

[x] EXPEDITE (If filed within 5 court days of hearing)
[X] Hearing is set: To accompany motion on same day & time
Date: 9-17-21
Time: 10:00am Zoom #: 242-974-5214 Rm:4
Judge/Calendar: Schaller/Revision

E-FILED
THURSTON COUNTY, WA
SUPERIOR COURT
09/16/2021 8:02:24 AM
Linda Myhre Enlow
Thurston County Clerk

**Superior Court of Washington
for Thurston County Family &
Juvenile Court**

In re: Guardianship of
Hazel Belle Ursa Smith

Respondent(s): Minor Child(ren)

No. 21-4-00443-34

[] Proposed Order

[] ORDER

By John Smith, grandfather
(Index & Attachments 501 - 607
(Pursuant to ER 902 & 1005)

(Cover Sheet)

TITLE OF DOCUMENT
Proposed Order/PRDER

by JOHN SMITH, grandfather, pro se

NAME: John Smith, grandfather
Mailing ADDRESS: PO Box 1711,
Shelton, WA 98584
PHONE: (360)427-3599


MATERIAL & RELEVANT FACTS (& DECLARATION)

New evidence revealing the **Abuse of Process** by the Stokers and **fraud** by security guard Robert K. Kurtz have been discovered affecting the disposition of this case and must be weighed and a STAY granted to prevent a miscarriage of justice and harm to the children at issue.

I, John Smith, **certify the Court record Index List and Attachments submitted** are true copies of what I received and entered into the record from the Thurston County Family & Juvenile Court in case #21-4-00443-34 pursuant to ER 902 and 1005. Selena Smith is indigent, presently unemployed and unable to afford transcripts of the audio of the review hearings of this case, & was never appointed a lawyer.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Washington and pursuant to GENERAL Court RULE 13 and RCW 9A.72.085 that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signed at Mason, [County] Washington [State] on 9-15-2021.




Signature of Petitioner or Lawyer/WSBA No.

John Smith (grandfather), pro se
Print Name

I have e-mailed/posted a copy of this entire document and contents to Breckan Scott, attorney for the Stokers, Selena Smith & James Wells on 9-15-21. (<http://amicuscuria.com/wordpress/?p=24546>), not Mr. Ayer.

Respectfully Signed & submitted in Mason, [County] Washington [State] on 9-15-2021 [Date]



Signature of Petitioner or Lawyer/WSBA No.

John Smith (grandfather), pro se
Print Name

[X] EXPEDITE (If filed within 5 court days of hearing)
[X] Hearing is set: To be submitted along w/motion same time
Date: 9-20-21
Time: 2:30pm Zoom #: 772-162-1402 Rm:1
Judge/Calendar: Schaller/Revision

**Superior Court of Washington
for Thurston County Family &
Juvenile Court**

In re: Guardianship of
Hazel Belle Ursa Smith

Respondent(s): Minor Child(ren)

No. 21-4-00443-34

[] Proposed

**[] ORDER Granting Motion for
REVISION**

**Submitted by John Smith,
grandfather**

TO: The Clerk of the Thurston County and Juvenile Court, (360)709-3260, 2801 32nd AVE SW,
Tumwater, WA 98512;

AND,

Breckan Scott-Gabriel, bar #:41585, attorney for Kathryn Stoker (maternal grandmother) and Hans
Stoker (husband of Kathryn Stoker, but NOT the grandfather), PO Box 1123, Yelm, WA 98597-1123,
PH. (360)960-8951, fax (360)485-1916, e-mail: breckan@breckanlaw.com;

AND,

Selena Ursa Smith, mother, e-mail: doublekachina007@protonmail.com, domiciled in Oregon
mailing address: 6901 26th Ct SE, Lacey, WA 98503, Ph. (971)803-9898

AND,

Robert Ayers (father), e-mail: unknown, Ph. unknown, address: unknown

AND,

James D Wells, e-mail: rodytok@gmail.com, Ph. (253) 948-8260, 210 Kiona Rd
Randle WA 98377

**Order: Granting Motion for Revision
FINDINGS**

1. The Respondent and her gather, John Smith (grandfather) made/submitted a Motion for Order for
Revision de Novo.

A hearing on the Motion was held on (date): 10-17-21 @ 10:00am

2. The Court has considered the Motion and any supporting documents, response from the other party, other documents from the court record identified by the court, if any, and any testimony or argument.
3. The court finds good cause to approve this Order.
Other findings (if any): ☐ Selena Smith, mother of the 3 minors at issue, and John Smith (grandfather) repeatedly objected to these proceedings and jurisdiction at each stage while reserving the same continuously. She/They never consented to jurisdiction in this forum or jurisdiction during these proceedings, but continued to assert her domicile was and remained in Oregon.
4. ☐ There is no record of properly served original process or summons in this cause except James Wells' acceptance for himself roughly 2 weeks after the seizure of the minors in Oakridge, Oregon after midnight on May 30 in Oakridge, Oregon in the wee hours of Sunday morning when Raven (1), Onawa (3), and Hazel (8) were delivered to Kathryn and Hans Stoker at a gas station adjacent to I-5 south of Eugene, Oregon.
5. ☐ The SUMMONS filed in this cause is defective on its face, does not conform to RCW 11.130.225 mandates (48 hours notice to all parents of the minor children, 60 day limit to proceedings unless extended for an additional 60 days) and may not be emasculated by staying the proceedings or incremental continuances meeting the review every 2-weeks requirement.
6. ☐ The form and content requirements for a SUMMONS are strictly construed.
7. ☐ Selena Smith was and is indigent. Her parental rights to raise, nurture, and enjoy the companionship of her 3 minor children, the oldest most fundamental right recognized in American jurisprudence, were at risk. She had little to no meaningful access to the court, no laptop, PC, or tablet, no attorney or representation or means to hire one.
8. ☐ Selena Smith received no trial, no due or proper original process/service with only conjecture calling for speculation arrayed against her on 5-27-21 & 5-28-21 by Hans & Kathryn Stoker, New Jersey DCF security guard Robert Kurtz.
9. ☐ Robert K. Kurtz had no professional expertise as a social worker or family and children's services. Ergo, he was and is not a 'professional' in the context of being qualified to render opinions on Selena's medical health, state of mind, or purpose of travel.
10. ☐ Robert K. Kurtz had no proper authority by any government agency to keep Selena Smith under surveillance, access her credit/debit card data minute by minute or dissemble to various government/police agencies, and is liable for the damages resulting from his misconduct.
11. ☐ Robert K. Kurtz was acting as the plaintiffs' and their attorney's (Breckan Scott, esq.) agent.
12. ☐ Breckan Scott, esq. abused her position as a Washington State attorney licensed to practice law and admitted to the State bar by issuing a subpoena without lawful authority and prior to any litigation or filing in this cause or notice of appearance in any case related to Selena Smith.
13. ☐ Selena Smith was indigent & denied a court appointed attorney to represent her in this matter.
14. ☐ Selena Smith's minor children were denied an attorney and a GAL (court visitor) during these proceedings. Washington State was an inconvenient forum for Selena.

15. [] Selena Smith's right to a court appointed attorney in subsequent proceedings was restricted to 10 hours @ \$50/hour in Thurston County Family & Juvenile cause #'s 21-4-00577-34 & 21-4-00578-34, instead of standby counsel—a straight jacket more than meaningful representation in a complex case with jurisdiction issues and multiple procedural irregularities.
16. [] More than 60 days lapsed between 5-28-21 (issuance of an ex parte immediate emergency guardianship of minors order by commissioner Kortokrax who admitted in open court he had a conflict of interest) and 6-29-21, the date of the last hearing and entry of the order and findings proposed by the petitioners' attorney, Breckan Scott.
17. [] No 60 day extension of the proceedings in this matter were entered into the record, but an indefinite stay was entered due to the failure of the petitioners to provide proper notice as required under RCW 11.139.225 to Robert Ayer within 48 hours after the minor children at issue were seized, as intended, in a foreign jurisdiction where they were lawfully and peacefully residing and domiciled with their mother, Selena Smith. The seized child (Hazel Smith) remains in the hands of the Stokers.
18. [] The Stokers repeatedly denied John Smith, the maternal grandfather, time with or communication with his grandchildren throughout these proceedings.
19. [] The Stokers, through their attorney, sought an impromptu protection order in open court against John Smith, grandfather of said minors, in retaliation, should he succeed in joining this action to protect his & his grandchild(ren)'s rights to continue to engage, visit, and communicate with him.
20. [] Hans Stoker knowingly and falsely made the material and substantive claim to be the child(ren)'s grandfather in the petition to seek an emergency guardianship for minors. His wife, Kathryn Stoker. Knowingly and falsely confirmed her husband's false assertion under penalty of perjury. Breckan Scott, esq., their attorney and an officer of this court, knowingly and deceptively signed, then submitted the perjured statements which served as a substantive and material misrepresentation leading to the execution of the ex parte immediate emergency seizure of the children under cover of darkness from a foreign jurisdiction.
21. [] The court finds evidence in the record of the Thurston County Sheriff's Report (Welfare check called in by Robert Kurtz) on 4-21-21 of Hans Stoker revealing his true purpose of filing his action for the ex parte immediate emergency relied without notice to be executed in Oregon was to get "...his grandchild(ren) back".
22. [] The court finds the declaration by the Stokers to the court that the minor children resided and lived in Thurston county was knowingly materially and substantively false inasmuch as the Stokers knew (and this court so finds) the children were lawfully residing and domiciled with their mother, Selena Smith, in Oregon where she maintained a full-time job in Portland delivering auto parts.
23. [] Based on the evidence, the court finds Selena Smith had a good faith belief she was free to visit and contact her children at her convenience based on her father's assurances, her daughter's (Hazel Smith) assurances, her history of casual use of her mother for child care while living on and off the Stoker estate, the verbal and written assurances of the Stokers' attorney, Breckan Scott, and the extraordinary circumstance and lack of due process involved in the seizure of Selena's children. There were no restraining orders or conditions imposed to the contrary in existence on 7-17-21.

24. [] This court finds Selena Smith had no intent to ‘burglarize’ the dwelling where her children were being held when she set out and engaged in play/visitation with Hazel Smith and Onawa Smith on 7-17-21.
25. [] This court finds Selena Smith was attempting to protect her 2 children (Hazel and Onawa) when she was buried beneath a scrum of Thurston County Deputy Sheriffs trying to separate her from her children. This court finds Selena weighs 140 pounds, is handicapped with only one good hand and 45 years of age. This court finds no criminal intent motivated Selena’s visit.
26. [] This court finds Kathryn Stoker has a history of prior bad acts including assault with a firearm (shotgun) in a DV situation against her prior husband, John Smith, circa 1980 on their farmstead near Brinnon, WA, and perjuring herself in court documents (Thurston 99-3-00727-2 | [IN RE MAYA JOY URSA SMITH](#)) then unsuccessfully attempting to have the court SEAL the documents containing the perjured declaration from access by the public.
27. [] The court notes and finds Kathryn Stoker’s perjured statement in her Motion/Declaration For Ex Parte Restraining Order and For Order To Show Cause (Nonparental Custody) entered into the record on 6-25-99 on page 2, paragraph 2.2 as follows:
- “REASONS WHY THE INJURY MAY BE IRREPARABLE.*
This injury may be irreparable because:
*I, Kathryn Stoker, am the grandmother of Maya Smith. Maya's mother, Selena, my daughter, voluntarily admitted herself to St. Peter's Psychiatric Unit last Sunday, June 20, 1999. My daughter has suffered from depression and disorganized thinking. **Her biological father is schizophrenic and they are currently trying to determine if Selena also suffers from schizophrenia.** I believe she is a good mother when she is stable and taking her medication, however, I am very concerned about her when she is not.”*
- by reason of the statement above in **BOLD** is factually false and Kathryn Stoker did not know it to be true. Implicitly & presumptively she knew it to be false by attempting to hide the perjury from the public & detection by seeking to have those very documents sealed. Moreover, this court notes the language immediately following the above quoted passage reflects a casual open door historical relationship between the Stokers & Selena Smith regarding her presence/arrival.
28. This court finds Breckan Scott, esq. was not sworn in as a witness when offering argument effectively as testimonial in nature. Thus, this court finds it was not “evidence” to serve as the basis for the ex parte immediate emergency guardianship of minors order signed by recused commissioner Kortokrax on 5028021 as indicated.
29. [] This court finds no court order in the record or motion for the same to bifurcate cause 21-4-00443-34 into 21-4-00443-34 & 21-4-00452-34, nor does it find a motion or order granting the altering of the caption, nor does it find proper original process was served on Selena Smith after said bifurcation occurred in fact, if not in law.
30. [] From the record, this court finds commissioner Kortokrax continued to issue a material substantive discretionary order AFTER recusing himself in open court for conflict of interest on 6-16-21. The court also finds Breckan Scott’s proposed order substantially differed from the record.
31. From the record, this court finds Kathryn Stoker misrepresented the Stokers’ involvement in filing and execution of the ex parte immediate emergency guardianship of minors Order in Oakridge, Oregon to John Smith, Selena Smith’s father.

32. From the record and Oakridge, Oregon police report exhibit, the court finds [] probable cause [] reasonable suspicion Breckan Scott, esq. issued an unlawful subpoena for security guard Robert Kurtz to monitor and surveil Selena Smith's credit card usage in real time on a minute-by-minute basis including eever stop/location where she used it, every purchase made, and every penny spent long before this action or any other action involving Selena Smith had been filed. This was a violation of CR 45. RCW 5.51.020, the code of ethics governing Washington attorneys and an egregiously intentional tort.
33. [] Commissioner Indu Thomas failed to adequately consider CR 19 along with 24 in denying John Smith his motion to Join/Intervene to protect his interest in contact with his grandchildren in this case and his interest was neither aligned with that of his daughter, nor adequately represented by her, especially given her lack of appointed counsel, her poverty, her lack of resources to file/prepare documents/pleadings for the court or even the ability to remain in communication with the court. Ms. Vanderwal, admin & Breckan Scott added immaterial e-mail to bias the court. (#557)
34. [] Selena Smith received no trial, no genuine due process or proper original service of process, access to the court, or actual evidence rising to the necessary level to sustain a claim she was an unfit mother or an immediate imminent threat to her children, nor was there a nationwide manhunt for her, nor were her children 'missing', nor was she obligated to remain in Washington State, nor was she obligated to. remain under the "oversight" of her mother or Hans Stoker, nor did the Stokers have standing in this respect prior to their filing this action, nor were the children residing/domiciled in Washington State but with their mother in Oregon where she was domiciled and working. Breckan Scott, esq. issued an unlawful subpoena w/o authority in violation of CR 45 used to stalk and harass Selena Smith and breach Selena's credit card data for weeks with up to the minute 24/7 reports to Robert K. Kurtz. This information was used to target Selena Smith and her children in the dead of night on Memorial day weekend on 5-30-21 in Oakridge, OR per the PD report from there.
35. [] The Stoker's petition for an emergency appointment of a guardian for minors in this cause was planned well in advance by the Stokers, their attorney, Breckan Scott, and Robert K. Kurtz was filed on 5-27-21 after their stalking and harassment of Selena Smith had turned up her presence over the Memorial day weekend in Oakridge, OR. The Stokers struck their blow to seize the children on 5-28-21 with an ex parte motion for the immediate emergency seizure of the children signed by recused (for entanglements with the parties) commissioner Kortokrax. The Stokers and their attorney, Breckan Scott had known for weeks prior, or more, the children were not 'missing', but lawfully in the custody of their mother, Selena Smith. The Stokers engaged in a campaign of stalking and harassment by falsely calling in multiple child endangerment reports and welfare checks to multiple agencies and jurisdictions with their announced (TCSO report of 4-21-21) abuse of process intent to "...get my grandchildren back" (quote by Hans Stoker) and NOT for the primary purpose of concern for the child(ren)'s welfare, but because of the money they had spent on the child(ren) and Selena Smith over the years and the heartfelt exclamation of Hans Stoker on 7-17-21 at his residence to Selena Smith that he had always hated her.
36. [] The stalking and harassment of Selena Smith by the Stokers and their attorney, Breckan Scott, through their agent, NJ security guard Robert K. Kurtz, was without lawful authority by a man who did not represent or act on behalf of the NJ DCF (Dept. of Children and Families) and was not a law enforcement officer or good Samaritan but instead misrepresented himself as a public official authorized to pursue a fleeing mother who had absconded with her children and was "traveling across the country for no reason" while a "nationwide manhunt" was being conducted for her when, in fact, there were no open cases from any state against Selena Smith during this stalking and

harassment which more closely resembled a nationwide witch hunt by the Stokers, their attorney, Breckan Scott, and Robert K. Kurtz. Recused commissioner Kortokrax signed the ex parte order on 5-28-21 based on counsel's arguments (see Order) not evidence. Arguments are not evidence.

Conclusions of Law

1. [] The exercise of Washington State's authority to seize children within its political boundaries in response to a genuine and sustainable claim of imminent and immediate irrevocable harm to a child is circumscribed by the Constitutional requirement such authority is exclusive, in the absence of standing by the petitioners or a pending case establishing a Washington Court as the one of original and continuing jurisdiction. Being the 1st State to adopt the UGA on 1-1-21, this case and the challenge to jurisdiction in a foreign state is one of first impression. The proper remedy, had the Stokers' claims been genuine, would have been to have filed their ex parte immediate emergency action to seize the children (without any advance notice to the mother and opportunity to respond in a proper local court of law) where the children were domiciled with their mother in Oregon. The legal right to issue such an order under the circumstances where the children were no longer domiciled in Washington State and had left there circa 11-21-20 was exclusively that of the state wherein they were located and lawfully in the custody of their mother who owed no duty to the Stokers for permission to leave their premises or to travel across the country or to submit to their oversight nor to provide them with visitation or communication with the children. The Stokers had no standing to bring an action of this unconstitutional type of ex parte immediate emergency seizure of children in a foreign state's jurisdiction with no judicial oversight of that state whatsoever. Assertions to the contrary by their attorney, Breckan Scott, in advising the Stokers amounted to malpractice, and Breckan Scott's premature issuance of a subpoena to Robert K. Kurtz to stalk and invade Selena Smith's credit card usage was not only unlawful, but a crime/intentional tort.
2. [] Selena Smith was not fleeing from authorities, there was no 'nationwide manhunt' for her, the stalking and invasion of her privacy by Ms. Stoker's surreptitious tracking her movements through her cell phone and an unauthorized subpoena issued by Breckan Scott, esq. to Robert K. Kurtz used to track Selena Smith's credit card usage in minute by minute updates weeks before this action was filed was unlawful, harmful, and used to present unlawfully acquired 'evidence' to the court that was the result of a deliberate crime/intentional tort. Selena Smith became the victim of that crime, stalking, harassment, and the slander of her character/reputation through the willful acts of the Stokers. Robert K. Kurtz, and their attorney, Breckan Scott, esq. The fruit of that crime/intentional tort was used to strip Selena of her reputation, her right to due process and proper notice, her children, and to create crippling expense and distress on a single destitute handicapped mother working full time in Portland, Oregon.
3. [] The opening of Selena's private mail by the Stokers without her permission was unlawful. As a result, the use of the contents therein cannot be lawfully relied on in this case.
4. [] The failure of Petitioners to provide proper notice, a validly constructed subpoena for RCW 11.130.225 purposes, and the failure to properly serve the petition denied this court proper in personam jurisdiction from the very outset of this unconstitutional execution of the ex parte immediate emergency order to seize Selena Smith's children in a foreign jurisdiction (Oregon) without the opportunity of one iota of judicial oversight

or protection from the courts of the state where she and her children were domiciled deprived Washington State of jurisdiction as a matter of law.

5. [] Both Selena Smith and her children were unfairly/unlawfully denied a court appointed counsel and a court visitor (GAL) for the child(ren) in this action.
6. [] No genuinely meaningful evidentiary hearing with live testimony and an opportunity to cross examine witnesses was offered to Selena Smith or John Smith, nor time to prepare and do so.
7. [] The failure of commissioner Indu Thomas to fully consider the language in CR 19 along with CR 24 in her ruling on both Selena Smith's and John Smith's motion to join/intervene was reversible error and was erroneously based on the commissioner's opinion Mr. Smith and his daughter's (Selena) goals/interests were "aligned" and Selena Smith adequately represented Mr. Smith's interest in his grandchildren in court.
8. [] Neither Selena nor Robert Ayer received proper original service of process, thus ating asd a bar to this court acquiring in personam jurisdiction. The unconstitutional execution of the ex parte immediate emergency order to seize the child(rn) in a foreign jurisdiction, given the petitioners' lack of standing and Washington's unconstitutional & unlawful execution of the order in a foreign jurisdiction where it had no standing as the court of original jurisdiction prior to the ex parte immediate emergency seizure of the children order served as a bar to this court, under the circumstances, to acquiring subject matter jurisdiction. Thus, all orders entered by this court from the beginning were void ab initio and moot. No parenting plan filing and service had been completed with respect to Onawa and Raven Smith. Colorado was the Court of original and continuing jurisdiction with respect to Hazel Smith. No UCCJEA conference was held regarding any of the children with Oregon where they were lawfully domiciled with their mother, Selena Smith.
9. [] The 60 day limit for a petition for the emergency guardianship of minors in this matter pursuant to RCW 11.130.225 had lapsed prior to 7-29-21, the day of entry of the final order by commissioner Indu Thomas. No additional 60 day extension of the court's authority (restricted to once only) was made, but only settings of the 14-day review hearings as required to be held every two weeks according to the statute. Thus the court's authority to enter additional orders was barred and the 7-29-21 order entered by commissioner Thomas was a nullity. Commissioner Thomas demonstrated bias against Selena Smith and John Smith by entering a tay of proceedings in the case affecting Hazel Smith as an end run around RCW 11.130.225 requirement the proceedings be limited to 60 days. Commissioner Indu Thomas' effort to defeat that provision contained in the statute constituted reversible error. Commissioner Thomas did not demonstrate impartiality or behave in an impartial manner, but appeared to be bent on excluding Mr. Smith's participation and to quashing Selena Smith's objections to the proceedings.
10. [] Both Selena Smith and John Smith repeatedly objected to this court's jurisdiction and pointedly reserved and maintained their continuing objection to this court's jurisdiction in this cause. Neither has ever consented to this court's jurisdiction or conceded proper original service of process or subject matter jurisdiction.
11. [] The multiple accumulation of errors, both procedurally and substantively require a reversal/dismissal of this case against Selena Smith and her children.

12. [] Selena Smith received neither a fair hearing nor the appearance of one, nor a full evidentiary hearing replete with live testimony and cross-examination, nor discovery. Commissioner Thomas made frequent reference to records and documents she could see on her screen Selena was never made privy to and could not adequately prepare for or rebut because she was not provided with them, Thus, commissioner Thomas acted more as an additional attorney supporting the Stokers and th anan impartial judge evaluating Selena Smith's right to a fair hearing and an opportunity to discover the truth, including perjured statements and misconduct by the Stokers, their attorney, and their agent, Robert K. Kurtz. Commissioner Kortokrax continue to issue an order AFTER he had recused himself, and commissioner Indu Thomas denied her prior incompetence in a case involving the termination of a handicapped mother with a brain injury and denying the woman an attorney (by twice ignoring the motion to have one appointed) was cause for recusal. Kortokrax signed the ex parte order based on counsel's arguments, not evidence.
13. [] This court concludes misconduct, stalking, harassment, unlawful issuance of a subpoena by Breckan Scott, abuse of process, and the unconstitutional extension of Washington's ex parte immediate emergency police powers (under the circumstances) into a foreign jurisdiction affecting its citizens and children domiciled therein, is an egregious abuse of Washington's authority under color of state law and the miscreant parties involved in the misconduct cannot be rewarded for their abuse of process under the laws of this state. This court also concludes Breckan Scott, esq, should not be rewarded for conspiring with her clients, issuing an unlawful subpoena, and giving bad legal advice to both her clients and misrepresentations to this court.
14. [] This court find, upon review, the misconduct of the petitioners and their attorney are so severe as to require compensatory damages and expenses be paid to Selena Smith and John Smith for those incurred along with punitive damages and sanctions appropriate under CR 11. This court retains jurisdiction over ruling on what those compensatory and punitive damages should be upon a showing of proof by the Smiths, but in no way restricts their right to seek damages, injunctive relief, and other relief in collateral actions against the Stokers and those that aided and abetted their misconduct, including damages on behalf of the child(ren) they and their attorney were responsible for having unlawfully seized. This court concludes the Stokers, their attorney (Brekan Scott), and Robert K. Kurtz may not rely on the presumptive authority of this court when they have materially misled this court in misrepresentations, perjury, and other substantive misconduct as a defense in any collateral action against them seeking damages and other relief.

The above findings of fact and conclusions of law are ENTERED into the record and SO ORDERED.

Date: _____

Judge or Commissioner: X _____

Signature

Printed Name

Respectfully submitted by:

Date: 9-15-21

John Smith (grandfather): X _____

John Smith

Signature
Printed Name: JOHN SMITH, grandfather
