SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CIVIL DIVISION

FREDERICK SHADDOCK, **Plaintiff,** **v.** **OKSANA SHEMET SHADDOCK,** **Defendant.**	**2025-CAB-004804** **Judge Carl E. Ross** **Next Event: January 16, 2026 Remote Initial Scheduling Conference**

OMNIBUS ORDER

Pending before the Court are Plaintiff's Motions. Defendant filed an Opposition to the Motions on October 27, 2025, arguing that Iowa Courts, where the Parties initiated divorce proceedings, are the appropriate forum to adjudicate these motions. Further, Defendant maintains that she denies all the factual allegations in the Motions and asserts that Plaintiff's persistent filings with the Court are part of a sustained campaign of harassment directed as Defendant. Defendant requests that the Court grant the pending Motion to Dismiss or set a Motions Hearing on the matter. It is by the Court, this 28th day of October 2025, hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order and Declaratory Judgement on Constitutional Grounds, filed September 22, 2025, is **DENIED without prejudice** because the Court is not able to discern what legal relief that Plaintiff seeks through this Motion; and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration on Financial Grounds and Clarification, filed October 9, 2025, is **DENIED without prejudice** because Plaintiff fails to allege what legal authority the Court possesses to grant the relief requested. Specifically, Plaintiff appears to request that the Court find a Post Nuptial Agreement executed in another jurisdiction

void but fails to proffer any legal authority for this Court to grant such relief. Accordingly, the Motion is Denied; and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Withdraw Consent for Asset Use and For Reciprocal Relief (Corrected Version), filed October 9, 2025, is **DENIED without prejudice** because Plaintiff fails to allege what legal authority the Court possesses to grant the relief requested. Specifically, Plaintiff appears to request that the Court find a Post Nuptial Agreement executed in another jurisdiction void but fails to proffer any legal authority for this Court to grant such relief. Accordingly, the Motion is Denied; and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Withdraw Consent for Asset Use and For Reciprocal Relief, filed October 9, 2025, is **DENIED without prejudice** because the relief requested appears to be connected to assets located in Iowa and Plaintiff fails to proffer legal support, and the Court questions its authority and jurisdiction, to provide relief regarding assets located in Iowa; and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Immediate Access to Essential Mail, filed October 10, 2025, is **DENIED without prejudice** because Plaintiff fails to allege sufficient factual allegations, or legal support, entitling him to relief. Specifically, Plaintiff does not allege that he is unable to access the mailbox only that he does not have access to an elevator key fob. Plaintiff's Motion is accordingly, denied without prejudice; and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Reconsideration and Clarification Based on Financial Grounds, refiled October 19, 2025, is **DENIED without prejudice** because Plaintiff fails to allege what legal authority the Court possesses to grant the relief requested. Specifically, Plaintiff appears to request that the Court find a Post Nuptial Agreement executed in

another jurisdiction void but fails to proffer any legal authority for this Court to grant such relief. Accordingly, the Motion is Denied; and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Attach True Legal Separation Agreement and Declare Post-Nuptial Hybrid Void, filed October 21, 2025, is **DENIED without prejudice** because Plaintiff fails to allege what legal authority the Court possesses to grant the relief requested. Specifically, Plaintiff appears to request that the Court find a Post Nuptial Agreement executed in another jurisdiction void but fails to proffer any legal authority for this Court to grant such relief. Accordingly, the Motion is Denied; and it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Proposed Order on Marital Property, Voiding Fraudulent Documents, and Sanctions, filed October 27, 2025 is **DENIED without prejudice** because Plaintiff fails to allege what legal authority the Court possesses to grant the relief requested. Specifically, Plaintiff appears to request that the Court find legal documents executed in another jurisdiction void but fails to proffer any legal authority for this Court to grant such relief. Accordingly, the Motion is Denied.

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint to Add Count for Equitable Reformation, filed October 24, 2025 is **GRANTED**, and Plaintiff may file an amended complaint on or before **November 12, 2025**. Plaintiff shall serve the amended complaint on Defendant on or before **December 12, 2025** and file an Affidavit of Service with the Court thereafter; and it is further

ORDERED that the Initial Scheduling Conference on November 21, 2025, is **CONTINUED** to **January 16, 2026 at 11:00 AM** in Courtroom 200.

SO ORDERED.

Judge Carl E. Ross

Copies to Parties.

Instructions for Remote Hearings Before Judge Carl E. Ross

Courtroom 200

Parties and counsel may access Virtual Courtroom 200 in the following ways:

(1) Going to the WebEx website at https://dccourts.webex.com/meet/ctb200 or going to https://dccourts.webex.com and, under "Join a Meeting," entering Meeting ID number 179 813 6225; or

(2) Downloading the WebEx Meetings app, opening the app, selecting Join Meeting, and entering https://dccourts.webex.com/meet/ctb200; or

(3) Calling 1-844-992-4726 or 202-860-2110 and entering Meeting ID number 179 813 6225 #, then # again.

Parties having trouble connecting to their remote hearing may contact chambers at JudgeCRossChambers@dcsc.gov. Staff will be monitoring the e-mail closely during hearings. **Failure to appear at a proceeding, including remote proceedings, may result in dismissal of a case or entry of default.**

PLEASE NOTE: Counsel is required to appear via WebEx video and log in so that their name appears on screen, absent extenuating circumstances that make it necessary for them to appear via telephone, or unless telephonic appearance is approved by Chambers prior to the hearing. All other parties are highly encouraged, but not required, to appear via WebEx video and identify themselves by name.

When entering the virtual courtroom (by dialing in on a phone, or signing in through the website or app), the party should not attempt to speak because another hearing may be underway. Each party should be automatically muted by the courtroom clerk when you first arrive. If you are using the WebEx website or the app, you may check in with the courtroom clerk using the "chat" function. If you are on a telephone, you should wait for your case to be called.