

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE
STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CANYON

IN RE: ORDER REQUESTING
DECLARATION OF MIRSAD HAJRO AS
A VEXATIOUS LITIGANT PURSUANT
TO IDAHO COURT ADMINISTRATIVE
RULE 59,

vs.

MIRSAD HAJRO,

A Vexatious Litigant.

CASE NO. CV14-21-8001

**ORDER FINDING VEXATIOUS
LITIGANT PURSUANT TO IDAHO
COURT ADMINISTRATIVE RULE
59**

This matter is before the Administrative District Judge (ADJ) on a referral from the magistrate court pursuant to Idaho Rule of Family Law Procedure 213(c)(5), requesting the ADJ of the Third Judicial District determine whether Mirsad Hajro is a vexatious litigant as defined by Idaho Court Administrative Rule 59(d).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On August 27, 2021, the magistrate judge in case CV14-19-1606, pursuant to Idaho Rule of Family Law Procedure 213(c)(5) and Idaho Court Administrative Rule 59(c), referred Mr. Hajro to the ADJ to determine whether Mr. Hajro qualifies as a vexatious litigant for failing to follow

PREFILING ORDER DECLARING
VEXATIOUS LITIGANT PURSUANT
TO I.C.A.R. 59

the appropriate rules when filing multiple motions for contempt despite multiple admonitions not to do so; filing duplicitous, repetitive, frivolous, or unmeritorious motions; and/or attempting to litigate or relitigate the validity of multiple determinations against him.

LEGAL STANDARDS

“This Court adheres to the rule that persons acting *pro se* are held to the same standards and rules as those represented by attorneys.” *In re Prefiling Order Declaring Vexatious Litigant*, 164 Idaho 771, 776, 435 P.3d 1091, 1096 (2019) (quoting *Huff v. Singleton*, 143 Idaho 498, 500, 148 P.3d 1244, 1246 (2006)) (italics in original); *see also Re Khurana*, No. 46652, 2021 WL 2369198, at *2 (Idaho June 10, 2021).

An administrative judge may declare a person to be a vexatious litigant who habitually, persistently, and without reasonable grounds engages in conduct that . . . serves merely to harass or maliciously injure another party in a civil action; is not warranted under existing law; imposes an unacceptable burden on judicial personnel and resources, or impedes the normal and essential functioning of the judicial process. I.C.A.R. 59(a). To find a person is a vexatious litigant, as is relevant to the present case, the ADJ must find:

(2) After a litigation has been finally determined against the person, the person has repeatedly relitigated or attempted to relitigate, *pro se*, either:

(A) the validity of the determination against the same defendant or defendants as to whom the litigation was finally determined or

(B) the cause of action, claim, controversy, or any of the issues of fact or law, determined or concluded by the final determination against the same defendant or defendants as to whom the litigation was finally determined.

(3) In any litigation while acting *pro se*, repeatedly files unmeritorious motions, pleadings, or other papers, conducts unnecessary discovery, or engages in other tactics that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay.

I.C.A.R. 59(d). Once declared to be a vexatious litigant, that person will be prohibited from filing any new litigation in the courts of this state *pro se* without first obtaining leave of a judge of the court where the litigation is proposed to be filed. I.C.A.R. 59(c).

Whether or not an individual is a vexatious litigant is a matter of discretion. *In Re Cook*, 481 P.3d 107, 113 (Idaho 2021) (citing *Telford v. Nye*, 154 Idaho 606, 610, 301 P.3d 264, 268 (2013)). When exercising its discretion, the ADJ must (1) perceive the issue as one of discretion; (2) act within the boundaries of that discretion; (3) act consistently with the legal standards applicable to the choices available; and, (4) exercise reason when reaching its decision. *Lunneborg v. My Fun Life*, 163 Idaho 856, 867, 421 P.3d 187, 198 (2018).

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS OF FACT

As a preliminary matter, the ADJ has considered every document contained within the Clerk's Record in case CV14-19-1606 pursuant to Idaho Rule of Evidence 201(c)(1), and makes its findings based on the information contained therein. A list of those documents is attached as Exhibit A.

A. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

1. Pre-Divorce Proceedings and Motions by Mirsad Hajro

Jennifer and Mirsad Hajro¹ were married in Caldwell on September 28, 1999. Jennifer grew up in Idaho, while Mirsad was born in Bosnia. Jennifer and Mirsad have four children, two of whom are now adults, and two who are still minors. Over the years, the family has lived in many places other than the Treasure Valley, including San Diego, Bosnia, and Malaysia. From November of 2017 to September of 2018, the family resided in Malaysia. In September of 2018, Jennifer and the children returned to Nampa to live with Jennifer's parents while Mirsad stayed in Malaysia where he was actively involved in missionary work and attempting to establish a business.

In November of 2018, Jennifer and her three youngest children returned to Malaysia. The eldest, then an adult, chose to remain in Idaho. Mirsad was upset and thereafter the relationship between him and Jennifer began to break down. After three days in Malaysia, Jennifer and her children returned to Idaho, again moving in with her parents. Mirsad returned to Idaho in January of 2019, and began living in Boise.

Jennifer filed for divorce in February 2019, citing irreconcilable differences. Mirsad counterclaimed that Jennifer abandoned one of their children in 2018, and that she had been unemployed since 2001, with Mirsad being the only provider for the family since then. Jennifer was represented by an attorney throughout the majority of the proceedings; Mirsad was *pro se*.

Throughout the entire long and contentious divorce proceeding, both pre and post-divorce, Mirsad filed numerous motions, objections, or other documents; the bulk of which were denied.²

¹ Because both parties share the same last name, for ease of reading and understanding, this document will refer to each by their first name.

² Only eight of Mirsad's motions were granted: Motion for Change of Visitation, filed April 15, 2020; motions to shorten time, filed September 1, 2019, January 8, 2020, September 23, 2020, November 15, 2020 (but only as to one of two other motions filed that day), and December 9, 2020; and motions to continue filed August 27, 2019, and August 10, 2020.

One example prior to the conclusion of the trial that began January 13, 2020, is a series of at least six motions for contempt, plus related amendments, filed between May 28, 2020, and August 27, 2020. The first such motion was denied as premature. The second, which was substantially similar to the first, was filed on June 26, 2020, amended on July 3, and denied on the record on July 9, 2020, because it failed to comply with the requirements of Rule 75 because it did not contain an affidavit swearing out the facts upon which the contempt was sought, it simply contained conclusory allegations without support.

A third motion and affidavit for contempt, also substantially similar to the preceding motions, was filed on July 10.³ This was amended on July 17, and again on July 23. This amended filing was accompanied by a contemporaneous motion to sanction Jennifer. These filings asserted substantially the same claims, with only a few minor additions, and sought substantially the same relief to the prior motions for contempt. On July 30, the Magistrate Judge once again denied the motion for contempt for failing to comply with Rule 75 because specific facts delineating the alleged contempt were not contained in a sworn affidavit as required by the rule. The motion for sanctions was denied as untimely.

Approximately one hour after the July 30, 2020 hearing, Mirsad filed a fourth motion for contempt. On August 12, Mirsad filed a fifth motion for contempt that may have been an attempt to amend the July 30 filing. He also filed an amended motion and affidavit for sanctions. These motions contained everything in the previously denied motions, but added a number of requested sanctions. Several of the requested sanctions in all of these motions for contempt involved custody, visitation, medical decisions, and therapy issues that had previously been specifically addressed

³ Although it was captioned as an amended motion, there was no pending motion to amend.

by the magistrate judge. Once again, Mirsad's motions failed to contain a sworn affidavit as required by Rule 75.

On August 27, the magistrate judge denied the pending motions for contempt and admonished Mirsad that if he filed another motion that failed to comply with Rule 75, he may be required to pay attorney's fees. Mirsad inquired as to whether he could file a corrected motion, but the court declined to make any ruling as to that question. The court also determined that the motion for sanctions could be heard as evidence at the ongoing trial. The motion for sanctions was ultimately denied.

Approximately one hour after the August 27th hearing, Mirsad filed a sixth motion for contempt. He amended the new motion on September 8, 2020. The substance of this motion was significantly different from any of the preceding motions, consisting of only one sentence alleging willful violation of signed orders and requesting monetary sanctions. Again, despite the previous admonitions of the court, the new motion for contempt failed to articulate any facts through sworn affidavit. At the hearing on this new motion, the court found that, as with the previous motions for contempt, the present motion failed to comply with Rule 75. The court therefore declined to hear the motion, struck it, awarded fees and costs to Jennifer, and once again admonished Mirsad about potential additional sanctions if he continued to file non-compliant motions.

Despite these admonitions, on November 15, Mirsad filed additional motions, including a motion for sanctions and request for a hearing concerning the appointed therapist. These motions once again repeated the allegations previously asserted. The court declined to rule on the motion for sanctions, and ordered therapy to continue with the previously ordered therapist. However, the court indicated it would reconsider appointing a different therapist if Mirsad submitted the name of a different counselor.

Closing arguments in the divorce trial were held on December 17, 2020, and the court took the matter under advisement. Thereafter, on January 13, 2021, Mirsad filed a document entitled “Declaration on Nurah’s Alienation and Therapy for it.” This document is eighty-seven pages, the first two of which contain allegations against Jennifer; Rita Mortenson, the therapist; and Jennifer’s first attorney. The remainder contains, in part, reference material on parental alienation copied from a website, email communications between Mirsad and the court-appointed therapist, numerous documents that appear to be receipts between school and his daughter confirming submission of his daughter’s schoolwork, an undated, unaddressed, unsigned generic document purporting to be an amicus brief by someone named Linda Gottlieb, and an unsigned generic declaration from the same.

Then, on February 4, 2021, Mirsad filed a document he titled “Declaration about Jennifer’s Continuous Child Abuse thru Alienation, Latest Abduction, her Kidnapping Tendencies, and Response to Petitioner’s and Her Attorney Lies Under Oath About Attorney Fees and Odyssey System. Update on Individual Therapy Failure.” This document was a continuation of the previous document’s allegation of parental alienation and references specific facts surrounding the failure to exchange one of the children because he was late to the appointment, which he asserted constituted parental kidnapping; the use of vulgarity in front of the children, which he characterized as child abuse; inconsistencies or inaccuracies with the attorney’s fees documentation, which he asserted was demonization strategies and double dipping through deception as well as child abuse; as well as copies of some of the same information included in the January 13 filing.

As there was no actual motion before it, the court did not address either of these two documents. Instead, after nine days of court trial spread out over the course of eleven months,⁴ on February 8, 2021, the magistrate judge issued an order granting Jennifer’s petition for divorce. On February 22, the court awarded Jennifer attorney and paralegal fees in the amount of \$319 arising out of the dismissal of Mirsad’s August 27, 2020 contempt motion.

2. Post-Divorce Proceedings

Subsequent to the entry of judgment, Mirsad began filing multiple documents relating to reconsideration. The initial documents were as follows as follows:

1. Motion & Affidavit to Reconsider Fact Finding, Order, Proposed Final Judgment, Order for Attorney Fees Judgment–Filed March 4, 2021;
2. Objection to Proposed Order for Final Judgment–Filed March 4, 2021;
3. Motion and Affidavit to Amend Findings or Make New–Filed March 05, 2021; and
4. Second Motion & Affidavit to Amend Filings of Make New–Filed March 08, 2021.

The Court issued a judgment on March 9, 2021, and heard argument on the above motions on April 1. At the hearing, Jennifer stipulated to amendment of the child support arrearage on one of the children who had reached the age of majority. The court therefore granted Mirsad’s motion on that issue but denied the remainder. An amended judgment was issued April 7, 2021. Thereafter, Mirsad filed the following two additional documents in support of reconsideration:

1. Objection to Amended Final Judgment–Filed April 14, 2021; and
2. Motion and Affidavit to Set Aside Judgment–Filed April 27, 2021.

A motion to reconsider is not, generally in and of itself, problematic; however, given the substance thereof and when considered in the totality of the circumstances, the motion to reconsider and other related filings are repetitive and attempt to relitigate multiple issues that were

⁴ Day 1 of the court trial was held January 13, 2020; day 2 was held May 26, 2020; day 3 was held June 1, 2020; day 4 was held June 22, 2020; day 5 was held July 20, 2020; day 6 was held September 14, 2020; day 7 was held October 20, 2020; day 8 was held October 26, 2020; and oral closing arguments were held December 17, 2020.

previously decided by the Court. Further, these documents are merely a continuation of Mirsad's practice of filing repetitive, conclusory, and unsupported documents throughout the course of the case in an attempt to relitigate issues.

The last document listed above, the Motion and Affidavit to Set Aside Judgment filed on April 27, 2021, was completely frivolous and without merit and constituted nothing more than an attempt to relitigate issues in violation of I.C.A.R. 59(a)(3). Mirsad claims that this filing contains "new evidences proving Jennifer's dishonesty and lack of credibility and integrity;" however, less than half of the pages of the filing contain new information. Otherwise, it contains only references to filings from 2019 and 2020, and cites to or copies documents and arguments included in the initial reconsideration filings. For example, the screenshots included in pages 29-35 were included in previous filings which had previously been denied by the magistrate court, page 2 contains a description of an incident that occurred on February 18, 2021, which Mirsad discussed on page 6 of the Second Motion and Affidavit to Amend Findings or Make New"; the end of page 24 through page 26 of this filing are virtually identical to pages 3-4 of Mirsad's previously denied "Objection to Amended Final Judgment"; and pages 12-13 are identical to arguments made in pages 2-3 of the "Objection for Proposed Order for Final Judgment."

In addition to the foregoing motions relating to reconsideration, Mirsad filed numerous motions, affidavits, objections, and/or other documents despite rulings and admonitions given by the magistrate court. *See Exhibit A.* As set forth below, these motions are largely repetitive, meritless, and attempts to relitigate issues already addressed. While only the tip of the iceberg, twenty-one of the post-divorce motions and filings bear further discussion because they clearly highlight Mirsad's attempt to relitigate the validity of the magistrate judge's determinations, the divorce itself, or the issues of fact and/or law concluded therein contrary to I.C.A.R. 59(a)(2).

Moreover, each of these filings is without merit as contemplated by I.C.A.R. 59(a)(3). For ease of discussion due to the similarity between the filings, the filings have been categorized into groups as set forth below.

a. Collateral challenges to the judgment

The first set of documents are from August 5, 2021, the day after the Supreme Court denied Mirsad’s request to stay and continue his appeal.

- Notice of Deprivation and Trespass upon Rights;
- Notice of Motion Trespass Upon Rights; and
- Notice to Court Objection Trespass Upon Rights.

i. Notice of Deprivation and Trespass upon Rights

In his “Notice of Deprivation and Trespass Upon Rights,” Mirsad alleged, in part, the magistrate court “trespassed” upon his rights by refusing to grant him a trial by jury. In support of these accusations, Mirsad repeatedly and improperly cites to 18 U.S.C. § 242 and to the United States Supreme Court case of *Howlett By & Through Howlett v. Rose*, 496 U.S. 356 (1990).⁵ The reliance on federal law and criminal standards that are inapplicable to Idaho family law

⁵ Title 18 of the United States Code is the “Crimes and Criminal Procedure” section, which is inapplicable here because this is a family law action and, with very few exceptions relating to community property which do not apply here, “[t]he whole subject of the domestic relations of husband and wife, parent and child, belongs to the laws of the States and not to the laws of the United States.” *Hisquierdo v. Hisquierdo*, 439 U.S. 572, 581 (1979) (quoting *In re Burrus*, 136 U.S. 586, 593–594 (1890)). Additionally, 18 U.S.C. § 242 is a criminal code that does not provide a private right of action. See, e.g., *United States v. Philadelphia*, 644 F.2d 187 (3d Cir.1980). Likewise, the proposition he claims *Howlett v. Rose* stands for—that those rights guaranteed by the Federal Constitution are enforceable in state courts—is misguided and inapplicable to the facts of this case. *Howlett v. Rose* specifically held that the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution required state courts to hear §1983 actions despite state law that purportedly provided “a ‘valid excuse’ for the state court’s refusal to entertain federal actions.” *Howlett v. Rose*, 496 U.S. at 379. Similarly, the remaining propositions Mirsad states are “facts” on pages two through fourteen likewise rely on inapplicable Federal Statutes or cases.

proceedings are simply continued attempts to relitigate issues previously decided by the magistrate judge and constitute nothing more than meritless argument.

ii. Notice of Motion Trespass Upon Rights

The full title of Mirsad's next filing was: Notice of Motion Trespass Upon Rights Are Committed Inside This Court By Its Staff And The Adjudicator Is Acting Under a Cooperative Agreement Under the Authority of 42 USC Section 654(7), 45 CFR 302.34, and 45 CFR 303.101 And Is Presider Over Expedited Processes Under Authority of 45 CFR 303.101 And These Facts Are Proof The Adjudicator Is Not Impartial And Is Violating the Defendant's Right To Impartial Due Process.

In this motion, Mirsad alleged he has "received notice that he must pay child support, child support arears, and participate in State title IV-D Child Support Enforcement proceedings." (p.1). He claimed that being required to pay past and future child support as ordered by the Magistrate Court is "proof [he] is ordered by this court under duress and not of his own free will," and that the lack of evidence of a loan or promissory note "he cannot be held in default as claimed by this Court." (p.2). To support these claims Mirsad cited to 42 U.S.C. § 654(7), 45 C.F.R. § 302.34, and 45 C.F.R. § 303.101. Title 42 U.S.C. § 654(7) requires that a state child support plan must allow courts and other officials to "assist the agency administering the plan . . . in order to assure optimum results[, and] with respect to any other matters of common concern." Title 45 C.F.R. § 302.34 requires the State to enter into cooperative agreements between "appropriate courts" and other officials, and that those "arrangements shall contain provisions for providing courts and law enforcement officials with pertinent information needed in locating noncustodial parents, establishing paternity and securing support." Finally, 45 C.F.R. § 303.101 requires states to use expedited procedures for child support actions, and outlines safeguards and expected "functions

performed by presiding officers.” Mirsad claims that these arrangements are “proof [he] is not receiving impartial due process under [45 C.F.R. § 303.101(c)(2),]” and that the magistrate court is being improperly “used for administrative Title IV-D proceedings.” (pp.3-4). The remaining pages, four through nine, are a repeat of the same inapplicable claims and assertions made in pages 10 through 14 of the “Notice of Deprivation of Rights” discussed previously.

This filing lacks any meritorious information or argument, is not based in relevant law, and constitutes nothing more than a frivolous attempt to relitigate issues already determined by the magistrate court.

iii. Notice to Court Objection Trespass Upon Rights

The final filing that day was titled: Notice to Court Objection Trespass Upon Rights 18 USC § 242 Deprivation of Rights and Notice Of Claim. As previously discussed, there is no private right of action under 18 U.S.C. § 242. *See, e.g., United States v. Philadelphia*, 644 F.2d 187 (3d Cir.1980). Mirsad conflates civil pleading issues with criminal law and the Seventh Amendment right to a jury trial in certain civil matters with the magistrate judge’s rulings against him in this family law case.

In this document Mirsad states “[he] is claiming 10,000 dollars for each violation or interference with his rights or trespass upon his property, including but not limited his children being his DNA property, and will charge this court 1 dollar per each second until his rights and property are restored,” and that those rights are “guaranteed by the US constitution [*sic*].” (p.7, citing *Santosky v. Kramer*, 455 U.S. 745 (1982)). This argument is correct as far as it goes. Idaho recognizes that parents have due process rights in proceedings to terminate their parental rights. *In re Doe*, 156 Idaho 103, 109, 320 P.3d 1262, 1268 (2014) (citing *In Interest of Bush*, 113 Idaho 873, 875, 749 P.2d 492, 494 (1988)). However, this was not a proceeding to terminate his parental

rights due to neglect, which was the subject of the *Santosky* case he relies upon. Rather, this was a divorce and custody proceeding. Given the vastly different nature of the cases, Mirsad's reliance on *Santosky* is misplaced, unfounded, and misguided. Ultimately, this filing was similar to prior filings and once again constitutes nothing more than a meritless attempt to relitigate issues already determined by the magistrate in violation of I.C.A.R. 59(a)(2) and lacks any meritorious argument.

b. Documents filed September 2, 2021

The next group of documents include the following filed on September 2, 2021⁶:

- Notice of Objection and Demand for Clarification of Evidence
- Notice of Motion Demanding Response
- Notice of Demand for Dismissal

i. Notice of Objection and Demand for Clarification of Evidence

On September 2, 2021, Mirsad filed the Notice of Objection and Demand for Clarification of Evidence. This motion repeats Mirsad's arguments concerning alleged violations of the magistrate's duties. Specifically, the same arguments were made in the Notice of Motion Objection Demand Dismissal of All Motions and the Notice of Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice filed August 26, 2021. Both motions were denied. The issues were previously considered and ruled upon by the magistrate as discussed in some detail above, and no further authority or support was provided in this motion. As such, the objection and demand for clarification is simply a further attempt to relitigate issues contrary to I.C.A.R. 59(a)(2).

ii. Notice of Motion Demanding Response

The Notice of Motion Demanding Response is functionally identical to the Notice of Objection and Demand for Clarification of Evidence; however, it also contains an argument

⁶ Mirsad filed additional documents on September 2nd, but they are discussed elsewhere and so will not be repeated here.

regarding the magistrate court’s duty to provide evidence of personal jurisdiction “over a living man with blood flowing through his body and a free citizen of the state.” Mirsad inexplicably argues that the court cannot issue judgments until it can provide evidence of an agreement under UCC 2-204, and that the state forced him to participate in the proceedings involuntarily, amounting to indentured servitude thereby violating Mirsad’s constitutional right to due process. These arguments are frivolous, repetitive to arguments previously presented and denied, and nothing more than an attempt to undermine proceedings.

The continued filing of documents of this nature is contrary to I.C.A.R. 59(3). “The voluntary appearance of a party or service of any pleading by the party . . . constitutes a voluntary submission to the personal jurisdiction of the court.” *Dep’t of Fin., Sec. Bureau v. Zarinegar*, 167 Idaho 611, 621, 474 P.3d 683, 693 (2020), *reh’g dismissed* (Nov. 5, 2020) (quoting I.R.C.P. 4.1(a)); *see also State v. Aguilar*, 103 Idaho 578, 580, 651 P.2d 512, 514 (1982) (holding a defendant consents to the court’s personal jurisdiction when the defendant fails to “object or raise as an affirmative defense the asserted lack of personal jurisdiction over him as required under I.R.C.P.... 12(h), and participated in the proceeding”). In the Magistrate Court’s Findings of Fact, the Magistrate Court detailed how Mirsad had filed an answer and counterclaim to Jennifer’s Petition for Divorce along with numerous other filings in this case, thereby subjecting himself to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Court. In addition, Idaho follows the rule that “the court of any state where the plaintiff is domiciled may issue a divorce decree entitled to full faith and credit in all other states,” which means the magistrate court not had both personal jurisdiction and subject matter jurisdiction and was authorized to grant the divorce Jennifer requested. *Donaldson v. Donaldson*, 111 Idaho 951, 956, 729 P.2d 426, 431 (Ct. App. 1986) (citing *Newell v. Newell*, 77 Idaho 355, 363, 293 P.2d 663, 668 (1956), *overruled on other grounds by Baker v. Baker*, 100

Idaho 635, 637, 603 P.2d 590, 592 (1979)); *see also* I.C. § 5-514(e) (conferring jurisdiction on parties who have maintained a “matrimonial domicile” in the State at the time “of any act giving rise to a cause of action for divorce”).

It is also notable that this filing, as well as the Objection and Demand for Clarification contain identical arguments to those presented in the Motion for Permissive Appeal filed on June 25, 2021, and denied by the magistrate on July 27, 2021.

iii. Notice of Demand for Dismissal

Next, in the Notice of Demand for Dismissal, Mirsad argues the magistrate court is required to dismiss this case under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) because Jennifer “has failed to prove standing by fail[ing] to introduce clear and convincing evidence proving [she] suffered an injury in fact.” Again, as with other motions made and ruled upon, there is no merit to Mirsad’s argument because the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are not controlling in Idaho Courts. *See Kalashnikov v. State*, No. 41413, 2014 WL 4243639, at *3 (Idaho Ct. App. Aug. 27, 2014) (finding that allegations of violations of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are inapplicable in a state court matter). Further, issues of standing and the existence of an injury in fact were ruled upon by the magistrate and/or any such arguments became moot at the conclusion of trial. Again, these arguments are without merit. Further, they are repetitive to arguments presented and previously denied.

c. Post-Divorce Motions for Contempt

Following the decree of divorce, and despite repeated warnings from the magistrate concerning the filing of unsupported and unmeritorious contempt motions, Mirsad continued to file motions for contempt. A total of eight such motions were filed. The first post-judgment motion seeking contempt was filed April 15, 2021, and denied on the record on May 6, 2021. Four

more motions were filed on April 25, 2021,⁷ and denied on May 20, 2021. The sixth was filed on August 26, 2021, and the most recent two were filed on September 2, 2021, and denied on September 13. Despite numerous admonitions from the magistrate throughout the course of litigation, each of these motions failed to comply with the requirements of Rule 75 by failing to properly outline or articulate the behavior that was alleged to constitute contempt, and containing conclusory and unsupported allegations. They were all found to be meritless and frivolous by the magistrate judge. This Court agrees.

Mirsad filed the first of these multiple motions for contempt a mere one week after the magistrate court issued the Amended Judgment and Decree of Divorce. The affidavits supporting these motions were lengthy and more importantly, repetitious. The first affidavit alone was fifty-nine pages and the affidavits supporting the subsequent four motions contained a total of sixty-nine pages, at least twenty-nine of which were information that was previously filed in motions for contempt denied by the magistrate court prior to issuance of the Findings of Fact.⁸ These motions were denied by the magistrate court because they did not comply with the mandatory requirements of I.R.C.P. 75.

Idaho Rule of Civil Procedure 75(c)(3) requires that a motion for contempt:

⁷ The filing date referenced is that of the physical filing stamp on the document rather than the date in the electronic filing system.

⁸ As just a few examples: page 5 of the April 15 affidavit contains an identical screenshot to pages 13-14 of a motion for contempt filed on May 28, 2020; pages 6 and 7 are screenshots of emails found on pages 8 and 9 of a motion for contempt filed June 26, 2020, page 9 contains a screenshot of an email included on page 30 of a motion for contempt filed July 3, 2020; and page 3 of the affidavit in support of the April 25 2nd motion is a screenshot also found on page 31 of a motion for contempt filed on July 17, 2020.

...must allege the specific facts constituting the alleged contempt and set forth each instance of alleged contempt separately. The written charge or affidavit need not allege facts showing that the respondent's failure to comply with the court order was willful. If the alleged contempt is the violation of a court order, the written charge or affidavit must also allege that either respondent or the respondent's attorney was served with a copy of the court order or had actual knowledge of it.

I.R.C.P.75(c)(3). Upon review of each of these filings, it is clear that none of the contempt motions as set forth above complied with Civil Rule 75(c)(3) in that they do not contain any specific allegations of fact showing the alleged contempt.

Mirsad was repeatedly informed that any motions for contempt must comply with the rule and he had been previously sanctioned for failure to comply with this requirement.⁹ These filings contain no new information, lack merit, and constitute nothing more than repetitious attempts designed to frustrate, obfuscate, and relitigate this this case.

d. Motions Relating to Appointment of a Parenting Coordinator

Mirsad has made multiple motions concerning appointment of a parenting coordinator, but the following are most notable:

- Objection on Appointment of Parenting Coordinator—filed July 23, 2021;
- Motion and Affidavit Objecting to Proposed Order Appointing Parenting Coordinator—filed August 13, 2021;
- Notice of Appeal on Order Appointment of Parenting Coordinator—filed August 26, 2021;
- Motion & Affidavit to Restart Visits – filed August 31, 2021; and
- Affidavit to Support Objection to Appointment of Parenting Coordinator—filed September 5, 2021.

In May 2021, Jennifer filed a motion to appoint a parenting coordinator with the magistrate court, requesting appointment of a parenting coordinator due to the difficulty “co-parent[ing] effectively” with Mirsad; and a month later, she supplied the magistrate court with the name of an available parenting coordinator. The motion was granted.

⁹ September 10, 2020.

Following an additional opportunity to oppose the motion and the ruling by the magistrate, Mirsad filed a lengthy objection to the appointment of Jennifer's suggested coordinator, claiming the magistrate court "fail[ed] to state a claim upon which relief must be granted" under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), and that the magistrate court was in violation of various United States Supreme Court cases. The remainder of this objection repeated many of the claims from his original objection to Jennifer's Motion for Parenting Coordinator, including the same screenshots, and included an additional fourteen pages of information on parental alienation.

The repetitious nature of Mirsad's arguments opposing appointment of the parenting coordinator continue throughout the other nearly contemporaneous filings on this issue including:

1. Motion and Affidavit Objecting to Proposed Order Appointing Parenting Coordinator—This was filed August 13, 2021, in which Mirsad alleged "[the order] violates IRFLP 1002, lacks written evidences requested from this court, lacks due process, trespasses with the rights of the aggrieved, continues child abuse by officer of this court, and causes hardship to aggrieved and his children." That filing then included twenty-four pages repeating the information contained in his previous parenting coordinator objections, including the same arguments, screenshots, and information regarding parental alienation. *Id.*, pp.3-26.
2. Notice of Appeal of Order for Parenting Coordinator—this thirty-eight page document was filed August 26, 2021, the day before the hearing on Mirsad's objection above. It contained thirty-five pages of the same screenshots, arguments, and parental alienation information included in his previously filed objections. *See* Notice of Appeal of Order for Parenting Coordinator (filed 08/26/2021);

3. Motion and Affidavit to Restart Visits–filed August 31, 2021, in which Mirsad again repeated many of the same arguments and includes the same screenshots discussed in his previous objections to the parenting coordinator;¹⁰ and
4. Affidavit to Support Objection to Appointment of Parenting Coordinator–Here, Mirsad asserted that the appointed coordinator has a conflict because Mirsad filed a bar complaint and a notice of claim for \$750,000. The filing references his past filings as part of the support for his motion and asks for additional time to find an acceptable parenting coordinator. No related motion to appoint a different coordinator was filed, as the court noted during the October 27th hearing.

The filings after the magistrate court’s July 1st appointment of the parenting coordinator are frivolous and without merit.¹¹ They offer no valid basis for the objection to the parenting coordinator and appear merely obstreperous in nature, Mirsad objected because he was unhappy with the entire process and wished to exert control over Jennifer and the children. Ultimately, this is nothing more than multiple repeated baseless attempts by Mirsad to relitigate the cause of action, claim, controversy, and the issues decided by the magistrate court.

e. **August 26, 2021 Filings:**

The next group concerns the following seven filings, all made on August 26, 2021:¹²

¹⁰ Pages 2-6 repeat the same arguments from pages 10-14 from the Notice to Court Objection Trespass Upon Rights filed August 5, and pages 3-7 from the Motion and Affidavit Objecting to Parenting Coordinator based on the children being “his DNA property;” pages 9-28 repeat the same parental alienation information from pages 10-26 of the Motion and Affidavit Objecting to Parenting Coordinator; and pages 28-40 repeat (including highlights) pages 26-37 of the Notice of Appeal of Order for Parenting Coordinator.

¹¹ The appointment of parenting coordinator was made on the record during the July 1, 2021 hearing. The order was issued July 9.

¹² There was also a motion for contempt filed on this day, but it will not be addressed here as it was discussed previously.

- Affidavit of Conflict of Interest;
- Motion & Affidavit for Contempt;
- Notice of Motion Objection Demand Dismissal of All Motions;
- Notice of Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice;
- Notice to Court Change of Venue;
- Notice to Court Demanding a Trial by Jury; and
- Petition for Non-Statutory Writ of Habeas Corpus.

i. **Affidavit of Conflict of Interest**

Here Mirsad asserted without foundation or basis that the appointed Parenting Coordinator had a conflict of interest preventing her from being impartial and a request for appointment of his proposed Parenting Coordinator. This filing is largely repetitive of the “Objection Trespass Upon Rights,” filed on August 5, the “Motion Objecting to Parenting Coordinator,” and the “Motion to Shorten Time,” filed on August 27, and the “Urgent Motion” filed on August 31, 2021. Despite the allegations, there is no evidence provided of any conflict of interest and the document can be considered nothing more than an attempt to disrupt proceedings and relitigate issues.

ii. **Motion & Affidavit for Contempt**

This filing concerns allegations that Mirsad is entitled to equal custody despite the entry of Judgment in this case that had been previously issued. This contains no new information and is an attempt to continuously relitigate matters that have already been determined.

iii. **Notice of Motion Objection Demand Dismissal of All Motions**

Here Mirsad asserts that statements made by counsel in briefs or argument are not evidence and cannot form the basis for granting a motion, that as a non-lawyer, he should not be held to the same standards as a lawyer, and that under the federal rules, the court was required to dismiss the

case because there was no evidence of jurisdiction or injury in fact. The arguments here are without any merit or basis in law and are repetitious in nature.

iv. **Notice of Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice**

This filing is again largely repetitious of claims that Mirsad has made throughout the course of the litigation despite the entry of judgment in the case.

v. **Notice to Court Change of Venue**

This motion demands removal to the Federal Courts—a remedy that is not available under the circumstances here. It is also once again similar in nature to many of Mirsad’s previous filings. Once again this constitutes an attempt to relitigate issues already determined by the magistrate court.

vi. **Notice to Court Demanding a Trial by Jury**

This motion is meritless and is yet another attempt to relitigate issues already determined previously in the litigation.

vii. **Petition for Non-Statutory Writ of Habeas Corpus**

This petition is meritless because habeas petitions only apply to those that are in custody.¹³

These motions were all properly denied by the magistrate judge as without merit or basis in law. Upon review, and as noted above, the documents constitute attempts to relitigate issues already determined and also constitute frivolous and unmeritorious documents.

¹³ The Court also questions whether such petition is an available mechanism of relief in a family law case subsequent to enactment of the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction act. See *Marks v. Vehlow*, 105 Idaho 560, 574, 671 P.2d 473, 487 (1983).

f. Documents Relating to the Magistrate Judge

Beginning in late October, 2021, Mirsad began directing his filings against the magistrate judge personally. These filings include the following:

- Affidavit on Grievance;
- Affidavit on Bar Grievance Against Mr. Sullivan; and
- Notice of Claim for Mr. Sullivan.

i. **Affidavit on Grievance**

This filing appears to be a complaint to the judicial council. With no bearing on the issues in the divorce case.

ii. **Affidavit on Bar Grievance Against Mr. Sullivan for Child Abuse and Mental Torture**

This document simply notes the filing of a bar grievance, again with no apparent bearing on the issue in the divorce case.

iii. **Notice of Claim for Mr. Sullivan**

Herein, Mirsad alleges the magistrate judge has committed multiple crimes and/or violations against him resulting from the decisions rendered in the divorce case. There is no merit to the filing.

None of these filings have any relevance to the divorce and custody matters before the magistrate judge. They are inappropriate filings and can only be considered further attempt to delay or complicate the proceedings.

g. Other documents in the divorce proceeding

There are several other recent filings since the referral of Mirsad as a vexatious litigant that have not yet been ruled upon by the magistrate court, but that appear to amount to no more than additional meritless argument/motions or attempts to relitigate issues previously adjudicated in much the same way as those filings specified above. A sampling of those documents is as follows:

1. First Motion and Affidavit for Contempt filed October 21, 2021;
2. Affidavit of Status filed October 27, 2021;
3. Special Appearance filed November 8, 2021;
4. Motion and Affidavit to Clarify filed November 8, 2021;
5. Second Motion and Affidavit for Contempt filed November 12, 2021 and amended November 18, 2021;
6. Affidavit with Objection to Writ of Plea filed November 22, 2021;
7. Affidavit in Support of First and Second Motions for Contempt filed November 22, 2021;
8. Notice of Federal Claim Filed December 8, 2021;
9. Demand to Appellate Court to Show all Evidence filed December 17, 2021;
10. Second Demand for Written Response filed December 17, 2021;
11. Notice of Objection to December 20, 2021 Order filed December 22, 2021;
12. Six distinct motions for contempt files December 24, 2021;
13. Four motions for contempt filed January 3, 2022; and
14. Notice of Immediate Urgent Motion for Court to Issue a Statement Clarifying Final Judgment filed January 5, 2022.

The Court has not considered these motions in making its decision regarding whether Mirsad is a vexatious litigant; however, it is noted that these documents reflect that Mirsad apparently intends to continue his now long-standing pattern of filings.

h. Filings in the present case

Following the prefilings order issued on September 7, 2021, in the present case, Mirsad filed multiple documents in response to the proposed prefilings order. While several were ministerial in nature, the substantive filings are as follows:

- Affidavit in Objection;
- Affidavit in Confirmation of Bar Grievance;
- Affidavit Requesting Sanctions;
- Affidavit on Mr. VanderVelde and Mr. Southworth;

- Notice to Court Motion to Dismiss and Notice to Change of Venue; and
- Order (proposed) for compensation.

i. **Affidavit in Objection**

In this document, Mirsad makes multiple claims and arguments including, but not limited to, the violation of numerous constitutional provisions; the lack of a valid claim before the court; the fact that because he did not bring this case, none of his filings are frivolous, that he was robbed of his property (his children); that he was not warned about the length of his filings; and that he has only been involved in two other small claims in Idaho, thus his claims here are not vexatious or frivolous. He also sets forth his own allegations of conspiracy and his reasoning as to the errors of the proceedings below.

ii. **Affidavit in Confirmation of Bar Grievance**

Herein Mirsad asserts that the filing of the bar related documents in the divorce case were informational and not frivolous. However, a document that bears no relevance to the issues at hand is frivolous. There is nothing about a judicial complaint that makes any issue decided in Mirsad's divorce case more or less likely. It was simply an attempt by Mirsad to express his frustration and displeasure with the court's rulings;

iii. **Affidavit Requesting Sanctions**

This document is simply another attempt to readjudicate the determinations made by the magistrate judge in the divorce proceeding;

iv. **Affidavit on Mr. VanderVelde and Mr. Southworth**

This filing challenges the validity of the divorce judgment both because he was denied a jury trial and because the court lacks personal jurisdiction. It is not clear whether Mirsad is referencing the jurisdiction of the magistrate court or this Court; however, as discussed above, his

presence before the Court subjects him to the personal jurisdiction herein. Simply stating he is making a special appearance, whether in this specific document or others, is insufficient to avoid submission to jurisdiction of the court where Mirsad brings up issues and argues for relief other than those relating to jurisdiction. I.R.C.P. 4.1;

v. Notice to Court Motion to Dismiss and Notice to Change of Venue

Herein, Mirsad states, “Vexatious litigant is unconstitutional declaration AND in my case it is used to intimidate, frighten, harass, fear monger, and to deprive my first amendment right to free speech and right to defend in the court of law and right to petition the court and sixth amendment [sic] right confrontation clause to be Belligerent in person.” He also claims to be a sovereign state citizen national and attempts to prohibit the Court from calling him a citizen. He then asks for a change of venue to an Article 3 court. While clearly expressing his vehement disagreement with the current proceeding, this document advances no meritorious facts or law that would weigh against him being found a vexatious litigant. As to his request for a change of venue to an Article 3 court, it is not clear Mirsad understands his own argument. To the extent he references removal to federal court, he does not meet the jurisdictional requirements for the same. The present court is the appropriate venue for the matter at hand. *See* I.C.A.R. 59; and

vi. Order (proposed) for compensation

Finally, submitted to this Court but not filed was a request for compensation for the time spent responding to some actions of the petitioner. The Court is not clear who the petitioner in this instance might be or what the complained of actions were. Further, *pro se* litigants are not entitled to such compensation. This document is therefore without any merit in law.

None of the documents filed by Mirsad in this case present any meritorious defense to the prefiling order or provide explanation as to why Mirsad should not be determined to be a vexatious

litigant. Rather, each of these filings constitute continued renewed attempts, and the emphasis of Mirsad's belief, that he has the right to continue to file any documents he wishes, saying anything he wishes, and relitigate issues already determined by the magistrate court.

i. Hearing in the present case

The hearing in this case took place on December 2, 2021. First, both through filings and at the hearing on this matter, Mirsad attempted to appear through individuals who are not licensed to practice law in Idaho. This request was denied. During the hearing, Mirsad offered no meritorious explanation for the frequent, repetitive and/or meritless filings that he continues to file in his divorce proceeding. Instead, Mirsad once again attempted to relitigate that case. Moreover, Mirsad acknowledged that he is a vexatious litigant, and he clearly believes that this continuing such behavior is necessary to protect his rights relating to custody of his children.

CONCLUSION AND ORDER

Idaho Court Administrative Rule 59(d)(2) permits a court to find a person to be a vexatious litigant where that person has, in effect, sought to repeatedly re-litigate a final determination made against that person. Additionally, Idaho Court Administrative Rule 59(d)(3) permits a court to make a vexatious litigant finding where a *pro se* litigant has “repeatedly file[d] unmeritorious motions, pleadings, or other papers, conduct[ed] unnecessary discovery, or engage[d] in other tactics that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay.” It is evident from a thorough review of case CV14-19-1606 and the information set forth above that Mirsad Hajro is a vexatious litigant as defined under both 59(d)(2) and (3). He demonstrates a clear pattern of filing frivolous motions and other documents that have no merit. Further, such filings They are simply attempts to relitigate issues already decided on facts and evidence already considered. This Court

therefore concludes that a prefiling order should be entered against him pursuant to I.C.A.R. 59(c), (d) and (e).

Pursuant to this court's finding Mirsad Hajro is ordered not to file any new *pro se* litigation, either in this case, the underlying proceeding CV14-19-1606, or in any new action, in this state without first obtaining leave of the court where the litigation is proposed to be filed.

Mirsad Hajro is further notified that disobedience of this order may be punished as a contempt of court and can result in the court dismissing any action filed by as provided by I.C.A.R. 59(h) and (j).

Dated; 1/11/2022 02:44 PM



Davis F. VanderVelde
Administrative District Judge
Third Judicial District of Idaho

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1/11/2022 3:47:53 PM

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this _____ day of January 2022, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing order by the method indicated below, and addressed to the following persons:

Brooke A. O'Neil, Sarah E. Scott, Greta C. Nycklemore
LAW/ALTERNATIVES/PLLC
2404 Bank Dr., Ste. 201
P.O. Box 50269
Boise, ID 83705
boneil@lawalternativesidaho.com
sscott@lawalternativesidaho.com
gnycklemore@lawalternativesidaho.com
Attorneys for Petitioner, Jennifer Hajro

E-Mail

Mirsad Hajro
mhajro@gmail.com
Pro Se Respondent

E-Mail

Jamie Robb
Trial Court Administrator

E-Mail

Hon. Davis F. VanderVelde
Administrative Judge

E-Mail

Hon. Thomas A. Sullivan
Magistrate Judge

E-Mail

CLERK OF THE DISTRICT COURT

By: *Sharon Carter*
Deputy Clerk

<u>Odyssey Document Date</u>	<u>Physical Filing Date</u>	<u>Odyssey Document Title</u>
02/22/2019		Family Case Law Information Sheet
02/22/2019		Motion and Affidavit for Fee Waiver
02/28/2019		Order Granting Fee Waiver
02/28/20219		Summons Issued
02/28/2019		Petition for Divorce (With Minor Children)
02/28/2019		Order to Attend Focus on Children
02/28/2019		Summons Hajro, Mirsad Served: 03/03/2019
03/11/2019		Affidavit of Service- Mirdad served 03/09/219
03/12/2019		Status Report- Focus on Children Defendant Appeared/Complied
03/18/2019	03/15/2019	Family Case Law Information Sheet
03/18/2019	03/15/2019	SEC-Response to Petition-Family Mirsad H.
03/20/2019		FOC Status Report 03/13/2019 Petitioner attended
03/20/2019		Affidavit of Service- Jennifer served 03/15/2019
03/21/2019	03/20/2019	SEC- Amended Response to Petition- Family
03/22/2019		Amended Reply to Counterclaim
04/02/2019		WF-FCS File Review Screening
04/03/2019		Certificate of Service- Jennifer served 03/20/2019
04/04/2019	04/03/2019	Certificate of Service
04/04/2019	04/03/2019	Motion for Temporary Order- Respondent
04/04/2019	04/03/2019	Affidavit
04/04/2019	04/03/2019	Notice of Hearing
04/04/2019		Proposed Order for Temporary Custody (HOLD)
04/08/2019		Order for Family Civil Intake Screen

04/08/2019		Order Setting Case
04/11/2019		Affidavit
04/11/2019		Response to Motion- Family- for Temporary Custody Order-Petr
04/11/2019		Status Report FCS Family Intake Screening
04/15/2019		WF Notice of Appearance J. Roark for J. Hajro
04/15/2019		Affidavit Support of Objection to Motion for Temp Ords-Ptr
04/19/2019	(Judge signed 3/16/20/18)	Joint Preliminary Injunction
04/30/2019		Order for Mediation- MPX1
04/30/2019		Temporary Order Custody-MPX1
04/30/2019		Supplemental Order
05/01/2019		Copy/Audio Request
05/08/2019		Notice of Service of Mandatory Disclosures
05/20/2019		Mediation Status Report- Ongoing
06/14/2019		Affidavit 04/15/2019
06/14/2019		Affidavit 04/11/2019
06/19/2019		Motion to Reconsider
06/19/2019		Notice of Hearing
06/19/2019		Affidavit in Support of Motion to Reconsider
06/19/2019		Proposed Order for Motion to Reconsider Hold for Hearing
06/19/2019		WF Response to Courts Request- Mirsad
06/19/2019		WF (6/25)-Notice of Proposed Providers
06/19/2019		Affidavit in Support of Motion
06/19/2019		Motion to Amend Temporary Orders
06/19/2019		Affidavit on Low Quality Therapist
06/25/2019		Notice of Hearing

06/25/2019	Motion to Strike
06/25/2019	Proposed order to strike
06/26/2019	Referral and Order for Investigation
07/03/2019	Affidavit against motion to amend
07/08/2019	Notice of Submission of Counseling Records
07/11/2019	Order for Safety Plan (mp; no cert)
07/11/2019	Order for Reunification Therapy (mp; no cert)
07/11/2019	Mediation Status Report - At Impasse
07/15/2019	Notice of Service of Discovery Requests Notice of Service Interrogs-Hajro
07/23/2019	Motion to Compel
07/23/2019	Affidavit of J. Roark in Support of Motion to Compel
07/23/2019	Notice of Hearing
07/25/2019	Certificate of Service
07/25/2019	Affidavit for Proposed Order from 6/26/19 Hearing
07/26/2019	Report of Investigation Court Ordered
07/30/2019	Amended Order for Child Custody and Support
07/30/2019	Supplemental Order
07/30/2019	Proposed Order on Motion to Reconsider
07/30/2019	Affidavit for Motion to Compel
07/30/2019	Affidavit for Motion to Amend
07/30/2019	Notice of Hearing - 07.31.19 - Resp's Motn to Reconsider
07/30/2019	Motion to Amend (Thumbdrive w/ Secretary)
07/31/2019	Request to Inspect or Obtain Copies/Audio
08/01/2019	Notice of Hearing

08/01/2019	Motion for In Camera Interview
08/02/2019	Order Setting Case and Scheduling Order (T. Sullivan)
08/08/2019	Notice of Service- Petitioner's
08/08/2019	Objection -Petitioner's
08/08/2019	Affidavit of J. Hajro
08/08/2019	Affidavit of J. Roark
08/09/2019	Motion to Compel
08/09/2019	Proposed Order to compel
08/09/2019	Notice of Hearing
08/09/2019	Affidavit in Support of Motion to Compel
08/09/2019	Objection to in camera interview and school schedule.pdf
08/09/2019	Affidavit on objection for school schedule
08/14/2019	Affidavit on Opposing Parties Manipulations & Parental Alien
08/16/2019	Notice of Hearing for Motion to Compel
08/16/2019	Aff-response to interogs
08/19/2019	Memorandum of Costs & Attorney Fees
08/21/2019	Objection to Motion to Compel
08/23/2019	Second Amended Temporary Order (T. Sullivan)
08/27/2019	Order for Interview of Minor Children
08/27/2019	Order to Compel and for Atty Fees
08/27/2019	WF (8/27)-Proposed Order for Motion to Continue
08/27/2019	Motion and Affidavit to Continue
08/27/2019	Order Setting Case
08/29/2019	Request to inspect or obtain Copies of Judicial Records

08/30/2019		WF (8/30)-Affidavit of Clarafication of Order to Compel from 08/27/19
08/30/2019		Affidavit in Support of Motion for Sanctions
08/30/2019		Motion to Shorten Time
08/30/2019		WF- Motion for Sanctions
09/01/2019		Affidavit of clarification of 8.27.19 Order to compel-amende
09/03/2019		Request to Inspect or Obtain Copies/Audio
09/03/2019		Audio/Copy Request
09/04/2019	09/01/2019	Affidavit in Response to Motion to sanction
09/05/2019		Order to Shorten Time Petitioner's Motion for Sanctions (NO Cert) (T. Sullivan)
09/05/2019		Proposed Order for relief and to sanction (No Cert)
09/05/2019	09/01/2019	Motion for relief and to sanction
09/05/2019	09/01/2019	Motion to Shorten Time
09/05/2019	09/01/2019	Affidavit in support of motion for relief and to sanction
09/06/2019		WF- Pretrial Memorandum- Petitioner's
09/06/2019		WF- Pretrial Memorandum- Respondent's
09/07/2019		Objection to Pretrial memorandum
09/09/2019	09/01/2019	Letter with Discoveries
09/10/2019		WF (9/11)-Report - FCS Interview of a minor child
09/11/2019		WF Memorandum of Costs & Attorney Fees
09/11/2019		Notice of Service – Supplemental
09/13/2019		Letter with Answers to 9/6/19 Request
09/16/2019		Order Releasing Interview (no mp/cert)
09/17/2019		Audio/Copy Request

09/20/2019	Order Granting Motion for Santions (no mp/cert)
09/21/2019	letter of Non-received Evidence & Discoveries
09/30/2019	Audio/Copy Request
01/08/2020	Proposed Order - to Continue - no mp/no cert *hold for hearing*
01/08/2020	Motion to Shorten Time
01/08/2020	Motion and Affidavit to Continue
01/09/2020	Order to Shorten Time - no mp/no cert
01/09/2020	Notice of Hearing
01/09/2020	Affidavit of Service Risa Mortensen
01/09/2020	Affidavit of Service Jeff Moreno
01/09/2020	Objection to Motion to Continue
01/13/2020	Petitioner's Exhibit 002 - Letter From Risa Mortensen Dated 07/03/19
01/14/2020	Exhibit List/Log
01/17/2020	Audio/Copy Request
01/23/2020	Notice of Service
02/07/2020	Request to Inspect or Obtain Copies.Audio
03/20/2020	Amended Order Setting Case
04/01/2020	Second Amended Order Setting Case
04/15/2020	WF Motion & Affidavit to Change Therapist – Defendant
04/27/2020	Order Setting Case- Telephonic Hearing
05/04/2020	wf Objection to Motion and affidavit
05/06/2020	Order Setting Case
05/18/2020	Request to Inspect or Obtain Copies/Audio
05/20/2020	Motion to Shorten Time & Continue
05/20/2020	WF Proposed Order to Continue

05/22/2020	Notice of Service- Petnr
05/22/2020	Subpoena Issued- Jeff Moreno
05/26/2020	Exhibit List/Log
05/26/2020	Petitioner's Exhibit 003 - Copies Of Text Messages (Three Pages)
05/26/2020	Petitioner's Exhibit 004 - E-mail From Respondent To Petitioner Dated December 26, 2018 (One Page)
05/26/2020	Petitioner's Exhibit 005 - Text Messages Between Petitioner And Child (Nurah) (Six Pages)
05/26/2020	Petitioner's Exhibit 011 - Petitioner's Proposed Judgment And Decree
05/26/2020	Petitioner's Exhibit 013 - Copies From Petitioner's Journal In Regards To Visitation And Exchanges
05/26/2020	Petitioner's Exhibit 014 - Report Cards
05/26/2020	Petitioner's Exhibit 015 - Three Letters (Three Pages Total)
05/27/2020	Proposed Respondent's Exhibits
05/27/2020	Certificate of Service for Electronic Exhibits – Mirsad
05/28/2020	WF Proposed Order to Shorten Time and Contempt
05/28/2020	Motion and Affidavit to Shorten Time, Contempt and Sanction
05/29/2020	Objection to Motion for Contempt and Motion to Shorten Time
06/11/2020	Records Request
06/18/2020	Request to Inspect or Obtain Copies/Audio
06/22/2020	Exhibit List/Log
06/22/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 101 - Receipt AMT Coffee Ireland Dublin Airport

06/22/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 102 – DB
06/22/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 103 - Invoice 2018-3473844
06/22/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 104 – Video
06/22/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 105 - Video Called "Angry"
06/23/2020	Temporary Orders Taxes and Holiday (Sullivan)
06/26/2020	WF Proposed Order Re: Motion for Contempt (No Cert)
06/26/2020	Notice of Hearing - 06.26.2020 - Respondents Motion for Contempt
06/26/2020	Motion and Affidavit for Contempt
07/01/2020	Objection to second motion for contempt and motion to shorten time
07/03/2020	WF Motion and Affidavit for Contempt – Amended
07/10/2020	Notice of Hearing
07/10/2020	Proposed Order re Motion for Contempt *hold for hearing*
07/10/2020	Motion and Affidavit for Contempt – Amended
07/14/2020	Letter with List of Exhibits
07/15/2020	Proposed Other Document Requiring Court Signature
07/17/2020	WF Motion & Affidavit for Contempt- Second Amended - Defendant's
07/20/2020	Objection to Third Motion for Contempt – Petitioner
07/23/2020	Motion for Contempt - Respondent – Amended
07/23/2020	WF Proposed Order Re: Motion for Contempt (No Cert)

07/23/2020	WF Proposed Order on Motion to Sanction (No Cert)
07/23/2020	Motion to Shorten Time – Respondent
07/23/2020	Affidavit in Support of Respondent's Motion for Contempt – Amended
07/23/2020	Motion and Affidavit to Sanction – Respondent
07/24/2020	Substitution of Counsel
07/28/2020	DENIED Proposed Order on Motion to Shorten Time (No Cert)
07/30/2020	Notice of Hearing
07/30/2020	Proposed Order on Motion for Contempt - Respondent's no mp no cert ** Hold for Hearing**
07/30/2020	Motion for Contempt - Respondent's **Hold for Hearing**
07/30/2020	Affidavit in Support of Motion for Contempt - Respondent's
07/31/2020	WF Notice of Non-Availability
07/31/2020	Partial Satisfaction of Judgment of Attorney Fees - \$30 Paid
08/03/2020	Notice of Hearing - Respondent's Motion for Contempt & Sanctions
08/10/2020	Motion to Continue
08/12/2020	Order to Continue
08/12/2020	Motion For contempt amended
08/12/2020	wf Proposed Order For Motion For Sanctions Amended
08/12/2020	wf Proposed Order Contempt amended
08/12/2020	Affidavit in support of motion for contempt
08/12/2020	Motion & Affidavit for Sanctions Amended
08/19/2020	Objection to Fourth Motion for Contempt

08/27/2020	Notice of Hearing for Motion to Contempt
08/27/2020	Motion for Contempt - Respondent's
08/27/2020	Proposed Order for Motion for Contempt **hold for hearing**
08/27/2020	Affidavit ISO for Motion for Contempt
09/03/2020	Objection to Fifth Motion for Contempt
09/08/2020	Motion for Contempt- Amended
09/09/2020	Proposed Order of Amended Motion for Contempt *Hold for Hearing
09/11/2020	WF- Verified Motion to Amend Second Amended Temporary Order
09/14/2020	objection to Amend Second Amended Temporary Order v4
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 200 - 07/09/2020 IDHW Letter
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 201 - 02/26/2020 IDHW Letter
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 202 - 07/26/2019 IDHW Letter
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 203 - 06/11/2019 IDHW Letter
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 204 - 07/08/2019 IDHW Letter
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 205 - St. Al's, Patient Plan Dated 06/17/2020, 5 Pages
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 206 - St. Al's, Patient Plan Dated 07/01/2020
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 207 - One Page Text Message Dated 11/21/2018
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 208 - Text Message Dated 11/23-12/28/2018
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 209 - 11 Pages, Text Messages And Additional Pages Added

09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 210 - Picture Of Islamic Culture
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 211 - Picture Of Mosque
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 212 - Two Page Holiday Celebration Picture
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 213 - Picture 06/07/2019 Of Area Where Jennifer's House
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 214 - Target Website Re: Products 6 Pages
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 215 - Two Pages Pictures Of Bag Interior
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 216 - Odyssey Printout
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 217 - Picture Of H&W Pamphlet
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 218 - Food And Nutrition Pamphlet
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 220 - Retirement System Case Refund Form
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 222 - Arm With Bites (Mr. Hajro)
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 223 - Text Message Re: Cure For COVID
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 225 - Pictures Of Homework
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 226 - Picture Of Nina And Mirsad Hajro
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 227 - Stellar Mental Health And Mediation Letters
9/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 228A - Copy Of Check
09/14/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 228B - Transaction History

09/14/2020		Respondent's Exhibit 228C - Withdrawal Slip
09/14/2020		Respondent's Exhibit 229 - Picture Of Modest Attire
09/14/2020		Respondent's Exhibit 230 - Picture Of Nina Hajro
09/14/2020		Respondent's Exhibit 232 - Itinerary Flight Record
09/14/2020		Respondent's Exhibit 233 - Text Message From Mr. Hajro To Mrs. Hajro 11/20-12/26
09/14/2020		Respondent's Exhibit 234 - 11/23/19, Text Message
09/14/2020		Respondent's Exhibit 235 - 05/28/19, Text Messages
09/14/2020		Respondent's Exhibit 236 - Screenshot From Risa Mortensen Website
09/14/2020		Respondent's Exhibit 237 - CDC Printout
09/14/2020		Respondent's Exhibit 238A - Bank Statement
09/14/2020		Respondent's Exhibit 238B - Bank Statement
09/15/2020		Exhibit List/Log
09/15/2020		Records Request
09/16/2020		WF Proposed Order of Judgment for Attorney and Paralegal Fees
09/16/2020		WF Proposed Order for Attorney and Paralegal Fees & Costs
09/16/2020		Memorandum of Attorney and Paralegal Fees
09/18/2020		Third Amended Temporary Order
09/18/2020	09/17/2020	Objection for Attorney Fees
09/18/2020	09/17/2020	Objection to Amend Second Amended Temporary Order

09/18/2020	Supplemental Order
09/22/2020	Notice of hearing for objection for Third Amended Temporary Order and motion for sanctions
09/23/2020	Motion to Shorten Time
09/23/2020	Affidavit on 3rd amended order
09/24/2020	Motion to Modify 3rd Amended Order
09/24/2020	wf Proposed Order to modify 3rd amended order
09/26/2020	Objection to Motion to Amend Third Amended Order
09/28/2020	DENIED Order to Shorten Time
09/28/2020	Order to Shorten Time-Amended
10/07/2020	WF Report- Reintegration Therapy
10/13/2020	Objection to Inaccurate Proposed Fourth Temporary Order
10/16/2020	Affidavit of Jennifer Hajro Re: Counseling
10/19/2020	Fourth Temporary Order
10/20/2020	Exhibit List/Log
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 300 - Article from BSU Re: Misrad Hajro
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 301 - Email from Jennifer Hajro
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 302 - Text Picture of Marijuana Info
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 303 - Wells Fargo Account Dated 02/22/2019
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 305 - Text Message Dated 03/22/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 306 - Text Message Re: Laylaa 03/22/2020

10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 308 - Email to Jennifer Hajro from Misrad Hajro
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 309 - Capital One Bank Statement Dated 09/23/2017
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 310 - Text Message Dated 01/25/2019
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 311 - Another Text Message Dated 01/25/2019
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 312 - Text Message Dated 03/20/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 313 - Text Message Dated 04/24/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 314 - Text Message Dated 04/11/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 315 - Stellar Report Two Pages
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 316 - Text Message, 09/20/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 318 - Emails Between Parties Dated 01/25/2020 Re: LifeWay
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 319 - Email Re: Settlement Offer Dated 01/10/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 320 - Email Dated 03/15/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 321 - Two Page, CPS Report Dated 06/26/2019
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 322 - Two Page, CPS Report Dated 02/10/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 323 - CPS Report Dated 06/16/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 324 - CPS Report Dated 04/28/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 325 - Text Message Dated 09/13/2020

10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 326 - Text Message Dated 09/13/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 327 - Letter From Mr. Fischer 09/09/2019
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 328 - Text Message Dated 12/10/2019
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 329 - Text Message Dated 12/17/2019
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 330 - Steven Miller M.D. Re: Parental Alienation
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 331 - Text Message Dated 02/23/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 332 - Text Message Dated 02/08/2020 And 02/12/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 333 - Text Message Dated 02/07/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 334 - Text Message Dated 02/04/2020
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 335 - Emails Re: Misrad Hajro's Business/Employment Info
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 336 - Email Re: Bank Account Closed, Dated 04/04/2019
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 337 - Texting from The Parties June Through August
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 338 - Text Message Dated 10/11/2019
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 339 - Text Message Dated 10/11/2019
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 340 - Text Message Dated 01/25-27/19
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 341 - Text Message Dated 01/17-19/19
10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 342 - Picture Dated 05/27/2020

10/20/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 343 - Picture of Messy Car
10/21/2020	Proposed Other Document Requiring Court Signature - Exhibits Log for Zoom Hearing - Respondent's
10/26/2020	Amended Fourth Temporary Order
10/26/2020	Exhibit List/Log
10/26/2020	Exhibit List/Log
10/26/2020	Petitioner's Exhibit 100 - Idaho Behavioral Health
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 344 - IDHW Letter Dated 10/20/2020
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 345 - Emails, Various
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 346 - Email To Jeff From Jennifer Hajro
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 347 - Statement/Invoice (Incomplete)
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 348 - Statement (Incomplete)
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 349 - Text Message Dated 10/12/2019 Between Parties
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 350 - Letter From Wells Fargo
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 351 - Bank Statement For Wells Fargo
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 352 - Affidavit Verifying Income
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 353 - Text Message Dated 11/08/2019
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 354 - Text Message Dated 12/13/2019
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 355 - String Of Emails/Text Messages Between The Parties 04/10-11/2019

10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 357 - Email Dated 05/08/2019
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 358 - Picture Of "Community";
10/26/2020	Respondent's Exhibit 359 - Email To Teacher From Nurah
10/30/2020	Fifth Temporary Order
11/04/2020	Copy Status Report - Child Advocacy Services - Supervised Access from CPOR CV14-20-9032
11/05/2020	Status Report-Therapeutic Service 11/05/2020
11/06/2020	Notice of Remote Hearing
11/06/2020	Sixth Temporary Order (No Cert)
11/06/2020	Notice of Petitioners Choice of Individual Counselor
11/13/2020	Seventh Temporary Order (Sullivan)
11/13/2020	Hearing for Motion on new hearing for child's therapy and sanctions
11/15/2020	Motion to Shorten
11/15/2020	WF Proposed Order to Sanction
11/15/2020	Motion to New Hearing for Therapist Proposal
11/15/2020	Motion and Affidavit to Sanction
11/17/2020	Objection to Another Motion for Sanctions and to Hearing for Therapist Proposal
11/19/2020	Order to Shorten Time
11/19/2020	Order to New Hearing for Therapy
12/09/2020	WF-Proposed Order to Continue Trial (No MP)
12/09/2020	Motion to Continue Trial
12/09/2020	Motion to Shorten

12/09/2020		Objection to Motion to Continue Trial Due to New Therapist, Adj Schedule, and Enforce Court Orders
12/11/2020		Notice of Hearing
12/11/2020		Order to Shorten Time
12/13/2020		Copy Status Report - Child Advocacy Services - Supervised Access from CPOR CV14-20-9032
12/21/2020	12/18/2020	Declaration and Summary of Final Argument Requests – Mirsad
12/28/2020		Notice of Change of Address- K. Stretch
01/12/2021		Copy of WF Report - Child Advocacy Services - Summary of Visit (3rd) from CPOR Case CV14-20-9032
01/13/2021		Declaration on Nurah's Alienation and Therapy for It - Respondent's
01/25/2021		WF Records Request
01/29/2021		Notice Correcting Info
01/29/2021	01/27/2021	Partial Satisfaction of Judgment
01/29/2021	01/28/2021	Notice to Court
02/04/2021		Declaration About Petitioner's Continuous Child Abuse Through Alienation and Abduction
02/08/2021		Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order
02/22/2021		Order for Attorney and Paralegal Fees (no cert)
02/22/2021		Judgment for Attorney and Paralegal Fees (no cert)
03/04/2021		Notice of Hearing for Motion to Reconsider
03/04/2021		Motion and Affidavit to Reconsider Fact Finding, Proposed Final Judgment, Order for Attorney Fees

03/05/2021	WF Proposed Order for Motion to Amend Findings or Make New (No Cert)
03/05/2021	Motion and Affidavit to Amend Filings or Make New – Respondent
03/08/2021	Motion to Amend Findings or Make New
03/09/2021	Judgment and Decree of Divorce email only cert x1
03/09/2021	Certified Copy of Judgment and Decree of Divorce email only cert x1
03/09/2021	Objection to Proposed Order for Final Judgment – Mirsad
03/10/2021	Notice of Remote Hearing
03/10/2021	Order Setting Hearing (Email Only)
03/15/2021	Partial Satisfaction of Judgment of Attorney Fees for the Amount of \$5
03/17/2021	WF Records Request mb
03/25/2021	Respondent's Exhibit 356 - Info Re: Rep Brandon Hixon
03/25/2021	Respondent's Exhibit 356 - Info Re: Rep Brandon Hixon
04/01/2021	Record Request – CG
04/01/2021	WF Report- 4th Supervised Access Report- Child Advocacy Services
04/07/2021	Order Denying Motions for Reconsider, New FoF, New Trial, Granting Amend Judgement
04/07/2021	Amended Judgment and Decree of Divorce- no MP; Cert x1
04/07/2021	Certified Copy of Amended Judgment and Decree of Divorce- no MP; Cert x1
04/07/2021	Supplemental Order
04/14/2021	Notice of hearing re motion for sanctions and contempt (Respondent's)

04/14/2021		Motion and Affidavit for Fee Waiver for Supreme Court Appeal (Respondent's)
04/14/2021		Objection to amended final judgment and divorce decree (Respondent's)
04/14/2021		WF APPLS/TRANS-Notice of Appeal notarized (Respondent's)
04/15/2021		Motion for Contempt – Resp
04/15/2021		Affidavit in Support of Motion for Contempt
04/16/2021		Notice of Remote Hearing
04/16/2021		wf Notice of Non-Availability Petn for Hearing
04/19/2021		Notice of Hearing 5/6/21
04/19/2021		WF 2nd Memorandum of Attorney and Paralegal Fees
04/19/2021		Proposed Order of 2nd Order for Attorney & Paralegal Fees & Costs- Email Only; no Cert
04/19/2021		Proposed Order of 2nd Judgment for Attorney & Paralegal Fees & Costs- Email Only; no Cert
04/22/2021		Notice of Remote Hearing
04/22/2021	04/21/2021	Motion to Continue
04/22/2021		Proposed Notice of Hearing for Contempt & Objection Set Aside
04/23/2021		Proposed Order DENIED to Continue
04/26/2021		Supreme Court Order Conditionally Dismiss Appeal #48757-2021
04/26/2021		SC Received Email re: Order Conditionally Dismissing Appeal
04/26/2021	04/25/2021	Motion for Contempt - 1st – Respondent
04/26/2021	04/25/2021	Motion for Contempt - 2nd – Respondent
04/26/2021	04/25/2021	Motion for Contempt - 3rd – Respondent

04/26/2021	04/25/2021	Motion for Contempt - 4th – Respondent
04/26/2021	04/25/2021	Affidavit for 2nd Motion for Contempt – Respondent
04/26/2021		WF Proposed Order for Motions for Contempt 1 thru 4 (No Cert)
04/26/2021	04/25/2021	Affidavit for 1st Motion for Contempt – Respondent
04/26/2021	04/25/2021	Declaration for Motion for Contempt
04/26/2021	04/25/2021	Affidavit in Support of 3rd Motion for Contempt – Respondent
04/26/2021	04/25/2021	Affidavit for 4th Motion for Contempt – Respondent
04/27/2021		Motion to Shorten Time – Resp
04/27/2021		Motion & Affidavit to Set Aside Judgment
04/28/2021		DENIED Order for Fee Waiver Supreme Court Appeal NO MP, NO CERT PD
04/29/2021		WF Proposed Order to Set Aside Judgment (no cert)
04/29/2021		DENIED- Proposed Order to Shorten Time and Continue Hearing (No Cert)
04/29/2021		Sent Receipt - Proposed Order Denied to Shorten Time and Continue Hearing
04/29/2021		Objection to Motion & Affidavit to Set Aside the Judgment- Plaintiff
04/29/2021		Objection to Five Post-Judgment Motions for Contempt- Plaintiff
04/29/2021		Response to Objection to Amended Final Judgment & Divorce Decree- Plaintiff
04/30/2021		Motion to Shorten and Continue Hearing Scheduled 04.29.2021 – Respondent
04/30/2021		Proposed Order DENIED Re: Motion to Shorten and Continue Hearing (No Cert)

04/30/2021	Motion to Continue Hearing for Contempt & Set Aside Judgment
04/30/2021	WF Proposed order on Motn to Continue - Email Only; no Cert
04/30/2021	Motion to Shorten Time for Motion to Continue Hearing
04/30/2021	WF Proposed Order of Motion to Shorten Time for Motion to Continue
04/30/2021	WF Prpsd Order to Shorten Time for Motions for Contempt & to Set Aside Jdgmnt - Email Only; no Cert
04/30/2021	Memorandum & Affidavit in Support of Objection to Proposed Order for Attorney Fees
04/30/2021	WF Proposed Order for Hearing for Motion for Contempt & to Set Aside- Email Only; no Cert
04/30/2021	Motion to Shorten for Objection for Memorandum & Affidavit of Fees & Costs
04/30/2021	WF Proposed Order of Motion to Shorten for Objection for Mem & Aff of Fees & Costs-Email; no cert
04/30/2021	Objection to 2nd Memorandum & Affidavit of Attorney & Paralegal Fees
04/30/2021	Motion to Shorten Time for Motions for Contempt & Set Aside Judgment
05/03/2021	Supreme Court Order Dismissing Appeal SC#48757-2021
05/05/2021	Proposed- Notice of Hearing
05/06/2021	Petitioner's Verfied Motion for Parenting Coordinator
05/07/2021	Motion to Shorten Time - Petitioner's
05/10/2021	Order Shortening Time w/Zoom Hearing Info 5/20/2021 11:30 am no mp no cert

05/10/2021		Order Denying Second Request for Attorney and Paralegal Fees and Costs nomp/nocert
05/10/2021		Order Denying Respondent's First Post-Judgment Motion for Contempt Nomp/nocert
05/14/2021		WF Motion to Clarify Judgment – Respondent
05/14/2021		WF Motion to Clarify Protection Order – Respondent
05/14/2021		Proposed Order for Motion to Clarify Judgment No MP No Cert **Hold for Hearing**
05/14/2021		Proposed Order for Motion to Clarify Protection Order No MP No Cert **Hold for Hearing**
05/14/2021		Motion to Shorten Time for Motions to Clarify – Respondent
05/14/2021		Proposed Notice of Hearing Motion to Clarify – Respondent
05/14/2021		Affidavit in Support of Motion to Clarify Judgment and Protection Order – Respondent
05/14/2021		WF Notice of Appeal to Supreme Court 4-7-2021 Judgment
05/14/2021		WF Notice of Appeal to SC 3-9-2021 Judgment
05/17/2021		Motion to Withdraw - Petitioner's
05/17/2021		Affidavit in Support of Motion for Leave to Withdraw - Petitioner's
05/17/2021		Motion to Shorten Time - Petitioner's
05/17/2021		Proposed Order Granting Leave to Withdraw *Hold for Hearing* mp no cert
05/17/2021	05/18/2021	Order Shortening Time
05/17/2021	05/18/2021	Denied Order for Motion to Shorten Time Respondent

05/19/2021	WF Amended Order to Shorten Time
05/25/2021	Supreme Court Order Conditionally Dismissing Appeal
05/25/2021	Record Request – MA
05/25/2021	Order Granting Leave to Withdraw as Attorney of Record
05/25/2021	Order Denying Respondent's Motions and Reserving Judgment on Petitioner's Motion
05/25/2021	Notice of Remote Hearing
06/04/2021	WF Notice of Appearance - Jennifer Pro Se
06/04/2021	Response to Resp Motion to Clarify the Final Judgment
06/11/2021	Motion for Parenting Coordinator – Jennifer
06/11/2021	Notice of Hearing - 07.01.2021 - Petitioner's Motion for Parenting Coordinator
06/15/2021	Notice of Remote Hearing
06/15/2021	Supreme Court Document Filed-Misc
06/21/2021	wf Letter Recieved-Child Advocacy Service of The Treasure Valley
06/22/2021	Letter - Child Advocacy Services
06/23/2021	WF Notice of Appearance - B. O'Neil for Jennifer
06/25/2021	Objection and Affidavit to Proposed Parenting Coordinator
06/25/2021	Motion and Aff for permissive appeal
06/25/2021	Motion shorten coord
06/25/2021	Proposed Order for Permissive Appeal NO MP, NO CERT PD **hold for hearing**
06/25/2021	Objection to all motions
06/25/2021	Proposed Notice of hearing for obj tara permissive coord

06/28/2021	DENIED - Proposed Order for Hearing for short objection NO MP, NO CERT PD
06/30/2021	WF SEC -Petitioner's Response to Objection and Affidavit to Proposed Parenting Coordinator
07/01/2021	WF SEC - Respondent's Affidavit and objection on opposing party dishonest claims
07/01/2021	Notice of Hearing 7/22/21
07/07/2021	Notice of Remote Hearing
07/09/2021	Order Appointing Parenting Coordinator – Petitioner
07/12/2021	Records Request – CK
07/16/2021	Objection to Notice of Hearing on 7/22
07/23/2021	Proposed order for mot to tara bosnia cas NO MP, NO CERT PD
07/23/2021	Proposed Notice of hearing for mot to tara cas bosnia
07/23/2021	Motion shorten tara bosnia cas
07/23/2021	Motion and Affidavit for tara bosnia coord writing
07/23/2021	Objection on Appointment of Parenting Coordinator-Respondent
07/27/2021	Order Denying Respondent's Motion for Permissive Appeal no mp no cert
07/28/2021	DENIED - Proposed order on Motion to short tara bosnia cas NO MP, NO CERT PD
07/28/2021	Mtn to Shorten Time to allow travel
07/28/2021	Proposed Order to Allow Travel Hold for Hearing
07/28/2021	Proposed Notice of hearing
07/29/2021	Notice of Remote Hearing 8.5.21
08/04/2021	Received Email from SC Re: Order Denying

08/04/2021		Supreme Court Order Denying Motion to Stay and Continue Appeal #48816-2021
08/05/2021		Notice of Deprivation and Trespass Upon Rights CF.18 USC Section 242-Respondent
08/05/2021		Notice of Motion Trespass Upon Rights Are Committed Inside This Court-Respondent
08/05/2021		Notice to Court Objection Trespass Upon Rights-Respondent
08/06/2021	08/09/2021	Order Appointing Parenting Coordinator Amended
08/09/2021		Order Appointing Parenting Coordinator-Amended
08/13/2021		Motion & Affidavit Objecting to Order Appointing Parenting Coordinator
08/16/2021		Motion to Shorten Time on Motion & Affidavit Objecting to Order Appointing Parenting Coordinator
08/16/2021		WF Proposed Order for Motion Objecting to Appointment of Parenting Coordinator NO CERT
08/16/2021		Proposed Other Document Requiring Court Signature Notice of Hearing
08/16/2021		Order Setting Case
08/16/2021		Proposed Order Denied Order to Shorten Time
08/18/2021		Objection to Motion and Affidavit Objecting to Prop Order Appoint Parent Coordinator, etc-Petitioner
08/23/2021		Status Report - Parenting Coordination Compliance Report
08/24/2021		Motion to Allow Travel with Children **Hold for Hearing**
08/24/2021		Declaration in Support of Motion to Travel
08/24/2021		Motion to Shorten Time

08/24/2021	Affidavit in Support of Motion to Shorten Time
08/25/2021	Order to Shorten Time
08/25/2021	Notice of Remote Hearing 8.26.21
08/26/2021	Notice to Court Change of Venue – Respondent
08/26/2021	Motion to Shorten Time – Respondent
08/26/2021	Petition for Non-Statutory Writ of Habeas Corpus – Respondent
08/26/2021	Notice of Motion Objection Demand Dismissal of All Motions – Respondent
08/26/2021	Affidavit of Conflict of Interest – Respondent
08/26/2021	Notice to Court Demanding a Trial by Jury – Respondent
08/26/2021	Objection to Motion to Allow Travel – Respondent
08/26/2021	Motion & Affidavit for Contempt – Respondent
08/26/2021	Notice of Remote Hearing 9.03.21
08/26/2021	Proposed Order Denied to Shorten Time
08/26/2021	Notice of Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice
08/26/2021	Notice of Appeal of Order for Parenting Coordinator
08/27/2021	Motion to Shorten Time - Respondent's
08/27/2021	Transcript Request – CG
08/27/2021	Proposed Order to Shorten Time Denied
08/27/2021	Order for Referral to Administrative Judge for a Declaration of Vexatious Litigant
08/27/2021	Notice of Estimate of Transcript Cost
08/31/2021	Received Receipt re; estimate
08/31/2021	Motion to Shorten Time – Resp

08/31/2021		Motion and Affidavit to Restart Visits - Respondent **Hold for Hearing**
09/01/2021		Declaration Re:Parenting Coordinator-Petitioner
09/02/2021		Motion and Affidavit for Contempt 1
09/02/2021		WF Proposed Order for Contempt no cert
09/02/2021		Notice of Objection and Demand for Clarification of Evidence
09/02/2021		Notice of Motion Demanding Response
09/02/2021		Notice of Demand for Dismissal
09/02/2021		Motion and Affidavit for Contempt 2
09/02/2021		Affidavit in Objection to Petitioner's Declaration
09/02/2021		Proposed Order Denied to Shorten Time – Respondent
09/03/2021		Order Denying Objection to Parenting Coordinator – Petitioner
09/05/2021		Affidavit to Support Objection to Appointment of Parenting Coordinator – Respondent
09/05/2021		Objection to Referral to Admin Judge – Respondent
09/05/2021		WF Proposed Notice of Hearing
09/13/2021		Order on Request for Hearing
09/14/2021		Supreme Court Order Denying Motion for Appeal by Permission SC #49044-2021
09/30/2021	09/29/2021	Affidavit in Objection to Courts Denial of Hearing and Demand of Written Response - Respondent's
10/06/2021		Supreme Court Document - Order Re: Affidavit with Notice of Appeal and Objection to Denied Permissiv
10/13/2021	10/14/2021	Notice of Remote Hearing

10/14/2021		Order Order Re: Affidavit in Objection and Order of Review
10/21/2021		Motion & Affidavit for Contempt
10/21/2021		Motion to Shorten Time
10/22/2021		Response RE Review of Parenting Coordinator
10/26/2021		Affidavit in Objection to Response to Review for Parenting Coordinator
10/26/2021		Affidavit on Grievance Against Mr Sullival with Judiciary Board and Bar
10/27/2021		Affidavit on bar grievance against Mr Sullivan for child abuse and mental torture
10/27/2021		Order to Shorten Time DENIED
11/02/2021		NOH - 1st Motn of Contempt 11/18/21 – Respondent
11/03/2021	10/27/2021	Affidavit of Status – Respondent
11/03/2021	10/27/2021	Notice of Claim – Respondent
11/03/2021	10/27/2021	Petition to Appellate Court for Writ Of Mandamus – Respondent
11/05/2021		Notice of Remote Hearing
11/11/2021	11/08/2021	Motion to Shorten Time - Respondent's
11/11/2021		WF Proposed - Notice of Hearing on Motions - Respondent's
11/11/2021		WF Proposed Order for Compensation no cert
11/11/2021	11/08/2021	Motion and Affidavit for Sanctions – Respondent's
11/11/2021	11/08/2021	Notice of Special Appearance – Respondent's
11/11/2021	11/08/2021	Motion & Affidavit to Clarify the Amended Final Judgment - Respondent's

11/12/2021		Motion and Affidavit for Contempt – Respondent
11/15/2021		Proposed Order DENIED Shortening Time
11/15/2021		Objection and Affidavit RE Rescheduling Hearing – Respondent
11/16/2021		Motion to Vacate and Reset Hearing – Petitioner
11/16/2021		Affidavit ISO Motion to Vacate and Reset Hearing
11/16/2021		Affidavit ISO Motion to Vacate and Reset Hearing
11/16/2021		Zoom Supplemental J. Sullivan
11/16/2021		Order Vacating and Resetting Hearing no cert
11/16/2021		Notice of Hearing - Respondent's 2nd Motion for Contempt
11/18/2021		Motion to Shorten Time
11/18/2021		Affidavit about Court's Mistake to Schedule Hearing
11/18/2021	11/19/2021	WF Proposed Order DENIED to Shorten Time no cert
11/18/2021		Notice of Hearing - Amended - Urgnt Motn to Restart, 2nd Motn for Contempt, Motn for Sanctions
11/18/2021		Motion & Affidavit for Contempt - Amended – Respondent
11/19/2021		Not Guilty Plea & Request for Trial – Petitioner
11/22/2021		Affidavit with Objection to Writ of Plea, Challenging Personal Jurisdiction and Notice of Claim
11/22/2021		Affidavit in Support of 1st & 2nd Motions for Contempt Describing Indicators of Parental Alienation

11/23/2021	Objection to Motn & Affidavit to Clarify the Amended Final Judgment from 4-7-2021 RE: Holidays, ETC.
11/24/2021	Notice of Remote Hearing 11.29.21
11/24/2021	Order Setting Case and Scheduling Order
11/26/2021	Notice of Motion/Objection/Demand/ Dismissal-Respondent's
11/26/2021	Affidavit in Verification of Earlier Affidavits - Respondent's
11/26/2021	Affidavit Rebutting Opposing Party Objection - Respondent's
11/29/2021	Notice of Appearance of Non Bar Counsel
11/29/2021	Affidavit RE Rebutting Opposing Party Objection – Amended
11/29/2021	Motion and Affidavit RE Vaccine
11/29/2021	Motion to Shorten Time
11/29/2021	WF Proposed Order to Shorten Time no cert
12/01/2021	Order on Motion to Clarify Judgment
12/03/2021	Order on Motion to Shorten Time to Hear Motion & Affidavit RE: Vaccine