

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**THE HONORABLE MONICA BENTON**

**THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KING**

DIANE ARMESTO, a single woman;

Plaintiff,

v.

PARRIS ANDREA ROSOLINO, fka  
PARRIS ANDREA TILTON, fka PARRIS  
ANDREA LORING, a single woman.

Defendant.

No. 11-2-23405-3 SEA

**[PROPOSED]**

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S  
EIGHTH MOTION TO HOLD  
DEFENDANT IN CONTEMPT FOR  
VIOLATIONS OF INJUNCTION  
DATED AUGUST 14, 2015 AND  
CONTEMPT ORDER DATED  
OCTOBER 24, 2016**

**Noted: May 31, 2018**

The Court considered PLAINTIFF'S EIGHTH MOTION TO HOLD DEFENDANT IN CONTEMPT FOR VIOLATIONS OF INJUNCTION DATED AUGUST 14, 2015 AND CONTEMPT ORDER DATED OCTOBER 24, 2016 ("Eighth Motion for Contempt"). The Court has considered the following:

1. Plaintiff's Eighth Motion for Contempt;

1 2. Declaration of Paul Fogarty with attached exhibits.

2 3. Declaration of Diane Armesto.

3 Additionally, the Court notes that the Defendant admitted and declared in open Court,  
4 on March 1, 2016, and while under oath, that she has intentionally violated the Permanent  
5 Injunction and has no intention of abiding by it.

6 The Court finds that the Eighth Motion for Contempt has merit and should be granted.

7 The Court incorporates herein the Permanent Injunction dated August 14, 2015  
8 (“Injunction”), including the findings contained in the Injunction, and the Court’s Order  
9 Granting Plaintiff’s Fifth Motion to Hold Defendant in Contempt for Violations of Injunction  
10 dated October 24, 2016, including the findings contained in the order (“Contempt Order”) and  
11 the Court’s Orders Granting Plaintiff’s Sixth and Seventh Motions to Hold Defendant in  
12 Contempt for Violations of Injunction dated February 14, 2017, including the findings  
13 contained in the orders.

14 In addition to the continuing violations of the Injunction as noted in the Contempt Order  
15 and in the Court’s Order Granting Plaintiff’s Sixth and Seventh Motions to Hold Defendant in  
16 Contempt for Violations of Injunction dated February 14, 2017, the Court also finds additional  
17 violations of the Injunction and Contempt Order, as sets forth the following additional findings  
18 of fact and conclusions of law:

19 **A. Defendant continues to ignore and violate the Injunction and Contempt Order.**

- 20 **1. Defendant continues to falsely hold herself out as Parris “Rosolino” with her**  
21 **Washington State driver’s license.**

1 After the Court took away Defendant's "Rosolino" name in the Contempt Order dated  
2 October 24, 2016, the Defendant circumvented the order and immediately renewed her driver's  
3 license as Parris "Rosolino" less than one month later, on November 21, 2016. See seventh  
4 motion for contempt where the issue and evidence are discussed.

5 **2. Defendant continues to mispresent herself as Frank Rosolino's biological**  
6 **daughter and continues with her scheme on the internet and social media sites.**

7 The Court entered its seventh contempt order on July 28, 2017.

8 Undeterred, Defendant continued misrepresenting herself as Parris "Rosolino" and  
9 continued with her scheme on Facebook. See selected excerpts from Defendant's Facebook  
10 page post-dating the seventh contempt order, Exhibit 3 to Fogarty Declaration.<sup>1</sup>

11 Undeterred, Defendant has continued misrepresenting herself as Parris "Rosolino" and  
12 continued with her scheme on Google+. See excerpts from Defendant's Google+ page, Exhibit  
13 4 to Fogarty Declaration.

14 Additionally, despite being ordered to take down internet references relating to Armesto  
15 and Defendant's misrepresentations as Parris "Rosolino," a Google search of "Parris Rosolino"  
16 reveals multiple references to Parris "Rosolino," being Frank Rosolino's daughter, and to  
17 Armesto. Exhibits 5-8 of Fogarty Declaration.

18 **3. Defendant is still registered to vote as Parris "Rosolino."**

19 Despite the Injunction and contempt orders, Defendant continues to be registered to vote  
20 as Parris "Rosolino." Exhibit 9 to Fogarty Declaration.

21  

---

<sup>1</sup> It is understood that Facebook recently suspended Defendant's Facebook account after Facebook had reviewed this Court's findings, Injunction and contempt orders relating to Defendant's fraudulent identity and scheme.



1           **4. Defendant continues to be identified as Parris “Rosolino” on additional internet**  
2           **sites and/or Armesto continues to be identified as the person who murdered**  
3           **Frank Rosolino.**

4           Defendant continues to be identified throughout the internet as Parris “Rosolino” on  
5 Google+, All About Jazz, You Tube, Myspace, Sound Cloud, Wikipedia and in a book about  
6 Frank Rosolino by Wade Anastasia Jere that lends even more credibility to her fraud. Exhibit 10  
7 to Fogarty Declaration. Additionally, Defendant’s false claims about Armesto continue to reside  
8 on the Internet and there is no evidence that Defendant has attempted to remove these references  
9 despite it being within her control to do so. See, e.g., Mel Torme site, Dead of the Day/Garzol  
10 site.

11           **5. Defendant’s continuing violations continue to damage Armesto.**

12           Defaming Armesto (the former executrix of Frank Rosolino’s will and estate), while  
13 falsely posing as Frank Rosolino’s daughter, is at the core of Defendant’s fraudulent scheme to  
14 access the royalties from Frank Rosolino’s music estate. While the scheme continues unabated,  
15 Armesto continues to be extremely concerned about Defendant and her impact on Armesto in  
16 the jazz world.

17           Meanwhile, as the Court has noted, *paternal* DNA test results have proven Parris Tilton  
18 (self-named Rosolino) is not the biological daughter of Frank Rosolino and that he never  
19 adopted Defendant, and that Armesto did not shoot, murder, and maim anyone, and that  
20 Defendant’s motive all along has been to collect money from music companies and from Frank  
21 Rosolino’s estate for which Armesto was executrix while also defaming Armesto and  
          attempting to destroy her reputation throughout the music world in which Defendant knows  
          Armesto work(ed). *Id.* at ¶4.

1 **B. The Court has attempted lesser sanctions to obtain Defendant's compliance with its**  
2 **orders.**

3 The Injunction and Contempt Order required Defendant to undertake certain actions such  
4 as changing her surname from "Rosolino" to another name, to update the public record with her  
5 new surname, and to remove the defamation from the Injunction. Defendant has ignored the  
6 Injunction and has continued to use social media to perpetuate her scheme. As a result, in the  
7 Contempt Order, the Court vacated the 2007 District Court name-change order, and changed  
8 Defendant's last name from "Rosolino" back to "Tilton" and provided recourse in the Contempt  
9 Order for the various public entities to update the public record with the name change. In its  
10 Seventh Contempt Order, the Court ordered Defendant \$10 per day for Defendant's continuing  
11 disobedience of the Court's orders. The foregoing relief has not had any impact on Defendant's  
12 compliance with the Injunction and Contempt Order.

13 The Court has attempted to obtain Defendant's compliance through the use of warnings,  
14 admonishments, financial sanctions (unpaid), a name-change and other relief as set forth in more  
15 detail in the Injunction, Contempt Order and other contempt orders and Defendant has simply  
16 ignored the Court's orders. In the Contempt Order, the Court warned Defendant: "Defendant is  
17 warned that if she continues to violate the Injunction, the Court will consider additional  
18 sanctions. For example, the Court recognizes that Defendant's fraudulent scheme has been  
19 perpetuated in part, using social media. If Defendant continues her scheme in violation of the  
20 Injunction, the Court will consider additional prohibitions against Defendant such as limiting,  
21 restricting or barring Defendant's use of social media until Defendant complies with the Court's  
orders. E.g., Contempt Order at 10:10-16.


1 Under RCW 7.21.030(2)(c), when a person is in contempt, the Court may enter a  
2 contempt order “designed to ensure compliance with a prior order of the court.”  
3 Short of incarceration, the Court is running out of tools to enforce the Injunction and Contempt  
4 Order and obtain compliance with the Injunction and Contempt Order. Defendant has ignored  
5 all prior attempts by the Court to enforce its Injunction and Contempt Order.

6 Accordingly, in an attempt to obtain Defendant’s compliance with the Injunction and  
7 Contempt Order, the Court orders the following:

- 8 1. From the date of this order, the Court *increases* the daily sanctions from **\$10 per**  
9 **day (seventh contempt order) to \$30** per day and such sanctions will continue until Defendant  
10 complies with the Court’s Injunction and Contempt Order or as otherwise ordered by the Court;
- 11 2. Armesto may present to the Court a proposed judgment in the amount of the  
12 contempt sanctions of \$10 per day at 12% simple interest for the time period from the date of the  
13 Court’s seventh contempt order of July 28, 2017 to the date of this order;

14 The Injunction and Contempt Order remain in full force.

15 **DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2018.**

16  
17   
18 **Honorable Monica J. Benton**  
19  
20  
21