

Laura Owens

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

ELECTRONICALLY

FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

10/13/2025

Clerk of the Court

BY: JOSHUA MANDAPAT
Deputy Clerk

LAURA OWENS,
Petitioner in Pro Per

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Case No.: FDV-18-813693

**PETITIONER'S WITNESS
LIST**

LAURA OWENS,
PETITIONER,

Vs.

MICHAEL MARRACCINI,
RESPONDENT.

Date: October 21 and 22, 2025
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept.: 405A

1. David S. Gingras, Esq. — Former Counsel (Owens v. Echard, Maricopa County Superior Court, FC2023-052114) and Fact Witness – 60 minutes

Attorney licensed in Arizona and California who represented Petitioner in her 2023–2024 paternity case against Clayton Echard. Mr. Gingras is expected to testify as a percipient witness regarding Respondent's continuing violations of the San Francisco Superior Court DVRO (FDV-18-813693)..

Mr. Gingras will testify that on April 19, 2024, Respondent's attorney, Randy Sue Pollock, confirmed in writing that "my client will not be testifying" in the Arizona paternity case. Despite this assurance, Respondent traveled from California to Phoenix and appeared in person at the Maricopa County Superior Court on June 10, 2024, where he sat approximately 20–25 feet from Petitioner for over two hours while she testified—without permission from the issuing court and in direct violation of the active San Francisco protective order prohibiting all contact.

Mr. Gingras immediately contacted court security and local law enforcement after Petitioner became visibly distressed on the stand, providing documentation of the active order and requesting enforcement.

Following this incident, Respondent publicly admitted in a recorded interview with media figure Megan Fox that he attended the hearing knowing he was not going to testify.

Mr. Gingras also possesses knowledge of Respondent's involvement in providing a laptop to a forensic examiner that resulted in a 2,489-page extraction of Petitioner's private text messages, which were leaked online to the group "Justice for Clayton", which is dedicated to harassing Petitioner.

2. Michael Marraccini — Respondent in Underlying DVRO (San Francisco Superior Court Case No. FDV-18-813693) – 90 minutes

Expected to be cross-examined regarding his continuing violations of the San Francisco protective order, his repeated public misrepresentations about Petitioner, and his ongoing use of coercive control and reputational abuse to circumvent court restrictions.

Respondent has engaged in a sustained campaign of post-separation harassment, including a two-and-a-half-hour interview with media figure Megan Fox, during which he discussed the protected case, disclosed private details about Petitioner's mental health, and made false, humiliating statements designed to damage her reputation.

In that same interview, Respondent admitted that he traveled to Arizona for the June 10, 2024 Owens v. Echard hearing despite knowing he "wasn't going to be testifying." He neither sought nor obtained authorization from the issuing San Francisco Superior Court, in violation of the active CLETS restraining order prohibiting contact and proximity. His deliberate disregard for the order and court jurisdiction constitutes a willful violation under 18 U.S.C. § 2262 (interstate violation of a protection order) and *Family Code* § 6320, reflecting ongoing coercive control and intimidation.

Respondent also leaked or authorized the publication of private text messages between himself and Petitioner—communications covered by the DVRO—to third-party online accounts associated with the *Justice for Clayton* network. These acts were intended to retaliate, harass, and humiliate Petitioner, in direct violation of the spirit and purpose of the protective order.

In pleadings filed through counsel, Respondent further alleged that Petitioner "traveled to New York to confront his employer's HR department," and asserted that she has "pursued communication, harassed, and publicly confronted" him—claims that are entirely false. Petitioner has had no contact of any kind with Respondent since 2018, has never known his employer's name or address, and has not initiated or encouraged any communication or confrontation. These knowingly false statements to the Court illustrate Respondent's ongoing

fixation and continued efforts to weaponize litigation and public narrative to punish and defame Petitioner.

Respondent's conduct—including the willful violation of a standing protective order, public exploitation of confidential material, and dissemination of defamatory narratives—demonstrates an unbroken pattern of coercive control and reputational abuse warranting renewal and extension of the protective order under *Family Code* § 6345.

3. Family Witnesses - Peggy Marraccini and Stephanie Ash Marraccini (now Scanlon) — Respondent's Mother and Sister – 45 minutes total

Expected to testify regarding their close and frequent relationship with Petitioner during her relationship with Respondent, including multiple family gatherings, dinners, and shared events between the Marraccini and Owens families. Both women personally witnessed Petitioner experience a grand mal seizure in Petaluma, California, on May 13, 2017, shortly after an incident of physical abuse by Respondent.

Peggy Marraccini sent her son a text message the following day stating, "I don't want you to be my son because of how you treated her," which even Respondent's own witness, John Berryhill, acknowledged as authentic. Her contemporaneous messages to Petitioner described her as "so loving & caring" and "so blessed you are home with your sister and Daddy," confirming the seriousness of the relationship and undermining Respondent's current claim that it was casual or delusional. Petitioner also retains multiple voicemails from Ms. Marraccini, many recorded after she had distanced herself from Respondent, in which Ms. Marraccini pleaded for renewed contact—reflecting both emotional distress and implicit recognition of her son's culpability.

Stephanie Ash Marraccini (now Scanlon) also socialized frequently with Petitioner, borrowing her car, dining together, and exchanging messages acknowledging Respondent's volatility. Since 2023, Ms. Scanlon has aligned herself with online harassment networks defending Respondent and targeting Petitioner, including *Justice for Clayton*. Posting under the handle "JusticeForMM," she has publicly identified herself as Respondent's sister and leaked previously unseen photographs she personally took of Petitioner to the *Justice for Clayton Official* Instagram account (@justiceforclaytonofficial). These included images from a May 2017 horse show and a private birthday dinner, confirming her as the original source of private material later used to harass Petitioner.

Taken together, Peggy and Stephanie Marraccini's prior statements, actions, and communications provide direct, independent corroboration of Respondent's abusive behavior and evidence of coordinated, ongoing efforts by his family to intimidate Petitioner and undermine the protective

intent of prior court orders. Their testimony collectively supports renewal under Family Code §6345 by demonstrating that the abuse has persisted both directly and by proxy.

4. Callie Supsinskas (now McClain) — Former Partner of Respondent – 15 minutes

Former intimate partner of Respondent who independently contacted Petitioner to confirm that Petitioner's prior warnings about Respondent's behavior were accurate. In her messages, Ms. McClain stated, "Some things happened and I would prefer to stay far removed from him," and, "I just wanted to say thank you for giving me the heads up on Mike and I apologize for not believing you at the time. Woman to woman, I just want you to know that I appreciate what you did." She also wrote that she "blocked him on every platform" to avoid further contact.

Although the communication occurred in 2018, Ms. McClain's account remains highly relevant under Family Code §6345 because it independently corroborates the long-term pattern of coercive control, emotional volatility, and retaliatory behavior that continues to drive Petitioner's ongoing, reasonable fear. Her testimony provides objective validation from a separate partner who, after direct experience, chose to sever all contact for her own protection—underscoring that Respondent's behavior presents an enduring threat, not an isolated past event.

5. Julia Brozek — Competition Safety Coordinator, United States Equestrian Federation (USEF) – 20 minutes

Expected to testify as a neutral records custodian and expert witness regarding Petitioner's official United States Equestrian Federation (USEF) competition history, safety logs, and incident reports.

In Respondent's Motion to Dismiss DVRO Pursuant to CCP §473(b)(d), his counsel alleged that Petitioner "rebranded horse-fall injuries as domestic-violence bruises," citing competitions in February 2017. Ms. Brozek will testify that USEF's official safety records reflect no reported falls, injuries, or on-site medical incidents involving Petitioner at any USEF-sanctioned competition in 2016 or early 2017, including those cited by Respondent.

The only recorded equestrian-related event occurred in May 2017, when Petitioner experienced a grand mal seizure while mounted at the walk on a horse at a USEF-sanctioned competition in Petaluma, California. She fell as a result of the seizure—not a riding error or accident—and was treated and released the same day, without overnight hospitalization. The incident was witnessed by Peggy Marraccini and Stephanie Ash Scanlon, and independent observers confirm that they were present and followed Petitioner by car to the hospital.

USEF's mandatory reporting protocols require documentation of any rider fall or medical transport. No such records exist for Petitioner at any other time in her competitive history, confirming that she has never been hospitalized for any fall reported in USEF competition logs or in general.

This neutral, governing-body evidence directly disproves Respondent's claim that Petitioner's injuries were equestrian-related and reinforces eyewitness accounts showing that her May 2017 medical emergency was the result of a seizure—not a riding accident.

6. Karen Ambro Bernatis (formerly Ilmberger) — Independent Eyewitness – 20 minutes

Neutral third-party eyewitness who personally observed Respondent verbally and emotionally abuse Petitioner on an international flight in December 2016. Ms. Bernatis wrote contemporaneously that Respondent was “so menacing that I felt her life was at stake were she to stay with him,” and slipped Petitioner a note urging her to seek help .

In 2023, Ms. Bernatis publicly recounted the same event in *Chicken Soup for the Soul: Get Out of Your Comfort Zone* (Simon & Schuster), writing that the situation “was so dangerous that I couldn't even risk sharing my phone number.” Her recent publication provides contemporary corroboration that an uninvolved stranger perceived Respondent's conduct as life-threatening, supporting the continuing reasonableness of Petitioner's fear and the need for renewal of protection.

7. Records Custodians — Child Protective Services and Human Resources Department ([Respondent's Employer, New York]) – 20 minutes total

Expected to testify or provide certified documentation regarding two discrete factual issues raised by Respondent in this proceeding.

First, the Child Protective Services (CPS) records custodian or assigned investigator is expected to confirm that a CPS report concerning Respondent was received and investigated in 2024. Petitioner was not the reporting party, and CPS records confirm that neither Petitioner nor any member of her family was identified as such. The report's existence became public only after Respondent and his online affiliates discussed it on Reddit, falsely accusing Petitioner and her family of making the report.

In reality, the report originated from an independent third party who found Respondent's conduct sufficiently concerning to alert authorities. The fact that a neutral observer viewed Respondent's behavior as warranting a CPS report supports the inference that others, not only Petitioner,

continue to perceive him as threatening. Respondent's subsequent effort to weaponize and publicly mischaracterize the report further demonstrates his ongoing use of intimidation, deflection, and reputational abuse — all consistent with coercive control under Family Code §6320.

Second, the Human Resources Department (records custodian or designated representative) of Respondent's employer in New York is expected to confirm that Petitioner has never contacted, visited, or communicated with any HR personnel, and that no record, visitor log, or correspondence supports Respondent's claim that she "made an impromptu stop" to discuss the existence of the DVRO. This verification will establish that Respondent's allegation was entirely fabricated and reflects his ongoing attempt to distort facts and portray himself as the victim.

Collectively, these neutral record verifications provide objective, third-party evidence disproving Respondent's false claims and corroborating that his conduct continues to generate concern and fear in others. This supports renewal under Family Code §6345, demonstrating that Petitioner's ongoing fear in 2025 remains objectively reasonable and well-founded.

8. Joan O'Neill and Elisha Jussen-Cooke, Esq. (Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic) — Recanting Witness and Rebuttal Counsel – 35 minutes total

(see Ms. O'Neill's admission that she wrote the statement in her Declaration)

Former friend of Petitioner and the attorney of record who handled Petitioner's 2018 DVRO filing through the Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic (CROC).

In 2018, Ms. O'Neill independently authored, signed, and transmitted under penalty of perjury a sworn declaration supporting Petitioner's DVRO through the Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic (CROC). Filed on March 29, 2018, it was prepared and submitted by CROC attorney Elisha Jussen-Cooke, not by Petitioner. Contemporaneous emails and text messages confirm Ms. O'Neill's independent submission, including her message stating, "I just wanted to finish up the statement ... I faxed the declaration ... I have confirmation that it went through."

Although this Court has indicated it does not intend to revisit the 2018 or 2020 orders, Ms. O'Neill's relevance arises solely from Respondent's counsel's October 7, 2025 representation that she "is willing to recant prior testimony," implying fraud in the original filings. Petitioner will show that this recantation is motivated by personal animus, not fact. Shortly after Ms. O'Neill asked Petitioner to serve as her maid of honor for her 2020 wedding, Petitioner urged her—out of genuine concern—to reflect on whether she wished to marry her fiancé, Philip Ross, given her ongoing involvement with former MLB player Mario Hollands. The friendship deteriorated soon after. Petitioner did not attend the wedding, which, as far as she is aware, was postponed from its original 2020 date.

Attorney Jussen-Cooke will testify to the preparation and submission process, confirming that Ms. O'Neill's declaration was independently authored and transmitted through CROC and that Petitioner played no role in drafting or editing the statement.

Together, their testimony directly rebuts Respondent's allegation of fraud in the 2018 filings, clarifies the provenance of the declaration, and establishes that any later "recantation" arises from personal motives, not factual error—offered solely to address credibility issues in the present proceeding.

9. Ms. Arianna Huffington – Rebuttal Witness – 5 minutes

Public figure known to Petitioner's family through her father's professional career. Ms. Huffington will confirm that she has never met, spoken with, or interacted with Respondent in any capacity, directly rebutting Respondent's false public claims of association and thereby impeaching his credibility. Her testimony will demonstrate Respondent's ongoing pattern of fabrication and self-aggrandizement, further undermining the reliability of his representations to the Court and to the public.

10. Owner / Operator of Instagram Accounts "@justiceforclaytonofficial" and "@victims_of_laura_owens" — Identity Unknown (to be identified via subpoena to Meta Platforms, Inc.) – 30 minutes total

Expected to testify regarding the authorship, operation, and content sourcing for the Instagram accounts @justiceforclaytonofficial and @victims_of_laura_owens, which have each engaged in coordinated online harassment, defamation, and indirect contact directed at Petitioner in violation of the San Francisco DVRO (FDV-18-813693).

Petitioner intends to subpoena Meta Platforms, Inc. to identify the subscriber(s), registered email address(es), IP addresses, and device logs associated with both accounts, as well as upload metadata for the posts compiled in Exhibits 22 and 23. The operators' testimony is necessary to authenticate those records, confirm content origination, and establish that Respondent and/or his counsel provided, approved, or directly coordinated the dissemination of materials used in the posts.

The operators are expected to testify regarding:

- How private materials—including photos, videos, and screenshots known to have been in Respondent's or his relatives' exclusive possession—were obtained and uploaded;
- How Respondent's unserved legal filings, including his CCP §473(b)(d) motion, appeared on @victims_of_laura_owens before Petitioner was served, with captions stating "filings coming soon", "approved by attorney", and "his legal team has

confirmed it,” reflecting insider access and active communication with Respondent or his counsel;

- Any communications or coordination with Respondent, his relatives (including Stephanie Ash Marraccini, now Scanlon), or representatives concerning the publication of posts targeting Petitioner;
- Metadata or message logs establishing that Respondent or his legal team directly uploaded, authorized, or supplied content used to harass Petitioner, including court pleadings, sealed materials, and defamatory statements; and
- The accounts’ coordination with Respondent’s public appearances, statements, and filings, showing that posts were timed to coincide with Respondent’s interviews and legal actions.

This testimony will authenticate Exhibits 22 and 23 and establish that Respondent has maintained ongoing communication with the operators of both accounts—constituting indirect contact, harassment through third parties, and “disturbing the peace” under Family Code §6320.

Even if Respondent denies authorship, the operators’ admissions, combined with subpoenaed platform data, will demonstrate that he knowingly supplied, approved, or facilitated the release of private and litigation-sensitive materials. Such conduct is directly relevant to the permanent renewal of protection under Family Code §6345, as it shows Respondent’s continuing pattern of coercive control, reputational abuse, and disregard for court orders.