FC 2023-052114

02/01/2024

HONORABLE JULIE ANN MATA

CLERK OF THE COURT
L. Overton
Deputy

IN RE THE MATTER OF LAURA OWENS

CORY B KEITH

AND

CLAYTON ECHARD

GREGG R WOODNICK

JUDGE MATA

MINUTE ENTRY

IT IS ORDERED setting an Evidentiary Hearing regarding the issue of sanctions and attorney's fees, on <u>February 27, 2024, at 4:00 p.m.</u> (45 minutes allotted). The parties, and counsel if represented, shall appear in person before:

Judge Julie Mata Superior Court of Arizona Northeast Regional Court Center 18380 North 40th Street Courtroom 102 Phoenix, Arizona 85032 (602) 372-0825

Failure to Appear:

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the failure of a party to appear pursuant to the instructions set forth above may result in the Court proceeding in that party's absence, taking evidence from the appearing party and making findings and orders on the Motion. Failure of both parties to appear may result in the dismissal of the Motion.

Docket Code 056

Form D000B

Page 1

FC 2023-052114 02/01/2024

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if this matter involves a request for contempt sanctions against you for failure to pay child support, a failure to appear at the hearing may result in the court issuing a child support or civil warrant for your arrest. If you are arrested, you may be held in jail for up to 24 hours before you see a judge.

Exhibits:

EXHIBITS SUBMITTED THROUGH CASE CENTER

This division is piloting Case Center (also known as Case Lines), a statewide electronic exhibit portal. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that the parties shall submit all proposed exhibits for the upcoming evidentiary hearing as follows:

(1) Submit Hearing Exhibits through Case Center. Attorneys must submit exhibits through Case Center. Self-represented litigants can request to opt-out of Case Center by contacting the judge's division (<u>DRJ06@jbazmc.maricopa.gov</u> or (602) 372-0825). Exhibits must be submitted at least 3 days before the hearing.

Each party must make sure the Court has the party's valid current email address. If you do not have an email address, you can obtain a free one through accounts.google.com. Each party must register for Case Center at www.digitalevidence.azcourts.gov. The website has links to training resources that will guide you through uploading exhibits and navigating Case Center. The Clerk of Court will email each party (or their attorney of record) a case-specific Case Center link that the party will use to upload exhibits. Case Center accepts most digital formats (including photographs, PDFs, Word files, audio files, and video files). Case Center automatically numbers the exhibits. Petitioner's exhibits have an A- prefix (Exhibit A1, A2, etc.) and Respondent's exhibits have a B- prefix (Exhibit B1, B2, etc.). Third parties will have a C- or D- prefix. During the hearing, the parties must refer to exhibits using the Case Center exhibit numbers. For assistance with Case Center, contact AOC Support Services at (602) 452-3519 or passistance with Case Center, contact AOC Support

- (2) Exchange Exhibits. At least 3 days before the hearing, you must give the other party copies of all exhibits you submitted for use at the hearing. Exhibits you do not give to the other party before the hearing may not be used in the hearing.
- (3) Appear for the Hearing and Present Your Case. At the hearing, each party will be allowed approximately half of the time available to present their case, including any witness

Docket Code 056 Form D000B Page 2

FC 2023-052114 02/01/2024

testimony and exhibits. All witnesses must be present at the beginning of the hearing to be sworn in by the Clerk and to be provided the Court's admonition. The witnesses may then be released from the hearing, and you will need to notify the witness when to return to the hearing to testify.

The Court only considers an exhibit after a party explains its relevance and moves for its admission into evidence. The judge will use Case Center to view the exhibits. Each party must either (1) bring paper copies for themselves and any witnesses or (2) access the exhibits on Case Center using their own wifi-enabled device or the iPads provided in the courtroom.

A party presenting an exhibit should be prepared to identify the page(s) with relevant information. Any party that wants to present electronic media (such as audio or video) during a hearing must upload it into Case Center and be prepared to identify and play the relevant portions during the hearing.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if a witness will be virtually testifying by audio or video, the parties/counsel shall, prior to that witness' virtual testimony, provide that witness with copies of all properly numbered exhibits that the party/counsel intends to use in the virtual examination.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that failure to provide a copy of any exhibit to the opposing party pursuant to this Minute Entry will likely result in the Court not considering the exhibit and not admitting it into evidence.

Pretrial Filings and Exchange of Information:

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that at least two business days (48 hours) prior to the evidentiary hearing, each party must file a pre-trial statement identifying the disputed issues and the party's position on those issues, along with the names, contact information, and summary of testimony from proposed witnesses. If child support is at issue, each party must also file an Affidavit of Financial Information (AFI) along with a Parent's Worksheet for Child Support Amount. Due to delays that may be caused by the electronic docketing system, each party shall also provide a hard copy of these filings to the Judge at the same time they are filed with the Clerk of the Court.

For information about pre-trial statements, affidavits of financial information, and worksheets for child support, see Rule 76.1, Arizona Rules of Family Law Procedure, at the court website, www.superiorcourt.maricopa.gov, and/or the forms available at the Court Resource Center.

Requests for reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities must be made to the office of the Judge or Commissioner scheduled to hear this case seventy-two (72) hours before

Docket Code 056 Form D000B Page 3

FC 2023-052114

02/01/2024

your scheduled court date. Requests for an interpreter for persons with limited English proficiency must be made seventy-two (72) hours in advance of your hearing.

All parties representing themselves must keep the Court updated with address changes. A form may be downloaded at: https://superiorcourt.maricopa.gov/llrc/fc_gn9/

Docket Code 056

Form D000B

Cory B. Keith - SBN 035209 3101 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1470

Phoenix, Arizona 85012

3 Phone: (480) 300-6012 Fax: (480) 781-0722

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

and

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

In Re the Matter Of:

LAURA OWENS,

Cory@thevalleylawgroup.com

Attorneys for Petitioner

Petitioner.

THE VALLEY LAW GROUP, PLLC

CLAYTON ECHARD,

Respondent.

Case No. FC2023-052114

REPLY TO RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRELIMINARY PROTECTIVE ORDER

(Assigned to the Hon. Julie Mata)

Petitioner, LAURA OWENS (hereinafter "Petitioner"), by and through undersigned counsel, files this "Reply to Respondent's Response to her Motion for Confidentiality and Preliminary Protective Order" pursuant to Rule 53, Arizona Rules of Family Law Procedure, ("ARFLP").

1. Respondent Repeatedly Cites Petitioner's Lack of Compliance in Disclosure, While Seemingly Every Communication or Piece of Evidence Petitioner Provides to the Media with Intent to Further Embarrass Petitioner.

In his Response, Respondent asserts the Court issuing a protective order prohibiting Respondent from speaking to the public would not withstand Constitutional scrutiny. Rather than using his Response as a platform to assert he has not frequently communicated with and distributed information to the media, Respondent instead claims it as his Constitutional

Page 1 of 6

3101 N. Central Avenue, Ste. 1470- Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Phone: (480) 300-6012 ~ Attorneys@thevalleylawgroup.com

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

right to do so. To this point, Respondent admits in his Response to "not doubt[ing] that Petitioner will be annoyed or embarrassed by ... deposition." Response at 4. While in a normal case or under ordinary circumstances, this discovery might not be problematic, this case is not normal. Conveniently omitted from his Response is Respondent's likely intent to disseminate Petitioner's deposition and its contents to "[his] little Reddit army."1

With good reason, Petitioner fears this "Reddit army" will then use the information to create further embarrassing content against her. Respondent also attacked Petitioner's reluctance to disclose privileged documents while enlisting the help of his self-proclaimed army to further embarrass and oppress Petitioner. To the extent Respondent really believes Rule 52, ARFLP "ignore[s] the First Amendment," Respondent should address his concern with the legislature-outside of the family court. Response at 2. Respondent believes his First Amendment rights should be given heavy consideration while constantly undermining and disregarding Petitioner's right to privacy. Petitioner simply seeks protection from further embarrassment and harassment from Respondent's army.

As such, the Court should limit the method or scope of prospective discovery under Rule 52, ARFLP. Such limitations are most appropriate in situations like that at bar, when the anticipated discovery will embarrass and further oppress a litigant.

Respondent's continued exploits to seek privileged documents must be thwarted with such disclosures being ordered protected and deemed further confidential, avoiding

During his January 11, 2024, interview with Nick Viall, Respondent gives praise to what he calls "[his] little Reddit army." Specifically, Respondent discussed users on the Reddit platform who help him in this matter, stating, "So, that's what Reddit found. My little Reddit army. I'll shout them out. They also tore me to shreds in the beginning, but now they're mostly on my side." Nick Viall, Going Deeper with Clayton Echard - "I Am Not The Father" | The Viall Files w/ Nick Viall at 01:31:25, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zakKq3kUloc. This same Reddit army is now at least one of the groups of people harassing and embarrassing Petitioner online.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

unnecessary dissemination to the public. Petitioner has documents she believes appropriate to disclose and witnesses who have stated that they are not willing to come forward as they are concerned with being subjected to similar ridicules online as Petitioner. Unfortunately, Respondent's "Reddit army" and his other followers have created an environment where Petitioner does not feel comfortable disclosing information and presenting her case without confidentiality.

2. Respondent is Intentionally Worsening the Embarrassment of Petitioner with his Pleadings and Conduct.

Respondent's "Reddit army" has risen to new heights causing concerns for Petitioner's safety and well-being. Case in point, recently Petitioner has received erratic voicemails on her personal cell phone referencing this case and stating that she should "go fuck herself" and referring to her as a "con artist cunt." The petitioner was also subject of what appear to be three prank welfare check calls sending officers to her home. Respondent's active engagement and encouragement of this type of conduct from his followers has risen to the level of concern and warrants protections or confidentiality designations being ordered as requested.

All the while, Respondent's Motions and statements have worsened and become more aggressive, sarcastic, and demeaning. Respondent's motions are littered with false allegations and unnecessary, borderline unprofessional remarks. This conduct has become the subject of more parody for Petitioner online. Respondent claims the public interest in the case only adds weight to maintaining transparency, instead of limiting it. Response at 5. However, that rationale is flawed when that public interest rises to the level of causing 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

extreme embarrassment and oppression, and when it limits Petitioner's ability to defend her claims and to put forth evidence corroborating her allegations.

3. Deposition Participation.

Petitioner is not refusing to be deposed, she is just asking for time to allow the Court to address these issues. Petitioner will fully participate at a properly noticed deposition in the event the Court denies her Motion to Quash and once the Court has issued a ruling on her Motion for a Protective Order. Prior to the postponement of the January 17, 2024, deposition, Petitioner sought postponement from Respondent pending resolution of the ruling on her Motion to Quash; Respondent declined. As such, when Petitioner observed worsening conduct, she postponed the deposition pending the Court's involvement.

Regarding Respondent's noticed deposition, Petitioner offered to postpone same to afford Respondent the protections she has sought from this Court.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court sign the proposed form of Preliminary Protective Order attached as "Exhibit 1" to her Motion for Confidentiality. Respondent seeks disclosure of Petitioner's confidential medical records; the Court should grant Petitioner's request and allow her to prove her case under the confines of confidentially.

RESPECTFULLY submitted this 31st day of January 2024.

THE VALLEY LAW GROUP, PLLC

/s/ Cory B. Keith

Cory B. Keith Attorney for Petitioner

Page 4 of 6

ORIGINAL of the foregoing e-filed
this 31st day of January 2024, with:
Clerk of the Superior Court
Maricopa County Superior Court
COPY presumed delivered even date to: The Honorable Julie Mata
COPY emailed this 31st day of January 2

ry 2024 to: Gregg Woodnick Woodnick Law, PLLC 1747 E. Morten Ave. Ste 205 Phoenix, Arizona 85020 office@WoodnickLaw.com Attorney for Respondent

By: <u>ILS</u>

THE VALLEY LAW GROUP, PLLC 3101 N. Central Avenue, Stc. 1470- Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Phone: (480) 300-6012 ~ Attorneys@thevalleylawgroup.com

VERIFICATION

I, LAURA OWENS, Petitioner in the above-mentioned matter, declare (or certify, verify or state) under penalty of perjury that the contents of the forgoing "Reply to Respondent's Response to Petitioner's Motion for Confidentiality and Preliminary Protective Order" are true and correct to the best of my present knowledge, information and belief.

31/01/2024	Laura Oi
	Laura Owens (Jan 3
Date	Laura Owens, Pe

Laura Owens, Petitioner

Page 6 of 6

Reply to Motion for Confidentiality and Preliminary Protective Order Final

Final Audit Report

2024-02-01

Created:

2024-01-31

By:

Cory Keith (isabel@attorneys-arizona.com)

Status:

Signed

Transaction ID:

CBJCHBCAABAAEgF3_GmmlBkVN4kZqR5WWjh36G1KXwnh

"Reply to Motion for Confidentiality and Preliminary Protective Or der Final" History

- Document created by Cory Keith (isabel@attorneys-arizona.com) 2024-01-31 11:40:04 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Laura Owens (laura@lauramichelleowens.com) for signature 2024-01-31 11:40:08 PM GMT
- Email viewed by Laura Owens (laura@lauramichelleowens.com) 2024-02-01 0:33:40 AM GMT
- Agreement completed. 2024-02-01 - 0:37:31 AM GMT

