IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Electronically Filed Jul 21 2023 09:45 AM Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

RONALD DAVID HARRIS, Appellant(s),

VS.

JENNIFER FIGUEROA, Respondent(s), Case No: D-20-606828-C Docket No: 85333-COA

RECORD ON APPEAL VOLUME 4

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT
RONALD HARRIS, PROPER PERSON
NECX P.O. BOX 5000
MOUNTAIN CITY, TN 37683

ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT
JENNIFER FIGUEROA, PROPER PERSON
3874 CALLE DE ESTE
LAS VEGAS, NV 89121

VOLUME :	PAGE NUMBER:
1	1 - 242
2	243 - 483
3	484 - 597
4	598 - 623

VOL	DATE	PLEADING	PAGE NUMBER:
2	4/22/2022	Affidavit in Response to Defendant's Request for Disqualification 360 -	
1	4/30/2020	Affidavit of Service	33 - 34
2	6/29/2022	Amended Notice of Evidentiary Hearing	441 - 443
2	5/13/2022	Amended Notice of Evidentiary Hearing on Legal Custody	377 - 386
1	5/21/2020	Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (Confidential)	37 - 40
1	9/2/2020	Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (Confidential)	109 - 111
1	9/2/2020	Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (Confidential)	112 - 113
2	3/23/2022	Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (Confidential)	
3	8/4/2022	Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (Confidential)	567 - 569
1	9/2/2020	Case Appeal Statement	123 - 131
1	9/3/2020	Case Appeal Statement	133 - 134
1	9/3/2020	Case Appeal Statement	135 - 136
3	9/8/2022	Case Appeal Statement	581 - 582
3	9/8/2022	Case Appeal Statement	583 - 584
1	5/21/2020	Certificate of Mailing	41 - 41
1	7/6/2020	Certificate of Mailing	82 - 82
3	8/4/2022	Certificate of Mailing	543 - 543
3	8/4/2022	Certificate of Service	570 - 570
4	07/21/2023	Certification of Copy and Transmittal of Record	

VOL	DATE	PLEADING	PAGE NUMBER:
1	4/22/2021	Certification of Transcripts Notification of Completion	146 - 146
4	07/21/2023	Certification of Transcripts Notification of Completion	623 - 623
1	6/2/2020	Clerk's Notice of Nonconforming Document	72 - 74
1	7/21/2020	Clerk's Notice of Nonconforming Document	83 - 85
2	6/9/2022	Clerk's Notice of Nonconforming Document	430 - 432
1	4/24/2020	Clerk's Notice of Nonconforming Document and Curative Action	31 - 32
1	4/22/2020	Complaint for Custody and UCCJEA Declaration	
1	7/22/2020	Custody Decree	86 - 94
2	5/13/2022	Decision and Order	371 - 376
3	8/2/2022	Decision and Order	534 - 538
1	5/21/2020	Defendant's Answer	42 - 54
1	3/9/2021	Defendant's Transcript Order Request	137 - 138
1	8/19/2020	Deft's Appeal Letter	105 - 106
3	10/11/2022	District Court Minutes	585 - 597
2	5/20/2022	Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for the County of Clark the Honorable Mathew Harter, Presiding; Defendant's brief	390 - 412
1	3/22/2021	Estimated Cost of Transcript(s)	139 - 139

VOL	DATE	PLEADING	PAGE NUMBER:
2	5/25/2022	Ex Parte Application to Seal File (Application Denied Pursuant to Order 06/11/2022)	426 - 426
1	4/22/2020	Ex Parte Motion for Alternative Service	16 - 18
1	6/2/2020	Ex Parte Motion to Waive Mediation at Family Mediation Center	66 - 69
1	6/2/2020	Ex Parte Motion to Waive Mediation at Family Mediation Center	70 - 71
1	6/3/2020	Ex Parte Order Regarding Mediation	75 - 76
1	9/2/2020	Exhibit	114 - 119
1	4/24/2020	Exhibit Appendix	19 - 30
1	3/3/2022	Exhibit Appendix	181 - 240
2	3/23/2022	Exhibit Appendix	270 - 286
2	3/23/2022	Exhibit Appendix	287 - 291
2	5/5/2022	Exhibit Appendix	364 - 366
2	7/14/2022	Exhibit Appendix (Continued)	444 - 483
3	7/14/2022	Exhibit Appendix (Continuation)	484 - 533
2	4/6/2022	Exhibits	329 - 348
1	4/30/2020	Exhibits Appendix	35 - 36
2	3/28/2022	Exhibits Appendix	311 - 328
3	8/4/2022	Exhibits Appendix	548 - 559
2	5/25/2022	List of Witnesses	423 - 425
2	4/22/2022	Minute Order	357 - 359
2	6/8/2022	Minute Order	427 - 429
2	6/11/2022	Minute Order	433 - 435

VOL	DATE	PLEADING	PAGE NUMBER:
2	3/23/2022	Motion for Contact with my 4 Children. Weekly Phone Calls and Holidays, Birthdays	257 - 264
2	3/23/2022	Motion to Disqualify Judge Mathew Harter from this Case	265 - 269
1	12/1/2021	Nevada Supreme Court Clerk's Certificate/Remittitur Judgment - Reversed and Remand	147 - 156
1	9/2/2020	Notice of Appeal	121 - 122
3	8/23/2022	Notice of Appeal from Legal Custody Order	573 - 574
3	9/1/2022	Notice of Appeal from Legal Custody Order	579 - 580
1	12/6/2021	Notice of Department Reassignment	157 - 158
3	8/2/2022	Notice of Entry of Decision and Order	539 - 539
1	6/12/2020	Notice of Entry of Order / Judgment	77 - 81
1	7/22/2020	Notice of Entry of Order / Judgment	95 - 104
2	6/23/2022	Notice of Evidentiary Hearing	436 - 438
1	1/3/2022	Notice of Evidentiary Hearing on Legal Custody	169 - 178
2	5/20/2022	Notice of Evidentiary Hearing on Legal Custody	388 - 389
2	5/3/2022	Notice of Hearing	363 - 363
1	12/6/2021	Notice of Hearing and Order Regarding Procedures	159 - 163
1	3/8/2022	Notice of Intent to Serve Subpoena	241 - 242
2	3/8/2022	Notice of Intent to Serve Subpoena	243 - 244
2	5/6/2022	Notice of Intent to Serve Subpoena	367 - 368
2	5/6/2022	Notice of Intent to Serve Subpoena	369 - 370

VOL	DATE	PLEADING	PAGE NUMBER:
1	5/22/2020	Notice of Order of Appearance for: NRCP 16.205 Case Management Conference Paternity or Custody Actions Between Unmarried Persons	57 - 64
1	12/20/2021	Notice of Rescheduling of Hearing and Order Regarding Procedures	164 - 168
3	8/4/2022	Notice of Writ	560 - 566
2	4/20/2022	Opposition to Contact and Custody Motion	349 - 356
1	5/22/2020	Order for Family Mediation Center Services	65 - 65
1	5/22/2020	Order to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (Confidential)	55 - 56
2	3/24/2022	Order to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (Confidential)	295 - 296
3	8/8/2022	Order to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (Confidential)	571 - 572
2	5/25/2022	Plaintiff's Brief	413 - 422
2	6/24/2022	Proof of Service for Defendant's Notice of Evidentiary Hearing	439 - 440
1	1/4/2022	Proof of Service	179 - 180
2	5/16/2022	Proof of Service for Amended Notice of Evidentiary Hearing	387 - 387
1	9/2/2020	Request for Transcript of Proceedings	132 - 132
3	8/4/2022	Response	540 - 542
3	8/4/2022	Subpoena - Domestic (for Personal Appearance) (Electronically Issued)	544 - 547
2	3/28/2022	Subpoena - Duces Tecum (Records May be Mailed in Lieu of Appearance) (Electronically Issued)	297 - 304

VOL	DATE	PLEADING	PAGE NUMBER:
2	3/28/2022	Subpoena - Duces Tecum (Records May be Mailed in Lieu of Appearance) (Electronically Issued)	305 - 310
2	3/8/2022	Subpoena Duces Tecum (Records May be Mailed in Lieu of Appearance)	251 - 256
2	3/8/2022	Subpoena Duces Tecum (Records May Be Mailed in Lieu of Appearance)	245 - 250
1	4/22/2020	Summons (Electronically Issued)	14 - 15
1	4/22/2021	Transcript of Hearing Held on July 16, 2020	140 - 145
4	07/21/2023	Transcript of Hearing Held on July 28, 2022	598 - 622
1	9/2/2020	Unfiled Document(s) - Affidavit in Support of Motion to Proceed on Appeal in Forma Pauperis (Confidential)	107 - 108
3	8/24/2022	Unfiled Document(s) - Emergency Motion Under NRAP 27(e) Action by May 31, 2022 or as Soon as Possible (Supreme Court)	575 - 578
1	9/2/2020	Unsigned Document(s) - Order Regarding Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (Confidential)	120 - 120

FILED JUL 2 1 2023

TRANS

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

JENNIFFER FIGUEROA,

Plaintiff,

RONALD DAVID HARRIS,

Defendant.

10

11

vs.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

FAMILY DIVISION

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

CASE NO. D-20-606828-C DEPT. N

SUPREME COURT NO. 85333-COA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MATHEW HARTER THURSDAY, JULY 28, 2022

TRANSCRIPT RE: EVIDENTIARY HEARING

APPEARANCES:

JENNIFFER FIGUEROA The Plaintiff:

Pro Se

The Defendant: RONALD DAVID HARRIS

Pro Se

D-20-606828-C FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS

07/28/2022

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, JULY 28, 2022

* * * *

(Proceedings commenced at 11:11:03 a.m.)

THE COURT: Madam Clerk, are we on the record?

THE CLERK: We're on the record, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. This -- let's make sure the parties can hear me.

Jenniffer can you hear me?

MS. FIGUEROA: Yes. I can.

THE COURT: Ronald, can you hear me?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. This case is D606828. The reason we are here for a brief evidentiary hearing is the Court of Appeals remand. That case is 81746. And that was an order entered November 11th, 2021.

I will note for the record, Mr. Harris, I don't know if they've notified you yet or you got a copy of it that there was an order denying your writ that was issued yesterday. That is case, Court of Appeals, 84980.

MR. HARRIS: Yes. Excuse me. I just had this handed just now. THE COURT: Okay.

So we -- we talked a little bit before we decided to continue the matter last time. I can't recall because I didn't go back and go over the video. So I'll kind of go over what we're -- the issue is today is a very limited issue. It was remanded back

D-20-606828-C FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS 07/28/2022

to this Court -- and if you guys don't have a copy of the order reversing, I think my JEA is in the process of resending it to both of you. But regard- -- we -- we need to -- to start the hearing. Let me -- you need to keep notes so you can reference it later.

Let me reiterate why we're here. Starting on page seven of that — that order, the District Court made no findings as to Harris and Figueroa's attempts or lack thereof to communicate or compromise in the best interest of their children. There's sort of a sub-issue. The Court indicated additionally in deciding that arrangement whether it's in the best interest of the children necessarily involves resolving disputed questions of fact. Indeed, they dispute whether Harris's behavior with his stepdaughter renders him unable to participate in important legal decisions.

Reading from page six, again, legal custody is the basic legal responsibility for a child in making major decisions regarding the child's health, education or religious upbringing. It's presumed to be in the child's best interest if certain conditions are met under 125C.002. However, this presumption is overcome when the Court finds that the parents are unable to communicate, cooperate or compromise in the best interest of the children.

As I indicated last time, I have -- I reviewed the briefs. I kind of discussed the fact that a lot contained in both

D-20-606828-C FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS 07/28/2022

briefs are more -- seemed to be more personal attacks. That -- at the end of the day, we -- this is not a jury trial. This is a bench trial. So if we start and we get into areas or things are being said or talked about that this Court believes is not relevant to assist this Court in making that determination, the Court will certainly pipe in and let both parties know that.

I also noted last time, Ronald, that a lot of the stuff that you were requesting on page -- on your last page about seeing the children, video chatting, anything other than this limited issue, we'll go back, I believe it's in front of Department Z, immediately after this Court renders this decision on this limited issue. Okay?

MR. HARRIS: Okay.

THE COURT: Again, we're not doing cac- -- character assassinations. The issue is the ability or lack thereof to cooperate, communicate or compromise in your children's best interest.

MR. HARRIS: All right. Judge, I just -- I just have one question, though. When you had the -- the one hearing in July, the one that I appealed, and she brought up the issues of he wants to talk to the kids, blah, blah, blah; and you said she can do whatever she wants. He has no rights to them now whatsoever. I -

23 | - I -- I mean --

THE COURT: So --

MR. HARRIS: -- is -- isn't that --

D-20-606828-C FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS 07/28/2022

THE COURT: -- that -- that --1 2 MR. HARRIS: -- (indiscernible) --THE COURT: -- that was --3 MR. HARRIS: Go ahead. 4 THE COURT: -- way be- -- no. That was way before, again, your 5 -- the Court of Appeals again reviewed your previous appeal. 6 appealed all of that. The only limited issue after that -- again, 7 this was issued November 5th. So this is the only issue before 8 this Court right now. That's the only issue. 9 MR. HARRIS: No. I -- I do -- I do understand that. But I --10 I -- I -- I would -- I would -- I quess I was assuming that if I 11 have joint legal custody then I have a right to, you know, speak 12 to my children. And I thought that, you know, when you -- when 13 she brought that up, you shot it down and said I had no rights --14 THE COURT: So that is -- that --15 MR. HARRIS: -- whatsoever. So I --16 THE COURT: That is why we're here. You appealed that. 17 MR. HARRIS: Okay. 18 THE COURT: That issue went up in front of the Court of 19 Appeals. It came back down. That's why we're here today. That 20 is why we're here. 21 22 MR. HARRIS: Okay. 23 THE COURT: Okay? MR. HARRIS: Yeah. Thank you. 24 THE COURT: Do you understand that, Jenniffer? 25

07/28/2022

FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS

D-20-606828-C

MS. FIGUEROA: Yes. I do.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. FIGUEROA: Okay.

So again, I know you guys are not attorneys. Again, I will be the first one to let you know if and when we're getting into irrelevant issues. Again, this is not a -- a -- the Court's -- again, I'm not gonna go over it a third time. I think you both acknowledge what the limited issue is that's in front of the Court today.

So with that being said, as I indicated previously, you're not likely gonna get a decision to- -- well, you won't, I can assure you that, get a decision today. This Court will take it under advisement. It then has up to 21 days to issue a decision. But I can let you know, I don't -- I don't like keeping things on the backburner. I'd rather get decisions done. So it will most likely be within the next week to ten days. Okay?

MR. HARRIS: Okay. And, Your Honor, can -- can you please -- I've been having trouble. One of the things that I wanted to get on the record later is the stuff that I've been sending to you guys is -- is for some reason terribly delayed. And -- and so I'm hoping that maybe you can direct someone to e-mail me your decision, that way my counselor can print it out. And I'll know pretty much immediately what your decision is?

THE COURT: Absolutely. My -- my JEA has had contact with whoever it is at -- at the prison he's been getting the stuff to.

D-20-606828-C FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS 07/28/2022

MR. HARRIS: Okay.

THE COURT: And -- and again, he will -- as soon as it's issued, he will serve that person again.

MR. HARRIS: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

All right. Jenniffer, so now is the time again to make again your statement about the issue that we're here today. Does that make sense?

MS. FIGUEROA: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. If you want to go ahead and start.

MS. FIGUEROA: Okay. Basically, I just don't feel that he should have access to the children because of where he's at. The children don't know why he's there. We don't talk about that.

They -- they ask me. And I say, we don't talk about it.

So I feel that if he talks to them, he is gonna lie to them and tell them things that are false. He has said in the past in letters that when they turn 18 then they'll know the truth, quote, unquote, of why he is where he is, that they're gonna hate me.

And so I just feel that Mr. Harris doesn't take any accountability for what he's done and why he's where he's at and - and for the reason why he's where he is. And I feel that somebody who -- who doesn't apologize for something like that and doesn't take accountability for what he's done and is still

D-20-606828-C FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS 07/28/2022

reaching out to his victim, should not be allowed to make decisions in his children's lives. And I feel like that would cause them undue stress and anguish. And he -- he and I don't get along. We don't talk. And --

THE COURT: Let me stop you right there. This is the issue.

Just the -- do you remember what you just said?

MS. FIGUEROA: Yes.

THE COURT: That is the issue. So whatever is coming next, I just want to clarify, some of the stuff you said before was not really relevant. So go ahead and start with -- I'm sorry to cut you off and interrupt you. But you -- your sentence preceded exactly what the issue is. So go right ahead.

MS. FIGUEROA: That he and I don't get along and that we don't speak.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. FIGUEROA: And -- and it won't -- we will -- we would not be able to come to a common ground as far as talking to the kid -- him talking to the kids. Really that's -- that's it. He -- he's -- just shouldn't have access to the kids. I -- I don't know what else to say about it without --

THE COURT: Wait. Wait. Hold on one second there.

Again, this is not access to the kids. This is just -- just -
MS. FIGUEROA: The legal custody.

THE COURT: -- you -- contacting you making major decisions regarding the kids.

MS. FIGUEROA: Okay.

+1

THE COURT: This is -- this is not --

MS. FIGUEROA: Got it.

THE COURT: This is not him reaching out to them.

MS. FIGUEROA: Got it. Yes. I don't want him to have -- I don't want him to reach out to me regarding the kids. He's -- he threatens me. He's con- -- he -- I don't want to deal with him at all with regards to decisions on the kids. He -- he isn't here. He's not helping me raise them. He shouldn't be a part of their lives. I -- I don't -- I don't know what else to say without going off topic.

THE COURT: Well, again, I -- I want to clarify for the -- I'll probably even say it ten more times before we're done today, that the --

MS. FIGUEROA: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- that the issue here is so narrow.

MS. FIGUEROA: Yeah.

THE COURT: You understand that. Again, it's the ability or lack thereof to cooperate, communicate, compromise in the best interest of the children. And it's the because, because you can or because you cannot. And obviously your issue is beca- -- we cannot -- because we cannot. And you've kind of stated those reasons. So do you have any others before Ronald makes his statement?

MS. FIGUEROA: No.

D-20-606828-C FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS 07/28/2022

1 THE COURT: Okay. Ronald, are you ready to make --2 MR. HARRIS: Sure. 3 THE COURT: -- your statement? 4 MR. HARRIS: Yes, sir. I am. Thank you. 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MR. HARRIS: Obviously, Your Honor, you know that I have --7 well, you may not know, but I -- I spend a lot of time reading 8 these cases and -- and -- and I knew and know exactly what your 9 laser focus is on the cooperation and communication and that kind 10 of thing. I -- I know that law. 11

You know I argue first of all that she has not quoted or stated any kind of -- you know, cited any kind of law or really any good reason why, you know, I shouldn't be able to participate in -- in decisions.

I think what I said in one of my -- -- in -- in my brief is that, you know, no matter what, how we feel about each other, we didn't really fight a lot and we usually agreed on how to raise the kids. You know, it would -- it -- it just -- me being here has no, you know, bearing on -- on my four children.

THE COURT: Hold on one second.

MR. HARRIS: One thing that I'm --

THE COURT: Ronald, and again --

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I cut -- cut you off. But that -- that is what --

D-20-606828-C FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS 07/28/2022

again, let me read. I read it on the record beforehand. Again, this is page eight of that decision. And they -- I told you it was one of the sub-issues. Quote, Indeed, the parleys -- the parties clearly dispute whether Harris's behavior with his stepdaughter renders him unable to participate in important legal decisions for his four children.

So, again, I understand you may have at one time been able to get along, et cetera, et cetera. But that statement you were just making, that is one of the sub-issues, if that makes sense.

MR. HARRIS: Right. Well, one of the things that I -- that I'm disappointed in is I've sent these exhibits. Let me just state real quick, Your Honor, for the record that a couple of days ago, I received the exhibit appendix that I had sent and -- and dated and signed, it was May 19th of 2022. She has received all of that, as well. I mailed it at the same time. And that was to be uploaded for your review for that May 31st hearing. So I had like 12 days for that thing to get -- I'm at a disadvantage because I can't upload that stuff electronically filed. Now here's the problem. It says that it was received July 5th and then uploaded (indiscernible) --

THE COURT: Mr. Harris. Mr. Harris, it is -- it is uploaded and it's in there, again, this -- your (indiscernible) --

MR. HARRIS: I -- I know.

THE COURT: -- appendix. And there's also --

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- one uploaded July 14th. So again --

MR. HARRIS: Yes, sir. That -- that -- that's what I'm referring to. But I mailed it on, you know, in mid-May.

THE COURT: Stop. Mr. Harris, we're not having a hearing about your --

MR. HARRIS: Okay.

THE COURT: -- your problems with getting things filed. And -- and again, it's a unique situation, but --

MR. HARRIS: Okay.

THE COURT: -- I've -- I've got it. It's been in the system since July 14th. So go ahead --

MR. HARRIS: Well, there's -- well, I -- I'm going somewhere with this, Your Honor. There -- there is a -- some other reports or affidavits that I had -- or exhibits, rather, that I have sent that should've -- have well done been received.

And -- and one of those was a DCS report where the kids were asked by DCS if -- if I had done anything or anything to them and -- and they all said no and they weren't scared or anything like that. And then there was another report that I also sent where Ms. Figueroa was asked does she have any concerns about any of the other kids, blah, blah? And she said, no.

So what I'm trying to say is, you know, and look, you -you've read my brief. I -- I still maintain that, you know, she
is culpable in -- in many ways. And, you know, I had no -- no

issues with my children ever. So in my -- from my vantage point, what may or may not have occurred with my stepdaughter has nothing to do with -- with how I can make decisions for my children.

And, you know, one of the things that I want to read into the record please is the Mosley Figliuzzi case that the Supreme Court of Nevada used where they're trying to use the defense of, you know -- well, basically I'll just read this section.

It says, when a father or mother may say in effect I cannot get along with the mother of my child, therefore the Court must award sole custody to me, the father. The Court's accepting this kind of argument has the effect of permitting one uncooperative parent to deprive a child of either his mother or his father merely by establishing that the parents are in conflict. Proving the existence of a conflict between parents could thus allow the complaining party to win a custody battle. And they put that in parentheses.

The prize should not automatically go to the parent who comes before the Court and tells the Court, as did the mother in this case, something to that effect that I told the Court before we cannot get along. And we're not gonna get along in the future. Therefore the best interest of the child requires that you give me the sole custody.

Parental conflict almost always involves some fault on part of each parent. And to permit one uncooperative parent come in and get sole custody just because of a mutual conflict, not

only rewards uncooperative conduct but also as said before unnecessarily deprives a child of the company of one or the other of his parents. And I think that's what she's doing.

I want to remind the Court that up until February 3rd of 2019 everything was fine. I was talking to my kids. I've never had a inappropriate conversation with them. She keeps it on speaker phone.

And when it got to the part where I was letting her know that I am appealing, you know, post-conviction and all this stuff and that, you know, a lot of things are gonna come out about her, you know, situations, that's when it started. That's when she cut off the contact.

This has nothing to do, you know, she -- we haven't even had an opportunity. There hasn't been a -- a -- a chance for us to even try to cooperate or anything. She just cut it off. She's just using that as an excuse.

And I wanna make this clear to -- to you, Your Honor, to the Court, that my kids are bigger than my issues with her. All right? I -- I -- they -- I don't have to talk to her, you know, only on certain situations, you know, if it were to warrant.

I've been blacklisted, blackballed, cut out of my kids' lives for no reason. And, you know, my children are 10, 12 and 15. And they know how to use the internet. She may say, oh, we don't know. You know, we don't talk about dad or whatever. I know that they can go on the internet. They have siblings. They

have, you know, my siblings -- my three children, sorry, that are their half siblings, as well.

ก

I find it highly surprising that, you know, this has nothing to do -- I mean, my ability to make decisions for my kids for their best interest has nothing to do whether or not in my opinion she and I get along. I -- I -- I am able to be able to be cooperative with her. I'm able to be cordial with her. I love my kids, you know?

I don't, you know -- this is, in my opinion, Your Honor, just really ridiculous. She's only doing this, in my opinion, for retaliation because things, you know, I'm acquiring a lot of evidence against her and, you know, for -- it -- it -- that's why she's cutting me off.

I have never had a conversation with my children that's inappropriate. And I'm fully capable of making decisions about their health, their education, their upbringing, when it's warranted you know?

But right now, I don't know anything about them. I don't know about their school or their subjects or how they're doing in school, their health. My little boy has a rare disease that he survived that, you know -- he has issues, you know, possibly with his heart -- with his heart and his blood vessels and, you know?

I mean, this is just ridiculous. And so that's why I wanted to use that -- that case that, you know, I -- I see where - you know, where you're going with -- with that -- those specific

issues with being able to cooperate and communicate in, you know, the best of the children. That -- that's a very sticky issue. But I'm making it clear to you that I can be. And it's not fair to award her sole legal custody just because she wants to take that stance. And I think the Supreme Court of Nevada has already said that is not appropriate, you know?

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else, Ronald?

MR. HARRIS: No. I -- I think that's -- you know, if -- if the law, in my opinion, is -- is applied properly, I, you know, I don't think she's done anything to prove that I would tell my kids any -- anything or -- or that I couldn't -- I don't think she's proven that I can't make major decisions about my children or their health, you know?

It isn't like we would, you know -- I'm certainly not using this as any way to stay in touch with her or anything. You know, she is right about that. We -- we don't, you know -- we wouldn't be hanging out, you know? But that doesn't mean that we can't, you know, put our children first. At least it doesn't mean that I can't is what I'd like to say, so. I don't like being ripped out of their lives.

If -- if you look at that stuff that was filed on the 14th, you can see that I had a very good relationship with my children. I love them. They love me. I didn't just select, you know, just random photos, you know? There are no photos of -- of us sad or not getting along. I mean, I had a very significant

relationship with -- with them, so. THE COURT: A- -- again, this --2 3 MR. HARRIS: I -- there's no (indiscernible) --THE COURT: -- this, Ronald, again --4 MR. HARRIS: I know. I know. 5 THE COURT: -- (indiscernible) --6 MR. HARRIS: (Indiscernible) --7 THE COURT: -- (indiscernible) and I know. You sound like a 8 very intelligent person. And again --9 Well, you -- you both do. 10 But you particularly, Ronald, I believe know exactly what 11 the issue is. But again --12 MR. HARRIS: I know. 13 THE COURT: -- the relationship -- the relationship between you 14 and your kids is not the issue. The ability to cooperate, 15 communicate or compromise in your children's best interest with 16 Jenniffer is the issue. 17 MR. HARRIS: All right. Well, I just ask, Your Honor, that you 18 don't -- that, you know, that -- that you don't award her this 19 just because she wants to take that stance. 20 As you probably know in several cases, you know, the 21 Courts usually lean towards the parent who's the most cooperative 22 23 or the most willing to communicate or cooperate or -- or let the children, you know, have a relationship. That's how it usually 24

D-20-606828-C FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS 07/28/2022

25

goes.

And -- and that's what one of the NRS codes say, as well. So, you know, like the NRS 125.480-3, which parent would particularly co- -- predictably cooperate most in accordance with the other, you know, so? That's where I stand on that. I appreciate it.

THE COURT: All right. Let -- since we obviously have plenty of time, I'm -- I'm going to again read the what I consider sort of a sub-issue and then see if either one of you have any other further comments you want to make on the record.

And again, Jenniffer, we'll start with you. Okay?
MS. FIGUEROA: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. Again, listen. Indeed, and I'm quoting again from page eight of that decision, quote, indeed, the parties clearly dispute whether Harris's behavior with his stepdaughter renders him unable to participate in important legal decisions for his four children.

And you don't -- you're not required to make any further statement if you don't want to, neither is Ronald. But again, I'm just felt like since we've got plenty of time, I just want to read that sub-issue out clearly. And if there's anything you want to add since that's an issue this Court does have to address.

MS. FIGUEROA: I mean, no. I -- I feel like the Court understands my stance. And I'm not doing it, you know, as he says, just to make him pay or anything. Like it's nothing like that. I just don't feel that we would be in a place ever to agree

on our children. And I don't feel he's in the right state of mind for that, so. That's really all I have to say about it.

THE COURT: Ronald, do you want to make any further comments regarding that specific issue?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, Your Honor. I would just say that, you know, with all due respect, to me that is irrelevant on how I can go about making (indiscernible) --

THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on one second. I --

MR. HARRIS: Right.

THE COURT: Candidly, and no disrespect, Ronald, I don't think it would be irrelevant or I believe the Court of Appeals would've stated that's irrelevant. They're the ones who particularly put - they're the ones that made that statement. Again, that's one of the issues I -- sub-issues I have to address.

MR. HARRIS: Right.

THE COURT: You -- you --

MR. HARRIS: No. No. And -- and I --

THE COURT: You might feel that it's irrelevant. And I understand. I understand your position. I understand Jenniffer's position. But again, it -- it is an issue that the -- if they would've said that's not relevant, they would've said that's not relevant.

MR. HARRIS: That's true. You're right.

THE COURT: If that makes sense.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, sir. It does. All I would ask is that the

D-20-606828-C FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS 07/28/2022

Court look at all the ev- -- the evidence I've sent. It's different statements that were made. You know, I -- the -- the only thing that's separating her and I right now is that she hasn't been convicted of anything yet. And -- and I hate to say this. But I -- I start to feel that the only way I can have an even ground with her may be for her to be in the same boat as I am. Now there -- in my opinion, I don't want to get off topic, but, you know, there's --

THE COURT: Well, let me stop you right there. I will not let you get off topic. So what -- you're -- if you're admitting that's off topic, I'll stop you right there.

MR. HARRIS: Okay. Well, I -- I'm just saying that -- I -- I have the ability to make the -- the decisions for my children. I don't think that, you know -- I just want the Court to realize that this all stopped in -- in February of 2019 when we had that -- not really an argument but disagreement, you know? And I told her what my plans were to basically, you know, I'll just say it, bring her to justice. She knows that. And that's when it stopped. We had no issues before that.

And but, you know, my kids, I love my kids. And making decisions for them, you know, I'm able to make all kinds of decisions from here, you know, business decisions and all kinds of things. And it -- and I would know that I would be able to with my children. I don't think that she's shown any evidence or proven anything that -- that what may or may not have happened

with -- with my stepdaughter has anything to do with my ability to make decisions for my children that are important decisions, you know, about their health.

I -- I -- I'm -- I'm -- I -- I have no clue about any of the, you know, their health or how they're doing in school or -- or anything. I don't even remember what grade they're in now, you know?

And I'm just being -- and, you know, and I wanted the Court to know that, you know, she did not have permission from a Court to leave this state with my kids. So and I think I made that aware in July of 2017 when she -- when I filed my answer. And you acknowledged it about, you know, her ab- -- absconding, you know? So she didn't even have the right to leave without a court order.

So she's making these decisions, even without a court order for three years to not let me talk to my kids when up until that point, joint everything, even physical custody, which I realize is not logical. But we had joint. There was -- there were no orders. So she just, you know, played God with -- with my ability to make decisions for my kids or have a relationship with them.

So I just hope that the Court realizes that she hasn't proven anything and just because she says that she can't get along or we never will or this, that's her saying that. That's not me.

And I don't think that she should be awarded or re-awarded taking

that stance when the real reason was from February of 2019 when I told her I'm getting evidence and I'm gonna bring her to justice.

And I'm being honest, Your Honor, I plan on it still. I mean, right is right; and wrong is wrong.

But I will say this. I haven't done any crime against my children, any of them. And as I said in that brief, in my opinion, she cannot say the same.

THE COURT: All right. If there is nothing else, again, your - the Court will go over the underlying record again. I will rereview your briefs. I did prior to the hearing. I will again
before I render the decision. The Court has taken notes about
what was said at today's hearing.

And then, again, it will be a written decision issued within the next 21 days as the Court is going to take the matter under advisement. And to -- to clarify again for both of you, once -- and I probably will put it in the decision just to be -- to be clear, once this Court makes that decision, all the other issues that Ronald put in his brief regarding contact with -- telephonic contact, et cetera, et cetera, those issues would then possibly be available to that new Judge, if that makes sense.

MS. FIGUEROA: Yes.

MR. HARRIS: Yeah, Your Honor. Your Honor, I have a question. So are you saying possibly if you were to deny me and give her sole legal custody, are you saying that there's another Court that could still allow me to have contact with my children?

THE COURT: I'm not -- I'm not saying that, sir. And I'm also -- say -- I -- I will make the statement that custody -- I would submit both types of custody, legal custody and physical custody are always modifiable.

MR. HARRIS: I understand.

THE COURT: But this Court is only following through with what I did not do apparently according to the -- the -- properly on the record, that previously, if that makes sense.

Once this Court makes that decision, again, the case -your whole -- your whole case goes over -- I believe it's Judge
Mercer. I'm not sure. I won't (indiscernible) --

MR. HARRIS: Mercer.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. HARRIS: Yeah. It's Mercer, Department Z; right.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. HARRIS: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay? All right. The Court will take the matter under advisement. You guys have a good day. I hope you stay safe and healthy. And I will, again, try to get this out, particularly since -- I'm not gonna do a rush job. I don't want you to think we can do a rush job. But I am going to give this obviously priority so that then you can possibly proceed with your other issues in front of Judge Mercer. Okay?

MS. FIGUEROA: Thank you.

MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, just one last qu- -- yes. One last

D-20-606828-C FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS 07/28/2022

question, Your Honor. I -- I -- what about any of the documents that I sent like maybe three weeks to a month ago, those DCS reports, those exhibits, are those something you can't use now since they're not in the system today or -- I mean, again, I'm -- THE COURT: So (indiscernible) --

MR. HARRIS: -- at a disadvantage.

THE COURT: -- first -- I -- listen. We -- technically, again, I will note that you filed previous exhibits. But everything should have been filed prior to the last time. We only continued the matter because of your request that you had filed a writ. But everything should have been done. And again, the briefs were from before. But --

MR. HARRIS: Right.

THE COURT: -- everything previously -- there shouldn't have been anything subsequent to that if you had access to it before. If it was something that occurred since the last court date up until now and you're now sending that to me, that's again, if it's something you could have done previously, you probably should have done previously.

MR. HARRIS: Okay. I -- I --

THE COURT: I can (indiscernible) --

MR. HARRIS: -- just got it late. That's -- understand. I understand, sir. That's fine.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MR. HARRIS: All right.

THE COURT: All right. Again, you guys have a good day. safe and healthy. MS. FIGUEROA: Thank you. You, too. MR. HARRIS: Thank you, sir. Thank you. Bye-bye. (Proceedings concluded at 11:47:13 a.m.) ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability. Thenny centice

D-20-606828-C

FIGUEROA vs. HARRIS

07/28/2022

Stay

ORIGINAL

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

FAMILY DIVISION

FILED

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JUL 2 1 2023

CLERK OF COURT

JENNIFER FIGUEROA,)	CASE NO. D-20-606828-C
Plaintiff,)	DEPT. Z
vs.)	
)	
RONALD DAVID HARRIS,) NV	V SUPREME CT. APPEAL NO. 81746 & 85333
Defendant.)	

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPTS NOTIFICATION OF COMPLETION

The Office of Transcript Video Services received a request for transcript and one copy, for the purposes of appeal from Heather Ungermann, RJC Appeal Department, on July 17, 2023 for the following proceedings in the above-captioned case:

July 28, 2022

I do hereby certify that copies of the transcript requested in the above-captioned case were submitted to be filed with the Eighth Judicial District Court on July 21, 2023, and ordering party was notified July 21, 2023.

DATED this 21st day of July 2023.

Maria Balagtas, Legal Office Assistant, II Transcription Video Services

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

Certification of Copy and Transmittal of Record

State of Nevada County of Clark SS

Pursuant to the Court of Appeals order dated July 14, 2023, I, Steven D. Grierson, the Clerk of the Court of the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County, State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and correct copy of the supplemental trial court record for the case referenced below. The record comprises volume four with pages numbered 598 through 623.

JENNIFER FIGUEROA,

Plaintiff(s),

VS.

RONALD DAVID HARRIS,

Defendant(s),

now on file and of record in this office.

Case No: D-20-606828-C

Dept. No: Z

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto Set my hand and Affixed the seal of the Court at my office, Las Vegas, Nevada This 21 day of July 2023.

Steven D. Grierson, Clerk of the Court

Heather Ungermann, Deputy Clerk