

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 2/19/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL 2103123

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: HEATHER MARY
MCMILLS

and

RESPONDENT: LISA MELANIE GRANT

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – ISSUE ASSIGNMENT ORDER

RULING

Movant Collins Judgment Recovery Services, as assignee of support rights pursuant to Family Code section 4502, requests an Assignment Order directing that \$3,000.00 per month of rental income from the property located at 101 Headlands Court, Sausalito, California 94965, otherwise payable to Respondent Heather Mary McMills, be paid to Movant and applied toward satisfaction of the outstanding family support judgment consisting of accrued support arrears. Movant requests that this assignment order apply to all tenants, current or future tenants, whether known or unknown.

On March 28, 2023, the Court entered a family support judgment against Petitioner Heather Mary McMills in case number FL 2103123. The support rights from the judgment were assigned to Movant. As of January 2026, support arrears total approximately \$310,785.43, excluding interest. Movant has provided evidence that Petitioner owns, controls or has the legal right to receive rental income from real property at 101 Headlands Court. Movant now seeks an assignment under CCP section 708.510 of rents due from the property.

Petitioner has filed an objection to the Request for Order. She has not, however, filed a claim that the right to payment is exempt from enforcement under CCP section 708.550. Petitioner is referred to the Legal Self-Help Center in Room C-44, telephone 415-444-7130. The matter is continued to March 5, 2026, at 9:00 am to allow Petitioner the opportunity to comply with CCP section 708.550.

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: 2/19/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0000267

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: ANA ARVIZU

and

RESPONDENT: FREDDY OTTONIEL
ORDONEZ RICHER

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

RULING

This matter is before the Court on Father Freddy Ordoñez’s Request for Order (RFO) relating to child custody and visitation filed on December 17, 2025. Father seeks sole legal custody of the two shared children, Christian Ordonez (DOB 12/23/2013) and Ever Ordonez (DOB 4/13/2016), and a change to the visitation schedule for Mother, Ana Arvizu. The parents were referred to Marin Family Court Services (FCS) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation. Only Father was interviewed as Mother did not attend mediation. FCS submitted its report and recommendations January 26, 2026.

The Court notes that joint legal custody was ordered as part of the juvenile court exit orders despite concerns about Mother continuing to abuse drugs. The juvenile exit orders provide that Mother’s visits were to be supervised by her family members because she had not completed a drug treatment program with random testing during the time the family was under the jurisdiction of Dependency Court.

The Court has reviewed the materials submitted as part of the underlying RFO and the January 26, 2026 FCS report and finds that it is in the best interest of the children for the parents to continue to share joint legal custody with Father having sole authority to make legal custody decisions for the children if Mother does not cooperate or respond to Father’s communications regarding legal custody decisions that need to be made. Further, the Court finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the children to adopt the following FCS recommendations as follows:

PARENTING PLAN for Freddy Ordonez / Ana Arvizu:

Custody orders from Juvenile Court filed 4/18/25 for case numbers JD 0000029 and JD 0000039 shall remain in effect with the following modifications.

1. Sole physical custody to Father.
2. Joint legal custody shall remain in place. However, Father shall be authorized to make legal custody decisions for the children if there has been no response or cooperation by Mother to Father's communications regarding legal custody decisions that need to be made.
3. Until such time that Mother can demonstrate to the court that she has achieved a track record of being clean and sober, including successfully completing a drug treatment program and random drug testing as she was previously ordered to do through Juvenile Dependency Court, Mother shall have professionally supervised visits at Rally once a week for a period of two hours per visit for any visits that are not supervised by the maternal grandmother or another maternal relative per the juvenile custody order filed 4/18/25.
4. Father shall not permit the children to have unsupervised visits with Mother until she has been authorized by the court to have unsupervised visits.
5. The children shall continue to visit with their maternal relatives on Wednesdays from 1 PM to 4 PM, Thursdays from 5 PM to 8 PM, and every other weekend on both Saturdays and Sundays from 11 AM to 7 PM even if Mother is not present for these visits so that the children can maintain contact with their maternal relatives and younger sibling. Father shall make the children available for these visits and shall not obstruct the visits.

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: 2/19/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0001811

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: MARCEL JAMES SHADD

and

RESPONDENT: DIAMOND HARDDMOND

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

RULING

Parties are ordered to appear.

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: 2/19/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0002080

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: ALONDRA R. RAMIREZ

and

RESPONDENT: CASEY JOSE ESCOBAR

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST – CHANGE OR END – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
RESTRAINING ORDER

RULING

Respondent Casey Jose Escobar (Father) filed a Request to Change or End Restraining Order (DV-300) on January 6, 2026. Father seeks a change to the terms of an existing Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO) issued on August 18, 2025, in which Alondra Ramirez (Mother) is the protected person. The DVRO also protects the parents' child (Mattias Escobar DOB 1/25/25), permitting supervised visitation through Rally Visitations Services pending further orders.

Father seeks a change to the DVRO to allow him to select any provider on the Court-approved provider list, so that supervised visits may begin. Father reports that he contacted Rally on September 16, 2025, and was informed that he would be placed on a waiting list. Supervised visits have not yet occurred.

The subject matter of this request came on originally for hearing in this Court on January 5, 2026. Father's prior RFO (filed December 17, 2025) was denied without prejudice as he had not served Mother.

Father has corrected this omission. Father filed a completed proof of service with this Court dated January 13, 2026.

CUSTODY AND VISITATION

The Court has reviewed the underlying papers as well as the prior Marin Family Court Services (FCS) Report dated September 3, 2025, filed in case number FL 0002066. The Court finds that it is the best interest of the child to maintain the recommendations of FCS with the following additional modifications to facilitate the supervised visits of Father with Mattias. 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. Until Father successfully completes the 52-week batterers' intervention program that was ordered on 8/18/25, he shall have professionally supervised visits at Rally, or other Court-approved visitation provider, once a week for one hour per visit. Fees to be apportioned between the parties equally, with each parent paying one-half.
3. Father shall take a parenting class focused on parenting infants and young toddlers.
4. Father shall not consume alcohol 24 hours prior to or be under the influence of alcohol during his parenting time with Mattias.
5. Unsupervised visits for Father shall not be considered until he has completed the 52-week batterers' intervention program and parenting class and provided that he has adhered to court orders to not be under the influence of alcohol during his visits.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the Court shall prepare the formal order after hearing, including an Amended Form DV-130 with DV-140 (Child Custody and Visitation Order) attached.

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: 2/19/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: L CASE NO: FL0002127

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: KAREN GOMEZ
MENDEZ

and

RESPONDENT: EDGAR OMAR HERRERA
VEGA

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE 2) REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD/SPOUSAL SUPPORT

RULING

Petitioner Karen Gomez Mendez (Mother) filed a Request for Order seeking, among other things, that Respondent Edgar Omar Herrera Vega (Father) be (1) restrained from taking unpaid leave, resigning or altering his compensation structure at Airbnb and (2) ordered to place all harvested Restricted Stock Units (RSUs) into Petitioner’s counsel’s account, if they are not being used for support, income or division. Mother seeks an additional 19 separate findings and orders as part of this Request for Order.

Father has not filed any response to Mother’s Request for Order.

This Court memorialized a stipulation for child/spousal support on November 13, 2025, with the parties and their respective counsel. That Stipulation provided as follows: (1) commencing November 1, 2025, through February 1, 2026, Father shall pay Mother family support in the amount of \$4,037.00 a month (with one half due on the first of the month and the second half due on the 15th); (2) commencing February 1, 2026, Father’s family support will increase to \$4,898.00 a month. Further, Mother is to receive \$20,000 for her share of the August RSU. Finally, the November RSU in the amount of \$40,000 shall be placed in an attorney’s trust account. The Court reserved jurisdiction, at Mother’s request, to address retroactive application of spousal support to October 2, 2025, in the event Father receives bonus income.

The Court ordered the parties to return on February 19, 2026, as a date for setting a Bench/Bar Settlement Conference.

Mother’s Request for Order is DENIED without prejudice to Mother seeking to make a further evidentiary showing as to certain matters. The Court observes that certain matters are simply beyond this Court’s authority (e.g., restraining Father from resigning from his current job) and other matters lack the necessary evidentiary predicate for imposing such an order (e.g., ordering all RSUs to be placed in Petitioner’s counsel’s account).

The parties are ordered to appear and be prepared to discuss the scheduling of a Bench Bar Settlement Conference.

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: 2/19/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0002290

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: GITANJALI DEVI DEAN

and

RESPONDENT: CHRISTOPHER REYES

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

RULING

Appearance is 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 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: 2/19/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0001639

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

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 (Mother) 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.

This matter originally came on for hearing in this Court on January 8, 2026. The Court found there was no proof of service filed with this Court. Further, Petitioner Miguel Paredes (Father) had not filed a response.

Accordingly, the Court (1) directed Mother to complete service of the underlying Request for Order on Petitioner Miguel Paredes, and (2) referred the parties to Marin County Family Court Services (FCS) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation relating to the move-away request.

The Court continued 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 FCS.

FCS interviewed both parents and the three older children, Miguel, Andrew and Liam. FCS issued its Custody Report and Recommendation January 27, 2026.

Father filed a Responsive Declaration on January 16, 2026. Father opposes the request for relocation of the children.

The Court has reviewed the most recent FCS report and preceding report as well as the materials submitted in support of the Request for Order. The Court finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the children to grant permission for the relocation of the children with the Mother to Los Angeles. The Court adopts the recommendations from FCS as modified as follows:

PARENTING AND VISITATION PLAN

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.
2. The children shall have permission to move with Mother to Los Angeles.
3. Until Mother and the children move to Los Angeles, Father shall have visits on Saturdays from 10 AM to 5 PM and on the first, second, and third Sundays from 10 AM to 5 PM. The children shall be permitted to call Mother to end the visit early if they wish to do so.
4. Father shall take a parenting class focused on positive and peaceful parenting.
5. Once Father completes a positive and peaceful parenting class, Mother shall bring the children to Marin County one weekend every other month for Father to have day visits with the children. The length of the visits shall be seven hours (on both Saturday and on Sunday) unless longer visits are desired by the children. Father may visit the children in Los Angeles once a month for day visits on Saturday and Sunday in the months that the children are not brought to Marin.
6. The children may call or video call Father whenever they wish to do so.
7. The children shall continue in therapy to address trauma resulting from exposure to domestic violence.
8. Father shall not hit or strike the children, nor shall he threaten to do so.
9. Parents shall not show the children a copy of this report. Parents shall not discuss or interrogate the children regarding their interviews with FCS. There shall be no physical or emotional retaliation towards the children for what they reported during their interviews.

CHILD SUPPORT

Mother further requests a child support order, but she fails to identify how much in monthly payments she is seeking. Further, while both Mother and Father provide some limited financial information, neither provided sufficient detail to base a child support order from this Court. The parties are referred to Family Law Self-Help for information and assistance with providing the required financial information. Mother's request for child support is continued to March 26, 2026, at 9 AM in Department B to allow the parties time to comply with MCR Fam 7.13(A)-(D).

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.