

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 3/20/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: E      CASE NO: FL 1601598

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

---

PETITIONER:    LORI BONNICI

and

RESPONDENT: JERROLD BONNICI

---

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: STATUS ONLY HEARING

**RULING**

This matter is set for status only on Respondent/Husband's payment to Wife of \$20,818.67 in attorneys' fees (due by 1/20/2025) and appointment of a forensic accountant per Evidence Code § 730 to prepare a valuation of Showplant Nurseries, Inc. per the Court's 7/25/2025 Findings and Order After Hearing.

On 3/13/2026 Petitioner/Wife's attorney of record filed a Declaration on behalf of Wife confirming that Husband paid the outstanding attorneys' fees, albeit 3 months late, on 1/26/2026. Further, although Husband had advised Wife he would issue a check for the retainer for Alex Spaete, CPA, on 11/21/2025, he failed to do so. Mr. Spaete's retainer was ultimately paid late, but Mr. Spaete commenced work on 2/9/2026. Although Mr. Spaete requested general ledgers for Showplant Nurseries from 2019 through 2023, Husband still has not provided Mr. Spaete with the general ledgers. Nonetheless, according to counsel, Mr. Spaete expects to complete his report by 4/17/2026.

On 3/13/2026, Husband's attorney of record filed a Declaration on behalf of Husband stating the memory and other health problems Husband has experienced.

Based on the foregoing, the Court sets the matter for further status review on 5/1/2026 at 9:00 am in Department E. Although the Court previously ordered personal appearances at the 3/20/2026 status review, that appears unnecessary. However, if either party wishes to appear, they shall notify the Court and opposing counsel, as they would when requesting oral argument on a tentative ruling.

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 Comi 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: 3/20/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: E      CASE NO: FL 1701135

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

---

PETITIONER:    KATRINA SIRDOFSKY

and

RESPONDENT: MYNOR GUILLERMO  
ANDRADE ORTEGA

---

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – ENFORCEMENT OF  
JUDGMENT

**RULING**

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Wife’s 9/22/2025 Request for Order (“RFO”) to enforce the terms of the Stipulated Judgment of Dissolution entered 10/3/2019 regarding a community business, which subsequently went into bankruptcy.

Respondent/Husband filed a Responsive Declaration on 12/4/2025 opposing the requested relief and noting the parties agreed to a continuance of the hearing to conduct discovery. A Stipulation & Order was filed and signed by the Court on 1/5/2026 continuing the matter to 3/20/2026. Husband filed a Supplemental Responsive Declaration, a Declaration of Alex Grager, Esq., and a Memorandum of Points and Authorities on 3/9/2026. He notes that the Stipulated Judgment requires the parties to attend mediation before bringing an RFO, and states that Wife has agreed to mediation. Wife’s Reply Declaration filed on 3/13/2026 confirms the parties are set for mediation.

Based on the requirement of the Judgment for mediation and the parties’ agreement, this matter is continued for status review on 6/26/2026 at 9:00 am in Department E.

**SO ORDERED.**

Counsel for Husband shall 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 Comi 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: 3/20/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: E      CASE NO: FL 1801381

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

---

PETITIONER:    ZOE CLARK FABER

and

RESPONDENT: SCOTT M. FABER

---

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

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Mother’s 11/21/2025 Request for Order (“RFO”) re: child custody/visitation regarding the parties’ two children: Phoebe (DOB 6/12/2013) and Chloe (DOB 11/5/2014).

The current order in the parties 12/14/2018 Marital Settlement Agreement provides that the parties share joint legal and physical custody of the children, with a 50%/50% timeshare schedule. Mother requests a modification of both physical and legal custody. Mother contends the children’s needs are not being met when in Father’s care, which is significantly impacting the children’s health and stability. Mother requests the Court order the children be with her during the school week, with Father having one weekday evening per week, and alternating weekends. She also requests sole legal custody for decisions regarding the children’s education, healthcare and after-school activities.

Father filed a Responsive Declaration on 3/9/2026 stating his shock at Mother’s RFO and presents an entirely different picture. According to Father, and confirmed by Dr. Hausman, Ph.D., (the Parenting Coordinator with whom they have been working since 2018, and recently agreed to extend their work with through 12/21/2027), and this is the first time the parties have come to court. Father says the urgency Mother expresses is unsubstantiated. He contends Mother misstates and/or makes up the facts relating to his care and interactions with the children. He states he is a very involved, loving and supportive father, has a very close relationship with both girls, and requests the current custody orders remain in place.

The parties were referred to Family Court Services (“FCS”). Both parents, Sheryl Hausman and Phoebe and Chloe were all interviewed by FCS, and FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 3/13/2026.

Having reviewed and considered all of the parties’ written submissions and the FCS Report & Recommendations, the Court is not satisfied that a change in custody is warranted and finds that it is in the best interests of the children to adopt the FCS recommendations, as stated below:

---

1. All current orders shall remain in effect with the following additions/modifications:
2. The parents shall continue to work with an agreed upon Co-Parent Coordinator.
3. Neither parent shall share any information from this report with either child.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Father to 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 Comi 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: 3/20/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: E      CASE NO: FL 1803029

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

---

PETITIONER:    JOHN GAETA

and

RESPONDENT: ROSE LASTON

---

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – SPOUSAL SUPPORT

RULING

This matter was continued from 2/13/2026 for review regarding Petitioner/Husband's 12/23/25 post-judgment Request for Order ("RFO") to terminate spousal support. In accordance with the Court's Findings and Order After Hearing, Husband submitted to the court a Work Search Log, copies of his retirement account statements, 2025 Forms W-2 and 1099, 2026 Profit & Loss Statement for Escape Media, which show combined income of approximately \$236,000, withdrawals from two retirement funds totaling approximately \$29,000. Husband has remaining retirement funds of approximately \$410,000, and has a consulting contract through March 31, 2026 with total compensation of \$15,000.

In addition, Husband submitted an Xspouse support calculation. As previously stated by the Court, support calculations may *not* be used by the Court in setting post-judgment support; they are only used to determine temporary (pre-judgment) support, so the calculation has no relevance to this matter.

Although Husband's 12/23/2025 Declaration states he is continuing to try to obtain alternative or secondary jobs, his work search log shows that during the 7 months from 8/2/2025 through 2/2026 he has contacted between 2 and 4 employers per month. The Court does not believe this reflects an earnest effort to find employment. In addition, the Court needs more information on whether Escape Ai Media has begun to generate revenue and how Husband is meeting his living expenses. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. Husband shall increase his work search efforts, making at least 5 employment inquiries per week, with entries for each inquiry maintained in his work search log, to find employment commensurate with his skills and ability.
2. The matter is continued for hearing to 6/26/2026 at 9:00 am in Department E.

3. By 6/15/2026, Husband shall file with the Court a 2026 year-to-date profit & loss statement for Ai Media, a Declaration updating the Court on how he is meeting his expenses. Husband shall also provide an updated Income & Expense Declaration.
4. Spousal Support shall remain set at zero pending further Court order.

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 Comi 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: 3/20/26                      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: E      CASE NO: FL0000859

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

---

PETITIONER:    IAN DAVIS-TREMAYNE

and

RESPONDENT:   NATALIE DAVIS-  
TREMAYNE

---

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

**RULING**

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Mother’s 2/5/2026 Request for Order (“RFO”) for guideline child support, guideline pendente lite spousal support and custody/visitation relating to the parties’ two children, Corbin (DOB 7/5/2012) and Nova (DOB 10/15/2015). Wife further requests attorneys’ fees and costs per Family Code §2030 of \$20,000. With her RFO, Mother filed a supporting Declaration and lodged the parties’ joint 2023 and 2024 income tax returns, the 2023 and 2024 income tax returns of Tremayne Chiropractic and a preliminary balance sheet and profit & loss statement for the period 1/1/2024 through 11/30/2024. Wife had already filed an Income & Expense Declaration (“I&E”) on 1/14/2026.

On 3/9/2026 Petitioner/Father filed a Responsive Declaration, I&E, Support Calculations, and lodged with the Court the parties’ 2023 and 2024 joint tax returns and the 2023 and 2024 S Corporation tax returns for Tremayne Chiropractic. Father seeks a referral to Family Court Services, proposes guideline child support and pendente lite spousal support based on calculations prepared by Alex Spaete, CPA, subject to modification pending a vocational evaluation of Mother. Father further asks the Court to deny Mother’s attorneys’ fees request, and that the Court order Mother to pay all carrying costs of the marital home since she has exclusive use and possession, and all of her personal expenses which Father is currently paying on Mother’s behalf.

**Custody/Visitation**

The parties are in agreement that they share legal and physical custody of the children with a 50%-50% timeshare; however, there are several issues for which they believe a referral to FCS would be helpful. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. The parties are referred to Family Court Services. The custody/visitation issues are continued to 5/1/2026 at 9:00 am in Department E for receipt of the FCS Report & Recommendations and further hearing on the custody/visitation issues.

### **Child Support**

Mother is 42 years old, works approximately 17 hours/week and earns \$2,080/month fabricating orthotics for Davis Shoe Therapeutics, which is confirmed by her paystubs. In addition, her I&E states she has been receiving \$3,500-\$4,000/month in (voluntary) support from Father. Mother claims \$7,061.93 in deposit accounts, and real and personal property of \$500,000. She lists her monthly living expenses at \$13,785, with outstanding credit card debt of approximately \$4,350. The Court has difficulty understanding how Mother can be paying monthly expenses which are more than twice her monthly income and only has \$4,350 in debt.

Petitioner/Father is 43 years old and a chiropractor. His I&E states he receives salary/wages of \$5,000/month from Group Chiropractic, Inc. and receives \$22,096/month in self-employment income as a chiropractor, for a total of \$27,096/month, although his forensic accountant, Alex Spaete, CPA, provides an income available for support analysis that calculates Father's S Corp income at \$13,551/month. Father has provided no explanation for this discrepancy. In addition, he has provided no 2025 Profit & Loss Statement, and his I&E is incomplete in that he provided no information as to his assets in deposit accounts, investments, retirement accounts and/or real or personal property. Father claims monthly living expenses of \$28,135. He also claims outstanding credit card debt of \$33,473 but, again, did not provide the requested information as to how much he is paying per month on the credit cards and/or the dates of his last payments.

Although Mother questions Father's stated income and expenses that are paid through the S corporation, she has neither specified nor provided documentation demonstrating Mr. Spaete's analysis is incorrect. While Mother may deem discovery necessary, the Court has sufficient information to make temporary orders for support. Mr. Spaete's income available for support analysis effectively adds back the obvious personal expenses and calculates the total benefit to Husband from the business for 2023 was \$230,067 and for 2024, \$226,162. Averaging the 2023 and 2024 income, and deducting Husband's compensation of \$65,500 results in adjusted net income from the business of \$162,614, or \$13,551/month.

Although Mother tacks on an Xspouse support calculation to her Reply Declaration, she failed to file a supporting Declaration detailing the assumptions relied upon in the calculation, as required by Marin County Rule, Family 7.13 D. Wife fails to state the basis for finding Father's S Corporation income is \$29,625/month. Moreover, for calculation purposes S Corporation is not considered self-employed income; it is taxable income. The Court has prepared its own Xspouse calculation, which is attached as Exhibit "A" and uses the assumptions in Father's proposed calculation, except as to Mother's income. The Court finds it inappropriate to impute Mother with minimum wage income at this time. Exhibit "A" attributes her with wages of \$2,080/month, which are her actual earnings at this time. The parties' time-share is 50%-50%; the parties will each file taxes as Head of Household, and each will claim themselves and one child as exemptions. Father's income consists of \$5,458 in wages and \$13,351 in other taxable income, and he pays \$659/month for health insurance. Mother's income, as noted, is

\$2,080/month, and (given her exclusive use and possession of the home), she gets the deduction for property taxes and mortgage interest. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

2. Commencing 2/6/2026 Father shall pay to Mother as and for guideline child support the sum of \$2,679/month (\$974 for the benefit of Corbin, and \$1,623 for the benefit of Nova). Said support is payable on or before the first day of each month.
3. In addition, bonus child support shall be payable by Father to Mother if his income exceeds the amount attributed to him on Exhibit "A." Bonus child support shall be paid in accordance with the Xspouse bonus schedule attached as Exhibit "A-1."
4. Father is ordered to prepare, serve and file a 2025 Profit & Loss Statement forthwith. The Court reserves jurisdiction to modify child support retroactively in the event that Husband's 2025 total income is higher than that assumed for him in Exhibit "A" and the Court deems a modification to be appropriate.
5. Child support shall continue until (1) the child reaches the age of 18, or if still a full-time student in high school at age 18, until the child reaches age 19 or graduates from high school, whichever first occurs; (2) the child dies; or (3) the child is emancipated. The amount of child support is modifiable if there is a material change of circumstances for either party.
6. In addition, the parties shall share, in proportion to their net incomes with Father paying 60% and Mother paying 40% of all reasonable uninsured medical expenses and dental expenses incurred on behalf of their 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 is attached to the Order After Hearing. These provisions shall apply to reimbursement for childcare expenses, as well.

### **Pendente Lite Spousal Support**

Based upon Exhibit "A" attached hereto, the Court orders as follows:

7. Commencing 2/6/2026 , Father shall pay to Mother as and for guideline pendente lite spousal support the sum of \$1,927/month, payable on or before the first day of each month.
8. In addition, bonus spousal support shall be payable by Father to Mother if his income exceeds the amount attributed to him on Exhibit "A." Bonus child support shall be paid in accordance with the Xspouse bonus schedule attached as Exhibit "A-1."
9. The Court reserves jurisdiction to modify pendente lite support retroactively in the event that Husband's 2025 total income is higher than that assumed for him in Exhibit "A" and the Court deems a modification to be appropriate. .

10. Spousal support shall continue until Wife remarries, either party dies, or further order of the Court.
11. Spousal support is neither taxable to the recipient nor deductible by the payor.
12. Wife is advised that it is the goal of the State of California that each party must make reasonable good-faith efforts to become self-supporting as provided in Family Code § 4320. Failure to make reasonable, good-faith efforts may be one of the factors considered by the court as a basis for modifying or terminating support. See, e.g., *In re Marriage of Gavron* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 705.

### **Home Carrying Costs and Personal Expenses**

Having reviewed the home carrying costs and personal expenses detailed on page 2 of Father's Responsive Declaration, the Court finds that, so long as Mother has exclusive use and possession of the family home, she is responsible for payment of the mortgage, property taxes, homeowner's insurance, earthquake insurance, ADT Home Security, utilities, and solar panel lease.

In addition, Mother is responsible for the car payment and insurance for the car she drives, as well as for her phone bill. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

13. Effective immediately, Mother shall be solely responsible for payment of all of the above-referenced expenses.

### **Attorneys' Fees and Costs**

Mother requests Father pay her attorneys' fees of \$20,000. Father filed an objection and motion to strike Mother's request on the grounds that counsel for Mother did not timely serve her Declaration supporting the fees, which precluded Father's addressing the issue in his Responsive Declaration.

Respondent's request to strike Mother's request for attorneys' fees is denied. Pursuant to Family Code § 2030(a)(1), it is the Court's obligation to ensure both parties have access to legal representation to preserve each party's rights. Before awarding attorneys' fees, the Court must consider the relative circumstances of the parties and find (1) an award is appropriate; (2) there is a disparity in access to funds to retain counsel; and (3) one party is able to pay for the legal representation of both parties. (Fam C § 2030(a)(2).)

There is no reasonable argument here that there isn't a significant disparity in the parties' incomes respective incomes, or that Mother is in need of immediate legal assistance. While Father is correct that counsel for Mother has not properly justified her request for \$20,000 or the reasonableness of fees incurred to date, she can do so by supplementing her Declaration and providing the Court with her billing statements. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

14. Father shall advance to Mother the sum of \$10,000 as and for attorneys' fees and costs.  
Said sum is payable to Mother by 3/30/2026. The Court reserves jurisdiction as to the ultimate allocation of said fees.
15. Counsel for Mother shall supplement her Declaration to specify work anticipated to be necessary, estimated time/fees to accomplish further tasks and provide billing statements, with only privileged information redacted, to be filed with the Court by 4/10/2026. Father may file any response to the information provided by 4/24/2026.
16. Mother's attorneys' fees request will be further addressed on 5/1/2026.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Father to 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 Comi 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.*



## Annual Bonus Income Father

- Cost is an increase in support paid or a decrease in support received by this spouse
- Bonus income may reverse direction of CS and/or SS
- R = recipient of support

Annual bonus paid to Mother: 0  
Prior relationship(s): OFF

### Additional Cost to Father

Father's Bonus	Child Support		Spousal Support		Total CS	Total SS (adjusted)
	% of bonus	\$	% of bonus	\$		
5,000	7.76	388	10.49	525	30,712	23,908
10,000	7.74	774	10.51	1,051	31,099	24,434
15,000	7.73	1,160	10.52	1,578	31,484	24,961
20,000	7.84	1,569	10.71	2,141	31,893	25,524
25,000	7.97	1,994	10.92	2,730	32,318	26,113
30,000	8.06	2,417	11.06	3,319	32,741	26,702
35,000	8.11	2,839	11.17	3,910	33,163	27,293
40,000	8.15	3,259	11.26	4,502	33,583	27,886
45,000	8.17	3,678	11.32	5,096	34,002	28,479
50,000	8.19	4,095	11.38	5,690	34,419	29,073
55,000	8.19	4,503	11.41	6,274	34,827	29,657
60,000	8.15	4,893	11.39	6,835	35,217	30,218
65,000	8.13	5,282	11.38	7,397	35,606	30,780
70,000	8.10	5,670	11.37	7,959	35,994	31,342
75,000	8.08	6,056	11.36	8,522	36,380	31,905
80,000	8.05	6,442	11.36	9,086	36,766	32,469
85,000	8.03	6,827	11.35	9,651	37,151	33,034
90,000	8.01	7,211	11.35	10,217	37,535	33,600
95,000	8.01	7,610	11.33	10,768	37,934	34,151
100,000	8.02	8,022	11.31	11,308	38,346	34,691
105,000	8.03	8,433	11.28	11,849	38,757	35,232
110,000	8.04	8,843	11.26	12,390	39,167	35,773
115,000	8.05	9,252	11.25	12,933	39,576	36,316
120,000	8.09	9,706	11.29	13,546	40,030	36,929
125,000	8.13	10,163	11.33	14,166	40,487	37,549
130,000	8.17	10,619	11.42	14,843	40,943	38,226
135,000	8.20	11,073	11.50	15,527	41,397	38,910
140,000	8.23	11,520	11.57	16,201	41,844	39,584
145,000	8.25	11,966	11.64	16,876	42,290	40,259
150,000	8.27	12,411	11.70	17,552	42,735	40,935
155,000	8.29	12,855	11.76	18,229	43,179	41,612
160,000	8.31	13,296	11.82	18,904	43,620	42,287
165,000	8.32	13,736	11.87	19,579	44,060	42,962
170,000	8.34	14,175	11.91	20,254	44,499	43,637
175,000	8.35	14,614	11.96	20,929	44,938	44,312
180,000	8.36	15,051	12.00	21,605	45,375	44,988
185,000	8.37	15,488	12.04	22,282	45,812	45,665
190,000	8.38	15,924	12.08	22,959	46,248	46,342
195,000	8.39	16,359	12.12	23,637	46,683	47,020
200,000	8.40	16,794	12.16	24,315	47,118	47,698

**EXHIBIT**     A-2

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 3/20/26      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: E      CASE NO: FL0001247

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

---

PETITIONER:      KAILEY BARNARD

and

RESPONDENT:      ROBERT BARNARD

---

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

RULING

This matter was calendared after the Court filed and served its Findings and Order After Hearing regarding child custody/visitation on 3/6/2026, striking the initial tentative ruling issued on 3/6/2026 to correct the time-share to the existing 2-2-5-5 schedule. If either party disagrees with, or wishes to be heard on the revised ruling, they must notify the Court and the other party by 4:00 pm on 3/19/2026 that they intend to appear for the hearing and must appear in Department E at 9:00 on 3/20/2026. If neither party disagrees or wishes to be heard, no appearance is necessary; the revised order will become the Court's final order.

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 Comi 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: 3/20/26                      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: E      CASE NO: FL0002281

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

---

PETITIONER:    MARIA MARTIN

and

RESPONDENT: ADELSON FUENTES  
MECKLER

---

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD CUSTODY/VISITATION  
– ALLOCATION OF DEBTS AND FUTURE EXPENSES

**RULING**

This matter is set for hearing on custody/visitation regarding the parties' daughter, Isabel (DOB 2/19/2010).

Respondent/Father did not appear for his initial appointment. Apparently he missed the appointment because he was in Guatemala. A new appointment was scheduled for Father, who was then interviewed by FCS on 3/10/2026, and FCS filed an updated Report & Recommendations with the Court on 3/13/2026. Father indicated he was fine with Isabel living primarily with Mother, and she can see him whenever she wants. He is now in a new relationship and living in San Francisco with his girlfriend; he understands Isabel isn't ready to go to his new home, and he does not want to push her. He said he and Isabel get together for lunch from time to time. He finds she is doing very well in school and is happy, and that's what he wants for her. He knows she will be leaving for college in two years; and she will be his daughter forever. It seems clear Father loves and respects Isabel, is sensitive to her feelings and wants what is best for her.

Mother filed a Statement of Agreement/Disagreement with the updated FCS Recommendations on 3/16/2026. She states that she is concerned with Father having joint legal custody, as that requires ongoing communication and cooperation, but Father has been absent or consistently non-responsive for extended periods of time, which can undermine a child's stability. Mother also objects to taking co-parenting classes, but apparently misunderstands the recommendation, which only requires that each party take one parenting class. It does not require the parties to take multiple classes or even to take one class together. Each parent can attend a separate class. The Court believes this is particularly important so that both parents understand the importance of Isabel's having both of her parents in her life.

Isabel is 16 and is making her own decisions about when she wants to see Father; and should be able to continue to do so.

---

Having considered all of Mother's written submissions and both FCS Reports & Recommendations, the Court finds it is in the best interests of Isabel to adopt the updated FCS recommendations, as modified below. Therefore, the Court modifies its Findings and Order After Hearing filed 2/6/2025 and orders as follows:

**Parental Responsibilities**

1. The parents shall share joint legal custody of Isabel. They shall share in the responsibility and confer in good faith on matters concerning Isabel's health, education, and welfare. Each parent shall have access to the child's school, medical, mental health, and dental records and the right to consult with professionals who are providing services to the child.
2. Maria shall have sole physical custody of Isabel.

**Timeshare Schedule**

3. Isabel shall continue to live primarily with Maria and shall have contact with Adelson as desired by Isabel and as arranged by Isabel and Adelson.

**Collateral Issues**

4. Both parents shall each take a co-parenting class (separately) and bring proof of attendance to any future mediations or court hearings.
5. The parents shall engage in peaceful contact only in the presence of Isabel.
6. Neither parent shall make any disparaging comments about the other parent in the presence of Isabel or allow others to do so.
7. Neither parent shall discuss any court matters or share any information from this report with Isabel.

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 Comi 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.*