

EXHIBIT "2" (continued)

EXHIBIT "2"

← Post



David S. Gingras
@DavidSGingras

Follow

New motion filed yesterday (4.8.24) in Owens v. Echard.

I'll probably post a short blog update later this morning.

gingraslaw.com/Motion%20to%20...

1 David S. Gingras, #021097
2 **Gingras Law Office, PLLC**
3 4802 E Ray Road, #23-271
4 Phoenix, AZ 85044
5 Tel: (480) 264-1400
6 Fax: (480) 248-3196
7 David@GingrasLaw.com

8 Attorney for Petitioner
9 Laura Owens

10
11 **MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT**
12 **STATE OF ARIZONA**

13 **In Re Matter of:**

14 **LAURA OWENS,**

15 **Petitioner,**

16 **And**

17 **CLAYTON ECHARD,**

18 **Respondent.**

Case No: FC2023-052114

**MOTION TO COMPEL LUNCH AND
FOR ALTERNATIVE RELIEF**

(Assigned to Hon. Julie Mata)

19
20
21
22
23
Laura S. Owens, PLLC
4802 E Ray Road, #23-271
Phoenix, Arizona 85044

19 Various procedural rules (e.g. Rule 9c) require lawyers to talk, in person or by
20 phone, before they may file motions. Email discussions are not enough.

21 But what if a lawyer refuses to talk with you? How can counsel complete the
22 mandatory pre-filing conference requirements of Rule 9c) when opposing counsel won't
23 accept your calls?

Post your reply



David S. Gingras, #021097
Gingras Law Office, PLLC
4802 E Ray Road, #23-271
Phoenix, Arizona 85044

So for now, onward we march. Absent a last minute settlement (which is probably the most likely outcome), we will have a trial in June, and the judge will decide who is lying and who is telling the truth. The only issue NOT up for debate that day is the bullshit motion for sanctions that Clayton filed in January and which he has now withdrawn. And that is a good thing.

~DSG

P.S. As I get more up to speed with this case, I am really starting to lose patience with the small but vocal handful of people out there who are milking this case for personal financial gain (I am not one of them since I make \$0 from writing this stuff). You, the guilty and the dirty, know who you are.

These people (not naming names) are generally blogging or hosting YouTube videos every day to talk about the

videos every day to talk about the case...but they are *not really talking about the case*. Not even close. They don't explain all the facts, and they don't give both sides of the story, like any real journalist would. At the end of the day, they don't give a shit about this case, and they don't give a shit about the people involved or the truth. They are nothing but mosquitoes, sucking their meager livings out of the First Amendment I've fought so hard to protect.

These human leeches are selling half-truths and twisting shit WAYYYY out of perspective in order to INCREASE THE DRAMA! SO MUCH DRAMA!, and thereby get a few more pennies of Google AdSense revenue and a few "super chat" bucks to pay for breadsticks.

It honestly makes me puke.

FUCK THESE SICK, SELFISH, LYING ASSHOLES. Should I clarify how I feel?

These vile scum, I mean people, are not helping anything. They are human cockroaches spreading feces on the floor and then spinning the facts to make them more dramatic than they really are in the hopes this will drive traffic and increase revenue for their sad, pathetic lives. One day, these trash humans will wake up and realize that lying for money is not a good way to live. Or maybe they will never see their sins. Either way, I look forward to reading their obituaries, briefly, before throwing them in the trash where they belong.




David S. Gingras @David... · 5m ...

Thanks for the \$1. When I go the casino tonight, I'll put it on the roulette wheel and let fortune decide my fate.

Also, I don't plan to make further public comments for now. The process was helpful, but not very productive.

Moving on to other tasks.



David S. Gingras is a former member of the House of Commons. He is currently a senior advisor at the University of Ottawa.



David S. Gingras @DavidSGin... · 11m

Replying to @nutinliket and @acerbic_comic

I am commenting because there is a HUGE amount of misinformation being spread, unfairly, about Laura. The purveyors of these lies will likely be sued in the near future.

For now, I am trying to correct the record and help people understand the law. I'll blog about that ASAP.

1 1 29



David S. Gingras @DavidSGing... · 6m

Just look at Alex Jones. He spread lies about parents who lost their kids in a school shooting.

He was sued, couldn't prove his lies were true, and a jury ordered him to pay \$1.5 BILLION.

Anyone who thinks it's funny to spread lies better own a tent and a sleeping bag.

1 1 15

David S. Gingras is a lawyer who has been sued for libel.



David S. Gingras @DavidSGi... · 53m

Replying to @courtwatcher123

And what makes you so confident you know the truth? Were you there when Clayton and Laura hooked up? Have you seen all her medical records? I have, and trust me - the people who have accused Laura of lying are probably going to end up sued for defamation (not talking about you).



112





Kim #MedicareForAll 🏠👤 @... · 32m

Replying to @GayleWysock and @DavidSGingras

Nah they can refile anytime. This guy won't be around long anyway. Judge is going to chew him out and spit him out.



41



David S. Gingras @DavidSGi... · 26m

Here for the long haul. Don't believe me? Let's bet. I'll bet you \$1k (my own money) that I will be here through the end of this case.

Want to take that bet? Message me and we will set up escrow for the wager. I won't hold my breath.



47





David S. Gingras

@DavidSGingras

Follow

Replying to @FlowersAreR3d and @GayleWysock

Is that a yes? Put your money where your mouth is.

We both know you won't. Enjoy troll life.
#sad

10:28 PM · 03 Apr 24 · 52 Views



Kim #MedicareForAll 🏠👤 @... · 17m

Replying to @DavidSGingras and @GayleWysock

Don't need to. I can watch you fail and laugh.



20





David S. Gingras
@DavidSGingras

Follow



Hang on -- several people posted "shame on you" for posting someone's name (I have NO CLUE who they are talking about).

Now you are saying you want NOTHING confidential? OK, which is it? All confidential or nothing?

Again, Laura asked for confidentiality, and Clayton said NO.

9:09 PM · 2024-04-02 From Earth · View





David S. Gingras
2.3K posts

Follow

Posts

Replies

Media

Likes



Replying to @MeganFoxWriter

And yes, of course I read my own emails. I have no idea who is. No idea why he would need to be shielded from public view. Clayton's lawyer could have told me that, but never did.

If this crazy talk continues, hard blocks will follow. Seriously. Stop.



35



David S. Gingras @Davi... · 12m

Replying to @MeganFoxWriter

For like the 99th millionth time - LAURA ASKED FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER. She asked for the court to say that certain stuff should be kept private.

Clayton OPPOSED THIS. He wanted NOTHING to be private, and the court agreed.

If you don't like that, tell Clayton to change his view.



42



David S. Gingras is a former reporter for the New York Times. He is currently a writer for the New York Times. He is also a frequent speaker at industry events.



David S. Gingras @DavidSGingras · 3m ...

Don't like my bio? Ask for details. I am the Conor McGregor of litigation. Done TONS of family law cases. I don't list those, because they are boring.

FYI - Clayton's lawyer has handled TWO federal cases (high profile cases go to federal court).

Me? 79 federal cases & counting.



5





Court watcher

@courtwatcher123

Follow

You've said yourself that you are trying to get up to speed with this case. There are people posting replies to you that know this case, inside out. Every court document, every televised court hearing, every article LO has written about this. Why do you assume they are lying?

12:24 AM · 4/3/24 From Earth · 18 Views



David S. Gingras @DavidSG... · 3m

And put all the noise aside - Laura had MULTIPLE positive pregnancy tests before she filed this case. Not one, not two, multiple positives, including one purchased by Clayton and taken directly in front of him (which was positive).

What else really matters?



0/0



David S. Gingras @DavidSGi... · 1m

The ONLY remaining issue in the case right now is this - did Laura lie about being pregnant?

Yes I'm still new to the case, but the evidence on that point appears to be 10000% clear. SHE TOOK A PREGNANCY TEST THAT CLAYTO BOUGHT, IN FRONT OF HIM.

How is that not conclusive?



David S. Gingras @DavidSG... · 5m

I'm not assuming they are lying. That isn't how this works.

Clayton has a duty to disclose admissible evidence to me through his lawyer. I get to look at that evidence and determine what it means.

Views of strangers on X is not admissible evidence.



B

KoldT @Koldlemonadetea · 4m

It's pretty simple. She has already admitted to doctoring ultrasounds. She never saw an obgyn who performed an ultrasound. That is the **ONLY** way to confirm twins. The **WOMAN** lawyer was the fastest to peace out, because any woman worth her salt can see right through this.



4



David S. Gingras @DavidSG... · 16s

The woman lawyer took a job in another state. Her leaving had **NOTHING** to do with Laura.

And Laura has testified she **DID** have an ultrasound. She admitted changing the name of the place where it was done (bad idea) but she stands by her story. So what if it was twins or not?



4





Posts

Replies

Media

Likes



David S. Gingras @DavidSGingras · 20s ...

A woman can file a paternity case with ZERO positive tests.

She can file the case just because she missed a period.

She can file the case just because she thinks she might be pregnant.

Even if she ends up not pregnant, it's not illegal to ask courts to help verify paternity.



David S. Gingras @DavidSGingras · 3m ...

Replying to @courtwatcher123 and @HayleyBoyd14


And if you "feel" a positive lab test doesn't prove anything, that's fine. That is your opinion. I respect that.

But legally, you are wrong. Medical tests are admissible proof (bearing in mind, there is NO legal requirement that Laura EVER test positive before going to court).



David S. Gingras @DavidSGingras · 5m ...

Replying to @courtwatcher123 and @HayleyBoyd14



One step at a time, Laura went to an urgent care. She asked for a pregnancy test. They took a sample, sent it to a lab, the result: POSITIVE

David S. Gingras is a lawyer who has been practicing law since 1998. He is a member of the State Bar of Michigan and the American Bar Association. He is also a frequent speaker at legal seminars and conferences.



David S. Gingras @DavidSGingras · 11m

...

Let me explain as clearly as I can - this case is NOT ABOUT Laura offering 1000% confirmed proof she was pregnant. That is NOT an issue here under the law.

The ONLY question is: did Laura have SOME reason to think she MIGHT be pregnant? That's it. THAT. IS. IT.

If so, we win.



39



David S. Gingras @DavidSGingras · 7m

...

Bottom line - Clayton's cult hates Laura because you do not understand what is going on here. That mistake is making you see the case incorrectly.

I am trying to explain and clarify so you understand, but people are not listening.

That's fine. I will keep moving forward.



31





David S. Gingras

@DavidSGingras

Follow

Replying to @skdkjsjssjsn1

Doesn't matter if she never had an ultrasound. Doesn't matter if she faked an ultrasound. Doesn't matter if she never sought OB care. Doesn't matter if it was twins. Doesn't matter if they weren't Claytons.

At some point, you'll catch on to how this works. You're not there yet.

1:53 PM · 03 Apr 24 · **363** Views

1 Quote

What other legal arguments are there?
Genuine question. Can you the give the
rules you'll be mentioning so I can look
them up.

11:51 AM · 4/3/24 From Earth · 298 Views



David S. Gingras @DavidS... · 57m

Laura is also probably going to file one
or more motions for sanctions under a
BUNCH of different rules/laws. Don't
ask for details. That will come when
the motions are filed (if needed).



384



Court Watcher @courtwatc... · 41m

I'm intrigued by what sanctions LE
will be requesting.



88



David S. Gingras @DavidS... · 17m

If he does not withdraw the motion
(the rule gives him 10 biz days), then
we will file a motion for sanctions



rebecca @rebecca_raines · 10m

Replying to @DavidSGingras and @happy_mom_life

I'd be interested to hear what peaked your interested in posting updates about this particular case versus other cases you take.



49



David S. Gingras @DavidSGing... · 8m

Replying to @rebecca_raines and @happy_mom_life

Main thing is because one party is **AGGRESSIVELY** making public statements about the case, and Laura feels her story is being drowned out by misinformation. That is a problem that needs addressing, so I've decided to post **SOME** info to try and clear the air. More to come soon.



51





Jes

@happy_mom_life

Follow

Replying to @DavidSGingras and @rebecca_raines

I'm sure you will, just as her revolving door of previous lawyers got there. Good luck.

5:24 PM · 03 Apr 24 · 47 Views



David S. Gingras @DavidSGing... · 8m

Replying to @happy_mom_life and @rebecca_raines

In this case, ONE lawyer left to take a new job, and the 2nd guy left after Clayton's lawyer threatened him (poor guy was young and not ready for battle).

I am ready for battle. I am not going anywhere.



38





Jody Knish @HowMuchUDeadlif · 7m



Replying to @DavidSGingras

Attempt to get someone to sign a "relationship contract" 2 weeks after they allegedly raped you is insane.



20



David S. Gingras @DavidSGingras · 4m



If that is what happened, you may have a point.

Or maybe you only know like 3% of the facts, and forming this strong of an opinion based on 3% of the facts is honestly fucking stupid.



21





David S. Gingras

@DavidSGingras

Follow

Replying to @Y0uRmysunshine1 and
@iGA5RDmpy6187


If you can show me how Laura lied, I
would drop her as a client. Instantly.

If you mean what you say, you'd be open
to helping me understand the truth. That
is all I ask.

If you turn your back on my request,
what does that say about your true
motives?

10:41 PM · 04 Apr 24 · **60** Views





Y0uaremysunshine @Y0uRmy... · 5h

Replying to @DavidSGingras and @iGA5RDmpy6187

She had the DNA test done more than once and all results said “little to no fetal DNA”. Doesn’t matter when she “miscarried”, as fetal DNA lives in mom’s blood for months and sometimes years after miscarriage/delivery. This is definitive proof there was never a pregnancy.



David S. Gingras @DavidSGing... · 2h

Great analysis. Just one thing - do you have a pic of the time machine Laura used on 8.1.23 to go forward in time to 10.15.23, see these test numbers, then travel back to 8.1.23 where she proceeded to maliciously file for paternity knowing what the future held? Plz send pics. 🙏

