

Laura Owens
[REDACTED]
Scottsdale, AZ 85254
[REDACTED]
Pro Per

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

In Re the Matter of:

LAURA OWENS

Petitioner,

vs.

Case No. FC2023-052114

CLAYTON ECHARD

Respondent,
_____ /

EXPEDITED (!)
MOTION TO SEAL COURT RECORD

COMES NOW, Petitioner Laura Owens, who requests that the Court seal the case (all that has been submitted so far and everything that will be filed in the future) so that the general public may not access it. This filing is EXPEDITED due to the fact that media outlets New York Post and Page Six have expressed interest in publicizing the case (*EXHIBIT 1*), which involves unborn minor children, and have attempted communication with both parties for comment.

ARFLP Rule 17(c)(1) states that the court may order files or records to be sealed if “there exists an overriding interest that overcomes the right of public access to the record.” The Respondent, Clayton Echard, was *The Bachelor* on ABC in 2022. The show was watched by millions and Echard is still a public figure. The Petitioner, Laura Owens, is a popular self-help podcaster and TEDx speaker.

The Respondent makes knowingly false allegations against the Petitioner in his Response to the Petition to Establish Paternity that would be detrimental to the Petitioner’s reputation.

These statements, made under penalty of perjury, include “Party A is making up this entire claim and is refusing a paternity test” and “pregnancy has not been proven, neither has paternity”.

When the Respondent was initially told about the pregnancy, he was provided with discharge papers from the Petitioner’s visit to the Banner Urgent Care Health Clinic on June 1st, 2023 (*EXHIBIT 2*). Therefore, Respondent knew that Petitioner was not “making up the claim”.

When the Respondent initially showed doubts about the validity of the pregnancy test, he purchased one for Petitioner to take, which she took in front of him. It came back positive. Petitioner acknowledges this in *EXHIBIT 3* when he states, “I wanted you to come over to confirm what I was doubting. And it did confirm that. So, I don’t see you as a liar anymore.” Based on the medical test results provided in *EXHIBIT 2* and those seen with the Respondent’s own eyes, Respondent undoubtedly knew that the pregnancy was “proven”.

Respondent’s multiple claims that Petitioner has “refused a paternity test” are blatant lies. From the onset of the pregnancy, Petitioner offered to take a prenatal paternity test at the soonest possible time and never waived. To date, Petitioner has offered more than fifty times in writing. At one point, Respondent agreed to the test and selected a lab that he trusted named Ravgen. Petitioner paid \$725 as a deposit and scheduled her blood draw. Respondent never responded to Petitioner, nor Ravgen, to schedule his part, nor pay for his portion. The test was canceled due to the Respondent’s unwillingness to participate (*EXHIBIT 4*). Despite this, Respondent filed in his Response to the court that it was the Petitioner who was refusing. Petitioner has the backing of Ravgen in regards to the action of the Respondent. In a recorded call on September 13th, 2023, a representative from Ravgen stated, "you tried to do everything right the first time and he backed out on you", "It sounds like he wouldn't come", “he's being uncooperative". The representative also suggested trying to get a Motion to Compel to force the

Respondent to participate. The audio of the call is available upon request.

The Respondent makes inflammatory statements about the Petitioner in the section "Statements About Paternity", where under the "Summary" section of "Other", after he once again states that the "entire petition is made up", he writes that, "upon information received and belief, Party A suffers from mental health issues". The Respondent is not a medical doctor and his "diagnosis" of the Petitioner's emotional well being is not necessary, accurate, nor required in answering that section. In addition, the Respondent writes that he is "concerned that she is stalking me", despite the fact that it is the Petitioner who has made a police report about the Respondent, not the other way around (*EXHIBIT 5*). Those extremely serious allegations are completely unfounded and would undoubtedly be damaging to the Petitioner's reputation if they were to be exposed in an article written by any media news outlet.

The Respondent's blatant disregard for the truth in his Response, which is public record, has left the Petitioner in a very vulnerable state if the New York Post and Page Six publish them as they plan to. Despite the fact that the Respondent's statements are false, the allegations would be linked to the Petitioner, who is a speaker on domestic violence, and would surely harm her career. This speaks to ARFLP Rule 17(c)(3) that "a substantial probability exists that the overriding interest will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed or redacted."

The Petitioner also referred to the fact that the public would likely not respond well to the fact that the Respondent stated on his Response that even if he is proven to be the natural father, he does not want to appear on the unborn twins' birth certificates, nor give them his last name. The Petitioner attempted to get the Respondent to file a Stipulated Motion to Seal in an effort to protect the Respondent's false claims from becoming public knowledge, but did not receive a response. A good faith effort was made, however, as it is in the best interest of the children that

both parents maintain a good public image. If information from this case is disseminated to the public through tabloid media outlets, it would be negative in nature, portray the Petitioner in a false light, and affect the careers of both the Petitioner and Respondent. This would mean that both would have decreased earnings and therefore less money to contribute to child support.

Public disclosure serves neither the best interest of the parties nor public access to judicial records.

WHEREFORE, the Petitioner requests:

That the Court seal FC2023-052114 in its entirety as soon as possible to prevent tabloid media outlets from being able to publish filings in this case.

ORIGINAL AND ONE COPY of the foregoing document e-filed and e-mailed this 14th day of September, 2023 to:

Clayton Echard

[REDACTED]
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

[REDACTED]
Respondent Pro Per

By: /s/ Laura Owens

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this date: September 14th, 2023.

Laura Owens /s/
Filing Party

