

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 11/21/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL1202069

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: HALCYON FOSTER

and

RESPONDENT: BARBARA FIGARI

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: STATUS ONLY HEARING – CHILD SUPPORT

RULING

This matter is set for status conference. On 11/18/25, Respondent filed a Status Conference Statement, in which she indicates she is still awaiting the IRS approval of her 2020 tax return, filed in October 2024. Respondent advises that, according to her accountant, the IRS will not accept any tax returns for years subsequent to 2020 until they approve the 2020 return.

The Court accepts Respondent's proposal to continue the matter for 90 days, and sets a status conference for 2/20/2026 at 9:00 am in Department D.

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:

November 2025 at 09:00 AM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9E8WHjm1j7jzvTrwjExIV0by4.1>

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: 11/21/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL1701971

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: MICHELLE BOURKE

and

RESPONDENT: DARRACH BOURKE

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: OEX/DEBTOR'S EXAM

RULING

Appearances required for Debtor's exam of Respondent.

SO ORDERED.

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:

November 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: 11/21/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL2203175

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: PIERRE-OLIVIER
LATOUR

and

RESPONDENT: NOOSHIN LATOUR

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – 1) SPOUSAL SUPPORT 2)
ATTORNEY’S FEES

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Father’s 9/24/2025 Request for Order(“RFO”) to Modify Existing Orders for 2026-2027 school year. Father seeks to change the existing order for the parties two children, Mirabelle (DOB 3/26/15) and Clementine (DOB 2/19/18), to spend the 2026-2027 school year with him at his home in Switzerland, to his new home in Dubai. Father requests that either the Court enforce the existing order re: his custodial 2026-2027 school year, or alternatively, to modify the 2023 order to apply it to his current residence.

On 11/10/25, Respondent/Mother filed her Responsive Declaration in which she opposes the children living in and attending school in Dubai for the 2026-2027 school year.

First, either option Father suggests requires a modification of the existing order; the agreement cannot be enforced as it is written, as that would require the children to spend the school year with Father in Switzerland, which is not what Father is requesting. The request to modify the current order to provide the children spend the 2026-2027 school year in Dubai rather than in Switzerland is a substantial modification. Mother opposes the modification for valid reasons. Dubai is not a signatory to the Hague-Convention. On that basis alone, Father’s request to modify the current order is DENIED.

If Father wishes to return to Switzerland for the 2026-2027 school year, the order will be enforced. If not, the children shall remain in California for the 2026-2027 school year.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Mother 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:

November 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.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 11/21/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL 2301127

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: MARK GOLDSTEIN

and

RESPONDENT: KRISTEN KOH
GOLDSTEIN

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – 1) SPOUSAL SUPPORT
INCLUDING RETROACTIVE TO 9/1/23 PER 9/15/23 STIP/ORDER 2) ATTORNEY’S FEES

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Wife’s 4/9/25 Request for Order (“RFO”) re: pendente lite spousal support and need-based attorneys’ fees and costs. Wife requests guideline spousal support of: (a) \$22,822/month for the period from 4/1/25 which takes into account the child support being paid by Petitioner/ Husband during that time period for two of the parties’ children; , (b) \$25,290/month from 7/1/25 to account for the reduction in child support due to one of the children reaching majority and finishing high school; and (c) that the Court reserve jurisdiction over the retroactivity of pendente lite spousal support to 9/1/23, per the parties’ Stipulation & Order. Wife also requests attorneys’ fees in the amount of \$806,724.25 per Family Code § 2030.

Pendente Lite Spousal Support

Husband opposes Wife’s request and asks the Court to deviate from guideline spousal support and limit the award \$9,500/month. Husband argues that he is paying \$70,000/month in living expenses, a good deal of which benefits Wife, including but not limited to paying \$50,500/month for the mortgage, property taxes, promissory note and insurance on the 9-acre parcel of land in Tiburon on which they both live, separately; \$3,000/month for maintenance and taxes on community property they own on Central Park West, NYC; \$2,000/month for property maintenance and gardening at their community property rental property in Tahoe; and \$3,000 in therapist and therapeutic intervention costs for their son, who has special needs. Husband further argues that the \$37,816/month in expenses Wife claims on her 8/12/25 I&E are grossly inflated.

Wife’s most recent I&E states her monthly expenses are \$37,816. The Court seriously questions Wife’s claimed \$12,000/month for groceries, household supplies and eating out, as well as \$5,000/month in uninsured healthcare costs.

Nonetheless, the Court has not been presented with sufficient evidence to justify deviating from guideline spousal support down to \$9,500/month. As to Husband's claim that Wife has imputed him with \$90,000 of passive income is unreasonable, that amount was taken from Husband's support calculation, adopted by the Court for child support.

Having reviewed and considered all of the parties' written submissions, the Court orders as follows.

For the period from 4/1/25 to 6/30/25, attached as Exhibit "A" is an Xspouse calculation prepared by the Court which uses the same assumptions the Court used when ordering child support on 3/21/2025 (see, 4/16/2025 Findings and Order After Hearing), The Xspouse report sets guideline spousal support at \$19,238/month.

For the period commencing 7/1/25, attached as Exhibit "B" is an Xspouse calculation prepared by the Court which with the same assumptions, except that child support is reduced to one child of \$10,161. This does not change the amount of spousal support. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. Effective 4/1/25, Husband shall pay to Wife as and for pendente lite spousal support the sum of \$19,238/month, payable on or before the first day of each month. The Court reserves jurisdiction to retroactively modify the amount of pendente lite spousal support if the Court deems it appropriate.
2. The Court reserves jurisdiction as to the retroactivity of spousal support for the period from 9/1/23 to 4/1/25.
3. The Court reserves jurisdiction as to bonus spousal support.
4. Pendente lite Spousal support is not taxable to Wife and not tax-deductible by Husband.
5. Pendente lite spousal support shall continue until Wife remarries, either party dies, or further court order.

Child Support

6. Effective 7/1/25, child support is reduced. As and for child support for the benefit of Rex, Husband shall pay to Wife the sum of \$10,161/month, payable on or before the first day of each month.
7. The Court reserves jurisdiction over the issue of bonus child support.
8. Child support shall continue until (1) Rex 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.

Attorneys' Fees

The issue of attorneys' fees and costs has been before the Court a number of times, and the Court is very familiar with both parties' positions. Wife requests need-based attorneys' fees in the amount of \$806,727.25. She has already incurred \$1.2 million with an inordinate number of different attorneys. Wife has significantly exceeded Husband's attorneys' fees and costs, and the Court finds the total fees incurred to date by Wife is unreasonable. However, the Court has already responded to Wife's request by ordering Father to advance fees, rather than to order an award of fees. By doing so and reserving jurisdiction over the ultimate allocation of fees, Wife should clearly recognize that she faces the potential of having to ultimately pay for the fees advanced out of her share of community assets. The reality remains that, given his income, Husband has greater access to funds. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

9. Husband shall advance to Wife the sum of \$350,000 as and for attorneys' fees. The Court reserves the issue of the ultimate allocation of such funds to the time of trial.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Wife 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:

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

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7jzyTrwjExlV0by4.1>

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.

*Goldstein v. Goldstein***2025****Xspouse 2025-2-CA****Monthly Figures**

Fixed Shares	Mark Kristen		Monthly Figures		Cash Flow	
			2025		Guideline	Proposed
Number of children	0	2				
Percent time with NCP	0.00%	0.00%			Combined net spendable	84894 84894
Filing status	MFJIN	MFJIN			Percent change	0% 0%
Number of exemptions	1	3				
Wages and salary	0	0				
Self employed income	35400	0				
Other taxable income	89000	10000				
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	0	0				
Other medical expenses	0	0				
Property tax expenses	0	0				
Ded interest expense	0	0				
Contribution deduction	0	0				
Misc tax deductions	0	0				
Qualified business income deduction	0	0				
Required union dues	0	0				
Mandatory retirement	0	0				
Hardship deduction	0	0				
Other GDL deductions	0	0				
Child care expenses	0	0				

Mark pays Guideline CS, Guideline SS, Proposed CS, Proposed SS

FC 4055 checking: **OFF****Per Child Information**

	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
All children		0 - 100	0	0	0 Mark	16,258 Mark	16,258 Mark
Athena	2006-12-15	0 - 100	0	0	0 Mark	6,097 Mark	6,097 Mark
Rex	2011-07-14	0 - 100	0	0	0 Mark	10,161 Mark	10,161 Mark

Superior Court of California
County of Marin*Exhibit "A"*

2025

Xspouse 2025-2-CA

Monthly Figures

Fixed Shares	Mark Kristen		Monthly Figures		Cash Flow	
	Mark	Kristen	2025		Guideline	Proposed
Number of children	0	2			84894	84894
Percent time with NCP	0.00%	0.00%			0%	0%
Filing status	MFJIN	MFJIN	GUIDELINE			
Number of exemptions	1	3	Nets (adjusted)			
Wages and salary	0	0	Mark	78372	Mark	
Self employed income	35400	0	Kristen	6522	Payment cost/benefit	-29399
Other taxable income	89000	10000	Total	84894	Net spendable income	48973
TANF CS received	0	0	Support		Change from guideline	0
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	0	% of combined spendable	58%
New spouse income	0	0	User CS	10161	% of saving over guideline	0%
Employee 401-k contribution	0	0	Marin SS	19238	Total taxes	46028
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	29399	Dep. exemption value	0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	Settings changed		# withholding allowances	0
CS paid prev marriage	0	0	Proposed		Net wage paycheck	0
Health insurance	0	0	Tactic 9		Kristen	
Other medical expenses	0	0	CS	10161	Payment cost/benefit	29399
Property tax expenses	0	0	SS	19238	Net spendable income	35921
Ded interest expense	0	0	Total	29399	Change from guideline	0
Contribution deduction	0	0	Saving	0	% of combined spendable	42%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	Releases	0	% of saving over guideline	0%
Qualified business income deduction	0	0			Total taxes	3478
Required union dues	0	0			Dep. exemption value	0
Mandatory retirement	0	0			# withholding allowances	0
Hardship deduction	0	0			Net wage paycheck	0
Other GDL deductions	0	0				
Child care expenses	0	0				

Mark pays Guideline CS, Guideline SS, Proposed CS, Proposed SS

FC 4055 checking: OFF

Per Child Information

	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
All children		0 - 100	0	0	0 Mark	10,161 Mark	10,161 Mark
Athena	2006-12-15	0 - 100	0	0	0 Mark	0 Mark	0 Mark
Rex	2011-07-14	0 - 100	0	0	0 Mark	10,161 Mark	10,161 Mark

Superior Court of California
County of Marin

Exhibit "B"

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 11/21/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0001282

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: PHILLIP FLORES

and

RESPONDENT: DEWAN ANDREA BURNS

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER - VISITATION

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Father's 10/7/2025 Request for Order ("RFO") re: modification of visitation regarding the parties' son, Felipe (DOB 2/10/23) to reflect the parties' current schedule. Father raised concerns regarding Respondent/Mother's use of alcohol, her co-parenting and decision-making for Felipe. Father also requests he have the right of first refusal if Mother is unavailable for more than 8 hours. Respondent/Mother filed a Responsive Declaration on 11/12/25 in which she states that the visitation schedule changed out of necessity when she began working on 7/7/25. In addition, Mother raised concerns about Father's non-responsiveness and lack of communication when she is trying to make decisions, such as day-care for Felipe. Mother states that Father continues to make negative comments about her in front of Felipe when she is trying to make decisions. She cited an instant where Father raged at her, calling her a "whore" and "fucking bitch" while she was holding Felipe during an exchange.

Both parties were interviewed by Family Court Services ("FCS"), and FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 10/30/25. The parties were able to reach agreement on a number of issues, including timeshare, holiday schedule, right of first refusal, non-disparagement agreement, and coparenting communications. FCS made recommendations as to those issues in which the parties could not agree. Mother filed a Responsive Declaration on 11/12/25 and a Statement of Agreement/Disagreement with the FCS Report & Recommendations.

After reviewing and considering the parties' written submissions, as well as the FCS Report & Recommendations, the Court finds that it is in the best interests of Felipe to adopt the Agreements and Recommendations, as modified below, and orders as follows:

Agreements

1. Parental Timeshare: Until parents agree otherwise to change the timeshare, Felipe shall be in Father's custody each Saturday from noon through Sunday 7 PM, Tuesday from 4:30 PM to Wednesday 10 AM (drop off at daycare), and Thursdays from 4:30 PM to

Friday 10 AM (drop off at daycare). The Sunday evening return time may remain fluid including the addition of an overnight per mutual parental agreement. Every third Saturday, Felipe shall remain in Mother's care until 5 PM at which time he shall transition to Father's custody. Felipe shall be in Mother's custody at all other times during the week when not in Father's custody.

2. Thanksgiving: odd years with Father, even years with Mother.
3. Winter Break: defined as the days in which daycare is closed. Except for the Christmas Eve/Christmas Day schedule detailed below in paragraph number 4, parents shall maintain the regular weekly custody schedule during the Winter Break with the only modifications being that Father shall start his custody time at 9 AM on Tuesdays and Thursdays rather than 4:30 PM. Each parent shall be responsible for caring for Felipe during their custody days or arranging for alternative childcare during the Winter Break.
4. Christmas Eve (12/24) and Christmas Day (12/25): In odd years, Felipe shall be with Mother from 12/24 through 8 AM on 12/25 and then with Father beginning 8 AM Christmas Day. In even years, Felipe shall be with Father from 12/24 through 8 AM on 12/25 and then with Mother beginning 8 AM on Christmas Day.
5. Summer break: defined as the days in which daycare is closed. The regular weekly schedule shall remain in place with the only modification being that Father shall start his custody time at 9 AM on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Each parent shall be responsible for either caring for Felipe themselves or arranging for alternative childcare during the days that daycare is closed during the summer.
6. Other holidays: shall fall on the regular weekly custody schedule. If a parent has the day off on any particular holiday, they shall have the option to have Felipe in their custody for that holiday.
7. Parents may modify the custody schedule at any time per mutual parental agreement in order to accommodate changes to their work schedules, etc.
8. First right of refusal: shall be triggered by a period of four hours or more. In other words, if the custodial parent cannot directly care for Felipe during their designated custody time for a period of four hours or more, they shall first offer the other parent first right of refusal to care for Felipe before calling a babysitter or other childcare provider. The other parent is not obligated to care for Felipe. If the other parent cannot care for Felipe, the custodial parent shall then make alternative childcare arrangements.
9. Non-disparagement: Parents agree not to make disparaging remarks to one another, especially in the presence of Felipe as this is detrimental to him. Parents shall always speak to one another in a civil and respectful manner. Parents shall not denigrate the other parent to third parties in the presence of Felipe.
10. Coparenting communications: Parents shall respond within 24-48 hours to any coparenting communications that require action or a decision. If there is no response from

the other parent within 48 hours, the requesting parent shall have unilateral authority to move forward with the action/decision.

Recommendations

11. All prior orders not in conflict with the below shall remain in full force and effect with the following modifications.
12. Mother shall submit to at least nine months of Sober Link testing for alcohol during her custody time. Mother shall test three times a day on days when she is not working and two times a day on days when she works and Felipe is in daycare.
13. Mother shall pay 65% of the cost for Sober Link testing, and Father shall pay 35% of the cost for Sober Link testing.

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:

November 2025 at 09:00 AM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjmlj7jzvTrwjExIV0by4.1>

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: 11/21/25 TIME: 10:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL2202322

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: JASON VOELKER

and

RESPONDENT: TREACHS MCMAHON

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW HEARING – CHILD CUSTODY/VISITATION

RULING

This matter is set for review hearing on child custody/visitation regarding the parties' two daughters: Sadie (DOB 7/15/20) and Dorothy (1/10/19).

On 9/24/25, the Court granted Temporary Emergency Orders giving Respondent/Mother temporary physical custody and control of both girls. In addition, the Court ordered Petitioner/Father to provide to Minor's Counsel documentation regarding his eye surgery and confirmation of his current vision in each eye by 11/14/25.

Appearances required.

SO ORDERED.

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:

November 2025 at 09:00 AM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7jzvTrwjExIV0bv4.1>

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.