

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 1/29/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL 1204301

PRESIDING: HON. MATTHEW A. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER:    MICHELE RENEE  
ALBOUY-ARNOLD

and

RESPONDENT:   GARY RONAL ARNOLD

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – MODIFY SPOUSAL SUPPORT

**RULING**

Respondent Gary Ronal Arnold filed a Request for Order to modify spousal support on October 14, 2025. Specifically, Respondent requests this Court modify the November 1, 2022, order setting spousal support at \$1,750.00. Respondent requests (1) a temporary spousal support payment of \$100 per month continuing until the first day of the month following the date Respondent obtains full-time employment and (2) set spousal support at \$500 per month, the first day after Respondent obtains full-time employment.

The parties were married on April 6, 1996. Petitioner Michele Renee Albouy-Arnold filed a petitioner for dissolution on September 12, 2012. The parties filed a Stipulated Judgment, including a *Gavron* warning and a step-down in spousal support, on April 25, 2014.

This Court has addressed spousal support in a series of subsequent orders, on December 9, 2015; April 24, 2018; and the current order, November 1, 2022. Under the terms of the November 1, 2022, Order, Respondent is to pay \$1,250.00 in spousal support with monthly payments reverting to \$1,750.00 in July 2026.

Initially, Petitioner did not file a responsive declaration addressing the underlying request. Husband filed a supplemental declaration on November 24, 2025. The matter came on for hearing on December 4, 2025.

The request was continued to January 29, 2026. Petitioner Wife was referred to the Family Law Facilitator and directed to update her Income and Expense Declaration before the scheduled hearing. Finally, the Court reduced monthly Spousal Support to \$750.00, starting January 1, 2026, pending further orders.

Both Petitioner and Respondent filed additional materials with this Court on January 21, 2026, providing updated IEDs and supporting materials.

The Court has received the extensive procedural history of this matter together with the materials submitted by the parties in reference to this Request for Order. As set forth below, the relevant Family Code section 4320 factors support a modification to spousal support. The court may order a party to pay for the support of the other party in an amount, for a period of time, that the court determines in just and reasonable, based on the standard of living established during the marriage. Family Code section 4330. At the December 4, 2025, hearing, the Wife testified that she is in her 70s, retired, and receiving disability income. This Court cannot order a retired person into the workforce. *Marriage of Reynold* (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 1373, 1380.

A request to modify post-Judgment spousal support requires a two-step analysis by the Court. First, the Court must determine whether there has been a material change of circumstances. *In re Marriage of Minkin* (2017) 11 Cal.App.5th 939. If the Court determines that a change of circumstances exists, it may proceed to consider the Family Code section 4320 factors. *In re Marriage of Dietz* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 387.

Here, Husband has experienced changes in his employment. This change in circumstances requires that the Court consider the Family Code section 4320 factors.

The fourteen Family Code § 4320 factors and their application to Father's RFO are:

1. **The extent to which each party's earning capacity will maintain the standard of living established during the marriage, taking into account each party's marketable skills and the time necessary to develop or acquire same, and the extent to which a party's earning capacity was impaired by unemployment during marriage to devote time to domestic duties.**

2.

Husband has experienced changes in his employment that have caused a disruption in his earning capacity. During the 8 months he was unemployed, he continued to make spousal support payments. Wife has provided details of her indebtedness and details of her disability. The Court finds that both parties are addressing financial strain.

2. **The extent to which Mother contributed to Father's attainment of education or a professional license.**

Not applicable.

3. **Father's ability to pay spousal support, taking into account Mother's earning capacity, assets, and standard of living.**

As reflected above, Husband has continued to make spousal payments. Husband has further indicated to this Court that he is able to make monthly spousal support payments of up to \$1,200.00. Husband has provided additional evidence as to changes in his earning capacity in his field due to technology and advances in artificial intelligence.

**4. The needs of each party based on the standard of living established during the marriage.**

5.

The marital standard of living was modest. The parties have both presented evidence as to the income they require to maintain their standard of living.

**5. The obligations and assets, including the separate property, of each party.**

6.

Husband provided details regarding his financial obligations and assets. Wife indicates that she has no assets beyond a \$600.00 checking/savings account. Wife's IED appears to be inconsistent with prior disclosures as to inheritance assets received by Wife.

**6. The duration of the marriage.**

7.

The parties' marriage qualifies as "lengthy," approximately 16 years. Husband has paid spousal support for approximately 13 years.

**7. The ability of Mother to engage in gainful employment without unduly interfering with the interest of dependent children in the custody of the party.**

Not applicable.

**8. The age and health of the parties.**

9.

Father is 54. Wife is 74. Wife reports health issues.

**9. History of domestic violence.**

Not applicable.

**10. Immediate and specific tax consequences to each party.**

The current spousal support is nontaxable to Mother and nondeductible to Father.

**11. The balance of hardships to each party.**

Husband has experienced substantial disruption in his earning capacity that required the expenditure of proceeds from a home sale. Wife continues to owe a debt for attorney fees associated with earlier legal proceedings.

**12. The goal that the supported party shall be self-supporting within a reasonable period of time.**

Wife received spousal support and Social Security income. Given her age, it is not expected that she will enter the workforce.

**13. Criminal conviction of an abusive spouse.**

Not applicable.

**14. Any other factors the court deems just and equitable.**

None.

The Court finds a modification to monthly spousal support is warranted and orders as follows:

1. Effective February 1, 2026, monthly spousal support is modified to \$1,200.00, payable by Husband to Wife.
2. Wife still owes \$3,542.50 to Husband. The November 1, 2022 order of a \$500.00 per month reduction shall remain in effect until the overpayment are satisfied in whole.
3. Accordingly, effective February 1, 2026, Husband is to pay \$700.00 a month, reverting to \$1,200.00 when outstanding overpayments have been satisfied.

***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 G. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department G 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: 1/29/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL 1802056

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER:    ALETHEA HARAMPOLIS	
and	
RESPONDENT:   CHRIS SEITZ	

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – ENFORCE EXISTING COURT ORDER; APPOINT ELISOR; EXPUNGE LIS PENDENS

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY RULING**

Petitioner Alethea Harmopolis filed a Request for Order on September 22, 2025, seeking to enforce a prior order of this Court and further actions to effectuate this Court’s earlier order. Specifically, this Court’s January 27, 2025, Findings and Order After Hearing (the “Order”) ordered as follows:

- Petitioner was granted sole authority to sell the community residence located at 16527 Roberson Road, Truckee, California (the “Property”);
- Petitioner was granted sole authority to select the real estate agent and broker;
- The Property was to be put on the market or purchased by Respondent no later than February 28, 2025;
- All proceeds were to be divided equally after closing costs;
- Respondent was ordered to pay Petitioner \$18,000.00 in restitution costs for debt and fees incurred due to his failure to timely honor the terms of the MSA.
- 

Following issuance of the Order, Respondent Chris Seitz filed a series of motions contesting the Order. Respondent filed a Motion for Reconsideration on February 25, 2025, seeking relief from the Court’s Order. Respondent’s motion was denied on March 27, 2025. Respondent then filed a further motion on April 7, 2025, seeking to set aside the Court’s March 27, 2025 Order denying his motion to set aside the Court’s Order. This motion was denied in the Court’s July 31, 2025, Findings and Order After Hearing.

Respondent has now filed a Responsive Declaration on January 27, 2026, opposing the request and re-arguing many of the issues previously addressed in his earlier motions relating to the Order. Respondent urges this Court to order that Mr. Seitz stay in the house until May 1, 2026, due to the challenges of moving contracting equipment and tools that are stored in a large

outbuilding on the property. Mr. Seitz advises the Court that the equipment cannot be moved easily in deep snow.

Mr. Seitz concedes that he will pay Petitioner's attorney's fees. With respect to the underlying prior Order issued by this Court, however, he takes issue. Most importantly, Respondent argues that he is entitled to 100% of the proceeds from the sale of the Property. Respondent declares: "I will pay her attorney fees, cooperate with the realtor of her choice, and we should take the first off in the first 30 days of listing that is the closest to matching the listing price. That is up to her realtor for a quick sale since there will no staging as I will not move out until we are in escrow and I can secure relocation [of] all my equipment and tools."

Respondent may not ignore the Orders of this Court. Further, Respondent may not take actions for the purpose of frustrating the Court's orders and obstructing the sale of the Property.

Accordingly, the Court orders as follows:

1. Petitioner's request to expunge the lis pendens is GRANTED.
2. Petitioner's request for appointment of an elisor is CONTINUED to allow Petitioner the opportunity to comply with the provisions of the Marin County Superior Court Local Rule 7.35.
- 3.

Counsel for Petitioner 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 G. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department G 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: 1/29/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL0000760

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER:    EVAN PATRICK  
ANDREWS

and

RESPONDENT:   NICOLE DANA CIBELLIS

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) REQUEST FOR ORDER – CUSTODY/SPOUSAL  
SUPPORT 2) TRIAL READINESS CONFERENCE

**RULING**

The Parties agreed to continue Respondent's RFO requesting child support and spousal support modification filed on July 31, 2025, and the Request for Order to Enforce Support Orders and Establish Arrears filed by Petitioner on August 28, 2025, both set originally for hearing on December 4, 2025, in Dept. B at 9:00 a.m. to January 29, 2026. The parties further informed this Court that they have reached a global resolution of all issues and need time to effectuate a marital settlement agreement.

Parties are ordered to appear and advise the Court as to the status of the marital settlement agreement.

***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 G. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department G 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: 1/29/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL0001311

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER:      EDGAR CONTRERAS

and

RESPONDENT:      BRENDA CORONA

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

**RULING**

The matter is continued to March 12, 2026, and re-referred to Marin Family Court Services (FCS) for interview of the Petitioner, Edgar Contreras, and the daughter, Haley (DOB 8/8/2010), should FCS find it appropriate.

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

1. Any changes to the schedule shall occur as desired by each child and as agreed upon by the parents.
2. Both girls shall have reasonable phone or text communication with Brenda, as desired by each child.

***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 G. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department G 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: 1/29/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL0002219

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER:    KATE DANE

and

RESPONDENT:   TIMOTHY THOMPSON

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: CHILD CUSTODY RECOMMENDING COUNSELING

**RULING**

The parties are returning following a referral to Family Court Services (FCS) for mediation of custody and visitation issues. The parties were referred to FCS November 24, 2025. The parties are subject to the First Amended Restraining Order After Hearing (DV-130) filed November 25, 2025, including the Child Custody and Visitation Order (DV-140) attached to the DV-130.

The one-year restraining order was issued with Father as the restrained party and Mother and the daughter, Farah Thompson (DOB 9/27/23), as the protected parties. Father was ordered to have nonprofessionally supervised visits on the first, second, and third Wednesdays from 3:30 PM – 5:30 PM. The visits are to be supervised by the paternal aunt. Under the terms of the Order, Parents may stipulate to increase visitation time. Further, Father's visits are subject to the following conditions: (1) Father is not to consume alcohol 12 hours before and during the visit; (2) Father is to continue in AA; and (3) Father shall not drive with Farah in the car. Both parents attended their interviews with FCS. Parents have modified the visitation schedule such that Father's visits with Farah are every Wednesday to provide more consistency and predictability for Farah.

Further, Mother reported that she would like a peaceful communication clause to be added as part of the restraining order as she wants to be able to communicate with Father regarding visits and other coparenting matters without either of them violating the restraining order. Father reports that the weekly Wednesday visits have been going well although they are not long enough, and he would like to have more time with Farah. Specifically, Father would like to have joint legal and physical custody with a 2/2/5 schedule. In addition, Father wants to share legal custody to jointly make medical and other important decisions for Farah.

FCS issued its report and recommendations on January 20, 2026.

The Court has reviewed the FCS report together with the existing DV-130 First Amended Restraining Order and related submissions. The Court finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the minor child to adopt the following FCS recommendations, as modified, as follows:

All prior orders not in conflict with the below shall remain in full force and effect with the following modifications.

1. Mother shall maintain sole legal and physical custody until further court order.
2. Father shall continue to have weekly nonprofessionally supervised Wednesday visits from 3:30 PM to 5:30 PM. The visits shall continue to be supervised by the paternal aunt or another mutually agreed-upon supervisor. Additional visitation, including longer visits, may occur per mutual parental agreement.
3. Any individual supervising Father's visits with Farah shall follow court guidelines for nonprofessional visitation supervisors. The supervisor shall be present at all times during the visit and shall not leave Father and Farah alone for any portion of the visitation.
4. Father shall submit to Sober Link testing for a period of one year with the results made available to Mother. As long as Father's visits are supervised, he shall submit to Sober Link testing prior to the start of his visitation. Father shall submit to either random Sober Link testing or Sober Link testing on a schedule determined by the Court outside of his visitations with Farah. Any positive or missed Sober Link test shall result in a cancellation of the visit.
5. Once Father has achieved at least six months of clean Sober Link tests, he shall have a day visit on either Saturday or Sunday each week from 10 AM to 4 PM in addition to the weekly Wednesday visits.
6. Parents shall work towards increasing Father's time with Farah provided that he continues to maintain sobriety and is not in violation of any court orders including restraining orders, family law orders, and any orders resulting from his criminal DUI matter.
7. Father shall continue to refrain from consuming alcohol 12 hours before and during any visits with Farah.
8. Father and Farah may have Face Time calls at a time convenient for Mother and Farah. Mother shall facilitate these calls.
9. Father shall engage in some form of sobriety support which may include regular attendance at AA or attendance in other sobriety support groups. If Father is unable to maintain sobriety through AA or attendance in sobriety support groups, he shall enroll in an outpatient alcohol abuse treatment program.
10. Father shall abide by all orders issued by the criminal court including any recommendations to participate in substance abuse treatment, alcohol testing, etc.

11. Father shall not drive with Farah until further court order.
12. Parents shall be permitted to engage in peaceful communications via text, email, and phone regarding Farah. Provided these communications are peaceful and civil, these communications shall not be a violation of the restraining order issued on 11/25/25.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the Court shall prepare the formal Findings and Order 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 G. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department G 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: 1/29/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL0002256

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER:    BRISSA NATALY  
BENITEZ

and

RESPONDENT:   DEREON JACKSON

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: CHILD CUSTODY RECOMMENDING COUNSELING

**RULING**

The parties are returning following a referral to Family Court Services (FCS) for mediation of custody and visitation issues. The parties were referred to FCS on December 8, 2025. The parties are subject to the Restraining Order After Hearing (DV-130) filed December 8, 2025, including the Child Custody and Visitation Order (DV-140) attached to the DV-130.

The underlying three-year restraining order was issued with Father as the restrained party and Mother, Mother's mother, and Mother's sister as protected parties. The children are not protected parties on the restraining order. Under the terms of the Restraining Order Father was ordered to have unsupervised visits on the first, second, third, and fifth weekends of the month from Friday 10 AM through Sunday 6 PM. Exchanges are to occur at the Vallejo Police Department.

Mother was interviewed by FCS. Father did not attend his scheduled mediation appointment. FCS issued its report and recommendations on January 2, 2026.

The Court has reviewed the FCS report and the earlier submissions by the parties and finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the minor children, Legend Jackson (DOB 12/18/2021), and Lennon Jackson (DOB) 04/13/2023), to adopt the following FCS recommendations, as modified, as follows:

All prior orders not in conflict with the below shall remain in full force and effect with the following modifications.

1. Sole legal and physical custody to Mother.
2. Father shall have professionally supervised visits at a supervising agency in Solano County once every other week for a period of 1 hour per visit.

3. There shall be no corporal punishment of the children. Father shall not hit the children with his hand or other objects.
4. The children shall not be exposed to domestic violence.
5. The children shall not be exposed to marijuana smoke.
- 6.

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 G. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department G 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: 1/29/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL0002466

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER:      MAYORGI DELGADILLO

and

RESPONDENT:      FELIX PEREZ

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

**RULING**

Petitioner, Mayorgi Delgadillo (Mother) filed a Request for Order—Temporary Emergency Orders for Child Custody and Visitation on December 3, 2025. At the December 3, 2025, hearing, this Court referred the parties to the Family Court Services (FCS) for mediation of their custody and visitation issues and issued temporary orders pending hearing on January 29, 2026. Specifically, this Court ordered that the daughter—Seraphina (DOB 3/29/2023)—be with Respondent Felix Perez (Father) on alternate weekends (beginning 12-5-25) from Friday at 6:00 to Sunday at 6:00 with exchanges taking place at Peet’s Coffee in Novato. It was further ordered that (1) neither parent bad mouth the other, and (2) they provide the address of where the child is staying. It was also ordered that Seraphina be with Mother for Christmas and New Years this year and they alternate in future years.

Both parties attended their interview with FCS. FCS issued its report and recommendations on January 20, 2026.

The Court has reviewed the FCS report, priors order of this Court and related submissions and finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the minor child Seraphina to adopt the following recommendation, as modified, as follows:

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

**Holidays/Vacations**

1. **Monday holidays:** If the Monday following Father’s weekend is a school holiday, then Seraphina shall remain in his care until Monday at 6:00 p.m.
2. **Mother’s Day/Father’s Day:** Seraphina shall be with Mother every year on Mother’s Day and with Father every year on Father’s Day.
3. **Christmas Eve/Christmas Day:** Christmas Eve shall be from December 23<sup>rd</sup> 6:00 p.m. to December 25<sup>th</sup> at 3:00 p.m. Christmas Day shall be from December 25<sup>th</sup> at 3:00 p.m. to December 27<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 p.m. In the even-numbered years, Seraphina shall be



with Father on Christmas Eve and with Mother on Christmas Day, and in the odd-numbered years the schedule shall be reversed.

4. **New Year's Eve/New Year's Day:** This holiday shall be from December 30<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 p.m. to January 2<sup>nd</sup> at 10:00 a.m. Seraphina shall be with Mother in the even-numbered years and with Father in the odd.

#### **Collateral Issues**

5. Seraphina shall have reasonable Facetime calls with both parents as requested.
6. Both parents shall ensure that the other parent has the address of where Seraphina is staying.
7. Both parents shall ensure that any roommates in their home are safe and healthy adults.
8. Both parents shall ensure that Seraphina is properly supervised at all times.
9. Neither parent shall say anything disparaging about the other parent in the presence of Seraphina or allow others to do so.
10. Seraphina shall be exposed to peaceful contact only between the parents.
11. Both parents shall participate in a co-parenting class and shall bring proof of successful completion to any future mediations or court hearings.

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 G. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department G 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.***