

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/25/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL1500976

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: ARASH SALKHI

and

RESPONDENT: NOOSHIN SALKHI

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE – RETURN OF FUNDS ON DEPOSIT

RULING

This matter comes before the court on the court's Amended Order to Show Cause Re: Return of Funds on Deposit, filed May 8, 2025.

Respondent/Wife filed a Response asserting that the parties have resolved this matter by Stipulation which was signed by all parties and submitted to the court for approval on January 14, 2025.

The parties submitted a Stipulation for Court Commissioner to Act as Temporary Judge for All Purposes on January 14, 2025, but did not submit their Stipulation regarding the distribution of funds.

Based on the Respondent's response, which attaches the parties' signed Stipulation as Exhibit A, the court will order as follows:

Pursuant to C.C.P. § 917.1, the Clerk of the Court shall distribute the Deposit in Lieu of Appeal Bond made by Petitioner/Husband on June 21, 2022, in the amount of \$33,778.50, with the distribution of funds allocated as follows:

1. \$28,200.77 to Wife.
2. \$5,577.73 to Husband.

Checks will be mailed to the addresses provided to the court's accounting office by the parties. As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the court shall prepare the formal order after hearing.

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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 video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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.

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/25/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL2002525

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: ALEXANDRIA BROWN

and

RESPONDENT: MATTHEW FRANKEL

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW HEARING – CUSTODIAL TIMESHARE, RIGHT OF 1ST REFUSAL, CONTINUING SOBERLINK, AND TRAVELING RESTRICTIONS.

RULING

This matter comes before the court for custody review, on Petitioner/Mother's Request for Order (Mother's RFO) filed August 29, 2024, and on Respondent/Father's Request for Order (Father's RFO), filed August 30, 2024. The matters set for review are whether the Mother's Soberlink requirement and travel restrictions should terminate, and whether the parties should be ordered to adopt a Right of First Refusal.

Mother filed a Status Update Declaration on June 13, 2025, seeking termination of the requirement for Soberlink testing. Mother provides a Soberlink report showing 333 compliant tests between November 19, 2024 and June 11, 2024, with zero missed, positive, or noncompliant tests.

Father filed a Review Hearing Declaration on June 18, 2025, seeking one change to the current timeshare and parenting plan: Father seeks an order that Father may enter Mother's gated community for custodial drop-offs at Mother's front door. Father argues that the parties have no need for an order regarding the Right of First Refusal and argues that the restriction on travel for Mother is needed due to her alcohol abuse in the past.

Findings and Orders:

Mother is in compliance with her Soberlink Plus testing. Mother's track record of clean tests warrants lifting the Soberlink Plus requirement for Mother while the children are in her care overnight during her regular custodial time.

Mother shall be free to travel outside the State of California with the children during her custodial time. Due to the risk to the children when Mother is out-of-state, away from her regular routine and local support system, additional safeguards to protect the children when Mother travels out of state are appropriate.

Therefore, based on the information before the court, it appears that the best interests of the minor children, Noah, born June 22, 2019, and Zoey, born September 16, 2016, will be served by the court making the following orders:

1. All prior orders, except as modified below, shall remain in effect.
2. SOBERLINK: Mother is in compliance with her Soberlink Plus testing and the order for alcohol monitoring of Mother is hereby terminated, except as otherwise ordered in Item 3.a. below with respect to out-of-state travel.
3. TRAVEL:
 - a. If Mother is traveling with the children outside of the State of California, she shall use Soberlink Plus and shall test three times each day on days the children are in her care for an overnight.
 - b. Both parents may travel freely within the United States with the children during their custodial time with 30-days' notice to the other parent.
 - c. International travel with the children shall require written consent of the other parent.
 - d. All travel shall require a full itinerary be provided to the other parent, which shall include all of the following:
 - i. Destination.
 - ii. Accommodation (name/address/phone number of hotel or place where the children will be staying).
 - iii. Departure and return dates and times.
 - iv. Copies of tickets for travel (eg., airplane, train, bus).

v. Emergency contact information.

Counsel for Mother shall prepare the formal order after hearing.

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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 video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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.

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/25/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0000187

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: JULIE TURNER

and

RESPONDENT: JEROME BARCLAY

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE – ENTRY OF PLEA/TRIAL

RULING

This matter comes before the court on Respondent/Father's Order to Show Cause (OSC), filed on February 27, 2025, seeking a finding of contempt against Mother for failure to obey domestic violence restraining orders and child custody and visitation orders.

Mother appeared for arraignment on April 16, 2025, waived time, and the matter was continued to June 4, 2024 for entry of plea and trial. The matter was then continued on the court's own motion to June 25, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B.

Mother is ordered to appear for entry of plea and trial.

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

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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 video appearances through Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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.

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/25/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0000690

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: PATRICK MURRAY

and

RESPONDENT: VANESSA POWERS

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE
2) REVIEW HEARING – CHILD CUSTODY

RULING

This matter comes before the court on a custody review hearing stemming from Petitioner/Father's Request for Order (RFO) filed March 1, 2024.

On March 19, 2025, the parties were re-referred to Family Court Services (FCS) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation. The parties reached some agreements and are the court commends them for doing so.

Based on the information before the court, it appears that the best interest of the minor child, Delilah, born November 8, 2021, will be served by the court adopting the agreements of the parties as set forth in the FCS report issued on June 12, 2025, and the court orders as follows:

1. Parents shall have joint legal custody of Delilah.
2. Parents shall communicate using Our Family Wizard for all coparenting communications.
3. Parents shall select a coparenting counselor. If they are unable to do so by their June 25, 2025 hearing date, they shall each provide one to two names of prospective coparenting counselors to each other and to the court at the hearing date, and the court shall make the selection.
4. Mother shall give Father access to Delilah's Kaiser online medical portal.

Additionally, based on the information before the court, it appears that the best interest of the minor child, Delilah, born November 8, 2021, will be served by the court adopting the recommendations of Family Court Services (FCS), as set forth in its report issued on June 12, 2025, as modified by the court. The court will do so, and orders as follows:

1. All prior orders not in conflict with the below shall remain in full force and effect with the following modifications.
2. Parental Timeshare:
 - a. Commencing June 26, 2025, and for a period of two months, Delilah shall be in Mother's custody on each Thursday and Sunday for an overnight. Mother shall pickup Delilah at the end of her summer camp or preschool on Thursdays, and at Father's home at 10:00 a.m. on Sundays. Mother shall dropoff Delilah at her summer camp or preschool on Friday and Monday mornings.
 - b. Delilah shall continue to be in Mother's custody during the day on weekdays when Father is working and when Delilah is not in preschool or summer camp.
 - c. Delilah shall be in Father's custody at all other times when not in Mother's custody.
 - d. Commencing August 28, 2025, if there have been no problems with Mother getting Delilah to school on time on Friday and Monday mornings according to the above schedule as specified in paragraph 2a-c, Mother shall have parenting time on alternate weekends from Friday after school through Monday morning drop off at school and each Thursday for an overnight. Mother's weekend shall begin on August 29, 2025.
 - e. This schedule shall be in place for four months. Delilah shall be in Father's custody at all other times when not in Mother's custody.
 - f. Commencing January 5, 2026, if there have been no problems with Mother getting Delilah to school on time on the schedule specified above in paragraph 2b, Delilah shall transition to a 2/2/3 schedule. Under a 2/2/3 schedule, the following two-week rotating schedule shall be in place:

- a. In week 1 (commencing January 5, 2026), Delilah shall be in Mother's custody on Mondays and Tuesdays (with drop off at school on Wednesday morning) and in Father's custody from Wednesday after school through Friday morning drop off at school. Mother shall then have custody for the weekend from Friday after school through Monday morning drop off at school.
 - b. In week 2, (commencing January 12, 2026) Delilah shall be in Father's custody on Mondays and Tuesdays (with drop off at school on Wednesday morning) and in Mother's custody from Wednesday after school through Friday morning drop off at school. Father shall then have custody for the weekend from Friday after school through Monday morning drop off at school.
3. Overnights for Mother are contingent on Mother maintaining sobriety.
4. Exchanges shall occur at school whenever possible.
5. Delilah shall be brought to school on time unless she has a medical appointment, physical or occupational therapy appointment, etc. If there is a pattern of Mother failing to bring Delilah to school on time, this shall be grounds for a reconsideration of the timeshare.
6. Summer 2025: If a parent is available to care for Delilah during the day when she would otherwise be in preschool/daycare, Delilah shall not be obligated to attend preschool/daycare beyond her regular three-days per week schedule between 9:30 AM through 1 PM.
7. Delilah shall participate in her physical and occupational therapies as scheduled.
8. Both parents shall support the recommended physical activities for Delilah to help address her medical needs (e.g. swimming and other regular exercise).

CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE

The Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) opened a case and filed a Supplemental Summons and Complaint. The Case Progress Conference is continued to September 24, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. and will be ordered off-calendar if a Judgment Regarding Parental Obligations is filed prior to that date.

Counsel for Mother is ordered to prepare the formal order after hearing.

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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 video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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.

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/25//25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0001137

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: YOLANDA ORDAZ
SILVA

and

RESPONDENT: LUIS JESUS ESCOBAR
ESTRADA

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD/SPOUSAL SUPPORT;
OTHER: RETURN OF PROPERTY; PAYMENT OF TAX ARREARS
2) CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE

RULING

This matter comes before the court on Petitioner/Mother's Request for Order (RFO), filed March 28, 2025. Mother seeks orders regarding child custody and visitation, child support, *pendente lite* spousal support, attorney's fees and costs, and the return of property and payment of tax arrears.

CHILD SUPPORT / PENDENTE LITE SPOUSAL SUPPORT

Discussion:

Mother seeks guideline child support and guideline *pendente lite* spousal support.

Mother's Income and Expense Declaration reveals that her income is \$8,684 per month, she received an annual bonus for 2024 in the amount of \$10,457, she pays \$511 per month in medical insurance costs (pre-tax), she contributes \$258 per month to a 401(k) (pre-tax), she has \$9,539 in savings, and her expenses are \$6,022 per month for herself and the parties' daughter, Sofia, for whom the parties share a 50/50 timeshare.

Mother estimates Father's income to be \$13,333 per month. Father has not responded to Mother's RFO.

Findings and Orders:

Based on the above inputs, effective March 28 2025, Father shall pay \$502 to Mother per month as and for guideline child support, and *pendente lite* spousal support in the amount of \$451 per month, for a total of \$953 per month. Father shall pay 55% and Mother shall pay 45% of all uninsured medical costs for Sofia, as well as for any agreed-upon extra-curricular activities for Sofia, agreement shall not be unreasonably withheld.

See attached XSpouse Calculations Printout.

RETURN OF PROPERTY / REIMBURSEMENTS / PAYMENT OF TAX ARREARS:

Discussion:

Mother alleges that Father removed personal property from the residence when the parties separated. Mother seeks the return of the property (Mother's wedding ring, a Dior ring, a Burberry cardigan, a Burberry bag, a Gucci belt bag, and a Gucci GC bag), which Mother values at \$7,370. In the alternative, Mother seeks an order that Father reimburse her in the amount of \$7,370. Mother also alleges that Father took Mother's car, a Ford Escape, and that Mother was forced to get a new car.

Mother seeks reimbursement from Father for one-half of California state taxes paid by Mother in the amount of \$3,073.13; Mother seeks an order that Father pay his one-half share to the FTB, or \$1,535.56. Mother also states that she is making payments on taxes owed by the parties to the IRS in the amount of \$38,012. Mother seeks an order that Father pay his one-half share of the amount owed to the IRS, or \$19,006.

Mother's RFO refers to various Exhibits, but there are no Exhibits attached to her RFO, making it difficult for the court to evaluate Mother's requests.

Findings and Orders:

Mother's requests for reimbursement and property issues are trial issues. Mother's requests for the orders regarding tax debt and the return of property are DENIED as premature, and all are reserved to trial.

ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS:

Discussion:

Mother has paid \$9,000 in attorney's fees to date to her attorney. Mother requests an order for \$25,000 payable by Father for Mother's attorney's fees and costs, based on Family Code section 271 (based on Father's failure to respond to the RFO), and Family Code section 2030 *et seq* (based on the disparity in the parties' incomes).

Findings and Orders:

Failure to respond to a Request for Order is not, without more, evidence that Father has "flouted the policy of promoting settlement," as alleged by Mother. The issues of the parties' tax debt and Mother's allegations regarding removal of property have yet to be fully considered by the court. Mother's request for fees pursuant to Family Code section 271 is DENIED, without prejudice. As to Mother's request for attorney's fees based on Family Code section 2030, after payment of the support ordered herein, Father's net spendable income is still greater than that of Mother, who has clearly taken the laboring oar in moving this matter along. Mother's fees incurred to

date and her estimate of anticipated fees are both reasonable. Father is ordered to pay \$10,000 as an advance towards Mother's attorney's fees, payable as follows: \$2,500 shall be due on July 1, \$2,500 shall be due on August 1, 2025, and \$5,000 shall be due on September 1, 2025.

CHILD CUSTODY/VISITATION:

Discussion:

Mother seeks joint legal and physical custody of the minor child Sofia Escobar Ordaz, born December 9, 2008. The parties were referred to child custody recommending counseling and mediation with Family Court Services (FCS). Mother was interviewed by FCS on April 25, 2025. Father did not appear for his appointment. FCS filed its Report on April 29, 2025.

Findings and Orders:

On May 14, 2025, Father appeared and requested continuance of the custody and visitation issues, which was granted, and continued to July 9, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B. The court now continued that matter further to July 23, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B on the issue of custody and visitation.

CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE:

This matter is also on for a Case Progress Conference. On May 14, 2025, the court noted that Father was ordered to provide his Preliminary Declaration of Disclosure by March 28, 2025. Father's counsel, Mr. Pickett, advised that Father's disclosures would be served that same day. Father is ordered to file his Declaration Regarding Service of Declaration of Disclosure and Income and Expense Declaration (Form FL-141) forthwith.

The Case Progress Conference is continued to July 23, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B.

Counsel for Mother is ordered to prepare the formal order after hearing.

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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 video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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.

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/25/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FS0000259

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: COUNTY OF MARIN

and

RESPONDENT: NIKITA CHIZHOV

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: PETITION – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RESTRAINING
ORDER

RULING

Appearances required.

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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 video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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.

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.