

[x] EXPEDITE (if filed < 5 days of Hearing)  
[x] Hearing is Set (time sensitive)  
Date: 3-15-24 Rm. 2697/tbd  
Time: 1:30 ZOOM #: rbd? passcode tbd?  
Judge/Calendar: Adams disqualified/Departmental

Superior Court of Washington,  
County of Kitsap

**FILED**  
MAR 12 2024  
KITSAP COUNTY CLERK  
DAVID T. LEWIS III

**In re Lenard Feulner's Petition De Novo for  
a parenting plan & support of:  
Adeline Marylynn Feulner (child)  
DOB: 6-2-07**

Petitioner (party who started case 07-3-01713-1):

**Heather Lynn Wood (mother)**

And Respondent/s (other party/parties):

**Lenard Ray Feulner (father)**

**No. 07-3-01713-1**    (objection to case #)

Rebuttal to GAL Report #1 filed 2-26-24  
after Mother's Petition was withdrawn &  
dismissed

by Affiant: Heather Wood

**& RE: Objection to disqualified judge  
Adams hearing Mr. Feulner's Petition De  
Novo (See Ms. Wood's Notice invoking her  
right to disqualify Adams)**

(Clerk's Action Required re: RCW 4.12.050)

TO: The Kitsap County Superior Court Clerk, 614 Division St #202, Port Orchard, WA, 98366,  
(360) 337-7164, [superiorcourt@kitsap.gov](mailto:superiorcourt@kitsap.gov); [exparte@kitsap.gov](mailto:exparte@kitsap.gov), AND

**Lenard Feulner, Respondent, 333 Lippert Dr, W, #C129, (360) 228-6079,**

**Lenardfeulner@gmail.com; AND**

**Adeline Feulner, 4101 Anderson Hill Rd SW, Port Orchard, WA, 98367, (564) 220-8922,**

**Adelinewolfpaw@gmail.com ; AND**

**Nancy Tarbell, esq. #26686, (GAL/knight errant) PO Box 840, Manchester, WA 98353-0840,**

**nancy@tarbelllaw.com, (360)871-2794; AND**

**Kerry Stevens, esq., Bar #15420, (previously appointed atty in withdrawn & dismissed Petition)  
11074 SE Glendale Ave Unit A, Port Orchard, WA 98366-9033, (360) 269-2947,**

**slo@wavecable.com; AND**

**Commissioner Matthew Clucas, esq. #22929, 614 Division St, Port Orchard, WA 98366-4683,  
(360) 337-7140, superiorcourt@kitsap.gov**

07-3-01713-1  
OTHER 206  
Other  
16291382



Rebuttal to GAL Report #1 untimely filed on 2-26-24

& OBJECTIONS

Heather L Wood, [hrwood012@gmail.com](mailto:hrwood012@gmail.com)  
9129 James Rd, SW, Rochester, WA 98579

p. 1 of 19

## **I Identity of the Parties**

**COMES now, Heather Wood, pro se of necessity, w/o counsel, under protest, indigent, in Forma Pauperis to make the Objections noted herein, remind all persons of notice via declaration pursuant tp RCW 4.12.050 disqualifying judge Adams as a nondiscretionary matter of right, & to clarify the arc of this cause:**

## **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

**While the case # captioned above would have been properly within Kitsap County's Family Court subject matter and in personum jurisdiction due to the minor child's birth and both litigants' residency in Washington State, the Kangaroo unlawfully held impromptu hearing on 8-15-23 before Commissioner Clucas, without a scintilla of due process after the regularly scheduled MTSC hearing was disposed of and Lenard Feulner's motion dismissed, DEPRIVED jurisdiction and authority from this Court when it failed to meet even the most minimal procedural mandates subsequent to luring the parties back into the courtroom w/o notice in collusion with two non-participating attorneys (Williamson & Yelish) who observed a commotion/altercation between Heather Wood, mother, and Adeline, her child, OUTSIDE the COURTROOM & Courthouse in the hallway/lobby where it ensued-extrajudicially contacting Clucas and MODIFYING THE RECORD through UNSWORN statements without either parent's permission or participation. Thus, Heather Wood took exception to jurisdiction, and reserved the objection THROUGHOUT these *fruit of the poisoned tree* proceedings in protest despite her appearance. Similarly, Venue was improper in Kitsap because the child's domicile remained with the legal custodial parent, Heather Wood, who was and remains domiciled in Thurston County. Heather Wood NEVER abandoned Adeline. Adeline refused to leave the Lewis county (Providence) hospital w/her mother, & ran away wi/her father who acted in concert w/his daughter to further alienate Adeline's affections from her mother while engaging in custodial interference, i.e. hiding/sheltering a runaway.**

**(1) OBJECTION 1: Commissioner Clucas was privately contracted by these two women w/o standing, local attorneys, Amanda Williams and Laura Yelish, who manipulated Clucas into unlawfully recalling the case w/o due process, notice, or an opportunity to confront the litigants' accusers, and taking statements from the two attorneys on the record w/o swearing them in: i.e. with NO testimony as a basis, and an illegally held hearing at that. Heather Wood continues to take exception on the record to this outrage and lawless Kangaroo hearing.**

**Heather Wood, the complaining mother in this instance continues to take exception on an continuing ongoing basis, reserving her protest/objection to the same to this violation of her civil rights and the kidnapping of her child under the pretext of the Court's authority without even the color of State law, thus lack of proper jurisdiction. Moreover, as a matter of law, the above captioned cause number, a Petition by the mother for a parenting plan was withdrawn and confirmed as withdraw by judge Adams, after recognizing the mother had served notice on all parties she had withdrawn her petition effective immediately. i.e.**

**Procedurally, there exists no Petition to be joined to Lenard Feulner's de novo Petition for a parenting plan, thus requiring either a new case # to distinguish it from the rubbish pile he created in the above captioned cause number, now defunct/dismissed. Ms. Wood objects to Lenard Feulner's attempt to further his trashing the record, ambiguation and abuse of process. If he chooses to file a de novo petition, he is required to strictly adhere to original procedural requirements. He has yet to do so.**

**Mr Feulner may file under the original cause number brought on by the State of Washington as the Petitioner in 2007 or file under a NEW cause # issued by the Kitsap County Clerk's office as a parenting case. Procedurally, he should file as the Petitioner in that new cause # for a parenting plan, allowing for discovery and the full exercise of Due Process by the parties instead of the court acting as a shadow litigant and knight errant for the at risk child, Adeline Feulner.**

**(2) OBJECTION 2: Nanct Tarbell's GAL Report was filed after Heather Wood's Petition under the above captioned cause # was withdrawn & Dismissed. It should be struck from the record as untimely for a cause # wherein the record has been closed subsequent to the cause of the action being withdrawn and dismissed. Ms. Wood requests her objection be acted on.**

**(3) OBJECTION 3: GAL's *PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND RE: GAL AUTHORITY***

*Ms. Wood takes exception to the GAL's assertion in her 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of her report, "Many of the issues that halted my investigation have since been resolved with Judge Adams becoming the assigned judicial officer." The most salient and substantive of procedural errors remain including a plethora of corrupt substantively deficient on their face documents/pleadings in the case as well as void ab initio improper jurisdiction and venue resulting from an impromptu Kangaroo hearing conducted by Commissioner Clucas on 8-15-23 along with all the poisoned fruit procedurally emanating from that event—voiding them each in turn. The Court cannot un-ring the death nell Commissioner Clucas struck to its authority/proper jurisdiction on 8-15-23.*

All subsequent orders/appointments and settings were void ab initio as a result of the complete lack of Due Process afforded the litigants by Clucas on 8-15-23. The GAL coyly omits the salient fact the 2-16-24 hearing she references (case #23-2-01534-18) was docketed to hear Ms. Wood's Motion for Summary Judgment in her daughter's Emancipation Petition, an entirely separate cause in which Nancy Tarbell had NO standing whatsoever. Moreover, Ms. Wood struck HER motion from the docket, as was her right. Yet the GAL and judge Adams treated it as though it was one and the same despite judge Adams acknowledging the mother's withdrawal of her Petition and effectively dismissing it. The abomination of procedural errors continued apace when Adams ruled Mr. Feulner's responsive pleading to the now defunct Petition brought by the mother would be treated as a COUNTER CLAIM when none existed in fact or in law. Like the nunc pro tunc magic the GAL references, judge Adams needed only to snap her gavel to make it so despite the stars in the heavens, time, or any other facts based in reality or law. Ms. Wood HAD provided timely notice to the Court, both electronically (2-9-24) and by mail well before 2-16-24, a proceeding scheduled for Adeline's Emancipation cause but struck from the Docket by Ms. Wood as it was HER Motion for Summary Judgment in Adeline's Petition, which the Court had NO AUTHORITY to hold as the Child failed to ever provide the mother

with a SUMMONS or Proof thereof as required. It would seem the Court's failure to ensure mandatory Original Service & Due Process in both cause #'s deprived it of proper legal jurisdiction in either. Thus, arguments relating to "Counter Claims" under such circumstances are moot; challenges to jurisdiction are ALWAYS timely. The documented sexual abuse of Adeline was not checked by the GAL

**Counter Declaration & Rebuttal of Heather Wood to GAL Report 1**  
**INVESTIGATION**

**1, Heather Wood, the mother of the minor Adeline Feulner, have been unlawfully stripped of my parental rights w/o due process in the Kitsap County Courthouse. I am a fit parent who has exclusively nurtured and raised Adeline Feulner for her 16 years of life.**

**2. I am over 18, a U.S. citizen, and a permanent resident of the State of Washington as is Lenard Feulner. My only child. Adeline Feulner, a minor, born in Washington State and permanent resident thereof currently domiciled in Thurston County, the domicile of her legally custodial parent, Heather Wood, mother.**

**3. In Nancy Tarbell's (GAL) 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph (Investigation), she cites a litany of hearsay. Nor are her own statements sworn or under the penalty of perjury. She has communicated via e-mail to the mother she is not obliged to make such statements under penalty of perjury. She admitted in the same e-mail those she interviewed were not under penalty of perjury and could invent whatever conjecture or opinion they chose. Thus, these statements should receive minimum weight as to credibility or none at all. E.g. The GAL's reference to Dianna & Jack Watkins (mother's aunt & uncle) directly contradicted the child's (Adeline) statement falsely complaining of hardship while being accommodated by the relatives, maligning them as well in the bargain.**

**4. The GAL does not adequately identify the persons she claims to have interviewed in her 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, nor their contact information to allow for the mother to interview them in her own defense given the Court has chosen to summarily (in effect) strip her of her parental rights without representation and act as a shadow litigant hostile to her fundamental rights. E.g. Michelle Robb is not a "friend" of the mother's but an acquaintance and the mother of the 14yo girl videotaped (online) w/Adeline encouraging the 14yo child to snort a white powdery substance. The GAL trivializes this incident and the child's posting it on social media...accepting the child's mendacity about the incident as a "prank" she was pulling on her mother despite the evidence Adeline took no steps to ensure her mother saw the "prank" and was surprised to learn of her mother's possession of the evidence of misconduct/criminal behavior. The mother's theory of this incident is consistent with the video evidence she has of Adeline receiving obscene and Nazi tattoos from a child along with other video evidence of Adeline tattooing other children. This was all invited by the father's failure to protect, parent, or supervise, or even to reside with his daughter at all.**

**5. With respect to the GAL's 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, the mother does not deny she fostered and paid for Adeline's education at UTI, an internet search will not provide the salient details, attendance, cost, or merits of that education. Adeline physically attended her classes at SPSCC, successfully completing them w/excellent grades under her mother's guidance at 13yo.**

**6. Re GAL's 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph: It reads more like a billing invoice than a report. Again, there is inadequate identification, contact info, or details including time spent w/each.**

7. Re GAL's 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph: As in #6 (ibid) there's inadequate info, details, & time spent.

8. Re Gal's 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph: The mother failed to obtain an assessment, but did receive a UA at Court expense. She was not given the results of that test for want of an 'Assessment'. The mother argues her job and litigation demands were too hectic for her to meet them all despite her best efforts. Nevertheless, the GAL concedes none of the parties have asserted the mother has any drug dependency or substance abuse and she confirms this is the case.

9. Re GAL's 7<sup>th</sup> Paragraph: Yet another billing invoice statement relevant to the GAL's fees.

#### **GAL's RELEVANT INFO TO DATE**

10. Re GAL's 8<sup>th</sup> paragraph: The mother closely monitored the father's visits w/Adeline per mutual agreement between the parents shortly after a child molestation/sexual abuse complaint had been filed in 2013 alleging the father raped his 6yo daughter after the child complained of it to her mother, Heather Wood. Many mothers have been convicted for failure to protect for taking lesser steps under similar circumstances. The GAL's position/theory of the case appears to be Ms. Wood is too fit to be a fit mother.

11. Re GAL's 9<sup>th</sup> paragraph: The mother takes exception to the GAL's pejorative innuendo characterizing her lifelong bond w/her daughter, Adeline. Ms. Tarbell's use of the phrase "unusually close connection" alludes to 'ATTACHMENT PARENTING' defined as "an approach to raising infants that aims to promote a close relationship between the baby and its parent(s) by method such as feeding on demand and letting the baby sleep with its parents," per the online dictionary. It is defined by WebMD as "is a parenting style that aims to create a secure, trusting bond between parent(s) and her/their baby." By those definitions, Ms. Wood pleads guilty as charged. However, WebMD goes on to clarify the hotly debated controversy as follows:

[Controversy still surrounds attachment theory. In part, that's because early research was based on animal studies. Here are some of the things the critics say]:

- **Bed-sharing and infant death.** Critics are concerned with bed-sharing, which has been linked to sudden infant death syndrome, or SIDS. Attachment Parenting International tries to address this risk with rules for safe bed-sharing.
- **Changes in attachment with experience.** Many developmental psychologists no longer view attachment as a "trait." In psychological terms a trait is a more or less permanent, lifelong characteristic. Recent research has shown that the ability to form healthy, intimate attachments is affected by peer pressure, relationships in school, dating, and marriage -- as well as early childhood experience.
- **Multiple caregivers, changing times.** Attachment theory arose in the 1950s, before the advent of childcare. Then, psychologists argued over whether mothers should stay home to raise their children. Many children since then have been exposed to multiple, relatively consistent caregivers as a result of childcare. Critics want attachment parenting research to be updated to reflect this changing reality.

- Overstressed parents, overdependent children. Critics of attachment parenting claim that constant attention to a child's every mood and tantrum can lead to overdependent children and highly stressed parents. Or worse, kids learn to control and bully their well-meaning parents.
- Scientific basis. Proponents of attachment parenting raise the threat of severely maladapted children if children don't form secure attachments. They point to a psychiatric condition called reactive attachment disorder (RAD). But the American Psychiatric Association's definition of RAD requires considerable physical and emotional deprivation, such as occurs with neglected orphans. Even then, research has found attachment issues can be changed with interventions such as therapy.

**HOWEVER**, the critics have not overcome *Troxel v. Granville*, inter alia, a State violates the Constitution when it substitutes its judgment for a fit parent's as to the best interest of the child. Poverty is Constitutionally bared from being construed as negligence per se, and a fit parent's decisions for their child are presumed in law to be in the child's best interest. Strict scrutiny must be applied to this large burden the state must carry to overcome a fit parent's fundamental right to parent their child without state interference. This Court has consistently violated this core Constitutional principle to date. The alienation of affections promoted by it and Mr. Feulner make it all the more egregious. Ms. Wood stands four square on this proposition and these principles.

**12. Re GAL's 9<sup>th</sup> paragraph(p (p5, ln3):** The mother is in agreement w/this paragraph.

**13. Re: GAL's 10<sup>th</sup> Paragraph (p5, ln9):** Adeline repeated kindergarten, but no subsequent grades—contray to the GAL's assertion. The mother took a hands on approach to Adeline's education, even working to provide her w/a private math tutor.

Blaming the victim, the GAL recites a CPS file w/o quoting it claiming Adeline instigated the incident of sexual harassment; This is a false narrative and a vacuous repetition of a decade old incident. The mother believes its recitation is intended to dilute the significance of the father's 2013 rape of his 6yo daughter. The oversexualization observation the GAL references was subsequent to Adeline's father raping her shortly after her 6<sup>th</sup> birthday in 2013. The mother has subpoenaed the police report investigating the rape, but the KCSO and WASPC each ignored their subpoena. Torri Feulner, Lenard's adult daughter, is married to Reed Colburn, a Washington State patrolman, offering some explanation for the coverup effort by KCSO and WASPC. The connection to Adeline's oversexualization is obvious. The failure of the Court to follow up on the mother's complaint regarding her daughter's sexual abuse or to direct the GAL to do so is a red flag in itself.

**14. Re GAL's 11<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p5, ln 16):** The mother objects to the GAL's pejorative use of "unschool" as catering to the GAL's & Court's confirmation biases. Adeline's schooling was focused on producing a strong, independent, critical reasoning child. Though incomplete, the mother's efforts toward that end have taken root in her child, but remain untempered by judgment/maturity.

**The mother takes issue w/the GAL's use of "low" 6<sup>th</sup> grade math scores w/o further clarification. In any event, math scores provide no basis to unlawfully strip a fit mother's**

fundamental right to parent her child in violation of *Troxel v. Granville*—a violation the court has consistently condoned ab initio on 8-15-23 if not 8-4-23. The mother agrees she provided but one standardized test result, cost being a consideration, but the test's limited value in holistically assessing a child academic progress being another. E.g Adeline's grades in her college level automotive repair were excellent as well as her piano class @ SPSCC where her academic ability was assessed before she qualified for admittance.

15. Re GAL's 12<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p5, ln 24): The GAL concedes Adeline's academic performance and attendance at S. Kitsap High School have been inadequate while in the "nominal" care of Adeline's father. The mother agrees while pointing out the girl receives no actual supervision or parenting. Nor is she disciplined enough to succeed on her own. Her time spent tattooing minors would be better spent completing her homework. That's not going to happen while she works 5 days/week, spends school nights in the nude in Long Lake, or lives in an adjacent RV alone outside her 94yo grandmother, also living alone. Adeline has attempted to mislead the Court by claiming her father is part of the household while simultaneously admitting he lives w/his girlfriend. Adeline's father is an absentee father, a fact consistent throughout her life and immutable despite Commissioner Clucas' unlawful order.

The GAL engages in conjecture calling for speculation while imagining Adeline graduating w/her class. Adeline will never graduate from any academic curriculum requiring scholastic discipline while under her father's influence. She will continue to destroy her health vaping, smoking marijuana, drinking, and tattooing children on her path to dissolution and wasted years she can never recover thanks to THIS Court and its excesses. This charitable prediction ignores evidence Adeline is engaged in drug distribution and other crimes. She may end up having to complete her education while in custody. Unfortunately, it is unlikely the Court will ever hold Mr. Feulner responsible for criminal neglect and failure to protect. The Court appears more eager to pillory the mother for her diligence in protecting her daughter from the very man the Court ordered her to reside with, the man who sexually abused her at 6 years of age.

16. Re GAL's 13<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p6, ln 4): The mother does not object to/contest this paragraph.

17. Re GAL's 14<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p6, ln 6): A family relative sexually abused my young (3yo) daughter, not a family "friend". The mother reported the incident to the police. The GAL's claim Adeline ran away from home when she was 6yo (2013) is flatly false and w/o foundation/details/clarification—because there is none. It never happened. This GAL's report is unreliable, presumptive, and too often false regarding critical dispositive issues. Adeline NEVER ran away from home until 7-20-23 when she refused to come home from Providence hospital (Lewis County) after a positive drug test result exposed her mendacity.

18. Re GAL's 15<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p6, ln 11): "Few" is not "two", the number of years the mother allowed some relaxation of supervision of the father's visitation time—a mistake in retrospect.

A 15yo girl does not have "suitors", but boyfriends. I terminated the relationship because it is inappropriate for children to be having children which is where the relationship was imminently headed.



19. Re GAL's 16<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p6, ln 15): Whether the mother was reluctant to believe her daughter was snorting an illegal drug or not is immaterial to the point (which the GAL avoids stating) the other child Adeline was enticing was but 14yo. Adeline is now persona non grata w/that child's parents and a host of other parents who perceive Adeline as a threatening influence on their children as well. No candy wrapper is readily visible in the video, but the GAL is quick to accept Adeline's explanation of the scene being a prank but for the fact Adeline never arranged to have her mother see it. It was provided by the other girl's mother, Michelle Robb, a deeply concerned mother. Adeline's public stunt, if it was that, reveals a callous attitude for the law and the concerns of loving parent for their child's safety, including her own. The mother believes this was due to the father's (Mr. Feulner) influence and alienation of affections toward her mother, Heather Wood. While Ms. Wood, the child's mother, may have understandably been gulled by her daughter, Ms. Wood was not acting as a GAL. the veritable eyes and ears of the Court.

20. Re GAL's 17<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p6, ln 20): The mother was unaware Adeline was tested for pregnancy, a needless test if the child was not sexually active, an activity the mother did not condone. And while the standard disclaimer for positive marijuana test results were included, the specific details and the girl's self-serving dodge it could be attributed to use of her mother's CBD pain relief cream was highly unlikely, as a scientific fact, to explain away the indication of THC use because the test is engineered to distinguish between the two and the CBD cream would have had minimum amounts of THC contamination (if any) skewing the results. The mother now has video evidence of Adeline smoking marijuana inside her landlord's daughter's bedroom BEFORE the drug testing conducted in Providence Hospital of Lewis County. This is also evidence Adeline perjured herself before presiding judge Houser in the 8-4-23 hearing when she was sworn.

21. Re GAL's 18<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p7, ln 3): The mother takes exception to the GAL's gratuitous use of the word "recently." Neither did the mother ever use the phrase "rage episodes." The mother admitted rare incidents of being angry w/her daughter, but assured all concerned she had never laid hand on her daughter out of anger.

The GAL does not cite the name, title, or qualifications of the medical staff she references describing the tone of the mother's relationship w/her daughter, Adeline. It is unknown whether the notes come from one of the minimally trained social workers, or what historical basis serves to justify them. Was it a nurse, doctor, physician's assistant? Was it a child psychologist with expertise in parenting? We don't know from this report. What we do know is the mother is a fit parent and the Court abuses its authority in ignoring *Troxel v. Granville* in substituting its judgment for the mother's while summarily stripping her of her fundamental right to parent her child, an intolerable violation of her civil rights which the U.S. Supreme Court has noted is common in Washington State Courts' interpretation of "the best interest of the child." And, of course, the GAL's report is not sworn, but she will be subpoenaed to testify under oath, including her credentials qualifying her as an expert to give such opinions—what are they? The true expert in these proceedings is not the GAL or anonymous medical staff or the ham-handed Kitsap County Family Court, but the mother who has raised this 16yo child exclusively, alone, for the child's entire life.

**22. Re GAL's 19<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p7, ln 8):** The mother takes exception to the GAL's statement largely for the reason of omitting material facts contradicting the claim the mother was 'agreeable' to transferring care of Adeline to the man who raped Adeline when the girl was 6yo (2013). In fact, the mother initially objected to the father picking up Adeline, at least twice, only to be met w/laughter from the nurse practitioner on duty when the mother cited the father's rape of his daughter when she was 6yo. Providence Hospital staff interfered w/the mother taking her underage daughter home despite having no medical or legal basis for doing so. If that's 'consent', all things considered, then 'coercion' must be removed from the dictionary. Omission of material facts is often more pernicious than falsifying them. Often, what one does NOT hear is more important than what one does hear, such as here.

e.g. The mother's text message exchange that night w/Adeline's girlfriend, Erron on 7-20-23 @6:00 pm in re Erron's rejected offer to transport Adeline as follows: "Adeline has a positive drug test. NO rides from anyone!" Moreover, the mother provided this text to the GAL who failed to include it in her report.

**23. Re GAL's 20<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p7, ln 14):** The mother has conceded being upset on occasion w/her daughter's mendacity, and delinquent behavior. The fact the GAL attempts to utilize that despair as a basis for her pernicious conclusions/opinions is obscene and unconscionable. Every parent has experienced moments of disappointment and despondency regarding their child(ren). **THAT DOES NOT MOOT 16 YEARS OF LOVE, COMMITMENT, AND DEDICATION TO HEATHER WOOD'S DELINQUENT DAUGHTER.** What the GAL has in mind for this Court is a structured overseer of every aspect of the mother's parenting for the rest of Adeline's minority at the impoverished mom's expense and dignity. This mother can assure that won't happen because she won't participate or agree to this violation of her fundamental right to parent her daughter even over the child's objections. Parenting involves the courage to do the right thing in the interest of one's child even if the child disagrees. This Court has condoned the child's incorrigibility and mendacity. The GAL seeks to be the child's knight errant. The mother has already served notice she is not going to play the part of a straw man by withdrawing her Petition. Adeline will be fortunate to survive the excesses of this GAL and Court. This is strong, but necessary language given the above.

e.g. E-mail exchanges between the mother and Adeline on 7-30-23 @ 2:40am & 2:51am: [Heather Wood] "Dearest Love One Adeline, I want you to know I forgive you. I love you unconditionally. I'm sorry I didn't tell you sooner that I would protect you and care [no] matter what you're doing you could tell me the truth. ... No matter what you've done, no matter what you've said about me, I forgive you and it can all be fixed, it's all OK—Hormones are a lot of our moods, and so is diet. Find the divine God inside of you, dear, because God lives within you, you are God." And "Dearest Loved One Adeline, I know you have a tattoo on your finger. If there's anything else going on, please let me know. You need support around you. Sometimes situations are too big for us to handle by ourselves, I don't want you to turn to the wrong person or the wrong people for help. [Nazis] I'm sure your dad's side of the family loves you very much, and so do we—so don't throw any of us away. I love you, Mom." The mother provided this exchange to the GAL on 11-10-23.

24. Re GAL's 21<sup>st</sup> paragraph (p7, ln 21): This is a false narrative by the GAL inasmuch as her own report concedes the father does not reside w/Adeline, but w/her 94yo grandmother, and at best, occasionally calls her by phone to ask what she is or has been doing. This absentee parenting style has led to Adeline swimming in the nude at night in Long Lake on a school night (Halloween), lying to the GAL about it claiming she was partially clothed when she was NOT, getting tattooed by another child, smoking marijuana, vaping, tattooing other children, drug distribution, and sexual promiscuity. The GAL habitually describes this as a normal pattern associated w/the coming of age of a child, ignoring the extreme risk created by such behavior, not to mention criminality. In fact, the GAL often euphemizes pedophilia and trivializes Adeline's rape at 6yo by her father, attributing her "advanced sexual knowledge" to another pedophile Adeline had encountered previously when 3yo. Inter Alia, suggesting Adeline's molestation @ 6yo as trivial because she had already been molested.

25. Re GAL's 22<sup>nd</sup> paragraph (p8, ln 1): While true per se, the GAL leaves out important elements in her abbreviated/partial narrative. The order she cites was in full, not in part as she claims. She alarmingly evades the Kangaroo nature of the ensuing impromptu hearing convened sua sponte after the extrajudicial communication w/Commissioner Clucas by two local attorneys well known to him, but w/o standing in the mater, i.e. Amanda Williamson & Laura Yelish. Adeline also communicated extrajudicially w/Commissioner Clucas after she disrupted a separate hearing being conducted w/an outburst in his courtroom. Clucas advised Adeline there was nothing he could do and to return home w/her mother. Yet Adeline defied this instruction from the bench, shoved her mother on the stairwell outside the courtroom, and after listening to her father whisper into her ear, ran by her mother outside to her father's car and drove it onto the adjacent sidewalk, endangering herself and the public. The police were called as a result, and Adeline initially refused to leave the car. She was not cited. Adeline was unlicensed and negligent or worse.

The mother has repeatedly taken exception in all her pleadings to the Kangaroo Court Commissioner Clucas held sua sponte w/o even sworn testimony from the two attorneys (Yelish & Williamson) w/o standing. Nor did either parent have an opportunity to say one word, question the attorneys, or participate. Neither knew the nature or intent of the court, nor were they given any opportunity to prepare. The Court violated every known element of Due Process in the bargain, making all of its pronouncements, orders, settings, and fruit from this poisoned tree void ab initio, along w/the GAL's appointment itself. Even the Court are liable for orders and acts entered w/oi proper jurisdiction as is the case here. All principals engaged in this tainted fruit are civilly liable for their participation in egregiously violating the mother's civil rights, her child's, the father's. and virtually kidnapping Adeline w/o even the pretense of Due Process or color of law. Arguably, the public has standing to sue the miscreants as well given public money has been spent on this miscarriage of justice w/o Due Process or proper jurisdiction—a mandatory requirement under both State and federal law. The mother has not, nor can she receive a fair trial/hearing in Kitsap County. Nor does she choose to litigate her grievance and remedies in that venue. Civil liability of the defendants will be heard in a federal venue where principles of proper jurisdiction and Due Process are better understood.

26. Re GAL's 23<sup>rd</sup> paragraph (p8, ln 8): The mother has withdrawn her Petition. Judge Adams acknowledged and treated the Notice of Withdrawal as a motion to withdraw, entering her court granting it into the record. Ergo, there is no parenting plan before the Court now other than any contained in Mr. Feulner's Petition De Novoi to modify the order entered by the State of Washington in its PARENTAGE case on 12-24-07. Procedurally, the cause number being currently used is now inappropriate and the mother takes exception to it for continuing the campaign of ambiguity & confusion conducted by Mr. Feulner, along with further distribution of fruit from that poisoned tree, i.e. Commissioner Clucas' Kangaroo hearing held on 8-15-23. This objection can only be ignored by the principals at their own peril.

27. Re GAL's 24<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p8, ln 13): The mother agrees with this as stated.

28. Re GAL's 25<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p8, ln 20): The GAL routinely engages in conjecture calling for speculation. The mother's assertion/concerns as cited but ridiculed by the GAL are real. The GAL's ignorance/disbelief of them are born of her status as a stranger to my daughter, while mine are born of a lifetime of intimate familiarity. The GAL characterizes these as rumors despite the mother's documented evidence of the same, yet the GAL casually uses hearsay as a basis for her own conclusions/opinions...conclusions, opinions, and statements remaining unsworn to date. They are, by definition, unreliable and devoid of genuine expertise. They are the self-serving dreams and arguments of a knight errant rather than a genuine investigator.

29. Re GAL's 26<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p9, ln 3): Law enforcement's litmus test is the likelihood of conviction in a criminal proceeding beyond reasonable doubt absent in the instant case. Civil proceedings are governed by a different standard, i.e. the PROPONDERANCE of evidence. Any 1<sup>st</sup> year law student knows O.J. Simpson was acquitted of a criminal charge of murdering his ex-wife, but was held civilly liable for it in a subsequent civil lawsuit brought on by her family. Nancy Tarbell fails the most basic litmus test of a competent lawyer and should not be offering this court legal advice/conclusions, nor asking the Court for legal advice. She is to investigate the facts and is nobody's legal counsel, fortunately, in this cause.

30. Re GAL's 27<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p9, ln 5): Mr. Feulner's adult daughter is married to a Washington State patrolman. The fallacy of the GAL's argument here amounts to arguing the father must not have sexually abused his minor daughter because his adult daughter alleges he did not rape/abuse her, despite Ms. Wood's documented evidence and Lenard's admissions to the detective charged with investigating allegations of sexual abuse by Mr. Feulner against his 6yo daughter in 2013. The GAL's theory of this case is distorted by her misapprehensions of what a logical argument consists of. It flies in the face of common sense, but caters to her perceived mission as a knight errant. The hearsay the GAL cites illustrate the error and fallacy. It also dismisses Adeline's complaint lodged when she was 6 years old. Child molestation is difficult to prosecute precisely because there are no witnesses other than the too often exceptionally young victims unqualified to testify in a court of law. The GAL adopts the wrong standard in a civil case, thus encouraging Mr. Feulner to follow suit—a transgression on the rights of the child the father has spent considerable time coaching/grooming. So Lenard was "disappointed" when his 1<sup>st</sup> daughter smoked marijuana, but not his 2<sup>nd</sup>?

31. Re GAL's 28th paragraph (p9, ln 16): The GAL is susceptible to glib responses when Mr. Feulner utters them. Where was he when Adeline was swimming in the nude in Long Lake late one Halloween night—a school knight? Where was the father when his underage daughter was receiving a swastika and obscene tattoo from another child. Where was the father when Adeline was tattooing other children?—on the phone? Where does the father reside?—not w/ his underage daughter. Why has Mr. Feulner not been arrested or had his daughter taken from him when he does not reside with, supervise, or parent her? The GAL does not ask these questions or report them...a mandated reporter.

Contrary to the GAL's innuendo, Mr. Feulner did not restrict Adeline's driving out of a sense of responsibility or to protect her, but because the child's underwriter dropped her insurance given her propensity to get into accidents and drive onto public sidewalks at the age of 16, smoke marijuana, and engage in other scofflaw/outlaw behavior. Moreover, Mr. Feulner lied to the GAL as Adeline has been seen by family members driving since then including speeding down their driveway where young grandchildren play. Yes, the mother trusted her daughter. Now the GAL hints this was feckless and the same may be true of the father. However, a key difference is the mother DID reside w/ her daughter and was brave enough to hold her daughter accountable for her misconduct. Mr. Feulner does not, despite his claim to the contrary.

32. Re GAL's 29th paragraph (p9, ln 24): Here the GAL bases her innuendo the mother is responsible for Adeline's promiscuity and risky behavior on hearsay from unnamed sources. THIS IS THE CORE of the GAL's theory of this case: i.e. Adeline's delinquency, incorrigibility, truculence, and naivete are a consequence of the mother's neglect, yet overprotective dedication to her only daughter, Adeline. Inter alia, the mother (Ms. Wood) is TOO FIT TO BE FIT! This oxymoron is further advanced by the GAL suggesting Mr. Feulner's absentee parenting is doing Adeline some kind of favor. That the GAL is being paid on the public's dime for this kind of vacuous reasoning boggles the mind and is obnoxious to every American parent. It invites conversion of parents to the legal status of children, and transfers family oversight to the child—an invitation this Court has accepted wholeheartedly.

Here, the GAL infers the child's faults lie w/ the mother, but trivializes the father's sexual abuse and years of neglecting her welfare while he literally threatened the mother should she contemplate seeking modification of his child support obligations. Rather, the GAL virtually eulogizes the father's 'parenting'. If so, and if the father is assisting Adeline's math studies, where is the evidence of it in test scores? If the man has such good rapport w/ Adeline, why is she committing crimes tattooing minors, vaping, and smoking marijuana? Does the GAL & Court seriously believe this & distributing drugs is in the child's best interest? Does the GAL and Court believe Adeline's attempt to have her 14yo girlfriend, Keira, engage in a 3-some w/ a guy Adeline met online is in either child's best interest? Why did the GAL omit this information from her report?—the specifics. Is the Court in the habit of hiring the blind & tin eared to serve as its investigator? This knight errant has her own agenda and is no investigator. If the mother chooses to excoriate the GAL & the Court herein, it is because the Court has consistently pilloried the mom for her best efforts and vilified her in its proceedings, a witch hunt that won't go unanswered. This Court's actions have been criminal in tone and effect. Its efforts to dodge accountability via a rubber stamp GAL are noted.

**33. Re GAL's 29th paragraph (p10, ln 6):** The GAL avers Adeline 'SEEMS' to accept her father's parenting. An easy explanation of this non sequitur is there is none: parenting! It takes courage to be a parent—Mr. Feulner has none of that. The GAL continues Mr. Feulner 'SEEMS' to take responsibility for knowing her situation & being actively involved in parenting Adeline. Where is the EVIDENCE of that? His phone log? Adeline will never graduate from high school under her father's tutelage. Where is the EVIDENCE she is on track? Are the father's professed goals evidence?—a man who cannot afford to reside w/his daughter and has hidden his income from this Court and the government for decades? Where are his income tax returns to the IRS supporting his Petition De Novo? The GAL submitted nothing reflecting what Lenard's true income is. His mother promises she has taken steps to hide Lenard's true interest in her estate once she passes and influenced Adeline w/similar promises.

**34. Re GAL's 29th paragraph (p10, ln 10):** The mother contests the contention abandonment allegations are 'unsettled'. Ms. Wood has never abandoned her child, nor would she. Adeline refused to come home after her mendacity was uncovered by a hospital administered drug test and other evidence resulting from her mother's due diligence. The mother's exceedingly brief bouts of despair resulting from the abuse of process to which she has been subjected to by her daughter, the girl's father, and this Court do nothing to discount her lifetime of love, affection, and dedication to her only child. The Court's contempt for this mother's efforts and dedication to her daughter are both breathtaking and shocking. Nor will this mother bow and scrape before this Court's feigned authority or attempts to act as her overseer over her care of her own child, given her status as a fit mother. Ms. Wood is NOT too fit to be fit. Nor is this Court 'fit' to put her on trial in a virtual witch hunt. The mother notes, tellingly, the father has now reversed his position supporting Adeline's Petition for Emancipation. His pretext for doing so claims he now realizes how immature Adeline is and believes she is not prepared for emancipation—a position the mother has held all along and consistently held even in her motion for a summary judgment in the Emancipation Petition filed by her daughter. Yet this Court and the GAL cling to the myth Adeline should be in charge of her custody litigation, visitation, and parenting plan while her mother should be the one under supervision at her own expense. This makes sense only to monarchists who hide in the judiciary. Many believe America's revolution was incomplete given its importation of the King's Court to this country wholesale along w/sovereign immunity and unaccountability. The mother's trial by ordeal in this instance is no exception. In Kitsap County, when a mother has a child, the family court has a hostage.

**35. Re GAL's 30th paragraph (p10, ln 16):** On the contrary, the mother did undergo drug testing at the GAL's request; the results were negative, but no assessment accompanied the results, thus they were rejected by the GAL. Drug testing conducted on the father and Adeline both returned positive results. Those are the unmitigated facts in this case. If not, where are the test results indicating otherwise. It is black letter law under Washington's rules of evidence, if a litigant fails to present evidence at trial he/she is innocent of an allegation, the trier of fact may infer the allegation is true. The GAL wishes to rely on an assessment/opinion rather than unmitigated drug test results which were available to the GAL, but she did not include in her report. Lenard's assessment as him being in remission infers the test results were positive or he admitted using. The mother's evidence contradicts KRC's opinion/conclusions. Both Adeline and Lenard use marijuana. Adeline's is illegal.

It is illegal for Mr. Feulner to knowingly allow any of the illegal activities Adeline is engaging in w/other children. Yet, the GAL argues he knows what his daughter is doing and monitors/supervises her. If so, he is failing to protect. If he does not know, he is failing to parent. Even after being denied contact w/Adeline, the mother SEEMS to know more about Adeline's behavior than the father who falsely claims she resides w/him and he is parenting her. Remarkably, Adeline came to the attention of the Court due to her unlawful acts including negligent/reckless driving, yet blamed the mother for the child's misconduct.

36. Re GAL's 31<sup>st</sup> paragraph (p10, ln 22): The mother agrees w/this statement. Lenard was dealing marijuana before it was legalized in Washington State.

37. Re GAL's 32<sup>nd</sup> paragraph (p10, ln 24): The mother agrees as to the record of DV. However, Lenard did threaten the mother should she move to modify child support. Sexual molestation of a 6yo is DV by definition which the GAL falsely avers no official record exists indicating the same. This is a lie. Such a record exists w/WASPC which refused to produce it or comply with a subpoena demanding it, as did the KCSO. Notably, the parentage form the Court and GAL misused glaringly evades checking the box ordering the GAL to investigate such reports.

38. Re GAL's 33<sup>rd</sup> paragraph (p10, ln 25): The mother agrees w/this per the record only.

39. Re GAL's 34<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p11, ln 1): The GAL has failed to perform her duties to report on the parties' physical health as well as Adeline's. All the parties and the child have physical health issues afflicting them. The mother has stated her own health crises in open Court and in her pleadings, including being currently under a doctor's care for a life-threatening condition suspected of being related to her environment including the stress of the instant litigation. Adeline has been admitted to the hospital and Lenard has a long standing congenital/organic brain malady that limits his cognitive/social skills according to his own mother. Why the GAL has omitted these material facts or averred there are none is left to the conjecture of the Court but for the impeachment of the GAL's credibility.

40. Re GAL's 35<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p11, ln 2): Once again, the GAL illustrates her incompetence as a GAL and an attorney. The GAL trivializes Mr. Feulner's sexual abuse of his 6yo daughter, Adeline, for his own erotic gratification—an act that caused the mother to assert vigilance, particularly when combined w/Mr. Feulner's other alarming behaviors in the presence of his young daughter such as exposing her to sexually provocative violent internet videos and Playboy magazines. The mother asserts Adeline's father groomed her and suborned perjury from the child. The GAL did nothing to acquire the police report.

The GAL goes on to ridicule the mother's use of the term 'rape' in reference to Mr. Feulner's sticking his tongue inside 6yo Adeline's mouth, rubbing her genitalia and back parts. The mother stands 4-square by her 6yo daughter's complaint when the girl reported this behavior to her mom. The GAL brazenly defends Mr. Feulner's behavior on the basis he was not criminally convicted or prosecuted for the crime. Neither was Adeline convicted or prosecuted for negligent/reckless driving outside the Kitsap County Courthouse on 8-15-23, nor for tattooing minors, smoking marijuana, or perjury. The failure of Kitsap County's criminal justice system is not a proper argument/defense in a civil proceeding driven by a preponderance of the evidence standard of proof.

Rape can occur when someone engages in sexual CONDUCT with a person who cannot provide legal consent. Adeline's denial of her father's misconduct is consistent w/her lying to the GAL about swimming in the nude in Long Lake. Neither Adeline's nor her father's statements can be relied on. The GAL's cannot be relied on because she fecklessly presents unconfirmed hearsay to this Court as FACT when her claims fly in the face of actual evidence the statements (as referenced) are false.

41 . Re GAL's 36<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p11, ln 10): Here, the GAL seems to be acting as Mr. Feulner's attorney/advocate. She misconstrues the record, jurisdiction, facts, and procedural mandates. The mother takes exception to these errors. Ms. Wood filed and properly served both a Petition and Summons for a parenting plan. Mr. Feulner never filed a **Counter-Claim**, but an alternate proposed parenting plan. This occurred in 2008 & 2009, but languished until 2023 when Mr. Feulner fraudulently filed an emergency ex parte motion to strip the mother of her parental rights on 8-4-23, judge Houser presiding. Houser granted a temporary order to that effect setting a review hearing on 8-15-23 before Commissioner Clucas. Mr. Feulner took this opportunity, after heavily coaching his daughter, to have Adeline sworn in open court to denounce and slander her mother. The girl was not asked her age nor was a colloquy conducted to probe her understanding of the legal ramifications of perjury. Inter alia, the Court condoned and promoted abuse of process and alienation of affections in one fell swoop. NO EMERGENCY EXISTED. Adeline had been residing undisturbed in an RV located adjacent to her 94yo paternal grandmother's home since 7-20-23 sans Mr. Feulner. Mr. Feulner has approached and deceived the administrative office of child support enforcement, telling them his daughter no longer resided w/the mother and he now had legal CUSTODY. The mother, once she learned of this perfidy, advised the administrative office no order had modified custody, but only ordered a temporary change in residence. The mother continues to pay for Adeline's health care through her insurance. She believes Mr. Feulner has no health care plan for Adeline at all.

After Adeline's 6<sup>th</sup> birthday, neither parent was inclined to seek a parenting plan given Mr. Feulner's sexual misconduct w/his daughter, accountability for acts he was eager to avoid and fully aware of after admitting to them when asked by the investigating Sheriff's detective, thus establishing a basis for perjury in this cause and suborning the same from Adeline.

Ms. Wood served timely notice of her withdrawal of her Petition as a matter of right on all parties as well as the Court and Clerk. The Court, in turn, gratuitously granted the notice as though it was a 'motion'. Mr. Feulner responded by filing and serving a Petition De Novo and Summons on Ms. Wood. Ms. Wood timely filed a Notice/Declaration to Disqualify judge Adams from Lenard's new Petition shortly thereafter pursuant to RCW 4.12.050 as a matter of right to all parties, the Clerk, and the Court. As a matter of law, judge Adams is now not permitted to hear any proceedings involving Mr. Feulner's new Petition. Mr. Feulner has never filed a Cross-Claim under case # 07-3-1713-1. Such filings and their procedural requirements are strictly construed. It is now barred, the record closed. In any event, Ms. Wood's Petition no longer exists and Lenard's Petition must comply with all elements of Due Process, including discovery and opportunity to exercise the same.

42 . Re GAL's 37<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p11, ln 19): The GAL's innuendo is transparent, biased, w/o meaningful foundation, but a gratuitous invitation to conjecture calling for speculation. For all we



know, Adeline sat on a tack or was overcome by guilt or shocked at her mother's appearance after the strain of these proceedings on her health. However, it does serve as a measure of the caliber of the GAL's work or lack thereof. The GAL's statement is insulting and a further indice of her unprofessionalism undermining her credibility.

Ms. Tarbell is using an old dodge practiced by slippery lawyers relying on the ER stipulating spontaneous utterances have heightened credibility. But Ms. Wood is not on trial, despite the GAL's and this Court's best efforts to convert her Petition into one or a PARENTAGE case. The resulting hostile environment created and transparent ill will toward the mother for insisting on parenting her child shine the light of a thousand suns on the need for the mother to have withdrawn her petition. She has as much chance of receiving a fair trial in Kidnap County as a chicken in a hog pen.

43 . Re GAL's 38<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p12, ln 1): The mother knows of no one who has neutral feeling about child molesters. Mr. Feulner, aided and abetted by this GAL and this Court has done immeasurable irreconcilable harm to my daughter and this family. It should be abolished. The mother does not consent to an abattoir of children and families serving as her personal overseer. I want my daughter back and to be left alone by this perpetrator of injustice along w/its minions.

What Lola wants, Lola gets? Adeline wants to continue vaping. Adeline wants to smoke marijuana. Adeline wants to post videos online of her enticing a 14yo girlfriend into snorting a white powdery substance. Adeline wants to call the girl's mother, Michelle Robb, (who the GAL interviewed but reported nothing) to harass her anonymously, claiming she'd stolen her daughter's virginity. Adeline wanted to use drugs while charged with being a lifeguard for children at the Great Wolf Lodge. Adeline wanted to swim in the nude in Long Lake on Halloween night, a school night 54 miles away. Adeline wants to tattoo children and receive an obscene tattoos and swastika. Adeline wants to slander her mother in open Court under oath. Adeline wants to distribute/sell prohibited devices and banned substances to children. In fact, she has done all these things with the blessing and tender mercy of this Court egged on by Nancy Tarbell. These proceedings are both a farce and a tragedy. Adeline has become persona non grata to the parents of her childhood friends. This is hardly in her best interest. The father is not fit to parent my daughter or meet these challenges, unemployed and virtually homeless according to his submissions.

44 . Re GAL's 39<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p12, ln 7): The mother rejects out of hand the idea of placing herself under Adeline's control or her agents, including this Court. The GAL's 'Opinion' is worthless. Adeline is free to select her own counselor. I am not obliged to adopt her selection. When my daughter turns 18, she will be free of the GAL and this Court, as will I. I look forward to that day.

45 . Re GAL's 40<sup>th</sup> paragraph (p12, ln 15): It is a mother's job to protect her underage teen even from the child's own poor judgment despite the GAL's stillborn opinion. It appears to be the case the GAL is misinformed and misguided. Whatever faults the GAL finds w/the mother's parenting are trivial compared to the deluge of gasoline she and this Court poured on the alienation. The mother is the true expert on the state of her relationship w/her daughter. The GAL would not last a week w/my daughter were they under the same roof. The GAL is completely out of her depth, as is this Court when it comes to what is in the best interest of my child. Unfit? Or too fit? Both?

46 . Re GAL's 41<sup>st</sup> paragraph (p12, ln 25): Adeline does not LIVE w/her father. Hello? Nor would it be in her best interest to live w/a dissolute licentious absentee father who cannot even care for himself, let alone a 16yo rebellious teen. The GAL's opinion flies in the face of Washington child abuse laws and guidelines for proposed Parenting Plans. Moreover, her opinion is pernicious to the child as well as the mother, but encourage the father's indolence.

The GAL trivializes the magnitude of her incompetence on the mother and child by contradicting as par for the course Adeline's coming of age she earlier admitted was quite unusual. What the mother finds unusual is the depth and breadth of her child's cruelty to the mother, to say nothing of this Court and GAL encouraging it while they've summarily stripped the mother of her most fundamental right to parent her child w/o interference from a rogue State. (Troxel v. Granville)

47. Re GAL's 42<sup>nd</sup> paragraph (p13, ln 5): The mother rejects all of the GAL's recommendations as naïve and gratuitous. Adeline is effectively living as a de facto emancipated teen w/o meaningful supervision. The mother will not participate in any program controlled by this Court or GAL. It would be a violation of her heart felt religious beliefs to allow a child to disrespect her fit mother or agree to allow a Court or anyone to condone/encourage the child to do so. Inter alia, the mother rejects the Court's and GAL's efforts to substitute their opinions for the mother's decisions presumed in law to be in the child's best interest.


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.

DATED this 10th day of March, 2024, in the County of Thurston, WA.



Heather Wood

Respectfully submitted,



DATED this 10th day of March, 2024, in the County of Thurston, WA.