

Sixth No. H052147

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

EKATERINA STRULYOV,

Petitioner and Respondent,

v.

EUGENE STRULYOV,

Respondent and Appellant.

Court of Appeal No. H052147

(Super. Ct. No. 19FL001660)

Appeal From Order of the Superior Court
County of Santa Clara
Honorable Brooke A. Blecher

REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION

EUGENE STRULYOV
Appellant in Pro Per
600 Righters Ferry Rd, apt 224
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004
Telephone: (818) 306-7030

I respectfully request that the Opinion in the above matter be published. As noted in both my AOB and ARB, the instant case presents two issues of first impression:

1. This is the first "omitted assets" case in history where the "aggrieved" party had already received the dollar value of the asset that was supposedly "omitted" and then was also awarded the asset itself by Family Court. In fact, she was slightly overpaid (AOB 19).
2. This is also the first "omitted assets" case in history where the "aggrieved" party had already received more than half of community property in the initial division and then had her share further increased by Family Court (from approximately 53% to 77%, AOB 23).


(The above statements are based on mathematical calculations. Math is not subject to opinion. 2+2 will never be 5.)

Court of Appeal has now explicitly endorsed Ekaterina's argument that she should get paid twice: via equalization + in kind. It did not consider this to be a miscarriage of justice. Never before has Fam.Code § 2556 been applied in this manner and, from my discussions with attorneys, nobody understood the law to operate this way. They remain in disbelief that this was, in fact, what was ordered. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Court of Appeal to make an important point of clarification that it is perfectly comfortable with this outcome. Surely, it did not reserve this punishment only for me.

Notably, Ms Finelli has not cited a single prior case with the same fact pattern. It is therefore quite fitting to make her victory a binding precedent. If such precedent had existed, this appeal would not have occurred.

Dated: 3/24/2025

Respectfully submitted,



Eugene Strulyov