

On July 22nd, 2005 the defendant applied to me for an order that payments be made to the Court Funds Office, that \$500 in payments be recognized and credited against the outstanding arrears, and for a restraining order.

Both the file material and the oral presentations of the parties made it clear there is a great deal of personal animosity between them. Apparently, Ms. Bodden has been delivering demand letters to Ms. Prendergast at her place of employment. The tone of these letters, which are on file, is harassing and inappropriate. Ms. Bodden has no other reason to attend at Ms. Prendergast's residence or place of employment. I determined that the circumstances justify an order restraining Ms. Bodden from attending at those locations or having any communication directly or indirectly with Ms. Prendergast.

I was satisfied that it would be to the advantage of both parties to have payments made to the Court Funds Office, and made that order.

I accepted documentary evidence from Ms. Prendergast demonstrating she has made payments in the amount of \$500 since the date of Justice Panton's order. In ordinary circumstances, that would leave the sum of \$600 to be regarded as "arrears" under the instalment regime established by that order. However, the defendant said she was prevented by the circumstances prevailing in the aftermath of Hurricane Ivan from making some of the instalment payments. I accepted this, and determined that the arrears payable immediately under the instalment payment regime should be set at \$300 rather than \$600. I ordered the defendant to pay that sum by September 1st, 2005.

I warned the defendant that she is the beneficiary of a rather liberal instalment payment regime and must adhere strictly to it in the future. I said that if the defendant is late by seven days in making any instalment payment, the plaintiff is at liberty to apply for a warrant of committal.

Dated this 6th day of September, 2005

Henderson, J.

Henderson, J.
Judge of the Grand Court

