



2. After receiving actual notice of the action following service of process, Defendants collectively filed a Four-Part Omnibus Pre-Answer Motion (D0001, pp. 112–133) and a Motion to Quash Service and Joinder (D0001, pp. 107–111).

Collectively Requested Relief:

- Change of venue from Polk County to Story County;
- Dismissal of Plaintiff's Petition;
- Recasting of Plaintiff's Petition;
- A more specific statement requiring substantially greater factual detail;
- Quashing service upon multiple Defendants;
- Assessment of costs against Plaintiff;
- Assessment of attorney fees against Plaintiff; and
- Additional relief deemed appropriate by the Court.

**Narrative Characterizations of Plaintiff:**

3. Within these filings, Defendants characterized Plaintiff and her claims as follows:

- "This action is the latest in a string of unsubstantiated claims pursued by Plaintiff."
- Plaintiff allegedly engaged in "harassing conduct" toward customers and employees.
- Defendants allegedly had been subjected to "years of harassing conduct by Plaintiff, both inside and outside of the legal system."

**Plaintiff's Position:**

4. Plaintiff disputes these allegations and contends they repeated and expanded upon allegations previously advanced during Iowa Civil Rights Commission proceedings.

5. Plaintiff further alleges that these filings were submitted after Defendants had actual notice of the action and after Plaintiff had expressly pled a factual basis for venue in Polk County arising from submissions allegedly made to the Iowa Civil Rights Commission in Des Moines. Plaintiff contends that Defendants nevertheless represented that Polk County was an improper venue, sought transfer to Story County, and requested costs and attorney fees associated with the transfer despite having notice of Plaintiff's pleaded venue allegations. See D0001 pp. 143–144; D0001 pp. 114–115.

6. Plaintiff further alleges that certain Defendants simultaneously challenged service, joined substantive motions directed to the merits, sought venue transfer, requested attorney fees and costs, and advanced disputed factual characterizations of Plaintiff, despite having actual notice of the action and actively participating in coordinated motion practice. Plaintiff alleges that these requests were presented concurrently, requiring responses to multiple procedural and merits-related issues at the outset of the litigation before discovery had commenced.

7. Plaintiff further alleges that these filings collectively imposed multiple simultaneous response obligations concerning venue, service, dismissal, pleading sufficiency, recasting, fee-shifting, and attorney-fee issues before discovery had commenced and before Plaintiff had any meaningful opportunity to develop evidence supporting her claims. Plaintiff alleges that the cumulative effect of these overlapping motions substantially increased the procedural burden of the litigation, required extensive legal research and drafting within compressed deadlines, and diverted time and resources away from Plaintiff's educational, professional, advocacy, and other activities.

8. Plaintiff further notes that Defendants later accepted service on March 19, 2024, after previously moving to quash service and after obtaining transfer of the action to Story County.

9. Plaintiff further alleges that, rather than seeking resolution of discrete procedural issues through narrower or sequential means, Defendants elected to pursue multiple overlapping forms of relief simultaneously, thereby increasing the complexity, cost, and burden of responding to the litigation at its earliest stage.

10. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants expressly represented to the Court that "No exception contained in Iowa Code § 616 is applicable" while simultaneously seeking transfer of venue, transfer costs, and attorney fees. Plaintiff disputes that representation and alleges that Defendants continued pursuing venue transfer and related cost-shifting relief after Plaintiff identified Iowa Code § 616.18 and articulated the factual basis upon which Plaintiff contended Polk County venue was proper.

11. Plaintiff alleges that the significance of Defendants' early filings lies not in their volume alone, but in their cumulative and coordinated use. Defendants simultaneously pursued service objections, venue transfer, dismissal, recasting, heightened pleading requirements, fee-shifting, and attorney-fee demands while repeatedly invoking allegations portraying Plaintiff as a harasser, stalker, or otherwise improper actor. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants undertook this coordinated motion practice despite having notice that Plaintiff was enrolled full-time at DMAACC, had requested a continuance until the end of the semester, and had disclosed that litigation demands were interfering with completion of her Honors Program obligations. Plaintiff alleges that this combination of procedural attacks, disputed characterizations, and disregard for Plaintiff's academic constraints substantially increased the burden of responding to the litigation at its outset thereby causing Plaintiff to be unable to fulfill her commitments and obligations associated with her DMAACC Honors project under the supervision of Dr. Jeff Schroeder.

12. Plaintiff contends that this coordinated motion practice established the procedural posture that shaped the subsequent phases of the litigation.

**Phase II – Evidentiary Preparation, Opposition to Evidentiary Development, and Dismissal (May–October 2024)**

**Procedural Setting**

13. Following transfer to Story County, multiple pre-answer motions remained pending, including Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, Motion to Recast, and Motion for More Specific Statement. No discovery had yet occurred.

**Court-Directed Evidentiary Preparation**

14. On May 16, 2024, the Court requested that the parties advise whether they intended to present evidence so that sufficient hearing time could be scheduled. On May 28, 2024, the Court again addressed anticipated evidentiary presentation and indicated that an in-person hearing might be necessary if numerous exhibits were to be presented. Plaintiff undertook evidentiary preparation in reliance on the Court's directive that evidence would be presented at the hearing and on continuances granted for that purpose. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants later reframed these court-directed preparations as dilatory when the case was reassigned to Judge Doyle, in a manner that appeared designed to create confusion regarding the origin and purpose of the continuances, despite knowing that the time was granted by the Court to allow Plaintiff to respond to Defendants' overlapping February filings and to prepare evidence as instructed.

15. Plaintiff advised the Court that she intended to present exhibits and evidence in support of her claims. Plaintiff thereafter devoted substantial time to organizing exhibits, amending pleadings, preparing evidentiary materials, and seeking continuances necessary to

complete those preparations. Plaintiff alleges that these efforts were undertaken in reliance upon the Court's directives concerning anticipated evidentiary presentation.

### **Defendants' Position**

16. During this same period, Defendants repeatedly characterized Plaintiff's claims as lacking factual support, argued that Plaintiff had insufficient evidence, and sought dismissal before discovery. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants simultaneously opposed continuances, opposed evidentiary presentation, opposed consideration of materials outside the pleadings, opposed evidentiary hearings, and opposed further factual development of the record.

### **Result**

17. Plaintiff alleges that after substantial preparation had been completed in anticipation of evidentiary presentation, the anticipated evidentiary path did not occur. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants continued to argue that Plaintiff lacked sufficient factual support while simultaneously opposing the mechanisms through which Plaintiff sought to present evidence and develop the factual record.

18. On October 4, 2024, the Court dismissed most claims and declined to consider exhibits referenced in Plaintiff's filings because the exhibits were not attached to the pleading itself.

### **Plaintiff's Position**

19. Plaintiff alleges that she reasonably relied upon the Court's directives concerning anticipated evidentiary presentation and devoted substantial time and effort to organizing exhibits, preparing evidence, amending pleadings, and seeking continuances necessary to

complete those preparations. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants simultaneously argued that Plaintiff lacked sufficient factual support while opposing continuances, opposing evidentiary presentation, opposing amendment, opposing discovery, and opposing further factual development of the record.

20. Plaintiff alleges that the practical effect of these proceedings was to require substantial evidentiary preparation while limiting Plaintiff's ability to obtain, develop, present, or rely upon evidence prior to dismissal. Plaintiff contends that Defendants repeatedly asserted that Plaintiff lacked evidentiary support while simultaneously opposing mechanisms through which Plaintiff sought to develop and present evidence. Plaintiff further alleges that disputed allegations concerning Plaintiff's conduct continued to be advanced in support of procedural motions while factual development of the record remained restricted.

21. Plaintiff contends that these events are relevant to her abuse-of-process claim because they illustrate a recurring pattern in which Defendants sought dismissal and other procedural relief while simultaneously opposing amendment, evidentiary development, discovery, and other efforts directed toward creation of a fully developed factual record. Plaintiff alleges that the cumulative effect of these actions was to increase litigation burdens, multiply response obligations, delay factual development, and impede resolution of the underlying dispute on its merits.

**Phase III – Amendment, Reconsideration, Deadline Disputes, and Academic Burdens  
(January–March 2025)**

22. Following reassignment of this action to the Honorable Angela Doyle, Plaintiff sought leave to amend her pleadings, preserve reconsideration rights, and comply with deadlines

that had previously been stayed by agreement of the parties during settlement-related proceedings and later restarted by court order.

23. On January 13, 2025, the Court granted Plaintiff leave to amend pursuant to Iowa Rule of Civil Procedure 1.402(4) but denied Plaintiff's request for a continuance of the reconsideration deadline. Plaintiff alleges that this ruling created a procedural conflict because amendment had been authorized while the deadline to seek reconsideration of the October 4, 2024 dismissal order remained in dispute.

24. Plaintiff thereafter filed motions directed toward preserving amendment rights, reconsideration rights, appellate rights, and compliance with competing procedural deadlines arising from the January 13 ruling.

25. During this same period, Plaintiff informed the Court and Defendants that she was enrolled in a full academic course load and requested continuances extending certain deadlines until completion of the Spring 2025 semester. Plaintiff alleges that these requests were based upon ongoing academic obligations, court-directed exhibit preparation, amendment efforts, and compliance with existing litigation deadlines.

26. Defendants opposed such requests and characterized Plaintiff's filings as part of a "yearslong pattern of delay and obfuscation." Plaintiff disputes that characterization and alleges that Defendants omitted significant portions of the procedural history, including venue-transfer proceedings, service-related motions, dismissal motions, pleading challenges, fee requests, jointly requested settlement stays, discovery disputes, and other litigation activity that contributed to the duration and complexity of the case. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants characterized amendment efforts, preservation motions, and requests for additional time as delay

while simultaneously opposing continuances, opposing amendment-related relief, and seeking procedural rulings that would have limited Plaintiff's ability to respond, amend, or seek reconsideration.

27. On March 14, 2025, the Court resolved the pending motion practice, restored Plaintiff's reconsideration deadline, clarified the procedures governing amendment, and established the procedural framework controlling the next phase of the litigation.

28. Plaintiff alleges that the deadlines ultimately imposed required substantial legal research, drafting, amendment efforts, and motion practice immediately preceding final examinations and major academic deadlines. Plaintiff further alleges that she was effectively required to choose between protecting her legal rights in this litigation and completing her academic obligations.

29. Plaintiff alleges that, as a direct result of those overlapping litigation demands and deadlines, she withdrew from two courses, received an incomplete in another course, lost tuition previously paid for the withdrawn courses, disrupted her academic progress, adversely affected her academic standing, and suffered related educational and financial damages.

#### **Phase IV – Discovery Resistance and Dispositive Motion Practice (*January–May 2026*)**

30. Plaintiff alleges that by 2026 Defendants had spent approximately two years asserting that Plaintiff lacked sufficient evidence to support her claims while simultaneously opposing amendment, opposing evidentiary development, opposing discovery, opposing consideration of materials outside the pleadings, and seeking dismissal or summary disposition before a complete factual record could be developed.

31. Plaintiff further alleges that information concerning the authorship, drafting, revision history, metadata, internal communications, and preparation of the Iowa Civil Rights Commission submissions remained largely within Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Plaintiff contends that these materials are directly relevant to determining the truth or falsity of the allegations underlying the remaining defamation claim.

32. Plaintiff further alleges that many of the materials sought in discovery concerned information uniquely within Defendants' possession, custody, or control and therefore could not reasonably be obtained through alternative means.

33. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants repeatedly relied upon allegations portraying Plaintiff as a stalker, harasser, racist, boundary violator, or otherwise improper actor throughout the litigation while resisting discovery directed toward the preparation and development of the materials containing those allegations.

34. Plaintiff disputes the truth of those allegations and contends that discovery concerning the creation, revision, and submission of the Iowa Civil Rights Commission materials is necessary to determine the accuracy of the statements, the circumstances under which they were made, and the extent to which they were subsequently repeated throughout the litigation.

35. Following entry of the Court's discovery schedule, Plaintiff served discovery requests directed toward the drafting, authorship, revision history, metadata, and preparation of the June 28, 2022 Iowa Civil Rights Commission submissions.

36. Defendants objected to production of drafts, metadata, revision histories, internal communications, and related materials.

37. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants repeatedly asserted that Plaintiff lacked evidence while opposing amendment, evidentiary development, production of drafts, metadata, revision histories, and related discovery that Plaintiff contended was necessary to determine the truth or falsity of the disputed allegations.

38. On April 6, 2026, Defendants moved for summary judgment seeking dismissal of Plaintiff's remaining claim.

39. Plaintiff thereafter filed a resistance to summary judgment and a motion to compel, asserting that discovery concerning the preparation and development of the disputed Iowa Civil Rights Commission materials remained incomplete and was necessary to establish the truth or falsity of the statements underlying the remaining defamation claim.

40. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants sought termination of the action through summary judgment while simultaneously resisting discovery directed toward evidence Plaintiff contended was necessary to evaluate, challenge, and test the factual basis of the disputed statements underlying the remaining defamation claim.

41. Plaintiff further alleges that this continued a pattern present throughout multiple phases of the litigation in which Defendants repeatedly asserted that Plaintiff lacked evidentiary support while opposing efforts to obtain, develop, present, or discover evidence relevant to the disputed allegations.

42. Plaintiff contends that the cumulative effect of these actions was to impede factual development of the record while simultaneously relying upon the absence of a fully developed record as a basis for dismissal or summary disposition.

43. Plaintiff further alleges that the discovery disputes described above concerned materials directly relevant to the preparation, authorship, revision, and submission of the statements underlying the remaining defamation claim.

44. Plaintiff alleges that discovery concerning the preparation, revision, authorship, and submission of the ICRC materials remains central to resolving disputed factual issues concerning the allegations repeatedly advanced against Plaintiff throughout the administrative proceedings and subsequent litigation.

### **Recurring Characterizations of Plaintiff Across Multiple Litigation Phases**

**Scope:** Phase I (Polk County) → Phase II (Story County) → Phase III (Amendment Proceedings) → Phase IV (Discovery and Summary Judgment Proceedings)

45. Plaintiff alleges that the statements reproduced below are not isolated litigation characterizations but are continuations, repetitions, expansions, or reassertions of the same underlying allegations that form the basis of Plaintiff's defamation claims. Plaintiff disputes the truth and accuracy of those allegations and contends that they were repeatedly advanced throughout the course of this litigation.

46. Plaintiff further alleges that these allegations were not confined to the Iowa Civil Rights Commission proceedings but were repeatedly incorporated into motions, briefs, resistances, affidavits, declarations, and other filings submitted during multiple phases of this action. Plaintiff contends that the continuing repetition of these allegations forms part of the factual basis for the claims asserted in the Second Amended Petition.

47. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants repeatedly relied upon these allegations in support of requests for venue transfer, dismissal, fee-shifting, heightened pleading requirements, limitations

on amendment, opposition to continuances, opposition to evidentiary development, opposition to discovery, summary judgment, and other procedural relief. Plaintiff offers the excerpts below solely to document continuity, timing, and repetition across multiple phases of the litigation. The legal significance of this pattern is addressed in the Second Amended Petition.

## **Conclusion**

48. Cumulative Burden and Damages – Plaintiff alleges that the proceedings summarized above extended from February 2024 through May 2026 and involved recurring disputes concerning venue, service, dismissal, pleading sufficiency, amendment, evidentiary development, discovery, and summary judgment. Plaintiff contends that the cumulative effect of these proceedings substantially increased the cost, complexity, duration, and burden of litigating the action and contributed to the reputational, educational, professional, advocacy-related, financial, and political damages alleged throughout the Petition.

## **Continuing Impacts Alleged by Plaintiff**

49. Plaintiff further alleges that these proceedings affected multiple independent areas of her life over a period exceeding two years, including academic coursework, scholarship-related obligations, professional opportunities, advocacy efforts, publishing activities, community-organizing activities, and ultimately her 2026 gubernatorial campaign. Plaintiff alleges that the cumulative burden of litigation obligations, motion practice, hearings, briefing requirements, discovery disputes, and related proceedings caused substantial personal, educational, professional, reputational, financial, advocacy-related, and political damages.

50. Academic Harms – Plaintiff alleges that the litigation burdens described above directly interfered with her academic pursuits, including obligations associated with the DMACC

Honors Program and subsequent coursework at Iowa State University. Plaintiff alleges that these proceedings contributed to course withdrawals, an incomplete grade, loss of tuition previously paid, delayed academic progress, adverse effects upon academic standing and grade-point average, and other educational harms.

51. Reputational, Professional, and Political Harms – Plaintiff further alleges that repeated publication and repetition of disputed allegations in administrative and judicial records contributed to continuing reputational harm and impaired Plaintiff's professional, advocacy, publishing, community-organizing, and political activities. Plaintiff alleges that substantial time and resources were diverted toward responding to litigation-related obligations and attempting to address allegations Plaintiff contends were false or misleading. Plaintiff further alleges that these burdens ultimately interfered with campaign activities during the 2026 gubernatorial election cycle and contributed to the filing of a petition seeking extension of ballot-access deadlines.

52. Plaintiff incorporates this Exhibit by reference into the Second Amended Petition and alleges that the events summarized herein form part of the factual basis for the claims asserted therein.