

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 01/07/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: G CASE NO: FL2001502

PRESIDING: HON. MATTHEW A. SIROKA

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENN CHARIFA

PETITIONER: SARA ARLYN

and

RESPONDENT: SAMUEL STEIN

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

RULING

Mother made three requests in her request for orders (RFO). First, that Father be required to cooperate to modify the custody schedule based on Mother's anticipated new job schedule. The request is DENIED. The Court cannot issue advisory opinions. If Mother's new work schedule, once known, requires the parties to cooperate to effectuate the 50/50 timeshare, the Court expects the parties to work in good faith to that end. If they are unable to reach an agreement, Mother may file a new request for orders.

Mother's second request is that her mother ("Grandmother") be permitted to care for Penelope alone. There were extensive hearings and findings to support the existing order prohibiting Grandmother from caring for Penelope alone. Mother has not provided any evidence of changed circumstances that would support modifying the order. The request is DENIED without prejudice.

Mother's third request is that Grandmother be permitted to sleep at her house or come to her house at 6:00 a.m. every other Monday and every other Friday on alternating weeks.

Grandmother is not prohibited from sleeping at Mother's house or visiting; the existing order only prohibits her from supervising Penelope alone. The request is therefore DENIED.

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.

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 MARIN
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 01/07/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: G CASE NO: FL0000643

PRESIDING: HON. MATTHEW A. SIROKA

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENNIFER CHARIFA

PETITIONER: SARIT HELMAN

and

RESPONDENT: MARK SOCKELL

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER- PAYMENT OF CARRYING COSTS OF FAMILY HOME

RULING

Respondent/Husband seeks an order directing Petitioner/Wife to pay the carrying costs for the property at 326-328 Irving Street, San Francisco property (“Irving Street”) she solely occupies. The request is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART as follows:

Wife shall have exclusive use, possession and control of Irving Street until further order of the Court or by written agreement of the parties. Wife may occupy any part of Irving Street as her residence and shall have all rights attendant to such residence. Wife may rent part or all of Irving Street to third persons in her sole discretion and need not seek permission of Husband to do so, and shall disclose any rental agreements or leases to Husband.

Wife shall be solely responsible for paying the following costs of Irving Street:

Mortgage payments, insurance, property taxes, utilities, ordinary repairs and maintenance.

The allocation between the parties of financial responsibility for major repairs to the Irving Street property is reserved.

Husband’s request for indemnification is premature until the Irving Street property is characterized and divided, and therefore DENIED. The Court reserves jurisdiction as to claims for charges and credits per *In re Marriage of Watts* (2005) 171 Cal.App.3d 366 and *In re Marriage of Epstein* (1979) 24 Cal.3d 76.

Wife may keep all rents of the Irving Street Property which shall be deemed her income available for spousal support. Wife’s obligations will be effective as of November 3, 2025.

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 MARIN
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 01/07/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: G CASE NO: FL0000772

PRESIDING: HON. MATTHEW A. SIROKA

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENNIFER CHARIFA

PETITIONER: JON GOLDSTEIN

and

RESPONDENT: MIRIAM K. GOLDSTEIN

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER- CONSOLIDATE WITH CIVIL ACTION

RULING

Petitioner/Husband seeks to consolidate the pending civil action for the tort of domestic violence CV0005986 Miriam Goldstein vs. Jon Goldstein into the instant action. Respondent/Wife opposes. The motion is DENIED.

Husband has not demonstrated why judicial efficiency would support consolidation. Simply because the allegations of the civil case occurred during the marriage is not sufficient. The domestic violence allegations are not relevant to issues of dissolution, division of property or support, the primary issues in the instant matter. Furthermore, prior misconduct is not admissible in the dissolution trial. The Court agrees with Wife that coordination, not consolidation is the proper course.

Husband submitted evidentiary objections to the declaration of Wife's counsel submitted in opposition to the request for consolidation. The objections are OVERRULED. Ms. Brekhus' declaration is admissible opinion based on her personal knowledge of the case.

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.

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: 01/07/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: G CASE NO: FL0001018

PRESIDING: HON. MATTHEW A. SIROKA

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENNIFER CHARIFA

PETITIONER: MARINA NARBUTOVICH

and

RESPONDENT: DZMITRY SKAREDAU

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) MOTION – RELIEVE COUNSEL
2) REQUEST FOR ORDER – ATTORNEY’S FEES
3) REQUEST FOR ORDER – MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION
4) CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE

RULING

Petitioner/Mother made three requests for order: (1) for substitution of counsel; (2) for reconsideration of spousal support orders and (3) for attorney’s fees.

The request for substitution is DENIED as moot. Mother has already filed a substitution and is self-represented.

Spousal support is modifiable upon a showing of changed circumstances, but Mother has not demonstrated changed circumstances. The request is DENIED without prejudice. Mother can file a new RFO if she has evidence of changed circumstances.

Mother also appears to seek additional discovery. While discovery remains available in this proceeding, Mother must propound proper discovery requests. An RFO is not the proper vehicle to obtain discovery. Mother is referred to the Legal Self-Help Office for assistance.

Mother seeks Attorney’s fees. The Court previously awarded Mother \$5,000 in Attorney’s fees. She owes her Attorney \$21,204.10. Mother is entitled to fees given the disparity in income. However, the fees do appear excessive. The time sheets also reflect a high frequency of communications between Mother and her attorney’s office. The Court awards \$7,500 in attorney’s fees, payable directly to Ibarra Professional Law Corporation, unless Mother has new counsel ready to substitute in as attorney of record.

Father requested a trial setting or Bench Bar conference. The request appears premature, and the matter will be continued 90 days for further case progress conference.

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: 01/07/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: g CASE NO: FL0001040

PRESIDING: HON. MATTHEW A. SIROKA

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENNIFER CHARIFA

PETITIONER: MIKI SUZUKI

and

RESPONDENT: JUNJI SUZUKI

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) REQUEST FOR ORDER - VISITATION
2) CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE

RULING

Petitioner Miki Suzuki (“Mother”) filed this Request for Order (“RFO”) on November 10, 2025. Mother requested the following orders:

- a. That Father’s weekly dinner visits with their daughters either be professionally supervised by a monitor who meets state requirements, or terminated after considering all information at the noticed hearing and based on the FCS recommendation.
- b. That if supervised visits are ordered, any costs associated with the supervised visits shall be paid for by Father.
- c. That Father shall not use the children to communicate matters to Mother concerning the parties’ litigation or his weekly visitation schedule or changes thereto, whether it involves rescheduling or cancellation of his visits, and that Father shall provide Mother with at least 24-hour advance notice about any changes or cancellation to his dinner visits through OurFamilyWizard application (Hereafter “OFW”).
- d. That Respondent shall not discuss with the parties’ children, the parties’ finances or any financial matters affecting the children or matters concerning the parties ongoing litigation including past motions filed or new motions to be filed.

The parties have two minor daughters Yuki and Saki, who are 15 and 13 respectively. The Court is in receipt of a Family Court Services (“FCS”) report dated December 31, 2025. Mother filed a document entitled “Supplemental to Family Court Services Recommendations” which she asserts are “consistent” with FCS recommendations. The Supplement also effectively modifies the request for orders to request 48-hour notice prior to any cancellation of his Tuesday visits with the daughters.

The FCS report recommends no change in custody status.

Mother's request is DENIED. Father may continue to have weekly dinner visits with the children. Mother has not shown a basis to require supervised visits, the parties share custody and a residence, at least in name if not in practice. Moreover, the Court is pleased to note that the children are enjoying their dinners with Father.

The parties are already ordered not to disparage each other or expose either child to any court information or other adult information. Those orders remain in effect. Neither party may use the children to communicate matters to each other. The court will not require Father to provide 24-hour advance notice about changes or cancellation to his dinner visits, nor will the court order 48-hour advance notice but reminds the parties to demonstrate courtesy and advise each other of changes as soon as reasonably practical through the OurFamilyWizard application. All orders remain in effect.

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.

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: 01/07/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: G CASE NO: FL0002206

PRESIDING: HON. MATTHEW A. SIROKA

REPORTER:

CLERK: JENNIFER CHARIFA

PETITIONER: MITCHELL
STANKEWITZ

and

RESPONDENT: EVAN TIMMEL

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW OF REPORTS HEARING – CHILD
CUSTODY/VISITATION

RULING

In this parentage action the parties also filed competing domestic violence restraining order requests, which were both denied. The temporary custody orders in those proceedings are at issue here. Family Court Services (FCS) filed a recommendation on December 29, 2025. No statements of objection or agreement were filed. The Court adopts the FCS recommendation in its entirety and adds the additional requirement that neither party is to disparage the other parent in front of the children.

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.