

**SUPERIOR COURT OF MARIN
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 7/9/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL 095748

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: MILES ARCHER
WOODLIEF

and

RESPONDENT: JENNIFER LYNN
WOODLIEF

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – COMMUNITY ASSETS

RULING

This matter is before the Court following Petitioner/Husband's May 22, 2026, Request for Order (RFO) for accounting and turnover of community assets.

Husband request for Respondent/Wife to be ordered to account for all proceeds she has received in connection with her books "Ski to Die" and "A Wall of White," including without limitation book royalties, book option payments, purchase price (if movie goes to production), contingent compensation, and back-end royalties from film, (collectively "Proceeds"), and specifically including any such Proceeds from Convergence Entertainment and Martin Scorsese, and immediately turnover to Movant his 50% community interest in such Proceeds.

On June 26, 2026, Wife filed a Responsive Declaration. Wife states that Husband's argument is premature as she states that she has received no money to provide accounting for. Wife states that she gave an option for her book for free in 2025. Wife request that Court order Petitioner to pay her one-half of the value of the Truckee residence (minus the mortgage) or order the home sold and she be paid her share if the court is to entertain Husband's request.

Judgment on the parties' dissolution was entered on December 17, 2009. There is no evidence that proceeds from writing, if indeed there are any, are community property that Husband is entitled to. The Judgment and the attachment to the Judgment make no mention of royalties or of community assets. Further, Husband's Petition of Dissolution states that there are no community or quasi community assets subject to disposition. The Judgment lists only retirement assets for disposition. Therefore, there is no basis in the Judgment for addressing supposed assets.

Here, Husband has not presented any actual evidence that proceeds have been received that would qualify as a community asset. Moreover, Husband has not provided sufficient evidence

that there is a reasonable basis for ordering an accounting in this matter. Wife has indicated that she has received no money. Husband has not provided any contrary evidence suggesting that there are unacknowledged community assets that may be subject to division.

Accordingly, Husband's request for accounting and turnover of community assets is denied.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the Court shall prepare the Findings and Order After Hearing.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 7/9/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL 1502263

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: MAHMOUD SHIRAZI

and

RESPONDENT: FARANAK HAGHIGHI

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER - SPOUSAL SUPPORT

RULING

This matter is before the Court on Petitioner/Husband's May 20, 2026, Request for Order (RFO) to modify the Spousal Support as ordered in the April 14, 2023, Findings and Order After Hearing (FOAH). The FOAH modified post-Judgment spousal support, after consideration of the Family Code §4320 factors, to \$600 per month, payable to Husband by Respondent/Wife through December of 2024. After December 2024, spousal support would terminate unless Husband failed to qualify for Wife's social security derivative benefit.

Husband requests \$8,000 a month in spousal support. Husband asserts that he is unable to maintain the marital standard of living despite his efforts, and he now requires support in order to be able to retire due to his medical condition.

Wife's June 23, 2026, response urges the Court to deny Husband's request because it is not based on a material change of circumstances.

A request to modify spousal support may be granted only if the party seeking the modification shows a material change of circumstance since the most recent order. *Marriage of West*, (2007) 152 Cal.App.4th 240, 260.

Family Code §4320

In addressing post-judgment requests for spousal support, the Court must consider factors outlined in Family Code §4320.

1. *The extent of earning capacity to maintain the standard of living established during the marriage.*

Husband reports that Wife's earnings supported the parties throughout the marriage in what he states was a middle-class lifestyle.

2. *The extent to which the supported party contributed to the supporting party's education, training, and career path.*

Husband states that he played a pivotal role in Wife obtaining her Nursing license but does not provide evidence of how.

3. *Supporting party's ability to pay.*

Wife does have the ability to pay support if ordered by the court.

4. *Each party's needs based on the standard of living.*

Husband currently receives Social Security retirement income. He continues to live on a boat in San Rafael. He still reports having the mini mart and is driving for Lyft. Husband states that he has never been able to establish the standard of living that he grew accustomed to. Husband reports having \$5,490 in monthly expenses while having \$6,222 in total income.

Wife is employed and continues to be able to maintain her standard of living on her own.

5. *Obligations and Assets.*

At the April 13, 2023, hearing, Husband reported having property in another country. On his May 20, 2026, Income and Expense Declaration, Husband indicated that he has "lots of land \$15,000" valued at \$14,510. Husband does not specify its location or whether it is income-producing. He reports having \$67,360 in outstanding debt that he pays \$1,021 a month for.

Wife reports monthly income as a nurse at MarinHealth of \$14,980 (base salary) plus \$6,111 (last months' overtime), \$2,696 in social security retirement, \$2,017 as adjunct faculty at Dominican, \$2,275 as a staff nurse at Kaiser, for a total of \$28,069 in her nurse's salary, and \$12,275 in monthly expenses. She reports owning \$743,000 in assets.

6. *Duration of the marriage.*

This was a long-term, 18-year marriage.

7. *The supporting party's ability to be gainfully employed without interfering with the interests of the dependent children.*

There are no children from this relationship.

8. *Each party's age and health.*

Husband is now 75 ½ and in relatively good health. However, he reports he has lower back and sciatica issues because of his time driving for Uber. In the past, he reported his work at the mini-mart negatively affected his back, however, he does not report how running the mini-mart is affecting him. He reports that he is now in need of retiring to live a "good, relax life".

Wife is 64 and in good health.

9. *History of domestic violence.*

Husband does not make indication of there being a history of domestic violence. However, at the last hearing, the Court reported that there is a history of domestic violence, with a history of violence and verbal abuse by the Husband upon Wife. Hon. Beverly Wood included a finding in

the Judgment entered on July 16, 2016, that Wife was a victim of sustained mental and physical abuse. Wife has undergone treatment for post-traumatic stress.

10. *Immediate and specific tax consequences to each party.*

Spousal support is no longer tax deductible for Wife.

11. *Balance of hardships.*

Wife reports that for many years, she worked multiple jobs and long hours to support their family and subsidize Husband's business losses. Wife states that she continues to work to support herself and prepare for her own retirement. Wife's monthly income was reported at \$13,035 at the April 2023 hearing. Her current monthly income has approximately doubled in the last 3 years.

Husband states that he is 75 ½ years old and that he is living in "extreme hardship" living at a shipyard with chemical dust and noise and his weak back and side make it difficult to go up and down the ladder to get into the boat. He also states he is "not happy" about all the debt he must carry. At the April 2023 hearing, Father reported making \$323 in Social Security retirement. His Social Security retirement income has gone up to \$1,372.

Both parties report an increase in their income and this not a hardship.

12. *Criminal convictions.*

None reported.

13. *Any other relevant factors.*

Husband states that this was a long marriage and that the Court should "issue a very good amount of spousal support that [he] is due for."

At the April 13, 2023, hearing, the Court stated that spousal support duration may be indefinite "in the event that the Husband cannot qualify for Wife's social security derivate payment" which would go into effect once Wife turned 62. According to Wife, that event has now happened and therefore Spousal support should remain as issued on June 13, 2026.

As a threshold matter, "[c]ircumstances accounted for in the previous order cannot constitute a change of circumstances." *Marriage of Khera & Sameer* (2012) 206 Cal.App.4th 1467. Based on the information provided to the Court, Husband does not demonstrate a change of circumstances. Accordingly, Husband's request for a modification of spousal support is DENIED.

Counsel for Wife is ordered to prepare the formal Findings and Order After Hearing.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be

permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 7/9/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL 1804292

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: CHRISTINA YSABELLA MURILLO MORENO	
and	
RESPONDENT: JUAN JOSE MORENO, JR.	

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW HEARING – CHILD CUSTODY/VISITATION

RULING

This Court entered a Findings and Order after Hearing (FOAH) on July 28, 2025. Under the terms of FOAH, the parents—Juan Moreno (Father) and Christina Murillo (Mother)—agreed to a framework relating to visitation and school selection for their shared son Juan (DOB 11/07/2017). The FOAH further provided that the parents were to contact Marin Family Court Services (FCS) in May 2026, to review school preferences and evaluate the visitation conditions and terms agreed to by the parties and ordered by this Court.

The parents complied with this direction in the FOAH and FCS has conducted further mediation with the parties, as reflected in FCS’s report of June 11, 2026. In addition, FCS interviewed the parties’ son, Juan.

Under the terms of this Court’s previous FOAH, during the school year Juan is in Mother’s custody on the first, third, and fifth weekends of the month from Friday after school through Sunday evening. Commencing Summer 2026, Juan shall be in the custody of Mother for the summer, returning one week before school starts. During the summer, Father has custody on alternate weekends and for one two-week vacation.

As to the question of school choice, both parents now live in Sonoma County. The school choice issue, however, remains in dispute as Father would like Juan to continue attending Hamilton Elementary in Novato while Mother would like Juan to attend her neighborhood school in the Santa Rosa school district (Luther Burbank).

As a threshold matter, as neither parent resides in Marin County, venue for this matter needs to be transferred to Sonoma County where both parents reside following the 6/25/26 hearing in Marin. Mother reports that she has filed in Sonoma County to transfer their case, and a hearing has been scheduled for 8/27/26 in Sonoma Family Court.

As to the question of school selection, the Court finds good cause, based on a review of the materials submitted, and that it is in the best interest of the child that Juan attend Luther Burbank Elementary in Mother's school district beginning school year 2026 – 2027. As Mother is available to provide care and individual attention to Juan, the Court further orders Juan to be in Mother's custody during the school week.

As reflected in the FCS report, the quality of communication between the parties is constructive and positive. The texts submitted by Mother showing communications between her, Father, and Juan's stepmother show respectful and friendly coparenting communications between the adults in Juan's life. That bodes well for continued and healthy coparenting which as the parties transition to a shared custody schedule now that Mother has moved closer to Father's home. The Court adopts the recommendations of the FCS report, as modified, as follows: All prior orders not in conflict with the below shall remain in effect with the following modifications.

1. Venue for this matter shall be transferred to Sonoma County where both parents reside. Custody orders issued following the 6/25/26 hearing in Marin County shall be lodged with Sonoma County Family Court. All future custody filings shall be filed in Sonoma County.
2. Joint legal custody.
3. Joint physical custody.
4. Unless otherwise agreed to between the parents, commencing school year 2026 – 2027, Juan shall attend school at Luther Burbank in Sonoma County.
5. Parental Timeshare:
 - a. During the school year, Juan shall be in Mother's custody during the school week and alternate weekends. Father shall have custody on alternate weekends from Friday after school through noon on Sunday. If Father is not working on Sunday, Jr. shall remain in his custody until Monday morning drop off at school. If Father is not working on Fridays, he shall have custody on Fridays from after school through 9 AM Saturday morning in the weeks opposite his alternate weekends.
 - b. Summers: In addition to the schedule that is in place during the school year, Father may have additional custody time during the weekdays in the summers when he is not working.
6. There shall be no corporal punishment of Juan.
7. Parents may modify the timeshare at any time per mutual parental agreement.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the Court shall prepare the Findings and Order After Hearing.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 7/6/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL 1900469

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: MICHAEL WOLF

and

RESPONDENT: LAURA PUCCI

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – TERMINATE DVRO

RULING

This matter is before the Court on Respondent/Mother's May 11, 2026, *ex-parte* Request for Order to modify custody and visitation regarding the parties' child Bodhi (DOB: 01/20/2018). Mother also requests to terminate the 3-year DVRO that was issued on August 22, 2024.

Procedural History

The *ex parte* application was heard on May 11, 2026, where Mother's request was denied and set for hearing on May 19, 2026, in order to set a hearing schedule. On May 19, 2026, the matter was continued to July 9, 2026, with all existing orders in effect and the parties referred to Marin Family Court Services for mediation, counseling and recommendations.

This case has a detailed and complicated procedural history. There are at least two orders that are at the center of Mother's request: (1) the Findings and Order After Hearing dated May 15, 2025, and (2) the Domestic Violence Restraining Order dated August 22, 2024.

At a hearing on May 15, 2025, the Court confirmed that Father was granted sole legal and physical custody of the parties' child and was allowed to relocate to Mexico. The order followed an evidentiary hearing on March 26, 2025, that involved testimony from both parties and an additional six witnesses. The Court found that Mother did not meet her burden of proving that Bodhi's moving to Mexico would be detrimental to the child.

The restraining order that issued by this Court on August 22, 2024, is for a period of three years and grants Father sole legal and physical custody of Bodhi with supervised visits to Mother.

Discussion

Mother request that the Court order joint legal and physical custody, restore communication via OFW, Sun/Wed 6pm PST, commencing no later than Mother's Day, and specify that all visitations be unsupervised. Mother also request a hearing date for full custody re-evaluation under FC 3011, 3044, 3111 as well as make-up visitation with grandparents for one month during the summer of 2026.

On June 29, 2026, Father submitted a Responsive Declaration. He requests that Mother's requests be denied. He states that Mother's request for the child to have visitation in New Jersey with supervision by the Maternal Grandmother is a ploy "to circumvent the restraining order".

Family Code §3044 states that "Upon a finding by the court that a party seeking custody of a child has perpetrated domestic violence within the previous five years...there is a rebuttable presumption that an award of sole or joint physical or legal custody of a child to a person who has perpetrated domestic violence is detrimental to the best interest of the child, pursuant to [Sections 3011](#) and [3020](#). This presumption may only be rebutted by a preponderance of the evidence."

On July 6, 2026, Marin Family Court Services (FCS) submitted its report following interviews with both parties. Recommendations were made by FCS, including that all orders remain in effect and a schedule for contact with Mother was made. This is the fifth report prepared by FCS with respect to this family (prior reports are dated 6/17/2024, 5/1/2024, 3/18/2024, and 4/25/2019).

On July 7, 2026, Father submitted a statement of agreement/disagreement. Father does not agree to the Maternal grandmother, Kathy, being the supervisor. Father also wants the ability to change the calls if there is a scheduling conflict.

Order

Based on the information before the court, the Court finds good cause and that it is the best it the minor child, Bodhi (DOB: 01/20/2018), to adopt the FCS recommendations, as set forth in its report issued on June 30, 2026, as modified by the Court, as follows:

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

1. Laura shall have the opportunity to have reasonable text communication with Bodhi, which shall be monitored by Michael. "Reasonable" shall be construed as no more than twice a week of Mother-initiated texts. In addition, Mother may respond to texts initiated by Bodhi. Such responses shall not be counted in the twice-a week texts.
2. Laura shall have video calls with Bodhi through Our Family Wizard every 1st, 3rd, and 5th (if any) Sunday of the month at 6:00 p.m. Mexico time. Visits shall be anywhere from 20 minutes to 60 minutes, depending on Bodhi's interest and participation. Visits shall be supervised by Laura's mother, Kathy, or another supervisor agreed upon by

Michael. Any supervisors shall review the court guidelines for supervision and shall abide by them.

3. Any contact or visits between Bodhi and any of his grandparents shall occur as arranged and agreed upon by Michael.
4. The current orders around visits and contact with Bodhi shall be reviewed in March of 2027.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the Court shall prepare the Findings and Order After Hearing.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 7/9/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL 2103195

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: NICHOLAUS CLARENCE
GARCIA

and

RESPONDENT: MICHELE WEIR GARCIA

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – VEXATIOUS LITIGANT
REQUEST 2) REQUEST FOR ORDER – VISITATION

RULING

Respondent/Mother Michele Weir has filed two Requests for Order (RFO). First, Mother filed a RFO on May 28, 2026, relating to custody and visitation of the parties' three minor children, Jaxson (FOB 8/3/2012), Tamzin (DOB 3/8/2015), and Bellamy (DOB 6/12/2017). Second, Mother has filed a Request that Petitioner/Father Be Declared a Vexatious Litigant under California Code of Civil Procedure section 391.7 and 391.1. As to this second RFO, Mother requests this Court impose a pre-filing order requiring that all proposed litigation be submitted to the Presiding Judge and that the Presiding Judge permit the filing only if it appears to have merit and is not intended for harassment or delay. Further Mother seeks an order for deposit of security of \$7,500 which would constitute a fund for reimbursement for continued abuses as well as serve to deter Father from his alleged on-going abuses of the judicial system. The Court addresses each of these RFOs below.

Request for Order regarding Visitation and Custody

Mother filed a request to modify visitation and custody orders and decrease Father's time with the children due to Father's failure to comply with current orders of this Court. Specifically, Mother seeks to suspend Father's alternating Thursday overnights until Father complies with the Findings and Order After Hearing of December 19, 2025 (FOAH). Mother identifies three areas of Father's noncompliance: (1) failure to move forward with co-parenting counseling, (2) failure to respond in a timely way to Our Family Wizard messages, and (3) failure to provide check-ins with the children as set out in the FOAH during Father's custodial time.

The parties were referred to Marin Family Court Services (FCS) for mediation, counseling and recommendations. Both parties were interviewed. FCS submitted its report dated July 3, 2026.

This is the fifth report prepared by FCS involving this family.

FCS expresses concern regarding the parents' continuing struggles to coparent effectively. The Court shares this concern. The parents were directed to engage in coparenting counseling in December of 2025. Father subsequently filed a motion for reconsideration relating to this aspect of the Court's order. Father's motion for reconsideration was denied March 10, 2026. Despite the passage of time, the parties have not made progress selecting a coparenting counselor or initiating coparenting counseling.

Further, the parties are having trouble with respect to the administration of medication for their daughters.

The FOAH provides a detailed framework for visitation. Despite this level of detail, the parties have had trouble adhering to certain directions/conditions. Specifically, as to the check-ins with the children and timeliness of responses on Our Family Wizard. The Court has considered the submissions of the parties and finds good cause and that it is the best interest of the children to adopt the recommendations of FCS as modified, as follows:

All prior orders not in conflict with the below shall remain in effect with the following modifications.

1. No changes to the timeshare as provided for in the FAOH filed 12/19/25.
2. Mother shall have sole legal custody for purposes of directing medical care for the children.
3. Father shall submit the names of 2-3 in network coparenting counselors who have experience working with high conflict families to the list of coparenting counselors suggested by Mother for the Court to make a final selection. Father shall submit the names to this Court within 15 calendar days of the entry of this Order.
4. Parents shall comply with orders to participate in coparenting counseling.
5. Parents are to comply with FOAH 4(d)(1) by agreeing to a set time when the one five-minute telephone or video call per day, per child is to occur. This shall be a default, reserved time. The parties may agree to move the time for their convenience.
6. Tamzin shall be tested for ADD. Parents shall cooperate with getting Tamzin tested for ADD.
7. Father shall ensure that the children receive any needed medications to treat their asthma and allergies during his custody time.
8. Neither parent shall release confidential FCS reports to anyone not expressly authorized by the court to view the reports.

The Court is directing the parties to appear to address a concern raised by Marin Family Court Services that unauthorized individuals have received FCS reports. FCS urges this Court to issue an order prohibiting such individuals from disseminating the reports and directing them to immediately delete the reports. FCS further recommends that Father shall contact all individuals to whom he released FCS reports to provide them with a copy of such a court order instructing recipients to delete all FCS reports they have received.

Parties are ordered to appear. A copy of a proposed order is attached to this tentative.

Request for Order that Father Be Declared a Vexatious Litigant

Mother has filed an RFO seeking orders from this Court that Father be declared a vexatious litigant. Her request is supported by two detailed declarations (from Mother and her counsel).

Father has opposed the request and filed a Memorandum of Points and Authorities that greatly exceeds the page limits imposed by the State Court Rules. Father also provided a Request for Judicial Notice. Mother has provided detailed evidentiary objections to Father's submissions and urges this Court to disregard all of Father's Memorandum which violates court rules.

Mother's objection to the Memorandum is overruled. The Court, however, advises Father that failure to comply with Court filing rules may be a basis for striking filings. Father is instructed to comply with page limits as well as the requirement that all submissions to the Court are to be double-spaced.

Mother has submitted reply papers filed with this Court on July 6, 2026, together with a supporting declaration seeking relief from the filing deadline requirements. In response, Father filed a seven and a half page single-spaced objection to the Court considering the reply papers.

As to Mother's *ex parte* application for late filing of the reply papers, the application is granted. The Court finds good cause based on review of the papers, including the Declaration of Kristine Cirby. Father's objections to Mother's reply papers are overruled.

Turning to the merits of the underlying motion, the Court offers the following analysis. Mother's Request for Order chronicles a procedural history that is deeply concerning to this Court.

Under California law, a "vexatious litigant" is defined by Civil Procedure Code (CPC) § 391(b) as a person who, acting in propria persona, repeatedly files meritless lawsuits, motions, or pleadings; initiates or prosecutes numerous litigations; relitigates issues previously decided against them; or has been declared vexatious in related actions. The statute specifically applies to family law proceedings (Fam. Code § 210) and allows courts to impose prefilings orders requiring the litigant to obtain court permission before filing new actions or motions, excluding discovery motions.

In evaluating a request that a party be declared a vexatious litigant, the court need not find a likelihood of success in future cases (or motions) to impose such an order. Rather, the court acts prospectively to prevent abuse of judicial resources. Such orders may include requiring security

for costs and may be subject to modification if there is a material change in circumstances (CPC §§ 391-391.8; *In re Marriage of Rifkin & Carty* (2015) 234 Cal.App.4th 1339).

The determination of whether a party is a “vexatious litigant” involves weighing factual evidence, considering the litigant's history of filings, and assessing the party’s reasonable probability of prevailing. California Courts apply their discretion guided by statutory standards and case law, recognizing that the purpose is to curb "persistent and obsessive" groundless litigation that burdens courts.

Self-represented litigants receive no special leniency and are subject to the same sanctions as represented parties.

California courts have applied these standards directly in dissolution and custody proceedings. In *In re Marriage of Rifkin & Carty*, a family court found a father to be a vexatious litigant under § 391(b)(3) based on his repeated filing of unmeritorious motions in propria persona, and imposed a prefiling order requiring him to obtain leave before filing new litigation in Los Angeles County Superior Court (*In re Marriage of Rifkin & Carty*, 234 Cal.App. 4th 1339 (2015).) Similarly, in *In re Marriage of Deal*, a husband was designated a vexatious litigant even though he had only been a respondent to his wife's dissolution petition and the appellant on appeal, confirming that the designation is not limited to parties who initiated the underlying family law action (*In re Marriage of Deal*, 45 Cal.App.5th 613 (2020).) Most recently, in *In re Marriage of Kouvabina & Veltman*, the Court of Appeal sua sponte issued an order to show cause and ultimately declared a wife a vexatious litigant based on nine prior litigations initiated pro se in connection with a dissolution of marriage, imposing a prefiling order under § 391.7. (*In re Marriage of Kouvabina & Veltman*, 115 Cal.App.5th 293 (2025).)

Here, Father’s behavior in this litigation has been problematic and resulted in Mother incurring substantial fees to address what, in many cases, may be considered routine matters. The Court is not prepared, however, *at this time*, to declare Father a vexatious litigant. Father has devoted substantial energy seeking to comply with the California Code of Civil Procedure, the Family Code, and this Court’s local rules. This effort to comply has not always been successful, as evidenced by Father’s opposition papers to this motion. Moreover, Father has taken positions that have been found to be without merit. But the Court does not find that Father’s litigation tactics have been taken with the intent to cause delay, abuse the process, or inflict injury. Based on the extensive record before this Court, the Court does not find that Father’s tactics taken for the purpose of delay or overtly frivolous.

It is also clear to this Court that Father is imposing a substantial burden on Mother in terms of addressing the myriad motions, objections, and appellate proceedings. To date, Father’s repeated writ filings have been unsuccessful. The Court does not address the merits of these proceedings. But the Court cannot ignore the substantial, cumulative financial burden this has put on Mother. Father is encouraged to seek guidance from the Legal Self Help Center as he continues through this legal proceeding.

Counsel for Mother to prepare the Findings and Order After Hearing.

Separate attached Order (with Caption)

NAME OF ORDER: ORDER PROHIBITING DISSEMINATION AND MANDATING DELETION OF CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

TO PERSONS WHO HAVE RECEIVED CONFIDENTIAL MARIN FAMILY COURT SERVICES CUSTODY REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It has come to the Court's attention that confidential Marin Family Court Services Custody Reports and Recommendations have been disclosed. Such reports are dated 10/15/21, 5/31/22, 6/3/23, and 6/26/25 involving the family in the above-entitled case.

Any individuals who received, but were not authorized to receive, Marin Family Court Services reports in this case are prohibited from disseminating the reports and shall immediately delete such reports.

[Signature Judge James Schurz]

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 7/9/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0001759

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: SILVIO SANTOS
VICENTE

and

RESPONDENT: MARIA MAZARIEGOS
CIFUENTES

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER - SPOUSAL SUPPORT

RULING

This matter is before the Court on Respondent/Wife's May 28, 2026, Request for Order (RFO) requesting pendente lite spousal support, property control, \$10,000 in attorney fees, and exclusive use of the marital home in Novato, CA. The parties have one child, Damian, (DOB 5/13/22).

Pendente Lite Spousal support

Wife's May 28, 2026, Income and Expense Declaration (IED) reported \$1,932 in income and \$2,024 in expenses.

Husband's June 24, 2026, IED reported \$6,971 in income from wages last month and \$9,784 in expenses, \$1,549 in work-related childcare expenses and \$339 for the child's health care expenses not covered by insurance. Wife alleges that Husband is receiving unreported rental income.

On July 1, 2026, Wife submitted calculations for spousal support. However, Wife's calculations uses income from a job that Husband hasn't worked at since April of 2026. Additionally, neither of the submitted calculations factor in Husband's childcare expenses or uninsured medical expenses for their son. The calculations also account for unreported rental income for Husband. Wife doesn't provide any proof of the rental income either.

The following monthly inputs were used in running an XSpouse calculation.

Wife:

1. \$2,285 average income, including overtime, from her four provided paystubs.

Husband:

1. \$6,131 average income, including overtime, from his four provided paystubs.

Husband has no deductions.

Husband claims \$1,549 in work-related childcare and \$339 health insurance costs (Husband claims this is his uninsured health care cost in one place, and claims it is cost of health insurance for the child in another place). This is subject to Husband providing supporting documentation.

Based on the above inputs, effective May 28, 2026, Husband must pay to Wife *pendente lite* spousal support in the amount of \$687 per month, payable one-half on the 1st and one-half on the 15th of each month. Spousal support shall continue until Wife remarries, either party dies, or further Court order. Spousal support is neither taxable to the recipient nor deductible by the payor.

Attorney fees

Wife submitted a declaration stating that her attorney charges \$500 an hour, that she has incurred \$7,327 in fees and costs related solely to the dissolution proceedings. Her IED also reports \$2,775 in outstanding balance of attorney fees. Wife states that Husband has the ability to pay for her attorney fees because he is living in the family home and renting out 2 bedrooms in the house.

On June 10, 2026, Husband's attorney substituted out and Husband is now self-represented. Husband states that he has outstanding balance of \$5,000 in attorney fees from his former attorney. (Father also shows in his IED a total of \$10,400 in outstanding legal fees.)

Based on the record before this Court, the Court does not find that Father has the ability to pay Mother's attorney's fees at this time. Accordingly, Mother's request for a contribution of attorney's fees in the amount of \$10,000 is denied.

Property Control- Exclusive use of Marital Home

On January 26, 2026, the court granted each party's request for Domestic Violence Restraining Orders. Husband's December 17, 2025, Temporary DVRO required Wife to move out of the Novato property; both parties acknowledge that Husband has continued to live in the marital home.

Per Fam. Code §6340, "(c) The court may issue an order...excluding a person from a dwelling if the court finds that physical or emotional harm would otherwise result... a minor child of the parties..."

Wife has not presented any evidence to support a Court order that Husband move out of the marital home. In fact, the basis for Wife's request is that Husband is a higher earner and thus has the ability to rent an apartment. However, Wife, per her IED, states that she pays rent in the amount of \$800. Husband's IED states that he pays the mortgage of the marital home in the amount of \$3,011.17. It would not be a financial benefit to Wife who is asking for spousal support to meet her needs.

Accordingly, Wife's request for exclusive use of the marital home is denied.

Counsel for Mother to prepare the Findings and Order After Hearing.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

Fixed Shares	Father	Mother	Monthly figures		Cash Flow		Guideline	Proposed
#of children	1	0	2026					
% time with NCP	0.00 %	40.00 %	GUIDELINE		Comb. net spendable		6904	6904
Filing status	MFS->	<-MFS	Nets(adjusted)		Percent change		0%	0%
# exemptions	2 *	1 *			Father			
Wages+salary	6971	1932	Father	5204	Payment cost/benefit		-687	-687
Self-employed income	0	0	Mother	1700	Net spendable income		4517	4517
Other taxable income	0	0	Total	6904	Change from guideline		0	0
TANF+CS received	0	0	Support		% of combined spendable		65%	65%
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	0	% of saving over guideline		0%	0%
New spouse income	0	0	Guideln CS	0	Total taxes		1428	1428
401(k) employee contrib	0	0	Marin SS	687	Dep. exemption value		0	0
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	687	# withholding allowances		0	0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	-		Net wage paycheck		5054	5054
CS paid prev marriage	0	0	Settings changed		Mother			
Health insurance	339	0			Payment cost/benefit		687	687
Other medical expense	0	0			Net spendable income		2387	2387
Property tax expense	0	0			Change from guideline		0	0
Ded interest expense	0	0	Proposed		% of combined spendable		35%	35%
Charitable contributions	0	0	Tactic 9		% of saving over guideline		0%	0%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	CS	0	Total taxes		232	232
Qual bus income ded	0	0	SS	687	Dep. exemption value		0	0
Required union dues	0	0	Total	687	# withholding allowances		0	0
Mandatory retirement	0	0			Net wage paycheck		1601	1601
Hardship deduction	0 *	0 *	Saving	0				
Other GDL deductions	0	0	Releases	0				
Child care expenses	0	0						

Father pays Guideline SS, Proposed SS

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information									
	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons	Payor	Basic CS	Payor	Pres CS	Payor
All children	60 - 40	0	0	0	Father	0	Father	0	Father
Damian	60 - 40	0	0	0	Father	0	Father	0	Father

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 7/9/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0001943

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: DAVE FEIFERIS

and

RESPONDENT: ADRIANA FEIFERIS

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – ENFORCEMENT OF
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

RULING

This matter is before the Court following Petitioner/Husband's May 18, 2026 Request for Order (RFO) for compliance with the settlement agreement that was attached to the Judgment that was filed December 16, 2026.

On June 30, 2026, Respondent/Wife submitted a responsive declaration. Wife states she is committed to complying with the agreement and requests an additional 30 days to do so.

The Court continues the matter to September 3, 2026.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 7/9/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0002203

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: ANTONIO VASQUEZ

and

RESPONDENT: JULIA CONTRERAS

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

RULING

This matter is before the Court on Petitioner/Father's May 21, 2026, Request for Order (RFO) to modify child visitation and support regarding the parties' two shared children, Abigail (DOB: 12/16/2013) and Aaliyah (DOB: 11/13/2021).

Father seeks to expand his timeshare to have the children on the second, third, and fourth weekends from Friday 7 PM through Sunday 7 PM with Mother to drop the children off on Friday evening and he will return them to her on Sunday evening. Father also requests to change the child support order that was issued in the Judgment on November 20, 2025, in the amount of \$856 per month payable by Father.

Mother filed a responsive declaration indicating that she is opposed to Father's requests. She states that she works full-time and would not want to lose time with their daughters by limiting her time with them during the weekends. To provide Father with the option to have more time with the children, Mother proposes that Father have weeknight dinners.

On June 23, 2026, Marin Family Court Services (FCS) submitted its report. The parties were both interviewed by FCS.

Child Support

Father submitted his Income and Expense Declaration (IED) on May 21, 2026. Father reports \$3,640 in W2 wages (he reports working 40 hours a week at \$21.00 an hour). He reports his tax filing as single. Consistent with the recommendations from FCS, Father will have 13% parenting time. Father did not comply with Local Rule MCR Fam §7.13 and did not submit his current taxes.

Mother also did not comply with Local Rule MCR Fam §7.13 and did not submit current paycheck stubs for her jobs. Mother's June 15, 2026, IED reports that she makes \$8,670 in W2 income as well \$856 in monthly child support from Father. Mother's custodial time is 87%.

The following inputs were used in the attached XSpouse calculations.

Father's monthly inputs:

1. \$3,640 income
2. 13% timeshare

Mother's monthly inputs:

1. \$8,670 income
2. 87% timeshare

Based on the foregoing, the court calculates child support to be \$787, payable by Father to Mother, payable half on the first day of each month and half on the 15th day of each month, continuing until further order of this Court, or until the child involved marries, dies, is emancipated, reaches age 19, or reaches age 18 and is not a full-time high school student, whichever occurs first.

Child Visitation

The Court has reviewed the report from FCS as well as the submissions of the parties. The Court finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the children to adopt the recommendations from FCS as it relates to child custody and visitation, as modified, as follows:

All prior orders not in conflict with the below shall remain in effect with the following modifications.

1. Parental Timeshare: The children shall be in Father's custody on the second and fourth weekends from Friday 7 PM through Sunday 7 PM. Whenever he is available to do so, Father may have an afterschool visit with the children during the weekdays until 7 PM provided he gives Mother at least one-week advance notice. Father may have additional parenting time with the children at any time per mutual parental agreement. The children shall be in Mother's custody at all other times when not in Father's custody.
2. Father shall continue to be responsible for transportation for the exchanges until further court order. Father shall pick up and drop off the children at Mother's home.
3. Abigail shall be encouraged to participate in the weekly Friday 5:30 PM video call with Father. However, she shall not be mandated to do so. Father and Abigail may connect with one another at any time via text, calls, etc. during the week.
4. The children shall not address Father by his first name.

5. If the “Parenting Education & Child Development Course” class that Father completed cannot be verified through a course syllabus as a coparenting class, Father shall complete a coparenting class such as the class entitled “Divorce/Coparenting Education & Family Stabilization Course” offered through American Integrity Courses. Father may complete a coparenting class through another provider if he chooses.
6. Provided that Father has completed his coparenting class, has been consistent in exercising his alternating weekend custody time, has continued to adhere to court orders, and provided the custody schedule has been working well for the girls, joint legal custody shall be awarded commencing November 25, 2026.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the Court shall prepare the Findings and Order After Hearing.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party’s absence.

Fixed Shares	Father	Mother	Monthly figures	Cash Flow	Guideline	Proposed
#of children	0	2	2026			
% time with NCP	13.00 %	0.00 %				
Filing status	SINGLE	SINGLE	GUIDELINE	Comb. net spendable	9736	9736
# exemptions	1 *	3 *	Nets(adjusted)	Percent change	0%	0%
Wages+salary	3640	8670	Father	Father		
Self-employed income	0	0	Mother	Payment cost/benefit	-787	-664
Other taxable income	0	0	Total	Net spendable income	2219	2342
TANF+CS received	0	0	Support	Change from guideline	0	123
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	% of combined spendable	23%	24%
New spouse income	0	0	Guideln CS	% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
401(k) employee contrib	0	0	Marin SS	Total taxes	634	410
Adjustments to income	0	0	Total	Dep. exemption value	0	0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	-	# withholding allowances	0	0
CS paid prev marriage	0	0	Settings changed	Net wage paycheck	2892	2892
Health insurance	0	0		Mother		
Other medical expense	0	0		Payment cost/benefit	787	664
Property tax expense	0	0		Net spendable income	7516	7393
Ded interest expense	0	0	Proposed	Change from guideline	0	-123
Charitable contributions	0	0	Tactic 9	% of combined spendable	77%	76%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	CS	% of saving over guideline	0%	0%
Qual bus income ded	0	0	SS	Total taxes	1940	2165
Required union dues	0	0	Total	Dep. exemption value	0	0
Mandatory retirement	0	0		# withholding allowances	0	0
Hardship deduction	0 *	0 *	Saving	Net wage paycheck	6053	6053
Other GDL deductions	0	0	Releases			
Child care expenses	0	0	Released to Father			

Father pays Guideline CS, Proposed CS

FC 4055 checking: ON

Per Child Information	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons	Payor	Basic CS	Payor	Pres CS	Payor
All children	13 - 87	0	0	0	Father	787	Father	787	Father
Abigail	13 - 87	0	0	0	Father	287	Father	287	Father
Aaliyah	13 - 87	0	0	0	Father	500	Father	500	Father

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 7/9/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0002346

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: ROBERT VIRAMONTES

and

RESPONDENT: KALEY CLONEY

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

RULING

This matter is before the Court following Respondent/Mother's May 22, 2026, *ex parte* Request for Order (RFO) for custody and visitation regarding the parties' children, Camden (DOB: 06/28/2018) and Hudson (DOB: 04/07/2020). Mother requested joint legal and physical custody.

On May 22, 2026, the court granted temporary sole legal/physical custody to Mother. On May 29, 2026, the court continued temporary sole custody to Mother and awarded Father non-professional supervised visits on Tuesdays and Thursdays 3 p.m. – 6 p.m. and Sundays 1 p.m. – 4 p.m., with the parties stipulating to Amira Mostafa as the non-professional supervisor. The court also ordered SoberLink testing for Father, and communication via Our Family Wizard. The parties stipulated to Father attending extracurricular activities and end-of-the-school-year activities during Mother's time, with advance notice beforehand to Mother. Father was ordered to complete the FCS intake form.

The parties were referred to Marin Family Court Services for mediation, counseling, and recommendations. On June 30, 2026, following interviews with both parties, FCS submitted its report. Recommendations were made, including maintaining the timeshare schedule already in place.

Father submitted a statement of disagreement with the FCS recommendations providing additional evidence supporting his claims of continued sobriety.

The Court finds good cause and that it is in the best interest of the minor children, Camden (DOB: 06/28/2018) and Hudson (DOB: 04/07/2020), to adopt the recommendations of FCS, as set forth in its report issued on June 30, 2026, as modified by the Court, as follows:

The current orders shall remain in effect with the following additions/modifications:

Parental Responsibilities

1. The parents shall share joint legal custody of both 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 and the right to consult with professionals who are providing services to the children.
2. Kaley shall continue to have temporary physical custody of both children.

Timeshare

3. Robert's visits with the boys shall continue to be supervised as currently ordered. The parties shall meet and confer to come to an agreement on mutually acceptable nonprofessional supervisors. If the parents are not able to agree on supervisors, then the visits shall be supervised by a professional. Parties will share in the cost of professional supervisors on a 50/50 basis.

Collateral Issues

4. Kaley shall consume alcohol only very moderately while the boys are in her care.
5. Both parents shall have a valid driver's license and insurance if they are going to drive with the children.
6. The parties shall return to Court January 7, 2027, for a status report as to compliance with the terms of this Order.

Counsel for Mother to prepare the formal Findings and Order After Hearing.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing. Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 7/9/26 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0002727

PRESIDING: HON. JAMES M. SCHURZ

REPORTER:

CLERK: A. URTON

PETITIONER: MOHAMED TAKFAOUI	
and	
RESPONDENT: MAIRA CAROLINA MARTINEZ DE PAZ	

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – RECONSIDERATION

RULING

Respondent/ Mother filed a motion for reconsideration on May 20, 2026. Mother requests that the Court reconsider the Findings and Order After Hearing (FOAH) entered May 14, 2026, which adopted recommendations offered by Marin Family Court Services (FCS) in its report of May 7, 2026.

Mother did not attend the interview with FCS. Moreover, Mother did not file a responsive declaration to the original Request for Order (RFO) filed by Petitioner/ Father on April 24, 2026. Father’s RFO sought sole legal custody and joint physical custody.

This Court’s FOAH adopted the FCS recommendation that Mother “should be compelled to participate in the FCS process so more information can be provided, and Samara’s needs can be considered more thoroughly.”

Accordingly, the Court (1) re-refers this matter to FCS and (2) ORDERS Mother to participate in interviews with FCS.

This matter will be continued for further consideration by this Court to August 20, 2026, at 9:00 am.

All existing orders relating to custody and visitation shall remain in effect.

SO ORDERED.

Parties must comply with Marin County Superior Court Local Rules, Rule 7.12(B), (C), which provide that if a party wants to present oral argument, the party must contact the Court at (415) 444-7046 and all opposing parties by 4:00 p.m. the court day preceding the scheduled hearing.

Notice may be by telephone or in person to all other parties that argument is being requested (i.e., it is not necessary to speak with counsel or parties directly.) Unless the Court and all parties have been notified of a request to present oral argument, no oral argument will be permitted except by order of the Court. In the event no party requests oral argument in accordance with Rule 7.12(C), the tentative ruling shall become the order of the court.

IT IS ORDERED that evidentiary hearings shall be in-person in Department B. For routine appearances, the parties may access Department B for video conference via a link on the court website. Litigants in the virtual courtroom are required to leave the video screen on and wait for your case to be called.

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are responsible for ensuring that they have a good connection and that they are available for the hearing. If the connection is inadequate, the Court may proceed with the hearing in the party's absence.