



Stephen Cooke <stephencooke.c@gmail.com>

NCC3896/2023Cooke and Cooke Family Law Matter

Stephen Cooke <stephencooke.c@gmail.com>

Fri, Mar 15, 2024 at 6:56 PM

To: Jacqueline Turner <j.turner@claritylawyers.com.au>

Cc: Samantha Miller <samantha@claritylawyers.com.au>

I'll take a look and will get back to you shortly. Thank you.

I have prepared the statement below to ensure that my portrayal accurately reflects the reality of the situation. Anything less would be a disservice to justice.

In 2023, Heather complimented my parenting, acknowledging my significant contribution. Additionally, as recent as October, expressions of love were exchanged through shared photos. These interactions, along with Heather's own affirmation of my involvement in meal contributions, contradict her current claims.

It is evident that Heather's actions are driven by vindictiveness rather than consideration for the well-being of our children. Her decision to punish me stems from my refusal to grant her an unreasonable loan of one million dollars to buy property in Queensland.

Heather also punished her Father Steve in 2023 as well when she denied him access to seeing the boys and an opportunity to reconcile with Heather before he passed due to kidney failure in 2023 despite my pleas to Heather to reconsider. Joshua even coins this event in the Child Impact Report.

Furthermore, Delany's sudden withdrawal from the situation after the "Game Plan" document was introduced speaks volumes to me.

In preparation for the upcoming court date, I request a meeting with the Barrister to ensure alignment in presenting the facts.

Here is how I feel I am to be portrayed before the court:

As the court considers its decision regarding parenting, I ask that it treats me as it would any woman who gave up a successful business career, her country, her family and her friends to move to her husband's land to stay home and raise the family's children while her husband spent 12 hours a day Monday to Friday and frequently some weekends establishing his career as a cardiologist.

Would the court recognize the woman's claims that every time she expressed interest in returning to the work, she was met with arguments against doing so because of the consequential loss of tax benefits derived by such a decision? Would they believe that her husband suggested working in a coffee shop for a few hours a week "if you need to get out of the house." Would they consider her claim that on at least one occasion her expressed desire to re-enter the workforce was met with tears and the comment, "if you do this, you'll have no time to look after the kids!"

Would the court grant any credence to the husband's claim that he was the primary care giver for the children the past 8 years when he was not present in the home from 7 am to 7 pm Monday to Friday as well as working some weekends? Would the court remember that bi location remains impossible for all human beings - even ones self described as "exceptional."

How would the court respond when the woman's husband suddenly left the marital home with the children after first withdrawing nearly \$400,000 from their Joint bank account? How would the court react given that this happened just after the woman refused to sign a bank application aimed at transferring joint assets away from her?

How would the court react to the woman's husband taking a photo of her crying as he and his friends removed most of the furniture and toys and clothing from the marital home? And how would the court react if the husband, subsequently, used that photo on his phone in such a way that every time the children wanted to call their mom, they had to look at the photo of her crying?

Would the court place any credence on sudden claims of alcohol abuse by the husband against the wife when she, of her own fruition, subsequently undertook a F.B.I. hair follicle test which cost her \$1,000 and returned the lowest possible alcohol consumption rating possible?

Would the court decide against allowing the woman parenting or co-parenting rights because she, at the insistence of her husband (conveniently just before he moved out) went for ADHD testing and was found to have mild ADHD which is being fully controlled by the mildest dose of the medication prescribed?

Would the court pay attention to the fact that the specialist treating the wife for ADHD has adamantly stated that the wife's mild ADHD should have no negative bearing whatsoever on her ability to parent other than to result in her potentially being a better parent for one of her boys who also has ADHD.

I think the court would choose to be influenced by the facts and not the convenient words of her doctor husband who simply seeks to dispose of his wife now that the children are older and leave her homeless with little to show for her nearly decade long support and child raising contribution.

I think a just court would not be swayed by the entirely unsubstantiated claims of the husband but rather be mindful of the enormous sacrifices made by his wife over many years to help ensure his success.

I think simple outrage would be warranted if any court said to that woman that she was not fit to parent or co-parent the two wonderfully balanced, happy kids who are today the very product of her love, her child care, and her deepest ongoing concern.

Although male, I am that woman. I stand in this court - respectful, hopeful, but financially disadvantaged and entirely alone.

Deny me co-parenting rights and you will not only destroy my life, you will destroy the lives of my two boys who literally jump with joy each time they come to me and cry each time they leave me when our court appointed time is up.

Stephen

Follow me on LinkedIn: [www.linkedin.com/in/stephen-cooke-b853702ab]

[Quoted text hidden]