

*This opinion is nonprecedential except as provided by
Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 136.01, subd. 1(c).*

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS
A24-1738**

In the Matter of Caitlin Alexandra Valentine-Johnston,

Caitline Alexandra Valentine-Johnston,
Respondent,

vs.

Robert Andrew Reidy,
Appellant.

**Filed August 11, 2025
Affirmed; motion denied
Ross, Judge**

Ramsey County District Court
File No. 62-DA-FA-20-961

Caitlin Valentine-Johnston, St. Paul, Minnesota (self-represented respondent)

Robert Andrew Reidy, St. Paul, Minnesota (self-represented appellant)

Considered and decided by Wheelock, Presiding Judge; Ross, Judge; and Connolly,
Judge.

NONPRECEDENTIAL OPINION

ROSS, Judge

The district court amended a September 2020 order for protection against Robert Reidy in December 2022, limiting him from direct contact with Caitlin Valentine-Johnston except to discuss matters involving their children in joint sessions with the parties' parenting consultant or using a designated co-parenting communication platform.

Valentine-Johnston successfully applied to the district court in August 2024 to again extend the order. Because the district court received ample evidence demonstrating that Reidy continued to communicate with Valentine-Johnston with personal comments about matters that did not involve their children, we affirm.

FACTS

Robert Reidy and Caitlin Valentine-Johnston were romantically involved from 2015 to 2019 and had two children together. Valentine-Johnston sought and obtained a two-year order for protection (OFP) against Reidy in 2020, which was later amended to prohibit Reidy from direct communication with her except through the Our Family Wizard application and “only as it relates to the minor children.” Valentine-Johnston applied to the district court in August 2022 to extend the OFP against Reidy, and the district court issued the extension. The parties stipulated to an amended OFP in December 2022. That December 2022 amended OFP restricted Reidy as follows:

[Reidy] must not have any contact[] with [Valentine-Johnston] whether in person, with or through other persons, by telephone, mail, email, through electronic devices, social media, or by any other means, except [that he] may communicate with [her] regarding the minor children through Our Family Wizard [and] in joint sessions with [the parties’] Parenting Consultant . . . if [the consultant] requests joint sessions.

Valentine-Johnston applied to again extend the OFP, alleging that Reidy continued to harass her by sending messages through Our Family Wizard unrelated to their children. The district court considered the application to extend the OFP at a hearing where it received documentary evidence that Reidy sent Valentine-Johnston the following allegedly

noncompliant communications through Our Family Wizard between November 2023 and July 2024:

- November 29, 2023: “You made that comment about Ramsey [C]ounty but you do know they . . . don’t believe you, right? You have been proven to be lying 3 times so now they don’t even follow up? It’s not a secret.”
- November 29, 2023: “I will never understand how you couldn’t just admit to your lying with your family and let me the kids and probably you have a normal life.”
- July 25, 2024: “You’re a miserable human being.”

The district court granted Valentine-Johnston’s application, extending the OFP for another two years.

Reidy appeals.

DECISION

Reidy argues that the evidence does not support the OFP extension. We review the decision to grant an OFP for an abuse of discretion, and a district court abuses its discretion when it bases its decision on an erroneous view of the law or its decision is against logic and the facts in the record. *Thompson v. Schrimsher*, 906 N.W.2d 495, 500 (Minn. 2018). The district court “may extend the terms of an existing order . . . upon a showing that . . . the respondent has violated a prior or existing order for protection.” Minn. Stat. § 518B.01, subd. 6a(b)(1) (2024). The district court extended the terms of the existing OFP because it concluded that Reidy violated the existing OFP by communicating with Valentine-Johnston about matters not related to their minor children.

The district court’s decision is supported by the evidence. A person violates an OFP when an OFP exists, the person knows it exists, and he violates a term or condition of it.

See id., subd. 14(b) (2024). The record shows that Reidy knew that an OFP existed from the previous multiple orders mentioned above. Reidy submitted exhibits revealing that he scolded Valentine-Johnston for allegedly “choosing not to follow the order” and warning her that he was “not knowingly violating the order.” The listed examples also demonstrate that Reidy violated an OFP term, because his messages accusing Valentine-Johnston of being a proven liar and “a miserable human being” were prohibited by the OFP’s restriction to communicate only “regarding the minor children.”

We are not persuaded to reverse based on Reidy’s contention that the district court should not have credited Valentine-Johnston’s testimony because she lied during testimony and submitted incomplete message histories. We do not reconcile competing evidence on appeal from a district court’s decision to grant an OFP and defer to the district court’s witness-credibility determinations. *Butler v. Jakes*, 977 N.W.2d 867, 871 (Minn. App. 2022). The district court implicitly credited Valentine-Johnston’s testimony when it extended the OFP “[b]ased on [Valentine-Johnston]’s testimony” and “the information . . . in [the submitted] exhibits.” And it is apparent to us that, on their face, Reidy’s Our Family Wizard statements violated the OFP regardless of their context.

After briefing was complete, Reidy moved this court to accept additional documents in our consideration of the appeal. We will not base our decision on information outside the record on appeal or even consider documents not produced and received into evidence in the district court. *Thiele v. Stich*, 425 N.W.2d 580, 582–83 (Minn. 1988); *see also* Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 110; *In re Application by Block*, 727 N.W.2d 166, 177 (Minn. App. 2007) (granting motion to strike documents not considered by decision-maker). Our review of the

record informs us that none of the documents identified in the motion are in the record. We deny the motion.

Affirmed; motion denied.