Applicant: Miss I - S Spalletti EXHIBITS to Statement nº: 1 Exhibit nº ISS-03

Exhibit dated: 24/10/2023, 19:16

## IN THE FAMILY COURT AT EDMONTON IN THE MATTER OF THE FAMILY LAW ACT 1996

**BETWEEN:** 

Miss Irene Sara Spalletti

- and -

**Applicant** 


Respondent

Mr Alexander Michael Luke Wolf Walker

## Exhibit no ISS-03 · "DIRTY BITCH!"

signal conversation, dated [24/10/2023, 19:16], referred to in the Section 4.3.3

Written communication in which the respondent claims that to establish a basis for conversation, I should be silenced by being called "dirty bitch" and "grumpy cow".



changed by you to fit your argument
 taken entirely out of context.

If you listened you would understand the difference between what you are suggesting and what I actually said.

As I say, there is no point in us talking until we can have open communication which requires us both to listen. You have demonstrated (again) you don't listen because you think you know all the answers already.

'im sorry i called you names, its childish but i did it because its impossible to have a conversation with you because you don't listen - however it was the only thing that seemed to get an actual reaction from you"

If you listened that is what i said.

The point being (the difference)? the only thing you heard was the name I called you (although you got that wrong too, i called you a grumpy cow, and not a dirty bitch) and that is the only thing you reacted to. Which shows that when I say things you don't listen.

he did