

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 3/12/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL 2100407

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: ERGUIN GALINDO
DELEON

and

RESPONDENT: ASHLEY CECILIA
JIMENEZ

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: CHILD CUSTODY RECOMMENDING COUNSELING -
RECEIPT OF FAMILY COURT SERVICES RECOMMENDATION

RULING

This Court entered a stipulated two-year restraining order on December 23, 2025, with Erguin Deleon (Father) as the restrained party and Ashley Jimenez (Mother) as the protected party. As part of the order, the Court referred the parties to Marin Family Court Services (FCS) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation relating to the son, Santiago DeLeon (DOB 08/26/2018). The matter was originally scheduled for a return to this Court February 19, 2026. On February 2, 2026, the matter was continued on the Court's motion to March 12, 2026. Both parents attended their FCS interviews, and FCS issued its report and recommendations dated March 2, 2026.

By stipulation, the parties agreed that Father has nonprofessionally supervised visits on Wednesdays from after school (noon) through 7 PM and Sunday from 9 AM to 6 PM. Father's visits are supervised by the paternal grandmother.

Father seeks an extended visitation schedule with the end objective of a 50/ 50 schedule. Father reports that he is taking anger management classes, has started a coparenting class, and has been attending AA since the beginning of the year. Father states that he is not drinking now because he has a bad liver. Father states that his liver was damaged from drinking contaminated water from a well in Guatemala and not because of a history of alcohol abuse.

Mother expressed concerns regarding Santiago's visits with Father and further expressed concerns regarding Father's living arrangements. Mother states that Father is currently staying with his mother who works as a live-in caretaker for an elderly person. Mother states that the paternal grandmother stays in the living room of the house where she assumes Father also stays.

Mother states that there is not enough space for Santiago to be there for overnights or extended periods of time. Mother states that Santiago does not want to spend overnights with his father. FCS reports that both parents allege that the other parent perpetuated domestic violence toward them. As set forth below, the Court is ordering that both parents take domestic violence class to learn about the impact of domestic violence on children.

Having reviewed the materials submitted by the parties as well as the FCS report, the Court finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the child to adopt the following recommendations from FCS, as modified by the Court, as follows:

PARENTING PLAN

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

1. Until such time that Father has completed Recommendation number 12 below, he shall continue to have nonprofessionally supervised visits each Wednesday from after school through 7 PM and Sunday from 9 AM to 6 PM. Visits shall be supervised by the paternal grandmother. Santiago shall be in Mother's custody at all other times when not in Father's custody.
2. Per previous court orders, the paternal grandmother is to be present during pickups of Santiago and during the visit as she is responsible for supervising the visit. Violations of this provision shall result in the paternal grandmother being removed as a visitation supervisor.
3. Both parents shall take a domestic violence class to learn about the impact of domestic violence on children.
4. Father shall not be under the influence of alcohol or prescription drugs that would impact and/or impair his ability to safely care for Santiago during his custody time.
5. Both parents shall take a coparenting class.
6. There shall be no corporal punishment of Santiago.
7. Both parents shall take an anger management class.
8. Mother shall take a parenting class focused on positive parenting of school-aged children that does not involve the use of corporal punishment.
9. Neither parent shall denigrate the other parent to Santiago including calling the other parent derogatory names.
10. Father shall not give Santiago gifts to give Mother as this is a violation of the current restraining order in effect.

11. Father shall not make comments to Santiago referring to reconciling with Mother or other comments that would place him in the middle of the parental conflict.
12. After Father has completed a domestic violence class, an anger management class, and a coparenting class, and provided there have been no violations of the restraining order for a period of at least four months, Father's parenting time shall transition to unsupervised parenting time each Sunday from 9 AM to 6 PM and Wednesdays from after school through 7 PM. Overnights may commence provided Father's living quarters can accommodate overnights for Santiago in a comfortable manner.

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.

Petitioner's retirement account is awarded to Petitioner.

Each party is awarded all the assets and property in their own names or under their control, including deposit accounts, retirement accounts, household furniture and furnishings, and personal property in each of their various businesses except for certain items of personal property and artwork in Respondent's possession that belong to Petitioner. The parties shall work together to identify those items and put them in Petitioner's possession. The Court retains jurisdiction over those items in the event that the parties are unable to agree.

In consideration of this agreement, Respondent shall pay Petitioner the sum of \$10,000 to be paid in monthly installments of \$1,000 per month beginning March 1, 2026.

Spousal Support: Both parties mutually agree to waive their right to spousal support. The Court's jurisdiction to award spousal support to either party is terminated.

Custody & Visitation: The 7/18/25 Findings & Order After Hearing (attached) remain in full force and effect.

In addition, no court approval is necessary for each party to travel with the children outside of the United States (Mother to Israel and Father to Germany) to visit family without the prior consent of the other party so long as the party provides at least 30 days' notice of their intent to travel (unless there is an exigent circumstance and emergency). Any other travel outside the United States will require notice to the other parent.

Child Support: The 7/18/25 Findings & Order After Hearing (attached) remain in full force and effect.

Child support arrearages and child support add-on arrearages: As of January 5, 2026, neither party owes the other child support arrearages nor child support add-on arrearages.

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.

<p>ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address):</p> <p>Prepared by the Court</p> <p>TELEPHONE NO.: _____ FAX NO. (Optional): _____</p> <p>E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): _____</p> <p>ATTORNEY FOR (Name): _____</p> <p>SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF MARIN</p> <p>STREET ADDRESS: 3501 Civic Center Drive</p> <p>MAILING ADDRESS: PO Box 4988</p> <p>CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Rafael, CA 94913</p> <p>BRANCH NAME: _____</p> <p>PETITIONER/PLAINTIFF: REVITAL SCHLESINGER</p> <p>RESPONDENT/DEFENDANT: HERBERT NICOLAY KREIDLER</p> <p>OTHER PARTY: _____</p>	<p>FOR COURT USE ONLY</p> <p style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; letter-spacing: 0.5em;">FILED</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em; font-weight: bold;">JUL 18 2025</p> <p>JAMES M. KIM, Court Executive Officer MARIN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT <i>By: J. Charifa, Deputy</i></p>
FINDINGS AND ORDER AFTER HEARING	<p>CASE NUMBER: FL0000554</p>

1. This proceeding was heard on (date): July 17, 2025 at (time): 9:00am in Dept.: L Room: L
 by Judge (name): Honorable Mark A. Talamantes Temporary Judge
- On the order to show cause, notice of motion or request for order filed (date): May 6, 2025 by (name): HERBERT NICOLAY KREIDLER
- a. Petitioner/plaintiff present Attorney present (name): _____
- b. Respondent/defendant present Attorney present (name): _____
- c. Other party present Attorney present (name): _____

THE COURT ORDERS

2. Custody and visitation/parenting time: As attached on form FL-341 Other Not applicable
3. Child support: As attached on form FL-342 Other Not applicable
4. Spousal or family support: As attached on form FL-343 Other Not applicable
5. Property orders: As attached on form FL-344 Other Not applicable
6. Attorney's fees: As attached on form FL-346 Other Not applicable
7. Other orders: As attached Not applicable
8. All other issues are reserved until further order of court.
9. This matter is continued for further hearing on (date): _____ at (time): _____ in Dept.: _____
 on the following issues:

Date: 7/18/25

 JUDICIAL OFFICER
 Honorable Mark A. Talamantes

Approved as conforming to court order.

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER / PLAINTIFF RESPONDENT/DEFENDANT OTHER PARTY

Attachment to Findings and Order After Hearing

There are two matters on calendar. Respondent Herbert Nicolay Kreidler ("Father") filed a Request for Order ("RFO") on May 6, 2025, seeking custody and visitation orders. Petitioner Revital Schlesinger ("Mother") filed an RFO on May 19, seeking spousal and child support orders. She also seeks an award of attorney's fees.

On May 6, 2025, Mother filed a request for emergency order seeking access to the family home to share a "nesting" agreement. Father opposed the request, and it was denied. The court granted Mother's request for clarification regarding summer visitation scheduling.

On June 2, 2025, Father filed a request for emergency orders to permit the children to travel to Europe on a pre-planned vacation. The request was granted.

The parents were referred to Marin Family Court Services on the custody and visitation requests submitted by Father. Marin is a recommending county. (Family Code §3183; Marin County Rules, Family 7.17.A.) Both parents were interviewed on or about June 24, 2025. The court appreciates that the parents came together and reached several agreements voluntarily with the assistance of FCS.

Together, these parents have two children. Anais is 16, born March 20, 2009. Arielle is 12, born August 28, 2012.

CUSTODY AND VISITATION

The court has reviewed the agreements reached by the parents with the assistance of FCS, and finds good cause to approve those as follows:

1. Parental Timeshare: The children shall continue on an alternating weekly schedule from Monday to Monday. Both children, particularly 16-year-old Anais, shall have flexibility in the schedule to determine where they wish to spend their time. Parents shall respect the children's wishes regarding a flexible custody schedule. The children shall be permitted to be on separate schedules if and whenever they wish to do so.
2. Mother and Arielle shall participate in family therapy in order to improve their relationship. Father shall make himself available to participate per the directive of the therapist, including providing background information from his perspective.

3. Parents shall try using Our Family Wizard or another equivalent coparenting app for their coparenting communications.
4. Parents shall find a coparenting counselor so that they may participate in coparenting counseling to learn how to more effectively coparent together.
5. Parents may modify any portion of this agreement at any time per mutual parental agreement.

The remaining issue is Mother's request for a family nesting agreement. A nesting agreement during divorce or separation is a co-parenting arrangement where children remain in the family home while parents take turns living there. Under the agreement, the parents rotate use of the home, allowing the children to stay in the familiar environment of the family home. This arrangement requires cooperation between the parents. This court has presided over two *ex parte* hearings since May, which were attended by both parents. The court has observed that these parents are in high conflict. Mother request, which was originally heard on May 6, was denied for that reason. It is not in the best interests of the children to be exposed to constant parental conflict while living in Father's residence. The request is again, DENIED.

CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT

Mother reports in her income and expense declaration that she does not have an income. She is the owner of "Somagine", which she explains is a "VC holding company" and also a non-profit corp. She has been surviving on an inherited IRA while trying to make the company viable. Wife reports she has also been living off of her IRA since she separated from Husband. She provided an itemized list for monthly draws from 2024-2025. The court, after removing the highest draw of \$20,000 and lowest draw of \$2,000, has calculated her monthly withdrawal for income from the IRS averages to \$3,974 per month.

In calculating income, the court has included this amount for Mother. The court may consider such inherited gifts as income if the gift bears a reasonable relationship to the traditional meaning of income as a reoccurring monetary benefit. On the other hand, a one-time non-reoccurring gift or inheritance normally does not constitute income. Whether such payments are income is a matter left to the court's discretion based on all relevant factors. In making this decision, the court has considered these factors. *In the Marriage of Alter* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 718, 736-737.

1. Payments were made regularly and in regular amounts.
2. The payments are made over a lengthy period of time.
3. No written loan agreement exists.
4. Repayments not made.

5. Interest is not charged.
6. It is unlikely Mother can repay herself for the monthly draws.
7. Payments have not stopped.
8. The court has also considered that Mother has not made efforts to secure gainful employment during this period.

Although the court has no information as to whether a loan agreement exists or whether interest on the withdrawals is charged, for the remaining reasons enumerated the court concludes that payments from Mother's IRA may be considered as her income for determining support. Mother has elected to use the IRA as her regular income as she attempts to make the non-profit profitable to generate income available for child support. It is unclear whether Mother can continue to withdraw from her IRA. She has no other savings or assets. She reports no other income. She reports no healthcare obligations.

Father reports he works as a marketing consultant. The Profit and Loss statement he submitted was incomplete in that it did not identify the fiscal year of the financial analysis. The court has assigned that financial information for 2024, in which he reports \$111,434 in gross income, less \$40,862 net in expenses, with a net income of \$74,660 or (\$6,222 per month). He reports paying family healthcare costs of \$507 per month. He reports no savings.

Both parents carry substantial debt.

Based on the above assumptions set forth in the attached *XSpouse* calculation, commencing June 1, 2025, Father shall pay to Mother monthly child support in the amount of \$210 payable one-half on the 1st and one-half on the 15th day of each month, and continuing until further court orders, or until the children in question marry, pass away, are emancipated, reach age 19, or reach age 18 and are not full-time high school students, whichever occurs first.

No spousal support is owed, due to the income levels reported for support.

The parties shall share equally all reasonable uninsured medical and dental expenses incurred on behalf of their minor children, and childcare costs related to either party's employment or reasonably necessary education or training for employment skills. The parties are ordered to comply with the provisions of Family Code §4063 in seeking reimbursement for uninsured medical and dental expenses, and a copy of the *NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES – Health-Care Costs and Reimbursement Procedures* shall be attached to the *ORDER AFTER HEARING*. These provisions shall apply to reimbursement for childcare expenses as well.

Regarding medical add-ons, the parents are directed to Family Code Section 4063(l), which provides that the parents shall arrange to use medical providers who are in the insurance

network. If providers are used outside of network, the parent who arranged the medical and/or therapy appointment is obligated to pay the difference.

The parents are expected to share equally the costs of extracurricular activities for the children. The activities are to be agreed upon in advance, in writing, and the children's participation in that activity is not to be unreasonably withheld.

ATTORNEY'S FEES

Given the income level of the parents, and the fact that both are struggling to raise two children in costly Marin County, there are limited resources available to pay for attorney's fees by either parent. Mother's request for an award of fees is DENIED.

SIGNATURE ON JUDICIAL COUNCIL FORM

2025

Xspouse 2025-1.1-CA

Monthly Figures

	Herbert Revital		Monthly Figures		Cash Flow		
	Herbert	Revital	2025		Guideline	Proposed	
Fixed Shares							
Number of children	1	1					
Percent time with NCP	49.99%	49.99%			Combined net spendable	8534	8534
Filing status	HH/MLA	HH/MLA			Percent change	0%	0%
Number of exemptions	2	2					
Wages and salary	0	0			GUIDELINE		
Self employed income	6222	0			Nets (adjusted)		
Other taxable income	0	3974	Herbert	4617	Herbert		
TANF CS received	0	0	Revital	3917	Payment cost/benefit	-210	-210
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Total	8534	Net spendable income	4407	4407
New spouse income	0	0			Change from guideline	0	0
Employee 401-k contribution	0	0			% of combined spendable	52%	52%
Adjustments to income	0	0	Support		% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	Addons	0	Total taxes	1098	1098
CS paid prev marriage	0	0	Guideln CS	210	Dep. exemption value	0	0
Health insurance	507	0	Marin SS	0	# withholding allowances	0	0
Other medical expenses	0	0	Total	210	Net wage paycheck	0	0
Property tax expenses	0	0			Revital		
Ded interest expense	0	0			Payment cost/benefit	210	210
Contribution deduction	0	0	Proposed		Net spendable income	4127	4127
Misc tax deductions	0	0	Tactic 9		Change from guideline	0	0
Qualified business income deduction	0	0	CS	210	% of combined spendable	48%	48%
Required union dues	0	0	SS	0	% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
Mandatory retirement	0	0	Total	210	Total taxes	57	57
Hardship deduction	0	0	Saving	0	Dep. exemption value	0	0
Other GDL deductions	0	0	Releases	0	# withholding allowances	0	0
Child care expenses	0	0			Net wage paycheck	0	0

Herbert pays Guideline CS, Proposed CS

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information

	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
All children		50 - 50	0	0	0 Herbert	210 Herbert	210 Herbert
Analis	2009-03-20	50 - 50	0	0	0 Herbert	117 Herbert	117 Herbert
Arielle	2012-08-28	49 - 51	0	0	0 Herbert	93 Herbert	93 Herbert

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 3/12/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0000630

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: ANDREA GHIEMMETTI

and

RESPONDENT: SOPHIA ISABELLA JOAN
GARDNER

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – VISITATION

RULING

Parties are ordered to appear as Respondent Sophia Gardner (Mother) has requested an evidentiary 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: 3/12/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0001073

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: KIMMA BARRY

and

RESPONDENT: KEITH BARRY

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE 2) REVIEW HEARING – CHILD/SPOUSAL SUPPORT

RULING

The parties are ordered to appear to provide an update as to status and compliance with previous orders of this 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 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: 3/12/26 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 on calendar for hearing following a re-referral to Marin Family Court Services (FCS) for additional interviews. The further evaluation by FCS is an outgrowth of an order issued by this Court July 10, 2025. Petitioner Edgar Contreras (Father) and Haley (daughter; DOB 08/07/10) were interviewed separately on March 3, 2026. Respondent Brenda Corona (Mother) was interviewed previously on January 13, 2026. The younger daughter, Donna (DOB 05/15/2015) was not interviewed.

As outlined in the Findings and Order After Hearing (FOAH) dated July 10, 2025, the parents share joint legal custody of both children. The parents share responsibility for the children and are directed to confer in good faith on matters concerning the children's health, education and welfare. Both parents have access to the children's school, medical, mental health, and dental records and the right to consult with professionals who are providing services to the child. Father has sole physical custody of both children. The FOAH of July 10, 2025, further provided that the parties would return to FCS (and this Court) after six months.

FCS prepared an initial report dated January 25, 2026. FCS provided a supplemental report based on the additional interviews dated March 6, 2026.

The court has reviewed the submissions of the parties together with the most current and prior FCS reports. The Court finds good cause and that it is the best interest of the children to adopt the recommendations of FCS, as modified by this Court, as follows:

All current orders, including the FOAH of July 10, 2026, shall remain in effect with the following additions/modifications:

1. The girls' visits with Mother shall be on Saturday or Sunday (alternating) from 11:00 to 4:00. The girls shall not be forced to visit if they do not want to. If they are

uncomfortable during a visit, they shall call their father, and he shall pick them up as soon as possible.

2. Mother shall comply with taking whatever action necessary to change the girls' health insurance so they can be seen by practitioners in Marin instead of Contra Costa County.
3. The parents shall continue to communicate through the Talking Parents app.

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: 3/12/26 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 re-referral to Family Court Services (FCS) for mediation of custody and visitation issues. The parties were originally 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 originally attend his scheduled mediation appointment.

On January 29, 2026, this Court re-referred Father to FCS and entered order pending further hearing that Mother is to have sole legal and physical custody. Father is to have supervised visits in Solano County once every other week for a period of one hour per visit. The children are not to be exposed to marijuana or domestic violence and there is to be no corporal punishment of the children.

FCS issued its initial report and recommendations on January 19, 2026. FCS issued a follow-up report that encompassed an interview with Father dated March 2, 2026.

The Court has reviewed the FCS reports and the submissions by the parties and finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the minor children, Legond Jackson (DBO 12/18/2021), and Lennon Jackson (DOB) 04/13/2023), to adopt the 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. If it is determined that Father is no longer a resident of Marin County, venue for this matter may be transferred to Solano County and all future custody filings shall be filed with Solano County Family Court.
2. Mother shall maintain sole legal and physical custody.
3. Father shall take a domestic violence class of no less than six weeks duration to learn about the impact of domestic violence on children.
4. Mother shall take a domestic violence class for victims of domestic violence that contains information about the impact of domestic violence on children.
5. Father shall take a parenting class focused on parenting toddlers and preschool age children that contains information on positive parenting that does not use corporal punishment as discipline.
6. Until such time that Father completes the above specified domestic violence class and parenting class, Father shall have unsupervised parenting time each Saturday from 9 AM to 7 PM.
7. Once Father completes his domestic violence and parenting classes, he shall have unsupervised parenting time from Friday 10 AM through Sunday 6 PM on the first, second, third, and fifth weekends of the month. The children shall be in Mother's custody at all other times when not in Father's custody.
8. Exchanges shall occur at the Vallejo Police Department.
9. If the children are enrolled in daycare or preschool, Father may pick the children up from daycare/preschool.
10. There shall be no corporal punishment of the children including hitting them with objects.
11. Neither parent shall consume alcohol to the point of impairment when the children are in their custody.
12. Neither parent shall be under the influence of illegal drugs when the children are in their custody.

13. The children shall not be exposed to marijuana or domestic violence.

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: 3/12/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FS0000015

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: COUNTY OF MARIN

vs.

RESPONDENT: MATTHEW ALAN
URREA

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

RULING

Respondent Matthew Urrea (Father) filed a request for order dated February 5, 2026, seeking custody and visitation orders. Meghan Rodgers (Mother) filed a responsive declaration dated March 3, 2026. The parties were referred to Marin Family Court Services (FCS) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation relating to their shared child Maison (DOB 5/14/18). Both parents were interviewed. FCS reports that the parents reached a full agreement in mediation, but Mother failed to sign the draft mediated agreement. Father subsequently filed a Statement of Agreement with FCS Recommendations dated March 9, 2026, urging the Court to adopt the terms of the mediated agreement that (according to Father) reflects the custody arrangement that the parties have followed for the last five years.

The Court has reviewed the materials submitted by the parties together with the FCS report. The Court finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the child to adopt the terms of the draft mediated agreement as reported by FCS, as follows.

PARENTING PLAN

1. Joint legal custody. The parents shall share responsibility and confer in good faith on matters concerning the health, education, and welfare of Maison. Each parent shall have access to Maison's school, medical, mental health, and dental records and the right to consult with professionals who are providing services to him.
2. Joint physical custody.
3. Parental Timeshare: Maison shall be in the custody of his parents on a 2/2/5 schedule with Father having Mondays and Tuesdays and Mother having Wednesdays and

Thursdays each week. Parents shall alternate weekends from Friday after school through Monday morning drop off at school.

4. Exchanges shall occur at school whenever possible. Exchanges that occur on non-school days (e.g. school breaks, school holidays, etc.) shall occur at 8 AM unless otherwise agreed to between the parents.

5. Holidays:

Easter: even years with Father, odd years with Mother

Halloween: even years with Mother, odd years with Father

Mother's Day: with Mother each year

Father's Day: with Father each year

Thanksgiving: even years with Mother, odd years with Father

Christmas (defined as both 12/24 and 12/25): even years with Father, odd years with Mother

6. School breaks: School breaks such as the Winter Break, Midwinter Break (Ski Week), Spring Break, and Summer Break shall remain on the regular weekly custody schedule unless otherwise agreed to between the parents.
7. Vacation time: Each parent shall have one week of vacation each year with Maison. The vacationing parent shall notify the other parent at least three months in advance of the intended dates of their one-week vacation. This one week of vacation time shall supersede the regular weekly custody schedule. Parents may have additional vacation time with Maison outside of their regular custody days per mutual parental agreement.
8. Any out-of-state travel with Maison requires notice from the other parent.
9. Any out-of-country travel with Maison shall require written consent from the other parent.
10. Maison shall continue to attend school in the Novato Unified School District unless otherwise agreed upon between the parents.
11. Parents shall respond to any coparenting communication requests within 24 hours. If there has been no response within 24 hours to a time-sensitive request, the requesting parent shall have authority to act on the request.
12. Parents agree to communicate respectfully regarding matters involving Maison.
13. Both parents shall encourage a positive and loving relationship between Maison and the other parent.

14. Both parents shall share important school, medical, and extracurricular information involving Maison in a timely manner.
15. Parents may modify any portion of their parenting plan including the timeshare at any time per mutual parental agreement.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.1256, 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.