

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 11/07/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0000761

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: MARK T. VOELKER

and

RESPONDENT: WANDA J. VOELKER

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD SUPPORT

RULING

On 9/19/25, this Court issued an order on Respondent/Wife's 7/8/25 Request for Order ("RFO") re pendente lite spousal support and attorneys' fees and costs. This matter is now set for hearing on Petitioner/Husband's 9/8/25 RFO re: guideline child support for the benefit of the parties' son, Daniel (DOB 9/20/08). Husband requests guideline child support retroactive to 7/8/25; (2) modification of spousal support to account for guideline child support; (3) an order that each party contribute to mandatory add-on expenses, and (4) the parties share expenses for Daniel's extracurricular activities and tutoring expenses. Husband filed his Income & Expense Declaration, 2024 W-2, 2023 as well as 2022 Federal and State income tax returns on 9/8/25. He filed a Reply Declaration and proposed support calculations with supporting declaration on 10/31/25.

On 9/30/25, Wife filed a Responsive Declaration, 10/31/25 she filed Respondent's Evidentiary Objections to Husband's Reply Declaration, and on 11/3/25, Respondent's Amended Evidentiary Objections. With regard to Respondent's Evidentiary Objections, the Court is well versed in the rules of evidence and does consider only relevant, admissible evidence in making its determinations. The Court suggests counsel heed her own advice, as the Court finds Wife's Declarations to be no less argumentative than Husband's.

Respondent/Mother filed her Responsive Declaration on 9/30/25, in which she agrees to guideline child support, but claims a 50% - 50% timeshare, and objects making the child support other than to the date Husband filed his RFO. Wife proposes add-on expenses should be allocated proportionally, per Family Code §4061(a). Additionally, Wife requests the Court order joint legal and physical custody of Daniel, with a 50%-50% timeshare. Since custody/visitation is beyond the scope of Husband's RFO, that request is not properly before the Court and will not be considered. If Wife wishes to seek custody orders, she needs to file the appropriate RFO.

Support

Having reviewed and considered all of the parties' written submissions, the Court refers to its 9/19/25 Findings and Order After Hearing with regard to the assumptions on which pendente lite spousal support were based. Attached hereto as Exhibit is "A" an XSpouse calculation which, sets guideline pendente lite spousal support payable from Husband to Wife at of \$2,290/month, and guideline child support payable from Wife to Husband of \$402/month, for a net monthly payment from Husband to Wife of \$1,888/month. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. Husband's request to retroactively modify spousal support to 7/8/25 is denied. The Court finds no reason for a modification to a date prior to his filing the RFO re: child support on 9/8/25.
2. Mother's request to assume a 50%-50% timeshare for child support is denied, as the Court finds that contrary to the evidence.
3. Wife shall pay to Husband as and for guideline child support the sum of \$402/month, retroactive to 9/8/25. Said support shall be payable on or before the 1st day of each month.
4. Retroactive to 9/8/25, Husband shall pay to Wife as and for pendente lite spousal support, the sum of \$2290/month. Said support shall be payable on or before the 1st day of each month.
5. Net combined spousal and child support payable from Husband to Wife is \$1,888/month, retroactive to 9/8/25.
6. Effective 9/8/25, Mandatory add-on expenses for Daniel shall be shared per the parties' respective net incomes, in accordance with Family Code §4061(a), with Husband paying 70% of said expenses and Wife paying 30% of said expenses.
7. The parties shall share Daniel's tutoring expenses and other agreed-upon extracurricular activities in the same proportion as set forth in item 6 above.
8. Spousal support shall continue until Wife remarries, either party dies, or further order of the Court.
9. Spousal support is neither taxable to the recipient nor tax-deductible by the payor.
10. Child support shall continue until (1) the child reaches the age of 18, or if still a full-time student in high school at age 18, until the child reaches age 19 or graduates from high school, whichever first occurs; (2) the child dies; or (3) the child is emancipated. The amount of child support is modifiable if there is a material change of circumstances for either party.
11. The parties are ordered to comply with the provisions of Family Code § 4063 in seeking reimbursement for uninsured medical and dental expenses, and a copy of the NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES – Health-Care Costs and Reimbursement

Procedures is attached to the Order After Hearing. These provisions shall apply to reimbursement for childcare expenses, as well.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Husband to prepare the order.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that If a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted. Evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department D. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

*October 2025 at 09:00 AM
Join Zoom Meeting*

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7jzvTrwjExIV0by4.1>

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If you are only able to appear by phone you may dial the phone number below, follow the prompts and enter the meeting ID and passcode.

+1-669-254-5252 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

2025

Xspouse 2025-1.2-CA

Monthly Figures

Fixed Shares	Mark Wanda		Monthly Figures		Cash Flow		
			2025			Guideline	Proposed
Number of children	1	0			Combined net spendable	12865	12865
Percent time with NCP	0.00%	1.00%			Percent change	0%	0%
Filing status	MFJIN	MFJIN					
Number of exemptions	2	1					
Wages and salary	13897	0					
Self employed income	0	2849					
Other taxable income	1637	0					
TANF CS received	0	0					
Other nontaxable income	0	0					
New spouse income	0	0					
Employee 401-k contribution	0	0					
Adjustments to income	0	0					
SS paid prev marriage	0	0					
CS paid prev marriage	0	0					
Health insurance	437	0					
Other medical expenses	0	0					
Property tax expenses	989	0					
Ded interest expense	507	0					
Contribution deduction	0	0					
Misc tax deductions	0	0					
Qualified business income deduction	0	0					
Required union dues	89	0					
Mandatory retirement	294	0					
Hardship deduction	0	0					
Other GDL deductions	0	0					
Child care expenses	0	0					

Mark pays Guideline SS, Proposed SS

Wanda pays Guideline CS, Proposed CS

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information

	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
All children		99 - 1	0	0	0 Mark	402 Wanda	402 Wanda
Daniel	2008-09-20	99 - 1	0	0	0 Mark	402 Wanda	402 Wanda

Superior Court of California
County of Marin

Exhibit "A"

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 11/07/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0001118

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: MARIO ZOGBI

and

RESPONDENT: DABHNE PALACIOS
CURI

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW HEARING – CHILD CUSTODY/VISITATION –
RECEIPT OF FCS REPORT

RULING

This matter is set for custody review hearing regarding the parties' two children: Jonathan (DOB 8/11/15) and Jimena (DOB 8/15/17). On 1/31/25, the Court granted a 3-year Domestic Violence Restraining Order with Father the restrained person and Mother and both children the protected persons.

The parties were re-referred to Family Court Services ("FCS"). Both parties were interviewed by FCS, and FCS also interviewed the children's therapist at the Center for Domestic Peace, Deborah McNeil, MFT. FCS' Report & Recommendations were filed with the Court on 10/14/25. Dr. McNeil confirmed the children's continuing fear of seeing Father, that the children have a very close relationship with Mother, and that Mother does not disparage or denigrate Father. Father continues to deny any responsibility for his acts of domestic violence in the presence of the children.

Respondent/Mother filed a Statement of Agreement/Disagreement on 10/15/25 requesting an evidentiary hearing but fails to state any facts supporting the request. Given that the Court finds it is in the best interests of the children to adopt the FCS recommendations, the Court finds no reason to have an evidentiary hearing. After full consideration of the history of this case, as well as the FCS Report & Recommendations, and in particular the information provided by the children's therapist, the Court orders as follows:

1. All prior orders not in conflict with the below shall remain in full force and effect with the following modifications.
2. Mother shall maintain sole legal and physical custody.

3. The children shall not be mandated to visit with Father for supervised visits if they do not wish to do so.
4. The children shall continue in therapy until otherwise clinically indicated. The children's therapies shall not be terminated against clinical advice.
5. Father shall continue to comply with all aspects of his mental health diversion including participation in regular therapy and being medication compliant with any medications prescribed to him to treat mental health issues.
6. Father shall continue in and complete the 52-week batterers' treatment course he is currently enrolled in (Street to School) and provide proof of completion with the Court.
7. Professionally supervised visits for Father may again be considered in the future after Father successfully completes his mental health diversion as well as his batterers' treatment course and upon a showing that Father has genuinely taken responsibility for his violence and has been rehabilitated.
8. Mother's request for an evidentiary hearing is denied.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Mother shall prepare the order.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted. Evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department D. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

October 2025 at 09:00 AM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7jzyTrwjExIV0by4.1>

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If you are only able to appear by phone you may dial the phone number below, follow the prompts and enter the meeting ID and passcode.

+1-669-254-5252 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 11/07/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0001461

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: YASMINA PAJKIN

and

RESPONDENT: CHAFIQ FDAOCH

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE – CONTEMPT/FAILURE TO COMPLY – POSSIBLE SANCTIONS 2) CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE
3) REQUEST FOR ORDER – SPOUSAL SUPPORT

RULING

This matter was continued for hearing on (1) Petitioner/Wife's 5/16/25 Request for Order ("RFO") for guideline *pendente lite* spousal support and (2) Order to Show Cause re: contempt and sanctions against Husband. Husband was ordered to produce additional financial documentation. Husband did not timely file the additional financial information. He did file an Income & Expense Declaration ("I&E") and the parties' 2023 and 2024 income tax returns, but for 2025 the only information he provided was a self-reported profit and loss statement for June and July, which indicates after expenses he netted \$796.01 in June and he was negative \$140.99 in July. This is directly contrary to his I&E, filed in August, on which he states he earned \$2,046 in July, and also with his 2023-2024 income on his tax returns of \$2,916/month. So how is it he is covering his monthly living expenses of \$4,766, making monthly payments on outstanding debts he claims of \$85,629, and still has \$5,369.49 in cash and deposit accounts?

In the Declaration supporting her RFO, Wife states that both parties are chauffeurs; during the marriage Husband developed the chauffer business, and she worked as a driver for the business. However, the parties' jointly-filed tax returns for 2023 and 2024, signed by the parties and filed with the IRS, state that Husband was self-employed and Wife was a homemaker. Total household income reported on both the 2023 and 2024 returns was approximately \$35,000, or \$2,916/month. The Court questions how a family of three (the parties have a son that is now 18) could have lived on \$2,916/month. As noted, Husband claims \$4,476/month in expenses.

Wife reports she moved out of the family home with the parties' (now adult) son in March 2025. She states on her most recent I&E monthly income of \$4,407 from driving and babysitting. Her supporting documentation appears to be a partial printout from a Venmo account. Wife claims living expenses of Her living expenses are \$5,928. She claims \$3,044 in cash and deposit accounts and personal property valued at \$17,916. has \$65,440 in outstanding debt.

Wife filed an additional Declaration in which she contends that Husband has a Certificate of Deposit worth over \$205,634.64, sends an average of \$6,000/month to his family in Morocco

and owns approximately 8 different properties in Morocco, including a villa, a Riyadh, 3 apartments and an empty lot. Wife provides no evidence to corroborate these claims.

Husband claims Wife is earning \$8,000/month as a result of stealing clients from him. He provides no corroborating evidence for his statement.

Wife claims her living expenses include the parties' adult son, but Husband claims on his I&E that their son is living with him.

While ordinarily tax returns are assumed to be accurate, given all of the inconsistencies and conflicting claims provided by the parties, the Court does not believe it has sufficiently reliable information regarding either of the parties' actual financial circumstances. incomes. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. Pendente lite spousal support is set at zero, subject to modification if additional credible financial information is provided to the Court.

Order to Show Cause

2. Hearing on the Order to Show Cause is deferred and will be reset if and when the Court receives additional financial information from the parties.

SO ORDERED.

The Court will prepare the order per Rule 5.125, CA Rules of Court.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that If a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted. Evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department D. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

October 2025 at 09:00 AM
Join Zoom Meeting

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHim1j7izvTrwjExIV0by4.1>

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If you are only able to appear by phone you may dial the phone number below, follow the prompts and enter the meeting ID and passcode.

+1-669-254-5252 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 11/07/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0001978

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: DULCE MARIA CALDERON MALDONADO	
and	
RESPONDENT: ISABEL MARISOL CALDERON MALDONADO	

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – SPECIAL IMMIGRANT
JUVENILE FINDINGS

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on the Petitioner's Amended Request for Order re: Child Custody and Amended Request for Special Immigrant Juvenile Findings. Having reviewed the submissions, no opposition having been filed, and good cause appearing, the Request for Mother to have sole legal and physical custody of the Petitioner, and the Request for Special Immigrant Juvenile Findings are GRANTED.

The Court will sign the proposed orders which have been lodged in the court file.

SO ORDERED.

The Court will prepare the order per Rule 5.125, CA Rules of Court

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted. Evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department D. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

***October 2025 at 09:00 AM
Join Zoom Meeting***

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHim1j7jzyTrwjExIV0by4.1>

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If you are only able to appear by phone you may dial the phone number below, follow the prompts and enter the meeting ID and passcode.

+1-669-254-5252 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 11/07/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0002121

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: MARISSA LEE

and

RESPONDENT: HERBERT BAEZ

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD CUSTODY/VISITATION

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Mother's 8/28/25 Request for Order ("RFO") re: custody/visitation and child support regarding the parties' son, Brandon (DOB 12/8/24). Mother requests the parties share joint legal custody with Respondent/Father to have visitation on the 2nd and 4th weekends of the month for 2 hours on Saturday and 2 hours on Sunday, as arranged by the parties. Father filed a Responsive Declaration on 8/25/25, in which he requests joint legal and joint physical custody. On 8/28/25, Father filed a separate Request for Order re: custody/visitation and seeks immediate visitation so that he and Brandon can properly bond. On 10/9/25, Mother filed a separate Request for Order ("RFO") re: child support, which is set for hearing on 12/5/25.

The parties were referred to Family Court Services ("FCS"). (Marin County is a "recommending county.") Both parties attended mediation with FCS, and after an extended mediation session, came to agreement on a number of issues. As to other issues, FCS made recommendations. Both the Agreements and recommendations were submitted to the Court by FCS in its Report & Recommendations filed 10/20/25.

After reviewing and considering the matter, the Court finds that it is in the best interests of the child to adopt the Agreements reached by the parties, as well as the FCS recommendation, as set forth below. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. Parental Timeshare: Father shall have unsupervised parenting time once a month for a period of 4 to 5 days in Marin County (or for however many days Father is in Marin County). Father's visits shall be for full days starting from 6:45 - 7 AM through a mutually agreed upon time in the evening. Father shall exercise his parenting time in the temporary housing where he is staying when in Marin County (e.g. Air B&B or other short-term rental, etc.). Brandon shall remain in Mother's custody at all other times when not in Father's custody.

2. For the first one to two visits, Mother shall be present to walk Father through Brandon's current routine and to inform him of what foods he is currently eating, feeding and nap schedule, and all other aspects of caretaking. Once Father has been provided with this introduction from Mother, Mother shall not participate in Father's parenting time unless otherwise agreed to between the parents.
3. Neither parent shall consume or be under the influence of alcohol to the point of impairment during their parenting times.
4. Parents shall utilize a coparenting app such as Our Family Wizard or Talking Parents or some other equivalent app to communicate about coparenting matters including posting Brandon's schedule of medical and other appointments, daily feeding and nap schedule, and any other important coparenting information.
5. Both parents shall be permitted to jointly attend Brandon's medical appointments and other appointments related to his medical care (e.g. occupational therapy). When parents are attending a medical or other appointment involving Brandon, other family members shall not attend the appointment unless otherwise agreed between the parents.
6. Brandon shall be taken to his occupational therapy appointments and any other medical or other regular appointments by Father during Father's custody time in Marin County.
7. Father shall be given access to Brandon's medical and future educational records and shall be given access to the portals. If a particular medical or educational portal only permits one parent to register for access, Father shall be given the access information including username and password.

Recommendations

8. The parties shall share joint legal and physical custody.
9. Father shall begin overnights with Brandon in Marin County starting with his third visit to Marin County.
10. Neither parent shall introduce casual dating partners to Brandon until such time that the relationship is a committed and long-term relationship of at least one year.
11. Father may exercise his parenting time with Brandon in Los Angeles County where he resides starting January 1, 2026. Until Brandon gets older, he shall be limited to four trips a year to Los Angeles County. Brandon shall be transported on a plane for trips to Los Angeles County so as to avoid an unduly long car ride given his young age and medical history. Transportation via car from Marin County to Los Angeles County may be reassessed in the future as Brandon gets older.
12. Father shall continue to have regular Face Time calls with Brandon outside of his in-person parenting time. Mother shall facilitate and make Brandon available for these calls.

13. Parents may modify any portion of their parenting plan including making changes to the timeshare as needed anytime per mutual parental agreement.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Mother shall prepare the order.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted. Evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department D. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

*October 2025 at 09:00 AM
Join Zoom Meeting*

*<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7izyTrwjExIV0by4.1>
Meeting ID: 160 111 4119
Passcode: 636308*

If you are only able to appear by phone you may dial the phone number below, follow the prompts and enter the meeting ID and passcode.

*+1-669-254-5252 US (San Jose)
Meeting ID: 160 111 4119
Passcode: 636308*

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.