

Petitioner in Pro Per

The request to extend time to file the opening brief on or before 7/29/26 is granted. ****FURTHER EXTENSIONS ARE NOT CONTEMPLATED.***

Humes, P.J.

COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

San Francisco Superior Court
Case No. FDV-18-813693)

Petitioner-Appellant Laura Owens applies ex parte pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.60, for a 30-day extension of time to file her Opening Brief, currently due June 29, 2026, to and including July 29, 2026.

I. INTRODUCTION

On April 23, 2026, this Court granted Petitioner’s first application for an extension of time, extending the Opening Brief deadline to June 29, 2026. The purpose of that extension was to allow Petitioner to correct the trial court record before briefing proceeded. She has pursued that correction

with diligence. It has not yet been accomplished — not because of any lack of effort, but because the trial court has not ruled on the motion Petitioner filed for that precise purpose.

On June 8, 2026, Petitioner filed a Motion to Correct and Augment the Record in the San Francisco Superior Court, with an explicit request for expedited consideration in light of the approaching briefing deadline. As of June 22, 2026 — fifteen days later — the trial court has not ruled. That ruling is the prerequisite to everything else. Pro bono legal counsel who have reviewed this matter substantively and offered to assist Petitioner in preparing her Opening Brief have advised that they cannot proceed until the trial court record is corrected to reflect the facts on which this appeal rests. The moment the trial court acts, counsel can step in and briefing can proceed responsibly. Until it does, Petitioner faces the same obstacle this Court recognized on April 23: a Reporter’s Transcript that does not reflect the proceeding it purports to describe.

The extension period has not been idle. In the weeks following this Court’s April 23 order, Respondent filed a \$109,633.98 attorneys’ fees motion that required Petitioner’s immediate attention and was ultimately withdrawn after Petitioner documented that it contained an admitted false statement of material fact. Additional misconduct by Respondent’s lead counsel — including a June 3, 2026 television appearance making false public statements about Petitioner while this appeal is pending — prompted Petitioner to file a Request for Review with the California State Bar’s Complaint Review Unit. These developments, described in detail below, consumed significant time during the extension period and further underscore why the assistance of counsel is essential to briefing this appeal properly.

Thirty days is the minimum necessary to allow the trial court to rule on a motion it has held without action for fifteen days, to allow pro bono counsel to step in with the corrected record they are waiting for, and to allow this appeal to proceed as it should — on an accurate record.

II. THE RECORD DEFICIENCY THAT PROMPTED THE FIRST EXTENSION REMAINS UNCORRECTED

This Court granted the April 23 extension on the ground that the facts underlying this appeal are not in the official trial court record. That remains true today, and it is worth stating plainly what is missing and why it matters.

The Reporter's Transcript on Appeal spans five pages and documents a proceeding lasting approximately four minutes. It reflects only that Petitioner did not appear and the matter was dismissed. It contains no reference to what actually occurred in the hours before that dismissal — events that are documented in writing, were known to the trial court before it acted, and are essential to any meaningful review of whether the dismissal was an abuse of discretion.

The day before the hearing, at 10:05 a.m., the Court emailed all parties that there was a high chance no official court reporter would be available and that the matter would need to be continued if any party declined to waive. Petitioner relied on that directive. She did not waive, and she canceled her planned travel to San Francisco in writing that same morning, documenting her reliance on the Court's representation that the matter would be continued absent waiver.

Five minutes later, at 10:10 a.m., Respondent's counsel emailed the Court's department directly — without Petitioner added to the chain — to inquire about securing a private reporter. What followed were six hours of

ex parte communications between Court staff and Respondent's counsel from which Petitioner was entirely excluded. At 3:32 p.m., Court staff asked whether the proposed reporter was certified. At 3:42 p.m., Respondent's counsel confirmed a reporter had been secured. At 4:08 p.m., Court staff asked for the reporter's name and license number. These communications went directly to the question that determined whether the hearing could legally proceed — and they were conducted entirely without Petitioner's knowledge or participation.

Petitioner was not added to the email chain until 4:40 p.m. — after the reporter had been identified, vetted, credentialed, and effectively approved. She immediately objected in writing, invoked her statutory rights under Government Code section 68086 and California Rules of Court, rule 2.956(c)(1), and reiterated her non-waiver. At 5:08 p.m. — the first moment she learned the hearing would proceed — her family purchased emergency last-minute air travel from Phoenix to San Francisco departing at 6:25 a.m. the following morning.

That flight was not taken. In the early morning hours of November 5, 2025, Petitioner suffered a sudden and severe medical emergency. She was vomiting blood — a recurrence of gastrointestinal bleeding her physicians had previously warned required immediate emergency care. She canceled her flight and went directly to HonorHealth Scottsdale Shea Hospital's emergency department, where she was admitted at approximately 5:37 a.m. — more than three hours before the scheduled hearing, so that the medical team could determine the source of the bleeding. She remained hospitalized overnight. The following day, November 6, she underwent surgery.

Before the 9:00 a.m. hearing began, Petitioner notified the Court and all counsel of her condition in two separate written communications. Her

first email, sent at 6:21 a.m., described the emergency in detail, advised that she was physically unable to appear, submitted medical documentation, and offered without reservation to execute HIPAA authorizations permitting independent verification by both the Court and Respondent's counsel. Her second email, sent at 6:53 a.m., advised that she was being formally admitted, that she was expected to remain hospitalized overnight, and explicitly requested a continuance. Court Manager Frances Yokota acknowledged both notifications in writing — at 7:11 a.m. and again at 7:33 a.m. — before the matter was called at 9:26 a.m. Neither the Court nor Respondent's counsel requested the HIPAA verification Petitioner had offered.

The matter was dismissed in four minutes. Respondent's lead counsel and co-counsel were both present in the courtroom that morning and both copied on Petitioner's emergency notifications. Neither said a word about them. Days later, in a recorded interview, Respondent's lead counsel acknowledged receiving those communications and explained his silence: *"We did not respond ... I didn't want to give her a chance to give her anything to respond to."* No final order was ever prepared. The minute entry — the only official memorialization of the dismissal — states simply "No Order is prepared for today's hearing" and records the dismissal as having occurred "[b]ecause of the non-appearance of Petitioner," with no reference to any of the foregoing. The Reporter's Transcript contains no reference to any of this either.

Also absent from the transcript are Petitioner's ADA accommodation requests, submitted before the hearing on the basis of documented disabilities including autism spectrum disorder, PTSD, epilepsy, and severe anorexia nervosa with active gastrointestinal complications — the very condition that produced the November 5

emergency — which were denied on October 30, 2025 without the interactive process California Rules of Court, rule 1.100 requires.

The significance of these omissions is not speculative. On November 18, 2025, Respondent’s lead counsel acknowledged on camera that “[l]uckily because the judge didn’t make us make a record, her options for appeal are severely limited” — a public concession that the incomplete transcript benefits Respondent and prejudices Petitioner’s right to meaningful appellate review. The Motion to Correct and Augment filed June 8 is directed at correcting precisely this. The trial court has not acted in fifteen days.

III. DEVELOPMENTS SINCE THE APRIL 23 EXTENSION

A. Respondent’s Attorneys’ Fees Motion and Withdrawal

On May 4, 2026, while Petitioner was working to correct the trial court record, Respondent filed a motion under Family Code section 6344 seeking \$109,633.98 in attorneys’ fees arising from the dismissed renewal proceeding at issue in this appeal. Petitioner learned of the motion only because it was posted on social media; she had not been properly served prior to this.

On May 6, 2026, Petitioner emailed Respondent’s counsel documenting a false statement of material fact in the filing: the motion represented to the Superior Court that Petitioner’s bankruptcy case had been dismissed on April 15, 2026, and used that misrepresentation to argue the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. section 362(a) had already terminated before the motion was filed. That was false. No dismissal order had been entered. The bankruptcy court’s own docket confirmed the case remained open — an Amended Notice of Hearing filed April 20, 2026 had scheduled a dismissal hearing for May 14, 2026, five days after the date Respondent

claimed the case was closed. Petitioner notified counsel that filing a collection action during an active automatic stay exposed him to liability under 11 U.S.C. section 362(k) and demanded immediate withdrawal.

On May 7, 2026, Respondent withdrew the motion without prejudice and filed a “Procedural Posture Correction” acknowledging the misstatement. The withdrawal came one day after Petitioner’s demand. It did not address the motion’s other defects, including a sworn billing statement containing entries that were impossible as written: an August 6, 2025 entry billing for review of a criminal indictment under a case number not assigned until November 5, 2025; an August 19, 2025 entry billing for research on a bankruptcy adversary proceeding not filed until January 9, 2026; and an August 14, 2025 entry billing for a conference with co-counsel who did not associate into the case until October 31, 2025. The motion also relied on a sworn witness declaration describing observations of Petitioner at a Scottsdale horse show on October 21 and 22, 2025, that official competition records establish could not have occurred on those dates. Those defects, documented in Petitioner’s June 8 trial court filing, remain uncorrected on the record.

The time Petitioner devoted to identifying, analyzing, and responding to these defects during the extension period was time that would otherwise have been devoted to the record correction this Court authorized on April 23.

B. State Bar Complaint Review Unit Request and Continued Public Conduct

On November 3, 2025 — two days before the dismissal hearing — Petitioner filed a complaint with the California State Bar against

Respondent's lead counsel, Omar Raul Serrato, Esq., arising from his conduct in connection with this litigation.

On May 4, 2026, the Office of Chief Trial Counsel determined the complaint warranted action, and Mr. Serrato was required to comply with conditions imposed as a result. Petitioner contests the sufficiency of that outcome on the ground that the conduct she reported continued after those conditions were imposed — most recently through the fees motion described above, which was filed and withdrawn with an admitted false statement of material fact while those conditions remained in effect.

On June 3, 2026, Petitioner filed a Request for Review with the Complaint Review Unit contesting the adequacy of the discipline imposed and presenting new evidence of continuing misconduct.

On the same date, Mr. Serrato appeared on local Phoenix television and made public statements about Petitioner that bear directly on this appeal. Petitioner delivered a TEDx talk in 2022 about her experience as a domestic violence survivor, centered on the account of Karen Ilmberger — a stranger to both parties who witnessed Respondent's conduct toward Petitioner on a December 2016 flight to Iceland. Ms. Ilmberger submitted a sworn declaration in support of Petitioner's 2018 restraining order in which she attested under oath that Respondent was *"emotionally and verbally abusing Ms. Owens for a long time"*; that *"he was so menacing that I felt her life was at stake were she to stay with him"*; and that she was so frightened of Respondent that she omitted her own name from the note she passed to Petitioner because she *"was afraid that he would come after me if he found the note."* That account — from a disinterested witness who had never met either party — has never been challenged in any court proceeding. Ms. Ilmberger independently published her own account of the same events in a nationally distributed book before this litigation began.

Despite this, Mr. Serrato told the station that *"every single one of her claims in the TEDx video are false"*. Those statements are directly contradicted by the sworn declaration and independent published account of a disinterested witness whose testimony has never been challenged in any court proceeding.

This conduct is documented in the Motion to Correct and Augment filed June 8, which asks the trial court to include Respondent's counsel's post-dismissal public statements in the appellate record as bearing on the candor owed to this Court. That motion remains pending, and until it is resolved, the record on which this appeal must be briefed remains incomplete.

C. The Motion to Correct and Augment the Record

On June 8, 2026, Petitioner filed a Motion to Correct and Augment the Record in the San Francisco Superior Court with an explicit request for expedited consideration in light of the approaching briefing deadline. The motion asks the trial court to place into the official court file the November 4 and 5 written communications described in Section II — including the Court's own emails, the ex parte reporter communications, Petitioner's notifications, and the Court's written acknowledgments — so that they can be transmitted to this Court as part of the clerk's transcript. It further asks the trial court to correct the November 5 minute order to reflect the pre-hearing notifications the Court received and acknowledged in writing, and to include Respondent's fees motion and withdrawal papers in the clerk's transcript.

The motion also documents that Respondent's lead counsel acknowledged on camera on November 18, 2025 that *"[l]uckily because the judge didn't make us make a record, her options for appeal are severely*

limited” — a public concession that the incomplete record benefits Respondent and prejudices Petitioner’s right to meaningful appellate review.

As of June 22, 2026, the trial court has not ruled on the motion despite the request for expedited consideration.

IV. PRO BONO COUNSEL ARE PREPARED TO ASSIST ONCE THE RECORD IS CORRECTED

Petitioner’s inability to secure appellate representation does not reflect the weakness of this appeal. It reflects the state of the trial court record. Pro bono legal counsel who reviewed this matter substantively advised Petitioner that they could not proceed to briefing until the trial court record is corrected to reflect the facts underlying the appeal. That is precisely the relief the June 8 motion seeks. A 30-day extension gives the trial court the time it has not yet taken to rule on that motion and gives pro bono counsel the corrected record they need to step in and prepare a brief adequate to the issues this Court will be asked to decide.

V. RESPONDENT FACES NO PREJUDICE

Respondent will suffer no cognizable prejudice from this extension. No active restraining order is currently in place. The attorneys’ fees motion was withdrawn without prejudice on May 7, 2026, removing any immediate fees-related deadline. No substantive right of Respondent is affected by what is requested here.

The equitable considerations could not be more stark. Respondent is fully represented by retained counsel and, as of June 22, 2026, has raised \$100,461 through a public crowdfunding campaign dedicated to his legal representation in this matter — a campaign built on the same public

narrative about these proceedings that Respondent's counsel has acknowledged on camera is strategically advantageous precisely because the trial court record is incomplete.

Petitioner has not pursued crowdfunding. She has relied on the channels available to a domestic violence survivor without resources: pro bono legal counsel who reviewed this matter, advised that the record deficiency is the obstacle to representation, and are prepared to assist the moment the trial court acts on the pending motion. A 30-day extension costs Respondent nothing and gives Petitioner the minimum time necessary to allow this appeal to proceed on the accurate record it deserves.

VI. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

1. Grant a 30-day extension of time to file her Opening Brief, extending the current deadline from June 29, 2026 to July 29, 2026; and
2. Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: June 22, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Laura Michelle Owens
LAURA MICHELLE OWENS
Petitioner-Appellant, In Pro Per

STATE OF CALIFORNIA California Court of Appeal, First Appellate District	<i>PROOF OF SERVICE</i> STATE OF CALIFORNIA California Court of Appeal, First Appellate District
Case Name: L.O. v. Marraccini	
Case Number: A175236	
Lower Court Case Number: FDV18813693	

1. At the time of service I was at least 18 years of age and not a party to this legal action.

2. My email address used to e-serve [REDACTED]

3. I served by email a copy of the following document(s) indicated below:

Title(s) of papers e-served:

Filing Type	Document Title
REQUEST - REQUESTED - EXTENSION OF TIME (FEE PREVIOUSLY PAID)	Second Extension Request
PROOF OF SERVICE - PROOF OF SERVICE	Proof of Service - Second Extension Request

Service Recipients:

Person Served	Email Address	Type	Date / Time
Omar Serrato The Eagle Law Firm	[REDACTED]	e-Serve	6/22/2026 4:05:20 PM
Laura Owens		e-Serve	6/22/2026 4:05:20 PM
Rachel Juarez Bersch Juarez LLP 273133		e-Serve	6/22/2026 4:05:20 PM

This proof of service was automatically created, submitted and signed on my behalf through my agreements with TrueFiling and its contents are true to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief.

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

6/22/2026

Date

/s/Laura Owens

Signature

Owens, Laura (Pro Per)

Last Name, First Name (PNum)

Law Firm
