

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER

In the Matter of the Application of

STEPHEN GRANT RUSSELL, Petitioner,

For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules,

— against —

MICHELE REED BOWMAN, Support Magistrate, Westchester County Family Court;
WESTCHESTER COUNTY FAMILY COURT; and **TARA KATELYN WALSH**,

Respondents.

Index No.: ____

VERIFIED PETITION PURSUANT TO CPLR ARTICLE 78

Filed Pursuant to CPLR §§ 7801–7806; U.S. Const. Amends. I & XIV; 42 U.S.C. § 1983

NATURE OF PROCEEDING

This is a proceeding under CPLR Article 78 to review determinations of Support Magistrate Michele Reed Bowman, issued on February 3, 2026 and March 12, 2026, that are:

- arbitrary and capricious;
 - contrary to the record;
 - affected by errors of law;
 - made in excess of jurisdiction; and
 - made in violation of lawful procedure and constitutional due process.
-

CORE CLAIM

Respondents enforced support obligations based on a custody order that:

- was originally entered on default;
- was characterized as a default by Respondent Walsh’s own counsel in appellate briefing;
- was later determined by the Appellate Division, Second Department, not to be a valid default (*Matter of Walsh v. Russell*, 214 A.D.3d 890 (2d Dep’t 2023));
- has since been retroactively recharacterized in court records as entered “after hearing” — without any judicial order, notice, or process;
- was entered without a single exhibit being admitted into evidence, without cross-examination, and without the respondent’s participation; and
- was enforced despite the Court being presented with all of these contradictions on the record.

The enforcement of obligations based on such an order is arbitrary and unlawful.

PARTIES

1. Petitioner STEPHEN GRANT RUSSELL is a resident of Santa Barbara, California, and is the Respondent in the underlying Family Court support proceeding, File No. 154703, Docket No. F-08146-18/25F.
 2. Respondent MICHELE REED BOWMAN is a Support Magistrate of the Westchester County Family Court who issued the challenged determinations.
 3. Respondent WESTCHESTER COUNTY FAMILY COURT is the court in which the challenged proceedings occurred.
 4. Respondent TARA KATELYN WALSH is the Petitioner in the underlying support proceeding and has an interest in its outcome.
-

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to CPLR § 7804(b). Venue is proper in Westchester County pursuant to CPLR § 7804(b) because the Respondent body or officer is located in Westchester County.
 2. This proceeding is timely. The challenged orders were mailed on March 19, 2026. This petition is filed within the four-month statute of limitations under CPLR § 217(1).
-

STATEMENT OF FACTS

A. Procedural History

1. On or about July 12, 2018, Tara Katelyn Walsh filed custody and family offense petitions in Westchester County Family Court, thirty-three days after arriving in New York with the parties' minor child, Evelyn Grace Walsh (DOB: January 27, 2018).
2. The petitions invoked emergency jurisdiction under DRL § 76-a based on an allegation that Petitioner Stephen Russell had threatened to kill Walsh and the child with a gun. Walsh later recanted this allegation in a signed letter to the Chappaqua Police Department dated November 23, 2020 (ExM_01).
3. On January 5, 2022, an inquest proceeding was held before Hon. Michelle I. Schauer. Russell was outside the United States. His retained counsel appeared in person and requested electronic participation, which was denied. Walsh was the sole witness. No documentary exhibits were marked or admitted into evidence (Inquest Tr. 2).
4. On February 2, 2022, Judge Schauer entered an Order of Custody granting Walsh full legal and physical custody, an Order of Protection, and a speech restriction order. The speech restriction was later struck by the Appellate Division as an unconstitutional prior restraint. *Matter of Walsh v. Russell*, 214 A.D.3d 890, 891 (2d Dep't 2023).

5. On February 22, 2022 — twenty days after the custody order — a San Francisco jury unanimously found Walsh liable for Intentional Battery, Domestic Violence, and Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress, with findings of Malice, Oppression, or Fraud (ExG_01). The judgment of \$332,080.74 was affirmed on appeal and domesticated in New York.

B. The Support Proceeding

1. The existing support order directs Russell to pay \$4,788.00 monthly. Russell filed a modification petition seeking reduction based on a substantial change in circumstances: income had declined from approximately \$350,000+ (at the time of the original order in 2018) to \$115,184 (2025 W-2 income from Prism Space LLC).
2. On February 3, 2026, Support Magistrate Bowman conducted a hearing on the modification petition and issued an Order of Dismissal (Motion 1) denying the petition.
3. On March 2, 2026, Russell filed a Notice of Related Motion and Request to Stay Enforcement (NYSCEF Doc. No. 33) advising the Court of a pending motion to vacate the underlying custody orders.
4. On March 12, 2026, Support Magistrate Bowman dismissed the Notice of Related Motion as “procedurally defective” under CPLR § 2214 (Motion 2).
5. Both orders were mailed on March 19, 2026.

C. The February 3, 2026 Hearing — Transcript Evidence

1. At the hearing, the Court stated:

“I reviewed the court file and it seems to indicate that custody was granted after hearing.”

(ExTR_20, Bowman Support Hearing Transcript.)

1. Petitioner Russell immediately corrected the record:

“The order was granted on default, and the New York Supreme Court upon reviewing the order stated that there could be no default because I was represented by an attorney that was in attendance.”

(ExTR_20.)

1. Russell further stated:

“There were two orders, one a custody order and one a gag order... The court overruled the content of the gag order and stated that those two orders created on default were not possible because there was no default, I had an attorney present.”

(ExTR_20.)

1. The Court responded:

“But another order hasn’t been issued... the prevailing order, the law of this case, grants Ms. Walsh custody... and that entitles her to child support.”

(ExTR_20.)

1. The Court further acknowledged:

“I’m particularly curious to know the outcome of any proceeding that would impact custody... but another order hasn’t been issued.”

(ExTR_20.)

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS — RELIANCE ON CONTRADICTORY RECORD

1. Petitioner repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 21.
2. The record contains four mutually exclusive characterizations of the same custody order:

- a. **The original order (Jan. 5, 2022 Inquest Transcript):** entered “on default” — Judge Schauer stated: “an order on default... a final order” (Inquest Tr. 92; see also Tr. 88, 94);
- b. **Respondent Walsh’s own counsel on appeal:** In opposing Russell’s appeal, Walsh’s attorney (Weddle) affirmatively argued that the order was entered upon Russell’s default and that the appeal should be dismissed under CPLR § 5511 as premature — because default orders require a motion to vacate, not a direct appeal. (Respondent’s Brief, Appeal No. 2022-02838, Point I.) This is an affirmative litigation concession by Respondent Walsh’s own counsel that the order was a default;
- c. **The Appellate Division (214 A.D.3d 890):** expressly rejected both the trial court’s and Walsh’s counsel’s characterization, holding that default was not possible because counsel appeared and participated;
- d. **Support Magistrate Bowman (Feb. 3, 2026):** custody was granted “after hearing” — a characterization that appears nowhere in the original record and contradicts every prior account.

1. These four characterizations are mutually exclusive. They cannot all be true. The Court enforced the order without resolving which characterization is correct.
 2. The fourth characterization is particularly significant: Respondent Walsh is judicially estopped from claiming that a valid hearing occurred. Her own counsel conceded on appeal that the order was entered on default. The Appellate Division rejected that concession. The court’s internal records now reflect a third position — “after hearing” — that was never the product of any judicial determination.
 3. The court’s internal system was retroactively altered to reflect the orders as “after hearing.” This alteration occurred after the Appellate Division adjudicated that no default occurred, after the trial court itself had characterized the proceeding as a default, and after Walsh’s own counsel conceded default as an affirmative litigation position. No order, stipulation, or judicial determination authorized this change. It constitutes the retroactive fabrication of a false procedural history (ExSS_03).
 4. A determination that rests on a disputed, unresolved, and internally contradictory predicate order — one whose procedural history has been retroactively altered without judicial authorization — is arbitrary and capricious as a matter of law.
-

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: CONTRARY TO THE RECORD — FINDINGS NOT SUPPORTED BY EVIDENCE

1. Petitioner repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 27.
 2. The Court found that Russell failed to provide financial documentation. This is false. Russell:
 - a. Submitted W-2 earnings statements at the hearing, which the Court acknowledged in its order;
 - b. Filed a complete 2025 federal income tax return (Form 1040) on February 9, 2026, via NYSCEF Doc. No. 32, showing total income of \$115,184;
 - c. Testified under oath as to his financial condition.
 1. The Court rejected Russell’s sworn testimony and filed documentation without identifying what additional evidence would have been required.
 2. The Court simultaneously found that “Ms. Walsh did not submit financial disclosure to the court” and that “Ms. Walsh is precluded from offering evidence or testimony regarding her resources” — yet credited Walsh’s unsupported claims about Russell’s alleged assets while dismissing Russell’s documented evidence.
 3. A determination that rejects both sworn testimony and filed documentary evidence, while crediting unsupported assertions from a non-complying party, is contrary to the weight of the evidence.
-

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: ERRORS OF LAW — FAILURE TO APPLY STATUTORY STANDARD

1. Petitioner repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 32.
2. FCA § 451(3)(b)(i) and (ii) provide for modification of support where three years have passed since the order was entered or where a party’s gross income has changed by 15% or more.

3. Russell's income changed from approximately \$350,000+ (2018) to \$115,184 (2025) — a reduction of more than 67%. This exceeds the 15% statutory threshold by a factor of more than four.
 4. The Court did not apply this statutory standard. Instead, the Court found that Russell "has failed to meet his burden" without identifying what that burden requires, what evidence was lacking, or how the statutory standard was considered.
 5. The Court further imposed an imputed income standard without identifying any income figure, citing any labor market data, or applying the statutory factors for imputation under FCA § 413.
 6. These constitute errors of law requiring vacatur.
-

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: EXCESS OF JURISDICTION — ENFORCEMENT OF AN INVALID PREDICATE ORDER

1. Petitioner repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 38.
2. The support determination rests entirely on the validity of the February 2, 2022 Order of Custody. That order:
 - a. Was entered following a proceeding that the Appellate Division determined was not a default;
 - b. Was entered without a single documentary exhibit being marked or admitted into evidence (Inquest Tr. 2);
 - c. Was entered after the trial court denied Russell's retained counsel the right to present a defense: "You don't get to put on a case here. This is an inquest" (Inquest Tr. 93-94) — even though the Appellate Division later held it was not a default;
 - d. Was entered after the trial court denied Russell's request for electronic appearance during documented COVID-era global flight cancellations (Inquest Tr. 16-17);
 - e. Was entered in a proceeding where the only witness was Petitioner Walsh, without cross-examination or independent evidence;

f. Has been challenged in a pending motion to vacate (NYSCEF Doc. No. 33, filed March 2, 2026) on grounds including lack of subject-matter jurisdiction under the UCCJEA (DRL § 76), extrinsic fraud (CPLR § 5015(a)(3)), and failure to conduct the mandatory domestic violence inquiry (DRL § 240(1)(a));

g. Is the subject of a pending ex parte Order to Show Cause seeking vacatur under CPLR §§ 5015(a)(3) and (a)(4).

1. The jurisdictional defect is independently dispositive. California was the child's home state under DRL § 76(1)(a). New York assumed temporary emergency jurisdiction under DRL § 76-a based solely on Walsh's allegation that Russell threatened to kill her and the child with a gun. Walsh formally recanted this allegation in a signed letter to the Chappaqua Police Department: "Mr. Stephen Russell never made a threat to kill myself or our daughter Evelyn... statements to the contrary were not true" (ExM_01, Nov. 23, 2020). The retraction permanently vitiates the emergency predicate. Without valid emergency jurisdiction, the court lacked subject-matter jurisdiction to enter the custody order upon which support obligations are predicated.
2. The Court was advised of the pending challenge to the predicate order at the hearing and in the Notice of Related Motion. The Court dismissed the notice as "procedurally defective" without providing any guidance as to what form would be acceptable.
3. Enforcement of support based on an order whose validity is under active challenge on jurisdictional, constitutional, and fraud grounds — and whose procedural basis has been rejected by an appellate court — exceeds the lawful authority of the Support Magistrate.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF LAWFUL PROCEDURE —
DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS**

1. Petitioner repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 43.
2. Russell was denied due process in the following respects:

- a. **Predicate Defect:** The Court enforced a custody order whose default status has been rejected by the Appellate Division, while declining to resolve the contradiction;
 - b. **Factual Findings Contrary to Record:** The Court based its determination on findings that are directly contradicted by filed evidence;
 - c. **Undefined Standard:** The Court required Russell to prove loss of assets and physical impairment without defining what proof would be sufficient;
 - d. **Unequal Treatment:** The Court credited Walsh’s unsupported claims — including escalating accusations of hidden wealth, connections to technology executives, concealed cryptocurrency, and secret real property, offered without a single piece of supporting evidence — while rejecting Russell’s sworn testimony and filed documentation. The Court penalized Russell for a six-day delay in filing a tax return while imposing no consequence on Walsh for total failure to provide financial disclosure. The Court accommodated Walsh’s repeated interruptions and filibustering, requiring multiple admonishments to maintain an orderly record, while sidelining Russell’s citations to binding appellate authority;
 - e. **Denial of Forum:** The dismissal of both the modification petition and the notice of related motion eliminates every available mechanism for Russell to challenge the enforcement framework while enforcement continues;
 - f. **Procedural Trap:** Russell is simultaneously subject to enforcement based on a custody order, challenging the validity of that order, and unable to obtain a stay — a procedural configuration that denies any meaningful opportunity to be heard;
 - g. **Retroactive Record Alteration:** The court’s internal records were retroactively changed from “on default” to “after hearing” without any judicial order, notice to the parties, or process — constituting active spoliation of official records that demonstrates institutional awareness that the orders cannot withstand scrutiny.
-

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION: PRESERVATION OF FEDERAL CLAIMS — 42 U.S.C. § 1983

1. Petitioner repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 45.
2. The facts set forth herein constitute continuing deprivation of liberty and property interests under color of state law in violation of the Due Process and Equal

Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment, actionable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

3. Specifically:

- a. State courts are relying on custody records that are materially disputed and arguably false, while continuing to impose downstream consequences;
- b. Later courts acknowledge appellate criticism but continue to enforce the tainted order;
- c. The court system retroactively altered official records to insulate void orders from challenge — transforming passive institutional failure into active, ongoing spoliation;
- d. Russell is denied a forum to correct the predicate defect, yet suffers ongoing consequences including support enforcement, denial of access, and reputational injury;
- e. The predicate custody order was procured through documented extrinsic fraud, including Walsh’s contemporaneous text messages outlining a financial strategy (“pretending I want to be with him and getting the most while I can”), her father’s sworn admission that his written agreement was “not entirely genuine” (ExQQ_01c), and Walsh’s own trial testimony: “I lied... I had no intention to come back” (ExTR_19e);
- f. The Family Court never conducted the mandatory domestic violence inquiry under DRL § 240(1)(a) despite a California jury having found Walsh liable for Intentional Battery, Domestic Violence, and IIED with findings of Malice, Oppression, or Fraud;
- g. The harm is ongoing and continuing.

- 1. This is not about relitigating family-court facts. It is about continuing deprivation of constitutional rights under color of state law, with knowledge.
- 2. Russell preserves these claims for assertion in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, where related federal civil rights litigation is pending.

SYSTEMIC RECORD FAILURE

- 1. The pattern documented herein is not limited to the support proceeding. The same record contradictions — four incompatible characterizations of a single custody

order, retroactive alteration of court records, enforcement of orders whose validity is under active challenge — pervade the underlying custody, protection, and support proceedings.

2. The February 3, 2026 hearing created a live judicial record of:

a. The Court’s actual knowledge of the disputed predicate; b. The Court’s conscious decision to enforce despite that knowledge; c. The Court’s reliance on records that contradict appellate findings; d. The Court’s imposition of obligations based on an unresolved and internally contradictory order.

1. This constitutes a systemic record failure that cannot be cured by the exercise of discretion within the support proceeding alone.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Petitioner Stephen Grant Russell respectfully requests that this Court:

1. **Vacate** the Order of Dismissal dated February 3, 2026 (Motion 1) and the Order of Dismissal dated March 12, 2026 (Motion 2) as arbitrary and capricious, contrary to the record, affected by errors of law, made in excess of jurisdiction, and in violation of lawful procedure;
2. **Remand** the support modification petition for a proper hearing with application of the correct statutory standard under FCA § 451(3);
3. **Stay all support enforcement** pending resolution of the pending motion to vacate the underlying custody orders (NYSCEF Doc. No. 33);
4. **Declare** that the Support Magistrate’s reliance on the February 2, 2022 Order of Custody was arbitrary and unlawful in light of the Appellate Division’s determination that the order was not entered on default and the unresolved contradiction in the court’s records;
5. **Direct** the Family Court to resolve the status of the predicate custody order before imposing further enforcement;

6. **Order** that the court's internal records be corrected to accurately reflect the procedural history of the custody order, consistent with the Appellate Division's holding;
7. **Note** Petitioner's preservation of federal constitutional claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983;
8. Award Petitioner costs, disbursements, and such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPHEN GRANT RUSSELL Petitioner, Pro Se

DATED: March ___, 2026

1117 State Street, STE 77 Santa Barbara, CA 93101 (415) 999-3944 sg.russ@aol.com

VERIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss.: COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA)

I, Stephen Grant Russell, affirm under the penalties of perjury pursuant to CPLR § 2106 that the foregoing petition is true and correct based upon personal knowledge, except as to those matters stated upon information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

Dated: March ___, 2026 Santa Barbara, California

STEPHEN GRANT RUSSELL

EVIDENTIARY APPENDIX

The following evidence is referenced throughout this Verified Petition. Items designated with NYSCEF Doc. numbers are part of the Family Court record (File No. 154703, Docket No. F-08146-18/25F). Items designated with exhibit codes are part of the record in the related custody proceeding and/or the federal civil rights action (S.D.N.Y.). All materials were presented to or available to the Respondent court at or before the February 3, 2026 hearing.

A. THE CHALLENGED ORDERS

Order of Dismissal — Motion 1 (Feb. 3, 2026): Denied Russell’s petition for downward modification of child support. Found Russell “failed to meet his burden” despite filed income documentation and sworn testimony. Acknowledged Walsh “did not submit financial disclosure to the court” and that Walsh “is precluded from offering evidence or testimony regarding her resources” — yet credited Walsh’s unsupported testimony about Russell’s alleged assets.

Detailed Order of Dismissal (Feb. 3, 2026): Contains findings including the \$4,788/month support figure, Walsh’s testimony about Russell’s “\$18 million” in Uber stock and Stanford degree, and the Court’s reliance on the existing custody arrangement as the predicate for support.

Order of Dismissal — Motion 2 (Mar. 12, 2026): Dismissed Russell’s Notice of Related Motion as “improper and dismissed as procedurally defective” under CPLR § 2214, without guidance as to what form would be acceptable.

All three orders were mailed on March 19, 2026.

B. APPELLATE DIVISION DECISION (ExR_04)

Matter of Walsh v. Russell, 214 A.D.3d 890, 891 (2d Dep’t 2023).

“Initially, contrary to the contention of the mother and the attorney for the child, the order appealed from was not entered upon the father’s default, inasmuch as his attorney appeared on his behalf at the January 5, 2022, hearing.”

The Court reached the merits and struck the speech restriction as an unconstitutional prior restraint. This determination is binding on the Family Court and on the Respondent Support Magistrate.

C. WEDDLE RESPONDENT BRIEF — DEFAULT CONCESSION (ExR_05)

Attorney's Brief for Respondent (Walsh), Appellate Division Docket No. 2022-02838 (Christopher S. Weddle, Esq., One North Broadway, Suite 412, White Plains, NY 10601).

Point I — “THE APPEAL IS PREMATURE”:

“The instant appeal is not procedurally appropriate. As noted in the Brief for Respondent-Appellant, the trial court’s order was issued on default, due to Appellant’s failure to appear as required. See, Appellant’s Brief at p. 7. An appeal from a default judgment is procedurally infirm. The proper remedy is for Appellant to move to vacate default, showing first an excuse for the default and a meritorious defense on the merits.” (Citing Uhlfelder v. Uhlfelder, 266 A.D.2d 388 (2d Dep’t 1999); In re Gallagher, 289 A.D.2d 237 (2d Dep’t 2001).)

Statement of Facts:

“Upon Appellant’s failure to appear on that date, the Family Court entered an order granting Respondent an order of sole custody of E.W. on default and provided for supervised visitation for the Appellant as agreed by the parties.”

This is Walsh’s own counsel’s affirmative litigation concession that the order was entered on default. The Appellate Division expressly rejected this position and reached the merits. Walsh is judicially estopped from now claiming a valid hearing occurred.

D. INQUEST TRANSCRIPT EXCERPTS (Jan. 5, 2022)

Certified transcript, *Walsh v. Russell*, File No. 154703, before Hon. Michelle I. Schauer, Westchester County Family Court, January 5, 2022.

Tr. p. 2 — No Exhibits Admitted: “No exhibits were marked or admitted into evidence.” The Court entered a permanent custody order and order of protection without a single documentary exhibit in the evidentiary record.

Tr. p. 92 — Default Characterization: “Well, I think the issue here is that—an order on default... a final order. Once an order becomes a final order, there’s nothing more the court can do about it.”

Tr. pp. 15-17 — Electronic Appearance Denied: Russell’s counsel stated: “Your Honor, my client is currently stuck in Bora Bora, and he’s been having difficulty getting out of there for the last few days, due to COVID reasons and flights being canceled... my client is available by telephone or electronically; is there any way to—” The Court responded: “No... I’m not permitting your client to appear electronically. He needs to be here, in person, and under control...”

Tr. pp. 93-94 — Defense Precluded: “You don’t get to put on a case here. This is an inquest.” And: “You don’t get to present his case without a client, Mr. Advocate.”

Tr. pp. 4-5 — Pre-Judgment: Prior to any evidence being introduced: “He’s not been the most credible person.” And: “So that’s at least one lie.”

E. FEBRUARY 3, 2026 HEARING — BOWMAN TRANSCRIPT (ExTR_20)

Hearing before Support Magistrate Michele Reed Bowman, February 3, 2026, File No. 154703, Docket No. F-08146-18/25F.

Bowman states custody was “after hearing”:

“I reviewed the court file and it seems to indicate that custody was granted after hearing... the prevailing order grants Ms. Walsh full legal and physical custody of your daughter.”

Russell corrects the record:

“The order was granted on default, and the New York Supreme Court upon reviewing the order stated that there could be no default because I was represented by an attorney that was in attendance.”

“There were two orders, one a custody order and one a gag order... The court overruled the content of the gag order and stated that those two orders created on default were not possible because there was no default, I had an attorney present.”

Bowman acknowledges but enforces anyway:

“But another order hasn’t been issued... the prevailing order, the law of this case, grants Ms. Walsh custody... and that entitles her to child support.”

“I’m particularly curious to know the outcome of any proceeding that would impact custody... but another order hasn’t been issued.”

Walsh’s unsupported claims:

“I have complex PTSD... To hear him talk about this is disturbing and upsetting.” (No medical documentation offered.)

Walsh’s accusations escalated to claims of hidden wealth, connections to Elon Musk, concealed cryptocurrency, and secret real property — without evidence.

Bowman admonishes Walsh:

“Ms. Walsh, please... Ms. Walsh, you’ll get an opportunity to respond... it’s really important that we keep the record clear.”

F. RETROACTIVE RECORD ALTERATION (ExSS_03)

The court’s internal computer system was retroactively altered to reflect the February 2, 2022 custody orders as entered “after hearing.” This alteration occurred after the Appellate Division adjudicated that no default occurred (2023), after the trial court itself characterized the proceeding as a default (Inquest Tr. 92), and after Walsh’s own counsel conceded default. No judicial order, stipulation, notice, or determination authorized the change. The alteration was first observed on the record at the February 3, 2026 hearing.

G. SAN FRANCISCO JURY VERDICT (ExG_01)

On February 22, 2022, a jury in the San Francisco Superior Court (Case No. CGC-19-578742) unanimously found Respondent Tara Katelyn Walsh liable for Intentional Battery, Domestic Violence (Cal. Civ. Code § 1708.6), and Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress, with specific findings of Malice, Oppression, or Fraud. Judgment of \$332,080.74 was entered, affirmed on appeal (ExG_05), and domesticated in New York.

H. WALSH GUN THREAT RECANTATION (ExM_01)

Signed letter from Tara Katelyn Walsh to the Chappaqua Police Department, November 23, 2020:

“TO WHOM IT CONCERNS: I would like to let this police department know that Mr. Stephen Russell never made a threat to kill myself or our daughter Evelyn. I would like to withdraw any complaints regarding this... statements to the contrary were not true. Sincerely, Tara Walsh”

This is the allegation upon which New York assumed temporary emergency jurisdiction under DRL § 76-a. The formal recantation permanently vitiates the emergency predicate.

I. EXTRINSIC FRAUD — WALSH TEXT MESSAGES (WALSH_004106-07)

Text messages, Tara Walsh to Matan Gavish, February 20, 2018 (while parties cohabitated in California, weeks after the child’s birth):

“If I sue him for child support I will get like \$2k a month. Which is not enough to live off of. I’m better pretending I want to be with him and getting the most while I can - then leaving him for good.”

“I really mostly hate him at this point - not sure if I can manage to hold myself back. But would be the sweetest revenge if I could.”

J. EXTRINSIC FRAUD — STEPHEN WALSH DEPOSITION (ExQQ_01c)

Sworn deposition of Stephen Walsh (Petitioner’s father), April 2021, regarding his June 8, 2018 email confirming a “temporary visit” agreement:

“I would say I was not entirely genuine. And again, I I was trying to defray what what I viewed as a caustic situation.”

K. EXTRINSIC FRAUD — WALSH TRIAL TESTIMONY (ExTR_19e)

Sworn testimony of Tara Katelyn Walsh, San Francisco Superior Court civil trial, regarding the “temporary vacation” agreement:

“I lied... I had no intention to come back.”

L. FINANCIAL DOCUMENTATION (NYSCEF Docs. 32-33)

NYSCEF Doc. 32 (filed Feb. 9, 2026): Ex Parte Supplemental Affirmation with completed 2025 federal income tax return (Form 1040) showing total income of \$115,184, and 2025 W-2 from Prism Space LLC showing wages of \$115,184.43.

NYSCEF Doc. 33 (filed Mar. 2, 2026): Notice of Related Motion and Request to Stay Enforcement, advising the Court of a pending motion to vacate the underlying custody orders. Dismissed as “procedurally defective” on March 12, 2026.