

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 07/02/25      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: CV0002765

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER:      GEORGE S. SARLO

and

RESPONDENT:      JAIME B. HERREN

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) PETITION – ELDER/DEPENDENT ADULT  
ABUSE/RESTRAINING ORDER  
2) MOTION – ATTORNEY’S FEES

**RULING**

This matter comes before the court on a Notice of Motion and Motion for Attorney’s Fees (NOM), filed September 19, 2024, by Petitioner George Sarlo, by and through his DPA, Susannah Sarlo, as the prevailing party in an Elder Abuse Restraining Order (EARO) trial which concluded on July 19, 2024.

The matter also comes before the court on the Petitioner’s Request to Renew Restraining Order (EARO Renewal Request), filed January 15, 2025.

Both matters were continued until July 2, 2025, due in part to pending appellate proceedings, which resolved on June 11, 2025.

**REQUEST TO RENEW RESTRAINING ORDER:**

On June 25, 2025, in support of his EARO Renewal Request, Petitioner filed a Request for Judicial Notice of various appellate pleadings, pursuant to Evidence Code section 452(d)(1). Appearances are required on the EARO Renewal Request.

**REQUEST FOR PREVAILING PARTY ATTORNEY’S FEES:**

Petitioner requests \$129,657 in attorney’s fees. Petitioner asserts that this amount was reasonably incurred in the face of the aggressive defense presented by Respondent over many court days.

On April 24, 2025, in support of her opposition to Petitioner’s NOM, Respondent filed a Request for Judicial Notice of various pleadings and portions of the transcripts from the restraining order hearings, pursuant to Evidence Code section 452(d)(1).

Respondent asserts that Petitioner’s fee request is excessive and unreasonable. Respondent argues that the majority of the case concerned Susannah Sarlo’s years-long dispute with her

sister, Gabriella Sarlo, and that Petitioner's fee request includes fees incurred by Petitioner in a second EARO that Petitioner sought against Gabriella Sarlo, in case number CV0002766 (*Sarlo v. Sarlo*). Respondent also argues that the case was unusually time consuming because Petitioner's counsel was disorganized and inefficient.

Petitioner responds that *Sarlo v. Herren* and *Sarlo v. Sarlo* were heard together by stipulation, but that Respondent's counsel took the lead during the trial. Petitioner argues that it is not necessary to apportion the fees between the cases where it is impossible to do so, and Petitioner already excluded items which were related only to *Sarlo v. Sarlo*.

Petitioner argues that the hearing was lengthy due to the issues and quantity of proof required, not solely due to Petitioner's attorney's disorganization or malfeasance.

### ***Findings and Order:***

#### **JUDICIAL NOTICE OF COURT RECORDS:**

The court grants the request for judicial notice brought by Respondent.

Petitioner and Respondent each claim that the actions of the other party caused the trial to be longer than necessary. The record provides instances to support both Petitioner's and Respondent's claims. The record demonstrates that Petitioner indeed did advance and argue the theory of undue influence, contrary to Respondent's assertion.

Petitioner's counsel states that he parsed out those fees incurred in this matter versus fees incurred in *Sarlo v. Sarlo*, whereas Respondent claims that the time incurred in the two lawsuits was identical and not attributable only to *Sarlo v. Herren*.

An award of prevailing party attorney's fees is mandatory. WIC § 15657 *et seq.* The court must consider factors relevant to the value of the services rendered; the amount of the fee award must be related to value of the litigation in terms of the quality of life of the elder involved and the results obtained. The court considers the nature, difficulty and amount of the litigation involved, the skill required and employed, the attention given, and the success. Respondent has not claimed inability to pay or financial hardship.

The court reviewed the detailed billing records submitted by Petitioner, and adjusts the requested fees based on the court's assessment of reasonableness and necessity.

An adjustment in the fee request may be warranted based on the additional time needed by Petitioner to present his case, inefficiency in questioning witnesses, failures to timely object, and lengthy arguments. On the other hand, any downward adjustment in fees is tempered by Respondent's vigorous defense of the EARO: additional time was needed to address Respondent's improper summary adjudication motion, Respondent's long arguments and objections, and Respondent's unsupported statements of fact. Respondent's aggressive defense, while not improper, increased the difficulty of the litigation for Petitioner, requiring greater skill and time.

As to those fees in *Sarlo v. Herren* which may be identical to the time spent in *Sarlo v. Sarlo*, it is not disputed that Petitioner also incurred those fees in *Sarlo v. Herren*. Respondent's assertion that Petitioner is only entitled to fees attributable "solely" to *Sarlo v. Herren*, where the two matters were heard simultaneously, is not persuasive. Petitioner credibly states that he already excluded fees attributable solely to *Sarlo v. Sarlo*.

Based on all of the foregoing factors, the court makes a downward adjustment in the amount of \$20,000. Additionally, after review of Petitioner's spreadsheet (Exhibit 4), the court makes a further downward adjustment of \$12,588 based on 15 separate line items which specifically refer to the *Sarlo v. Sarlo* matter.

After considering all of the above factors, including the adjustments made by the court, the court grants Petitioner's request for prevailing party fees in the amount of \$97,069, payable forthwith by Respondent to Petitioner.

Counsel for Petitioner is ordered to 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 through Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at [www.marin.courts.ca.gov](http://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: 07/02/25      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL2103195

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER:    NICHOLAUS CLARENCE  
GARCIA

and

RESPONDENT:   MICHELE WEIR GARCIA

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: 1) REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD  
CUSTODY/VISITATION  
2) REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD CUSTODY/VISITATION  
3) REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD CUSTODY/VISITATION

**RULING**

This matter comes before the court on three separate motions: (1) Respondent/Mother's Request for Order (Mother's RFO) filed on May 5, 2025, seeking modification of parental timeshare; (2) Petitioner/Father's *ex parte* Request for Order (Father's first *ex parte* RFO) filed on May 5, 2025, seeking make-up time, enforcement of current orders, and an order that Dr. Skelton testify or provide information to the court; and (3) Father's *ex parte* Request for Order (Father's second *ex parte* RFO), filed June 6, 2025, seeking enforcement of court orders.

The court made interim orders and referred the parties to Family Court Services (FCS) for child custody recommending counseling and mediation. FCS interviewed both parents and Dr. Skelton and issued its report on June 26, 2025.

Respondent/Mother filed a Statement of Disagreement with the recommendations of FCS, and requests a custody evaluation pursuant to Evidence Code section 730, the parties to agree to a parenting coordinator, and appointment of minor's counsel for the children.

Based on the information before the court, it appears that the best interest of the minor children, Jaxson, born March 8, 2012, Tamzin, born August 3, 2015, and Bellamy, born June 12, 2017, will be served by the court adopting the recommendations of FCS, as set forth in its report issued on June 26, 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.

COPARENTING COUNSELING:

1. Parents shall immediately resume working with a coparenting counselor.
  - a. Mother's request for a custody evaluation is denied at this time, without prejudice.
  - b. Mother's request for appointment of minor's counsel is denied at this time, without prejudice.
  - c. Father's refusal to work with a coparenting counselor, if he so refuses, shall be grounds for the court to re-consider Mother's request for consider a custody evaluation or appointment of minor's counsel for the children.

PARENTAL TIMESHARE:

2. All three children shall be in Father's custody on Father's upcoming scheduled vacation from 7/21/25 – 7/28/25.
3. For the remainder of the summer, the children shall be on an alternating week schedule with Friday after work as the transition day. Mother shall start the rotation starting July 28 when the children return from their vacation with Father. The children shall continue to alternate weeks in future summers.
4. School year timeshare: Commencing school year 2025 – 2026, the children shall be in Father's custody in alternate weeks from Thursday after school through Monday morning drop off at school. In the off weeks, Father shall have custody from Thursday after school through Friday morning drop off at school. Father's weekly Wednesday afterschool visits shall be eliminated. The children shall be in Mother's custody at all other times when not in Father's custody.

THERAPY FOR FAMILY MEMBERS:

5. Father and Jax shall continue to work with Dr. Jay Skelton for only as long as recommended by Dr. Skelton. If Dr. Skelton recommends that these sessions are no longer necessary, they shall be terminated.

6. All of the children shall continue to work with Dr. Skelton until no longer clinically indicated.
7. Parents shall sign releases for all the professionals involved in working with their family on custody and coparenting issues (e.g. coparenting counselor, the children's therapist, parents' individual therapists) so that there can be collaboration between these professionals in their work with this family.

#### HEALTHCARE FOR CHILDREN

8. Neither parent shall make routine medical, dental, or mental health appointments for the children without consent from the other parent. When such an appointment needs to be scheduled, the parent shall communicate the proposed appointment date in OFW. If the other parent does not respond within 24 hours, the first parent shall have authority to schedule the appointment. That parent shall then immediately notify the other parent of the appointment in OFW. Neither parent shall unilaterally make changes to the children's appointments without consent from the other parent.
9. Father shall be notified by the children's medical, dental, and mental health providers of any appointments that are made for the children by Mother.

#### SCHOOL / EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

10. Both parents may attend the children's school events/performances or extracurricular activities that fall on the other parent's custody time. Parents shall comport themselves in a civil and respectful manner at these events and shall not interfere with the children interacting with the other parent.

#### HOMEWORK:

11. The children's laptops/chrome books shall be made available to them during Father's custodial time in order to complete their homework.

Counsel for Mother is ordered to 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 through Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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

Any party contesting the ruling and requesting oral argument shall appear in person or remotely through Zoom either by video or telephone. Please follow the guidelines set forth on the court website at [www.marin.courts.ca.gov](http://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: 07/02/25      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL0001018

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER:      MARINA NARBUTOVICH

and

RESPONDENT:      DZMITRY SKAREDAU

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

**RULING**

This matter comes before the court on Petitioner/Wife's Request for Order (RFO) filed on June 4, 2025. Wife seeks custody and visitation orders and spousal support in the amount of \$7,000 per month from Respondent/Husband.

Custody and Visitation:

The parties met with the Family Court Services for child custody recommending counseling and reached agreements regarding custody and visitation, which the court approved on June 30, 2025.

Spousal Support:

Wife states that she accompanied Husband to the United States in 2019 when Husband relocated for work with an L-1 Visa.

Wife asserts that she and Husband stopped living together in February 2023, and Husband co-signed a lease on Barbaree Way (The Cove) for Wife and the parties' son, but after January 2024 Husband stopped paying for the lease or giving Wife any money. Wife states she was able to meet her expenses until she was fired from her job. Wife asserts she is now homeless, and their son lives with Husband. Wife asks for spousal support in the amount of \$7,000 to meet her needs.

In her income and expense declaration, Wife asserts that her income was \$1,600 last month but she lists no employer. Wife's 2023 tax return lists gross annual income of \$39,710 and \$3,150 in annual unemployment insurance benefits. Wife's 2024 Schedule C lists \$12,650 annual gross receipts from Wife's graphic design business, with expenses only for advertising and travel and net profit of \$7,950.



Husband asserts that the parties' marriage was dissolved in a Belarus Judgment dated June 17, 2024. Husband attaches an uncertified translation of a Belarus Judgment as Exhibit A to his Responsive Declaration, and claims that the Belarus Judgment resolves the issue of marital property and support.

Husband's income and expense declaration provides that he earns \$16,666 per month, plus \$1,500 per month from self-employment. Husband's paystubs show that he earns \$8,368.83 twice a month, or \$16,738 per month. Husband contributes \$1,333 to a 401(k), pays \$205 for medical/vision/dental insurance, and contributes \$125 to an HSA. Husband does not provide a Profit & Loss from his business.

Wife states that Husband advised Wife about the Belarus divorce proceedings on February 9, 2024. Wife also claims that Husband provided the wrong address for Wife to the Belarus court, even though Husband knows Wife lives at The Cove in Tiburon. Wife asserts that this was to keep Wife from knowing about the Belarus divorce proceedings.

Pending resolution of the jurisdictional challenge, the court will issue *pendente lite* spousal support orders to address Petitioner's immediate financial needs while reserving resolution of the jurisdictional challenge for later proceedings. (Family Code section 3600, *Marriage of Stich* (1985) 169 Cal.App.3d. 64.)

For the purposes of calculating *pendente lite* spousal support, the court will use the following inputs:

1. Husband's salary of \$16,738.
2. Husband's self-employed income of \$1,500.
3. Husband's 401(k) contribution of \$1,333.
4. Husband's health insurance premium of \$205.
5. Husband's contribution to his HSA of \$125.
6. Wife's income of \$1,600.
7. Married filing separately.

Based on the foregoing, monthly guideline *pendente* spousal support is \$4,516. Effective June 4, 2025, Husband is ordered to pay Wife \$4,516 as and for temporary spousal support, payable on the first day of each month.

Husband's challenge to the court's jurisdiction based on a foreign Judgment is pending. In order for the court to properly consider a foreign judgment, it must be registered in this court. The issue of the validity and effect of the foreign judgment is continued to August 13, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B to allow Husband additional time to obtain a certified copy, certified translation, and additional documentation which may be needed in order for the court to rule on the issue.

Counsel for Husband is ordered to 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 through Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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

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

2025

Xspouse 2025-1.1-CA

Monthly Figures

Fixed Shares	Dzmitry Marina		Monthly Figures		Cash Flow	
Number of children	0	0	2025		Guideline	Proposed
Percent time with NCP	0.00%	0.00%			Combined net spendable	13933 13933
Filing status	MFSIN	MFSIN	GUIDELINE		Percent change	0% 0%
Number of exemptions	1	1	Nets (adjusted)		Dzmitry	
Wages and salary	16738	1600	Dzmitry	12732	Payment cost/benefit	-4096 -4096
Self employed income	1500	0	Marina	1202	Net spendable income	8216 8216
Other taxable income	0	0	Total	13934	Change from guideline	0 0
TANF CS received	0	0	Support		% of combined spendable	59% 59%
Other nontaxable income	0	0	Addons	0	% of saving over guideline	0% 0%
New spouse income	0	0	User CS	0	Total taxes	5301 5301
Employee 401-k contribution	1333	0	Marin SS	4516	Dep. exemption value	0 0
Adjustments to income	125	0	Total	4516	# withholding allowances	0 0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	Settings changed		Net wage paycheck	9281 9281
CS paid prev marriage	0	0	Proposed		Marina	
Health insurance	205	0	Tactic 9		Payment cost/benefit	4294 4294
Other medical expenses	0	0	CS	0	Net spendable income	5717 5717
Property tax expenses	0	0	SS	4516	Change from guideline	0 0
Ded interest expense	0	0	Total	4516	% of combined spendable	41% 41%
Contribution deduction	0	0	Saving	0	% of saving over guideline	0% 0%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	Releases	0	Total taxes	399 399
Qualified business income deduction	0	0			Dep. exemption value	0 0
Required union dues	0	0			# withholding allowances	0 0
Mandatory retirement	0	0			Net wage paycheck	1335 1335
Hardship deduction	0	0				
Other GDL deductions	0	0				
Child care expenses	0	0				

Dzmitry pays Guideline SS, Proposed SS

FC 4055 checking: **ON**

## Per Child Information

	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
All children		0 - 0	0	0	0 Dzmitry	0 Dzmitry	0 Dzmitry

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 07/02/25      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL0001040

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER:      MIKI SUZUKI

and

RESPONDENT:      JUNJI SUZUKI

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: REQUEST FOR ORDER – CHILD/SPOUSAL SUPPORT

**RULING**

This matter comes before the court on Petitioner/Wife's Request for Order (RFO), filed May 30, 2025, seeking child and spousal support.

Wife asserts that although the parties both reside in the Mill Valley family residence with their two daughters, Respondent/Husband has another home in Mariposa where he spends his weekends. Wife also asserts that Husband has little to no interaction with their daughters and asks the court to use a 15% timeshare for Husband for child support.

Wife's states her monthly income is \$3,000 from self-employment, although her income and expense states that her 12-month average is \$2,800 and that last month she earned \$4,081. Wife has no deductions.

Wife's Reply, filed June 25, 2025, refers to a Responsive Declaration which was served by Husband on June 18, 2025, and filed on June 30, 2025.

In his Responsive Declaration, Husband states that he is currently paying \$4,387 in monthly carrying costs (mortgage, property tax, utilities) for the marital home where both parties and their children reside. Husband also states he gives Wife \$2,500 per month for additional expenses for their daughters, including extracurricular activities, groceries, and other needs. Husband estimates he is paying \$7,687 for the benefit of Wife and their children. Husband states that he lost the consulting job he had in 2023, and no longer receives an additional \$120,000 per year from that source. Father states he does not have any other income besides his income from Marshall Suzuki Law Group (\$12,100 per month) and his monthly rental income of \$1,350.

Husband's income and expense declaration states the following monthly amounts:

1. Salary of \$12,100.
2. Rental income of \$1,350.
3. Real property taxes \$1,342.

4. Mortgage interest of \$1,168.
5. 401(k) contribution of \$1,210.

In her Reply, Wife asserts that Husband earns other, undisclosed income. For example, Wife asserts that Husband receives income from Fujiya USA Corp. Wife attaches documents filed with the California Secretary of State which list Husband as an officer (Secretary) and as agent for service of process for that corporation.

On June 26, 2025, Husband filed a Responsive Declaration to Wife's Reply. Husband states that the parties still reside jointly at their marital residence in Mill Valley, and Husband pays all of the carrying costs associated with the home, totaling more than \$8,000 per month. Husband states that Wife has full use of the home, utilities all paid for, and the use of a car.

*Findings and Order:*

Wife has not presented evidence that Husband currently earns more than his salary from his employment at Marshall Suzuki Law Group, or \$12,100 per month. The Secretary of State documents reflect administrative roles. They are not evidence of additional income. The court finds credible Husband's assertion that his only income in 2025 is from Marshall Suzuki, and his rental income.

For the purposes of child support and *pendente lite* spousal support, the court will use the following inputs:

1. Husband's salary of \$12,100.
2. Husband's rental income of \$1,350.
3. Husband's real property taxes \$1,342.
4. Husband's mortgage interest of \$1,168.
5. Husband's 401(k) contribution of \$1,210.
6. Wife's \$3,000/mo self-employment income.
7. 85%/15% timeshare.
8. Married filing jointly.

Based on the foregoing, monthly guideline child support is \$3,482 (breakdown is \$1,321 for Yuki and \$2,161 for Saki) and monthly *pendente lite* spousal support is \$1,652, for a total of \$5,134. This amount is less than the amount Husband is currently paying to support the family while they continue to reside in the marital residence. See XSpouse calculation, attached as Exhibit A.

Effective June 1, 2025, as and for support of his family, Husband is ordered to continue to pay the carrying costs for the family residence and for the extra-curricular activities for the children, and to pay an additional \$2,500 per month to Wife for the children's additional expenses. The court finds that this amount is above-guideline and is in the children's best interests as it maintains the status quo while the parties reside in the marital residence together, pending trial or further court order. Family Code section 4057(b)(6).

Counsel for Husband is ordered to 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](http://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.

2025

Xspouse 2025-1.1-CA

Monthly Figures

Fixed Shares	Junji	Miki	Monthly Figures		Cash Flow	
Number of children	0	2	2025		Guideline	Proposed
Percent time with NCP	15.00%	0.00%			Combined net spendable	12862 12862
Filing status	MFJIN	MFJIN	GUIDELINE		Percent change	0% 0%
Number of exemptions	1	3	Nets (adjusted)		Junji	
Wages and salary	12100	0	Junji	10668	Payment cost/benefit	-5134 -5134
Self employed income	0	3000	Miki	2194	Net spendable income	5534 5534
Other taxable income	1350	0	Total	12862	Change from guideline	0 0
TANF CS received	0	0	Support		% of combined spendable	43% 43%
Other nontaxable income	0	0			% of saving over guideline	0% 0%
New spouse income	0	0	Addons	0	Total taxes	2782 2782
Employee 401-k contribution	1210	0	Guideln CS	3482	Dep. exemption value	0 0
Adjustments to income	0	0	Marin SS	1652	# withholding allowances	0 0
SS paid prev marriage	0	0	Total	5134	Net wage paycheck	7760 7760
CS paid prev marriage	0	0	Proposed		Miki	
Health insurance	0	0	Tactic 9		Payment cost/benefit	5134 5134
Other medical expenses	0	0			Net spendable income	7328 7328
Property tax expenses	833	0	CS	3482	Change from guideline	0 0
Ded interest expense	1168	0	SS	1652	% of combined spendable	57% 57%
Contribution deduction	0	0	Total	5134	% of saving over guideline	0% 0%
Misc tax deductions	0	0	Saving	0	Total taxes	806 806
Qualified business income deduction	0	0	Releases	0	Dep. exemption value	0 0
Required union dues	0	0			# withholding allowances	0 0
Mandatory retirement	0	0			Net wage paycheck	0 0
Hardship deduction	0	0				
Other GDL deductions	0	0				
Child care expenses	0	0				

Junji pays Guideline CS, Guideline SS, Proposed CS, Proposed SS

FC 4055 checking: **ON**

## Per Child Information

	DOB	Timeshare	cce(F)	cce(M)	Addons Payor	Basic CS Payor	Pres CS Payor
All children		15 - 85	0	0	0 Junji	3,482 Junji	3,482 Junji
Yuki	2011-01-03	15 - 85	0	0	0 Junji	1,321 Junji	1,321 Junji
Saki	2012-09-02	15 - 85	0	0	0 Junji	2,161 Junji	2,161 Junji

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF MARIN**

DATE: 07/02/25      TIME: 9:00 A.M.      DEPT: B      CASE NO: FL0001531

PRESIDING: HON. JANET L. FRANKEL

REPORTER:

CLERK: ALEX URTON

PETITIONER:      KIM NOBLE BAEZ

and

RESPONDENT:      QUAIL LOUISE BAEZ

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS: CASE PROGRESS CONFERENCE

**RULING**

The Case Progress Conference is continued to August 13, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in Department B.

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 through Zoom are permitted unless a party is ordered to appear in court. In-person appearances are also permitted.

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

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