

FILED

01/29/2025

Bowen Greenwood
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF MONTANA

Case Number: OP 25-0082

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

Case No. OP 25-0082

Jacob Lloydson Elder,

Petitioner,

vs.

FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, MISSOULA COUNTY, MONTANA,
HONORABLE ROBERT L. DESCHAMPS, III, PRESIDING JUDGE,

Respondent

PETITION FOR WRIT OF SUPERVISORY CONTROL

On Petition from the Fourth Judicial District Court

Cause No. DR – 22 – 335

Related Cause No. DR – 24 - 443

Hon. Robert L. Deschamps, III, Presiding Judge

Pro Se:

Jacob L. Elder
5055 Abby Lane, 202
Missoula, MT 59808
(406) 459 – 8395
Jacobyelder34@gmail.com

FILED

JAN 29 2025

Bowen Greenwood
Clerk of Supreme Court
State of Montana

Elder v. Christopher – WRIT

1 of 27

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....2

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES3

ISSUE PRESENTED4,5

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 8-14

ARGUMENT..... 15-22

 I. Judicial bias and conflict of interest..... 15

 II. Gross Misuse of Protective Orders.....15

 III. Non-Adherence to Montana Child Custody Statutes.....16

 IV. Racial and Cultural Bias in Family Law.....17

 V. Due Process for Pro Se Litigants..... 18

 VI. Misconduct in Legal Representation.....18

 VII. Supervised Visitation and Parental Alienation.....19

 VIII. Mental Health Considerations in Custody Cases.....20

 IX. Urgency and Gross Injustice for Supervisory Control.....20

 X. Access to Justice and Legal Representation.....21

CONCLUSION22

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....24

EXHIBIT APPENDIX.....26

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Montana Constitution

- Article II, Section 4 (Equal Protection Clause) 18
- Article II, Section 17 (Due Process) 5,16,19
- Article VII, Section 2(2) (General Supervisory Control) 5, 16

United States Constitution

- Fourteenth Amendment (Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses). 16-18

STATUTES

Federal Statute

- 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. (Americans with Disabilities Act)3,6, 21

State of Montana Statutes

- Mont. Code Ann. § 10 – 2 –401 et seq. (Protection of Veterans)3,11,14-17
- Mont. Code Ann. § 40-4-212 (Best Interest of the Child) 3
- Mont. Code Ann. § 45 – 4 – 234 (Final Parenting Plan Criteria) 16
- Mont. Code Ann. § 45 – 5 – 206 (Protection Orders)3

RULES

Montana Rules of Procedure

M.R. App. P. 14(3)
..... 3

Montana Rules of Professional Conduct

ISSUE PRESENTED

Did the Missoula County Fourth Judicial District Court proceed under multiple mistakes of law, resulting in gross injustices to J.L.E., age three by Issuing and upholding protective orders without sufficient evidence (MCA § 45-5-206; Ex.: M), by failing to adhere to MCA § 40-4-234 in creating parenting plans that neglect J.L.E.'s best interests, including his cultural identity, and by allowing judicial bias from Judge Kim Christopher's familial involvement (Article VII, Section 2(2) of the Montana Constitution; Cause No.: DR-22-364)?

Further, did the court's actions infringe upon Jacob Elder's due process rights under both state (Article II, Section 17) and federal law (Fourteenth Amendment), reflecting racial bias (Article II, Section 4, Montana Constitution; Fourteenth Amendment, U.S. Constitution) in the handling of custody and visitation arrangements, particularly in the use of supervised visitation at facilities like Planet Kids (Ex.: E – Termination Letter from Planet Kids), which might constitute de facto parental alienation?

Did these proceedings, marked by the potential professional misconduct of opposing counsels, Emily Lucas and Brandi Ries, and in lockstep with the University of Montana School of Law, (hereinafter ABII) under the Montana Rules of Professional Conduct alongside the withdrawal of Jacob's legal representation at critical moments (Ex.: E – Motion for Leave to Withdraw), deny Jacob access to

justice, especially considering his status as a pro se litigant, and improperly use his mental health to limit his parental rights, possibly violating the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.)?

Under Mont. R. App. P. 14(3), does this case present an exigency or emergency where the normal appeal process would not provide adequate relief, thereby justifying this Court's exercise of supervisory control to correct these injustices and protect J.L.E.'s right to a relationship with both parents?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Jacob Elder ("Petitioner"), an African American father, Marine Corps veteran (Ex.: E, pgs. 2-3; *DD-214*), and former law student at the University of Montana (hereinafter "ABIII"), respectfully petitions this Honorable Court for a Writ of Supervisory Control. This petition arises due to systemic failures in the Missoula County Fourth Judicial District Court (hereinafter "District Court") regarding child custody, parental rights, and the application of protective orders, which have collectively served to undermine his relationship with his son, Jaxton Elder ("J.L.E."). The following detailed statement of facts presents a timeline of events that justifies this Court's immediate and necessary intervention.

Early Life and Educational Journey:

Jacob was adopted from war-torn Liberia at a young age, growing up in Helena, Montana (Aff. ¶ 1). His educational path took him through local schools,

where he was known for his involvement in football, before enrolling at the University of Montana (hereinafter “UM”) to study Sociology and Criminal Justice (Aff. ¶ 1). Jacob’s academic pursuits were interrupted when he briefly returned to Liberia for closure and then enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in 2013, serving until his honorable discharge in 2017 (Ex.: E, pgs. 2-3; *DD-214*), after which he was diagnosed with chronic depression and anxiety (Ex.: E, pgs. 4-5; *VA disability letter & Meds*).

Upon returning to civilian life, Jacob completed his bachelor's degree at UM and was accepted into the Alexander Blewett III School of Law ("ABIII") in 2019 (Aff. ¶ 1). His tenure at law school was marked by challenges (Ex.: E, including accusations of misconduct from peers, which he attributes to his political campaign for Mayor of Missoula announced in July 2020.

Political Aspirations and Legal Scrutiny:

Jacob's mayoral candidacy was met with significant public and institutional opposition, including the re-opening of an investigation by UM into allegations made by Lindsay Garpestad, which he contends was politically motivated (Ex.: E. pgs. 9-20). The scrutiny of his character during this time had lasting repercussions on his academic and personal life (Aff.).

Family Dynamics and Relationship with Jacey Christopher:

Jacob's romantic relationship with Jacey Christopher ("Jacey") began in 2021, leading to the birth of their son, J.L.E. The relationship was strained by the interference of Jacey's family, particularly her parents, Stacey Mueller ("Mrs. Mueller") and Mike Mueller ("Mr. Mueller"), and her aunt, Kim Christopher ("Judge Christopher"), who is a judge in Missoula County (Ex.: E. pgs. 21-27). Text messages between Jacob and Mrs. Mueller reveal attempts at reconciliation amidst family tension, alongside discussions about the Missoulian's biased coverage of Jacob's political (Ex.: E.).

Legal Proceedings and Custody Disputes:

In May 2022, Jacey filed for a Temporary Order of Protection ("TOP") (Ex.: E. pg. 18), resulting in Jacob's forcible removal from their shared home by law enforcement, an action he describes as traumatic and unsubstantiated by any criminal behavior on his part (Ex.: E. pg. 6 – *VA psychiatrist evaluation*). This was followed by a series of court hearings where Jacob's character and mental health were leveraged to justify limiting his parental rights and interactions with J.L.E. (Ex.: E).

Judicial Bias and Influence:

The June 24, 2022 (Ex.: E. pgs. 21-30) hearing was particularly contentious, with Judge Christopher's testimony appearing to unduly influence proceedings due to her familial relationship with Jacey (Cause No.: DR-22-364). Judge Christopher,

hijacking the hearing as Jacey's sole witness, with only one in-person interaction with the parties and their baby, Judge Christopher stated in part as follows:

1. Before Judge Christopher's involvement, during one of the young couple's disagreements regarding Mrs. Mueller's desire to control the family's financial decisions, among others, Jacey contacted her aunt, Judge Christopher, for mediation (Cause No. DR. 22-364., pg. 55: ¶ 4-25; 56: ¶ 1-4).
2. In testimony, it was revealed that Judge Christopher had taken time away from her court docket to coach Jacey (pg. 53: ¶ 9-13) to seek legal avenues, breaking up the young family and removing Jacob from the parties' young son's life.
3. Jacob and Judge Christopher's first in-person meeting first meeting was initiated by the judge, who invited Jacob to lunch with her adult son (NAME), expressing a desire 'to meet Jacey's boyfriend' (Cause No. DR. 22-364: ¶ 17-25).
4. Regarding the young family parenting, Judge Christopher stated, "*I was terrified because he wouldn't allow her to feed J.L.E.*" (pg. 58, ¶ 17-25).
5. Regarding Jacob's tone on one occasion after the Judge had interfered in the young family's matter, describing what she heard over a phone call while the

young couple argued, Judge Christopher stated in front of her peer, the presiding federal district court judge, *“It was so different than anything I had ever had with him up to that point. He was very polite, courteous, interested. And he was – he was yelling. His tone was raised. At times, he would even lose his ability to find a word or he would stutter. And you could really tell what stuff bothered him and what stuff didn’t because those were the times he was at a loss for words and, yet, he was still struggling to find them”* (Cause No. DR. 22-364; pg. 59, ¶ 14-22).

6. Referring to the negative publicity against Jacob, the federal judge stated, *“I had concerns – in an around stuff through social media, I would just ask Jacey, Are you Okay?”* (Cause No. DR. 22-364; pg. 60, ¶ 17-25).
7. Regarding the day the federal judge ordered a welfare check on the family to no avail, Judge Christopher stated under oath, and leveraging her lengthy experience on the federal bench, Judge Christopher stated to her peer:

“well, Jacob’s an ex-Marine. I know he’s on a disability. I don’t know what the disability is for, but I was concerned, given his age that there might be something that had happened to him that was of concern. And having been a JAG officer, a lawyer in the Army, I’m – I know

those things. And so, I wanted to know what things I was sending people into” (Cause No. DR. 22-364; pg. 63, ¶ 6-12)

8. Regarding whether the Judge had fear for niece, Jacey’s safety, the judge stated “Absolutely” (Cause No. DR. 22-364; pg. 63, ¶ 115)
9. Regarding having concerns about Jacey filing the TOP timely, the judge stated “I was terrified” (Cause No. DR. 22-364; pg. 66, ¶ 4)
10. Highly notably, when asked about her thoughts of Jacey going back to the family’s home after the discriminatory welfare check ordered by the judge to no avail of any real safety concerns, Judge Christopher, leveraging her trauma and legal experience stated,:

“I – I had – my bets were on a murder/suicide. I figured that somebody was going to die, and maybe all of them. And my hope was that that wasn’t the case. But at that point, that was really the only place to go” (Cause.No. DR. 22-364; pg. 67, ¶ 1-5).

11. Further explaining what would happen if the TOP was not extended, Judge Christopher stated:

“I think there’s an incredible amount of frustration and rage that lives within Jacob Elder. And I think he’s bright, I think he’s talented, but I don’t know if he knows how to figure out how to chain down the demons that he has. I don’t know what they are, but I certainly have

seen and listened, in particular, to what that's all about" (Cause No. DR. 22-364; pg. 68, ¶ 19-25).

12. Notably, although testifying under oath, the federal Judge Christopher has never seen Jacob upset in person except the times her niece called her at a staged argument where she listened on the phone unbeknownst to Jacob (Aff.)
13. Lastly, referring to her giant adult sons, and grossly leveraging her recurring trauma responses, Judge Christopher stated:

"It's incredibly sad, but right now, there's no way I would want to leave my child – in fact, I have one that's 21 and 24, and they're bigger than he is, and I wouldn't want to leave them alone in a room with him because I don't know – I just don't know. It might be okay" (Cause No. DR. 22-364; pg. 63, ¶ 1-5).

14. Presenting her recommendations to her peer during the hearing when asked about her thoughts of the TOP extension, the federal judge, once more leveraging her lengthy judicial experience, although not a child development expert, Judge Christopher stated:

"I think there's a lot of work that needs to be done before – before J.L.E. can be in a place where he can grow up and his brain can develop with security" (Cause No. DR. 22-364; pg. 67, ¶ 16-19).

15. Notably, the district court has honored Judge Christopher's trauma-informed recommendations up to the present (Aff.).

The mutual civil no-contact order initially issued was later modified to apply only to Jacob, a change he perceives as indicative of judicial bias or overreach (Ex.: E. pg. 34) (Cause No.: DR-22-364).

Challenges with Supervised Visitation:

Jacob's attempts to maintain contact with J.L.E. through supervised visits at Planet Kids were fraught with difficulties (Ex.: E, pg. 36). He contends that the facility's environment and policies were not in J.L.E.'s best interest, especially given the demographic of its clientele and the restrictive nature of the visits (Aff).

An altercation in October 2023 led to the cessation of services at Planet Kids (Ex.: E. pg. 40), leaving Jacob without a viable means to interact with his son (Aff.).

Mental Health and Legal Representation Struggles:

Throughout these proceedings, Jacob's mental health deteriorated, exacerbated by the legal battles and perceived injustices. His relationship with legal counsel, including Esq. Quentin Rhoades and Esq. Miva VanEngen, was marked by misunderstandings, strategic disagreements, and ultimately, the withdrawal of representation by Esq. Rhoades (Ex.: E – Motion for Leave to

Withdraw). This left Jacob to navigate the complex legal landscape as a pro se litigant.

Continued Legal Battles and Protective Orders:

The legal conflicts extended into 2024 with another temporary protection order filed against Jacob (Ex.: E. pg. 142-143), which he contested through multiple motions (Ex.: E. pgs. 143-170). The opposition by Jacey's attorneys, Emily Lucas ("Esq. Lucas") and Brandi Ries ("Esq. Ries"), was characterized by what Jacob perceives as racial bias and the strategic use of legal mechanisms to further alienate him from his son (Ex.: E – Response Brief in Opposition to Motion to Modify TOP).

Racial and Cultural Identity Concerns:

Jacob has consistently raised alarms about the impact of the custody arrangements on J.L.E.'s cultural identity, arguing that his son's African American heritage was being sidelined (Ex.: E – Jacob v. Judge Christopher). His advocacy for cultural connection was often misconstrued in court as aggressive or unsuitable behavior.

Recent Developments and Urgent Need for Intervention:

Recent attempts to secure alternative visitation through Garden Grove were met with delays and obfuscation by Jacey and her legal team, significantly impacting Jacob's relationship with J.L.E., especially during significant times like

the holiday season (Ex.: E. pgs. 192 – 194)). The lack of prompt response and the attorneys' unavailability further complicated Jacob's efforts to maintain a bond with his son (Affidavit).

Judicial Conduct and Community Influence:

Jacob's case also raises questions about the integrity of judicial proceedings, particularly with the involvement of Judge Christopher and the perceived influence of family and community dynamics in Missoula. The handling of evidence, the allowance of testimony (Ex.: E. pgs. 54 – 56), and the apparent disregard for Jacob's due process rights suggest a need for this Court's oversight to ensure a fair and unbiased application of law.

Conclusion of Statement of Facts:

This comprehensive recounting of events demonstrates a pattern where Jacob Elder's rights as a father and J.L.E.'s rights to a relationship with both parents have been compromised by judicial decisions that appear influenced by personal connections, racial bias, and a failure to uphold Montana's statutes on child custody and parental rights. The repeated issuance of protective orders without substantiation of harm, the manipulation of visitation arrangements, and the overall conduct of the legal proceedings necessitate this Court's supervisory control to rectify these injustices and protect the best interests of J.L.E. and his father.

ARGUMENT

I. Judicial Bias and Conflict of Interest.

The judicial proceedings in this matter have been marred by an unmistakable conflict of interest, specifically arising from Judge Kim Christopher's familial connection to Jacey Christopher. Article VII, Section 2(2) of the Montana Constitution mandates that the Supreme Court maintain supervisory control over all courts to ensure fairness and impartiality. Yet, the involvement of Judge Christopher, who is not only Jacey's aunt but also provided testimony in a manner that clearly favored her niece, directly contravenes this constitutional obligation.

The U.S. Constitution's Fourteenth Amendment and Article II, Section 17 of the Montana Constitution guarantee due process, which includes the right to an impartial tribunal. Here, the District Court's actions suggest a departure from these fundamental principles. Judge Christopher's testimony during the June 24, 2022, hearing (Cause No.: DR-22-364) was not only biased but also pivotal in influencing the court's decisions, including the issuance of an initial mutual no-contact order that was later amended to disadvantageously affect Jacob alone. This judicial conduct raises serious questions about the integrity of the judicial process (Ex.: E – Jacob v. Judge Christopher).

II. Gross misuse of Protective Orders.

The District Court's repeated issuance and continuation of protective orders against Jacob Elder, without credible evidence of imminent harm or danger, constitutes a gross misuse of judicial discretion. MCA § 45-5-206 outlines the legal requirements for issuing such orders, emphasizing the need for a reasonable belief in an imminent threat. Yet, the court's actions have not aligned with these statutory provisions. The protective orders were issued based on allegations of emotional or verbal abuse, without criminal findings or even a police report to substantiate these claims (Aff.).

This practice infringes upon Jacob's parental rights under MCA § 40-4-212, which requires that custody and visitation arrangements serve the child's best interest. Here, the protective orders have not only limited Jacob's ability to parent but have also deprived J.L.E. of a meaningful relationship with his father, possibly amounting to parental alienation. The court's decision to issue a three-year protective order on September 23, 2024 (Ex.: E – Email exchange January 13-16, 2025), further demonstrates a punitive approach rather than one focused on the child's welfare.

III. Non-Adherence to Child Custody Statutes

The District Court's approach to crafting a parenting plan for J.L.E. has flagrantly disregarded MCA § 40-4-234, which mandates individualized plans that prioritize the child's best interests. Instead, the court has relied on the Missoula

County Parenting Guidelines, which may not align with the nuanced needs of J.L.E., particularly concerning his cultural identity and the need for a balanced relationship with both parents.

The guidelines have been applied in a manner that limits Jacob's parenting time to supervised visits at facilities like Planet Kids, which Jacob has argued are not conducive to a child's emotional and cultural development (Ex.: E – Termination Letter from Planet Kids). This strict adherence to local guidelines over state law not only misapplies the law but also potentially discriminates against Jacob as a Black father, raising concerns under the Equal Protection Clauses of both the U.S. and Montana Constitutions.

IV. Racial and Cultural Bias in Family Law

Jacob Elder's experience in these proceedings starkly illustrates how racial biases can permeate family law decisions, affecting not only his rights but also J.L.E.'s cultural identity. The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and Article II, Section 4 of the Montana Constitution both prohibit discrimination based on race or color. However, Jacob's treatment, from the scrutiny of his political campaign to the handling of his custody case, suggests a systemic bias that has influenced judicial decisions against him (Ex.: E – Jacob v. Mrs. Mueller).

The court's failure to consider J.L.E.'s biracial background and the importance of his African American heritage in custody decisions could be seen as a direct violation of these constitutional protections. Moreover, the disproportionate focus on Jacob's character rather than substantive issues of parenting capability or the child's needs points to a prejudicial approach.

V. Due Process for Pro Se Litigants

As a pro se litigant, Jacob Elder has faced numerous procedural hurdles that compromised his due process rights. Article II, Section 17 of the Montana Constitution provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. The complexities of family law, coupled with the court's allowance of hearsay evidence, omission of key testimony, and the court reporter's unprofessional conduct, have collectively denied Jacob a fair opportunity to be heard.

The court's actions, including the editing of court transcripts (Affidavit), suggest an environment where Jacob's rights to present his case thoroughly and effectively were not respected. This is particularly egregious considering his pro se status, where the court should have taken additional measures to ensure fairness, as recommended by the Montana Supreme Court in cases where litigants represent themselves.

VI. Misconduct in Legal Representation

The conduct of attorneys Emily Lucas and Brandi Ries has raised serious ethical questions. Under the Montana Rules of Professional Conduct, attorneys are expected to act with integrity and in good faith. Yet, the delays in communication, misrepresentation of facts, and the strategic use of legal mechanisms to maintain distance between Jacob and J.L.E. suggest a pattern of manipulation (Ex.: E – Email exchange January 13-16, 2025).

Furthermore, the attorneys' apparent alliance with UM Law School, where they operate a clinic, and the timing of legal actions against Jacob, particularly post his mayoral candidacy announcement, indicate a coordinated effort to undermine his parental rights (Ex.: E – UM Notice to Respondent Elder). This not only potentially breaches their professional obligations but also contributes to the unfair treatment Jacob has endured.

VII. Supervised Visitation and Parental Alienation

The insistence on supervised visitation, especially at facilities like Planet Kids, has not served J.L.E.'s best interests as required by MCA § 40-4-212. Instead, it has created a barrier to a healthy father-son relationship, potentially amounting to parental alienation. The visitation arrangements have been structured in a way that limits Jacob's time with J.L.E., restricts his parental role, and even uses his

emotional responses to the legal proceedings against him, portraying him as unsuitable for unsupervised visits.

This practice directly contradicts research on child development that emphasizes the importance of both parents' involvement for a child's emotional and social growth. The termination of services at Planet Kids due to an incident where Jacob expressed his concerns about the facility's suitability for J.L.E. further underscores the punitive rather than welfare-oriented approach taken (Ex.: E – Termination Letter from Planet Kids).

VIII. Mental Health Considerations in Custody Cases:

The District Court's use of Jacob's mental health, particularly his diagnosed depression and anxiety from military service, to limit his parental rights is both stigmatizing and legally questionable. The Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.) prohibits discrimination based on disability, including in child custody decisions. Yet, the court's focus on Jacob's mental health without substantial evidence linking it to any harm or risk to J.L.E. appears to contravene this federal law, as well as Montana's statutes protecting veterans (MCA § 10-2-401 et seq.).

The portrayal of Jacob's mental health in court, especially without a recent psychological evaluation, has been used to justify restrictive measures on his

parenting, which is not only unjust but also ignores his demonstrated capability and commitment to his son.

IX. Urgency and Gross Injustice for Supervisory Control

Under Mont. R. App. P. 14(3), the use of supervisory control by this Court is justified when there is an urgency or gross injustice resulting from a mistake of law or judicial overreach. The cumulative effect of the issues discussed herein, including judicial bias, misuse of protective orders, non-adherence to custody statutes, racial bias, inadequate due process for pro se litigants, legal representation misconduct, and the improper handling of mental health issues, creates an environment where normal appellate processes would be inadequate to rectify the harm already done to Jacob and, more importantly, to J.L.E.

The delay in addressing these injustices could further erode the father-son relationship, potentially causing irreparable harm to J.L.E.'s development and cultural identity. This Court's intervention is necessary to ensure that Montana law is applied fairly, without bias, and in the true best interests of the child.

X. Access to Justice and Legal Representation

Jacob's journey through the legal system has been fraught with challenges, notably the withdrawal of his legal representation by Esq. Quentin Rhoades at a critical juncture (Ex.: E – Motion for Leave to Withdraw). This action, combined with the financial and procedural barriers Jacob faces, severely limits his access to

justice, particularly considering his status as a pro se litigant in a complicated legal environment.

The Montana Constitution and the U.S. Constitution both guarantee access to the courts. Yet, the dynamics of this case, including the refusal of opposing counsel to engage in timely communication or negotiation, have effectively blocked Jacob's path to a fair resolution. The attorneys' unavailability and the strategic legal maneuvering, particularly around holiday visitation, exemplify how legal representation can be used to obstruct rather than facilitate justice (Ex.: E – Email exchange January 13-16, 2025).

The issues presented here collectively demand this Court's supervisory control to correct a series of legal errors, procedural injustices, and potential constitutional violations that have severely impacted Jacob Elder's parental rights and J.L.E.'s well-being. The pattern of judicial conduct, legal representation, and systemic biases noted herein not only undermines the integrity of the judicial process but also fails to serve the child's best interests, as mandated by Montana law. This Court must intervene to restore justice, ensure due process, and uphold the constitutional rights of all parties, particularly in safeguarding the rights of minority parents and children with biracial identities in family law proceedings.

CONCLUSION

This petition meets the requirements of Mont. R. App. P. 14(3) for the exercise of supervisory control in this matter. The emergency nature of this case, coupled with the misguided orders that restrict J.L.E.'s contact with his father, make the normal appeal process inadequate. The trauma resulting from the current custody and visitation arrangements is compounded by orders that limit father-son contact, potentially causing lasting harm to J.L.E.'s emotional and cultural development.

This case involves purely legal questions—whether the District Court erred in its handling of protective orders, custody arrangements, and the application of Montana statutes concerning the best interests of the child. The Missoula County Fourth Judicial District Court is proceeding under a mistake of law, causing gross injustice and posing a risk of harm to the minor child, J.L.E.

Jacob Elder respectfully requests that this Court grant this 'Petition for Writ of Supervisory Control' and enter an order: (1) reversing the District Court's orders related to custody, visitation, and protective measures; and (2) directing that J.L.E. be allowed immediate, meaningful, and culturally sensitive interaction with his father.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Mont. R. App. P. 12, and in compliance with Mont. R. App. P. 14(9)(b), I, Jacob Elder, hereby certify that this Petition for Writ of Supervisory Control has been prepared using a proportionally spaced, 14-point serif typeface and is double-spaced, except for headings, footnotes, and quoted and indented material. The document's margins are at least one inch on all sides. Moreover, this document contains 2276 words, exclusive of the certificate of compliance, table of contents, table of authorities, exhibit index, and any addendum containing statutes, rules, regulations, etc., as calculated by the word-processing system used to prepare this document.

DATED: 1-17-2025

SIGNED



Pro Se Litigant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 17th day of January, 2025, true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served by email to the following attorneys at the address listed below:

Emily A. Lucas

Brandi R. Ries

RIES LAW GROUP, P.C.

P.O. Box 8364

Missoula, MT 59807

(406) 541-4141

brandi@rieslawgrouppc.com

Attorneys for Petitioner

DATED: 1/17/2025

SIGNED: 
Pro Se Litigant

APPENDIX

- ORDER
- EX.: E
- AFFIDAVIT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jacob L. Elder, hereby certify that I have served true and accurate copies electron
of foregoing Petition – Writ to the following on 1-17-2025:

4th Judicial District Court (Respondent)

DATED: 1-17-2025

SIGNED:


Pro Se Litigant