

64741-5

64741-5

RECEIVED

APR 22 2011

64741-5
NO. 60956-4-1

NANCY HAWKINS
ATTORNEY AT LAW

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

DIVISION ONE

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF LINDSEY

DEBORAH LINDSEY

APPELLANT

v.

EDWARD LINDSEY

RESPONDENT

2011 APR 22 PM 3:56

ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR
KING COUNTY

THE HONORABLE RICHARD MCDERMOTT, JUDGE

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF

Edward A. Lindsey

11840 HOLMES POINT DRIVE NE

KIRKLAND, WA. 98034

425.802.5815

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....
II.	Response to the Appellant's assignment of errors.....
III.	Conclusion.....

I. INTRODUCTION

I Edward Lindsey, the respondent, ex parte, believes that the appellant does not have grounds to bring this before the court of appeals. The trial span over a period of three weeks in May of 2009. While I certainly do not feel that Judge McDermott's ruling was fair and just on my behalf. What I know the truth to be is that each side had more than enough time to present our case. Judge McDermott made his rulings after a complete review of all property, incomes, expenses and parenting arrangements, past, present, and future assumptions.

II. Response to the Appellant's assignment of errors.

1. Assignment of error No 1. At the time of trial the court was presented with certified appraisals. The Appellant had more than enough time to get second appraisals. The Appellant accepted the Appraisals before and at the time of trial. The claim that the properties I was awarded were undervalued and the properties the appellant was awarded were overvalued. Is ridiculous! I disagree and believe that the appellant does not have grounds to bring this before the court of appeals.

2. Assignment of error No 2. The court ordered me the respondent to pay \$100,000. In the Appellant's credit card debt. Plus awarded the Appellant 57% of all money and property. I disagree and believe that the appellant does not have grounds to bring this before the court of appeals.

3. Assignment of error 3. The Court review all credits, debits, incomes and expenses very closely. Every bank statement all journals of expenses including excel spread sheets. These numbers that are being put before the Court of Appeals in whole are misleading, embellished and taken out of context. The Claims that are being made by the Appellant is wrong. Plus Nancy Hawkins spent a lot of time reviewing all expenses and incomes during the trial. Trying to prove misuse of community money and could not. As a side note, Judge McDermott he went through the credits and debits very closely. I disagree and

believe that the appellant does not have grounds to bring this before the court of appeals.

4. Assignment of error 4. The Appellant never attempted to make one payment on the properties. She has not paid taxes on the Arkansas lots. The court showed these were income producing properties. Plus the Appellant had and still has the liquidity to have made the payments until they sold. I disagree and believe that the appellant does not have grounds to bring this before the court of appeals.

5. Assignment of error 5. The Appellant received 57% of community property The respondent received 43%. The timber tracts are connected to the respondent's family farm. By the grace of God and Judge McDermott these two timber tracts were awarded to the husband. I disagree and believe that the appellant does not have grounds to bring this before the court of appeals.

6. Assignment of error 6. The appellant had 130,000 in credit card debt the Respondent was awarded 100,000. of the debt to pay. The appellant was awarded the income producing properties. Both of the Appellant Automobiles were paid off. The Appellant was awarded 2500.00 a month for spousal support and 834.00 a month child support for 50/50 joint parenting. I disagree and believe that the appellant does not have grounds to bring this before the court of appeals.

III. Conclusion

I plead to the court of appeals to see the ridiculousness and the inconsistency of this appeal. I am broke I have used all of my retirement from the 43% that was awarded to me to make the monthly payments to my ex-wife that was awarded to her by the court, base on an inflated assumed future income by the court. She continues to file ridiculous motions in court. The legal fees have financially ruined me. The only thing that matters in all of this is our two Sons Walker 15 and Noah 12. Because of the financial drain this is starting to affect their life. I see that Nancy is asking for me to pay Debbie's legal fees. Debbie's legal fees

have already been paid for by her Father for this Court of Appeal. That is what Debbie told me. Please put an end to this.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eddie Lindsey", written over a horizontal line.

Eddie Lindsey
(Edward)
Exparte

Respondent