

1 CASE NUMBER: BD621137  
2 CASE NAME: REED RANDOY, PETITIONER VS.  
3 MARICKE RANDOY, RESPONDENT  
4 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 2015  
5 DEPARTMENT CE 22 HON. TAMARA HALL, JUDGE  
6 REPORTER: BARBARA A. KING, CSR NO. 8347  
7 TIME: 3:45 P.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 IN PROPRIA  
13 PERSONA

14 -OOO-

15  
16 THE COURT: LET'S CALL NUMBER 24, RANDOY VERSUS RANDOY.

17 MR. SALICK: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR.

18 THE COURT: APPEARANCES PLEASE.

19 MR. SALICK: GOOD AFTERNOON, NICHOLAS SALICK FOR THE  
20 PETITIONER, WHO IS PRESENT AT COUNSEL TABLE.

21 THE RESPONDENT: MARICKE RANDOY, PRESENT.

22 THE COURT: THANK YOU. CAN YOU SWEAR THE PARTIES, PLEASE.

23 THE CLERK: PLEASE RAISE YOUR RIGHT HAND.

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

27 THE PETITIONER: I DO.

28 THE RESPONDENT: I DO.

1 THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.

2 OKAY. WE CONTINUED THIS MATTER FROM LAST WEEK UNTIL  
3 TODAY -- JUNE 26TH, 2015 UNTIL TODAY, AND I HAD AN  
4 OPPORTUNITY -- FIRST OF ALL, YOU'RE HERE, AND I HAD AN  
5 OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THE LAW REGARDING THE ISSUE THAT THE  
6 RESPONDENT RAISED WHETHER OR NOT THE COURT HAS JURISDICTION TO  
7 MAKE CUSTODY ORDERS, AND WHETHER OR NOT WE ARE THE HOME COURT OR  
8 WHETHER OR NOT CANADA IS THE HOME COURT -- A COURT IN CANADA IS  
9 THE HOME COURT, AND I WILL HEAR FROM YOU, COUNSEL, BUT BASED ON  
10 THE COURT'S REVIEW OF THE LAW, THE MOTHER APPEARS TO BE CORRECT,  
11 THAT WE ARE NOT THE HOME COURT. SO I WILL HEAR FROM YOU --

12 FIRST LET ME ASK YOU, MA'AM, HAVE YOU STARTED  
13 PROCEEDINGS IN CANADA?

14 THE RESPONDENT: YES.

15 THE COURT: AND YOU HAVE A COURT DATE AND -- IN CANADA.  
16 HAS A CASE BEEN FILED?

17 THE RESPONDENT: A CASE HAS BEEN FILED, SO HE STILL NEEDS  
18 TO BE SERVED.

19 THE COURT: OKAY.

20 THE RESPONDENT: BUT BECAUSE HE LIVES ON A BOAT, AND  
21 BECAUSE HE DOES HAVE AN ATTORNEY --

22 THE COURT: OKAY.

23 THE RESPONDENT: -- I GUESS THE PLAN IS JUST TO SERVE THE  
24 ATTORNEY.

25 MR. SALICK: NO.

26 THE COURT: NO, NO, JUST ONE MOMENT. JUST LISTEN TO THE  
27 QUESTION THE COURT IS ASKING.

28 THE RESPONDENT: YES.

1 THE COURT: SO A CASE HAS BEEN FILED?

2 THE RESPONDENT: YES, MA'AM. I HAVE IT RIGHT HERE.

3 THE COURT: HAS A CASE BEEN ASSIGNED TO A JUDGMENT IN  
4 CANADA?

5 THE RESPONDENT: I HAVE THE -- IT'S CALLED A NOTICE OF  
6 FAMILY CLAIM, AND IT'S WITH THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH,  
7 COLUMBIA. IT'S GOT A VANCOUVER REGISTRY NUMBER. I DON'T  
8 UNDERSTAND IT. IT'S VERY DIFFERENT THAN IT IS HERE. BUT PLACE  
9 OF TRAVEL THE VANCOUVER LAW COURTS. IT'S GOT THE ADDRESS.  
10 LET'S SEE IF IT HAS AN ACTUAL DATE --

11 THE COURT: OKAY. MY QUESTION IS HAS A JUDGE BEEN  
12 ASSIGNED THE CASE?

13 THE RESPONDENT: I DON'T KNOW YET. BUT I DO KNOW THAT  
14 IT'S ALREADY ON FILE, AND I JUST THINK WE NEED TO SERVE HIM  
15 FIRST. BUT ABOUT THE ACTUAL JUDGE YET, I DON'T KNOW. ON THIS  
16 PAPERWORK IT DOESN'T SEEM TO STATE THE NAME OF A JUDGE YET.

17 THE COURT: OKAY. SO FAMILY CODE SECTION 3421 READS AS  
18 FOLLOWS: "CALIFORNIA HAS JURISDICTION" -- THIS IS INITIAL  
19 CUSTODY DETERMINATIONS -- "CALIFORNIA HAS JURISDICTION TO MAKE  
20 AN INITIAL CHILD CUSTODY" -- FAMILY CODE SECTION -- "INITIAL  
21 CHILD CUSTODY DETERMINATION ONLY IF ANY OF THE FOLLOWING ARE  
22 TRUE: ONE, CALIFORNIA IS THE HOME STATE OF THE CHILD ON THE  
23 DATE THAT FAMILY LAW PROCEEDINGS ARE COMMENCED OR WAS THE  
24 CHILD'S HOME STATE WITHIN SIX MONTHS IMMEDIATELY BEFORE THE  
25 COMMENCEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS, IF THE CHILD IS NOT IN  
26 CALIFORNIA, BUT A PARENT OR PERSON ACTING AS A PARENT CONTINUES  
27 TO LIVE IN THE STATE.

28 "HOME STATE IS DEFINED AS THE STATE IN WHICH A CHILD

1 LIVED WITH THE PARENT OR A PERSON ACTING AS A PARENT FOR AT  
2 LEAST SIX CONSECUTIVE MONTHS IMMEDIATELY BEFORE THE COMMENCEMENT  
3 OF A CHILD CUSTODY PROCEEDING."

4 SO THAT'S WHY I INQUIRED -- THAT'S WHY I'M INQUIRING  
5 OF COUNSEL. DO YOU WISH TO BE HEARD?

6 MR. SALICK: YES, THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

7 THE COURT: AND NORMALLY THAT'S -- AND BEFORE YOU --  
8 BEFORE I HAVE YOU ADDRESS THE COURT, NORMALLY THE COURT HERE  
9 WOULD HAVE A CONSULTATION WITH THE OTHER JUDGE, BUT THAT'S WHY I  
10 ASKED YOU, MA'AM, HAS A CASE IN CANADA BEEN FILED AND HAS IT  
11 BEEN ASSIGNED TO A JUDGE SO THAT THIS JUDGE COULD HAVE SOME TYPE  
12 OF CONFERENCE WITH THE JUDGE IN CANADA. BUT YOU CAN'T ANSWER  
13 THAT, BECAUSE YOU DON'T KNOW IF A JUDGE HAS BEEN ASSIGNED.

14 MR. SALICK: YOUR HONOR, MAY I LOOK AT HER PAPERWORK TO  
15 SEE MAYBE IF I COULD --

16 THE COURT: YES.

17 THE RESPONDENT: I DO HAVE AN ATTORNEY IN VANCOUVER, SO I  
18 COULD GET THAT ANSWER TO YOU VERY QUICKLY.

19 MR. SALICK: OKAY. SO SHALL I READ --

20 THE COURT: NO, REVIEW IT. IF YOU SEE THAT -- A JUDGE  
21 THAT I COULD CALL, THEN WE COULD HAVE A CONFERENCE.

22 MR. SALICK: THIS WAS FILED JUNE 26TH, 2015. IT  
23 DOES -- IT DOES SAY ON PAGE 2 -- IT DOES RECOGNIZE -- I'M SORRY.  
24 IT DOES SET FORTH THAT THERE IS A RELATED PRIOR COURT  
25 PROCEEDING, SO THIS CASE NUMBER IS LISTED.

26 THE COURT: OUR CASE NUMBER IS LISTED ON THOSE PAPERS?

27 MR. SALICK: ON THE SECOND PAGE, YES, UNDER PRIOR COURT  
28 PROCEEDINGS AND AGREEMENT, AND THE BOX IS CHECKED ONE OR MORE OF

1 THE FOLLOWING RELATES TO CLAIMS MADE IN THIS NOTICE OF FAMILY  
2 CLAIM, AND THERE IS TWO BOXES CHECKED. ONE SAYS, "A COURT ORDER  
3 DATED JUNE 5TH, 2015." AND THE BOX UNDERNEATH SAYS, "A PRIOR  
4 COURT PROCEEDING" WITH THE BD621137 AND IDENTIFIES THIS  
5 PROCEEDING. IT SAYS, "THE PLACE OF TRIAL WILL BE VANCOUVER LAW  
6 COURTS." IT HAS AN ADDRESS. THERE IS A LAWYER'S NAME -- KNOW  
7 IT'S GOING TO BE THE LAST PAGE THAT I LOOK AT.

8 THE RESPONDENT: THOSE ARE MY NOTES. THAT WASN'T PART OF  
9 IT.

10 MR. SALICK: THIS WAS IT? THERE IS NOTHING ELSE?

11 THE RESPONDENT: YEAH -- NO.

12 MR. SALICK: IT DOESN'T APPEAR TO LIST A COURT DATE. IT  
13 LIST THE COURT ADDRESS, AND IT HAS A CASE NUMBER. MAYBE IT'S  
14 LIKE IN CALIFORNIA WE FILE A PETITION AND THEN YOU GET ASSIGNED  
15 TO A COURTROOM THEN.

16 THE COURT: OKAY.

17 MR. SALICK: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS A VERY -- I'M HANDING THE  
18 FORMS BACK TO RESPONDENT. THIS IS A VERY TECHNICAL AREA, AND  
19 FRANKLY, I THOUGHT THAT AFTER LAST -- AFTER LAST FRIDAY THAT  
20 THIS ISSUE WAS RESOLVE. I UNDERSTAND THE COURT REVISITED THAT,  
21 BUT I MEAN, THERE IS A PROPER PROCEDURAL ISSUE, ONE IS  
22 PETITIONER FILED, THE PERSON THEN SERVED RESPONDENT, THE  
23 RESPONDENT THEN FILED AND SERVED A RESPONSE. AND IT SEEMS AS IF  
24 THE CANADA FAMILY LAW CASE WAS FILED AFTER SHE FILED HER  
25 RESPONSE.

26 THE COURT: WELL, SEE WE'RE DEALING WITH TWO DIFFERENT  
27 THINGS. YOUR CLIENT FILED -- THE PARTIES ARE MARRIED. HE FILED  
28 HIS PETITION FOR DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE ON MAY 19TH, 2015, AND

1 THE RESPONDENT FILED HER RESPONSE SOME TIME THEREAFTER AND --

2 MR. SALICK: I HAVE A JUNE 18TH --

3 THE COURT: OKAY. JUNE 18TH, 2015, AND YOU DID ARGUE THAT  
4 JURISDICTION -- I'M SUMMARIZING, BUT YOU ARGUED JURISDICTION WAS  
5 MOOT BECAUSE SHE FILED A RESPONSE. AND I LISTENED TO THAT  
6 ARGUMENT. I CONSIDERED IT. BUT THEN ON FURTHER REFLECTION OF  
7 THE LAW, WHAT IS BEING ASKED OF THE COURT AT THIS JUNCTURE IS  
8 NOT ISSUES -- RESOLVING ISSUES PERTAINING TO THE DISSOLUTION  
9 PER SE, BUT IT'S PERTAINING TO CUSTODY ORDERS.

10 AND IN AN EX PARTE, WHEN THERE IS AN EX PARTE BEFORE  
11 THE COURT, THE COURT CAN MAKE TEMPORARY -- THE COURT DOES HAVE  
12 TEMPORARY EMERGENCY JURISDICTION, BUT THE COURT ALREADY MADE THE  
13 EX PARTE ORDERS ON JUNE 5TH, 2015; CONTINUED THIS MATTER TO  
14 JUNE 26, 2015; HEARD BOTH SIDES; FOUND THAT FOR REASONS ALREADY  
15 STATED, THERE WAS NO EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES; SO THEN THE NEXT  
16 STEP IS TO GO TO MAKING CHILD -- AN INITIAL CHILD CUSTODY ORDER.  
17 AND THAT'S WHERE THE JURISDICTION ISSUE IS RAISED AGAIN. AND  
18 THAT'S WHERE THE COURT CANNOT IGNORE THAT ISSUE BECAUSE IN ORDER  
19 FOR THE COURT TO MAKE AN INITIAL CUSTODY ORDER -- INITIAL CHILD  
20 CUSTODY ORDERS, THE COURT MUST FIRST HAVE JURISDICTION. THAT'S  
21 UNDER THE UNIFORM CHILD CUSTODY JURISDICTION ENFORCEMENT ACT  
22 U.C.C.J.E.A., AND THAT'S FAMILY CODE SECTIONS 3400 THROUGH 3465.

23 SO, YES, YOU'RE CORRECT. THE COURT PUT THIS MATTER  
24 OVER FOR SEVERAL REASONS. BUT THE COURT, AGAIN, IT STOPPED AND  
25 REFLECTED, AND I FIRST HAVE TO HAVE JURISDICTION; THAT MEANS THE  
26 AUTHORITY TO MAKE AN ORDER BEFORE I MAKE AN ORDER.

27 MR. SALICK: MAY I BE HEARD?

28 THE COURT: YES.

1 MR. SALICK: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

2 THERE IS A CASE THAT CAME DOWN LAST YEAR, IT'S CALLED  
3 MURPHY VERSUS SLOAN. IT'S 764F, AS IN FRANK, 3D1144, AND THAT  
4 WAS OUT OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT. AND THE FACTS OF THIS CASE -- I  
5 READ IT BETWEEN THE LAST HEARING AND THIS HEARING -- ARE ALMOST  
6 IF NOT SPOT ON. AND SO I UNDERSTAND THE COURT'S CONCERN. IT'S  
7 EXTREMELY LEGITIMATE. OBVIOUSLY, THE COURT CANNOT MAKE CUSTODY  
8 ORDERS UNLESS IT HAS JURISDICTION. BUT BEFORE THAT  
9 DETERMINATION IS MADE WHETHER OR NOT THE COURT HAS JURISDICTION,  
10 I THINK IT HAS TO HAVE MORE FACTS AND INFORMATION. AND ONE OF  
11 THE CONTENTIONS BETWEEN PETITIONER AND RESPONDENT IS THAT  
12 PETITIONER CONTENDS THAT MOTHER'S MOVE TO VANCOUVER WAS  
13 TEMPORARY. IT WAS A TRIAL PERIOD.

14 RESPONDENT SAYS OTHERWISE. WE HAVE TEXT MESSAGES  
15 WHERE RESPONDENT IS ADMITTING "I'M MOVING BACK." THERE IS AN  
16 INTENTION TO RELOCATE BACK TO CALIFORNIA. THEREFORE, JUST LIKE  
17 IN MURPHY VERSUS SLOAN, IN THAT CASE THERE IS ALSO A TRIAL  
18 PERIOD. IN THAT CASE THERE WAS ALSO A TWO-YEAR GAP. BUT THE  
19 COURT -- THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEAL FOUND THAT BECAUSE IT  
20 WAS A TRIAL PERIOD AND THAT THERE WAS THIS INTENTION -- IT  
21 WASN'T PERMANENT -- THERE WAS A POSSIBLE INTENTION TO COME BACK,  
22 THAT THEREFORE JURISDICTION WAS NOT RELINQUISHED BY THE  
23 COURT -- I DON'T KNOW -- WELL, IN THIS CASE THE COURT WAS  
24 NOT -- CALIFORNIA DID NOT RELINQUISH JURISDICTION. IT WAS A  
25 TRIAL PERIOD FOR APPROXIMATELY A YEAR THAT RESPONDENT WAS -- THE  
26 PARTIES AGREED, THAT SHE GO UP THERE AND TRY TO EARN FILM  
27 CREDITS. AND AROUND APRIL OR MAY OF THIS -- THAT WAS APRIL OF  
28 2014 IS WHEN SHE MOVED TO CANADA. SO APRIL, 2015 OR AROUND

1 APRIL, 2015, RESPONDENT COMMUNICATED WITH PETITIONER THAT SHE  
2 WAS NOT COMING BACK. AND THEN WE HAVE A TEXT MESSAGE MAY 22ND,  
3 2015 IN WHICH SHE TEXTED PETITIONER -- RESPONDENT TEXTED THAT  
4 SHE HAS INTENTION TO MOVE BACK. SHE JUST NEEDS FILM CREDITS.

5 BUT THE TRIAL PERIOD WAS FOR A YEAR, AND IT WAS FOR  
6 HER TO GET THE FILM CREDIT. AND IF SHE DIDN'T MAKE IT, THEN SHE  
7 WOULD COME BACK. HENCE, THAT'S WHY PETITIONER HAS HIS HOUSE  
8 BOAT AND ALL OF THE ASSETS WEREN'T SOLD.

9 I IMPLORE OR REQUEST THE COURT READ THAT CASE. IT'S  
10 ACTUALLY QUITE SPOT ON. AND IF FURTHER BRIEFING IS NECESSARY,  
11 THEN SO BE IT, WHICH IS FINE, BECAUSE THIS IS A VERY, VERY  
12 IMPORTANT ISSUE. AND I THINK THAT THE COURT SHOULD HAVE --  
13 BECAUSE WE DIDN'T KNOW THAT WE NEEDED TO BRIEF THIS ISSUE. WE  
14 WERE OFTEN EX PARTE (SIC).

15 THE COURT: I'M SORRY.

16 MR. SALICK: I SAID WE DIDN'T KNOW WE NEEDED TO BRIEF THE  
17 POSITION BECAUSE WHAT WE FILED WAS AN EX PARTE R.F.O. SO THE  
18 HEARING IS OFTEN EX PARTE R.F.O. IT'S NOT A R.F.O. CHALLENGING  
19 JURISDICTION. SO WE HAVEN'T PROPERLY PLED THIS OR RESPONDED TO  
20 IT.

21 THE COURT: OKAY. LET ME SAY THIS AGAIN, THE COURT -- YOU  
22 FILED AN EX PARTE ASKING FOR EMERGENCY ORDERS. THE COURT  
23 GRANTED THOSE EMERGENCY ORDERS, HAD THE HEARING, HEARD FROM THE  
24 RESPONDENT, MADE A DETERMINATION THAT THERE IS -- THERE WASN'T  
25 AN EMERGENCY. SO NOW, IT BECOMES INITIAL CUSTODY ORDERS.

26 WHAT THE COURT CAN DO -- BECAUSE AS YOU JUST  
27 ACCURATELY STATED, SINCE THERE IS NO INITIAL -- THE COURT FINDS  
28 THERE IS NO -- NO EMERGENCY. THE COURT DOES NOT HAVE TO MAKE



1 ANY ORDERS AT THIS TIME. THE MATTER IS JUST OFF CALENDAR, AND  
2 EITHER SIDE COULD FILE ANOTHER REQUEST FOR ORDER FOR INITIAL  
3 ORDERS.

4 ORDINARILY, WHAT JUDGES DO WHEN THERE IS AN EX PARTE  
5 AND IF IT'S DETERMINED THAT THERE IS NO EMERGENCY, THE COURT  
6 WILL JUST GO RIGHT AHEAD AND MAKE INITIAL ORDERS. WHAT MAKES  
7 THIS CASE UNIQUE -- I DON'T KNOW ABOUT THE CASE THAT YOU HAVE  
8 JUST CITED, BUT WHAT MAKES THIS CASE UNIQUE IS THAT JURISDICTION  
9 HAS -- IT IS AN ISSUE. AND I DON'T KNOW WHAT THAT CASE SAYS,  
10 BUT I DO KNOW WHAT THE CALIFORNIA STATUTE SAYS THAT THIS COURT  
11 IS BOUND BY, AND IT SIMPLY STATES THAT THERE MUST BE FIRST A  
12 DETERMINATION OF WHETHER THE COURT HAS THE JURISDICTION TO MAKE  
13 INITIAL CUSTODY ORDERS.

14 THIS WOULD BE MOOT IF THIS WAS A TEMPORARY  
15 EMERGENCY -- TEMPORARY EMERGENCY ORDERS, AND THE COURT HAS  
16 ALREADY MADE THEM AND FOUND THAT THERE WAS NO EMERGENCY, SO WE  
17 CAN TREAT THIS AS THE COURT WILL TAKE IT OFF CALENDAR, AND THE  
18 PARTIES CAN START ALL OVER, OR YOU COULD HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO  
19 BRIEF THE ISSUE, BUT IT'S -- IT'S NOT VERY MUCH TO BRIEF. I  
20 NEED TO KNOW THE NAME OF THE JUDGE WHO THIS COURT -- THIS CASE  
21 IS BEING ASSIGNED TO, AND I NEED TO HAVE A CONVERSATION WITH  
22 THEM. BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT THIS COURT IS BOUND BY.

23 IT'S VERY CLEAR. IT SAYS 3421 OF THE FAMILY CODE  
24 SECTION, "CALIFORNIA IS THE HOME STATE OF THE CHILD ON THE  
25 DATE" -- STRIKE THAT. "CALIFORNIA HAS JURISDICTION TO MAKE AN  
26 INITIAL CHILD CUSTODY DETERMINATION ONLY IF ANY OF THE FOLLOWING  
27 ARE TRUE: ONE, CALIFORNIA IS THE HOME STATE OF THE CHILD ON THE  
28 DATE THAT FAMILY LAW PROCEEDINGS ARE COMMENCED OR WAS THE

1 CHILD'S HOME STATE WITHIN SIX MONTHS IMMEDIATELY BEFORE THE  
2 COMMENCEMENT OF THE PROCEEDINGS; IF THE CHILD IS NOT IN  
3 CALIFORNIA BUT A PARENT OR PERSON ACTING AS A PARENT CONTINUES  
4 TO LIVE IN THE STATE."

5 THESE PROCEEDINGS WITH RESPECT TO THE EX PARTE  
6 COMMENCED ON -- LET ME SEE, THE EX PARTE WAS FILED ON JUNE 5TH,  
7 2015. THEY COMMENCED ON THAT DATE. "HOME STATE JURISDICTION  
8 HAS PRIORITY OVER ALL OTHER BASES FOR JURISDICTION. HOME STATE  
9 IS DEFINED AS THE STATE IN WHICH A CHILD LIVED WITH A PARENT OR  
10 A PERSON ACTING AS A PARENT FOR AT LEAST SIX CONSECUTIVE MONTHS  
11 IMMEDIATELY BEFORE THE COMMENCEMENT OF A CHILD CUSTODY  
12 PROCEEDING.

13 "IN THE CASE OF A CHILD LESS THAN SIX MONTHS OF AGE,  
14 THE TERM MEANS THE STATE IN WHICH THE CHILD LIVED FROM BIRTH  
15 WITH ANY OF THE PERSON MENTIONED. A PERIOD OF TEMPORARY ABSENCE  
16 OF ANY OF THE MENTIONED PERSONS IS PART OF THE PERIOD. FAMILY  
17 CODE SECTION 3402(G).

18 "NUMBER 2, A COURT OF ANOTHER STATE DOES NOT HAVE THE  
19 JURISDICTION UNDER, ONE, I.E., ANOTHER STATE IS NOT THE HOME  
20 STATE OR A COURT OF THE HOME STATE OF THE CHILD HAS DECLINED TO  
21 EXERCISE JURISDICTION, BECAUSE CALIFORNIA IS A MORE APPROPRIATE  
22 FORM, AND BOTH OF THE FOLLOWING ARE TRUE: A, THE CHILD AND THE  
23 CHILD'S PARENTS OR THE CHILD AND AT LEAST ONE PARENT OR A PERSON  
24 ACTING AS A PARENT HAS A SIGNIFICANT CONNECTION WITH CALIFORNIA  
25 OTHER THAN MERE PHYSICAL PRESENCE; AND, B, SUBSTANCE" -- STRIKE  
26 THAT -- "SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IS AVAILABLE IN CALIFORNIA  
27 CONCERNING THE CHILD'S CARE, PROTECTION, TRAINING AND PERSONAL  
28 RELATIONSHIPS."

1 MR. SALICK: YOUR HONOR, I'M SORRY WHAT CODE SECTION ARE  
2 YOU READING FROM?

3 THE COURT: I'M READING 3421 IN ITS ENTIRETY.

4 "THREE, ALL COURTS HAVE JURISDICTION UNDER 1 AND 2  
5 AND HAVE DECLINED TO EXERCISE JURISDICTION ON THE GROUND THAT  
6 CALIFORNIA IS THE MORE APPROPRIATE FORUM TO DETERMINE CUSTODY OF  
7 THE CHILD.

8 "OR FOUR, NO COURT OF ANY OTHER STATE WOULD HAVE  
9 JURISDICTION UNDER PARAGRAPHS 1, 2 OR 3."

10 THEN IF YOU LOOK AT 3405 FOREIGN, COUNTRIES -- JUST  
11 ONE MOMENT -- AND IT STATES, "A COURT OF THIS STATE SHALL TREAT  
12 A FOREIGN COUNTRY AS IT WERE A STATE OF THE UNITED STATES FOR  
13 THE PURPOSE OF APPLYING THIS CHAPTER IN CHAPTER 2, COMMENCING  
14 WITH SECTION 3421." THAT'S 3405 SUBSECTION A.

15 SUBSECTION B, EXCEPT AS OTHERWISE PROVIDED IN  
16 SUBDIVISION C, A CHILD CUSTODY DETERMINATION MADE IN A FOREIGN  
17 COUNTRY UNDER FACTUAL CIRCUMSTANCES IN SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY  
18 WITH THE JURISDICTIONAL STANDARDS OF THIS PART MUST BE  
19 RECOGNIZED AND ENFORCED UNDER CHAPTER 3, COMMENCING WITH  
20 SECTION 3441 AND 3405.

21 "C, A COURT OF THIS STATE NEED NOT APPLY THIS PART,  
22 IF THE CHILD CUSTODY LAW OF A FOREIGN COUNTRY VIOLATES  
23 FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF HUMAN RIGHTS."

24 SO THE THRESHOLD QUESTION IS, WHO IS THE HOME STATE?  
25 AND 3421 SUBSECTION 2 WILL ALLOW THIS COURT TO BE THE HOME  
26 STATE, IF -- AGAIN, I WILL READ THE LAW -- "A COURT OF ANOTHER  
27 STATE, I.E., HERE, CANADA, TREATING IT LIKE IT IS A STATE OF THE  
28 UNITED STATES, DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION UNDER, ONE, ANOTHER

1 STATE IS NOT THE HOME STATE; OR, TWO, OR A COURT OF THE HOME  
2 STATE OF THE CHILD HAS DECLINED TO EXERCISE JURISDICTION BECAUSE  
3 CALIFORNIA IS A MORE APPROPRIATE FORM AND BOTH OF THE FOLLOWING  
4 ARE TRUE."

5 SO IN ORDER FOR THE -- CANADA TO EXERCISE A DECLINE  
6 OF WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAVE JURISDICTION, THIS COURT HAS TO HAVE  
7 A CONFERENCE WITH CANADA. I CANNOT JUST MAKE A DETERMINATION  
8 WITHOUT FIRST ANSWERING THIS THRESHOLD QUESTION. SO THAT'S  
9 WHERE WE ARE, BECAUSE YOU ARE ASKING THE COURT TO MAKE INITIAL  
10 CUSTODY ORDERS ON YOUR EX PARTE REQUEST FOR ORDER. GO AHEAD.

11 MR. SALICK: YES, THE EX PARTE I BELIEVE WE DID ASK FOR  
12 A -- REQUEST FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME TO SET A FORMAL HEARING  
13 OR A FULL HEARING.

14 BUT TO BACK UP, UNDER FAMILY CODE 3421(A)(1), IT SAYS  
15 THAT CALIFORNIA HAS JURISDICTION IF THIS IS THE CHILD'S HOME  
16 STATE OR WAS THE HOME STATE WITHIN SIX MONTHS PRIOR -- BEFORE  
17 THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE PROCEEDING.

18 THE CASE THAT I CITED, THE MURPHY VERSUS SLOAN,  
19 THAT'S WHY I BELIEVE THAT CASE IS SPOT ON IN THIS CASE --

20 THE COURT: COUNSEL, LET ME STOP YOU THERE --

21 MR. SALICK: YES.

22 THE COURT: ONE THING I DON'T DO -- OR ONE THING I KNOW I  
23 DO FOR SURE IS I FOLLOW THE LAW. I KNOW WHAT I HAVE TO DO.  
24 THIS IS A THRESHOLD QUESTION THIS COURT HAS TO ANSWER. I HAVE  
25 TO HAVE A CONVERSATION WITH THE JUDGE IN CANADA, A CONFERENCE  
26 WITH THE JUDGE IN CANADA. I WILL REVIEW YOUR CASE, BUT I'M  
27 LETTING YOU KNOW NOW THAT THAT CASE, WHATEVER IT HOLDS FOR, ARE  
28 YOU STATING THAT IT OVERRIDES -- IT OVERRULES THE U.C.C.J.E.A?

1 MR. SALICK: NOT AT ALL.

2 THE COURT: OKAY.

3 MR. SALICK: BUT WHAT I'M SAYING -- WHAT THE CASE DOES IS  
4 IT -- IT WOULD HELP -- IT HELPED ME, AND I BELIEVE IT WOULD HELP  
5 THE COURT DEFINE WHICH STATE IS A CHILD'S HOME STATE. AND  
6 SEE --

7 THE COURT: COUNSEL, THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO EXPLAIN TO  
8 YOU. IT'S NOT A DECISION THAT THIS COURT UNILATERALLY CAN MAKE.  
9 BASED ON MY READING OF THE LAW AND MY UNDERSTANDING OF  
10 JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES, THIS COURT HAS TO HAVE A COMMUNICATION  
11 WITH CANADA. A CONFERENCE WITH CANADA.

12 MR. SALICK: I HEAR THAT PART.

13 THE COURT: OKAY.

14 MR. SALICK: I UNDERSTAND THAT PART. BUT WHAT I WAS  
15 ARGUING -- AND I WON'T ARGUE IT AGAIN -- WAS THAT -- THAT  
16 CALIFORNIA WAS NOT GIVEN UP, ABANDONED AS THE CHILD'S HOME STATE  
17 BECAUSE THE REASON WHY THE RESPONDENT WAS UP IN VANCOUVER WITH  
18 THE CHILD IS FOR A TRIAL PERIOD, AND THE TRIAL PERIOD EXPIRED,  
19 AND ACCORDING TO PETITIONER, SHE DECIDED THAT SHE WANTED TO STAY  
20 THERE. THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT THAT TRIAL PERIOD IS SUDDENLY  
21 ELIMINATED, AND SHE GETS TO STAY IN CANADA. IF THE INTENTION  
22 WAS TO COME BACK IF IT DIDN'T WORK IN CANADA, THEN CALIFORNIA  
23 WAS NEVER ABANDONED AS THE HOME STATE. AND THAT'S WHAT THE CASE  
24 IDENTIFIES. WHETHER THERE WAS AN ABANDONMENT OR -- WHETHER  
25 THERE WAS AN INTENT TO RETURN OR WHETHER IT WAS ABANDONMENT.

26 THE COURT: OKAY.

27 MR. SALICK: AND I COULD CITE THE CASE AGAIN.

28 THE COURT: I WILL TAKE THE CITE, BUT BEFORE I TAKE THE

1 CITE, WHERE DID THAT CHILD IN THAT CASE RESIDE SIX MONTHS BEFORE  
2 THE PROCEEDINGS WERE FILED?

3 MR. SALICK: IN THAT CASE IN -- -- THE PARTIES WERE  
4 AMERICAN. THERE IS AN AGREED UPON TRIAL PERIOD THAT MOTHER  
5 WOULD MOVE WITH THE DAUGHTER TO IRELAND, AND I BELIEVE FOR THE  
6 NEXT THREE YEARS, THE CHILD ATTENDED SCHOOL IN IRELAND BUT  
7 FREQUENTLY RETURNED TO THE UNITED STATES, AND THEN FATHER WENT  
8 TO VISIT AND REALIZED OR DISCOVERED THAT MOM DID NOT WANT TO  
9 RETURN OR WAS NOT GOING TO RETURN THE CHILD -- I THINK SHE WAS  
10 GOING TO TAKE THE CHILD TO ASIA INSTEAD. SO HE TOOK THE CHILD  
11 TO UNITED STATES.

12 AND THEN THE MOTHER IS -- I BELIEVE WAS THE MOVING  
13 PARTY, SHE IS THE ONE WHO THEN FILED AN ACTION UNDER THE HAIG  
14 CONVENTION, CLAIMING THAT FATHER ABDUCTED THE CHILD, AND THE  
15 APPELLATE COURT SAID, NO, THAT'S -- THERE WAS NO ABDUCTION,  
16 BECAUSE IT WAS A TRIAL PERIOD AND THEREFORE THE UNITED STATES  
17 DIDN'T HAVE JURISDICTION.

18 THE COURT: OKAY.

19 MR. SALICK: OR CALIFORNIA.

20 THE COURT: OKAY. SO THAT'S YOUR ARGUMENT THAT -- OKAY.  
21 I HEAR YOUR ARGUMENT. WHAT'S THE CRIME?

22 MR. SALICK: IT'S 764.

23 THE COURT: 764 -- MA'AM, YOU MAY WANT TO TAKE THIS.

24 MR. SALICK: F, AS IN FRANK, VD, AS IN DAVID, 1144.

25 THE COURT: 1144. THE NAME OF IT.

26 MR. SALICK: 9TH CIRCUIT, 2014. DID YOU SAY THE NAME?

27 THE COURT: JUST ONE MOMENT. 9TH CIRCUIT 2014? WHAT'S  
28 THE NAME OF THE CASE?

1 MR. SALICK: MURPHY, M-U-R-P-H-Y VERSUS SLOAN, S-L-O-A-N.

2 THE COURT: S L-O-A-N-N?

3 MR. SALICK: NO, JUST ONE N, S-L-O-A-N.

4 THE COURT: OKAY. OKAY. SO THE COURT WILL READ MURPHY.

5 MR. SALICK: AND WITH RESPECT TO -- IT SEEMS AS -- I  
6 MEAN --

7 THE COURT: OKAY. SO THE COURT IS GOING TO READ THAT  
8 AND --

9 MR. SALICK: AND THEN WITH RESPECT TO THE CONFERENCE CALL  
10 WITH THE VANCOUVER JUDGE, I -- I WOULD LIKE TO PUT THE ON ONUS  
11 RESPONDENT. APPARENTLY SHE HAS AN ATTORNEY IN VANCOUVER. THE  
12 ATTORNEYS'S NAME IS ON THE PAPERS THAT I WAS READING BEFORE ON  
13 THE RECORD. PERHAPS HER ATTORNEY IN VANCOUVER COULD COMMUNICATE  
14 WITH ME, SO I COULD PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THE JUDGE'S NAME --

15 THE COURT: NO, THAT'S HER RESPONSIBILITY. SHE'S GOING TO  
16 HAVE TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH THE NAME OF THE JUDGE. I DON'T  
17 NEED YOUR LAWYER'S NAME OR HIS TELEPHONE NUMBER BECAUSE THE  
18 COURTS DO NOT COMMUNICATE WITH LAWYERS, AND YOU ARE TO  
19 PROVIDE -- THE SAME INFORMATION YOU'RE GOING TO PROVIDE TO THE  
20 COURT, YOU'RE TO PROVIDE THAT TO COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER, AND  
21 YOU ARE TO PROVIDE YOUR LAWYER'S NAME AND TELEPHONE NUMBER IN  
22 CANADA TO COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER. BUT ALL THE COURT NEEDS IS  
23 THE NAME OF THE JUDGE, THE DEPARTMENT -- IF YOU COULD WRITE THIS  
24 DOWN, PLEASE.

25 THE RESPONDENT: UH-HUH.

26 THE COURT: I NEED THE NAME OF THE JUDGE, THE DEPARTMENT,  
27 A TELEPHONE NUMBER, AN E-MAIL ADDRESS, AND THEIR BUSINESS HOURS.  
28 I'M NOT ASSUMING THAT THEY HAVE THE SAME BUSINESS HOURS AS OURS.

1           OKAY. AND SO THEIR ARGUMENT, MA'AM? COUNSEL HAS  
2 SUMMARIZED THE CASE. THEIR ARGUMENT IS THAT WHEN YOU  
3 RESIDED -- BOTH OF YOU ALONG WITH YOUR CHILD RESIDED IN CANADA,  
4 IT WAS FOR A TEMPORARY BASIS AND WITH THE INTENT OF RETURNING TO  
5 CALIFORNIA. THEREFORE, THIS COURT IS THE HOME COURT AND HAS  
6 JURISDICTION.

7           THAT'S YOUR ARGUMENT, BASED ON MURPHY; CORRECT?

8           MR. SALICK: CORRECT.

9           THE COURT: SO THE COURT IS GOING TO REVIEW MURPHY. I  
10 WOULD ADVISE YOU MA'AM TO REVIEW MURPHY. I DON'T KNOW IF YOU  
11 HAVE A LAWYER HERE IN LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, BUT I THINK YOU  
12 SHOULD HAVE -- HAVE A LAWYER.

13           SO WE ARE GOING TO CONTINUE --

14           THE COURT: DID YOU HAVE SOMETHING --

15           THE RESPONDENT: YES, I DEFINITELY DO.

16           CONTRARY TO WHAT COUNSEL JUST SAID, THIS WAS -- I  
17 LIKE THE WORD "UNILATERAL." THIS WAS NOT A UNILATERAL DECISION  
18 TO MOVE UP TO VANCOUVER. IT NEVER WAS. WE DECIDED TO MOVE UP  
19 AS A FAMILY. MY HUSBAND IS AN ACTOR. HE WANTED TO GO UP THERE  
20 AND AUDITION AS WELL.

21           THE IDEA WAS FOR HIM TO COME EVERY WEEKEND, BUT AS  
22 SOON AS WE MOVED UP, HE CHANGED HIS MIND. FROM MAY UNTIL  
23 SEPTEMBER OF LAST SUMMER, INSTEAD OF SELLING ALL OF HIS THINGS,  
24 WHAT HE WANTED TO DO TO, YOU KNOW, MAKE A SACRIFICE AND DECIDE  
25 YOU KNOW WHAT, I'M GOING TO FOCUS ON MY ACTING CAREER, INSTEAD  
26 OF DOING THAT HE SPENT \$20,000 ON BOATS AND CARS. HE DID NOT  
27 COME UP TO VISIT HIS SON AND HIS WIFE THAT SUMMER. HE PARTIED  
28 WITH WOMEN ON HIS NEW BOAT. HE GOT A THIRD SHARE ON A NEW BOAT,



1 A THIRD BOAT, AND BOUGHT A NEW CAR.

2 EVERYTHING THAT HE IS DOING IS OUT OF SPITE. IT'S  
3 NOT OUT OF WHETHER HE WANTS TO SEE HIS SON MORE. THE SUGGESTION  
4 THAT I MADE WAS, YOU KNOW, BECAUSE OF THE WAY -- THE NATURE  
5 OF -- I MEAN HIS COMPLAINT IS HE CAN'T JUST COME EVERY WEEKEND.  
6 HE DOESN'T KNOW WHEN HE WORKS NEXT. HE WORKS TWO DAYS HERE,  
7 THREE DAYS THERE. HE ONLY KNOWS ONE OR TWO DAYS IN ADVANCE WHEN  
8 HE'S GOING TO WORK.

9 MY SUGGESTION WAS TELL YOUR BOOKER, YOU KNOW, JUST  
10 PICK FIVE DAYS OUT OF THE MONTH TO COME SEE YOUR SON. BOOK IT  
11 WELL IN ADVANCE, THIS WAY YOU CAN TAKE TRIPS WITH THE  
12 GRANDPARENTS; YOU COULD COME AND YOU COULD PLAN YOUR TRIP. YOU  
13 COULD TAKE THE TIME OFF. YOU LOOK ON YOUR CALENDAR, RIGHT, AND  
14 YOU COULD SPEND SOME QUALITY TIME WITH YOUR SON. AND IT'S JUST  
15 ONE TRIP, RIGHT. AND YOU COULD GO ANYWHERE YOU WANT WITH  
16 YOUR -- BECAUSE HIS MOM IS A TRAVEL AGENT, AND HIS -- THE OTHER  
17 SET OF GRANDPARENTS, THEY TRAVEL A LOT. THEY'RE WEALTHY. HE  
18 COULD DO ALL KINDS OF THINGS. THE OTHER SIDE OF THE FAMILY IS  
19 IN SEATTLE, WHICH IS JUST A TWO-AND-A-HALF HOURS DRIVE AWAY.

20 IF HE BOOKED OFF THE FIVE DAYS, THEN HE WOULD SEE HIS  
21 SON EVERY SINGLE MONTH, AND THEN HE WORKS 15 DAYS OUT OF THE  
22 MONTH. AND HE NEEDS FIVE RECOVERY DAYS BECAUSE WHEN HE WORKS,  
23 HE BARELY GETS ANY SLEEP. HE COMES HOME AT 11:00 AT NIGHT, AND  
24 THEN HE HAS TO GET UP AT 3:00 IN THE MORNING TO GET BACK TO THE  
25 SET, RIGHT --

26 THE COURT: OKAY. LET ME STOP YOU THERE, BECAUSE ALL OF  
27 THE INFORMATION THAT YOU'RE TELLING ME, AND COUNSEL HAS FURTHER  
28 INFORMATION -- I AM GOING TO HESITATE TO SAY THIS, BUT I AM

1 GOING TO REQUEST FURTHER DECLARATIONS FROM BOTH SIDES --

2 THE RESPONDENT: OKAY.

3 THE COURT: -- STATING YOUR RESPECTIVE POSITIONS. WHY,  
4 FROM THE PETITIONER, YOU THINK CALIFORNIA IS THE HOME STATE.  
5 PROVIDE YOUR SUPPORTED EVIDENCE.

6 AND, MA'AM, YOUR POSITION WHY YOU THINK CANADA IS THE  
7 HOME STATE, AND PROVIDE YOUR SUPPORTED EVIDENCE.

8 AND I NEED ALL OF THIS INFORMATION FILED WITH THE  
9 COURT BEFORE THE NEXT COURT DATE I AM ABOUT TO GIVE, AND I ALSO  
10 NEED -- I NEED THE NAME OF THE JUDGE -- I AM ORDERING YOU,  
11 MA'AM, TO PROVIDE THAT INFORMATION TO BOTH THE COURT AND COUNSEL  
12 ON OR BEFORE JULY 10TH --

13 THE RESPONDENT: OKAY.

14 THE COURT: -- 2015.

15 THE RESPONDENT: UH-HUH, AND --

16 THE COURT: AND THE FURTHER DECLARATIONS THAT THE COURT IS  
17 ALLOWING FROM BOTH SIDES THAT IS DUE TO BE FILED ON OR BEFORE  
18 JULY 17TH --

19 MR. SALICK: FILED DIRECTLY IN THE COURTROOM OR --

20 THE COURT: MARK, DIRECTLY IN THE COURTROOM?

21 THE CLERK: THEY COULD FILE IT DIRECTLY IN THE COURTROOM.

22 THE COURT: YES, DIRECTLY IN THE COURTROOM. AND WE'RE  
23 GOING TO COME BACK ON JULY 31ST. BECAUSE WHAT THE COURT INTENDS  
24 TO DO -- I NEED THE INFORMATION BY JULY 10TH SO THAT WHEN I HAVE  
25 THE INFORMATION OF THE CANADA JUDGE -- THE NAME OF THE JUDGE IN  
26 CANADA ON THE 10TH, AND I RECEIVE YOUR ADDITIONAL PAPERWORK ON  
27 THE 17TH, I COULD THEN COORDINATE BETWEEN THE 17TH AND THE 30TH  
28 OF SPEAKING -- HAVING A CONFERENCE WITH THAT JUDGE. SO IF I

1 DON'T RECEIVE THE INFORMATION -- I NEED IT BY JULY 10TH, OKAY.

2 THE RESPONDENT: LAST FRIDAY I CAME IN LATE. I GAVE A  
3 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES, WHICH WAS IN SUPPORT OF  
4 THE RESPONSE DECLARATION, AND I GAVE A COPY TO MR. SALICK. I  
5 KNOW YOU DIDN'T GET A CHANCE TO READ IT THEN, AND YOU OBVIOUSLY  
6 DIDN'T GET A CHANCE TO READ IT SINCE BECAUSE I DIDN'T FILE IT  
7 CORRECTLY. I MUST NOT HAVE FILED IT CORRECTLY. I JUST WANT TO  
8 BE SURE THAT I DO IT CORRECTLY, BECAUSE THIS WAS -- THIS WAS  
9 JUST A -- A MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES TO -- TO MY  
10 VERY FIRST RESPONSE TO HIS EX PARTE.

11 THE COURT: OKAY. I DON'T NEED THAT, BECAUSE IT WASN'T  
12 THAT IT WASN'T FILED CORRECTLY; IT WAS FILED LATE.

13 THE RESPONDENT: OKAY.

14 THE COURT: SO LATE FILINGS WE DON'T RECEIVE BECAUSE I  
15 HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO READ THEM. COUNSEL HAS NOT HAD A CHANCE  
16 TO REVIEW THEM.

17 WHAT I'M ASKING NOW IS INFORMATION ON THIS ISSUE OF  
18 JURISDICTION AND --

19 THE RESPONDENT: I COVER ALL OF IT, SO I'LL JUST BE  
20 REFILEING IT.

21 THE COURT: SO YOU'LL HAVE TO REFILE AND JUST FOCUS ON THE  
22 INFORMATION THAT I'M REQUESTING AT THIS JUNCTURE. AND WHATEVER  
23 YOU ARE GOING TO FILE, YOU HAVE TO PROVIDE COUNSEL WITH THAT  
24 INFORMATION AS WELL.

25 MR. SALICK: WITH RESPECT TO THE JULY 10TH AND THE  
26 JULY 17TH DUE DATES, CAN -- BECAUSE SHE'S -- I DON'T KNOW WHERE  
27 SHE'S GOING TO SERVE IT FROM. COULD WE DO SERVICE BY E-MAIL?

28 THE COURT: OKAY. DO YOU HAVE EACH OTHER'S E-MAIL

1 ADDRESS?

2 THE RESPONDENT: YES. WHICH ONE SHOULD I -- BECAUSE WE  
3 BOTH HAVE SO MANY E-MAIL ADDRESSES. CAN YOU DO THEM  
4 MARICKETAYLOR@ME? AND THEN WHICH ONE SHALL --

5 MR. SALICK: NAS@SALICKFAMILYLAW.

6 THE COURT: SO THE PARTIES HAVE AGREED THAT SERVICE WILL  
7 BE BY E-MAIL; HOWEVER, WITH THE COURT, WE DON'T HAVE E-MAIL, SO  
8 YOU'LL HAVE TO FILE YOUR PAPERS WITH THE COURT.

9 THE RESPONDENT: AND WITH --

10 THE COURT: YOU COULD FILE IT INSIDE THE COURTROOM.

11 THE RESPONDENT: OKAY. IN THE COURTROOM.

12 THE COURT: YES. SO THE INFORMATION REGARDING THE JUDGE,  
13 IF THAT COULD ALSO BE FILED IN THE COURTROOM JULY 10TH, 2015?

14 MR. SALICK: AND SERVED BY E-MAIL.

15 THE COURT: AND SERVED BY E-MAIL, YES.

16 JULY 31 -- HOW MANY MATTERS DO WE HAVE.

17 THE CLERK: WE HAVE 15.

18 MR. SALICK: IS IT POSSIBLE TO SET IT AT 1:30? I DON'T  
19 KNOW IF THAT WOULD --

20 THE CLERK: WE HAVE A BACKUP DATE FOR A 217 ON THE 30TH.

21 THE COURT: ON THE 31ST.

22 THE CLERK: WELL, ON THE 30TH WE HAVE THE 217, AND THEN WE  
23 SET THE 31ST AS A BACKUP IN CASE IT DOES NOT FINISH.

24 THE COURT: OKAY. YOU NEED A 1:30?

25 MR. SALICK: NO, I WAS JUST WANTING TO KNOW JUST TO  
26 LIMIT -- BECAUSE I CHARGE HIM. IF IT WOULD BE BETTER FOR ALL  
27 INVOLVED TO COME AT 1:30, OTHERWISE 8:30 IS FINE. LET'S MAKE IT  
28 8:30.

1 THE COURT: I MEAN IT COULD BE 1:30. WE HAVE ANOTHER  
2 MATTER ON CALENDAR, BUT I HEAR WHAT YOU'RE SAYING. IT'S EASIER  
3 AND MORE COST EFFICIENT FOR YOUR CLIENT FOR YOU TO SIT FROM 1:30  
4 TO 4:30, AS OPPOSED TO FROM 8:30 TO 4:30.

5 MR. SALICK: PLUS IT'S BASICALLY A LAW AND MOTION TYPE  
6 THING. I WOULD THINK IT WOULDN'T TAKE TOO LONG.

7 THE COURT: SO IT'S UP TO YOU. WE COULD SET IT FOR 8:30,  
8 OR WE COULD SET IT FOR 1:30. WE HAVE 15 MATTERS IN THE MORNING.

9 THE CLERK: YES.

10 THE COURT: WE COULD SET IT FOR 8:30, AND I'LL GIVE IT  
11 PRIORITY. I'LL CALL THE CASE. IF EVERYONE IS HERE AT 8:30,  
12 I'LL CALL IT FIRST. JUST REMIND ME THAT I SAID THAT IF YOU WANT  
13 TO DO IT AT 8:30.

14 MR. SALICK: YES, PLEASE.

15 THE COURT: SO JULY 31ST, 2015 AT 8:30 -- 8:30 A.M. THIS  
16 CASE WILL -- THE COURT WILL GIVE PRIORITY. SO JUST REMIND THE  
17 COURT THAT I SAID THAT SO THIS CASE WILL BE CALLED FIRST.

18 AND WE'LL SEE EVERYONE BACK ON THAT DATE -- COUNSEL  
19 FOR THE PETITIONER, IF YOU COULD GIVE NOTICE?

20 MR. SALICK: DO THE PROPOSED ORDER AND NOTICE, OR CAN THE  
21 MINUTE ORDER BE THE ORDER AFTER HEARING?

22 THE COURT: WELL, THERE ARE NO ORDERS MADE TODAY. SO  
23 DON'T -- SO JUST NOTICE.

24 MR. SALICK: OKAY.

25 THE COURT: OR IS NOTICE WAIVED? NOTICE ESSENTIALLY  
26 STATING THAT YOU WILL RECEIVE IN THE MAIL EITHER FROM COUNSEL OR  
27 FROM THE COURT REGARDING WHAT THE COURT ORDERED TODAY IN TERMS  
28 OF FURTHER DECLARATIONS ON THE ISSUE OF JURISDICTION. I NEED

1 THE TELEPHONE NUMBER OF THE JUDGE IN CANADA WHO THIS CASE IS TO  
2 BE ASSIGNED TO, BY JULY 10TH, 2015. AND I'VE ORDERED THE  
3 PARTIES TO FILE FURTHER DECLARATIONS REGARDING THE ISSUE OF  
4 JURISDICTION TO BE FILED ON OR BEFORE JULY 17TH, 2015. THE  
5 PARTIES HAVE AGREED THAT THEY COULD SERVE EACH BY WAY OF E-MAIL.  
6 AND YOU'RE ORDERED TO BE HERE JULY 31ST, 2015 AT 8:30 A.M. THE  
7 COURT WILL ATTEMPT TO HAVE A CONFERENCE WITH THE JUDGE IN CANADA  
8 BETWEEN JULY 17TH, 2015 AND JULY 30TH, 2015.

9 SO IF WE WERE TO GIVE YOU NOTICE, MA'AM, THAT'S  
10 ESSENTIALLY WHAT THE NOTICE WILL SAY, AND YOU'RE ORDERED TO BE  
11 HERE ON JULY 31ST AT 8:30 A.M.

12 SO IS NOTICE WAIVED?

13 THE RESPONDENT: YES.

14 THE COURT: OKAY. COUNSEL, IS NOTICE WAIVED?

15 MR. SALICK: SO WAIVED, THANK YOU.

16 THE COURT: SO WE'LL SEE EVERYONE BACK ON THAT DAY.

17 THE RESPONDENT: YOUR HONOR, LAST FRIDAY, YOU MADE SOME  
18 ORDERS FOR JOINT CUSTODY, AND YOU ORDERED MY HUSBAND TO TAKE  
19 CUSTODY OF MY SON ON FRIDAYS 3 P.M. THROUGH MONDAY 8:P.M. MY  
20 HUSBAND DIDN'T SEE HIS SON THIS PAST WEEKEND.

21 MR. SALICK: HE COULDN'T AFFORD IT.

22 THE RESPONDENT: THAT'S BECAUSE HE SPENT SO MUCH ON THIS  
23 EX PARTE, AND HE'S CUT ME OFF.

24 THE COURT: OKAY. WELL, THIS IS WHAT THE COURT IS GOING  
25 TO DO AT THIS TIME, BECAUSE THE ISSUE OF JURISDICTION MUST BE  
26 DEALT WITH FIRST, ORDERS THAT THE COURT MADE ON JUNE 26TH, 2015  
27 REGARDING CUSTODY AND/OR VISITATIONS ARE VACATED AT THIS TIME,  
28 AND THIS EX PARTE IS BEING CONTINUED UNTIL JULY 31ST, 2015 TO

1 DETERMINE WHETHER THE COURT, ONE, HAS JURISDICTION; AND TO, TWO,  
2 MAKE INITIAL CUSTODY AND VISITATION ORDERS. OKAY. NOW, IF THE  
3 PARTIES COULD WORK OUT SOMETHING BETWEEN NOW AND JULY 31ST, 2015  
4 SO THAT EACH COULD SEE YOUR SON, THAT WOULD BE WONDERFUL.

5 MR. SALICK: AND IF WE COULD JUST HAVE IT ON THE RECORD.

6 THE RESPONDENT: I COULD TAKE MY SON BACK UP TO VANCOUVER;  
7 RIGHT?

8 MR. SALICK: THE FACT THAT THIS IS CONTINUED TO JULY 31ST  
9 THE ATROS ON THE BACK OF THE SUMMONS ARE STILL IN EFFECT?

10 THE COURT: YES.

11 MR. SALICK: SO THE CHILD, HUNTER, CANNOT LEAVE THE STATE  
12 OF CALIFORNIA UNLESS THERE IS A WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM THE  
13 PETITIONER OR THERE IS A COURT ORDER UNLESS THEY WORK SOMETHING  
14 OUT?

15 THE RESPONDENT: MAY I AT LEAST ARGUE -- SINCE WE'RE HERE,  
16 COULD I AT LEAST ARGUE MY CASE FOR JUST A SECOND?

17 THE COURT: YOU CAN, YES.

18 THE RESPONDENT: THANK YOU.

19 ACCORDING TO SECTION 152.208, THE COURT MAY DECLINE  
20 JURISDICTION IF THE PERSON SEEKING TO INVOKE ITS JURISDICTION  
21 HAS ENGAGED IN UNJUSTIFIABLE CONDUCT.

22 THE COURT: WHAT SECTION IS THAT? WHAT CODE?

23 THE RESPONDENT: THIS IS FROM THE SAME UNIFORM CHILD  
24 CUSTODY JURISDICTION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT SECTION 152 -- OKAY.

25 THE COURT: IS IT FAMILY CODE?

26 THE RESPONDENT: YES.

27 THE COURT: IS IT A FAMILY CODE SECTION?

28 THE RESPONDENT: YES.

1 THE COURT: WHAT SECTION?

2 THE RESPONDENT: THERE IS TWO THINGS -- THERE IS TWO  
3 THINGS I WOULD LIKE TO ARGUE; SECTION 152.208, JURISDICTION  
4 DECLINED BY REASON OF CONDUCT, AND SECTION 152.207, INCONVENIENT  
5 FORUM.

6 "COURTS OF THE STATE, WHICH IS JURISDICTION UNDER  
7 THIS CHAPTER TO MAKE A CHILD CUSTODY DETERMINATION, MAY DECLINE  
8 TO EXERCISE ITS JURISDICTION AT ANY TIME IF IT DETERMINES THAT  
9 IT IS AN INCONVENIENT FORUM UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES AND THAT A  
10 THE COURT OF ANOTHER STATE IS A MORE APPROPRIATE FORUM. THE  
11 ISSUE OF INCONVENIENT FORUM MAY BE RAISED UPON MOTION OF THE  
12 PARTY, THE COURT'S OWN MOTION, OR A REQUEST OF ANOTHER COURT."

13 SHOULD I SHOW YOU WHERE IT IS, OR SHOULD I CONTINUE  
14 READING?

15 THE COURT: YOU COULD CONTINUE TO MAKE YOUR ARGUMENT.

16 THE RESPONDENT: THANK YOU. "BEFORE DETERMINING WHETHER  
17 IT IS AN INCONVENIENT FORUM, THE COURT OF THIS STATE SHALL  
18 CONSIDER WHETHER IT IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE COURT OF ANOTHER  
19 STATE TO EXERCISE JURISDICTION."

20 MR. SALICK: YOUR HONOR, I'M GOING TO INTERRUPT. SHE'S  
21 READING FROM THE DOCUMENT WHICH WAS FILED LATE LAST TIME, AND  
22 SHE'S GOING -- SHE REPRESENTED TO THE COURT SHE'S GOING TO  
23 REFILE. SO SHE'S BASICALLY ARGUING WHAT WE'RE GOING TO TALK  
24 ABOUT ON JULY 31ST.

25 THE RESPONDENT: YOU JUST BROUGHT UP A CASE WHICH IS WHY  
26 WE'RE EXTENDING THIS ENTIRE THING. I'M SORRY, BUT, YOU KNOW  
27 WHAT, I --

28 THE COURT: LET ME STOP YOU THERE --



1 THE RESPONDENT: IF I MAY, ESPECIALLY THE -- I'M SO SORRY.  
2 BUT ESPECIALLY FURTHER BY REASON OF CONDUCT.

3 THE COURT: OKAY. LET ME STOP YOU THERE. I READ -- I'VE  
4 HEARD WHAT YOU JUST READ.

5 THE RESPONDENT: YES.

6 THE COURT: INCONVENIENT FORUM --

7 THE RESPONDENT: YES.

8 THE COURT: BUT I NEED YOU TO REALLY UNDERSTAND, BEFORE  
9 THE COURT COULD EVEN MAKE THAT DECISION IF I'M GOING TO DECLINE  
10 THAT THIS IS THE INCONVENIENT FORUM, CALIFORNIA, I FIRST HAVE TO  
11 HAVE THE JURISDICTION TO DO SO.

12 THE RESPONDENT: THAT I COMPLETELY UNDERSTAND.

13 THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW IF I HAVE THE JURISDICTION TO DO  
14 SO. THAT'S WHY THIS MATTER IS BEING CONTINUED. IT'S NOT  
15 BECAUSE COUNSEL BROUGHT OUT A CASE. COUNSEL WAS DOING HIS JOB  
16 IN BRINGING OUT THAT CASE. HE ANTICIPATED MAYBE THE COURT WILL  
17 REVISIT THE JURISDICTION ISSUE, SO LET ME BE PREPARED WITH  
18 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES TO HELP DIRECT THE COURT OR GIVE THE  
19 COURT SOMETHING TO REVIEW IN ITS DETERMINATION. THAT'S WHY HE  
20 BROUGHT THE CASE. IT WASN'T JUST LET ME SPRING THIS ON YOU.

21 THE RESPONDENT: OKAY.

22 THE COURT: THAT BEING SAID, SO BEFORE YOU COULD ARGUE  
23 WHAT YOU'RE STATING, AND YOU WANT ME TO CONSIDER THAT, I FIRST  
24 HAVE TO MAKE THE DETERMINATION OF WHETHER OR NOT I HAVE THE  
25 JURISDICTION, THE POWER, THE AUTHORITY, TO SAY I DON'T WANT TO  
26 HEAR THE CASE HERE, BECAUSE CANADA IS A MORE CONVENIENT FORUM.  
27 OR I DON'T HAVE JURISDICTION, BECAUSE THE CANADA COURT SAID THEY  
28 HAVE JURISDICTION. I FIRST HAVE TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION OKAY.

1 THE RESPONDENT: OKAY.

2 THE COURT: THAT BEING SAID, HOWEVER -- SEE WE'RE WORKING  
3 ON TWO DIFFERENT THINGS -- THE ATROS STILL APPLY. BECAUSE WHEN  
4 HE FILED HIS PETITION FOR DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE, AND YOU FILED  
5 YOUR RESPONSE, LONG BEFORE YOU FILED YOUR RESPONSE, THERE IS A  
6 SUMMONS; AND THE ATROS THAT I READ TO YOU, IT STATES ONCE A  
7 PETITION IS FILED THERE ARE THINGS THAT THE PARTIES CANNOT DO.  
8 AND WHAT YOU DID IS YOU VIOLATED THE ATROS BY REMOVING YOUR  
9 CHILD FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

10 SO TO HIS POINT, YOU HAVE TO KEEP THE CHILD -- THE  
11 CHILD HAS TO REMAIN IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, BECAUSE YOU ARE  
12 IN VIOLATION OF THE ATROS.

13 THE RESPONDENT: WHERE IS HE GOING TO LIVE?

14 THE COURT: NOW, THAT BEING SAID, WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO  
15 LIVE, WHERE YOUR CHILD IS GOING TO LIVE, I DON'T KNOW, BUT I  
16 JUST KNOW WHAT THE LAW IS.

17 THE RESPONDENT: CAN I GIVE YOU A COUPLE OF LAWS THAT ARE  
18 IN MY CASE, PLEASE. JUST -- THE HAIG CONVENTION THAT HE  
19 MENTIONS "APPLIES WHEN A CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 16 AT THE TIME  
20 OF A HEARING HAS BEEN WRONGFULLY REMOVED TO OR RETAINED IN A  
21 COUNTRY. THE CHILD'S HABITUAL RESIDENCE -- IT'S REALLY  
22 IMPORTANT -- IMMEDIATELY BEFORE THE REMOVAL WAS IN A ANOTHER, AS  
23 IN THE UNITED STATES, AND THE CHILD WAS REMOVED OR RETAINED FROM  
24 A PERSONAL INSTITUTION OR BODY THAT HAS AND WAS ACTUALLY  
25 EXERCISING LAWFUL RIGHTS OF CUSTODY, OR THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN  
26 EXERCISING LAWFUL RIGHTS BUT FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE CHILD. AND  
27 THEN IT SAYS -- IT STATES WHERE IT IS -- WHERE COULD YOU FIND  
28 IT.

1           "WHEN DECIDING WHETHER CHILDREN HAVE ACQUIRED NEW  
2 HABITUAL RESIDENCE, COURTS MUST FOCUS ON WHETHER BOTH PARENTS,  
3 NOT THE CHILD, HAVE A SUBTLE INTENT TO ABANDON THE PREVIOUS  
4 RESIDENCE. THE OBJECTIVE OF THE HAIG CONVENTION IS TO PREVENT  
5 PARENTS FROM ENGAGING IN GAMESMANSHIP WITH THE CHILD'S  
6 UPBRINGING IN ORDER TO SECURE AN ADVANTAGE IN AN ANTICIPATED  
7 CUSTODY BATTLE."

8           BECAUSE HUNTER RANDOY IS UNDER 16 YEARS OF AGE AND A  
9 HABITUAL RESIDENCE OF CANADA PRIOR TO THE DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS,  
10 THE HAIG CONVENTION APPLIES, AND RESPONDENT IS EXEMPT FROM  
11 COMPLYING WITH THE STANDARD TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER THAT  
12 FOLLOWS WITH THE SUMMONS.

13           THE COURT: OKAY.

14           THE RESPONDENT: HE ALSO -- WITH THE SUMMONS, MA'AM, HE  
15 LISTS VANCOUVER AS OUR RESIDENCE FOR OVER A YEAR FOR THE THREE  
16 OF US -- HUSBAND, WIFE AND CHILD FOR OVER A YEAR.

17           MR. SALICK: ACTUALLY, THERE IS TWO ADDRESSES LISTED THERE  
18 FOR THE SAME TIME PERIOD.

19           THE RESPONDENT: YES, A UPS MAILBOX THAT OUR SON WAS NEVER  
20 AT. HE LIED.

21           THE COURT: OKAY. THERE IS NO PETITION BEFORE THIS COURT  
22 FOR A HABEAS CORPUS FOR A HAIG CONVENTION HEARING. THOSE TAKE  
23 PLACE ONLY IN DEPARTMENT 2.

24           SO YOU ARE CITING LAW THAT IT SOUNDS LIKE IT'S ON  
25 YOUR SIDE, BUT I DON'T HAVE BEFORE ME, AGAIN, A PETITION FOR A  
26 HABEAS CORPUS HAIG CONVENTION. THAT IS SOMETHING YOU WILL HAVE  
27 TO FILE, AND YOU WILL HAVE TO FILE THAT IN DEPARTMENT 2.

28           THAT BEING SAID, WHAT I DO HAVE BEFORE ME IS A

1 PETITION FOR A DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE BY THE FATHER. HE SERVED  
2 UPON YOU THE ATROS WHICH STATE PARENTS CANNOT REMOVE THE CHILD  
3 OUT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND YOU DID SO, SO THAT'S IN  
4 VIOLATION, AND I'M ORDERING YOU TO REMAIN IN THE STATE WITH THE  
5 CHILD.

6 THE RESPONDENT: I HAVE NO MONEY. I DON'T KNOW WHAT TO  
7 DO. HOW AM I SUPPOSED TO LIVE? IN A SHELTER? SERIOUSLY,  
8 PLEASE TELL ME WHAT I'M SUPPOSED TO DO.

9 THE COURT: I CAN'T TELL YOU WHAT YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO DO.  
10 I COULD ONLY STATE WHAT THE LAW IS.

11 THE RESPONDENT: BUT I BELIEVE THE LAW IS IN MY FAVOR. I  
12 BELIEVE WHAT HE'S DOING IS COMPLETE AND UTTER ABUSE AND  
13 HARASSMENT. AND IT'S NOT IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE CHILD. WE  
14 HAVE A HOME IN VANCOUVER THAT HE PAID THE RENT FOR.

15 THE COURT: OKAY. LET ME ASK YOU THIS QUESTION --

16 THE RESPONDENT: -- AT LEAST UNTIL THE NEXT HEARING CAN WE  
17 GO HOME?

18 THE COURT: JUST ONE MOMENT. JUST ONE MOMENT.

19 LET ME ASK YOU THIS QUESTION, SIR, DO YOU HAVE A  
20 PLACE OF RESIDENCE FOR HUNTER?

21 THE PETITIONER: YES, I DO.

22 THE COURT: HOW OLD IS HUNTER?

23 THE PETITIONER: THREE.

24 THE COURT: OKAY. DO YOU HAVE A PLACE OF RESIDENCE FOR  
25 HIS MOTHER?

26 MR. SALICK: YOUR HONOR, ONE OF THE THINGS WE WERE GOING  
27 TO REQUEST IS A NESTING ORDER. THERE IS A ONE BEDROOM  
28 FURNISHED --

1 THE COURT: OKAY.

2 MR. SALICK: GUEST HOUSE AND THEN MY CLIENT -- PETITIONER  
3 HAS THE BOAT, SO WHAT THEY COULD DO IS HUNTER COULD STAY IN THE  
4 HOUSE, AND THEN --

5 THE RESPONDENT: THIS IS THE SAME --

6 MR. SALICK: AND THE CUSTODIAL PARENT COULD BE IN THE  
7 HOUSE OR THE NONCUSTODIAL -- THE PETITIONER COULD BE ON HIS  
8 BOAT, AND I DON'T KNOW WHERE THE RESPONDENT WILL GO, BUT THERE  
9 IS A PLACE WHERE HUNTER COULD SLEEP.

10 THE COURT: MY QUESTION IS DO YOU HAVE ROOM FOR THE MOTHER  
11 TO STAY WITH HUNTER IN THE UNITED STATES? CALIFORNIA, L.A.  
12 COUNTY, YES OR NO?

13 THE PETITIONER: YES.

14 THE COURT: OKAY.

15 THE RESPONDENT: MA'AM, THAT'S NOT OUR HOME, AND THIS IS  
16 THE -- THESE ARE THE PEOPLE THAT ACCUSED ME OF A FELONY.

17 THE COURT: OKAY.

18 THE RESPONDENT: I AM NOT -- I'M NOT WELCOMED THERE.  
19 THAT'S NOT MY HOME. I DON'T HAVE A CAR THERE. I DON'T HAVE  
20 ANYTHING THERE. JUST FOR THE SAFETY -- LISTEN, CAN I SHOW YOU  
21 MY -- THE BEDROOM THAT I MADE FOR MY SON. IT'S A TREE HOUSE,  
22 LIKE. I JUST -- HE KEPT ME HERE ON MY FRIEND'S COUCH FOR ALMOST  
23 A MONTH. I WROTE A LETTER TO -- HE ACTUALLY HAD IT AS  
24 EXHIBIT A, OKAY --

25 THE COURT: OKAY. WE HAVE TO END. SO WE ARE GOING TO  
26 END, BUT THE COURT IS GOING TO FIND GOOD CAUSE FOR THIS LIMITED  
27 PURPOSE, MOTHER WILL BE ABLE TO RETURN BACK TO CANADA WITH  
28 CHILD.

1 THE RESPONDENT: THANK YOU.

2 THE COURT: AND YOU'RE ORDERED TO RETURN BACK JULY 31ST,  
3 2015.

4 MR. SALICK: WAIT, YOUR HONOR, MY CLIENT HASN'T SEEN -- HE  
5 DOES -- HE HASN'T HAD --

6 THE RESPONDENT: HE SPENT ALL OF HIS MONEY ON YOU.

7 MR. SALICK: OKAY. YOUR HONOR, THAT'S --

8 THE COURT: I NEED YOU BOTH TO UNDERSTAND, I CANNOT MAKE  
9 ANY CUSTODY ORDERS. I DON'T HAVE -- I DON'T KNOW IF I HAVE  
10 JURISDICTION.

11 MR. SALICK: BUT THE COURT JUST SAID THAT MOM CAN'T LEAVE  
12 THE STATE WITH THE CHILD; AND NOW THE COURT IS SAYING THAT THE  
13 MOM CAN LEAVE THE STATE WITH THE CHILD.

14 THE RESPONDENT: OF COURSE.

15 MR. SALICK: BUT THAT DEPRIVES MY CLIENT FROM SEEING THE  
16 CHILD.

17 THE RESPONDENT: NO, YOU CAN. YOU COULD GET ON A PLANE  
18 ANYTIME. I'VE NEVER STOPPED YOU.

19 MR. SALICK: SHE'S THREATENED TO FILE A RESTRAINING  
20 ORDER --

21 THE RESPONDENT: I WON'T. I WON'T. OF COURSE NOT. YOU  
22 COULD COME SEE YOUR CHILD ANY TIME YOU WANT.

23 THE COURT: THE COURT IS GOING TO MAKE THIS ORDER, AND YOU  
24 ARE DONE, MA'AM. YOU ARE IN VIOLATION OF THE ATROS. THE CHILD  
25 HAS TO REMAIN IN THE -- IN CALIFORNIA BECAUSE YOU'RE IN  
26 VIOLATION OF THE ATROS.

27 THE RESPONDENT: THEN -- THEN DOES MY HUSBAND HAVE TO TAKE  
28 CARE OF HIM? IS HE TAKING CARE OF HIM THEN WITH A NANNY OR

1 SOMETHING?

2 MR. SALICK: YES.

3 THE COURT: THE COURT IS NOT MAKING ANY CUSTODY ORDERS. I  
4 DON'T HAVE -- I DON'T KNOW IF I HAVE JURISDICTION. THE CHILD  
5 HAS TO REMAIN HERE, AND THE PARENTS HAVE TO TAKE CARE OF THE  
6 CHILD UNTIL THE COURT MAKES ORDERS.

7 MR. SALICK: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

8 THE COURT: WE ARE ADJOURNED.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

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,

)  
)  
6 PETITIONER, )

7 VS.

) CASE NO. BD621137  
) REPORTER'S  
) CERTIFICATE

8 MARICKE RANDOY,

)  
)  
9 RESPONDENT. )  
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 31,  
15 INCLUSIVE, COMPRISE A FULL, TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF THE  
16 TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS TAKEN IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER ON  
17 JULY 1, 2015.

18 DATED THIS 19TH 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, JULY 1, 2015

13  
14  
15 APPEARANCES:

16 FOR THE PETITIONER:

NICHOLAS A. SALICK,  
ATTORNEY AT LAW

17  
18  
19 FOR THE RESPONDENT:

IN PROPRIA PERSONA

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