

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 01/08/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL1900336

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: SANDRA ESQUIVIAS

PETITIONER: JESSICA A. JACKSON

and

RESPONDENT: SAAD J. JACKSON

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

**RULING**

Respondent Saad Jackson (“Father”) filed a Request for Order (RFO) September 10, 2025, seeking changes to visitation and custody orders. Father seeks legal and physical custody of their daughter, Saadiya (DOB 12-24-2013). Saadiya is a 6<sup>th</sup> grader at Kent Middle School. Petitioner Jessica Jackson (“Mother”) filed an opposition declaration on October 3, 2025. The current custody orders are for Mother to have sole legal and physical custody with Father having visits with his daughter one weekend day from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm and one weekday afternoon from after school to 7:00 pm.

The current, informal custody arrangement involves more frequent visits with Father. Mother is studying at San Francisco State to get her B.A. She has classes Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday from 6:00 to 9:00 pm, during which time Saadiya stays with Father. The current pattern is for Saadiya to sleep at Mother’s house during the week, and at Father’s house on the weekend. Mother asserts this is because when Saadiya has stayed at Father’s house on weekdays, it resulted in unexcused absences and tardiness at school. Saadiya attributes this to the fact that her father does not have a car, so they rely on the bus.

Father requests custody of his child accusing Mother of being “abusive” to the child and asserting “it’s safer for the kid to live with me.” He further states Saadiya “would rather live with me.”

Mother expresses concern over Father’s alcohol use, reporting that Saadiya has had to call for emergency services due to his drinking.

The parents were referred to Marin Family Court Services (“FCS”) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation. Both Mother and Saadiya were interviewed by FCS. Father did not attend the FCS interview, either initially or following a re-referral by this Court. FCS issued its report and recommendations on October 30, 2025.

CUSTODY AND VISITATION

The Court has reviewed the moving and responsive papers, as well as the FCS reports issued October 30, 2025, and September 14, 2021, and finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the child to adopt the following FCS recommendations, as modified, as follows:

1. Mother shall have sole physical and legal custody over the child.
2. All current orders shall remain in effect.
3. Saad shall not consume alcohol while Saadiya is in his care.
4. Neither parent shall share any information from the FCS report with Saadiya.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the court shall prepare the formal Findings and Order After Hearing.

*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 evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.***

***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.***

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 01/08/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL1900683

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: SANDRA ESQUIVIAS

PETITIONER: MUNEERA MANSURI-BORA

and

RESPONDENT: ALTAF Y. BORA

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – MODIFY VISITATION

**RULING**

Petitioner/Mother filed an *ex parte* Request for Order seeking a modification of the existing Stipulation and Order re: Visitation and Insurance Coverage entered November 13, 2023. Specifically, Petitioner seeks a suspension of Respondent/Father, Altaf Bora's, visitation pending completion of an investigation by Child Protective Services. On November 10, 2025, this Court denied the *ex parte* petition and referred the parents and the minor child, Alaleh (DOB 07-06-2018), to Marin County Family Court Services (FCS) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation, with a return to this Court on January 8, 2026.

Subsequent to this initial *ex parte* request, Mother filed a further *ex parte* emergency request for a temporary order seeking to suspend Father's visitation based on further alleged disclosures of abuse by the minor child, including physical abuse, following the November 10, 2025, hearing. On December 23, 2025, this *ex parte* request for temporary emergency order was denied with direction from this Court that (1) visitation with Father will take place from December 25, 2025, to December 30, 2025, and (2) Father is ordered to enroll in a parenting class.

Father opposed both *ex parte* emergency petitions.

FCS interviewed the parents individually on December 9, 2025, Alaleh on December 10, 2025, and Dr. Christina Reed on December 30, 2025. FCS issued its report December 31, 2025.

It is the express public policy of the State of California to ensure that the health, safety, and welfare of children shall be the court's primary concern in determining the best interests of the children when making any orders regarding the physical or legal custody or visitation of children. Family Code, section 3020(a). It is also the public policy of this state to ensure that children have frequent and continuing contact with both parents who have separated or dissolved their marriage, or ended their relationship, and to encourage parents to share the rights and responsibilities of child rearing in order to effectuate this policy, except when the contact would not be in the best interests of the child. Family Code, section 3020(b).

Based on the information before this Court, and having considered the submissions of the parties as well as the December 31, 2025, FCS report, and previous records and materials filed in this matter, the Court finds that the best interest of the minor child, Alaleh (DOB 07-06-2018), will be served by adopting the recommendations of the child custody recommending counselor, as modified by the Court.

**ORDER**

All current orders shall remain in effect with the following additions/modifications:

Timeshare

1. Alaleh's June, July, and August visits with Altaf shall be for 7 nights each rather than 5 nights.

Collateral Issues

2. Alaleh shall continue in counseling with Dr. Christina Reed, at the frequency and duration recommended by Dr. Reed. Both parents shall consult with Dr. Reed to have a better understanding of Alaleh's needs and how best to address them. Both parents shall follow Dr. Reed's recommendations. *Muneera shall ensure that Alaleh attends all sessions scheduled with Dr. Reed and does not cancel appointments.*

3. Altaf shall take a parenting class (as recently ordered) focusing on positive discipline.

4. Neither parent shall use any physical discipline with Alaleh and neither parent shall lock her in a room.

5. Alaleh shall not be exposed to any verbal or physical abuse.

6. Neither parent shall share any information from this report with Alaleh.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the court shall prepare the formal Findings and Order After Hearing.

*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 evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.***

***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.***

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 01/08/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL0001639

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: SANDRA ESQUIVIAS

PETITIONER: MIGUEL ANGEL  
PUERTAS PAREDES

and

RESPONDENT: LORENA BEATRIZ  
ESQUIVEL MORA

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD SUPPORT (AND  
REQUEST TO RELOCATE WITH CHILDREN)

**RULING**

Respondent Lorena Mora filed Request for Order – Child Support for her four minor children Miguel (17), Andrew (11), Liam (9), and Samahara (5) on November 24, 2025. Although denominated as a Request for Order re Child Support, the request includes an express request for permission to relocate with the children from Marin County to Los Angeles. Such relocation will impact the visitation order issued by this Court. See Findings and Order After Hearing dated September 25, 2025.

There is no proof of service filed with this Court. Further, Petitioner Miguel Paredes (Father) has not filed a response.

Accordingly, the Court (1) directs Respondent Lorena Mora to complete service of the underlying Request for Order on Petitioner Miguel Paredes, and (2) refers the parties to Marin County Family Court Services for preparation of a report relating to the move-away request. The Court continues the Request for Order–Child Custody (and the accompanying move-away request) until February 19, 2026, at 9:00 am in Department B for proof of service and to allow the parties time to participate in child custody recommending counseling and mediation with Marin County Family Court Services. The parties are referred to Family Court Services for that purpose.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the court shall prepare the formal Findings and Order After Hearing.

*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 evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.***

***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.***

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 01/08/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL0001811

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: SANDRA ESQUIVIAS

PETITIONER: MARCEL JAMES SHADD  and	
RESPONDENT: DIAMOND HARDDMOND	

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER –VISITATION ENFORCE COURT ORDERS

**RULING**

Petitioner Marcel James Shadd (Father) filed this Request for Order to Change Visitation arrangements filed November 11, 2025. Petitioner seeks to modify the terms of the Findings and Order After hearing entered by this Court on August 19, 2025.

As the matter involves a disagreement between parents on custody and visitation arrangements, the matter was referred to Marin County Family Services (“CFS”) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation. FCS emailed and mailed to the parties notice of their appointments with FCS and their respective obligations to participate in the counseling process.

On January 6, 2026, Respondent Diamond Harddmond filed a Responsive Declaration noting that the underlying Request for Order was not served on Respondent’s counsel until December 16, 2025, depriving Respondent of adequate time to respond. Further, Respondent’s counsel noted that a restraining order was issued on December 26, 2025, naming Petitioner as a restrained person and Respondent as the protected person.

As FCS has not been able to complete its anticipated report, the Court re-refers the parties to FCS and sets a further hearing date on this matter for February 19, 2026.

Counsel for Respondent is ordered to prepare the formal Findings and Order After Hearing.

*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 evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.*

*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.*

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 01/08/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL0002360

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: SANDRA ESQUIVIAS

PETITIONER: HOLLY CARRINGTON  
DRESDEN

and

RESPONDENT: DAVID MITCHELL  
DRESDEN

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

**RULING**

Petitioner Holly Carrington Dresden (“Mother”) filed this motion on November 18, 2025, requesting modifications to existing custodial order and decree issued by the District Court, Travis County, Texas on July 3, 2018. Respondent David Dresden did not file a responsive declaration.

The matter was referred to Marin Family Court Services (“FCS”) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation. Petitioner Mother appeared for her interview with FCS on December 15, 2025. The parties’ daughter, Charlotte, appeared for her interview on December 29, 2025. Respondent Father did not appear for his appointed interview and did not make any contact with FCS.

FCS issued its custody report with recommendations on December 30, 2025.

Respondent Father filed a Statement of Disagreement with FCS Recommendations on January 5, 2026. Father argues that the recommendations are “based on incomplete information” as he was “unable to participate in the mediation appointments.” Respondent offers no explanation for his failure to participate in the FCS process, nor does he indicate what additional information he would have provided to FCS that would be relevant to the underlying Request for Order. The parties are ordered to appear. Respondent will be afforded the opportunity to explain to this Court his failure to participate in the FCS process and why a re-referral to FCS is warranted.

***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 evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.***

***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.***