

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 11/6/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: L CASE NO: FL1704083

PRESIDING: HON. MARK A. TALAMANTES

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENNIFER CHARIFA

PETITIONER: JOHN ORDWAY

and

RESPONDENT: LESLIE ORDWAY

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – ACCOUNTING OF SALE OF
REAL PROPERTIES AND SET OFF AGAINST WIFE’S PAYMENT OF SANCTIONS,
ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT AND SANCTIONS RE 271

RULING

Petitioner John Ordway (“Husband”) filed a Request for Order (“RFO”) on August 29, 2025, to 1) enforce the terms of the judgment to split the costs of sale for the Arizona property; (2) an accounting of costs incurred during the sale of the Red Hill and Arizona property and rents received while listed; (3) to enforce the terms of the judgment to have Wife pay \$181,520 towards the Ordway construction debt including unspecified interest; and (4) an offset of \$34,000 in spousal support arrears against the \$70,000 in sanctions Wife was ordered to pay, reducing the outstanding sanctions to \$36,000. This matter was continued several times to accommodate Respondent Leslie Ordway’s (“Wife”) being out of the state.

The parties are allowed to appear by zoom.

Husband’s request to offset Wife’s order to pay sanctions in the amount of \$70,000 with his \$34,000 in back spousal support is GRANTED. The sanctions award is modified down to \$36,000 in remaining sanctions.

As to all other issues, appearances are required.

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

Counsel for Husband 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 evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department L. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department L 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: 11/6/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: L CASE NO: FL1900336

PRESIDING: HON. MARK A. TALAMANTES

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENN CHARIFA

PETITIONER: JESSICA A. JACKSON	
and	
RESPONDENT: SAAD J. JACKSON	

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

RULING

Respondent Saad Jackson (“Father”) filed a Request for Order (“RFO”) on September 10, 2025, seeking changes to visitation and custody orders. Petitioner Jessica Jackson (“Mother”) filed an opposition declaration on October 3, 2025. No other papers were received by the parents.

The parents were referred to Marin Family Court Services (“FCS”) for mediation and counseling on the issues raised by Father. [Marin is a recommending county. (Family Code § 3183; Marin County Rule, Family 7.17(A).)] Father, who filed the RFO, did not attend the FCS interview. Mother did, however

Together, these parents have one daughter Saadiya, who was born on December 24, 2013. She was also interviewed by FCS.

Prior FCS recommendations were issued on September 14, 2021.

The current orders are for Jessica to have sole legal and physical custody and for Saad to have one weekend day from 9:00 to 5:00 and one day after school until 7:00 p.m.

Mother expresses a concern over Father’s alcohol use, reporting that the daughter has had to call for emergency services due to his drinking. She believes Saadiya has some awareness of her Father’s issues, and they have a safety plan.

Should Father appear at the hearing, he may ask for a re-referral to FCS.

CUSTODY AND VISITATION

The court has reviewed the moving and responsive papers, as well as the FCS Report issued on October 30, 2025, and September 14, 2021, and finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the child to adopt those recommendations in part as follows:

1. Mother shall have sole physical and legal custody over the child.
2. All current orders shall remain in effect.
3. Saad shall not consume any alcohol while Saadiya is in his care.
4. Neither parent shall share any information from this report with Saadiya

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

As authorized by CRC 5.125, the court will 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 L. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department L 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: 11/6/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: L CASE NO: FL0000277

PRESIDING: HON. MARK A. TALAMANTES

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENN CHARIFA

PETITIONER: DONALD GRAY

and

RESPONDENT: MARCIA MARCILINO
GRAY

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) REQUEST FOR ORDER – PROPERTY CONTROL;
DIVIDE JOINT ACCOUNTS; SELECT BROKER
2) REQUEST FOR ORDER -BIFURCATION – SALE OF TIBURON PROPERTY HOME;
ACCOUNTING OF HOME LOAN PROCEEDS; APPOINTMENT OF ELISOR; SANCTIONS
PER FC 271 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5000

RULING

Petitioner Donald Gray (“Husband”) filed an RFO on September 29, 2025, seeking: (1) all Tiburon and Sausalito rental income be deposited into joint account to pay for carrying costs; (2) stock division of E*TRADE account to cover living expenses and excess rental property costs; (3) to use cryptocurrency to cover excess rental property costs and attorney’s fees and costs; (4) stipulate to the validity of the prenuptial agreement or set it for a bifurcated trial; and (5) selection of real estate broker, Candace Nordstrom, for sale of the Tiburon rental property. Husband requests \$4,000 in sanctions.

Respondent Marcia Marcilino Gray (“Wife”) filed an RFO on October 1, 2025, seeking bifurcation on the sale of Tiburon rental property; (2) accounting of \$300,000 reverse mortgage proceeds on Tiburon property; (3) appointment of Ellisor to facilitate the sale; and (4) \$5,000 in sanctions pursuant to Family Code section 271. Wife seeks \$5,000 in sanctions.

Husband filed a Responsive Declaration and a supporting declaration on October 24. Wife filed a Responsive Declaration on October 28. No Reply Declaration was filed by either party, which is an indication that a settlement on the many issues raised in the dueling RFOs is possible.

It appears there is agreement that the Tiburon property will be sold. It shall be on the Market by January 13, 2026, unless the parties stipulate to a sale schedule.

The issue of sanctions is reserved.

The issue of whether the stock Wife claims is her separate property is a triable issue, and cannot be resolved through law and motion.

The court notes that there is a Temporary Restraining Order with Wife as the protected party. It was filed on May 1, 2025, and has been continued multiple times. The purpose of the Domestic Violence Restraining Order Act, Family Code §6200, et seq, is to provide for an expedited hearing when valid threats of violence, among other things, exist. It is not to have the threat of a DVRO looming over one party for the purposes of gaining an advantage over that person. The court is inclined to dismiss the TRO and requests argument to support its continuation by Wife.

Appearances are required.

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

Counsel for Father to draft 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 L. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department L 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: 11/6/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: L CASE NO: FL0001262

PRESIDING: HON. MARK A. TALAMANTES

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENN CHARIFA

PETITIONER: JEANINE M. VAN PELT

and

RESPONDENT: TROY C. VAN PELT

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) REQUEST FOR ORDER – RE BUSINESS EVALUATION FEES
2) CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE

RULING

This matter is on for a case progress conference.

Also, Petitioner Jeanine Van Pelt (“Wife”) filed this Request for Order (“RFO”) on August 21, 2025, seeking an order for Petitioner Troy Van Pelt (“Husband”) to cover the costs of a forensic accountant to evaluate Husbands dental practice. Proof of service indicates that Husband was served through his lawyer on August 27. The court granted Husband’s request for a continuance on September 25.

Husband did not file an opposition to the RFO to oppose Wife’s request for an advance of funds. His non-action after receiving proper notice of this hearing is viewed as a concession to Wife’s request. See, *Calton v Quint* (2000) 77 Cal.App.4th 690, 697 (failure to file and serve a written opposition to a motion can be construed as an admission that the motion has merit.)

Wife’s request is GRANTED. Husband is to fund the requested retainer of \$7,500 and is ordered to participate in the forensic evaluation by Brian Boon of the community property and business, by providing access to the financial bookkeeping forms as requested by the accountant.

Fees for Wife is awarded in the amount of \$7,500, as compensation for her needing to file an uncontested RFO to keep this case moving to resolution.

The retainer and fees are to be paid within 30 days of entry of order.

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

Counsel for Mother to 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 L. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department L 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.