

**Organize I All the key points made in this**

'

Here are the key points organized from the provided document:

**1. AI Evidence and Filings**

* There is no rule in Snohomish County prohibiting the use of **AI-generated filings**.
* Some evidence has been thrown out due to **AI-tampered video**, but not AI-enhanced transcripts[[1]](#fn1).
* The respondent holds the **original audio recordings** and can provide official law enforcement transcripts if required[[1]](#fn1).

**2. Civil Standby Misunderstandings**

* The **purpose of the standby** was to transfer ordered items (including dogs), not to facilitate moving out[[1]](#fn1).
* There is a claim of **due process** being ignored regarding eviction or moving out[[1]](#fn1).

**3. Disputes Over Property and Evidence**

* Photographic evidence exists of **personal items being disposed of**, contradicting opposing claims[[1]](#fn1).
* Respondent asserts that tools and materials used for the El Dorado Rockwall project were primarily business or communal property, which were not cleaned or maintained by the other party[[1]](#fn1).
* Majority of the wood and shop materials in dispute are claimed to have been acquired solely by the respondent, with the other party contributing nothing to acquisition or payment[[1]](#fn1).

**4. Allegations and Lack of Evidence**

* The respondent is accused of stealing unspecified items, but **no proof is offered**—deemed unfounded and defamatory[[1]](#fn1).
* Opposing party claims to follow court orders but is accused of **breaking orders and deflecting issues**[[1]](#fn1).
* Claims regarding **jointly owned assets** and the timing of the couple's separation are disputed, with the assertion of continued engagement and joint asset intermingling after the claimed breakup[[1]](#fn1).
* Significant **contributions to home improvements** are cited as evidence of shared property rights[[1]](#fn1).

**5. Legal Process and Fairness**

* Claims of **retaliatory, slanderous, and unsubstantiated statements** by the opposing party, alleging an attempt to intimidate and harass through filings[[1]](#fn1).
* Accusation that the **protection order** was structured to allow continued cohabitation but is not enforced properly, with the respondent’s rights overlooked[[1]](#fn1).
* Examples are cited of **misrepresentation and disregard for court orders** by the opposing party, supported by recordings and existing evidence[[1]](#fn1).

**6. Police and Court Interactions**

* Recordings were made of law enforcement interactions with the respondent, which is legally permissible[[1]](#fn1).
* Claims of **exploitation** and lack of access to appointed counsel, along with procedural inconsistencies and misrepresentation[[1]](#fn1).
* Allegation of the other party submitting **misrepresented court recordings** to the sheriff, violating due process[[1]](#fn1).

**7. Bad Faith and Manipulation Claims**

* The opposing party is accused of *gaslighting, stonewalling, and narcissistic behaviors*, especially in avoiding conflict resolution or counseling[[1]](#fn1).
* Filings from the respondent have not been deemed frivolous, and accusations of bad faith by the opposing party are countered as being projection and manipulation[[1]](#fn1).

**8. Disputed Legal Standards and Remedies**

* No known rules prohibit **purchasing court recordings** or **recording law enforcement** interactions personally[[1]](#fn1).
* Some motions filed may be outside the court’s scope but are said to be necessary for addressing **violations of the protection order** and other issues[[1]](#fn1).
* There is a call for **striking serious allegations** from the court record to prevent future harassment based on unsubstantiated claims[[1]](#fn1).

**9. Medical Condition and Insurance Benefit Issues**

* The respondent claims to have provided *extensive proof of medical condition* and upcoming surgeries, with earlier confirmation and documentation submitted[[1]](#fn1).
* There are allegations that the opposing party **violated fiduciary duties** by backdating documents and mishandling insurance claims that resulted in financial loss to the respondent[[1]](#fn1).

**10. General Pattern of Behavior**

* The respondent portrays a pattern of the opposing party **controlling, gaslighting, and making unsupported defamatory statements** with the intent to intimidate and harm the respondent’s legal standing and well-being[[1]](#fn1).

These points cover the central themes and arguments presented in the document, highlighting claims of evidence mishandling, property disputes, legal strategy concerns, and interpersonal conflict dynamics.
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**what are all the points in here? update the pis of points with this new one**

Here are **all the key points** made in the updated document, grouped thematically and in the order they appear or escalate throughout your detailed rebuttal:

**Medical and Incident Disputes**

* **Respondent disputes the claim of drug overdose**, noting no personal recollection, and claims there is no evidence in the toxicology reports to substantiate drug abuse as the cause of hospitalization[[2]](#fn2).
* Medical reports mention **hypothermia, blunt force, and signs of trauma** with missing or suspicious surveillance footage; the respondent raises doubts about how injuries were documented and the motives around their occurrence[[2]](#fn2).
* **Harassment by the petitioner (Candy) is alleged to have contributed to emotional deterioration and hospitalization**, with claims of manipulation, gaslighting, and narcissistic abuse[[2]](#fn2).
* **Allegations of the respondent being more valuable “dead than alive” are made as suspicions rather than direct accusations**, stemming from observed behavior and missing camera footage[[2]](#fn2).

**Legal Due Process and Residency Disputes**

* **Exclusion from the home was done without due process**, and there’s ongoing contention that the protection order was designed to allow cohabitation, not exclusive occupation[[2]](#fn2).
* There are **allegations of due process, right to contest, and appeal violations** by both law enforcement and court order execution (e.g., trespass order issued and enforced without proper narrative or hearing)[[2]](#fn2).
* **Ex parte communications** between law enforcement and petitioner’s counsel are alleged, alongside ignored attempts by the respondent to provide documentation and contest accusations[[2]](#fn2).
* Multiple **rights are named as violated**: tenant/occupant rights, right to be free from false accusation, right to appeal, right to due process, and alleged disregard of protection for a “vulnerable adult”[[2]](#fn2).
* The respondent argues **the civil standby process was misrepresented** and unlawfully used to imply they had moved out, though there was no order or legal eviction process satisfying landlord-tenant law or committed intimate relationship protections[[2]](#fn2).

**Claims of Abuse, Defamation & Manipulation**

* The respondent describes **persistent emotional, psychological, and social manipulation**, including isolating the respondent from family, “pushing” the respondent to breaking points, and orchestrating family alienation[[2]](#fn2).
* Allegations of abusive conduct—including use of **homophobic slurs, emotional blackmail, gaslighting, and threats**—are raised as central to the dynamic leading up to and following the legal disputes[[2]](#fn2).
* The petitioner's **declarations and evidence are portrayed as containing no substantiated facts** and designed to downplay or refute the respondent’s every concern[[2]](#fn2).
* The respondent claims **their attempts at de-escalation, negotiation, or counseling** were repeatedly weaponized or rebuffed by the petitioner and counsel[[2]](#fn2).

**Property, Assets & Business Interference**

* **Disputes over communal versus personal property**: The respondent insists much of what was disposed of or altered (tools, materials, shop items) was communal or essential for business, and provided photo evidence of key items missing[[2]](#fn2).
* **Unauthorized disposal and alteration of property** is described, with claims of ongoing home changes contrary to orders and claims made by the petitioner[[2]](#fn2).
* There are continued **denials of access to work-critical items**, directly impacting the respondent’s business and means of earning an income[[2]](#fn2).
* Respondent asserts **financial control was exerted by the petitioner**, not vice versa, citing how joint accounts and business dealings were managed[[2]](#fn2).

**Conduct of Petitioner’s Counsel and Process Concerns**

* Serious accusations against **petitioner’s lawyer and paralegal**: Misrepresenting court orders, making false statements, imposing unauthorized restrictions, and communicating outside of court to orchestrate eviction[[2]](#fn2).
* **Professional misconduct and ethical violations** by the petitioner’s legal team are alleged (violations of Washington RPC 3.3, 4.1, 3.4, 8.4, harassment of a vulnerable adult, and disobeying orders)[[2]](#fn2).
* **Barriers created around the civil standby and retrieval of property** are framed as deliberate efforts to exploit the respondent’s pro se status and escalate the situation[[2]](#fn2).
* Communication from counsel is cited as escalating rather than de-escalating, with flat denials of any off-the-record or good faith negotiation attempts[[2]](#fn2).

**Claims of False Allegations, Retaliatory Filings, and Perjury**

* Respondent **refutes allegations of harassment, intimidation, or violating property rights**, stating they are unsupported by actual evidence and are instead retaliatory or fabricated for court advantage[[2]](#fn2).
* Accusations that **filings and declarations by the petitioner and counsel are riddled with perjury, CR 11 violations, and designed to manipulate the court**[[2]](#fn2).
* Further claims of **improper labeling of mental health status and misrepresentation of the respondent’s medical/vulnerable adult status**[[2]](#fn2).

**Child and Family Welfare Allegations**

* The respondent maintains that **petitioner engaged in parental alienation and exposed children to inappropriate conflict**, contrary to what is presented by the petitioner[[2]](#fn2).
* Text evidence is claimed to exist showing **petitioner acknowledged misuse of children in the conflict**; respondent denies slandering or manipulating the petitioner or children[[2]](#fn2).

**Personal Trauma and Criminal Acts Described**

* The respondent describes experiencing **profound trauma**, including assault and sexual violence, as a direct or indirect consequence of the petitioner’s conduct and the stress of the ongoing legal situation[[2]](#fn2).
* The ongoing litigation and exclusion from residence are claimed to directly contribute to **mental health decline and physical insecurity** for the respondent[[2]](#fn2).
* Respondent sees the **entire process as abusive litigation (“abusive litigation designed to hurt me”)** designed to destroy their emotional and financial position[[2]](#fn2).

**Technical and Evidence Issues**

* **Claims about surveillance, hacking, and digital misconduct**: When petitioner alleges technical misconduct like hacking, respondent calls these allegations fabricated, referencing technical data to refute them[[2]](#fn2).
* Disputes over whether items such as **emails, text messages, or “songs” were properly represented in court filings**, and if any were mischaracterized as threatening communications[[2]](#fn2).

**Calls for Relief and Striking of Claims**

* **Calls for the petitioner's entire declaration to be stricken with prejudice** due to alleged lack of foundation, fabrication, and malicious intent[[2]](#fn2).
* Asserts that all the issues—property, legal, emotional, and procedural—should result in **court action to restore rights, correct orders, and sanction misconduct** by the opposing party and their legal team[[2]](#fn2).

If you want points extracted by section, or in a more summarized format, let me know how best to organize or group these for your use.
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**and now for these two please**

update the list with new topics

Below is an organized update of all **major topics and themes** that appear in the two documents you provided, restructuring (and expanding) your existing issue list with **new points and topics**:

**1. Medical Events, Documentation, and Disputed Allegations**

* Respondent **denies the overdose was caused by self-inflicted drug use or suicide attempts** and claims medical findings (hypothermia, blunt force trauma, blood loss) support alternative explanations[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* **No illicit substances were found in blood or urine toxicology** despite conflicting police hearsay and hospital paperwork[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Missing or incomplete **security camera footage** at critical moments is highlighted as suspicious[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Medical stress and health events are directly connected, according to the respondent, to the alleged **emotional abuse and manipulation** by the petitioner[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**2. Patterns of Abuse, Gaslighting, and Psychological Manipulation**

* Assertions of **long-standing manipulation, gaslighting, and narcissistic abuse** by the petitioner[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* **Isolation tactics**: claiming the petitioner alienated respondent from family and support systems, setting up the respondent to "unravel"[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* **Aggressive confrontations**, insults (including homophobic slurs), and escalated situations engineered by the petitioner, driving the respondent to breaking points[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Attempted **control over whether the respondent leaves or stays in the home during conflict**; attempts to chase, corner, or provoke the respondent when personal space is needed[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**3. Due Process and Legal Rights Violations**

* **Alleged denial of due process**: respondent argues that ouster and trespass orders were issued and enforced without proper notice, hearing, or lawful process under Washington state law (including protection order context)[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Ordinarily, both parties were supposed to **retain equal home access per initial court protection order**, not exclusive use[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Respondent identifies **violations of residential tenant, occupant, and appeal rights**[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Professional misconduct and possible **ex parte communication** between law enforcement and petitioner’s counsel, with respondent’s contrary evidence being ignored by authorities[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**4. Court, Lawyer, and Paralegal Misconduct**

* **Counsel and paralegal accused of misrepresenting court orders**, inventing extra-judicial restrictions, and creating unlawful barriers to compliance[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Specific claims that **lawyer Dexter Callahan and staff communicated with authorities outside court to secure a trespass order** without proper process, in violation of Washington Rules of Professional Conduct (e.g., RPC 3.3, 4.1, 8.4)[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Allegations of **abuse of process, defamation, and interference with business relations and legal status** by opposing counsel[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Repeated, unsupported accusations by the petitioner and her counsel are said to be intentionally defamatory, intended to **intimidate, silence, and destabilize the respondent**[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**5. Communal Property, Asset Control, and Business Interference**

* Extensive disputes regarding **shared business and household property**, denial of access to work-critical items, and claims of unauthorized disposal or alteration of communal assets[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* **Unlawful “self-help eviction”** is alleged in the respondent being locked out; missing or disposed items are documented with photographs[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* **Deliberate interference with the respondent’s ability to retrieve work materials** is framed as an attack on their livelihood and business operations[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* The petitioner’s actions are said to obstruct fair division of property and potentially constitute financially abusive behavior[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**6. Civil Standby Procedure and Contested Orders**

* Dispute over **the purpose and handling of civil standby**: whether it was a one-time access or part of an ongoing right to retrieve property and maintain residency[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Opposing counsel and petitioner are accused of adding “sanctions” and procedural hurdles not found in the original court order, such as mandatory itemized lists or denying access to property[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* The respondent maintains **they remain a resident of the property** as a result of the committed intimate relationship doctrine and business interests, and that court orders have not lawfully evicted them[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**7. Allegations of Child/Familial Alienation**

* Petitioner is accused of **parental alienation** and exposing children to adult conflict, contrary to her own claims in declarations[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Text evidence allegedly exists showing the petitioner admitted to involving or alienating children, and the respondent claims to have had minimal contact due to this manipulation[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**8. Claims of Assault, Trauma, and Reprisals**

* Respondent describes being the victim of **serious physical and sexual assault** during periods of homelessness precipitated by exclusion from the home and loss of community support[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Respondent links their vulnerability and trauma directly to the combined impact of the petitioner’s actions and the legal/authority response[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**9. Retaliatory and Bad-Faith Litigation**

* Petitioner’s filings are characterized as **retaliatory, filled with baseless and scandalous accusations**, and designed to further inflict emotional and legal harm[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* There are repeated calls for **statements and entire filings by the petitioner to be stricken from the record for lack of factual foundation and malicious purpose**[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**10. Procedural Barriers and Exploitation of Pro Se Status**

* Petitioner’s legal team is alleged to **exploit the respondent's pro se (self-represented) status** by imposing extra-legal demands and barriers to retrieving property or defending against claims[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Respondent documents repeated, unanswered efforts to negotiate, clarify orders, or pursue mediation, typically rebuffed by petitioner or counsel[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**11. Mischaracterization of Evidence and Technology Use**

* Respondent disputes claims of “hacking” or technical misconduct, arguing that all allegations regarding digital activity or surveillance are **factually incorrect or fabricated**[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Disputes over whether **communications (text, email, voicemails, songs, etc.) were misrepresented in evidence** submitted by the petitioner[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**12. Psychological Evaluation and Mental Health Issues**

* Respondent is willing to undergo psychological evaluation but requests the same for the petitioner, citing **patterns consistent with narcissistic personality disorder and coercive control**[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Questions regarding the respondent’s status as a **vulnerable adult** are addressed with claims of medical documentation and official healthcare assessments supporting the designation[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**13. Court-Ordered Animal Custody and Dispute**

* Disagreements over **animal (especially dog) ownership and compliance with temporary orders** remain unresolved, with each side providing conflicting evidence[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**14. Patterns in Law Enforcement Response**

* Law enforcement is depicted as **biased or uninformed, often taking the side of the petitioner**, ignoring or discounting respondent’s documentation and requests for support[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).
* Claims that police repeatedly declined to arrest the respondent during conflict, underscoring a lack of merit to the petitioner's claims[[3]](#fn3)[[4]](#fn4).

**If you need an even more granular breakdown by event or theme, or a condensed summary highlighting just the new or most critical developments from these documents, please specify.**
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1. point-by-point.docx

1. point-for-point-Candi-dec-rebuttal.pdf

1. 1752506697961aac\_250714\_202914.pdf

1. monologue.pdf