

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 12/19/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL1601598

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: LORI BONNICI

and

RESPONDENT: JERROLD BONNICI

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: STATUS ONLY HEARING

RULING

This matter is set for hearing, after being continued by Stipulation & Order, from 10/20/25 to 12/19/25 for status on Respondent/ Husband's payment to Wife of \$20,818.67 in attorneys' fees (due by 10/20/25) and appointment of a forensic accountant per Evidence Code §730 to prepare a valuation of Showplant Nurseries, Inc., per the Court's 7/25/25 Findings and Order After Hearing ("FOAH") Husband was to advance the costs of the forensic accountant.

On 12/16/25 Wife submitted a Declaration of Petitioner's Counsel Re: Review Hearing which states, despite repeated requests and assurances of payment, Husband still has not paid the ordered attorneys' fees, which through December 19, 2025 will have accrued interest at the legal rate of 10% per annum in the amount of \$5.70 per day, for a total owing to Wife as of 12/19/25 of \$21,160.67.

Moreover, although the parties agreed to retain Alex Spaete, CPA, Husband has failed to sign Mr. Spaete's engagement letter or pay his retainer of \$7,500 since requested to do so on 11/20/25.

Wife asks the Court to continue the review hearing for 90 days, confirm that Husband owes interest of \$5.70/day on the attorneys' fees ordered to be paid by 10/20/25, and order Husband to pay the previously ordered fees and interest thereon plus the newly requested fees of \$4,490.72 within ten days of this hearing, and requiring Husband to pay Alex Spaete's retainer and execute the paperwork provided by Mr. Spaete within ten days of this hearing.

The Court notes that Husband has provided no update to the Court, and at no time has he sought relief from the Court's as to the above-referenced orders.

Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. The Court confirms the outstanding balance of attorneys' fees plus interest owing from Husband to Wife from 10/20/25 through 12/19/25 is \$21,160.67.* Interest shall continue to accrue at the rate of \$5.70/day until paid in full.
2. Husband shall pay additional, reasonable fees and costs incurred in Wife's having to seek payment and attempt to get Husband to pay Alex Spaete's retainer and sign the requisite paperwork to commence the Showplant valuation, according to proof. Counsel needs to provide his billing statements to the Court.
3. Husband shall pay the \$7,500 retainer to Alex Spaete, CPA, and sign the paperwork necessary for Mr. Spaete to commence valuation of Showplant Nurseries no later than 12/29/25.
4. This matter is continued for status conference on the above on 3/20/26 at 9:00 am in Department D. Appearances required on that date.

SO ORDERED.

*10/21-12/19/25 = 59 days; 59 x 5.70/day = 336.30 interest + \$20,818.67 principal = \$21,154.97

Counsel for Wife 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:

*December 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: 12/19/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL2002808

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: REKHA PAL

and

RESPONDENT: BALWANT PAL

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW HEARING – CHILD CUSTODY/VISITATION

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on custody/visitation regarding the parties son, Mason (DOB 2/18/11). The parties were referred to Family Court Services (“FCS”) following The Court’s denial of the parties’ dueling Requests for Restraining Orders.

Both parties and Mason were interviewed by FCS, and the FCS Report & Recommendations were filed with the Court on 12/10/25. Having presided over the extended evidentiary hearing on the parties’ dueling DVRO’s, and having ultimately denied them both, the Court finds that it is in the best interests of Mason to make the following orders:

Custody

1. Mother and Father shall share joint legal and physical custody of Mason.

Timeshare

2. Unless the parties agree to an different schedule, the parties’ timeshare with Mason commencing Sunday, December 21, 2025 shall be as follows:
 - a. Mason shall be in Mother’s care each Sunday from 9:00 am until Wednesday drop off at school (or 9:00 if there is no school), and in Father’s care from Wednesday after school (or 3:00 pm if there is no school) until Sunday drop off at 9:00 am.
3. Mother shall continue in individual therapy with a licensed mental health practitioner.

4. Mother shall take a coparenting class to learn how to best support Mason while living in separate households. Mother shall provide verification to the court of completion of the class once she has done so. (Father has already completed a coparenting class.)
5. Neither party shall expose Mason to divorce-related issues, place him in the middle of the parental conflict, or share adult information related to custody issues, court, etc.
6. If he is not already doing so, Mason shall sleep in his own bed and shall not co-sleep with another adult when in the home of either parent or at his grandparent's home.
7. Parents shall communicate using Our Family Wizard. All communications shall be civil and peaceful in nature.
8. Mason shall be evaluated by a therapist for individual therapy, and if the therapist deems it appropriate, he shall continue in individual therapy.
9. Both parents shall participate in Mason's ABA therapy as directed by the therapist.
10. Neither parent shall disparage the other parent to Mason or within hearing of him nor shall they allow third parties to do so.
11. Neither parent shall travel out of the country with Mason absent written consent by the other parent or court order.
12. Vacations: Each party shall have two weeks of vacation time with Mason, and shall give the other party at least one month's advance notice. The vacationing party shall also provide a full itinerary of all travel plans (including flights, accommodations, and a number at which Mason can be reached). The vacation schedule shall supersede the regular weekly schedule.
13. Mason shall have unfettered phone, text, or video contact with the other parent.
14. Both parents shall have access to Mason's school and medical records. Both parents shall be listed as emergency contacts on school and medical records.
15. Holidays shall supersede the regular weekly custody schedule. Parents shall alternate major holidays.
16. Mother's Day/Father's Day: shall be with the parent being honored.
17. Parents' birthdays: shall be with the birthday parent.
18. Mason's birthday: shall fall on the regular custody schedule. The noncustodial parent may have a two-hour visit with Mason on his birthday.

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:

*December, 2025 at 09:00 AM
Join Zoom Meeting*

*<https://marin-courts-ca-gov.zoomgov.com/j/1601114119?pwd=p6bV9Ef8WHjm1j7izvTrwjExIV0bv4.1>
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: 12/19/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL2202346

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: KATHRYN CONERY

and

RESPONDENT: ROBERT CONERY

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – SPOUSAL SUPPORT

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Husband's 11/10/25 Amended Request for Order to terminate Husband's spousal support based on his unemployment.

On 7/25/25, the Court temporarily suspended Husband's spousal support obligation through October 2025 due to his involuntary layoff from Microsoft in 5/2025 (with severance payments received through 7/2025). Effective November 1, 2025, support payments of \$2,500/month were to resume and continue per the terms of the parties' Marital Settlement Agreement, incorporated into the Judgment of Dissolution entered 2/8/23). The MSA provides for Husband to pay spousal support until 6/30/2030. Husband was also ordered to use his best efforts to seek work and provide the Court with a log of his work search efforts.

Husband now – four months later - requests the Court terminate spousal support due to his layoff from Microsoft in 5/2025 (with severance pay received through 7/2025). Husband argues that Wife's financial independence and inheritance allows her to live at a higher standard of living than during the parties' marriage. On 12/8/25, Petitioner/Wife filed a Responsive Declaration in which she opposes Husband's request and asks the Court to reinstate spousal support at \$2,500/month effective January 1, 2026.

Husband did provide a log of his search for work, but the Court is not satisfied with his efforts. Although the log lists a number of jobs, it is not clear that those were anything more than sending an email, which takes only a few minutes. Husband received only one interview and three phone screen interviews. The log provides no contact names for any of the companies, even those with whom Husband had interviews. In 16 of his inquiries, he received no response. This suggests Husband needs to widen his search efforts and look for other positions, even if less than ideal. Moreover, Husband does indicate he received three contract jobs, but provides no information as to what type of work they involved or what he was paid for each job.

In addition, the Court ordered Husband to fully complete an updated Income & Expense Declaration to includes itemization of all assets on Form FL-150, page 2, item No. 11, which he failed to do.

In the Court's 7/25/25 Findings and Order After Hearing, Wife was advised that she needed to lodge with the court her two most recently filed income tax returns. This is required for any support motion, per Rule 7.13, Marin County Local Family Court Rules. Wife has failed to lodged her tax returns. She also has failed to attach her last two months' paystubs to her Income & Expense Declaration, as required, in bold print, at the top of page 2. Without this documentation, the Court has no way to confirm Wife's income and tax deductions.

The Court does not have sufficient information on which to make an order. However, the Court notes that this is a long-term marriage, and the MSA provides for payment of spousal support by Husband until 6/30/2030. Husband is 57, still well below retirement age and has paid only three years of support on a seven year spousal support commitment. Unless Husband steps up his work search efforts considerably, the Court will order him to undergo a vocational evaluation and will consider imputing income to him.

Therefore, the court orders as follows:

1. This matter is continued for hearing to March 6, 2026 at 9:00 am in Department D.
2. Both parties are ordered to file all financial information, and for Mother to lodge her last two years' income tax returns with the Court by February 20, 2025, as required by Rule 7.13 of the Marin County Local Family Court Rules.
3. In addition, Father shall lodge with the Court monthly statements for each checking and savings account in his name for the period from May 1, 2024 through December 31, 2025, as well as his 2025 income tax returns.
4. The temporary suspension of Husband's \$2,500/month spousal support payments to Wife is extended through March 6, 2026. The Court reserves jurisdiction to retroactively modify this order if it deems such a modification is appropriate.

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:

***December, 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: 12/19/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL 2301127

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: MARK GOLDSTEIN

and

RESPONDENT: KRISTEN KOH
GOLDSTEIN

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – OTHER: ORDER REGARDING
2900 PARADISE DRIVE

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Husband's 11/6/25 Request for Orders ("RFO") regarding 2900 Paradise Drive. More particularly, Husband is requesting the Court authorize him to sell the 2900 Paradise Drive property. Husband contends that, as sole trustee of the Trust since 8/12/14, he has the authority to do so. Respondent/Wife filed a Responsive Declaration on 12/5/25 in which she only states that she does not consent to the relief requested. In a Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed 12/5/25, she makes numerous objections, procedural and substantive, to Husband's requests.

This is not a matter that can be decided on a law and motion calendar. As the parties are aware, the Court appointed Richard Franceschini, Esq., per Evidence Code § 730, as a trust expert in this matter. Until Mr. Franceschini has an opportunity to review and consider the issues presented, and advise the Court and parties of his analysis, the Court cannot make a decision on the propriety of the sale. Mr. Franceschini is requested to provide the Court with his opinions regarding the following:

- Does a separate probate action need to be filed to address any of the issues raised?
- Did Petitioner have a legal right to amend the provisions of the Trust to remove Respondent as co-trustee? Was the process he used correct?
- What powers does a sole settlor have?
- What, if any, is the effect of the Marin Recorder's Office rejecting the August 12, 2024 Affidavit – Change of Trustee which Petitioner attempted to have recorded?
- What is the effect of 2900 Paradise Drive being titled in the name of the Goldstein Trust?

- Does the fact that the children have a 90% irrevocable interest in the Trust affect Petitioner's ability to sell the property; i.e., do the children own 90% of 2900 Paradise Drive, or just have a 90% interest in the value of the property?
- What is the effect, if any, of the Correction Grant Deed identifying the funding sources of the 2900 Paradise Drive property?
- Any other issues Mr. Franceschini thinks should be addressed as to whether Petitioner has the right to sell the property?

•
Appearances required.

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:

*December 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: 12/19/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0000595

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: SUSANNAH LEIA
SLOCUM

and

RESPONDENT: JAMES ROBERT
SLOCUM

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER - VISITATION

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Mother's 11/10/25 Request for Order ("RFO") re: custody/visitation regarding the parties' two sons, Callan (DOB 8/22/19) and Asher (7/6/21). Mother initially filed an *ex parte* request for temporary emergency orders; however, the Court found the issue was not an emergency warranting immediate attention and continued the hearing. Mother raises concerns about Asher's having been kicked out of the YMCA before and after-school daycare due to his aggressive behavior. She states that the days on which Asher is more aggressive are Mondays and Tuesdays after his weekend visits with Father, and Thursdays, following his Wednesday visit with Father. She states the YMCA reports Asher's physical aggression has included his hitting, kicking, jumping on, and pulling the hair of other children. His final act of aggression was poking another child with a pencil hard enough to draw blood. Asher has been allowed back into the YMCA on probation.

Mother believes Asher's behavior results from Husband's allowing him to play inappropriate, violent video games. She requests an order that the boys not be given sugar or allowed to play videogames during their time with Father, and that they be returned to her earlier so that she can get them sufficiently settled down before they go to bed. Father states that Asher has always been aggressive and has a history of being kicked out of various places, and has a history of beating on his older brother. He believes that the boys need to spend more time with him, as Mother is the violent parent, and that she is trying to keep him out of the boys' lives. Father accuses Mother of being neglectful.

It is unfortunate that both parents would rather blame one another than look at their conflict and how it may be adversely affecting the boys. Both parents have exposed the children to domestic violence. The Court agrees with FCS that Mother's proposed timeshare changes are unlikely to have any effect on Asher's aggressive behaviors.

Respondent/Father did not file a Responsive Declaration. Both parents were interviewed by Family Court Services ("FCS"), and the FCS Report & Recommendations were filed with the Court on 12/10/25. The Court finds that it is in the best interests of the children to adopt the FCS recommendations, as modified below. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. All prior orders not in conflict with the below shall remain in full force and effect with the following modifications.
2. The current timeshare shall not be changed.
3. The children shall not be permitted to play age- inappropriate video games or video games that contain violence. The children shall have consistent limits on the amount of time they spend playing video games while at the home of each parent. Parents shall consult Asher's therapist for a recommendation on this issue.
4. The children shall not be fed high sugar foods or drinks during their afterschool visits with Father.
5. If Father has not already done so, he shall utilize the same behavioral reward system in his home as the one that Mother and the YMCA personnel are utilizing for Asher.
6. If they have not already done so, both parents shall complete a coparenting class and provide verification to the court that they have done so.
7. In addition, both parents shall follow through on the September 22, 2025, orders to participate in coparenting counseling forthwith. As previously ordered, the coparenting counseling shall be conducted via separate sessions so as to maintain compliance with the DVRO that is currently in place. Both parties are ordered to provide confirmation to the Court that they have participated in co-parenting counseling, as ordered.
8. If Asher's behavioral problems do not improve after he has had an opportunity to work with the behavioral specialist therapist and after parents have implemented all recommendations from Asher's TK program and the YMCA before and aftercare program, the court shall consider ordering a Brief Focused Assessment if it is financially feasible for the parents. The BFA shall focus on investigating what might be the root causes of Asher's behavioral issues, the impact of the current timeshare schedule on the boys, and to make recommendations on whether the timeshare schedule should be modified.
9. Father shall continue in individual therapy and shall provide documentation to the court that he is in compliance with this order. Father shall work with a licensed therapist.
10. Asher shall continue to work with a behavioral specialist until no longer clinically indicated. Both parents shall participate in Asher's therapy as directed by his therapist. Both parents shall follow all recommendations from Asher's therapist as to how to best support Asher while he is in their custody.

11. A referral to FCS for any future RFOs filed by either parent within one year of the last time parties were seen by FCS shall require a finding of a change of circumstance by the court prior to the case being reopened with FCS.

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:*

*December 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: 12/19//25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0001636

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: JACQUELINE LOU
THOMS

and

RESPONDENT: RONAN DAVID THOMS

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

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Father's 10/29/25 Request for Order ("RFO") re: modification of child custody/visitation with respect to the parties' two sons, Emmett (DOB 3/23/18) and Oliver (DOB 1/25/22). Father asks the Court to modify the current orders to establish 50%/50% timeshare, including overnights, to allow him to resume driving and transporting the children and for him to be able to attend the children's school and extracurricular activities.

On 12/8/25 Petitioner/Mother filed a Responsive Declaration opposing all of Father's requests. In addition to custody/visitation matters, Mother raises issues regarding payment of expenses, which are not properly before the Court and will not be considered at this time. Father filed a Reply Declaration on 12/12/25 countering Mother's allegations, and Mother filed a Statement of Agreement with the FCS Recommendations, which she used only to further complain about Father.

The current order provides for Mother to have temporary sole legal and physical custody, with non-professional supervised visits with Father every Saturday or Sunday from 10:00 am to 6:00 pm and a weekday for four hours. Father is required to test with Soberlink regularly, and submit to random drug tests twice a week.

Father produced the results of his Soberlink testing, which show that out of 786 tests, 777 were compliant that is approximately 99% compliant. Over the entire course of the testing, there were 7 missed tests and 2 non-compliant tests. The most recent missed test was four months ago, in mid-August, and the 2 non-compliant tests occurred in June. The results of the random drug testing all show non-detect.

Both parents were interviewed by Family Court Services ("FCS"), and FCS filed its Report & Recommendations on 12/15/2025. The Court applauds the progress Father has made to date and is hopeful his commitment continues. At the same time, the court is concerned with the level of

Mother's anger at Father. She appears to be unable to say a single good thing about him, and fails to acknowledge the strides he has made in staying sober.

It is imperative that these parties learn to stop sniping and blaming each other and start learning to co-parent. This is essential for the well-being of Emmett and Oliver, as well as each other. The Court agrees with FCS that it is time to start increasing Father's time with the boys and finds that it is in the best interest of the children to adopt the FCS recommendations, as modified below. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

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

Timeshare Schedule

2. Both children shall continue to live with Mother and shall have supervised visits with Father on the following schedule each week:
 - a. Every Wednesday from 3:00 to 7:00.
 - b. Every weekend from Friday at 3:00 to Saturday at 4:00 or Sunday at 10:00 to return to school Monday (or 9:00 a.m. if school is not in session), alternating.
3. The first Sunday overnight shall be on 12-28-25 and the first Friday overnight shall be on 1-2-26.
4. Visits shall be supervised by Father's parents. If they are not available, then the visit shall be cancelled or professionally supervised.
5. All exchanges that do not occur at school shall occur curbside outside of Mother's home and shall be very brief, cordial, and peaceful.

Holidays 2025

The regular custodial Wednesday visits shall *not* take place during the week of Christmas and New Years'. Instead, the regular custodial Wednesday visits shall be replaced with the following:

6. **Christmas:** Thursday, December 25th from 2:00 to 7:00
7. **New Years:** Wednesday, December 31st from 10:00 to 3:00.

Collateral Issues

8. Father shall continue with the existing drug and alcohol testing. The Court is not permitted to order hair follicle testing (Fam. C. § 3041.5; *Deborah M. v. Superior Court* (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 1881).
9. Both children should be properly supervised at all times.

10. Neither child shall be left alone in a vehicle at any time.

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

The Zoom appearance information is as follows:

December 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: 12/19//25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0002380

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: DONJAYE ROARY

and

RESPONDENT: KEVONNA SMITH

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

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Father's 10/30/25 Request for Order ("RFO") re: child custody/visitation regarding the parties' daughter, Denver (DOB 8/24/25). Father requests sole legal custody, with the parties sharing joint physical custody of Denver on the schedule that has been in place since Denver's birth because this "fosters a strong relationship with both parents while allowing one parent to make sound decisions regarding the child's health, education and general welfare."

Mother filed a Responsive Declaration on 12/2/225 in which she requests sole legal and physical custody of Denver, stating she has been Denver's primary caregiver.

Both parties met with Family Court Services ("FCS"), and FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 12/5/25. The Court finds that it is in the best interests of the parties to adopt the FCS recommendations, as modified below. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. The parents shall share joint legal and physical custody of Denver.
2. Parental Timeshare:
 - a. Until the parents agree otherwise or until further court order, the following timeshare shall be in place. Father shall have parenting time with Denver each Sunday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from noon to 8 PM.
 - b. Additionally, in alternate weeks, Father shall have parenting time on Monday, Wednesday, and Saturday from noon to 8 PM.

- c. Denver shall be in Mother's custody at all other times when not in Father's custody. This timeshare is intended to serve Denver at this stage of her life. Parents understand that the timeshare shall be modified as Denver's needs change and as she gets older.
 - d. Father may begin overnights with Denver per mutual parental agreement.
 - e. Either parent may utilize another trusted adult to help with driving Denver for exchanges. All adults shall comport themselves in a civil and respectful manner at exchanges of Denver.
3. Once Mother is employed in January 2026, if she is unable to transport Denver to the exchanges at noon and if another trusted adult cannot do so on Mother's behalf, Father shall pick Denver up from her daycare. All other exchanges shall continue to occur at the Sonoma Raceway.
4. Vacations: Each parent shall have two 7-day vacation periods with Denver each year. The parent requesting vacation shall provide at least two weeks advance notice to the other parent. The vacation dates shall supersede the regular weekly custody schedule with no expectation of makeup time.
- a. Travel within the U.S. with Denver shall not require consent from the other parent provided that the traveling parent provides two weeks advance notice to the other parent and includes an itinerary including flight information, travel dates, travel destination, lodging information, and a phone number where the other parent can be reached, etc.
 - b. Travel outside the US requires agreement of the other parent or court order.
5. Both parents shall complete a coparenting class and shall submit proof of completion of the class to the court.
6. Parents may modify the timeshare at any time per mutual parental agreement.

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:

*December 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: 12/19/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: D CASE NO: FL0002417

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: STACY BOND

PETITIONER: CORNELIA MAZARIEGOS
CIFUENTES

and

RESPONDENT: NORVIN ARNOLDO
TZUM OROZCO

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

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Petitioner/Mother's 11/13/25 Request for Order ("RFO") re: child custody/visitation, child support and for adjudication of parentage. Mother requests she be granted sole legal and physical custody of the parties' child, Norvin (DOB2/15/22) and that Respondent/Father be ordered to pay guideline child support. Mother states that Father has not been present for a relationship with Norvin, and Norvin cries for him. Father declines to take Mother's calls. She states he drinks heavily, and she is concerned for Norvin's safety.

Custody/Visitation

Before the Court will make custody/visitation orders, the parties are required to meet with a Custody Recommending Counselor at the Court's Family Court Services ("FCS"). FCS telephoned Mother and left several messages in Spanish that she had an appointment scheduled with FCS. Mother failed to appear for the appointment or otherwise contact FCS.

Mother provided no contact information for Father on the intake form she completed, so FCS has no way to contact him.

Mother needs to contact FCS at 415-444-7090 to schedule an appointment and provide contact information for Father.

The matter is continued for hearing to February 6, 2026 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:

*December 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.