent that govern both attorneys and the Court in the Family  
17 Court Division. His motion is procedurally improper, vexatious, and without legal  
18 justification.  
19

20  
21                                   **II.**  
22                                   **LAW AND ANALYSIS**

23                   **A. Adam Makes Several Irrelevant Claims**

24           Adam begins by claiming that Judge Moss’s award to him of \$3,888.50 as a  
25 discovery sanction from February of 2019 is relevant to the present award. He also  
26 mentions that Judge Moss deferred an award of fees for an Opposition that he filed  
27  
28

1 opposing Chalese's attempts to restore Joint Physical Custody.

2  
3 To begin, this Court has already made clear that many of the Orders issued  
4 by the previous Court were improper. Chalese was punished for alleged use of  
5 marijuana, but, as this Court pointed out, marijuana is legal in this State, this is a  
6 State Court, and there was never any proof offered that Chalese was actually  
7 *abusing* marijuana. More alarming, the previous Court admitted in open court to  
8 modifying child custody and taking Joint Physical Custody away from Chalese as a  
9 way of "getting her attention." Such a modification is strictly prohibited and there  
10 is a litany of caselaw already cited by this Court in the Decree affirming that. The  
11 Decree is incorporated pursuant to EDCR 10(c). Now Adam wants to hang his hat  
12 on past orders that were likely improper in the first place. That makes no sense.  
13  
14  
15

16 The discovery sanction Adam references was in 2020, not 2019. The  
17 Answer was not even filed until February of 2019 so there was no way discovery  
18 could have been in dispute by February 19, 2019. As Adam admits, that matter  
19 was deferred to trial. Just because he was not awarded fees does not mean it was  
20 not considered. In fact, the Decree was quite clear in that the totality of the  
21 litigation was taken under consideration. The Court noted in its opinion that Pecos  
22 Law Group charged \$204,000 in fees with \$27,010.72 in courtesy credits and  
23 \$38,447.50 in legal services were provide at "No Charge." Chalese was awarded  
24 \$180,000 in legal fees. There is nothing in the Court's order to substantiate  
25  
26  
27  
28 Adam's claim that the past orders were not taken into consideration or that they

1 were somehow ignored.

2  
3 Judge Bell denying Chalese's counter-motion for fees and costs in opposing  
4 Adam's ill-considered motion to disqualify is irrelevant. Adam's motion was a  
5 baseless, vexatious motion (as have been the majority of his filings in this case)  
6 and all it did was delay and obstruct the handling of this matter. Adam claims it is  
7 "unclear" whether the Court's award of fees takes this into account; however, the  
8 wording in the Decree makes it clear that the Court's award is based on the totality  
9 of the litigation and the circumstances, not on one particular finding or ruling.  
10

11  
12 Adam has clearly picked through the history of the case, desperately trying  
13 to paint a picture that he is somehow entitled to an award or he has been wronged.  
14 He attempts to pick out a few discrete instances as justification for his motion, but  
15 his efforts are misplaced. Adam complains that the Decree does not recite the  
16 entire procedural history of the case when in reality, if the entire history of the case  
17 was recited, the Decree would be hundreds of pages long. Adam has filed so often  
18 and so vexatiously in this case that the register of actions is as long as novel. The  
19 Decree succinctly and appropriately referenced several noteworthy filings, but did  
20 not recite the entire case history in exact detail; nor is it required to.  
21

22  
23  
24 **B. Adam Misinterprets *Sargeant v Sargeant***

25  
26 The Nevada Supreme Court's ruling in *Sargeant v. Sargeant*, 88 Nev. 223,  
27 226, 495 P.2d 618 (1972) provides that a party "must be afforded [their] day in  
28

1 court without destroying [their] financial position” and that they “should be able to  
2 meet [their] adversary in the courtroom on an equal basis.” Adam appears to be  
3 operating under the presumption that this means the preliminary award of \$10,000  
4 that Judge Moss awarded Chalese at the start of litigation is *all* that Chalese is  
5 entitled to under *Sargeant*. By its very wording, the Court’s opinion in *Sargeant*  
6 says otherwise. “Equal footing” does not mean that an initial, preliminary award  
7 somehow precludes any further award under *Sargeant*. There is nothing in the  
8 plain language reading of *Sargeant* that precludes a court from awarding additional  
9 fees and costs at the conclusion of litigation.  
10  
11  
12

13 Adam characterizes this award as a retroactive sanction which, frankly, is  
14 demonstrative of how Adam views this entire case. When he does not get his way,  
15 everyone else is wrong and his actions are flawless. Reality is a lot harsher than  
16 that. Adam over litigated this case and has made repeated and outrageous claims  
17 against Chalese and her loved ones and he has simply failed to prove his case. He  
18 was given literally years to litigate this matter. He conducted numerous  
19 depositions. He filed motion after motion after motion. He has treated opposing  
20 counsel with arrogant disdain. And he has done all of this at his own peril.  
21  
22  
23

24 As any family court practitioner would have advised him, if a party is not  
25 reasonable in family court, they run the very real risk of paying the opposing  
26 party’s fees and costs. Not only does *Sargeant* provide the Court with the legal  
27 basis to award fees based on the financial position of the parties, but the numerous  
28

1 cases and statutes cited by the Court in the Decree provide additional basis.

2 Adam goes on to complain that Chalese's filings are not mentioned. This is  
3 a disingenuous argument if there ever was one. Adam filed over and over and over  
4 again in this case, each time seeking to take more and more time and control away  
5 from Chalese. Of course Chalese filed – she HAD to file because she had to not  
6 only oppose his filings, but she has had to fight for every minute of time she has  
7 had with her children for the last three years. This is a beast of Adam's creation; it  
8 is neither Chalese's nor this Court's fault if he doesn't like the outcome of  
9 unleashing that beast.  
10  
11  
12

13 NRS 18.010(2)(b) provides that “[i]t is the intent of the Legislature that the  
14 court award attorney's fees pursuant to this paragraph and impose sanctions...in all  
15 appropriate situations to punish for and deter frivolous or vexatious claims and  
16 defenses because such claims and defenses overburden limited judicial resources.”  
17 In the present matter, Adam has put forth a baseless claim that appears anchored to  
18 his misapplication of the Court's ruling in *Sargeant*. As Adam has told us many,  
19 many times, he is the plaintiff *and* an attorney. A pro se litigant does not get away  
20 with this kind of vexatious litigation; Adam most certainly should not. Chalese  
21 should be awarded her fees and costs in having to oppose this frivolous motion.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 **C. Brunzell Factors WERE Briefed**

27 Contrary to Adam's suggestion that the Court did not consider the factors  
28

1 outlined in *Brunzell v. Golden Gate National Bank*, 85 Nev. 345, 349, 455 P.2d 31,  
2 33 (1969), the Court in fact DID. Page 46 of the Decree (on file herein) did recite  
3 the factors that the Court considered. On page 51 of the Decree, the Court found  
4 the *Brunzell* factors, as briefed by counsel, “appropriate and acceptable” for both  
5 Alex Ghibaud, PC and Pecos Law Group. The Court accepted the briefing from  
6 both law firms as appropriate and acceptable. There is no need for rote recitation  
7 when the memorandum of fees and costs from both firms is on file herein.  
8  
9 Furthermore, Adam was given notice and opportunity to oppose both  
10 memorandums. He did not. Nor did he bother filing a closing brief as directed by  
11 the Court.  
12

#### 13 **D. Chalese Was Not Given Funds**

14 Adam claims that his parent’s generosity was held against him, but  
15 Chalese’s was not. Chalese was not *given* funds to litigate this case; nor was she  
16 able to benefit from a legal education herself. Her mother loaned her money. The  
17 promissory note she signed was submitted as Defendant’s Exhibit YY. All  
18 exhibits were admitted by stipulation, but Chalese is happy to submit another copy  
19 if the Court directs her to do so. Other than the funds this Court ordered paid  
20 directly to counsel, the rest of the money awarded will be going right back to  
21 Chalese’s mother.  
22  
23

24 Adam, on the other hand, *was* given money. He hired one of the  
25 community’s premier family law firms, The Abrams & Mayo Law Firm, with  
26 partner Vince Mayo sitting co-counsel for much of this case. His father testified to  
27 gifting him \$85,000 in equity for the marital residence and Adam currently resides  
28

1 in a home that was gifted, in part, to him and Jessica Sellers by his parents.

2 Adam's parents are both medical professionals with his father being a  
3 gastroenterologist.

4  
5 Adam goes on to essentially argue that Chalese lost motions in front of  
6 Judge Moss and it is what it is – she lost so she's not entitled to fees. Not only  
7 were several of Judge Moss's rulings flawed, such as when she changed custody to  
8 get Chalese's attention, and those flaws were argued by Chalese's counsel at the  
9 time. This argument also indicates Adam's own inability to accept responsibility.  
10 He CHOSE to over litigate this case. He CHOSE to chip away at Chalese's time  
11 with the children to the point that she barely had custodial time with them. He  
12 CHOSE to file motion after motion after motion. He CHOSE to have her  
13 followed. He CHOSE to file repeated CPS reports. He CHOSE not to be a  
14 cooperative co-parent, but rather a vexatious, arrogant litigant. Adam does not get  
15 to escape responsibility now by blaming Judge Moss.  
16  
17

18 **E. Adam's Motion Is Without Merit**

19 Adam proceeds to argue under NRAP 8(c), but his motion was filed days  
20 before his appeal. In fact, his notice of appeal was filed as this Opposition was  
21 being prepared for filing. Nevertheless, the factors as outlined in NRAP 8(c) are  
22 offered below:  
23

24 **(1) Whether the object of the appeal or writ petition will be defeated if**  
25 **the stay or injunction is denied;**  
26

27 While Adam claims the object of his appeal will be the award of attorney  
28 fees, it is highly doubtful that he is going to accept any part of the Court's order in



1 light of his history of vexatious and meritless demands, as well as his rude and  
2 unfounded accusations of bias. It is more than likely that the object of his appeal is  
3 going to be the entire Decree. He essentially stated as much in open court.  
4 Nothing Adam has briefed or argued supports his claim and the caselaw on point  
5 has been cited extensively by the Court. Adam has been given every opportunity  
6 to course correct and he chose to litigate this case to the bitter end. He failed to  
7 prove his case and is dissatisfied with the outcome; however, that does not change  
8 the fact that Chalese is still entitled to meet him “on equal footing” before the  
9 Court. Whether he “won” or “lost” is irrelevant, given the Court’s ruling in  
10 *Sargeant* and the vast income disparities in this case, Adam was going to pay fees  
11 and costs. He chose to over litigate this case, forced Chalese to respond to protect  
12 her rights as a parent, and now he is bearing the fruit of those decisions. If he  
13 actually follows through and only appeals the award of fees and costs, which is  
14 doubtful, he is not likely to succeed. Admittedly, without the stay, the object of his  
15 appeal would be defeated insomuch as it is money and will go to paying back  
16 Chalese’s mother for the fees she paid on her behalf.  
17  
18  
19

20 **(2) Whether appellant/petitioner will suffer irreparable or serious injury**  
21 **if the stay or injunction is denied;**  
22

23 Adam of course claims he will suffer irreparable harm or injury if the stay is  
24 denied; however, as briefed above, he is unlikely to succeed on the merits of his  
25 appeal. The stay he seeks involves the dispersal of money. Adam has to pay  
26 Chalese anyways. He is not going to be irreparably harmed by the loss of money  
27 that, really, he never possessed. It was a gift of equity in the marital residence.  
28

1 Adam is a practicing attorney who earns a very comfortable living as such. His  
2 family is wealthy as demonstrated by the fact that they have purchased two homes  
3 for Adam.

4  
5 Adam has improperly interpreted the holding in *Sargeant* and fails to accept  
6 responsibility for his own behavior and decisions in handling this case. Chalese  
7 has outstanding bills that she has to pay; primarily, the promissory note that she  
8 signed agreeing to pay her mother back for the loan of legal fees.

9  
10 **(3) Whether respondent/real party in interest will suffer irreparable or**  
11 **serious injury if the stay or injunction is granted;**

12 Chalese has already been irreparably harmed by this litigation. Her mother  
13 has loaned her hundreds of thousands of dollars in retaining attorneys, hiring  
14 experts, and litigating this monstrosity of a divorce. It is time for this case to be  
15 done, the bills to be paid, and life to go on. Of course Adam is not going to settle  
16 for that because he is apparently constitutionally unable to move on, but that does  
17 not mean that Chalese needs to live another two years with these bills hanging over  
18 her head in an appeal that Adam is more than likely going to lose.

19  
20  
21 **(4) Whether appellant/petitioner is likely to prevail on the merits in the**  
22 **appeal or writ petition.**

23 Adam's motion already indicates that his appeal facially insufficient. He  
24 clearly does not understand the application of *Sargeant* and lacks the self-  
25 awareness to understand that the award of fees is not based on a discrete, single  
26 finding, but rather the case as a whole and specifically on how he conducted  
27 himself during this case. This Court made specific findings that there was blame to  
28

1 go around, but that Adam’s “continued bad faith and unreasonable conduct  
2 permeated the entirety of the litigation.” (See Decree, on file herein, page 21.)  
3 “Findings of fact, whether based on oral or other evidence, must not be set aside  
4 unless clearly erroneous, and the reviewing court must give due regard to the trial  
5 court’s opportunity to judge the witnesses’ credibility.” NRCP 52(a)(6).  
6

7 Despite his over abundance of confidence, Adam is highly unlikely to  
8 prevail on an appeal. There is more than sufficient grounds for the award of fees  
9 and costs as well as the entirety of the Court’s Findings of Facts and Conclusions  
10 of Law. Adam’s behavior has been abominable and, frankly, this writer found the  
11 Decree gracious and optimistic in light of his actions over the past three and half  
12 years.  
13

14 Adam’s request for a stay should be denied.  
15

16 **F. Chalese Should Be Granted Her Fees And Costs For Having To**  
17 **Oppose This Frivolous Motion**  
18

19 Chalese should be awarded her fees and costs for having to oppose this  
20 frivolous motion pursuant to NRS 18.010. Upon the Court’s direction, a  
21 memorandum of fees and costs with the appropriate *Brunzell* analysis can be  
22 submitted.  
23

24 **III.**  
**CONCLUSION**

25 **WHEREFORE**, based upon the foregoing, and for the reasons set forth  
26 herein, Chalese respectfully requests that the Court:  
27

- 28 1. Enter an Order denying Plaintiff’s Motion in its entirety;

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

2. Award Chalese any other relief this Court deems just and appropriate.

**DATED** this 27th day of May, 2022.

Respectfully Submitted,

*//s//Michancy M. Cramer*

---

**Michancy M. Cramer, Esq.**  
*Attorney for Defendant*

1                                    **DECLARATION OF MICHANCY M. CRAMER, ESQ.**

- 2                                    1. I, Michancy M. Cramer, Esq., represent the Defendant, Chalese Solinger, in
- 3                                    the above action and am competent to testify to the facts contained herein.
- 4
- 5                                    2. Alex Ghibaud, Esq. of this firm did reach out via email to Plaintiff, Adam
- 6                                    Solinger, regarding the procedural and substantive deficiencies in his Motion
- 7                                    today, May 27, 2022, and Adam declined to compromise.
- 8
- 9                                    3. Since I was retained to represent Chalese Solinger in December of 2021
- 10                                   Adam has filed multiple motions on a variety of issues. My office has
- 11                                   represented her on those motions and continues to do so.
- 12
- 13                                   4. Adam is unwilling to accept virtually anything that is not completed exactly
- 14                                   as he sees fit. For example, a motion was filed in March by Chalese
- 15                                   regarding an incident in her home. She then filed for an OST that was
- 16                                   granted. Adam promptly filed for *another* OST because he was not satisfied
- 17                                   with the date that was given and he wanted an earlier date.
- 18
- 19
- 20                                   5. Chalese continues to incur fees and costs defending herself against Adam's
- 21                                   vexatious and harassing litigation.
- 22
- 23                                   6. I have prepared and read the foregoing Opposition and believe the facts as
- 24                                   stated to be true, and as to those facts stated upon information and belief, I
- 25                                   believe them to be true.
- 26
- 27                                   7. I am signing this Declaration in support of the above Opposition because of
- 28                                   the application for an OST that Adam filed and in the interest of getting it

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

filed immediately. My client shall be made available to testify under oath in support of this Opposition should the Court deem it necessary.

8. Further declarant sayeth naught.

**I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Nevada (NRS 53.045 and 28 U.S.C. § 1746), that the forgoing is true and correct.**

**DATED** this 27<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2022.

*//s//Michancy M. Cramer*

---

**Michancy M. Cramer**

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

Pursuant to NRC 5(b), I declare under penalty of perjury, under the law of the State of Nevada, that I served a true and correct copy of *Defendant's Motion*, on May 27, 2022, as follows:

- [ ] Pursuant to EDCR 8.05(a), EDCR 8.05(f), NRCP 5(b)(2)(D), and Administrative Order 14-2 captioned “*In the Administrative Matter of Mandatory Electronic Service in the Eighth Judicial District Court*,” by mandatory electronic service through the Eighth Judicial District Court’s electronic filing system;
- [ x] By depositing a copy of same in a sealed envelope in the United States Mail, postage pre-paid, in Las Vegas, Nevada;
- [ ] Pursuant to EDCR 7.26, sent via facsimile by duly executed consent for service by electronic means.

To the following address:

Adam Solinger  
7290 Sea Anchor Ct  
Las Vegas, NV 89131  
attorneyadamsolinger@gmail.com  
*Plaintiff*

//s//*Michancy M. Cramer*

**Alex Ghibaud, P.C.**  
*Attorneys for Defendant*

**EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT  
FAMILY DIVISION  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

**Adam Solinger**

Plaintiff/Petitioner

vs.

**Chelese Solinger**

Defendant/Respondent

Case Number: **D-19-582245-D**Department: **P**

**MOTION/OPPOSITION  
FEE INFORMATION SHEET**

Notice: Motions and Oppositions after entry of a final Order issued pursuant to NRS 125, 125B, or 125C are subject to the reopen filing fee of \$25, unless specifically excluded by NRS 19.0312. Additionally, Motions and Oppositions filed in cases initiated by Joint Petition may be subject to an additional filing fee of \$129 or \$57 in accordance with Senate Bill 388 of the 2015 Legislative Session.

**Step 1.** Select either the \$25 or \$0 filing fee in the box below:

- |                                     |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <b>\$25</b>                         | The Motion/Opposition being filed with this form is subject to the \$25 reopen fee.  |
|                                     | -OR-                                |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <b>\$0</b>                          | The Motion/Opposition being filed is not subject to the \$25 reopen fee because:   |
|                                     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | The Motion/Opposition is being filed before a Divorce/Custody Decree has been entered.   |
|                                     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | The Motion/Opposition is being filed solely to adjust the amount of child support established in a final Order.  |
|                                     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | The Motion/Opposition is for reconsideration or for a new trial and is being filed with 10 days after a final judgment or Decree was entered. The final Order was entered on: _____. |
|                                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Other Excluded Motion  |

**Step 2.** Select the \$0, \$129, or \$57 filing fee in the box below:

- |                                     |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <b>\$0</b>                          | The Motion/Opposition being filed is not subject to the \$129 or \$57 fee because:   |
|                                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The Motion/Opposition is being filed in a case not initiated by Joint Petition.  |
|                                     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | The party filing the Motion/Opposition previously paid a fee of \$129 or \$57  |
|                                     | -OR-                                |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <b>\$129</b>                        | The Motion/Opposition being filed with this form is subject to the \$129 fee because it is a Motion to modify, adjust, or enforce a final Order.   |
|                                     | -OR-                                |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <b>\$57</b>                         | The Motion/Opposition being filed is subject to the \$57 fee because it is an Opposition to a Motion to modify, adjust, or enforce a final Order or it is a Motion and the opposing party has already paid a fee of \$129. |

**Step 3.** Add the filing fees from Step 1 and Step 2:

The total filing fee for the Motion/Opposition I am filing with this form is	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$0	<input type="checkbox"/> \$25 <input type="checkbox"/> \$57 <input type="checkbox"/> \$82 <input type="checkbox"/> \$129 <input type="checkbox"/> \$154

Party filing Motion/Opposition: **Defendant**Date: **5-24-22**Signature of Party or Preparer: //s//Michancy M. Cramer



**DISTRICT COURT; FAMILY DIVISION  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

Adam Michael Solinger	)	Case No.: D-19-582245-D
Plaintiff,	)	Dept. P
-vs.-	)	
	)	Date: Chambers
Chalese Marie Solinger	)	Time: n/a
Defendant.	)	

This matter having come before the court on the Plaintiff's Emergency Motion to Stay Judgment Pending Appeal and Emergency Motion for Order Shortening Time; and in reviewing this matter, the Court Finds:

3. Plaintiff submitted an Order Shortening Time, and the Court reviewed the underlying motion, and saw that there was no proof of service of the Ex-Parte Application for Order Shortening Time on opposing counsel. The Court returned the Order Shortening Time to the Plaintiff, requesting that it be resubmitted after service to opposing counsel and e-filing proof of same into the case.

1           4. Plaintiff resubmitted the Order Shortening Time, but did not efile proof  
2 of service with the Court of the ex-Parte Application as requested<sup>1</sup>. The Court took  
3 no further action, awaiting proof of service, which was never filed.

4           5. Plaintiff thereafter filed a Notice of Appeal (Friday, 5/27/22 -Doc. 512  
5 at 5:04 pm), after the Court closed for the Memorial Day Weekend.

6           6. Defendant, through counsel, filed an Opposition to the Emergency  
7 Motion (5/27/22 - Doc. 513).

8           7. In the Decree, the Court awarded attorney's fees to the Defendant,  
9 release of fees already awarded to the Defendant, but was stayed until conclusion of  
10 this matter, as well as disbursement of other amounts held in the Client Trust  
11 Account of the Abrams and Mayo Law Firm, as and for community property and  
12 attorney's fees, to be dispersed five (5) days after Notice of Entry, which would be  
13 Tuesday, May 31, 2022 (not counting day of service of Notice of Entry).

14           8. At the end of Trial, the Court requested that both parties file a Closing  
15 Brief, with any other closing argument, and to include any other matters that were  
16 pertinent. The Plaintiff failed and/or refused to file a Closing Brief. Defendant's  
17 counsel did file a Closing Brief.

18           9. The sole reason provided by the Plaintiff in his Motion for Stay, was the  
19 issue of payment of all attorney's fees, simply because the Court did not take "into  
20 account" that the prior Judicial Officer awarded attorney's fees to Adam in the  
21 amount of \$3,888.50 as it pertained to discovery, and a general argument as to the  
22 other attorney's fees awarded. Plaintiff also proffered an imprudent argument of  
23 attorney's fees awards under *Sargeant v. Sargeant*, 88 Nev. 223, 226, 495 P.2d 618  
24 (1972), as noted in Defendant's Opposition, which are right on point, in that  
25 Sargeant fees is not a "one time only" award but rather goes throughout the case  
26

27           <sup>1</sup> *Maheu v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct. ex.rel. County of Clark*, 88 Nev. 26, 34, 493 P.2d 709, 714 (1972);  
28           *Turner v. Saka*, 90 Nev. 54, 518 P.2d 608 (Nev., 1974); *Matthews v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct. ex.rel.*  
              *County of Washoe*, 91 Nev. 96, 98, 531 P.2d 852, 853 (1975); and its progeny, all relating to  
              procedural due process and ex-parte applications/orders.

1 including post decree matters, to keep the parties on “equal footing” throughout the  
2 children’s minority.

3 10. The Plaintiff argues that the Court did not include his award of fees.  
4 By way of explanation of the fees awarded, if not fully clear in the Decree, are as  
5 follows:

6 (a) The Court found that the Plaintiff was the primary reason for the  
7 majority of the litigation which took place in this matter, which the Court found to  
8 be unwarranted;

9 (b) In the Decree, the Court found that much of the litigation was  
10 caused as a result of the Plaintiff’s actions, and under appropriate case law,  
11 including, *inter alia*, *Sargeant, supra*, that given the disparity of income (Plaintiff an  
12 attorney with about \$10,000/GMI, versus the Defendant, who was a stay at home  
13 mother until the last couple of years at a fraction of what the Plaintiff earned), that  
14 an award of attorney’s fees were warranted.

15 (c) The fees to Louis Schneider, Esq., were already awarded,  
16 reduced to judgment and stayed until the conclusion of the case, which is the  
17 Decree.

18 (d) The fees to the Alex Ghibaudo, PC lawfirm were flat fee, despite  
19 the attorney hours to prepare and the additional full days of trial; the firm provided a  
20 Memorandum of Fees and costs with Brunzell factors which the Court accepted (see  
21 (a) & (b) above).

22 (e) The issue then becomes the Memorandum of Fees and Costs  
23 from The Pecos Law Group, with acceptable Brunzell factors, who handled the  
24 majority of the motion practice in this matter from August 2019 through September  
25 2021. Despite their generosity of either “not charging (\$38,447.50)” or “courtesy  
26 credits (\$27,010.72)” of about \$65,000, there still were fees and costs in the total  
27 amount of \$204,760.72 in a divorce action that did not have any major financial  
28 issues, but rather the majority of the time spent on custody. The Court discounted  
the \$204,760.72 to a total of \$180,000.

1 (f) The Court requested a Closing Brief from the Plaintiff which  
2 was to address any other issue which the trial either did not cover or should be  
3 included in the Court's final Decree. The Plaintiff failed to provide a Closing Brief,  
4 wherein he could have provided the Court the prior fee award as it related to  
5 discovery.

6 (g) The Court finds that the \$3,888.50, as well as any other amounts  
7 for fees, as sought by the Plaintiff, is included as part of the discounted amount to  
8 The Pecos Law Group fees.

9 *NOW, THEREFORE*, with the Court having reviewed the pleadings and papers on  
10 file in this matter, and good cause appearing, It Is Hereby


11 ORDERED that the Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Stay be and hereby  
12 is Denied; and it is further

13 ORDERED that all payments as ordered in the Decree of Divorce are to be  
14 timely disbursed by the Abrams and Mayo Law Firm; and it is further

15 ORDERED that the Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider Decision  
16 After Defendant's Motion to Place on Calendar and Take Testimony, the  
17 Defendant's Opposition and Countermotion thereto, currently set for June 22, 2022,  
18 shall be vacated. That once the Court is advised as to the issues on appeal, and  
19 depending on what may or may not be collateral to the appeal (or if necessary, once  
20 the appeal has concluded) this motion as well as Defendant's Countermotion for  
21 Attorney's Fees for the Motion for Stay shall be placed on the Court's calendar for  
22 hearing.

23 **SO ORDERED**

Dated this 31st day of May, 2022

24   
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **CSERV**

2  
3 DISTRICT COURT  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

4  
5  
6 Adam Michael Solinger, Plaintiff | CASE NO: D-19-582245-D  
7 vs. | DEPT. NO. Department P  
8 Chalese Marie Solinger,  
9 Defendant.


10  
11 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

12 This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District  
13 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:

14 Service Date: 5/31/2022

15 Jack Fleeman	jack@pecoslawgroup.com
16 Alicia Exley	alicia@pecoslawgroup.com
17 Adam Solinger	adam@702defense.com
18 Louis Schneider	lcsllawllc@gmail.com
19 Alex Ghibaudo	alex@glawvegas.com
20 Adam Solinger	attorneyadamsolinger@gmail.com
21 Alex Ghibaudo	alex@glawvegas.com
22 Michancy Cramer	michancy@glawvegas.com

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

NEO

**DISTRICT COURT; FAMILY DIVISION  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

\* \* \* \* \*

Adam Michael Solinger ) Case No.: D-19-582245-D  
Plaintiff, ) Dept. P  
-vs.- )  
Chalese Marie Solinger )  
Defendant. ) **NOTICE OF ENTRY**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that a Decree of Divorce, a copy of which  
is attached hereto, was entered by the Court on May 31, 2022.

Date: May 31, 2022

/s/ Marj Arena

Marj Arena

Judicial Executive Assistant- Dept. P

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that pursuant to Rule 9(b) of the Nevada Electronic  
Filing and Conversion Rules a copy of this Notice of Hearing was electronically  
served, on the date filed, to all registered users on this case in the Eighth Judicial  
District Court Electronic Filing System; or via US Mail or regular email to the  
last known mail/email addresses on file with the court.

Adam Solinger -- attorneyadamsolinger@gmail.com  
Michancy Cramer, Esq. ----- michancy@glawvegas.com

Louis C. Schneider, Esq. --- lcsllawllc@yahoo.com  
Jack Fleeman, Esq. --email@pecoslawgroup.com  
Vincent Mayo, Esq. --- VMgroup@theabramslawfirm.com

/s/ Marj Arena

Marj Arena

Judicial Executive Assistant- Dept. P

**DISTRICT COURT; FAMILY DIVISION  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

\* \* \* \* \*

Adam Michael Solinger	)	Case No.: D-19-582245-D
Plaintiff,	)	Dept. P
-vs.-	)	
	)	Date: Chambers
Chalese Marie Solinger	)	Time: n/a
Defendant.	)	

## ORDER

This matter having come before the court on the Plaintiff's Emergency Motion to Stay Judgment Pending Appeal and Emergency Motion for Order Shortening Time; and in reviewing this matter, the Court Finds:

1. The Court filed the Decree of Divorce (5/25/22 - Doc. 508) and Notice of Entry (5/26/22 - Doc. 509);

2. Plaintiff filed the Emergency Motion to Stay Judgment Pending Appeal (5/27/22 - Doc. 510) and Emergency Motion for Order Shortening Time (5/27/22 - Doc. 511).

3. Plaintiff submitted an Order Shortening Time, and the Court reviewed the underlying motion, and saw that there was no proof of service of the Ex-Parte Application for Order Shortening Time on opposing counsel. The Court returned the Order Shortening Time to the Plaintiff, requesting that it be resubmitted after service to opposing counsel and e-filing proof of same into the case.

1           4. Plaintiff resubmitted the Order Shortening Time, but did not efile proof  
2 of service with the Court of the ex-Parte Application as requested<sup>1</sup>. The Court took  
3 no further action, awaiting proof of service, which was never filed.

4           5. Plaintiff thereafter filed a Notice of Appeal (Friday, 5/27/22 -Doc. 512  
5 at 5:04 pm), after the Court closed for the Memorial Day Weekend.

6           6. Defendant, through counsel, filed an Opposition to the Emergency  
7 Motion (5/27/22 - Doc. 513).

8           7. In the Decree, the Court awarded attorney's fees to the Defendant,  
9 release of fees already awarded to the Defendant, but was stayed until conclusion of  
10 this matter, as well as disbursement of other amounts held in the Client Trust  
11 Account of the Abrams and Mayo Law Firm, as and for community property and  
12 attorney's fees, to be dispersed five (5) days after Notice of Entry, which would be  
13 Tuesday, May 31, 2022 (not counting day of service of Notice of Entry).

14           8. At the end of Trial, the Court requested that both parties file a Closing  
15 Brief, with any other closing argument, and to include any other matters that were  
16 pertinent. The Plaintiff failed and/or refused to file a Closing Brief. Defendant's  
17 counsel did file a Closing Brief.

18           9. The sole reason provided by the Plaintiff in his Motion for Stay, was the  
19 issue of payment of all attorney's fees, simply because the Court did not take "into  
20 account" that the prior Judicial Officer awarded attorney's fees to Adam in the  
21 amount of \$3,888.50 as it pertained to discovery, and a general argument as to the  
22 other attorney's fees awarded. Plaintiff also proffered an imprudent argument of  
23 attorney's fees awards under *Sargeant v. Sargeant*, 88 Nev. 223, 226, 495 P.2d 618  
24 (1972), as noted in Defendant's Opposition, which are right on point, in that  
25 Sargeant fees is not a "one time only" award but rather goes throughout the case  
26

27           <sup>1</sup> *Maheu v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct. ex.rel. County of Clark*, 88 Nev. 26, 34, 493 P.2d 709, 714 (1972);  
28           *Turner v. Saka*, 90 Nev. 54, 518 P.2d 608 (Nev., 1974); *Matthews v. Second Jud. Dist. Ct. ex.rel.*  
              *County of Washoe*, 91 Nev. 96, 98, 531 P.2d 852, 853 (1975); and its progeny, all relating to  
              procedural due process and ex-parte applications/orders.



1 including post decree matters, to keep the parties on “equal footing” throughout the  
2 children’s minority.

3 10. The Plaintiff argues that the Court did not include his award of fees.  
4 By way of explanation of the fees awarded, if not fully clear in the Decree, are as  
5 follows:

6 (a) The Court found that the Plaintiff was the primary reason for the  
7 majority of the litigation which took place in this matter, which the Court found to  
8 be unwarranted;

9 (b) In the Decree, the Court found that much of the litigation was  
10 caused as a result of the Plaintiff’s actions, and under appropriate case law,  
11 including, *inter alia*, *Sargeant, supra*, that given the disparity of income (Plaintiff an  
12 attorney with about \$10,000/GMI, versus the Defendant, who was a stay at home  
13 mother until the last couple of years at a fraction of what the Plaintiff earned), that  
14 an award of attorney’s fees were warranted.

15 (c) The fees to Louis Schneider, Esq., were already awarded,  
16 reduced to judgment and stayed until the conclusion of the case, which is the  
17 Decree.

18 (d) The fees to the Alex Ghibaud, PC lawfirm were flat fee, despite  
19 the attorney hours to prepare and the additional full days of trial; the firm provided a  
20 Memorandum of Fees and costs with Brunzell factors which the Court accepted (see  
21 (a) & (b) above).

22 (e) The issue then becomes the Memorandum of Fees and Costs  
23 from The Pecos Law Group, with acceptable Brunzell factors, who handled the  
24 majority of the motion practice in this matter from August 2019 through September  
25 2021. Despite their generosity of either “not charging (\$38,447.50)” or “courtesy  
26 credits (\$27,010.72)” of about \$65,000, there still were fees and costs in the total  
27 amount of \$204,760.72 in a divorce action that did not have any major financial  
28 issues, but rather the majority of the time spent on custody. The Court discounted  
the \$204,760.72 to a total of \$180,000.

1 (f) The Court requested a Closing Brief from the Plaintiff which  
2 was to address any other issue which the trial either did not cover or should be  
3 included in the Court's final Decree. The Plaintiff failed to provide a Closing Brief,  
4 wherein he could have provided the Court the prior fee award as it related to  
5 discovery.

6 (g) The Court finds that the \$3,888.50, as well as any other amounts  
7 for fees, as sought by the Plaintiff, is included as part of the discounted amount to  
8 The Pecos Law Group fees.

9 *NOW, THEREFORE*, with the Court having reviewed the pleadings and papers on  
10 file in this matter, and good cause appearing, It Is Hereby


11 ORDERED that the Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Stay be and hereby  
12 is Denied; and it is further

13 ORDERED that all payments as ordered in the Decree of Divorce are to be  
14 timely disbursed by the Abrams and Mayo Law Firm; and it is further

15 ORDERED that the Hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider Decision  
16 After Defendant's Motion to Place on Calendar and Take Testimony, the  
17 Defendant's Opposition and Countermotion thereto, currently set for June 22, 2022,  
18 shall be vacated. That once the Court is advised as to the issues on appeal, and  
19 depending on what may or may not be collateral to the appeal (or if necessary, once  
20 the appeal has concluded) this motion as well as Defendant's Countermotion for  
21 Attorney's Fees for the Motion for Stay shall be placed on the Court's calendar for  
22 hearing.

23 **SO ORDERED**

Dated this 31st day of May, 2022

24   
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **CSERV**

2  
3 DISTRICT COURT  
4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

5  
6 Adam Michael Solinger, Plaintiff | CASE NO: D-19-582245-D  
7 vs. | DEPT. NO. Department P  
8 Chalese Marie Solinger,  
9 Defendant.


10  
11 **AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

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

15 Service Date: 5/31/2022

16 Jack Fleeman	jack@pecoslawgroup.com
17 Alicia Exley	alicia@pecoslawgroup.com
18 Adam Solinger	adam@702defense.com
19 Louis Schneider	lcsllawllc@gmail.com
20 Alex Ghibaudo	alex@glawvegas.com
21 Adam Solinger	attorneyadamsolinger@gmail.com
22 Alex Ghibaudo	alex@glawvegas.com
23 Michancy Cramer	michancy@glawvegas.com

24  
25  
26  
27  
28



CAS  
ADAM M. SOLINGER  
Nevada Bar No 13963  
2970 W. Sahara Ave  
Las Vegas, NV 89102  
In Proper Person

**EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT  
FAMILY DIVISION  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA**

ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
vs. )  
)  
CHALESE MARIE SOLINGER, )  
)  
Defendant. )  
)

CASE NO.: D-19-582245-D  
DEPT.: P

**CASE APPEAL STATEMENT**

1. Name of appellant filing this case appeal statement:

**Adam M. Solinger**

2. Identify the judge issuing the decision, judgment, or order appealed from:

**Honorable Judge Mary Perry**

3. Identify each appellant and the name and address of counsel for each appellant:

**Adam M. Solinger**

4. Identify each respondent and the name and address of appellate counsel, in known, for each respondent (if the name of a respondent's appellate counsel is unknown, indicate as much and provide the name and address of that respondent's trial counsel:

**Chalese Marie Solinger  
Alex B. Ghibaud, Esq.  
197 E. California Ave., Suite 250  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
(702) 217-7442  
alex@glawvegas.com  
Counsel for Respondent**

1 5. Indicate whether any attorney identified above in response to question 3 or 4 is not licensed to  
2 practice law in Nevada and, if so, whether the district court granted that attorney permission to  
appear under SCR 42 (attach a copy of any district court order granting such permission):

3 **N/A**

4  
5 6. Indicate whether appellant was represented by appointed or retained counsel in the district  
court:

6 **Retained at times and in proper person at others.**

7  
8 7. Indicate whether appellant is represented by appointed or retained counsel on appeal:

9 **N/A**

10 8. Indicate whether appellant was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and the date of  
11 entry of the district court order granting such leave:

12 **N/A.**

13 9. Indicate the date the proceedings commenced in the district court (e.g., date complaint,  
14 indictment, information, or petition was filed):

15 **January 4, 2019 date complaint for divorce was filed.**

16 10. Provide a brief description of the nature of the action and result in the district court,  
17 including the type of judgment or order being appealed and the relief granted by the district  
court:

18 **Complaint for divorce and child custody resulting in a several day long non-jury trial that**  
19 **resulted in a decree of divorce being issued that addressed child custody and attorney's**  
20 **fees.**

21 11. Indicate whether the case has previously been the subject of an appeal to or original writ  
22 proceeding in the Supreme Court and, if so, the caption and Supreme Court docket number of the  
prior proceeding:

23 **Solinger v. Schneider, Esq. Docket Number: 81787**

24 **Solinger v. Dist. Ct. (Solinger), Docket Numbers: 84795 and 84795-COA**

25 12. Indicate whether this appeal involves child custody or visitation:

26 **Child Custody.**


27 **///**

28

1 13. If this is a civil case, indicate whether this appeal involves the possibility of settlement:

2 **It is possible to settle the attorney's fees portion of the divorce decree.**

3 Dated this 6th day of June, 2022.

4  
5  
6 

ADAM M. SOLINGER  
Nevada Bar No. 13963  
In Proper Person

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12 **AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030**

13 The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the  
14 social security number of any person.

15  
16 Dated this 6th day of June, 2022.

17  
18 

19 ADAM M. SOLINGER  
20 Nevada Bar No. 13963  
In Proper Person


1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing **CASE APPEAL STATEMENT** was filed electronically with the Eighth Judicial District Court in the above-entitled manner, on June 6, 2022. Electronic service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List, pursuant to NEFCR 9, as follows:

Alex Ghibaudo, Esq.  
Attorney for Defendant

/s/ Adam M. Solinger  
ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER



1 **RTPR**

Vincent Mayo, Esq.

2 Nevada State Bar Number: 8564

THE ABRAMS & MAYO LAW FIRM

3 6252 South Rainbow Blvd., Suite 100

Las Vegas, Nevada 89118

4 Tel: (702) 222-4021

Fax: (702) 248-9750

5 Email: vmgroup@tamlf.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

6 Eighth Judicial District Court

Family Division

7 Clark County, Nevada

8 ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER,

) Case No.: D-19-582245-D

)

9 Plaintiff,

) Department: P

)

10 vs.

)

)

11 CHALESE MARIE SOLINGER,

)

)

12 Defendant.

)

)

13 **REQUEST FOR ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT**

14 TO: Eighth Judicial District Court Family Division

15 Transcript Video Services

16 ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER, Plaintiff named above, requests  
17 preparation of a rough draft transcript of certain portions of the  
18 proceedings before the district court as follows:

19 Specific individual dates of proceedings for which transcripts are  
20 being requested: **May 10, 2021; January 21, 2022; March 1,**  
**2022; March 2, 2022; March 3, 2022; April 14, 2022**

21 Specific portions of the transcript requested: **All - Trial**



1       This notice requests a transcript of only those portions of the  
2 district court proceedings that counsel reasonably and in good faith  
3 believes are necessary to determine whether appellate issues are present.  
4 Voir dire examination of jurors, opening statements and closing  
5 arguments of the counsel, and the reading of jury instructions shall not  
6 be transcribed unless specifically requested above.

7       I recognize that I must serve a copy of this form on the above-  
8 named court reporter and opposing counsel, and that the above-named  
9 court reporter shall have 21 days from the receipt of this notice to prepare  
10 and submit to the district court the rough transcript requested herein.

11 DATED Thursday, September 08, 2022.

12                               Respectfully Submitted,

13                               THE ABRAMS & MAYO LAW FIRM

14                               /s/ Vincent Mayo, Esq.

15                               Vincent Mayo, Esq.

16                               Nevada State Bar Number: 8564

17                               6252 South Rainbow Blvd., Suite 100

18                               Las Vegas, Nevada 89118

19                               Attorney for Plaintiff  
20  
21

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing *Request for Rough Draft Transcript* was filed electronically with the Eighth Judicial District Court in the above-entitled matter on September 8, 2022. Electronic service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List, pursuant to NEFCR 9, as follows:

Alex B. Ghibaud, Esq.  
Michancy Cramer, Esq.  
Attorneys for Defendant

And via email to:

Clark County Family Courts and Services Center  
Transcript Video Services  
[videorequests@clarkcountycourts.us](mailto:videorequests@clarkcountycourts.us)

/s/ David J. Schoen, IV, ACP  
An Employee of The Abrams & Mayo Law Firm

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

EOT

ORIGINAL

FILED

SEP 12 2022

*Sherry Justice*  
CLERK OF COURT

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT  
FAMILY DIVISION  
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER,	)	CASE NO. D-19-582245-D
Plaintiff,	)	DEPT. P
	)	APPEAL NO. 81787
vs.	)	
	)	<b>SEALED</b>
CHALESE MARIE SOLINGER,	)	
Defendant.	)	

ESTIMATED COST OF ROUGH DRAFT TRANSCRIPT(S)

The office of Transcript Video Services received a request for **rough draft** transcripts estimate from DAVID J. SCHOEN, IV, ACP, on September 09, 2022, for the following proceedings in the above-captioned case:

JANUARY 21, 2022; MARCH 01, 2022;  
MARCH 02, 2022; MARCH 03, 2022, APRIL 14, 2022  
(MAY 10, 2021 - PREVIOUSLY TRANSCRIBED, AVAILABLE THROUGH RECORDS DEPARTMENT.)

for original transcripts and one copy of each.  
The estimated cost for the transcripts is \$2075.00.  
Payment in the amount of **\$2075.00** must be paid directly to  
**VERBATIM REPORTING & TRANSCRIPTION** prior to work commencing on the  
transcripts. Please call Verbatim Reporting & Transcription to  
make deposit payment (281) 724-8600 or (520) 303-7356.

DATED this 12th day of September, 2022

*Sherry Justice*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sherry Justice  
Transcript Video Services

Transcript ESTIMATE amount of \_\_\_\_\_ Direct Pay Invoice # \_\_\_\_\_

Received this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2022.

This is only an **estimate**. Upon completion of transcript(s), a balance may be due, or you may receive a refund of your deposit if overpayment is greater than \$15.00.

NOTE: STATUTORY FEES ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE PER LEGISLATIVE SESSION.  
ITEMS LEFT BEYOND NINETY DAYS ARE SUBJECT TO DISPOSAL WITHOUT REFUND.  
COUNTY RETENTION POLICY APPROVED BY INTERNAL AUDIT.

FILED  
SEP 15 2022  
CLERK OF COURT

ORIGINAL

James J. Smith

1 ORIGINAL

2 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

3 FAMILY DIVISION

4 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

FILED

NOV 02 2022

*William A. Johnson*  
CLERK OF COURT

5  
6  
7 ADAM MICHAEL SOLINGER, ) CASE NO. D-19-582245-D  
Plaintiff, )  
8 ) DEPT. P  
vs. )  
9 ) NV SUPREME CT. APPEAL NO. 81787 & 84832  
10 CHALESE MARIE SOLINGER, )  
Defendant. ) SEALED

11 CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPTS NOTIFICATION OF COMPLETION

12 The Office of Transcript Video Services received a request for transcript and one copy,  
13 for the purposes of appeal from David J. Schoen, IV., ACP., on August 30, 2022 for the  
following proceedings in the above-captioned case:

14 January 21, 2022; March 01, 2022;

15 March 02, 2022; March 03, 2022; April 14, 2022

16 (May 10, 2021-PREVIOUSLY TRANSCRIBED, AVAILABLE THROUGH RECORDS DEPARTMENT.)

17  
18 I do hereby certify that copies of the transcript requested in the above-captioned case  
19 were submitted to be filed with the Eighth Judicial District Court on November 02, 2022, and  
ordering party was notified November 02, 2022.

20 DATED this 02<sup>nd</sup> day of November, 2022.

21  
22 *Maria Balagtas*

23 Maria Balagtas, Law Office Assistant II  
24 Transcription Video Services

25  
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT - TRANSCRIPT VIDEO SERVICES  
601 N. Pecos Road, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 455-4977

003993