

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK

-----X

MARCO BATTISTOTTI,

Plaintiff,

Index No. 101147/2024

- against -

SUZANNE AARONSON

**AFFIDAVIT OF DOMESTICATION**

Defendant.

-----X

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

**PERSONAL INFORMATION:**

I, Marco Battistotti, Plaintiff, being duly sworn, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am an adult person, and my address is 244 Fifth Avenue, B256, New York, N.Y. 10001, and I am the Plaintiff in this case.

**ORIGINAL ORDERS:**

2. I affirm that the Stamford Family Court in the State of Connecticut issued the following orders:
  - a. September 7, 2016 (original order #243.00) is a true and corrected certified copy of the original order attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
  - b. November 18, 2016 (#255.00 is a corrected version of #243.00) is a true and correct certified copy of the original order is attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

- c. May 19, 2017 (psychological evaluation order #274.01) is a true and correct certified copy of the original order attached hereto as Exhibit 3.
- d. October 15, 2018 (individual therapy and temporary order for visitations #424.00) is a true and correct certified copy of the original order attached hereto as Exhibit 4.
- e. June 21, 2019 (modification of child support #467.00) is a true and correct certified copy of the original order attached as Exhibit 5.
- f. June 24, 2019 (sleepovers in Greenwich #458.01 amending #255.00 and amending #424.00) is a true and correct certified copy of the original order attached hereto as Exhibit 6.
- g. July 19, 2019 (order of child support #470.00) is a true and correct certified copy of the original order attached hereto as Exhibit 7.
- h. August 19, 2019 (sleepovers in New York City amending #458.01) is a true and correct certified copy of the original bench order attached hereto as Exhibit 8.
- i. November 1, 2023 (Case dismissed #499.02) is a true and correct certified copy of the original order is attached hereto as Exhibit 10.

**MODIFICATION STATUS:**

- 3. I declared that the aforementioned orders (#243.00, 255.00, 424.00, 458.01) have been partially amended with the bench ruling (Exhibit 8) and remain in full effect.

4. I declared that the aforementioned orders (#274.01, 424.00, 458.01, 470.00, and 499.02) have been amended with the bench ruling (Exhibit 8) that remain in full effect.
5. I declare that the aforementioned orders (Exhibits 8 and 10) have not been modified <sup>(1)</sup>, vacated, or set aside by any court. They remain in full force and effect as of the date of this affidavit.

### **JURISDICTION:**

6. I confirm that the Supreme Court of the State of New York, county of New York, has jurisdiction over this matter and that the original orders are enforceable in this jurisdiction.

### **AFFIRMATION OF VALIDITY:**

7. I affirm that all the conditions outlined in the orders/bench ruling and transcripts continue to be valid and that I am in compliance with the terms set forth therein.

---

(1) Further and erroneously replaced by a Spanish order (Exhibit 9 *Id.* at “Verdict”) that was prematurely issued BEFORE the Connecticut Family Court relinquished jurisdiction by dismissing the entire case (Exhibit 10), which couldn’t be modified even if proper procedure was followed as two more amendments (Exhibits 7 and 8) were issued by the Connecticut court BEFORE the Spanish ruling (Exhibit 9), and NOT specifically mentioned in the Spanish ruling, therefore partially null and void because of a procedural defect (ruled before Connecticut relinquished jurisdiction, and not referring to latest order as per Exhibit #8). In short, visitations on #243.00 and #255.00 (Exhibits 1 and 2) were amended by Exhibit 8 and remain in full effect. Only paragraphs 1a., 5, and 8a. of Exhibit 2 could have been modified by the Spanish Court IF they had moved AFTER the Connecticut Order was issued, but NOT before. Full faith and credit cannot be given to the Spanish order.

For further clarification, Plaintiff provides a full case summary of the pertinent Connecticut docket as Exhibit 11.

**NOTE:** The Guardian ad Litem resigned in 2017 but did not withdraw appearance.

Further Affiant Sayeth Not.

New York, N.Y.

Date: September 25, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

By \_\_\_\_\_  
**Marco Battistotti,**  
(Plaintiff pro-se)  
244 Fifth Avenue, B256  
New York, NY 10001  
(212) 777.7304  
(917) 930.6200  
[marco@justmarco.com](mailto:marco@justmarco.com)

TO:  
**Suzanne Aaronson,**  
in care of Attorney Rosa Pederà  
Carrer de Josep Anselm Clave' 8  
07002 Palma, Illes Balears, Spain

## INDEX OF EXHIBITS

<b>09/07/2016</b>	<b>Judge Tindill's Original Order #243.00 .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>11/18/2016</b>	<b>Judge Tindill's Corrected Original Order #255.00 .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>05/19/2017</b>	<b>Judge Tindill's Order for Psychological Eval #274.01 .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>10/15/2018</b>	<b>Judge Tindill Temporary Order for Visitation and Individual Therapy #424.00 .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>06/21/2019</b>	<b>Judge Truglia's Modification of Child Support #467.00 .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>06/24/ 2019</b>	<b>Judge Truglia's Order for Visitation #458.01 .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>07/19/2019</b>	<b>Judge Truglia's Order of Child Support #470.00 .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>08/19/2019</b>	<b>Judge Truglia's Amended Order for Visitations .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>07/12/2022</b>	<b>Spanish Order .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>11/01/2023</b>	<b>Judge Heller's Order Dismissing the Case #499.02 .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>09/20/2024</b>	<b>Printout of Case Summary with all entries .....</b>	<b>11</b>

# EXHIBIT “1”

FA14-4027535

MARCO BATTISTOTTI

VS.

SUZANNE AARONSON

SUPERIOR COURT  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF STAMFORD/NORWALK

2016 SEP -7 P At STAMFORD

SEPTEMBER 7, 2016

**MEMORANDUM OF DECISION**

This is a custody action instituted by the Plaintiff on June 11, 2014. The Defendant was served on June 19, 2014 at her usual place of abode. The Court has jurisdiction to enter orders in this action. The Plaintiff and Defendant are living apart. The Plaintiff is the father and the Defendant is the mother of Leornard Michael Aaronson, born June 11, 2014; acknowledgement of paternity was executed and signed in court on May 14, 2015. Neither party nor the minor child has been the recipient of state or municipal assistance. Trial took place over the course of ten days between May 2015 and May 2016 (May 13, May 14, May 15, June 17, June 19, December 10, December 11, and December 17, 2015, and May 4 and May 10, 2016). The Plaintiff was *pro se* throughout the trial<sup>1</sup>; the Defendant was represented by counsel. The minor child's court-appointed guardian *ad litem*<sup>2</sup> was present for each day of the trial and testified regarding her ward's best interests. A total of sixty-six exhibits were introduced – fifty-seven by the parties and nine by the Court. In addition to the guardian *ad litem*, a witness and both parties testified. The Court took judicial notice of relevant portions of the court file.

SUPERIOR COURT  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF  
STAMFORD/NORWALK

SEP 23 2024

<sup>1</sup>The Plaintiff was represented by Schoonmaker, George and Blomberg, SEAL OFFICER instituted the instant action. On December 1, 2014, the Plaintiff filed an appearance in addition to the Schoonmaker firm. On February 27, 2015, he filed a *pro se* appearance in lieu of his counsel pursuant to a stipulation resolved by the Clerk. See #157, #157.01, and #162.

<sup>2</sup>Attorney Jacquelyn Conlon, of Conlon & McGlynn, LLC, was appointed by agreement of the parties on September 22, 2014. See #135

243.00

The Court has carefully considered all of the testimony, thoroughly reviewed each piece of evidence, and taken into account the argument of the Plaintiff and counsel for the Defendant. The Court has also reviewed and considered relevant case law, rules, and statutory provisions, including the criteria contained in C.G.S. §§ 46b-56, 46b-56a, 46b-56b, 46b-56c, and 46b-56d, and was guided by the best interests of the child based on the credible evidence before it to make its orders and findings.

### **FINDINGS**

1. It is in the minor child's best interest to have a healthy relationship with both the Plaintiff father and the Defendant mother.
- 2a. The Defendant mother has rebutted the presumption of joint legal custody of C.G.S. §46b-56a by a preponderance of the evidence.
- b. Joint legal custody is not in the minor child's best interests as the parties have, since his birth, consistently demonstrated an inability and unwillingness to effectively co-parent.
- c. The high level of conflict and mistrust between the parents and sheer volume and frequency of charges, allegations, and complaints by both parents to various local, state, and federal authorities has the potential to do irreparable harm to the minor child.
3. At the time trial in the instant matter concluded, the minor child was 23-months-old. His temperament and developmental needs as a toddler are such that it is in his best interests to live with his mother and spend significant, quality time with his father.
4. The Defendant mother, more so than the Plaintiff father, demonstrates the capacity and disposition to understand and meet the needs of the minor child. For example, the Defendant hired a registered nurse to assist her in caring for her newborn son. Further, in spite of her failed romantic relationship with the Plaintiff, the Defendant made repeated attempts to provide the Plaintiff with appropriate parenting time. The Plaintiff, on the other hand, has exhibited a considerable lack of knowledge and understanding of the needs of his son as a newborn, infant, and toddler. While his parenting skills improved with supervision, the evidence reveals his singular focus on what he perceives to be the failings of the Defendant that appears to diminish his capacity for recognizing and prioritizing the developmental needs of his son. See Plaintiff's Exhibits 2, 8, 16, 22, 31, 32, and 33; see Defendant's Exhibits A, F, R, S, and T.
5. The minor child cannot articulate an informed preference for a custody arrangement and parenting schedule at his age. There is no evidence that he should not spend time with the Plaintiff father.

6. The Plaintiff father seeks joint legal and shared physical custody; the Defendant mother proposes sole legal custody with a parenting schedule for Plaintiff. The Plaintiff proposes certain restrictions regarding transportation and location of the Plaintiff's parenting time that she believes are essential to address the child's safety.

7a. The child has bonded significantly with the Defendant mother and his maternal grandparents; he has no siblings.

b. The Plaintiff father has endeavored to establish a bond and healthy relationship with his son. Their relationship continues to improve as the Plaintiff exercises more visitation and the child grows. The Plaintiff's efforts have been hindered for several reasons: his poor relationship with the child's maternal grandparents and caretakers hired by the Defendant, his arrest on August 22, 2014 for Disorderly Conduct which prohibited contact with his infant son for nearly four months, the vitriolic relationship the parties have cultivated, and his own failure to take advantage of parenting time offered by the Defendant or facilitated by the guardian *ad litem*.

8a. The Defendant mother is the parent most willing and able to facilitate and encourage a healthy relationship between the Plaintiff and the child. See Plaintiff's Exhibits 2, 5, 6, and 14; see Defendant's Exhibits R, S, and T.

b. Both parents demonstrate a respect for court orders.

9. The Plaintiff engages in manipulation and coercive behavior in an effort to involve the child in the parents' dispute. See Plaintiff's Exhibits 24, 31, 32, and 33; see Defendant's Exhibits F, Q, and R. The Defendant too has engaged in behavior that indirectly affects the child by jeopardizing the Plaintiff's immigration status and legal relationships. See, for example, Plaintiff's Exhibits 3 and 7; Defendant's Exhibit N.

10a. Both parents have the ability to be actively involved in the life of the child.

b. The Plaintiff father's ability to be actively involved in person could be affected at some point in the future by the result of immigration proceedings currently pending regarding his status in the United States.

11. The child has adjusted well to his home, daycare, and community environments.

12a. The child has lived in a stable and nurturing environment with the Defendant mother and his maternal grandparents since his birth. It is in his best interests to maintain continuity in that environment.

b. Both parents currently offer stable home environments. The Plaintiff rented and renovated an apartment in proximity to the Defendant's and child's residence to be able to spend time with him. The stability of the Plaintiff's Greenwich, Connecticut apartment, however, could be impacted in the future by the result of the Plaintiff's immigration proceedings.

13a. Both parents appear to be in good physical health. The Plaintiff offered testimony about some significant health issues which required treatment and surgery prior to the child's birth. There is no evidence of a physical disability of either parent<sup>3</sup>.

b. There is no evidence of mental disability of either parent. The Court denied the Plaintiff's *pendente lite* motion (#165)<sup>4</sup> for a psychological evaluation of the Defendant.

14. The minor child is the son of an American mother and an Italian father. He has been exposed to the Latino culture and language by a caretaker hired by the Defendant.

15. There has been an impact on the child as a result of the Plaintiff's arrest for a family violence crime (as defined by C.G.S. §53a-182) in that he did not have contact with his father for a significant amount of time. This negatively affected the child and Plaintiff's ability to bond during a formative period in the child's infancy.

16. The minor child has not been abused or neglected, as defined respectively in C.G.S. §46b-120 (6) and (7).

17. Neither party, as of May 10, 2016, had participated in the parenting education program. The six-hour program currently required C.G.S. §46b-69b is insufficient to address the co-parenting needs of the parties with respect to the child.

18. It is more likely than not that the parents would have provided support to the child for higher education or private occupational school.

19. The Plaintiff has a minimum net annual earning capacity of \$174,356.00.

20. The Defendant has met her burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that the Plaintiff has violated a clear court order regarding payment of unreimbursed, uninsured medical expenses. The Defendant is found to be in willful contempt.

21. Both the hourly fee charged and amount of time spent on behalf of the minor child by Attorney Jacquelyn Conlon, guardian *ad litem* from January 1 through April 30, 2016 are reasonable.

<sup>3</sup>The Defendant did not litigate her *pendente lite* motion (#125) for drug and alcohol testing of the Plaintiff.

<sup>4</sup>The Plaintiff filed three separate *pendente lite* motions for a psychological evaluation of the Defendant; one filed at the inception of the instant action when he was represented by counsel (#118), and two *pro se* filings (#152 and #165). The first two such motions were not litigated.

### TRIAL ORDERS

- 1a. **Custody.** The Defendant mother shall have sole legal custody of the minor child.
- b. Primary physical custody of the children shall be with the Plaintiff mother. The Plaintiff mother shall have final decision-making authority over educational, medical, and religious matters concerning the child.
- 2a. **Parenting.** The Plaintiff father shall have *no less than* (in other words, a minimum of 18 hours per week) the following parenting time, beginning September 12, 2016:
- **Week 1** (week of September 12, 2016): – Monday and Wednesday - 3:45pm to 6:00pm; Saturday – 9:00am to 6:00pm; Sunday – 9:00am to 12:30pm
  - **Week 2:** Monday and Wednesday - 3:45pm to 6:00pm
  - **Holidays/Special Occasions** (Easter, Thanksgiving, Christmas, the child's birthday, and the Plaintiff's birthday): 9:00am to 12:30pm in even-numbered years; 2:30 to 6:00pm in odd-numbered years. The holiday/special occasion parenting time supersedes the Plaintiff's regular parenting time.
  - Other days/times for the Plaintiff's parenting time must be by written (electronic mail or text communication will suffice) mutual agreement of the parties.
- b. The Plaintiff's parenting time shall occur in Greenwich, Connecticut. The Plaintiff shall not remove the child from Greenwich nor the state of Connecticut.
- c. The Plaintiff shall not drive the minor child anywhere, for any reason, without a valid driver's license from Connecticut or another state and an order of the Court. The Plaintiff shall give the Defendant 24-hour advance written (electronic mail or text communication will suffice) notice of his intention to transport the child in any moving vehicle, public or private, within Greenwich, Connecticut. Said advance written notice shall include confirmation that the vehicle is properly licensed, registered, and insured.
- d. The Defendant or her designee shall transport the child to and from the Plaintiff's apartment at 30 Lincoln Avenue, Greenwich, CT. The Defendant shall be 100% responsible for all costs associated with transportation of the child to and from the Plaintiff's Greenwich residence for his parenting time.
- 3a. **Guardian ad litem.** Attorney Jacquelyn Conlon shall continue to serve as guardian *ad litem* for the minor child until further order of the Court.
- b. The parties shall work to resolve any dispute or conflict regarding the minor child by mediation first with the guardian *ad litem*, Attorney Jacquelyn Conlon, prior to filing a motion with the Court. The cost and fees associated with mediation of disputes with the guardian *ad litem* shall be split equally by the parents. In the event that a motion is filed and litigated after unsuccessful resolution of the dispute or issue regarding the minor child, the party who prevails in court shall be reimbursed his/her 50% for the guardian *ad litem* fees.
- c. Fees and costs for the guardian *ad litem*'s services, if any, pursuant to #3b above and #4b below are to be submitted on a monthly basis by affidavit to the Court and the parties.

d. The guardian *ad litem*'s motion for fees (#164) is granted. The parties shall pay the \$49,617.40 in outstanding guardian *ad litem* fees as follows: \$45,890.95 by the Plaintiff, \$3,726.45 by the Defendant. Said fees shall either be paid in full by each party in their respective amounts no later than October 14, 2016 or the parties shall have a written, agreed upon installment plan with Conlon McGlynn, LLC for full payment no later than October 14, 2016. Any additional fees owed for services between December 8, 2014 and January 1, 2016 may be placed on a short calendar docket for a hearing at the request of the guardian *ad litem*.

4a. **Co-parenting counselor/coordinator.** In lieu of the parenting education course required by C.G.S. §46b-69b, the parties are ordered to work with a co-parenting counselor/coordinator selected by the guardian *ad litem* for a minimum of six months.

b. The guardian *ad litem* shall offer the parties no less than three options for said co-parenting counselor/coordinator in writing no later than October 1, 2016. The options presented for the co-parenting counselor/coordinator shall be based on the guardian's own independent research and work on behalf of her ward in the instant case since her appointment. The parties shall notify the guardian *ad litem*, in writing, no later than one week from receipt of the options of their choice of the co-parenting counselor/coordinators options. In the event the parties do not agree on one of the co-parenting counselor/coordinator options, or do not agree in writing within one week (without good cause as determined by the guardian *ad litem*), the guardian *ad litem* shall select and notify the co-parenting counselor/coordinator of her choice.

c. The parties shall schedule their first appointment/session with the co-parenting counselor/coordinator within one week of their notification of the selection.

d. The topics of counseling/coordination of the co-parenting sessions shall include, but not be limited to, effective communication between parents living apart, information on the developmental stages of children, adjustment of children to parental separation, dispute resolution and conflict management, guidelines for visitation, stress reduction in children and cooperative parenting. Length and frequency of the co-parenting sessions with the parties shall be determined by counselor/coordinator.

e. Fees for co-parenting sessions shall be paid for equally (50/50) by the parties.

5. **Notice of issues concerning the child.** The parties shall continue to inform the each other of the child's progress and activities each week via electronic mail. Such weekly communications shall focus on the child's activities, care, developmental milestones, education, and medical need/concerns. The Defendant mother shall include in her weekly communications, as well as in co-parenting sessions with the counselor/coordinator pursuant to #4(inclusive) above, information and decisions (if any) related to the child's care, education, medical needs/concerns, and religious issues.

6a. **Child Support.** In accordance with the Connecticut Child Support Guidelines (Court Exhibit A, attached), the Plaintiff father is ordered to pay \$253.00/week as child support to the Defendant mother beginning September 12, 2016. Said support shall be paid by wire transfer from the Plaintiff's account to the Defendant's, the same manner in which *pendente lite* child support was paid.

b. The Plaintiff is ordered to pay 49% of any work-related child care and 49% unreimbursed/uninsured medical, dental, therapeutic, optical, medical device, pharmaceutical, surgical, psychological, psychiatric, and orthodontic expenses; the Defendant is ordered to pay 51% of said expenses. The percentage allocation is in accordance with the Connecticut Child Support Guidelines.

c. The Defendant's motions for contempt (#159 filed *pro se* on December 14, 2014 and #177 filed by counsel for the Defendant on March 20, 2015) are granted. The Plaintiff shall pay the Defendant \$849.48 no later than November 30, 2016.

d. Counsel for the Defendant shall submit to the Court and provide to the Plaintiff a calculation and accounting, along with documentation, of the child support arrearage claimed from June 11, 2014 by September 30, 2016.

7. **Educational Support.** Pursuant to C.G.S. §46b-56c(b)(1) the Court shall retain jurisdiction over the entry of any educational support orders upon the filing of a motion or petition by either parent.

8a. **Health Insurance.** The Defendant mother shall continue to provide and maintain health insurance for the minor child.

b. The provisions of C.G. S. §46b-84(e) are hereby incorporated by reference.

9. The parties and guardian *ad litem* shall report to the Court on August 31, 2017 regarding 1) whether the parenting plan ordered herein remains in the minor child's best interests, 2) the status of any pending immigration proceedings against the Plaintiff, 3) whether the Plaintiff has secured a valid U.S. driver's license, 3) co-parenting counseling/coordination sessions.

So Ordered,

  
Tindill, J

Decision made in  
accordance with the  
finding. Attorney's &  
Rec'd. Party with appearance  
on file and GAL notification  
9/8/16. H. M. Assis  
Assistant Clerk  
9/8/16.

7

# EXHIBIT “2”

FA14-4027535

MARCO BATTISTOTTI

VS.

SUZANNE AARONSON

SUPERIOR COURT  
STAMFORD-NORWALK  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT

2016 NOV 18 A 10:16

SUPERIOR COURT

J.D OF STAMFORD/NORWALK

AT STAMFORD

NOVEMBER 18, 2016

**CORRECTED<sup>1</sup> MEMORANDUM OF DECISION**

This is a custody action instituted by the Plaintiff on June 11, 2014. The Defendant was served on June 19, 2014 at her usual place of abode. The Court has jurisdiction to enter orders in this action. The Plaintiff and Defendant are living apart. The Plaintiff is the father and the Defendant is the mother of Leonard Michael Aaronson, born June 11, 2014; acknowledgement of paternity was executed and signed in court on May 14, 2015. Neither party nor the minor child has been the recipient of state or municipal assistance. Trial took place over the course of ten days between May 2015 and May 2016 (May 13, May 14, May 15, June 17, June 19, December 10, December 11, and December 17, 2015, and May 4 and May 10, 2016). The Plaintiff was *pro se* throughout the trial<sup>2</sup>; the Defendant was represented by counsel. The minor child's court-appointed guardian *ad litem*<sup>3</sup> was present for each day of the trial and testified regarding her ward's best interests. A total of sixty-six exhibits were introduced – fifty-seven by the parties and nine by the Court. In addition to the guardian *ad litem*, a witness and both parties testified. The Court took judicial notice of relevant portions of the court file.

<sup>1</sup>Inadvertent references to Plaintiff instead of Defendant and vice versa, the minor child referred to in the plural, omitted findings, and various grammatical and calculation errors are corrected herein. The Court also included a mechanism for the Plaintiff father's payment of unreimbursed medical expenses and work-related child care, corrected the order regarding the Defendant's motions for contempt, and vacated the Court's international support order pursuant to C.G.S. §46b-56c.

<sup>2</sup>The Plaintiff was represented by Schoonmaker, George and Blomberg, a law firm who instituted the instant action. On December 1, 2014, the Plaintiff filed an appearance in addition to the Schoonmaker firm. On February 27, 2015, he filed a *pro se* appearance in lieu of his counsel pursuant to a stipulation resolving a motion to withdraw. See #157, #157.01, and #162.

<sup>3</sup>Attorney Jacquelyn Conlon, of Conlon & McGlynn, LLC, was appointed by agreement of the parties on September 22, 2014. See #135.

1

255.00

SUPERIOR COURT  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF  
STAMFORD-NORWALK  
SEP 23 2024  
CERTIFIED COPY  
SEAL AFFIXED  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_ CLERK

The Court has carefully considered all of the testimony, thoroughly reviewed each piece of evidence, and has taken into account the argument of the Plaintiff and counsel for the Defendant. The Court has also reviewed and considered relevant case law, rules, and statutory provisions, including the criteria contained in C.G.S. §§ 46b-56, 46b-56a, 46b-56b, 46b-56c, and 46b-56d, and was guided by the best interests of the child based on the credible evidence in order to make its orders and findings.

### **FINDINGS**

1. It is in the minor child's best interest to have a healthy relationship with both the Plaintiff father and the Defendant mother.
- 2a. The Defendant mother has rebutted the presumption of joint legal custody of C.G.S. §46b-56a by a preponderance of the evidence.
  - b. Joint legal custody is not in the minor child's best interests as the parties have, since his birth, consistently demonstrated an inability and unwillingness to effectively co-parent.
  - c. The high level of conflict and mistrust between the parents and sheer volume and frequency of charges, allegations, and complaints by both parents to various local, state, and federal authorities has the potential to do irreparable harm to the minor child.
3. At the time trial in the instant matter concluded, the minor child was 23-months-old. His temperament and developmental needs as a toddler are such that it is in his best interests to live with his mother and spend significant, quality time with his father.
4. The Defendant mother, more so than the Plaintiff father, demonstrates the capacity and disposition to understand and meet the needs of the minor child. For example, the Defendant hired a registered nurse to assist her in caring for her newborn son. Further, in spite of her failed romantic relationship with the Plaintiff, the Defendant made repeated attempts to provide the Plaintiff with appropriate parenting time. The Plaintiff, on the other hand, has exhibited a considerable lack of knowledge and understanding of the needs of his son as a newborn, infant, and toddler. While his parenting skills improved with supervision, the evidence reveals that his singular focus on what he perceives to be the failings of the Defendant appears to diminish his capacity for recognizing and prioritizing the developmental needs of his son. See Plaintiff's Exhibits 2, 8, 16, 22, 31, 32, and 33; see Defendant's Exhibits A, F, R, S, and T.

5. The minor child cannot articulate an informed preference for a custody arrangement and parenting schedule at his age. There is no evidence that he should not spend time with the Plaintiff father.

6. The Plaintiff father seeks joint legal and shared physical custody; the Defendant mother proposes sole legal custody with a parenting schedule for Plaintiff. The Defendant proposes certain restrictions regarding transportation and location of the Plaintiff's parenting time that she believes are essential to address the child's safety.

7a. The child has bonded significantly with the Defendant mother and his maternal grandparents; he has no siblings.

b. The Plaintiff father has endeavored to establish a bond and healthy relationship with his son. Their relationship continues to improve as the Plaintiff exercises more visitation and the child grows. The Plaintiff's efforts have been hindered for several reasons: his poor relationship with the child's maternal grandparents and caretakers hired by the Defendant, his arrest on August 22, 2014 for Disorderly Conduct which prohibited contact with his infant son for nearly four months, the vitriolic relationship the parties have cultivated, and his own failure to take advantage of parenting time offered by the Defendant or facilitated by the guardian *ad litem*.

8a. The Defendant mother is the parent most willing and able to facilitate and encourage a healthy relationship between the Plaintiff and the child. See Plaintiff's Exhibits 2, 5, 6, and 14; see Defendant's Exhibits R, S, and T.

b. Both parents demonstrate a respect for court orders.

9. The Plaintiff engages in manipulation and coercive behavior in an effort to involve the child in the parents' dispute. See Plaintiff's Exhibits 24, 31, 32, and 33; see Defendant's Exhibits F, Q, and R. The Defendant too has engaged in behavior that indirectly affects the child by jeopardizing the Plaintiff's immigration status and legal relationships. See, for example, Plaintiff's Exhibits 3 and 7; Defendant's Exhibit N.

10a. Both parents have the ability to be actively involved in the life of the child.

b. The Plaintiff father's ability to be actively involved in person could be affected at some point in the future by the result of immigration proceedings currently pending regarding his status in the United States.

11. The child has adjusted well to his home, daycare, and community environments.

12a. The child has lived in a stable and nurturing environment with the Defendant mother and his maternal grandparents since his birth. It is in his best interests to maintain continuity in that environment.

b. Both parents currently offer stable home environments. The Plaintiff rented and renovated an apartment in proximity to the Defendant's and child's residence to be able to spend time with him. The stability of the Plaintiff's Greenwich, Connecticut apartment, however, could be impacted in the future by the result of the Plaintiff's immigration proceedings.

13a. Both parents appear to be in good physical health. The Plaintiff offered testimony about some significant health issues which required treatment and surgery prior to the child's birth. There is no evidence of a physical disability of either parent<sup>4</sup>.

b. There is no evidence of mental disability of either parent. The Court denied the Plaintiff's *pendente lite* motion (#165)<sup>5</sup> for a psychological evaluation of the Defendant.

14. The minor child is the son of an American mother and an Italian father. He has been exposed to the Latino culture and language by a caretaker hired by the Defendant.

15. There has been an impact on the child as a result of the Plaintiff's arrest for a family violence crime (as defined by C.G.S. §53a-182) in that he did not have contact with his father for a significant amount of time. This negatively affected the child and Plaintiff's ability to bond during a formative period in the child's infancy.

16. The minor child has not been abused or neglected, as defined respectively in C.G.S. §46b-120 (6) and (7).

17. Neither party, as of May 10, 2016, had participated in the parenting education program. The six-hour program currently required C.G.S. §46b-69b is insufficient to address the co-parenting needs of the parties with respect to the child.

18. The Court does not have sufficient evidence to make the requisite findings pursuant to C.G.S. §46b-56c regarding an educational support order.

19. The Plaintiff has a minimum net annual earning capacity of \$174,356.00.

20. The Defendant has met her burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that the Plaintiff has violated a clear court order regarding payment of unreimbursed, uninsured medical expenses. The Plaintiff is found to be in willful contempt. The Court finds that the Plaintiff owes the Defendant at total amount of \$27,210.24 in unreimbursed medical expenses and work-related childcare expenses for the period of June 11, 2014 through May 10, 2016.

21. Both the hourly fee charged and amount of time spent on behalf of the minor child by Attorney Jacquelyn Conlon, guardian *ad litem* from January 1 through April 30, 2016 are reasonable.

<sup>4</sup>The Defendant did not litigate her *pendente lite* motion (#125) for drug and alcohol testing of the Plaintiff.

<sup>5</sup>The Plaintiff filed three separate *pendente lite* motions for a psychological evaluation of the Defendant; one filed at the inception of the instant action when he was represented by counsel (#118), and two *pro se* filings (#152 and #165). The first two such motions were not litigated.

### TRIAL ORDERS

1a. **Custody.** The Defendant mother shall have sole legal custody of the minor child.

b. Primary physical custody of the child shall be with the Defendant mother. The Defendant mother shall have final decision-making authority over educational, medical, and religious matters concerning the child.

2a. **Parenting.** The Plaintiff father shall have *no less than* (in other words, a minimum of 17 hours) the following parenting time, beginning September 12, 2016:

- **Week 1** (week of September 12, 2016): – Monday and Wednesday - 3:45pm to 6:00pm; Saturday – 9:00am to 6:00pm; Sunday – 9:00am to 12:30pm
- **Week 2:** Monday and Wednesday - 3:45pm to 6:00pm
- **Holidays/Special Occasions** (Easter, Thanksgiving, Christmas, the child's birthday, and the Plaintiff's birthday): 9:00am to 12:30pm in even-numbered years; 2:30 to 6:00pm in odd-numbered years. The holiday/special occasion parenting time supersedes the Plaintiff's regular parenting time.
- Other days/times for the Plaintiff's parenting time must be by written (electronic mail or text communication will suffice) mutual agreement of the parties.

b. The Plaintiff's parenting time shall occur in Greenwich, Connecticut. The Plaintiff shall not remove the child from Greenwich nor the state of Connecticut.

c. The Plaintiff shall not drive the minor child anywhere, for any reason, without a valid driver's license from Connecticut or another state and an order of the Court. The Plaintiff shall give the Defendant 24-hour advance, written (electronic mail or text communication will suffice) notice of his intention to transport the child in any moving vehicle, public or private, within Greenwich, Connecticut. Said advance, written notice shall include confirmation that the vehicle is properly licensed, registered, and insured.

d. The Defendant or her designee shall transport the child to and from the Plaintiff's apartment at 30 Lincoln Avenue, Greenwich, CT. The Defendant shall be 100% responsible for all costs associated with transportation of the child to and from the Plaintiff's Greenwich residence for his parenting time.

3a. **Guardian *ad litem*.** Attorney Jacquelyn Conlon shall continue to serve as guardian *ad litem* for the minor child until further order of the Court.

b. The parties shall work to resolve any dispute or conflict regarding the minor child by mediation first with the guardian *ad litem* prior to filing a motion with the Court. The cost and fees associated with mediation of disputes with the guardian *ad litem* shall be split equally by the parents. In the event that a motion is filed and litigated after unsuccessful resolution of the dispute or issue regarding the minor child, the party who prevails in court shall be reimbursed his/her 50% for the guardian *ad litem* fees.

c. Fees and costs for the guardian *ad litem*'s services, if any, pursuant to #3b above and #4b below are to be submitted on a monthly basis by affidavit to the Court and the parties.

d. The guardian *ad litem*'s motion for fees (#164) is granted. The parties shall pay the \$49,617.40 in outstanding guardian *ad litem* fees as follows: \$45,890.95 by the Plaintiff, \$3,726.45 by the Defendant. Said fees shall either be paid in full by each party in their respective amounts no later than October 14, 2016 or the parties shall have a written, agreed upon installment plan with Conlon McGlynn, LLC for full payment no later than October 14, 2016. Any additional fees owed for services between December 8, 2014 and January 1, 2016 may be placed on a short calendar docket for a hearing at the request of the guardian *ad litem*.

4a. **Co-parenting counselor/coordinator.** In lieu of the parenting education course required by C.G.S. §46b-69b, the parties are ordered to work with a co-parenting counselor/coordinator selected by the guardian *ad litem* for a minimum of six months.

b. The guardian *ad litem* shall offer the parties no less than three options for said co-parenting counselor/coordinator in writing no later than October 1, 2016. The options presented for the co-parenting counselor/coordinator shall be based on the guardian's own independent research and work on behalf of her ward in the instant case since her appointment. The parties shall notify the guardian *ad litem*, in writing, no later than one week from receipt of the options of their choice of the co-parenting counselor/coordinators options. In the event the parties do not agree on one of the co-parenting counselor/coordinator options, or do not agree in writing within one week (without good cause as determined by the guardian *ad litem*), the guardian *ad litem* shall select and notify the co-parenting counselor/coordinator of her choice.

c. The parties shall schedule their first appointment/session with the co-parenting counselor/coordinator within one week of their notification of the selection.

d. The topics of counseling/coordination of the co-parenting sessions shall include, but not be limited to, effective communication between parents living apart, information on the developmental stages of children, adjustment of children to parental separation, dispute resolution and conflict management, guidelines for visitation, stress reduction in children and cooperative parenting. Length and frequency of the co-parenting sessions with the parties shall be determined by counselor/coordinator.

e. Fees for co-parenting sessions shall be paid for equally (50/50) by the parties.

5. **Notice of issues concerning the child.** The parties shall continue to inform the each other of the child's progress and activities each week via electronic mail. Such weekly communications shall focus on the child's activities, care, developmental milestones, education, and medical need/concerns. The Defendant mother shall include in her weekly communications, as well as in co-parenting sessions with the counselor/coordinator pursuant to #4(a) above, information and decisions (if any) related to the child's care, education, medical needs/concerns, and religious issues.

6a. **Child Support.** In accordance with the Connecticut Child Support Guidelines (Court Exhibit A, attached), the Plaintiff father is ordered to pay \$253.00/week as child support to the Defendant mother beginning September 12, 2016. Said support shall be paid by wire transfer from the Plaintiff's account to the Defendant's, the same manner in which *pendente lite* child support was paid.

b. The Plaintiff is ordered to pay 49% of any work-related child care and 49% unreimbursed/uninsured medical, dental, therapeutic, optical, medical device, pharmaceutical, surgical, psychological, psychiatric, and orthodontic expenses; the Defendant is ordered to pay 51% of said expenses. The percentage allocation is in accordance with the Connecticut Child Support Guidelines. The Defendant shall provide receipts and/or invoices for said expenses to the Plaintiff on a monthly basis via electronic mail. The Plaintiff shall pay his 51% in the same manner as he pays child support (See order #6a above) no later than two weeks from receipt of said receipts and/or invoices.

c. The Defendant's motions for contempt (#159 filed *pro se* on December 14, 2014 and #177 filed by counsel for the Defendant on March 20, 2015) are granted.

(i.) The Defendant's request for attorney's fees for motion #159 is denied. The Defendant requests attorney's fees for motion #177; however, no affidavit of fees incurred for the preparation and prosecution of the motion was submitted. The Court, therefore, declines to make such an award.

(ii.) The Plaintiff shall pay the Defendant \$849.48 no later than November 30, 2016. Said amount represents the Plaintiff's 20% of unreimbursed medical expenses and work-related childcare he owed pursuant to the Court's (*Shay, J.*) July 14, 2014 order through March 20, 2015. The Plaintiff shall pay the remaining \$26,360.76<sup>6</sup> arrearage of unreimbursed medical expenses and work-related childcare he owes the Defendant in three installments of \$8,786.92 each on December 30, 2016, March 3, 2017, and April 28, 2017. Arrearage installment payments shall be by wire transfer to the Defendant's account used to receive child support. See order #6a above.

d. Counsel for the Defendant shall submit to the Court and provide to the Plaintiff a calculation and accounting, along with documentation, of the child support arrearage claimed from June 11, 2014 by September 30, 2016.

**7. Educational Support.** The Court lacks jurisdiction over the entry of an educational support order pursuant to C.G.S. §46b-56c.


**8a. Health Insurance.** The Defendant mother shall continue to provide and maintain health insurance for the minor child.

b. The provisions of C.G. S. §46b-84(e) are hereby incorporated by reference.

9. The parties and guardian *ad litem* shall report to the Court on August 31, 2017 regarding 1) whether the parenting plan ordered herein remains in the minor child's best interests, 2) the status of any pending immigration proceedings against the Plaintiff, 3) whether the Plaintiff has secured a valid U.S. driver's license, 3) co-parenting counseling/coordination sessions.

  
Tindill, J

<sup>6</sup>Arrearage June 11, 2014 through May 10, 2016 of \$27,210.24 less \$849.48 arrearage payment ordered pursuant to order #6c(ii).

11/18/16 Decision entered in accordance with the foregoing.  
All counsel and self-represented parties of record notified  
on 11/18/16.   
Alexandra Roisman, TAC

# EXHIBIT “3”

DOCKET NO: FSTFA144027535S

SUPERIOR COURT

ORDER 435711

BATTISTOTTI, MARCO  
V.  
AARONSON, SUZANNE

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF STAMFORD  
AT STAMFORD

5/19/2017

SUPERIOR COURT  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF  
STAMFORD/NORWALK

ORDER

SEP 23 2024

ORDER REGARDING:  
04/24/2017 274.00 MOTION FOR MENTAL OR PHYSICAL EXAM

CERTIFIED COPY  
SEAL AFFIXED  
BY  CLERK

The foregoing, having been heard by the Court, is hereby:

ORDER:

The Plaintiff's motion for psychological evaluation of the Defendant (#274) came before the Court on the May 15, 2017 short calendar. The Defendant failed to appear. The guardian ad litem was summoned to address the Court.

The Defendant filed a motion for continuance with a pleading attached (#291) requesting that the Court dismiss the Plaintiff's motion for psychological evaluation. The Court will treat said pleading as an objection to the Plaintiff's motion for psychological evaluation.

The Plaintiff was heard on May 15, 2017 regarding his objection to the Defendant's motion for continuance. The guardian ad litem was not present during argument regarding the Defendant's continuance request, nor did she provide any input on behalf of her ward regarding a continuance. The Defendant's motion for continuance was denied.

At the time of this ruling, the Court has heard testimony and has been presented with evidence on eight separate days beginning on March 20, 2017 regarding:

- \* the Defendant's January 30, 2017 motion for modification of the parenting orders (#261);
- \* the Defendant's January 30, 2017 motion for contempt (#262) regarding alleged violations of the parenting orders and failure to mediate disputes utilizing the guardian ad litem;
- \* the Plaintiff's ex parte emergency motion to resume parenting time (#271); and
- \* the Plaintiff's October 17, 2016 motion for contempt (#252) regarding the Plaintiff's alleged failure to pay childcare costs as ordered.

The Court finds that both the Greenwich Police Department and the Department of Children and Families has been involved with the parties and their minor child since the September 7, 2016 order.

Based on the credible evidence before the Court pertaining to post-judgment incidents and interactions between the parties, both in the presence of the minor child and with each other, the Court further finds that a psychological evaluation of the Plaintiff and the Defendant would be relevant and helpful to the Court in making its decisions on the pending aforementioned motions (with the exception of #252 which concerns a financial dispute).

Attorney Jacquelyn Conlon is ordered to secure an appropriate professional to conduct the respective evaluations in accordance with orders #4b, 4c, and 4d of the court order (#243/255). All costs, expenses, and fees associated with the psychological evaluations - including but not limited to retainers, hourly rates, evaluation, co-pays, GAL fees, reports, postage, copying, and court appearances - shall be paid 100% up front by the Plaintiff movant. The Plaintiff shall have the right to request reallocation of the

FSTFA144027535S 5/19/2017

Page 1 of 2

274.01

costs, expenses, and fees at the conclusion of the evaluator's services.

Hearing continuation dates will not be rescheduled to accommodate the completion of the psychological evaluation of the parties. The Court will continue to hear evidence as scheduled and will accept testimony, reports, and/or evaluations they becomes available to the extent their submission into evidence is permitted.

In the event that an evaluator has not been selected or appointments for both parties to meet with the evaluator have not been made by Sunday, June 25, 2017, the parties and guardian ad litem shall appear before the Court on the Monday, June 26, 2017 short calendar to report the reasons for the delay.

435711

---

Judge: ERIKA MONIQUE TINDILL

# EXHIBIT “4”

Judicial District of New Haven  
SUPERIOR COURT  
FILED

SUPERIOR COURT  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF  
STAMFORD/NORWALK

OCT 15 2018

SEP 23 2024

FA14-4071735

CHIEF CLERK'S OFFICE

SUPERIOR COURT  
CERTIFIED COPY  
SEAL AFFIXED

MARCO BATTISTOTTI

:

BY J.D. OF NEW HAVEN CLERK

VS.

:

AT NEW HAVEN

SUZANNE AARONSON

:

OCTOBER 15, 2018

**TEMPORARY ORDERS RE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
TO REFER TO FAMILY RELATIONS (#347.10)**

On April 19 and June 8, 2018, the Court issued temporary orders (#363 and #393 respectively) regarding the Plaintiff's post-judgment motion for referral to Family Relations (#347.10).

The Plaintiff had parenting time in accordance with the Court's April 19 and June 8, 2018 temporary orders. On July 27, 2018, the parties appeared to report back regarding said parenting time. Both parties and counsel for the Defendant appeared before the Court. Both parties presented proposals for additional temporary orders. The Court did not hear testimony from Dr. Ingi Soliman due to her limited availability, but did have the benefit of a report submitted in accordance with order #12 (of #393).

The parties testified to recommendations not contained in Dr. Soliman's report. To resolve the conflicting evidence and by agreement of the parties, the Court submitted questions to Dr. Soliman which she answered in writing to the Court, the parties, and counsel of record on August 22, 2018.

To make its orders and findings, the Court considered the testimony of the parties, their written proposed orders (#415, #416, and #417), the argument of the Plaintiff and counsel for the Defendant, Dr. Soliman's July 25, 2018 report and her answers to the Court's questions. The Court finds 1) that the Plaintiff is not having parenting time in accordance with the schedule ordered in September 2016 (#243), and 2) it is in the minor child's best interest to have consistent quality time with his father. The following temporary orders shall enter.

**ORDERS**

**1. Individual therapy**

a. Both parties shall engage in individual therapy, no later than November 5, 2018, with a therapist, psychologist, or counselor of their choice to address effective communication between parents living apart, information on the developmental stages of children, adjustment of children to parental separation, dispute resolution and conflict management, guidelines for effective co-

parenting, parents' role in stress reduction for children, and cooperative parenting. In the event a party is already engaged in individual therapy and addressing the parenting issues described above, s/he shall continue to do so.

b. The length and frequency of individual therapy sessions shall be determined by the therapist, psychologist, or counselor chosen by the party.

c. Each party shall be responsible for 100% of the cost associated with his/her own individual therapy.

d. Both parties shall include the following statement of compliance in their weekly parenting report (see order #5 of #243 and #255): *I am engaged with a provider of my choice and am addressing the specific parenting issues ordered by the Court with that provider in compliance with order #1 (inclusive) of the Court's October 15, 2018 temporary order.*

## **2. Parenting**

a. The Plaintiff shall have parenting time with the minor child, beginning Monday, October 22, 2018 as follows:

- **Week 1** (week of October 22, 2018): – Monday and Wednesday - 3:45pm to 6:00pm; Saturday – 9:00am to 6:00pm; Sunday – 9:00am to 12:30pm
- **Week 2:** Monday and Wednesday - 3:45pm to 6:00pm
- **Holidays/Special Occasions** (Easter, Thanksgiving, Christmas, the child's birthday, and the Plaintiff's birthday): 9:00am to 12:30pm in even-numbered years; 2:30 to 6:00pm in odd-numbered years. The holiday/special occasion parenting time supersedes the Plaintiff's regular parenting time.
- **Other days/times** for the Plaintiff's parenting time must be by written (electronic mail or text communication shall suffice) mutual agreement of the parties.

b. Giovanna Vernuccio, the minor child's current babysitter, or a babysitter familiar with the minor child of the Defendant's choosing, shall transport the minor child to and from the Defendant to the Plaintiff for the Plaintiff's parenting time.

c. Ms. Vernuccio or the babysitter selected by the Defendant shall remain with Plaintiff and the minor child during the Plaintiff's parenting time.

d. The supervising babysitter shall be paid for by the Defendant.

e. If the Plaintiff exercises his parenting time in accordance with these temporary orders without issue as determined either by agreement of the parties or upon determination of the Court, his parenting time shall be unsupervised beginning April 15, 2019.

f. If the Plaintiff exercises his unsupervised parenting time in accordance with these temporary orders without issue as determined either by agreement of the parties or upon determination of the Court, his parenting time shall be expanded to include an overnight (Saturday at 9:00am, to Sunday at 12:30pm; week 1) beginning October 15, 2019.

3. These temporary orders shall be in effect until further order of the Court.

4. All other provisions of the court order (#243/255) not modified by these temporary orders shall remain in full force and effect.

5. The parties shall report back to the Court on **Monday, December 16, 2019** regarding these temporary orders.

*Grika Tindill*  
Tindill, J

Judgment entered \_\_\_\_\_  
Counsel/self-rep. ind. notified 10/15 <sup>20</sup>/<sub>20</sub> <sup>18</sup>/<sub>18</sub>  
By ☐ JDNO ☒ copy of memo ☐ other  
☒ Copy to Reporter of Judicial Decisions

mailed to:  
Marco Battistotti - SRP  
Suzanne Davidson - SRP  
Atty for Chalumeau Law Group  
BAC Conlon & McGlynn LLC

# EXHIBIT “5”

DOCKET NO: FSTFA144031121S

SUPERIOR COURT

ORDER 434450

BATTISTOTTI, MARCO  
V.  
AARONSON, SUZANNE

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF STAMFORD  
AT STAMFORD

6/21/2019

**SUPERIOR COURT  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF  
STAMFORD/NORWALK**

ORDER

SEP 23 2024

The following order is entered in the above matter:

ORDER:

CERTIFIED COPY  
SEAL AFFIXED  
BY  CLERK

The parties have asked the court to state the parameters of the July 9-10, 2019 hearing for reconsideration of child support orders previously entered by this court.

On September 7, 2016, this court ordered the plaintiff to pay child support of \$253 per week to the defendant based on the plaintiff's \$174,356 net annual earning capacity. Additionally, the order limited the plaintiff's visitation with his son to the town of Greenwich. The court found that the defendant rented an apartment in Greenwich to be able to have visitation with his son. The court issued a corrected memorandum of decision on November 18, 2016, but did not modify the amount of child support. The plaintiff appealed the court's order.

At the original hearing, the defendant testified about expenses he incurred as a result of maintaining the second residence, including rent, utility and maintenance expenses. Both parties agreed that the plaintiff's expenses for the Greenwich apartment were related to the child. The record indicates that the defendant did not challenge any of the plaintiff's expenses for the second residence. The trial court, however, did not address these expenses in its child support calculations.

On May 15, 2018, the Appellate Court affirmed in part and reversed in part the trial court's child support order, finding that the trial court should have considered evidence of the plaintiff's extraordinary visitation expenses as a possible deviation criterion. Additionally, the Appellate Court held that the trial court should have found the presumptive child support amount in accordance with the child support guidelines based on the parties' respective incomes, and then considered whether strict application of the presumptive guidelines amount would be inequitable or inappropriate in this case given the undisputed evidence of the plaintiff's visitation expenses.

The trial court should have then considered whether the criterion for deviation on the basis of extraordinary visitation expenses was met, and if so, whether the court should order a deviation from the presumptive guidelines amount. "The proper remedy is to remand the matter for the court to hold a new hearing on the issue of calculation of child support." *Battistotti v. Suzanne A.*, 182 Conn. App. 40, 51, 188 A.3d 798, cert. denied, 330 Conn. 904, 191 A.3d 1000 (2018).

Therefore, the remand hearing will be limited to argument and reconsideration of the evidence introduced at trial on the issue of child support. The court will entertain no new evidence, as the sole purpose of the hearing will be to determine the presumptive amount of child support as would have been applicable during the initial trial in 2016, whether that amount is inequitable or inappropriate under the circumstances, and whether a deviation is warranted pursuant to § 46b-215a-5c (b) (3) (A).

Additionally, "in determining whether the plaintiff has incurred significant visitation expenses warranting a deviation from the presumptive support amounts . . . the court may consider that the plaintiff consistently represented that he resided in New York City at the time of the child's birth and that

FSTFA144031121S 6/21/2019

Page 1 of 2

467

he continues to reside in New York City, but is required to spend his parenting time within the town of Greenwich. The court may further consider that the defendant never challenged the amount of the Greenwich apartment expenses or that such expenses were incurred by the plaintiff for the sole purpose of effectuating parenting time with their child.” Id., 50–51.

It is so ordered.

434450

---

Judge: ANTHONY D TRUGLIA JR

This document may be signed or verified electronically and has the same validity and status as a document with a physical (pen-to-paper) signature. For more information, see Section I.E. of the *State of Connecticut Superior Court E-Services Procedures and Technical Standards* (<https://jud.ct.gov/external/super/E-Services/e-standards.pdf>), section 51-193c of the Connecticut General Statutes and Connecticut Practice Book Section 4-4.

# EXHIBIT “6”

DOCKET NO: FSTFA144031121S

BATTISTOTTI, MARCO  
V.  
AARONSON, SUZANNE

SUPERIOR COURT

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF STAMFORD  
AT STAMFORD

6/24/2019

ORDER 434450

SUPERIOR COURT  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF  
STAMFORD/NORWALK

ORDER

SEP 23 2024

ORDER REGARDING:  
04/18/2019 458.00 MOTION FOR LEAVE

CERTIFIED COPY  
SEAL AFFIXED

The foregoing, having been considered by the Court, is hereby:

BY  CLERK

ORDER:

The court has listened carefully to the testimony of both parties and has carefully considered all of the exhibits introduced in support of and in opposition to the plaintiff's claims for relief.

After an evidentiary hearing on the motion, the court finds good cause to grant part of the relief requested.

The court's current order of October 15, 2018 (entry 424), contemplates that the plaintiff's visitation and parenting time with the child will be unsupervised after April 15, 2019. The defendant opposes resumption of unsupervised visitation. The defendant argues that all of the plaintiff's parenting time should be suspended until he completes additional counseling.

The court finds that it is in the child's best interest to resume unsupervised visitation at this time. The court has carefully considered the defendant's testimony and the testimony of her witnesses. Although concerning, the issues raised by the defendant are not sufficient to require supervision. For example, the court agrees with the defendant that the plaintiff should not discuss any part of these proceedings with the child and certainly should not criticize the defendant in any way in the child's presence. These issues should be raised by way of a motion for contempt and should not be the basis for continuing supervised visitation.

The court finds no basis in the evidence now before the court that psychological evaluations of either party are warranted at this time. The defendant asserts, inter alia, that the plaintiff has failed to take advantage of visitation time offered to him and that he has numerous lawsuits now pending against him, including immigration proceedings and an eviction action. None of the grounds asserted by the defendant, even when considered in the totality of the circumstances as argued by the defendant, persuade the court that the plaintiff should have a psychological evaluation before he is allowed to have unsupervised visitation with his son.

The court also finds no basis in the evidence for the defendant's claim that the plaintiff should not have overnight visitation with the child. The court finds that it is in the child's best interest at this time to have as much quality time with his father as possible, which includes overnight visitation.

The court orders the defendant to comply fully with the weekly visitation schedule set forth in the Memorandum of Decision dated October 15, 2018, starting July 1, 2019 (for purposes of this order, "Week 1" will be the week starting July 1, 2019).

The court also orders that the visitation schedule henceforth shall include overnight visitation, from Saturday 9:00 a.m. to Sunday at 12:30 p.m.

FSTFA144031121S 6/24/2019

Page 1 of 2

458.01

The court also removes the restriction limiting the plaintiff's visitation to the Town of Greenwich during daylight hours (overnights to continue in Greenwich). The court finds no good cause to continue the geographical restriction at this time.

Pickup and drop off will occur at the Greenwich Police Station until further order of this court.

The court's other orders regarding custody and visitation remain in effect (entries 255 & 424).

It is so ordered.

434450

---

Judge: ANTHONY D TRUGLIA JR

This document may be signed or verified electronically and has the same validity and status as a document with a physical (pen-to-paper) signature. For more information, see Section I.E. of the *State of Connecticut Superior Court E-Services Procedures and Technical Standards* (<https://jud.ct.gov/external/super/E-Services/e-standards.pdf>), section 51-193c of the Connecticut General Statutes and Connecticut Practice Book Section 4-4.

# EXHIBIT “7”

DOCKET NO: FSTFA144031121S

SUPERIOR COURT

ORDER 434450

BATTISTOTTI, MARCO  
V.  
AARONSON, SUZANNE

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF STAMFORD  
AT STAMFORD

7/19/2019

**SUPERIOR COURT  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF  
STAMFORD/NORWALK**

ORDER

SEP 23 2024

The following order is entered in the above matter:

ORDER:

CERTIFIED COPY  
SEAL AFFIXED  
BY  CLERK

The court held a hearing on July 9, 2019, pursuant to the decision of Battistotti v. Suzanne A., 182 Conn. App. 40, 188 A.3d 798 (2018), which remanded the case to the trial court for a re-determination of the child support order entered in favor of the defendant dated November 18, 2016.

The court considered no new evidence at the remand hearing; the court heard only argument on two questions. First, whether it was appropriate for this court to deviate from the presumptive weekly child support amount based on the court's earlier finding that the plaintiff had an annual earning capacity of \$267,800, despite showing no income on his most recently filed financial affidavit. If so, the second question before the court was whether and to what extent this court should deviate from the presumptive amount due to the plaintiff's extraordinary visitation expenses.

Both parties agree that if the plaintiff had no earned or unearned income at the time of trial, the presumptive weekly support amount based on the Connecticut Child Support Guidelines would be \$0. The plaintiff's presumptive weekly amount based on a net earning capacity of \$174,356 for the plaintiff and \$157,456 for the defendant, as found by the court, Tindall J., is \$253.

The court finds, after considering the arguments of the parties, that strict application of the guidelines (retroactive to November, 2016) is not appropriate in the present case. The trial court's finding of earning capacities far higher than either parent's stated income compels the court to deviate from the presumptive support of amount of \$0 and adopt the court's calculation based on earning capacity. The court finds, therefore, that the plaintiff's presumptive child support obligation, calculated using the parties' respective earning capacities, is \$253.

The court's prior orders restricted the plaintiff's visitation and parenting time with the child to the town of Greenwich. Uncontradicted evidence introduced at trial showed that the prior order required him to maintain and furnish two separate residences. The evidence also demonstrated that the plaintiff incurred extraordinary monthly expenses related to his visitation, including rent for the Greenwich apartment (\$1,475), utility and upkeep expenses (\$177), and travel expenses (\$702).

Section 46b-215-5c of the Connecticut Child Support Guidelines (Rev. July 1, 2015) lists "significant visitation expenses" as a deviation criterion, provided that the expenses are "extraordinary" and "exist on a substantial and continuing basis." The requirement that the plaintiff, who resides in New York City, exercise his parenting time only in Greenwich presents an extraordinary situation. It is also clear that these extraordinary expenses will continue until the restriction is lifted. Finally, the court finds that monthly visitation expenses of approximately \$2350 from net monthly income of approximately \$14,400 is substantial. The court finds, therefore, that deviation from the presumptive support amount of \$253 is appropriate in the present case.

The court noted in its decision that "[t]here is negligible appellate case law explicating the deviation  
FSTFA144031121S 7/19/2019

Page 1 of 2

470<sup>00</sup>

7  
criterion for significant visitation expenses." Id., 48. Neither party offered at the remand hearing a proposed weekly amount should the court decide to deviate based on extraordinary visitation expenses. The trial court must therefore estimate what it believes to be a fair and reasonable deviation from the presumptive guidelines amount.

At trial, "the plaintiff requested that past, current and future child related expenses . . . should be paid . . . in effect, 80 [percent] defendant, 20 [percent] plaintiff." Id., 48. In the court's view, this is not a reasonable allocation. The court finds that a fairer and more reasonable apportionment would be to reverse the plaintiff's proposed allocation and charge seventy-five percent of the costs to him and twenty-five percent to the defendant.

Monthly support paid to the defendant at the presumptive amount of \$253 per week totals \$1088. Twenty-five percent of the monthly visitation expenses is \$588. Subtracting \$588 from \$1088 leaves a monthly support amount of \$500, or \$116 per week.

The court finds an arrearage in child support owed to the defendant of \$16,356 through August 3, 2019 - calculated as \$116 per week for 141 weeks from November 18, 2016 through August 3, 2019.

The plaintiff is ordered to pay \$116 per week in child support to the defendant commencing August 5, 2019 until further order of the court. The court's previous orders allocating payment of unreimbursed medical expenses and work-related child-care expenses remain unchanged.

It is so ordered.

Judicial Notice (JDNO) was sent regarding this order.

434450

---

Judge: ANTHONY D TRUGLIA JR  
Processed by: Andrew Lorenzo

This document may be signed or verified electronically and has the same validity and status as a document with a physical (pen-to-paper) signature. For more information, see Section I.E. of the *State of Connecticut Superior Court E-Services Procedures and Technical Standards* (<https://jud.ct.gov/external/super/E-Services/e-standards.pdf>), section 51-193c of the Connecticut General Statutes and Connecticut Practice Book Section 4-4.

# EXHIBIT “8”

NO: FST-FA14-4031121-S : SUPERIOR COURT  
MARCO BATTISTOTTI : JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
OF STAMFORD/NORWALK  
V. : AT STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT  
SUZANNE AARONSON : AUGUST 19, 2019

PM SESSION

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANTHONY TRUGLIA, JUDGE

A P P E A R A N C E S:

Representing the Plaintiff:

MR. MARCO BATTISTOTTI  
Self-Represented  
30 E 95<sup>th</sup> Street  
New York City New York 10128

Representing the Defendant:

ATTORNEY ALICIA CHALUMEAU  
40 Richards Avenue  
Norwalk, Connecticut 06854

Recorded By:  
Dawn Chase

Transcribed By:  
Dawn Chase  
Court Recording Monitor  
123 Hoyt Street  
Stamford, Connecticut 06905

1           ATTY. CHALUMEAU: All right. Did the parties  
2           want to report back on Aaronson versus Battistotti?  
3           ATTY. CHALUMEAU: Yes, Your Honor.  
4           THE COURT: Battistotti versus Aaronson. Okay.  
5           Just -- you can stay there just accommodate the --  
6           UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.  
7           UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sure.  
8           THE COURT: All right.  
9           ATTY. CHALUMEAU: Your Honor, may I approach the  
10          clerk?  
11          THE COURT: Please.  
12          ATTY. CHALUMEAU: With the report back forms.  
13          THE COURT: Please. Please.  
14          ATTY. CHALUMEAU: Your Honor, the family visited  
15          the family -- visited with Family Relations, Family  
16          Relations conducted an intake and a screen. They  
17          have slated this for an issue focus evaluation with a  
18          report back date I think sometime in October, mid-  
19          October.  
20          The parties also discussed the expansion of the  
21          current access schedule during the weekday  
22          considering the variance there was no agreement on  
23          that at this time. My client still stands behind her  
24          offer that the Wednesday period can be expanded to  
25          allow him the entire after preschool period until the  
26          child's bedtime.  
27          THE COURT: So four hours basically every

1 Wednesday as opposed to an hour and a half on Monday,  
2 an hour and a half on --

3 MR. BATTISTOTTI: Two hours and fifteen minutes  
4 and two hours and fifteen minutes --

5 THE COURT: Oh, okay.

6 MR. BATTISTOTTI: -- total four and a half. Now  
7 they're giving four. And, Your Honor, we're homeless  
8 in Connecticut we don't --

9 ATTY. CHALUMEAU: I think it's four and a half.

10 MR. BATTISTOTTI: We don't know what to do in  
11 Greenwich.

12 THE COURT: Yeah, but I lifted the geographical  
13 restriction you can take the child to New York.

14 MR. BATTISTOTTI: In four and a half hours I can  
15 take him and we can stay in the City for two hours  
16 and come back. Your Honor, why not having an  
17 overnight stay during the week, the child is relaxed,  
18 he's not confused, there is nothing detrimental about  
19 it, he's five years old it's about time. So I can  
20 pick him up, I will absorb all the cost and the time  
21 to pick him up and drop him back without  
22 inconvenience Ms. Aaronson any way shape or form.  
23 This is a person like myself, Your Honor, that has  
24 the time to spend with the child.

25 THE COURT: So what you want to do is you want  
26 to do one overnight during the week like Wednesday  
27 night?

1 MR. BATTISTOTTI: One overnight during the week  
2 then one overnight during week and then one overnight  
3 during the weekend. So we consolidate instead of two  
4 small portions Monday and Wednesday --

5 THE COURT: Right.

6 MR. BATTISTOTTI: -- into a very simple one  
7 which I will pick-up my child at ten o'clock in  
8 Greenwich on Tuesday on week one and I will drop him  
9 off at seven Greenwich myself. Then on weekend pick-  
10 up at ten deliver again at seven.

11 THE COURT: Sir, I can't do this without an  
12 evidentiary hearing that's the thing. I can't do it  
13 without an evidentiary hearing.

14 MR. BATTISTOTTI: But we just done -- this is  
15 just modify something that is three years old.

16 THE COURT: I know the law says I can't do that  
17 without an evidentiary hearing.

18 ATTY. CHALUMEAU: Your Honor, the child is also  
19 enrolled in school.

20 ATTY. BATTISTOTTI: It doesn't start until  
21 September 9.

22 THE COURT: Honestly if Mr. Battistotti is  
23 willing to pick-up the child up in Connecticut, take  
24 him overnight in New York, and bring him back to  
25 Greenwich the following morning and so the child --  
26 is he in daycare?

27 ATTY. CHALUMEAU: He is in daycare, Your Honor.

1 MR. BATTISTOTTI: No now --

2 THE COURT: No?

3 ATTY. CHALUMEAU: Right now he's not in a  
4 daycare program --

5 THE COURT: No.

6 ATTY. CHALUMEAU: -- but he's about to start one  
7 in a week or two.

8 MS. AARONSON: School.

9 MR. BATTISTOTTI: And I will drop him off by  
10 nine o'clock.

11 THE COURT: It really doesn't sound --

12 ATTY. CHALUMEAU: Five year old child.

13 THE COURT: -- unreasonable.

14 MR. BATTISTOTTI: I will drop him off, Your  
15 Honor.

16 THE COURT: Even a five year old child and  
17 overnight during the week for a five year old child  
18 does not seem unreasonable to me.

19 MR. BATTISTOTTI: Not at all.

20 THE COURT: It really doesn't.

21 ATTY. CHALUMEAU: Your Honor, I believe that the  
22 -- my client --

23 THE COURT: But I will not order it without an  
24 evidentiary hearing.

25 ATTY. CHALUMEAU: Thank you.

26 THE COURT: So -- and the problem is I can't do  
27 it this afternoon I'm just jammed pack with stuff, I

1           can't do it this afternoon.

2           So we made some progress today.

3           ATTY. CHALUMEAU: A lot of progress.

4           MR. BATTISTOTTI: No I don't think we went  
5 anywhere because --

6           THE COURT: Sure we did they lifted the  
7 geographical restriction for overnights, right, by  
8 agreement.

9           MR. BATTISTOTTI: Well, she consented to that on  
10 Friday but --

11          THE COURT: Right.

12          MR. BATTISTOTTI: -- yes.

13          THE COURT: That's a big deal.

14          MR. BATTISTOTTI: Okay.

15          THE COURT: And you know she's willing to  
16 consolidate the Monday and Wednesday which I think is  
17 at least a decent accommodation or halfway, meeting  
18 you halfway. Do I think it should be overnight on  
19 Wednesdays yeah I do but I can't order it without an  
20 evidentiary hearing or an agreement.

21          MR. BATTISTOTTI: When is the sooner because Ms.  
22 Aaronson again now will take the child away, she just  
23 came back from the vacation.

24          THE COURT: Okay.

25          ATTY. CHALUMEAU: Your Honor, he's --

26          MR. BATTISTOTTI: And she's threatening to take  
27 him --

1           ATTY. CHALUMEAU:  -- Mr. Battistotti just --

2           MR. BATTISTOTTI:  -- on vacation again.

3           THE COURT:  Sir, I can't --

4           ATTY. CHALUMEAU:  -- is a don't (sounds like)

5           THE COURT:  I can't do it now.

6           MR. BATTISTOTTI:  Can we do any --

7           THE COURT:  I'm sorry, sir.

8           MR. BATTISTOTTI:  -- time on Wednesday, Your  
9           Honor?

10          THE COURT:  No the best thing I can do, the best  
11          thing I can do at this point is --

12          (Pause)

13          MR. BATTISTOTTI:  Your Honor, we spending time  
14          at Home Depo and Whole Foods --

15          ATTY. CHALUMEAU:  Your Honor?

16          MR. BATTISTOTTI:  -- to go an use a toilet.

17          ATTY. CHALUMEAU:  Your Honor, Mr. Battistotti  
18          has just come off of five years of access with the  
19          minor child where he's used two hours.  By his own  
20          request we've extended it and now he's acting as if  
21          he's now burdened by his own request for an  
22          extension, Your Honor, that's essentially what's  
23          happened.

24          MR. BATTISTOTTI:  No that's absolutely --

25          THE COURT:  So maybe there has to be a little  
26          bit of give so it's --

27          ATTY. CHALUMEAU:  Oh we've done nothing but

1 give, Your Honor.

2 MR. BATTISTOTTI: Oh yeah two and a half percent  
3 a year.

4 ATTY. CHALUMEAU: I mean Mr. Battistotti, just  
5 so the Court is aware, my client, my motion for  
6 continuance sought that my client have these -- not  
7 be here today so that she can spend two weeks' time  
8 with her --

9 THE COURT: Okay.

10 ATTY. CHALUMEAU: -- client (as spoken), Your  
11 Honor. She's moved that trip back and Mr.  
12 Battistotti's enjoying overnight access this week as  
13 the minor child is out of school, Your Honor.

14 MR. BATTISTOTTI: Ms. Aaronson can --

15 THE COURT: Sir?

16 MR. BATTISTOTTI: Yes, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: If I were you I would take the  
18 combined Wednesday visitation, do the best you can  
19 with it. Other than that I'm marking everything off  
20 for today, that's the best I can do right now.

21 MR. BATTISTOTTI: Should we have something with  
22 Attorney Diamond for the overnight stay, Your Honor?  
23 This is torturing for the child.

24 THE COURT: It'll be up to you to speak with  
25 Attorney Chalumeau. The two of you should meet with  
26 Attorney Diamond and work something out but it's not  
27 going to happen today. I appreciate the

1           consideration so far, if I were you I'd do the  
2           overnight on Wednesday but I can't push it, I can't  
3           force people to agree to anything.

4           MR. BATTISTOTTI: How about compliance with the  
5           current Court orders.

6           THE COURT: Sir, it's off for today.

7           ATTY. CHALUMEAU: Thank you, Your Honor.

8           THE COURT: I can't do it, I can't do anymore.

9           MR. BATTISTOTTI: Thank you, Your Honor.

10          MS. AARONSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

11          THE COURT: Okay. Good luck to both parties I  
12          hope you guys can work something out.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

\* \* \*

NO: FST-FA14-4031121-S : SUPERIOR COURT

MARCO BATTISTOTTI : JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
OF STAMFORD/NORWALK

V. : AT STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

SUZANNE AARONSON : AUGUST 19, 2019

C E R T I F I C A T I O N  
ELECTRONIC

I hereby certify the electronic version is a true and correct transcription of the audio recording of the above-referenced case, heard in Superior Court, Judicial District of Stamford/Norwalk at Stamford, Connecticut, before the Honorable Anthony Truglia, Judge, on August 19, 2019.

Dated August 5, 2021 in Stamford, Connecticut.



---

Dawn Chase  
Court Recording Monitor

# EXHIBIT “9”


## *Certification of Translation Accuracy*

Translation of **JUDGMENT**  
From **SPANISH** to **ENGLISH**

We, CinchTranslations, LLC, a professional translation services company hereby certify that the above-mentioned document has been translated by experienced and qualified professional translators and that, in our best judgment, the translated text truly reflects the content, meaning, and style of the original text and constitutes in every respect a correct and true translation of the original document.

This is to certify the correctness of the translation only. We do not guarantee that the original is a genuine document, or that the statements contained in the original document are true. Further, CinchTranslations, LLC, assumes no liability for the way in which the translation is used by the customer or any third party, including end-users of the translation.

A copy of the translation is attached to this certification.

  
Doyle L. Witcher  
President  
CinchTranslations, LLC  
Dated: December 15, 2022



ADMINISTRATION  
OF JUSTICE**COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE N° 12  
PALMA DE MALLORCA****JUDGMENT: 00425/2022**

TRAVESSA D'EN BALLESTER, N° 20 - PLANTA 3°

Telephone: 971.219397/98, Fax: 971.219298

Email: instancia12.palmademallorca@justicia.es

Equipment/user: MER

Model: 0030K0

N.I.G. (General Identification Number): 07040 42 1 2021 0020976

MMC MODIFICATION OF MEASURES - CONTESTED MATTER 0001056 /2021

Original Proceedings: EXE - EXEQUATUR 0000771 /2021

**Ref. OTHER MATTERS**

PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

PLAINTIFF: SUZANNE DENISE AARONSON

Court Attorney: SARA TERESA COLL SABRAFIN

DEFENDANT: MARCO BATTISTOTTI

**JUDGMENT**

In Palma, on the seventh day of December of two thousand and twenty-two.

I, Borja Antolin Herreros, Magistrate-Judge of the Court of First Instance n° 12 of Palma de Mallorca and of its judicial district, after having reviewed the present proceedings for modification of definitive measures recorded under the number indicated above at the request of Mrs. SUZANNE DENISE AARONSON, represented by the Court Attorney, Mrs. Sara Coll Sabrafin and assisted by the legal counsel, Mrs. Rosa Torrandell Pedrera, against Mr. MARCO BATTISTOTTI, the defendant, who has been declared in situation of procedural default, and the mandatory participation of the Public Prosecutor's Office.

**FINDING OF FACTS**

**First.** - This trial was initiated by a lawsuit filed by the Court Attorney Mrs. Sara Coll Sabrafin acting in the name and on behalf of Mrs. SUZANNE DENISE AARONSON, in which she requested that a judgment be issued in accordance with the plea of her claim in order to previously recognize the judgment entered on November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016 by the Superior Court for the Judicial District of Stamford/Norwalk, State of Connecticut, United States as incidental, and modify the measures contained therein.

**Second.** - Once the lawsuit was admitted for processing by Decree dated September 29<sup>th</sup>, 2021, the defendant was summoned to appear and answer the claim within twenty days. The Defendant was defaulted for failure to appear. The Public Prosecutor's Office answered the claim in due time and form.

Signed by: BORJA ANTOLIN  
HERREROS  
12/07/2022 10:54  
Minerva

Secure Verification Code E04799402-Ml:bCMK-QY4c-iZFF-kerQ-D

You can verify this document at <https://www.administraciondejusticia.gob.es>.



**Third.** - After failing to answer the claim, the parties were summoned to the oral hearing, with all the legal measures.

Being the day and time established for the hearing, only the Plaintiff appeared. The Defendant and the Public Prosecutor's Office, in spite of having been legally summoned, did not. The Defendant ratified its petitions, and the proposed evidence was examined and declared pertinent, the result of which is kept in the recording, which we restate as if fully reproduced here. Having completed the closing arguments, the case was ready for judgment.

**Fourth.** - In the proceeding, all legal requirements have been observed.

#### LEGAL GROUNDS

**First.** - The present decision is issued with the defendant in default, that is to say, without the defendant having answered the claim or appeared at the trial. According to Article 496 of the Civil Procedural Law, the declaration of default, with due respect for the defendant's right of defense, should not be considered as an acceptance or admission of the facts of the claim, without prejudice to the effects arising from the Civil Procedural Law itself.

**Second.** - In accordance with Article 775 of the Civil Procedural Law, the spouses may request from the Court the modification of the measures that were agreed upon by the spouses or those adopted in the absence of agreement, provided that the circumstances that were taken into account when approving or agreeing them have substantially changed. These petitions will be processed in accordance with the provisions of Article 770 of the Civil Procedural Law.

The Judgment of the 4th section of the Provincial Court of the Balearic Islands dated March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2009 recalls that, as this Court has repeatedly stated, the measures judicially approved in separation, divorce or custody, physical custody, and child support proceedings are not irrevocable and indefinitely fixed, because, in the same way, that the vital situation to which they respond is subject to changes, they can also be modified. However, this requires a substantial alteration of the circumstances that were taken into account at the time of their adoption. This presupposition of the action for modification, in turn, acts as a limit to the power of action, since the legal system tries to find the balance between the necessary adaptation of the measures to the new family situation and the no less necessary legal security that the members of the so-called nuclear family must have to reorganize their lives after the crisis that has led to the suspension or rupture of the marriage bond. Therefore, in order for the action of modification to prosper, the following requirements must be met:

1. That a substantial alteration of circumstances is accredited and understood as evident with sufficient importance to produce a modification of what was agreed or judicially adopted, so that the simple fluctuations of income, of little importance, cannot give rise to such modifying pretension.
2. That the indicated changes or alterations must be unforeseen, so that they arise from events external to the debtor of the obligation, without the possibility of foreseeing them in advance, in terms of ordinary diligence.

ADMINISTRATION  
OF JUSTICE

3. That such alterations must have stability or permanence in time and not be merely circumstantial, in other words, the alteration must be permanent in time and not merely occasional or transitory.
4. That it is irrelevant whether the previous situation has been previously agreed upon by agreement of wills embodied in a regulatory agreement, or judicially imposed, because what is at issue is to gauge whether there have been substantial changes or modifications that make it necessary to rethink the benefits, without giving greater value to what has been agreed between the parties because it lacks justification.
5. That if the alteration, even if it is substantial, has occurred due to fraud or fault of the person who has the obligation to provide maintenance or any other economic contribution, then such alteration will not happen, since it will have been intentionally or culpably achieved by the parties, and it's a fraud, abuse of right, or breach of the principles of good faith.
6. That such substantial alterations must be proven before the courts, by operation of the procedural law.

It has been documented that on November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016, the parents obtained a judgment issued by the Superior Court of the Judicial District of Stamford/Norwalk, State of Connecticut (United States) by virtue of which Ms. Aaronson was awarded legal custody as well as physical custody of the minor child, Leonard, being expressly empowered to make decisions regarding the child's educational, medical and religious matters.

In addition, Mr. Battistotti was granted parenting time consisting of weekly visitation at various times to take place in Greenwich, Connecticut, and guidelines were established for the coordination of shared parenting.

Finally, Mr. Battistotti was ordered to pay a weekly child support of \$253, starting on September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2016, and to contribute certain percentages to child care and medical expenses.

**Third.** - By means of the present proceeding, the plaintiff seeks the recognition of the judicial decision issued by the Superior Court of the Judicial District of Stamford/Norwalk and the modification of measures regarding the new address and place of residence of the mother and minor, and to the suppression of the parenting time of the non-custodial parent.

First, since there is no international agreement between Spain and the United States regarding the recognition and enforcement of judgments, the applicable text is the Law on International Legal Cooperation in Civil Matters (LCJI), which requires the corresponding exequatur for the enforcement of a foreign judgment in Spain.

Pursuant to Article 41 of said legal text, "foreign final judgments rendered in a contentious proceeding shall be subject to recognition and enforcement in Spain in accordance with the provisions of this title", this is understood to mean those decisions that are not subject to ordinary appeal in the state of origin, which is the present case.

ADMINISTRATION  
OF JUSTICE

The case at present requests the incidental recognition of the judgment and the subsequent modification of measures, in accordance with the provisions of the following articles:

“Article 44.2. If the recognition of a foreign judgment is raised incidentally in a judicial proceeding, the judge hearing the judgment shall decide on the recognition in each judicial proceeding in accordance with the procedural laws. The effectiveness of incidental recognition shall be limited to the resolution of the main proceeding and shall not interfere with the seeking of exequatur of the foreign decision.

“Article 45.1. A foreign decision may be modified by the Spanish courts, provided that it had previously obtained its recognition by main or incidental proceedings in accordance with the provisions of this title.”

Analyzing the applicable regulations, this court must pronounce in favor of the prior claim introduced in the present proceeding for the incidental recognition of the judgment issued on November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016 by the Superior Court of the Judicial District of Stamford/Norwalk, State of Connecticut (United States).

Likewise, in order to corroborate the jurisdiction of this court to hear the present proceedings, the legal provisions contained in the different community regulations introduced by the Plaintiff in the hearing serve as perfect and correct application:

\*Article 9, paragraph 3 of the Council Regulation (EC) n° 2019/1111 of 25 June 2019 concerning jurisdiction, the recognition, and enforcement of decisions in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility, and on international child abduction, which provides that:

“Without prejudice to Article 10, in the case of the wrongful removal or retention of a child, the courts of the Member State where the child was habitually resident immediately before the wrongful removal or retention shall retain their jurisdiction until the child has acquired a habitual residence in another Member State and b) the child has resided in that other Member State for a period of at least one year after the person, institution or other body having rights of custody has had or should have had knowledge of the whereabouts of the child and the child is settled in his or her new environment and at least one of the following conditions is met:

ii) an application for return lodged by the holder of rights of custody was refused by a court of a Member State on grounds other than point (b) of Article 13(1) or Article 13(2) of the 1980 Hague Convention and that decision is no longer subject to ordinary appeal;” (as has occurred in proceeding X57 1271/2022 with the issuance of the judgment on July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2022 by this Court, the appeal filed by the State Attorney's Office having been dismissed by virtue of the judgment issued on October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022, with no ordinary appeal against the said decision).

\*Points b and c of Article 3 of the Council Regulation (EC) n° 4/2009 of 18th December of 2008 on the jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition and enforcement of decisions, and cooperation in matters relating to maintenance obligations, which states:

“The following shall have jurisdiction to give a decision in matters relating to maintenance obligations in the member states:

ADMINISTRATION  
OF JUSTICE

(b) the court for the place where the creditor is habitually resident; or

(c) the court which, according to its own law, has jurisdiction to entertain proceedings concerning the status of a person if the matter relating to maintenance is ancillary to those proceedings,

\*Article 15 of the convention on the jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition, enforcement and cooperation in respect of parental responsibility, and measures for the protection of children, done at The Hague on October 19<sup>th</sup>, 1996, provides:

"In exercising their jurisdiction under the provisions of Chapter II, the authorities of the Contracting States shall apply their own law".

2. However, in so far as the protection of the person or the property of the child requires, they may exceptionally apply or take into consideration the law of another State with which the situation has a substantial connection.

3. If the child's habitual residence changes to another Contracting State, the law of that other State governs, from the time of the change, the conditions of application of the measures taken in the State of the former habitual residence."

**Fourth.** - Analyzing the object of the controversy, as it has been accredited in the procedure of returning the minor followed before this Court under the number X57 1271/2022, in accordance with the statements of the judgment issued on appeal dated October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022, the minor has fully adapted to living in Mallorca Island, developing solid bonds in all the spheres of his social, educational and family life. This has been proven by documents 7 to 11 submitted at the hearing, plus other complementary documents that appear unnumbered. This adaptation of the minor to his new environment should be positively valued; it is a legal argument that has not been disproven as no evidence to the contrary has been presented, just mere speculation.

Furthermore, the situation of the father who requested the return of the child was assessed at the time; he is in an irregular situation in the country in which he is requesting the return of the child. His interests depend on not being displaced from his habitual residence and there are insufficient guarantees that the new residence will be stable.

All these reasons argued in the second instance served as grounds for the dismissal of the claim for the return of the child Leonard, thus providing the child with security and stability in his current environment in Mallorca, where he has been living since November 2020, where he attends school, has friends and his maternal grandparents come frequently.

In order to corroborate these arguments, the defense of the plaintiff brings to the hearing, sufficient documentation to support her arguments, along with the rest of the documents in the file, such as the last Wealth Tax Declaration corresponding to the year 2021 and the last Individual Income Tax Declaration corresponding to the year 2021 of Mrs. Aaronson; the certificate of the Green Valley School where the minor Leonard is enrolled and studies, as well as the certificates of Census Registration of Mrs. Aaronson and the minor issued by the City Council of Calvia.

ADMINISTRATION  
OF JUSTICE

The passage of time without having contact with the minor since he has been residing in Spain permanently, far from strengthening the father-child bond, has been detrimental to their relationship. This has caused the mother to devote herself exclusively to the upbringing and education of her son in a mature and responsible manner, attending to his basic needs to the extent that her economic possibilities allow, as has been demonstrated by the documents submitted in the case file.

Moreover, the lack of interest and concern on the part of Mr. Battistotti with respect to his minor son in order to attend to his basic needs is evident in the present proceedings, and it increased by the degree of conflict prevailing between both parents; the civil and criminal problems that Mr. Battistotti has faced - he has even been detained until February 2020 - and the protection orders issued in favor of Ms. Aaronson; the situation in which the Defendant has been living, as he is not a legal resident in the United States and is awaiting the issuance of a deportation order; and the lack of any contact with his minor son, as he did not exercise his visitation rights in the United States, and has not traveled to Spain, the place of residence of the minor since November 2020.

All these points could not be refuted at the hearing due to the Defendant's failure to appear despite having been legally summoned; his testimony would have been enlightening in order to know first-hand the motivations or impulses that have led him to act in the manner described by the Plaintiff.

By means of the present proceeding, in accordance with the ruling handed down by the Superior Court of the Judicial District of Stamford/Norwalk, the plaintiff seeks the awarding of the physical and legal custody of her minor child, a measure that must be agreed upon since it implies the maintenance of the situation agreed upon by the parties de facto; a situation for which no evidence has been produced to prove that it is harmful to the child, and it should be expressly stated that the minor's residence is in the Mallorca Island.

Likewise, it is therefore considered and thus accredited that the father has seriously failed to comply with the obligations inherent to parental authority, and it is therefore appropriate to grant the mother the right to make decisions concerning the education, health, religion, choice of school and all those related to the day to day life of the minor, as was agreed in the foreign resolution.

**Fifth.** - Article 94 of the Civil Code establishes that the parent who does not have the children with him/her will have the right to visit them, and the Judge shall establish the time, manner and place for the exercise of this right, being able to limit and suspend this right if there are serious circumstances that make it advisable or if the duties imposed in the judicial resolution are not complied with seriously or persistently.

It is appropriate not to establish a visitation regime for Mr. Battistotti with respect to his minor son, in view of the passive attitude that he has been demonstrating with respect to his own son and the lack of interest shown, as recognized by Mrs. Aaronson, in her lawsuit. This is without prejudice to the possibility of agreeing at a later date on a free and flexible visitation regime between father and son if the personal circumstances of the Defendant change in a positive sense and he achieves the stability necessary to maintain frequent contact with his son, taking always into account the exclusive interest and benefit of their son.

ADMINISTRATION  
OF JUSTICE

With regard to child support, the third rule of Article 770 of the Civil Procedural Law provides that the unjustified failure to appear of any of the parties allows the facts alleged by the party appearing in support of his or her petitions on measures of a patrimonial nature may be considered admitted.

In relation to the contribution that the Defendant is obliged to pay to Mrs. Aaronson as child support for their child, under the protection of the provisions of Articles 93 and 142 and subsequent of the Civil Code, in line with what was agreed in the last court order 434450 of July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2019, it is appropriate to order him to pay the amount of € 450 per month, payable and revisable in the manner that will be specified in due course, taking into account the personal and economic circumstances of the members of the family nucleus as set forth by Mrs. Aaronson throughout the documents presented in the proceedings.

The amount established shall be increased by half of the medical and child care expenses (understood as necessary extraordinary expenses) incurred by the minor in Spain.

**Sixth.** - It is not necessary to make an express order for costs, given the public nature of the interests in the dispute.

In view of the aforementioned Articles and others of general and pertinent application.

#### VERDICT

That, fully upholding the claim filed by the Court Attorney Ms. Sara Coll Sabrafin acting in the name and on behalf of Ms. SUZANNE DENISE AARONSON against Mr. MARCO BATTISTOTTI, I must declare and declare to be admissible the incidental recognition of the judgment issued by the Superior Court of the Judicial District of Stamford/Norwalk, State of Connecticut (United States) issued on November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016 and likewise declare to be admissible the modification of the measures ordered therein in the following sense:

1. - The parental authority and the physical and legal custody of the minor son LEONARD MICHAEL AARONSON are awarded to the mother, Mrs. SUZANNE DENISE AARONSON with whom the minor will reside, and who will be the responsible for the decisions regarding education, health, religion, choice of school and all those related to the day to day life of the minor, expressly establishing that the residence of the minor is in the Mallorca Island.

2. - No visitation regime is established in favor of Mr. MARCO BATTISTOTTI in relation to the minor child, without prejudice that it may be requested by the defaulting Defendant parent at any time by means of a subsequent claim for modification of effects under the protection of the provisions of Article 775 LEC.

3. - Mr. MARCO BATTISTOTTI shall pay FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY Euros (€ 450) monthly as child support in favor of his minor child; the monthly payments shall be paid in advance into the account designated or to be designated by the custodial parent within the first five days of each month, and shall be updated each year on the first day of January according to the variations experienced by the CPI, published by the National Institute of Statistics or equivalent official organism.

ADMINISTRATION  
OF JUSTICE

4. - Mr. MARCO BATTISTOTTI and Mrs. Aaronson each shall cover half of the medical and child care expenses (understood as necessary extraordinary expenses) of the minor child in Spain.

Notify the parties and the Public Prosecutor's Office.

No Award of Fees or Costs.

This resolution may be appealed and resolved by the Provincial Court of Palma by filing the appeal before this Court of First Instance in a period of twenty days after the notification of this resolution. The parties who do not have the right to free legal assistance are informed of the need to make a deposit of € 50 in the account of judicial deposits and consignations, 0925 0000 02, file number (four digits + year with two digits), indicating the word "Appeal" in the field "concept", and must attach the corresponding receipt of payment to the document of appeal, in accordance with the provisions of the LO 1/2009 of November 3. No process of appeal will be admitted without the said payment.

I, Borja Antolin Herreros Magistrate-Judge of the Court of First Instance n° 12 of Palma de Mallorca, so state, order, and sign.

The disclosure of the text of this resolution to parties not interested in the proceedings in which it was issued may only be carried out after dissociation of the personal data contained therein and with full respect for the right to privacy, to the rights of persons who require a special duty of guardianship or guarantee of the anonymity of victims or injured parties, when appropriate.

The personal data included in this resolution cannot be assigned, nor communicated for purposes contrary to the laws.

# EXHIBIT “10”

CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF STAMFORD-NORWALK  
123 HOYT STREET  
STAMFORD, CT 06905

MARCO BATTISTOTTI  
30 EAST 95TH STREET  
NEW YORK, NY 10128

Docket Number: FST-FA-14-4031121-S Noticed Issued: 11/01/2023

Case Caption: BATTISTOTTI, MARCO v. AARONSON, SUZANNE

Order(s) entered on this case:

499.02 Filed: 11/01/2023 C  
ORDER

Result: Granted 11/01/2023 HON DONNA HELLER

CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF STAMFORD-NORWALK  
123 HOYT STREET  
STAMFORD, CT 06905

MARCO BATTISTOTTI  
30 EAST 95TH STREET  
NEW YORK, NY 10128

Docket Number: **FST-FA-14-4031121-S** Notice Issued: **11/01/2023**  
Case Caption: **BATTISTOTTI, MARCO v. AARONSON, SUZANNE**

JDNO NOTICE

Sequence #: **1**

ORDER

ORDER REGARDING:  
09/03/2021 499.00 MOTION TO DISMISS PB 10-30

The foregoing, having been heard by the Court, is hereby:

ORDER: GRANTED

The defendant's motion to dismiss, post-judgment (#499.00) is hereby  
GRANTED. Further articulation to follow.

DONNA NELSON HELLER, P.J. FAMILY  
11/01/2023

# EXHIBIT “11”



# State of Connecticut Judicial Branch Superior Court Case Look-up



Superior Court Case Look-up  
Civil/Family  
Housing  
Small Claims

FST-FA14-4031121-S

BATTISTOTTI, MARCO v. AARONSON, SUZANNE

Prefix/Suffix: [none]

Case Type: F40

File Date: 06/13/2014

Return Date: 06/13/2014

Case Detail

Notices

History

Scheduled Court Dates

E-Services Login

Screen Section Help

Exhibits

To receive an email when there is activity on this case, click here, &

Attorney/Firm Juris Number Look-up

Case Look-up

By Party Name

By Docket Number

By Attorney/Firm Juris Number

By Property Address

Short Calendar Look-up

By Court Location

By Attorney/Firm Juris Number

Motion to Seal or Close

Calendar Notices

Court Events Look-up

By Date

By Docket Number

By Attorney/Firm Juris Number

Legal Notices

Pending Foreclosure Sales

Understanding

Display of Case Information

Contact Us



Comments

Information Updated as of: 09/23/2024

## Case Information

Case Type: F40 - Family - Custody Application - C.G.S. 46b-61  
Court Location: STAMFORD JD  
Financial Disputes: No  
Parenting Disputes: No  
RFTD Referral: No  
RFTD Accepted: No  
Last Action Date: 11/01/2023 (Last Action Date is a data entry date, not actual date)

## Disposition Information

Disposition Date: 09/07/2016  
Disposition: JUDGMENT AFTER COMPLETED TRIAL TO THE COURT WITH NO JURY  
Judge or Magistrate: HON ERIKA TINDILL

## Party/Appearance/ IV-D Authorized Filer Information

Party	No Fee Party	Category
<b>P-01 MARCO BATTISTOTTI</b> Self-Rep: 30 EAST 95TH STREET NEW YORK, NY 10128 File Date: 12/01/2014 Limited: BRIAN DIETER KASCHEL (412601) 1100 SUMMER ST STAMFORD, CT 06905 File Date: 01/09/2017		Plaintiff
<b>D-01 SUZANNE AARONSON</b> Self-Rep: ROSA PEDERA ATTORNEY CALLE JOSE ANSELMO CLAVE 8 PALMA MALLORCA, PALMA MALLORCA, SPAIN File Date: 09/23/2021 Attorney: AMENDOLA & AMENDOLA LLC (414045) 2000 POST ROAD SUITE 205 FAIRFIELD, CT 06824 File Date: 02/03/2015 Appearance For: No Family Superior Court or IV-D Child Support selection made on form. Attorney: MOORE DAVID LAW OFFICES LLC (417216) 111 SIMSBURY ROAD SUITE 207 AVON, CT 06001 File Date: 10/31/2016 Appearance For: No Family Superior Court or IV-D Child Support selection made on form.		Defendant
<b>O-01 GUARDIAN AD LITEM</b> Attorney: CONLON & MCGLYNN LLC (425451) 222 RIVERSIDE AVENUE BUILDING E/UNIT 16 WESTPORT, CT 06880 File Date: 12/23/2015 Appearance For: Family Superior Court Only		GAL for Minor Child



## Viewing Documents on Family Cases:






- Documents, court orders and judicial notices in electronic (paperless) family cases are not available publicly over the internet.\*
- Documents, court orders and judicial notices in paper family files can be viewed at the Clerk's Office in the Judicial District where the case is located during normal business hours\*
- If there is an 'e' in front of the docket number of a case, the court file for that case is electronic (paperless). Documents and court orders in electronic (paperless) family cases can be viewed at public access computers in any judicial district courthouse during normal business hours.\*



\*Any documents protected by law or by court order that are not open to the public cannot be viewed by the public online and can only be viewed in person at the clerk's office where the file is located by those authorized by law or court order to see them.

Motions / Pleadings / Documents / Case Status			
Entry No	File Date	Filed By	Description
101.00	06/13/2014	P	CUSTODY APPLICATION
102.00	06/23/2014	P	RETURN OF SERVICE
103.00	06/23/2014	D	MOTION FOR REFERENCE-FAMILY RELATIONS DIVISION
104.00	06/23/2014	D	MOTION FOR SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE OF MINOR CHILD PENDENTE LITE
105.00	06/23/2014	D	MOTION FOR CUSTODY OF MINOR CHILDREN PENDENTE LITE
106.00	06/30/2014	D	WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION

107.00	06/30/2014	D	MOTION FOR CUSTODY OF MINOR CHILDREN PENDENTE LITE
108.00	07/01/2014	D	MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER
109.00	07/01/2014	P	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE
110.00	07/03/2014	D	OBJECTION TO MOTION
111.00	07/16/2014	P	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT JD-FM-6-SHORT
112.00	07/16/2014	D	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT JD-FM-6-LONG
113.00	07/16/2014	P	WORKSHEET FOR THE CONNECTICUT CHILD SUPPORT AND ARREARAGE GUIDELINES CCSG-1
114.00	07/16/2014	P	AGREEMENT RESULT: Order 7/16/2014 HON MICHAEL SHAY
115.00	07/30/2014	D	NOTICE
116.00	08/06/2014	P	REQUEST TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO INTERROGATORIES OR PRODUCTION REQ P.B. 13-7(a)(2)/13-10(a)(2)
117.00	08/12/2014	P	MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF GUARDIAN AD LITEM
118.00	08/12/2014	P	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE
119.00	08/15/2014	P	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE RESULT: Order 3/4/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL Last Updated: Result Information - 03/05/2015
120.00	08/18/2014	D	OBJECTION TO MOTION
121.00	08/22/2014	D	MOTION TO MODIFY - GENERAL PENDENTE LITE
122.00	09/02/2014	P	MOTION FOR COUNSEL FEES PENDENTE LITE RESULT: Denied 6/8/2015 HON DONNA HELLER
123.00	09/04/2014	D	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE
124.00	09/04/2014	D	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE
125.00	09/04/2014	D	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE
126.00	09/12/2014	P	REQUEST TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO INTERROGATORIES OR PRODUCTION REQ P.B. 13-7(a)(2)/13-10(a)(2)
127.00	09/18/2014	D	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT
128.00	09/18/2014	D	REQUEST
129.00	09/15/2014	P	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE
130.00	09/22/2014	P	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT
131.00	09/22/2014	D	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT
132.00	09/22/2014	P	OBJECTION TO REQUEST RESULT: Overruled 9/22/2014 HON DONNA HELLER
133.00	09/22/2014	P	REPLY
134.00	09/22/2014	P	OBJECTION TO REQUEST RESULT: Overruled 9/22/2014 HON DONNA HELLER
135.00	09/22/2014	P	STIPULATION RESULT: Order 9/22/2014 HON DONNA HELLER
136.00	09/22/2014	P	AFFIDAVIT RE: ATTORNEY/COUNSEL FEES
137.00	09/22/2014	D	REQUEST
138.00	10/01/2014	D	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT
139.00	10/02/2014	D	OBJECTION TO REQUEST RESULT: Overruled 10/6/2014 HON DONNA HELLER
140.00	10/02/2014	D	MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER RESULT: Denied 10/6/2014 HON DONNA HELLER
141.00	10/06/2014	P	AFFIDAVIT RE: ATTORNEY/COUNSEL FEES
142.00	10/06/2014	P	AFFIDAVIT
143.00	10/06/2014	D	OBJECTION
144.00	10/23/2014	P	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE
145.00	11/12/2014	D	REQUEST
146.00	11/13/2014	P	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT
147.00	11/13/2014	D	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT
148.00	11/13/2014	D	MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
149.00	11/14/2014	P	MEMORANDUM
150.00	12/05/2014	P	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE
151.00	12/11/2014	P	APPLICATION FOR EMERGENCY EX PARTE ORDER OF CUSTODY RESULT: Order 12/22/2014 HON DONNA HELLER Last Updated: Result Information - 12/22/2014
152.00	12/11/2014	P	MOTION FOR MENTAL OR PHYSICAL EXAM RESULT: Order 9/4/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
152.01	09/04/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 9/4/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
153.00	12/16/2014	P	APPLICATION FOR EMERGENCY EX PARTE ORDER OF CUSTODY RESULT: Denied 12/16/2014 HON STANLEY NOVACK
154.00	12/16/2014	P	AFFIDAVIT CONCERNING CHILDREN

155.00	12/18/2014	P	RETURN OF SERVICE
156.00	12/22/2014	P	AGREEMENT RESULT: Order 12/22/2014 HON SYBIL RICHARDS
157.00	12/19/2014	P	ORDER HEARING AND NOTICE
157.01	12/19/2014	P	MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO WITHDRAW APPEARANCE RESULT: Order 2/9/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
158.00	12/23/2014	D	PENDENTE LITE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION - OTHER
159.00	12/23/2014	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE RESULT: Granted 9/7/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
159.01	09/07/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 9/7/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
160.00	01/02/2015	D	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE
161.00	01/26/2015	C	TRANSCRIPT
162.00	02/09/2015	P	STIPULATION RESULT: Order 2/9/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
163.00	02/06/2015	D	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Order 2/11/2015 HON DONNA HELLER
164.00	02/13/2015	O	MOTION FOR COUNSEL FEES PENDENTE LITE
165.00	02/20/2015	P	MOTION FOR MENTAL OR PHYSICAL EXAM RESULT: Denied 3/23/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
166.00	02/26/2015	D	MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER
167.00	02/27/2015	P	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
168.00	02/27/2015	D	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT JD-FM-6-LONG  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
169.00	02/27/2015	P	AFFIDAVIT RE: ATTORNEY/COUNSEL FEES
170.00	02/04/2015	C	TRANSCRIPT
171.00	03/04/2015	P	AGREEMENT RESULT: Order 3/4/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
172.00	03/11/2015	D	NOTICE
173.00	03/12/2015	O	MOTION FOR COUNSEL FEES PENDENTE LITE
174.00	03/12/2015	P	PENDENTE LITE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION - CHILD SUPPORT
175.00	03/20/2015	P	REQUEST
176.00	03/20/2015	P	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE
177.00	03/20/2015	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE RESULT: Order 9/4/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL Last Updated: Result Information - 09/16/2016
177.01	09/07/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 9/7/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
178.00	03/23/2015	P	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE
179.00	03/04/2015	C	TRANSCRIPT
180.00	03/27/2015	P	APPLICATION FOR EMERGENCY EX PARTE ORDER OF CUSTODY RESULT: Denied 3/27/2015 HON MICHAEL SHAY
181.00	04/06/2015	P	REQUEST
182.00	04/06/2015	P	RETURN OF SERVICE
183.00	02/27/2015	C	TRANSCRIPT
184.00	04/06/2015	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Granted 4/7/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL Last Updated: Party Type - 04/14/2015
185.00	04/15/2015	D	MOTION TO COMPEL RESULT: Granted 5/11/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
186.00	04/16/2015	D	MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
187.00	04/20/2015	P	MOTION TO COMPEL RESULT: Order 5/13/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
188.00	04/20/2015	P	MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
189.00	04/20/2015	P	REPLY
190.00	04/09/2015	O	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Granted 4/20/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
191.00	04/14/2015	P	OBJECTION TO MOTION RESULT: Overruled 4/20/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
192.00	04/27/2015	P	RETURN OF SERVICE
193.00	04/27/2015	P	MOTION FOR GENETIC TEST RESULT: Order 9/4/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
193.01	09/04/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 9/4/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
194.00	04/27/2015	P	OBJECTION
195.00	04/27/2015	P	OBJECTION
196.00	04/30/2015	D	MOTION IN LIMINE RESULT: Denied 5/11/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL


197.00	04/30/2015	D	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT JD-FM-6-LONG  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
197.01	04/30/2015	D	WORKSHEET FOR THE CONNECTICUT CHILD SUPPORT AND ARREARAGE GUIDELINES CCSG-1
198.00	05/11/2015	P	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
199.00	05/13/2015	D	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT JD-FM-6-LONG  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
200.00	05/13/2015	C	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT(S) UNSEALED BY ORDER OF THE COURT RESULT: Order 5/13/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
201.00	06/08/2015	C	MEMORANDUM OF DECISION RESULT: Order 6/8/2015 HON DONNA HELLER
202.00	07/06/2015	P	PENDENTE LITE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION - VISITATION
202.01	02/01/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 2/1/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
203.00	08/10/2015	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE RESULT: Order 8/31/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
204.00	08/31/2015	C	TRANSCRIPT
205.00	09/14/2015	P	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE
206.00	09/28/2015	P	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE
207.00	09/21/2015	C	ENTRY ERASED TO CORRECT ERROR Last Updated: Legend Code - 11/16/2015
208.00	10/02/2015	C	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Granted 10/5/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
209.00	10/05/2015	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 10/5/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
210.00	12/04/2015	O	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE RESULT: Granted 12/4/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL Last Updated: Date Filed - 12/04/2015
211.00	11/09/2015	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 12/10/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL Last Updated: Party Type - 12/15/2015
212.00	11/09/2015	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 12/10/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
213.00	11/09/2015	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 12/10/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
214.00	11/09/2015	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 12/10/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
215.00	11/09/2015	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 12/10/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
216.00	11/09/2015	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 12/10/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
217.00	11/09/2015	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 12/10/2015 HON ERIKA TINDILL
218.00	12/15/2015	P	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE
219.00	12/11/2015	D	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT JD-FM-6-LONG  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
220.00	12/10/2015	O	AFFIDAVIT RE: ATTORNEY/COUNSEL FEES
221.00	12/17/2015	P	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
222.00	12/18/2015	P	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE
223.00	12/17/2015	C	TRANSCRIPT
223.01	12/10/2015	C	TRANSCRIPT
224.00	12/28/2015	P	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE RESULT: Order 2/1/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
225.00	01/11/2016	C	ENTRY ERASED TO CORRECT ERROR Last Updated: Additional Description - 01/26/2016
226.00	01/19/2016	C	ENTRY ERASED TO CORRECT ERROR Last Updated: Additional Description - 01/26/2016
227.00	01/19/2016	P	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE
228.00	01/19/2016	P	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE RESULT: Denied 9/7/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
228.01	09/07/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 9/7/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
229.00	01/25/2016	D	PENDENTE LITE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION - VISITATION RESULT: Order 2/1/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
230.00	02/04/2016	P	REPLY
231.00	02/01/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 2/1/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
231.10	02/01/2016	C	TRANSCRIPT
231.20	02/01/2016	C	ORDER
232.00	03/30/2016	P	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE RESULT: Denied 9/7/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL



232.01	09/07/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 9/7/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
233.00	04/11/2016	D	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE
234.00	04/11/2016	D	MOTION FOR ORDERS BEFORE JUDGMENT - PENDENTE LITE
235.00	04/25/2016	P	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT PENDENTE LITE RESULT: Order 5/10/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
235.01	05/10/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 5/10/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
236.00	04/25/2016	P	REPLY
237.00	05/03/2016	D	REPLY
238.00	06/03/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 6/3/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
239.00	06/30/2016	D	MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE RESULT: Denied 9/7/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
239.01	09/07/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 9/7/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
240.00	07/13/2016	P	REPLY
241.00	05/04/2016	P	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
242.00	02/01/2016	C	TRANSCRIPT
243.00	09/07/2016	C	MEMORANDUM OF DECISION RESULT: Order 9/7/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
244.55	09/07/2016	C	JUDGMENT AFTER COMPLETED TRIAL TO THE COURT WITH NO JURY RESULT: HON ERIKA TINDILL
245.00	09/22/2016	P	APPEAL TO APPELLATE COURT ALL FEES PAID
246.00	09/28/2016	P	MOTION FOR ARTICULATION RESULT: Granted 10/6/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
247.00	09/29/2016	D	STATEMENT RESULT: Order 11/16/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
247.01	11/16/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 11/16/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
248.00	10/06/2016	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 10/6/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
249.00	10/17/2016	D	MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION-COURT ORDER
250.00	10/06/2016	C	APPELLATE COURT MATERIAL
251.00	10/17/2016	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT RESULT: Order 4/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
252.00	10/17/2016	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT RESULT: Granted 12/11/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL Related Limited Appearance(s)
252.01	12/11/2017	C	ORDER
253.00	10/17/2016	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT Related Limited Appearance(s)
253.01	05/11/2017	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 5/11/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
254.00	11/07/2016	D	RETURN OF SERVICE
255.00	11/18/2016	C	CORRECTED MEMORANDUM OF DECISION RESULT: Order 11/18/2016 HON ERIKA TINDILL
256.00	12/20/2016	O	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT RESULT: Granted 12/3/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
257.00	12/21/2016	D	MOTION FOR ORDER POST-JUDGMENT
258.00	12/21/2016	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT RESULT: Order 4/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
258.01	12/21/2016	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT RESULT: Granted 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
258.02	12/21/2016	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT RESULT: Granted 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
259.00	01/09/2017	P	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
260.00	01/09/2017	P	Limited Appearance JD-CL-121
261.00	01/30/2017	D	POST-JUDGMENT MOTION FOR MODIFICATION - OTHER
262.00	01/30/2017	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT
263.00	03/09/2017	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT RESULT: Granted 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
264.00	03/09/2017	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT
265.00	03/09/2017	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT RESULT: Granted 12/11/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
265.01	12/15/2017	C	ORDER
266.00	03/09/2017	D	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT RESULT: Granted 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL

267.00	03/10/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR ORDER POST-JUDGMENT</b> RESULT: Denied 3/20/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
268.00	03/20/2017	D	<b>OBJECTION</b> RESULT: Sustained 3/20/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
269.00	03/20/2017	D	<b>POST-JUDGMENT MOTION FOR MODIFICATION - OTHER</b>
270.00	03/23/2017	C	<b>FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT(S) UNSEALED BY ORDER OF THE COURT</b> RESULT: Order 3/23/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
271.00	03/30/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR ORDER POST-JUDGMENT</b> RESULT: Denied 3/31/2017 HON DONNA HELLER
272.00	03/27/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR ARTICULATION</b>
272.01	04/07/2017	C	<b>ORDER</b> RESULT: Order 4/7/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
273.00	04/20/2017	P	<b>RETURN OF SERVICE</b>
274.00	04/24/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR MENTAL OR PHYSICAL EXAM</b>
274.01	05/19/2017	C	<b>ORDER</b> RESULT: Order 5/19/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
275.00	04/24/2017	P	<b>MEMORANDUM</b>
276.00	04/12/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 4/25/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
277.00	04/12/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 4/25/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
278.00	04/12/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 4/25/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
279.00	04/12/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 4/25/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
280.00	04/12/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 4/25/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
281.00	04/12/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 4/25/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
282.00	04/12/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 4/25/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
283.00	04/12/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 4/25/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
284.00	04/12/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 4/25/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
285.00	04/12/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 4/25/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
286.00	04/12/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 4/12/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
287.00	04/12/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 4/25/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
288.00	05/02/2017	P	<b>DISCLOSURE OF EXPERT WITNESS</b>
289.00	05/08/2017	D	<b>OBJECTION</b>
290.00	05/11/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR ORDER PENDENTE LITE</b>
291.00	05/08/2017	D	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Denied 5/15/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
292.00	05/30/2017	D	<b>STATEMENT</b>
293.00	06/15/2017	D	<b>MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER</b>
294.00	07/07/2017	D	<b>MOTION FOR ORDER POST-JUDGMENT</b> RESULT: Denied 4/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
295.00	07/13/2017	D	<b>PROPOSED ORDER</b> Last Updated: Legend Code - 07/20/2017
296.00	07/13/2017	D	<b>AFFIDAVIT RE: ATTORNEY/COUNSEL FEES</b> RESULT: Order 10/15/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
297.00	07/13/2017	D	<b>AFFIDAVIT RE: ATTORNEY/COUNSEL FEES</b> RESULT: Order 10/15/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
298.00	07/14/2017	C	<b>ORDER</b>
298.10	07/14/2017	P	<b>FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT</b>  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
298.20	07/14/2017	P	<b>REPLY</b>
299.00	07/27/2017	D	<b>STATEMENT</b>
300.00	08/07/2017	P	<b>STATEMENT</b>
301.00	08/07/2017	D	<b>STATEMENT</b>
302.00	08/29/2017	P	<b>MOTION FOR CONTEMPT</b> Related Limited Appearance(s)
303.00	09/14/2017	D	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Granted 9/18/2017 HON THOMAS COLIN
304.00	09/22/2017	D	<b>Limited Appearance JD-CL-121</b>
305.00	09/22/2017	O	<b>PERIODIC REVIEW WORKSHEET - FEES CHARGED BY COUNSEL OR GUARDIAN AD LITEM</b>

306.00	09/29/2017	D	<b>MOTION FOR LEAVE</b> RESULT: Granted 9/22/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
307.00	09/29/2017	D	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Granted 9/22/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
308.00	11/15/2017	O	<b>AFFIDAVIT</b> RESULT: Order 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
309.00	11/27/2017	D	<b>DISCLOSURE OF EXPERT WITNESS</b>
310.00	11/27/2017	D	<b>DISCLOSURE OF EXPERT WITNESS</b>
311.00	11/26/2017	C	<b>ORDER</b> RESULT: Order 11/26/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
311.50	11/26/2017	P	<b>REQUEST TO BRING AUDIO/VISUAL EQUIPMENT INTO THE COURTHOUSE (JD-CL-90)</b> RESULT: Order 11/27/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL Last Updated: Entry Number - 04/12/2018
312.00	11/27/2017	C	<b>ORDER</b> RESULT: Order 11/27/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
312.10	11/28/2017	D	<b>PROPOSED ORDER</b>
312.20	11/28/2017	D	<b>DISCLOSURE OF EXPERT WITNESS</b>
313.00	12/03/2017	C	<b>ORDER</b> RESULT: Order 12/3/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
314.00	11/27/2017	D	<b>MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE</b> RESULT: Granted 11/27/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
314.10	12/18/2017	P	<b>REQUEST TO BRING AUDIO/VISUAL EQUIPMENT INTO THE COURTHOUSE (JD-CL-90)</b> RESULT: Order 12/18/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
314.50	12/04/2017	P	<b>REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION</b> RESULT: Granted 12/15/2017 HON ERIKA TINDILL
315.00	01/05/2018	P	<b>MOTION TO SEAL DOCUMENT</b> RESULT: Denied 7/5/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
315.01	01/05/2018	P	<b>MOTION TO CLOSE COURTROOM PROCEEDING</b> RESULT: Denied 7/5/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
316.00	01/05/2018	P	<b>MOTION TO REARGUE/RECONSIDER</b> RESULT: Denied 1/9/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
317.00	01/12/2018	P	<b>MOTION FOR ORDER</b> RESULT: Granted 1/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
318.00	01/10/2018	P	<b>MOTION FOR ORDER</b>
319.00	01/10/2018	P	<b>MOTION FOR ORDER</b> RESULT: Denied 1/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL Last Updated: Result Information - 01/16/2018
320.00	01/12/2018	P	<b>MOTION FOR ORDER</b> RESULT: Denied 1/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
321.00	01/17/2018	C	<b>REQUEST FOR ORDER - FAMILY SERVICES CASE MANAGEMENT (JD-FM-252)</b> RESULT: Granted 1/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
322.00	01/24/2018	P	<b>MOTION FOR LEAVE</b> RESULT: Granted 1/29/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
323.00	01/16/2018	C	<b>TRANSCRIPT</b>
324.00	01/17/2018	C	<b>REQUEST FOR REFERRAL BY CSSD FAMILY SERVICES (FORM JD-FM-230)</b> RESULT: Granted 1/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
325.00	01/24/2018	P	<b>POST-JUDGMENT MOTION FOR MODIFICATION - CHILD SUPPORT</b>
326.00	02/08/2018	C	<b>TRANSCRIPT</b> RESULT: Order 1/27/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
327.00	02/09/2018	C	<b>TRANSCRIPT</b> RESULT: Order 1/31/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
328.00	01/31/2018	C	<b>ORDER</b>
329.00	01/31/2018	C	<b>ORDER</b>
330.00	02/14/2018	C	<b>ORDER</b> RESULT: Order 2/14/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
331.00	02/13/2018	C	<b>RECORD CORRECTION</b> Last Updated: Document Moved - 04/17/2018
332.00	02/14/2018	D	<b>REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION</b> RESULT: Denied 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
333.00	02/06/2018	D	<b>MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT</b>
334.00	02/14/2018	D	<b>REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION</b> RESULT: Denied 4/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
335.00	02/14/2018	D	<b>REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION</b> RESULT: Denied 4/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
336.00	02/26/2018	D	<b>LIST OF OPERATIVE PLEADINGS</b>
337.00	02/22/2018	P	<b>CASEFLOW REQUEST (JD-CV-116)</b>
338.00	02/23/2018	P	<b>LIST OF DOCUMENTS IN LIEU OF THE LIVE TESTIMONY OF AN EXPERT WITNESS</b>
339.33	03/16/2018	C	<b>TRANSFERRED FROM SUPERIOR COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF STAMFORD-NORWALK</b>
340.33	03/16/2018	C	<b>TRANSFERRED TO SUPERIOR COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF NEW HAVEN</b>
341.00	01/31/2018	C	<b>MITTIMUS ISSUED</b> RESULT: Order 1/31/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL

342.00	11/20/2017	C	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSFER/FILE RECEIPT FORM NO JD-CL-52
343.00	04/04/2018	D	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Denied 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
344.00	04/11/2018	D	PLEADING - SEE FILE
345.00	03/14/2018	D	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Granted 3/15/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
346.00	03/14/2018	D	MOTION TO TRANSFER RESULT: Granted 3/15/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
347.00	04/09/2018	P	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Granted 4/19/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
347.10	04/19/2018	P	MOTION FOR REFERENCE-FAMILY RELATIONS DIVISION RESULT: Order 4/19/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL Last Updated: Entry Number - 04/24/2018
348.00	04/16/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
349.00	04/16/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
350.00	04/16/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
351.00	04/16/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
352.00	04/16/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
353.00	04/16/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
354.00	04/16/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
355.00	04/16/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
356.00	04/17/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
357.00	04/17/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
358.00	04/17/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
359.00	04/17/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
360.00	04/17/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
361.00	04/17/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/17/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
362.00	04/16/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
363.00	04/19/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/19/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
364.00	04/24/2018	D	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Denied 5/11/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
365.00	04/24/2018	D	OBJECTION TO MOTION
366.00	04/24/2018	P	NOTICE
367.00	04/24/2018	D	PLEADING - SEE FILE
368.00	04/06/2018	C	TRANSCRIPT
368.10	04/06/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 4/6/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
369.00	04/25/2018	F	REQUEST FOR ORDER - FAMILY SERVICES CASE MANAGEMENT (JD-FM-252) RESULT: Granted 4/25/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
370.00	04/25/2018	F	REQUEST FOR REFERRAL BY CSSD FAMILY SERVICES (FORM JD-FM-230) RESULT: Granted 4/25/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
370.10	04/24/2018	P	PLEADING - SEE FILE
371.00	05/10/2018	P	REQUEST
372.00	05/11/2018	P	REQUEST
373.00	05/11/2018	P	NOTICE
374.00	05/11/2018	P	NOTICE
375.00	05/11/2018	P	AMENDMENT
376.00	05/11/2018	P	OBJECTION RESULT: Overruled 5/21/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
377.00	05/11/2018	P	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Denied 5/14/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
378.00	05/11/2018	P	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Denied 5/31/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
379.00	05/14/2018	P	MOTION TO COMPEL

380.00	05/14/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 5/14/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
381.00	05/15/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 5/15/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
382.00	05/14/2018	D	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Granted 5/21/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
383.00	05/21/2018	D	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Granted 5/21/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
384.00	05/21/2018	D	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Granted 5/21/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
385.00	05/21/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 5/21/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
386.00	05/22/2018	C	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Granted 5/22/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
386.10	05/23/2018	C	SUBPOENA ISSUED
386.20	06/07/2018	F	RETURN OF SERVICE
387.00	05/15/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 5/15/2018 BY THE COURT
388.00	05/31/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 5/31/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
389.00	05/31/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 5/31/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
390.00	06/05/2018	D	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Granted 6/6/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
391.00	06/06/2018	D	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Denied 6/6/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
391.20	06/07/2018	D	LIST OF EXHIBITS (JD-CL-28/JD-CL-28a)
392.00	06/05/2018	P	OBJECTION TO MOTION RESULT: Sustained 6/6/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
393.00	06/08/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 6/8/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
393.10	06/11/2018	P	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT JD-FM-6-SHORT  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
394.00	06/12/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 6/12/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
395.00	06/14/2018	P	REQUEST
396.00	06/27/2018	P	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION
397.00	07/05/2018	C	LIST OF EXHIBITS (JD-CL-28/JD-CL-28a)
398.00	07/03/2018	D	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Denied 7/5/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
399.00	07/05/2018	D	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION
400.00	07/05/2018	D	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION
401.00	07/06/2018	D	PETITION FOR CERTIFICATION
402.00	07/12/2018	P	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION
403.00	07/12/2018	P	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION
404.00	07/13/2018	D	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION
405.00	07/11/2018	P	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION
406.00	07/20/2018	D	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION
407.00	07/27/2018	P	OBJECTION TO MOTION
408.00	08/03/2018	C	CASEFLOW REQUEST (JD-CV-116) RESULT: Denied 8/3/2018 HON KAREN GOODROW Last Updated: Legend Code - 08/07/2018
409.00	08/03/2018	P	CASEFLOW REQUEST (JD-CV-116) RESULT: Denied 8/3/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL Last Updated: Legend Code - 08/07/2018
410.00	07/20/2018	D	MOTION FOR COUNSEL FEES
411.00	07/27/2018	C	LIST OF EXHIBITS (JD-CL-28/JD-CL-28a)
412.00	08/03/2018	D	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Granted 8/16/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
413.00	08/16/2018	D	OBJECTION TO MOTION
414.00	08/20/2018	C	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 8/21/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
415.00	08/24/2018	D	PROPOSED ORDER
416.00	08/27/2018	D	PROPOSED ORDER
417.00	08/27/2018	P	PROPOSED ORDER
418.00	09/10/2018	D	AFFIDAVIT RE: ATTORNEY/COUNSEL FEES
418.10	09/10/2018	D	AFFIDAVIT RE: ATTORNEY/COUNSEL FEES
419.00	09/10/2018	D	PROPOSED ORDER

420.00	09/13/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 9/13/2018 HON KAREN GOODROW
421.00	09/26/2018	D	REQUEST Last Updated: Legend Code - 10/04/2018
422.00	10/01/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 10/1/2018 HON KAREN GOODROW
423.00	09/12/2018	C	PETITION FOR CERTIFICATION RESULT: Denied 9/12/2018 BY THE COURT
424.00	10/15/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 10/15/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
425.00	10/11/2018	P	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Denied 10/22/2018 HON KAREN GOODROW
426.00	10/15/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 10/15/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
427.00	10/15/2018	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 10/15/2018 HON ERIKA TINDILL
428.33	10/01/2018	C	TRANSFERRED FROM SUPERIOR COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF NEW HAVEN
429.33	10/01/2018	C	TRANSFERRED TO SUPERIOR COURT JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF STAMFORD-NORWALK
430.00	10/29/2018	C	ORDER
431.00	10/29/2018	D	MOTION FOR LEAVE
432.00	11/01/2018	P	APPEAL TO APPELLATE COURT ALL FEES PAID
433.00	11/05/2018	P	RECORD CORRECTION Last Updated: Document Moved - 11/05/2018
434.00	11/05/2018	P	RECORD CORRECTION Last Updated: Document Moved - 11/05/2018
435.00	11/01/2018	D	MOTION FOR LEAVE
436.00	11/01/2018	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE
437.00	11/01/2018	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE
438.00	11/19/2018	D	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT JD-FM-6-LONG  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
439.00	11/08/2018	D	MOTION FOR LEAVE
440.00	11/01/2018	D	MOTION FOR LEAVE
441.00	11/06/2018	D	MOTION FOR LEAVE
442.00	11/28/2018	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE
443.00	11/30/2018	P	STATEMENT
444.00	12/13/2018	F	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT
445.00	12/31/2018	P	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Denied 1/2/2019 HON MARGARITA HARTLEY MOORE
446.00	03/14/2019	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 3/14/2019 HON DONNA HELLER
447.00	03/13/2019	C	ORDER
448.00	03/13/2019	C	ORDER
449.00	04/08/2019	C	ORDER
450.00	04/03/2019	P	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Denied 4/5/2019 HON DONNA HELLER
451.00	04/03/2019	F	OBJECTION
452.00	04/17/2019	D	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Granted 4/17/2019 HON DONNA HELLER
453.00	04/17/2019	D	NOTICE
454.00	03/11/2019	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE
455.00	03/11/2019	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE
456.00	03/11/2019	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE
457.00	04/18/2019	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE
458.00	04/18/2019	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE
458.01	06/24/2019	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 6/24/2019 HON ANTHONY TRUGLIA
459.00	04/18/2019	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE
460.00	05/06/2019	P	LIST OF OPERATIVE PLEADINGS
461.00	05/06/2019	D	LIST OF OPERATIVE PLEADINGS
462.00	05/06/2019	D	FINANCIAL AFFIDAVIT JD-FM-6-LONG  Sealed pursuant to PB § 25-59A(h)
463.00	05/21/2019	D	MOTION FOR LEAVE
464.00	05/22/2019	P	APPLICATION FOR EMERGENCY EX PARTE ORDER OF CUSTODY RESULT: Denied 5/22/2019 HON ANTHONY TRUGLIA
464.01	06/28/2019	C	ORDER
465.00	06/13/2019	P	RETURN OF SERVICE
466.00	06/20/2019	P	STIPULATION RESULT: Order 6/20/2019 HON ANTHONY TRUGLIA

466.01	06/20/2019	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 6/20/2019 HON ANTHONY TRUGLIA
467.00	06/21/2019	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 6/21/2019 HON ANTHONY TRUGLIA
468.00	06/24/2019	C	LIST OF EXHIBITS (JD-CL-28/JD-CL-28a)
469.00	07/08/2019	D	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Granted 7/9/2019 HON ANTHONY TRUGLIA
470.00	07/19/2019	C	ORDER RESULT: Order 7/19/2019 HON ANTHONY TRUGLIA
471.00	08/08/2019	P	RETURN OF SERVICE
472.00	07/23/2019	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE RESULT: Granted 8/5/2019 HON ANTHONY TRUGLIA
473.00	08/05/2019	P	POST-JUDGMENT MOTION FOR MODIFICATION - VISITATION
474.00	08/05/2019	P	POST-JUDGMENT MOTION FOR MODIFICATION - CUSTODY, VISITATION
475.00	08/05/2019	P	APPLICATION FOR EMERGENCY EX PARTE ORDER OF CUSTODY RESULT: Denied 8/5/2019 HON ANTHONY TRUGLIA
476.00	08/05/2019	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE RESULT: Granted 8/5/2019 HON ANTHONY TRUGLIA
477.00	08/06/2019	D	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Granted 8/6/2019 HON DONNA HELLER
478.00	08/08/2019	P	RETURN OF SERVICE
479.00	08/08/2019	D	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE
479.01	08/16/2019	C	ORDER RESULT: Denied 8/16/2019 HON ANTHONY TRUGLIA
480.00	08/05/2019	P	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Denied 8/27/2019 HON MARGARITA HARTLEY MOORE
481.00	08/21/2019	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE RESULT: Denied 9/5/2019 HON MARGARITA HARTLEY MOORE
482.00	09/11/2019	P	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Denied 9/23/2019 HON MARGARITA HARTLEY MOORE
483.00	09/11/2019	P	REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR MODIFICATION RESULT: Denied 9/23/2019 HON MARGARITA HARTLEY MOORE
484.00	09/23/2019	D	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Granted 9/24/2019 HON DONNA HELLER
485.00	10/04/2019	C	FAMILY SERVICES NOTICE TO COURT JD-FM-223
486.00	10/17/2019	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE RESULT: Denied 10/30/2019 HON MARGARITA HARTLEY MOORE
487.00	11/06/2019	D	MOTION FOR LEAVE RESULT: Denied 11/18/2019 HON MARGARITA HARTLEY MOORE
488.00	12/05/2019	D	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Granted 12/5/2019 HON MARGARITA HARTLEY MOORE
489.00	11/14/2019	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE RESULT: Denied 11/26/2019 HON MARGARITA HARTLEY MOORE
490.00	11/19/2019	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE RESULT: Denied 12/17/2019 HON ANTHONY TRUGLIA
491.00	01/23/2020	C	FAMILY SERVICES NOTICE TO COURT JD-FM-223
492.00	02/06/2020	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE RESULT: Granted 2/19/2020 HON MARGARITA HARTLEY MOORE
493.00	02/19/2020	P	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT
494.00	05/03/2021	P	MOTION FOR LEAVE RESULT: Granted 5/19/2021 HON DONNA HELLER
495.00	05/03/2021	P	MOTION FOR CONTEMPT POST-JUDGMENT
496.00	09/30/2021	O	MEMORANDUM OF RESOLUTION SCREENING (FORM JD-FM-290)
497.00	10/08/2021	C	MEMORANDUM OF RESOLUTION SCREENING (FORM JD-FM-290)
498.00	09/07/2021	D	MOTION FOR LEAVE RESULT: Order 10/15/2021 HON DONNA HELLER
499.00	09/03/2021	D	MOTION TO DISMISS PB 10-30
499.01	08/19/2022	C	ORDER
499.02	11/01/2023	C	ORDER RESULT: Granted 11/1/2023 HON DONNA HELLER
500.00	09/03/2021	D	MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
501.00	09/08/2021	P	OBJECTION RESULT: Overruled 10/15/2021 HON DONNA HELLER
502.00	10/21/2021	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 10/22/2021 HON DONNA HELLER
503.00	10/21/2021	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 10/21/2021 HON DONNA HELLER
504.00	10/21/2021	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 10/22/2021 HON DONNA HELLER

505.00	10/21/2021	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 10/22/2021 HON DONNA HELLER
506.00	10/21/2021	P	APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA BY SELF-REP PARTY - PB SEC 7-19 RESULT: Denied 10/22/2021 HON DONNA HELLER
507.00	10/12/2021	C	FAMILY SERVICES NOTICE TO COURT JD-FM-223
508.00	11/30/2021	P	CASEFLOW REQUEST - FAMILY MATTERS (FORM JD-FM-292)
509.00	04/26/2022	D	Limited Appearance JD-CL-121
510.00	04/29/2022	P	PROPOSED ORDER
511.00	04/29/2022	D	NOTICE OF COMPLIANCE
512.00	04/27/2022	P	LIST OF EXHIBITS (JD-CL-28/JD-CL-28a)
513.00	07/15/2022	D	Certificate of Completion JD-CL-122
514.00	07/29/2022	D	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Granted 8/1/2022 HON DONNA HELLER
515.00	10/12/2022	D	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE RESULT: Granted 10/13/2022 HON DONNA HELLER
516.00	10/13/2022	P	OBJECTION TO MOTION
517.00	08/19/2022	P	STATEMENT
518.00	09/19/2022	D	REQUEST
518.01	12/08/2022	C	ORDER
519.00	09/12/2022	P	REQUEST
519.01	12/08/2022	C	ORDER
520.00	09/12/2022	P	REQUEST
521.00	01/05/2023	P	STATEMENT
522.00	06/23/2023	P	PROPOSED ORDER
523.00	06/23/2023	P	STATEMENT
524.00	06/30/2023	P	STATEMENT
525.00	07/05/2023	P	STATEMENT
526.00	07/06/2023	D	STATEMENT Last Updated: Party Type - 11/01/2023
527.00	03/06/2023	C	TRANSCRIPT
528.00	07/20/2023	D	STATEMENT Last Updated: Party Type - 11/01/2023

Scheduled Court Dates as of 09/20/2024				
FST-FA14-4031121-S - BATTISTOTTI,MARCO v. AARONSON,SUZANNE				
#	Date	Time	Event Description	Status
No Events Scheduled				

Judicial ADR events may be heard in a court that is different from the court where the case is filed. To check location information about an ADR event, select the **Notices** tab on the top of the case detail page.

Matters that appear on the Short Calendar are shown as scheduled court events on this page. The date displayed on this page is the date of the calendar.

The status of a Short Calendar matter is not displayed because it is determined by markings made by the parties as required by the calendar notices and the [civil](#) standing orders. Markings made electronically can be viewed by those who have electronic access through the Markings History link on the Civil/Family Menu in E-Services. Markings made by telephone can only be obtained through the clerk's office. If more than one motion is on a single short calendar, the calendar will be listed once on this page. You can see more information on matters appearing on Short Calendars by going to the [Civil/Family Case Look-Up](#) page and [Short Calendars By Juris Number](#) or [By Court Location](#).

Periodic changes to terminology that do not affect the status of the case may be made.

[Attorneys](#) | [Case Look-up](#) | [Courts](#) | [Directories](#) | [Educational Resources](#) | [E-Services](#) | [FAQ's](#) | [Juror Information](#) | [News & Updates](#) | [Opinions](#) | [Opportunities](#) | [Self-Help](#) | [Home](#)

This list does not constitute or replace official notice of scheduled court events.

[Common Legal Terms](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Website Policies](#)  
**Disclaimer:** For civil and family cases statewide, case information is displayed and is available for inquiry on this website for a period of time, one year to a maximum period of ten years, after the disposition date. To the extent that Connecticut Practice Book Sections 7-10 and 7-11 provide for a shorter period of time, this information will be displayed for the shorter period.

In accordance with the Federal Violence Against Women Act of 2005, cases involving relief from physical abuse (restraining orders), civil protection orders, foreign protective orders, and motions that would be likely to publicly reveal the identity or location of a protected party may not be displayed and may be available only at the courts.

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK

-----X

MARCO BATTISTOTTI,

Plaintiff,

Index No. 101147/2024

- against -

SUZANNE AARONSON

Defendant.

-----X

---

---

AFFIDAVIT OF DOMESTICATION

---

---

Plaintiff/pro-se:

Marco Battistotti  
244 Fifth Avenue, B256  
New York, New York 10001  
(212) 777-7304  
(917) 930-6200  
marco@justmarco.com


Further Affiant Sayeth Not.

New York, N.Y.

Date: September 25, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

By



**Marco Battistotti,**  
(Plaintiff pro-se)  
244 Fifth Avenue, B256  
New York, NY 10001  
(212) 777.7304  
(917) 930.6200  
[marco@justmarco.com](mailto:marco@justmarco.com)

NO PREVIOUS APPLICATION HAS  
BEEN MADE FOR THE RELIEF  
REQUESTED HEREIN.

  
(INITIALS)


TO:

**Suzanne Aaronson,**  
in care of Attorney Rosa Pederà  
Carrer de Josep Anselm Clave' 8  
07002 Palma, Illes Balears, Spain

State of New York  
County of New York

Sworn to before me this

25 day of Sept. 2024



DANIEL T. CHENG  
Notary Public, State of New York  
Reg. No. 04CH0015293  
Qualified in New York County  
Commission Expires Oct. 30, 2027