ELECTRONICALLY FILED 2025 Jul 11 PM 2:52

2025 Jul 11 PM 2:52
CLERK OF THE RUSH COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
CASE NUMBER: 2018-DM-000019
PII COMPLIANT



Court: Rush County District Court

Case Number: 2018-DM-000019

Case Title: Tyce Bonjorno vs. Tara Lynn Jennings

Type: ORD: Order (Generic) Order and Memorandum of

the Court

SO ORDERED,

/s/ Honorable Meryl D. Wilson, District Court Judge

Electronically signed on 2025-07-11 14:52:03

page 1 of 5

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF RUSH COUNTY, KANSAS

TYCE A. BONJORNO, Individually and as Father and Next Friend of DOMINIC A. BONJORNO, INDI L. BONJORNO, and HENDRIX A. BONJORNO Petitioners

Vs

Case no. 2018-DM-0019

TARA L. JENNINGS

Respondent

ORDER and MEMORANDUM of the COURT

Petitioner filed his pro se Motion for Relief from Void Judgement on July 4^{th} , 2025. Said motion now comes before the court for disposition. There are no appearances.

This case has a long history, which has included multiple motions, hearings, orders and judges. Petitioner now alleges the

order of March 30, 2020 is a void judgement for the following reasons: 1. Lack of Jurisdiction

- 2. No adjudication of paternity
- 3. Lack of due process

LACK OF JURISDICTION

Petitioner claims that Kansas and Rush County lacked jurisdiction when the Honorable Judge Bruce Gatterman entered his Memorandum and Decision, and subsequent Parenting Plan. Apparently, the petitioner has forgotten his verified petition filed September 24th, 2018 which states:

"jurisdiction and venue are proper in Rush County Kansas"

Respondent never denied jurisdiction and the petitioner at numerous hearings never objected to this court having jurisdiction.

The order of March 30, 2020 was never appealed and the time for the appeal has long since expired. Almost eight years after filing his petition he now seeks to challenge jurisdiction. As a general rule jurisdiction can be challenged at any time however in this case it was the petitioner that selected the venue. It is clear from the pleadings and orders that Rush County Kansas had jurisdiction in 2018 and continues to have jurisdiction in 2025.

NO ADJUDICATION OF PATERNITY

Once again the petitioner has failed to review his own verified petition which states:

"he is the natural father of the minor children"

Petitioner now claims he never signed a voluntary acknowledgement of paternity. This court finds that the verified petition is a signed voluntary acknowledgement. A review of Judge Gatterman's order of July 16, 2020, states:

"...that paternity has already been established and neither party shall bring the issue before the court again."

No appeal to this order was filed and time for appeal has expired.

LACK OR DUE PROCESS

Petitioner alleges he has been denied Due Process. On August 2, 2024, the Honorable Judge James Fleetwood entered his order which reflected a hearing held on July 29, 2024. Judge Fleetwood stated:

"this case has a long history of contentious litigation...driven by the petitioner..."

Judge Fleetwood further found that the petitioner has misused and abused the court system and judicial process by using it solely for the purpose of harassing and punishing the respondent. The order of August 2, 2024, was never appealed and the time for appeal has expired. This order states:

"The clerk of the court will not, nor will any staff of the court set any matter for hearing brought by the petitioner until after the petitioner pays in full the bill invoiced June 5, 2024 by Law Office of Donald E. Anderson for services rendered by Audra Asher in the amount of \$807.56 ... The petitioner must also pay \$5,000.00 to

counsel as a retainer fee for the respondent's selected attorney in advance of setting any further pleadings for hearing..."

Due Process requires that a party be provided a hearing with adequate notice. Petitioner has been provided numerous hearings, allowed to present evidence and testimony and he has received adequate notice.

For the reasons stated herein and a review of the courts file the petitioner's motion is denied. THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS the children shall be returned to Kansas and to the respondent persuant to the previous orders issued in the District Court of Rush County Kansas. Should the petitioner fail to return the minor children to the respondent, the court will order appropriate sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED