

1 **WOODNICK LAW, PLLC**  
1747 E. Morten Avenue, Suite 205  
2 Phoenix, Arizona 85020  
Telephone: (602) 449-7980  
3 Facsimile: (602) 396-5850  
[office@woodnicklaw.com](mailto:office@woodnicklaw.com)

4 *Gregg R. Woodnick, #020736*  
5 *Isabel Ranney, #038564*  
6 *Attorney for Respondent/Defendant*

7 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA**

8 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA**

9 In Re the Matter of:

Case No.: FC2023-052114

10 **LAURA OWENS,**

11  
12 Petitioner,

13 And

14 **CLAYTON ECHARD,**

15  
16 Respondent.

**RESPONSE/OBJECTION TO  
PETITIONER'S MOTION IN LIMINE**

(Assigned to the Honorable Julie Mata)

17  
18 Defendant/Respondent, **CLAYTON ECHARD**, by and through counsel undersigned,  
19 hereby files his Response and objects to Plaintiff/Petitioner, **LAURA OWENS**, Motion *In*  
20 *Limine*, filed April 30, 2024.  
21

22 Laura has already filed the following, upon information and belief, to hinder or  
23 otherwise prevent a fair, equitable, and transparent resolution on the merits of this case:  
24 *Motion to Dismiss* (denied), *Motion to Quash Deposition of Petitioner* (denied), *Motion for*  
25 *Confidentiality and Preliminary Protective Order* (denied), *Motion for Extension of Time to*  
26 *Respond to Respondent's Motion to Compel* (denied), and *Motion for Lunch* (denied). She  
27  
28

1 now seeks to preclude the testimony of the three (3) prior victims/witnesses *she testified about*  
2 at her deposition, one (1) of whom she requested this Court take judicial notice about and two  
3 (2) of whom she has suggested have somehow tampered with her records (relevant to her  
4 fraud on this court) spanning 8 years.

6 Rule 404(b) does not prohibit testimony about Laura's related pregnancy schemes.  
7 Instead, the rule **expressly permits** the anticipated testimony to show "*proof of motive,*  
8 *opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, or absence of mistake or accident.*" [Rule  
9 404(b)(2)].

11 As and for his Response/Objection, Clayton states as follows:

12 1. **Rule 404(b)(2) expressly permits the testimony of the three (3) prior**  
13 **victim/witnesses.** Contrary to Laura's assertion, evidence of "other wrongs" is expressly  
14 permitted for specific circumstances under Rule 404(b)(2) and *every permitted* reason for the  
15 testimony applies here.<sup>1</sup> To be clear, Rule 404 only prohibits evidence of other acts being  
16 used to prove the character of a person to show action in conformity therewith. Clayton will  
17 produce copious direct evidence of Laura's actions, statements, etc. and does not need to fill  
18 some factual void with propensity evidence. The testimony of the witnesses Laura seeks to  
19 exclude will show motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, and absence of  
20 mistake. It will also be used to rebut anticipated testimony from Laura herself about her  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 <sup>1</sup> Suggesting this case has *any* analog to the Harvey Weinstein trial in New York is yet another  
26 folly and overt attempt to distract from Laura's egregious conduct and behavior in the instant  
27 case. That was a criminal sexual assault jury trial in another state. This is an Arizona Title 25  
28 paternity matter, with different rules, and where there is no risk of confusing the jury because  
the Court serves as the trier of fact.

1 truthfulness and credibility as contemplated in Rule 608(b)(1) & (b)(2) (i.e., if Laura testifies  
2 that she sincerely believed she was pregnant by Clayton and feigns ignorance about the  
3 numerous problems with the *curated* information she gave to her expert about her alleged  
4 pregnancy, the testimony of these witnesses will be entirely admissible and extremely  
5 probative).

6  
7 **Each witness listed**, like Clayton, is anticipated to testify to their experiences of what  
8 they believe to be fabricated pregnancy claims from Laura Owens that arose from her effort  
9 to coerce them to commit to a relationship with her. They are anticipated to testify about her  
10 alleged motivation, which includes her alleged preparation and knowledge of fake medical  
11 records and repeated threats of self-harm if these men did not agree to *stay* with her if she  
12 aborted/miscarried the alleged fetuses. With Clayton, these harassing behaviors were already  
13 previewed before Judge Gialketsis, who issued and affirmed an injunction against harassment  
14 against Owens following over 500 texts and emails that served no legitimate purpose.

15  
16  
17  
18 With witness Greg Gillespie, this Court already took judicial notice (per Laura's  
19 request) of the lawsuit Laura filed against him alleging he got her pregnant with twins (which  
20 she now denies), and then when it was clear he was not interested in her, she got an OOP  
21 against him and later sued him civilly. With the other two (2) witnesses, they are expected to  
22 testify to their belief that they had similar relationship demands with alleged pregnancy  
23 claims, that Laura similarly feigned miscarriages and abortions, and that Laura fabricated  
24 medical evidence to support her pregnancy ruse out of California.

25  
26  
27 If this entire case seems extraordinary to the Court, it is. That is the exact reason why  
28 these witnesses need to testify and can do so consistent with 404(b)(2). This is not about

1 improper character evidence, it is about showing Laura Owens had the motive, intent,  
2 knowledge, etc. necessary to fabricate pregnancies as expressly allowed by our Rules of  
3 Evidence.  
4

5 **The reasons for the witnesses testimony include:**

- 6 • Laura's *motive* with the witnesses was to create pregnancy narratives and later  
7 "terminations" (abortions, miscarriage, cancers/oophorectomies) in effort to secure  
8 relationships after being rejected;  
9
- 10 • Laura has the *opportunity* and *intent* to fabricate medical records to support her fictitious  
11 pregnancy and later pregnancy "termination;" (In this case, she has admitted to  
12 tampering with an exhibit already used in court proceedings but the anticipated  
13 testimony will show this is not the first record she has tampered with);  
14
- 15 • Laura *prepares* and *plans* to effectuate her pregnancy narrative, including notifying  
16 her victims *days* after a sexual encounter<sup>2</sup> to plant the seed that she may be pregnant  
17 by (allegedly) creating medical records and photos to support her story (with the plan  
18 and preparation also including pirating sonograms and correspondence from providers  
19 and reusing the "twins" allegory, which appears to have originated with witness  
20 Marraccini);  
21
- 22 • Laura has *knowledge* that she was and is *not* pregnant as her fabrication of records  
23 would not be necessary if she had actual medical documentation (she only provides  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 

---

<sup>2</sup> Even here, where Clayton maintains there was not intercourse.

1 positive hCG tests).<sup>3</sup> Laura also has *knowledge* that the medical records she submits in  
2 court proceedings and provides to her victims are not authentic. (Notably, Clayton  
3 would never have known the ultrasound Laura sent to him was modified if Laura had  
4 not been ordered to attend her deposition or cooperate with a HIPAA release).

- 5 • There is an absence of mistake or accident as the anticipated testimonies will address  
6 identical efforts of fabricated sonograms, claims of “twins” and failure to seek regular  
7 obstetric/gynecological care, and alleged abortions that result in the “loss” of one, but  
8 not both, fetuses (in both the Gillespie and Maraccini matters).<sup>4</sup>

9  
10  
11 2. **The disclosure of the three (3) prior witnesses and their expected testimony**  
12 **was provided under Rule 49(i)**. First, the deadline for disclosure and discovery in this case  
13 is thirty (30) days before trial. That date is May 10, 2024 and has yet to pass (in any event,  
14 the identities and contact information for the three (3) prior victims was provided to Laura on  
15 March 29, 2024).<sup>5</sup> Therefore, any claim of “*untimeliness*” is confounding.

16  
17  
18 Second, Rule 49(i) was complied with. Rule 49(i) requires each party to “disclose the  
19 names, addresses, and telephone numbers of any witness whom the disclosing party expects  
20 to call at trial, along with a statement fairly describing the substance of each witness’s  
21

22  
23 <sup>3</sup> Note, hcG tests are *not* proof of pregnancy. As will be explored at trial, a pregnancy must be verified  
24 by ultrasound – which Laura does not have because the one ultrasound she will admit to was falsely  
25 (per Laura’s deposition) attributed to SMIL and it has been confirmed to not have originated at *any*

26 <sup>4</sup> The absence of mistake is also with prior actions and exemplified in Laura’s testimony she was  
27 **actively being seen by** doctors Higley and Makhoul for a “high risk” twin pregnancy, who have since  
28 confirmed she was never seen by them for pregnancy. It is also shown in what now appears to be a  
story that she miscarried (again Echard denies they ever had sex) on July 23, 2023 but somehow her  
stomach was growing throughout court hearings in October/November when she testified to being  
“24 weeks” along before Judge Gialketsis and Judge Doody).

<sup>5</sup> See Respondent’s 2<sup>nd</sup> Supplemental Disclosure Statement.

1 expected testimony.” All of this was timely provided to Laura as early as the 2<sup>nd</sup> Supplemental  
2 Disclosure statement, provided March 29, 2024.

3  
4 As conceded in Laura’s *Motion in Limine*, statements describing the substance of each  
5 witness’s expected testimony have been provided. Laura’s claim that she is so in the dark  
6 about what her prior victims will testify about that there is a risk of a “*trial by ambush*” is  
7 paradoxical. They are each claiming to be victimized by her fake pregnancy con.

8  
9 Moreover, **Laura has had four (4) legal conflicts with her prior victims, which all**  
10 **involved pregnancy claims.** She has had approximately thirteen (13) attorneys involved in  
11 her cases in Arizona, and an unknown number from California. She has published Medium  
12 articles, sent “*medical evidence*” to journalists, and even had a TEDx talk about one of the  
13 men. She continues to, through her attorney, Tweet and engage in a dialog with public  
14 commentators, which includes her counsel bizarrely publishing the entire 2018 deposition of  
15 witness Michael Marraccini (her lawyer Tweeted and blogged about an unredacted deposition  
16 transcript from a California case).<sup>6</sup> **See Exhibit 1.** Now, only after she *again* claimed to be  
17 pregnant by yet another man (after non-intercourse) and then went to the media when he  
18 rejected her, these men have found one another. Each of their testimonies are independent,  
19 relevant for non-propensity purposes, and admissible under Rule 404(b)(2).  
20  
21  
22

23 Specifically, and despite it not yet being May 10, 2024:

24  
25 <sup>6</sup> See Laura’s granted Request for Judicial Notice of Greg Gillespie’s case (CV2021-052893), where  
26 Laura alleged that she was pregnant with Greg’s “twins” (which she now denies) days after  
27 intercourse, that he had coerced her into having an abortion, and that she had taken the abortion pills  
28 incorrectly several times. Laura initiated this litigation and then repeatedly stated in emails that she  
would abandon the litigation if Greg agreed to date her, which he was not interested in. This  
litigation ended with neither party being awarded costs for their respective emotional damage  
claims.

1           **Mr. Marraccini's** testimony is important to show her motive, intent, plan, preparation,  
2 knowledge and absence of mistake. There was extensive litigation in San Francisco regarding  
3 these parties. Owens claimed to Marraccini that she was pregnant with his "twins," that she  
4 miscarried, that she needed to take abortion pills/have a D&C because she had a "*severe*  
5 *allergic reaction*" to the abortion drug and that only one of the fetuses was terminated. Laura  
6 also allegedly told him she had ovarian cancer and that she had to have an ovary removed,  
7 fabricated medical records to support this, claimed that she might have cervical cancer, and  
8 that she might have "Asherman's Syndrome" and "Crohn's disease."  
9

10  
11           Laura, after seemingly realizing that Marraccini provided relevant information in the  
12 instant litigation, has since claimed that the medical records Marraccini provided (disclosed  
13 to Laura), were fabricated. Ostensibly, Marraccini was distressed by Laura (via counsel)  
14 posting the 2018 deposition and blogging about him being a liar and "100% false" which led  
15 him to surrender his laptop to a San Francisco based computer forensic expert (Jon Berryhill;  
16 Berryhill Computer Forensics). **Exhibit 2.** Mr. Berryhill analyzed thousands of pages of text  
17 messages and "medical records" communicated between Laura and Mr. Marraccini and  
18 determined all text messages/medical records from Laura's phone number came from Laura.  
19 Meaning, Laura appears to be continuing to commit perjury by filing affidavits that disclaim  
20 texts and "medical records" that *she* sent. It is no wonder she does not want Marraccini  
21 addressing her intent, motive, knowledge, absence of mistake, and preparation, despite his  
22 testimony being admissible under the Rules.  
23  
24  
25  
26

27           As for **Mr. Gillespie**, this Court has already taken judicial notice of his Court case and  
28 Laura is therefore very aware of his anticipated testimony, which is expected to be about

1 Laura's motive, intent, plan, preparation, knowledge and absence of mistake. As provided in  
2 the supplemental disclosure statement, Gillespie will likely testify as to "*his personal*  
3 *knowledge of Petitioner's false allegation that she was pregnant with his twins, the allegation*  
4 *that he doctored ultrasound images that Petitioner shared with the media, and the*  
5 *communications he had with Petitioner regarding the alleged pregnancy.*" He is anticipated  
6 to testify about his belief that Laura was never pregnant by him, that she told him she was  
7 pregnant by him with "twins" days after intercourse, that she only showed him hCG tests, she  
8 claimed she erred in the abortion medication process resulting in the loss of one of the "twin"  
9 fetuses, and that Laura sent him fabricated sonograms. At least one of these sonograms (there  
10 were two to three in the Gillespie case) appears to have been taken directly from a blog of a  
11 woman who was *actually* pregnant twins and tragically lost one due to Vanishing Twin  
12 Syndrome.<sup>7</sup>

13  
14  
15  
16 **Mr. MM<sup>8</sup>** is also expected to testify about Laura's motive, intent, plan, preparation,  
17 knowledge, and absence of mistake based on his personal knowledge and experiences of  
18 Laura claiming to be pregnant by him. Per Clayton's supplemental disclosure, he is expected  
19 to testify about "*his prior interactions with Petitioner, including his personal knowledge*  
20 *about her alleged fabricated pregnancy back in 2014....*" in San Francisco. This also is  
21 consistent with *proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, or*  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 <sup>7</sup> Witness, as disclosed, indicated that one of the Owens' sonograms was from her lost pregnancy as reported (and image  
copied) from a medical journal article and blog about Vanishing Twin Syndrome.

28 <sup>8</sup> This witness' name is not being used in a public filing, as he, upon information and belief, is unhappy with the  
publicity Laura and her counsel have stirred up, which included him being publicly doxxed by Laura (through counsel)  
over Twitter and his blog.



1 *absence of mistake or accident.* Notably, the existence of MM only came to light after *Laura*  
2 testified about him during her deposition.

3  
4 3. **Oral Argument is an unnecessary delay tactic.** This is a bench trial and all  
5 proffered testimony is admissible under Rule 404(b)(2) for non-propensity purposes. Of  
6 course, for counsel, the larger issue will be time management at trial, but the testimony  
7 regarding *proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, or absence of*  
8 *mistake or accident* should take only a handful of minutes per witness, and the tangible  
9 evidence to support their testimonies will be available for this Court’s review. In any event,  
10 Laura (via her counsel’s blog) has already determined that if the Court finds in Clayton’s  
11 favor it will be a *mistake* as there is not “*any chance in hell the judge will say Laura had no*  
12 *reason to think she was pregnant when the case is filed.*”<sup>9</sup> This statement, standing alone,  
13 supports admitting the evidence Laura seeks to preclude because that evidence will directly  
14 impeach the proffered “reasonableness” and “sincerity” of her beliefs with substantial proof  
15 of knowledge and lack of mistake. **See Exhibit 3 (Pages 33-37, Laura’s Counsel’s public**  
16 **comment on April 30, 2024).**<sup>10</sup> There is no cause under Rule 404 to preclude these three (3)  
17 witnesses testimony or otherwise engage in proceedings designed to further delay trial.

18 //

19 //

---

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 <sup>9</sup> Laura appears to be convinced that the standard is whether Laura “reasonably believed” she was pregnant by Clayton  
when she filed her petition in August.


26 <sup>10</sup> (Laura’s counsel stating in response to “Paul” “*it is always possible the judge could still rule in Clayton’s favor. I*  
27 *don’t see any basis for this, but judges are human being and sometimes they make mistakes [...] I don’t think I see no*  
28 *way the judge could sanction Laura for filing the case in bad faith, and I see no way she could be sanctioned for failing*  
*to withdraw the case sooner*). Notably, this is after counsel received the records from Planned Parenthood that showed  
Laura had *not* been seen there on any date for any ultrasound pertaining to this alleged pregnancy, contrary to Laura’s  
testimony in court proceedings, deposition, and statements in her “affidavit” for her medical expert.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**WHEREFORE, Clayton respectfully requests the Court:**

- A. Deny Laura’s *Motion in Limine*;
- B. Order such further relief as the Court deems just.

**RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED** this 7<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2024.

**WOODNICK LAW, PLLC**  
  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Gregg R. Woodnick  
 Isabel Ranney  
*Attorneys for Respondent/Defendant*

**ORIGINAL** of the foregoing e-filed this 7<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2024 with:

Clerk of the Court  
Maricopa County Superior Court

**COPY** of the foregoing document delivered this same day to:

The Honorable Julie Mata  
Maricopa County Superior Court

**COPY** of the foregoing document emailed this same day to:

David Gringas  
 Gringas Law Office, PLLC  
 4802 E. Ray Road, #23-271  
 Phoenix, AZ 85004  
[David@GringasLaw.com](mailto:David@GringasLaw.com)  
*Attorney for Petitioner/Plaintiff*

By: /s/ MB

VERIFICATION

I, **CLAYTON ECHARD**, declare under penalty of perjury that I am the Respondent in the above-captioned matter; that I have read the foregoing *Response/Objection to Petitioner's Motion in Limine* and I know of the contents thereof; that the foregoing is true and correct according to the best of my own knowledge, information and belief; and as to those things stated upon information and belief, I believe them to be true.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Clayton Echard (May 7, 2024 12:07 PDT)  
**CLAYTON ECHARD**

\_\_\_\_\_  
May 7, 2024  
Date

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28