

PROPOSED ORDER ON MOTION FOR TEMPORARY FAMILY LAW ORDERS

Superior Court of Washington, County of King

In re Parenting and Support of: E.L.R., A.W.R., AND R.S.R.

Case No. 20-3-03830-3 SEA

Petitioner: VERONIKA GOODNIGHT (Pro Se)

Respondent: MATHEW RALIDAK

ORDER ON MOTION FOR TEMPORARY FAMILY LAW ORDERS

This matter came before the Court on Respondent's Motion for Temporary Family Law Orders filed July 11, 2025, and Petitioner's Opposition thereto. The Court has reviewed the pleadings, evidence submitted, including Dr. Michael R. Oreskovich's psychiatric evaluation, government agency findings from multiple sources, and legal analysis presented by the parties.

Based on the evidence presented, the Court makes the following findings and orders:

I. RULING ON TFLO REQUESTS

A. Mental Health Evaluation Request - DENIED

The Court finds that Respondent's request for mental health evaluation is moot as a comprehensive

psychiatric evaluation has already been completed by Dr. Michael R. Oreskovich, MD, Board Certified General and Addiction Psychiatrist, who concluded:

“There is no reason to preclude her having sole custody of her children.”

FINDING: The requested mental health evaluation has been completed and the professional recommendation does not support the relief Respondent seeks.

B. Mental Soundness Determination Request - DENIED

The Court finds that mental soundness for parenting purposes has been professionally evaluated by Dr. Oreskovich who determined:

“Veronika Goodnight is not impaired from any psychiatric, mental, behavioral or substance use disorder that would affect her ability to parent her children with reasonable skill and safety.”

FINDING: Professional psychiatric evaluation establishes Petitioner’s mental soundness for parenting purposes.

C. Continued Separation Request - DENIED

The Court finds that continued separation is not supported by the professional recommendation, as Dr. Oreskovich specifically recommends sole custody to Petitioner.

FINDING: Expert professional evaluation does not support the basis for Respondent's requested continued separation.

D. Restraining Order and Weapons Surrender - DENIED

The Court finds that protective restrictions lack sufficient factual foundation based on: 1. Police Investigation: Officer Jennifer Kellogg concluded "no crime occurred between Ralidak and Good-night" 2. Professional Evaluation: Dr. Oreskovich found no evidence supporting safety concerns 3. Government Agency Findings: Multiple agencies found no basis for safety concerns

FINDING: Insufficient evidence supports need for protective restrictions.

II. FINDINGS REGARDING CURRENT CIRCUMSTANCES

A. Separation Duration

The Court finds that the current separation of 143 consecutive days substantially exceeds this Court's previously established guidance of "not more than one week," representing a significant departure from established parameters that warrants judicial intervention.

B. Government Agency Validation

The Court finds that multiple government agencies have investigated and either: 1. Found no basis for separation concerns (Police, DCYF), OR 2. Validated Respondent's concerns about process

integrity (DCYF Supervisor, Department of Health)

FINDING: Government validation supports Petitioner's position regarding fitness for parenting.

C. Professional Consensus

The Court finds professional support for Petitioner's parenting capacity: - This Court's Previous Finding: Petitioner performed "majority of day-to-day child-rearing" - Psychiatric Evaluator: Recommends sole custody to Petitioner - Primary Physician: Supports Petitioner's medical decision-making authority - Court-Appointed GAL: Found children healthy and well-cared for under Petitioner's care

D. Pattern of Proceedings

The Court finds that Petitioner has filed multiple similar proceedings:

1. 2020: Motion filed and denied with sanctions imposed (\$8,500)
2. May 2025: Motion filed and withdrawn before hearing
3. July 2025: Current motion (third proceeding of this nature)

Total Cost Impact: \$25,000+ in defensive costs imposed on Petitioner through repetitive proceedings over 5-year period.

III. CUSTODY RESTORATION ORDER

A. Primary Residential Care

The Court finds that custody should be restored to Petitioner VERONIKA GOODNIGHT based on:

1. Professional Psychiatric Recommendation: Dr. Oreskovich recommends sole custody
2. Government Validation: Multiple agencies support Petitioner's fitness
3. Judicial Necessity: Extended separation substantially exceeds established guidance
4. Professional Consensus: All evaluators support Petitioner's parenting capacity

B. Implementation Schedule

TRANSITION PERIOD: The Court orders a reasonable transition of physical custody of the minor children to Petitioner within seven (7) days of entry of this Order to allow for appropriate planning and the children's adjustment.

C. Residential Schedule Pending Full Hearing

Pending full hearing on the underlying parenting plan modification:

RESIDENTIAL TIME WITH PETITIONER (MOTHER): - Primary Residence: All three children reside with Petitioner - School Registration: Petitioner authorized to maintain children in current schools - Medical Decision-Making: Petitioner retains sole medical decision-making authority as previously ordered

RESIDENTIAL TIME WITH RESPONDENT (FATHER): - Supervised Visitation: Every other Saturday, 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM - Supervision Required: Given the extended separation and need for transition - Location: Neutral location to be agreed upon by parties or designated by Court

IV. PROTECTIVE MEASURES

A. Professional Oversight

THERAPEUTIC SERVICES: Any future therapeutic services for the minor children shall be: 1. Jointly Selected: Both parties must agree on provider selection 2. Professionally Independent: No provider with previous involvement in this case 3. Court Order Compliance: Provider must be educated on Final Parenting Plan requirements

B. Regulatory Coordination

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH INVESTIGATION: The Court notes that licensed mental health professional Danielle Smith, LMHCA (License #MC61294206) is under Department of Health investigation for professional conduct issues during the May 1, 2025 therapy session, as referred by DCYF.

The parties shall cooperate with the ongoing Department of Health investigation regarding License #MC61294206.

C. Communication Protocol

TALKING PARENTS PLATFORM: All communication between parties shall continue through Talking Parents platform with daily communication between children and non-residential parent.

V. DUE PROCESS CONSIDERATIONS

A. Constitutional Protections

This Order addresses due process concerns by: 1. Ending Extended Separation: 143-day separation substantially exceeded established guidance 2. Following Professional Recommendation: Implementing Dr. Oreskovich's recommendation 3. Respecting Government Findings: Acknowledging agency validation 4. Restoring Parental Rights: Returning children to judicially-preferred parent

B. Future Proceedings Standards

PATTERN RECOGNITION: The Court notes the pattern of proceedings despite previous sanctions and advises that future motions should be supported by substantial new evidence.

VI. FUTURE PROCEEDINGS

A. Evidence Standards

The Court notes that any future motions should be supported by substantial evidence and considera-

tion of existing professional evaluations and government agency findings.

VII. EXPEDITED FULL HEARING

A. Scheduling

FULL HEARING DATE: The Court schedules a full hearing on the underlying parenting plan modification for [DATE TO BE SET] within 30 days of this Order.

B. Evidence Standards

FUTURE MOTIONS: Any future motions seeking separation must be supported by substantial evidence that overcomes: - Dr. Oreskovich psychiatric evaluation recommending sole custody - Multiple government agency validation supporting mother - Due process concerns regarding extended separation - Professional consensus for custody restoration

VIII. EFFECTIVE DATE AND COMPLIANCE

A. Immediate Effect

This Order is effective IMMEDIATELY UPON ENTRY and shall remain in full force and effect until modified by subsequent Court order.

B. Enforcement Authority

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE: If necessary, law enforcement agencies are authorized to assist in enforcement of this Order.

C. Contempt Warning

COMPLIANCE REQUIRED: Willful violation of this Order may result in contempt of court proceedings and additional sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: _____, 2025

THE HONORABLE [JUDGE NAME] Judge of the Superior Court

PRESENTED BY: Veronika Goodnight Pro Se Petitioner Date: August 18, 2025

APPROVED AS TO FORM: _____ Attorney for Petitioner (if applicable)

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE

I certify that this is a true and correct copy of the original Order on file in this office.

Clerk of the Superior Court Date: _____