

1 CASE NUMBER: BD621137
2 CASE NAME: REED RANDOY, PETITIONER VS.
3 MARICKE RANDOY, RESPONDENT
4 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 2016
5 DEPARTMENT CE 22 HON. TAMARA HALL, JUDGE
6 REPORTER: BARBARA A. KING, CSR NO. 8347
7 TIME: 11:30 A.M.

8 APPEARANCES:

9 THE PETITIONER, REED RANDOY,
10 PRESENT WITH COUNSEL, NICHOLAS A. SALICK,
11 ATTORNEY AT LAW; THE RESPONDENT,
12 MARICKE RANDOY, PRESENT WITH COUNSEL,
13 ANAT RESNIK, ATTORNEY AT LAW.

14 -OOO-

15
16 THE COURT: LET'S CALL NUMBER 14, RANDOY VERSUS RANDOY.

17 MR. SALICK: NICOLAS SALICK FOR THE PETITIONER REED
18 RANDOY, WHO IS PRESENT AT COUNSEL TABLE.

19 MS. RESNIK: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR, ANAT RESNIK ON
20 BEHALF OF RESPONDENT, WHO IS PRESENT AT COUNSEL TABLE.

21 THE COURT: IF WE COULD SWEAR THE PARTIES.

22 THE CLERK: PLEASE RAISE YOUR RIGHT HAND.

23 DO YOU SOLEMNLY STATE THE TESTIMONY YOU MAY GIVE IN
24 THE CAUSE NOW PENDING BEFORE THIS COURT SHALL BE THE TRUTH, THE
25 WHOLE TRUTH, AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH, SO HELP YOU GOD?

26 THE PETITIONER: I DO.

27 THE RESPONDENT: I DO.

28 THE COURT: THANK YOU. AND EVERYONE COULD HAVE A SEAT IF

1 YOU WISH.

2 OKAY. WE ARE HERE TODAY FOR -- JUST ONE MOMENT --
3 FOR TWO PURPOSES, FOR PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
4 RESTRAINING ORDER. TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER WAS GRANTED IN
5 PART, DENIED IN PART ON MARCH 25TH, 2016. THE COURT HAS
6 REVIEWED THE RESPONSE FILED BY THE RESPONDENT APRIL 28TH, 2016.
7 AND THE SECOND REQUEST IS THE RESPONDENT'S EX PARTE FILED
8 APRIL 8TH, 2016 REQUESTING MODIFICATION OF CHILD CUSTODY,
9 VISITATIONS ORDER THAT THE COURT MADE ON JULY 31ST, 2015.

10 MR. SALICK: YOUR HONOR --

11 THE COURT: JUST ONE MOMENT. PLEASE DO NOT INTERRUPT THE
12 COURT. THE COURT REVIEWED THE RESPONSE FILED BY THE RESPONDENT
13 APRIL 24TH, 2016, AND ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT A, A LETTER FROM --
14 DATED APRIL 11TH, 2016 FROM THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, AND
15 THEY HAVE ALSO PROVIDED THE COURT A COPY, AND THE COURT REVIEWED
16 THIS LETTER. THEY KINDLY ATTACHED TO THE COURT'S COPY THE
17 INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION -- JUST ONE MOMENT -- THE
18 INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION REMEDIES ACT, WHICH IS CITED AT
19 22 U.S.C. SECTION 9001 THROUGH 9011. THE ACRONYM IS I-C-A-R-A.

20 AND THE COURT HAS HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THE
21 ATTACHMENT. AND IN READING THE LETTER, IT STATES THAT AUGUST --
22 STRIKE THAT -- APRIL 11, 2016, THIS IS FROM THE DISTRICT
23 ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, SPECIFICALLY DEANNE CASTERINA, DEPUTY IN
24 CHARGE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE CHILD ABDUCTION
25 SECTION. IT STATES THAT AN APPLICATION FOR THE RETURN OF HUNTER
26 RANDOY TO CANADA UNDER THE 1980 HAIG CONVICTION ON THE CIVIL
27 ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION HAS BEEN RECEIVED BY
28 THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE -- UNITED STATES

1 DEPARTMENT OF STATE WHICH SERVES AS THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY FOR
2 THE CONVENTION.

3 IT ALSO STATES, "A PETITION FOR THE RETURN OF THE
4 CHILD WILL BE FILED IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
5 CALIFORNIA IN LOS ANGELES. NO COURT DATE HAS BEEN SET. THIS
6 FACT MAY EFFECT YOUR" -- IT'S ADDRESSED TO ME, JUDGE HALL -- SO
7 "YOUR" IS REFERRING TO JUDGE HALL -- "THIS MAY AFFECT YOUR
8 ADMINISTRATION OF THE CUSTODY PROCEEDING BEFORE YOU."
9 SPECIFICALLY IT CITES ARTICLE 16, AND THE COURT REVIEWED
10 ARTICLE 16, AND IN SOME -- ON THE SECOND PAGE IT SAYS,
11 "ARTICLE 16 REQUIRES THAT WHEN A COURT CONSIDERING CUSTODY OF
12 THE CHILDREN RECEIVES NOTICE THAT AN APPLICATION FOR RETURN OF
13 THE CHILDREN UNDER THE CONVENTION HAS BEEN RECEIVED, IT SHOULD
14 DEFER ANY DECISION ON THE MERITS OF THE RIGHTS OF CUSTODY UNTIL
15 AN APPROPRIATE FEDERAL OR STATE COURT HAS DETERMINED THAT THE
16 CHILDREN ARE NOT TO BE RETURNED UNDER THE CONVENTION."

17 THE APPLICATION -- STRIKE THAT -- THE APPLICANT --
18 THE APPLICANT'S COUNSEL, OR THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
19 SHOULD BE ABLE TO KEEP THE JUDGE INFORMED OF THE STATUS OF THE
20 PETITION FOR RETURN OF THE CHILD, AND IT ALSO STATES THAT IT IS
21 THE RESPONSIBILITY THE APPLICANT FOR RETURN OF CHILD, HOWEVER,
22 TO INITIATE RETURN PROCEEDINGS IN AN APPROPRIATE STATE OR
23 FEDERAL COURT UNDER SECTION 9003 OF THE I.C.A.R.A. WITHIN A
24 REASONABLE TIME.

25 SO IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO FILE
26 THE PETITION FOR RETURN OF THE CHILD IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
27 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES.

28 MY READING OF ARTICLE 16 IS THAT MY HANDS ARE TIED

1 WITH RESPECT TO, ONE, MAKING CUSTODY AND VISITATION ORDERS IN
2 THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RESTRAINING ORDER THAT IS BEING SOUGHT;
3 AND, TWO, IN MODIFYING THE EX PARTE ON APRIL 8TH, 2016.

4 SO AS WE SIT HERE, THE COURT CAN HEAR THE DOMESTIC
5 VIOLENCE RESTRAINING ORDER AND HEAR THE ALLEGED ACTS OF ABUSE,
6 MAKE A DETERMINATION WHETHER A RESTRAINING ORDER SHOULD OR
7 SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED AGAINST THE RESPONDENT; BUT BASED ON
8 WHAT'S BEFORE ME, THE COURT'S HANDS ARE TIED, SO IT'S NOT GOING
9 TO MAKE ANY DECISIONS REGARDING CUSTODY, AND IT'S NOT GOING TO
10 MODIFY THE CHILD CUSTODY -- THE CHILD CUSTODY ORDERS THAT THE
11 COURT HAS ALREADY MADE ON JULY 31ST, 2015, WHICH IS BEING
12 REQUESTED BY THE RESPONDENT IN HER EX PARTE FILED APRIL 8TH,
13 2016.

14 ANYONE WISH TO BE HEARD AT THIS POINT?

15 MR. SALICK: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS THE FIRST TIME THAT WE'VE
16 HEARD ABOUT THE APRIL 8TH EX PARTE. WE WERE NEVER GIVEN NOTICE
17 OR NEVER SERVED WITH A COPY.

18 MS. RESNIK: YOUR HONOR, WE WITHDRAW THE EX PARTE FILED ON
19 APRIL 8TH.

20 THE COURT: WHEN DID YOU WITHDRAW IT?

21 MS. RESNIK: NO, AS WE SIT HERE TODAY. I WAS -- MY CLIENT
22 FILED IT ON HER OWN IN PRO PER.

23 THE COURT: OKAY.

24 MS. RESNIK: I WASN'T EVEN AWARE THAT IT HAD BEEN FILED.

25 THE COURT: BUT WERE YOU AWARE OF IT BEFORE THE COURT JUST
26 STATED IT?

27 MS. RESNIK: YEAH, I GOT A COPY -- I GOT A COPY OF IT. IT
28 WAS E-MAILED TO ME YESTERDAY BY MY CLIENT. I WASN'T AWARE THAT

1 IT HAD BEEN FILED BY HER IN PRO PER. I WOULD NOT HAVE THOUGHT
2 THAT THE COURT WOULD HAVE EVEN ALLOWED IT TO BE FILED, GIVEN
3 THAT I AM HER ATTORNEY OF RECORD. AND SHE WAS NOT AWARE THAT
4 SHE NEEDED TO GO THROUGH MY OFFICE FOR PURPOSES OF FILING
5 ANYTHING.

6 THE COURT: OKAY. WELL, ALL OF THE DOCUMENTATION WAS
7 PROPER, AND THE COURT DENIED AND CONTINUED IT UNTIL TODAY.

8 MS. RESNIK: CORRECT. BUT WE ARE WILLING TO TAKE IT OFF
9 CALENDAR AND NOT PROCEED WITH THE HEARING.

10 THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE WILLING TO DO, BUT
11 IT'S STILL -- COUNSEL IS UPSET THAT HE WASN'T GIVEN NOTICE OF
12 IT.

13 MR. SALICK: YOUR HONOR --

14 THE COURT: JUST ONE MOMENT, PLEASE. ON APRIL 12TH, 2016,
15 COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER WAS PRESENT HERE. PER STIPULATION OF
16 COUNSEL THE HEARING WAS CONTINUED TO MAY 4TH, 2016. I'M READING
17 THE MINUTE ORDER.

18 MS. RESNIK: RIGHT. THAT'S THE RESTRAINING ORDER.

19 THE COURT: AND ON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION, THE COURT --
20 READING THE APRIL 12TH, 2016 MINUTE ORDER -- PLEASE DO NOT
21 INTERRUPT THE COURT -- THE RESTRAINING ORDER WAS CONTINUED UNTIL
22 MAY 4TH, 2016. AND ON THE COURT'S OWN MOTION, THE RESPONDENT'S
23 EX PARTE REQUEST FOR ORDER WAS CONTINUED UNTIL THIS DAY.

24 SO, COUNSEL, YOU WEREN'T AWARE OF IT, BUT SHE DID
25 FILE AN EX PARTE.

26 WISH TO BE HEARD.

27 MR. SALICK: YES, I'M SORRY. THE REASON WHY I AM VERY
28 UPSET ABOUT HEARING THIS IS THIS IS NOW THE THIRD TIME THAT

1 RESPONDENT HAS -- IN THIS CASE HAS FILED A NO NOTICE EX PARTE --
2 WELL, ACTUALLY I TAKE THAT BACK. IT WAS IN JUNE. THERE WERE
3 TWO EX PARTES THAT WERE FILED. SHE GAVE NOTICE ON MONDAY FOR
4 AN EX PARTE THE NEXT DAY. WHEN WE CAME HERE ON TUESDAY MORNING,
5 WE WERE -- WE LEARNED THAT SHE HAD FILED THE EX PARTE MONDAY AND
6 IT WAS DENIED, AND SO THEN WEDNESDAY, THE NEXT DAY, WE GOT
7 NOTICE FOR EX PARTE NOTICE AGAIN, AND WE SHOW UP TO COURT
8 THURSDAY, AND WE LEARNED IT WAS DENIED AGAIN, AND WE LEARNED
9 THAT IT WAS FILED INSTEAD ON WEDNESDAY.

10 SO BOTH TIMES WE WERE GIVEN NOTICE, BUT SHE FILED IT
11 THE DAY THAT SHE GAVE NOTICE. SO -- AND NOW THIS IS THE THIRD
12 TIME THAT WE LEARN THAT SHE FILED A NO NOTICE EX PARTE WHICH WE
13 GOT -- THAT WE DIDN'T GET A COPY OF.

14 THE COURT: OKAY. COUNSEL, SO YOU MIGHT WANT TO TALK TO
15 YOUR CLIENT AND INFORM HER THAT SHE CAN'T -- SHE'S EITHER
16 REPRESENTED OR SHE'S REPRESENTING HERSELF. BUT WHEN SHE FILES
17 DOCUMENTS WITH THE COURT, AND IT'S PROPER, THE COURT WILL FILE
18 THEM -- WILL RECEIVE THEM.

19 MS. RESNIK: I WILL HAVE THAT CONVERSATION WITH MY CLIENT.
20 I DO NOT BELIEVE THERE IS ANY PREJUDICE TO PETITIONER. WE ARE
21 REQUESTING THAT THE EX PARTE FILED APRIL 8TH, 2016 BE TAKEN OFF
22 CALENDAR. SURELY WE'RE NOT LOOKING TO AMBUSH PETITIONER AND
23 PROCEED WITH A HEARING ON AN EX PARTE ON THIS DATE.

24 MR. SALICK: WOULD THE COURT BE WILLING TO ORDER THAT,
25 UNLESS YOU HAVE AN EXTRA COPY, THAT RESPONDENT'S COUNSEL E-MAIL
26 US A COPY OF THAT EX PARTE?

27 THE COURT: YES. SO IS THERE ANY OBJECTION THAT THE
28 EX PARTE BE TAKEN OFF CALENDAR?

1 MR. SALICK: NO.

2 THE COURT: OKAY. SO THE RESPONDENT'S EX PARTE FILED
3 APRIL 8TH, 2016 IS TAKEN OFF CALENDAR; HOWEVER, COUNSEL FOR THE
4 RESPONDENT IS ORDERED TO E-MAIL TO THE PETITIONER THE EX PARTE
5 THAT WAS FILED BY THE RESPONDENT ON APRIL 8TH, 2016.

6 MS. RESNIK: OKAY.

7 MR. SALICK: THANK YOU.

8 THE COURT: YOU'RE WELCOME.

9 MS. RESNIK: MAY I JUST BE HEARD ON THE ISSUE OF THE
10 REQUEST FOR A RESTRAINING ORDER THAT I THINK WILL RESOLVE -- I
11 HOPE WILL RESOLVE THIS ISSUE.

12 THE COURT: WELL, LET ME HEAR FROM MOVING PARTY BECAUSE
13 THEY'RE REQUESTING THE RESTRAINING ORDER -- THE PETITIONER IS
14 REQUESTING A RESTRAINING ORDER AGAINST THE RESPONDENT, SO I NEED
15 TO HEAR FROM THEM HOW THEY WOULD LIKE TO PROCEED.

16 MR. SALICK: WE ARE READY TO PROCEED TODAY.

17 THE COURT: HOW MANY WITNESSES DO YOU HAVE?

18 MR. SALICK: JUST THE PARTIES.

19 THE COURT: OKAY. AND YOUR OFFER OF PROOF?

20 MR. SALICK: MY CLIENT WOULD PROVE UP THE ALLEGED
21 INSTANCES OF ABUSE THAT WERE SET FORTH IN OUR MARCH 25TH, 2016
22 DV-100.

23 THE COURT: OKAY.

24 MR. SALICK: AND ALSO SINCE -- ON APRIL 1ST, 2016,
25 RESPONDENT WAS PERSONALLY SERVED WITH A T.R.O., AND SO MY CLIENT
26 WOULD TESTIFY ABOUT INCIDENTS THAT HAVE HAPPENED BETWEEN
27 APRIL 1ST -- CORRECT -- THERE IS A FEW INCIDENTS THAT I THINK
28 OUR TIME ESTIMATE WOULD BE REALISTICALLY A HALF AN HOUR TO AN

1 HOUR.

2 THE COURT: OKAY. COUNSEL WISH TO RESPOND?

3 MS. RESNIK: YES, I WOULD. ESSENTIALLY WHAT PETITIONER IS
4 PROPOSING IS THAT WE PROCEED AHEAD WITH JUST ONE PORTION OF THE
5 REQUEST FOR RESTRAINING ORDERS, AS HE REQUESTED AGAINST MY
6 CLIENT; AND THEN DEPENDING ON THE OUTCOME OF THE HEARING ON THE
7 HAIG CONVENTION -- WHICH BY THE WAY I SPOKE TO THE DISTRICT
8 ATTORNEY'S OFFICE THIS MORNING, DEANNE CASTERINA, AND SHE
9 INDICATED TO ME THAT THE HEARING WILL BE IN APPROXIMATELY THREE
10 WEEKS, AND THAT IT'S BEING FILED THIS WEEK.

11 DEPENDING ON THE OUTCOME OF THAT HEARING, IF IN FACT
12 IT'S DENIED, THEN WE WOULD PROCEED AHEAD WITH THE REMAINING
13 PORTIONS OF THE REQUEST FOR RESTRAINING ORDERS. ESSENTIALLY WE
14 WOULD BE LITIGATING THIS ISSUE TWICE.

15 SO WHAT I WAS GOING TO PROPOSE, AND IT'S CERTAINLY NO
16 PREJUDICE TO PETITIONER, IS TO KEEP ALL CURRENT ORDERS IN EFFECT
17 PENDING AFTER THE HEARING ON THE HAIG CONVENTION, WHICH WILL BE
18 WITHIN APPROXIMATELY THREE WEEKS, AND THEN WE DETERMINE, IF WE
19 COME BACK, WHETHER WE'RE GOING TO RESOLVE JUST THE PORTION OF
20 THE REQUEST FOR THE RESTRAINING ORDERS AGAINST MY CLIENT, OR
21 INCLUDE THE ISSUE OF THE RESTRAINING ORDER FOR THE PROTECTION OF
22 THE MINOR CHILD. OTHERWISE, WE'RE DOING THIS PIECEMEAL, AND
23 WE'RE NOT USING JUDICIAL EFFICIENCY FOR PURPOSES OF PROCEEDING
24 WITH THIS HEARING.

25 WE WOULD BE POTENTIALLY OPENING OURSELVES UP TO TWO
26 SEPARATE HEARINGS ON THIS REQUEST FOR RESTRAINING ORDER, ONE
27 TODAY, AND ONE IF THE HAIG CONVENTION IS DENIED, AT A LATER TIME
28 ON THE ISSUE OF THE MINOR CHILD. IT MAKES SENSE TO ME TO

1 CONTINUE THIS MATTER UNTIL AFTER THE HAIG CONVENTION HEARING,
2 GIVE ENOUGH TIME FOR THAT TO PROCEED, AND THEN RETURN BACK INTO
3 COURT -- OR PERHAPS THE ISSUE WILL BE MOOT, BECAUSE I BELIEVE
4 THAT THE MAIN ISSUE HERE IS THIS MINOR CHILD.

5 THE COURT: WELL, HOW THE COURT SEES IT, THE MAIN ISSUE
6 THAT'S BEFORE THE COURT IS WHETHER OR NOT THE PETITIONER SHOULD
7 HAVE A RESTRAINING ORDER AGAINST THE RESPONDENT. I'M NOT
8 CONSIDERING HUNTER. YOU ALL HAVE MOVED THAT ISSUE TO A LATER
9 DATE TO A DIFFERENT COURT, SO I WON'T CONSIDER ANY TESTIMONY
10 REGARDING HUNTER. IT'S BETWEEN THE PETITIONER AND THE
11 RESPONDENT.

12 SO FROM A JUDICIAL STANDPOINT, TODAY SEEMS THE BEST
13 DAY THAN ANY DAY TO PROCEED WITH THAT PORTION OF THE D.V.R.O.
14 BECAUSE THE OTHER PORTION IS NOT BEFORE THE COURT. THE COURT IS
15 NOT GOING TO MAKE ANY CUSTODY ORDERS SO -- AND WE DON'T KNOW
16 WHERE THIS CASE IS GOING TO GO AFTER THE HAIG CONVENTION, BUT
17 WHAT'S BEFORE THE COURT TODAY, THE COURT CAN HEAR THE MATTER.

18 SO I'LL HEAR FROM COUNSEL REGARDING YOUR REQUEST TO
19 CONTINUE IT. COUNSEL, SHE SAYS THERE IS NO PREJUDICE. THE
20 T.R.O. WILL STILL REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT. SO I'LL HEAR
21 FROM YOU.

22 MR. SALICK: WE WOULD BE AGREEABLE TO REISSUING THE
23 TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND SETTING A HEARING AFTER --
24 PROBABLY LIKE A MONTH AND A HALF. WHENEVER THE COURT IS
25 AVAILABLE.

26 THE COURT: OKAY. WELL, DO YOU KNOW WHEN -- SO HAS THE
27 PETITION BEEN FILED YET?

28 MS. RESNIK: IT'S BEING FILED THIS WEEK BY FRIDAY,

1 ACCORDING TO DEANNE CASTERINA, AND SHE INDICATED TO ME THE
2 TIMELINE IS APPROXIMATELY THREE WEEKS FOR A HEARING IN FRONT OF
3 JUDGE NELSON.

4 THE COURT: OKAY. THREE WEEKS FROM TODAY OR JUST THREE
5 WEEKS?

6 MS. RESNIK: TODAY SHE TOLD ME IN APPROXIMATELY THREE
7 WEEKS.

8 THE COURT: OKAY. SO WHAT ABOUT TO BE SAFE, WHAT ABOUT
9 JUNE 22ND, 23RD OR 24TH IF THOSE DAYS ARE GOOD FOR THE COURT.

10 MR. SALICK: THE 24TH IS MY BIRTHDAY.

11 MS. RESNIK: IT'S MY BIRTHDAY TODAY, AND I'M HERE.

12 THE CLERK: 22ND OR 23RD.

13 THE COURT: 22ND OR THE 23RD.

14 MS. RESNIK: I'M AVAILABLE.

15 MR. SALICK: I WANT TO SAY THE 23RD IS GOOD.

16 THE COURT: BUT --

17 MR. SALICK: WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE TO SET IT IN THE
18 AFTERNOON OR HAVE IT SPECIALLY SET?

19 THE COURT: NO, IT WOULD HAVE TO BE SET AT 8:30 SO THAT WE
20 COULD START IT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

21 MR. SALICK: OKAY.

22 THE COURT: SO THAT WE COULD HAVE AS MUCH TIME AS
23 POSSIBLE.

24 DO YOU NEED A DIFFERENT DATE? WE COULD DO THE 16TH
25 OR THE 17TH OF JUNE.

26 MR. SALICK: THE 22ND.

27 THE COURT: 22ND, COUNSEL YOU SAID IS GOOD?

28 MS. RESNIK: YES.

1 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO THE TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
2 THAT WAS GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART ON MARCH 25TH, 2016
3 IS CONTINUED TO JUNE 22ND, 2016. AND ALL PARTIES ARE TO WAIT
4 FOR THE RE-ISSUANCE.

5 MA'AM, YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO HAVE A RESTRAINING
6 ORDER (SIC) WITHIN 25 DAYS. DO YOU GIVE UP THAT RIGHT?

7 THE RESPONDENT: WAIVE IT --

8 THE COURT: IS THAT A "YES".

9 THE RESPONDENT: YES.

10 THE COURT: THANK YOU. TIME IS WAIVED BY THE RESTRAINED
11 PARTY, WHO IS THE RESPONDENT. OKAY. WE'LL SEE EVERYONE BACK,
12 JUNE 22ND, 2016 AT 8:30 A.M.

13 MS. RESNIK: THANK YOU.

14 MR. SALICK: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

15 THE COURT: YOU'RE WELCOME. AND ON THAT DATE, IF EITHER
16 SIDE COULD UPDATE THE COURT REGARDING THE HAIG CONVENTION, AND
17 NO FURTHER SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS ARE AUTHORIZED.

18 MS. RESNIK: OKAY.

19
20 (PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED
21 ACTION WERE CONCLUDED.)
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

2 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

3 DEPARTMENT NO. CE 22

HON. TAMARA HALL, JUDGE

4
5 REED RANDOY,

PETITIONER,

7 VS.

8 MARICKE RANDOY,

9 RESPONDENT.

)
)
)
) CASE NO. BD621137
) REPORTER'S
) CERTIFICATE
)
)
)
)
)

10
11
12 I, BARBARA A. KING, OFFICIAL REPORTER OF THE SUPERIOR
13 COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
14 DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING PAGES 1 THROUGH 11,
15 INCLUSIVE, COMPRISE A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF THE
16 TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS TAKEN IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER ON
17 MAY 4, 2016.

18 DATED THIS 17TH DAY OF MAY, 2016.

19
20
21
22
23 _____
24 BARBARA A. KING, CSR NO. 8347
25 OFFICIAL REPORTER
26
27
28

1 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

2 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

3 DEPARTMENT NO. CE 22

HON. TAMARA HALL, JUDGE

4 REED RANDOY,)

5)
6 PETITIONER,)

7 VS.)

CASE NUMBER BD621137

8 MARICKE RANDOY,)

9)
RESPONDENT.)
_____)

10
11 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

12 WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 2016

13
14
15 APPEARANCES:

16 FOR THE PETITIONER:

NICHOLAS A. SALICK,
ATTORNEY AT LAW

17
18
19 FOR THE RESPONDENT:

ANAT RESNIK,
ATTORNEY AT LAW

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 BARBARA A. KING, CSR. NO. 8347
28 OFFICIAL REPORTER