

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 3/19/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL 1201866

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: DENISE SCOLES-OLSON

and

RESPONDENT: GREGORY MICHAEL
OLSON

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – SPOUSAL SUPPORT

RULING

Denis Scoles Olson (Wife) filed a request for order on February 2, 2026, seeking: (1) that Gregory Olson (Husband) resume spousal support; (2) order payment of any support in arrears because Husband stopped paying the full amount; (3) order payment of \$2,300 in unpaid spousal support with respect to three separate months in which partial payments were made.

Husband filed a responsive declaration on March 3, 2026, opposing Wife's request to order the continued payment of spousal support due to his inability to pay his living expenses. Husband further states that (1) in January of 2026 he began the process of filing for bankruptcy; (2) the amount of support that Wife claims she is owed to her is incorrect and he requests a credit for overpayment; and (3) the expenses listed in Wife's I&E are inaccurate based on other working adults living with Wife and he believes that her living expenses are shared with those other adults.

This Court entered a Judgment of Dissolution on October 24, 2012, in which the Marriage Settlement Agreement (MSA) was incorporated as part of the judgment. The MSA provides that Husband is to pay Wife \$1,500 on the first day of the month.

Here, although denominated as a modification of spousal support, Wife's claim for relief is limited to a determination of money owed and an order to pay such arrears. Husband states that he paid \$800 in November, \$800 in December, \$600 in January, and zero in February or March. Husband further asserts that approximately in February 2012 he got ahead by one month and requests to apply a credit of \$1500. Husband has not provided this Court with evidence that this overpayment was made and that he communicated to Wife that it was intended as an advance of spousal support, as opposed to a gift. (*Marriage of Peet* (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 974.) Accordingly, the Court declines to apply this credit at this time. The Court's decision is

without prejudice to Husband providing evidence at such future time in the context of a modification of spousal support.

Using Husband's confirmation of amounts paid, arrears are calculated as follows:

Nov arrears: \$700.

Dec arrears: \$700.

Jan arrears: \$900.

Feb arrears: \$1500.

Mar arrears: \$1500.

Total arrears through Mar 2026: \$5,300.

Husband has raised in his responsive declaration a request to modify spousal support. Husband is referred to Family Law Self-Help, located in Room C-44 at the the Marin County Civic Center, for information and assistance regarding preparation of a request for order relating to modification of spousal support. The telephone number for the Self-Help Center is (415) 444-7130; its email address is selfhelp@marincourt.org.

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: 3/19/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL 2001713

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: ANNIKA SPARRE
VIRAGH

and

RESPONDENT: JOSEPH LOREN OSTLER

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

RULING

Joseph Ostler (Father) filed a request for order for a change in child custody/visitation dated December 18, 2025, relating to Josph Ostler (AJ) (DOB 11-30-17). Specifically, Father requests that AJ be in his care Tuesday, Thursday, Sunday, and alternate Saturday overnights. The current orders are from 9-23-20 and are for Annika Viragh (Mother) to have sole legal and physical custody and for AJ to be with Father every Tuesday and Thursday from 2:30 to 7:30 and every Sunday from 10:00 to 7:30.

The parties were referred to Marin Family Court Services (FCS) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation. Following rescheduling of initial interviews, both parents were interviewed separately on 2-24-26. FCS issued its report and recommendations dated March 12, 2026. Neither party submitted a statement of agreement/disagreement. Both parents expressed an interest in doing what is best for AJ. The court has reviewed the most recent FCS report as well as the previous report dated 9-18-20. 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:

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

Timeshare Schedule

1. AJ shall continue to live primarily with Annika and shall be with Joseph on the following schedule:
 - Every Tuesday and Thursday with Joseph picking up AJ at school at 2:30 and returning him to an agreed upon location in San Rafael at 7:00 p.m.
 - Every Sunday from 10:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. with exchanges occurring at Hamilton in Novato.

- Alternate weekends from Saturday at 10:30 a.m. to Sunday at 7:00 p.m. with exchanges taking place at Hamilton in Novato.

Holidays/Vacations

2. **Mother's Day/Father's Day:** These days shall be from 10:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and AJ shall be with Annika on Mother's Day and with Joseph on Father's Day every year.
3. **Easter:** Easter shall be Easter Sunday from 10:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. AJ shall be with Annika in the even-numbered years and with Joseph in the odd-numbered years.
4. **Winter Break (February) and Spring Break:** AJ shall remain on the regular custodial schedule during these breaks. However, if he is not in camp, then the Tuesday and Thursday visits shall be from 10:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
5. **Summer:** AJ shall remain on the regular schedule (above) except Joseph shall pick him up on Tuesday and Thursdays from camp at 1:00 p.m. (instead of school at 2:30). In addition, the Tuesdays shall be overnights and Joseph shall return AJ to camp on Wednesday morning.
6. **Halloween:** AJ shall remain in Strawberry to celebrate, unless otherwise desired by AJ.
7. **AJ's birthday (11/30):** The regular custodial schedule shall remain in effect.
8. **Parents' birthdays (5/29 and 2/22):** Either parent can have AJ with them on their birthday as requested, from 10:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
9. **Thanksgiving:** Thanksgiving shall be from Thursday at 10:30 a.m. to Friday at 7:00 p.m. AJ shall be with Annika in the odd-numbered years and with Joseph in the even-numbered years.
10. **Christmas:** Every year, AJ shall be with Annika on Christmas Eve until December 25th at 10:30 a.m. and with Joseph every Christmas Day at 10:30 a.m. until December 26th at 7:00 p.m.

Collateral Issues

11. Any changes to the schedule, or any additional time for AJ to be with either parent, shall occur as mutually agreed upon.
12. Both parents shall maintain their sobriety.
13. Joseph shall ensure that AJ is always properly supervised while in his care.
14. Both parents shall ensure that AJ's video game and screen time is limited.
15. AJ shall have reasonable, unrestricted contact with the non-custodial parent.

16. The parents shall use Our Family Wizard or another parenting app to communicate with one another.

As authorized by CRC 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: 3/19/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0001055

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: GRACIELA LOPEZ ROCCA	
and	
RESPONDENT: BEATRIZ JUANA VALENCIA	

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) REQUEST FOR ORDER – COMPEL – DISCOVERY FACILITATOR PROGRAM 2) CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE 3) REQUEST FOR ORDER – COMPEL- DISCOVERY FACILITATOR PROGRAM

RULING

The matter is on for hearing regarding Petitioner’s motion to compel, filed October 27, 2025 relating to (1) demand for production of documents and (2) further responses to special interrogatories (set one), and Petitioner’s motion to compel, filed December 22, 2025, relating to (1) further responses to special interrogatories (set two), and (2) sanctions.

The parties were referred to the Discovery Facilitator, Terrell Mason, who met with the parties on February 24, 2026, in an effort to resolve the underlying issues. The effort was unsuccessful. Counsel for Petitioner submitted a supplemental declaration of non-resolution identifying areas remaining in dispute. Counsel for Petitioner has further provided this Court with Amended Separate Statements identifying the outstanding requests for production and special interrogatories that require resolution by this Court.

The Court addresses each, in turn.

Petitioner’s Demand for Production of Documents, Set One

Amended Response nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14. Objections are overruled. Respondent is directed to produce all non-privileged responsive documents. If the documents are limited to the identified sworn statements alone, Respondent is further directed to include in their response that such responses are in compliance with CCP section 2031.220.

Amended Response no. 3, 4. Objections are overruled. Respondent initially indicated there are no documents. Respondent’s amended response provides copies of Respondent’s bank

statements. The Court does not see that any additional documents are being withheld or are in existence. Respondent is further directed to include in their response that such responses are in compliance with CCP section 2031.220.

Amended Response no. 13. Objections are overruled. Respondent is ordered to produce all responsive documents from 2021 to the present. Respondent is further directed to include in their response that such responses are in compliance with CCP section 2031.220.

Petitioner's Demand for Further Responses to Special Interrogatories (Amended)

Amended Response to Special Interrogatory no. 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 23, 26, 44, 45, 46, 47. Objections are overruled. No further response is required. Respondent has provided a complete answer.

Amended Response to Special Interrogatory no. 2. Objections are overruled. Respondent is directed to state all "facts" that support the contention in Interrogatory no. 1. Respondent may not simply refer to sworn statements previously provided. Respondent has provided a broad categorical response referencing "numerous informal discussions and communications." This is inadequate. Respondent must state with particularity all facts it intends to rely on.

Amended Response to Interrogatory no. 3. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to provide a further response without the qualifier as to "express contracts." This is a contention interrogatory. Respondent is to apply the definition provided by Petitioner.

Amended Response to Interrogatory no. 4. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to state all "facts" that support the contention in Interrogatory no. 3. Broad responses as to the existence of "mutually explicit discussions" is inadequate. Respondent is to provide specifics as to each discussion that will allow further exploration of identified conversations.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 6. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to state all facts in support of the contention in no. 5. Reference to prior sworn statements is inadequate. Respondent must identify each fact it is relying upon, whether contained in a prior sworn statement or otherwise. It is not the responsibility of Petitioner to "mine" for facts in reviewing prior statements.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 8. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to state all facts in support of the contention in no. 7. Once again, reference to prior sworn statements is inadequate. Respondent must identify each fact it is relying upon, whether contained in a prior sworn statement or otherwise. It is not the responsibility of Petitioner to "mine" for facts in reviewing prior statements.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 11. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to state all facts in support of the contention in no. 10. Reference to prior sworn statements is inadequate. Respondent must identify each fact it is relying upon, whether contained in a prior sworn statement or otherwise. It is not the responsibility of Petitioner to "mine" for facts in reviewing prior statements. Respondent's statement as to her "understanding" is conclusory. Respondent is directed to identify all facts supporting this understanding.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 13. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to state all facts in support of the contention in no. 12. Reference to prior sworn statements is inadequate. Respondent must identify each fact it is relying upon, whether contained in a prior sworn statement or otherwise. It is not the responsibility of Petitioner to “mine” for facts in reviewing prior statements. Further, Respondent’s boiler-plate statement as to her “understanding” is conclusory. Respondent is directed to identify all facts supporting this understanding.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 15. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to respond by identifying each fact. A statement that “facts exist which may support the existence of rights or obligations []” is facially inadequate.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 17. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to respond by identifying each fact. A statement that “facts exist which may support the existence of rights or obligations []” is facially inadequate.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 19. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to respond by identifying each “promise.” The statement: “Respondent contends that she relied to her detriment on promises made by Petitioner during the period from the commencement of cohabitation to the time they registered as Domestic Partners” is inadequate.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 20. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to provide specific details relating to (1) contributing substantial personal funds, (2) refraining from pursuing independent financial investments, (3) non-compensated labor, and (4) personal and financial decisions.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 21. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to identify all facts supporting its contention in no. 20.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 22. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to identify the “substantial economic detriment.” If such information is to be provided by an expert, Respondent must provide the outlines of the economic detriment she has suffered. Respondent may not simply state, without more, that she has suffered various categories of harm.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 24. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to state all facts in support of the contention in no. 22. Reference to prior sworn statements is inadequate. Respondent must identify each fact it is relying upon, whether contained in a prior sworn statement or otherwise. It is not the responsibility of Petitioner to “mine” for facts in reviewing prior statements.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 25. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to identify all facts supporting its contention in no. 23. Reference to prior sworn statements is inadequate. Respondent must identify each fact it is relying upon, whether contained in a prior sworn statement or otherwise.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 27. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to identify all facts supporting its contention in no. 25. Respondent has simply repeated the contention without identifying any supporting facts.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 28. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to answer this contention interrogatory.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 29. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to answer identifying all facts supporting the contention.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 30, 32, 34, 36. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to answer this contention interrogatory.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 31, 33, 35. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to answer identifying all facts supporting the contention.

Amended response to Interrogatory 37. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to provide an amount of compensation she believes she earned from a specified period of time.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 38. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to answer yes or no whether she had W-2 income.

Amended response to Interrogatory 39. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to provide the years, if any.

Amended response to Interrogatory no. 40. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to answer yes or no.

Amended response to Interrogatory 41. Objections overruled. Respondent is directed to state each year such income was received.

Respondent is to provide further responses within 30 days of this Order, and this matter is continued to May 7, 2026, at 9:00 AM in Department B for an update regarding compliance and further hearing on the issue of sanctions. Each party is to file and serve a separate statement updating the court on these issues by April 30, 2026.

Counsel for Petitioner is directed to prepare the 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.

The Court has reviewed the report from FCS and finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the child to adopt the recommendations from FCS, as modified by this Court, as follows:

PARENTING PLAN for Luke Miller / Ivone Miller:

1. Court orders shall issue for the immediate return of Deacon from Mexico to Father's custody Marin County. Law enforcement shall be given authority to facilitate and execute court orders for the immediate return of Deacon from Mexico.
2. Father shall immediately file for ex parte orders requesting the issuance of emergency orders for the immediate return of Deacon to Marin County.
3. Sole legal and physical custody to Father.
4. Mother shall be limited to professionally supervised visits with Deacon until further court order. Visits shall be twice a week through Rally Family Visitation Services. A third-party independent professional supervisor shall not be utilized at this time due to flight risk by Mother.
5. Mother shall participate in a mental health assessment with the results being provided to Father and the Court.

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: 3/19/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0002615

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: NAHOMI FRANCELLA
 LOPEZ ARAUZ

and

RESPONDENT: JONATHAN JOAQUIN
 NATAREN LOPEZ

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

RULING

Parties are ordered to appear. Nahomi Lopez Arauz (Mother) did not appear for mediation. Marin Family Court Services is unable to issue it report until it interviews Mother who is the custodial parent.

Mother is directed to contact FCS to set up an appointment. The matter will be continued to April 30, 2026.

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: 3/19/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FS0000299

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: COUNTY OF MARIN

and

RESPONDENT: SEAN MARTIN
WALASHEK

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

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner Jasmine Simmons' (Mother) Request for Order (RFO) filed January 8, 2026. Mother seeks orders relating to three shared children: Green (DOB 3-13-20), Kove (5-7-22), and Oak (4-18-24). The parties were referred to Marin Family Court Services (FCS) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation relating to the children. FCS interviewed the Mother on February 24, 2026. The interview with Sean Martin Walashek (Father) did not go forward due to a change in schedule prompted by FCS.

The parties are re-referred to FCS to provide the opportunity for FCS to interview Father.

The matter is continued to April 30, 2026 at 9:00 AM in Department B for further hearing, after Father has an opportunity to participate in FCS child custody recommending counseling and mediation.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the court shall prepare the formal 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.
