

SUMMONS
(CITACION JUDICIAL)

FOR COURT USE ONLY
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:
(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

Aidan Kearney

A TRUE COPY ATTEST

DEPUTY CLERK

5/7/26

FILED
4/24/2026 1:02 PM
Clerk of the Napa Superior Court
By: Ellie Bowden, Deputy

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:
(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

Kylie Kirkpatrick

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. **NOTE:** The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. **¡AVISO!** Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. **AVISO:** Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 o más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es) Napa Superior Court
111 Third St. Napa CA 94559

CASE NUMBER
(Número del Caso) 26CV000896

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:
(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es)
Aidan Kearney 136 Winthrop Lane Holden, MA 01520

DATE
(Fecha) 4/24/2026

Clerk, by Ellie Bowden, Deputy
(Secretario) *(Adjunto)*

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)
(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010).)

Robert E. Fleshman



NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

- as an individual defendant.
- as the person sued under the fictitious name of *(specify)*.
- on behalf of *(specify)*:

under: <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.10 (corporation)	<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.60 (minor)
<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation)	<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.70 (conservatee)
<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)	<input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.90 (authorized person)
<input type="checkbox"/> other <i>(specify)</i> :	
- by personal delivery on *(date)*.

For your protection and privacy, please press the Clear This Form button after you have printed the form.

Print this form

Save this form

Clear this form

Conclusion and Prayer for Relief

Plaintiff has made good faith efforts to resolve this matter without court intervention, including requesting that Defendant remove false and harmful content and cease further publication. Defendant has refused to do so and instead has continued to maintain and benefit from the continued publication of such content. As a result, Plaintiff has no remaining option but to seek relief through this Court.

This action is not brought out of retaliation, but out of necessity. Plaintiff seeks only to be left alone and to prevent further harm to herself and her minor child. Despite Defendant's own public statements suggesting that individuals should be afforded the opportunity to move on, Plaintiff has not been afforded that same consideration.

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant engaged in a sustained pattern of publishing false statements concerning her over a period of years, resulting in significant reputational, emotional, and economic harm. The underlying criminal case referenced in Defendant's publications has since been dismissed, undermining the factual basis of the narrative that Defendant repeatedly promoted.

Plaintiff therefore respectfully requests that this Court provide appropriate relief to prevent further harm, to address the damage already sustained, and to allow Plaintiff and her family the peace and privacy they have been denied.

1. **For general and special damages** in an amount according to proof at trial.
2. **For compensatory damages** for loss of income, loss of earning capacity, and damage to Plaintiff's personal and professional reputation.
3. **For damages for emotional distress**, including anxiety, humiliation, and harm suffered by Plaintiff as a result of Defendant's conduct.
4. **For injunctive relief** ordering Defendant to remove and cease publication of false and defamatory statements concerning Plaintiff and her minor child.
5. **For injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant** from publishing further false statements concerning Plaintiff and her minor child in the future.
6. **For costs suit incurred herein.**
For punitive damages, based on Defendant's willfull, malicious, and reckless conduct an amount sufficient to deter such conduct in the future.



Kylie Kirkpatrick MS, BA

April 16, 2026

- “Napa Valley Register Prints Story Filled With Lies About Our Reporting...” — January 4, 2020
 - “Update: Kylie Kirkpatrick Has Taken Down Donation Button...” — January 2, 2020
 - “Investigating Kylie Kirkpatrick Part 3: Shopping Sprees, Fraud...” — January 2, 2020
-

Origin of narrative (Dec 2019)

- “Investigating Kylie Kirkpatrick Part 2: Conning Politicians And Celebrities At The Expense Of West Park Elementary” — December 31, 2019
- “Investigating Kylie Kirkpatrick Part 1: Coaching A Child To Lie About ‘Lunch Shaming’” — December 30, 2019
- “Allegedly Heroic Kid Being Used By Manipulative Mother To End ‘Lunch Shaming’ Is All Based On A Lie” — December 27, 2019

1. The first article was published on December 27, 2019, and was titled “Allegedly Heroic Kid Being Used By Manipulative Mother To End ‘Lunch Shaming’ Is All Based On A Lie”.
2. The second article was published on December 30, 2019, and was titled “Investigating Kylie Kirkpatrick Part 1: Coaching A Child To Lie About ‘Lunch Shaming’”.
3. The third article was published on December 31, 2019, and was titled “Investigating Kylie Kirkpatrick Part 2: Conning Politicians And Celebrities At The Expense Of West Park Elementary”.
4. The fourth article was published on January 4, 2020, and was titled “Napa Valley Register Prints Story Filled With Lies About Our Reporting...”.

[Handwritten signature]

January 2, 2020

Posts referencing MINOR son (Ryan Kyote)

2022

- “Video Shows Kylie Kirkpatrick’s Scamming Son Tormenting Smaller Boy, Brady Sullivan Allows Him To Go Through Resident’s Trash, Raise Money For Cancer Scam” — October 13, 2022
 - “Warrant Issued For Kylie Kirkpatrick For Violating Bail Conditions By Pretending To Have Cancer, Starting Fraudulent GoFundMe, Attacking Man With MS In Blog” — October 5, 2022
-

2020

- “Providence Mayor Who Fell For Kylie Kirkpatrick Scam Deputizes Army Of Karens To ‘Socially Shame’ Those Who Won’t Wear Masks” — May 6, 2020
-

Early 2020 (Public exposure phase)

- “Kylie Kirkpatrick Forced Her Son To Hold A Curt Menefee Cardboard Cutout To Get On TV During The Super Bowl Pregame Show” — February 4, 2020
 - “Oakland Raiders Give Kylie Kirkpatrick 2 Super Bowl Tickets As A Reward For Coaching Her Son To Lie Repeatedly” — January 22, 2020
-

“Investigating” Series (major cluster involving your son)

- “Investigating Kylie Kirkpatrick Part 7: Media Lies, Creates A Monster, Refuses To Retract Fake News” — January 15, 2020
- “Napa Police Announce Investigation Into Kylie Kirkpatrick For Fraudulent Fundraising...” — January 11, 2020
- “Investigating Kylie Kirkpatrick Part 6: Threatening Parents, Harassing Critics...” — January 9, 2020
- “Investigating Kylie Kirkpatrick Part 5: Fraudulent Sign Language Interpreting...” — January 7, 2020
- “Investigating Kylie Kirkpatrick Part 4: Criminal History, Drug Addiction, Profiting Off Of Death...” — January 6, 2020

“Investigating Kylie Kirkpatrick” Series

- Part 7: “Media Lies, Creates A Monster, Refuses To Retract Fake News” — January 15, 2020
 - “Stay Away Order From Son’s Former School...” — January 13, 2020
 - “Napa Police Announce Investigation...” — January 11, 2020
 - Part 6: “Threatening Parents, Harassing Critics...” — January 9, 2020
 - Part 5: “Fraudulent Sign Language Interpreting...” — January 7, 2020
 - Part 4: “Criminal History, Drug Addiction...” — January 6, 2020
-

Beginning of series (Dec 2019)

- “Napa Valley Register Prints Story Filled With Lies...” — January 4, 2020
- “Update: Kylie Kirkpatrick Has Taken Down Donation Button...” — January 2, 2020
- Part 3: “Shopping Sprees, Fraud...” — January 2, 2020
- Part 2: “Conning Politicians And Celebrities...” — December 31, 2019

EXHIBIT D – SOCIAL MEDIA AMPLIFICATION

Overview

Defendant did not limit his publications to a single website. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant republished, promoted, and amplified the same allegations across multiple social media platforms, including but not limited to Twitter/X, Facebook, Instagram, Reddit, and video-based platforms.

Through these channels, Defendant expanded the reach of his statements to a significantly broader audience, encouraging engagement, commentary, and further dissemination of the allegations. This multi-platform distribution resulted in repeated exposure of the same claims and contributed to the escalation of harassment, reputational harm, and real-world consequences experienced by Plaintiff and her minor child.

Exhibit A – Index of Defendant’s Publications Concerning Plaintiff (2019–2023)*

*2026 "Defendant's YouTube Broadcast Responding to Lawsuits - Episode 869" - April 19, 2026

2023

- "Poor Behavior" — July 7, 2023
 - "Rhode Island Wellness And Counseling Facility Hires Kylie Kirkpatrick Despite Facing 11 Felony Charges, 21 Counts Of Fraud, Not Having Appropriate Licensure" — May 8, 2023
-

2022

- "Video Shows Kylie Kirkpatrick's Scamming Son Tormenting Smaller Boy, Brady Sullivan Allows Him To Go Through Resident's Trash, Raise Money For Cancer Scam" — October 13, 2022
 - "Warrant Issued For Kylie Kirkpatrick For Violating Bail Conditions By Pretending To Have Cancer, Starting Fraudulent GoFundMe, Attacking Man With MS In Blog" — October 5, 2022
-

2020

- "Providence Mayor Who Fell For Kylie Kirkpatrick Scam Deputizes Army Of Karens To 'Socially Shame' Those Who Won't Wear Masks" — May 6, 2020
 - "Kylie Kirkpatrick Is Out Of Jail On Recognizance, Reunited With Son, Driving For Instacart Despite 8th Felony Charge Of Child Abuse" — April 7, 2020
 - "Breaking News: Kylie Kirkpatrick Arrested By Napa Police, Charged With 7 Felonies, Held On \$100K Bail" — March 19, 2020
-

Early 2020 (initial wave)

- "Kylie Kirkpatrick Forced Her Son To Hold A Curt Menefee Cardboard Cutout To Get On TV During The Super Bowl Pregame Show" — February 4, 2020
- "Oakland Raiders Give Kylie Kirkpatrick 2 Super Bowl Tickets As A Reward For Coaching Her Son To Lie Repeatedly" — January 22, 2020
- "Kylie Kirkpatrick Forced Elementary School To Shelter In Place After Harassing Parents, Driving By School" — January 18, 2020

11. Following dismissal of the criminal case, Plaintiff contacted Defendant for the first time requesting removal of the false and harmful content. Defendant refused to remove the content and instead conditioned potential removal on Plaintiff's participation in Defendant's monetized online platform.
12. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's conduct has caused substantial harm, including but not limited to reputational damage, loss of income and professional opportunities, emotional distress, and ongoing impairment of earning capacity.
13. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant's actions were intentional, malicious, and undertaken with disregard for the foreseeable harm to Plaintiff and her minor child.

Plaintiff further notes that Defendant's publications appear to have significantly decreased or ceased around 2023. This timing coincides with developments in Plaintiff's criminal case, including court findings related to the handling and preservation of evidence. While Plaintiff does not have direct knowledge of the reasons for the change in Defendant's publication activity, the timing raises questions regarding whether relevant communications, materials, or content were altered, removed, or no longer maintained. Plaintiff respectfully requests that any investigation includes review of record preservation and potential deletion of communications related to these events.

Plaintiff reported Defendant's online publications and the resulting harassment to law enforcement on or about December 2019. Plaintiff informed officers that Defendant's posts were generating harassment, unwanted contact, and safety concerns for Plaintiff and her minor child. Plaintiff was advised that the matter would be addressed; however, Defendant's publications and related harassment continued without interruption. As a result, Plaintiff remained in fear for her safety and the safety of her child. Based on the response received and the continued conduct, Plaintiff has concerns regarding whether appropriate action was taken in response to her report.

As a result, Plaintiff has been forced to pursue legal action to protect her rights, clear her name, and seek redress for the damage caused.

COMPLAINT – FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

1. Beginning in or about December 2019, Defendant Aidan Timothy Kearney began publishing statements and media content concerning Plaintiff and her minor child across his online platforms.
2. Upon information and belief, Defendant was contacted by a former acquaintance of Plaintiff who provided information that formed the basis of a narrative about Plaintiff. In a publicly available video, Defendant acknowledged that he was approached to publish content regarding Plaintiff and identified an individual connected to that request.
3. Defendant proceeded to publish numerous statements presenting allegations about Plaintiff as facts, including claims that Plaintiff fabricated her minor child's charitable donation and misrepresented personal matters. Plaintiff alleges that these statements were false.
4. Beginning in 2019, Defendant engaged in a sustained campaign of publication, producing a high volume of posts, commentary, and related media content concerning Plaintiff and her minor son. These publications repeatedly asserted that Plaintiff had engaged in fraudulent conduct and dishonesty, including statements concerning her child's donation and her personal health.
5. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant either knew these statements were false or acted with reckless disregard for their truth or falsity. Despite being placed on notice of inaccuracies, Defendant continued to publish and republish the content.
6. Defendant's publications were widely disseminated and encouraged public engagement, resulting in third parties contacting Plaintiff's employers, clients, family members, and community institutions. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant's platform enabled and amplified hostile commentary directed at Plaintiff and her minor child, including statements encouraging harassment.
7. As a result of Defendant's publications, Plaintiff experienced intrusion into her personal and professional life, including contact with her child's school, involvement of social services, and disruption to her employment and business relationships.
8. Plaintiff further alleges that statements and content published by Defendant were relied upon, at least in part, in the initiation of a criminal investigation against her. During a preliminary hearing, testimony was presented indicating that information consistent with Defendant's published content was referenced in connection with the investigation and warrant process.
9. Plaintiff was subsequently arrested; however, the criminal case against her has since been dismissed.
10. Plaintiff alleges that, but for Defendant's sustained publication of false statements and amplification of the narrative, the investigation and resulting arrest would not have occurred.

Defendant knew or reasonably should have known that these statements were false, or acted with reckless disregard for the truth.

As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's publications, Plaintiff suffered harm to her reputation, loss of income and professional opportunities, and other damages.

Second Cause of Action - Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

(Plaintiff v. Defendant)

Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs.

Defendant's conduct, including the repeated publication of false statements concerning Plaintiff and her minor child over a period of years, was extreme and outrageous.

Defendant intended to cause, or acted with reckless disregard of the probability of causing, emotional distress to Plaintiff.

Defendant's conduct resulted in severe emotional distress to Plaintiff, including anxiety, fear, humiliation, and disruption to her personal and professional life.

Third Cause of Action - Harassment and Related Misconduct

(Plaintiff v. Defendant)

Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs.

Defendant engaged in a course of conduct directed at Plaintiff, including repeated online publications and amplification of allegations concerning Plaintiff and her minor child.

This conduct served no legitimate purpose and resulted in substantial emotional distress, reputational harm, and unwanted contact from third parties.

Defendant's actions contributed to ongoing harassment experienced by Plaintiff and her family.

II. PARTIES

5. Plaintiff, Kylie Kirkpatrick, is an individual who resided in Napa, CA, and at all relevant times was engaged in professional and community activities that depended on her reputation and public standing.
 6. Defendant, Aidan Kearney, is an individual residing in Holden, MA, who operates online media platforms, including blogs and social media accounts, through which he publishes content to a broad audience.
-

7. At all relevant times, Defendant acted individually and in concert with others, whose some identities are presently unknown, in publishing and amplifying defamatory statements about Plaintiff. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to add such parties when their identities are ascertained.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. Jurisdiction is proper in this Court because the events giving rise to this action occurred in California.
 9. Venue is proper in this Court because the conduct at issue occurred in this county and Plaintiff resided here at the time.
-

V. CAUSES OF ACTION

First Cause of Action - Defamation (Libel)

(Plaintiff v. Defendant)

Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

Defendant published numerous written statements concerning Plaintiff on online platforms, including blogs and social media, in which Defendant presented allegations as statements of fact.

Plaintiff alleges that these statements were false, including but not limited to allegations that Plaintiff engaged in fraudulent conduct, misrepresented her minor child's charitable activities, and made false claims regarding her personal circumstances.

FILED
4/24/2026 1:02 PM
Clerk of the Napa Superior Court
By: Ellie Bowden, Deputy

Kylie Kirkpatrick
1110 Dillon Dr.
Napa, CA 94558

Plaintiff, In Pro Per

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF NAPA**

Kylie Kirkpatrick,
Plaintiff,

Case No. 26CV000896

v.

Unlimited Civil Action

Aidan Kearney,
Defendant.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Defamation; Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress; Harrassment and Related Misconduct

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This action arises from Defendant Aidan Kearney's publication of false, defamatory statements about Plaintiff Kylie Kirkpatrick through online platforms, including blog posts and social media.
 2. Defendant engaged in a pattern of conduct that included publishing misleading and unverified claims, encouraging public harassment, and coordinating or amplifying harmful narratives about Plaintiff.
 3. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's actions, Plaintiff suffered significant reputational harm, emotional distress, and economic damages.
 4. Defendant's conduct was intentional, malicious, and carried out with reckless disregard for the truth.
-

2. Is this case complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court? Yes No

If the case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional judicial management:

- a. Large number of separately represented parties
- b. Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel issues that will be time-consuming to resolve
- c. Substantial amount of documentary evidence
- d. Large number of witnesses
- e. Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court
- f. Substantial postjudgment judicial supervision

3. Remedies sought (check all that apply):

- a. monetary
- b. nonmonetary; declaratory or injunctive relief
- c. punitive

4. Number of causes of action (specify): 3

5. Is this case a class action suit? Yes No

6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form CM-015.)

Date: 4/16/2026

Kylie Kirkpatrick

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)

NOTICE

- Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result in sanctions.
- File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.
- If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding.
- Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 of the California Rules of Court or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only.

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you **must** complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on pages 1 and 2. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check **one** box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the **primary** cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 of the California Rules of Court is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$35,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex.

SEE PAGE 3 FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY.



ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY NAME: Kylie Kirkpatrick FIRM NAME: STREET ADDRESS: 1110 Dillon Drive CITY: Napa STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 94558 TELEPHONE NO.: 305.897.2959 FAX NO.: EMAIL ADDRESS: kyliektarp@gmail.com ATTORNEY FOR (name): Pro Se		FOR COURT USE ONLY FILED 4/24/2026 1:02 PM Clerk of the Napa Superior Court By: Ellie Bowden, Deputy	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Napa STREET ADDRESS: 825 Brown St. MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Napa 94559 BRANCH NAME: CIVIL		CASE NUMBER: 26CV000896 JUDGE: DEPT.:	
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unlimited (Amount demanded exceeds \$35,000)		<input type="checkbox"/> Limited (Amount demanded is \$35,000 or less)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Complex Case Designation <input type="checkbox"/> Counter <input type="checkbox"/> Joinder Filed with first appearance by defendant (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)		CASE NUMBER: 26CV000896 JUDGE: DEPT.:	

Items 1-6 below must be completed (see instructions on page 2).

1. Check **one** box below for the case type that best describes this case:

Auto Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Auto (22) <input type="checkbox"/> Uninsured motorist (46)	Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Breach of contract/warranty (06) <input type="checkbox"/> Rule 3.740 collections (09) <input type="checkbox"/> Other collections (09) <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage (18) <input type="checkbox"/> Other contract (37)	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.404) <input type="checkbox"/> Antitrust/Trade regulation (03) <input type="checkbox"/> Construction defect (10) <input type="checkbox"/> Mass tort (40) <input type="checkbox"/> Securities litigation (28) <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental/Toxic tort (30) <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive groundwater adjudication (47) <input type="checkbox"/> Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41)
Asbestos <input type="checkbox"/> Asbestos (04)	Real Property <input type="checkbox"/> Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14) <input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful eviction (33) <input type="checkbox"/> Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> Enforcement of judgment (20)
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Product liability (24) <input type="checkbox"/> Medical malpractice (45) <input type="checkbox"/> Other PI/PD/WD (23)	Unlawful Detainer <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial (31) <input type="checkbox"/> Residential (32) <input type="checkbox"/> Drugs (38)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint <input type="checkbox"/> RICO (27) <input type="checkbox"/> Other complaint (not specified above) (42)
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort <input type="checkbox"/> Business tort/Unfair business practice (07) <input type="checkbox"/> Civil rights (08) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defamation (13) <input type="checkbox"/> Fraud (16) <input type="checkbox"/> Intellectual property (19) <input type="checkbox"/> Professional negligence (25) <input type="checkbox"/> Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Judicial Review <input type="checkbox"/> Asset forfeiture (05) <input type="checkbox"/> Petition re arbitration award (11) <input type="checkbox"/> Writ of mandate (02) <input type="checkbox"/> Other judicial review (39)	Miscellaneous Civil Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership and corporate governance (21) <input type="checkbox"/> Other petition (not specified above) (43)
Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Wrongful termination (36) <input type="checkbox"/> Other employment (15)	Employment Development Department (EDD) <input type="checkbox"/> EDD decision review (48)	



**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF NAPA**
825 Brown Street, Napa, CA 94559

Notice of Case Management Conference

Case #: 26CV000896 **Kylie Kirkpatrick vs Aidan Kearney**

A Case Management Conference has been scheduled in this matter pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.221.

Date: 10/06/2026 **Time:** 8:30 AM **Room:** Courtroom A

The plaintiff/petitioner must include a copy of this notice with the complaint when serving the defendant/respondent. Cross complainants must serve a copy of this notice on any new parties named to the action. (Civil only)

To learn more about the types and benefits of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), and whether it may be appropriate for your case, please access the California Courts website at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/programs-adr.htm>.

This site also contains Judicial Council forms applicable to ADR.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC DELIVERY

This notice was delivered via eMail to:

Napa Court is equipped to handle remote appearances. With proper notice to all parties, you may be allowed to appear remotely. See CCP section 367.75. Zoom meeting links and participant information can be found at www.napacourt.com/remote. When appearing via video, court hearings should be treated the same as if you are appearing in Court. Please contact the court with any questions 707-299-1100.