

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 5/15/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL 1205763

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

PETITIONER: JAMIE DOMINGUEZ

and

RESPONDENT: RAUL ALFREDO
DOMINGUEZ TORRES

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – ORDER - SHOW CAUSE -
CONTEMPT

RULING

This matter is set for arraignment on Petitioner/Mother’s 4/6/2026 Order to Show Cause re Contempt. Respondent/Father filed a Responsive Declaration on 4/30/2025 in which he states he does not have the ability to pay the amount owed. Father also filed an Income & Expense Declaration and lodged his 2024 and 2025 income tax returns with the Court.

Appearances required.

Any party who disagrees with the Court's tentative ruling and wishes to have oral argument must notify the Court at (415) 444-7046 and opposing counsel (or if the opposing party is self-represented, notice must be given directly to the opposing party) of their intent to appear at the hearing for oral argument by 4:00 pm on the court day before the hearing, as required by Marin County Superior Court Family Law Local Rules 7.12(B) and (C). Notice may be given by telephone or in person. Absent proper notice, no oral argument will be permitted. If no request for oral argument is made, the tentative ruling will become the order of the Court.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, persons who requested oral argument must appear for the hearing in person or remotely via Zoom, in accordance with the Court website guidelines. If appearing remotely via Zoom (video or telephone), you are responsible for ensuring you have adequate connectivity; the Court may proceed in a party’s absence if technical issues arise. Proper Zoom etiquette and courtroom decorum are required, and failure to comply may result in the hearing being halted and an order to appear in person being made.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 5/15/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL 1901746

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

PETITIONER: BROOKE T. HAWKS

and

RESPONDENT: ERIC A. HAWKS

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – FIX AND LIQUIDATE
UNREIMBURSED EXPENSES

RULING

This matter was continued for hearing on Respondent/Father’s Request for Order (“RFO”) to fix and liquidate unreimbursed expenses in the amount of \$8,747.16, representing Mother’s 50% share of childcare, medical and other expenses Father paid on behalf of the parties’ children, Kayden (DOB 10/9/2007) and Dillan (DOB 8/18/2011). Petitioner/Mother’s Response included a request for reimbursement for expenses paid by her.

The Court’s 3/13/2026 ordered each party seeking reimbursement to provide a summary of the mandatory add-on categories and those expenses for which there is an express, mutual agreement to share the expense and to take out any from their initial filings any expenses which are not mandatory add-ons or for which there is not an express, mutual agreement. The Court further ordered that the parties were then to meet and confer to see what they agree on, and then file by 4/16/2026 an updated Declaration attaching their summaries and advising the Court, as to each summary category, what amount they are requesting.

On 4/16/2026 Father filed a Declaration stating that, despite multiple good faith attempts to contact Mother to meet and confer, he never received a response until the day before the revised spreadsheets were due. Father further states that Kayden’s health insurance is paid through his spouse (Nicki), but it is treated as taxable income to Nicki, which “results in a significant out-of-pocket cost that I reimburse to Nicki.” Father lists on his spreadsheet seeking \$275/month for Kayden’s health, but the Court has been advised the agreement was for Father to be responsible for Dillan’s medical expenses, and Mother to be responsible for Kayden’s medical expenses. Father provides no proof of the amount he is paying to Nicki for the insurance coverage.

On 4/17/2024 Mother filed a Declaration Re: Reimbursement of Add-On Expenses with a revised spreadsheet. The Court is unable to make sense of Mother’s spreadsheet.

In short, both parties' spreadsheets raise more questions than they answer. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. The parties are ordered to meet and confer in person to see what expenses on each other's spreadsheets they agree to, and what expenses they do not agree to. If Mother does not meet and confer in good faith as ordered, her requests for reimbursement will be denied.
2. The matter is being specially set by the Court for hearing on 6/29/2026 at 9:00 am in Department E. Both parties are ordered to appear. Appearances may be made remotely via Zoom.

SO ORDERED.

The Court will prepare the order per Rule 5.125, CA Rules of Court.

Any party who disagrees with the Court's tentative ruling and wishes to have oral argument must notify the Court at (415) 444-7046 and opposing counsel (or if the opposing party is self-represented, notice must be given directly to the opposing party) of their intent to appear at the hearing for oral argument by 4:00 pm on the court day before the hearing, as required by Marin County Superior Court Family Law Local Rules 7.12(B) and (C). Notice may be given by telephone or in person. Absent proper notice, no oral argument will be permitted. If no request for oral argument is made, the tentative ruling will become the order of the Court.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, persons who requested oral argument must appear for the hearing in person or remotely via Zoom, in accordance with the Court website guidelines. If appearing remotely via Zoom (video or telephone), you are responsible for ensuring you have adequate connectivity; the Court may proceed in a party's absence if technical issues arise. Proper Zoom etiquette and courtroom decorum are required, and failure to comply may result in the hearing being halted and an order to appear in person being made.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 5/15/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL0000859

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

PETITIONER: IAN DAVIS-TREMAINE

and

RESPONDENT: NATALIE DAVIS-
TREMAINE

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CUSTODY/CHILD
SUPPORT/SPOUSAL SUPPORT/VISITATION; ATTORNEY FEES; RECEIPT OF FCS
REPORT

RULING

This matter was continued for hearing on (1) custody/visitation regarding the parties’ children: Corbin (DOB 7/5/2012) and Nova (DOB 10/10/2015), (2) review of child support and pendente lite spousal support, (3) Respondent/Mother’s request for attorneys’ fees and costs, and (4) trial readiness conference.

Custody/Visitation

Through Family Court Services (“FCS”), the parties entered into a Mediated Custody Agreement, which was approved by the Court and filed on 5/4/2026. The Court will incorporate the agreement into its Findings and Order After Hearing, and this issue is taken off calendar.

Child Support and Pendente Lite Spousal Support

On 4/24/2026, Father filed a Supplemental Responsive Declaration and Petitioner’s Amended Assumptions and Calculations for Child Support and Spousal Support. Father requests the Court modify support to adopt the Xspouse calculation prepared by Alex Spaete, CPA, based on Mr. Spaete’s revised report of income available for support which now takes account of the 2025 Profit & Loss Statement (“P&L”) for Tremayne Group Chiropractic Inc. The Court notes Mother filed no opposition to the Amended Calculation or updated Spaete report of income available for support. However, as the Court stated in its last FOAH, it does not deem it appropriate to impute Mother with income at this time. Therefore, the Court has prepared its own Xspouse calculation using all of the same assumptions stated in Petitioner’s Amended Assumptions and Calculations, except Mother’s income remains at \$2,080/month.

Based on these assumptions, the Court orders as follows:

1. Effective May 1, 2026, Father shall pay to Mother as and for guideline child support the sum of \$2,276/month (\$804 for the benefit of Corbin, and \$1,472 for the benefit of Nova). Said support is payable on or before the first day of each month.
2. In addition, bonus child support shall be payable by Father to Mother if his income exceeds the amount attributed to him on Exhibit "A." Bonus child support shall be paid in accordance with the Xspouse bonus schedule attached as Exhibit "A-1."
3. Child support shall continue until (1) the child reaches the age of 18, or if still a full-time student in high school at age 18, until the child reaches age 19 or graduates from high school, whichever first occurs; (2) the child dies; or (3) the child is emancipated. The amount of child support is modifiable if there is a material change of circumstances for either party.
4. In addition, the parties shall share, in proportion to their net incomes with Father paying 60% and Mother paying 40% of all reasonable uninsured medical expenses and dental expenses incurred on behalf of their 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 is attached to the Order After Hearing. These provisions shall apply to reimbursement for childcare expenses, as well.

Pendente Lite Spousal Support

Based upon Exhibit "A" attached hereto, the Court orders as follows:

5. Effective 5/1/2026 Father shall pay to Mother as and for guideline pendente lite spousal support the sum of \$1,555/month, payable on or before the first day of each month.
6. In addition, bonus spousal support shall be payable by Father to Mother if his income exceeds the amount attributed to him on Exhibit "A." Bonus spousal support shall be paid in accordance with the Xspouse bonus schedule attached as Exhibit "A-1."
7. Spousal support shall continue until Wife remarries, either party dies, or further order of the Court.
8. Spousal support is neither taxable to the recipient nor deductible by the payor.

Attorneys' Fees and Costs

Mother requested Father pay her attorneys' fees and costs of \$20,000 pursuant to Family Code §2030. At the initial hearing on 3/20/2026, the Court ordered (a) Father advance the sum of \$10,000 as and for attorneys' fees to Mother by 3/10/2026, with the Court reserving jurisdiction as to the ultimate allocation of said fees; and (b) Mother's Counsel to supplement her Declaration to specify work anticipated to be necessary, estimated time-fees to accomplish further tasks and provide billing statements, with only privileged information redacted, to be filed with the Court by 4/10/2026, and Father to file any response by 4/24/2026. (See FOAH filed 4/14/2026, attached Tentative Ruling, page 5, Nos. 14-15.) Counsel's Declaration was filed on 4/15/2026.

Having now reviewed Counsel's billing statements, the Court finds the work done and fees for such work were both reasonable. In addition, the Court is satisfied that Wife will need an expert accountant (albeit presumably only one) to address support and valuation of the chiropractic practice. The Court finds \$7,500 to be a reasonable retainer for an expert accountant for these issues. The Court further finds that, given the parties' respective incomes, that Father is in a better position to pay at least some of Mother's attorneys' fees and expenses and is in a better position to access funds. Therefore, the Court orders:

9. Father shall advance the additional sum of \$7,500 to Mother to retain an expert.
10. The Court orders both parties to lodge their Schedules of Assets & Debts with the Court within 10 days of the date of this order.

Notice of ATRO Violation

This issue is not properly before the Court at this time and will not be considered.

Trial Readiness

Both parties filed Trial Readiness Conference Statements on 5/4/2026. Father states the case will be ready for Bench Bar Settlement Conference on 6/1/2026. Mother states that discovery is not complete in that a business valuation of the medical practice needs to be done. She states the case will be ready for trial in 12/2026.

Appearances required.

The Court will prepare the order.

Any party who disagrees with the Court's tentative ruling and wishes to have oral argument must notify the Court at (415) 444-7046 and opposing counsel (or if the opposing party is self-represented, notice must be given directly to the opposing party) of their intent to appear at the hearing for oral argument by 4:00 pm on the court day before the hearing, as required by Marin County Superior Court Family Law Local Rules 7.12(B) and (C). Notice may be given by

telephone or in person. Absent proper notice, no oral argument will be permitted. If no request for oral argument is made, the tentative ruling will become the order of the Court.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, persons who requested oral argument must appear for the hearing in person or remotely via Zoom, in accordance with the Court website guidelines. If appearing remotely via Zoom (video or telephone), you are responsible for ensuring you have adequate connectivity; the Court may proceed in a party's absence if technical issues arise. Proper Zoom etiquette and courtroom decorum are required, and failure to comply may result in the hearing being halted and an order to appear in person being made.

2026

Xspouse 2026-1-CA

Monthly Figures

	Father	Mother	Monthly Figures		Cash Flow	
			2026	GUIDELINE	Guideline	Proposed
Fixed Shares						
Number of children	0	2				
Percent time with NCP	49.99%	0.00%			Combined net spendable	14856 14899
Filing status	HH/MLA	HH/MLA			Percent change	0% 0%
Number of exemptions	2	2				
Wages and salary	5458	2080	Nets (unadjusted)		Father	
Self employed income	0	0	Father	12038	Payment cost/benefit	-3309 -3218
Other taxable income	11228	0	Mother	2654	Net spendable income	8729 8820
TANF CS received	0	0	Total	14692	Change from guideline	0 90
Other nontaxable income	0	0			% of combined spendable	59% 59%
New spouse income	0	0	Support		% of saving over guideline	0% 212%
Employee 401-k contribution	0	0	Addons	0	Total taxes	3467 3217
Adjustments to income	0	0	Guideln CS	2276	Dep. exemption value	0 0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	Marin SS	1555	# withholding allowances	0 0
CS paid prev marriage	0	0	Total	3831	Net wage paycheck	4418 4418
Health insurance	659	0				
Other medical expenses	0	0	Settings changed		Mother	
Property tax expenses	0	1579	Federal SS included		Payment cost/benefit	3473 3425
Ded interest expense	0	1587			Net spendable income	6127 6079
Contribution deduction	0	0	Proposed		Change from guideline	0 -48
Misc tax deductions	0	0			% of combined spendable	41% 41%
Qualified business income deduction	0	0	CS	2358	% of saving over guideline	0% -112%
Required union dues	0	0	SS	1633	Total taxes	-216 -9
Mandatory retirement	0	0	Total	3991	Dep. exemption value	0 0
Hardship deduction	0	0	Saving	43	# withholding allowances	0 0
Other GDL deductions	0	0	Releases	1	Net wage paycheck	1815 1815
Child care expenses	0	0				

Father pays Guideline CS, Guideline SS, Proposed CS, Proposed SS

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information

	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
All children		50 - 50	0	0	0 Father	2,276 Father	2,276 Father
	0000-00-00	49 - 51	0	0	0 Father	804 Father	804 Father
	0000-00-00	49 - 51	0	0	0 Father	1,472 Father	1,472 Father

EXHIBIT A

Annual Bonus Income Father

- Cost is an increase in support paid or a decrease in support received by this spouse
- Bonus income may reverse direction of CS and/or SS
- R = recipient of support

Annual bonus paid to Mother: 0
Prior relationship(s): OFF

Additional Cost to Father

Father's Bonus	Child Support		Spousal Support		Total CS	Total SS (unadjusted)
	% of bonus	\$	% of bonus	\$		
5,000	8.63	431	12.19	610	27,739	19,273
10,000	8.94	894	12.00	1,200	28,201	19,864
15,000	9.07	1,360	11.92	1,788	28,667	20,451
20,000	9.12	1,824	11.89	2,378	29,131	21,041
25,000	9.14	2,286	11.88	2,969	29,593	21,633
30,000	8.95	2,686	11.62	3,485	29,993	22,148
35,000	8.78	3,074	11.40	3,990	30,381	22,653
40,000	8.65	3,461	11.24	4,495	30,768	23,159
45,000	8.59	3,863	11.17	5,025	31,171	23,689
50,000	8.58	4,290	11.18	5,590	31,597	24,254
55,000	8.57	4,715	11.19	6,157	32,023	24,820
60,000	8.56	5,139	11.21	6,724	32,446	25,388
65,000	8.56	5,561	11.22	7,293	32,868	25,957
70,000	8.54	5,981	11.23	7,863	33,288	26,527
75,000	8.53	6,400	11.25	8,435	33,707	27,098
80,000	8.52	6,818	11.26	9,007	34,125	27,671
85,000	8.48	7,210	11.23	9,547	34,517	28,210
90,000	8.44	7,600	11.21	10,087	34,907	28,750
95,000	8.41	7,989	11.19	10,627	35,296	29,291
100,000	8.38	8,377	11.17	11,169	35,684	29,832
105,000	8.35	8,763	11.15	11,711	36,070	30,375
110,000	8.32	9,149	11.14	12,254	36,456	30,918
115,000	8.29	9,534	11.13	12,799	36,841	31,462
120,000	8.30	9,958	11.17	13,401	37,265	32,065
125,000	8.34	10,422	11.25	14,062	37,729	32,726
130,000	8.37	10,885	11.33	14,725	38,192	33,388
135,000	8.40	11,345	11.40	15,387	38,652	34,051
140,000	8.43	11,798	11.46	16,041	39,105	34,705
145,000	8.45	12,249	11.51	16,696	39,556	35,359
150,000	8.47	12,700	11.57	17,351	40,007	36,015
155,000	8.48	13,149	11.62	18,008	40,456	36,671
160,000	8.50	13,598	11.67	18,665	40,905	37,329
165,000	8.51	14,045	11.71	19,323	41,352	37,987
170,000	8.52	14,491	11.75	19,982	41,798	38,646
175,000	8.54	14,937	11.80	20,642	42,244	39,306
180,000	8.55	15,381	11.83	21,302	42,688	39,966
185,000	8.55	15,825	11.87	21,963	43,132	40,627
190,000	8.56	16,268	11.91	22,625	43,575	41,289
195,000	8.57	16,707	11.94	23,284	44,014	41,948
200,000	8.57	17,146	11.97	23,943	44,453	42,607

EXHIBIT A-1

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 5/15/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL0001156

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

PETITIONER: RICHARD F. MUNZINGER	
--	--

and

RESPONDENT: KEABNESH MUNZINGER	
-----------------------------------	--

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – COMPEL DISCOVERY FACILITATOR PROGRAM; ATTORNEY FEES AND COSTS

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Wife’s 10/22/2025 Motion to Compel Production of Documents and Sanctions. On 1/26/2026 Petitioner/Father filed the Declaration of Sean Fisher, Esq. in opposition to the Motion to Compel, together with a Memorandum of Points and Authorities. At the request of Wife, the matter was referred to the Court’s Discovery Facilitator Program. On 12/22/2025, Kathleen Merrill, Esq. was appointed Discovery Facilitator for this matter, and on 3/24/2026 Ms. Merrill filed her Report & Recommendations in which she recommended Wife’s motion to compel be denied for numerous reasons and that Wife be ordered to pay sanctions in the amount of \$10,000 for Husband’s attorneys’ fees.

On 4/23/2026 Wife filed Respondent’s Reply to Petitioner’s Response and to the Report of the Discovery Referee. Wife suggests that her failures to abide by the Code of Civil Procedure are merely “technical defects,” which she is prepared to cure. The Court finds this to be too little, too late and fails to consider all of the time that was wasted, and attorneys’ fees expended, dealing with Wife’s failure to conduct discovery in accordance with the CCP. The Reply also states that Respondent did not misuse the discovery process. The Court disagrees, as evident by the failure to abide by the CCP requirement. Finally, the Court agrees with Husband that trial was needlessly delayed for months, to his prejudice.

On 4/27/2026 Husband filed a Reply to Respondent’s Opposition to Discovery Facilitator Report and Recommendations in which he agrees with the Report & Recommendations.

Having reviewed the written submissions by the parties, including the underlying discovery requests, motion to compel, opposition to the motion to compel, the underlying discovery requests, as well as the Discovery Facilitator’s Report & Recommendations, the Court orders as follows:

1. Wife's motion to compel is denied.
2. Wife shall pay to Husband his necessary and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in connection with defending against the motion to compel, according to proof.
 - a. Counsel for Husband shall serve and lodge with the court billing statements that detail the work performed, reflect the work performed, time spent and amount charged, with only privileged information redacted by 6/26/2026.
 - b. Both parties are ordered to submit updated Income & Expense Declarations to the Court by 6/26/2026.
3. This matter is continued to 7/10/2026 for hearing to on the amount of sanctions Wife is to pay to Husband.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Father to prepare the order.

Any party who disagrees with the Court's tentative ruling and wishes to have oral argument must notify the Court at (415) 444-7046 and opposing counsel (or if the opposing party is self-represented, notice must be given directly to the opposing party) of their intent to appear at the hearing for oral argument by 4:00 pm on the court day before the hearing, as required by Marin County Superior Court Family Law Local Rules 7.12(B) and (C). Notice may be given by telephone or in person. Absent proper notice, no oral argument will be permitted. If no request for oral argument is made, the tentative ruling will become the order of the Court.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, persons who requested oral argument must appear for the hearing in person or remotely via Zoom, in accordance with the Court website guidelines. If appearing remotely via Zoom (video or telephone), you are responsible for ensuring you have adequate connectivity; the Court may proceed in a party's absence if technical issues arise. Proper Zoom etiquette and courtroom decorum are required, and failure to comply may result in the hearing being halted and an order to appear in person being made.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 5/15/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL0002008

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

PETITIONER: MONA MAHMOODI

and

RESPONDENT: EHSAN KARIMIAN

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – PROPERTY CONTROL

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on Respondent/Husband’s 3/6/2026 Request for Order (“RFO”) re: Property Control. Together with the RFO, Respondent filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities and Declaration of Ehsan Karimian. On 5/7/2025, Husband filed a Reply Declaration. To the extent that the Reply Declaration makes new arguments/requests for relief, they are improper and have been disregarded. In reliance on Family Code §2108, Respondent asks the Court to order an interim, pre-judgment release of \$995,000 to him from liquid community funds held in a joint bank account. Husband argues that this is necessary to equalize the parties’ personal exposure from community SBA loans.

On 5/4/2026, in opposition to Respondent’s request Petitioner filed a Responsive Declaration, Memorandum of Points and Authorities, Declaration of Mona Mahmoodi, Declaration of Fiona Huang, Esq. and Petitioner’s Income & Expense Declaration. She requests that Husband’s RFO be denied in its entirety and Husband pay to Wife sanctions in the amount of \$11,100 pursuant to Family Code § 271 within 7 calendar days of the hearing on this matter. Wife argues that the parties stipulated to pay a number of community property debts, only two of which are SBA loans, from community property funds held in the parties’ joint Bank of America account. The Stipulation provides the Court reserves jurisdiction over all payments and reimbursements to be equalized as part of the parties’ entire community estate; and as a result, there is no reason to make the requested, unequal award of community property funds totaling \$995,000 at this time. Moreover, Wife notes that Husband has already received advances of \$4.2 million within the last six months, so he should have more than sufficient funds to meet his living expenses.

Having reviewed and considered the parties’ written submissions, the Court finds that there is no basis under Family Code §§2040, 2550 or 2108 to make an interim, unequal award to Husband of \$995,000 in community funds. Moreover, given the clarity of the law on the issue of community property division, the Court finds Husband’s RFO to be frivolous and frustrates the policy of the law to reduce, where possible, the cost of litigation. Based on the distributions Husband has already received, as well as his monthly income as set forth in his 12/5/2025

Income & Expense Declaration, the Court finds that Husband has or is reasonably likely to have the ability to pay Wife's attorneys' fees and costs incurred in connection with this proceeding. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

1. Husband's request for an interim, pre-judgment release of \$995,000 from community funds held in the parties' joint Bank of America account is denied in its entirety.
2. Husband shall pay to Wife, according to proof, Wife's reasonable and necessary fees and costs incurred in responding to Husband's RFO.
 - a. Counsel for Wife is ordered to serve and lodge with the court by 7/2/2026 billing statements (with only privileged information redacted) detailing work performed and fees incurred in responding to the instant RFO so that the Court can assess the necessity and reasonableness of such fees and costs.
3. This matter is continued to 7/10/2026 on the issue of the amount of sanctions.

SO ORDERED.

Counsel for Wife to prepare the order.

Any party who disagrees with the Court's tentative ruling and wishes to have oral argument must notify the Court at (415) 444-7046 and opposing counsel (or if the opposing party is self-represented, notice must be given directly to the opposing party) of their intent to appear at the hearing for oral argument by 4:00 pm on the court day before the hearing, as required by Marin County Superior Court Family Law Local Rules 7.12(B) and (C). Notice may be given by telephone or in person. Absent proper notice, no oral argument will be permitted. If no request for oral argument is made, the tentative ruling will become the order of the Court.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, persons who requested oral argument must appear for the hearing in person or remotely via Zoom, in accordance with the Court website guidelines. If appearing remotely via Zoom (video or telephone), you are responsible for ensuring you have adequate connectivity; the Court may proceed in a party's absence if technical issues arise. Proper Zoom etiquette and courtroom decorum are required, and failure to comply may result in the hearing being halted and an order to appear in person being made.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 5/15/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: E CASE NO: FL0002506

PRESIDING: HON. BETH S. JORDAN

REPORTER:

CLERK: S. BOND

PETITIONER: MATTHEW CONWAY

and

RESPONDENT: BROOKE CONWAY

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD CUSTODY/VISITATION; PARENTING PROVISIONS 2) REQUEST FOR ORDER – PAYMENT ON TAX OBLIGATION

RULING

This matter is set for hearing on (1) Petitioner/Father’s 3/30/2026 Request for Order (“RFO”) re: custody/visitation regarding the parties’ three children: William (“Liam” DOB 11/22/2015), Henry (“Hank” DOB 5/21/2018) and Sarah (DOB 5/3/2021); and (2) Father’s 4/7/2025 RFO re: payment of tax obligations, advanced hearing re: vocational evaluation, Family Case Centered Resolution and sanctions.

Preliminary Matters

The Court notes that, although Father’s Reply Declaration and the Declaration of Robert L. Kaufman, Ph.D, ABPP were apparently served on Mother, neither was filed with the Court until 5/13/2026, which is untimely for a 5/15/2026 hearing. Neither the Reply nor the Declaration has or will be considered by the Court. That obviates the basis for Mother’s 5/13/2025 Written Evidentiary Objections to Dr. Kaufman’s Declaration and Father’s Reply Declaration, as well as Mother’s 5/13/2026 Sur-Reply Declaration, which also have not and will not be considered by the Court.

Custody/Visitation

On 5/5/2025, Respondent/Mother filed a Responsive Declaration re: custody and visitation in which she objects extensively to Father’s RFO.

There are no custody/visitation orders in effect. Father requests joint legal and physical custody of the children with a 2/2/5/5 schedule, proposes a holiday schedule and requests orders on collateral issues. Respondent/Mother filed a Responsive Declaration on 5/5/2026 in which she opposes virtually all of Father’s requests.

The Court notes that Mother's supporting Declaration is 19 pages long, despite the fact that the FL-320 expressly states: "The facts that I write and attach to this form cannot be longer than 10 pages, unless the Court gives me permission. Mother neither sought, nor was given, permission to exceed the 10-page limit. Counsel is admonished that should the 10-page limit be exceeded in the future, the Court will consider only the first 10 pages and strike the remainder of the Declaration.

The parties were referred to Family Court Services ("FCS") and were interviewed separately. FCS filed its Report & Recommendations with the Court on 5/7/2026. On 5/13/2026 Father filed a Statement of Agreement/Disagreement with the FCS recommendations.

Having reviewed and considered the timely written submissions by the parties, as well as the FCS Report & Recommendations and Father's Statement of Agreement/Disagreement, the Court finds that it is in the best interests of the children to adopt the FCS recommendations with the modifications set forth below. Therefore, the Court orders as follows:

Parental Responsibilities

1. The parents shall share joint legal custody of all three children. The parents shall share in the responsibility and confer in good faith on matters concerning the children's health, education and welfare. Both parents shall have access to the children's school, medical, mental health, and dental records, have the right to consult with professionals who are providing services to the children, and shall be apprised by the other parent of all medical appointments made for the children, as well as the resulting recommendations with regard to treatment and medication for the children.
2. The parents shall share joint physical custody of all three children.

Timeshare Schedule

3. All three children shall be with Matt on the following schedule (and with Brooke the remainder of the time):
 - The 1st, 2nd, and 4th weekend of the month from Friday pick up from school (or 4:00 p.m.) to Sunday at 5:30 p.m. Father shall pick the children up from school on Fridays; or if school is not in session, curbside at Mother's residence. Mother shall pick up the children on Sundays curbside at Father's residence.
 - Every Tuesday (or another agreed upon weekday) from pick up from school (or 4:00 p.m.) until 7:00 p.m. (During the summer months this shall be an overnight until 9:30 a.m. the following morning).
 - Exchanges. Father shall pick the children up at the commencement of his timeshare from school; or if school is not in session, curbside at Mother's residence. Mother shall pick the children up at the end of their timeshare with Father, curbside at Father's residence.

4. The "1st weekend of the month" is the weekend that contains the first Saturday of the month.
5. Except as set forth for the summer (No. 10 below), any additional time for Father or Mother to be with the children, or any changes to the schedule, shall occur as mutually agreed upon by the parents.

Holidays/Vacations

6. **Monday holidays:** The children shall remain in the care of the parent having custody for the preceding weekend for any Monday holidays that are not otherwise specified in the Holiday/Vacation schedule. If the children are with Father, they shall return to Brooke's custody at 5:30 on Monday night.
7. **Winter Break (February):** The regular custodial weekend schedule shall remain in place during this break and in the odd years the children shall be with Father for the weekdays, including overnights, and in the even years they shall be with Mother.
8. **Spring Break:** The regular custodial weekend schedule shall remain in place during this break and in the odd years the children shall be with Mother for the weekdays and in the even years they shall be with Father, including overnights.
9. **Mother's Day/Father's Day:** These days shall be from Saturday at 5:30 to Monday at 9:30 a.m. The children shall be with Mother every year on Mother's Day and with Father every year on Father's Day. Mother's Day is the 2nd Sunday of each May, and Father's Day is the 3rd Sunday of each June. This schedule takes precedence over the usual weekend schedule so Father will lose the 2nd weekend of the May but gain the 3rd week in June.
10. **Summer:** The regular custodial schedule shall be extended to include overnights each Tuesday and Sundays on the 1st, 2nd and 4th weekends of the month. Mother shall pick the children up curbside in time for camp, or if there is no camp scheduled, at 9:30 am. Both parents shall have the opportunity to have all three children for two 7-day vacations. The parents shall share their desired vacation dates by April 1st every year. If there is any disagreement, Brooke's preferred dates shall take priority in the odd years, and Matt's shall take priority in the even.
11. **Fourth of July:** The holiday shall be from July 3rd at 5:30 to July 5th at 9:30 a.m. The children shall be with Mother in the odd years and with Father in the even years.
12. **Parents' Birthdays (4/29 and 10/10):** Both parents have the option to have the children with them on their birthday from after school until 7:00 p.m. or if it is not a school day from 9:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
13. **Halloween:** Halloween shall be from 3:00 p.m. on 10/31 to 9:30 a.m. on 11/1. The children shall be with Father in the odd years and with Mother in the even years.

14. **Thanksgiving:** In 2026 and even years thereafter, the children shall be with Father from Friday release from school until Wednesday at 9:30 am and with Mother from Wednesday at 9:30 am until return to school Monday morning, when the regular schedule will resume. In 2027 and odd years thereafter, the children shall be with Mother from Friday release from school until Wednesday at 9:30 a.m. and with Father from Wednesday at 9:30 a.m. until return to school Monday morning when the regular schedule shall resume.
15. **Christmas:** In 2026 and even years, the children shall be with Mother from release of school at the start of the break to Christmas Day at 3:00 pm, and with Father from Christmas Day at 3:00 pm to January 1st at 5:30 when the regular schedule shall resume. In 2027 and odd years, the children shall be with Father from release of school at the start of break to Christmas Day at 3:00 p.m. and with Mother from Christmas Day at 3:00 p.m. to January 1st at 5:30 when the regular schedule shall resume.

Collateral Issues

16. The parents shall participate in co-parent counseling with an agreed-upon therapist.
 - a. If the parties are unable to agree on a co-parent counselor, they shall each provide the names of up to 3 co-parent counselors agreeable to that parent and who are readily available by 6/5/2026, and the Court will designate and appoint the co-parent counselor.
17. Except in emergencies, the parents shall use Our Family Wizard (“OFW”) to communicate, unless another method is agreed upon. Each parent shall check OFW daily and reply to any OFW communications within 24 hours. In case of emergencies, communications should be made by phone.
18. If either parent is unable to care for the children overnight during their custodial time, they shall give the other parent the right of first refusal to care for the children.
19. Neither parent shall make any disparaging comments about the other parent in the presence of the children or allow others to do so.
20. The children shall be exposed to peaceful contact only between the parents.
21. Neither parent shall use the children as a messenger for their communication.
22. This matter is set for review hearing on custody/visitation on 11/20/2026 at 9:00 am in Department E. The parties are re-referred to Family Court Services for an updated Report & Recommendation for the 11/20/2026 hearing.

Tax Obligation

Father requests an order that the 2025 community tax obligation be paid from community funds and identifies several sources for payment. Father contends Mother has unreasonably rejected his proposal, in breach of her fiduciary duties to the him and to the community, per Family Code §§ 271 and 1101. Mother stated her opposition to Father's request and the basis for her concerns in filed a Responsive Declaration In her Responsive Declaration to the initial Ex Parte Request filed a Responsive Declaration filed 4/7/2027, a Supplemental Declaration filed 4/7/2026. Mother contends that she has not unreasonably denied Father's request to pay the tax liability but has been given conflicting information regarding both the amount of community's 2025 income and the amount of the 2/2025 community tax obligation. In addition, she has not been given a copy of the proposed 2025 state and federal returns and is not satisfied with the sources of payment proposed by Father. Although Mother's Responsive Declaration suggests a different proposal in the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, no such Points and Authorities were filed with the Court (as the Courtroom Clerk confirmed with Mother's counsel).

Given the diametrically opposed scenarios presented by the parties, the Court finds it has insufficient information on which to make an order on this issue. Therefore,

23. Father's request for an order for payment of the 2025 tax obligations out of community funds designated by Father is denied, without prejudice.

Vocational Evaluation/Gavron Warning

24. Mother is ordered to undergo a vocational evaluation, to be commenced within the next 30 days with the vocational evaluator of her choice. All fees and costs for the vocational evaluation shall be paid by Father.
25. Mother is advised that it is the goal of the State of California that each party must make reasonable good-faith efforts to become self-supporting as provided in Family Code § 4320. Failure to make reasonable good-faith efforts may be one of the factors considered by the court as a basis for modifying or terminating support. See, e.g., *In re Marriage of Gavron* (1988) 203 Cal.App.3d 705.

Family-Centered Case Resolution

The Court already has measures in place that satisfy the requirements for a family-centered case resolution process, including case progress conferences, status conferences, bench bar settlement conferences, and when deemed appropriate interdisciplinary settlement conferences and judicial settlement conferences.

Sanctions

26. The Court reserves jurisdiction over, and defers rulings on, all requests for sanctions and breach of fiduciary duty.

SO ORDERED.

The Court will prepare the order.

Any party who disagrees with the Court's tentative ruling and wishes to have oral argument must notify the Court at (415) 444-7046 and opposing counsel (or if the opposing party is self-represented, notice must be given directly to the opposing party) of their intent to appear at the hearing for oral argument by 4:00 pm on the court day before the hearing, as required by Marin County Superior Court Family Law Local Rules 7.12(B) and (C). Notice may be given by telephone or in person. Absent proper notice, no oral argument will be permitted. If no request for oral argument is made, the tentative ruling will become the order of the Court.

Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, persons who requested oral argument must appear for the hearing in person or remotely via Zoom, in accordance with the Court website guidelines. If appearing remotely via Zoom (video or telephone), you are responsible for ensuring you have adequate connectivity; the Court may proceed in a party's absence if technical issues arise. Proper Zoom etiquette and courtroom decorum are required, and failure to comply may result in the hearing being halted and an order to appear in person being made.