

NO. UWY-FA-20-5026583-S : SUPERIOR COURT
MARLENA ANDERSON-HARRIS : JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF
WATERBURY
V. : AT WATERBURY
DANA HARRIS : OCTOBER 8, 2021

Memorandum of Decision

Jurisdiction/Parties

The plaintiff, Marlena Anderson-Harris, and the defendant, Dana Harris, were married on December 14, 2007 in Danbury, Connecticut. Both parties have been residents of the State of Connecticut for many years preceding the filing of the dissolution proceeding on July 22, 2020, return date August 18, 2020. Neither party is a recipient of state or federal assistance. At the time of trial, the plaintiff and defendant were in their early 40s and in good physical health. The plaintiff has an associates degree in fashion design and advertising. (Testimony Trial 7/20/21) with an earning capacity of approximately \$19,000

10-8-2021 Decision entered in
accordance with the foregoing.
J.D.N.O. Sent to all Counsel
of record and copy emailed
to the Reporter of Judicial
Decisions.
Tracy Banaco
Assist. Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT
WATERBURY, CT

OCT 08 2021

CLERK'S OFFICE

per year in 2019 making upholstery covers for chiropractic tables. She is an accomplished seamstress working from home. (Testimony Trial 7/20/21). The defendant has a bachelor's degree in communications and has been employed for the past six years for Frontier Communications, beginning in sales and promoted to his current position of business service representative in the back office. He is on medication for high blood pressure and high cholesterol but otherwise in good health. (Trial 7/20/2021).

Early in their marriage, approximately 2008 (dates uncertain) the parties suffered the severe loss of two pregnancies which terminated in miscarriage; the first of twins, the second a son after seventeen weeks of pregnancy. The dual miscarriages strained the marriage. For a brief time the parties engaged in therapy and were both working; the plaintiff self-employed, the defendant a business employee. Subsequently, twin daughters were born, issue of the marriage, namely, Scarlett d.o.b. 12/24/2013 and Skye d.o.b. 12/25/2013. This pregnancy was unplanned and a surprise (Testimony defendant, Trial, 7/20/2021). At this juncture, the plaintiff stayed home

nursing and caring for the twins. The twin's care was constant and overwhelming. The defendant assumed the traditional role of primary wage earner. Finances were extremely precarious understandably causing marital strain. Of note, the court concentrates on the marital history primarily because it is a prelude to the emotional and procedural nightmare that ensued and continues to this day.

Between 2014-2015, the defendant became increasingly concerned with the plaintiff's mental health. He noticed an attitude of "her way or no way", her refusal to contribute in any fashion financially to the household. The home was always "a mess." She insisted that he do more at home. At this time, he was traveling by bus from Waterbury to his job in New Haven so she would have the car, a two and a half hour daily commute. Once home, he cleaned up, did laundry, cooked and helped with the twins, bathing them before bed. (Testimony, Trial 7/20/2021).

In 2015, the plaintiff filed an action for divorce which was subsequently dismissed. During the pendency of the proceeding, the plaintiff demanded a monetary "stipend" for

staying home at a time when the parties were facing eviction, utility shutoff for non-payment, and often, no food. Finally, the plaintiff, at the defendant's urging, sought medical help. She entered the Institute of Living in-patient in 2015 and was diagnosed with bipolar phase 2. According to the defendant, the diagnosis and medication did not significantly alter the marital situation. He did change jobs taking a cut in pay to be at home more. She did work upholstering the chiropractic tables. She did not however regularly contribute her earnings to the household. At this time the defendant described the parties' relationship as "roommates with kids". The plaintiff was still nursing the twins at the age of three and one half.

Finally, in 2020, the whole marital relationship exploded with the plaintiff leveling allegations of repeated acts of child sexual abuse committed by the defendant upon the twins from the age of six months to the present. These allegations arose after her release from a voluntary commitment for treatment at Silver Hill, a psychiatric hospital in Connecticut. Silver Hill allegedly confirmed the earlier diagnosis of bipolar disorder with recommended outpatient follow-up at the Waterbury

Hospital.¹ The plaintiff subsequently testified that the Silver Hill diagnosis of bipolar changed to PTSD, a diagnosis unconfirmed by evidence. What followed next can only be described as a scenario from hell. The plaintiff's behavior became increasingly bizarre.

The exact time frame is debatable but at sometime mid-2020, the defendant testified that the plaintiff would travel to the casino at Mohegan Sun with the twins on a weekly basis, two to three times a week. The twins were deposited at the casino childcare facility.² The plaintiff would gamble, lose her money, and then call him to come to the casino with the money necessary to pay childcare in order to retrieve their children. The plaintiff did not offer testimony to refute this claim.

The defendant next testified credibly that at the time of the plaintiff filing for divorce in mid-July 2021, he was surprised by the institute of the divorce proceeding. He

¹Outpatient treatment was not followed, cost prohibitive. (Diagnosis testified to by the parties at trial, medical records not in evidence, permission to obtain such revoked by plaintiff through counsel).

²The defendant testified that he did accompany her on occasion but most times, he did not go.

believed that the parties had a decent, albeit "roommate" relationship, the children were enrolled in school in Wolcott and she was earning money from her upholstery business. Those earnings stopped when the plaintiff started receiving money (\$800 week) from the government Cares Act in the end of June 2020 or start of July 2020.

At this time COVID was rampant in the United States and worldwide, forcing schools to physically close and require remote learning. Travel was severely restricted with mandatory quarantining. Despite such, the plaintiff traveled to Cape Cod with the twins leaving their pet rabbit at home. Upon their return the rabbit was dead. The plaintiff accused the defendant of intentionally killing the rabbit. She actually contacted the Wolcott Police requesting that the defendant be arrested for animal cruelty. The rabbit's corpse was sent to UCONN for an autopsy. Cause of death was an E. coli infection not murder.

As indicated previously, the dissolution proceeding was instituted in July of 2020 with a return date of August 18, 2020. The first application for Emergency Ex Parte Order of Custody alleging sexual abuse was filed with the complaint. It

was denied (Ficeto, J.). On September 14, 2020, after hearing, the court ordered joint legal custody of the minor children with shared physical at the parties' Wolcott residence, one week on, one week off. The children were ordered to continue in therapy at Wellmore with Tess Stokes, their therapist. (Court Edison Joe Q case info 9/14/2020). The defendant testified that his mother would come to the house to assist him during his custody time. He also testified that the plaintiff came over during his custodial time to "clean the insides" of the twin's private area on occasion.

At the beginning of the 2019 school year, the twins were enrolled in the Wolcott School district, in person learning, first grade.³ The defendant testified that the plaintiff would remove the children from school resulting in repeated tardy and absent markings. This created significant issues with the twin's progress - they were not at grade level, school work was not handed in during October and November of 2020. This culminated in notice from the school in January, 2021, that the children were borderline of being retained with the school

³Pre-COVID remote mandate.

requiring extra tutoring in reading and math. (Testimony defendant at trial).⁴ Despite such, the plaintiff continued to remove the children from the state traveling to New Hampshire in January, 2021. Then on February 5, 2021, the plaintiff took the children, disappearing with them until March 18, 2021. The defendant had no knowledge of their location and no communication. Later testimony revealed that the plaintiff was residing with the twins in various homeless shelters in the State of Connecticut. When the mother finally returned to the Wolcott home in March, 2021, she remained and slept with the girls in a locked room in the home to protect them from their father's alleged abuse.⁵

While the activity described above was occurring, the court did whatever was within its power to address and correct this recurring nightmare. The plaintiff at times was represented by

⁴The plaintiff did enroll the children in the Sylvan Learning Center. However, whether they attended was not in evidence.

⁵Testimony elicited at trial revealed that the plaintiff slept naked with the now 7-year-old girls and only slept clothed once Skye objected to the nakedness.

counsel but for the majority of the proceedings was self-represented.⁶

Between 7/22/2020 and 4/26/2021, the plaintiff filed eight applications for emergency ex parte orders of custody, the majority alleged identical incidents of sexual abuse perpetrated by the defendant or the 9-year-old cousin while the twins were in the custody of the paternal grandmother. (Edison Case Information 2). Each application was denied with hearing held.

In response to the plaintiff's allegations, the court took appropriate action. It conducted hearings or entered orders on 4/14/2020, 1/14/2021, 3/18/2021, 3/24/2021, 3/29/2021, 3/30/2021, 5/4/2021, 5/6/2021, and subsequent dates until trial on 7/20/2021, 7/22/2021, 8/18/2021 hearing, trial continuation on 9/3/2021, 9/22/2021, 9/24/2021. These hearings were a concerted effort to investigate and uncover any truth underlying these very serious and extremely disturbing allegations. On December 29, 2020, the defendant by motion docket number 137.00

⁶From approximately 12/4/2020 until 4/6/2021, Plaintiff was represented by counsel. Permission to withdraw was granted after the plaintiff accused counsel of personal misconduct. New counsel appeared and withdrew within days of their initial appearance. Final counsel filed an appearance on 7/20/2021.

requested a psychological evaluation of the plaintiff. In response on January 6, 2021, the court ordered the parties referred to family relations for a case evaluation (Edison Case Information 2 #143).⁷ The case evaluation was not completed due to intervening ex parte applications filed by both parties, the court appointment of a GAL and referral to DCF, (CMIS, Family Services Information System), and the subsequent COVID restrictions on court operations. Subsequently, on 4/1/2021, the Court (Ficeto, J.) canceled the comprehensive evaluation by Family Relations reaffirming the GAL appointment. Also of note on that same January, 6, 2021, the Court (Ficeto, J.) ordered the plaintiff to pay the sum of fifty dollars (\$50) per week to the defendant as a contribution to household expenses during the period of shared custody time. That money was never paid during the pendency of the proceedings nor was a motion to modify that order ever granted. (Court docket file).

⁷Testimony elicited during hearings indicated that private psychological evaluations cost \$10,000, a cost the parties could not afford and were not funded by the State of Connecticut in family matters.

On February 17, 2021, the Court (Ficeto, J.) appointed Attorney Jill Allward as the guardian ad litem for the minor children with full statutory duties, fees at state rate. (Docket #155). Attorney Allward during the course of her appointment expended over sixty (60) hours in the course of her representation/investigation which proved invaluable to the court. (Testimony Trial 7/20-7/22/2201).

In an attempt to impose order and curtail the repetitive applications for Emergency Ex Parte Applications, this court scheduled hearings in March on outstanding motions. At that time extensive testimony was elicited from DCF, the children's therapist, the paternal grandmother, Lisa Harris, the plaintiff, the defendant and the GAL. Following said hearing the court entered the following orders;

ORDER

All Parties Present. All Counsel Present. GAL Present.

The following order is entered in the above matter:

ORDER:

CORRECTED ORDER:

1) The minor children Scarlett M. Harris (DOB 12/24/2013) and Skye L. Harris (DOB 12/25/2013) are to be surrendered to the

care and custody of paternal grandmother Lisa Harris immediately. Placement of the minor children with the paternal grandmother is temporary pending further review by the Court.

2) The parties will cooperate with a psychological evaluation which will include interactional with mother and the children and father and the children. The children will also participate in a full psychological evaluation. The parties will follow all recommendations of the psychological evaluation.

3) The children will be returned to the care of their lifelong pediatrician Naugatuck Pediatrics.

4) The children will be returned to Wolcott schools immediately.

5) The children will remain engaged in supportive individual counseling through Wellmore.

6) The children will not be scheduled for any further evaluations and/or intakes unless therapeutically recommended by Wellmore and all parties are in agreement and/or a court order.

7) The mother will consistently attend therapy to address all past/current trauma issues and follow all recommendations of the therapist. Mother will also consistently attend appointments with her treating psychiatrist and will take her prescribed medications as directed by her treating psychiatrist.

8) Father will consistently attend therapy to address any past/current trauma issues and follow all recommendations of the therapist.

9) Both parties will not discuss any adult/court related information with the children.

10) The parties will communicate through AppClose.

11) The referral to Family Services for the Comprehensive Evaluation is terminated.

12) Parties shall have visitation with the minor children only upon the recommendation of the minor children's therapist.

This matter is continued to 3/30/2021 at 2:00 pm for report back.

Judicial Notice (JDNO) was sent regarding this order.

On April 26, 2021, the plaintiff filed a Motion for Modification of Child Support, Custody and Visitation. (D.N. 186, 186.5).

A hearing was held on May 4, 2021. On May 6, 2021, this court restricted the plaintiff from filing any new ex parte applications or motions based on allegations previously heard and adjudicated. Prior to filing, the Plaintiff's motions had to be approved by the presiding judge. Applications based on allegations arising after May 4, 2021 were allowed. On May 6, 2021, this court also denied the plaintiff's Motion to Remove the Guardian Ad Litem and Motion to Disqualify.

Trial dates were scheduled to commence on July 20, 2021. On July 2, 2021, the plaintiff moved for a trial continuance, reference to Family Relations, and a Motion for Order. The Court (Ficeto, J.) denied all motions. On July 20, 2021, trial commenced. This court, concerned that the custody issues could

not be resolved until the therapy previously ordered had progressed sufficiently to adequately address the underlying issues bifurcated the trial, addressing financial issues first. The court was also extremely troubled by the plaintiff's mental state and hoped to address once and forever her inability to accept the findings of no substantiation of sexual abuse by state agencies and court appointed referrals.

To this end, the court inquired whether the plaintiff would consent to a single issue evaluation, i.e., whether the plaintiff was ready to assume a joint custodial role in her children's lives. In order to make that assessment, Family Relations would have to: 1. Accept the limited evaluation assignment; 2. The plaintiff and defendant needed to provide authorization for release of their psychiatric, medical and therapist records; and 3. Both parties would agree to cooperate fully with Family Relations. This was a "last ditch attempt" by the court to determine if the plaintiff was, however reluctantly, willing to accept that the defendant was not a sexual predator, a fact proven throughout the case by overwhelming evidence thus setting the stage for an eventual

joint custody order. The plaintiff agreed, the supervisor of Family Relations reported to the court during trial, the limited issue to be evaluated put on the record, releases were prepared and signed by both parties. The financial aspect of the trial then concluded with orders entered for continued temporary custody in the paternal grandmother and transitional visitation as determined by the children's therapist.

This order was necessitated by the extremely alarming testimony of the GAL during the last day of trial on July 22, 2021. Her testimony was corroborated by earliest testimony of a DCF worker, the children's therapist, Tess; the grandmother, Ms. Lisa Harris, and the defendant, Dana Harris. In sum, the GAL testified:

1. The plaintiff has accused the defendant of sexually assaulting the children since the age of six months by rubbing their vaginal areas with his hands.
2. This belief has resulted in the plaintiff consistently and repeatedly throughout the years asking the girls if their vaginas "hurt".

3. The plaintiff has insisted on "washing" the girls' vaginal areas on repeated bases.
4. This behavior prompted the girls to focus on this area and complain to their mother on occasion that the area hurt or that they (Skye in particular) felt or dreamed they had been "stabbed" in the vagina.
5. On one occasion, the mother consulted with the girls' pediatrician who observed vaginal irritation and as a mandated reporter, ordered clinical/hospital examination for sexual assault. Findings - no assault.
6. Referral to DCF. SCAN testing. Negative for sexual assault (workers trained in sexual assault/abuse).
7. Forensic evaluation by Wolcott Police, result negative for sexual assault.
8. Children's therapist related no discussion of sexual assault from either child, including incident relating to 9-year-old cousin Jordan at grandmother's house.
9. Mother's continuing offer of breast to seven year olds "for comfort".

10. The removal of the girls from their home, living in a shelter, observing a stabbing in the shelter.
11. The removal of the children from their home, school, pediatrician and therapist resulting in their repeating first grade and instability.
12. The girls reporting to the GAL that they wanted to stay with their grandmother.
13. The girls now in a safe environment, thriving, learning, making friends, caring for their personal hygiene, clothing themselves, taking pride in their hair.
14. The girls happy to see their father and reluctant to leave him once visitation over.
15. Lawrence, the uncle of the plaintiff, expressing concern to the GAL relating to the plaintiff's mental health and safety.
16. The GAL's opinion that she was concerned that the plaintiff's "vile behavior" (i.e., vaginal washing, breast feeding, removal from the home, living in a

shelter, accusations against the cousin and grandmother) was itself "sexual abuse".

17. The plaintiff's insistence that DCF, Family Relations were not "experts" trained in sexual abuse.

The court could provide more detailed examples but believes all of the foregoing sufficiently establishes the difficulties experienced when confronted with obsessive delusion.

The court sincerely hoped that the bifurcation plan established during trial would have produced a positive result. Unfortunately, less than 12 days after the trial, defendant's counsel on August 4, 2021, filed an emergency motion to modify, as well as a motion for judgment dated July 30, 2021. The emergency motion was granted on the papers. A hearing was scheduled for August 18, 2021. Of note, during that intervening time, the defendant was complying with all previous court orders, actively engaging in court-ordered therapy, as well as therapy of his own initiative.

At the August 18, 2021 hearing, neither plaintiff nor her counsel appeared. Based on the documentary evidence attached to the application and testimony, the court granted the motion and

terminated the plaintiff's visitation. The plaintiff's posting on the internet clearly evinced her continued belief in the defendant's abuse broadcasting such and her alleged victimization to whomever would listen.⁸ At this hearing, the court set additional dates for hearings to conclude the trial based on the defendant's motion for judgment and any other outstanding issues.

On September 8, 2021, all counsel and parties were present. Plaintiff's counsel proceeded to obstreperously claim due process and constitutional violations of her client and her own due process rights, claiming conflict with a hearing previously scheduled in a different court. The court was aware of such but had been informed by the Administrative Judge (Ficeto, J.) that Edelman J. had excused counsel's attendance to allow this court to proceed. Despite such, counsel then claimed another conflict unresolved. Admittedly a heated exchange ensued between the court and counsel over counsel's failure to follow preliminary trial procedure, i.e., filing of proposed orders, exhibit list,

⁸Plaintiff's counsel's appearance was filed August 3, 202, "in addition to" the plaintiff's pro se appearance.

the plaintiff's flagrant disregard of previous orders, postings on the internet, etcetera. Counsel denied such, engaged in personal attacks on the court and counsel claiming confusion over JDNO notices and general inability to prepare for the issues to be addressed. Particularly upsetting to the court was the plaintiff's, through counsel, revocation of all permission for medical record releases previously given and ordered to family relations including her revocation of the GAL's authority to continue in her court-ordered appointment - all done in flagrant disregard of orders not modified by motion and hearing. The court in an attempt to diffuse an explosive situation, acquiesced and set additional dates to conclude the trial also acknowledging a change in the financial circumstances of the plaintiff since the date of the bifurcated trial on financial issues.⁹

On September 17, 2021 trial recommenced, again without the plaintiff or her counsel's compliance with standing trial procedure. Nevertheless, in the interests of concluding the

⁹At the time of the previous trial of financial issues, the plaintiff qualified for Section 8 housing and had been receiving unemployment stimulus checks. Both benefits had now expired.

trial, the court proceeded outlining Practice Book § 5-5 re: objection procedure to avoid lengthy discourse by counsel and Practice Book § 1-13A, civil and criminal court contempts for conduct directed against the dignity or authority of the court. Despite such, at various times counsel engaged in inflammatory conduct, at one time claiming to have affidavits in her briefcase admitting misconduct by previous counsel as well as attacking the integrity of the court and opposing counsel. Finally, another heated exchange ensued with counsel refusing to sit down and keep quiet resulting in the court asking the marshal to escort counsel from the courtroom. This was late afternoon and court then adjourned.

The next scheduled trial date was September 22, 2021, at 2:00 p.m. Neither did counsel appear or did she notify anyone of reason for delay. The plaintiff, pro se, did text her and did receive a text back, the content not indicative of counsel's whereabouts or intention. After consultation with the Administrative Judge, the court proceeded on the limited issue of the plaintiff's new financial affidavit and her pro se compliance with proposed orders. Later that afternoon during

the hearing the court was advised by the family caseflow clerk that plaintiff's counsel had e-filed a Motion for Mistrial claiming, inter alia, constitutional violations, judicial discrimination, and egregious bias, etcetera. Clearly, although not in attendance at court, plaintiff's counsel was actively engaged in litigation practice.

Trial concluded on September 24, 2021. Plaintiff's counsel, without explanation, arrived one and a half hours late. At this juncture, the court refrained, despite just cause and full authority to do so, from engaging. Invoking the wrath of the court and its contempt power would be an exercise in futility, further delaying the resolution of the case - definitely not in the best interests of the children.

ORDER

Accordingly, the parties having met all statutory requirements, the court orders the marriage of the parties dissolved on the grounds of irretrievable breakdown. The parties are declared single and unmarried.

Custody

The defendant, Dana Harris, is awarded sole legal and physical custody of the two minor children, Scarlett and Skye Harris. Due to the plaintiff's continued allegations of abuse and refusal to cooperate pursuant to court order, the court finds it is in the children's best interest concerning their physical safety and mental well-being to limit visitation with the plaintiff mother to two video meetings per week, on consistent time and dates chosen by the father.¹⁰ Duration of said visitation is limited to one hour each supervised by the father or a person of his choosing.¹¹ The mother shall not discuss the court proceedings during the visitation. The father may terminate visitation if the mother engages in inappropriate behavior. Visitation shall only increase and/or change upon recommendation of the children's therapist in conjunction with consultation of the plaintiff's therapist as previously ordered.

¹⁰The plaintiff persisted to claim abuse even at trial, despite all evidence to the contrary and further documented by her video exhibits, suggestive of running away asking for funds to help her defend her children.

¹¹The court must at this time acknowledge the incredible contribution the paternal grandmother, Lisa Harris, has made to the well-being of the children.

The mother may receive the children's school records and notice of medical appointments. She is prohibited from picking up the children from school.

Stimulus Check

There is a current order dated January, 2021, that the plaintiff contribute \$50 per week toward household expenses. That order has not been modified and has been accruing. There was however testimony by the plaintiff with defendant's counsel concurring that it was agreed that said order would offset the plaintiff's claim for return of stimulus funds. The defendant testified at trial that all stimulus checks were transferred directly by the government into the parties' checking account. Simple mathematical calculation equals approximately \$1,935 offset (38.7 weeks x \$50), owed and continuing to accrue.

Child Support

Currently, the plaintiff is unemployed. She ceased employment once the government unemployment subsidy began. That subsidy has now stopped. There is no physical reason preventing her from working. She has earned between \$18,000 and \$21,000 in the past. She is currently in default of court orders of \$50

per week household contribution, offset however by her claim for stimulus funds. For the purpose of trial, defendant's counsel calculated a gross weekly income of \$480 based on minimum wage resulting in a guidelines computation of \$119 week in child support. The court orders that amount to be paid to the defendant weekly commencing December 1, 2021, providing the plaintiff ample time to secure employment.

Alimony

Having considered the statutory criteria, the court awards the plaintiff the sum of one dollar (\$1) a year alimony for a period of five years. While this award is negligible, it recognizes the current financial reality of the parties which is tottering on the brink of disastrous debt. The court has closely examined the parties' financial affidavits, scrutinizing line items hoping to discover "soft" expenses and/or liabilities. The court has discovered none. The defendant waives any claim to alimony.

Marital residence

The Defendant will continue to reside at the marital residence located at 261 Todd Road, Wolcott, Connecticut ("the

residence") and will, within sixty (60) days from the date of dissolution, assume the obligations of the lease by re-executing a separate lease with the landlord that removes the Plaintiff from the lease. The Plaintiff will cooperate with the Defendant and the landlord to effectuate the re-execution of the lease.

Medical Insurance

The Defendant shall continue to cover the children for medical insurance purposes with coverage available through his employer, provided that health insurance is available at a reasonable cost. In the event that health insurance is no longer available at a reasonable cost, the parties will obtain health insurance for the children, sharing equally (50%/50%) the cost of premiums, co-pays, etc. All unreimbursed medical, dental, orthodontic, psychiatric, psychological, prescriptions and optical expenses incurred on behalf of the minor children shall be equally shared by the parties (50%/50%). The Plaintiff shall be responsible for her own health insurance at her own cost and expense. The Defendant shall be responsible for his own health insurance at his own cost and expense.

Assets and Liabilities

The Plaintiff shall be responsible for all liabilities listed on her financial affidavit and shall hold the Defendant harmless from same. The Defendant shall be responsible for all

liabilities as shown on his financial affidavit and shall hold the Plaintiff harmless from same.

The parties shall share equally (50%/50%) the total amount of debt described outstanding debts in the tax warrant issued by the City of Waterbury.

The Defendant will retain the 2016 Toyota Camry and 2016 Kia Sorento and shall be responsible for all expenses and maintenance associated therewith.

Each party shall retain their savings accounts and checking accounts and, in the case of the Plaintiff, her business sales account, as indicated on their respective financial affidavits.

The Defendant shall retain his retirement accounts as indicated on his financial affidavit free and clear of any claim to same by the Plaintiff. Neither account is in pay status at this time.

The Plaintiff shall retain her interest in Molly Couture LLC as indicated on her financial affidavit, free and clear of any claim to same by the Defendant.

The Defendant shall retain his interest in the life insurance policies as indicated on his financial affidavit.

The Plaintiff is precluded from filing any future motions without the prior review and approval of the Administrative Judge.

The Court


_____, JTR
Schofield