

Commonwealth of Kentucky

Court of Appeals

NO. 2026-CA-0853-OA

J.P.

PETITIONER

AN ORIGINAL ACTION
v. ARISING FROM JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT
ACTION NO. 24-J-502394-001

HONORABLE LAUREN ADAMS OGDEN

RESPONDENT

AND

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
CABINET FOR HEALTH AND FAMILY
SERVICES

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

AND

NO. 2026-CA-1032-OA

J.P.

PETITIONER

AN ORIGINAL ACTION
v. ARISING FROM JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT
ACTION NO. 24-J-502394-001

HONORABLE LAUREN ADAMS OGDEN

RESPONDENT

AND

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
CABINET FOR HEALTH AND FAMILY
SERVICES

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

ORDER
DENYING MOTIONS FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF

** ** *

The above-styled original actions arise from the same dependency, neglect, and abuse (DNA) action and involve the same parties and substantially similar issues. Therefore, the Court has decided to rule on Petitioner's motions for emergency relief, pursuant to Kentucky Rule of Appellate Procedure (RAP) 60(H), in the same order. *See* RAP 2(G).

Petitioner has five active cases before this Court, two direct appeals¹ and three original actions.² All of Petitioner's cases arise from the same DNA action. On July 7, 2026, the Court issued an order denying Petitioner's RAP 60(H) motion in Case No. 2026-CA-0722. The order set forth the procedural history of the underlying case, and, ultimately, the Court concluded Petitioner had not met his burden of showing irreparable harm. The Court reasoned that Petitioner's statements, alone, were not proof of his allegations and that his claims regarding the loss of custody did not meet the legal definition of irreparable harm.

The primary differences between the RAP 60(H) motions now before the Court and the motion the Court denied in July are (1) Petitioner's assertions

¹ Case Nos. 2026-CA-0282 and 2026-CA-0905.

² Case Nos. 2026-CA-0722, 2026-CA-0853, and 2026-CA-1032.

that the Respondent Judge is acting without proper jurisdiction and (2) the additional claims regarding the violation of his due process rights. These arguments go to the merits of his petitions for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition and will be addressed by a three-Judge panel of this Court in due time. As the Court already informed Petitioner, to receive emergency relief he must show he will suffer immediate and irreparable injury. RAP 60(H)(1). Petitioner's assertions that he is irreparably harmed because the family court's orders essentially sever and terminate his parental rights are not supported by the limited record and do not meet the legal definition of irreparable harm. *Lee v. George*, 369 S.W.3d 29, 34 (Ky. 2012).

As a final note, the Court understands Petitioner's desire to receive an expeditious resolution to his cases before this and the family court. However, "every paper filed in court exhausts some of the court's limited resources." *Cardwell v. Commonwealth*, 354 S.W.3d 582, 585 (Ky. App. 2011). Thus, Petitioner's repetitious filing of nearly identical documents is not helping to achieve his goal and could be construed as frivolous. RAP 11; *see also* Kentucky Rule of Civil Procedure (CR) 11.

WHEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that Petitioner's motions for emergency relief be DENIED. The petitions for a writ of prohibition shall be

assigned to a three-Judge panel of this Court following expiration of the response time provided in the Rules of Appellate Procedure.

ENTERED: September 1, 2026



HON. JACQUELINE M. CALDWELL
JUDGE, COURT OF APPEALS