

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 3/13/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL 1901746

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

PETITIONER: BROOKE T. HAWKS

and

RESPONDENT: ERIC A. HAWKS

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – FIX AND LIQUIDATE
UNREIMBURSED EXPENSES

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Father’s Request for Order (“RFO”) to fix and liquidate unreimbursed expenses in the amount of \$8,747.16, representing Mother’s 50% share of childcare, medical and other expenses paid on behalf of the parties’ children, Kayden (DOB 10/9/2007) and Dillan (DOB 8/18/2011). Mother filed a Responsive Declaration on 3/4/2026.

The Court has been provided with a combined total of 94 pages of documentation regarding add-on expense reimbursements. Mother states that the only expenses she agreed to share 50%-50% are therapy, co-pays, medication and dental, and for Father to pay soccer expenses for 2024, but nonetheless submits a spreadsheet in which she seeks reimbursement for \$36,207.97 in expenses that fit none of those categories, including charges for one child driving the other, which this Court has never before seen as a proposed reimbursement.

The Judgment of Dissolution filed 9/24/2021 provides at paragraph 4.7 that, as long as it is available through either party’s employment, that party will maintain medical insurance for the minor children. Paragraph 4.9 provides that each party agrees to be solely responsible for child care expenses when either or both children are in his or her care. Paragraph 4.10 states the parties will share equally the cost of *any agreed upon extracurricular* activities for the children. In addition, mandatory add-on expenses for which each party is entitled to reimbursement include child care expenses necessary due to either party’s employment, as well as the children’s medical, dental, and therapy expenses. All other expenses outside of these categories must be expressly agreed upon by the parties.

The Court will not read through scores of emails trying to determine who said what about which expenses; the burden is on each of the parties to provide proof to the Court of a mutual agreement for any non-mandatory expense. Either there was an express agreement to pay an expense or there wasn’t. The parties are ordered to review their claims in light of the terms of the

Judgment, determine whether there was an express, mutual agreement to pay a category of expenses that is not mandatory, and take out any expenses which are not mandatory or not mutually agreed upon.

Then the party seeking the reimbursement shall provide a summary of the mandatory add-on categories and those expenses for which there is an express, mutual agreement, and provide the summary to the other party.

The parties are then ordered to meet and confer to see what they agree on, and what they don't agree on, and then file with the Court by 4/16/2026 an updated Declaration attaching their summaries and advising the Court, as to each summary category what amount they are requesting.

The matter is continued for hearing to 4/24/2026 at 9:00 am in Department E.

The Court will prepare the order per Rule 5.125, CA Rules of Court.

Any party who disagrees with the Court's tentative ruling and wishes to have oral argument must notify the Court at (415) 444-7046 and opposing counsel (or if the opposing party is self-represented, notice must be given directly to the opposing party) of their intent to appear at the hearing for oral argument by 4:00 pm on the court day before the hearing, as required by Marin County Superior Court Family Law Local Rules 7.12(B) and (C). Notice may be given by telephone or in person. Absent proper notice, no oral argument will be permitted. If no request for oral argument is made, the tentative ruling will become the order of the Court.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, persons who requested oral argument must appear for the hearing in person or remotely via Zoom, in accordance with the Court website guidelines. If appearing remotely via Zoom (video or telephone), you are responsible for ensuring you have adequate connectivity; the Court may proceed in a party's absence if technical issues arise. Proper Zoom etiquette and courtroom decorum are required, and failure to comply may result in the hearing being halted and an order to appear in person being made.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 3/13/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL 2002626

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

PETITIONER: PETRICE SARAH
DEGENHARDT HAVASSY

and

RESPONDENT: ROBB RUSSELL
HAVASSY

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

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Father’s 1/5/2026 Request for Order (“RFO”) re: child custody/visitation regarding the parties’ children: Marin (DOB 4/2/2009) and Ripley (DOB 8/25/2016), with a number of requested modifications, as set forth on page 1 of his Declaration. Petitioner/Mother filed a Responsive Declaration on 2/25/2026 addressing each of Father’s requests and claims, and Minor’s Counsel, Scott Slomiak, Esp., provided a Report on 3/5/2026. Family Court Services (“FCS”) conducted interviews of Father, Mother and Minor’s Counsel, and filed a Report & Recommendations with the Court on 3/6/2026.

As a preliminary matter, Mother objects that Father did not properly serve her with his RFO. Given Mother clearly had notice of the RFO and filed a Responsive Declaration, the Court will proceed to address this matter. However, Father is admonished that, if in the future he does not abide by the statutory requirements for proper service of process, the RFO will be stricken. The Court further notes that, in disregard of the California Rules of Court, Rules 2.108, 2.109, et seq., and Marin County Local Rules, Civil 2.7, Father filed a single-spaced, unnumbered 23-page Declaration in support of his RFO, without permission of the Court. The Court will not tolerate such violations, which it deems to be an abuse of the legal process. Therefore, the Court has read the equivalent of the mandated ten-page limit and strikes the rest of Father’s Declaration.

Regrettably, the parties continue to disagree about everything. Having reviewed the written submissions, as set forth above, Minor’s Counsel’s Report, with recommendations, and the FCS Report & Recommendations, the Court finds it is in the best interests of the children to adopt some of the FCS Recommendations and some of Minor’s Counsel’s recommendations, as modified below. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. Father’s renewed request to modify Ripley’s time-share is denied. The Court finds no material change of circumstances to warrant a modification.

2. Ripley shall remain in her current school district.
 - a. If Mother relocates outside of the current school district or changes employment to a different school district for the 2026-2027 school year, the parties shall meet and confer to see if they can reach agreement on which school Ripley should attend.
 - b. If the parties cannot reach agreement, they shall promptly submit the matter to the Court for determination. Neither party may change Ripley's school without written agreement of the other party or Court order.
 - c. With respect to Ripley's attendance at middle school, the parties shall meet and confer no less than eight months prior to the first year of middle school to see if they can reach agreement on which middle school Ripley should attend.
 - d. If the parties cannot reach agreement, by March 1st prior to Ripley's starting middle school, the parties shall submit the matter to the Court for decision. Neither party may enroll Ripley in middle school without the other party's written agreement or Court order.
3. Father shall obtain a US Passport for Ripley using the name "Ripley Dane Degenhardt Havassy" as Minor's Counsel confirms is reflected on Ripley's birth certificate and the Judgment of Dissolution. If Father needs an updated Form DS-3053 to apply for the passport, Mother shall provide the updated form forthwith.
4. With regard to the holiday/vacation schedule, the Court does not find a settlement conference is appropriate. Each party shall submit to the Court, with a limitation of 5 pages, those vacation/holiday issues they believe require clarification, with their suggestion as to the clarification. The submissions shall be made to the Court by 4/3/2026. The Court will review and consider the submissions and make clarifications it deems appropriate.
5. Both parties shall support Ripley's extracurricular activities.
 - a. Mother shall be responsible for taking Ripley to Love2Dance in Novato on Wednesdays, as well as for paying all costs associated with Ripley's participation in Love2Dance. Father shall not attend classes but may attend performances (subject to any requested restrictions by the Studio, which must be respected) and must observe the performance from opposite sides of the studio from Mother. Ripley shall be permitted to spend up to 10 minutes with Father following the performance.
 - i. If the parties both attend a performance, any contact between them shall be respectful, polite and cordial.

- ii. If Mother is unable to get Ripley to her practice on Mother's custodial time, she shall notify Father, and if available, Father may take Ripley to her practice.
 - b. Father shall be responsible for taking Ripley to Rocco Studios in Mill Valley on Fridays, as well as for paying all costs associated with Ripley's participation in Rocco Studios. Mother shall not attend classes but may attend performances (subject to any restrictions requested by the Studio, which must be respected) and must observe the performance from opposite side of the studio from Father.
 - i. If the parties both attend any performance, any contact between them shall be respectful, polite and cordial.
 - ii. If Father is unable to get Ripley to her practice on his custodial time, he shall notify Mother, and if available, Mother may take Ripley to her practice.
 - c. Any inappropriate behavior or interaction with staff, or failure to abide by restrictions requested by either Studio, shall be cause for the Court to revise the foregoing. Both parents are admonished that the studios need to be "safe space" for Ripley; any negative behavior toward the studios and/or their staff is detrimental to Ripley's well-being.
6. If Ripley is signed up to play soccer, dance shall take priority in the event of a conflict with soccer practice/games.
 - a. Only the custodial parent shall attend soccer practices unless there is an agreement in writing that the non-custodial parent can also attend. The custodial parent is responsible for getting Ripley to practice and games.
 - i. If the custodial parent is unable to take Ripley to a practice/game, the non-custodial parent shall be notified, and if available, shall take Ripley to the practice/game.
 - iii. Both parents may attend soccer games, and Ripley shall be permitted up to 10 minutes with the non-custodial parent following the game. If the parties both attend a game, any contact between them shall be respectful, polite and cordial, and the parties shall keep a significant distance between them during the game.
7. If FCS should determine to interview Ripley in the future, FCS shall designate the manner and place of the interview.
8. The Court finds no change of circumstances with regard to Father and Marin; therefore, all current orders regarding contact between Marin and Father shall remain in full force and effect.

9. All existing otherwise not in conflict with the above shall remain in full force and effect.
10. All other requests are DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

The Court will prepare the order per Rule 5.125, CA Rules of Court.

Any party who disagrees with the Court's tentative ruling and wishes to have oral argument must notify the Court at (415) 444-7046 and opposing counsel (or if the opposing party is self-represented, notice must be given directly to the opposing party) of their intent to appear at the hearing for oral argument by 4:00 pm on the court day before the hearing, as required by Marin County Superior Court Family Law Local Rules 7.12(B) and (C). Notice may be given by telephone or in person. Absent proper notice, no oral argument will be permitted. If no request for oral argument is made, the tentative ruling will become the order of the Court.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, persons who requested oral argument must appear for the hearing in person or remotely via Zoom, in accordance with the Court website guidelines. If appearing remotely via Zoom (video or telephone), you are responsible for ensuring you have adequate connectivity; the Court may proceed in a party's absence if technical issues arise. Proper Zoom etiquette and courtroom decorum are required, and failure to comply may result in the hearing being halted and an order to appear in person being made.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 3/13/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL 2203175

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

PETITIONER: PIERRE-OLIVIER
LATOUR

and

RESPONDENT: NOOSHIN LATOUR

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CLOSE DCSS CASE

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Father’s 2/4/2026 Request for Order (“RFO”) to find that Mother improperly re-opened the Department of Child Support Services (“DCSS”) case, that Mother be ordered to close the DCSS case, that DCSS be ordered to close the case, etc.

This is a matter that should be heard in the DCSS Court, which is Department O before Commissioner Frankel. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. This matter is continued to 4/14/2026 at 9:00 am in Department O.

SO ORDERED.

The Court will prepare the order.

Any party who disagrees with the Court's tentative ruling and wishes to have oral argument must notify the Court at (415) 444-7046 and opposing counsel (or if the opposing party is self-represented, notice must be given directly to the opposing party) of their intent to appear at the hearing for oral argument by 4:00 pm on the court day before the hearing, as required by Marin County Superior Court Family Law Local Rules 7.12(B) and (C). Notice may be given by telephone or in person. Absent proper notice, no oral argument will be permitted. If no request for oral argument is made, the tentative ruling will become the order of the Court.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, persons who requested oral argument must appear for the hearing in person or remotely via Zoom, in accordance with the Court website guidelines. If appearing remotely via Zoom (video or telephone), you are responsible for ensuring you have adequate connectivity; the Court may proceed in a party’s absence if technical issues arise. Proper Zoom etiquette and courtroom decorum are required, and failure to comply may result in the hearing being halted and an order to appear in person being made.