Exhibit L: Lotta Liotta Lawyer Loot - All for Nothing

Judge Fern Sadler dismissed the divorce because of cohabitation within 180 days.
Liotta failed to tell Oksana, yet billed her anyway.
Liotta's bill for $7212.15 to Oksana his "Cash Cow" since 2009

2009DivorceDismissed$7242.pdf

LIOTTA, DRANITZKE & ENGEL, LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
1666 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 250
WASHINGTON D.C. 20009
202-797-7700

Oksana Shaddock
2861 Chain Bridge Road
Vienna, VA 22181

April 1, 2009

A/c 2147/ 1

Ref

Matter: Domestic Relations A/c 2147/ 1 Page 1

Date		Hours	Amount
Legal Services Rendered			
04/01/2009	March Legal Services	3.20	1,280.00
		Total Legal Services:	$ 1,280.00
Expenses, Advances, Payments Received			
	Brought Forward 02/01/2009		5,931.55
04/01/2009	Costs		30.60
		Sub-Total:	$ 5,962.15
		Balance Due	$ 7,242.15

Family Court
ENTERED
MAR 24 2009
Washington, D.C.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
FAMILY COURT
DOMESTIC RELATIONS BRANCH

OKSANA SHEMET SHADDOCK, **Plaintiff,**	**Case Number: 2007 DRB 2108**
vs.	
FREDERICK SHADDOCK, **Defendant.**	**Judge Fern Flanagan Saddler**

ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT FOR ABSOLUTE DIVORCE

This matter came before this Court on March 13, 2009, for a hearing on Defendant Frederick Shaddock's motion to dismiss, which filed on February 3, 2009. Plaintiff Oksana Shemet Shaddock filed an opposition to Defendant's motion to dismiss on February 13, 2009. At the March 13, 2009 hearing, Plaintiff was present with counsel, and Defendant was present *pro se*.

This Court credits the testimony of the witnesses, Plaintiff Oksana Shemet Shaddock and Defendant Frederick Shaddock. After assessing the credibility of the witnesses and evaluating all of the evidence, this Court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law. To the extent that this written order differs from any oral findings of fact and conclusions of law made on the record on March 13, 2009, then the instant order controls.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff Oksana Shemet Shaddock filed a complaint for legal separation on July 24, 2007. Defendant Frederick Shaddock was properly served with the complaint on July 31,

2007; however, he did not file an answer and was in default. Plaintiff filed an Affidavit in Support of Default along with the required Affidavit in Compliance with the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, 50 U.S.C. §520 (2003) on August 23, 2007. However, on January 10, 2008, Defendant Frederick Shaddock filed a motion to dismiss, asserting that the District of Columbia did not have jurisdiction because Plaintiff was not a *bona fide* resident of the District of Columbia at the time she filed her complaint. Plaintiff filed an opposition to Defendant's motion on January 14, 2008. On May 28, 2008, Judge Fern Flanagan Saddler issued an order granting Defendant's oral motion to vacate the default, and denying Defendant's motion to dismiss as moot because Defendant admitted that the District of Columbia has jurisdiction. On May 28, 2008, Plaintiff filed a supplemental complaint for absolute divorce. Defendant filed the instant motion to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint for absolute divorce asserting that the parties continue to cohabitate with each other and engage in sexual relations with each other, and therefore, Plaintiff lacks proper grounds for a divorce at this time.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Direct Examination of Defendant Frederick Shaddock by Defendant

1. Defendant Frederick Shaddock testified that his current address is 390 M Street, Southwest, Apartment #400, Washington, D.C. 20024.
2. Defendant testified that he and Plaintiff Oksana Shemet Shaddock were married on January 17, 2001 in Arlington, Virginia.
3. Defendant testified that he and Plaintiff did not have any children together.

4. Defendant testified that there was a period of time beginning in 2006 when he lived on and off in Iowa, but Plaintiff had visited Defendant in Iowa on several occasions, and the parties kept in contact with each other on a daily basis.

5. Defendant testified that the parties separated from each other for a period of time beginning on August 26, 2006.

6. Defendant testified that the parties' separation has not been continuous, without interruption, and without sexual relations since August 26, 2006.

7. Defendant testified that the parties have had sexual relations with each other within the past week.

8. Defendant testified that the parties are a "normal married couple" who reside under the same roof and share the same bed.

9. Defendant testified that he believes that Plaintiff treats Defendant as if he is on "probation"; meaning if Defendant does something Plaintiff does not like, Plaintiff threatens to proceed with the divorce.

Cross-Examination of Defendant Frederick Shaddock by Plaintiff

10. Defendant testified that the parties resumed sexual relations with each other in September 2006.

11. Defendant testified that the parties were never separated for a period longer than two to three months.

12. Defendant testified that since 2006, he has lived off and on in Iowa and Washington, D.C., and that Plaintiff also travels back and forth between Iowa and Washington, D.C.

13. Defendant testified that the parties spent Christmas and New Year's Eve together in 2008.

14. Defendant testified that the parties resumed living together in Washington, D.C. in February 2009.

Direct Examination of Robert Ray Stone, Jr. by Defendant

15. Robert Ray Stone, Jr. testified that he has known Defendant Frederick Shaddock since 1999.

16. The witness testified that he and the defendant are former neighbors.

17. The witness testified that he is a member of the District of Columbia Bar.

18. The witness testified that he represented Defendant in this case in the past.

19. The witness testified that he has personal knowledge that the parties are cohabitating with each other.

Direct Examination of Plaintiff Oksana Shemet Shaddock by Defendant

20. Plaintiff Oksana Shemet Shaddock testified that she is married to Defendant Frederick Shaddock.

21. Plaintiff testified that she has been residing at 390 M Street, Southwest, Apartment #400, Washington, D.C. 20024 since May 2008.

22. Plaintiff testified that she lives by herself.

23. Plaintiff testified that the night before the hearing in the instant matter, Defendant showed up at Plaintiff's apartment to ask her something, and that Defendant slept on the couch that night.

24. Plaintiff testified that she slept in her bed by herself the night before the hearing in the instant matter.

25. Plaintiff testified that Defendant periodically shows up at Plaintiff's apartment asking for a place to stay.

26. Plaintiff testified that Defendant has some belongings at Plaintiff's apartment, including a toothbrush.

27. Plaintiff testified that she has not had sexual relations with Defendant in the past month.

28. Plaintiff testified that the parties have not shared a bed together recently.

29. Plaintiff testified that Defendant does work from Plaintiff's apartment.

30. Plaintiff testified that she was in Iowa in October or November 2008, and that she flew there, and back to Washington, D.C. with Defendant.

31. Plaintiff testified that she attended President Barack Obama's Inauguration with Defendant.

Direct Examination of Plaintiff Oksana Shemet Shaddock by Plaintiff

32. Plaintiff testified that on August 26, 2006, she left the apartment she was sharing with Defendant.

33. Plaintiff testified that since August 26, 2006 she has lived in a separate residence from Defendant.

34. Plaintiff testified that in August 2008, Defendant began spending time at Plaintiff's apartment because Defendant needed a place to stay because of financial troubles he was having.

35. Plaintiff testified that she has not had sexual relations with Defendant recently.

36. Plaintiff testified that she traveled to Iowa with Defendant in October or November 2008 because she wanted to visit her friends in Iowa. Plaintiff further testified that the parties stayed in different bedrooms at their house in Iowa during their visit.

37. Plaintiff testified that the parties have shared one or two dinners together out at restaurants recently.

38. Plaintiff testified that the parties do not regularly have dinners together.

Cross-Examination of Plaintiff Oksana Shemet Shaddock by Defendant

39. Plaintiff testified that within the last six months, Plaintiff and Defendant have discussed Plaintiff's ability to have a child, and that Plaintiff would like to have a child, in general, but not necessarily with Defendant.

40. Plaintiff testified that Defendant has closet space in Plaintiff's apartment.

41. Plaintiff testified that Defendant has been living in Plaintiff's apartment for awhile.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

D.C. Code states that "a divorce from the bonds of marriage may be granted if: (1) both parties to the marriage have mutually and voluntarily lived separate and apart without cohabitation for a period of six months next preceding the commencement of the action; or (2) both parties to the marriage have lived separate and apart without cohabitation for a period of one year next preceding the commencement of the action." D.C. Code § 16-904 (a) (2008).

In the instant case, Plaintiff Oksana Shemet Shaddock filed her complaint for absolute divorce based on the ground that the parties have lived continuously separate and apart from each other, without interruption, and without cohabitation (i.e. sexual relations), for a period of one year immediately preceding the filing of the complaint for absolute

divorce, beginning on August 26, 2006. However, at the March 13, 2009 hearing, Defendant testified credibly that the parties have had sexual relations with each other at various times since August 26, 2006, and that the parties continue to reside together as husband and wife and continue to have sexual relations with each other. Plaintiff testified that the parties have not had sexual relations with each other since August 26, 2006. However, Plaintiff further testified credibly that Defendant has some of his belongings at Plaintiff's home; that Defendant regularly sleeps on the couch in Plaintiff's home; that the parties have gone out to dinner with each other recently; that the parties traveled to Iowa together in October or November 2008; and that the parties attended President Barack Obama's Inauguration together.

This Court finds Defendant Frederick Shaddock's testimony to be more credible than Plaintiff Oksana Shemet Shaddock's testimony. This Court finds that the parties' separation has not been continuous, without interruption, and without sexual relations since August 26, 2006. Accordingly, this Court finds that Plaintiff Oksana Shemet Shaddock lacks proper grounds for an absolute divorce at this time.