FIRMBINDER · ATTORNEY REPORT · SAMPLE REPORT · FICTIONAL DATA

Jordan Avery Sample

Family law · Example County, NC · NC Bar #99001 · licensed 2016 · 80 cases on record (2019–2026)

B+
OVERALL GRADE

Jordan Avery Sample's 80 Example County cases are mostly unopposed absolute divorces (44); in 17 contested cases the record is 5 wins, 3 losses and 9 negotiated or split results.

Overall grade from 4 of 4 graded areas — see Grades.

GRADES BY KIND OF CASE

A — Divorce
45 cases · W-L-T 0-0-0 · **process only**
Speed A · Reliability A · Volume A

B — Child custody
25 cases · W-L-T 4-2-8
Results C · Speed B · Reliability C · Volume A

B — Child support
13 cases · W-L-T 3-1-3
Results C · Speed B · Reliability B · Volume B

C — Property division (ED)
5 cases · W-L-T 0-0-3
Results C · Speed B · Reliability C · Volume D

D — Alimony & PSS
3 cases · W-L-T 0-1-1 · **process only**
Reliability D · Volume D

B- — Contempt
3 cases · W-L-T 1-0-1 · **process only**
Reliability A · Volume D

A case counts in every kind it involves. "Process only" = fewer than 3 contested cases, so the grade reflects speed, volume and reliability, not wins and losses.

80
CASES ON RECORD
2019–2026

5-3-9
CONTESTED W-L-T
17 contested · score 56%

45
UNOPPOSED
granted with nobody opposing

84
MEDIAN DAYS TO CLOSE
75 closed cases



Win **5** · Tie / split **9** · Loss **3** · Unopposed **45** · Own claims dismissed **6** · Not credited **4** · Pending **3** · Unknown **5**

AT A GLANCE

The record at a glance

2019–2026	80	5-3-9	45	84	3	$325/hr
years in the record	cases found	contested W-L-T	unopposed	median days to close	asked to withdraw	observed 2024 (estimate)

Cases filed each year, by how they ended



What kind of cases, by year



Median days from filing to close, by filing year



Which side she represented, by year



Every contested case, filing to close



Green flags

- Fast: median **84 days** from filing to close across 75 cases.
- Few outright losses: **3** in 17 contested cases (5 wins, 9 ties).

Red flags

- Asked to withdraw within 30 days of a trial or hearing **1** time(s).
- Left **3** case(s) before they were resolved.
- **3** contested loss(es) on record.
- **1** documented procedural problem(s) attributed to her in the case reviews.
- Weak in alimony & pss: grade **D** (process only).

Credentials & public record (checked Nov 20, 2026)

10 yrs
Licensed in NC
since Aug 19, 2016 · Bar #99001

Active
Bar status
eligible to practice

None
Discipline on record
NC State Bar directory

No
Board-certified family law specialist
NC State Bar specialization

0
Appellate opinions naming her
0 notices of appeal on her dockets

None on record (fictional sample profile). Not board-certified as a family law specialist (fictional sample profile). Appeals: Fictional sample: no search was run. A real report lists the appellate searches made and their results. Source: NC State Bar membership directory.

Highlight reel

Biggest win

100%

Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 100% of what it asked for, weighted across 3 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial)....

23CVD824921-999 →

Largest one-time award to her client

$22,000

distributive award · Judge Nora Elowen Castellane

24CVD661491-999 →

Fastest divorce she filed

46 days

from filing to judgment

21CVD789918-999 →

Longest fight

2.7 years

Win · Child custody

22CVD508741-999 →

Judge she sees most

Nora Elowen Castellane

decided 12 of her cases · W-L-T 1-0-1

Opposing lawyer she faces most

Brenna Lavinia Talloway

5 cases · W-L-T 1-1-1

Recent trend (last two filing years vs. before)

Cases filed per year

▼ 8.0

was 10.7 before 2025 (partial 2026)

Median days to close

▼ 77

was 101 before 2025 (partial 2026)

Share unopposed

▲ 62%

was 55% before 2025 (partial 2026)

CONTENTS

What's in this report

★. At a glance p. 2
1. Grades p. 6
2. Win / loss / tie record p. 8
3. Record by case type p. 12
4. Judges, opponents & other breakdowns p. 14
5. Workload, hourly rate, costs & practice profile p. 21
6. Time to resolution p. 25
7. Hiring vs. facing this attorney p. 26
8. Case files (78) p. 28
A. Appendix A · Every case on record p. 98
B. Appendix B · Method, sources & limits p. 103
C. Appendix C · Filings needed to verify outcomes p. 105
D. Appendix D · Case lists behind every card p. 107

How to read this report

Every case is scored from the point of view of the side this attorney represented. Counts and percentages are computed from the court records; the narrative parts (case summaries, strengths, concerns) are written by AI from those same records, and every case file shows whether its result came from a full AI review of the documents or only from docket entries.

Contested score = (wins + ½ ties) ÷ contested cases. Uncontested, dismissed, withdrawn, pending and unknown cases are left out of it, so a docket full of unopposed divorces does not inflate the number.

- **Win** — the client got substantially what they asked for on contested issues, or defeated the claims against them.
- **Loss** — the other side got substantially what it sought, or the client's own claims were denied.
- **Own claims dismissed** — the client voluntarily dropped their own claims; the record does not say why.
- **Pending** — the case is still open.
- **Tie / split** — mixed result, or a negotiated resolution (consent order, settlement, mediated agreement) where both sides gave ground.
- **Unopposed** — relief granted with no real opposition, e.g. a divorce the other spouse never answered. Not counted as a win.
- **Not credited** — the attorney left before the case was resolved, or joined after it was decided and nothing has been ruled since; not counted for or against.
- **Unknown** — the record collected so far is not enough to tell.

Coverage today: 78 of 80 dockets collected, 586 of 650 documents downloaded. Results for cases without a collected docket show as Unknown until they are collected. The report rebuilds as more records arrive.

SECTION 1

Grades

Overall grade **B+** (3.00 GPA) from 4 of 4 graded areas. Areas without enough data are left ungraded rather than guessed.

A — **Experience & volume**

80 cases on record across 8 filing year(s).

How graded: A: 75+ cases over 5+ years · B: 40+ over 3+ · C: 15+ · D: 5+ · fewer: not graded

C — **Contested results**

5-3-9 (W-L-T) in 17 contested cases; adjusted score 55%.

How graded: (wins + ½ ties + 2) ÷ (contested cases + 4): A ≥ 70% · B ≥ 60% · C ≥ 50% · D ≥ 40% · F below. Needs 3+ contested cases.

B — **Speed to resolution**

Median case closes in 77% of the reference time for its slowest issue (75 closed cases).

How graded: Median of (days to disposition ÷ reference days for the case's slowest issue): A ≤ 75% · B ≤ 100% · C ≤ 125% · D ≤ 150% · F above. Reference days are provisional until peer data exists.

B — **Procedural reliability**

3 procedural concern(s), withdrawal(s) or sanction(s) across 78 reviewed case(s).

How graded: Concerns per reviewed case (withdrawals before disposition, sanctions or contempt against the client side, documented procedural problems): A 0 · B ≤ 0.10 · C ≤ 0.20 · D ≤ 0.35 · F above.

Grades by kind of case

A — **Divorce**
45 cases · W-L-T 0-0-0 · **process only**
Speed A · Reliability A · Volume A

B — **Child custody**
25 cases · W-L-T 4-2-8
Results C · Speed B · Reliability C · Volume A

B — **Child support**
13 cases · W-L-T 3-1-3
Results C · Speed B · Reliability B · Volume B

C — **Property division (ED)**
5 cases · W-L-T 0-0-3
Results C · Speed B · Reliability C · Volume D

D — **Alimony & PSS**
3 cases · W-L-T 0-1-1 · **process only**
Reliability D · Volume D

B- — **Contempt**
3 cases · W-L-T 1-0-1 · **process only**
Reliability A · Volume D

B- — **Modifications**
3 cases · W-L-T 0-1-1 · **process only**
Reliability A · Volume D

B- — **Civil lawsuits**
3 cases · W-L-T 1-0-0 · **process only**
Speed B · Reliability A · Volume D

KIND OF CASE	GRADE	CASES	W-L-T	RESULTS	SPEED	RELIABILITY	VOLUME	
Divorce process only	**A**	45	0-0-0	—	A	A	A	cases →
Child custody	**B**	25	4-2-8	C	B	C	A	cases →
Child support	**B**	13	3-1-3	C	B	B	B	cases →
Property division (ED)	**C**	5	0-0-3	C	B	C	D	cases →

KIND OF CASE	GRADE	CASES	W-L-T	RESULTS	SPEED	RELIABILITY	VOLUME	
Alimony & PSS process only	**D**	3	0-1-1	—	—	D	D	cases →
Contempt process only	**B-**	3	1-0-1	—	—	A	D	cases →
Modifications process only	**B-**	3	0-1-1	—	—	A	D	cases →
Civil lawsuits process only	**B-**	3	1-0-0	—	B	A	D	cases →

Each kind of case is graded on the same four areas, using only the cases that involve it. Volume: A 25+, B 12+, C 6+, D 3+ cases. Results and speed use the same cut-offs as the overall grades (results need 3+ contested cases). Speed is not graded for contempt and modification work, because those motions come years after the case was first filed. A kind of case with too few contested cases gets a **process-only** grade from speed, reliability and volume.

SECTION 2

Win / loss / tie record

All 80 cases on record, from the side this attorney represented.



Win **5** Tie / split **9** Loss **3** Unopposed **45** Own claims dismissed **6** Not credited **4** Pending **3** Unknown **5**

GROUP	CASES	WIN	TIE	LOSS	UNCONT.	DISM./N.C.	PEND./UNK.	CONTESTED SCORE
All cases	80	5	9	3	45	10	8	56%
Verified only asks and orders read in the filings	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	83%

Custody and contested cases are scored by **asked vs. got**: each side's requests (from its own pleadings) are compared with what the orders gave, topic by topic, counting only topics decided while this attorney was on the case. A client that got 67% or more of what it asked for (weighted) is a win, 33% or less a loss, in between a tie. "Verified" cases are the ones where both the requests and the deciding orders were read; Appendix C lists the filings that would verify the rest.

> **Why most results are "Uncontested":** 45 of the cases with a known result were granted with no real opposition (typically an absolute divorce the other spouse never answered). Those show the attorney gets routine relief entered, but they say little about how the attorney performs in a fight, so they are kept out of the contested score.

Contested cases at a glance (17)

Every case that counts toward the contested score, with the deciding judge and the reason. Case numbers link to the full case file.

CASE	CLIENT	MATTER	RESULT	JUDGE	WHY
25CVD507814-999	Defendant	Child custody	Win	Hugh Odhran Pendlebury	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 94% of what it asked for, weighted across 3 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). The final order gave the client most of what it...
23CVD824921-999	Defendant	Child custody	Win	Cora Delyth Netherby	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 100% of what it asked for, weighted across 3 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). The final order gave the client most of what it...
22CV454978-999	Defendant	Contract	Win	Iris Ffion Quarrington	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 100% of what it asked for, weighted across 1 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Summary judgment for the client; every claim...
22CVD508741-999	Plaintiff	Child custody	Win	Nora Elowen Castellane	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 94% of what it asked for, weighted across 4 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (verified). The final order gave the client most of what it...

CASE	CLIENT	MATTER	RESULT	JUDGE	WHY
20CVD803047-999	Plaintiff	Child custody	Win	Miriam Isadora Aldercott	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 82% of what it asked for, weighted across 3 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (verified). The final order gave the client most of what it…
23CVD705997-999	Defendant	Alimony	Loss	Elliot Idris Montgarde	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 22% of what it asked for, weighted across 3 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). The court ordered alimony, PSS and fees well above…
21CVD885264-999	Defendant	Child custody	Loss	Simon Caradoc Ketteridge	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 27% of what it asked for, weighted across 3 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). The final order adopted the other side's position…
19CVD561602-999	Plaintiff	Child custody	Loss	Lydia Bronwen Haversham	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 8% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (unverified). Post-judgment phase (joined 2024-03-12, after…
25CVD441029-999	Plaintiff	Child custody	Tie / split	Elliot Idris Montgarde	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 52% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides…
24CVD625927-999	Defendant	Child custody	Tie / split	Cora Delyth Netherby	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 55% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides…
24CVD661491-999	Plaintiff	Child custody	Tie / split	Nora Elowen Castellane	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 55% of what it asked for, weighted across 4 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides…
23CVD739657-999	Plaintiff	Child custody	Tie / split	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 54% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides…
22CVD778253-999	Defendant	Child custody	Tie / split	Marcus Emrys Iversley	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 53% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides…

CASE	CLIENT	MATTER	RESULT	JUDGE	WHY
21CVD784175-999	Plaintiff	Equitable distribution	Tie / split	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 52% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Consent judgment with give on both sides on the...
21CVD791778-999	Plaintiff	Child custody	Tie / split	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 52% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides...
20CVD578489-999	Defendant	Child custody	Tie / split	Dane Perrin Rosswick	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 46% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (verified). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides...
19CVD743710-999	Plaintiff	Child custody	Tie / split	Miriam Isadora Aldercott	Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 47% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides...

Case numbers by result

Every case on record, grouped by how it counts, with the deciding judge's surname. Linked numbers jump to the case file.

Win 5	20CVD803047-999 Aldercott, 22CV454978-999 Quarrington, 22CVD508741-999 Castellane, 23CVD824921-999 Netherby, 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury
Tie / split 9	19CVD743710-999 Aldercott, 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick, 21CVD784175-999 Fairclothe, 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe, 22CVD778253-999 Iversley, 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven, 24CVD625927-999 Netherby, 24CVD661491-999 Castellane, 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde
Loss 3	19CVD561602-999 Haversham, 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge, 23CVD705997-999 Montgarde
Unopposed 45	19CVD577273-999 Pendlebury, 19CVD795413-999 Quarrington, 20CV520579-999, 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury, 20CVD600023-999 Lockhaven, 20CVD843625-999 Iversley, 21CVD574049-999 Rosswick, 21CVD575303-999 Aldercott, 21CVD759389-999 Castellane, 21CVD762354-999 Ellsmere, 21CVD763106-999 Haversham, 21CVD789918-999 Ellsmere, 22CVD427652-999 Rosswick, 22CVD434892-999 Aldercott, 22CVD468404-999 Ellsmere, 22CVD680883-999 Aldercott, 22CVD683421-999 Iversley, 22CVD728833-999 Netherby, 22CVD772344-999 Castellane, 22CVD823541-999 Deverill, 23CVD475795-999 Castellane, 23CVD513514-999 Netherby, 23CVD666477-999 Netherby, 23CVD793964-999 Lockhaven, 23CVD811754-999 Pendlebury, 23CVD845051-999 Montgarde, 23CVD847936-999 Castellane, 24CVD418200-999 Quarrington, 24CVD447532-999 Haversham, 24CVD466077-999 Castellane, 24CVD510475-999 Deverill, 24CVD705387-999 Castellane, 24CVD733194-999 Castellane, 24CVD815577-999 Rosswick, 24CVD837899-999 Aldercott, 25CVD572297-999 Lockhaven, 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe, 25CVD618703-999 Fairclothe, 25CVD619474-999 Lockhaven, 25CVD681803-999 Bristowe, 25CVD749053-999 Iversley, 26CVD418644-999 Haversham, 26CVD513993-999 Quarrington, 26CVD593819-999 Haversham, 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe
Own claims dismissed 6	19CVD528662-999 Lockhaven, 20CVD606448-999, 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe, 23CVD496017-999 Lockhaven, 24CVD822334-999 Castellane, 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge

Not credited 4	20CVD861454-999 Deverill, 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere, 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe, 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington
Pending 3	25CVD712012-999 Castellane, 26CVD663278-999 Netherby, 26CVD871727-999 Castellane
Unknown 5	19CV604697-999 Deverill, 19CVD724348-999, 19CVD790705-999 Rosswick, 20CVD647851-999, 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere

By client role



By filing year



SECTION 3

Record by case type

The record split by the kind of case. Custody is shown on its own first; the type summary counts each case once, under its main issue (custody over support over property over divorce), so its rows add up to the overall record.

Custody vs. everything else

GROUP	CASES	WIN	TIE	LOSS	UNCONT.	DISM./N.C.	PEND./UNK.	CONTESTED SCORE
Custody-related	25	4	8	2	0	7	4	57%
Everything else	55	1	1	1	45	3	4	50%
All cases	80	5	9	3	45	10	8	56%

By main case type



CASE TYPE	CASES	WIN	TIE	LOSS	UNCONT.	DISM./N.C.	PEND./UNK.	CONTESTED SCORE
Child custody	25	4	8	2	0	7	4	57%
Child support	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	—
Equitable distribution	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	50%
Alimony	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0%
Absolute divorce	45	0	0	0	44	1	0	—
Civil damages	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	—
Contract	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	100%
Collections	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	—
Docket not collected	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	—

Case types at a glance

'All custody-related' counts any case with a custody claim and overlaps the type cards; each type card counts a case once, under its main issue.

All custody-related cases

25 cases



W 4 T 8 L 2 U 0 … 11

Contested score **57%** · median 280 d · custody 25 · 2019–2026

See the 25 cases →

Everything else (no custody claim)

55 cases

W 1 T 1 L 1 U 45 … 7

Contested score **50%** · median 68 d · custody 0 · 2019–2026

See the 55 cases →

Child custody

25 cases



W 4 T 8 L 2 U 0 … 11

Contested score **57%** · median 280 d · custody 25 · 2019–2026

See the 25 cases →

Child support

1 case



W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 1

Contested score — · median 98 d · custody 0 · 2023

See the 1 case →

Equitable distribution

3 cases



W 0 T 1 L 0 U 0 … 2

Contested score **50%** · median 427 d · custody 0 · 2021–2025

See the 3 cases →

Alimony

1 case



W 0 T 0 L 1 U 0

Contested score **0%** · median 504 d · custody 0 · 2023

See the 1 case →

Absolute divorce

45 cases



W 0 T 0 L 0 U 44 … 1

Contested score — · median 66 d · custody 0 · 2019–2026

See the 45 cases →

Civil damages

1 case

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 1

Contested score — · median 314 d · custody 0 · 2019

See the 1 case →

Contract

1 case



W 1 T 0 L 0 U 0

Contested score **100%** · median 281 d · custody 0 · 2022

See the 1 case →

Collections

1 case

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 1

Contested score — · median 68 d · custody 0 · 2020

See the 1 case →

Docket not collected

2 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 2

Contested score — · median — · custody 0 · 2019–2020

See the 2 cases →

SECTION 4

Judges, opponents & other breakdowns

92
HEARINGS HELD
18 canceled

377
FILINGS BY THIS ATTORNEY
docket entries listing this attorney as filer

40
CASES VS. NO LAWYER
other side self-represented

7
REMOTE APPEARANCES
hearing notes mention Webex/video

Letters after each case number: **W** win, **T** tie, **L** loss, **U** unopposed (nobody opposed - e.g. an unanswered divorce), **D** client dropped own claims, **NC** not credited, **?** unknown. Case numbers link to the case files.

By judge

Each case counts under the judge who decided it; 'appeared before' counts every case where that judge held a hearing or signed an order.

Nora Elowen Castellane

12 cases

W 1 T 1 L 0 U 7 … 3

Contested score **75%** · median 67.5 d · custody 3 · 2021–2026

Appeared before in **12** of her cases

See the 12 cases →

Adele Heulwen Lockhaven

7 cases

W 0 T 1 L 0 U 4 … 2

Contested score **50%** · median 98 d · custody 2 · 2019–2025

Appeared before in **7** of her cases

See the 7 cases →

Cora Delyth Netherby

6 cases

W 1 T 1 L 0 U 3 … 1

Contested score **75%** · median 93 d · custody 3 · 2022–2026

Appeared before in **6** of her cases

See the 6 cases →

Miriam Isadora Aldercott

6 cases

W 1 T 1 L 0 U 4

Contested score **75%** · median 91 d · custody 2 · 2019–2024

Appeared before in **6** of her cases

See the 6 cases →

Owen Tiernan Fairclothe

6 cases

W 0 T 2 L 0 U 3 … 1

Contested score **50%** · median 137.5 d · custody 2 · 2021–2026

Appeared before in **6** of her cases

See the 6 cases →

Dane Perrin Rosswick

5 cases

W 0 T 1 L 0 U 3 … 1

Contested score **50%** · median 107 d · custody 2 · 2019–2024

Appeared before in **5** of her cases

See the 5 cases →

Greta Lowri Ellsmere

5 cases



W 0 T 0 L 0 U 3 … 2

Contested score **—** · median 75 d · custody 2 · 2021–2022

Appeared before in **5** of her cases

See the 5 cases →

Iris Ffion Quarrington

5 cases



W 1 T 0 L 0 U 3 … 1

Contested score **100%** · median 85 d · custody 1 · 2019–2026

Appeared before in **5** of her cases

See the 5 cases →

Lydia Bronwen Haversham

5 cases



W 0 T 0 L 1 U 4

Contested score **0%** · median 71 d · custody 1 · 2019–2026

Appeared before in **5** of her cases

See the 5 cases →

Hugh Odhran Pendlebury

4 cases

W 1 T 0 L 0 U 3

Contested score **100%** · median 58.5 d · custody 1 · 2019–2025

Appeared before in **4** of her cases

See the 4 cases →

Marcus Emrys Iversley

4 cases

W 0 T 1 L 0 U 3

Contested score **50%** · median 72.5 d · custody 1 · 2020–2025

Appeared before in **4** of her cases

See the 4 cases →

Philip Gethin Deverill

4 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 2 … 2

Contested score **—** · median 172.5 d · custody 1 · 2019–2024

Appeared before in **5** of her cases

See the 4 cases →

Elliot Idris Montgarde

3 cases

W 0 T 1 L 1 U 1

Contested score **25%** · median 210 d · custody 1 · 2023–2025

Appeared before in **3** of her cases

See the 3 cases →

Calvin Fintan Bristowe

2 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 1 … 1

Contested score **—** · median 240.5 d · custody 1 · 2023–2025

Appeared before in **2** of her cases

See the 2 cases →

Simon Caradoc Ketteridge

2 cases

W 0 T 0 L 1 U 0 … 1

Contested score **0%** · median 311.5 d · custody 2 · 2021–2025

Appeared before in **2** of her cases

See the 2 cases →

Leaving cases: withdrawals, replacements and late joins

3
LEFT BEFORE THE CASE ENDED
of 78 cases; 1 replaced by new counsel, 0 removed by the court

3
ASKED TO WITHDRAW
3 granted (1 only after the case ended), 0 never completed

1
WITHIN 30 DAYS OF A TRIAL OR HEARING
withdrawal or replacement close to a court date

1
JOINED MID-CASE
substituted in or limited appearance

10 other cases ended with the routine release of counsel written into the final judgment - that is not leaving a case. Cases without any sign of a lawyer joining or leaving were not sent for this review and count as stayed through resolution.

CASE	WHAT HAPPENED	REQUESTED	STARTED BY	STATED REASON	NEXT COURT DATE	JUDGE
24CVD753288-999	Replaced by new counsel	Mar 18, 2025	client	—	Motion Hearing Apr 22, 2025 - **35 days** after the request	Iris Ffion Quarrington
23CVD591382-999	Withdrew (court allowed)	Mar 26, 2024 order Apr 5, 2024	attorney	The client has not met the terms of the engagement and communication has broken down.	Bench Trial Apr 16, 2024 - **21 days** after the request	Calvin Fintan Bristowe
22CVD778253-999	Withdrew (court allowed)	Apr 4, 2023 order Apr 18, 2023	attorney	The custody claim the firm was retained for is resolved; the client consents to the withdrawal.	—	Marcus Emrys Iversley
21CVD529015-999	Withdrew (court allowed)	May 10, 2022 order May 24, 2022	mutual	The client has asked counsel to withdraw and intends to retain other counsel.	Pretrial Conference Aug 2, 2022 - **84 days** after the request	Greta Lowri Ellsmere

CASE	WHAT HAPPENED	REQUESTED	STARTED BY	STATED REASON	NEXT COURT DATE	JUDGE
20CVD861454-999	Stayed through resolution joined mid-case (substituted in, Feb 9, 2021)	May 18, 2021	not applicable	—	—	Philip Gethin Deverill

By opposing counsel (head-to-head)

(other side had no lawyer)

40 cases

W 1 T 0 L 0 U 35 … 4

Contested score **100%** · median 68 d · custody 3 · 2019–2026

See the 40 cases →

Brenna Lavinia Talloway

5 cases

W 1 T 1 L 1 U 1 … 1

Contested score **50%** · median 252 d · custody 4 · 2019–2026

See the 5 cases →

Piers Aurelian Ballantrae

3 cases

W 1 T 1 L 0 U 1

Contested score **75%** · median 392 d · custody 2 · 2023–2025

See the 3 cases →

Sabine Ysolde Lochranza

3 cases

W 1 T 1 L 0 U 1

Contested score **75%** · median 224 d · custody 2 · 2022–2024

See the 3 cases →

Garrick Wystan Kilbrannan

2 cases

W 0 T 0 L 1 U 0 … 1

Contested score **0%** · median 416.5 d · custody 2 · 2021–2023

See the 2 cases →

Heddwyn Carys Dalmally

2 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 2

Contested score — · median 68 d · custody 0 · 2021–2026

See the 2 cases →

Sioned Elidir Ettrickdale

2 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 2

Contested score — · median 63 d · custody 0 · 2021–2024

See the 2 cases →

Angharad Tudur Lammermoor

1 case

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 1

Contested score — · median 69 d · custody 0 · 2025

See the 1 case →

Bleddyn Iolo Corriemoor

1 case

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 1

Contested score — · median — · custody 1 · 2026

See the 1 case →

Cadfael Rhodri Urquhardt

1 case

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 1

Contested score — · median — · custody 0 · 2025

See the 1 case →

Derwa Cynan Pentlande

1 case

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 1

Contested score — · median 107 d · custody 0 · 2024

See the 1 case →

Dorian Merrick Gowanbank

1 case

W 0 T 1 L 0 U 0

Contested score **50%** · median 196 d · custody 1 · 2019

See the 1 case →

Eluned Morwenna Pitcaithly

1 case

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 1

Contested score — · median 314 d · custody 0 · 2019

See the 1 case →

Esme Rhiannon Drummellan

1 case

W 0 T 1 L 0 U 0

Contested score **50%** · median 385 d · custody 1 · 2021

See the 1 case →

Finlo Brioc Ormistoun

1 case

W 1 T 0 L 0 U 0

Contested score **100%** · median 281 d · custody 0 · 2022

See the 1 case →

13 more with fewer cases: Gwenllian Maelon Rosslyne (1), Gwynfor Madoc Kinlochard (1), Hollis Tobiah Eskdale (1), Ingram Bastian Valleyfield (1), Linnea Vesper Cromartie (1), Marlowe Nesta Aberfoyle (1), Niamh Isolt Whittingehame (1), Oriana Sorcha Fincastle (1), Talfryn Owain Quarrelwood (1), Tegwen Aeron Braemore (1), Tierney Caerwyn Montrosse (1), Yvaine Llewela Newbattle (1), Zephyrine Greer Invermay (1).

Other side represented vs. self-represented

Other side had no lawyer

40 cases

W 1 T 0 L 0 U 35 … 4

Contested score **100%** · median 68 d · custody 3 · 2019–2026

See the 40 cases →

Other side had a lawyer

38 cases

W 4 T 9 L 3 U 10 … 12

Contested score **53%** · median 252 d · custody 22 · 2019–2026

See the 38 cases →

By client role

Represented the plaintiff

61 cases

W 2 T 6 L 1 U 41 … 11

Contested score **56%** · median 79 d · custody 15 · 2019–2026

See the 61 cases →

Represented the defendant

17 cases

W 3 T 3 L 2 U 4 … 5

Contested score **56%** · median 273.5 d · custody 10 · 2019–2026

See the 17 cases →

How cases ended

Unopposed hearing

26 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 26

Contested score — · median 65 d · custody 0 · 2019–2026

See the 26 cases →

Summary judgment

19 cases

W 1 T 0 L 0 U 18

Contested score **100%** · median 74 d · custody 0 · 2020–2026

See the 19 cases →

Consent order

10 cases

W 0 T 7 L 0 U 0 … 3

Contested score **50%** · median 325.5 d · custody 9 · 2020–2025

See the 10 cases →

Trial (judge)

8 cases

W 4 T 0 L 3 U 0 … 1

Contested score **57%** · median 406 d · custody 7 · 2019–2025

See the 8 cases →

Voluntary dismissal

6 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 6

Contested score — · median 147 d · custody 3 · 2019–2025

See the 6 cases →

Pending

3 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 3

Contested score — · median — · custody 2 · 2025–2026

See the 3 cases →

Unknown

3 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 3

Contested score — · median 308 d · custody 2 · 2019–2021

See the 3 cases →

Mediated agreement

2 cases

W 0 T 2 L 0 U 0

Contested score **50%** · median 196 d · custody 2 · 2019–2023

See the 2 cases →

Trial by judge

2 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 2

Contested score — · median — · custody 0 · 2019–2020

See the 2 cases →

Default judgment

1 case

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 1

Contested score — · median 68 d · custody 0 · 2020

See the 1 case →

By how hard the case was fought

None = nobody opposed; low = other side appeared but nothing was fought; moderate = contested motions or negotiation; high = contested hearings or trial.

None

48 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 45 … 3

Contested score — · median 67.5 d · custody 1 · 2019–2026

See the 48 cases →

Moderate

18 cases

W 0 T 9 L 0 U 0 … 9

Contested score **50%** · median 287 d · custody 15 · 2019–2026

See the 18 cases →

High

9 cases

W 5 T 0 L 3 U 0 … 1

Contested score **62%** · median 399 d · custody 7 · 2019–2025

See the 9 cases →

Low

3 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 3

Contested score — · median 210 d · custody 2 · 2019–2025

See the 3 cases →

Not reviewed

2 cases

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 2

Contested score — · median — · custody 0 · 2019–2020

See the 2 cases →

Alone vs. with co-counsel

No co-counsel on the docket

65 cases

W 4 T 7 L 2 U 38 … 14

Contested score **58%** · median 83.5 d · custody 21 · 2019–2026

See the 65 cases →

With co-counsel Tessa Corisande Brannigan

11 cases

W 0 T 2 L 1 U 7 … 1

Contested score **33%** · median 91 d · custody 2 · 2019–2026

See the 11 cases →

With co-counsel Milo Kenelm Varrenthal

1 case

W 0 T 0 L 0 U 0 … 1

Contested score — · median — · custody 1 · 2026

See the 1 case →

With co-counsel Tessa Corisande Brannigan, Milo Kenelm Varrenthal

1 case

W 1 T 0 L 0 U 0

Contested score **100%** · median 987 d · custody 1 · 2022

See the 1 case →

By court

Example County District Court

80 cases

W 5 T 9 L 3 U 45 … 18

Contested score **56%** · median 84 d · custody 25 · 2019–2026

See the 80 cases →

Money ordered in her cases

Support, alimony, property and fee amounts found in the reviewed orders, and which way the money flows relative to her client.

CASE	TYPE	AMOUNT	HOW OFTEN	DIRECTION	JUDGE
20CV520579-999	Damages	$9,800.00	one time	▲ paid to her client	—
20CVD803047-999	Child support	$612.00	monthly	▲ paid to her client	Miriam Isadora Aldercott
21CVD784175-999	Distributive award	$15,500.00	one time	▲ paid to her client	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe
21CVD791778-999	Distributive award	$38,000.00	one time	▼ paid by her client	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe
21CVD885264-999	Child support	$520.00	monthly	▼ paid by her client	Simon Caradoc Ketteridge
22CVD508741-999	Attorney fees	$15,000.00	one time	▲ paid to her client	Nora Elowen Castellane
22CVD508741-999	Child support	$1,140.00	monthly	▲ paid to her client	Nora Elowen Castellane
22CVD778253-999	Child support	$495.00	monthly	▼ paid by her client	Marcus Emrys Iversley
23CVD705997-999	Alimony	$2,150.00	monthly	▼ paid by her client	Elliot Idris Montgarde
23CVD705997-999	Attorney fees	$6,500.00	one time	▼ paid by her client	Elliot Idris Montgarde
23CVD705997-999	Post separation support	$1,600.00	monthly	▼ paid by her client	Elliot Idris Montgarde
23CVD739657-999	Child support	$705.00	monthly	▲ paid to her client	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven
24CVD661491-999	Alimony	$1,800.00	monthly	▲ paid to her client	Nora Elowen Castellane

CASE	TYPE	AMOUNT	HOW OFTEN	DIRECTION	JUDGE
24CVD661491-999	Distributive award	$22,000.00	one time	▲ paid to her client	Nora Elowen Castellane
24CVD661491-999	Post separation support	$1,500.00	monthly	▲ paid to her client	Nora Elowen Castellane
25CVD507814-999	Child support	$415.00	monthly	▲ paid to her client	Hugh Odhran Pendlebury
25CVD712012-999	Post separation support	$1,350.00	monthly	▲ paid to her client	Nora Elowen Castellane

Courtroom events by who caused them

Counted from the AI case reviews: how many cases had each kind of event, and which side (or the court) it came from.

Continuances

Her client's side	Other side	Court
3	11	0

her client's side cases → · other side cases →

Withdrawals / releases of counsel*

Her client's side	Other side	Court
7	0	0

her client's side cases →

Substitutions of counsel

Her client's side	Other side	Court
3	0	0

her client's side cases →

Contempt / show cause

Her client's side	Other side	Court
0	3	0

other side cases →

Discovery disputes

Her client's side	Other side	Court
0	1	0

other side cases →

Fee awards

Her client's side	Other side	Court
0	0	1

court cases →

Mediation

Her client's side	Other side	Court
0	0	0

—

* Withdrawal counts here come from the case reviews and include routine releases of counsel written into divorce judgments. The "Leaving cases" table above separates real departures from routine releases.

SECTION 5

Workload, hourly rate, costs & practice profile

Current workload

4	5	5	About normal
OPEN OR LIVE NOW open cases, upcoming hearings, recent post-judgment filings	HER USUAL NUMBER OPEN typical range 3–6, peak 10	NEW CASES, LAST 6 MONTHS her average: 4.7 per 6 months	WORKLOAD VS. NORMAL open now vs. her usual range

About normal



Line: her cases open in each month, rebuilt from filing and closing dates. Gray band: her usual range (middle half of all months, excluding the last six). Dot: today.

CASE	MATTER	WHY IT COUNTS AS LIVE
26CVD663278-999	Child custody	case open (Pending)
26CVD871727-999	Child custody	case open (Pending)
25CVD712012-999	Equitable distribution	case open (Pending)
23CVD824921-999	Child custody	hearing set 2026-12-15

Estimated hourly rate by year



Solid dots: rates actually billed (observed). Hollow dots and dashed line: projected. Gray band: likely range.

YEAR	TYPE	HOURLY RATE	BASIS
2019	Projected	*~$265* likely $250–$280	projected from her 2022 observed rate
2020	Projected	*~$275* likely $265–$290	projected from her 2022 observed rate

YEAR	TYPE	HOURLY RATE	BASIS
2021	Projected	*~$290* likely $285–$295	projected from her 2022 observed rate
2022	Observed	**$300**	8 billing entries, 19.1 hours · 22CVD508741-999
2023	Projected	*~$310* likely $305–$320	projected from her 2024 observed rate
2024	Observed	**$325**	8 billing entries, 27 hours · 22CVD508741-999
2025	Projected	*~$340* likely $330–$345	projected from her 2024 observed rate
2026	Projected	*~$350* likely $340–$365	projected from her 2024 observed rate

Other people on the same bills (for context)

TIMEKEEPER	YEAR	RATE	ENTRIES
Rhea Quillfeather	2022	$150	3
Tessa Brannigan	2024	$400	2
Milo Varrenthal	2024	$225	2
Rhea Quillfeather	2024	$150	2

Rates stated under oath in fee affidavits

- "My hourly rate is $325.00 per hour." (22CVD508741-999, doc 2, Oct 8, 2024)
- "My hourly rate was $300.00 per hour in 2022." (22CVD508741-999, doc 2, Oct 8, 2024)
- "Our associate attorney bills at an hourly rate of $225.00 per hour, and paralegal time is billed at $150." (22CVD508741-999, doc 2, Oct 8, 2024)

Charges on top of the hourly rate: Monthly Admin Fee of 5% on invoices (22CVD508741-999).

These are estimates, not quotes. They come only from what is in the public court file: itemized billing statements attached to attorney-fee affidavits or fee motions (timekeeper, date, hours, rate, total) and rates stated under oath in those affidavits. A billing line counts only when hours × rate equals the line total (so scanning errors are thrown out), duplicate copies of the same invoice are counted once, and "no charge" entries are left out. The rate shown for a year is the typical (median) rate on her billed entries that year. **Projected years are not observed.** They are calculated from the nearest observed year using her own observed change of about 4.1% a year between 2022 and 2024 (range ±2 points), rounded to the nearest $5, with a low-high range. Billing appears in only 1 of the 80 cases searched, firms often charge different clients different rates, may discount or change rates mid-year, and retainers and flat fees never show up in court - so ask the attorney for a written fee agreement before relying on any number here.

Estimated cost by kind of case

KIND OF CASE	HER CASES	SHARE CONTESTED	ATTORNEY HOURS SEEN ON THE DOCKET	TYPICAL COST (ESTIMATE)
Unopposed divorce the other spouse filed nothing or did not oppose	44	0%	4–13 h	**$1,280 – $4,260**
Any contested case cases that were actually fought	17	100%	14–43 h (docket)	**$10,520 – $33,560**
Child custody	21	86%	12–38 h (docket)	**$8,910 – $28,380**
Child support	11	82%	12–37 h (docket)	**$8,550 – $27,360**

KIND OF CASE	HER CASES	SHARE CONTESTED	ATTORNEY HOURS SEEN ON THE DOCKET	TYPICAL COST (ESTIMATE)
Property division (ED)	5	80%	10–29 h (docket)	**$6,840 – $21,170**
Alimony & PSS	3	100%	14–43 h (docket)	**$10,520 – $34,160**
Contempt	3	67%	14–44 h (docket)	**$10,720 – $33,560**
Civil lawsuits	3	67%	6–19 h (docket)	**$3,380 – $12,250**

Reality check against real billing. In 22CVD508741-999 the firm's own fee affidavit (25 itemized billing lines filed with fee affidavits / fee motions) shows **$19,760.00** billed for 2022-03-02 to 2024-09-30 by all of its timekeepers. The docket-only task model for that same period comes to only $3,900–$12,060, because the docket shows filings but not the discovery, document review, preparation and client time behind them. So every **contested** case below is scaled up by that measured gap (×2.5). Unopposed matters are not scaled: their docket shows nearly all the work. One billed case is a thin basis - treat contested figures as order-of-magnitude.

These are estimates, not quotes. For each of her cases we counted the work her client's side filed or attended on the docket (pleadings, motions, orders, hearings actually held, mediations), gave each task a low-high hour range (e.g. divorce complaint 1–2.5 h, contested motion 3–8 h, trial 6–16 h), added 20–40% for client communication and an intake meeting, and priced the hours at that year's hourly rate (observed where billing exists, projected otherwise). The "typical case" is the median of her cases of that kind. Real bills depend on the client, how hard the other side fights, paralegal and associate time, retainers, flat fees and the firm's admin fee - get a written fee agreement before relying on any number here.

Practice mix

78%
REPRESENTS PLAINTIFF
61 of 78 docketed cases

22%
REPRESENTS DEFENDANT
17 of 78 docketed cases

Family law
MAIN PRACTICE AREA
Family law 77, Civil litigation 3

Cases filed per year



How cases were closed (court's disposition label)



Reading the court's labels: North Carolina eCourts records most divorce hearings as “Disposed – Trial by Judge” even when nothing was contested — so the 36 “Trial by judge” closings are mostly routine hearings, not contested trials. The outcome classifications in this report look past the label to what actually happened.

Matter types (docketed cases)



Courts



SECTION 6

Time to resolution

Closed cases took a median of **84 days** from filing to disposition (middle half: 62–252 days, 75 cases).

Each dot is one case. Solid tick = median. Dashed tick = reference time for that matter type (provisional until enough peer attorneys are in the database).



MATTER	CASES	MEDIAN DAYS	MIDDLE HALF	RANGE	REFERENCE
Absolute divorce	45	66	58–81	46–107	90
Child custody	23	280	210–413	119–987	300
Equitable distribution	2	329	182–476	231–427	540
Alimony	1	504	504–504	504–504	450
Child support	1	98	98–98	98–98	180
Contract	1	281	281–281	281–281	365
Collections	1	68	68–68	68–68	270
Civil damages	1	314	314–314	314–314	365

Speed depends on the case as much as the lawyer: a North Carolina absolute divorce cannot be granted until the answer period runs after service, and custody cases wait on mandatory mediation. Compare like with like.

SECTION 7

Hiring vs. facing this attorney

A family-law practice in Example County District Court, 2019-2026, nearly always on the filing side of unopposed absolute divorces, which close on the first hearing date or by summary judgment. About a third of the files are custody cases, often combined with child support and sometimes with property division or alimony; most of those end in consent orders or mediated parenting agreements, and five went to a full custody trial. She appears on both sides of custody disputes, works with a firm partner on the larger property and alimony files, and has a small number of civil cases tied to separation agreements and family money disputes.

Strengths

- Unopposed divorces move quickly: most close within about three months of filing, usually at the first hearing or by summary judgment. (21CVD789918-999, 22CVD823541-999, 26CVD593819-999)
- Custody trials where she stayed through judgment mostly went her client's way: four of five ended with the client getting most of what it asked for. (22CVD508741-999, 20CVD803047-999, 23CVD824921-999, 25CVD507814-999)
- Requests are specific and documented; a fee request backed by an itemized affidavit was largely granted. (22CVD508741-999)
- Settles most custody disputes by consent order or mediated agreement instead of trial. (19CVD743710-999, 20CVD578489-999, 21CVD791778-999, 23CVD739657-999, 24CVD625927-999, 25CVD441029-999)
- Won a civil breach-of-agreement suit on summary judgment using payment records. (22CV454978-999)

Concerns

- Asked to withdraw three times; once 21 days before a scheduled custody trial, after which the client tried the case without a lawyer. (23CVD591382-999, 21CVD529015-999, 22CVD778253-999)
- Lost the custody trial where her client sought equal time, and an alimony trial where the award far exceeded her client's offer. (21CVD885264-999, 23CVD705997-999)
- One documented procedural problem: a late-filed equitable distribution inventory affidavit. (24CVD661491-999)
- Several outcomes cannot be verified because the deciding orders are not in the public file. (19CVD790705-999, 21CVD893492-999, 19CVD561602-999)

If you are thinking of hiring this attorney

A good fit for an unopposed divorce or a custody case likely to settle; the record shows fast divorces and mostly negotiated custody results. In the few custody trials she finished, clients usually got most of what they asked for, but three withdrawal requests, one shortly before trial, are worth asking about.

Good fit for

- Unopposed absolute divorce
- Custody cases likely to settle in mediation
- Custody cases with clear documentation for trial

Weaker fit for

- Clients who may struggle with the fee agreement terms (see the withdrawals)
- Complex alimony disputes where the record shows a loss

What to expect

- A temporary custody motion filed early
- Pressure toward mediation and a consent order

- Itemized bills at about $325 an hour (2024), plus a 5% monthly admin fee seen on one invoice

Questions to ask before hiring

- Under what circumstances would you withdraw from my case?
- Who else at the firm will work on my file, and at what rates?
- How many custody trials have you taken to judgment in the last two years?

If your case is against this attorney's client

Expect an early temporary custody motion and a push toward mediation. When her cases are tried, her clients have usually obtained most of what they asked for, so a well-documented position matters.

What to expect

- A specific proposed schedule in the first pleading
- Contempt or show-cause motions if a temporary order is not followed
- Unopposed divorces moved to judgment as soon as the answer period runs

How to prepare

- Calendar the answer deadline from the date of service
- Bring school and medical records to the temporary hearing
- Follow every temporary order exactly while the case is open

General information drawn from the public record, not legal advice for your case.

Tactics seen across cases

TACTIC	HOW OFTEN	CASES
Moves unanswered divorces to judgment soon after the answer period ends, often by summary judgment.	usually	19CVD795413-999, 19CVD577273-999, 20CVD843625-999, 20CVD567105-999, 20CVD600023-999, 21CVD575303-999
Files a motion for temporary custody together with the complaint.	often	22CVD508741-999, 20CVD803047-999, 21CVD791778-999, 24CVD661491-999, 21CVD529015-999, 24CVD753288-999
Resolves custody by consent order or mediated parenting agreement before the trial date.	often	19CVD743710-999, 20CVD578489-999, 21CVD791778-999, 23CVD739657-999, 24CVD661491-999, 24CVD625927-999, 25CVD441029-999
Brings contempt or show-cause motions to enforce custody orders.	sometimes	23CVD824921-999, 25CVD899318-999
Supports fee requests with an itemized billing affidavit.	rarely	22CVD508741-999

Confidence: **medium**. FICTIONAL SAMPLE DATA. Based on the sample's docketed cases and the documents reviewed in them; three contested results are verified against both sides' pleadings and the deciding order. Private settlements and work outside court are not visible.

SECTION 8

Case files

78 cases with a collected docket. Contested cases (win / loss / tie) come first, routine uncontested matters last. Each card shows how the case counts in the record, why, and how sure that call is. Party names are shown as initials; case numbers link to the public eCourts record.

25CVD441029-999 · T.L.B. v. C.L.B.

Tie / split

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (T.L.B.)

Asked vs. got · medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 52% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides (modification of physical custody: plaintiff gains school-year weekdays; summers stay with the defendant; holiday schedule: alternate thanksgiving and split winter break).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Feb 25, 2025	Sep 23, 2025	210	Elliot Idris Montgarde
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
MONTROSSE, TIERNEY CAERWYN	—	Moderate	Consent order

Asked vs. got — Partly verified

Client obtained about **52%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Modification of physical custody weight 3	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff	Keep the out-of-state order unchanged	Plaintiff gains school-year weekdays; summers stay with the defendant Sep 23, 2025 · order text	**50%**
Holiday schedule weight 1	Alternate all major holidays	Keep the existing holiday split	Alternate Thanksgiving and split winter break Sep 23, 2025 · order text	**60%**

A consent order: both sides gave ground, so shares near the middle are expected.

T.L.B. filed for child custody on February 25, 2025, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. C.L.B. answered and counterclaimed through Tierney Caerwyn Montrosse. The case settled before trial: a consent order entered on September 23, 2025 provides a modified schedule giving the plaintiff more school-year time but leaving summers with the defendant.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Modification	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff	Plaintiff gains school-year weekdays; summers stay with the defendant	Split
Child custody	Alternate all major holidays	Alternate Thanksgiving and split winter break	Split

Timeline

Feb 25, 2025	T.L.B. files for child custody
Apr 4, 2025	C.L.B. answers and counterclaims
Sep 23, 2025	Consent Order for Permanent Custody entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Negotiated a schedule close to the middle of the two sides' positions.

Other counsel in the case

- **MONTROSSE, TIERNEY CAERWYN** — **Tactic:** Opposed the requested schedule with school-attendance records.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Consent Order for Permanent Custody** (consent order, outcome determinative) — By agreement, Judge Elliot Idris Montgarde entered an order providing a modified schedule giving the plaintiff more school-year time but leaving summers with the defendant.
- **#3 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — C.L.B. answers and counterclaims, asking for keep the out-of-state order unchanged; keep the existing holiday split.
- **#7 Complaint to Register and Modify Out-of-State Custody Order** (complaint, substantive) — T.L.B. asks the court to decide child custody. The complaint registers an out-of-state custody order and asks to modify it. The requests are: Primary physical custody to the plaintiff; Alternate all major holidays.

Docket documents: 7 total, 7 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

25CVD507814-999 · J.J.L. v. T.H.O.

Win

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Defendant** (T.H.O.)

Asked vs. got · medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 94% of what it asked for, weighted across 3 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). The final order gave the client most of what it asked for (physical custody / schedule: defendant primary; plaintiff alternate weekends; legal custody: joint legal custody).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jan 14, 2025	Feb 10, 2026	392	Hugh Odhran Pendlebury
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
BALLANTRAE, PIERS AURELIAN	—	High	Trial (judge)

Asked vs. got — Partly verified

Client obtained about **94%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Primary physical custody to the defendant	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff with supervised visits	Defendant primary; plaintiff alternate weekends Feb 10, 2026 · order text	**90%**
Legal custody weight 3	Joint legal custody	Sole legal custody to the plaintiff	Joint legal custody Feb 10, 2026 · order text	**100%**
Child support amount weight 2	Guideline support from the plaintiff	Support from the defendant	Plaintiff pays $415 a month to the defendant Feb 10, 2026 · order text	**90%**

Scored from the final order after trial; temporary orders are listed but the final order controls.

J.J.L. filed for child custody and child support on January 14, 2025, represented by Piers Aurelian Ballantrae. T.H.O. answered and counterclaimed through Jordan Avery Sample. The parties entered a temporary consent order on April 4, 2025. After a bench trial on January 20, 2026, Judge Hugh Odhran Pendlebury entered a permanent order on February 10, 2026 giving primary physical custody to the defendant with the plaintiff on alternate weekends, and child support paid to the defendant.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Primary physical custody to the defendant	Defendant primary; plaintiff alternate weekends	Client
Child custody	Joint legal custody	Joint legal custody	Client
Child support	Guideline support from the plaintiff	Plaintiff pays $415 a month to the defendant	Client

Timeline

Jan 14, 2025	J.J.L. files for child custody and child support
Feb 20, 2025	T.H.O. answers and counterclaims
Apr 4, 2025	Temporary Consent Order entered
Jan 20, 2026	Bench trial
Feb 10, 2026	Permanent order entered

Money ordered

- Child support: $415.00 monthly, plaintiff → defendant

About this attorney's work

- **Strength:** Proposed findings submitted after trial were largely adopted in the final order.

Other counsel in the case

- **BALLANTRAE, PIERS AURELIAN** — **Strength:** Pressed for an early temporary hearing.

Notable events

- Mar 7, 2025 · continuance (plaintiff): Temporary hearing continued at the plaintiff's request.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Order for Permanent Custody and Child Support** (order, outcome determinative) — After a bench trial on January 20, 2026, Judge Hugh Odhran Pendlebury ordered primary physical custody to the defendant with the plaintiff on alternate weekends, and child support paid to the defendant.
- **#2 Pre-Trial Order** (order, procedural) — Pre-trial order listing the contested issues, witnesses and exhibits for the custody trial.
- **#3 Temporary Consent Order** (consent order, substantive) — The parties entered a temporary consent order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#5 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — T.H.O. answers and counterclaims, asking for primary physical custody to the defendant; joint legal custody; guideline support from the plaintiff.
- **#9 Complaint for Child Custody and Child Support** (complaint, substantive) — J.J.L. asks the court to decide child custody and child support. The requests are: Primary physical custody to the plaintiff with supervised visits; Sole legal custody to the plaintiff; Support from the defendant.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 5 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

Gaps: Exhibits to the plaintiff's verified complaint (sealed)

24CVD625927-999 · I.D.A. v. C.L.W.

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Defendant** (C.L.W.)

Tie / split

Asked vs. got · medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 55% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides (physical custody / schedule: equal schedule with a new exchange location; plaintiff's contempt motion against the defendant: dismissed by consent; defendant gives two make-up weekends).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jun 18, 2024	Jan 28, 2025	224	Cora Delyth Netherby
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
LOCHRANZA, SABINE YSOLDE	—	Moderate	Consent order

Asked vs. got Partly verified

Client obtained about **55%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Primary physical custody to the defendant	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff	Equal schedule with a new exchange location Jan 28, 2025 · order text	**50%**
Plaintiff's contempt motion against the defendant weight 1	Dismiss the contempt motion	Hold the defendant in contempt	Dismissed by consent; defendant gives two make-up weekends Jan 28, 2025 · order text	**70%**

A consent order: both sides gave ground, so shares near the middle are expected.

I.D.A. filed for child custody on June 18, 2024, represented by Sabine Ysolde Lochranza. C.L.W. answered and counterclaimed through Jordan Avery Sample. After a temporary hearing the court entered a temporary custody order on August 22, 2024. The case settled before trial: a consent order entered on January 28, 2025 provides an equal schedule with a revised exchange location, and dismissal of the plaintiff's contempt motion with make-up time.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Primary physical custody to the defendant	Equal schedule with a new exchange location	Split
Contempt	Dismiss the contempt motion	Dismissed by consent; defendant gives two make-up weekends	Client
Contempt	Hold the defendant in contempt	Dismissed by consent with make-up time	Split

Timeline

Jun 18, 2024	I.D.A. files for child custody
Aug 8, 2024	C.L.W. answers and counterclaims
Aug 22, 2024	Temporary Custody Order entered
Oct 21, 2024	I.D.A. files a contempt motion
Jan 28, 2025	Consent Order for Permanent Custody entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Used mediation to narrow the issues, then documented the result in a consent order.

Other counsel in the case

- **LOCHRANZA, SABINE YSOLDE** — **Tactic:** Opposed the requested schedule with school-attendance records.

Notable events

- Jul 25, 2024 · continuance (plaintiff): Temporary hearing continued at the plaintiff's request.
- Oct 21, 2024 · contempt (plaintiff): I.D.A. moved to hold C.L.W. in contempt of the temporary order.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Consent Order for Permanent Custody** (consent order, outcome determinative) — By agreement, Judge Cora Delyth Netherby entered an order providing an equal schedule with a revised exchange location, and dismissal of the

plaintiff's contempt motion with make-up time.

- **#2 Motion for Order to Show Cause** (motion, substantive) — I.D.A. asks the court to hold C.L.W. in contempt for missed exchanges under the temporary order.
- **#3 Temporary Custody Order** (order, substantive) — After a temporary hearing, Judge Cora Delyth Netherby entered a temporary custody order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#5 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — C.L.W. answers and counterclaims, asking for primary physical custody to the defendant; dismiss the contempt motion.
- **#9 Complaint for Child Custody** (complaint, substantive) — I.D.A. asks the court to decide child custody. The requests are: Primary physical custody to the plaintiff; Hold the defendant in contempt.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 5 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

24CVD661491-999 · J.P.W. v. N.L.W.

Tie / split

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (J.P.W.)

Asked vs. got · medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 55% of what it asked for, weighted across 4 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides (physical custody / schedule: schedule slightly favoring the plaintiff (9 of 14 overnights); alimony: alimony of $1,800 a month for five years).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Feb 6, 2024	Jun 10, 2025	490	Nora Elowen Castellane
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
BALLANTRAE, PIERS AURELIAN	BRANNIGAN, TESSA CORISANDE	Moderate	Consent order

Asked vs. got — Partly verified

Client obtained about **55%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Primary physical custody	Equal shared custody	Schedule slightly favoring the plaintiff (9 of 14 overnights) Jun 10, 2025 · order text	**55%**
Alimony weight 3	Alimony of $2,500 a month for eight years	No alimony	Alimony of $1,800 a month for five years Jun 10, 2025 · order text	**55%**
Post-separation support weight 2	PSS of $2,000 a month	No PSS	PSS of $1,500 a month until alimony began Jul 5, 2024 · order text	**60%**
Division of marital property weight 2	Unequal division in the plaintiff's favor	Equal division	Roughly equal division; $22,000 distributive award to the plaintiff Jun 10, 2025 · order text	**50%**

A consent order: both sides gave ground, so shares near the middle are expected.

J.P.W. filed for child custody, equitable distribution, post-separation support and alimony on February 6, 2024, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. N.L.W. answered and counterclaimed through Piers Aurelian Ballantrae. The parties entered a temporary consent order on May 6, 2024. The case settled before trial: a consent order entered on June 10, 2025 provides a schedule slightly favoring the plaintiff, alimony of $1,800 a month for five years, and a roughly equal property division.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Primary physical custody	Schedule slightly favoring the plaintiff (9 of 14 overnights)	Split
Alimony	Alimony of $2,500 a month for eight years	Alimony of $1,800 a month for five years	Split
Post-separation support	PSS of $2,000 a month	PSS of $1,500 a month until alimony began	Split
Equitable distribution	Unequal division in the plaintiff's favor	Roughly equal division; $22,000 distributive award to the plaintiff	Split

Timeline

Feb 6, 2024	J.P.W. files for child custody, equitable distribution, post-separation support and alimony
Mar 25, 2024	N.L.W. answers and counterclaims
May 6, 2024	Temporary Consent Order entered
Jul 5, 2024	Post-separation support ordered
Jun 10, 2025	Consent Order and Judgment entered

Money ordered

- Alimony: $1,800.00 monthly, defendant → plaintiff
- Post separation support: $1,500.00 monthly, defendant → plaintiff
- Distributive award: $22,000.00, defendant → plaintiff

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Filed a motion for temporary custody together with the complaint.
- **Procedural issue:** The client's equitable distribution inventory affidavit was filed after the deadline in the scheduling order; the court accepted it late.
- **Tactic:** Resolved custody by agreement before the trial date.

Other counsel in the case

- **BALLANTRAE, PIERS AURELIAN** — **Strength:** Opposed the requested schedule with school-attendance records.

Notable events

- Mar 11, 2024 · continuance (defendant): Temporary hearing continued at the defendant's request.
- Apr 8, 2024 · continuance (plaintiff): Temporary hearing continued at the plaintiff's request.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Consent Order and Judgment** (consent order, outcome determinative) — By agreement, Judge Nora Elowen Castellane entered an order providing a schedule slightly favoring the plaintiff, alimony of $1,800 a month for five years, and a roughly equal property division.
- **#2 Equitable Distribution Inventory Affidavit** (affidavit, procedural) — The plaintiff's sworn inventory of marital property. It was filed after the deadline in the scheduling order; the court accepted it late.
- **#3 Order for Post-Separation Support** (order, substantive) — Judge Nora Elowen Castellane orders the defendant to pay post-separation support of $1,500 a month until alimony is decided.
- **#4 Temporary Consent Order** (consent order, substantive) — The parties entered a temporary consent order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#6 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — N.L.W. answers and counterclaims, asking for equal shared custody; no alimony; no pss; equal division.
- **#8 Motion for Temporary Custody** (motion, substantive) — J.P.W. asks for temporary custody on the schedule proposed in the complaint until the case is tried.
- **#11 Complaint for Child Custody, Equitable Distribution, Post-Separation Support and Alimony** (complaint, substantive) — J.P.W. asks the court to decide child custody, equitable distribution, post-separation support and

alimony. The requests are: Primary physical custody; Alimony of $2,500 a month for eight years; PSS of $2,000 a month; Unequal division in the plaintiff's favor.

Docket documents: 11 total, 11 downloaded, 7 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

Gaps: Mediated settlement memorandum (signed at mediation, not filed)

23CVD705997-999 · J.T.C. v. I.E.C.

Loss

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Defendant** (I.E.C.)

Asked vs. got · medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 22% of what it asked for, weighted across 3 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). The court ordered alimony, PSS and fees well above what the client offered.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Feb 7, 2023	Jun 25, 2024	504	Elliot Idris Montgarde
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
CROMARTIE, LINNEA VESPER	BRANNIGAN, TESSA CORISANDE	High	Trial (judge)

Asked vs. got — Partly verified

Client obtained about **22%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Alimony weight 3	No alimony, or at most $900 a month for three years	Alimony of $2,600 a month for ten years	Alimony of $2,150 a month for seven years Jun 25, 2024 · order text	**20%**
Post-separation support weight 2	PSS of $1,000 a month	PSS of $2,000 a month	PSS of $1,600 a month Jun 7, 2023 · order text	**35%**
Attorney fees weight 1	Each side pays its own fees	Fees of $9,000	Defendant pays $6,500 of the plaintiff's fees Jun 25, 2024 · order text	**0%**

Scored from the final judgment.

After a trial, the court ordered the defendant to pay alimony of $2,150 a month for seven years, post-separation support of $1,600 a month until then, and $6,500 of the plaintiff's attorney fees.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Alimony	No alimony, or at most $900 a month for three years	Alimony of $2,150 a month for seven years	Opponent
Post-separation support	PSS of $1,000 a month	PSS of $1,600 a month	Split
Attorney fees	Each side pays its own fees	Defendant pays $6,500 of the plaintiff's fees	Opponent

Timeline

Feb 7, 2023	J.T.C. files for alimony, post-separation support and attorney fees
Jun 7, 2023	Post-separation support ordered
Jun 25, 2024	Judgment for Alimony and Attorney Fees entered

Money ordered

- Alimony: $2,150.00 monthly, defendant → plaintiff
- Post separation support: $1,600.00 monthly, defendant → plaintiff
- Attorney fees: $6,500.00, defendant → plaintiff

About this attorney's work

- **Concern:** The court set alimony well above the amount the client offered; the findings credited the other side's budget.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Judgment for Alimony and Attorney Fees** (judgment, outcome determinative) — After a trial, the court ordered the defendant to pay alimony of $2,150 a month for seven years, post-separation support of $1,600 a month until then, and $6,500 of the plaintiff's attorney fees.
- **#2 Order for Post-Separation Support** (order, substantive) — Judge Elliot Idris Montgarde orders the defendant to pay post-separation support of $1,600 a month pending alimony.
- **#3 Answer and Counterclaim** (answer, substantive) — I.E.C. answers, denies the key allegations and counterclaims on the same issues.
- **#6 Complaint for Alimony and Post-Separation Support and Attorney Fees** (complaint, substantive) — J.T.C. brings claims for alimony, post-separation support and attorney fees.

Docket documents: 6 total, 6 downloaded, 4 reviewed by AI, 2 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

Gaps: Would show the evidence on the parties' budgets

23CVD739657-999 · D.H.E. v. L.I.P.

Tie / split

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (D.H.E.)

Asked vs. got · medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 54% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides (physical custody / schedule: equal schedule; plaintiff keeps school-night routine; child support amount: support of $705 a month).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Aug 15, 2023	Feb 27, 2024	196	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
FINCASTLE, ORIANA SORCHA	—	Moderate	Mediated agreement

Asked vs. got — Partly verified

Client obtained about **54%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Primary physical custody	Equal shared custody	Equal schedule; plaintiff keeps school-night routine Feb 27, 2024 · order text	**50%**
Child support amount weight 2	Guideline support of $820 a month	Support of $450 a month	Support of $705 a month Feb 27, 2024 · order text	**60%**

Terms come from the order approving the mediated parenting agreement; the agreement itself is confidential.

D.H.E. filed for child custody and child support on August 15, 2023, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. L.I.P. answered and counterclaimed through Oriana Sorcha Fincastle. The parties reached a parenting agreement in custody mediation, which the court approved on February 27, 2024: an equal custody schedule with the plaintiff keeping the school-year weekday routine, and guideline support.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Primary physical custody	Equal schedule; plaintiff keeps school-night routine	Split
Child support	Guideline support of $820 a month	Support of $705 a month	Split

Timeline

Aug 15, 2023	D.H.E. files for child custody and child support
Sep 27, 2023	L.I.P. answers and counterclaims
Feb 27, 2024	Order Approving Parenting Agreement entered

Money ordered

- Child support: $705.00 monthly, defendant → plaintiff

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Resolved custody by agreement before the trial date.

Notable events

- Jan 28, 2024 · mediation (both): Custody mediation produced a signed parenting agreement.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Order Approving Parenting Agreement** (consent order, outcome determinative) — By agreement, Judge Adele Heulwen Lockhaven entered an order providing an equal custody schedule with the plaintiff keeping the school-year weekday routine, and guideline support.
- **#4 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — L.I.P. answers and counterclaims, asking for equal shared custody; support of $450 a month.
- **#8 Complaint for Child Custody and Child Support** (complaint, substantive) — D.H.E. asks the court to decide child custody and child support. The requests are: Primary physical custody; Guideline support of $820 a month.

Docket documents: 8 total, 7 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket. Not yet reviewed: Custody Mediator's Report.

23CVD824921-999 · E.D.L. v. H.A.L.

Win

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Defendant** (H.A.L.)

Asked vs. got · medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 100% of what it asked for, weighted across 3 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). The final order gave the client most of what it asked for (physical custody / schedule: equal week-on, week-off schedule; legal custody: joint legal custody).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Apr 18, 2023	May 21, 2024	399	Cora Delyth Netherby
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
LOCHRANZA, SABINE YSOLDE	—	High	Trial (judge)

Asked vs. got — Partly verified

Client obtained about **100%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Equal week-on, week-off schedule	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff	Equal week-on, week-off schedule May 21, 2024 · order text	**100%**

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Legal custody weight 3	Joint legal custody	Sole legal custody to the plaintiff	Joint legal custody May 21, 2024 · order text	**100%**
Plaintiff's contempt motion against the defendant weight 2	Opposed the contempt motion	Hold the defendant in contempt of the temporary order	Contempt motion denied May 21, 2024 · order text	**100%**

Scored from the final order after trial; temporary orders are listed but the final order controls.

E.D.L. filed for child custody on April 18, 2023, represented by Sabine Ysolde Lochranza. H.A.L. answered and counterclaimed through Jordan Avery Sample. After a temporary hearing the court entered a temporary custody order on July 15, 2023. After a bench trial on April 30, 2024, Judge Cora Delyth Netherby entered a permanent order on May 21, 2024 giving equal week-on, week-off custody and joint legal custody, and denied the plaintiff's contempt motion. In October 2026 H.A.L. moved for an order to show cause; a hearing is set for December 15, 2026.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Equal week-on, week-off schedule	Equal week-on, week-off schedule	Client
Child custody	Joint legal custody	Joint legal custody	Client
Contempt	Opposed the contempt motion	Contempt motion denied	Client
Contempt	Hold the defendant in contempt	Denied	Client

Timeline

Apr 18, 2023	E.D.L. files for child custody
May 25, 2023	H.A.L. answers and counterclaims
Jul 15, 2023	Temporary Custody Order entered
Sep 13, 2023	E.D.L. files a contempt motion
Apr 30, 2024	Bench trial
May 21, 2024	Permanent order entered
Oct 6, 2026	Post-judgment motion for order to show cause

About this attorney's work

- **Strength:** Proposed findings submitted after trial were largely adopted in the final order.

Other counsel in the case

- **LOCHRANZA, SABINE YSOLDE** — **Tactic:** Opposed the requested schedule with school-attendance records.

Notable events

- Jun 17, 2023 · continuance (plaintiff): Temporary hearing continued at the plaintiff's request.
- Sep 13, 2023 · contempt (plaintiff): E.D.L. moved to hold H.A.L. in contempt of the temporary order.
- Oct 6, 2026 · contempt (plaintiff): Post-judgment: H.A.L. moved to hold E.D.L. in contempt for withheld weeks; a show cause hearing is set for December 15, 2026.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Motion for Order to Show Cause (Post-Judgment)** (motion, substantive) — H.A.L. asks the court to hold E.D.L. in contempt for withholding scheduled weeks under the 2024 custody order.
- **#2 Permanent Child Custody Order** (order, outcome determinative) — After a bench trial on April 30, 2024, Judge Cora Delyth Netherby ordered equal week-on, week-off custody and joint legal custody, and denied the plaintiff's contempt motion.

- **#3 Pre-Trial Order** (order, procedural) — Pre-trial order listing the contested issues, witnesses and exhibits for the custody trial.
- **#4 Motion for Order to Show Cause** (motion, substantive) — E.D.L. asks the court to hold H.A.L. in contempt for missed exchanges under the temporary order.
- **#5 Temporary Custody Order** (order, substantive) — After a temporary hearing, Judge Cora Delyth Netherby entered a temporary custody order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#7 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — H.A.L. answers and counterclaims, asking for equal week-on, week-off schedule; joint legal custody; opposed the contempt motion.
- **#11 Complaint for Child Custody** (complaint, substantive) — E.D.L. asks the court to decide child custody. The requests are: Primary physical custody to the plaintiff; Sole legal custody to the plaintiff; Hold the defendant in contempt of the temporary order.

Docket documents: 11 total, 11 downloaded, 7 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

Gaps: Order on the plaintiff's contempt motion (entered from the bench; only the docket entry is public)

22CV454978-999 · D.C.B. v. H.V.B.

Win

Example County District Court · General Civil Action · client: **Defendant** (H.V.B.)

Asked vs. got | medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 100% of what it asked for, weighted across 1 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Summary judgment for the client; every claim against it dismissed with prejudice.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Apr 5, 2022	Jan 11, 2023	281	Iris Ffion Quarrington
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
ORMISTOUN, FINLO BRIOC	—	High	Summary judgment

Asked vs. got

Partly verified

Client obtained about **100%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Breach of separation agreement claim weight 3	Dismiss the claim	$48,000 in damages	Summary judgment for the defendant; claim dismissed with prejudice Jan 11, 2023 · order text	**100%**

Civil case decided on a dispositive motion.

D.C.B. sued H.V.B. on April 5, 2022 for breach of a separation agreement, claiming $48,000 in unpaid amounts. Jordan Avery Sample answered for H.V.B., pleading payment, and moved for summary judgment with bank records showing the payments were made. Judge Iris Ffion Quarrington granted summary judgment and dismissed the claims with prejudice on January 11, 2023.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Contract	$48,000 for breach of the separation agreement	Dismissed with prejudice	Client

Timeline

Apr 5, 2022	D.C.B. sues for breach of a separation agreement
Oct 22, 2022	Defendant moves for summary judgment
Jan 11, 2023	Summary judgment for the defendant

About this attorney's work

- **Strength:** Won the case on a summary-judgment motion supported by payment records.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Order Granting Summary Judgment** (order, outcome determinative) — Judge Iris Ffion Quarrington grants summary judgment for H.V.B. and dismisses the plaintiff's claims with prejudice.
- **#2 Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, substantive) — H.V.B. asks for judgment without trial, attaching records that the disputed payments were made.
- **#3 Answer and Affirmative Defenses** (answer, substantive) — H.V.B. denies breaching the separation agreement and pleads payment and release.
- **#6 Complaint (breach of a separation agreement)** (complaint, substantive) — D.C.B. sues H.V.B. for breach of a separation agreement, seeking $48,000.

Docket documents: 6 total, 6 downloaded, 4 reviewed by AI, 2 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

22CVD508741-999 · J.E.K. v. L.D.A.

Win

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (J.E.K.)

Asked vs. got | high confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 94% of what it asked for, weighted across 4 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (verified). The final order gave the client most of what it asked for (physical custody / schedule: plaintiff primary; defendant alternate weekends and one weeknight; legal custody: joint legal custody).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Mar 8, 2022	Nov 19, 2024	987	Nora Elowen Castellane
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
TALLOWAY, BRENNA LAVINIA	BRANNIGAN, TESSA CORISANDE, VARRENTHAL, MILO KENELM	High	Trial (judge)

Asked vs. got

Verified: asks and order read in the filings

Client obtained about **94%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Primary physical custody with the defendant on alternate weekends	Primary physical custody to the defendant	Plaintiff primary; defendant alternate weekends and one weeknight Nov 19, 2024 · order text	**90%**
Legal custody weight 3	Joint legal custody	Sole legal custody to the defendant	Joint legal custody Nov 19, 2024 · order text	**100%**
Child support amount weight 2	Guideline child support of $1,140 a month	Support below the guidelines	Guideline support of $1,140 a month Nov 19, 2024 · order text	**100%**
Attorney fees weight 1	Fees of $20,748 per the fee affidavit	Each side pays its own fees	Defendant to pay $15,000 of the plaintiff's fees Nov 19, 2024 · order text	**72%**

Scored from the final order after trial; temporary orders are listed but the final order controls.

J.E.K. filed for child custody, child support and attorney fees on March 8, 2022, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. L.D.A. answered and counterclaimed through Brenna Lavinia Talloway. The parties entered a temporary consent order on June 12, 2022. After a bench trial on October 29, 2024, Judge Nora Elowen Castellane entered a permanent order on November 19, 2024 giving primary physical custody to the plaintiff, joint legal custody, and alternate weekends plus one weeknight to the defendant.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Primary physical custody with the defendant on alternate weekends	Plaintiff primary; defendant alternate weekends and one weeknight	Client
Child custody	Joint legal custody	Joint legal custody	Client
Child support	Guideline child support of $1,140 a month	Guideline support of $1,140 a month	Client
Attorney fees	Fees of $20,748 per the fee affidavit	Defendant to pay $15,000 of the plaintiff's fees	Client

Timeline

Mar 8, 2022	J.E.K. files for child custody, child support and attorney fees
Apr 15, 2022	L.D.A. answers and counterclaims
Jun 12, 2022	Temporary Consent Order entered
Oct 29, 2024	Bench trial
Nov 19, 2024	Permanent order entered

Money ordered

- Child support: $1,140.00 monthly, defendant → plaintiff
- Attorney fees: $15,000.00, defendant → plaintiff

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Filed a motion for temporary custody together with the complaint.
- **Strength:** Supported the fee request with an itemized affidavit; the court awarded most of the amount asked.
- **Strength:** Trial presentation tracked the requests in the client's pleading; the order adopted most of them.

Other counsel in the case

- **TALLOWAY, BRENNA LAVINIA** — **Strength:** Pressed for an early temporary hearing.

Notable events

- May 15, 2022 · continuance (defendant): Temporary hearing continued at the defendant's request.
- Nov 19, 2024 · fee award (court): Court ordered the defendant to pay $15,000 toward the plaintiff's attorney fees.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Order for Permanent Custody and Child Support** (order, outcome determinative) — After a bench trial on October 29, 2024, Judge Nora Elowen Castellane ordered primary physical custody to the plaintiff, joint legal custody, and alternate weekends plus one weeknight to the defendant.
- **#2 Affidavit of Attorney Fees** (affidavit, substantive) — Jordan Avery Sample swears to the fees billed on the custody and support claims, attaching an itemized statement of $19,760.00 across four timekeepers plus a 5% monthly admin fee.
- **#3 Pre-Trial Order** (order, procedural) — Pre-trial order listing the contested issues, witnesses and exhibits for the custody trial.
- **#4 Temporary Consent Order** (consent order, substantive) — The parties entered a temporary consent order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#6 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — L.D.A. answers and counterclaims, asking for primary physical custody to the defendant; sole legal custody to the defendant; support below the guidelines; each side pays its own fees.
- **#8 Motion for Temporary Custody** (motion, substantive) — J.E.K. asks for temporary custody on the schedule proposed in the complaint until the case is tried.
- **#11 Complaint for Child Custody, Child Support and Attorney Fees** (complaint, substantive) — J.E.K. asks the court to decide child custody, child support and attorney fees. The requests are: Primary physical custody with the defendant

on alternate weekends; Joint legal custody; Guideline child support of $1,140 a month; Fees of $20,748 per the fee affidavit.

Docket documents: 11 total, 11 downloaded, 7 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

22CVD778253-999 · C.W.D. v. A.T.Q.

Tie / split

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Defendant** (A.T.Q.)

Asked vs. got · medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 53% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides (physical custody / schedule: school year favors the plaintiff; alternating weeks in summer; child support amount: guideline support of $495 a month).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
May 10, 2022	Jan 24, 2023	259	Marcus Emrys Iversley
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
ESKDALE, HOLLIS TOBIAH	—	Moderate	Consent order

Asked vs. got — Partly verified

Client obtained about **53%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Equal shared custody	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff	School year favors the plaintiff; alternating weeks in summer Jan 24, 2023 · order text	**55%**
Child support amount weight 2	Support of $300 a month	Support of $700 a month	Guideline support of $495 a month Jan 24, 2023 · order text	**50%**

A consent order: both sides gave ground, so shares near the middle are expected.

C.W.D. filed for child custody and child support on May 10, 2022, represented by Hollis Tobiah Eskdale. A.T.Q. answered and counterclaimed through Jordan Avery Sample. After a temporary hearing the court entered a temporary custody order on August 2, 2022. The case settled before trial: a consent order entered on January 24, 2023 provides an alternating-week schedule during summers, a school-year schedule favoring the plaintiff, and guideline support. After the consent order, Jordan Avery Sample withdrew with the client's consent on April 18, 2023.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Equal shared custody	School year favors the plaintiff; alternating weeks in summer	Split
Child support	Support of $300 a month	Guideline support of $495 a month	Split

Timeline

May 10, 2022	C.W.D. files for child custody and child support
Jun 21, 2022	A.T.Q. answers and counterclaims
Aug 2, 2022	Temporary Custody Order entered
Jan 24, 2023	Consent Order for Permanent Custody entered
Apr 18, 2023	Counsel for the defendant allowed to withdraw

Money ordered

- Child support: $495.00 monthly, defendant → plaintiff

Other counsel in the case

- **ESKDALE, HOLLIS TOBIAH** — **Tactic:** Opposed the requested schedule with school-attendance records.

Notable events

- Jul 5, 2022 · continuance (plaintiff): Temporary hearing continued at the plaintiff's request.
- Apr 18, 2023 · withdrawal (defendant): Jordan Avery Sample was allowed to withdraw as counsel for the defendant after the custody claim was resolved.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Order Allowing Withdrawal of Counsel** (order, procedural) — Judge Marcus Emrys Iversley allows Jordan Avery Sample to withdraw as counsel for A.T.Q.
- **#3 Motion to Withdraw as Counsel** (motion, procedural) — Jordan Avery Sample asks to withdraw as counsel for A.T.Q. Stated reason: the custody claim the firm was retained for is resolved; the client consents to the withdrawal.
- **#4 Consent Order for Permanent Custody** (consent order, outcome determinative) — By agreement, Judge Marcus Emrys Iversley entered an order providing an alternating-week schedule during summers, a school-year schedule favoring the plaintiff, and guideline support.
- **#5 Temporary Custody Order** (order, substantive) — After a temporary hearing, Judge Marcus Emrys Iversley entered a temporary custody order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#7 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — A.T.Q. answers and counterclaims, asking for equal shared custody; support of $300 a month.
- **#11 Complaint for Child Custody and Child Support** (complaint, substantive) — C.W.D. asks the court to decide child custody and child support. The requests are: Primary physical custody to the plaintiff; Support of $700 a month.

Docket documents: 11 total, 11 downloaded, 6 reviewed by AI, 5 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

Gaps: Child support worksheet attached to the consent order (not in the public copy)

21CVD784175-999 · P.L.C. v. C.V.C.

Tie / split

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (P.L.C.)

Asked vs. got · medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 52% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Consent judgment with give on both sides on the property issues.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Apr 13, 2021	Jun 14, 2022	427	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
NEWBATTLE, YVAINE LLEWELA	—	Moderate	Consent order

Asked vs. got — Partly verified

Client obtained about **52%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Marital home weight 3	Unequal division and the marital home	Sale of the home and equal division	Plaintiff keeps the home; equal overall division Jun 14, 2022 · order text	**50%**
Retirement accounts weight 2	60% of the retirement account	Equal division	Equal division with a $15,500 distributive award to the plaintiff Jun 14, 2022 · order text	**55%**

Scored from the final judgment.

The parties settled equitable distribution by a consent judgment: the plaintiff kept the marital home and received a $15,500 distributive award, and a retirement account was divided by QDRO, an outcome close to an equal split.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Equitable distribution	Unequal division and the marital home	Plaintiff keeps the home; equal overall division	Split
Equitable distribution	60% of the retirement account	Equal division with a $15,500 distributive award to the plaintiff	Split

Timeline

Apr 13, 2021	P.L.C. files for equitable distribution
Jun 14, 2022	Consent Equitable Distribution Judgment entered

Money ordered

- Distributive award: $15,500.00, defendant → plaintiff

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Settled property issues by consent judgment after a financial settlement conference.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Qualified Domestic Relations Order** (order, administrative) — Order dividing the retirement account as the consent judgment provides.
- **#2 Consent Equitable Distribution Judgment** (consent order, outcome determinative) — The parties settled equitable distribution by a consent judgment: the plaintiff kept the marital home and received a $15,500 distributive award, and a retirement account was divided by QDRO, an outcome close to an equal split.
- **#3 Answer and Counterclaim** (answer, substantive) — C.V.C. answers, denies the key allegations and counterclaims on the same issues.
- **#6 Complaint for Equitable Distribution** (complaint, substantive) — P.L.C. brings claims for equitable distribution.

Docket documents: 6 total, 6 downloaded, 4 reviewed by AI, 2 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

Gaps: Would verify the values used in the split

21CVD791778-999 · F.M.A. v. O.I.A.

Tie / split

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (F.M.A.)

Asked vs. got · medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 52% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides (physical custody / schedule: 60/40 schedule favoring the plaintiff; division of marital property: equal division; plaintiff keeps the home and pays a $38,000 distributive award).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jan 26, 2021	Feb 15, 2022	385	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
DRUMMELLAN, ESME RHIANNON	BRANNIGAN, TESSA CORISANDE	Moderate	Consent order

Asked vs. got Partly verified

Client obtained about **52%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Primary physical custody	Equal shared custody	60/40 schedule favoring the plaintiff Feb 15, 2022 · order text	**60%**
Division of marital property weight 3	Unequal division in the plaintiff's favor and the marital home	Equal division and sale of the home	Equal division; plaintiff keeps the home and pays a $38,000 distributive award Feb 15, 2022 · order text	**45%**

A consent order: both sides gave ground, so shares near the middle are expected.

F.M.A. filed for child custody and equitable distribution on January 26, 2021, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. O.I.A. answered and counterclaimed through Esme Rhiannon Drummellan. The parties entered a temporary consent order on April 6, 2021. The case settled before trial: a consent order entered on February 15, 2022 provides a 60/40 custody schedule in the plaintiff's favor and an equal property division in which the plaintiff kept the marital home and paid a distributive award.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Primary physical custody	60/40 schedule favoring the plaintiff	Split
Equitable distribution	Unequal division in the plaintiff's favor and the marital home	Equal division; plaintiff keeps the home and pays a $38,000 distributive award	Split

Timeline

Jan 26, 2021	F.M.A. files for child custody and equitable distribution
Feb 27, 2021	O.I.A. answers and counterclaims
Apr 6, 2021	Temporary Consent Order entered
Feb 15, 2022	Consent Order and Judgment entered

Money ordered

- Distributive award: $38,000.00, plaintiff → defendant

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Filed a motion for temporary custody together with the complaint.
- **Tactic:** Resolved custody by agreement before the trial date.

Other counsel in the case

- **DRUMMELLAN, ESME RHIANNON** — **Strength:** Pressed for an early temporary hearing.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Consent Order and Judgment** (consent order, outcome determinative) — By agreement, Judge Owen Tiernan Fairclothe entered an order providing a 60/40 custody schedule in the plaintiff's favor and an equal property division in which the plaintiff kept the marital home and paid a distributive award.
- **#2 Temporary Consent Order** (consent order, substantive) — The parties entered a temporary consent order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#4 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — O.I.A. answers and counterclaims, asking for equal shared custody; equal division and sale of the home.
- **#6 Motion for Temporary Custody** (motion, substantive) — F.M.A. asks for temporary custody on the schedule proposed in the complaint until the case is tried.
- **#9 Complaint for Child Custody and Equitable Distribution** (complaint, substantive) — F.M.A. asks the court to decide child custody and equitable distribution. The requests are: Primary physical custody; Unequal division in the plaintiff's favor and the marital home.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 5 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

Gaps: Equitable distribution affidavits and the property spreadsheet (not filed publicly)

21CVD885264-999 · M.H.D. v. E.M.A.

Loss

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Defendant** (E.M.A.)

Asked vs. got | medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 27% of what it asked for, weighted across 3 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). The final order adopted the other side's position on the central issues (physical custody / schedule: plaintiff primary; defendant alternate weekends; legal custody: sole legal custody to the plaintiff, with a duty to consult).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jun 8, 2021	Jul 26, 2022	413	Simon Caradoc Ketteridge
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
KILBRANNAN, GARRICK WYSTAN	—	High	Trial (judge)

Asked vs. got — Partly verified

Client obtained about **27%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Equal shared custody	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff	Plaintiff primary; defendant alternate weekends Jul 26, 2022 · order text	**25%**
Legal custody weight 3	Joint legal custody	Sole legal custody to the plaintiff	Sole legal custody to the plaintiff, with a duty to consult Jul 26, 2022 · order text	**20%**
Child support amount weight 2	Guideline support of $380 a month	Support of $600 a month	Defendant pays $520 a month Jul 26, 2022 · order text	**40%**

Scored from the final order after trial; temporary orders are listed but the final order controls.

M.H.D. filed for child custody and child support on June 8, 2021, represented by Garrick Wystan Kilbrannan. E.M.A. answered and counterclaimed through Jordan Avery Sample. After a temporary hearing the court entered a temporary custody order on August 22, 2021. After a bench trial on July 5, 2022, Judge Simon Caradoc Ketteridge entered a permanent order on July 26, 2022 giving primary physical and sole legal custody to the plaintiff, alternate weekends to the defendant, and above-guideline support paid by the defendant.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Equal shared custody	Plaintiff primary; defendant alternate weekends	Opponent
Child custody	Joint legal custody	Sole legal custody to the plaintiff, with a duty to consult	Opponent
Child support	Guideline support of $380 a month	Defendant pays $520 a month	Split

Timeline

Jun 8, 2021	M.H.D. files for child custody and child support
Jul 22, 2021	E.M.A. answers and counterclaims

Aug 22, 2021	Temporary Custody Order entered
Jul 5, 2022	Bench trial
Jul 26, 2022	Permanent order entered

Money ordered

- Child support: $520.00 monthly, defendant → plaintiff

About this attorney's work

- **Concern:** The client's request for equal time was not supported by the findings; the court adopted the other side's proposed schedule.

Other counsel in the case

- **KILBRANNAN, GARRICK WYSTAN** — **Tactic:** Pressed for an early temporary hearing.

Notable events

- Jun 27, 2021 · continuance (plaintiff): Temporary hearing continued at the plaintiff's request.
- Jul 25, 2021 · continuance (defendant): Temporary hearing continued at the defendant's request.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Order for Permanent Custody and Child Support** (order, outcome determinative) — After a bench trial on July 5, 2022, Judge Simon Caradoc Ketteridge ordered primary physical and sole legal custody to the plaintiff, alternate weekends to the defendant, and above-guideline support paid by the defendant.
- **#2 Pre-Trial Order** (order, procedural) — Pre-trial order listing the contested issues, witnesses and exhibits for the custody trial.
- **#3 Temporary Custody Order** (order, substantive) — After a temporary hearing, Judge Simon Caradoc Ketteridge entered a temporary custody order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#5 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — E.M.A. answers and counterclaims, asking for equal shared custody; joint legal custody; guideline support of $380 a month.
- **#9 Complaint for Child Custody and Child Support** (complaint, substantive) — M.H.D. asks the court to decide child custody and child support. The requests are: Primary physical custody to the plaintiff; Sole legal custody to the plaintiff; Support of $600 a month.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 5 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

Gaps: Transcript of the July 2022 custody trial (not ordered by either side)

20CVD578489-999 · B.M.M. v. G.P.O.

Tie / split

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Defendant** (G.P.O.)

Asked vs. got · high confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 46% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (verified). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides (physical custody / schedule: equal 2-2-5-5 schedule; child support: no support either way; costs shared by income).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jul 21, 2020	Mar 30, 2021	252	Dane Perrin Rosswick
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
TALLOWAY, BRENNA LAVINIA	—	Moderate	Consent order

Asked vs. got

Verified: asks and order read in the filings

Client obtained about **46%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Primary physical custody to the defendant	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff	Equal 2-2-5-5 schedule Mar 30, 2021 · order text	**50%**
Child support weight 2	Child support paid to the defendant	Child support paid to the plaintiff	No support either way; costs shared by income Mar 30, 2021 · order text	**40%**

A consent order: both sides gave ground, so shares near the middle are expected.

B.M.M. filed for child custody and child support on July 21, 2020, represented by Brenna Lavinia Talloway. G.P.O. answered and counterclaimed through Jordan Avery Sample. The parties entered a temporary consent order on September 19, 2020. The case settled before trial: a consent order entered on March 30, 2021 provides an equal schedule, joint legal custody, and no child support either way.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Primary physical custody to the defendant	Equal 2-2-5-5 schedule	Split
Child support	Child support paid to the defendant	No support either way; costs shared by income	Split

Timeline

Jul 21, 2020	B.M.M. files for child custody and child support
Aug 24, 2020	G.P.O. answers and counterclaims
Sep 19, 2020	Temporary Consent Order entered
Mar 30, 2021	Consent Order for Permanent Custody entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Used mediation to narrow the issues, then documented the result in a consent order.

Other counsel in the case

- **TALLOWAY, BRENNA LAVINIA** — **Tactic:** Negotiated the exchange terms that ended up in the order.

Notable events

- Aug 22, 2020 · continuance (plaintiff): Temporary hearing continued at the plaintiff's request.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Consent Order for Permanent Custody** (consent order, outcome determinative) — By agreement, Judge Dane Perrin Rosswick entered an order providing an equal schedule, joint legal custody, and no child support either way.
- **#2 Temporary Consent Order** (consent order, substantive) — The parties entered a temporary consent order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#4 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — G.P.O. answers and counterclaims, asking for primary physical custody to the defendant; child support paid to the defendant.
- **#8 Complaint for Child Custody and Child Support** (complaint, substantive) — B.M.M. asks the court to decide child custody and child support. The requests are: Primary physical custody to the plaintiff; Child support paid to the plaintiff.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 4 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

20CVD803047-999 · H.M.C. v. A.E.G.

Win

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (H.M.C.)

Asked vs. got · high confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 82% of what it asked for, weighted across 3 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (verified). The final order gave the client most of what it asked for (physical custody / schedule: plaintiff primary; defendant alternate weekends and half of summer; legal custody: joint legal custody, plaintiff has final say on schooling and medical care).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Feb 11, 2020	Nov 17, 2020	280	Miriam Isadora Aldercott
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	High	Trial (judge)

Asked vs. got

Verified: asks and order read in the filings

Client obtained about **82%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Primary physical custody	Equal shared custody	Plaintiff primary; defendant alternate weekends and half of summer Nov 17, 2020 · order text	**85%**
Legal custody weight 3	Sole legal custody	Joint legal custody	Joint legal custody, plaintiff has final say on schooling and medical care Nov 17, 2020 · order text	**70%**
Child support amount weight 2	Guideline support of $640 a month	—	Support of $612 a month Nov 17, 2020 · order text	**95%**

Scored from the final order after trial; temporary orders are listed but the final order controls.

H.M.C. filed for child custody and child support on February 11, 2020, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. A.E.G. answered and counterclaimed without a lawyer. After a temporary hearing the court entered a temporary custody order on April 21, 2020. After a bench trial on October 27, 2020, Judge Miriam Isadora Aldercott entered a permanent order on November 17, 2020 giving primary physical custody to the plaintiff and joint legal custody with the plaintiff holding final say on schooling.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Primary physical custody	Plaintiff primary; defendant alternate weekends and half of summer	Client
Child custody	Sole legal custody	Joint legal custody, plaintiff has final say on schooling and medical care	Client
Child support	Guideline support of $640 a month	Support of $612 a month	Client

Timeline

Feb 11, 2020	H.M.C. files for child custody and child support
Mar 22, 2020	A.E.G. answers and counterclaims
Apr 21, 2020	Temporary Custody Order entered
Oct 27, 2020	Bench trial
Nov 17, 2020	Permanent order entered

Money ordered

- Child support: $612.00 monthly, defendant → plaintiff

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Filed a motion for temporary custody together with the complaint.
- **Strength:** Kept the case focused on the schedule and school stability, which the order's findings follow.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Order for Permanent Custody and Child Support** (order, outcome determinative) — After a bench trial on October 27, 2020, Judge Miriam Isadora Aldercott ordered primary physical custody to the plaintiff and joint legal custody with the plaintiff holding final say on schooling.
- **#2 Pre-Trial Order** (order, procedural) — Pre-trial order listing the contested issues, witnesses and exhibits for the custody trial.
- **#3 Temporary Custody Order** (order, substantive) — After a temporary hearing, Judge Miriam Isadora Aldercott entered a temporary custody order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#5 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — A.E.G. answers and counterclaims, asking for equal shared custody; joint legal custody.
- **#7 Motion for Temporary Custody** (motion, substantive) — H.M.C. asks for temporary custody on the schedule proposed in the complaint until the case is tried.
- **#10 Complaint for Child Custody and Child Support** (complaint, substantive) — H.M.C. asks the court to decide child custody and child support. The requests are: Primary physical custody; Sole legal custody; Guideline support of $640 a month.

Docket documents: 10 total, 10 downloaded, 6 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

19CVD561602-999 · N.O.N. v. V.E.E.

Loss

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (N.O.N.)

Asked vs. got | low confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 8% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (unverified). Post-judgment phase (joined 2024-03-12, after the 2019-10-29 disposition): The final order adopted the other side's position on the central issues ().

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Feb 19, 2019	Oct 29, 2019	252	Lydia Bronwen Haversham
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
TALLOWAY, BRENNA LAVINIA	—	High	Trial (judge)

Asked vs. got

Unverified: asks or terms known only from the docket

Client obtained about **8%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Modification of physical custody weight 3	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff	Keep the existing order	Motion to modify denied; existing schedule unchanged Sep 17, 2024 · docket entry	**0%**
Holiday schedule weight 1	Christmas Day every year	Alternate holidays as ordered	Holidays alternate as before; minor change to the Thanksgiving exchange time Sep 17, 2024 · docket entry	**30%**

Post-judgment motion only; the original 2019 order is outside this attorney's time on the case.

The original custody order was entered in 2019, before Jordan Avery Sample was involved. In 2024 N.O.N. hired Jordan Avery Sample, who filed a motion to modify custody on March 14, 2024. After a hearing on September 17,

2024, the docket shows the motion was denied; the order itself is not public, so the review relies on the docket entry.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Modification	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff	Motion to modify denied; existing schedule unchanged	Opponent
Child custody	Christmas Day every year	Holidays alternate as before; minor change to the Thanksgiving exchange time	Opponent

Timeline

Feb 19, 2019	N.O.N. files for child custody
Mar 29, 2019	V.E.E. answers and counterclaims
Oct 29, 2019	Original custody order (before this attorney)
Mar 14, 2024	Motion to modify filed
Sep 17, 2024	Motion to modify denied (docket)

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#3 Motion to Modify Custody** (motion, substantive) — N.O.N. alleges a substantial change in circumstances since the 2019 order and asks for primary physical custody and a new holiday schedule.
- **#4 Notice of Appearance** (notice, procedural) — Jordan Avery Sample appears for N.O.N. five years after the original custody order, to bring a motion to modify.
- **#7 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — V.E.E. answers and counterclaims, asking for keep the existing order; alternate holidays as ordered.
- **#11 Complaint for Child Custody** (complaint, substantive) — N.O.N. asks the court to decide child custody. The requests are: Primary physical custody to the plaintiff; Christmas Day every year.

Docket documents: 11 total, 8 downloaded, 4 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket. Not yet reviewed: Order on Motion to Modify Custody; Response to Motion to Modify Custody; Permanent Custody Order (2019).

Gaps: The order denying the motion to modify is not downloaded; the result comes from the docket entry only.; Order on Motion to Modify Custody (only the docket entry is public)

19CVD743710-999 · Z.A.M. v. I.B.M.

Tie / split

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (Z.A.M.)

Asked vs. got · medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: the client obtained about 47% of what it asked for, weighted across 2 issue(s) decided while this attorney was on the case (partial). Negotiated outcome with give on both sides (physical custody / schedule: 60/40 school-year schedule favoring the defendant; equal summers; legal custody: joint legal custody).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Mar 12, 2019	Sep 24, 2019	196	Miriam Isadora Aldercott
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
GOWANBANK, DORIAN MERRICK	—	Moderate	Mediated agreement

Asked vs. got Partly verified

Client obtained about **47%** of what it asked for (weighted; win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%).

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Primary physical custody	Primary physical custody to the defendant	60/40 school-year schedule favoring the defendant; equal summers Sep 24, 2019 · order text	**45%**
Legal custody weight 2	Sole legal custody	Joint legal custody	Joint legal custody Sep 24, 2019 · order text	**50%**

Terms come from the order approving the mediated parenting agreement; the agreement itself is confidential.

Z.A.M. filed for child custody on March 12, 2019, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. I.B.M. answered and counterclaimed through Dorian Merrick Gowanbank. The parties reached a parenting agreement in custody mediation, which the court approved on September 24, 2019: a 60/40 schedule in the defendant's favor during the school year and joint legal custody.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Primary physical custody	60/40 school-year schedule favoring the defendant; equal summers	Split
Child custody	Sole legal custody	Joint legal custody	Split

Timeline

Mar 12, 2019	Z.A.M. files for child custody
Apr 26, 2019	I.B.M. answers and counterclaims
Sep 24, 2019	Order Approving Parenting Agreement entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Negotiated a schedule close to the middle of the two sides' positions.

Notable events

- Aug 25, 2019 · mediation (both): Custody mediation produced a signed parenting agreement.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Order Approving Parenting Agreement** (consent order, outcome determinative) — By agreement, Judge Miriam Isadora Aldercott entered an order providing a 60/40 schedule in the defendant's favor during the school year and joint legal custody.
- **#4 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — I.B.M. answers and counterclaims, asking for primary physical custody to the defendant; joint legal custody.
- **#8 Complaint for Child Custody** (complaint, substantive) — Z.A.M. asks the court to decide child custody. The requests are: Primary physical custody; Sole legal custody.

Docket documents: 8 total, 7 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket. Not yet reviewed: Custody Mediator's Report.

Gaps: Parenting agreement reached in custody mediation (confidential; only the approving order is public)

24CVD753288-999 · I.B.R. v. B.I.R.

Not credited

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (I.B.R.)

AI review · medium confidence

Why: Attorney was removed from the case on 2025-03-18, before it was resolved.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Aug 20, 2024	Oct 14, 2025	420	Iris Ffion Quarrington
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**LATER COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**
INVERMAY, ZEPHYRINE GREER	—	FERNIEHIRST, CERYS ANWEN	Moderate

RESOLVED BY
Consent order

Asked vs. got Partly verified

Only minor topics could be scored (50% obtained); the central issues' requests or orders are not in the record, so this table does not decide the case's result.

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Temporary physical custody weight 2	Primary temporary custody	Equal temporary schedule	Equal schedule pending trial Nov 13, 2024 · order text	**50%**
Modification of the temporary order weight 3	Primary physical custody	Keep the equal schedule	Equal schedule kept in the final consent order Oct 14, 2025 · order text	**50%** Not counted: decided while other counsel represented the client

The final terms were negotiated by successor counsel after this attorney left.

I.B.R. filed for child custody and child support on August 20, 2024, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. B.I.R. answered and counterclaimed through Zephyrine Greer Invermay. The parties entered a temporary consent order on November 13, 2024. While the client's motion to modify the temporary order was pending, I.B.R. replaced Jordan Avery Sample with Cerys Anwen Ferniehirst on March 18, 2025. The case settled before trial: a consent order entered on October 14, 2025 provides a final consent order with an equal schedule and support paid to the plaintiff.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Primary temporary custody	Equal schedule pending trial	Split
Modification	Primary physical custody	Equal schedule kept in the final consent order	Split

Timeline

Aug 20, 2024	I.B.R. files for child custody and child support
Sep 25, 2024	B.I.R. answers and counterclaims
Nov 13, 2024	Temporary Consent Order entered
Mar 18, 2025	New counsel substituted for the plaintiff
Oct 14, 2025	Consent Order for Permanent Custody entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Filed a motion for temporary custody together with the complaint.

Other counsel in the case

- **INVERMAY, ZEPHYRINE GREER** — **Tactic:** Negotiated the exchange terms that ended up in the order.

Notable events

- Mar 18, 2025 · substitution (plaintiff): Cerys Anwen Ferniehirst substituted in as counsel for the plaintiff, replacing Jordan Avery Sample.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Consent Order for Permanent Custody** (consent order, outcome determinative) — By agreement, Judge Iris Ffion Quarrington entered an order providing a final consent order with an equal schedule and support paid to the plaintiff.

- **#2 Consent to Substitution of Counsel** (notice, procedural) — The plaintiff replaces Jordan Avery Sample with Cerys Anwen Ferniehirst. No reason is stated.
- **#3 Motion to Modify Temporary Custody Order** (motion, substantive) — I.B.R. asks to change the temporary equal schedule to primary physical custody with the plaintiff.
- **#4 Temporary Consent Order** (consent order, substantive) — The parties entered a temporary consent order providing equal schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#6 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — B.I.R. answers and counterclaims, asking for equal temporary schedule; keep the equal schedule.
- **#8 Motion for Temporary Custody** (motion, substantive) — I.B.R. asks for temporary custody on the schedule proposed in the complaint until the case is tried.
- **#11 Complaint for Child Custody and Child Support** (complaint, substantive) — I.B.R. asks the court to decide child custody and child support. The requests are: Primary temporary custody; Primary physical custody.

Docket documents: 11 total, 11 downloaded, 7 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

23CVD591382-999 · N.H.O. v. C.Z.I.

Not credited

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Defendant** (C.Z.I.)

AI review · medium confidence

Why: Attorney was removed from the case on 2024-04-05, before it was resolved.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
May 9, 2023	Jul 2, 2024	420	Calvin Fintan Bristowe
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
KILBRANNAN, GARRICK WYSTAN	—	High	Trial (judge)

Asked vs. got

Partly verified

Only minor topics could be scored (50% obtained); the central issues' requests or orders are not in the record, so this table does not decide the case's result.

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Temporary physical custody weight 2	Equal temporary schedule	Primary temporary custody to the plaintiff	Equal 2-2-3 schedule pending trial Oct 6, 2023 · order text	**50%**
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Equal shared custody	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff	Plaintiff primary; defendant alternate weekends Jul 2, 2024 · order text	**20%** Not counted: client was self-represented when this was decided

The temporary order was entered while this attorney was counsel; the final order came after the client went on alone.

N.H.O. filed for child custody on May 9, 2023, represented by Garrick Wystan Kilbrannan. C.Z.I. answered and counterclaimed through Jordan Avery Sample. The parties entered a temporary consent order on October 6, 2023. Jordan Avery Sample moved to withdraw on March 26, 2024, 21 days before the scheduled trial, and was allowed out on April 5, 2024; C.Z.I. tried the case alone. After a bench trial on June 11, 2024, Judge Calvin Fintan Bristowe entered a permanent order on July 2, 2024 giving primary physical custody to the plaintiff with the self-represented defendant on alternate weekends.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Equal temporary schedule	Equal 2-2-3 schedule pending trial	Split
Child custody	Equal shared custody	Plaintiff primary; defendant alternate weekends	Opponent

Timeline

May 9, 2023	N.H.O. files for child custody
Jun 15, 2023	C.Z.I. answers and counterclaims
Oct 6, 2023	Temporary Consent Order entered
Apr 5, 2024	Counsel for the defendant allowed to withdraw
Jun 11, 2024	Bench trial
Jul 2, 2024	Permanent order entered

About this attorney's work

- **Concern:** Moved to withdraw 21 days before the custody trial; the client tried the case without a lawyer.

Other counsel in the case

- **KILBRANNAN, GARRICK WYSTAN** — **Strength:** Pressed for an early temporary hearing.

Notable events

- Apr 5, 2024 · withdrawal (defendant): Jordan Avery Sample was allowed to withdraw as counsel for the defendant, 11 days before the scheduled custody trial.
- Apr 16, 2024 · continuance (defendant): Trial continued so the defendant could look for new counsel; the defendant then appeared without a lawyer.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Permanent Child Custody Order** (order, outcome determinative) — After a bench trial on June 11, 2024, Judge Calvin Fintan Bristowe ordered primary physical custody to the plaintiff with the self-represented defendant on alternate weekends.
- **#2 Pre-Trial Order** (order, procedural) — Pre-trial order listing the contested issues, witnesses and exhibits for the custody trial.
- **#3 Order Allowing Withdrawal of Counsel** (order, procedural) — Judge Calvin Fintan Bristowe allows Jordan Avery Sample to withdraw as counsel for C.Z.I.
- **#5 Motion to Withdraw as Counsel** (motion, procedural) — Jordan Avery Sample asks to withdraw as counsel for C.Z.I. Stated reason: the client has not met the terms of the engagement and communication has broken down.
- **#6 Temporary Consent Order** (consent order, substantive) — The parties entered a temporary consent order providing equal 2-2-3 schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#8 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — C.Z.I. answers and counterclaims, asking for equal temporary schedule; equal shared custody.
- **#12 Complaint for Child Custody** (complaint, substantive) — N.H.O. asks the court to decide child custody. The requests are: Primary temporary custody to the plaintiff; Primary physical custody to the plaintiff.

Docket documents: 12 total, 12 downloaded, 7 reviewed by AI, 5 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

21CVD529015-999 · H.P.M. v. F.L.O.

Not credited

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (H.P.M.)

AI review · medium confidence

Why: Attorney was removed from the case on 2022-05-24, before it was resolved.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Sep 14, 2021	Dec 6, 2022	448	Greta Lowri Ellsmere
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**LATER COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**
VALLEYFIELD, INGRAM BASTIAN	—	HALLGLEN, JORY KENWYN	Moderate
RESOLVED BY			
Consent order			

Asked vs. got Partly verified

No decided issue with a known request could be scored for this attorney.

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Primary physical custody	Equal shared custody	Equal schedule Dec 6, 2022 · order text	**50%** Not counted: decided while other counsel represented the client
Child support amount weight 2	Guideline support of $760 a month	Support of $500 a month	Support of $650 a month Dec 6, 2022 · order text	**55%** Not counted: decided while other counsel represented the client

The final terms were negotiated by successor counsel after this attorney left.

H.P.M. filed for child custody and child support on September 14, 2021, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. F.L.O. answered and counterclaimed through Ingram Bastian Valleyfield. After a temporary hearing the court entered a temporary custody order on December 3, 2021. Jordan Avery Sample withdrew at the client's request in May 2022 and Jory Kenwyn Hallglen took over. The case settled before trial: a consent order entered on December 6, 2022 provides an equal schedule and guideline child support.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Primary physical custody	Equal schedule	Split
Child support	Guideline support of $760 a month	Support of $650 a month	Split

Timeline

Sep 14, 2021	H.P.M. files for child custody and child support
Oct 19, 2021	F.L.O. answers and counterclaims
Dec 3, 2021	Temporary Custody Order entered
May 24, 2022	Counsel for the plaintiff allowed to withdraw
Dec 6, 2022	Consent Order for Permanent Custody entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Filed a motion for temporary custody together with the complaint.
- **Tactic:** Withdrew at the client's request before the pretrial conference; successor counsel finished the case.

Other counsel in the case

- **VALLEYFIELD, INGRAM BASTIAN** — **Tactic:** Pressed for an early temporary hearing.

Notable events

- Nov 5, 2021 · continuance (defendant): Temporary hearing continued at the defendant's request.
- May 24, 2022 · withdrawal (plaintiff): Jordan Avery Sample was allowed to withdraw as counsel for the plaintiff.
- Jun 14, 2022 · substitution (plaintiff): New counsel (Jory Kenwyn Hallglen) appeared for the plaintiff.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Consent Order for Permanent Custody** (consent order, outcome determinative) — By agreement, Judge Greta Lowri Ellsmere entered an order providing an equal schedule and guideline child support.
- **#2 Notice of Appearance** (notice, procedural) — Jory Kenwyn Hallglen appears as new counsel for H.P.M.
- **#3 Order Allowing Withdrawal of Counsel** (order, procedural) — Judge Greta Lowri Ellsmere allows Jordan Avery Sample to withdraw as counsel for H.P.M.
- **#5 Motion to Withdraw as Counsel** (motion, procedural) — Jordan Avery Sample asks to withdraw as counsel for H.P.M. Stated reason: the client has asked counsel to withdraw and intends to retain other counsel.
- **#6 Temporary Custody Order** (order, substantive) — After a temporary hearing, Judge Greta Lowri Ellsmere entered a temporary custody order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.

- **#8 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — F.L.O. answers and counterclaims, asking for equal shared custody; support of $500 a month.
- **#10 Motion for Temporary Custody** (motion, substantive) — H.P.M. asks for temporary custody on the schedule proposed in the complaint until the case is tried.
- **#13 Complaint for Child Custody and Child Support** (complaint, substantive) — H.P.M. asks the court to decide child custody and child support. The requests are: Primary physical custody; Guideline support of $760 a month.

Docket documents: 13 total, 13 downloaded, 8 reviewed by AI, 5 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

20CVD861454-999 · L.D.I. v. L.C.I.

Not credited

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Defendant** (L.C.I.)

Asked vs. got | medium confidence

Why: Asked vs. got: every issue decided in this case was decided while other counsel (or no counsel) represented the client, so the outcome is not this attorney's. Post-judgment phase (joined 2021-02-09, after the 2020-10-13 disposition): Negotiated outcome with give on both sides (physical custody / schedule: equal schedule by consent; legal custody: joint legal custody).

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jan 21, 2020	Oct 13, 2020	266	Philip Gethin Deverill
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**EARLIER COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**
ABERFOYLE, MARLOWE NESTA	—	GLENDARROCH, RAFFERTY DECLAN	Moderate
RESOLVED BY			
Consent order			

Asked vs. got

Partly verified

No decided issue with a known request could be scored for this attorney.

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Equal shared custody	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff	Equal schedule by consent Oct 13, 2020 · order text	**50%** Not counted: decided while other counsel represented the client
Legal custody weight 2	Joint legal custody	Joint legal custody with final say to the plaintiff	Joint legal custody Oct 13, 2020 · order text	**50%** Not counted: decided while other counsel represented the client
Plaintiff's post-judgment fee motion weight 1	Deny the fee motion	Fees of $4,500	Motion voluntarily dismissed before a ruling — · unknown	— Not counted: request or outcome unknown

Every decided topic was decided before this attorney substituted in; the only later item (a fee motion) was dismissed.

L.D.I. filed for child custody and attorney fees on January 21, 2020, represented by Marlowe Nesta Aberfoyle. L.C.I. answered and counterclaimed through Rafferty Declan Glendarroch. The case settled before trial: a consent order entered on October 13, 2020 provides a consent custody order with an equal schedule. Jordan Avery Sample substituted in for L.C.I. on February 9, 2021, after the custody order; the plaintiff's later fee motion was dismissed without a ruling.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Equal shared custody	Equal schedule by consent	Split

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Joint legal custody	Joint legal custody	Split
Attorney fees	Deny the fee motion	Motion voluntarily dismissed before a ruling	Unresolved

Timeline

Jan 21, 2020	L.D.I. files for child custody and attorney fees
Mar 8, 2020	L.C.I. answers and counterclaims
Oct 13, 2020	Consent Order for Permanent Custody entered
Dec 27, 2020	Plaintiff moves for attorney fees
Feb 9, 2021	Jordan Avery Sample substitutes in for the defendant
May 18, 2021	Fee motion dismissed

Other counsel in the case

- **ABERFOYLE, MARLOWE NESTA** — **Strength:** Negotiated the exchange terms that ended up in the order.

Notable events

- Feb 9, 2021 · substitution (defendant): Jordan Avery Sample substituted in for the defendant after the final custody order.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Voluntary Dismissal of Motion for Attorney Fees** (notice, procedural) — L.D.I. drops the pending fee motion before any hearing.
- **#2 Consent to Substitution of Counsel** (notice, procedural) — Jordan Avery Sample replaces Rafferty Declan Glendarroch as counsel for L.C.I. after the custody order, while the plaintiff's fee motion was pending.
- **#3 Motion for Attorney Fees** (motion, substantive) — L.D.I. asks for $4,500 in attorney fees after the consent custody order.
- **#4 Consent Order for Permanent Custody** (consent order, outcome determinative) — By agreement, Judge Philip Gethin Deverill entered an order providing a consent custody order with an equal schedule.
- **#6 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — L.C.I. answers and counterclaims, asking for equal shared custody; joint legal custody; deny the fee motion.
- **#10 Complaint for Child Custody and Attorney Fees** (complaint, substantive) — L.D.I. asks the court to decide child custody and attorney fees. The requests are: Primary physical custody to the plaintiff; Joint legal custody with final say to the plaintiff; Fees of $4,500.

Docket documents: 10 total, 10 downloaded, 6 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

26CVD663278-999 · Q.G.P. v. B.C.F.

Pending

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Defendant** (B.C.F.)

AI review · medium confidence

Why: The case is still open.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Sep 2, 2026	Open	—	Cora Delyth Netherby
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
CORRIEMOOR, BLEDDYN IOLO	—	Moderate	Pending

Asked vs. got Partly verified

No decided issue with a known request could be scored for this attorney.

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Temporary custody weight 3	Equal shared custody	Primary physical custody	Not yet decided — · unknown	— Not counted: request or outcome unknown

Nothing final yet; the table will be filled in when orders are entered.

Q.G.P. filed for child custody on September 2, 2026, represented by Bleddyn Iolo Corriemoor. B.C.F. answered and counterclaimed through Jordan Avery Sample. The case is open. Mediation orientation has been held and a temporary hearing is set for January 13, 2027.

Timeline

Sep 2, 2026	Q.G.P. files for child custody
Oct 11, 2026	B.C.F. answers and counterclaims
Jan 13, 2027	Temporary Hearing scheduled

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — B.C.F. answers and counterclaims, asking for custody of the minor children.
- **#6 Complaint for Child Custody** (complaint, substantive) — Q.G.P. asks the court to decide child custody. The requests are: custody of the minor children.

Docket documents: 6 total, 6 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

26CVD871727-999 · L.D.W. v. O.J.W.

Pending

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (L.D.W.)

AI review · medium confidence

Why: The case is still open.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jul 14, 2026	Open	—	Nora Elowen Castellane
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
TALLOWAY, BRENNA LAVINIA	VARRENTHAL, MILO KENELM	Moderate	Pending

Asked vs. got

Partly verified

No decided issue with a known request could be scored for this attorney.

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Temporary custody weight 3	Primary physical custody	Primary physical custody	Not yet decided — · unknown	— Not counted: request or outcome unknown

Nothing final yet; the table will be filled in when orders are entered.

L.D.W. filed for child custody and child support on July 14, 2026, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. O.J.W. answered and counterclaimed through Brenna Lavinia Talloway. The case is open. Mediation orientation has been held and a temporary hearing is set for December 9, 2026.

Timeline

Jul 14, 2026	L.D.W. files for child custody and child support
Aug 15, 2026	O.J.W. answers and counterclaims
Dec 9, 2026	Temporary Hearing scheduled

Notable events

- Oct 28, 2026 · continuance (defendant): First temporary hearing setting continued at the other side's request.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — O.J.W. answers and counterclaims, asking for custody of the minor children.
- **#6 Complaint for Child Custody and Child Support** (complaint, substantive) — L.D.W. asks the court to decide child custody and child support. The requests are: custody of the minor children.

Docket documents: 6 total, 6 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

25CVD712012-999 · M.O.B. v. P.T.B.

Pending

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (M.O.B.)

AI review · medium confidence

Why: The case is still open.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
May 20, 2025	Open	—	Nora Elowen Castellane
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
URQUHARDT, CADFAEL RHODRI	BRANNIGAN, TESSA CORISANDE	Moderate	Pending

Asked vs. got — Partly verified

Only minor topics could be scored (75% obtained); the central issues' requests or orders are not in the record, so this table does not decide the case's result.

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Post-separation support weight 2	PSS of $1,600 a month	No PSS	PSS of $1,350 a month Sep 17, 2025 · order text	**75%**
Division of marital property weight 3	Unequal division in the plaintiff's favor	Equal division	Not yet decided — · unknown	— Not counted: request or outcome unknown

Only the temporary support issue has been decided.

The plaintiff filed for equitable distribution, alimony and post-separation support. The court ordered PSS of $1,350 a month after a temporary hearing; a family financial settlement conference ended at impasse, and the equitable distribution and alimony trial is set for February 8, 2027.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Post-separation support	PSS of $1,600 a month	PSS of $1,350 a month	Client
Equitable distribution	Unequal division in the plaintiff's favor	Not yet decided	Unresolved

Timeline

May 20, 2025	M.O.B. files for equitable distribution, alimony and post-separation support
Sep 17, 2025	Post-separation support ordered
Feb 8, 2027	Bench Trial scheduled

Money ordered

- Post separation support: $1,350.00 monthly, defendant → plaintiff

Notable events

- Dec 6, 2025 · mediation (both): Family financial settlement conference ended at impasse.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Equitable Distribution Pre-Trial Order** (order, procedural) — Pre-trial order listing agreed and disputed property values ahead of the equitable distribution trial.
- **#2 Order for Post-Separation Support** (order, substantive) — Judge Nora Elowen Castellane orders the defendant to pay post-separation support of $1,350 a month pending alimony.
- **#3 Answer and Counterclaim** (answer, substantive) — P.T.B. answers, denies the key allegations and counterclaims on the same issues.
- **#6 Complaint for Equitable Distribution and Alimony and Post-Separation Support** (complaint, substantive) — M.O.B. brings claims for equitable distribution, alimony and post-separation support.

Docket documents: 6 total, 6 downloaded, 4 reviewed by AI, 2 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

25CVD899318-999 · I.E.H. v. E.I.H.

Own claims dismissed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (I.E.H.)

AI review · medium confidence

Why: The client voluntarily dismissed its own claims before any ruling; the notice gives no reason.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
May 13, 2025	Dec 9, 2025	210	Simon Caradoc Ketteridge
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	Low	Voluntary dismissal

Asked vs. got

Partly verified

No decided issue with a known request could be scored for this attorney.

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Custody of the minor children weight 3	Custody on the schedule in the complaint	—	Claims voluntarily dismissed before any ruling — · docket entry	— Not counted: request or outcome unknown

Nothing was decided: the client dismissed the claims before any ruling.

I.E.H. filed for child custody on May 13, 2025, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. The parties entered a temporary consent order on July 7, 2025. I.E.H. voluntarily dismissed the case on December 9, 2025; the case review notes that the defendant began following the temporary order, but the notice itself gives no reason.

Timeline

May 13, 2025	I.E.H. files for child custody
Jul 7, 2025	Temporary Consent Order entered
Sep 15, 2025	Contempt motion filed for the plaintiff
Dec 9, 2025	Plaintiff's voluntary dismissal

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Filed a motion for temporary custody together with the complaint.

Notable events

- Sep 15, 2025 · contempt (defendant): I.E.H. moved to hold E.I.H. in contempt for withheld weekends.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Notice of Voluntary Dismissal** (notice, outcome determinative) — I.E.H. voluntarily dismisses all claims without prejudice. No reason is stated in the notice.
- **#2 Motion for Order to Show Cause** (motion, substantive) — I.E.H. asks the court to hold E.I.H. in contempt for withholding weekends under the temporary order.
- **#3 Temporary Consent Order** (consent order, substantive) — The parties entered a temporary consent order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#6 Motion for Temporary Custody** (motion, substantive) — I.E.H. asks for temporary custody on the schedule proposed in the complaint until the case is tried.
- **#9 Complaint for Child Custody** (complaint, substantive) — I.E.H. asks the court to decide child custody. The requests are: custody of the minor children.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 5 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

24CVD822334-999 · T.P.I. v. G.L.I.

Own claims dismissed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (T.P.I.)

AI review | medium confidence

Why: The client voluntarily dismissed its own claims; the notice gives no reason.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jan 23, 2024	Sep 10, 2024	231	Nora Elowen Castellane
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
WHITTINGEHAME, NIAMH ISOLT	—	Low	Voluntary dismissal

The plaintiff filed for equitable distribution and attorney fees; the defendant answered. The plaintiff dismissed the action in September 2024. The notice gives no reason; a private property settlement is possible but not in the file.

Timeline

Jan 23, 2024	T.P.I. files for equitable distribution and attorney fees
Sep 10, 2024	Plaintiff's voluntary dismissal

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Notice of Voluntary Dismissal** (notice, outcome determinative) — T.P.I. voluntarily dismisses all claims without prejudice; no reason is stated.
- **#2 Answer and Counterclaim** (answer, substantive) — G.L.I. answers, denies the key allegations and counterclaims on the same issues.
- **#5 Complaint for Equitable Distribution and Attorney Fees** (complaint, substantive) — T.P.I. brings claims for equitable distribution and attorney fees.

Docket documents: 5 total, 5 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 2 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

23CVD496017-999 · M.D.B. v. G.R.B.

Own claims dismissed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (M.D.B.)

AI review | medium confidence

Why: The client voluntarily dismissed its own claims; the notice gives no reason.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jan 17, 2023	Apr 25, 2023	98	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Voluntary dismissal

The plaintiff filed for child support and dismissed the claim three months later, before any hearing; the notice of dismissal gives no reason and the defendant had not answered.

Timeline

Jan 17, 2023	M.D.B. files for child support
Apr 25, 2023	Plaintiff's voluntary dismissal

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Notice of Voluntary Dismissal** (notice, outcome determinative) — M.D.B. voluntarily dismisses all claims without prejudice; no reason is stated.
- **#4 Complaint for Child Support** (complaint, substantive) — M.D.B. brings claims for child support.

Docket documents: 4 total, 4 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 2 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

22CVD882745-999 · R.I.R. v. A.P.R.

Own claims dismissed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (R.I.R.)

AI review · medium confidence

Why: The client voluntarily dismissed its own claims before any ruling; the notice gives no reason.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Sep 20, 2022	Mar 14, 2023	175	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Voluntary dismissal

Asked vs. got — Partly verified

No decided issue with a known request could be scored for this attorney.

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Custody of the minor children weight 3	Custody on the schedule in the complaint	—	Claims voluntarily dismissed before any ruling — · docket entry	— Not counted: request or outcome unknown

Nothing was decided: the client dismissed the claims before any ruling.

R.I.R. filed for child custody and child support on September 20, 2022, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. R.I.R. voluntarily dismissed the case on March 14, 2023; the case review notes that the parties signed a private parenting agreement, but the notice itself gives no reason.

Timeline

Sep 20, 2022	R.I.R. files for child custody and child support
Mar 14, 2023	Plaintiff's voluntary dismissal

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Notice of Voluntary Dismissal** (notice, outcome determinative) — R.I.R. voluntarily dismisses all claims without prejudice. No reason is stated in the notice.
- **#6 Complaint for Child Custody and Child Support** (complaint, substantive) — R.I.R. asks the court to decide child custody and child support. The requests are: custody of the minor children.

Docket documents: 6 total, 6 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

20CVD606448-999 · M.D.L. v. E.I.C.

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (M.D.L.)

Own claims dismissed | AI review | high confidence

Why: Client dismissed its own divorce claim before a hearing; no reason on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Mar 10, 2020	May 12, 2020	63	—
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Voluntary dismissal

M.D.L. filed for absolute divorce on March 10, 2020 and dismissed the complaint on May 12, 2020, before any hearing. E.I.C. was served and filed nothing. The notice of dismissal does not give a reason.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Voluntarily dismissed	Neither

Timeline

Mar 10, 2020	Complaint filed
May 12, 2020	Voluntary dismissal

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Notice of Voluntary Dismissal** (notice, outcome determinative) — M.D.L. dismisses the divorce complaint without prejudice before any hearing; no reason is given.
- **#4 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — M.D.L. asks for an absolute divorce after more than a year of separation.

Docket documents: 4 total, 4 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 2 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

19CVD528662-999 · J.M.G. v. C.G.G.

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (J.M.G.)

Own claims dismissed | AI review | medium confidence

Why: The client voluntarily dismissed its own claims before any ruling; the notice gives no reason.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Aug 13, 2019	Dec 10, 2019	119	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
BRAEMORE, TEGWEN AERON	—	Low	Voluntary dismissal

Asked vs. got — Partly verified

No decided issue with a known request could be scored for this attorney.

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Custody of the minor children weight 3	Custody on the schedule in the complaint	Custody on the schedule in the counterclaim	Claims voluntarily dismissed before any ruling — · docket entry	— Not counted: request or outcome unknown

Nothing was decided: the client dismissed the claims before any ruling.

J.M.G. filed for child custody on August 13, 2019, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. C.G.G. answered and counterclaimed through Tegwen Aeron Braemore. J.M.G. voluntarily dismissed the case on December 10, 2019; the case review notes that the parties reconciled, but the notice itself gives no reason.

Timeline

Aug 13, 2019	J.M.G. files for child custody
Sep 25, 2019	C.G.G. answers and counterclaims
Dec 10, 2019	Plaintiff's voluntary dismissal

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Notice of Voluntary Dismissal** (notice, outcome determinative) — J.M.G. voluntarily dismisses all claims without prejudice. No reason is stated in the notice.
- **#3 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — C.G.G. answers and counterclaims, asking for custody of the minor children.
- **#7 Complaint for Child Custody** (complaint, substantive) — J.M.G. asks the court to decide child custody. The requests are: custody of the minor children.

Docket documents: 7 total, 7 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

21CVD893492-999 · T.A.F. v. B.I.F.

Unknown

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (T.A.F.)

AI review · low confidence

Why: The deciding order is on the docket but its text is not available.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Oct 19, 2021	Aug 23, 2022	308	Greta Lowri Ellsmere
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
ROSSLYNE, GWENLLIAN MAELON	—	Moderate	Unknown

Asked vs. got

Unverified: asks or terms known only from the docket

No decided issue with a known request could be scored for this attorney.

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Primary physical custody	Equal shared custody	Unknown: only the docket entry 'Order' is public — · unknown	— Not counted: request or outcome unknown
Child support amount weight 2	Guideline support	Support below the guidelines	Unknown — · unknown	— Not counted: request or outcome unknown

The deciding order is listed on the docket but not available, so nothing can be scored.

T.A.F. filed for child custody and child support on October 19, 2021, represented by Jordan Avery Sample. B.I.F. answered and counterclaimed through Gwenllian Maelon Rosslyne. After a temporary hearing the court entered a temporary custody order on January 22, 2022. The docket shows an order entered by Judge Greta Lowri Ellsmere on August 23, 2022, but the order is not in the downloaded file, so its terms and who it favored are not known.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Primary physical custody	Unknown: only the docket entry 'Order' is public	Unresolved
Child support	Guideline support	Unknown	Unresolved

Timeline

Oct 19, 2021	T.A.F. files for child custody and child support

Nov 29, 2021	B.I.F. answers and counterclaims
Jan 22, 2022	Temporary Custody Order entered
Aug 23, 2022	Order entered (text not available)

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Filed a motion for temporary custody together with the complaint.

Notable events

- Dec 25, 2021 · continuance (defendant): Temporary hearing continued at the defendant's request.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Temporary Custody Order** (order, substantive) — After a temporary hearing, Judge Greta Lowri Ellsmere entered a temporary custody order providing a temporary shared schedule pending trial. It stays in effect until trial or a final order.
- **#6 Motion for Temporary Custody** (motion, substantive) — T.A.F. asks for temporary custody on the schedule proposed in the complaint until the case is tried.
- **#9 Complaint for Child Custody and Child Support** (complaint, substantive) — T.A.F. asks the court to decide child custody and child support. The requests are: Primary physical custody; Guideline support.

Docket documents: 9 total, 7 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket. Not yet reviewed: Order; Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody.

Gaps: The final order is listed on the docket but its text is not available.; The other side's pleading is not on the portal.; Final order entered August 23, 2022 (not downloaded)

19CV604697-999 · L.S.T. v. W.A.U.

Example County District Court · General Civil Action · client: **Defendant** (W.A.U.)

Unknown

AI review low confidence

Why: The docket does not show how the claims ended.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Nov 12, 2019	Sep 21, 2020	314	Philip Gethin Deverill
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
PITCAITHLY, ELUNED MORWENNA	—	Moderate	Unknown

L.S.T. sued W.A.U. on November 12, 2019 for alienation of affection and criminal conversation. Jordan Avery Sample answered for W.A.U. After a discovery dispute the docket shows the case closed on September 21, 2020 with the label 'Disposed - Other' and no order describing why. No documents have been downloaded.

Timeline

Nov 12, 2019	L.S.T. sues for alienation of affection and criminal conversation
Sep 21, 2020	Case closed (Disposed - Other)

Notable events

- Apr 10, 2020 · discovery dispute (plaintiff): Plaintiff moved to compel discovery responses.

Docket documents: 5 total, 0 downloaded, 0 reviewed by AI. Not yet reviewed: Motion to Compel Discovery; Answer; Complaint (alienation of affection and criminal conversation).

Gaps: No documents downloaded.; No order or dismissal explains the closing; a private settlement is possible.

19CVD790705-999 · E.V.S. v. O.E.S.

Unknown

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic without Claim for absolute divorce · client: **Defendant** (O.E.S.)

AI review · low confidence

Why: The deciding order is on the docket but its text is not available.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
May 7, 2019	Feb 18, 2020	287	Dane Perrin Rosswick
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
QUARRELWOOD, TALFRYN OWAIN	—	Moderate	Unknown

Asked vs. got

Unverified: asks or terms known only from the docket

No decided issue with a known request could be scored for this attorney.

TOPIC	CLIENT ASKED	OTHER SIDE ASKED	OUTCOME	CLIENT GOT
Physical custody / schedule weight 3	Equal shared custody (counterclaim)	Primary physical custody to the plaintiff	Unknown: the custody order is not in the public file — · unknown	— Not counted: request or outcome unknown

The deciding order is listed on the docket but not available, so nothing can be scored.

E.V.S. filed for child custody on May 7, 2019, represented by Talfryn Owain Quarrelwood. O.E.S. answered and counterclaimed through Jordan Avery Sample. The docket shows a custody order entered by Judge Dane Perrin Rosswick on February 18, 2020, but the order is not in the downloaded file, so its terms and who it favored are not known.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Child custody	Equal shared custody (counterclaim)	Unknown: the custody order is not in the public file	Unresolved

Timeline

May 7, 2019	E.V.S. files for child custody
Jun 13, 2019	O.E.S. answers and counterclaims
Feb 18, 2020	Order entered (text not available)

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#3 Answer and Counterclaim for Child Custody** (counterclaim, substantive) — O.E.S. answers and counterclaims, asking for equal shared custody (counterclaim).

Docket documents: 7 total, 5 downloaded, 1 reviewed by AI, 4 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket. Not yet reviewed: Custody Order; Complaint for Child Custody.

Gaps: The final order is listed on the docket but its text is not available.; The other side's pleading is not on the portal.; Custody Order entered February 18, 2020 (docket entry only; the scanned order is not available)

26CVD418644-999 · A.Z.T. v. F.A.T.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (A.Z.T.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jul 5, 2026	Sep 4, 2026	61	Lydia Bronwen Haversham
OPPOSING COUNSEL	CO-COUNSEL	CONTEST LEVEL	RESOLVED BY
DALMALLY, HEDDWYN CARYS	—	None	Uncontested hearing

A.Z.T. filed for absolute divorce on July 5, 2026, alleging a separation that began on September 28, 2022. F.A.T. accepted service through counsel and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Lydia Bronwen Haversham granted the divorce on September 4, 2026 at an uncontested hearing, 61 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jul 5, 2026	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Jul 26, 2026	Service accepted by counsel
Sep 4, 2026	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Kept the complaint to the divorce claim alone, so nothing remained to litigate.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Lydia Bronwen Haversham grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — A.Z.T. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning September 28, 2022. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

26CVD513993-999 · O.M.D. v. H.C.D.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (O.M.D.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jul 18, 2026	Oct 5, 2026	79	Iris Ffion Quarrington
OPPOSING COUNSEL	CO-COUNSEL	CONTEST LEVEL	RESOLVED BY
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Summary judgment

O.M.D. filed for absolute divorce on July 18, 2026, alleging a separation that began on September 25, 2022. H.C.D. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Iris Ffion Quarrington granted the divorce on October 5, 2026 on a motion for summary judgment, 79 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jul 18, 2026	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Aug 12, 2026	Defendant served

Oct 5, 2026	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Iris Ffion Quarrington grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — O.M.D. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning September 25, 2022. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

26CVD593819-999 · E.O.D. v. T.B.D.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (E.O.D.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jun 17, 2026	Aug 4, 2026	48	Lydia Bronwen Haversham
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Summary judgment

E.O.D. filed for absolute divorce on June 17, 2026, alleging a separation that began on September 2, 2023. T.B.D. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Lydia Bronwen Haversham granted the divorce on August 4, 2026 on a motion for summary judgment, 48 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file. E.O.D. was also allowed to resume a former name.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce and Resumption of former name	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jun 17, 2026	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Jul 3, 2026	Defendant served
Aug 4, 2026	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Kept the complaint to the divorce claim alone, so nothing remained to litigate.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Lydia Bronwen Haversham grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer. The plaintiff may resume a former name.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — E.O.D. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning September 2, 2023. No custody, support or property claims are raised, and a return to a former name is requested.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

26CVD780583-999 · O.L.P. v. B.H.P.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (O.L.P.)

AI review | high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Mar 19, 2026	Jun 27, 2026	100	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	BRANNIGAN, TESSA CORISANDE	None	Summary judgment

O.L.P. filed for absolute divorce on March 19, 2026, alleging a separation that began on May 4, 2022. B.H.P. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Owen Tiernan Fairclothe granted the divorce on June 27, 2026 on a motion for summary judgment, 100 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Mar 19, 2026	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Apr 14, 2026	Defendant served
Jun 27, 2026	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Notable events

- Jun 27, 2026 · withdrawal (plaintiff): Judgment released counsel of record when the divorce was entered (routine).

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Owen Tiernan Fairclothe grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — O.L.P. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning May 4, 2022. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

25CVD572297-999 · M.C.N. v. C.T.T.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (M.C.N.)

AI review | high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jun 15, 2025	Sep 10, 2025	87	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Summary judgment

M.C.N. filed for absolute divorce on June 15, 2025, alleging a separation that began on September 11, 2022. C.T.T. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Adele Heulwen Lockhaven granted the divorce on September 10, 2025 on a motion for summary judgment, 87 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jun 15, 2025	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Jun 28, 2025	Defendant served
Sep 10, 2025	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Kept the complaint to the divorce claim alone, so nothing remained to litigate.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Adele Heulwen Lockhaven grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — M.C.N. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning September 11, 2022. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

25CVD613944-999 · X.I.S. v. L.E.S.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (X.I.S.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Sep 16, 2025	Nov 7, 2025	52	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

X.I.S. filed for absolute divorce on September 16, 2025, alleging a separation that began on April 11, 2024. L.E.S. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Owen Tiernan Fairclothe granted the divorce on November 7, 2025 at an uncontested hearing, 52 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Sep 16, 2025	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Sep 29, 2025	Defendant served
Nov 7, 2025	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Kept the complaint to the divorce claim alone, so nothing remained to litigate.

Notable events

- Nov 7, 2025 · withdrawal (plaintiff): Judgment released counsel of record when the divorce was entered (routine).

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Owen Tiernan Fairclothe grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — X.I.S. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning April 11, 2024. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

25CVD618703-999 · S.B.C. v. J.I.W.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (S.B.C.)

AI review | high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jun 5, 2025	Aug 28, 2025	84	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

S.B.C. filed for absolute divorce on June 5, 2025, alleging a separation that began on December 29, 2021. J.I.W. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Owen Tiernan Fairclothe granted the divorce on August 28, 2025 at an uncontested hearing, 84 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jun 5, 2025	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Jun 29, 2025	Defendant served
Aug 28, 2025	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Owen Tiernan Fairclothe grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — S.B.C. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning December 29, 2021. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

25CVD619474-999 · R.B.K. v. C.I.K.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Defendant** (C.I.K.)

AI review | high confidence

Why: Client did not oppose; the divorce was entered with no contested issue.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Mar 12, 2025	May 20, 2025	69	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
LAMMERMOOR, ANGHARAD TUDUR	—	None	Uncontested hearing

R.B.K., represented by Angharad Tudur Lammermoor, filed for absolute divorce on March 12, 2025. C.I.K. retained Jordan Avery Sample, who entered an appearance and did not contest the divorce. Judge Adele Heulwen Lockhaven granted the divorce on May 20, 2025. Neither side raised custody, support or property claims here.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Opponent

Timeline

Mar 12, 2025	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Apr 8, 2025	Defendant served
May 20, 2025	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Adele Heulwen Lockhaven grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant appeared through counsel and did not contest.
- **#5 Notice of Appearance** (notice, procedural) — Jordan Avery Sample enters an appearance for C.I.K. and states that the divorce is not contested.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — R.B.K. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning January 19, 2024. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

25CVD681803-999 · Z.M.I. v. U.E.I.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (Z.M.I.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Nov 1, 2025	Jan 1, 2026	61	Calvin Fintan Bristowe
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

Z.M.I. filed for absolute divorce on November 1, 2025, alleging a separation that began on June 29, 2024. U.E.I. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Calvin Fintan Bristowe granted the divorce on January 1, 2026 at an uncontested hearing, 61 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Nov 1, 2025	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Nov 19, 2025	Defendant served
Jan 1, 2026	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Moved the case to judgment soon after the answer period ran.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Calvin Fintan Bristowe grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — Z.M.I. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning June 29, 2024. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

25CVD749053-999 · M.M.U. v. R.Z.U.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (M.M.U.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jun 21, 2025	Aug 26, 2025	66	Marcus Emrys Iversley
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

M.M.U. filed for absolute divorce on June 21, 2025, alleging a separation that began on May 19, 2023. R.Z.U. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Marcus Emrys Iversley granted the divorce on August 26, 2025 at an uncontested hearing, 66 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jun 21, 2025	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Jul 5, 2025	Defendant served
Aug 26, 2025	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Marcus Emrys Iversley grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — M.M.U. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning May 19, 2023. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

24CVD418200-999 · G.B.S. v. W.S.H.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (G.B.S.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Apr 10, 2024	Jun 6, 2024	57	Iris Ffion Quarrington
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

G.B.S. filed for absolute divorce on April 10, 2024, alleging a separation that began on May 3, 2020. W.S.H. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Iris Ffion Quarrington granted the divorce on June 6, 2024 at an uncontested hearing, 57 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Apr 10, 2024	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Apr 17, 2024	Defendant served
Jun 6, 2024	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Calendared the divorce hearing promptly after service.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Iris Ffion Quarrington grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — G.B.S. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning May 3, 2020. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

24CVD447532-999 · H.D.C. v. K.D.C.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (H.D.C.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
May 3, 2024	Jul 13, 2024	71	Lydia Bronwen Haversham
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
ETTRICKDALE, SIONED ELIDIR	—	None	Summary judgment

H.D.C. filed for absolute divorce on May 3, 2024, alleging a separation that began on November 8, 2022. K.D.C. accepted service through counsel and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Lydia Bronwen Haversham granted the divorce on July 13, 2024 on a motion for summary judgment, 71 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file. H.D.C. was also allowed to resume a former name.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce and Resumption of former name	Granted	Client

Timeline

May 3, 2024	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
May 31, 2024	Service accepted by counsel
Jul 13, 2024	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Kept the complaint to the divorce claim alone, so nothing remained to litigate.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Lydia Bronwen Haversham grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer. The plaintiff may resume a former name.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — H.D.C. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning November 8, 2022. No custody, support or property claims are raised, and a return to a former name is requested.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

24CVD466077-999 · D.O.B. v. C.A.B.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (D.O.B.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Sep 28, 2024	Nov 22, 2024	55	Nora Elowen Castellane
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Summary judgment

D.O.B. filed for absolute divorce on September 28, 2024, alleging a separation that began on October 31, 2020. C.A.B. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Nora Elowen Castellane granted the divorce on November 22, 2024 on a motion for summary judgment, 55 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Sep 28, 2024	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Oct 8, 2024	Defendant served
Nov 22, 2024	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Moved the case to judgment soon after the answer period ran.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Nora Elowen Castellane grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — D.O.B. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning October 31, 2020. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

24CVD510475-999 · G.J.W. v. I.C.W.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (G.J.W.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Feb 26, 2024	May 15, 2024	79	Philip Gethin Deverill
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

G.J.W. filed for absolute divorce on February 26, 2024, alleging a separation that began on February 14, 2021. I.C.W. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Philip Gethin Deverill granted the divorce on May 15, 2024 at an uncontested hearing, 79 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file. G.J.W. was also allowed to resume a former name.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce and Resumption of former name	Granted	Client

Timeline

Feb 26, 2024	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Mar 19, 2024	Defendant served
May 15, 2024	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Calendared the divorce hearing promptly after service.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Philip Gethin Deverill grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer. The plaintiff may resume a former name.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — G.J.W. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning February 14, 2021. No custody, support or property claims are raised, and a return to a former name is requested.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

24CVD705387-999 · E.L.M. v. I.T.M.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (E.L.M.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jul 3, 2024	Sep 20, 2024	79	Nora Elowen Castellane
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

E.L.M. filed for absolute divorce on July 3, 2024, alleging a separation that began on December 9, 2020. I.T.M. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Nora Elowen Castellane granted the divorce on September 20, 2024 at an uncontested hearing, 79 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jul 3, 2024	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Jul 25, 2024	Defendant served
Sep 20, 2024	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Nora Elowen Castellane grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — E.L.M. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning December 9, 2020. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

24CVD733194-999 · A.Y.H. v. C.F.O.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (A.Y.H.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jul 7, 2024	Sep 5, 2024	60	Nora Elowen Castellane
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	BRANNIGAN, TESSA CORISANDE	None	Uncontested hearing

A.Y.H. filed for absolute divorce on July 7, 2024, alleging a separation that began on April 15, 2023. C.F.O. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Nora Elowen Castellane granted the divorce on September 5, 2024 at an uncontested hearing, 60 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jul 7, 2024	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Jul 17, 2024	Defendant served
Sep 5, 2024	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Nora Elowen Castellane grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — A.Y.H. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning April 15, 2023. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

24CVD815577-999 · J.I.N. v. A.I.H.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Defendant** (A.I.H.)

AI review | high confidence

Why: Client did not oppose; the divorce was entered with no contested issue.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Feb 17, 2024	Jun 3, 2024	107	Dane Perrin Rosswick
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
PENTLANDE, DERWA CYNAN	—	None	Summary judgment

J.I.N., represented by Derwa Cynan Pentlande, filed for absolute divorce on February 17, 2024. A.I.H. retained Jordan Avery Sample, who entered an appearance and did not contest the divorce. Judge Dane Perrin Rosswick granted the divorce on June 3, 2024. Neither side raised custody, support or property claims here.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Opponent

Timeline

Feb 17, 2024	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Mar 15, 2024	Defendant served
Jun 3, 2024	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Dane Perrin Rosswick grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant appeared through counsel and did not contest.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#6 Notice of Appearance** (notice, procedural) — Jordan Avery Sample enters an appearance for A.I.H. and states that the divorce is not contested.
- **#10 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — J.I.N. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning August 22, 2022. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 10 total, 10 downloaded, 4 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

24CVD837899-999 · O.P.G. v. I.E.F.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (O.P.G.)

AI review | high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
May 13, 2024	Jul 26, 2024	74	Miriam Isadora Aldercott
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Summary judgment

O.P.G. filed for absolute divorce on May 13, 2024, alleging a separation that began on February 26, 2023. I.E.F. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Miriam Isadora Aldercott granted the divorce on July 26, 2024 on a motion for summary judgment, 74 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

May 13, 2024	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Jun 3, 2024	Defendant served
Jul 26, 2024	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Miriam Isadora Aldercott grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — O.P.G. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning February 26, 2023. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

23CVD475795-999 · V.R.P. v. B.K.P.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Defendant** (B.K.P.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Client did not oppose; the divorce was entered with no contested issue.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Apr 19, 2023	Jun 25, 2023	67	Nora Elowen Castellane
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
TALLOWAY, BRENNA LAVINIA	—	None	Uncontested hearing

V.R.P., represented by Brenna Lavinia Talloway, filed for absolute divorce on April 19, 2023. B.K.P. retained Jordan Avery Sample, who entered an appearance and did not contest the divorce. Judge Nora Elowen Castellane granted the divorce on June 25, 2023. Neither side raised custody, support or property claims here.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Opponent

Timeline

Apr 19, 2023	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
May 11, 2023	Defendant served
Jun 25, 2023	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Notable events

- Jun 25, 2023 · withdrawal (defendant): Judgment released counsel of record when the divorce was entered (routine).

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Nora Elowen Castellane grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant appeared through counsel and did not contest.
- **#5 Notice of Appearance** (notice, procedural) — Jordan Avery Sample enters an appearance for B.K.P. and states that the divorce is not contested.

- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — V.R.P. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning March 12, 2019. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

23CVD513514-999 · A.I.G. v. R.A.S.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (A.I.G.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
May 13, 2023	Aug 14, 2023	93	Cora Delyth Netherby
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

A.I.G. filed for absolute divorce on May 13, 2023, alleging a separation that began on January 11, 2021. R.A.S. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Cora Delyth Netherby granted the divorce on August 14, 2023 at an uncontested hearing, 93 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

May 13, 2023	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Jun 10, 2023	Defendant served
Aug 14, 2023	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Cora Delyth Netherby grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — A.I.G. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning January 11, 2021. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

23CVD666477-999 · A.E.Y. v. F.R.Y.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (A.E.Y.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Nov 2, 2023	Jan 4, 2024	63	Cora Delyth Netherby
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Summary judgment

A.E.Y. filed for absolute divorce on November 2, 2023, alleging a separation that began on December 14, 2020. F.R.Y. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Cora Delyth Netherby granted the divorce on January 4, 2024 on a motion for summary judgment, 63 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Nov 2, 2023	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Nov 18, 2023	Defendant served
Jan 4, 2024	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Kept the complaint to the divorce claim alone, so nothing remained to litigate.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Cora Delyth Netherby grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — A.E.Y. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning December 14, 2020. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

23CVD793964-999 · P.F.G. v. P.T.G.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (P.F.G.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Sep 17, 2023	Nov 24, 2023	68	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

P.F.G. filed for absolute divorce on September 17, 2023, alleging a separation that began on July 15, 2020. P.T.G. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Adele Heulwen Lockhaven granted the divorce on November 24, 2023 at an uncontested hearing, 68 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Sep 17, 2023	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Oct 9, 2023	Defendant served
Nov 24, 2023	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Adele Heulwen Lockhaven grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — P.F.G. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning July 15, 2020. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

23CVD811754-999 · P.S.S. v. C.E.S.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (P.S.S.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Mar 8, 2023	May 4, 2023	57	Hugh Odhran Pendlebury
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
BALLANTRAE, PIERS AURELIAN	—	None	Summary judgment

P.S.S. filed for absolute divorce on March 8, 2023, alleging a separation that began on May 28, 2021. C.E.S. accepted service through counsel and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Hugh Odhran Pendlebury granted the divorce on May 4, 2023 on a motion for summary judgment, 57 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Mar 8, 2023	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Mar 17, 2023	Service accepted by counsel
May 4, 2023	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Hugh Odhran Pendlebury grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — P.S.S. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning May 28, 2021. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

23CVD845051-999 · B.F.U. v. P.B.R.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (B.F.U.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Sep 18, 2023	Nov 21, 2023	64	Elliot Idris Montgarde
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

B.F.U. filed for absolute divorce on September 18, 2023, alleging a separation that began on August 18, 2022. P.B.R. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Elliot Idris Montgarde granted

the divorce on November 21, 2023 at an uncontested hearing, 64 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Sep 18, 2023	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Oct 14, 2023	Defendant served
Nov 21, 2023	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Kept the complaint to the divorce claim alone, so nothing remained to litigate.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Elliot Idris Montgarde grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — B.F.U. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning August 18, 2022. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

23CVD847936-999 · D.O.T. v. S.A.G.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (D.O.T.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jul 6, 2023	Sep 6, 2023	62	Nora Elowen Castellane
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	BRANNIGAN, TESSA CORISANDE	None	Uncontested hearing

D.O.T. filed for absolute divorce on July 6, 2023, alleging a separation that began on October 26, 2020. S.A.G. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Nora Elowen Castellane granted the divorce on September 6, 2023 at an uncontested hearing, 62 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jul 6, 2023	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Aug 1, 2023	Defendant served
Sep 6, 2023	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Nora Elowen Castellane grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.

- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — D.O.T. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning October 26, 2020. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

22CVD427652-999 · I.F.F. v. Q.M.F.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (I.F.F.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Oct 4, 2022	Nov 25, 2022	52	Dane Perrin Rosswick
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

I.F.F. filed for absolute divorce on October 4, 2022, alleging a separation that began on April 10, 2021. Q.M.F. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Dane Perrin Rosswick granted the divorce on November 25, 2022 at an uncontested hearing, 52 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Oct 4, 2022	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Oct 17, 2022	Defendant served
Nov 25, 2022	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Moved the case to judgment soon after the answer period ran.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Dane Perrin Rosswick grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — I.F.F. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning April 10, 2021. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

22CVD434892-999 · F.L.H. v. O.I.H.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (F.L.H.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Nov 11, 2022	Feb 2, 2023	83	Miriam Isadora Aldercott
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	BRANNIGAN, TESSA CORISANDE	None	Uncontested hearing

F.L.H. filed for absolute divorce on November 11, 2022, alleging a separation that began on January 28, 2020. O.I.H. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Miriam Isadora Aldercott granted the divorce on February 2, 2023 at an uncontested hearing, 83 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Nov 11, 2022	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Nov 18, 2022	Defendant served
Feb 2, 2023	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Kept the complaint to the divorce claim alone, so nothing remained to litigate.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Miriam Isadora Aldercott grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — F.L.H. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning January 28, 2020. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

22CVD468404-999 · H.T.W. v. E.C.W.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (H.T.W.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Apr 3, 2022	May 31, 2022	58	Greta Lowri Ellsmere
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Summary judgment

H.T.W. filed for absolute divorce on April 3, 2022, alleging a separation that began on June 25, 2019. E.C.W. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Greta Lowri Ellsmere granted the divorce on May 31, 2022 on a motion for summary judgment, 58 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Apr 3, 2022	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Apr 12, 2022	Defendant served
May 31, 2022	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Greta Lowri Ellsmere grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer.

- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — H.T.W. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning June 25, 2019. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

22CVD680883-999 · F.M.M. v. O.B.M.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (F.M.M.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Apr 17, 2022	Jul 25, 2022	99	Miriam Isadora Aldercott
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	BRANNIGAN, TESSA CORISANDE	None	Summary judgment

F.M.M. filed for absolute divorce on April 17, 2022, alleging a separation that began on July 5, 2019. O.B.M. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Miriam Isadora Aldercott granted the divorce on July 25, 2022 on a motion for summary judgment, 99 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Apr 17, 2022	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
May 11, 2022	Defendant served
Jul 25, 2022	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Miriam Isadora Aldercott grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — F.M.M. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning July 5, 2019. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

22CVD683421-999 · E.T.F. v. M.D.S.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (E.T.F.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Apr 9, 2022	Jun 10, 2022	62	Marcus Emrys Iversley
OPPOSING COUNSEL	CO-COUNSEL	CONTEST LEVEL	RESOLVED BY
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

E.T.F. filed for absolute divorce on April 9, 2022, alleging a separation that began on May 22, 2019. M.D.S. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Marcus Emrys Iversley granted the divorce on June 10, 2022 at an uncontested hearing, 62 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Apr 9, 2022	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Apr 23, 2022	Defendant served
Jun 10, 2022	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Marcus Emrys Iversley grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — E.T.F. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning May 22, 2019. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

22CVD728833-999 · E.A.T. v. M.H.T.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (E.A.T.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jul 16, 2022	Sep 9, 2022	55	Cora Delyth Netherby
OPPOSING COUNSEL	CO-COUNSEL	CONTEST LEVEL	RESOLVED BY
LOCHRANZA, SABINE YSOLDE	—	None	Uncontested hearing

E.A.T. filed for absolute divorce on July 16, 2022, alleging a separation that began on January 13, 2019. M.H.T. accepted service through counsel and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Cora Delyth Netherby granted the divorce on September 9, 2022 at an uncontested hearing, 55 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jul 16, 2022	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Jul 29, 2022	Service accepted by counsel
Sep 9, 2022	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Calendared the divorce hearing promptly after service.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Cora Delyth Netherby grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — E.A.T. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning January 13, 2019. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

22CVD772344-999 · L.R.W. v. D.E.W.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (L.R.W.)

AI review · medium confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Apr 27, 2022	Jul 4, 2022	68	Nora Elowen Castellane
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	BRANNIGAN, TESSA CORISANDE	None	Uncontested hearing

L.R.W. filed for absolute divorce on April 27, 2022, alleging a separation that began on June 4, 2018. D.E.W. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Nora Elowen Castellane granted the divorce on July 4, 2022 at an uncontested hearing, 68 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Apr 27, 2022	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
May 15, 2022	Defendant served
Jul 4, 2022	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Docket documents: 8 total, 0 downloaded, 0 reviewed by AI. Not yet reviewed: Judgment of Absolute Divorce; Complaint for Absolute Divorce.

Gaps: No documents downloaded; review based on docket entries only.

22CVD823541-999 · N.R.S. v. L.E.S.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (N.R.S.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Feb 11, 2022	Mar 31, 2022	48	Philip Gethin Deverill
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Summary judgment

N.R.S. filed for absolute divorce on February 11, 2022, alleging a separation that began on June 2, 2019. L.E.S. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Philip Gethin Deverill granted the divorce on March 31, 2022 on a motion for summary judgment, 48 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Feb 11, 2022	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Feb 24, 2022	Defendant served
Mar 31, 2022	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Used summary judgment to finish an unanswered divorce without a live hearing.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Philip Gethin Deverill grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — N.R.S. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning June 2, 2019. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

21CVD574049-999 · T.R.T. v. L.B.P.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (T.R.T.)

AI review · medium confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jun 1, 2021	Aug 23, 2021	83	Dane Perrin Rosswick
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Summary judgment

T.R.T. filed for absolute divorce on June 1, 2021, alleging a separation that began on May 12, 2018. L.B.P. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Dane Perrin Rosswick granted the divorce on August 23, 2021 on a motion for summary judgment, 83 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jun 1, 2021	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Jun 8, 2021	Defendant served
Aug 23, 2021	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Docket documents: 9 total, 0 downloaded, 0 reviewed by AI. Not yet reviewed: Judgment of Absolute Divorce; Motion for Summary Judgment; Complaint for Absolute Divorce.

Gaps: No documents downloaded; review based on docket entries only.

21CVD575303-999 · O.A.L. v. L.H.L.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Defendant** (L.H.L.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Client did not oppose; the divorce was entered with no contested issue.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Oct 16, 2021	Dec 10, 2021	55	Miriam Isadora Aldercott
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
ETTRICKDALE, SIONED ELIDIR	—	None	Summary judgment

O.A.L., represented by Sioned Elidir Ettrickdale, filed for absolute divorce on October 16, 2021. L.H.L. retained Jordan Avery Sample, who entered an appearance and did not contest the divorce. Judge Miriam Isadora Aldercott granted the divorce on December 10, 2021. Neither side raised custody, support or property claims here.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Opponent

Timeline

Oct 16, 2021	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Oct 30, 2021	Defendant served
Dec 10, 2021	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Miriam Isadora Aldercott grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant appeared through counsel and did not contest.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#6 Notice of Appearance** (notice, procedural) — Jordan Avery Sample enters an appearance for L.H.L. and states that the divorce is not contested.
- **#10 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — O.A.L. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning October 19, 2018. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 10 total, 10 downloaded, 4 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

21CVD759389-999 · D.Y.N. v. T.A.B.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (D.Y.N.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Nov 12, 2021	Jan 11, 2022	60	Nora Elowen Castellane
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

D.Y.N. filed for absolute divorce on November 12, 2021, alleging a separation that began on April 9, 2019. T.A.B. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Nora Elowen Castellane granted the

divorce on January 11, 2022 at an uncontested hearing, 60 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Nov 12, 2021	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Dec 6, 2021	Defendant served
Jan 11, 2022	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Moved the case to judgment soon after the answer period ran.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Nora Elowen Castellane grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — D.Y.N. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning April 9, 2019. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

21CVD762354-999 · C.K.Q. v. M.T.M.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (C.K.Q.)

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Apr 18, 2021	Jul 2, 2021	75	Greta Lowri Ellsmere
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
DALMALLY, HEDDWYN CARYS	—	None	Summary judgment

C.K.Q. filed for absolute divorce on April 18, 2021, alleging a separation that began on January 17, 2018. M.T.M. accepted service through counsel and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Greta Lowri Ellsmere granted the divorce on July 2, 2021 on a motion for summary judgment, 75 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Apr 18, 2021	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
May 8, 2021	Service accepted by counsel
Jul 2, 2021	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Moved the case to judgment soon after the answer period ran.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Greta Lowri Ellsmere grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — C.K.Q. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning January 17, 2018. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

21CVD763106-999 · B.D.C. v. B.C.C.

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (B.D.C.)

Unopposed

AI review · high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jan 23, 2021	Apr 17, 2021	84	Lydia Bronwen Haversham
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

B.D.C. filed for absolute divorce on January 23, 2021, alleging a separation that began on February 18, 2018. B.C.C. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Lydia Bronwen Haversham granted the divorce on April 17, 2021 at an uncontested hearing, 84 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jan 23, 2021	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Feb 13, 2021	Defendant served
Apr 17, 2021	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Kept the complaint to the divorce claim alone, so nothing remained to litigate.

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Lydia Bronwen Haversham grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — B.D.C. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning February 18, 2018. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

21CVD789918-999 · S.I.W. v. G.E.W.

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (S.I.W.)

Unopposed

AI review · medium confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Apr 1, 2021	May 17, 2021	46	Greta Lowri Ellsmere
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

S.I.W. filed for absolute divorce on April 1, 2021, alleging a separation that began on September 4, 2018. G.E.W. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Greta Lowri Ellsmere granted the divorce on May 17, 2021 at an uncontested hearing, 46 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Apr 1, 2021	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Apr 12, 2021	Defendant served
May 17, 2021	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Docket documents: 8 total, 0 downloaded, 0 reviewed by AI. Not yet reviewed: Judgment of Absolute Divorce; Complaint for Absolute Divorce.

Gaps: No documents downloaded; review based on docket entries only.

20CV520579-999 · H.E.K. v. N.Z.Y.

Example County District Court · General Civil Action · client: **Plaintiff** (H.E.K.)

Unopposed

AI review · high confidence

Why: Default judgment for the full amount; the defendant never responded.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jun 16, 2020	Aug 23, 2020	68	—
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Default judgment

H.E.K. sued N.Z.Y. on June 16, 2020 for $9,800 owed on a promissory note. N.Z.Y. was served on June 27, 2020 and did not answer. The clerk entered default and then a default judgment for $9,800 plus interest on August 23, 2020.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Collections	$9,800 plus interest	Default judgment for the full amount	Client

Timeline

Jun 16, 2020	H.E.K. sues for money owed under a promissory note
Aug 2, 2020	Entry of default
Aug 23, 2020	Default judgment

Money ordered

- Damages: $9,800.00, defendant → plaintiff

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#1 Default Judgment** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Default judgment for H.E.K. for $9,800 plus interest and costs; the defendant never answered.
- **#2 Entry of Default** (order, procedural) — The clerk enters default because the defendant did not answer.

- **#6 Complaint (money owed under a promissory note)** (complaint, substantive) — H.E.K. sues N.Z.Y. for money owed under a promissory note, seeking $9,800 plus interest.

Docket documents: 6 total, 6 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 3 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

20CVD567105-999 · C.I.D. v. P.L.D.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (C.I.D.)

AI review | high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Apr 19, 2020	Jun 17, 2020	59	Hugh Odhran Pendlebury
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
KINLOCHARD, GWYNFOR MADOC	—	None	Summary judgment

C.I.D. filed for absolute divorce on April 19, 2020, alleging a separation that began on September 28, 2016. P.L.D. accepted service through counsel and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Hugh Odhran Pendlebury granted the divorce on June 17, 2020 on a motion for summary judgment, 59 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Apr 19, 2020	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Apr 28, 2020	Service accepted by counsel
Jun 17, 2020	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Moved the case to judgment soon after the answer period ran.

Notable events

- Jun 17, 2020 · withdrawal (plaintiff): Judgment released counsel of record when the divorce was entered (routine).

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Hugh Odhran Pendlebury grants the absolute divorce by summary judgment. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#4 Motion for Summary Judgment** (motion, procedural) — Plaintiff moves for summary judgment on the divorce claim, noting that no answer was filed and the answer period has run.
- **#9 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — C.I.D. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning September 28, 2016. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 9 total, 9 downloaded, 3 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

20CVD600023-999 · L.R.L. v. N.L.B.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (L.R.L.)

AI review | medium confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Oct 8, 2020	Jan 16, 2021	100	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven
OPPOSING COUNSEL	CO-COUNSEL	CONTEST LEVEL	RESOLVED BY
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Summary judgment

L.R.L. filed for absolute divorce on October 8, 2020, alleging a separation that began on January 10, 2018. N.L.B. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Adele Heulwen Lockhaven granted the divorce on January 16, 2021 on a motion for summary judgment, 100 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Oct 8, 2020	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Nov 4, 2020	Defendant served
Jan 16, 2021	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Docket documents: 9 total, 0 downloaded, 0 reviewed by AI. Not yet reviewed: Judgment of Absolute Divorce; Motion for Summary Judgment; Complaint for Absolute Divorce.

Gaps: No documents downloaded; review based on docket entries only.

20CVD843625-999 · Y.E.C. v. I.W.C.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (Y.E.C.)

AI review high confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
May 4, 2020	Jul 22, 2020	79	Marcus Emrys Iversley
OPPOSING COUNSEL	CO-COUNSEL	CONTEST LEVEL	RESOLVED BY
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

Y.E.C. filed for absolute divorce on May 4, 2020, alleging a separation that began on October 13, 2018. I.W.C. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Marcus Emrys Iversley granted the divorce on July 22, 2020 at an uncontested hearing, 79 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

May 4, 2020	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
May 25, 2020	Defendant served
Jul 22, 2020	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

Documents reviewed by AI

- **#2 Judgment of Absolute Divorce** (judgment, outcome determinative) — Judge Marcus Emrys Iversley grants the absolute divorce after an uncontested hearing. The defendant filed no answer.
- **#8 Complaint for Absolute Divorce** (complaint, substantive) — Y.E.C. asks for an absolute divorce based on a separation of more than one year beginning October 13, 2018. No custody, support or property claims are raised.

Docket documents: 8 total, 8 downloaded, 2 reviewed by AI, 6 routine filings (cover sheets, service papers, notices) read from the docket.

19CVD577273-999 · N.I.J. v. C.M.R.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (N.I.J.)

AI review · medium confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Sep 12, 2019	Nov 9, 2019	58	Hugh Odhran Pendlebury
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	BRANNIGAN, TESSA CORISANDE	None	Uncontested hearing

N.I.J. filed for absolute divorce on September 12, 2019, alleging a separation that began on June 20, 2017. C.M.R. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Hugh Odhran Pendlebury granted the divorce on November 9, 2019 at an uncontested hearing, 58 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Sep 12, 2019	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Sep 20, 2019	Defendant served
Nov 9, 2019	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Calendared the divorce hearing promptly after service.

Docket documents: 8 total, 0 downloaded, 0 reviewed by AI. Not yet reviewed: Judgment of Absolute Divorce; Complaint for Absolute Divorce.

Gaps: No documents downloaded; review based on docket entries only.

19CVD795413-999 · A.O.P. v. A.T.K.

Unopposed

Example County District Court · Civil Domestic with Absolute Divorce · client: **Plaintiff** (A.O.P.)

AI review · medium confidence

Why: Divorce granted with no answer or opposition on record.

FILED	CLOSED	DAYS TO CLOSE	DECIDED BY
Jan 8, 2019	Apr 3, 2019	85	Iris Ffion Quarrington
OPPOSING COUNSEL	**CO-COUNSEL**	**CONTEST LEVEL**	**RESOLVED BY**
none (unrepresented)	—	None	Uncontested hearing

A.O.P. filed for absolute divorce on January 8, 2019, alleging a separation that began on January 7, 2016. A.T.K. was served by certified mail and never filed an answer or any other response. Judge Iris Ffion Quarrington granted the divorce on April 3, 2019 at an uncontested hearing, 85 days after filing. No custody, support or property claims were part of this file.

Issues decided

ISSUE	ASKED FOR	RESULT	FAVORED
Absolute divorce	Absolute divorce	Granted	Client

Timeline

Jan 8, 2019	Complaint for absolute divorce filed
Jan 13, 2019	Defendant served
Apr 3, 2019	Judgment of absolute divorce entered

About this attorney's work

- **Tactic:** Moved the case to judgment soon after the answer period ran.

Docket documents: 8 total, 0 downloaded, 0 reviewed by AI. Not yet reviewed: Judgment of Absolute Divorce; Complaint for Absolute Divorce.

Gaps: No documents downloaded; review based on docket entries only.

APPENDIX A

Every case on record

Every case found for this attorney (80). Cases marked “Index” have only the search-result row so far; their outcome is Unknown until the docket is collected.

CASE NO.	CAPTION	CLIENT	COURT DISPOSITION	COUNTED AS	JUDGE	SOURCE
26CVD663278-999	Q.G.P. v. B.C.F.	Defendant	Pending	Pending	Cora Delyth Netherby	AI review
26CVD513993-999	O.M.D. v. H.C.D.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Iris Ffion Quarrington	AI review
26CVD871727-999	L.D.W. v. O.J.W.	Plaintiff	Pending	Pending	Nora Elowen Castellane	AI review
26CVD418644-999	A.Z.T. v. F.A.T.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Lydia Bronwen Haversham	AI review
26CVD593819-999	E.O.D. v. T.B.D.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Lydia Bronwen Haversham	AI review
26CVD780583-999	O.L.P. v. B.H.P.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe	AI review
25CVD681803-999	Z.M.I. v. U.E.I.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Calvin Fintan Bristowe	AI review
25CVD613944-999	X.I.S. v. L.E.S.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe	AI review
25CVD749053-999	M.M.U. v. R.Z.U.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Marcus Emrys Iversley	AI review
25CVD572297-999	M.C.N. v. C.T.T.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven	AI review
25CVD618703-999	S.B.C. v. J.I.W.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe	AI review
25CVD712012-999	M.O.B. v. P.T.B.	Plaintiff	Pending	Pending	Nora Elowen Castellane	AI review
25CVD899318-999	I.E.H. v. E.I.H.	Plaintiff	Voluntary dismissal	Own claims dismissed	Simon Caradoc Ketteridge	AI review
25CVD619474-999	R.B.K. v. C.I.K.	Defendant	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven	AI review
25CVD441029-999	T.L.B. v. C.L.B.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Tie / split	Elliot Idris Montgarde	Asked vs. got
25CVD507814-999	J.J.L. v. T.H.O.	Defendant	Trial by judge	Win	Hugh Odhran Pendlebury	Asked vs. got

CASE NO.	CAPTION	CLIENT	COURT DISPOSITION	COUNTED AS	JUDGE	SOURCE
24CVD466077-999	D.O.B. v. C.A.B.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Nora Elowen Castellane	AI review
24CVD753288-999	I.B.R. v. B.I.R.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Not credited	Iris Ffion Quarrington	AI review
24CVD733194-999	A.Y.H. v. C.F.O.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Nora Elowen Castellane	AI review
24CVD705387-999	E.L.M. v. I.T.M.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Nora Elowen Castellane	AI review
24CVD625927-999	I.D.A. v. C.L.W.	Defendant	Final judgment, no trial	Tie / split	Cora Delyth Netherby	Asked vs. got
24CVD837899-999	O.P.G. v. I.E.F.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Miriam Isadora Aldercott	AI review
24CVD447532-999	H.D.C. v. K.D.C.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Lydia Bronwen Haversham	AI review
24CVD418200-999	G.B.S. v. W.S.H.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Iris Ffion Quarrington	AI review
24CVD510475-999	G.J.W. v. I.C.W.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Philip Gethin Deverill	AI review
24CVD815577-999	J.I.N. v. A.I.H.	Defendant	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Dane Perrin Rosswick	AI review
24CVD661491-999	J.P.W. v. N.L.W.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Tie / split	Nora Elowen Castellane	Asked vs. got
24CVD822334-999	T.P.I. v. G.L.I.	Plaintiff	Voluntary dismissal	Own claims dismissed	Nora Elowen Castellane	AI review
23CVD666477-999	A.E.Y. v. F.R.Y.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Cora Delyth Netherby	AI review
23CVD845051-999	B.F.U. v. P.B.R.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Elliot Idris Montgarde	AI review
23CVD793964-999	P.F.G. v. P.T.G.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven	AI review
23CVD739657-999	D.H.E. v. L.I.P.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Tie / split	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven	Asked vs. got
23CVD847936-999	D.O.T. v. S.A.G.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Nora Elowen Castellane	AI review

CASE NO.	CAPTION	CLIENT	COURT DISPOSITION	COUNTED AS	JUDGE	SOURCE
23CVD513514-999	A.I.G. v. R.A.S.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Cora Delyth Netherby	AI review
23CVD591382-999	N.H.O. v. C.Z.I.	Defendant	Trial by judge	Not credited	Calvin Fintan Bristowe	AI review
23CVD475795-999	V.R.P. v. B.K.P.	Defendant	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Nora Elowen Castellane	AI review
23CVD824921-999	E.D.L. v. H.A.L.	Defendant	Trial by judge	Win	Cora Delyth Netherby	Asked vs. got
23CVD811754-999	P.S.S. v. C.E.S.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Hugh Odhran Pendlebury	AI review
23CVD705997-999	J.T.C. v. I.E.C.	Defendant	Trial by judge	Loss	Elliot Idris Montgarde	Asked vs. got
23CVD496017-999	M.D.B. v. G.R.B.	Plaintiff	Voluntary dismissal	Own claims dismissed	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven	AI review
22CVD434892-999	F.L.H. v. O.I.H.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Miriam Isadora Aldercott	AI review
22CVD427652-999	I.F.F. v. Q.M.F.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Dane Perrin Rosswick	AI review
22CVD882745-999	R.I.R. v. A.P.R.	Plaintiff	Voluntary dismissal	Own claims dismissed	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe	AI review
22CVD728833-999	E.A.T. v. M.H.T.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Cora Delyth Netherby	AI review
22CVD778253-999	C.W.D. v. A.T.Q.	Defendant	Final judgment, no trial	Tie / split	Marcus Emrys Iversley	Asked vs. got
22CVD772344-999	L.R.W. v. D.E.W.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Nora Elowen Castellane	AI review
22CVD680883-999	F.M.M. v. O.B.M.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Miriam Isadora Aldercott	AI review
22CVD683421-999	E.T.F. v. M.D.S.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Marcus Emrys Iversley	AI review
22CV454978-999	D.C.B. v. H.V.B.	Defendant	Final judgment, no trial	Win	Iris Ffion Quarrington	Asked vs. got
22CVD468404-999	H.T.W. v. E.C.W.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Greta Lowri Ellsmere	AI review
22CVD508741-999	J.E.K. v. L.D.A.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Win	Nora Elowen Castellane	Asked vs. got

CASE NO.	CAPTION	CLIENT	COURT DISPOSITION	COUNTED AS	JUDGE	SOURCE
22CVD823541-999	N.R.S. v. L.E.S.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Philip Gethin Deverill	AI review
21CVD759389-999	D.Y.N. v. T.A.B.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Nora Elowen Castellane	AI review
21CVD893492-999	T.A.F. v. B.I.F.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unknown	Greta Lowri Ellsmere	AI review
21CVD575303-999	O.A.L. v. L.H.L.	Defendant	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Miriam Isadora Aldercott	AI review
21CVD529015-999	H.P.M. v. F.L.O.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Not credited	Greta Lowri Ellsmere	AI review
21CVD885264-999	M.H.D. v. E.M.A.	Defendant	Trial by judge	Loss	Simon Caradoc Ketteridge	Asked vs. got
21CVD574049-999	T.R.T. v. L.B.P.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Dane Perrin Rosswick	AI review
21CVD762354-999	C.K.Q. v. M.T.M.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Greta Lowri Ellsmere	AI review
21CVD784175-999	P.L.C. v. C.V.C.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Tie / split	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe	Asked vs. got
21CVD789918-999	S.I.W. v. G.E.W.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Greta Lowri Ellsmere	AI review
21CVD791778-999	F.M.A. v. O.I.A.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Tie / split	Owen Tiernan Fairclothe	Asked vs. got
21CVD763106-999	B.D.C. v. B.C.C.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Lydia Bronwen Haversham	AI review
20CVD600023-999	L.R.L. v. N.L.B.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven	AI review
20CVD578489-999	B.M.M. v. G.P.O.	Defendant	Final judgment, no trial	Tie / split	Dane Perrin Rosswick	Asked vs. got
20CV520579-999	H.E.K. v. N.Z.Y.	Plaintiff	Other	Unopposed	—	AI review
20CVD843625-999	Y.E.C. v. I.W.C.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Marcus Emrys Iversley	AI review

CASE NO.	CAPTION	CLIENT	COURT DISPOSITION	COUNTED AS	JUDGE	SOURCE
20CVD567105-999	C.I.D. v. P.L.D.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Unopposed	Hugh Odhran Pendlebury	AI review
20CVD606448-999	M.D.L. v. E.I.C.	Plaintiff	Voluntary dismissal	Own claims dismissed	—	AI review
20CVD803047-999	H.M.C. v. A.E.G.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Win	Miriam Isadora Aldercott	Asked vs. got
20CVD861454-999	L.D.I. v. L.C.I.	Defendant	Final judgment, no trial	Not credited	Philip Gethin Deverill	Asked vs. got
20CVD647851-999	O.P.D. v. H.E.E.	—	Trial by judge	Unknown	—	Index
19CV604697-999	L.S.T. v. W.A.U.	Defendant	Other	Unknown	Philip Gethin Deverill	AI review
19CVD577273-999	N.I.J. v. C.M.R.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Hugh Odhran Pendlebury	AI review
19CVD528662-999	J.M.G. v. C.G.G.	Plaintiff	Voluntary dismissal	Own claims dismissed	Adele Heulwen Lockhaven	AI review
19CVD790705-999	E.V.S. v. O.E.S.	Defendant	Final judgment, no trial	Unknown	Dane Perrin Rosswick	AI review
19CVD743710-999	Z.A.M. v. I.B.M.	Plaintiff	Final judgment, no trial	Tie / split	Miriam Isadora Aldercott	Asked vs. got
19CVD561602-999	N.O.N. v. V.E.E.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Loss	Lydia Bronwen Haversham	Asked vs. got
19CVD795413-999	A.O.P. v. A.T.K.	Plaintiff	Trial by judge	Unopposed	Iris Ffion Quarrington	AI review
19CVD724348-999	L.J.M. v. U.G.M.	—	Trial by judge	Unknown	—	Index

APPENDIX B

Method, sources & limits

Where the data comes from

- nc_ecourts: samples/demo (fictional data from tools/make_demo_data.py) — imported 2026-11-22T09:00:00; 80 cases indexed, 78 with docket

Case search results, registers of actions (parties, counsel, events, hearings, judgments) and the public PDF filings are collected from the North Carolina eCourts portal. Each PDF's text is extracted (OCR for scanned pages) and kept with its page numbers.

How results are decided

1. **Document review:** AI reads each substantive PDF on its own (routine paperwork whose effect the docket already records is skipped) and records what it is, what it asks for or orders, money terms, and anything notable about counsel's work, with page citations.
2. **Case review:** AI combines the docket and all document reviews into a per-side outcome (definitions on the contents page), a contest level, issues, timeline and observations. Every call carries a confidence level.
3. **Asked vs. got (custody and contested cases):** AI lists each side's requests from its own pleadings and what the orders gave, topic by topic, with the counsel on the case at each decision. Code turns that into a weighted share of the client's requests obtained (win ≥ 67%, loss ≤ 33%), counting only topics decided while this attorney was counsel.
4. **Docket rules (fallback):** cases without an AI review are scored by fixed rules on the docket alone (for example, an absolute divorce granted with no answer or counterclaim = Uncontested). These are marked “Docket rules”, usually with low or medium confidence.
5. **Statistics** are computed only from those classifications; the AI never sets a count. Grades use the published rules on the Grades page and are withheld when the data is too thin.

Coverage

Cases found	80
Dockets collected	78
Cases with downloaded documents	71
Documents downloaded / total on dockets	586 / 650
Documents AI-reviewed	238
Routine filings not sent for AI review (cover sheets, SCRA declarations, summonses, service papers, hearing notices)	348
Cases AI-reviewed	78
Cases where this attorney was not on the collected docket	0

Limits

- Public dockets do not show private settlements, attorney fees charged, client satisfaction, or work done outside court.
- Family cases often end by agreement; a “tie” can still be a good result for the client.
- Small samples swing percentages; grades need minimum case counts and use a smoothed score.
- Reference times in Section 6 are provisional and will be replaced by peer medians.
- Names are matched by the court's attorney ID and printed name; an attorney with a common name should be checked against the case files.

Disclaimer

This report summarizes public court records. It is not legal advice, not an endorsement or rating by any court or State Bar, and not a prediction of any future case. Records may be incomplete or contain errors; verify important facts with the Clerk of Superior Court. Party names appear as initials; minor children are never named.

Report data schema firmbinder.report_card/1 · generated 2026-11-22T09:56:07 · synthesis by demo-generator .

APPENDIX C

Filings needed to verify outcomes

13 custody or contested case(s) can't be fully verified from what is public or downloaded. These filings would settle what each side asked for or what the court ordered. Files from before the county moved to eCourts usually have to be requested from the Clerk of Superior Court.

25CVD507814-999 partial

- Exhibits to the plaintiff's verified complaint (sealed) (Would confirm the plaintiff's original request for supervised visits)

24CVD661491-999 partial

- Mediated settlement memorandum (signed at mediation, not filed) (Would confirm the alimony and property terms agreed)

23CVD824921-999 partial

- Order on the plaintiff's contempt motion (entered from the bench; only the docket entry is public) (Confirms the contempt ruling the custody order refers to)

23CVD705997-999 partial

- Trial transcript (not ordered) (Would show the evidence on the parties' budgets)

22CVD778253-999 partial

- Child support worksheet attached to the consent order (not in the public copy) (Would confirm the incomes used)

22CV454978-999 partial

- Plaintiff's response brief to the summary-judgment motion (served, not filed) (Would show what the plaintiff argued against the motion)

21CVD893492-999 unverified

- seq 1 — Final order entered August 23, 2022 (not downloaded) (The order's terms decide the result)
- Defendant's answer (filed on paper; not on the portal) (Would show the defendant's requests)

21CVD885264-999 partial

- Transcript of the July 2022 custody trial (not ordered by either side) (Would show what each side argued at trial)

21CVD784175-999 partial

- Equitable distribution inventory affidavits (served, not filed) (Would verify the values used in the split)

21CVD791778-999 partial

- Equitable distribution affidavits and the property spreadsheet (not filed publicly) (Would verify the property values behind the split)

19CVD790705-999 unverified

- seq 1 — Custody Order entered February 18, 2020 (docket entry only; the scanned order is not available) (The order's terms decide the result)
- seq 7 — Plaintiff's complaint (legacy paper file, not scanned) (Would show what the plaintiff asked for)

19CVD743710-999 partial

- Parenting agreement reached in custody mediation (confidential; only the approving order is public) (Would show the full schedule the parties agreed)

19CVD561602-999 unverified

- seq 1 — Order on Motion to Modify Custody (only the docket entry is public) (The order's findings would verify the ruling)
- seq 2 — Defendant's response to the motion to modify (Would show what the defendant asked for)

APPENDIX D

Case lists

The cases behind every card in the report. Each line shows the case number, how it counted (**W** win, **T** tie, **L** loss, **U** unopposed, **D** client dropped own claims, **NC** not credited, **?** unknown) and the deciding judge. Case numbers link to the case files.

Grades by kind of case

Divorce (45)

U 19CVD577273-999 Pendlebury U 19CVD795413-999 Quarrington U 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury U 20CVD600023-999 Lockhaven
D 20CVD606448-999 U 20CVD843625-999 Iversley U 21CVD574049-999 Rosswick U 21CVD575303-999 Aldercott
U 21CVD759389-999 Castellane U 21CVD762354-999 Ellsmere U 21CVD763106-999 Haversham U 21CVD789918-999 Ellsmere
U 22CVD427652-999 Rosswick U 22CVD434892-999 Aldercott U 22CVD468404-999 Ellsmere U 22CVD680883-999 Aldercott
U 22CVD683421-999 Iversley U 22CVD728833-999 Netherby U 22CVD772344-999 Castellane U 22CVD823541-999 Deverill
U 23CVD475795-999 Castellane U 23CVD513514-999 Netherby U 23CVD666477-999 Netherby U 23CVD793964-999 Lockhaven
U 23CVD811754-999 Pendlebury U 23CVD845051-999 Montgarde U 23CVD847936-999 Castellane U 24CVD418200-999 Quarrington
U 24CVD447532-999 Haversham U 24CVD466077-999 Castellane U 24CVD510475-999 Deverill U 24CVD705387-999 Castellane
U 24CVD733194-999 Castellane U 24CVD815577-999 Rosswick U 24CVD837899-999 Aldercott U 25CVD572297-999 Lockhaven
U 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD618703-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD619474-999 Lockhaven U 25CVD681803-999 Bristowe
U 25CVD749053-999 Iversley U 26CVD418644-999 Haversham U 26CVD513993-999 Quarrington U 26CVD593819-999 Haversham
U 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe

Child custody (25)

D 19CVD528662-999 Lockhaven L 19CVD561602-999 Haversham T 19CVD743710-999 Aldercott ? 19CVD790705-999 Rosswick
T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick W 20CVD803047-999 Aldercott NC 20CVD861454-999 Deverill NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere
T 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge ? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane
T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley D 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe T 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven
W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington
T 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge P 26CVD663278-999 Netherby
P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane

Child support (13)

T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick W 20CVD803047-999 Aldercott NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge
? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley D 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe
D 23CVD496017-999 Lockhaven T 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington
W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane

Property division (ED) (5)

T 21CVD784175-999 Fairclothe T 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane D 24CVD822334-999 Castellane
P 25CVD712012-999 Castellane

Alimony & PSS (3)

L 23CVD705997-999 Montgarde T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane P 25CVD712012-999 Castellane

Contempt (3)

W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge

Modifications (3)

L 19CVD561602-999 Haversham NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington T 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde

Civil lawsuits (3)

? 19CV604697-999 Deverill U 20CV520579-999 W 22CV454978-999 Quarrington

Case types at a glance

All custody-related cases (25)

D 19CVD528662-999 Lockhaven L 19CVD561602-999 Haversham T 19CVD743710-999 Aldercott ? 19CVD790705-999 Rosswick
T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick W 20CVD803047-999 Aldercott NC 20CVD861454-999 Deverill NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere
T 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge ? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane
T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley D 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe T 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven
W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington
T 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge P 26CVD663278-999 Netherby
P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane

Everything else (no custody claim) (55)

? 19CV604697-999 Deverill U 19CVD577273-999 Pendlebury ? 19CVD724348-999 U 19CVD795413-999 Quarrington
U 20CV520579-999 U 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury U 20CVD600023-999 Lockhaven D 20CVD606448-999 ? 20CVD647851-999
U 20CVD843625-999 Iversley U 21CVD574049-999 Rosswick U 21CVD575303-999 Aldercott U 21CVD759389-999 Castellane
U 21CVD762354-999 Ellsmere U 21CVD763106-999 Haversham T 21CVD784175-999 Fairclothe U 21CVD789918-999 Ellsmere
W 22CV454978-999 Quarrington U 22CVD427652-999 Rosswick U 22CVD434892-999 Aldercott U 22CVD468404-999 Ellsmere
U 22CVD680883-999 Aldercott U 22CVD683421-999 Iversley U 22CVD728833-999 Netherby U 22CVD772344-999 Castellane
U 22CVD823541-999 Deverill U 23CVD475795-999 Castellane D 23CVD496017-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD513514-999 Netherby
U 23CVD666477-999 Netherby L 23CVD705997-999 Montgarde U 23CVD793964-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD811754-999 Pendlebury
U 23CVD845051-999 Montgarde U 23CVD847936-999 Castellane U 24CVD418200-999 Quarrington
U 24CVD447532-999 Haversham U 24CVD466077-999 Castellane U 24CVD510475-999 Deverill U 24CVD705387-999 Castellane
U 24CVD733194-999 Castellane U 24CVD815577-999 Rosswick D 24CVD822334-999 Castellane U 24CVD837899-999 Aldercott
U 25CVD572297-999 Lockhaven U 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD618703-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD619474-999 Lockhaven
U 25CVD681803-999 Bristowe P 25CVD712012-999 Castellane U 25CVD749053-999 Iversley U 26CVD418644-999 Haversham
U 26CVD513993-999 Quarrington U 26CVD593819-999 Haversham U 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe

Child custody (25)

D 19CVD528662-999 Lockhaven L 19CVD561602-999 Haversham T 19CVD743710-999 Aldercott ? 19CVD790705-999 Rosswick
T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick W 20CVD803047-999 Aldercott NC 20CVD861454-999 Deverill NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere
T 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge ? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane
T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley D 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe T 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven
W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington
T 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge P 26CVD663278-999 Netherby
P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane

Child support (1)

D 23CVD496017-999 Lockhaven

Equitable distribution (3)

T 21CVD784175-999 Fairclothe D 24CVD822334-999 Castellane P 25CVD712012-999 Castellane

Alimony (1)

L 23CVD705997-999 Montgarde

Absolute divorce (45)

U 19CVD577273-999 Pendlebury U 19CVD795413-999 Quarrington U 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury U 20CVD600023-999 Lockhaven
D 20CVD606448-999 U 20CVD843625-999 Iversley U 21CVD574049-999 Rosswick U 21CVD575303-999 Aldercott
U 21CVD759389-999 Castellane U 21CVD762354-999 Ellsmere U 21CVD763106-999 Haversham U 21CVD789918-999 Ellsmere
U 22CVD427652-999 Rosswick U 22CVD434892-999 Aldercott U 22CVD468404-999 Ellsmere U 22CVD680883-999 Aldercott
U 22CVD683421-999 Iversley U 22CVD728833-999 Netherby U 22CVD772344-999 Castellane U 22CVD823541-999 Deverill
U 23CVD475795-999 Castellane U 23CVD513514-999 Netherby U 23CVD666477-999 Netherby U 23CVD793964-999 Lockhaven
U 23CVD811754-999 Pendlebury U 23CVD845051-999 Montgarde U 23CVD847936-999 Castellane U 24CVD418200-999 Quarrington
U 24CVD447532-999 Haversham U 24CVD466077-999 Castellane U 24CVD510475-999 Deverill U 24CVD705387-999 Castellane
U 24CVD733194-999 Castellane U 24CVD815577-999 Rosswick U 24CVD837899-999 Aldercott U 25CVD572297-999 Lockhaven
U 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD618703-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD619474-999 Lockhaven U 25CVD681803-999 Bristowe
U 25CVD749053-999 Iversley U 26CVD418644-999 Haversham U 26CVD513993-999 Quarrington U 26CVD593819-999 Haversham
U 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe

Civil damages (1)

? 19CV604697-999 Deverill

Contract (1)

W 22CV454978-999 Quarrington

Collections (1)

U 20CV520579-999

Docket not collected (2)

? 19CVD724348-999 ? 20CVD647851-999

Courtroom events: Continuances

Her client's side (3)

L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane

Other side (11)

T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge ? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere
W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby
T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane

Courtroom events: Withdrawals / releases of counsel*

Her client's side (7)

U 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley U 23CVD475795-999 Castellane
NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe U 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe U 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe

Courtroom events: Substitutions of counsel

Her client's side (3)

NC 20CVD861454-999 Deverill NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington

Courtroom events: Contempt / show cause

Other side (3)

W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge

Courtroom events: Discovery disputes

Other side (1)

? 19CV604697-999 Deverill

Courtroom events: Fee awards

Court (1)

W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane

By judge

Nora Elowen Castellane (12)

U 21CVD759389-999 Castellane W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane U 22CVD772344-999 Castellane U 23CVD475795-999 Castellane
U 23CVD847936-999 Castellane U 24CVD466077-999 Castellane T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane U 24CVD705387-999 Castellane
U 24CVD733194-999 Castellane D 24CVD822334-999 Castellane P 25CVD712012-999 Castellane P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane

Adele Heulwen Lockhaven (7)

D 19CVD528662-999 Lockhaven U 20CVD600023-999 Lockhaven D 23CVD496017-999 Lockhaven T 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven
U 23CVD793964-999 Lockhaven U 25CVD572297-999 Lockhaven U 25CVD619474-999 Lockhaven

Cora Delyth Netherby (6)

U 22CVD728833-999 Netherby U 23CVD513514-999 Netherby U 23CVD666477-999 Netherby W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby
T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby P 26CVD663278-999 Netherby

Miriam Isadora Aldercott (6)

T 19CVD743710-999 Aldercott W 20CVD803047-999 Aldercott U 21CVD575303-999 Aldercott U 22CVD434892-999 Aldercott
U 22CVD680883-999 Aldercott U 24CVD837899-999 Aldercott

Owen Tiernan Fairclothe (6)

T 21CVD784175-999 Fairclothe T 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe D 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe
U 25CVD618703-999 Fairclothe U 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe

Dane Perrin Rosswick (5)

? 19CVD790705-999 Rosswick T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick U 21CVD574049-999 Rosswick U 22CVD427652-999 Rosswick
U 24CVD815577-999 Rosswick

Greta Lowri Ellsmere (5)

NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere U 21CVD762354-999 Ellsmere U 21CVD789918-999 Ellsmere ? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere
U 22CVD468404-999 Ellsmere

Iris Ffion Quarrington (5)

U 19CVD795413-999 Quarrington W 22CV454978-999 Quarrington U 24CVD418200-999 Quarrington
NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington U 26CVD513993-999 Quarrington

Lydia Bronwen Haversham (5)

L 19CVD561602-999 Haversham U 21CVD763106-999 Haversham U 24CVD447532-999 Haversham U 26CVD418644-999 Haversham
U 26CVD593819-999 Haversham

Hugh Odhran Pendlebury (4)

U 19CVD577273-999 Pendlebury U 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury U 23CVD811754-999 Pendlebury W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury

Marcus Emrys Iversley (4)

U 20CVD843625-999 Iversley U 22CVD683421-999 Iversley T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley U 25CVD749053-999 Iversley

Philip Gethin Deverill (4)

? 19CV604697-999 Deverill NC 20CVD861454-999 Deverill U 22CVD823541-999 Deverill U 24CVD510475-999 Deverill

Elliot Idris Montgarde (3)

L 23CVD705997-999 Montgarde U 23CVD845051-999 Montgarde T 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde

Calvin Fintan Bristowe (2)

NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe U 25CVD681803-999 Bristowe

Simon Caradoc Ketteridge (2)

L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge

By opposing counsel (head-to-head)

(other side had no lawyer) (40)

U 19CVD577273-999 Pendlebury U 19CVD795413-999 Quarrington U 20CV520579-999 U 20CVD600023-999 Lockhaven
D 20CVD606448-999 W 20CVD803047-999 Aldercott U 20CVD843625-999 Iversley U 21CVD574049-999 Rosswick
U 21CVD759389-999 Castellane U 21CVD763106-999 Haversham U 21CVD789918-999 Ellsmere U 22CVD427652-999 Rosswick
U 22CVD434892-999 Aldercott U 22CVD468404-999 Ellsmere U 22CVD680883-999 Aldercott U 22CVD683421-999 Iversley
U 22CVD772344-999 Castellane U 22CVD823541-999 Deverill D 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe D 23CVD496017-999 Lockhaven
U 23CVD513514-999 Netherby U 23CVD666477-999 Netherby U 23CVD793964-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD845051-999 Montgarde
U 23CVD847936-999 Castellane U 24CVD418200-999 Quarrington U 24CVD466077-999 Castellane U 24CVD510475-999 Deverill
U 24CVD705387-999 Castellane U 24CVD733194-999 Castellane U 24CVD837899-999 Aldercott U 25CVD572297-999 Lockhaven
U 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD618703-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD681803-999 Bristowe U 25CVD749053-999 Iversley
D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge U 26CVD513993-999 Quarrington U 26CVD593819-999 Haversham U 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe

Brenna Lavinia Talloway (5)

L 19CVD561602-999 Haversham T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane U 23CVD475795-999 Castellane
P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane

Piers Aurelian Ballantrae (3)

U 23CVD811754-999 Pendlebury T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury

Sabine Ysolde Lochranza (3)

U 22CVD728833-999 Netherby W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby

Garrick Wystan Kilbrannan (2)

L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe

Heddwyn Carys Dalmally (2)

U 21CVD762354-999 Ellsmere U 26CVD418644-999 Haversham

Sioned Elidir Ettrickdale (2)

U 21CVD575303-999 Aldercott U 24CVD447532-999 Haversham

Angharad Tudur Lammermoor (1)

U 25CVD619474-999 Lockhaven

Bleddyn Iolo Corriemoor (1)

P 26CVD663278-999 Netherby

Cadfael Rhodri Urquhardt (1)

P 25CVD712012-999 Castellane

Derwa Cynan Pentlande (1)
U 24CVD815577-999 Rosswick

Dorian Merrick Gowanbank (1)
T 19CVD743710-999 Aldercott

Eluned Morwenna Pitcaithly (1)
? 19CV604697-999 Deverill

Esme Rhiannon Drummellan (1)
T 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe

Finlo Brioc Ormistoun (1)
W 22CV454978-999 Quarrington

Gwenllian Maelon Rosslyne (1)
? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere

Gwynfor Madoc Kinlochard (1)
U 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury

Hollis Tobiah Eskdale (1)
T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley

Ingram Bastian Valleyfield (1)
NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere

Linnea Vesper Cromartie (1)
L 23CVD705997-999 Montgarde

Marlowe Nesta Aberfoyle (1)
NC 20CVD861454-999 Deverill

Niamh Isolt Whittingehame (1)
D 24CVD822334-999 Castellane

Oriana Sorcha Fincastle (1)
T 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven

Talfryn Owain Quarrelwood (1)
? 19CVD790705-999 Rosswick

Tegwen Aeron Braemore (1)
D 19CVD528662-999 Lockhaven

Tierney Caerwyn Montrosse (1)
T 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde

Yvaine Llewela Newbattle (1)
T 21CVD784175-999 Fairclothe

Zephyrine Greer Invermay (1)
NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington

Other side represented vs. self-represented

Other side had no lawyer (40)

U 19CVD577273-999 Pendlebury U 19CVD795413-999 Quarrington U 20CV520579-999 U 20CVD600023-999 Lockhaven
D 20CVD606448-999 W 20CVD803047-999 Aldercott U 20CVD843625-999 Iversley U 21CVD574049-999 Rosswick
U 21CVD759389-999 Castellane U 21CVD763106-999 Haversham U 21CVD789918-999 Ellsmere U 22CVD427652-999 Rosswick
U 22CVD434892-999 Aldercott U 22CVD468404-999 Ellsmere U 22CVD680883-999 Aldercott U 22CVD683421-999 Iversley
U 22CVD772344-999 Castellane U 22CVD823541-999 Deverill D 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe D 23CVD496017-999 Lockhaven
U 23CVD513514-999 Netherby U 23CVD666477-999 Netherby U 23CVD793964-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD845051-999 Montgarde
U 23CVD847936-999 Castellane U 24CVD418200-999 Quarrington U 24CVD466077-999 Castellane U 24CVD510475-999 Deverill
U 24CVD705387-999 Castellane U 24CVD733194-999 Castellane U 24CVD837899-999 Aldercott U 25CVD572297-999 Lockhaven
U 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD618703-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD681803-999 Bristowe U 25CVD749053-999 Iversley
D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge U 26CVD513993-999 Quarrington U 26CVD593819-999 Haversham U 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe

Other side had a lawyer (38)

? 19CV604697-999 Deverill D 19CVD528662-999 Lockhaven L 19CVD561602-999 Haversham T 19CVD743710-999 Aldercott
? 19CVD790705-999 Rosswick U 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick NC 20CVD861454-999 Deverill
NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere U 21CVD575303-999 Aldercott U 21CVD762354-999 Ellsmere T 21CVD784175-999 Fairclothe
T 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge ? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere W 22CV454978-999 Quarrington
W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane U 22CVD728833-999 Netherby T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley U 23CVD475795-999 Castellane
NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe L 23CVD705997-999 Montgarde T 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD811754-999 Pendlebury
W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby U 24CVD447532-999 Haversham T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane
NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington U 24CVD815577-999 Rosswick D 24CVD822334-999 Castellane T 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde
W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury U 25CVD619474-999 Lockhaven P 25CVD712012-999 Castellane U 26CVD418644-999 Haversham
P 26CVD663278-999 Netherby P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane

By client role

Represented the plaintiff (61)

D 19CVD528662-999 Lockhaven L 19CVD561602-999 Haversham U 19CVD577273-999 Pendlebury T 19CVD743710-999 Aldercott
U 19CVD795413-999 Quarrington U 20CV520579-999 U 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury U 20CVD600023-999 Lockhaven
D 20CVD606448-999 W 20CVD803047-999 Aldercott U 20CVD843625-999 Iversley NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere
U 21CVD574049-999 Rosswick U 21CVD759389-999 Castellane U 21CVD762354-999 Ellsmere U 21CVD763106-999 Haversham
T 21CVD784175-999 Fairclothe U 21CVD789918-999 Ellsmere T 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe ? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere
U 22CVD427652-999 Rosswick U 22CVD434892-999 Aldercott U 22CVD468404-999 Ellsmere W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane
U 22CVD680883-999 Aldercott U 22CVD683421-999 Iversley U 22CVD728833-999 Netherby U 22CVD772344-999 Castellane
U 22CVD823541-999 Deverill D 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe D 23CVD496017-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD513514-999 Netherby
U 23CVD666477-999 Netherby T 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD793964-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD811754-999 Pendlebury
U 23CVD845051-999 Montgarde U 23CVD847936-999 Castellane U 24CVD418200-999 Quarrington
U 24CVD447532-999 Haversham U 24CVD466077-999 Castellane U 24CVD510475-999 Deverill T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane
U 24CVD705387-999 Castellane U 24CVD733194-999 Castellane NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington
D 24CVD822334-999 Castellane U 24CVD837899-999 Aldercott T 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde U 25CVD572297-999 Lockhaven
U 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD618703-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD681803-999 Bristowe P 25CVD712012-999 Castellane
U 25CVD749053-999 Iversley D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge U 26CVD418644-999 Haversham U 26CVD513993-999 Quarrington
U 26CVD593819-999 Haversham U 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane

Represented the defendant (17)

? 19CV604697-999 Deverill ? 19CVD790705-999 Rosswick T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick NC 20CVD861454-999 Deverill
U 21CVD575303-999 Aldercott L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge W 22CV454978-999 Quarrington T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley
U 23CVD475795-999 Castellane NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe L 23CVD705997-999 Montgarde W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby
T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby U 24CVD815577-999 Rosswick W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury U 25CVD619474-999 Lockhaven
P 26CVD663278-999 Netherby

How cases ended

Unopposed hearing (26)

U 19CVD577273-999 Pendlebury U 19CVD795413-999 Quarrington U 20CVD843625-999 Iversley U 21CVD759389-999 Castellane
U 21CVD763106-999 Haversham U 21CVD789918-999 Ellsmere U 22CVD427652-999 Rosswick U 22CVD434892-999 Aldercott
U 22CVD683421-999 Iversley U 22CVD728833-999 Netherby U 22CVD772344-999 Castellane U 23CVD475795-999 Castellane
U 23CVD513514-999 Netherby U 23CVD793964-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD845051-999 Montgarde U 23CVD847936-999 Castellane
U 24CVD418200-999 Quarrington U 24CVD510475-999 Deverill U 24CVD705387-999 Castellane U 24CVD733194-999 Castellane
U 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD618703-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD619474-999 Lockhaven U 25CVD681803-999 Bristowe
U 25CVD749053-999 Iversley U 26CVD418644-999 Haversham

Summary judgment (19)

U 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury U 20CVD600023-999 Lockhaven U 21CVD574049-999 Rosswick U 21CVD575303-999 Aldercott
U 21CVD762354-999 Ellsmere W 22CV454978-999 Quarrington U 22CVD468404-999 Ellsmere U 22CVD680883-999 Aldercott
U 22CVD823541-999 Deverill U 23CVD666477-999 Netherby U 23CVD811754-999 Pendlebury U 24CVD447532-999 Haversham
U 24CVD466077-999 Castellane U 24CVD815577-999 Rosswick U 24CVD837899-999 Aldercott U 25CVD572297-999 Lockhaven
U 26CVD513993-999 Quarrington U 26CVD593819-999 Haversham U 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe

Consent order (10)

T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick NC 20CVD861454-999 Deverill NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere T 21CVD784175-999 Fairclothe
T 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane
NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington T 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde

Trial (judge) (8)

L 19CVD561602-999 Haversham W 20CVD803047-999 Aldercott L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane
NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe L 23CVD705997-999 Montgarde W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury

Voluntary dismissal (6)

D 19CVD528662-999 Lockhaven D 20CVD606448-999 D 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe D 23CVD496017-999 Lockhaven
D 24CVD822334-999 Castellane D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge

Pending (3)

P 25CVD712012-999 Castellane P 26CVD663278-999 Netherby P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane

Unknown (3)

? 19CV604697-999 Deverill ? 19CVD790705-999 Rosswick ? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere

Mediated agreement (2)

T 19CVD743710-999 Aldercott T 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven

Trial by judge (2)

? 19CVD724348-999 ? 20CVD647851-999

Default judgment (1)

U 20CV520579-999

By how hard the case was fought

None (48)

U 19CVD577273-999 Pendlebury U 19CVD795413-999 Quarrington U 20CV520579-999 U 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury
U 20CVD600023-999 Lockhaven D 20CVD606448-999 U 20CVD843625-999 Iversley U 21CVD574049-999 Rosswick
U 21CVD575303-999 Aldercott U 21CVD759389-999 Castellane U 21CVD762354-999 Ellsmere U 21CVD763106-999 Haversham
U 21CVD789918-999 Ellsmere U 22CVD427652-999 Rosswick U 22CVD434892-999 Aldercott U 22CVD468404-999 Ellsmere
U 22CVD680883-999 Aldercott U 22CVD683421-999 Iversley U 22CVD728833-999 Netherby U 22CVD772344-999 Castellane
U 22CVD823541-999 Deverill D 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe U 23CVD475795-999 Castellane D 23CVD496017-999 Lockhaven
U 23CVD513514-999 Netherby U 23CVD666477-999 Netherby U 23CVD793964-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD811754-999 Pendlebury
U 23CVD845051-999 Montgarde U 23CVD847936-999 Castellane U 24CVD418200-999 Quarrington
U 24CVD447532-999 Haversham U 24CVD466077-999 Castellane U 24CVD510475-999 Deverill U 24CVD705387-999 Castellane
U 24CVD733194-999 Castellane U 24CVD815577-999 Rosswick U 24CVD837899-999 Aldercott U 25CVD572297-999 Lockhaven
U 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD618703-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD619474-999 Lockhaven U 25CVD681803-999 Bristowe
U 25CVD749053-999 Iversley U 26CVD418644-999 Haversham U 26CVD513993-999 Quarrington U 26CVD593819-999 Haversham
U 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe

Moderate (18)

? 19CV604697-999 Deverill T 19CVD743710-999 Aldercott ? 19CVD790705-999 Rosswick T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick
NC 20CVD861454-999 Deverill NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere T 21CVD784175-999 Fairclothe T 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe
? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley T 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby
T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington T 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde P 25CVD712012-999 Castellane
P 26CVD663278-999 Netherby P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane

High (9)

L 19CVD561602-999 Haversham W 20CVD803047-999 Aldercott L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge W 22CV454978-999 Quarrington
W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe L 23CVD705997-999 Montgarde W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby
W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury

Low (3)

D 19CVD528662-999 Lockhaven D 24CVD822334-999 Castellane D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge

Not reviewed (2)

? 19CVD724348-999 ? 20CVD647851-999

Alone vs. with co-counsel

No co-counsel on the docket (65)

? 19CV604697-999 Deverill D 19CVD528662-999 Lockhaven L 19CVD561602-999 Haversham T 19CVD743710-999 Aldercott
? 19CVD790705-999 Rosswick U 19CVD795413-999 Quarrington U 20CV520579-999 U 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury
T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick U 20CVD600023-999 Lockhaven D 20CVD606448-999 W 20CVD803047-999 Aldercott
U 20CVD843625-999 Iversley NC 20CVD861454-999 Deverill NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere U 21CVD574049-999 Rosswick
U 21CVD575303-999 Aldercott U 21CVD759389-999 Castellane U 21CVD762354-999 Ellsmere U 21CVD763106-999 Haversham
T 21CVD784175-999 Fairclothe U 21CVD789918-999 Ellsmere L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge ? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere
W 22CV454978-999 Quarrington U 22CVD427652-999 Rosswick U 22CVD468404-999 Ellsmere U 22CVD683421-999 Iversley
U 22CVD728833-999 Netherby T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley U 22CVD823541-999 Deverill D 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe
U 23CVD475795-999 Castellane D 23CVD496017-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD513514-999 Netherby NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe
U 23CVD666477-999 Netherby T 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD793964-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD811754-999 Pendlebury
W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby U 23CVD845051-999 Montgarde U 24CVD418200-999 Quarrington U 24CVD447532-999 Haversham
U 24CVD466077-999 Castellane U 24CVD510475-999 Deverill T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby U 24CVD705387-999 Castellane
NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington U 24CVD815577-999 Rosswick D 24CVD822334-999 Castellane U 24CVD837899-999 Aldercott
T 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury U 25CVD572297-999 Lockhaven U 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe
U 25CVD618703-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD619474-999 Lockhaven U 25CVD681803-999 Bristowe U 25CVD749053-999 Iversley
D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge U 26CVD418644-999 Haversham U 26CVD513993-999 Quarrington
U 26CVD593819-999 Haversham P 26CVD663278-999 Netherby

With co-counsel Tessa Corisande Brannigan (11)

U 19CVD577273-999 Pendlebury T 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe U 22CVD434892-999 Aldercott U 22CVD680883-999 Aldercott
U 22CVD772344-999 Castellane L 23CVD705997-999 Montgarde U 23CVD847936-999 Castellane T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane
U 24CVD733194-999 Castellane P 25CVD712012-999 Castellane U 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe

With co-counsel Milo Kenelm Varrenthal (1)

P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane

With co-counsel Tessa Corisande Brannigan, Milo Kenelm Varrenthal (1)

W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane

By court

Example County District Court (80)

? 19CV604697-999 Deverill D 19CVD528662-999 Lockhaven L 19CVD561602-999 Haversham U 19CVD577273-999 Pendlebury
? 19CVD724348-999 T 19CVD743710-999 Aldercott ? 19CVD790705-999 Rosswick U 19CVD795413-999 Quarrington
U 20CV520579-999 U 20CVD567105-999 Pendlebury T 20CVD578489-999 Rosswick U 20CVD600023-999 Lockhaven
D 20CVD606448-999 ? 20CVD647851-999 W 20CVD803047-999 Aldercott U 20CVD843625-999 Iversley
NC 20CVD861454-999 Deverill NC 21CVD529015-999 Ellsmere U 21CVD574049-999 Rosswick U 21CVD575303-999 Aldercott
U 21CVD759389-999 Castellane U 21CVD762354-999 Ellsmere U 21CVD763106-999 Haversham T 21CVD784175-999 Fairclothe
U 21CVD789918-999 Ellsmere T 21CVD791778-999 Fairclothe L 21CVD885264-999 Ketteridge ? 21CVD893492-999 Ellsmere
W 22CV454978-999 Quarrington U 22CVD427652-999 Rosswick U 22CVD434892-999 Aldercott U 22CVD468404-999 Ellsmere
W 22CVD508741-999 Castellane U 22CVD680883-999 Aldercott U 22CVD683421-999 Iversley U 22CVD728833-999 Netherby
U 22CVD772344-999 Castellane T 22CVD778253-999 Iversley U 22CVD823541-999 Deverill D 22CVD882745-999 Fairclothe
U 23CVD475795-999 Castellane D 23CVD496017-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD513514-999 Netherby NC 23CVD591382-999 Bristowe
U 23CVD666477-999 Netherby L 23CVD705997-999 Montgarde T 23CVD739657-999 Lockhaven U 23CVD793964-999 Lockhaven
U 23CVD811754-999 Pendlebury W 23CVD824921-999 Netherby U 23CVD845051-999 Montgarde U 23CVD847936-999 Castellane
U 24CVD418200-999 Quarrington U 24CVD447532-999 Haversham U 24CVD466077-999 Castellane U 24CVD510475-999 Deverill
T 24CVD625927-999 Netherby T 24CVD661491-999 Castellane U 24CVD705387-999 Castellane U 24CVD733194-999 Castellane
NC 24CVD753288-999 Quarrington U 24CVD815577-999 Rosswick D 24CVD822334-999 Castellane U 24CVD837899-999 Aldercott
T 25CVD441029-999 Montgarde W 25CVD507814-999 Pendlebury U 25CVD572297-999 Lockhaven U 25CVD613944-999 Fairclothe
U 25CVD618703-999 Fairclothe U 25CVD619474-999 Lockhaven U 25CVD681803-999 Bristowe P 25CVD712012-999 Castellane
U 25CVD749053-999 Iversley D 25CVD899318-999 Ketteridge U 26CVD418644-999 Haversham U 26CVD513993-999 Quarrington
U 26CVD593819-999 Haversham P 26CVD663278-999 Netherby U 26CVD780583-999 Fairclothe P 26CVD871727-999 Castellane