

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 07/11/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL2103546

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: ANTJE MORAN

and

RESPONDENT: DAVID MORAN

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW HEARING – CHILD CUSTODY

RULING

This matter is set for review hearing on custody/visitation and family therapy regarding the parties three children: Sean (DOB 10/13/08); Jack (DOB 1/15/11) and Anna (DOB 9/18/14).

On 2/25/25, the Court granted Mother's request to renew the Domestic Violence Restraining Order originally issued on 12/15/21. The DVRO was made permanent as to Mother only, and as to the children, it was extended two years through 2/25/27. Father filed a Review Declaration on 7/3/25 and a Statement of Disagreement with the FCS Recommendations. Mother filed a Supplemental Declaration on 7/8/25.

The parties and all three children were interviewed by Family Court Services ("FCS"), and FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 7/3/25. Father states in his Statement of Disagreement that on July 2nd he submitted to a hair follicle test which proves he is negative for drugs. The Court has not yet been provided with the results.

The Court agrees with FCS that Mother does not appear to be doing anything to dissuade the boys from seeing Father; to the contrary, the boys have confirmed that Mother encourages them to see him.

After review and consideration of all of the parties' written submissions, as well as the current and previous FCS Reports & Recommendations, the Court finds that it is in the best interests of the children to adopt the FCS recommendations, with the modifications set forth below.

Custody

1. Mother shall continue to have sole legal and physical custody of the children.

Timeshare

2. Anna shall be with Father during the following times:
 - a. Each Tuesday from 5:00 to 7:00 pm.
 - b. Saturday or Sunday each week from 10:00 to 5:00.
3. Sean and Jack shall continue to live primarily with Mother and shall have contact with Father as desired by each child.
4. Any changes to the schedule shall occur as agreed upon by the parents.
5. All three children shall be encouraged to attend the visits, but none of them shall be forced.

Collateral Issues

6. The Court orders family therapy for the boys and Father on the following conditions:
 - a. The parties agree on a family therapist.
 - b. If the parties cannot agree on a family therapist, they shall each provide to the Court by 8/1/25 the names of up to two therapists who are available and acceptable to the submitting parent, and the Court will appoint one of the therapists.
 - c. The boys shall each first meet with the therapist for two sessions to determine their willingness to participate. If either of the boys is unwilling, they shall not be forced to participate.
 - d. If the boys, or either of them, is agreeable to continue in therapy, the therapist shall determine if, when, and under what circumstances Father should become involved.
 - e. If the therapy goes forward, all shall abide by the recommendations of the therapist.
 - f. The cost of therapy shall be shared equally between Mother and Father.
7. Father shall maintain his sobriety from alcohol and marijuana.
8. Father shall continue to test with Soberlink before the weekday visit and before and after the weekend visits with Anna .
9. Father shall refrain from asking Anna about Mother, or putting pressure on her regarding visits, texts, or phone calls.
10. Neither parent shall share any information from this report with any of the children.
11. Per the Court's 2/25/25 DVRO, the following additional orders were made:

- a. the parties are to communicate only through Our Family Wizard.
- b. Father is to stay 100 yards away from Marinwood Market, McGinnis Field (after school only); Miller Creek Park and the Fishing Pond at McGinnis Park.
- c. Father may attend Anna's school and sport functions if Anna wants him there.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Father shall prepare the order.

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. Evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department D. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website.

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

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

July 2025 at 09:00 AM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7jzvTrwjExIV0by4.1>

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If you are only able to appear by phone you may dial the phone number below, follow the prompts and enter the meeting ID and passcode.

+1-669-254-5252 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

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: 07/11/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL2202341

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: LAURA GONZALEZ
REED

and

RESPONDENT: ROSS REED

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

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Mother's 5/20/25 Request for Order ("RFO") re: (1) the parties' summer schedule with their two children, Chloe (DOB 7/31/12) and Lilianna (DOB 3/19/25); and (2) tax issues. Respondent/Father filed a Responsive Declaration on 6/30/25. The parties were referred to Family Court Services ("FCS") with regard to the custody issues. Both parents were interviewed together by FCS on 6/26/25, and FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 6/30/25.

Summer Schedule

Mother seeks an order detailing the summer timeshare with the children. Attached to the Marital Settlement Agreement, which is incorporated into the Judgment of Dissolution filed June 15, 2023, there is an eight page Parenting Plan signed by both parties on 6/12/23 which includes a list of all holidays and designates in which years (odd or even) the children are to be with each parent. It expressly provides for Father to have the children on the Fourth of July in odd years – which includes this year, 2025. It also provides for vacations, which are to be finalized by March 1st of each year and designates who is responsible for childcare and related expenses for each week of the summer. In addition, the Parenting Plan provides, under **Dispute Resolution**, that "Parents agree to attempt dispute resolution themselves. If they are unable, they agree to meet with a mediator for assistance." It does not appear that the parties have engaged in any mediation.

The Court will not re-do this schedule. Both parents need to read and abide by what they have already decided upon and what was ordered.

After consideration of the parties' written submission and the current and prior FCS Reports & Recommendations, the Court finds that it is in the best interests of the children to adopt the FCS Recommendations, as modified below.

1. All current orders shall remain in effect with the following addition/modifications:
2. For the summer schedule, the parents shall share their preferred calendars by February 1st each year and finalize it by March 1st every year. If they are in disagreement, the preferences of the "priority parent" designated in the Parenting Plan shall prevail.
3. Neither parent shall use any harsh or aggressive language, or attacks on the other parent's character, in their OFW communication.
4. The parents shall engage in co-parent counseling with an agreed upon therapist. Both parents shall follow any recommendations made by the counselor, including recommendations regarding frequency and duration of counseling.
 - a. If the parties cannot agree on a co-parent counselor, by July 25, 2025, each party shall submit to the court the names of up to two co-parent counselors who are available to work with the parties, and who are acceptable to the parent submitting the names. The Court will review the submissions and issue an order designating which co-parenting counselor the parties shall work with.
 - b. The cost of co-parenting counseling shall be shared equally by the parties.

Agreements

5. During the summer months, the exchanges shall occur on Mondays at 9:00 a.m. with the custodial parent dropping the children off, either at the other parent's home or the children's activity.
6. All communication on Our Family Wizard shall be restricted to issues about the children only.

Tax Issues

2020 Tax Deficiency

Mother requests the Court order Husband to pay 50% of a \$1,359.25 tax deficiency (See 2020 FTB Statement attached as Addendum B to Wife's submission), which is \$679.62. The deficiency was discovered by the California Franchise Tax Board in connection with the parties 2020 jointly-filed income tax return and was brought to Mother's attention by FTB notice in 2024. Husband is seeking "innocent spouse relief."

The parties' Marital Settlement Agreement provides at Sections X, A and B that the parties filed joint Federal and State income tax returns for the marital years through 2021, and that each party

is responsible for one-half of any potential liability related to any joint tax returns through 2021. Liability is exempted for any tax assessment or deficiency as to which a party establishes him or herself as an “innocent spouse” under the Internal Revenue Code. Therefore:

7. Husband shall pay his presumed 50% share of the 2020 tax deficiency within ten (10) days of this Order. If and when Husband is advised that his claim for innocent spouse relief has been granted, he shall provide proof to Wife of the same, and Wife will reimburse him for his 50% payment of the tax deficiency within ten (10) days of submitting such proof.

2024 Tax Exemptions/1095-A Form

First, Mother’s insistence that she had the right to claim both children as exemptions is incorrect, as it directly contradicts the plain wording of the MSA, which states:

“Commencing tax year 2024, WIFE shall be entitled to claim the dependency tax exemption and/or Child Care Tax Credit for Chloe and HUSBAND shall be entitled to claim the dependency tax exemption and/or the Child Care Tax Credit for Lilianna.”

If the parties wish to change that provision, they should consult with the attorneys who reviewed the MSA on their behalf, or they can seek assistance from the Court’s Legal Self-Help Center. They can be reached in person at Room C-44 at the Marin County Courthouse, by email at selfhelp@marin.courts.ca.gov and/or by telephone at (415) 444-7130.

Reimbursement of \$10,012

Mother asks the Court to order Father pay her \$10,012, plus any penalties and interest incurred, as a result of her not timely filing her 2024 tax returns, which she blames on Father. Mother claims her return was rejected because Father claimed both children as dependents for 2024. Mother concedes that Father has since amended his tax return releasing both exemptions to her. However, she claims that Father’s having listed Chloe on his Form 1095-A continues to affect her ability to file her returns. This makes no sense to the Court, and Mother provides no evidentiary support for her \$10,012 request.

The Court has no tax advice to give to the parties. If Mother is having difficulty filing her returns, she needs to consult with an accountant or a tax attorney.

Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

8. Mother’s request for reimbursement of \$10,012 is denied.
9. Before either party files another request for any relief from the Court, they must first review their Judgment and the attached MSA in their entirety to see if there are any provisions governing the issues in dispute, and they must specifically state in their supporting Declarations that they have reviewed the Judgment and MSA and cite to the section that deals with the issue, or confirm that they found nothing that pertains to the issue. Failure to do so will result in the Court issuing sanctions.

SO ORDERED.

The Court will prepare the order per Rule 5.125, California Rules of Court

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. Evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department D. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website.

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

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

July 2025 at 09:00 AM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7jzyTrwjExlV0by4.1>

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If you are only able to appear by phone you may dial the phone number below, follow the prompts and enter the meeting ID and passcode.

+1-669-254-5252 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

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: 07/11/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0000727

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: ERIC DEL BALSO

and

RESPONDENT: MOLLY WHITLOCK

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – ATTORNEY’S FEES

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Mother’s 5/19/25 Request for Order (“RFO”) for attorneys’ fees and costs of \$100,000. Mother contends that Petitioner/Father has been overly litigious, resulting in attorneys’ fees and costs she does not have the funds or resources to pay her outstanding balance of fees and costs, and to prepare for trial. Mother notes that Father has paid his attorneys \$531,726 in attorneys’ and expert fees through 4/28/25, with no outstanding balance – which she states is 5 times what she has paid her attorney. The 7/3/25 Declaration of Mother’s attorney, Alex Wei, Esq., with billing statements attached, confirms that Mother incurred \$82,995 in fees and costs, with an outstanding balance of \$40,499.59 and expert, plus attorneys fees to Eileen Burke, Esq. in connection with the custody trial, and expert forensic accountant fees of \$25,768.75. Father previously paid Mother approximately \$89,000 in attorneys’ fees and costs.

Father filed a Responsive Declaration on 6/27/25 in which he opposes Mother’s request for fees. He contends that Mother has had access to \$1.117 million since January 2024 and earns

approximately \$600,000/year, which exceeds his income. He states that Mother’s 2024 income was \$593,670, and she is on target to earn \$630,000 in 2025.

Father’s draft 2024 federal tax return reflects total income of \$203,052. Per his Income and Expense Declaration, he has deposit accounts totaling \$187,312, securities he could easily sell of \$23,353 and real property valued at approximately \$5.5 million. He claims between \$20,000 and \$24,000/month in expenses. He has no outstanding debts. Interestingly, Father’s Capital One Venture Visa credit card shows charges between 5/2024 through 6/2025 of \$497,949, almost of all of which was paid. The last statement has an outstanding balance of approximately \$64,000. The Court is at a loss as to where the funds came to pay for all those expenses.

Father’s counsel submitted a Declaration attaching a list (59 pages) stating Father’s attorneys’ fees by date. However, all of the actual entries of work performed have been completely redacted. As such, this summary is meaningless to the Court.

Mother's Income and Expense Declaration reflects monthly income of \$32,925/month and claims monthly living expenses of \$35,550, with outstanding installment payments and debts of \$273,279. While the Court has a number of questions regarding Mother's financial circumstances, it seems clear that Father is in a significantly better position to borrow funds than Mother. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. Father shall advance to Mother the sum of \$75,000 as and for attorneys' fees and costs. Father shall make the advance as follows: \$30,000 within 3 weeks of this order; and the remainder by September 1, 2025.
2. The Court reserves jurisdiction over the ultimate allocation of such funds, including any sanctions, until the time of trial.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Mother to prepare the order.

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. Evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department D. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website.

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

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

*July 2025 at 09:00 AM
Join Zoom Meeting*

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7zyTrwjExIV0by4.1>

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If you are only able to appear by phone you may dial the phone number below, follow the prompts and enter the meeting ID and passcode.

+1-669-254-5252 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

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: 07/11/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0001461

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: YASMIN PAJKIN

and

RESPONDENT: CHAFIQ FDAOCH

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) REQUEST FOR ORDER – SPOUSAL SUPPORT
2) CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner's 5/16/25 Request for Order ("RFO") re: spousal support. The Court notes that the RFO was not served within the time required for the 7/11/25 hearing; as a result, the matter is continued for hearing to 8/1/25 at 9:00 am in Department D.

SO ORDERED.

The Court will prepare the order per Rule 5.125, CA Rules of Court

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. Evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department D. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website.

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

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

July 2025 at 09:00 AM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7jzvTrwjExIV0by4.1>

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If you are only able to appear by phone you may dial the phone number below, follow the prompts and enter the meeting ID and passcode.

+1-669-254-5252 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

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: 07/11/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0001735

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: VANESSA KIRKPATRICK

and

RESPONDENT: FABIEN ROLAND
DUREUIL

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER - VISITATION

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Father's 6/27/25 Requests for Temporary Emergency Orders re: visitation with the parties' children, Aveline (DOB 4/19/16), Lucia (DOB 9/16/17), and Ronan (DOB 2/21/22), family therapy, and for the Court to follow the Recommendations of Minor's Counsel. Father further requests that the Court reinstate the pre-TRO custody/visitation orders. Father requests these orders be made before the Domestic Violence Restraining Order hearing, currently set to begin 10 days after this hearing date. Mother filed a Responsive Declaration opposing the Father's Requests on the grounds that the case involves very serious allegations of abuse regarding the children, and making custody determinations at this time is essentially tantamount to having the Court pre-judge the case before the trial.

The Court largely agrees with Mother. Given the circumstances, the Court will not make custody/visitation orders regarding Aveline or Lucia until completion of trial.

The Court has reviewed each of the Professional Supervisor's Reports; and given that the visits with Ronan appear to be going very well and there have been no issues, the Court will entertain increasing the number of visits or length of Father's visits with Ronan, so long as they continue to be supervised.

SO ORDERED.

The Court will prepare the order.

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. Evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department D. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website.

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

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

*July 2025 at 09:00 AM
Join Zoom Meeting*

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7izyTrwjExlV0by4.1>

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If you are only able to appear by phone you may dial the phone number below, follow the prompts and enter the meeting ID and passcode.

+1-669-254-5252 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

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: 07/11/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0001823

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: ANDREW YANDELL

and

RESPONDENT: MARIA GRACE
YANDELL

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW OF REPORTS HEARING

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Mother's 5/27/25 Request re: child custody/visitation regarding the parties' twin boys, George and August (DOB 8/23/22) and for access to school information regarding the children. Mother contends that Petitioner/Father has been overly restrictive in allowing her access to the boys since she suffered from postpartum depression.

On 6/12/25 Father filed a Responsive Declaration, in which he seeks temporary sole legal custody of the boys, and states that the parties have agreed upon Dana Vilas, MSW, as a professional supervisor for visits with the boys, with the cost of supervision to be shared equally. The parties signed a Stipulation & Order re Temporary Child Visitation ("Stipulation & Order"), which was signed by the Court and filed on 6/30/25 and which provides for supervised visitation for Mother every day on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday from 3:45–5:45 pm and alternating Thursdays and Sundays from 9-11 am.

Both parties were interviewed together on 6/16/25 by Family Court Services ("FCS"), and FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 6/27/25. The parties appear to be working well together. Father appears genuinely committed to fostering a good relationship between Mother and the boys but is understandably cautious and committed to ensure the boys' safety and well-being. Mother reiterated her concerns that Father was being overly restrictive with the boys and feels they should be spending more time with her.

After reviewing and considering the written submissions by the parties, as well as the FCS Report & Recommendations, the Court finds that it is in the best interests of George and August to adopt the FCS recommendations, as modified below.

Parental Responsibilities

1. Temporarily, Andrew shall have sole legal and sole physical custody of both children.

Timeshare Schedule

2. The current timeshare, as set forth in the Stipulation & Order signed by the Court and filed on 6/30/2025 shall remain in place until otherwise agreed upon by the parents or further court order.

Collateral Issues

3. An evaluation of Maia's mental health and ability to safely parent the boys shall be completed by Dr. David Kan, who was engaged by the parents for that purpose.
4. The parents shall engage in peaceful contact only in the presence of the boys.
5. Neither parent shall make any disparaging comments about the other parent in the presence of the boys or allow others to do so.
6. The boys shall not be exposed to any physical or emotional abuse.
7. The custody and timeshare shall be reviewed after the evaluation is completed.
8. The matter is continued to September 5, 2025 at 9:00 am in Department D for further hearing following receipt of Dr. Kan's evaluation report.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Father to prepare the order.

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. Evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department D. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website.

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

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

July 2025 at 09:00 AM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7jzyTrwjExIV0by4.1>

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

If you are only able to appear by phone you may dial the phone number below, follow the prompts and enter the meeting ID and passcode.

+1-669-254-5252 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 160 111 4119

Passcode: 636308

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: 07/11/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0001827

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: MANUEL GARCIA
GODINEZ

and

RESPONDENT: CAMILLE RENEE
HOWARD

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW OF REPORTS HEARING

RULING

This matter is set for custody/visitation regarding the parties' son, Ashton (DOB 10/3/23) and receipt of a Report & Recommendations from Family Court Services ("FCS") following the Court's issuing a one-year Domestic Violence Restraining Order ("DVRO") on 5/13/25 with Respondent/Mother as the restrained person and Petitioner/ Father and Ashton are protected persons. Father was granted sole legal and physical custody of Ashton with Mother having supervised visits at Rally twice a week. Mother is also required to complete a 17-week batterers' treatment course. The parties were both interviewed by FCS, and FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 6/26/25.

Mother reported she had completed the third week of an 18-week DV course, but denies she committed any domestic violence against Father and seeks sole legal custody of Ashton. The parties' attorneys are working to set up visits between Ashton and Tobias, Mother's son from another relationship, who is very close with Ashton.

After review and consideration of the parties' written submissions and the FCS Report & Recommendations, the Court finds that it is in the best interests of Ashton to adopt the FCS recommendations, as modified below.

1. All prior orders not in conflict with the below shall remain in full force and effect with the following modifications.
 2. Sole legal and physical custody to Father.
 3. Mother shall continue to have supervised visits at Rally twice per week.
-

4. Mother shall be assessed by a therapist to identify any mental health concerns. Mother shall participate in therapy with the frequency and duration to be directed by the therapist. A copy of this report shall be released to Mother's therapist.
5. Mother's son Tobias may visit with Ashton and Father as arranged per mutual agreement between the parents with the assistance of their attorneys.
6. Mother shall comply with any orders issued by the criminal court including participation in a longer-term in-person batterers' treatment course.
7. Once Mother completes her batterers' treatment course and once she has completed at least three months of weekly individual therapy, her visits with Ashton shall transition to unsupervised day visits twice a week (up to four hours per visit).
8. There shall be no corporal punishment of Ashton by either parent.
9. Father shall not put Ashton in a cold shower as punishment for toileting accidents or as a teaching tool for potty training once potty training begins for Ashton. Father shall take a parenting class focused on parenting toddlers to learn about appropriate toilet training techniques.
10. Ashton shall not be exposed to domestic violence when in the custody of either parent.
11. Father shall not drive Ashton if he does not possess a valid driver's license.

SO ORDERED.

The Court will prepare the order per Rule 5.125, CA Rules of Court

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. Evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department D. The parties may access Department D for video conference via a link on the court website.

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

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

***July 2025 at 09:00 AM
Join Zoom Meeting***

***<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7jzyTrwjExIV0by4.1>
Meeting ID: 160 111 4119
Passcode: 636308***

If you are only able to appear by phone you may dial the phone number below, follow the prompts and enter the meeting ID and passcode.

***+1-669-254-5252 US (San Jose)
Meeting ID: 160 111 4119
Passcode: 636308***

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.