

**I provided written statements (from multiple witnesses) to Dan, with his encouragement to keep providing these.**

- The day before the trial I was told these statements were "hearsay" and "inadmissible," yet financial charges were incurred every time one of those statements was read, faxed, copied, or handled in any way. Dan knew they were inadmissible. I should have been told.
- **No charges should have been incurred for any statements after the first one was read.**

**Statements/ witnesses would have shown my opponent was lying when he claimed that:**

- He was unable to earn income working at the company he started and he insisted I continue working until I became totally disabled.
- He wanted to sell the house, but I refused
- Cared for his family financially and emotionally.
- In lieu of income, contributed in a positive manner to the family and home.
- Returning to college at 65 would result in the same pay-off as my returning to college at age 24.
- Deserved half of the marital property because his contributions were equitable to mine.
- Cannot work now because of physical impairments.

**Even though Dan said statements from my witnesses were hearsay, when my opponent asked that written statements be entered into evidence, Dan didn't object on the basis that they were hearsay. When they were accepted into evidence, Dan didn't ask that my statements be entered into evidence.**

**Statements/witnesses would have substantiated that my opponent:**

- Probably has a personality disorder and was an abusive, controlling, mean man not only to his family, to employees, those with whom he did business, strangers, even pets.
- Brought revenue into the marriage only during six out of the past 18 years of the marriage.
- Contributed less than one third the income I did while working in the same business during the same time period.
- Squandered money taking vacations by himself.
- Squandered money becoming involved in various losing business ventures.

**and:**

- The information on a chart I was shown while on the stand was correct. When I saw it, I was confused and couldn't answer the commissioner's questions. Rather than call to the stand the witness I pointed to in the courtroom who could explain it, Dan did nothing. This resulted in making that evidence appear to be incorrect.
- When my opponent pointed out that M.S. can cause lapses in memory, Dan did not rebut, ask that statements be entered into evidence, nor call the two witnesses available in the courthouse that day who would have testified that my memory was correct.

**Dan didn't:**

- Ask for a single statement to be entered as evidence.
- Subpoena any witnesses.
- Call either of the two witnesses who were at the courthouse on the day of the trial.
- Call three other witnesses who were in town and available the day of the trial.
- Call any witnesses to the stand. They would have testified that the statements and evidence I presented were true, as well the fact that their statements were true and not "hearsay."

**During Discovery, no information on my opponent's hidden bank accounts, his P.O. Box, insurance policies, phone bills, etc. was sought. As the trial got under way, I told Dan that my opponent was presenting his case from an accounting perspective. Dan said it didn't matter and that the commissioner was bored with Bill's presentation wasn't paying attention and was probably reading his email.**

- Dan never addressed any of the accounting issues of the case.
- In fact, the commissioner's decision was strictly based on grounds of what appears to be on paper, an equitable distribution of property.
- In reality, the division of property wasn't equitable.

**During the trial, Dan asked that my opponent pay my attorney fees, but did not explain why.**

- My opponent's obsessive behavior of sending hundreds of pages of written material, faxes, emails and many, many phone calls added costs to my bill.
- Obviously, a person getting a divorce can't control the behavior of the other spouse.

**During the trial, Dan didn't rebut or call into question the validity of many statements made by my opponent. A couple of glaring examples:**

- My opponent asked if I thought it fair for him to pay maintenance that would leave him with less net income than my monthly income. **Dan failed to point out the amount cited was my GROSS income.**
- While recovering from a fractured back and using a walker/crutches, I was forced have boxes packed by a deadline. My opponent pointed out how easy it was for me to slide the boxes across the smooth floor into their proper places. Amazingly, Dan did nothing about this statement.

**Your invoices are padded with needless charges for:**

- Sending a copy of a letter regarding mandatory conflict resolution classes that the court had already sent. Greene County sends these letters to keep attorneys from charging their clients when they send them. **YOUR OFFICE SENT THE LETTER AND CHARGED ME ANYWAY.**
- Opening a letter sent to your office from Burrell that was obviously a mistake, then calling me about it, and then writing a letter to Burrell telling them it was mistake.

**Other issues:**

- I received ownership of the company. The stock has book value, but is worthless. Dan didn't point this out.
- I'm disabled and probably won't be able to work again.
- If I do earn income, I owe my opponent \$80,000.00—thanks to Dan's "representation." Prior to the trial, I pointed out that according to the books, my opponent claimed he was owed \$52,000.00 for 2010, yet he left Missouri on June 1<sup>st</sup> and contributed no income to the business for the year. This information wasn't entered into evidence or even addressed at trial.
- The \$100,000.00 my opponent withdrew from his IRA and "loaned" to the business was re-paid to him in full. Dan was shown this prior to the trial, but ignored the information and didn't enter it into evidence or address it in any way during the trial.