today?

A It says what it says. But you're asking me what he needed to do to participate in a --

Q All right.

A -- video call. And I don't know what that was.

Q With regard to the CBX, you testified earlier that you researched that, correct?

A I think I did it after this. This is kind of the first time I heard about --

Q But your testimony --

A -- the CBX.

Q -- was that you go through a tunnel straight to the Tijuana airport and that it is viewed as safer?

A Yeah, I think I --

Q Do you --

A -- understand -- I got that information after all this happened.

Q So -- well, you had the emails included and forwarded. There was also some phone conversation on all of this, wasn't there?

A Yes.

Q And part of that was that Enrique buys the CBX tickets at the -- the tunnel when he goes through. Do you recall that?

A That's what you are proposing. I agree with that --

Q And you came back --

A -- yeah.

Q -- and said that, "Well, you can also purchase them in

advance online," correct?

A Right.

Q And then you got the email from me saying, "Look, Enrique's position is that she will just put some other wall up. If she purchases the CBX tickets, he will reimburse her at the exchange." Correct?

A Right. Uh-huh.

Q Okay. Your client wouldn't do that, would she?

A She would not buy the CBX tickets, right.

Q Okay. So that could have resolved the entire thing, couldn't it?

A No, because he wouldn't have been -- he wouldn't have provided his itinerary.

Q We've just read the definition of itinerary.

A I -- I'm reading it on page 180.

Q On page 13 of the decree it says what the itinerary is, correct?

A Correct. And it was clarified in the conference call on the -- on March 15, 2023 that the CBX tickets are part of the itinerary.

Q It was also clarified that there was no order and the parties were expected to follow the orders of the court, correct?

A Well, no. There was an order. There's a written order in this parenting plan, and it was clarified at this --

Q That phone --

A -- conference call.

Q -- conference that day, the court made it very clear -- actually,

850

it wasn't the court. The Judge made it very clear to you and I that there was no orders issuing, that this was her attempting to assist us, correct?

A Right. To clarify --

Q Okay.

A -- that --

Q And that the parties were expected to follow the orders of this court, correct?

A Correct.

Q Okay.

MR. GHIBAUDO: Let me object -- well, let me ask -- because the Court can kind of take judicial notice of what happened. Was it a clarification of the order or was it not, Your Honor? Was that conference --

THE COURT: I can't testify, Mr. Ghibaudo.

MR. GHIBAUDO: Was that -- well, that puts me in a pickle. Was that a clarification or is it not?

THE COURT: I can't testify, Mr. Ghibaudo.

MR. GHIBAUDO: All right.

BY MR. GRIMES:

Q Mr. Childs, do you also agree that based on this, the discussion of using video call and -- and TalkingParents was not part of the phone conversation with the judge, correct?

A No, I do not agree with that. There had to be -- there had to be communication --

Q I understand.

A -- so.

Q I'm talking about the TalkingParents' video call. Because we actually addressed that in the emails as well?

A Right.

Q Okay.

A There had to be communication.

Q That was an issue that you and Luba raised after the phone call, correct?

A Absolutely not, because -- no.

Q Can you turn to Exhibit 4LS0174?

A Yes.

Q "Here's my summary of the Judge's ruling." You see that email, correct?

A Uh-huh. Yeah.

Q The last one, "Although not addressed, can they just agree to using TalkingParents' video app for the calls?" That was not --

A Yeah.

Q -- addressed in that call, correct? Or in the phone call --

A It was addressed --

Q -- with the judge?

A It was addressed because it said there had to be communication.

Q All right. Is it your testimony then that in that conversation, using the video app within TalkingParents, was discussed?

A I don't recall. Apparently not because it says, "Although not

052

EXHIBIT C

EXHIBIT C

person in the department. The Court having heard arguments of Counsel and reviewed the pleadings on file herein hereby Orders as follows:

THE COURT FINDS that according to the testimony presented today, there is clear and convincing evidence of a single act of unlawful detaining, in violation of NRS 125(c)(7) specifically willful detaining of the minor child on March 15, 2023, vacation timeshare that was owed to Defendant. A trial date is set to hear the complete testimony, review all exhibits, and determine whether or not that presumption has been overcome by Plaintiff.

NOW THEREFORE,

THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS AND STIPULATED BY THE PARTIES that Plaintiff/Ms. Snow will pay for a passport card for the child. Plaintiff will hold the minor child's Passport Card and Defendant/Mr. Gonzales will hold the minor child's Passport book. If Plaintiff travels to a location internationally that the book would be necessary for the minor child, Defendant will turn over the Passport book and vice versa.

STATUTORY NOTICES

Approved by Presiding Judge Pursuant to EDCR 5.707

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that pursuant to NRS 125C.0045(6):

PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF ORDER: THE ABDUCTION, CONCEALMENT OR DETENTION OF A CHILD IN VIOLATION OF THIS ORDER IS PUNISHABLE AS A CATEGORY D FELONY AS PROVIDED IN NRS 193.130. NRS 200.359 provides that every person having a limited right of custody to a child or any parent having

EXHIBIT D

EXHIBIT D

The Court FINDS this factor does not apply to this case.

c. Which parent is more likely to allow the child to have frequent associations and a continuing relationship with the noncustodial parent.

The Court FINDS Luba has interfered with Enrique's vacations to visit his family in Mexico by withholding the child in March 2023, demanding daily video contact with the child while the child was to be in Enrique's custody in Mexico, and sending letters to the Air B&Bs at which Enrique was scheduled to stay to verify his reservations. The Court FINDS Luba's claim she had concerns about the child's safety in Mexico NOT CREDIBLE in light of Luba taking the child to Mexico on a scheduled vacation three (3) months later or, in June 2023. The Court FINDS Luba's showed awareness of her interference with Enrique's parent-child relationship though *only* in the context of on-going litigation.

The Court FINDS Luba did not dispute Enrique does not interfere with her vacation requests with the child even when she fails to provide him with a full itinerary. The Court further FINDS Luba withheld the child from Enrique on Father's Day, 2023, by scheduling her vacation to Mexico with her husband on his ordered holiday then refusing to accommodate Enrique's request for compensatory visitation.

The Court FINDS Luba provided one example of Enrique withholding the child from her for three (3) days in 2021 after he filed an emergency motion alleging she abused and neglected the child. The Court FINDS Luba grudgingly agreed Enrique returned the child to her as ordered. The Court further FINDS Luba did not allege Enrique withheld the child from her at any other time prior to order following the incident in 2021 related to his emergency motion concerning abuse and neglect of the child. The Court FINDS that, even though Enrique disagrees with the CPS findings regarding Luba's behavior, he obeys the Court custody orders.

Therefore, the Court FINDS Enrique is the parent more likely to allow the child to have frequent associations and a continuing relationship with Luba.

Accordingly, the Court FINDS this factor favors Enrique.

d. The level of conflict between the parents.

The Court FINDS Enrique testified he does not trust Luba at all and will not be in the same room with her because she constantly brings him back to court. The Court FINDS Luba has filed twenty-three (23) motions causing Enrique to litigate since the beginning of this case, which is an exceptionally high number of motions for any case within a six

EXHIBIT E

EXHIBIT E

should not be Appointed to this Case at the Parties' Expense pursuant to NRCP 53(b)(a). Responsive pleadings to the Order to Show Cause are due not later than June 26, 2023. Hearing on the Order to Show Cause is scheduled for August 3, 2023.

This matter is also scheduled for an August 31, 2023 Order to Show Cause hearing based on Enrique's March 20, 2023 Emergency Motion for Return of the Child, for an Order to Show Cause and for Referral to the District Attorney for Criminal Charges. See Order to Show Cause (filed March 20, 2023); see also Order after April 6, 2023 Hearing (filed June 6, 2023).

LUBA'S MOVING PAPERS

The Requests for Additional Orders

In her April 27, 2023 motion, Luba seeks an Order to Show Cause for 110 alleged violations. In the context of her request for an Order to Show Cause, Luba requested additional orders enter to include: 1) an order for detailed travel itinerary for international travel to include modification to preclude travel to any 'Do not Travel' or 'Reconsider Travel' countries and addition of precluding on foot crossing as well as CBX border crossing ticket proofs; 2) an order for video communication with the child via Talking Parents on Mondays and Fridays at 7PM as well as Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays during specified Summer and Winter Break time periods and during any international travel; 3) a school selection request for the child to attend [redacted] Academy Charter School effective for the [redacted] academic year; and 4) an order changing the minor child's name to Snow-Gonzalez.

The Court FINDS, as Enrique argued in his May 5, 2023 Opposition and Countermotion, Luba failed to provide points and authorities in support of her requests for additional orders and/or modifications. See EDCR 5.503(a)(every motion shall include points and authorities supporting each position asserted). Further, the Court FINDS Luba has requested modification

055

EXHIBIT F

EXHIBIT F

[redacted]

Fw: Gonzalez divorce Case # D-18-575860-D

[redacted]

Here's my summary of the judge's ruling

Has to be communication
CBX tickets to be provided -going & coming
No travel out of Nueva Leon
Communication - every night at 20:00 for 5 - 10 minutes. Non-custodial parent initiates.
Although not addressed - can they just agree to use talking parents video app for the calls?

Please advise.

BENJAMIN B. CHILDS, ESQ.
[redacted]

Important Notice: Privileged and/or confidential information, including attorney-client communication may be contained in this message. This message is intended only for the individual directed. Any dissemination, transmission, distribution, copying or other use, or taking any action in reliance on this message by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited and illegal. If you receive this message in error, please delete. Nothing herein is intended to constitute an electronic signature unless a specific statement to the contrary is included in this message.

[redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 8:11 AM
[redacted]
Subject: Re: Gonzalez divorce Case # D-18-575860-D

I'll call you in 5

BENJAMIN B. CHILDS, ESQ.
[redacted]

[redacted]

Fw: Gonzalez divorce Case # D-18-575860-D

[redacted]

As soon as we have confirmation that these two tasks are completed, Luba will be at the exchange point within 45 minutes.

BENJAMIN B. CHILDS, ESQ.
[redacted]

Important Notice: Privileged and/or confidential information, including attorney-client communication may be contained in this message. This message is intended only for the individual directed. Any dissemination, transmission, distribution, copying or other use, or taking any action in reliance on this message by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited and illegal. If you receive this message in error, please delete. Nothing herein is intended to constitute an electronic signature unless a specific statement to the contrary is included in this message.

[redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 8:54 AM
[redacted]
Subject: RE: Gonzalez divorce Case # D-18-575860-D

We agree to talking parents calls this week only… this is not a permanent change… we can address that after this week.

Enrique will purchase the CBX tickets and provide copies.

Will she be exchanging the child?
[Quoted text hidden]

[redacted]

Fw: Gonzalez divorce Case # D-18-575860-D

[redacted]

Here's the passport, so that eliminates that objection.
If he does it all the time, he would certainly know whether it's required or not.

BENJAMIN B. CHILDS, ESQ.
[redacted]

Important Notice: Privileged and/or confidential information, including attorney-client communication may be contained in this message. This message is intended only for the individual directed. Any dissemination, transmission, distribution, copying or other use, or taking any action in reliance on this message by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited and illegal. If you receive this message in error, please delete. Nothing herein is intended to constitute an electronic signature unless a specific statement to the contrary is included in this message.

[redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 9:34 AM
[redacted]
Subject: RE: Gonzalez divorce Case # D-18-575860-D

I just looked up the CBX issue and it does not appear that Passport is required. However, Enrique believes she will simply put up another barrier. She can either pay for the CBX and they reimburse at the exchange... or they will provide after they receive [redacted]

Talking Parents video has been enabled.

[Quoted text hidden]
BellaPassport031523.pdf

[redacted]

Fw: Gonzalez divorce Case # D-18-575860-D

[redacted]

Your assumption is noted and denied.

I assume you are advising him NOT to buy the CBX ticket and provide proof to Luba.
And since you have not denied that video option has NOT been initiated with Talking Parents, that's an admission that it has NOT been enabled.

BENJAMIN B. CHILDS, ESQ.
[redacted]

Important Notice: Privileged and/or confidential information, including attorney-client communication may be contained in this message. This message is intended only for the individual directed. Any dissemination, transmission, distribution, copying or other use, or taking any action in reliance on this message by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited and illegal. If you receive this message in error, please delete. Nothing herein is intended to constitute an electronic signature unless a specific statement to the contrary is included in this message.

[redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 9:44 AM
[redacted]
Subject: RE: Gonzalez divorce Case # D-18-575860-D

I am assuming that you are advising your client not to exchange the child. Please be aware we are going to file a Motion for an OSC. My client have now left and are picking up their daughter and going on vacation. If your client chooses to be reasonable in the next 15-20 minutes have her contact them via talking parents.

We have complied with your demands and yet you just set more obstacles.

And... as I read this your client is stating that my client is lying and has not enabled video... he has and I have confirmed. Your client is simply not going to follow orders or even the direction of the Judge. I have a hearing now... and I cannot continue the back and forth.

[Quoted text hidden]

[redacted]

Fw: Gonzalez divorce Case # D-18-575860-D

[redacted]

Plus, as of 09:39, he has NOT enabled video call option on Talking Parents. See attached.

Here's at least my preliminary finding.
In his pyche report [attached], Enrique desribed being "almost kidnapped" by people with ties to the cartel and he "witnessed his cousin being shot when he was working in a pawnshop with this stepfather". [Page 7]
The stepfather who is abusive to him [Page 6]
And apparently his entire family is abusive , including his aunt and uncle. [Page 7]

So he's emphatic about taking the child to visit his abusive family.

BENJAMIN B. CHILDS, ESQ.
[redacted]

Important Notice: Privileged and/or confidential information, including attorney-client communication may be contained in this message. This message is intended only for the individual directed. Any dissemination, transmission, distribution, copying or other use, or taking any action in reliance on this message by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited and illegal. If you receive this message in error, please delete. Nothing herein is intended to constitute an electronic signature unless a specific statement to the contrary is included in this message.

[redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 9:38 AM
[Quoted text hidden]
MST9A32.pdf, BellaTalking Parents031523.pdf