FILED SUPREME COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON 10/21/2024 4:08 PM BY ERIN L. LENNON CLERK

No. 1034261 CoA No. 859480 – Division I

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

GREGORY MICHAEL KRSAK,

Petitioner,

vs.

CHRISTELL CHARITY KRSAK,

Respondent

REPLY TO RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A PETITION FOR REVIEW

> Gregory M. Krsak Petitioner pro se 9520 Mercerwood Dr. Mercer Island, WA 98040 greg.krsak@gmail.com 503-810-1655

I. IDENTITY OF MOVING PARTY

Gregory Michael Krsak (the "Petitioner"), former primary residential parent (from birth to five years of age) of biological child AFK and the former spouse of the child's biological mother, Ms. Krsak (the "Respondent"), files this reply to Ms. Krsak's *Respondent's Response to Petitioner's Motion for Extension of Time to File a Petition for Review* (the "Motion").

II. RELIEF REQUESTED

Petitioner respectfully asks this Court to consider his approved request for a reasonable accommodation for a disability, with respect to timeliness and communication, as it considers his request for a retroactive extension of time on his previously-filed petition for review.

Petitioner further, respectfully, asks this Court for any other relief it considers necessary to serve the interests of justice.

III. GROUNDS FOR RELIEF AND ARGUMENT

1. In her motion, the respondent did not acknowledge the medically documented evidence indicating that the petitioner has Autism Spectrum Disorder and a recognized executive functioning disability related to processing time.

2. Petitioner has been granted, by this Court, a reasonable accommodation for a disability, in part reading, "...the request for accommodation is granted to the extent that the Court will show patience, grace, and understanding to Mr. Krsak **with regard to time** and his communication style." (emphasis added)

3. Petitioner presents a noteworthy issue for this Court's consideration, challenging an appellate court's decision which allows for a litigant to be retroactively deemed in violation of a state law that was not in effect at the time of the alleged infraction.

4. Respondent has recently been addressed by the appellate court regarding the obligation to draft a Parenting

Plan as **per the trial judge's oral ruling**, which was not fulfilled. Instead, the respondent developed a Final Parenting Plan that reduced the petitioner's custodial time with the child by fifty percent, and this document was subsequently signed by the trial judge.

Respondent claims, in her motion, that this Final Parenting Plan was similar to the previous Temporary Parenting Plan, where the petitioner saw his child every weekend, but the record shows this to be **an attempt to mislead this Court**.

5. The blatant and concerning nature of the respondent's parental alienation has become evident to all other parties currently involved with the child, prompting the principal of the child's elementary school to take the additional step of granting the petitioner full access to the child's school records, exceeding the stipulations outlined in the Final Parenting Plan.

6. Respondent has not provided sufficient evidence todemonstrate that the petitioner is presently unworthy of shared,50/50 custody of their child. In fact, the petitioner has been an

active volunteer at the child's school for multiple years, participating in numerous events and class celebrations.

Additionally, the petitioner has chaperoned a school field trip to the local zoo, where he supervised a group of children, has served as the lead speaker at a school assembly, and has recently been **appointed as the sole room parent for the child's 3rd-grade class**.

IV. CONCLUSION

Respondent appears to be apprehensive about the merits of the petition before this Court, leading to the presentation of emotional arguments that may distract from the substantial legal issues at hand. These issues include concerns regarding the manipulation of the judicial process, the inappropriate application of state law, and allegations of parental alienation.

Additionally, this case is garnering attention from online legal analysis platforms, with at least one channel, Meg's Crime Watch, expressing interest in supporting the petitioner. It is crucial for this Court to carefully consider the significant matters raised in the petitioner's arguments and the reasonable request for an extension of time. Failing to do so may inadvertently lead to serious reputational consequences for the State of Washington, particularly in light of the accommodations previously granted to the petitioner regarding deadlines.

I certify that this document contains 629 words. Submitted this 21st day of October, 2024.

Gregory M. Krsak Petitioner pro se 9520 Mercerwood Dr. Mercer Island, WA 98040 greg.krsak@gmail.com 503-810-1655

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, that on October 21, 2024, I caused the foregoing document to be filed with the Court and served on counsel by way of the Washington State Appellate Courts' Portal.

SIGNED at Mercer Island, Washington, this 21st day of October, 2024.

Gregory M. Krsak Petitioner pro se 9520 Mercerwood Dr. Mercer Island, WA 98040 greg.krsak@gmail.com 503-810-1655

GREGORY KRSAK - FILING PRO SE

October 21, 2024 - 4:08 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court:	Supreme Court
Appellate Court Case Number:	103,426-1
Appellate Court Case Title:	In the Matter of the Marriage of: Christell Charity Krsak v. Gregory Michael Krsak

The following documents have been uploaded:

1034261_Answer_Reply_20241021152136SC486110_0966.pdf
 This File Contains:
 Answer/Reply - Reply to Answer to Motion
 The Original File Name was Krsak Reply to Response to Motion for Extention of Time.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- kristofer@smobrian.com
- melodie@smobrian.com

Comments:

Sender Name: Gregory Krsak - Email: greg.krsak@gmail.com Address: 9520 Mercerwood Dr. Mercer Island, WA, 98040 Phone: (503) 810-1655

Note: The Filing Id is 20241021152136SC486110