

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
3/25/2025 8:55 AM
BY SARAH R. PENDLETON
CLERK

Supreme Court No. 1039115
COA No. 39796-3-III

SUPREME COURT OF WASHINGTON

In re the Marriage of:

SCOTT G. DASHIELL,

Petitioner, and

GENESIS A. DASHIELL,

Respondent.

ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW

G. Olaf Hansen, WSBA #26930
Attorney for Respondent
621 W Mallon Ave, Ste 309
Spokane, WA 99201
(509) 319-2900

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW	1
-------------------------------------	---

A. Scott fails to identify the decision by Court of Appeals conflicts with a decision of the Supreme Court or any published decision by the Court of Appeals.....	1
---	---

CONCLUSION,.....	2
------------------------	---

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Table of Cases

<i>In re Marriage of Cohn</i> , 18 Wash.App. 502, 506 (1977)	1, 2
<i>In re Marriage of Shaffer</i> , 47 Wash.App. 189 (1987) ..	1, 2

ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW

A. Scott fails to identify the decision by Court of Appeals conflicts with a decision of the Supreme Court or any published decision by the Court of Appeals.

Scott provides no decision that exists which would conflict with the Court of Appeals decision. He does not dispute the Court of Appeals decision that applies fairness test for a separation agreement as provided from both *In re Marriage of Cohn*, 18 Wash.App. 502, 506 (1977) and *In re Marriage of Shaffer*, 47 Wash.App. 189 (1987). Even when Scott raises dispute regarding full disclosure was not necessary, he argues full disclosure was provided by reference to Scott's monthly income.

Making contrary statements with no reference to the record does not make a petition ripe for review. To claim the Court of Appeals findings and decision was sheer speculation regarding the inability to the value of the business does not make the petition ripe for review. Scott

argues the business itself is underwater in value yet somehow can generate \$112,000 a year of income to him.

But even if the business's value is determined to be underwater, *Shaffer* and *Cohn* do not indicate that full disclosure only applies to positive values. The test is that there is full disclosure of every asset and its value. The Court of Appeals, in its efficiency of the decision because of the lack of full disclosure, did not even have to address the second prong of the test: independent advice and knowledge of rights. It is undisputed that both parties were unrepresented and did not have independent advice. The separate property agreement would fail the second prong of the test regardless of the failure for full disclosure.

CONCLUSION

Based on the lack of conflict existing from the Court of Appeals, Genesis requests to deny the petition for review.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to RAP 18.17(b), I certify that there are 387 words in this document.

Dated this 25th day of March, 2025.



G. Olaf Hansen
WSBA #26930
Attorney for Respondent
621 W Mallon Ave, Ste 309
Spokane, WA 99201
(509) 319-2900

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on March 25, 2025, I served a copy of the Respondent's Answer to Petition for Review through the eFiling portal on Kenneth Kato and Matthew J. Dudley.



G. Olaf Hansen

OLAF HANSEN

March 25, 2025 - 8:55 AM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Supreme Court
Appellate Court Case Number: 103,911-5
Appellate Court Case Title: In the Matter of the Marriage of Scott Gilbert Dashiell and Genesis Anna Dashiell
Superior Court Case Number: 21-3-02482-8

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 1039115_Answer_Reply_20250325085129SC590308_3133.pdf
This File Contains:
Answer/Reply - Answer to Petition for Review
The Original File Name was Genesis Dashiell Answer Petition Review.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- khkato@comcast.net
- kimmy@pnwfamilylaw.com
- matthewjdudley@gmail.com
- mjdudley@cet.com

Comments:

Sender Name: Olaf Hansen - Email: goh@pnwfamilylaw.com
Address:
621 W MALLON AVE STE 309
SPOKANE, WA, 99201-2181
Phone: 509-319-2900

Note: The Filing Id is 20250325085129SC590308