

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 08/06/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL1604004

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: DUSTIN STRATTON

and

RESPONDENT: BRENNA STRATTON

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER; VISITATION

RULING

This matter comes before the court on Respondent/Mother's Request for Order (RFO), filed June 27, 2025, seeking orders regarding child visitation, division of omitted asset, and passport control orders.

The matter is continued to August 13, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 08/06/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL1904667

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: ROBIN MILLER

and

RESPONDENT: YANINA MILLER

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD CUSTODY

RULING

This matter comes before the court on Petitioner/Father's Request for Order (RFO), filed June 18, 2025, seeking an order that if Respondent/Mother moves to the UC Santa Cruz area, that the minor child, Adam, will remain in Marin County with Father and continue to attend Brookside School in San Anselmo.

This matter is continued to August 13, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B by agreement of the parties.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 08/06/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL2001502

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: SARA ARLYN

and

RESPONDENT: SAMUEL STEIN

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

RULING

This matter comes before the court on Respondent/Father's Request for Order (RFO), filed May 30, 2025, seeking an order that he may relocate with the minor child to Roseville, CA.

Both parents were interviewed together on July 11, 2025 by the Family Court Services (FCS) child custody recommending counselor. FCS prepared a custody report and recommendations on July 28, 2025, which the court reviewed.

The court additionally takes judicial notice of the court files and the court record in this matter. (Evidence Code section 452.) Notably, Father's request to relocate to Roseville, CA comes two years after Petitioner/Mother sought to relocate to Lincoln, CA (close to Roseville, also in Placer County).

In considering Father's request to relocate with minor child, the court is required to consider the factors set forth in *In re Marriage of LaMusga* (2004) 32 Cal.4th 1072 when determining a parenting plan that is in the minor child's best interests.

Here, the parents share joint custody with a 2-2-3 parenting plan. The court considers the minor's interest in stability and continuity, her relationship with both parents, the distance of the move, the child's age, the relationship between the parents, including their ability to cooperate and communicate, their willingness to put the child's best interests first, and the reasons for the move.

Father's reasons for the move are to provide housing security, a good education, and a good support system for the minor child. This is in the minor child's best interest.

Mother previously moved with the minor child to Lincoln without Father's consent, and the parties were able to share custody over that distance for several years. At the end of those years the court ordered that the minor child be returned to Marin County, due in part to the stability and consistency provided by Father and his family for the minor child. The distance of the move is therefore not a detrimental factor.

Both parents have strong ties to Placer County and a significant family support system there. This will provide stability and continuity for the minor child.

Father remains the parents more likely to cooperate and facilitate Mother's relationship with the minor child.

Based on the information before the court, it appears that the best interest of the minor child, Penelope, born April 20, 2018, will be served by the court adopting the recommendations of FCS, as set forth in its reports issued on July 28, 2025, and as modified by the court. The court will do so, and orders as follows:

All current orders shall remain in effect with the following additions/modifications:

1. If both parents remain in Marin or both parents move to Roseville, then all current orders shall remain in place.
2. If Father moves to Roseville and Mother remains in Marin, then Penelope shall also move to Roseville and attend Thomas Jefferson Elementary there, and shall see Mother during the following times:
 - a *During the school year:* alternate weekends in Marin and one-half of the holiday and vacation time.
 - b *During the summer:* on a "week on/week off" basis unless another 50/50 schedule is agreed upon by the parents.
 - c Any additional time as agreed upon by the parents.
3. Penelope shall continue in counseling as recommended by her current therapist.

The matter is continued to August 13, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B for oral argument. Any party wishing to present oral argument must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. on August 5, 2025. If neither party advises that they wish to appear for oral argument this tentative ruling shall be adopted. Pending the continued hearing date, Penelope shall be permitted to relocate with Father to Roseville, CA and shall attend Thomas Jefferson Elementary there.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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