

SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON
COUNTY OF KITSAP

WOOD, HEATHER LYNN

Petitioner,

vs

FEULNER, LENARD RAY

Respondent.

Hon./Comm: Adams, Michelle B
Reporter: Court Reporter, FTR
Courtroom: Courtroom 201
Court Clerk: Kuja, Amy
Date: April 19, 2024
No. 07-3-01713-1

Petitioner appeared Yes ~~By Zoom~~ through/with Counsel Pro se By Zoom
Respondent appeared Yes ~~By Zoom~~ through/with Counsel Pro se By Zoom
Guardian Ad Litem appeared Kerry Stevens | Nancy Tarbell ~~By Zoom~~
State / Other appeared _____ By Zoom

THE MATTER BEFORE THE COURT Show Cause re: _____

Motion _____

Entry of Order Settlement Support Modification Status/Review JABS Review

Testimony taken: Ms. Wood - Did a motion for Show Cause / waspic for 5/13/24. Ms. Stevens - Will be out of town that weekend. Ms. Stevens here on motion to shorten time. Ms. Wood has requested her client appear for a deposition on 5/10/24 at a library. Ms. Tarbell - Agrees w/ motion to shorten time. IS filing a ~~Subpoena~~ Subpoena duces tecum. Court wants to know if we should set it over for a week and Ms. Stevens objects. Ms. Woods objects to today's hearing. Ms. Woods states it would be easy to get those documents (Amazon, Internet, bank statements, school) want interactions between school and any adult. (Court suggest continue the trial - Ms. Woods agrees and wants 18 months. Would like to mediate and come to an agreement of 50/50. Court is concerned that if she places child w/ Ms. Wood she would run away.

- Courtroom polled for _____ No response Time _____
- Default Granted
- The Court grants/denies motion. The Court takes the matter under advisement.
- Temporary Orders granted/denied. Custody Investigator/GAL appointed
- Order signed as presented. Order to be presented.
- This matter stricken/continued. Court Scheduler advised
- Court directs parties to Court Scheduler for settlement conference date/trial date/ _____
- Court sets _____ hearing at _____ am/pm on _____
- Pleadings/File taken from this hearing by _____
- Bench copies returned to _____



Date: 4/19/24

Page No. 2 of 2

In re: Heather Wood vs Lenard Feulner

Cause Nos. 07-3-01713-1

State's Clucas told her that they (mom and dad) work together and get into an ARY/treatment. Has depositions (44) all set at libraries. Wants trial mid-august. Ms. Steven's - hasn't spoken to client yet. Very stressful to the child. The longer it drags out the longer her anxiety is. All the subpoenas to all of her friends are having repercussions on her. This is going to cause more time the longer it goes. Police showed up at her work the other day and she ended up having to leave work early. Now her job is in jeopardy. She needs to move on.

Ms. Tarbell- It's problematic that Ms. Woods states it would be 17 days by the time she gets done. Maybe start July 15th. Child is very impacted by these hearings. She is in counseling but since law enforcement got involved things have really been damaged. More and More barriers are being put into place. Mr. Feulner- Child would like to be done with this sooner then later. Everything her mother is doing is harming her. He is ok with child having contact with her mother but wants counseling involved. Ms. Wood states daughter is allowed to commit crimes. She is harming other people. She has graffiti on her (tattoo). She lives in a motorhome by herself. She drove drunk. Driving many cars. She is just trying to hold her accountable.

Court- Trial will stay currently set. Grants motion to shorten time. Ms. Steven's in 40 years has never once had a parent have a child testify against herself. This is about the parenting no the child's behavior. #1 should not be required, work schedule not relevant, purchases from amazon not relevant, bank statements not relevant, tattoo issue not relevant, #8 not relevant, #9 not relevant, food stamps not relevant, Medical and Dental information records not relevant, drug testing not relevant, vaping not relevant, #14 as well is not relevant; online sex talk's not relevant, route to school not relevant, the child is allowed to have privacy. Auto record & criminal charge-not her duty to prove to her mother's case. Ms. Tarbell states subpoena to child finds that the emails between the parties (over 400 attachments) is a lot. She is asking a lot and some of the things you can't get. Some of the apps delete right after they are sent. Mr. Feulner states that the child is remodeling mom's bus. She got hungry so they left to go eat. Mother asked where they went. Mother has a tracking device on the child's phone. It's a huge burden on child. She is focused on school and work and help takes care of her grandma.

Court states that #1 Mr. Feulner to contact the school and get mother access to records. Amazon purchases minimal relevance, bank records is over broad-relevance and cost, all photo's over broad not dates and cost and miner. #6, 7, 8 & 9 child has a 5th amendment right, food stamp, not relevant, medical and dental not relevant and costs, drug tests not relevant and will be quashing subpoena, #13 & #14 5th amendment rights, #15 not allowing, if she can provide a legal basis then might look at it again, route to school not relevant, school and family denied, snapchat, Instagram is over broad #19 quashed and court also quashes Adeline's subpoena duces tecum. Court asks if there is anything else that anyone wants to talk about and all parties state no. Court is adjourned