28

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2

3

5

6

10

Based upon the foregoing, HERSH, MANNIS & BOGEN, LLP on behalf of the Petitioner, CAMILLE GRAMMER hereby submitS the following Joint Case Management Statement:

The parties have two children, Mason, date of birth October 24, 2001, 1. age 9 and Jude, born August 28, 2004, age 6. The parties have worked with Dr. Stan Katz as their custody mediator. Dr. Katz also has conducted a private PACT program on behalf of the parties.

Respondent has filed an OSC re Custody in which he seeks primary custody of both children. Petitioner contends that this OSC was not filed in good faith and was done in order to create a false impression to the media and to wrongfully disparage Petitioner in the media. Respondent does not reside in California and refuses to provide information as to his residency and/or schedule for the summer and thereafter. Respondent filed his OSC on May 13, 2011 after the Petitioner sent Respondent a settlement proposal on May 11, 2011. Consequently, Petitioner contends that Respondent filed his OSC in bad faith. Petitioner contends that Respondent filed his OSC for the media attention that it would garner (which it did) and which was in direct contravention of a previously made and substantially different custody proposal. Both Respondent's custody proposal and his OSC are opposed by the Petitioner as the consequence of which would be to separate the children from each other and the other parent. Petitioner is requesting primary custody of both children.

Respondent also requests certain orders for the summer. Respondent did not file any declaration in support of his OSC. The OSC presently is set for hearing on June 27, 2011. Respondent also filed a List of Witnesses for the hearing. No witness declarations were filed in support on Respondent's OSC. Two of the witnesses are believed to reside outside the State of California. Petitioner served a Notice of Deposition for Respondent, which was set for June 6 and 7<sup>th</sup>, which dates are not acceptable to Respondent's counsel. Respondent's counsel has indicated that he also

2:1

wants to take Petitioner's deposition. Petitioner also has requested that Respondent make available the two out of state witnesses for their deposition in California. The third witness' deposition has been noticed for June 8<sup>th</sup>. However, Respondent's counsel again has indicated that this date also is not acceptable to him. Petitioner cannot proceed with Respondent's OSC without the above depositions. Petitioner cannot even ascertain from Respondent's filed pleading what he is requesting and the basis for his request.

The parties have an issue with summer visitation. The parties' son, Jude, has repeated kindergarten twice. He is now working with tutors so that he can enter first grade at a public elementary school beginning in Fall of 2011. In order to get into first grade, Jude will have to do a math study program for the entire summer in Los Angeles. Further, the parties' daughter, Mason, wants to attend camp in Los Angeles, which is a month long program. Mason is enrolled in this camp for July. Petitioner has proposed that the parties share a week on/week off schedule in Los Angeles for the summer. Respondent does not agree and wants each party to have a month with the children. It is not known whether the parties will be able to resolve the summer visitation issues.

Both parties have agreed to a custody evaluation. The parties are in the process of selecting a custody evaluator.

- 2. Both parties have exchanged Preliminary Declarations of Disclosure and the status was bifurcated. Respondent is remarried.
- 3. The Petitioner has hired the forensic accounting firm of Gursey Schneider, which firm has completed a comprehensive tracing of claimed separate and community assets. This tracing has been provided to Respondent's forensic accountants, Mayer, Hoffman & McCann. Gursey Schneider is now completing a post-separation accounting and community/separate balance sheet based upon the tracing. The parties have spoken and agreed that after review of the tracing that the parties will meet either directly or with the assistance of a private judge

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

5

7

9

to attempt to settle the property and support issues in their case. The accountants also are meeting to go over any issues with the tracing. It is anticipated that the review of the tracing and the parties' ability to move ahead with a settlement may take an additional two months since this is the time estimate which Mayer Hoffman is requiring to review the tracing. The accountants will continue to work cooperatively on preparing other joint accounting schedules including a marital standard of living and cash flow.

- The parties have retained their experts who are working cooperatively together. The parties will be designating a custody evaluator. No experts should be ordered by the Court in this matter.
- The parties are hopeful that the property and support issues can 5. be resolved. Petitioner is now waiting for the Respondent to be ready to proceed with a settlement conference in this matter.
  - The parties do not believe that a trial should be set at this time. 6.
- The parties do not believe that there are any orders or action 7. that could be taken by the Court in this matter at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

HERSH, MANNIS & BOGEN, L.L.P.

Dated: June 1, 2011

Attorneys for Petitioner CAMILLE GRAMMER

	11						
1 2 3 4	2				(2)	docum	party, delivery was made to the party or by leaving the ments at the party's residence with some person not ger than 18 years of age between the hours of eight in the ing and six in the evening.
	4		b.		By Uni or pack (specify	age ad	addressed to the persons at the addresses in item 5 and
	5 6				(1)		I deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the postage fully prepaid.
	7		)		(2)		our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with
. 9							ments at the party's residence with some person not er than 18 years of age between the hours of eight in the ng and six in the evening.  Tates mail. I enclosed the documents in a sealed envelope didressed to the persons at the addresses in item 5 and of the postage fully prepaid.  I deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the postage fully prepaid.  I placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.  Int or employed in the county where the mailing occurred, or package was placed in the mail at Beverly Hills,  It delivery. I enclosed the documents in an envelope or vided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the eaddresses in item 5. I placed the envelope or package and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized ne overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized ne overnight ment of a professional messenger service for eclaration by the messenger must accompany this Proof of econtained in the Declaration of Messenger below.)  In the service of the fax transmission, I faxed the documents to the persons at the listed in item 5. No error was reported by the fax machine to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification that item 5. I did not receive, within a reasonable time smission, any electronic message or other indication that sion was unsuccessful.  Indeed the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is
_1							
L.I	1 2				l am a The en Califori	velope	ent or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. e or package was placed in the mail at Beverly Hills,
HERSH, MANNIS & BOGER 9150 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite, Beverly Hills, California 90212-3 Phone: (310)786-1910 Fax: (310)788	4 5		C.	0	By over package person for coll-	ernight ge provi s at the ection a	nt delivery. I enclosed the documents in an envelope or vided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the ne addresses in item 5. I placed the envelope or package and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized the overnight delivery carrier.
	7		d.	[X]	envelor in item service	pe or pa 5 and pa 6. <i>(A de</i>	ger service. I served the documents by placing them in an package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed diproviding them to a professional messenger service for declaration by the messenger must accompany this Proof contained in the Declaration of Messenger below.)
	20		e.		service fax nur that I u	by fax	listed in item 5. No error was reported by the fax machine A copy of the record of the fax transmission, which I printed
	22		f.		parties	to acce	ic service. Based on a court order or an agreement of the cept service by electronic transmission, I caused the
	24 25				addres after th	ses list ne trans	sted in item 5. I did not receive, within a reasonable time assission, any electronic message or other indication that assis was unsuccessful.
2	26	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.					
	27 28		: June 2				L. Anthony Barnett
	1	,					

## **DECLARATION OF MESSENGER**

- [X] By personal service. I personally delivered the envelope or package received from the declarant above to the persons at the addresses listed in item 5.
  - (1) For a party represented by an attorney, delivery was made to the attorney or at the attorney's office by leaving the documents in an envelope or package, which was clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served, with a receptionist or an individual in charge of the office, between the hours of nine in the morning and five in the evening.
  - (2) For a party, delivery was made to the party or by leaving the documents at the party's residence with some person not younger than 18 years of age between the hours of eight in the morning and six in the evening.

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age. I am not a party to the above-referenced legal proceeding.

I served the envelope or package, as stated above, on June 2, 2011.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: June 2, 2011

(Print Name of Messenger)

(Signature of Messenger)