

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 04/24/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL1703773

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: ALEXANDER
KOPANICKY

and

RESPONDENT: NUENGRUETHAI
KOPANICKY

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW OF REPORTS HEARING – CHILD CUSTODY

RULING

This matter is set for oral argument on the Court's tentative ruling issued 4/3/2026, a copy of which is attached hereto.

Both parties are ordered to appear.

SO ORDERED.

*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: 04/03/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL1703773

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: ALEXANDER
KOPANICKY

and

RESPONDENT: NUENGRUETHAI
KOPANICKY

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW OF REPORTS HEARING – CHILD CUSTODY

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Father’s 2/26/2026 Request for Order (“RFO”) re: child custody, abuse and transportation regarding the parties’ son, Patrick (DOB 12/18/2015). Father’s RFO was initially filed as an *Ex Parte* Request for Emergency Orders; however, the *Ex Parte* request was denied on the Court’s finding the facts did not establish danger of imminent or irreparable harm. The Court file indicates that Mother was served by mail with the RFO on 2/27/2026.

Mother did not file a response to the RFO with the Court, and the last order sent to her by the Court was returned as undeliverable. However, both parties and Patrick were interviewed by Family Court Services (“FCS”), and FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 3/30/2026.

The Court, having reviewed the current as well as previous FCS Reports & Recommendations, and Court orders, finds that it is in the best interests of Patrick to adopt the FCS recommendations, as modified and set forth below. Therefore, the Court orders:

1. All current orders shall remain in effect with the following additions and modifications:

Timeshare

2. Patrick shall be with Ann on the 1st, 3rd, and 5th (if any) weekend of the month from Friday at 6:00 p.m. to Sunday at 6:00 p.m. Exchanges shall be curbside outside of Alexander’s home. Alexander shall remain in the house and Ann shall remain in her car or next to her car.

Collateral Issues

3. Patrick shall be in individual counseling as soon as possible. Both parents shall follow any recommendations made by the counselor.
4. Neither parent shall use *any* physical discipline with Patrick including striking him or any of his possessions with an object.
5. Patrick shall not be forced to take a cold shower or be subjected to *any* emotional abuse.
6. Patrick shall have his cell phone and shall have reasonable communication with both parents.

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: 4/24/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL 1901746

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY 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 continued for hearing to May 1, 2026, at 9:00 am in Department E.

SO ORDERED.

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: 4/24/26 TIME: 8:30 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL 1903008

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

PETITIONER: JULIANNE GENE
GORDON

and

RESPONDENT: NOAH ELLIOTT GORDON

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD SUPPORT

RULING

This matter is continued for hearing to May 8, 2026, at 9:00 am in Dept. E.

*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: 4/24/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL 1904429

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: JOSEPH E. CHAMBERS

and

RESPONDENT: HOLLY M. BRINKMAN

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – VISITATION – SCHOOL CHANGE

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Mother’s Request for Order (“RFO”) regarding a school change and visitation with respect to the parties’ son, Indiana (DOB 12/9/2016; referred to as “Indie”). The parties currently share legal and physical custody of Indie and have a 50%-50% timeshare. Respondent/Father lives in Forest Knolls, and Mother lives in the Oakland Hills. Indie is in the 3rd grade at Ross Valley Charter School. Mother requests an order that Indie change schools to Corpus Christi, a K-8 parochial school in Piedmont, although she is not tied to that school. Mother feels that living in the Oakland area would provide more opportunities for Indie. Father opposes the change to Corpus Christi because Indie has special learning needs, which parochial schools are not required to provide. Father would like Indie to stay at Ross Valley Charter School until he goes to middle school, where he is getting the support he needs and has both friends and a community. The very recent paperwork from Ross Valley that Father provided to the Court shows that Indie is doing very well and is engaged in school. In addition, Father states that Mother will not take Indie to his occupational therapy when Indie is in her care, which means Indie misses out on what appears to be something very helpful to him. The Court questions Mother’s judgment with regard to the importance of occupational therapy, and her failure to have considered that many of the services Indie is currently receiving at Ross Valley are not available at the alternative school she chose. This suggests Mother may not be as attuned to Indie’s educational issues and needs as is Father. In addition, Mother raises concerns regarding Indie’s lack of exposure to music and the arts in school; however, these are things that Mother could easily have been exposing Indie to for years outside of school when in her care. She can still do so.

The parties were referred to Family Court Services (“FCS”), and both parents were interviewed together on 4/8/2026. Mother filed a Statement of Agreement/Disagreement with the FCS Recommendations on 4/17/2026, and Father filed his Statement of Agreement/Disagreement with the FCS Recommendations on 4/20/2026.

After consideration of both parties' written submissions, as well as the FCS Report & Recommendations, the Court is in agreement with FCS that there is no compelling reason at this time to uproot Indie from his school and its community. At the same time, the Court is hopeful that the parties can work cooperatively together to best understand Indie's educational strengths and weaknesses and to find the best "next step" for middle school. The Court does not view the fact that Mother has concerns about Indie's educational future as a reason to give Father sole legal custody of all educational decisions for him. The Court finds that it is in the best interests of Indie to adopt the FCS recommendations, as modified below, and therefore orders as follows:

Custody

1. The parents shall continue to share joint legal and physical custody of Indie.

Timeshare

2. During the school year, Indie shall be with Mother every Sunday, Monday and Tuesday nights, and with Father every Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights.
3. During the summer and school breaks, Indie shall continue to live with both parents on a 50%-50% schedule.
4. Any changes to the schedule shall occur as mutually agreed upon by the parents.

Collateral Issues

5. Indie shall remain at Ross Valley Charter School through 5th grade, unless otherwise mutually agreed by the parents.
6. If school choice continues to be an issue, the parents shall work with a co-parent counselor and/or educational consultant in an effort to resolve the issue productively.

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 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: 4/24/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL 2300768

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: ANDREA MARIE
GIBNEY

and

RESPONDENT: IVAN JAMES LAMONT

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

RULING

This matter is set for review hearing on custody/visitation regarding the parties' three children: Callum (DOB 3/22/2010), Derren (DOB 10/19/2012) and Ian (DOB 4/4/2016). Both parties were interviewed by Family Court Services ("FCS"), and FCS filed a Report & Recommendations with the Court on 3/27/2026.

Neither parent wishes to modify the timeshare set by the Court in its 7/1/2024 Findings and Order After Hearing, which has both Derren and Ian on a 2/2/3 schedule. Callum is with Mother each Saturday and has an optional midweek visit with her. Both parents agree that Callum may spend additional time with Mother whenever he wishes to do so.

Having reviewed the FCS Report & Recommendations, it appears that, with a few minor changes, the parties are in agreement that the 7/1/2024 custody orders shall remain in effect. The Court confirms for the parties that these orders are not temporary orders. Therefore, the Court finds that it is in the best interests of the children to adopt the FCS Recommendations, as modified hereafter:

1. The 7/1/24 FOAH shall remain in effect with the following modifications.
 2. The parental timeshare as specified in the 7/1/24 FOAH shall remain in effect. Derren and Ian shall continue to be on a 2/2/3 schedule unless otherwise agreed to between the parents. Parents may transition to a 2/2/5 or an alternating week schedule for Derren and Ian at any time in the future per mutual parental agreement. Callum shall reside primarily with Father. Mother shall have parenting time with Callum on alternate Saturdays including an overnight. Callum shall have an optional midweek visit with Mother whenever he wishes.
 3. The children's residence shall not be moved out of the country absent court order or mutual parental consent.
-

4. Neither parent shall disparage the other parent to the children or within hearing of the children, nor shall they allow others to do so.
5. Paragraph 10 of the 7/1/24 FOAH shall be stricken. There shall be no further review by FCS regarding the timeshare unless another Request for Order is filed.

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.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 4/24/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL0000034

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: KATHERINE RETZ

and

RESPONDENT: DANIEL RETZ

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – SPOUSAL SUPPORT

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on (1) Petitioner/Wife's 11/26/2025 Request for Order ("RFO") re: spousal support, and (2) trial readiness conference.

Parties are ordered to appear.

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: 4/24/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL0000850

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: ANA CAROLINA
AMARAL SIMMONS

and

RESPONDENT: PHILLIP MICHAEL
SIMMONS

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

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Mother's 3/6/2026 Request for Order ("RFO") re: custody/visitation concerning the parties' three children: Theo (DOB 10/1/2014), Ravi (DOB 12/13/2017), and Hugo (DOB 5/25/2021). Mother seeks more specific orders and guidelines regarding the holidays, vacations, summer and travel. Respondent/Father did not file a Responsive Declaration to the RFO; however, the parties were referred to Family Court Services ("FCS"), and both parents were interviewed on 4/10/2026. FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 4/16/2026. Father filed a Statement of Agreement/Disagreement with the FCS Report & Recommendations on 4/20/2026.

The parties currently share legal and physical custody with a 2/2/5 time-share schedule. Mother wishes to maintain the 2/2/5 schedule through holiday and vacation periods and simply communicate requests back and forth to work together scheduling trips or vacations. Father states this doesn't work, and he wants clearly specified holiday and vacation time for each parent with the children.

The Court agrees that the parties will definitely benefit from a structured schedule for holidays and vacations, and that it is best for the children to have predictability in those schedules. Therefore, the Court finds it is in the best interests of the children to adopt the agreements of the parties and the FCS recommendations, as modified below, as the Court's order on these matters.

Agreements

1. The children shall be with Mother every year on Mother's Day and with Father every year on Father's Day. This holiday shall be from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

2. Domestic travel: If either parent plans to travel domestically with any of the children, they shall give the other parent 30 days' notice and provide itineraries and flight information no later than 10 days before travel.
3. International travel: the parents must obtain the written consent of the other parent for international travel. Neither parent shall unreasonably withhold consent. The non-traveling parent shall respond to the notification of international travel within 72 hours of receipt, either providing consent or identifying specific reasons for withholding consent. The traveling parent shall provide a full itinerary at least 30 days before travel is to commence.

Recommendations

4. February Break: The parents' regular custodial weekends shall remain in place during this break, and the break shall be from Monday morning at 9:00 a.m. to Friday at 5:00 p.m. The children shall be with Father for the break in 2026 and in even years thereafter, and with Mother in 2027 and odd numbered years thereafter.
5. Spring Break/Easter: The parents' regular custodial weekends shall remain in place during this break, and the break shall be from Monday morning at 9:00 a.m. to Friday at 5:00 p.m. The children shall be with Mother for the break in 2026 and all even years thereafter, and with Father in 2027 and odd years thereafter. If Easter does not fall on the custodial parent's regular weekend, then the exchange shall occur at 9:00 a.m. on Easter Sunday.
6. Halloween: The children shall be in Mother's care in 2026 and even years thereafter from 4:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. and in Father's care in 2027 and odd years thereafter from 4:00 pm to 8:30 p.m.
7. Thanksgiving: The parents' regular custodial weekends shall remain in place during this break, and the break shall be from Monday morning at 9:00 a.m. to Friday at 5:00 p.m. In 2026 and all even years thereafter, the children shall be with Mother for the break; and 2027 and odd years thereafter, they shall be with Father.
8. Christmas/Christmas Break: Christmas Break shall be from release from school at the beginning of break to return to school at the end of break. In 2026 and all even years thereafter, the children shall be with Mother for the first half of the Christmas break to December 25th at 1:00 p.m. and shall be with Father from December 25th at 1:00 p.m. for the second half of the break. In the odd years commencing with 2027, the schedule shall be reversed so that the children shall be with Father for the first half of the Christmas break to December 25th at 1:00 p.m. and with Mother for the second half of the break.
9. Birthdays: The regular custodial schedule shall remain in place for all of the children's birthdays. The non-custodial parent shall have the child for three hours on their birthday, at times agreed upon by the custodial parent.

10. Summer: The children shall remain on the regular custodial schedule during the summer months. Each parent may travel for two weeks with the children during the summer. In 2026 and even years thereafter, Father shall have priority and shall select his travel dates no later than March 1st and Mother shall then select her travel dates no later than March 15th. In 2027 and odd years thereafter, it shall be reversed so that Mother has priority. If the parent with priority misses the March 1st deadline, then the other parent shall have first choice of travel dates unless otherwise agreed upon in writing. No "make up time" shall be provided to the other parent.
11. Summer of 2026: Father shall be permitted to travel with the children to Canada from August 5th to August 9th.
12. Any holidays not specified shall remain on the regular custodial timeshare unless otherwise agreed upon by the parents.
13. Any changes to the above are permitted so long as the parties mutually agree to the changes.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Father 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 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: 4/24/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL0001890

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: BRYAN H. REALES
CORTEZ

and

RESPONDENT: MIRNA LIZETH RAMOS
ORELLANA

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

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Mother’s 3/9/2026 Request for Order (“RFO”) re custody/visitation concerning the parties’ daughter, Jimena (DOB 7/12/2022). She requests joint legal and physical custody and to have Jimena in her care and custody every morning, and in Father’s care every afternoon. The Court notes that this RFO was filed only a month after the Court filed its 2/6/2026 Findings and Order After Hearing.

Mother has had two scheduled appointments with Family Court Services (“FCS”), yet she failed to appear for both of them. After her first failure to appear, she wrote to the Court stating sincere apologies and stated she was unable to have made the FCS appointment because her son broke his arm. However, she attached a record from UCSF Health which stated her son’s medical appointment was on 2/5/2026 – the day before the scheduled FCS interview. FCS scheduled a new appointment for Mother, and she again failed to appear or otherwise contact FCS. She offers no excuse for her second failure to appear.

The Court is not willing to set another appointment with FCS. If Mother wishes to meet with FCS, she can contact them directly to see if they are willing to meet with her. The Court orders as follows:

1. The current Order re: custody and visitation filed on 2/6/2026 shall remain in full force and effect.

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.