

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/04/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL2203879

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: RACHEL A. BRUCE

and

RESPONDENT: MARK BRUCE

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – VISITATION

RULING

This matter comes before the court for a review hearing on Petitioner/Mother's Request for Order (RFO), filed May 8, 2025, seeking to temporarily relocate with the parties' minor child, Mason Xavier Bruce, born June 19, 2016, to San Jose, Costa Rica.

Mother seeks an order allowing her to relocate with the minor child to Costa Rica (from summer 2025 through summer 2027) due to her spouse's two-year military assignment at the U.S. Embassy in Costa Rica. Mother requests an order allowing Mason to move to Costa Rica, spend the school year there, and summer break and other school breaks with Father in San Rafael.

Mother asserts that she is the primary custodial parent and that it is in Mason's best interest to move with Mother to Costa Rica and to continue to reside with her for the school year. Mother argues that this will maintain the continuity of her support for Mason's emotional and general well-being, and will afford Mason valuable cultural and educational opportunities. The parties agree that the timeshare is 43% with Father, 57% with Mother.

Father asks the court to deny Mother's request, and argues the move is not in Mason's best interest and will significantly disrupt Mason's emotional, social, and educational stability.

The court must consider Mason's best interests, taking into account factors such as his need for stability, the impact of a move on his relationship with both parents, and the potential benefits of the relocation. *In re Marriage of LaMusga* (2004) 32 Cal.4th 1072, *In re Marriage of Burgess* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 425. In *LaMusga*, the court emphasized the importance of maintaining stable custodial arrangements and the potential harm from disrupting established patterns of care. *Burgess* highlights the need for continuity and the noncustodial parent's right to maintain a relationship with the child.

Mason is thriving in his current environment. He attends Vallecito Elementary School in San Rafael, California. He has a strong network of friends and support from family, including his parents and his grandparents. Both parents are very involved and supportive in Mason's life on a regular basis. The proposed relocation would disrupt this stability, requiring Mason to adjust to a new school, culture, and environment, which could have adverse effects on his well-being.

Both parents and the minor child were interviewed by the Family Court Services (FCS) child custody recommending counselor. Based on the information before the court, it appears that the best interest of the minor child, Mason Xavier Bruce, born July 19, 2016, will be served by the court adopting the recommendations of FCS, as set forth in its report issued on May 30, 2025, as modified by the court. The court will do so, and orders as follows:

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

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

CHILD CUSTODY

1. The parents shall continue to share joint legal and joint physical custody of Mason.

RELOCATION REQUEST DENIED

2. The potential benefits of relocation, such as providing Mason with cultural and educational opportunities while maintaining continuity in his relationship with Mother, are outweighed by the detriment the relocation will cause, due to the disruption of Mason's current stable environment and the disruption to his meaningful relationship with Father.

CHILD TIMESHARE

3. Once Mother relocates to Costa Rica, Mason shall live primarily with Father in Marin and shall be with Mother on the following schedule:
 - 4 weeks at Christmas
 - 2 weeks at Spring Break
 - One-half of Summer break
 - Any time Mother can spend time in Marin, Mason shall be with her on an agreed upon 50/50 schedule.

COLLATERAL ISSUES

4. The parents shall work with an agreed upon co-parent counselor
5. Neither parent shall make any disparaging comments about the other parent in the presence of Mason or allow others to do so.
6. Mason shall be exposed to peaceful contact only between his parents.
7. Neither parent shall share any information from the FCS report or the court proceedings with Mason.

As authorized by CRC 5.125 the court shall prepare the formal order after hearing.

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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

IT IS ORDERED that video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/04/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0000187

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: JULIE TURNER

and

RESPONDENT: JEROME BARCLAY

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE – ENTRY OF PLEA/TRIAL

RULING

This matter comes before the court on Respondent/Father's Order to Show Cause (OSC), filed on February 27, 2025, seeking a finding of contempt against Mother for failure to obey domestic violence restraining orders and child custody and visitation orders.

Mother appeared for arraignment on April 16, 2025, waived time, and the matter was continued to June 4, 2024 for entry of plea and trial.

This matter is continued on the court's own motion to June 18, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B. Mother is ordered to appear on June 18, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B for entry of plea and trial.

As authorized by CRC Rule 5.125, the court shall prepare the formal order after hearing.

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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

IT IS ORDERED that video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/04/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0000630

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: ANDREA GHIELMETTI

and

RESPONDENT: SOPHIA ISABELLA JOAN
GARDNER

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW HEARING – CHILD CUSTODY

RULING

This matter comes before the court on Petitioner/Father's Request for Order (RFO) filed January 31, 2024, seeking child custody and visitation orders. On February 5, 2024, Mother filed a Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO), which resulted in a Temporary Restraining Order (DVTRO), and Father's RFO was ordered to trail Mother's DVRO.

On March 18, 2024, the parties filed a "Stipulation of Parties to Conditions Pending Continuance of DVRO Hearing" (Stipulation), which provided that the DVTRO would continue for six months, that Father would attend coparenting and batterer's intervention courses, attend individual counseling, and abide by the DVTRO. The Stipulation provided for unsupervised visitation time for Father with the minor child every Saturday or Sunday from 9:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m., with increases of time for Father by agreement. The Stipulation granted temporary sole legal and sole physical custody to Mother.

On October 16, 2024, the court denied Mother's request for a permanent restraining order, and the parties were referred to Family Court Services' (FCS) child custody recommending counseling. The FCS child custody recommending counselor interviewed Mother on November 19, 2024 and Father on November 22, 2024, and issued its report on November 25, 2024. The court made orders on December 4, 2024, and set this matter for a review hearing. Parties were re-referred to FCS and were interviewed in separate sessions on May 21, 2025. FCS issued a report and recommendation on May 29, 2025.

Based on the information before the court, it appears that the best interest of the minor child, Adelyn, born December 6, 2022, will be served by the court adopting the recommendations of FCS, as set forth in its report issued on May 29, 2025, as modified. The court will do so, and orders as follows:

CHILD CUSTODY

1. The parents shall continue to share joint legal custody of Adelyn. The parents shall share in the responsibility and confer in good faith on matters concerning the child's health, education and welfare. Both parents shall have access to the child's school, medical, mental health, and dental records and the right to consult with professionals who are providing services to the child.
2. The parents shall continue to share joint physical custody of Adelyn.

CHILD TIMESHARE

3. Beginning June 5, 2025, Adelyn shall be with Father on the following schedule (and with Mother the remainder of the time). Week #1 and Week #2 shall be rotating:
 - Week #1: With Father from Friday at 5:30 p.m. to Monday at 9:00 a.m. If Monday is a Federal holiday, then Adelyn shall remain in Father's care until Monday at 5:00 p.m.
 - Week #2: With Father on Thursdays from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., and from Sunday at 9:00 a.m. to Monday at 9:00 a.m. If Monday is a Federal holiday, then Adelyn shall remain in Father's care until Monday at 5:00 p.m.
4. Beginning August 5, 2025, Adelyn shall be with Father on the following schedule (and with Mother the remainder of the time). Week #1 and Week #2 shall be rotating:
 - Week #1: With Father from Friday at 5:30 p.m. to Monday at 9:00 a.m. If Monday is a Federal holiday, then Adelyn shall remain in Father's care until Monday at 5:00 p.m.
 - Week #2: With Father on Thursday from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m., and from Sunday at 9:00 a.m. until Tuesday at 9:00 a.m.
5. Any additional time for Adelyn to be with Father, or any changes to the schedule, shall occur as mutually agreed upon.
6. All exchanges that do not occur at daycare shall occur at a well-populated public location (such as a coffee shop). At the beginning of his custodial time, Father shall pick up Adelyn up at a mutually agreed upon public location in Petaluma. At the beginning of her custodial time, Mother shall pick up Adelyn from a mutually agreed upon public location in Novato. The location shall be the same from week to week.

HOLIDAYS/VACATIONS

7. Mother's Day/Father's Day: Adelyn shall be with Mother every year on Mother's Day and with Father every year on Father's Day.
8. Parents' Birthdays: Both parents shall have the opportunity to have Adelyn with them on their birthday, if requested.
9. Thanksgiving: Adelyn shall be with Mother for Thanksgiving every year.
10. Christmas: In the odd-numbered years, Adelyn shall be with Father from 9:00 a.m. on Christmas Eve until 12:00 p.m. on Christmas Day and with Mother from 12:00 p.m. on Christmas Day until December 27th at 9:00 a.m. In the even-numbered years the schedule shall be reversed.
11. New Years: In the even-numbered years, Adelyn shall be with Father from 9:00 a.m. on December 31st until 12:00 p.m. on New Year's Day and with Mother from 12:00 p.m. on New Year's Day until January 3rd at 9:00 a.m. In the odd-numbered years the schedule shall be reversed.

12. Christmas Break: When Mother is in school and has a Christmas Break, the parents shall share this break equally, as agreed upon.
13. Easter: Adelyn shall be with Father on Easter Sunday in odd-numbered years and with Mother in the even-numbered years.
14. Spring Break: When Mother is in school and has a Spring Break, the parents shall share this break equally, as agreed upon.

COLLATERAL ISSUES

15. Neither parent shall travel outside of the United States with Sophie without written permission from the other parent, or a court order.
16. The parents shall participate in co-parent counseling with an agreed upon counselor. Both parents shall follow any recommendations made by the counselor regarding frequency and duration of counseling.

As authorized by CRC 5.125 the court shall prepare the formal order after hearing.

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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

IT IS ORDERED that video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/04/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0001302

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: EMMA FARR RAWLINGS

and

RESPONDENT: JAMES FARRELL

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – COMPEL; DISCOVERY
FACILITATOR PROGRAM; RESPONDENT’S RESPONSES TO RFPD, SET 1 AND
SANCTIONS

RULING

This matter comes before the court on Petitioner/Wife’s Request for Order (RFO), filed on May 7, 2025, requesting (a) a motion to compel Respondent’s responses to Request for Production of Documents, Set 1, and (b) sanctions in the amount of \$40,000 per CCP sections 2023.010 and 2023.030.

Pursuant to MCR Fam 7.16, this matter is already referred to the Discovery Facilitator Program, and the Discovery Facilitator is expected to be selected by June 6, 2025.

The matter is continued to August 13, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B in order to allow the parties time to participate in the Discovery Facilitator Program. If either party or counsel is unavailable on August 13, 2025, they are encouraged to meet and confer and submit a stipulation to reschedule the hearing date.

Counsel for Wife shall prepare the formal order after hearing.

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/04/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL00001319

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: RYAN MCKIM

and

RESPONDENT: RACHEL ELLYN
SHAPIRO MCKIM

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD/SPOUSAL SUPPORT;
ATTORNEY’S FEES AND COSTS

RULING

This matter comes before the court on Petitioner/Father’s Request for Order (RFO), filed on May 8, 2025, requesting (a) child support, (b) *pendente lite* spousal support, and (c) attorney’s fees and costs in the amount of \$200,000.

The court notes that neither party has complied with MCR Fam 7.13. Neither party has provided two years of their tax returns or support calculations. Mother did not file her Income and Expense Declaration (a mandatory form) until May 29, 2025.

The parties are referred to MCR Fam 7.13. The matter is continued to July 16, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B, to allow each party to file the necessary documents in compliance with MCR Fam 7.13.

Counsel for Wife shall prepare the formal order after hearing.

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/04/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FL0001345

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: ELIZABETH ANN
OLSEN

and

RESPONDENT: CHRISTOPHER
MICHAEL OLSEN

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: PETITION – DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RESTRAINING
ORDER

RULING

This matter comes before the court on Petitioner/Mother's Request for Domestic Violence Restraining Order (DVRO), filed on May 14, 2025. Mother previously filed a Request for DVRO on April 15, 2025. In that case the court denied the Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) in its entirety and Mother waived her right to a hearing.

Appearances required.

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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

IT IS ORDERED that video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 06/04/25 TIME: 9:00 A.M. DEPT: B CASE NO: FS0000022

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER: COUNTY OF MARIN

and

RESPONDENT: YORDI IZAAZ
CASTANON PEREZ

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REVIEW HEARING – CHILD CUSTODY

RULING

This matter comes before the court for a review hearing stemming from Respondent/Father's Request for Order (RFO) filed October 28, 2025, seeking emergency child custody and visitation orders.

On October 28, 2025, the court granted Father's request for temporary sole physical custody of the minor child, Liam, born April 4, 2022, to Father. The court referred the parties to Marin County Family Court Services (FCS) for child custody recommendation counseling and mediation, and set the matter for hearing on December 4, 2024.

On December 4, 2025 the court made additional orders, set the matter for custody review on June 4, 2025, and re-referred the parties to FCS.

Mother was interviewed by FCS. Father did not attend.

Based on the information before the court, it appears that the best interest of the minor child, Liam, born April 4, 2022, will be served by the court adopting the recommendations of FCS, as set forth in its report issued on May 15, 2025, as modified by the court. The court will do so, and orders as follows:

1. Father shall continue to have sole legal and physical custody.
2. Mother shall continue to have supervised visits on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 5:30 PM to 7:30 PM and Sundays from noon to 5 PM. These visits shall continue to be supervised by the maternal aunt, or another mutually agreed upon supervisor. Parents may extend the length of the visits or modify the visitation schedule at any time per mutual parental agreement.

3. Mother shall follow through with previous court orders to participate in Parent Child Interactive Therapy (PCIT) and to complete a parenting class to learn about the impact of child abuse on children. Mother shall submit to the court verification of completion of PCIT and the parenting class.

4. Franklin Orozco Garcia shall continue to have no contact with Liam.

5. Father shall take Liam to his medical and dental appointments. Mother shall have permission to take Liam to his medical and dental appointments (accompanied by the visitation supervisor, as described above) if Father cannot do so. Mother shall have permission to speak with Liam's doctors and dentists, have access to his medical and dental information, and make routine medical/dental decisions for Liam if Father is not present at the medical/dental appointments.

6. There shall be no corporal punishment of Liam of any kind by either parent, including but not limited to hitting, striking, or pinching.

7. Father shall properly attend to Liam's hygiene, including but not limited to bathing him regularly, and getting his hair cut when needed.

8. The parties shall exchange information regarding Liam's well-being (injuries received, illnesses, and/or medication administered) during exchanges.

9. Neither parent shall make any disparaging remarks about the other parent in Liam's presence or allow others to do so.

As authorized by CRC 5.125 the court shall prepare the formal order after hearing.

Litigants who require the assistance of an interpreter may appear in court to access the services of a staff interpreter, or they may appear remotely. Persons who require interpreter services via remote appearance shall notify the clerk of the court in advance to schedule remote interpreter services.

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

IT IS ORDERED that video appearances though Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at www.marin.courts.ca.gov.

If a party and/or counsel elects to appear over Zoom they must follow proper Zoom etiquette. This includes joining the call five minutes early, speaking only one at a time, avoiding disruptions, and wearing proper attire appropriate for a court environment. Parties must act and speak in a professional and respectful manner as though they are in an actual courtroom. If a party or counsel is unable to follow proper Zoom etiquette, the court may halt the hearing and order the parties to return in person.