

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 08/01/25      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: D      CASE NO: FL2203439

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

---

PETITIONER:      MARK BJERKE

and

RESPONDENT:      JENNIFER BJERKE

---

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

**RULING**

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Mother's 5/8/25 Request for Order ("RFO") to modify custody and visitation regarding the parties' children, Owen (DOB 7/5/12), Lyla (DOB 12/28/13) and Ira (DOB 3/17/15). The current order provides for the parties to share joint legal and physical custody of the children. The children are in Petitioner/Father's care every Sunday from 1 pm until Wednesday drop off at school, and in Mother's care every Wednesday after school until Sunday at 1 pm.

Mother recently remarried and moved to a home in Novato; Father is moving from San Rafael to Novato. Mother has raised concerns about Father's using his parents as caregivers; she says Father's father is physically and emotionally abusive to the children. Father has acknowledged that he has the same concerns about his Father. Mother also states that Father is abusive; and since her fiancée is moving to Marin County, she will be living full-time in Novato, rather than half-time in San Jose and half-time in Marin.

Father did not file a Response to the RFO. Both parties and the three children were separately interviewed by Family Court Services ("FCS"), and FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 7/25/25.

Having reviewed Mother's RFO, the FCS Report & Recommendations, and Mother's Statement of Disagreement with the FCS Recommendations, in which she requests several additions/modifications to the FCS Recommendations, the Court finds 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 additions/modifications:

Timeshare Schedule

2. The children shall be with Mark on the following schedule (and with Jennifer the remainder of the time):
  - a. Every week from Sunday at 1:00 p.m. to Tuesday at 8:00 p.m.
  - b. Any additional time as agreed upon by the parents.
3. Any changes to the schedule, or any additional time for any of the children to be with either parent, shall occur as mutually agreed upon by the parents.

Collateral Issues

4. The children shall not be left in the care of their paternal grandfather, or in the care of their paternal grandparents (paternal grandmother alone can continue to care for them, but only if grandfather is not on the property while she is caring for the children).
5. Neither parent shall use any physical discipline with any of the children or allow others to do so.
6. The children shall be protected from any verbal or physical abuse.
7. Neither parent shall make any disparaging comments about the other parent in the presence of any of the children or allow others to do so.
8. The children shall be exposed to peaceful contact only between the parents.
9. Neither parent shall discuss court or other adult matters with the children, or in their presence.
10. Neither parent shall share any information from this report with any of the children

**SO ORDERED.**

Counsel for Mother 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](http://www.marin.courts.ca.gov)***

***The Zoom appearance information is as follows:***

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

***<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7jzvTrwjExIV0bv4.1>  
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: 08/01//25      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: D      CASE NO: FL2301773

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

---

PETITIONER:      CERISE A. MAYO

and

RESPONDENT:      PHILIP L. WINN

---

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) REQUEST FOR ORDER – ATTORNEY’S FEES  
2) REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD SUPPORT

**RULING**

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Mother’s 6/4/25 Request for Order (“RFO”) re: attorneys’ fees and costs of \$38,411.50, for review regarding her 7/7/25 RFO re: allocation of travel expenses, appointment of minor’s counsel, removal of Petitioner from the existing mortgage on the San Francisco property, status of the parenting coordinator and review of parenting coordinator recommendations.

Respondent/Father filed a Responsive Declaration on 7/21/25 (to the ex parte request) and on 7/22/25.

Attorneys’ Fees & Costs

As noted, Mother requests Father pay her attorneys’ fees and costs of \$38,411.50. Per her supporting Declaration, Mother seeks \$23,750 in fees she incurred with Garen McCall, Esq., in connection with the 1/15/25 Interdisciplinary Settlement Conference (“ISC”), the 1/29/25 Bench Bar Settlement Conference and the 2/5/25 second ISC. The Court notes that in the parties’ Stipulated Judgment entered on 4/16/25, Mother expressly waived claims for past attorneys’ fees through the date of judgment. Therefore,

1. Mother’s request for the waived fees is denied.

The Stipulated Judgment excluded waiver of attorneys’ fees and costs related to the then upcoming move-away trial. Mother states she incurred \$13,020 in fees in connection with Mr. McCall’s representation at the move-away trial.

In his Responsive Declaration, Father opposes Mother’s request for attorneys’ fees. He states that he has already paid Mother \$50,000 towards her attorneys’ fees. He is unemployed and does not have the ability to pay. One of the main factors motivating Father to relocate to the East Coast is that he has a job awaiting him there. Father’s I&E states that he is withdrawing funds

from his inherited IRA to cover monthly living expenses. He has \$26,200 in cash and deposit accounts and real and personal property valued at \$918,170. He claims monthly living expenses of \$10,780 and credit card debts totaling \$31,159.

In addition, per Mother's 6/4/24 I&E, she (still working only part-time), earns \$2,628/month. She has \$40,000 in cash and deposit accounts and \$45,000 in assets. Mother claims \$4,686/month in living expenses and personal loan and credit card debt of \$9,000.

The Court notes that, through 7/21/25 Father has paid \$421,028.70 in his own attorneys' fees and costs, which he states he has borrowed from his sister.

The Court has admonished Mother on several occasions that she needed to seek full-time employment to contribute to Ines' support. She has failed to do so and continues to be underemployed. Father has paid virtually all of Ines' living expenses, as well as all costs of supervised visits, and the cost of the brief focused evaluation by Dr. Rhonda Lindsey, and the cost of the parties' parenting coordinator (other than \$50/month).

Nonetheless, the Court finds that there is still a significant disparity in the parties' assets, access to funds and earning capacity, and that Father has the ability to pay \$13,020 in Mother's attorneys' fees. However, Mother is again admonished that she must find full-time employment; if she is not able to do so in her current position, then she needs to take a second job. The Court orders:

1. Mother's request for Father to pay her attorneys' fees and costs that were waived in the Stipulated Judgment is denied
2. Mother's request for fees and costs related to the move-away trial in the amount of \$13,020 is granted. Father shall pay to Mother \$13,020. Said payment shall be made within 30 days of the date of this order.

All Other Matters

Appearances required (10:30 am) for discussion as to all other matters.

**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 through 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](http://www.marin.courts.ca.gov)*

*The Zoom appearance information is as follows:*

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

***<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7jzvTrwjExIV0bv4.1>***

***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: 08/01/25      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: D      CASE NO: FL0001461

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

---

---

PETITIONER:    YASMINA PAJKIN	
and	
RESPONDENT: CHAFIQ FDAOCH	

---

---

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

**RULING**

This matter is set for hearing on (1) Petitioner/Wife's 5/16/25 Request for Order ("RFO") re: spousal support and (2) Case Progress Conference. The matter was continued from 7/11/25, when Respondent/Husband was ordered to provide the financial documentation required by the Marin County Local Rules to enable the Court to calculate temporary spousal support, and referred to the Court's Legal Self-Help Center.

Pendent Lite Spousal Support

Although Husband was present for the 7/11/25 hearing via Zoom, he failed to comply with the Court's order and has provided no financial information and/or documentation.

The parties' were married for 16 years and have one adult child. Wife's Income & Expense Declaration shows her income from self-employment as a driver and babysitter of \$4,707/month. She claims \$3,044 in cash and deposit accounts and personal property valued at \$17,916. Wife claims monthly living expenses of \$5,928/month, with debts totaling \$65,450.

Wife does not know what Husband's income is, and the most recent joint tax return provided was 2023. Therefore, the Court has no information regarding Husband's 2024 and 2025 income to date. The Court hesitates to use the 2023 return as, even if all income therein is attributed to Husband, Wife will owe Husband spousal support, which he hasn't requested.

Therefore, the Court issues an Order to Show Cause why Husband should not be held in contempt of court for failing to abide by the Court's order to produce all required financial information. The OSC re: contempt is set for hearing on 8/26/25 at 9:00 am in Department D. Husband is ordered to appear in person; his failure to appear will result in the Court's issuing a bench warrant for his arrest.

Case Progress Conference

The Case Progress Conference is continued to 8/26/25 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](http://www.marin.courts.ca.gov)*

*The Zoom appearance information is as follows:*

*August 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: 08/01//25      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: D      CASE NO: FL0001925

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

---

<p>PETITIONER:    MAGDA MARIELA AGUILAR MAZARIEGOS</p> <p style="text-align:center">and</p> <p>RESPONDENT:   ELEAZAR ROSBELI MAZARIEGOS DE LEON</p>	
---	--

---

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD SUPPORT/SPOUSAL  
SUPPORT

**RULING**

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Mother’s 6/17/25 Request for Order (“RFO”) re: child custody/visitation and child support for the benefit of the parties’ minor child, Stephanie (DOB 5/22/13), as well as for spousal support. Mother also filed an Income & Expense Declaration (“I&E”). Father filed a Responsive Declaration on 6/30/25 with an Income and Expense Declaration on 6/30/25.

Custody/Visitation

Mother requests joint legal and physical custody of Stephanie with a week on/week off schedule. Respondent/Father filed a Responsive Declaration on 6/30/25 in which he states that Mother abandoned the family home in mid-May of this year and left the parties’ daughters for him to care for. He states that Mother has no communication with the parties’ adult daughter, Rosalyn, and provides no emotional or financial support for either Rosalyn or Stephanie. She only sees Stephanie for about an hour every three days.

The parties were referred to mediation with Family Court Services (“FCS”); however, Mother did not attend the scheduled mediation session, so only Father was interviewed. FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 7/10/25. Although Father stated in his Responsive Declaration that he does not object to Mother having joint legal and physical custody of Stephanie, during mediation he requested he be awarded full custody of Stephanie. He expressed concern regarding Mother’s caring for Stephanie, as while Mother was still at home, she would go out late at night with her friends, would leave the children with Father, and would come home late. She did not come home drunk, and there were no drug or alcohol issues.

He would like Mother to have only day visits. He says that Stephanie is fine visiting Mother and wants to spend more time with her, but for reasons he doesn't know or understand, Mother has not been available to Stephanie.

After reviewing and considering the parties' written submissions and the FCS Report & Recommendations, the Court finds that it is in the best interests of Stephanie to adopt the FCS Recommendations, as modified below, as the Court's order on this matter.

1. If Mother wishes to still pursue her RFO, she shall be re-referred to FCS.
2. If Mother does not appear at the 8/1/25 hearing, Father shall have sole legal and physical custody.
3. Mother shall have day visits with Stephanie per mutual parental agreement. The visits shall conclude no later than 8 PM.
4. Mother shall provide Father with her address as well as information regarding who is in the home if Stephanie will be spending time at Mother's home.
5. Father shall not be re-referred to FCS as he has already attended mediation and because it will be a hardship for him to request additional time off work.

#### Child Support & Spousal Support

At this time, the Court uses the timeshare of 95% Father and 5% Mother. Mother's Income & Expense Declaration ("I&E") states she is 41 years old, self-employed as a housecleaner and makes \$4,000/week. She claims expenses of \$1,400/month, has no cash, checking accounts or other assets, and owes \$3,740 in debts. Mother provides no documentation to support her earnings.

Father's I&E states he is 45 years old, self-employed as a construction worker/ handyman. He works 40 hours per week and earns \$25/hour, but on page 2 of the I&E states his self-employment income as \$4000/month. He claims monthly expenses of \$4,320/month for himself, his adult daughter, and Stephanie. Father has no assets and owes \$6,000 in credit card debt. Father also provided no documentation supporting his income.

Based upon the minimal information provided by the parties, the Xspouse calculation attached as Exhibit "A" calculates child support of \$760/month payable from Mother to Father, and 0 spousal support.

Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. Commencing 6/17/25, Mother shall pay to Father the sum of \$750 per month as and for guideline child support for the benefit of Stephanie. Said support shall be paid on or before the 1<sup>st</sup> day of each month.

2. Child support shall continue until (1) the child reaches the age of 18, or if still a full-time student in high school at age 18, until the child reaches age 19 or graduates from high school, whichever first occurs; (2) the child dies; or (3) the child is emancipated. The amount of child support is modifiable if there is a material change of circumstances for either party.
3. In addition, the parties shall share all reasonable uninsured medical expenses and dental expenses incurred on behalf of the minor child, and childcare costs related to either party's employment or reasonably necessary education or training for employment skills. The parties are ordered to comply with the provisions of Family Code § 4063 in seeking reimbursement for uninsured medical and dental expenses, and a copy of the NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES – Health-Care Costs and Reimbursement Procedures is attached to the Order After Hearing. These provisions shall apply to reimbursement for childcare expenses, as well.

**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 through 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](http://www.marin.courts.ca.gov)*

*The Zoom appearance information is as follows:*

*August 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.*

# 2025 Xspouse 2025-1.2-CA Monthly Figures

Fixed Shares	Eleazar	Magda	Monthly Figures		Cash Flow	
Number of children	1	0	2025		Guideline	Proposed
Percent time with NCP	0.00%	5.00%			Combined net spendable	6636 6636
Filing status	HH/MLA	HH/MLA	GUIDELINE		Percent change	0% 0%
Number of exemptions	2	1	Nets (adjusted)		Eleazar	
Wages and salary	0	0	Eleazar	3409	Payment cost/benefit	760 760
Self employed income	4000	4000	Magda	3228	Net spendable income	4169 4169
Other taxable income	0	0	Total	6637	Change from guideline	0 0
TANF CS received	0	0	Support		% of combined spendable	63% 63%
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	0	% of saving over guideline	0% 0%
New spouse income	0	0	Guideln CS	-760	Total taxes	591 591
Employee 401-k contribution	0	0	Marin SS	-0	Dep. exemption value	0 0
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	-760	# withholding allowances	0 0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	-		Net wage paycheck	0 0
CS paid prev marriage	0	0	Settings changed		Magda	
Health insurance	0	0	Proposed		Payment cost/benefit	-760 -760
Other medical expenses	0	0	Tactic 9		Net spendable income	2468 2468
Property tax expenses	0	0	CS	-760	Change from guideline	0 0
Ded interest expense	0	0	SS	-0	% of combined spendable	37% 37%
Contribution deduction	0	0	Total	-760	% of saving over guideline	0% 0%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	Saving	0	Total taxes	772 772
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	0 0
Hardship deduction	0	0				
Other GDL deductions	0	0				
Child care expenses	0	0				

Magda 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		95 - 5	0	0	0 Eleazar	760 Magda	760 Magda
Stephanie	2013-05-22	95 - 5	0	0	0 Eleazar	760 Magda	760 Magda

Superior Court of California  
County of Marin

Exhibit "A"

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 08/01//25      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: D      CASE NO: FL0001986

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

---

PETITIONER:      MOANALANI JEFFREY

and

RESPONDENT:      KARL ISOTALO

---

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

**RULING**

On 6/16/25 Petitioner/Mother filed a Petition to Establish Parental Relationship, Request for Order (RFO”) re custody/visitation and modification of child support regarding the parties’ minor child, Kaleo Isotalo.

Mother’s Declaration states there is a child custody case ongoing in San Francisco, Case No. FPT-22-377979. She also mistakenly states that Respondent/Father filed a Department of Child Support Services (“DCSS”) case in Marin.

Since there is a case open in San Francisco, this parentage and custody case is improperly filed in Marin County. San Francisco has continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over this matter.

Further, Father voluntarily closed the Marin DCSS case, which was never assigned a case number in Marin County. The open DCSS case in San Francisco is FCS-22-355582.

Therefore, this case is dismissed in its entirety.

**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 through 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](http://www.marin.courts.ca.gov)*

*The Zoom appearance information is as follows:*

*August 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.*