

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 12/18/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: L CASE NO: FL1500022

PRESIDING: HON. MARK A. TALAMANTES

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENN CHARIFA

PETITIONER: INGRID E. RYAN

and

RESPONDENT: ERIC T. RYAN

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) REQUEST FOR ORDER – MODIFY:
CUSTODY/VISITATION – BRIEF FOCUS ASSESSMENT – ATTORNEY’S FEES AND
COSTS
2) REQUEST FOR ORDER – OTHER: SEAL DECLARATION

RULING

There are two matters pending before the court.

Petitioner Ingrid Riley (“Mother”) filed a Request for Order (“RFO”) on November 13, 2025, seeking changes to child custody and visitation orders, and an order for Respondent Eric Ryan (“Father”) to undergo a brief focused assessment. The request follows an *ex parte* application for emergency orders filed on November 13. The court referred the parents to Marin Family Court Services (“FCS”) and continued the hearing to December 18. Father filed a responsive declaration to Mother’s request for temporary orders on November 12. He filed a supplemental declaration on December 15. Mother filed a responsive declaration on December 11.

The second RFO was filed by Mother on November 20, 2025. It seeks sanctions and fees against Father and is set for January 15, 2026, at 9 am in this Department. The court reserves any award of fees requested by Mother against Father associated with this RFO for hearing in January.

The parents were referred to Marin Family Court Services (“FCS”) for mediation and counseling on the issues raised by Mother. [Marin is a recommending county. (Family Code § 3183; Marin County Rule, Family 7.17(A).)] Both parents were interviewed separately on November 21. The child’s therapist was also interviewed by FCS.

Together, these parents have one child. Anders is 15, born October 18, 2020.

These parents have three children; Anya is 20 and no longer at home and Matias is 17 and a junior in high school. Anders is the only child at issue in this motion. Anders is a freshman at Headlands Preparatory school. Father lives in Kentfield and Mother lives in Greenbrae.

The court is familiar with this family and the parenting challenges they have faced. FCS has issued 4 different reports, two of which assisted this court in issuing orders. Those reports were issued on August 8, 2017, and July 15, 2019. The 2019 report was reviewed by the court in anticipation of this hearing.

These parents struggle with raising Anders for a lot of reasons. Both parents admit in their papers that the child is unfortunately caught in the middle between their struggles. Both parents recognize that this is not good for Anders. Parenthood is hard, particularly when raising an active 15 year old young man. The court is optimistic that things will grow better in the relationship.

The court must consider and give due weight to the wishes of children who are of sufficient age and capacity to reason to form an intelligent preference as to costume visitation Family Code §3042(a). A teenager who is at least 14 and wishes to address the court regarding custody and visitation must be permitted to do so unless it is not in his best interest. Family Code §3042(c).

The court appreciates Father's concession as stated in his Reply brief to allow Anders to live primarily with Mother. He has an electric scooter and may flow freely between either parent. He is at an age where he can set his own visitation schedule and sleep over with either parent if he wishes.

The court is unable to order Father to participate in a Brief Focused Assessment. The parties must stipulate if they are willing to pay for it.

The court has reviewed the papers filed by the parents, and in consideration of the FCS reports, including the report issued on December 11, 2025, the court finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the Anders, to adopt the recommendations of FCS as follows:

1. The parents shall continue to share joint legal and joint physical custody of Anders.
2. Anders shall live primarily with Mother and shall be with Father as desired by Anders.
3. If agreed upon, the parents shall work with a Co-Parent Coordinator.
4. All other orders not in conflict herein shall remain in effect.

The court notes the child's therapist says Anders needs two parents to support and raise him. These parents can do more to be kind, respectful and to listen to each other when raising the child.

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 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: 12/18/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: L CASE NO: FL1701550

PRESIDING: HON. MARK A. TALAMANTES

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENN CHARIFA

PETITIONER: SCOTT REEDER

and

RESPONDENT: MELISSA NICHOLLS
(FORMERLY REEDER)

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: STATUS ONLY HEARING – REVIEW MOTHER’S AND
MARIN COUNTY CLERK’S COMPLAINT WITH THE COURT’S ORDER ISSUED
10/30/25

RULING

This matter is on for the status of the transfer of this case from Marin County to Placer County pursuant to the court’s October 30, 2025, 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.

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 L. The parties may access Department L 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.*

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 12/18/25 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

This matter was last called on November 6, 2025, with the court re-referring Respondent Saad Jackson (“Father”) to Marin Family Court Services to be interviewed. 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 for a second time.

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.

CUSTODY AND VISITATION

The court has reviewed the moving and responsive papers, as well as the FCS Report issued on October 30, 2025, and Sept. 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: 12/18/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: L CASE NO: FL2200867

PRESIDING: HON. MARK A. TALAMANTES

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENN CHARIFA

PETITIONER: KEVIN AMES

and

RESPONDENT: ASHLEY AMES

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD SUPPORT

RULING

Petitioner Kevin Ames (“Father”) filed a Request for Order (“RFO”) on October 30, 2025, seeking changes to child support orders due to a layoff situation. Respondent Ashley James (“Mother”) did not file a responsive pleading. Proof of service entered on November 19, 2025, indicates that she was personally served with the documents. Father filed a Reply Declaration on December 11, and his attorney filed a declaration on the same date.

Together, these parents have two children. Violette was born on March 28, 2015. Celina was born on February 3, 2019.

CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT

Father reports that he has secured a job since his layoff at Lovable, Inc. Commencing December 8, 2025, his salary is \$196,000 per year or \$16,333 gross per month. His salary includes a bonus table as Father also has the possibility of receiving a bonus of \$49,000 annually, if he hits certain metrics. Father provides employer sponsored healthcare beginning in January 2026, of \$758 per month. He contributes to childcare in the amount of \$200 per month. There is no information regarding a mortgage deduction.

Mother’s 2024 Income and Expense Declaration stated that she receives Social Security benefits in the amount of \$2,658 per month. There is no current information after service of the documents. Therefore, the court assumes there is no change to her benefits.

The court adopts Father’s child support calculations. Father to pay support of \$116 per month for the period of November 5 – December 7, 2025.

Based on the above assumptions set forth in the attached *XSpouse* calculations provided by Father, commencing December 8, 2025, Father shall pay to Mother monthly child support in the amount of \$2,059.00 payable one-half on the 1st and one-half on the 15th day of each month, and continuing until further court orders, or until the children in question marry, pass away, are

emancipated, reach age 19, or reach age 18 and are not a full-time high school student, whichever occurs first.

The parties shall share equally all reasonable uninsured medical and dental expenses incurred on behalf of their minor children, 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* shall be attached to the *ORDER AFTER HEARING*. These provisions shall apply to reimbursement for childcare expenses as well.

Regarding medical add-ons, the parents are directed to Family Code Section 4063(l), which provides that the parents shall arrange to use medical providers who are in the insurance network. If providers are used outside of network, the parent who arranged the medical and/or therapy appointment is obligated to pay the difference.

The parents are expected to share equally the costs of extracurricular activities for the child. The activities are to be agreed upon in advance, in writing, and the child's participation in that activity is not to be unreasonably withheld.

The parties are ordered to report to each other, with documentation, all earnings in excess of the amounts used to calculate child support by February 15th of each year, with a bonus schedule reportable beginning February 2027. Any adjustments to support based on the attached bonus schedules to occur at the time the next support payment is due.

Counsel for Mother to provide an XSpouse

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.

