PETITIONER: KIM BASINGER		CASE NUMBER:	
RESPONDENT: ALEC BALDWIN		BD 337 739	
7. PROPERTY CONTROL To be order a. The petitioner respondent is given property we own or are buying (specify):	red pending the hearing the exclusive temporary	use, possession, and control of the f	ollowing
b. The petitioner respondent is orde	red to make the following	payments on liens and encumbrance	es coming
<u>Debt</u>	Amount of payment	Pay to	
I request that time for service of the Order to Sho			
I request that time for service of the Order to Sho may be served no less than (specify number): shortening time because of the facts specified in	days before the ti	ving papers be shortened so that the me set for the hearing. I need to hav	se documents ve the order
OTHER RELIEF (specify): THE PETITIONS ORDER PREVENTING THE RESPONDEN LITIGATION IN THIS MATTER WITH FURTHER, PETITIONER REQUESTS T SHOW CAUSE FILED ON APRIL 18, PETITIONER'S WITHIN MOTION FOR FACTS IN SUPPORT of relief requested and char Contained in the attached declaration.	T, ALEC BALDWIN OUT FIRST OBTAI HAT THE COURT CO 2006, UNTIL SUC	, FROM FILING ANY NEW NING LEAVE OF THE COURT ONTINUE RESPONDENTS OR! H TIME AS THE COURT HE?	r.
SEE ATTACHED MEMORANDUM OF POINT	S AND AUTHORITIE	ES.	
eclare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State	e of California that the for	egoing is true and correct.	
te: APRIL 27, 2006	1.	a rin. D.	
AM PHILIP LIPSIC, ESQ. FOR HERSH, MANNIS & BOGEN	1. LLD - 1-166	way filly Japain	
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		(SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT)	

		FL-305
PETITIONER/PLAINTIFF: KIM BASINGER	CASE NUMBER:	
RESPONDENT/DEFENDANT: ALEC BALDWIN	BD 337 739	
TEMPORARY ORE Attachment to Order to Show		
1. PROPERTY RESTRAINT	(= 555)	

	Atta	TEMPORARY ORDERS achment to Order to Show Cause (FL-300)
1. [P	ROPERTY RESTRAINT	comments of the officer of the order of the
, a	Petitioner Respondent disposing of any property, rea course of business or for the result of the court. The other party is to be made to the court. Both parties are restrained and	notified of any proposed extraordinary expenditures and an accounting of such is to
c.	for the benefit of the parties or	any insurance or other coverage including life, health, automobile, and disability hold
	ordinary course of business or ROPERTY CONTROL	for the necessities of life.
a.	Petitioner Respondent property the parties own or are	is given the exclusive temporary use, possession, and control of the following buying (specify):
b.	Petitioner Respondent while the order is in effect:	is ordered to make the following payments on liens and encumbrances coming due
	Debt	Amount of payment Pay to
a. b. c. d. 4. XOTH	Petitioner Respondent (1) from the State of California (2) from the following counties (3) other (specify): Child abduction prevention order (1) Jurisdiction: This court has jurisd Coustody Jurisdiction and Enforce (2) Notice and opportunity to be heap provided by the laws of the State (3) Country of habitual residence: The United States of Americal the United States of American the Unit	(specify): ers are attached (see form FL-341(B)). diction to make child custody orders in this case under the Uniform Child ment Act (part 3 of the California Family Code, commencing with §3400). rd: The responding party was given notice and an opportunity to be heard as of California. the country of habitual residence of the child or children is
Date.		JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
5. The date	of the court hearing is (insert date wi	hen known): APRIL 28, 2006
		CLERK'S CERTIFICATE
(SEAL)	l certify that the	e foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original on file in my office.
	Date:	Clerk, by, Deputy
Form Adopted for Ma	ndalory Use	Page 1 of 1

Form Adopted for Mandatory Us Judicial Council of California FL-305 [Rev. July 1, 2003]

Legal Solutions & Plus

HERSH, MANNIS & BOGEN, L.L.P. 9150 Wilshin Boulevard, 2011e 209 Beverly Hils, California 90212-3429 Phone: (310)786-1910 Fax;(310)786-1917

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

1.

INTRODUCTION

On April 18, 2006, the Petitioner was served with yet another Order to Show Cause (hereinafter "OSC"), which is a duplication of most, if not all, of the Respondent's previous requests, including, but not limited to, once again, requests regarding telephone time, the right of first refusal and more flexibility in the custodial schedule to accommodate the Respondent's alleged professional commitments. A true and correct copy of the Respondent's moving papers is attached hereto as Exhibit "1" and is incorporated herein by this reference. The Petitioner strongly believes that once the Court reviews the Respondent's moving papers, the Court will agree that, once again, the Respondent has demonstrated no change of circumstances that justify his filling of the instant OSC, and that further, the Court's prior adjudication of most of these issues is *res judicata*, rendering the vast majority, if not all, of the Respondent's requests contained in his moving papers moot. Further, the Petitioner contends that this Court, now possessing a working knowledge and history of this matter, will conclude, once again, that the Respondent provides no foundation for the allegations contained in his moving papers and will deny the requests.

In light of the Respondent's continued pattern of conduct in this matter, more specifically, his repeated filings of the same requests with this Court based on factually unsupported conclusions, which attempt to set aside an existing Custody Judgment, the Petitioner has been forced to bring the within motion.

This ex parte application requests that the Court issue a prefiling order, enjoining and preventing the Respondent from filing any action in this matter without first obtaining the Court's permission. In the alternative, the Petitioner is requesting that the Court continue Respondent's Order to Show Cause filed on April 18, 2006, until such time as the Court hears Petitioner's within motion for a prefiling order. Since the Respondent cannot speak about the case in the media, he continues

HERSH, MANNIS & BOGEN, L.L. 9150 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 209 Beverly Hills, California 90212-3429 Phone: (310)786-1910 Fax: (310)786-1917

1 2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

///

to create pleadings that are open to the public, knowing that the media will be attracted to the unsubstantiated attacks on the Petitioner and creating the meanspirited scenario that he wants. The Respondent's pleadings repeatedly contain fabricated renditions of the events and circumstances that have transpired between the parties for the sole purpose of keeping the Respondent's name in the public limelight while at the same time, attempting to demean the Petitioner and her attorneys. As a result, the Petitioner has been forced to incur excessive attorney's fees and costs to defend against the Respondent's baseless allegations and recurring requests for alterations to the Custody Judgment none of which, the Petitioner contends, are warranted.

The parties' minor child is only 10 $\frac{1}{2}$, which means the Petitioner is subject to the Respondent's shenanigans for at least 7 ½ more years. The Petitioner has no doubt that the Respondent's pattern of conduct will continue. Unfortunately, the Respondent has placed the Court in an untenable position where it must question the true purpose and intent of these repeatedly unsubstantiated Orders to Show Cause. However, the Petitioner submits that the purpose is clear; it is once again aimed at creating a media frenzy for Respondent's self-serving goals of wrongfully maligning the Petitioner and the minor child, and to circumvent the Court's prior orders preventing the parties from litigating the case in the media. The Court needs to implement some method to curb the Respondent's conduct, and the Petitioner is merely requesting that this Court implement the only mechanism that can prevent the Respondent from continuing to file these actions that have absolutely no merit. The Respondent continues to misuse the judicial system for his own self-serving reasons, and it is the Petitioner's hope that by this Court deeming the Respondent to be the "vexatious" litigant that he is, that the Respondent's actions will be stopped! /// ///