

Laura Owens

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

ELECTRONICALLY

FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

10/13/2025

Clerk of the Court
BY: JOSHUA MANDAPAT
Deputy Clerk

LAURA OWENS,
Petitioner in Pro Per

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Case No.: FDV-18-813693

**PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT
LIST**

LAURA OWENS,
PETITIONER,

Vs.

MICHAEL MARRACCINI,
RESPONDENT.

Date: October 21 and 22, 2025

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: 405A

1. Domestic Violence Restraining Orders (FDV-18-813693)

Includes the original 2018 order, the 2020 renewal, and Petitioner's 2018 declaration establishing the factual basis for protection through July 10, 2025.

2. Related Protective Orders Against Clayton Echard and Greg Gillespie

Copies of active protection orders issued by other courts involving the same or overlapping factual circumstances, demonstrating the continuity of Respondent's coordinated actions with individuals subject to those orders.

3. Declaration of Laura Owens (2025, with Exhibits)

Filed in support of renewal, detailing Respondent's continued violations of the 2020 DVRO, reputational attacks, indirect contact through third parties, and ongoing emotional distress.

4. Declaration of Attorney David S. Gingras, Esq. (with Exhibits)

Describes Respondent's unauthorized appearance at the **June 10, 2024 Owens v. Echard** hearing despite counsel's written assurance he would not appear, and documents his participation in social-media harassment — including his public **May 6, 2024 comment tagging @ted and @tedx_official** demanding removal of Petitioner's TEDx talk.

5. Video Posted by Clayton Echard (June 9, 2024)

Instagram video showing Respondent with Greg Gillespie in Arizona one day before the *Owens v. Echard* hearing, demonstrating coordinated conduct and disregard for court boundaries.

6. Video – Respondent Present for Arizona Paternity Case Against Clayton Echard (June 10, 2024)

Video with witnesses confirming Respondent's presence during Petitioner's paternity case hearing in Arizona despite the San Francisco DVRO's no-contact provision and "knowing he was not going to be testifying".

7. Article and Video – "Exclusive Interview: Second Victim of Bachelor False Accuser Speaks Out" (June 28, 2024)

Interview hosted by Megan Fox in which Respondent calls himself Petitioner's "victim" and repeats defamatory statements, showing indirect contact and reputational abuse in violation of the DVRO.

8. YouTube Video – "Breaking: Bachelor Clayton's Accuser Has Texts EXPOSED From Previous Boyfriend!" (2024)

YouTube link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Qjb1HkeVro>

Video with 17,000+ views spreading fabricated messages attributed to Petitioner, relying on leaked material traceable to Respondent or his relatives.

9. Website and Archive – victimsoflauraowens.com (including /michael-marraccini and Comprehensive Timeline)

Consolidated exhibit of the website's pages and posts containing over 2,000 leaked text messages, commentary, and defamatory narratives published between 2023–2025. Content mirrors private material in Respondent's possession, showing direct or family-assisted dissemination of confidential communications to damage Petitioner's reputation.

10. Respondent's Leaked Video of Petitioner's Fall (June 17, 2024)

Video uploaded online showing Petitioner's fall off of a horse in June 2017 — footage exclusively sent to Respondent — released to humiliate and discredit her. Respondent knows that Petitioner's business is selling horses and that her reputation as a good rider is key to her doing that. Leaking this video is damaging to Petitioner's reputation.

11. Posts by Respondent's Sister Stephanie Ash Marraccini (now Scanlon) under the Reddit username "JusticeForMM" (2023–2025)

Compilation of Reddit comments from Respondent's sister, posted under the handle "JusticeForMM" on r/JusticeForClayton. In multiple posts, Ms. Scanlon publicly identifies Respondent as her brother ("Mike is my younger brother and I could not be prouder of him") and asserts after his June 28, 2024 interview with content creator Megan Fox that he is "finally allowed to speak for himself," falsely suggesting that the San Francisco restraining order is no longer in effect.

Her comments further include targeted attacks against Petitioner and her family, such as "her parents bankrupted themselves because of her lies" and "Laura's whole family is toxic," and repeated demands to "take down your fraudulent TEDx talk Laura."

These posts demonstrate direct coordination with Respondent and an ongoing effort by his family to harass Petitioner, spread defamatory claims, and misrepresent the status of the restraining order. Such conduct constitutes indirect contact and “disturbing the peace” under Family Code § 6320 and violates the continuing DVRO protections through July 10, 2025.

12. Screenshot – Respondent Leaking Private Photographs (July 7, 2025)

Image confirming Respondent’s release of private and explicit photographs of Petitioner, constituting a direct violation of the DVRO and continued psychological abuse.

13. Folder – Respondent Sharing Private Photos and Videos on Discord (“Honk My Meat”) (August 10, 2024)

Screenshots and chat logs showing accounts linked to Respondent distributing private media of Petitioner and her family on Discord, causing reputational and emotional harm.

14. Communications Between Respondent’s Ex-Partner Callie Supsinskas (McClain) and Petitioner (2018)

Messages from Ms. Supsinskas acknowledging Respondent’s volatile behavior and thanking Petitioner for warning her, independently corroborating his pattern of emotional abuse and coercive control.

15. Declaration of Karen Ambro Bernatis (Ilmberger)

Independent eyewitness declaration describing Respondent’s aggressive behavior toward Petitioner on a 2016 international flight, later published in *Chicken Soup for the Soul: Get Out of Your Comfort Zone* (2023), showing that uninvolved witnesses recognized his dangerous conduct.

16. CPS and HR Records – Pending Subpoena (2024)

Petitioner intends to subpoena certified records from Child Protective Services and Respondent’s employer in New York to verify that she made no contact with either agency and that any CPS report regarding Respondent was filed by an independent third party. Both confirmations will demonstrate that Respondent falsely accused Petitioner of actions intended to incite harassment and deflect accountability.

17. Transcript & Video - “Owens v. Echard Post-Trial Interview with Mike Marraccini”

YouTube link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nhdseYCE9WU>

Video interview hosted by Megan Fox on June 28, 2024. Respondent appears on camera, refers to himself as Petitioner’s “victim,” and reiterates false and defamatory statements about her. He admits he “knew he wasn’t going to be testifying” at the hearing at 1:36:50.

This post-trial media appearance constitutes indirect contact, violates the spirit of the restraining order, and evidences an ongoing campaign to publicly humiliate and intimidate Petitioner.

18. YouTube Video – “Bachelor Clayton ISN’T ALONE – Wild Texts Revealed From ‘Victim 1’ Years Before...” (January 12, 2024)

YouTube link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qvVOovaTiMw>

Video posted by Dave Neal showing screenshots of Petitioner’s private messages that could only have come from Respondent or his associates. By leaking and distributing these communications publicly, Respondent violated the DVRO’s prohibitions on indirect contact and “disturbing the peace” under Family Code § 6320.

19. Screenshot – Respondent Comment on Instagram (May 6, 2024)

Under Clayton Echard’s verified post, Respondent publicly tagged @ted and @tedx_official writing, “enough is enough! Take down her completely fabricated Ted X talk about me!” This direct incitement of harassment and reputational attack further breaches the DVRO’s no-contact and no-harassment provisions.

20. Screenshot – Respondent Calling Petitioner “Dangerous” (January 2024)

Instagram exchange between Respondent and Greg Gillespie, against whom Petitioner holds an active Arizona Order of Protection (FN2022-052111). Gillespie wrote, “Stop this woman! No one should cave to her harassment, she is DANGEROUS,” and Respondent replied, “Dangerous is an understatement.” This public interaction constitutes indirect contact and reputational harassment, violating the San Francisco DVRO’s prohibitions against “disturbing the peace” and contact through third parties under Family Code § 6320.

21. Joan O’Neill – 2018 Signed Declaration and Supporting Text Messages

Includes Joan O’Neill’s original signed declaration filed March 29, 2018, in support of Petitioner’s DVRO (FDV-18-813693), together with contemporaneous text messages between Ms. O’Neill and Petitioner.

The declaration details firsthand observations of Respondent’s controlling, demeaning, and physically abusive conduct and was transmitted to the Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic (CROC) by Ms. O’Neill herself.

The attached messages confirm that Ms. O’Neill independently authored, signed, and faxed her declaration (“I just wanted to finish up the statement and have it notarized... I faxed the declaration...” – texts dated March 2018).

These records directly refute Respondent’s claim that Petitioner fabricated or drafted Ms. O’Neill’s statement, and they corroborate the authenticity and voluntary nature of her sworn declaration.

22. Instagram Account – “@justiceforclaytonofficial” (2023–2025)

Compilation of select posts from the Instagram account @justiceforclaytonofficial, which has persistently targeted Petitioner through defamatory and harassing content that could only have originated from Respondent or his family. The account operates as a coordinated proxy used to

continue Respondent's harassment and reputational attacks in violation of the 2020 San Francisco Domestic Violence Restraining Order.

The account routinely posts:

- **Private photos, videos, and screenshots** known to have been in Respondent's or his relatives' exclusive possession, including materials shared privately during the parties' relationship;
- **False, humiliating, and inflammatory statements** about Petitioner, including that she is "a serial liar," "mentally unstable," and "dangerous";
- **Hashtags and captions** directly tied to Respondent's public narrative, such as *#JusticeForMike*, *#ExposeLauraOwens*, and *#TeamMM*; and
- **Posts published in close coordination** with Respondent's own appearances, comments, or his family's online activity (see Exhibits 7, 11, 17, and 20), reflecting direct collaboration or shared content access.

The consistency in tone, timing, and use of private materials establishes that Respondent — or persons acting under his direction — have actively provided this account with content, commentary, or access to personal media and information. These actions amount to knowing and willful violations of the DVRO's prohibitions on:

- Direct or indirect contact;
- Harassment or intimidation through third parties; and
- "Disturbing the peace" under Family Code § 6320

This exhibit demonstrates Respondent's ongoing use of third-party intermediaries to perpetuate contact, reputational harm, and emotional abuse after being ordered to cease all communication with Petitioner.

23. Instagram Account – "@victims_of_laura_owens" (2024–2025)

Compilation of selected posts from the Instagram account *@victims_of_laura_owens*, which has repeatedly published defamatory and harassing content concerning Petitioner and these proceedings. The account presents itself as representing Respondent's "side of the story," repeatedly referring to him as "the victim" and echoing phrasing used by Respondent and his attorney in filings and media interviews.

The posts demonstrate direct or attorney-facilitated involvement by Respondent through their content, timing, and exclusive access to nonpublic materials. Examples include:

- Posts stating "filings coming soon", "our attorney approved this," and "his legal team has reviewed and confirmed it"—phrasing that reveals direct access to Respondent's counsel and advance knowledge of litigation events.
- Uploads of court pleadings, including Respondent's CCP § 473(b)(d) motion, which appeared on the account within hours of its electronic filing despite never being served on Petitioner. The presence of file-stamp headers and formatting identical to Respondent's

digital copies establishes that these documents were provided by Respondent or his counsel.

- Posts quoting specific lines and claims from Respondent's court filings and media statements, including false assertions that Petitioner "filed fake pregnancies and restraining orders," and that "her parents went bankrupt because of her lies."
- Captions such as "Mike finally gets to speak for himself," "The court will see through her fraud soon enough," and "San Francisco should not let her renew her bogus DVRO", which coincide with Respondent's public appearances and filings.
- Direct references to attorney approval and "legal team coordination", confirming that content was not sourced by random followers but by individuals with privileged or insider access to Respondent's litigation materials.

The timing and insider nature of these posts—especially the publication of unserved court documents and legal filings—prove that Respondent or his attorney either leaked, authorized, or facilitated the release of confidential information. Even if Respondent denies personally operating the account, his knowing participation and benefit from these disclosures constitute indirect contact and harassment through a proxy, prohibited under Family Code § 6320 and enforceable as a violation of the DVRO.

This exhibit establishes that Respondent has continued to disturb Petitioner's peace and reputation by using third parties and social media intermediaries to disseminate privileged court material, false statements, and humiliating commentary. These coordinated actions reflect ongoing coercive control and reputational abuse in willful violation of the DVRO, supporting renewal under Family Code § 6345.

24. Voicemails from Peggy Marraccini to Petitioner

Audio recordings of voicemail messages left by Peggy Marraccini, Respondent's mother, during a period when Petitioner was attempting to distance herself from Respondent and end the relationship.

The messages show that Petitioner was not returning calls or initiating contact, while Ms. Marraccini repeatedly reached out, expressing distress and attempting to reestablish a connection. Representative excerpts include:

"I'm a stage-five stalker right now, but I just want to hear your voice and know you're okay." [Peggy voicemail 4]

"I want to see you, want to hug you, want to kiss you." [Peggy voicemail 5]

"I don't know what happened, but I just want to see you, I miss you so much." [Peggy voicemail 1]

These voicemails confirm that Petitioner was not seeking or maintaining contact, directly contradicting Respondent's current narrative that she was "obsessed," "fixated," or "unable to move on." Instead, they show that it was Respondent's family pursuing Petitioner after the relationship ended.

While recorded prior to 2020, they remain relevant and admissible under *Family Code §6345* because they clarify the nature of the relationship, support Petitioner's credibility, and illustrate that her conduct since separation has been consistent with seeking distance and safety—not ongoing pursuit.