

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 5/14/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL 1100025

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: COUNTY OF MARIN

and

RESPONDENT: WILLIE E. KENNEDY, JR.

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – VISITATION

RULING

Respondent/Father Willie Kennedy filed a Request for Order seeking a modification of physical custody, a change in the location of exchanges, and a change of venue to Solano County. Father filed his Request for Order February 9, 2026. The underlying request concerns two minor children, Willie Kennedy III (DOB 10/12/2009) and Maximus Watkins (01/13/2014).

Lyndsey Watkins (Mother) did not file a responsive declaration.

The parents share joint legal and physical custody, and the boys are primarily with Mother and with Father on the 1st, 3rd, and 5th weekend of the month from Friday to Sunday.

The parties were referred to Marin Family Court Services (FCS) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation relating to the underlying requests. Both parents and the children were interviewed, and FCS provided their report on February 9, 2026.

The matter came on for hearing on April 30, 2026, at which time Mother requested a continuance to respond to the FCS report. Mother filed a Statement of Disagreement on May 8, 2026, requesting a private custody evaluation. Mother did not specify the provisions or recommendations of the FCS report she takes issue with. Further, Mother did not provide any detail as to who would pay for the private custody evaluation should such a request be granted.

During the interview with FCS, Mother expressed an interest in having sole custody of the children and expressed the belief that Father's interest in modifying the visitation schedule was driven by an interest in reducing child support payments.

The parties were recently in court relating to the adjudication of dueling requests for domestic violence restraining orders. At a hearing on March 23, 2026, no permanent orders were issued, and the TROs were discontinued.

Despite these recent areas of conflict, FCS reports that both children are doing well. They seem to have a generally positive relationship with both of their parents and are trying to make the most of a challenging situation between the adults in their lives.

Based on the Court's review of the submissions by the parties and the current and previous FCS reports, the Court finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the children to adopt the recommendations from FCS, as modified by the Court, as follows:

Timeshare

1. ***During the school year***, both boys shall continue to live primarily with Lyndsey and shall be with Willie every 1st, 3rd, and 5th weekend of the month from Friday pick up from school to return to school Monday morning. If Monday is a school holiday, then the boys shall remain in Willie's care until return to school Tuesday morning.
2. ***During the summer months***, both boys shall continue to live primarily with Lyndsey and shall be with Willie every 1st, 3rd, and 5th weekend of the month from Friday at 4:00 p.m. to Tuesday at 10:00 a.m.
3. All exchanges that do not occur at school shall occur outside of Target in Vallejo. Both parents and their partners shall remain in their cars at exchanges.
4. Any changes to the schedule, or any additional time for either child to be with either parent, shall occur as desired by each child, and as agreed upon by the parents.

Collateral Issues

5. Max shall continue in therapy if desired by Max. Both parents shall follow any recommendations made by the therapist, including any recommendations for family therapy.
6. Neither parent shall use any physical discipline on either child or allow anyone else to.
7. The children shall not be exposed to any domestic violence or any verbal or physical abuse.
8. The children shall be exposed to peaceful contact only between their parents and any other adults.
9. Neither child shall be exposed to any information about family court or child support, or other adult issues.
10. Neither parent shall make any disparaging comments about the other parent or their partners.
11. Both parents shall ensure that the kids get to school on time and have good attendance records.
12. Neither parent shall share any information from the FCS report or these Court orders with either child.

Change of Venue

The change of venue is denied without prejudice. As the children are currently in school in Marin County, there is considerable contact with this county. Should there be additional changes in circumstances in the future, the parties may revisit this issue with the Court.

Request for Private Custody Evaluation

Mother's request for a private custody evaluation is denied without prejudice as Mother has not provided the Court with an explanation for the reason for the further evaluation, nor has Mother provided a plan for how such an evaluation would be paid for. Mother is referred to the Legal Self Help Center for further discussion regarding her expressed wish for a private custody evaluation.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the Court shall prepare the formal Findings and Order After Hearing.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 5/14/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL 1500482

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: KRISTEN USICH

and

RESPONDENT: THOMAS CRUM

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD SUPPORT

RULING

This matter is on calendar for hearing on Thomas Crum’s (Father’s) Request for Order filed on March 23, 2026, seeking a modification of child support. Specifically, Father seeks a modification of child support to reflect that one of the two minor children—Thomas Crum (DOB 11/03/2007)—will be graduating from high school on May 30, 2026. The shared daughter Cassidy Rose is 16 (DOB 04/24/2010). Father further seeks clarification with respect to “add-on expenses.”

Kristen Usich (Mother) filed a responsive declaration March 27, 2026, opposing the request. Mother asks this Court to: (1) deny any reduction of support prior to June 1, (2) order complete financial disclosure by Father, (3) recalculate guideline support as of June 1st for 1 minor child, (4) increase support as appropriate, (5) allocate educational and medical add-ons, and (6) exercise its discretion to order Father’s continued contribution towards medical and dental expenses as their son transitions to college.

The case was continued on April 16, 2026, at a scheduled hearing during which Father was instructed to submit supporting papers for his request no later than May 7, 2026. Both Mother and Father submitted financial documents and accompanying declarations on May 7, 2026, in response to the Court’s request.

The Court has reviewed previous orders issued by this Court relating to child support, including, but not limited to, the Findings and Order After Hearing dated October 7, 2021.

ASSUMPTIONS AND VALUES USED IN XSPOUSE CALCULATION

There is a federal requirement that all states have a uniform child support guideline. The child support “guideline” on which the calculators are based is not an optional guide but rather is the name for the state law setting out a standardized formula for calculating child support. As required by Family Code section 3830 and California Rule of Court 5.275, the Judicial

Council has certified programs that provide child support calculations consistent with the applicable statutes and rules of court. This Court uses the XSpouse program for calculating child and spousal support.

Parenting time share. Father's Income and Expense Declaration (I&E) states the time share for the children as 50/50, but Father does not provide any explanation to support this time share. Mother's Responsive declaration states that Father has children Wednesdays and 27 weekends. This allocation is consistent with a Marin Family Court Services (FCS) report dated September 27, 2021 and this Court's October 7, 2021, order.

Under Local Rules 7.14(C) and consistent with this Court's Findings and Order After Hearing, dated October 7, 2021, the Court finds Father's timeshare with the children is 40%.

Father's and Mother's reported income. Father's most current paycheck stub shows year-to-date wages through April of 2026 of \$53,942.36 which calculates to an average monthly income of \$13,486. Further, Father's Income and Expense Declaration states average monthly income of \$13,750. Finally, Father's 2025 Federal Individual Income Tax Return (Form 1040) reflects an adjusted gross income of \$143,796 \div 12 = \$11,983.) The Court has used the \$13,486 value for purposes of Father's income.

Mother did not submit paycheck stubs but submitted evidence of deposits for January, February, and March in the amount of \$10,000. Mother has further submitted W2s showing annual wage income of \$139,074.30 or \$11,590 a month.

Other taxable income. Mother reports \$50 of interest income in the last month.

Health insurance. Mother has provided information and documentation regarding monthly health insurance payments.

The XSpouse calculation, showing guideline child support for Cassidy Rose effective June 1, 2026, is attached to this order as Exhibit A.

ORDER

1. The Court denies any reduction of child support prior to June 1, 2026.
2. The Court orders guideline child support for Cassidy Rose, effective June 1, 2026, and forward of \$735.00 a month payable half on the first day of each month and half on the 15th day of each month, continuing until further order of this Court, or until the child involved marries, dies, is emancipated, reaches age 19, or reaches age 18 and is not a full-time high school student, whichever occurs first.
3. The parties shall share equally all reasonable uninsured medical and dental expenses incurred on behalf of the minor child, Cassidy Rose. The parties are ordered to comply with the provisions of Family Code section 4063 in seeking reimbursement for uninsured medical and dental expenses.
4. Father is not responsible for contributions towards medical and dental expenses for Thomas Crum (DOB 11/03/2007) following graduation from high school as he transitions to college.

Any additional requests made by either party in their moving, responding, and reply pleadings which are not addressed in this order are denied.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the Court shall prepare the Findings and Order After Hearing.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

New Case

2026

Xspouse 2025-2-CA

Monthly Figures

	Father	Mother	Monthly Figures		Cash Flow		
Fixed Shares							
Number of children	0	1	2026			Guideline	Proposed
Percent time with NCP	40.00%	0.00%			Combined net spendable	16068	16068
Filing status	MFSIN	HH/MLA	GUIDELINE		Percent change	0%	0%
Number of exemptions	1	3	Nets (adjusted)		Father		
Wages and salary	13486	11590	Father	9122	Payment cost/benefit	-735	-735
Self employed income	0	0	Mother	6946	Net spendable income	8388	8388
Other taxable income	0	50	Total	16068	Change from guideline	0	0
TANF CS received	0	0	Support		% of combined spendable	52%	52%
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	0	% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
New spouse income	4000	0	Guideln CS	735	Total taxes	4364	4364
Employee 401-k contribution	0	0	Marin SS	0	Dep. exemption value	0	0
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	735	# withholding allowances	0	0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0			Net wage paycheck	8794	8794
CS paid prev marriage	0	0			Mother		
Health insurance	0	1850	Settings changed		Payment cost/benefit	735	735
Other medical expenses	0	0	Proposed		Net spendable income	7680	7680
Property tax expenses	0	0	Tactic 9		Change from guideline	0	0
Ded interest expense	0	0	CS	735	% of combined spendable	48%	48%
Contribution deduction	0	0	SS	0	% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	Total	735	Total taxes	2844	2844
Qualified business income deduction	0	0	Saving	0	Dep. exemption value	0	0
Required union dues	0	0	Releases	0	# withholding allowances	0	0
Mandatory retirement	0	0			Net wage paycheck	8252	8252
Hardship deduction	0	0					
Other GDL deductions	0	0					
Child care expenses	0	0					

Father pays Guideline CS, Proposed CS

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information

	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
All children		40 - 60	0	0	0 Father	735 Father	735 Father
Cassidy Rose	2020-04-24	40 - 60	0	0	0 Father	735 Father	735 Father

Superior Court of California
County of Marin

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 5/14/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL 2001314

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: JENNIFER TEDESKO

and

RESPONDENT: BRYAN P. CRAWLEY

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – IMPLEMENTATION OF
SPECIAL MASTER

RULING

Respondent Bryan Crawley (Father) filed a Request for Order on April 13, 2026, seeking entry of an order implementing the appointment of a special master appointed by the parties under California Code of Civil Procedure section 638. Petitioner Jennifer Tedesko (Mother) filed a Responsive Declaration on May 1, 2026, opposing the request and seeking sanctions.

This dispute arises out of a Stipulated Protective Order re: Financial Records Exchanged for Bonus Support True-Ups and Child Custody Support Add-ons Expenses filed with this Court August 13, 2025. Under the terms of the stipulation and order, the parties agreed to the appointment of a special master pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 638. Despite the clarity of the underlying stipulation and order, the parties are experiencing difficulty implementing the order.

Mother is directed to file with this Court a proposed order.

The parties are ordered to appear.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 5/14/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0001639

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: MIGUEL ANGEL
PUERTAS PAREDES

and

RESPONDENT: LORENA BEATRIZ
ESQUIVEL MORA

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD SUPPORT; CASE
PROGRESS CONFERENCE

RULING

Respondent Lorena Mora (Mother) filed a Request for Order – Child Support for her four minor children Miguel (17), Andrew (11), Liam (9), and Samahara (5) on November 24, 2025. This Court has issued three separate Findings and Orders After Hearing relating to the original request. (See, FOAH filed January 8, 2026; FOAH filed February 19, 2026; and March 26, 2026.)

In the most recent order, filed March 26, 2026, this Court directed the parties to submit the required financial information in support of a request for child support and to seek support from the Legal Self Help Center. In response, Mother filed an Income and Expense Declaration on March 11, 2026, with supporting documentation and Father filed his declaration on May 4, 2026.

The Court has calculated the guideline child support payment using the information provided by the parties. Consistent with the lower range from the calculation, the Court orders monthly child support of \$697.00 per month payable on the first of each month beginning with March 2026. The Court orders the parties to appear (the parties may appear by Zoom) to address whether Father qualifies for a credit for sums paid by Father relating to the prior residence.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be

permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

New Case

2026 Xspouse 2025-2-CA

Monthly Figures

	Father	Mother	Monthly Figures		Cash Flow		
Fixed Shares							
Number of children	0	4	2026			Guideline	Proposed
Percent time with NCP	8.00%	0.00%			Combined net spendable	10029	10029
Filing status	SINGLE	HH/MLA	GUIDELINE		Percent change	0%	0%
Number of exemptions	1	5	Nets (unadjusted)		Father		
Wages and salary	0	7493	Father	2260	Payment cost/benefit	-903	-903
Self employed income	2800	0	Mother	7769	Net spendable income	1357	1357
Other taxable income	0	1091	Total	10029	Change from guideline	0	0
TANF CS received	0	0	Support		% of combined spendable	14%	14%
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	0	% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
New spouse income	0	0	Guideln CS	-903	Total taxes	540	540
Employee 401-k contribution	0	0	User SS	0	Dep. exemption value	0	0
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	-903	# withholding allowances	0	0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	CS range: -697--903		Net wage paycheck	0	0
CS paid prev marriage	0	0	Settings changed		Mother		
Health insurance	0	0	Proposed		Payment cost/benefit	903	903
Other medical expenses	0	0	Tactic 9		Net spendable income	8673	8673
Property tax expenses	0	0	CS	-903	Change from guideline	0	0
Ded interest expense	0	0	SS	0	% of combined spendable	86%	86%
Contribution deduction	0	0	Total	-903	% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	Saving	0	Total taxes	815	815
Qualified business income deduction	0	0	Releases	0	Dep. exemption value	0	0
Required union dues	0	0			# withholding allowances	0	0
Mandatory retirement	0	0			Net wage paycheck	5836	5836
Hardship deduction	0	0					
Other GDL deductions	0	0					
Child care expenses	0	0					

Father pays Guideline CS, Proposed CS

FC 4055 checking: **ON**

Per Child Information

	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
All children		8 - 92	0	0	0 Father	903 Father	903 Father
Miguel	2008-02-26	8 - 92	0	0	0 Father	118 Father	118 Father
Andrew	2014-06-23	8 - 92	0	0	0 Father	157 Father	157 Father
Liam	2016-04-01	8 - 92	0	0	0 Father	236 Father	236 Father
Samahara	2020-02-06	8 - 92	0	0	0 Father	393 Father	393 Father

Superior Court of California
County of Marin

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 5/14/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0002250

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: EUFEMIO MUKUL PINA

and

RESPONDENT: MARIA ELIZABETH
YAM CAAMAL

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – SPOUSAL SUPPORT

RULING

Maria Elizabeth Yam Camaal (Mother) filed a request for order for spousal support on March 5, 2026. Eufemio Mukul Pina (Father) filed a responsive declaration opposing the request on April 8, 2026.

On March 17, 2026, the parties appeared and informed this Court that the parties had reached an agreement resolving this matter and a judgment would be filed.

On April 16, 2026, Judgment was filed with this Court reserving the issue of long-term spousal support for determination by this Court.

Subsequently, the parties each filed declarations addressing the Family Code section 4320 factors.

In the interest of justice, the Court will treat the previously filed Request for Order regarding interim spousal support as a request for long-term spousal support. In California, long-term spousal support is determined by weighing 14 mandatory factors under Family Code section 4320 to decide the amount and duration, aiming for the supported party to become self-supporting within a reasonable time. Key factors include the marital standard of living, earning capacities, assets/debts, age, health, and the length of the marriage. The Court addresses each of the factors below.

The fourteen Family Code § 4320 factors and their application to Mother’s RFO are:

- a. *The extent to which each party’s earning capacity will maintain the standard of living established during the marriage, taking into account (1) each party’s marketable skills and the time necessary to develop or acquire same, and (2) the extent to which a party’s*

earning capacity was impaired by unemployment during marriage to devote time to domestic duties.

Mother and Father agree that the marital standard of living was modest. Each party is employed with marketable skills. Father reports monthly income in his Income and Expense Declaration of \$3,698 a month in gross income. Mother reports gross income of \$3,107 a month. Father represents that he makes less than his expenses. Mother reports her income just meets her expenses. As threshold matter, there is a question of Father's current ability to spousal support in light of his current income, expenses associated with child support, and employment opportunities. Father reports, "for now I can't support myself. Firstly because I can't work much because of my hip. Secondly because I have a lot of debt. And lastly because I have child support and my own personal expenses."

b. *The extent to which the supported party contributed to the supporting party's attainment of education or a professional license.*

None (no contribution).

c. *The ability of the supporting party to pay spousal support, taking into account the supported party's earning capacity, assets, and standard of living.*

Petitioner and Respondent agree that neither currently earns sufficient income to maintain the marital standard of living. As indicated, both parties are working and reporting monthly income of \$3,107 (Mother) and \$3,698 (Father). Father is to pay child support of \$573.00 a month. Father's currently works as a food runner, four to five hours a day from Tuesday to Sunday. As discussed above, Father's current financial position, including outstanding debts, does not reflect an ability to pay spousal support.

d. *The needs of each party based on the standard of living established during the marriage.*

Both Mother and Father report the need for additional financial resources. Mother and Father purchased properties during their marriage. They did not, however, accumulate any meaningful savings in their names during their marriage. The Judgment entered by this Court provides that the real estate in Mexico is to be held in the names of their children. Father reports that the apartments are rented out with the proceeds directed to Mother. Father's income, after payment of child support and child-related expenses, is not sufficient to meet his needs at the level of the marital standard of living. As indicated, Mother's current income and expenses are closer to meeting Mother's needs.

e. *The obligations and assets, including the separate property, of each party.*

Both parties report owning cars. Mother reports not having any significant assets in her name. Father identifies various debts that are owed and no significant assets. There are no other known assets or obligations.

f. *The duration of the marriage.*

22 years, seven months.

- g. *The ability of the supported party to engage in gainful employment without unduly interfering with the interest of dependent children in the custody of the party.*

Both parents are currently working. Mother is working in retail. Mother reports no interest in participating in training to obtain additional schools, as she prefers to care for her children and attend to domestic duties.

- h. *The age and health of the parties.*

Father is 49 years old. Mother is 47 years old. Father's health is impaired. Specifically, Father has provided documentation relating to hip problems.

- i. *History of domestic violence.*

A Restraining Order After Hearing (DV-130) was issued October 26, 2023. Father is the restrained party. Mother and the children are identified as protected persons.

- j. *Immediate and specific tax consequences to each party.*

None.

- k. *The balance of hardships to each party.*

Both parents claim hardship.

- l. *The goal that the supported party shall be self-supporting within a reasonable period of time.*

Mother is employed. She possesses marketable skills. She does not, at this time, show any interest in expanding her skills or receiving education that would enable her to obtain higher paying employment.

- m. *Criminal conviction of an abusive spouse.*

Not applicable.

- n. *Any other factors the court deems just and equitable.*

None.

Conclusion

Based on the Court's consideration of the Family Code section 4320 factors (above), the relative incomes and needs of Mother and Father, Mother's request for spousal support is DENIED and spousal support is set at \$0. The Court's order is subject to modification, subject to a showing of changed circumstances.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the Court shall prepare the Findings and Order After Hearing.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 5/14/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0002727

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: MOHAMED TAKFAOUI

and

RESPONDENT: MAIRA CAROLINA
MARTINEZ DE PAZ

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

RULING

Mohamed Takfaoui (Father) filed a Request for Order on April 24, 2026, seeking sole legal custody and joint physical custody. Father proposes a structured visitation schedule with Maira Carolina Martinez de Paz (Mother) that includes the following elements: (1) Tuesday and Wednesday mornings and Thursdays and Mondays after 4:00 PM, (2) no use of alcohol of illicit substances around the child during parenting time, (3) no overnight visits outside the child’s primary residence, and (4) limiting exposure on social media. The parties have a shared daughter, Samara Takfaoui (DOB 10/26/2025).

Mother did not file a responsive declaration.

The parties were referred to Marin Family Court Services (FCS) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation. Father was interviewed by FCS. Mother did not appear for her interview. FCS issued its report May 7, 2026.

There is a parallel proceeding involving Mother in which Father is the protected person. (CR0001968.) Associated with this proceeding, a Criminal Protective Order Pending Trial was issued on September 9, 2025, with Father as the Protected Person. On March 30, 2026, Mother plead guilty to misdemeanor charges and is on probation until September 8, 2028, for violations of Penal Code 273.5 (inflict injury on spouse/cohab), Penal Code 243 (battery on spouse), and Penal Code 166 (contempt/disobey). On March 30, 2026, this Court issued an order modifying probation ordering that Mother was to serve a 60-day custodial sentence on the Custody Alternative Program. Mother is currently serving her custodial sanction on house arrest.

FCS offered the following recommendation with respect to child custody orders relating to Samara:

“Without input from Maira, the information is limited. However, there is sufficient information for FCS to have concerns about Samara in Maira’s care. Maira should be compelled to participate in the FCS process so more information can be provided, and Samara’s needs can be considered more thoroughly. In the meantime, the following recommendations are submitted. Given the Criminal Protective Order, it is possible that sole legal custody to Mohamad is a more appropriate order. In addition, the schedule for Samara to be with Mohamed was based on his work schedule and availability. The intent of FCS is that he should have at least three days a week with Samara for five hours each day, at a minimum.”

The Court has reviewed the FCS report, the submissions by Father, and the pleadings and orders in the accompanying criminal case. The Court finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the minor child, Samara, to adopt the FCS recommendations, as modified, as follows:

Parental Responsibilities

1. The parents shall share joint legal custody of Samara. The parents shall share in the responsibility and confer in good faith on matters concerning the child’s health, education and welfare. Both parents 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. The parents shall share joint physical custody of Samara.

Timeshare Schedule

3. Samara shall continue to be primarily with Maira and shall be with Mohamed on the following schedule:
 - Every Monday from 12:00 to 5:00
 - Every Tuesday from 10:00 to 3:00
 - Every Wednesday from 10:00 to 3:00
4. All exchanges shall take place at the police station in San Rafael.
5. Any changes to the schedule shall occur as mutually agreed upon by the parents.

Collateral Issues

6. Both parents shall be law abiding.
7. Neither parent shall consume any alcohol while caring for Samara.
8. Neither parent shall use any illegal drugs (or any prescription drugs beyond their prescribed amount) while caring for Samara.
9. Samara shall not be exposed to any drugs or drug paraphernalia.

10. The parents (and any other adults) shall engage in peaceful contact only in the presence of Samara.
11. Both parents shall take a co-parenting class and bring proof of participation to any future court hearings.

Neither parent shall change Samara's residence from Marin County without written permission from the other parent, or a court order
As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the Court shall prepare the Findings and Order After Hearing.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.