

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 01/09/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL1602482

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: ELIZABETH HOWES

and

RESPONDENT: CORBIN HOWES

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD SUPPORT

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Mother's Request for Order ("RFO") modifying her current child support obligation for the benefit of the parties' son, Fletcher (DOB 4/22/12). Mother contends that her income has substantially changed since the Court's 5/23/25 child support order as a result of losing 80% to 90% of her income due to the loss of her major client, which she states she was apprised would happen in October 2024. However, Mother goes on to state that her private practice "now generates a variable gross income of \$60,000 to \$80,000 annually, which means her gross income is between \$5,000 and \$6,666/month. As of the 3/15/25 child support order, her earnings were \$6,203/month. Wife has provided a Profit & Loss statement for the 11 months of 2025, which shows net profit of \$63,388; however, the Court finds it appropriate to add back the following expenses: \$675 home office; \$450 utilities; \$750 for 50% of meals; and \$1,082 for auto expenses. This brings Wife's net income for the 11 months up to \$66,345, or \$6,031/month. This is not materially different from the \$6,203 assumed for her in the 5/23/25 order.¹

However, it appears that Father's income has increased significantly since the 5/23/25 child support order. His I&E states he receives an average of \$14,352/month in self-employment income, which is more than twice the \$6,911 he was earning as of the last child support order. Father's 2025 Profit & Loss Statement reflects his net profit for 11 months of 2025 is \$157,875, or \$13,156/month. However, the Court finds it appropriate to add back the following expenses claimed in the P&L: \$5,054 for home office, \$2,167 for utilities, \$483 for 50% of auto expenses. This increases Father's net income for the 11 months of 2025 to \$165,679, or \$15,061/month.

¹ Wife states that in August 2025, her monthly child support payment was decreased from \$397 to \$330. This change in support was not pursuant to any Court order, and the Court has no information as to how or by whom that amount was calculated.

Attached is an XSpouse calculation prepared by the Court based on the following assumptions. Father will file taxes as Head of Household with two exemptions. Mother will file as Single with 1 exemption. Father's monthly earnings from self-employment are \$15,061, and he pays \$1,292/month for health insurance. Mother's monthly earnings are \$6,031/month, and she pays \$1,152/month for health insurance. Based on these assumptions, guideline child support payable from Father to Mother is \$94/month. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. Mother's request for modification of child support is granted.
2. Effective 11/19/2025, Father shall pay to Mother the sum of \$94/month as and for child support for the benefit of Fletcher, payable on or before the first day of each month.
3. To the extent that either party's income exceeds the amount of income ascribed to each in Exhibit "A," bonus child support shall be adjusted per the Bonus Reports included in Exhibit "A." Any additional support owing to either party shall be paid within 30 days of receipt of such additional income.
4. 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.
5. Pursuant to Family Code § 4055, the parties shall all reasonable uninsured medical expenses and dental expenses incurred on behalf of the child, and childcare costs related to either party's employment or reasonably necessary education or training for employment skills, in proportion to their respective net earnings, with Father paying 70% and Mother paying 30%. The parties are ordered to comply with the provisions of Family Code §4063 in seeking reimbursement for such expenses. A copy of the NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES – Health Care Reimbursement Procedures is attached to the Order After Hearing.

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:

*January 2026 at 09:00 AM
Join Zoom Meeting*

*<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615162449?pwd=e5SqeATq2HOsxxD7Fhrl3Q7qPFgFZa.1#success>
Meeting ID: 161 516 2449
Passcode: 073961*

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: 161 516 2449
Passcode: 073961*

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.

FL 1602482

2026

Guideline Summary

Monthly Figures

| Fixed Shares | Corbin Elizabet | | Monthly Figures | | Cash Flow | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------|-------------------|-------|------------------------|--------|
| Number of children | 1 | 0 | 2026 | | Combined net spendable | 13046 |
| Percent time with NCP | 0.00% | 30.00% | | | | |
| Filing status | HH/MLA SINGLE | | Nets (unadjusted) | | Corbin | |
| Number of exemptions | 2 | 1 | | | Payment cost/benefit | -94 |
| Wages and salary | 0 | 0 | Corbin | 9467 | Net spendable income | 9374 |
| Self employed income | 15061 | 6031 | Elizabet | 3579 | Federal income tax | 1612 |
| Other taxable income | 0 | 0 | Total | 13046 | Federal employment tax | 2128 |
| TANF CS received | 0 | 0 | Support | | State income tax | 562 |
| Other nontaxable income | 0 | 0 | Addons | 0 | State employment tax | 0 |
| New spouse income | 0 | 0 | Guideln CS | 94 | Total taxes | 4302 |
| Employee 401-k contribution | 0 | 0 | Marin SS | 0 | Federal filing status | HH/MLA |
| Adjustments to income | 0 | 0 | Total | 94 | State filing status | HH/MLA |
| SS paid prev marriage | 0 | 0 | | | Elizabet | |
| CS paid prev marriage | 0 | 0 | | | Payment cost/benefit | 94 |
| Health insurance | 1292 | 1152 | | | Net spendable income | 3673 |
| Other medical expenses | 0 | 0 | | | Federal income tax | 352 |
| Property tax expenses | 0 | 0 | | | Federal employment tax | 852 |
| Ded interest expense | 0 | 0 | | | State income tax | 95 |
| Contribution deduction | 0 | 0 | | | State employment tax | 0 |
| Misc tax deductions | 0 | 0 | | | Total taxes | 1300 |
| Qualified business income deduction | 0 | 0 | | | Federal filing status | SINGLE |
| Required union dues | 0 | 0 | | | State filing status | SINGLE |
| Mandatory retirement | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Hardship deduction | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Other GDL deductions | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Child care expenses | 0 | 0 | | | | |

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information

| | DOB | Timeshare | cce(F) | cce(M) | Addons Payor | Basic CS Payor | Pres CS Payor |
|--------------|------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| All children | | 70 - 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 Corbin | 94 Corbin | 94 Corbin |
| Fletcher | 2012-04-22 | 70 - 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 Corbin | 94 Corbin | 94 Corbin |

Superior Court of California
County of Marin

Exhibit "A"

Annual Bonus Income Corbin

- Cost is an increase in support paid or a decrease in support received by this spouse
- Bonus income may reverse direction of CS and/or SS
- R = recipient of support

Annual bonus paid to Elizabet: 0
Prior relationship(s): OFF

Additional Cost to Corbin

| Corbin's Bonus | Child Support | | Spousal Support | | Total CS | Total SS (unadjusted) |
|----------------|---------------|-------|-----------------|----|----------|--------------------------|
| | % of bonus | \$ | % of bonus | \$ | | |
| 2,500 | 4.61 | 115 | 0.00 | 0 | 1,238 | 0 |
| 5,000 | 4.58 | 229 | 0.00 | 0 | 1,352 | 0 |
| 7,500 | 4.56 | 342 | 0.00 | 0 | 1,465 | 0 |
| 10,000 | 4.54 | 454 | 0.00 | 0 | 1,577 | 0 |
| 12,500 | 4.52 | 565 | 0.00 | 0 | 1,688 | 0 |
| 15,000 | 4.55 | 683 | 0.00 | 0 | 1,806 | 0 |
| 17,500 | 4.64 | 812 | 0.00 | 0 | 1,934 | 0 |
| 20,000 | 4.69 | 939 | 0.00 | 0 | 2,061 | 0 |
| 22,500 | 4.73 | 1,065 | 0.00 | 0 | 2,187 | 0 |
| 25,000 | 4.76 | 1,190 | 0.00 | 0 | 2,312 | 0 |
| 27,500 | 4.78 | 1,313 | 0.00 | 0 | 2,436 | 0 |
| 30,000 | 4.79 | 1,436 | 0.00 | 0 | 2,558 | 0 |
| 32,500 | 4.79 | 1,557 | 0.00 | 0 | 2,680 | 0 |
| 35,000 | 4.79 | 1,677 | 0.00 | 0 | 2,799 | 0 |
| 37,500 | 4.79 | 1,797 | 0.00 | 0 | 2,919 | 0 |
| 40,000 | 4.79 | 1,916 | 0.00 | 0 | 3,039 | 0 |
| 42,500 | 4.79 | 2,035 | 0.00 | 0 | 3,158 | 0 |
| 45,000 | 4.79 | 2,154 | 0.00 | 0 | 3,276 | 0 |
| 47,500 | 4.76 | 2,261 | 0.00 | 0 | 3,383 | 0 |
| 50,000 | 4.74 | 2,371 | 0.00 | 0 | 3,493 | 0 |
| 52,500 | 4.72 | 2,477 | 0.00 | 0 | 3,599 | 0 |
| 55,000 | 4.70 | 2,582 | 0.00 | 0 | 3,705 | 0 |
| 57,500 | 4.68 | 2,691 | 0.00 | 0 | 3,813 | 0 |
| 60,000 | 4.66 | 2,795 | 0.00 | 0 | 3,917 | 0 |
| 62,500 | 4.64 | 2,902 | 0.00 | 0 | 4,025 | 0 |
| 65,000 | 4.62 | 3,006 | 0.00 | 0 | 4,128 | 0 |
| 67,500 | 4.61 | 3,108 | 0.00 | 0 | 4,231 | 0 |
| 70,000 | 4.59 | 3,214 | 0.00 | 0 | 4,337 | 0 |
| 72,500 | 4.56 | 3,307 | 0.00 | 0 | 4,429 | 0 |
| 75,000 | 4.53 | 3,394 | 0.00 | 0 | 4,517 | 0 |
| 77,500 | 4.50 | 3,485 | 0.00 | 0 | 4,607 | 0 |
| 80,000 | 4.46 | 3,572 | 0.00 | 0 | 4,694 | 0 |
| 82,500 | 4.43 | 3,658 | 0.00 | 0 | 4,780 | 0 |
| 85,000 | 4.41 | 3,747 | 0.00 | 0 | 4,870 | 0 |
| 87,500 | 4.38 | 3,833 | 0.00 | 0 | 4,956 | 0 |
| 90,000 | 4.36 | 3,925 | 0.00 | 0 | 5,048 | 0 |
| 92,500 | 4.35 | 4,020 | 0.00 | 0 | 5,143 | 0 |
| 95,000 | 4.33 | 4,115 | 0.00 | 0 | 5,237 | 0 |
| 97,500 | 4.32 | 4,209 | 0.00 | 0 | 5,331 | 0 |
| 100,000 | 4.30 | 4,303 | 0.00 | 0 | 5,425 | 0 |

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 01/09/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL 1901715

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: ROBERT F. KENNEDY

and

RESPONDENT: MELISSA M. KENNEDY

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: ORDER – SHOW CAUSE

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Wife's 11/14/25 Order to Show Cause Re Contempt ("OSC"). The OSC was personally served on Petitioner/Husband in Virginia on 11/21/25. No response has been filed by Respondent.

Appearances required.

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:

January 2026 at 09:00 AM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615162449?pwd=e5SqeATq2HOsxxD7Fhrl3O7qPFgFZa.1#success>
Meeting ID: 161 516 2449
Passcode: 073961

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: 161 516 2449

Passcode: 073961

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: 01/09/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL1904026

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: RHINA CUELLAR

and

RESPONDENT: ANIVAL GOMEZ

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW HEARING – CHILD CUSTODY

RULING

This matter is set for review hearing re: child custody/visitation with respect to the parties' children, Briana (DOB 6/19/09) and Angela ("Sofia") DOB 7/30/14).

Per the Court's 7/18/25 Findings and Order After Hearing, the parties were ordered to contact Family Court Services in December 2025 to schedule an appointment. It does not appear the parties ever did so. Therefore, the Court order as follows:

1. All current orders shall remain in full force and effect.

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:

***January 2026 at 09:00 AM
Join Zoom Meeting***

***<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615162449?pwd=e5SqeATq2HOsxxD7Fhrl3Q7qPFgFZa.1#success>
Meeting ID: 161 516 2449
Passcode: 073961***

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: 161 516 2449
Passcode: 073961***

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: 01/09/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL 2203196

PRESIDING: HON. BETH JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: LISA MARIE DEANE

and

RESPONDENT: BRIAN MICHAEL
BURDETTE

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW OF REPORTS HEARING – CHILD
CUSTODY/VISITATION

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on receipt of Family Court Services' ("FCS") Report & Recommendations regarding custody and Father's visitation with the minor, Hudson Deane (DOB 7/25/22). FCS interviewed Hudson's Guardians in the Probate Guardianship action, Sarah Deane and Andrew Steuble, as well as Respondent/Father in the family law action, Brian Burdette, and Petitioner/Mother in the family law action, Lisa Deane. FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 12/29/25.

The Guardians have also filed an *Ex Parte* Request to compel Father to undergo a psychiatric evaluation and for production of the probation reports in Father's criminal cases.

Appearances required.

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:

*January 2026 at 09:00 AM
Join Zoom Meeting*

*<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615162449?pwd=e5SqeATq2HOsxxD7Fhrl3Q7qPFgFZa.1#success>
Meeting ID: 161 516 2449
Passcode: 073961*

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: 161 516 2449
Passcode: 073961*

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: 01/09/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL0000595

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: SUSANNAH LEIA
SLOCUM

and

RESPONDENT: JAMES ROBERT
SLOCUM

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER - ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT
FOR CCP SECTION 664.6 REIMBURSEMENT OF PORSCHE EXPENSES ORDER RESP
TO SIGN TRANSFER DOCUMENTS

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Wife's 11/12/25 Request for Order ("RFO") for entry of Judgment per CCP § 664.6, and to enforce the provisions of the Judgment that (1) Husband pay Wife for repairs to the Porsche awarded to Wife, and (2) Husband sign the vehicle title transfer documents. Counsel asks that the Court enter the Judgment she prepared and submitted with her RFO. Respondent/Husband has not filed any responsive papers to the RFO.

CCP §664.6

California Code of Civil Procedure §644.6 provides that if the parties stipulate orally before the court to a settlement of the case, upon motion, the Court may enter judgment pursuant to the terms of the settlement. However, the Court may not change the terms of the settlement from those that were expressly agreed upon. (*See, Machado v. Myers* (2019) 39 Cal. App. 5th 779, 790 ["The power of the trial court under Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6... is extremely limited."]) The court is powerless to impose on the parties more restrictive or less restrictive or different terms than those contained in their settlement agreement. (*Machado*, citing *Hernandez v. Board of Education* (2004) 126 Cal. App. 4th 1161, 1176.)

"When parties place an oral settlement on the record, that transcript becomes the authoritative statement of the settlement terms. Courts must enter judgment that conforms to those recorded terms without alteration. Any judgment that states some settlement terms but omits or modifies others fails to comply with section 664.6's requirement that judgment be entered "pursuant to the terms of the settlement."

Having reviewed the transcript of the settlement terms read onto the record on 11/14/25, the Court finds that the proposed Judgment substantially augments, and therefore alters, the terms of the settlement reached on the record. As a result, the Court cannot sign the Judgment as submitted. If counsel resubmits the Judgment with only the reporter's transcript attached, the Court will enter the Judgment.

Damage to 2012 Porsche

The parties' 2012 Porsche, which had been in Husband's possession, was awarded to Wife as part of their settlement. Wife states that, when she picked up the Porsche, it was physically damaged and undriveable, with significant issues, including a cracked driver-side headlamp, misaligned hood and front passenger fender, bald tires, missing passenger roof bracket cover, etc. Wife notes that Husband took the Porsche in for a recall issue to Porsche Marin approximately a month before she picked up the car. She provided photos taken by Porsche Marin at the time of the recall visit that show the front headlights and rear taillights were all intact, and there is no visible damage to the hood noted.

Wife had the Porsche checked and received estimates for all necessary service and repairs and seeks reimbursement from Husband of \$10,233.62 for non-mechanical repairs and \$23,190.34 for mechanical repairs.

Wife's Declaration states that she has a video of the Porsche from an exchange which took place in June 2025, where "no such damage is visible." The Court needs to see that video, and any photos or video Wife has of the Porsche when she picked it up in August, and clarification of the the repairs. It is noted that the Porsche is 13 years old, and in the transcript of the parties' settlement Husband mentioned – seemingly with respect to the Porsche – that Wife was getting a used car that he had "brought up a number of occasions needs a number of repairs." Further, the Porsche Marin estimate identifies many items as 'next scheduled maintenance,' including spark plug replacements and the like, for which it would seem Husband should not be not responsible.

Title Transfer

Husband is ordered to provide proof to Wife with proof that title to the truck has been transferred solely into his name, and that he has signed title to the RV so that it may be transferred into Wife's name.

SO ORDERED.

The Court will 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:

*January 2026 at 09:00 AM
Join Zoom Meeting*

*<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615162449?pwd=e5SqeATq2HOsxxD7Fhrl3Q7qPFgFZa.1#success>
Meeting ID: 161 516 2449
Passcode: 073961*

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: 161 516 2449
Passcode: 073961*

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: 01/09/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL0000615

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: ASHLEY MARTINEZ

and

RESPONDENT: JOSE MARTINEZ

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: MOTION – RELIEVE COUNSEL

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on the 11/17/2025 Motion of Jonathan Cummings, Esq., Kaspar & Lugay, to be Relieved as Counsel of record for Petitioner Ashley Martinez in this matter. Having reviewed and considered the Declaration in Support of the Motion, and finding good cause therefor, the Court orders as follows:

1. Counsel's Motion to be Relieved as Counsel is granted.

SO ORDERED.

Mr. Cummings 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:

January 2026 at 09:00 AM

Join Zoom Meeting

*<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615162449?pwd=e5SqeATq2HOsxxD7Fhrl3Q7qPFgFZa.1#success>
Meeting ID: 161 516 2449
Passcode: 073961*

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: 161 516 2449

Passcode: 073961

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: 01/09/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL0001823

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: ANDREW YANDELL

and

RESPONDENT: MAIA GRACE YANDELL

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: HEARING - STATUS OF 730 EXPERT PROGRESS; RESET
ISC AND BBAR

RULING

This matter is set for status on appointment of the Evidence Code § 730 expert and to reset the
ISC and Bench Bar Settlement Conference.

Appearances required.

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:

January 2026 at 09:00 AM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1615162449?pwd=e5SqeATq2HOsxxD7Fhrl3Q7qPFgFZa.1#success>

Meeting ID: 161 516 2449

Passcode: 073961

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: 161 516 2449

Passcode: 073961

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.