

NO. DF-24-18010

IN THE MATTER OF	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT
THE MARRIAGE OF	§	
	§	
GWENDOLYN ULIJASZ-MCKEMIE	§	301ST JUDICIAL DISTRICT
AND	§	
JASON MCKEMIE	§	DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

**MOTION FOR ENFORCEMENT, SANCTIONS, CONTINUANCE,
AND LEAVE TO ISSUE THIRD-PARTY SUBPOENAS**

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

Jason McKemie files this **Motion for Enforcement, Sanctions, Continuance, and Leave to Issue Third-Party Subpoenas** and respectfully shows the Court as follows:

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

Trial is set for **June 11, 2026**.

This motion requests multiple forms of relief, but the threshold issue for the June 1 hearing is trial readiness:

No source records, no estate reconstruction. No estate reconstruction, no final trial.

Movant requests that the Court:

1. **Continue the June 11, 2026 trial setting;**
2. **Grant leave to issue third-party subpoenas** for source records concerning financial accounts, VEIP/equity, tax records, loans, San Antonio housing/rent, lease payoff, QLE/benefits, Accenture records, legal retainers, third-party contractors, April 16 theft, movers, security contractors, All My Sons, Merritt McClayton, Decisive Resources, Jetty Partners, and all related custodians;
3. **Modify the discovery deadline** for the limited purpose of third-party source-record discovery and related follow-up discovery;
4. **Enforce prior discovery rulings and prior discovery obligations;**
5. **Reserve sanctions, fee shifting, adverse inferences, estate reconstitution, reimbursement, offsets, healthcare enforcement, and April 16 theft remedies** without prejudice pending subpoena returns and further hearing;
6. Set a status/compliance hearing after subpoena returns are received; and
7. Require written rulings on any relief granted, denied, or reserved.

II. PROCEDURAL AUTHORITY

- **Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 190.5** authorizes the Court to modify a discovery-control plan at any time and requires modification when the interest of justice requires. This rule is directly implicated because new and materially changed circumstances now prevent trial readiness without third-party source records.
- **Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 176 and 205.3** authorize third-party subpoenas and nonparty production of documents and tangible things.
- **Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 215.2 and 215.3** authorize sanctions, fee shifting, adverse findings, evidentiary limits, staying proceedings, and other just orders for failure to comply with discovery orders or abuse of the discovery process.
- **Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 251 and 252** authorize continuance for sufficient cause supported by affidavit or declaration.
- **Texas Family Code §§ 6.501 and 6.502** authorize temporary orders and injunctive relief to preserve property, protect the parties, require production, protect access to resources, and prevent further waste or concealment during a pending divorce.
- **Texas Family Code § 6.708** authorizes attorney's fees, court costs, and expenses in a dissolution suit.
- **Texas Family Code § 7.001** requires a just and right division of the estate. A just and right division is impossible unless the estate is first identified, traced, and reconstructed.
- **Texas Family Code § 7.009** authorizes reconstitution of the estate when actual or constructive fraud on the community has occurred, including appropriate legal and equitable relief.
- **Texas Rule of Evidence 1006** permits summary charts and calculations for voluminous records. Movant intends to attach a visual production-gap chart as a Rule 1006 summary exhibit, with underlying records identified and made available as required.

III. WHY THIS MOTION IS NECESSARY: SYSTEMIC NONCOMPLIANCE

This is not a routine discovery dispute.

These proceedings are now in their third district, and the discovery record reflects the same pattern across multiple courts: Petitioner avoids source-record production, creates procedural delay, then attempts to declare discovery closed or trial-ready before the estate can be reconstructed.

In the 254th District Court, Respondent served discovery in good faith. Petitioner's legal team then moved to withdraw and remained absent during the discovery period. With approximately one hour remaining before discovery closed, Petitioner's counsel reappeared, filed blanket objections to Respondent's discovery, and approximately one hour later declared discovery closed.

The same pattern repeated in the 302nd District Court. Respondent served discovery. Petitioner responded that Respondent had to identify and label every defect across thousands of pages of production. Respondent did that work. Petitioner then delayed for approximately two months and produced only two pages. Those two pages reflected the same transactions, on the same dates, at the same locations, for the same amounts, for the same account, but with different monthly headers. One or both of those documents are necessarily false, inaccurate, or fabricated. That was not compliance. It was an obvious refusal to provide reliable source records.

In the 302nd District Court, a motion to compel was granted or reflected as granted on or about January 6, 2026. Petitioner was then found noncompliant on or about January 9, January 20, and February 5, 2026. Each time, Petitioner represented with increasing force that she was finally compliant. Between January 6 and February 5, Respondent did not receive a single additional page that cured the defects.

Respondent was instructed to draft a proposed order to bring these proceedings to an expeditious conclusion. Respondent did so. That proposed order still has not been ruled on. Since then, Petitioner still has not produced source records sufficient to cure the defects. The only later production came on the eve of trial and showed further account depletion, not compliance.

That matters because the defect is not a missing page.

The defect is the destruction of traceability.

Petitioner has repeatedly treated financial disclosure as a tactical narrative exercise rather than a source-record obligation. The result is an estate that cannot be reconstructed from Petitioner-controlled production. Third-party source records are now the only available cure.

IV. THIS IS NOT MISSING STATEMENTS; IT IS ARCHITECTED OBSTRUCTION

This is not merely "missing statements."

It is obstruction by an architect of the financial record.

The available production reflects intentional corruption of tracing data and intentional destruction of practical continuity, including:

1. Approximately **nine credit cards tied to one account relationship;**
2. Card-number flipping approximately every **10 to 14 days;**

3. Credit-card balances paid off **multiple times per month;**
4. Significant overpayments to cards;
5. At least one card with approximately **\$67,000 in overpayments;**
6. No reliable way to determine payment source from party-produced statements;
7. No reliable way to determine whether overpayments generated refunds, credits, transfers, or concealed liquidity;
8. No reliable account-lineage records connecting old card numbers, new card numbers, reissued cards, replacement cards, or linked accounts;
9. No single account with contiguous statements from **August 2023 through present;**
10. No sufficient employer-origin records for San Antonio housing reimbursements;
11. No sufficient expense reports for work-paid housing;
12. No legitimate tax transcripts, only emails and printouts;
13. Loan claims without loan origination documents, proof of funds transfer, repayment records, or credible tracing;
14. Large pretrial transfers, including to family members and taxing authorities;
15. Large legal and third-party contractor spend with no source tracing; and
16. Prior production that included two pages showing the same transactions, same dates, same locations, and same account, but different monthly headers.

A further deadline for Petitioner to self-produce is not a remedy.

It is procedural cover.

V. PARTY PRODUCTION IS IMPOSSIBLE AS A CURE

The Court should not give Petitioner more time to produce financials.

That remedy is impossible.

It cannot cure the defect.

No additional party-controlled production deadline can reconstruct:

1. Account continuity;
2. Replacement-card lineage;
3. Payment-source tracing;
4. Overpayment treatment;
5. Refund and credit history;

6. Payroll deductions;
7. Employer reimbursements;
8. VEIP/equity investment activity;
9. Tax withholding versus equity contribution classification;
10. IRS/tax payments;
11. Loan origination and funding;
12. San Antonio housing reimbursement;
13. Lease payoff/buyout records;
14. Legal retainer payment sources;
15. Third-party contractor payment sources; or
16. April 16 theft chain of custody.

Only third-party source records can do that.

If Petitioner has been fully forthcoming and compliant with discovery, then this will be a simple and painless process. The source records will confirm her position quickly.

If she has not, the source records are the only way to prevent a final trial based on financial fiction.

VI. VEIP / EQUITY INVESTMENT MISLABELED AS "EXTRA TAX WITHHOLDING"

One of the clearest examples is Petitioner's VEIP/equity investment activity.

Petitioner labeled or allowed a **\$130,000 equity investment** to be characterized as "extra tax withholding."

No one can mislabel a **\$130,000 equity investment** yielding approximately a **50% return in less than twelve months** – approximately **\$65,000 in gain** – and honestly claim it was merely a "tax" item.

That is beyond absurd.

The estate impact is massive:

Item	Amount
VEIP/equity investment principal	\$130,000
Approximate gain	\$65,000

Item	Amount
Total liquid asset value	\$195,000
Liability Effect of Mislabeling of Asset	-\$325,000
Total Variance in Estate Value	\$520,000

The net effect was the conversion of approximately **\$195,000 in liquid asset value** into an apparent **negative \$325,000 liability**, creating a more than **half-million-dollar estate distortion**.

This cannot be tried on party summaries, tax emails, or screenshots.

It requires employer-origin, payroll-origin, equity-plan-origin, tax-origin, and bank-origin source records.

VII. VISUAL GAP CHART / RULE 1006 SUMMARY

Movant intends to attach a visual summary showing missing account-statement continuity and production gaps.

The exhibit should be treated as:

Exhibit A – Rule 1006 Summary Chart of Financial Production Gaps

The chart is offered to show the Court the structural record problem: no account has contiguous source-record coverage from August 2023 through present.

Movant will make the underlying statements, productions, and available records supporting the summary available for inspection as required by Texas Rule of Evidence 1006.

The chart is not a substitute for source records.

It proves why source records are necessary.

VIII. NO CONTIGUOUS ACCOUNT HISTORY EXISTS

Not a single account has contiguous statements from **August 2023 through present**.

That alone prevents final trial.

The Court cannot conduct a final property division where:

1. The accounts cannot be mapped;
2. Account numbers cannot be tied to replacement cards;
3. Payments cannot be sourced;
4. Overpayments cannot be traced;
5. Credits/refunds cannot be located;
6. Loans cannot be authenticated;
7. Tax claims cannot be verified;
8. Employer reimbursements cannot be traced;
9. Legal and contractor spending cannot be allocated; and
10. The estate cannot be reconstructed.

No source records, no estate reconstruction.

No estate reconstruction, no final trial.

IX. SAN ANTONIO HOUSING / RENT / EXPENSE REPORTS

Petitioner's San Antonio housing records require third-party verification.

Movant requests subpoenas to Accenture, benefits/payroll custodians, expense-report custodians, the landlord, property manager, landlord-side bank/payment custodians, and related entities to determine:

1. Whether San Antonio rent was paid or reimbursed by work;
2. Whether any rental income or reimbursement was omitted from the marital estate;
3. Whether housing reimbursements were deposited into disclosed or undisclosed accounts;
4. Whether Petitioner failed to disclose employer-paid housing or housing-related reimbursements;
5. Whether rent, lease, payoff, or buyout records were concealed;
6. Whether eviction/writ pressure was pursued despite rent or lease obligations being paid, resolved, reimbursed, bought out, or otherwise satisfied; and
7. Whether landlord-side activity was used to create the access window exploited in the April 16 theft.

If the San Antonio housing was paid 100% by work, then the estate requires 100% reimbursement or tracing of those funds.

X. DISSIPATION, WASTE, AND ADD-BACKS REQUIRING SOURCE RECORDS

Movant requests third-party source-record discovery concerning dissipation, waste, reimbursement, and add-back issues, including:

A. Elective Cosmetic Surgery

- Petitioner pursued elective cosmetic surgery despite objection from Movant and Movant's prior counsel.
- Movant requests invoices, payment records, financing records, loan documents, card payments, bank payments, and any related communications so those amounts can be added back, reimbursed, offset, or charged to Petitioner's side of the estate.
- Movant is not paying for elective cosmetic surgery through community depletion.

B. Legal Retainers, Contractors, Security, OSINT, and Reputation Vendors

- Petitioner's legal, security, investigative, risk-mitigation, OSINT, reputational-defense, bodyguard, and third-party contractor spending must be traced.
- These expenses did not benefit Movant.
- They were used to build, support, protect, package, or distribute narratives against Movant, including alleged crimes that did not occur.
- The subpoena scope must include, at minimum:
 1. Hargrave Law Office / Hargrave Family Law;
 2. Sullivan & Cook;
 3. Beerman / Biermann;
 4. Armstrong Law Texas;
 5. Connatser Family Law;
 6. Hughes Socol Piers Resnick & Dym;
 7. Any prior, shadow, consulting, or undisclosed counsel;
 8. Decisive Resources;
 9. Jetty Partners;
 10. Security contractors;
 11. Bodyguards;
 12. OSINT / security tech resources;

13. Risk-mitigation firms;
 14. Reputational-defense vendors;
 15. Due-diligence vendors;
 16. Employment-interference vendors;
 17. Investigators;
 18. All My Sons;
 19. Merritt McClayton;
 20. Movers, storage providers, booking entities, and third-party payers; and
 21. Any entity paid to investigate, package, transmit, publish, or support claims against Movant.
- Legal fees and legal-adjacent expenditures should be traced and allocated. Movant requests that legal fees be subject to 50% reimbursement/add-back where community funds were used, and that third-party contractors used against Movant be added back 100% to Petitioner's side of the estate unless Petitioner proves by source records that the expenditure was disclosed, necessary, non-wasteful, and beneficial to the community.

C. San Antonio Rent / Employer-Paid Housing

- If San Antonio rent was work-paid or reimbursed by Accenture, those funds must be traced and reimbursed 100% to the estate or offset against Petitioner.

D. Loans

- Petitioner paid off 100% of her loans before leaving the marriage, then took out multiple "loans" immediately after Movant obtained counsel.
- These loans require source records because the current record lacks:
 1. Loan origination documents;
 2. Proof of funds transfer;
 3. Proof of disbursement;
 4. Proof of repayment;
 5. Proof of lender capacity;
 6. Proof that alleged family loans were actually funded;
 7. Proof that Petitioner's sister was actually paid;

8. Proof that any alleged loan was community debt; and
 9. Proof that any loan was not used for elective cosmetic surgery, legal warfare, or litigation-adjacent spending.
- Petitioner’s January 7 testimony represented that certain loans had already been received. Later claims conflict with that testimony. Source records are required.

E. Tax Records

- Petitioner has not produced legitimate tax transcripts sufficient to verify tax claims, tax liabilities, tax payments, withholding, refunds, or the alleged tax treatment of VEIP/equity.
- Emails and printouts are not enough.
- The Court should authorize subpoenas for IRS transcripts, tax preparer records, employer payroll/tax records, bank-origin tax payments, and records sufficient to determine whether tax claims were legitimate or used to obscure equity investments and estate value.

F. Gross Overpayments to Cards

- Credit-card overpayments must be traced to determine whether they created refunds, credits, hidden liquidity, substituted accounts, or undisclosed transfers.
- Card overpayments are not self-explanatory. They require issuer-origin and bank-origin source records.

XI. PRELIMINARY FUNDS AND CLAIMED SHARES REQUIRING PRESERVATION AND TRACING

Movant identifies the following funds and shares requiring preservation, tracing, and third-party verification:

Category	Calculation	Amount
Sign-on bonus	1/2 of \$300,000	\$150,000
Cognizant settlement	1/2 of \$156,045	\$78,022.50
VEIP/equity	1/2 of \$195,000	\$97,500

Category	Calculation	Amount
Salary	1/2 of \$390,000	\$195,000
Annual bonus	1/2 of \$49,893	\$24,946.50
Rent reimbursement / lease guarantor issue	reimbursement claimed	\$30,000
Additional dissipation / add-backs	to be traced	TBD

Movant also asserts that approximately **\$650,000 went missing before the divorce proceedings** and requires source-record reconstruction.

These figures are not the full estate calculation. They are minimum categories proving why the estate cannot be tried without third-party records.

XII. APRIL 16 THEFT IS PART OF THE SAME PATTERN

The April 16 writ event is more of the same pattern.

Petitioner repeatedly requested access to the residence. Those requests were not granted in the manner she sought. Movant repeatedly stated that if Petitioner wanted property, it should occur only through a neutral third party because direct access created danger, theft risk, destruction risk, allegation risk, and evidence risk.

That is exactly what happened.

On April 16, Petitioner stole Movant's hard drives, litigation evidence, financial records, trial materials, GPUs, network storage, music studio equipment, medication, and livelihood infrastructure.

The stolen hard drives were Movant's separate property owned before the marriage.

Those stolen hard drives contained:

1. Seventeen months of exhibits;
2. Financial reconstruction work;
3. Discovery materials;
4. Records prepared for production;
5. Trial preparation;
6. Accenture-related contribution evidence;

7. Technical work;
8. Network designs;
9. Presentations;
10. Talking points;
11. Research;
12. Music/studio materials;
13. Professional records; and
14. Data necessary to rebut Petitioner's false non-contributor narrative.

Before April 16, party production was already impossible as a cure.

But Movant at least had his own records.

Now he has nothing.

Petitioner stole the records Movant built to reconstruct the estate, prove contribution, respond to discovery, and prepare for trial. She should not be permitted to steal the evidence, obstruct third-party records, and then demand trial before the theft can be addressed.

XIII. THE APRIL 16 THIRD-PARTY SUBPOENAS ARE NECESSARY

The Court should authorize subpoenas to all third parties involved in the April 16 theft, including:

1. All My Sons;
2. Merritt McClayton;
3. Moving-company booking entities;
4. Third-party payers;
5. Security contractors;
6. Bodyguards;
7. Storage providers;
8. Landlord;
9. Property manager;
10. Landlord-side agents;
11. Locksmith/access vendors;
12. Constable-related custodians;

13. Bodycam/dashcam/open-records custodians;
14. Jetty Partners;
15. Decisive Resources;
16. Any contractor involved in planning, funding, booking, executing, transporting, receiving, storing, accessing, using, or concealing stolen property; and
17. Any person or entity with records concerning stolen hard drives, devices, GPUs, network storage, music studio equipment, medication, financial records, litigation records, safes, briefcases, or other stolen property.

The purpose is source verification, chain of custody, preservation, and trial readiness.

XIV. VEIP FRAUD, TAX FRAUD, LEASE FRAUD, LOAN FRAUD, QLE FRAUD, AND APRIL 16 WRIT RECORDS

Movant requests subpoena authority for source records concerning:

1. VEIP/equity fraud;
2. Tax fraud;
3. Lease fraud;
4. Loan fraud;
5. QLE fraud;
6. April 16 writ-related records;
7. Healthcare reinstatement and HSA/FSA functionality;
8. Accenture payroll, benefits, equity, reimbursement, and QLE records;
9. Landlord payoff, buyout, rent ledger, and eviction records;
10. Bank and credit-card continuity records; and
11. April 16 theft records.

These are not side issues.

They are the source-record foundation necessary to determine whether the estate exists in the form Petitioner claims, whether liabilities are real, whether assets were concealed, whether reimbursements were omitted, whether healthcare was fraudulently terminated, whether housing pressure was manufactured, and whether trial can proceed.

XV. THIS DIVORCE SHOULD HAVE ENDED LONG AGO

This divorce should have ended in March 2025.

It did not end because Petitioner's obstruction, false financial narratives, discovery gamesmanship, healthcare obstruction, lease/eviction manipulation, late production, source-record concealment, and April 16 theft kept expanding the dispute.

Petitioner has wasted Movant's time, the Court's time, and the resources of everyone forced into this litigation.

Petitioner has also caused severe harm to Movant and his parents through financial ambush, manufactured instability, and repeated emergency conditions. Parent-loan issues will be addressed in a separate filing, but the Court should recognize that this litigation posture has imposed collateral financial harm beyond ordinary divorce expense.

This is outright fraud.

It is not an accident.

XVI. DUE PROCESS REQUIRES THIRD-PARTY SOURCE RECORDS BEFORE TRIAL

- A final trial without source records would be a due process failure.
- The Court cannot divide an estate it cannot identify.
- The Court cannot classify property it cannot trace.
- The Court cannot evaluate dissipation without payment-source records.
- The Court cannot evaluate loans without loan origination and transfer records.
- The Court cannot evaluate VEIP/equity without employer and equity-plan records.
- The Court cannot evaluate tax claims without tax transcripts and bank-origin tax payments.
- The Court cannot evaluate San Antonio housing reimbursement without employer and landlord records.
- The Court cannot evaluate April 16 theft without movers, security, payment, landlord, constable, and chain-of-custody records.
- The Court cannot require Movant to defend against Petitioner's financial narrative after Petitioner stole his litigation hard drives and financial reconstruction materials.
- Proceeding to trial on June 11 without third-party source records would reward obstruction and punish the party seeking verification.

XVII. REQUEST TO SEQUENCE THE JUNE 1 HEARING

Movant urgently needs healthcare enforcement. However, Movant requests that the Court first address financial trial readiness because trial is set for June 11.

The June 1 hearing should first decide:

1. Whether trial can proceed without third-party source records;
2. Whether subpoenas should issue;
3. Whether discovery deadlines should be modified;
4. Whether trial should be continued; and
5. Whether sanctions and healthcare enforcement should be reserved or set for immediate follow-up.

Movant does not waive healthcare enforcement by asking the Court to address financial source records first.

XVIII. PRAYER

Movant respectfully requests that the Court grant this Motion and enter orders:

1. Continuing the June 11, 2026 trial setting;
2. Granting leave to issue third-party subpoenas;
3. Modifying discovery deadlines for source-record discovery;
4. Authorizing subpoenas concerning financial, VEIP/equity, tax, loan, San Antonio housing, lease/payoff, QLE/benefits, healthcare, Accenture, legal-retainer, contractor, and April 16 theft records;
5. Setting a status hearing after subpoena returns;
6. Reserving sanctions, fee shifting, adverse inferences, estate reconstitution, reimbursement, offsets, healthcare enforcement, property return, compensation, and April 16 theft remedies without prejudice;
7. Requiring written rulings; and
8. Granting all other relief to which Movant is entitled.

Respectfully Submitted,



Jason McKemie

539 W. Commerce St., #2010

Dallas, Texas 75208

214-868-4901

jmckemie@mckemie.net

VERIFICATION / UNSWORN DECLARATION

My name is Jason McKemie. I am over eighteen years of age, of sound mind, and competent to make this declaration. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this Motion, and they are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in Dallas County, Texas, on **May 26, 2026**.



Jason McKemie

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a true and correct copy of this Motion was served through the Texas eFile and Serve system on all counsel of record and all parties entitled to service on **May 26, 2026**.



Jason McKemie

Automated Certificate of eService

This automated certificate of service was created by the eFiling system. The filer served this document via email generated by the eFiling system on the date and to the persons listed below. The rules governing certificates of service have not changed. Filers must still provide a certificate of service that complies with all applicable rules.

Envelope ID: 115362137

Filing Code Description: Motion - Mod/Enf Other (Sapcr) (Oca Pja)

Filing Description: MOTION FOR ENFORCEMENT, SANCTIONS, CONTINUANCE, AND LEAVE TO ISSUE THIRD-PARTY SUBPOENAS

Status as of 5/28/2026 11:47 AM CST

Case Contacts

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
Kim Jones		kjones@sullivancook.com	5/26/2026 11:59:10 PM	SENT
Tiffany Castenada		tcastenada@sullivancook.com	5/26/2026 11:59:10 PM	SENT
William CCook		wcook@sullivancook.com	5/26/2026 11:59:10 PM	SENT
Rebecca LArmstrong		rebecca@armstronglawtexas.com	5/26/2026 11:59:10 PM	SENT
Terra Aguirre		terra@armstronglawtexas.com	5/26/2026 11:59:10 PM	SENT
Lauren N.Shaw		lauren@armstronglawtexas.com	5/26/2026 11:59:10 PM	SENT
Jason McKemie		jmckemie@mckemie.net	5/26/2026 11:59:10 PM	SENT
Gwendolyn Uljasz McKemie		GUljasz@gmail.com	5/26/2026 11:59:10 PM	SENT
Gwendolyn Uljasz		guljasz@gmail.com	5/26/2026 11:59:10 PM	SENT
JONATHAN STEEL		jsteele@beermannlaw.com	5/26/2026 11:59:10 PM	SENT
JASON EMORYMCKEMIE		jason@callvital.com	5/26/2026 11:59:10 PM	SENT