

FILED
JAN 09 2024
KITSAP COUNTY CLERK
DAVID T. LEWIS III

Superior Court of Washington
County of Kitsap

In re:

Petitioner
Heather Wood

Respondent
Lenard Feulner

No. 07-3-01713-1

Declaration of Lenard Feulner

My name is Lenard Feulner, I am the Respondent in this action. I am providing this response to the Petitioner's Motion to Amend / Terminate the Restraining Order entered on August 4, 2023. The Temporary Restraining Order terminated on August 15, 2023 when the court entered an order placing our daughter into my care. There is no restraining order to amend or terminate.

In response to the Petitioner's declaration filed on December 14, 2023, I have never molested my daughter or anyone else for that matter. The Petitioner has been attempting to use this narrative against me since the start of this action. I was not present during any of the statements the Petitioner includes in her declaration so I cannot speak to her allegations. I will have to defer to Adeline's attorney, Kerry Stevens to address these statements.

In response to the Petitioner's declarations and concern about our daughter being

07-3-01713-1
DCLR 144
Declaration Affidavit
15912308



bitten by a dog *while in her care* about 11 years ago, I was not present when this occurred. On August 21, 2023 the Petitioner, in her Motion for Continuance stated that "The father initiated close contact with pit bulls, one of which bit Adeline on her face when she was five years old... then blamed her despite encouraging her to put her face next to his friend's dog's face...". On September 1, 2023, Donna Ebentheuer, the owner of the dog, provided a declaration that described the events that she recalled. The declaration from Donna states that the Petitioner was on her laptop computer when the dog bit our daughter who was poking the dog in the face. On December 14, 2023 the Petitioner states in her declaration that "Lenard was not present I and Adeline were the only eye witnesses." On December 18, 2023 I stated under penalty of perjury that I do not now, nor have I ever owned dangerous dogs. I do not recall blaming my young daughter for being bitten. The Petitioner has asked that Donna' declaration be stricken from the record. I do not understand why the Petitioner is so wrapped up in this issue that occurred 11 years ago and by her own admission I was not ever present for. I ask that the court not strike the declaration without further testimony from Donna, which should be reserved for trial.

The Petitioner continues to state that I molested our daughter which is not true, no charges have ever been filed. Petitioner states that I was responsible for the dog biting our daughter, then states that I wasn't present. Petitioner obtained a statement that I axed my thumb off to obtain public assistance and get time off of work, I still have both of my thumbs and provided a statement from my former manager on September 1, 2023 that says she does not recall me dismembering my thumb. The Petitioner's statements are not credible.

An additional declaration was filed by the Petitioner on December 14, 2023, this declaration outlines my perceived parenting deficiencies from 2008 and two events in 2018. The Petitioner's version of events that took place in 2008 are false and are ridiculous. In 2018 the Petitioner said she observed me drinking with my family and I invited them to go shooting. She never saw me shooting while I was drinking, she left and that was the end of the visit. She complains that later the same year (2018) I suggested a YouTube video that she did not find appropriate, and I didn't help Adeline up when she fell while skiing. All of this is not relevant, especially given we are before the court because of the mother's inappropriate behavior in the courthouse, her literal abandonment of our daughter (she moved the bus and the van so Adeline could not come home) and her statements that she no longer wanted to care for Adeline. The Petitioner makes dramatic and unsubstantiated statements about me in her journal and would like the court (presumably) to consider these statements as my inability to parent our nearly adult daughter. None of this is relevant or warrants a response, other than to say that this was a long time ago and I do not believe her statements are true.

The Petitioner provided in addition to the above referenced declarations a 155+ page declaration in support of her motion to Amend / Terminate the Temporary Restraining Order. The court retains jurisdiction in this matter as the initial Petition was filed in Kitsap County and the minor child and residential parent reside in Kitsap County. THERE IS NO RESTRAINING ORDER AND NOTHING THAT PROHIBITS MYSELF OR THE CHILD FROM HAVING CONTACT OR COMING WITH IN A CERTAIN DISTANCE OF THE PETITIONER. An error in the caption does not void pleadings previously filed. I have never filed false or misleading pleadings (unlike the Petitioner). I do not contest that

the mother was the primary residential parent prior to my initial request for restraints. Most of this "motion" contains hearsay and is not substantiated by the person she claims is speaking. I have cancelled child support, the child is in my care and not her mother's care, it is only appropriate that child support be suspended until this matter has been concluded. Naming one party as the Petitioner and or Respondent has absolutely no impact on the outcome of the hearing, nor does it create a bias. Adeline is enrolled in therapy, her first appointment is January 9, 2024. She has also taken a UA, the results are pending, the results of the UA will be provided to the Guardian ad Litem. I am not providing a response to the Petitioner's Live Testimony Transcript(s), while this is not provided by a court transcriptionist, the Petitioner is entitled to *her* version of the events. I assume the Petitioner is attempting to relitigate the previous hearing by providing her version of the testimony in court and what she would have said. This is too little too late, there are legal remedies to return to court to litigate the same issues though her opportunity for reconsideration has expired. I would argue that these issues have already been disposed of and the Petitioner is attempting to cloud the subject by filing literally hundreds of pages of pleadings.

The Petitioner thinks that there is a restraining order which prohibits Adeline's contact with her family. Adeline told me that her family's Thanksgiving would be at her cousin Dillon's house this year. Adeline told me that there was a possibility that her mom would arrive at her cousin's house. Adeline told me that she told her great aunt that she had a restraining order against her mother – Adeline knows now that this is not the case. We made an agreement that if the Petitioner did show up that we would leave immediately. When the Petitioner showed up, Adeline and I immediately left as we had

agreed. Neither one of us spoke to the Petitioner on Thanksgiving Day. This issue will be addressed more fully in response to the Petitioner's motion set to be heard next week (January 19, 2024) in which she is seeking Contempt and a Summary Judgment.

In conclusion, there is no restraining order to amend or terminate. The issues regarding the dog bite should be reserved for trial so that the witness can provide testimony. I was not the primary parent when our daughter was young, but I have always had a presence in her life (as evidenced by the Petitioner's journal entries). While the Petitioner may not have always approved of my parenting choices, having only a few complaints about my parenting over the last 16 years should be evidence enough that I am able and fit to parent our daughter. I am not interested in listing the Petitioner's parenting faults, but if I did I would be able to list several concerns I have for her ability to parent our daughter as well.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signed at Bremerton, WA on January 8, 2024


Lenard Feulner / Respondent