

Tucker Hearing 2.1.2024

Judge Riquelme: "Please be seated. Good morning, everyone. Apologies for the delay. I had another meeting that got scheduled before this was on my calendar. I had asked to have this moved back to 9:30 but that apparently got moved to 9:00, so this is where we are. This is the Tucker matter 19-3503528. This is Aaron Tucker and Roberta Tucker and we are on for a motion that Mr. Lighthill had noted for on behalf of Mr. Tucker and it's noted on for a contempt review hearing. So, I believe this is a review hearing of the December 1st, 2023, order. I do note that Ms. Tucker had requested a continuance. A motion had been sent in for that this week--"

Ms. Tucker: "Yes."

Judge Riquelme: "--but it didn't appear that it was agreed and so without some sort of an agreement I wasn't going to grant an ex parte motion. We can only do things on hearings, but I do know that Ms. Tucker was requesting a continuance -- I believe to have counsel appointed. So, Ms. Tucker, is that something that you're still requesting?"

Ms. Tucker: "Yes, it is."

Judge Riquelme: "Is there anything that you would like to add to anything that you had indicated in your request?"

Ms. Tucker: "Yes, just like I said in my Declaration, I need counsel to help me prepare for this hearing and to get the adequate information that I need to be able to go to a hearing like this. I just didn't have enough time and resources to do so."

Judge Riquelme: "My understanding is that this is just a review hearing and I'm not entirely clear what Mr. Tucker is requesting so let's - without getting into all of the details here - Mr. Lighthill could you just give us a broad overview?"

Mr. Lighthill: "Thank you, Your Honor. Mr. Lighthill here appearing remotely on behalf of the petitioner, Aaron Tucker, who is also present on Zoom. I would like the opportunity to just speak really briefly without being unnecessarily interrupted by the opposing party who is pro se in this proceeding. This is a simple review hearing of at least three substantive orders of this court regarding the process of reunification. The first order was entered July 24th, 2023, and on this matter appointing the reunification counselor and that this process proceed and is in the best interest of the children. On September 22nd, the court entered a contempt hearing order finding Ms. Tucker in contempt for failing to cooperate with Dr. Kaufman and allowing the children to visit with their father, Mr. Tucker, under Dr. Kaufman's direction by October 23rd, 2023. After a subsequent hearing, this court entered yet another contempt hearing order on December 1st, 2023 awarding attorney fees and costs, entering a civil penalty, and providing for an ongoing daily retributive fine against the respondent -- a remedial sanction -- against the respondent in the amount of \$100 for each day the court's reunification orders are not followed starting on December 4th, 2023. About a month later, on January 9th, a further respondent's ex parte motion to remove Dr. Isabel Kaufman. The court denied that order as unfounded and noted that the time for presenting any kind of evidence in this matter is long since passed. The parties have not cohabitated since 2021. The trial is over. There is no further evidence to be presented. Your Honor, I am here simply on that review to finally note that over the last weeks my client received a packet of papers from a purported psychologist. My internet searches of this individual have found no actual licensing or records

of currently practicing as any kind of psychologist. This person definitely has not been appointed or recognized by this court as any kind of expert. But more than that, Your Honor, the correspondence that my client received that was cc'd to the court and to the court administrators (I don't know if that was received) threatened all kinds of legal and criminal sanctions against my client and against this court in troubling, troubling terms, making allegations about Mr. Tucker that have long since been dealt with."

Judge Riquelme: "I will say, all I have seen is what's been filed with the court."

Mr. Lighthill: "I'm glad, Your Honor, because I'll tell you that it is troubling, and I'm here today on this review hearing to ask for the court's guidance. In the permanent parenting plan for this case, two and half years ago, the court said if the gamesmanship continues, the court will consider a substantial change of custody. That's not the only time that this court has made indications like that, that the gamesmanship and the real – there's been no reunification, Your Honor. A father--"

Judge Riquelme: "And that was going to be my question because I don't really have anything substantive in the file about what's been going on. And--"

Mr. Lighthill: "Nothing, Your Honor, except for delays and threats and letters from purported experts from other parts of the country threatening to sue us all and take us all to federal court. This is a review hearing, Your Honor. What I - I would like to hear the court's guidance on this, but my suggestion is that we set a briefing schedule for this to consider a substantial change of custody."

Judge Riquelme: "Alright. So, Ms. Tucker, it sounds like Mr. Lighthill is not requesting immediate action today. Obviously we are under the prior court orders, but that he wants to have a hearing on behalf of his client to talk about the future of this case. I understand that you have your concerns as well that you would like to have addressed. I think that does make some sort of sense. There's nothing to prevent you from hiring an attorney to work on these things, but we can, at the very least, set some sort of a schedule so that everybody knows what the timeline is. So if you are working to hire somebody so that they know what the expectations are. Is that, is that something that you would be in a position to talk about today?"

Ms. Tucker: "I actually have been looking for an attorney. I do not have the funds, as this court knows and as I've stated many, many times since 2021 and beforehand. I was left with nothing from the debts and assets. Alimony was taken away from me by this court, by Your Honor. I was only given alimony for one year, even though I had been a stay at home mother my children's entire life, and homeschooled, and that was agreed upon by the petitioner, Aaron Vincent Tucker. And I was actually made to stay at home. I could not work to provide for myself. I could not build up a--"

Judge Riquelme: "I've heard the trial. I do understand what the background is."

Ms. Tucker: "Yes. Yes. I would just like to state why I'm saying this. Thank you, Your Honor. So, I don't have a retirement or anything. I was left with nothing unlike the petitioner who has everything. He was the one that was awarded – again, by this court – without my knowledge, a hearing, like I keep stating in many, many hearings, to dissolve the business as he wished and to take whatever he wanted. You allowed that, Your Honor, which is atrocious. And now, because I have four children who depend on me as a safe parent--"

Judge Riquelme: "I'm asking you a really simple question about the timelines. And I understand you're saying you have limited financial means to hire someone to represent you, so you don't need to give me all of the backstory. I've heard all of this testimony. I'm aware of the history of this case. So, you're saying that you don't have money to immediately hire somebody. Are you expecting that you will be able to retain somebody or is this just a hope that you might have that ability?"

Ms. Tucker: "Well Your Honor, I have been searching for an attorney that would be willing to take on this case because anyone who looks at this case who is a legal professional says that it is an entire mess and there are a lot of illegal things going on here from the opposing party and the court and that I have been targeted as a perpetrator. But I'm not. I'm the safe parent who has tried to protect my children from an abuser for their entire life from the petitioner. But yet, the court is allowing him to abusively litigate with me and financially abuse me as well. So the physical abuse stopped, but the other abuse hasn't. That's been allowed from the court, which is heinous, in my opinion, and my children are suffering because of it and so am I. So I have been trying to find legal counsel. No one wants to touch it because they see what's going on here and that there is a complete bias towards the petitioner, Aaron Vincent Tucker. So, yes, I am hoping to retain counsel, but, Your Honor, I'm being real with you, like I have been in the court, as I have been with Mr. Lighthill, it is very difficult to find an attorney when you have no money. Now, if the court would have awarded something different to me, that probably would have changed that fact. This has put me in a very, very difficult situation as I'm still on assistance in the state of Idaho, like I was in Washington, and the court knows this. So, I do not feel comfortable going to hearings, not being able to defend myself with proper counsel. I have a civil right to be heard and to be represented by legal counsel so that I can correctly go on with these hearings and protect my children and myself. I'm not being allowed to do that."

Judge Riquelme: "Alright. Well, at this point, I'm denying the motion to continue the hearing today. It doesn't sound like Mr. Tucker is suggesting a specific remedy or goal or action other than a schedule at this point because the ongoing orders are still in effect. We have these various findings, these various orders that have been ordered in July and September and December of 2023, in addition to the October 21st, 2021 trial ruling. So, we do have a series of orders that remain in effect, but it sounds like for a more substantive hearing about taking further action beyond just contempt, because what I'm hearing from Mr. Tucker's counsel, is that the contempt process has not affected any sort of change or compliance with court orders and they would like to talk about other remedies. So, it makes sense that we would be setting a schedule so that everybody will have notice and everybody will have some parameters for what that will look like as we prepare for that next hearing. So, Mr. Lighthill, was there something else that you were requesting other than the schedule?"

Mr. Lighthill: (not intelligible)

Judge Riquelme: "I think Mr. Lighthill's connection just glitched out so we'll wait for him to return. (Pause) Alright Mr. Lighthill, we lost you for a moment. You said, 'Sure, Your Honor, we-' and then your connection faltered so..."

Mr. Lighthill: "And then it came right back. So, we did submit a proposed order that calculates the penalty due. And my proposal, I guess, Your Honor, is that we switch gears, that that penalty stop accruing as of today. That, as of today, the court set, as I requested, set up a briefing schedule and a hearing date to review substantive custody of the children."

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, I have to object to this because I have a right to speak. The petitioner and his attorney have been doing this for some time trying to change custody of my four children to the petitioner who has abused my children at length, which the court has recognized. You yourself, Judge Riquelme, has recognized that my children have been a product of domestic violence, unfortunately. So, October 21st, 2021, you ordered that none of my children would have visitational rights with the petitioner and that they would not go to him at all. And first and foremost, in the hearings, you know this, Mr. Lighthill wasn't present. The petitioner, Mr. Tucker, did not want our children. He said it twice in the hearing when you asked him, 'No, I do not,' when you asked him if he wanted custody of our children. And he said no. Only then when you pressed him, the third time, in a hearing, if he wanted our children, then he said, 'Well, yes, but I want two of them to go live with my parents in Oklahoma and two of them to go to my brother and sister-in-law in Oklahoma and I would visit them.' Does this make any sense? Tell me how the court can find that it makes any sense to force my four children who have clearly voiced their opinions on Zooms, which have been recorded, and you yourself, Judge Riquelme, have viewed, have looked at, have acknowledged that you've watched. The hatred, the fear, the distaste that they have for Aaron Tucker, who had abused them for most of their life, and you would be willing now to hold me in contempt to force my children to be with their abuser. He has not only physically, mentally, emotionally, but sexually abused my children. How does that make sense? Tell me how it would make sense to force my children to be faced to talk with him, to talk with the petitioner even, not only see him, make them see their abuser which would give them more trauma. Their therapist's letters have said this many times, which the court has ignored and so has opposing counsel. To me, from what I can see, there is no regard for my children's safety from this court or the petitioner. Where is justice? So, Your Honor, I'm asking you. Are you saying that you are ignoring the fact that there has been substantial abuse, and it's been substantiated in Oklahoma and in Washington state, of the petitioner, Aaron Tucker, abusing my four children at length, but yet you're willing to make them going into this reunification therapy who has no scientific backing - and in fact there is proof - that is traumatizing and abusive to all children who have gone through this. Are you saying that you are ignoring all those facts and you're still pressing for my children to be in contact with this abusive petitioner? Is that what you're saying, Your Honor?"

Judge Riquelme: "So, Ms. Tucker, there was a ruling on the trial and there were findings about domestic violence and it was this ruling on October 21st, 2021. The reunification process was ordered if Mr. Tucker complied with certain components and the court has found that he has complied with those components and that the process could begin. And that happened quite some time ago. You are very aware of what the court rulings have been and what they continue to be. Mr. Lighthill, I've just asked my judicial assistant to look for the order. I wasn't given any proposed orders. I don't know when they were submitted so he's walked down to Ms. Cook's office because we didn't have copies of anything."

Mr. Lighthill: "Let me check on our end."

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, I have to say that when you did say that you wanted to have reunification start with my children, knowing the fact that all of this abuse had occurred, you would not let my children speak in court. You have not let my children send in a letter. You have not let my children's therapist speak on their behalf. You have not let them attend a Zoom hearing at all, neither my children or their therapist who is highly qualified in Idaho. And you will not, I don't know why, Your Honor, you're not letting my children speak up for themselves. That is a civil right that they have - to protect themselves. If you're going to punish me because of what their therapists say or anything else, that's wrong, but I do

have to tell you, I am aware of the orders that you have made. To me, those orders are illegal. They go against any protection rights for children, for advocating for children who have been abused. And, Your Honor, the petitioner did not have adequate therapy. He was ordered to have at least three months of therapy and that is just erroneous. That is nothing for abusing children for their entire life. And he didn't even, he didn't even qualify for all of it, and you let it go--"

Judge Riquelme: "Alright, Ms. Tucker, I disagree."

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, Your Honor, I have a civil right to speak and I need to finish. Thank you so much."

Judge Riquelme: "Ms. Tucker, I've heard a lot about this."

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, I need to speak. It is my civil right."

Judge Riquelme: "Ms. Tucker, you are relitigating issues that we have already ruled upon and actually you do not have a right to continue talking about this."

Ms. Tucker: "It is my right, Your Honor, to speak about what is happening and how you've ruled and how we got to this point. Your Honor, he is not--"

Judge Riquelme: "Ms. Tucker, I am fully aware. I have been involved in this case for three full years now."

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, please let me finish speaking."

Judge Riquelme: "I have a question for Mr. Lighthill. Mr. Lighthill--"

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, I am speaking. I am going to finish this."

Judge Riquelme: "No. No, you are done."

Ms. Tucker: "Excuse me?"

Judge Riquelme: "I know the history and you don't get to the point. I understand that you disagree with the rulings and I understand why you disagree with the rulings. And what I'm hearing is that they want to set a hearing to further address this. We will have a hearing."

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, I am speaking."

Judge Riquelme: "You will have an opportunity to respond."

Ms. Tucker: "I am responding right now, Your Honor. Please let me speak."

Judge Riquelme: "You do not have unlimited amounts of time to continue to address your grievances about prior rulings of this court."

Ms. Tucker: "I am talking, Your Honor, about what is happening right now -- why we are here. Why you have allowed yourself and the petitioner to see me as a criminal, so to speak, and to hold me in contempt for no reason at all. I have not willingly violated any order. Actually, you made my child get on a Zoom with Dr. Kaufman. You made that happen with Zade recently. Mr. Lighthill knows that Zade was on a reunification call with Dr. Kaufman. That did commence and he knows this. So, he's lying to the court saying he didn't. Now the only reason why Zade got on that call is because I had to make him

because the court threatened me that my children would be taken away if I don't do it. Well, now I'm standing up for my children and myself and I'm saying, my children need to be protected. I will do whatever I need to do to protect my children from this vile court and from this vile petitioner and his attorney."

Judge Riquelme: "Well, Ms. Tucker, I actually think this hearing might be of some benefit to you because I know that you have concerns and you disagree with what's been happening and you have your reasons. And those can be presented at a more substantive hearing. This was really just a review to see what is happening, if there is compliance with the order, and there have been several orders, but the most recent order was on December 1st, and it sounds like there is request for a further hearing. And this was something that was mentioned in the October 21st, 2021, ruling, that there could be additional action if there was obstruction from Ms. Tucker with the reunification process. So, what Mr. Lighthill is suggesting is consistent with the prior rulings and what everyone has had for several years now. I'm not saying what I'm going to do at that hearing. I don't know what kind of evidence will be presented, but you'll have your opportunity to present information as well."

Ms. Tucker: "So, Your Honor, I'm asking, why would have a hearing commence when you heard that my son Zade was on with Kaufman. I'm not calling her doctor because I don't think she's qualified. Where's her CV? She's never sent a letter to the court with her CV. You've never made her. That's concerning to me. So, why would there be a hearing if Zade was forced to do something that was terrifying for him and terrible for him? Why would you make another hearing happen on this when my son was forced to be on a call with Kaufman, and she lied to my son. Kaufman lied to my son."

Judge Riquelme: "This will give you a great opportunity to put some of those things in writing in a Declaration format. I don't know if the expectation is that we will have any sort of testimony. I'm not sure what Mr. Lighthill was envisioning here. Mr. Lighthill, could you just give us some idea of what you're requesting?"

Mr. Lighthill: "Again, I would defer to the court's judgement. I believe the evidence is done in this matter. These are post decree proceedings and there is no provision for the court to hear oral testimony in proceedings like this. I think – and, based on some of the incidences we have had in the courtroom - my preference would be to lean on the written submissions and to allow the court to make a decision based on only the briefest oral argument. It is empty of evidence, in this matter, I believe."

Ms. Tucker: "So, Mr. Lighthill, why did you not tell Judge Riquelme that Zade was on a Zoom with Kaufman and the petitioner?"

Judge Riquelme: "Alright, Ms. Tucker, that's not how this goes. So, it sounds like Ms. Tucker is saying that one of the children had a reunification appointment. Is that correct, Mr. Lighthill?"

Mr. Lighthill: "We – that's part of my reason for suggesting oral briefings. One of the children, and I know I'm going to get interrupted here or slap back from the respondent, so I'll just try to be brief. One of the children appeared briefly on one Zoom call with Dr. Kaufman. That was ended and followed by these renewed threats by this so called Jill Soderman expert who named lawsuits and habeus corpus petitions and all kinds of horrible things if we ever tried to do any reunification again. So, the briefest of calls happened, Your Honor. With regard to the contempt review, that's really not relevant since the court's orders state the parties shall not micromanage and shall cooperate with the schedule set by Dr.

Kaufman. The respondent did not follow the schedule set by Dr. Kaufman. One child and one briefest reunification before that was interrupted and followed by more threats of litigation, civil complaints, and professional – you know, really everything under the sun was threatened. Disbarment. This new expert is claiming that reunification violates the Geneva Convention and should be treated as a war crime. And so that was enough to cause Dr. Kaufman to pull back and now we're here seeking the court's guidance and review. So, my reasoning in requesting briefing was exactly as the court acknowledges, so we can present some reasonable argument and my proposal is that both parties be limited to fifteen to twenty pages per side. And, I'm concerned about the welfare of these children, Your Honor. No one outside has set any objective eye on these children. We don't have any –"

Ms. Tucker: "Objection, Your Honor."

Mr. Lighthill: "Your Honor, can I just talk for a little bit-"

Ms. Tucker: "Objection. There's no foundation for Mr. Lighthill's statement."

Judge Riquelme: "So Mr. Lighthill, I understand. And this was something you raised at the last hearing, that because there was a request-"

Ms. Tucker: "Excuse me, I said 'objection,' Judge Riquelme."

Judge Riquelme: "And the objection is overruled."

Ms. Tucker: "Why is that, Judge Riquelme?"

Judge Riquelme: "What's your basis for the objection?"

Ms. Tucker: "There's no foundation for Mr. Lighthill to say that my children's wellbeing is not ok and that there's no third party looking in on them when you all know that they have therapists that see them when they go to school. Judge Riquelme, I expect you-"

Judge Riquelme: "I am aware of that, Ms. Tucker. I think that what Mr. Lighthill is saying is that Mr. Tucker does not have a person who he knows who has eyes on these children who can say how they are doing."

Ms. Tucker: "Mr. Tucker knows from their therapist, which this court does not even allow my therapists letters to even be heard, which I don't understand why, and Mr. Tucker doesn't and shouldn't have the right to torture my children. You are allowing him to not only keep torturing them but abusing them in many ways right now – emotionally and financially. That is abuse. And just like Jill Jones-Soderman and Dr. – she's a doctor actually – and Dr. Bandy Lee said, we are taking steps to have this taken to another court. Everyone who is involved in this heinous crime against my children and myself will suffer the consequences of this. I am protecting my children. I am standing up for them. And I will not allow an abuser or a court or anyone else to in any way keep abusing my children. They have a civil right to speak. They are old enough. The law in Washington state says there is no age restriction to speak up for themselves. So answer me this, Your Honor, did you read my declaration response I sent in about this very hearing right now?"

Judge Riquelme: "I have read everything that's in the court file. So, what I'm going to do today. I understand that this is on for a contempt review. I was not provided with anything in advance from Mr. Tucker. I had no idea before I walked in here if there had been any reunification that had happened or if there had been any kind of delay or alleged obstruction with that or compliance. There was nothing that

was provided to this court in advance about that. I do understand that Mr. Lighthill's an officer of the court but also I am hearing from Ms. Tucker and there was some agreement that there was, that one of the children at least had some sort of reunification meeting, although it was brief, and I can't – I'm not going to characterize what it was - but Dr. Kaufman was involved and one of the children were involved and so I do understand there was something. I don't know exactly when that was. So today, I know that there was a request for remedial sanctions for an actual amount to be imposed based on the December 1st order and it looks like that was, is, it is \$100 per day and what is being requested is \$5800 so I would imagine that's for 58 days of non-compliance."

Mr. Lighthill: "That's correct, Your Honor."

Ms. Tucker: "Now, Your Honor, I am asking the court here, why would you impose sanctions on me to force my children to go to this so-called reunification therapy when Isabel Kaufman hasn't even sent in a CV to any one of us, including the court."

Judge Riquelme: "At this point, I am not imposing a specific dollar amount because I don't have something – what I'm hearing is that there was some sort of meeting with one of the children and, from what Ms. Tucker is saying, I am reserving on the amount. The amount will continue to accrue. We have the December 1st order. That amount is continuing to accrue for any non-compliance that Ms. Tucker is having, but I don't have anything in writing to suggest that there is or is not compliance with this so in order for me to issue a dollar amount, particularly when both parties are agreeing there was at least some kind of a meeting, I just don't have anything in the file to support that."

Mr. Lighthill: "May I be heard briefly, Your Honor?"

Judge Riquelme: "Go ahead."

Mr. Lighthill: "And I'm asking to be heard, again, without interruption and acknowledging the generous indulgement that this court has extended to the respondent. And what we have heard now is forty-five minutes of untruth and abuse against--"

Ms. Tucker: "Objection right now."

Mr. Lighthill: "Can I please speak without interruption?"

Ms. Tucker: "No. Objection. He's been found to be abusive and he's--"

Judge Riquelme: "Your objection is noted, Ms. Tucker. Mr. Lighthill--"

Mr. Lighthill: "I'd like to advocate on behalf of my client, Your Honor. What we're left with is basically the option of charging my client to file and present in front of the court the previous orders of this court. Ok, so what's before this court is a previous order that says the respondent shall fully cooperate and shall not micromanage, and obviously that has not been done. And I need to say one more thing here and then we'll move on--"

Ms. Tucker: "Objection."

Judge Riquelme: "Noted."

Mr. Lighthill: "The displays that we see here, Your Honor, are so troubling and give rise to a prima facie case of alienation where untruths--"

Ms. Tucker: "Objection. That allegation is unfounded. It's not a real thing."

Judge Riquelme: "Alright. I understand, Ms. Tucker. We actually have some testimony about that at the trial so that is actually part of the case. We do have some expert testimony on that issue so if you want to--"

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, I have to object to that because the previous judge ruled that I never interfered or alienated--"

Mr. Lighthill: "Just my final concern, Your Honor--"

Judge Riquelme: "I've read the entire file for this case, Ms. Tucker. I don't know who ruled previously on this case, but I've heard trial testimony. I don't know what that ruling was that you're referring to--"

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, I have sent it in to your court many times, this fall even, showing you the order from the judge who you probably deal with every day in Skagit County. And she said she found that I had not interfered with any of my children's visits or with anything like that, at all. But you have ignored that order and you went ahead and ruled over that order and said that I have. And you keep stating, Your Honor, that I am alienating -- you're allowing Mr. Lighthill to say that I'm alienating our children. Well, I'm not. And that's an erroneous thing in the court now. They don't even recognize that."

Judge Riquelme: "I understand. So, Ms. Tucker, I understand. And I am not ruling that you have alienated the children. Mr. Lighthill is suggesting that that has happened and that is why we need to have a hearing."

Ms. Tucker: "Well, it hasn't. There's no foundation. Your Honor, ask him for the proof. Ask him for the proof of the foundation of that. There is none."

Judge Riquelme: "We're not actually going to make a finding about alienation today. That's why we're going to have a hearing. It's called--"

Ms. Tucker: "So why are you allowing Mr. Lighthill to continue? I'm asking you--"

Judge Riquelme: "Ok, Ms. Tucker, this is preposterous. I'm not going to go back and forth with you, which is exactly what you are doing. Mr. Lighthill, you want to have a hearing. You want to have a schedule. Anything else?"

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, you're letting him file a motion on something he is withholding information on. Like, my son Zade being made to be on Zoom, which, my son Zade got on by himself. He's 13 years old. He talked to--"

Judge Riquelme: "Ms. Tucker, you are still under the court's orders to engage in good faith with the reunification efforts. That is still a court order. There are multiple court orders in this case about that. And we're going to set a hearing--"

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, how can I force my children. Do you expect me to force my children to go on a Zoom with Isabel Kaufman and Aaron Vincent Tucker who is, has, abused them? You're expecting me to force teenagers -- two 13 year olds, a 15 year old, and a 17 year old -- you're expecting me, are you expecting me to make my children do that? And are you expecting me to make a schedule, which Isabel

Kaufman never called me with a schedule by the way, are you expecting me to make my children face their abuser? Are you expecting me to do that?"

Judge Riquelme: "You know exactly what the prior ruling has been--"

Ms. Tucker: "I am asking you, Your Honor--"

Judge Riquelme: "Ms. Tucker. And so, we're going to schedule a hearing--"

Ms. Tucker: "I am asking you if you are going to make me--"

Judge Riquelme: "Ok, this has got to stop. If you don't stop you will be found in contempt of court in violation--"

Ms. Tucker: "On what grounds?"

Judge Riquelme: "It is my order to have you stop. I have given you plenty of opportunities to say what you have to say."

Ms. Tucker: "I'm asking you a question, Your Honor, and you're not answering me."

Judge Riquelme: "This isn't how it works, Ms. Tucker. I'm making a ruling--"

Ms. Tucker: "I'm asking you a question. Your Honor, are you expecting my children to face their abuser--"

Judge Riquelme: "You have asked and I have answered it multiple times."

Ms. Tucker: "I would like you to answer it again, now. Are you expecting my children to face their abuser?"

Judge Riquelme: "Ms. Tucker, you know what the prior rulings are--"

Ms. Tucker: "Are you expecting my children to face their abuser?"

Judge Riquelme: "Ok, Ms. Tucker, you are on mute. I have issued a ruling. We are going to set a hearing on this case. We will be having another hearing on this case to address the--"

Ms. Tucker: "You cannot mute me. I have a civil right--"

Judge Riquelme: "You do not have a civil right to speak ad nauseum. I understand what your position is. I am not giving Mr. Tucker anything at this point in time other than a hearing, which he has a right to. And a briefing schedule. And this will give you some certainty as well. If you have evidence that you need to present, then you should present it, but you will present it in an admissible form -- Declarations, something that has some sort of support. And if you need time to get an attorney then hopefully you will find someone that can give you some assistance but you do not have the right to have court appointed counsel, so you need to find an attorney to represent you on this."

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, did you say I don't have the right to have court appointed counsel? Is that what you said?"

Judge Riquelme: "That's correct. You don't have the right to have an attorney paid for by the state. So, if you can find an attorney to represent you, that's fine. You do have the right to have counsel represent you, but the court is not going to pay for your attorney to represent you. So, if you find legal counsel,

that's great. You will have more time to do that. We are going to schedule a hearing in this case and there was a briefing schedule that was suggested by Mr. Lighthill--"

Ms. Tucker: "Well, Your Honor, I would ask why you would let a hearing be scheduled when Mr. Lighthill right here and the petitioner did not come to you with all the facts? To me that's misleading. Can you not see that? And I still would like you to answer, are you saying you are making me have my children face their abuser? Even seeing him - it's a proven fact, Your Honor, that seeing your abuser causes more trauma. So, are you making them encounter with their abuser?"

Judge Riquelme: "I have ordered reunification and that order has been in place since October of 2021."

Ms. Tucker: "So that's a yes."

Judge Riquelme: "The briefing schedule that was requested - I'm not hearing anybody contest that - I am granting that request for a briefing schedule--"

Ms. Tucker: "I'm contesting all of it--"

Judge Riquelme: "I'm putting sanctions on the contempt request. That can be addressed at that hearing as well. I'm sure we'll have some more information from Dr. Kaufman about what has and hasn't happening. The orders of the court about reunification, they continue to be in place. Ms. Tucker is still under court orders to comply with the reunification process."

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, why is that?"

Judge Riquelme: "I will work with Ms. Cook. I will let her know we need a hearing on this. I can't schedule this order without us coordinating with Sam Lawn and everybody on this case. The hearing will happen before the end of March. So, we will have, it's February 1st - I do understand that some people have some unavailability that can make it difficult to schedule hearings but we will be having this. This does have to be heard. This does have to be heard in a relatively expeditious manner because everybody does have - this case has been going on for a long time. It doesn't feel like we've made much progress, if any, in quite some time. And everybody needs to have some answers on this. This is consistent with the October 21st, 2021, ruling that did put Ms. Tucker on notice that there could be some additional consequences if the reunification process was not successful. You all will need to work with Ms. Cook on the scheduling of that. I will enter an order once we get a date on that. And, we are adjourned."

Ms. Tucker: "Your Honor, would you let my children speak? Your Honor--"

Mr. Lighthill: "Thank you."