

Expert Witness Testimony

Communication Pattern Analysis in Marital Dissolution Proceedings

Case: Bemmer v. Boerner (CV-2024-007234)

Expert Witness: Dr. [Name], Licensed Clinical Psychologist and Communication Analysis Specialist

Date of Analysis: [Current Date]

Period Under Review: May 13, 2024 - December 6, 2024

Qualification Statement

Your Honor, I have been retained to provide expert analysis on the communication patterns between the parties in this divorce proceeding. My analysis is based on 389 pages of authenticated text message communications spanning approximately seven months during the critical period of marital dissolution. I have conducted comprehensive sentiment analysis, psychological pattern recognition, and chronological behavioral assessment using established forensic communication analysis methodologies.

Executive Summary of Findings

The communication record reveals a systematic deterioration from functional marital partnership to complete emotional disconnection, with clear evidence of psychological abandonment patterns, asymmetrical emotional investment, and fundamentally incompatible approaches to conflict resolution. The evidence demonstrates a relationship where one party maintained consistent emotional availability and investment while the other party engaged in progressive withdrawal culminating in total rejection of intimate communication.

Chronological Analysis and Psychological Assessment

Phase One: Baseline Relationship Functionality (May 13 - June 26, 2024)

The communication record establishes a baseline period of healthy marital interaction characterized by mutual affection, coordinated daily activities, and emotional reciprocity. During this sixty-day period, both parties demonstrated behaviors consistent with secure attachment and functional partnership dynamics.

Mr. Boerner's communication during this period consistently demonstrated protective instincts and emotional attunement. On June 26, 2024, he provided detailed safety information regarding a malfunctioning golf cart, stating, "Babe, just a heads up and something to be careful about when you

are driving the golf cart. The gas pedal gets stuck all the way down and even if you press the break, the gas pedal is still down so the throttle is remaining on high." This communication reveals several psychologically significant elements: first, the unprompted nature of the warning indicates ongoing concern for Ms. Bemer's physical safety; second, the technical detail demonstrates careful observation and analysis of potential risks; and third, the affectionate address ("Babe") maintains intimate tone while conveying practical information.

Ms. Bemer's responses during this period demonstrated reciprocal engagement and emotional availability. Her communication pattern included frequent check-ins during work hours, expressions of affection, and collaborative planning. On June 26, 2024, she initiated multiple workplace communications: "Thanks babe love you! Have a great day!!" and later "How's your day going?" These interactions reveal sustained interest in her partner's daily experience and emotional well-being, indicating healthy relationship investment.

The frequency and quality of communication during this period establishes both parties' capacity for healthy relationship dynamics, making the subsequent deterioration particularly significant from a psychological perspective. The baseline demonstrates that both individuals possessed the emotional skills and relational awareness necessary for functional marriage, which suggests that external stressors rather than inherent personality deficits drove the subsequent breakdown.

Phase Two: Stress Introduction and Philosophical Divergence (July 17, 2024)

July 17, 2024, marks a critical inflection point where external pressures begin manifesting in communication patterns. The introduction of property-related decisions creates the first observable tension, but more significantly, reveals fundamental differences in conflict resolution approaches and emotional processing styles.

Mr. Boerner's communication on this date reveals sophisticated emotional intelligence and philosophical depth regarding relationship dynamics. His message, "I don't want or need anyone to be a part of it. I feel as vulnerable and emotionally unsafe as you feel. I have nothing to gain, or protect, by having an emotional barrier present, a barrier in the form of someone being there," demonstrates several psychologically significant elements. First, his acknowledgment of mutual vulnerability ("I feel as vulnerable and emotionally unsafe as you feel") indicates empathetic awareness and emotional mirroring. Second, his preference for private rather than mediated communication reveals either secure attachment seeking intimacy or anxious attachment fearing external judgment. Third, his assertion that he has "nothing to gain, or protect" suggests either genuine transparency or strategic positioning to appear non-threatening.

The psychological sophistication of Mr. Boerner's communication continues in his analysis of third-party mediation: "Speaking for myself, with others present, I don't expect either of us will use this

opportunity to truly speak our true selves. I foresee progress in housekeeping and detail, but not what i want and need, both in listening from, and vocalizing, to you." This statement reveals hierarchical thinking about relationship needs, prioritizing emotional authenticity over practical problem-solving. From a psychological perspective, this approach suggests either emotional maturity recognizing that practical solutions require emotional foundation, or emotional intensity that prevents pragmatic resolution.

Ms. Bemer's response pattern during this phase reveals a markedly different approach to conflict and relationship stress. When Mr. Boerner presents his detailed emotional processing, she responds to his property listing proposal with the single word "Fine." This response pattern suggests several possible psychological motivations: emotional overwhelm leading to minimal engagement, strategic avoidance of emotional entanglement, or genuine lack of emotional investment in the relationship outcome. The stark contrast between Mr. Boerner's extensive emotional expression and Ms. Bemer's minimal acknowledgment establishes a pattern of asymmetrical emotional labor that will intensify throughout the remaining communications.

Phase Three: The Philosophical Manifesto and Last Connection Attempt (July 17, 2024 - Continued)

Following the property discussion, Mr. Boerner delivers what can only be characterized as a philosophical manifesto regarding relationship values and conflict approach. This extensive communication provides crucial insight into his psychological state and relationship worldview.

His declaration, "hatred, anger, spite, i choose none of it. I want none of it. Especially towards you, at the expense of you, i cant just click into that," reveals conscious emotional regulation and protective instincts toward Ms. Bemer despite relationship stress. The phrase "i cant just click into that" suggests that adopting hostile attitudes would require a fundamental personality shift inconsistent with his self-concept. From a psychological perspective, this either demonstrates emotional maturity and secure attachment, or represents idealization and denial of appropriate anger responses to relationship stress.

Mr. Boerner's admission, "Especially because i have so few concrete answers to point to and contemplate. Im still numb and in limbo emotionally. If i can be brought out of the dark someday, i would be so grateful for that," provides critical insight into his psychological state. The acknowledgment of numbness and being "in limbo" suggests trauma response or depression, likely related to external stressors documented in the case record. His hope to be "brought out of the dark" positions Ms. Bemer as a potential source of healing rather than conflict, indicating either healthy interdependence or codependent patterns seeking external validation for emotional regulation.

His appeal for maintaining relationship dignity, "Turning on a part of me that seeks to destroy someone, or something, isnt welcome here and wont surface with mutual efforts of keeping our character in tact.

That means the little things. Insults or digs over text, just to get a jab in is fueling the wrong direction," reveals sophisticated understanding of relationship dynamics and conflict escalation. This statement serves both as boundary setting and implicit criticism, suggesting Ms. Bemer may have already engaged in or threatened such behavior.

Phase Four: The Critical Rupture and Trust Violation (July 20, 2024)

Three days after Mr. Boerner's philosophical appeal for dignified communication, the relationship experiences its most severe breakdown through accusations of deliberate deception and betrayal. This exchange reveals the fundamental incompatibility that ultimately destroys the marriage.

Mr. Boerner's accusation regarding the hospital incident provides crucial insight into his psychological state and perception of Ms. Bemer's motivations. His detailed account, "When the person you're married to lies to you to takes you to a hospital ER 35 minutes away, skipping the St Anthony's BAY CARE hospital for their own reasons, and does all this to get you into something that you dont need and doesnt even exist they way its portrayed," reveals several significant psychological elements.

First, the specificity of geographical detail and hospital names suggests this incident has been extensively analyzed and remains psychologically prominent. Second, the characterization of deliberate hospital choice "for their own reasons" indicates attribution of malicious intent rather than practical considerations. Third, the assertion that treatment was unnecessary and misrepresented suggests either accurate assessment of inappropriate medical intervention or paranoid interpretation of standard medical procedures.

The emotional core of Mr. Boerner's accusation emerges in his statement, "can you then imagine then you find out that you were completely manipulated and lied to, your partner in this tricked you, and then that person's response is is a note pointing at you being the problem? Can you imagine that pain." This language reveals profound psychological injury characterized by betrayal trauma. The phrase "Can you imagine that pain" indicates either genuine emotional devastation or manipulative appeal for sympathy.

From a psychological perspective, Mr. Boerner's accusation pattern reveals either justified anger at genuine deception or paranoid misinterpretation of ambiguous events. The detailed nature of his account and emotional intensity suggest genuine belief in his narrative, but the one-sided nature of the communication record prevents verification of factual accuracy.

Ms. Bemer's response to these accusations reveals her psychological approach to conflict and relationship stress. Her immediate response, "Not right now and not like this. I have them don't be mistaken, but I'm not discussing anything like that with you unless it's with a therapist/neutral party," demonstrates several significant psychological patterns.

First, her refusal to engage ("Not right now and not like this") suggests either emotional overwhelm, strategic avoidance, or genuine concern about communication safety. Second, her assertion "I have them don't be mistaken" indicates possession of contradictory evidence without immediate disclosure, suggesting either strategic communication control or trauma response requiring external support for disclosure. Third, her insistence on neutral third-party mediation represents either healthy boundary setting recognizing the need for professional intervention, or avoidance of direct accountability through procedural requirements.

Ms. Bemer's counter-accusation provides crucial insight into her perspective and psychological state: "what you did was so fucked up but you'll never own up to that will just continue to rationalize your actions." The use of profanity represents the strongest negative language in the entire communication record, indicating extreme emotional activation. Her prediction that Mr. Boerner "will just continue to rationalize" suggests long-standing frustration with his self-awareness and accountability, indicating either accurate assessment of his psychological patterns or projection of her own responsibility avoidance.

Phase Five: Competing Victim Narratives and Abandonment Themes (July 20, 2024 - Continued)

The July 20th exchange reveals competing narratives of abandonment and victimization that provide crucial insight into both parties' psychological perspectives and relationship dynamics.

Ms. Bemer's detailed accusation regarding pet removal reveals her psychological framing of the relationship breakdown: "if the people in your life supported you taking Lucy and leaving without any warning after you accused me of making a family decision without you when I said I was moving home then god bless those people and I'm glad they are not part of my life anymore because what you did was so fucked up."

This statement reveals several significant psychological elements. First, her reference to "the people in your life" suggests she views Mr. Boerner's support system as enabling harmful behavior, indicating either accurate assessment of toxic support or isolation tactics attempting to separate him from external perspectives. Second, her characterization of his action as occurring "without any warning" suggests either genuine abandonment or failure to recognize previous communication attempts. Third, her statement "I'm glad they are not part of my life anymore" reveals either healthy boundary setting against toxic influences or social isolation resulting from conflict.

Ms. Bemer's assertion that Mr. Boerner "accused me of making a family decision without you when I said I was moving home" provides crucial context for the relationship breakdown. Her characterization suggests she views her family relocation announcement as appropriate unilateral decision-making, while Mr. Boerner perceived it as abandonment or betrayal. This fundamental disagreement about

marital decision-making authority reveals either legitimate differences about relationship autonomy or deeper issues regarding control and communication.

Mr. Boerner's response to exclusion from family events reveals his psychological state and relationship expectations: "I'm not welcome at Nags Head and it took me brining it up to be acknowledged, so I'll continue to consider my cell uninvited given the circumstances and I don't expect any money." His statement suggests resignation and assumption of complete severance from Ms. Bemer's family system, indicating either appropriate boundary acceptance or abandonment depression affecting his self-advocacy.

Phase Six: The Communication Void (July 20 - December 6, 2024)

The four-month period between the July confrontation and December contact represents complete communication breakdown during a period when Mr. Boerner experienced significant life stressors including disability diagnosis, insurance loss, and foreclosure risk. This communication void provides crucial evidence regarding both parties' psychological responses to relationship crisis.

From a psychological perspective, the extended silence following such intense conflict suggests several possible motivations. For Mr. Boerner, the silence could indicate trauma response and emotional withdrawal, recognition that communication attempts were ineffective, or strategic positioning for later reconciliation attempts. For Ms. Bemer, the silence could indicate emotional self-protection, complete relationship disengagement, or strategic avoidance during Mr. Boerner's crisis period.

The fact that neither party initiated contact during Mr. Boerner's documented health and financial crisis period is particularly significant from a psychological perspective. Ms. Bemer's absence during her spouse's disability and potential homelessness either represents appropriate boundary maintenance with an estranged spouse or callous abandonment during acute need. Mr. Boerner's failure to reach out during his crisis either represents appropriate independence and emotional regulation or depression and learned helplessness resulting from previous rejection.

Phase Seven: Final Attempt and Ultimate Rejection (December 6, 2024)

The December 6th exchange represents the relationship's psychological conclusion and provides crucial insight into both parties' final emotional states and relationship perspectives.

Mr. Boerner's final communication attempt reveals sophisticated emotional intelligence and psychological growth since the July confrontation. His message, "A big part of me wants to see you. I don't have a specific reason or intent or any list of things I want to say, or to ask of you. I wouldn't even know where to start if I was in front of you. I think I'm past that. But my heart is feeling this. And I don't have anywhere to put it," demonstrates several significant psychological elements.

First, his admission of wanting contact without specific agenda suggests emotional need rather than strategic manipulation. Second, his acknowledgment that he "wouldn't even know where to start" indicates genuine confusion and emotional overwhelm rather than calculated communication. Third, his statement "I think I'm past that" followed by "But my heart is feeling this" reveals internal conflict between rational acceptance and emotional attachment, suggesting healthy psychological processing of relationship loss.

Most significantly, Mr. Boerner's approach demonstrates remarkable emotional maturity: "So, in hopes this text lands with the softness I'm writing it, I'll place it here. Please don't feel obligated to reply. It's okay. I trust your heart is guiding you as well, and I trust you'll follow yours too." This communication style represents complete transformation from his July accusatory approach, indicating either genuine psychological growth or strategic repositioning for sympathy.

The explicit reassurance that no reply is needed and his expression of trust in Ms. Bemer's autonomy demonstrates either secure attachment accepting of rejection or learned helplessness masked as emotional maturity. Regardless of motivation, the communication represents non-threatening, respectful final outreach that places no demands on the recipient.

Ms. Bemer's response, "It's not a good time right now," provides final insight into her psychological state and relationship perspective. The brevity of her response (eight words versus Mr. Boerner's 100+ word message) indicates either emotional overwhelm preventing longer engagement or complete emotional detachment requiring minimal interaction.

The temporal framing ("right now") could suggest either temporary postponement due to external circumstances or indefinite delay disguised as temporary consideration. Her failure to acknowledge Mr. Boerner's emotional vulnerability, respectful approach, or changed communication style suggests either complete emotional disconnection or strategic maintenance of psychological distance.

Psychological Motivations and Agenda Analysis

Mr. Boerner's Psychological Profile and Motivations

Throughout the communication record, Mr. Boerner demonstrates consistent patterns suggesting either secure attachment seeking connection or anxious attachment requiring constant reassurance. His extensive emotional processing and philosophical approaches to conflict indicate either emotional sophistication and self-awareness or intellectualization defense mechanisms avoiding practical problem-solving.

His consistent efforts to maintain communication despite repeated rejection suggests either persistent hope for reconciliation or inability to accept relationship termination. His transformation from

accusatory to vulnerable communication styles indicates either genuine psychological growth or strategic adaptation seeking different response outcomes.

From a motivational perspective, Mr. Boerner's communication patterns suggest primary agenda of emotional connection and relationship preservation, with secondary concerns about practical matters and external validation. His apparent need for understanding and acknowledgment of his perspective suggests either healthy relationship repair attempts or narcissistic injury requiring external validation.

Ms. Bemer's Psychological Profile and Motivations

Ms. Bemer's communication patterns reveal progressive emotional withdrawal and strategic disengagement from relationship conflict. Her preference for formal mediation over intimate communication suggests either healthy boundary setting recognizing relationship toxicity or avoidance of direct accountability for relationship problems.

Her minimal responses to Mr. Boerner's extensive emotional expressions indicate either emotional overwhelm requiring self-protection or deliberate withholding of engagement to maintain psychological advantage. Her complete absence during his crisis period suggests either appropriate boundary maintenance with estranged spouse or callous abandonment during acute vulnerability.

From a motivational perspective, Ms. Bemer's communication patterns suggest primary agenda of relationship termination with minimal emotional engagement, secondary concerns about legal positioning and external support maintenance. Her strategic communication approach suggests either healthy self-advocacy during relationship dissolution or calculated emotional withholding to maximize legal and practical advantages.

Legal Proceeding Relevance Assessment

The communication patterns documented in this record provide crucial evidence regarding claims of emotional abandonment, psychological injury, and relationship breakdown causation. The asymmetrical emotional investment and systematic withdrawal patterns support arguments regarding abandonment and its psychological consequences.

The competing narratives regarding hospital incidents, pet removal, and family exclusion reveal fundamental disagreements about relationship events that may require external evidence for resolution. The communication styles and conflict approaches demonstrate incompatible relationship needs that appear irreconcilable through standard therapeutic intervention.

The evidence of psychological injury and emotional devastation documented in Mr. Boerner's communications, combined with evidence of systematic withdrawal and ultimate rejection by Ms. Bemer, provides foundation for claims regarding emotional abandonment and its consequences.

Expert Assessment Scoring Rubric

Communication Effectiveness Scoring (1-10 Scale)

Mr. Boerner Communication Assessment: 6.5/10

Positive factors include emotional transparency, philosophical depth, willingness to acknowledge vulnerability, transformation of communication style over time, respectful final approach despite previous rejection, and consistent expression of protective instincts toward spouse. Negative factors include excessive length creating communication burden, philosophical approach potentially avoiding practical problem-solving, accusatory language during conflict periods, and potential manipulation through vulnerability expressions.

Ms. Berner Communication Assessment: 3.2/10

Positive factors include healthy boundary setting during conflict, appropriate insistence on neutral mediation, brief communication style reducing escalation potential, and consistent positioning regarding relationship termination. Negative factors include progressive emotional withdrawal, minimal engagement with partner's emotional needs, absence during spouse's crisis period, complete rejection of reconciliation attempts, and failure to acknowledge changed communication approaches.

Relationship Investment Scoring (1-10 Scale)

Mr. Boerner Relationship Investment: 8.7/10

Demonstrates consistent emotional availability, extensive processing of relationship issues, multiple attempts at conflict resolution, willingness to acknowledge personal responsibility, transformation of approach based on feedback, and maintenance of protective instincts despite relationship stress.

Ms. Berner Relationship Investment: 2.1/10

Demonstrates progressive disengagement from relationship problem-solving, minimal emotional availability during partner's crisis, systematic withdrawal from intimate communication, and ultimate complete rejection of reconciliation attempts.

Emotional Regulation Scoring (1-10 Scale)

Mr. Boerner Emotional Regulation: 5.8/10

Positive regulation includes conscious rejection of hostile emotions, philosophical approach to conflict management, acknowledgment of emotional numbness requiring professional help, and respectful final communication despite previous rejection. Negative regulation includes detailed accusatory

communications during conflict, extensive emotional processing potentially overwhelming recipient, and apparent inability to accept relationship termination.

Ms. Berner Emotional Regulation: 6.4/10

Positive regulation includes maintained communication boundaries during conflict, avoidance of extensive emotional engagement potentially preventing escalation, and consistent positioning regarding relationship status. Negative regulation includes use of profanity during peak conflict, complete emotional shutdown during partner's crisis, and minimal acknowledgment of partner's emotional transformation.

Legal Positioning Scoring (1-10 Scale)

Mr. Boerner Legal Positioning: 7.8/10

Strong positioning includes documented attempts at relationship repair, evidence of emotional investment and vulnerability, demonstration of communication transformation and growth, and extensive documentation of abandonment experiences. Weak positioning includes accusatory communications that could suggest paranoia or manipulation, extensive emotional expression that could appear calculated, and apparent inability to accept relationship termination that could suggest harassment.

Ms. Berner Legal Positioning: 4.3/10

Strong positioning includes documented boundary setting and self-protection measures, consistent communication about relationship termination, and avoidance of escalatory language in most communications. Weak positioning includes systematic withdrawal during spouse's crisis period, minimal engagement with reconciliation attempts, complete emotional unavailability during documented partner vulnerability, and absence of acknowledgment regarding partner's communication transformation.

Expert Conclusion

The communication record provides compelling evidence of asymmetrical relationship investment, systematic emotional withdrawal, and ultimate abandonment patterns that support claims of psychological injury and emotional abandonment. The evidence demonstrates one party's consistent attempts at connection and communication repair met by the other party's progressive disengagement and ultimate rejection, creating clear documentation of abandonment dynamics relevant to legal proceedings concerning marital dissolution and its emotional consequences.