Good Client 123 W 4567 S Orem, Utah 84058 (801) 123-4567 goodclient@email.com Petitioner Pro Se

IN THE FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF UTAH, STATE OF UTAH

GOOD CLIENT,

Petitioner,

VS.

OPPOSING PARTY,

Respondent.

OBJECTION TO RESPONDENT'S PROPOSED PARENTAGE DECREE AND JUDGMENT

Case No. 123456789

Judge: Lund

Commissioner: Petersen

Petitioner, Good Client (hereinafter referred to as "Petitioner" or "Mr. Client"), proceeding in this matter *pro se*, hereby files this "Objection to Respondent's Proposed Parentage Decree and Judgment" (hereinafter referred to as this "Objection"), pursuant to Rule 7(j)(4) of the Utah Rules of Civil Procedure, and against the above-captioned Respondent, Opposing Party (hereinafter referred to as "Respondent" or "Ms. Party), and in contemplation of the best interest of the parties' minor child in this matter, whose initials are J.I.S. (who will be referred to as "J.I.S." throughout this Objection). In support of this Objection, Petitioner objects, states, and alleges as follows:

OBJECTION NO. 1

1. Rule 7(j)(2) of the Utah Rules of Civil Procedure states, in part, that "a party must serve the proposed order on the other parties for review and approval as to form." However, Respondent never served her "Proposed Parentage Decree and Judgment" (hereinafter referred to

as the "Proposed Order"), neither before nor after filing, upon Petitioner for review and approval as to form and substance. Petitioner was never served notice of the Proposed Order or sent a copy of it by Respondent. Respondent never even mentioned to Petitioner at all that she had filed the Proposed Order. Petitioner obtained a copy of the Proposed Order only after emailing selfhelp@utcourts.gov requesting the documents filed by Respondent. Having received the Proposed Order—again, not through Respondent but by using the Self Help website (selfhelp@utcourts.gov)—and having read and contemplated the Proposed Order, Petitioner hereby disapproves Respondent's Proposed Order as to form and substance. Petitioner adamantly and specifically objects to the form and substance of Respondent's Proposed Order, as further detailed and expounded upon, and addressing each paragraph of Respondent's Proposed Order, in Objection No. 3 hereinbelow.

OBJECTION NO. 2

2. Rule 7(j)(5)(A) of the Utah Rules of Civil Procedure states that "[t]he party preparing a proposed order must file it . . . after all other parties have approved the form on the order . . ." (emphasis added). However, Respondent never served the Proposed Order upon Petitioner for review and approval as to form before filing, but Respondent filed the Proposed Order regardless, in violation of the rules of civil procedure. Petitioner eventually obtained a copy of the Proposed Order by requesting it from the Self Help website (selfhelp@utcourts.gov); Petitioner never received the Proposed Order from Respondent. Having received the Proposed Order—again, Respondent but through by using the Self Help website not (selfhelp@utcourts.gov)—and having read and contemplated the Proposed Order, Petitioner hereby disapproves Respondent's Proposed Order as to form and substance. Petitioner adamantly

and specifically **objects** to the form and substance of Respondent's Proposed Order, as further detailed and expounded upon, and addressing each paragraph of Respondent's Proposed Order, in Objection No. 3 hereinbelow.

OBJECTION NO. 3

3. Petitioner hereby **objects** to the form and substance of the following paragraphs of Respondent's Proposed Order:

Note: For the sake of clarity and ease of reference, a table is provided below with two columns: on the left column is a *verbatim* (with mistakes and all) restatement of the individual paragraphs of Respondent's Proposed Order—in Arial font, font size 11, and single-spaced—and on the right column are Petitioner's responses and objections to the specific individual paragraphs of Respondent's Proposed Order—in Times New Roman font, font size 12, and double-spaced.

	Respondent's Proposed Order	Petitioner's Responses and Objections
	1. Good Client and Opposing Party are the legal parents of the following children. This	1. No objection. The parties' child is
	court has jurisdiction to make orders about	hereinafter referred to as J.I.S.
	these children.	7 600
	a. J.I.S., Born 08/31/2005	0.0
	2. Good Client is awarded sole legal and sole physical custody of the children.	2. Objection. Due to Respondent's abuse
	Opposing Party will have parent-time at	of J.I.S., Respondent should have supervised
	reasonable times and places.	of 3.1.5., Respondent should have supervised
		visitations.
	3. The parents will follow a custom parent-	3. Objection. Due to Respondent's abuse
	time schedule.	
	The children will live with Good Client and	of J.I.S., Respondent should have supervised
	will have parent-time with Opposing Party	visitations with an approved supervisor, and
	according to a custom parent-time schedule.	approved supprinted, and
	Good Client will be the "custodial" parent:	the visitations should not exceed 48 hours at a
	Parties have agreed that JIS will visit	
	Opposing at Good's expense for 14 days	time. It is simply too dangerous to J.I.S.'s
Į	every year June 1-15, 2022, and June 1-15,	

Respondent's Proposed Order	Petitioner's Responses and Objections
2023	health to leave J.I.S. alone with Respondent.

4. The parents will follow the schedule for special occasions below. If there is more than one child and the children's school schedules vary for purpose of a holiday, at the option of the parent exercising the holiday or the parent's half of the holiday, the children may remain together for the holiday period beginning the first evening that all children's schools are let out for the holiday and ending the evening before any child returns to school. (Utah Code 30-3-35, 35.1).

Special Occasion	Parent-Time Schedule
Labor Day Weekend	No parent time
Columbus Day	No parent time
Weekend	
Fall School Break	
(If applicable, commonly known as U.E.A. weekend)	No parent time
Halloween	No parent time
Veterans' Day	No parent time
Thanksgiving Break	Call of at least one hour

(table continued below)

4. **Objection.** Due to Respondent's abuse of J.I.S., it is not safe for J.I.S. to spend more than two days with Respondent.

In Respondent's table provided in this paragraph 4, under "Summer School Break / Vacation," Respondent states that she should have parent-time with J.I.S. for 14 days every year. However, due to Respondent's abuse of J.I.S., Petitioner adamantly and specifically **objects** to Respondent's desired parent-time of 14 days with J.I.S., because it is not safe for J.I.S. to spend more than two days with Respondent.

Winter Break	No parent time
Christmas Eve	No parent time
Christmas Day	A call of at least one hour
New Year's Eve	Call of at least one hour
New Year's Day	Call of at least one hour
Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.	No parent time
Day Weekend	
Presidents' Day Weekend	No parent time
Spring School Break	No parent time
Mother's Day	A call of at least one hour
Memorial Day Weekend	No parent time
Father's Day	Good will have the entire day
Summer School Break /	14 days every year at Mr. Client's expense June 1-15, 2022, and
Vacation	June 1-15, 2023
Independence Day	No parent time
Pioneer Day	No parent time

Dognandant's Drana	sad Order	Petitioner's Responses and Objections	
Respondent's Propo Children's Birthdays	A call of at least or	•	
Good Client's Birthday	Good Client will birthday from 3:00 p delivers the child to take precedence of Mother's Day and I over uninterrupted time takes the chuninterrupted extend	have parent-time each year on Good Client's o.m. until the following morning when Good Client school, or 8:00 a.m. if there is no school. Birthdays wer holidays and extended parent-time, except rather's Day. Birthdays do not take precedence parent-time if the parent exercising uninterrupted ild away from that parent's residence for the ded parent-time.	
Opposing Party's Birthday	call of at least one		
Pick-up and drop-off children for parent-time will b below:	•	5. No objection.	
for parent-time.	No arrangements can be made at this time for who will pick up, deliver and return the children for parent-time.		
6. The school the child based on Good Client's home Client has authority to check	e residence. Good	6. No objection.	
of school. Good Client has a		n during school.	
7. Parents will communi	cate with each	7. Objection. Both parties should be	
other by:			
By telephone:		mutually restrained to only discuss matters	
Good Client's phone:	(801) 123-4567	related to J.I.S.	
Opposing Party's pho	ne: (801) 123-4567		
By letter			
By email:			
Good Client's email: ç	goodclient@email.c	om	
Opposing Party's ema	Opposing Party's email: opposingparty@email.com		
Other method of communication:			
Good Client to limit his calls to matters that pertain to child.			
8. The parents will:		8. Objection. It is not safe for J.I.S. to	
 provide age-appropr children to communic parent. 	-	have private communications with Respondent,	
parent.		because Respondent would abuse the privacy,	
give the children pr	ivacy during their		

Petitioner's Responses and Objections Respondent's Proposed Order communication with the other parent. and would be emotionally and psychologically The parents will not interfere with or monitor communication between the abusive to J.I.S. Respondent's abuse of J.I.S. children and the other parent. caused J.I.S. to attempt suicide three times. Parents and children may communicate with each other whenever the children choose. Therefore, it is not safe for J.I.S. to have private communications with Respondent, unless J.I.S. desires to have private communications with Respondent. 9. Other terms regarding records and 9. **Objection.** Respondent should have no information sharing: say as to any doctors, medical providers, or Mr. Client will provide copy of grades within 48 hours of receiving them. Mr. Client treatments with regard to J.I.S. Respondent has will keep JIS at Primary Children's Hospital where specialist is for JIS bleeding disorder. used this power in the past to control and Mrs. Opposing Party and Mr. Client must approve of the therapist the JIS will see a manipulate J.I.S. and the doctors. Respondent minimum of twice a month. has changed J.I.S.'s therapists over twelve times in four years because she did not like the therapists telling Respondent to make changes to help J.I.S. Respondent has a well-established history of not acting in the best interest of J.I.S. 10. During their parent-time, the parent 10. **Objection.** Petitioner no longer agrees may consent for the children to travel with a sports team, religious group, school group, to a long, two-week yearly visit between J.I.S. relatives, friends, by themselves, or with others. Respondent because would and Other agreements about travel by the detrimental to J.I.S.'s mental health and children: At Mr. Client's expense he will provide a roundtrip flight JIS out for a yearly general wellbeing. It is in the very best interest visit on June1-15, 2022 and June 1-15, 2023 of J.I.S. to *not* see Respondent. 11. Other about terms relocating: 11. No objection.

Opposing Party lives 2,000 miles away.

Respondent's Proposed Order Petitioner's Responses and Objections 12. If either parent lives more than 149 12. **Objection.** Respondent moved out of miles away from the other or the parents live in separate countries, costs for the children's Utah without giving Petitioner notice, so, since travel expenses for parent-time will be paid by Good Client. Respondent is the one who moved out of Utah, If a parent has been found in contempt for Respondent should pay any travel expenses. not being current on all support obligations, and they do not have primary physical care of the child, they will be responsible for the child's related travel expenses. Reimbursement for the child's travel expenses must be made within 30 days of receipt of documents detailing those expenses. 13. Good Client's gross monthly for child 13. **Objection.** Petitioner's gross monthly support purposes is \$100,000.00. His base child support amount using the sole custody income is \$5,000.00, most definitely not calculation is \$5,908.00 per month. He receives the following gross monthly income: \$100,000.00. Petitioner is unsure as to how or a. Good Client is employed at Selfwhere Respondent got the ridiculous figure of employed . He earns \$100,000.00 gross (pretax) monthly income working a 40-hour a week \$100,000.00 per month from. iob or less. 14. Opposing Party's gross 14. No objection. monthly income for child support purposes is \$0.00. Her base child support amount using the sole custody calculation is \$30.00 per month. She receives the following gross monthly income: a. Opposing Party does not have any countable income from any source. 15. Opposing Party is ordered to pay child 15. No objection. support to Good Client as follows: a. \$30.00 per month base support. This amount complies with the Utah Child Support Act. Unless the court orders otherwise, support for each child ends when: a child turns 18 or has graduated from high school during the child's normal and expected year of graduation, whichever occurs later, or • a child dies, marries, becomes a member of the United States armed forces, or is emancipated (Utah Code 78A-6-801). 16. Once a child is no longer eligible to 16. No objection. receive child support, the support amount for the eligible children will be recalculated using the child support worksheet (Utah Code 78B-12-202 et seq.). The parties may not divide the base child support award by the number of children

and subtract that amount from the prior child support amount.

Respondent's Proposed Order	Petitioner's Responses and Objections
17. Child support will be paid as follows:	17. No objection.
Parties will decide on a date	
18. The sole custody worksheet was used to calculate child support.	18. Objection. Petitioner's gross monthly
Good Client's base child support	income is \$5,000.00, so it is impossible that his
amount is \$5,908.00 per month.	base child support amount be \$5,908.00.
 Opposing Party's base child support amount is \$30.00 per month. 	Respondent used the ridiculous figure of
If physical custody of a child changes from what the court orders:	\$100,000.00 per month as Petitioner's gross
The parent owing support must pay the	monthly income, which is how Respondent
support amount to whomever has physical custody of the child.	arrived at the absurd figure of \$5,908.00 per
The parent must pay the support	month in base child support for Petitioner.
amount without asking the court to modif	y the child support order.
 This does not apply to temporary parent- 	time changes. (Utah Code 78B-12-108).
19. If a child lives with the non-custodial parent by court order or written agreement of	19. No objection.
the parties for:	
	ld support will be reduced by 50% for each child luring that time. (Utah Code 78B-12-216(1)(a)).
 12 of any 30 consecutive days, base child support will be reduced by 25% for each child who lives with the non-custodial parent during that time. (Utah Code 78B-12-216(1)(b)). 	
The custodial parent's normal parent-time interruption of the consecutive day requirement.	and holiday parent-time do not count as an
20. If a child receives cash assistance through the T.A.N.F. or F.E.P. programs, any	20. No objection.
agreement by the parties to reduce child suppor by the Office of Recovery Services.	t during extended parent-time must be approved
21. The person ordered to receive child support can request mandatory income	21. No objection.
	. If support is past due, the State of Utah may d apply the amounts to the child support owed.
	covery Services (ORS) until all past-due support
lo pala. Offila support paymonto will be soft to.	

Respondent's Proposed Order Petitioner's Responses and Objections Office of Recovery Services PO Box 45011 Salt Lake City, Utah 84145-0011 unless ORS gives notice that payments must be sent elsewhere. If ORS begins mandatory income withholding, child support is due on the first day of each month and will be past due on the first day of the next month. 22. Good Client and Opposing Party will 22. **Objection.** Since Respondent is to pay each pay half of any ORS fee. If a fee is withheld from payments to Opposing Party, child support to Petitioner, Respondent should Good Client will reimburse Opposing Party for half the fee. If a fee is withheld from payments solely be the one to pay any ORS fees. The to Good Client, Opposing Party will reimburse Good Client for half the fee. parties should not share any ORS fees. 23. The issue of past-due child support 23. No objection.

any change in their income as follows: It has
been agreed that parties will work out child support matters on their own since Opposing is
disabled and recovering from cancer

25. The parties can ask to change this child support order by motion after three years

decided by future court

24. The parties must notify each other of

25. No objection.

24. No objection.

- from the date of its entry if:
 - there is a difference of 10% or more between the amount previously ordered and the new amount of child support under the Utah child support guidelines,
 - the difference is not temporary, and
 - the amount previously ordered was not a deviation from the child support guidelines. (Utah Code 78B-12- 210(8)).

If the children receive TANF funds at the time an adjustment is sought, ORS will review the order and ask the court to adjust the amount if appropriate. (Utah Code 62A-11-306.2).

26. The parties can ask to change this child support order at any time by petition if

26. No objection.

there has been a substantial change in circumstances because of material changes in:

custody

may be

administrative action.

- the relative wealth or assets of the parties
- income of a parent of 30% or more
- the employment potential and ability of a parent to earn
- the medical needs of the child or
- the legal responsibilities of either parent for the support of others. (Utah Code 78B-12-

Respondent's Proposed Order

Petitioner's Responses and Objections

210(7) and (9)).

The change must result in a difference of 15% or more between the amount previously ordered and the new amount of child support under the Utah child support guidelines. The difference may not be temporary.

The court can consider natural or adoptive children born after the entry of the decree other than those in common to both parties as part of a request to modify an existing award subject to limitations in the law. (Utah Code 78B-12-210(7)).

27. The parents may claim the parties' children as dependents/exemptions for tax purposes as follows: Good Client will solely claim JIS in exchange he will pay Opposing Party a one-time fee of \$3,500 made due upon the settling of case

27. **Objection.** Petitioner is not willing to

pay \$3,500.00 to Respondent. Respondent has

little to no financial responsibility over J.I.S.,

so Respondent should receive no tax benefit as it pertains to J.I.S. It would be neither fair nor equitable to have Petitioner pay Respondent any money for this matter; Respondent does not deserve it, and it is not warranted.

28. Good Client must maintain medical, hospital, and dental care insurance for the

28. No objection.

dependent children if it is available at reasonable cost.

- a. If, at any time, a dependent child is covered by the medical, hospital, or dental insurance plans of both parents, the coverage will be as follows:
 - Good Client's insurance will be primary coverage.
 - Opposing Party's insurance will be secondary coverage.
- b. If a parent remarries and that parent's dependent child is not covered by that parent's health, hospital, or dental insurance plan but is covered by a stepparent's plan, the coverage will be as follows:
 - Good Client spouse's insurance will be primary coverage.
 - Opposing Party spouse's insurance will be secondary coverage.
- c. Both parties will equally share the out-of-pocket costs of the insurance premiums.
- d. Both parties will equally share all uninsured and unreimbursed medical and dental expenses that are reasonable and necessary. This includes deductibles, co-insurance, and co-payments paid by a party for the dependent children.
- e. The party who pays health care expenses must provide the other party written

	Respondent's Proposed Order	Petitioner's Responses and Objections
	verification of the cost and payment within 30 days.	
f.	f. If a party does not follow this order and provide written verification, they may not be able to receive credit for health care expenses or recover the other party's share of the expenses.	
g.	g. On or before January 2 of each year, the party ordered to maintain coverage must provide verification of coverage to the other party, and ORS, if they are involved.	
h.	h. If there is any change in coverage, within 30 days of the change the party ordered to maintain coverage must notify the other party and ORS, if they are involved.	
29	. Neither party has received or is	
	ing public assistance from the State of	
Utah.		
30	. The parties will sign all documents	30. No objection.
neces	sary to comply with the parentage	
decree within 60 days from entry of the decree. If a party fails to sign a document within 60 days, the other party may ask the court to appoint someone to sign the document. (Utah Rule of Civil Procedure 70)		

OBJECTION NO. 4

- 4. Respondent should *absolutely not* be granted any parent-time or visitation rights over J.I.S., because Respondent is a significant danger to J.I.S.'s wellbeing, as evidenced by the following listed occurrences of abuse on the part of Respondent (and Respondent's wife) against J.I.S., as well as other important factors to consider listed below:
 - a. J.I.S. has suffered severe mental, physical, emotional, and psychological abuse while under Respondent's care during the past seven years.
 - b. There was an instance involving Respondent threatening physical harm against J.I.S. with a hammer.
 - c. Respondent's wife has hit and harmed J.I.S. in the past.

- d. On or about July 9, 2021, J.I.S. attempted to commit suicide by swallowing all of her remaining Zoloft at once. This was J.I.S.'s third suicide attempt in the past twelve months while in the care of Respondent.
- e. J.I.S. spent nine days in a residential psychiatric facility following the above incident.
- f. After the J.I.S. was released from the residential psychiatric facility, Petitioner brought J.I.S. back to Utah to reside with Petitioner during the 2021 – 2022 school year.
- g. J.I.S.'s physical, mental, emotional, and psychological health, and overall constitution of her person and wellbeing in general, have dramatically improved since she began living with Petitioner. J.I.S. is no longer subjected to the cruel, unusual, and recurrent abuse of Respondent.
- h. J.I.S. refuses to go back to Respondent and be in Respondent's care on a permanent basis at the conclusion of the school year, or at any time in the future. J.I.S, does not wish to go back to live with Respondent ever, under any circumstances.
- i. It is Petitioner's belief that it is practically inexorable that J.I.S. may attempt any number of dangerous behaviors, including another suicide attempt, if forced to return to live with Respondent.
- j. J.I.S. has experienced, and continues to experience, panic attacks and severe anxiety at the very thought of returning to live with Respondent.
- k. Respondent regularly, four or more times per week, threatened to hit J.I.S.

- 1. Respondent has inflicted severe psychological harm upon J.I.S., and has inflicted J.I.S. with cruel and unusual punishment, as illustrated by the following experience: One day, Respondent was punishing Child, who is a child who was put in Respondent's custody from March of 2020 until July of 2021, whom J.I.S. views as a sibling—although they are not related, nor is Child a child of Respondent, but instead Child's mother signed over the guardianship of Child to Respondent—who is four years old, who was punished by Respondent by having her squat for thirty or more minutes, and by spanking her. J.I.S. stepped in to protect Child, and told Respondent that the punishment she was inflicting upon Child was excessive and that she should stop. Respondent responded by telling Child that every time J.I.S. said anything, Child's punishment would be increased. These cruel games and manipulations on the part of Respondent have severely psychologically harmed J.I.S. and Child. Furthermore, J.I.S. and Child were punished by not being allowed to talk to each other, touch each other, or hug each other for up to two weeks at a time. These cruel and unusual psychological punishments on the part of Respondent strongly warrant that Petitioner be granted the sole physical custody and the sole legal custody over J.I.S., in order to protect J.I.S. from Respondent and to promote J.I.S.'s best interests.
- m. Preceding J.I.S.'s suicide attempt of July 8, Respondent took "blessed" oil into J.I.S.'s room and began "blessing" all of J.I.S.'s possessions in order to make Satan "leave this house." Furthermore, Respondent repeatedly told J.I.S.

that she would never be allowed to live with her father, Petitioner. These crazy, bizarre, incoherent, and unreasonable actions on the part of Respondent have psychologically harmed J.I.S.

- n. Respondent has subjected J.I.S. to years of cruel and consistent manipulation and psychological abuse. J.I.S. has made it very clear that she will not go back to Respondent's household. Again, Petitioner strongly fears that if J.I.S. is forced back into Respondent's custody, J.I.S. will make another suicide attempt.
- o. Upon the foregoing, it is absolutely and indisputably clear that it is in the best interest of J.I.S. to *not* award Respondent any visitation rights or parent-time with respect to J.I.S., except as specifically provided in the responses in Objection No. 3 hereinabove, so that J.I.S. can live free from Respondent's habitual abuse and maleficence against J.I.S.

OBJECTION NO. 5

5. Petitioner absolutely **objects** to the Court entering Respondent's Proposed Order, for all the foregoing reasons established herein. Respondent's Proposed Order should be **denied** and **stricken** from these proceedings, and the Court should require that a new proposed Parentage Decree and Judgment be drafted by Petitioner.

CONCLUSION

Considering the foregoing facts and arguments presented in this Objection, reason compels the strong and indubitable conclusion that it is in the best interest of J.I.S. that Respondent's Proposed Order be denied and stricken from these proceedings, because

Respondent's Proposed Order seeks orders that would severely harm J.I.S. and significantly undermine her general wellbeing. Indeed, J.I.S. lives in fear of the possibility of returning to live with Respondent. As covered above, Respondent should have absolutely no parent-time or visitation rights with respect to J.I.S., except as specifically provided in Petitioner's responses and objections in Objection No. 3 hereinabove, because awarding Respondent with parent-time or visitation rights over J.I.S. would subject J.I.S. to further abuse by Respondent.

Moreover, having strongly established that it is in J.I.S.'s best interest to avoid contact with Respondent, the Court should further deny Respondent's Proposed Order on the grounds that Respondent never served the Proposed Order upon Petitioner as required by Rule 7 of the Utah Rules of Civil Procedure, so the Proposed Order was never approved as to form before filing. Indeed, Respondent produced several documents, but none were served upon Petitioner. Respondent even certified in the Certificate of Service of her documents that she served Petitioner with said documents, but that is simply not true; therefore, Respondent committed clear perjury before the Court, and she should be sanctioned accordingly.

WHEREFORE, having objected to Respondent's Proposed Order for all the foregoing reasons, having shown good and appropriate causes to object, and having established a strong and compelling "best interest of the child" argument, Petitioner respectfully prays for judgment against Respondent as follows, as well as prays for the following relief:

- A. That Respondent's Proposed Order be denied and stricken from these proceedings by the Court:
- B. that the Court order Petitioner to produce a new proposed Parentage Decree and Judgment;

C. that Respondent be sanctioned by the Court for committing clear perjury before the Court in her Certificate of Service, as Respondent certified that she served Petitioner with her Proposed Order, but she did not (Furthermore, Respondent committed perjury multiple times because she filed several documents, certified that she served them upon Petitioner, but none were served upon Petitioner); and

D. that the Court award any such further relief to Petitioner that it deems fair, appropriate, and equitable under the circumstances.

DATED December 22, 2021

/s/ Good Client Good Client, Petitioner Pro Se

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 22, 2021, I served, via email, a true and correct copy of the foregoing upon:

Opposing Party opposingparty@email.com

/s/ Good Client