

Privacy Group Sues To Have Court Divulge Sheriff's Cell Phone Diversion Warrants

By Gail Fry and Mark Gutglueck

Though privacy advocates have hailed what they said were marginal improvements in how the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department's blanket interception of cell phone communications are being disclosed to an unsuspecting public that may otherwise have no inkling its private communications are being compromised, those

reforms have not been comprehensive enough, those advocates maintain, and legal efforts to limit law enforcement's reach into people's lives are ongoing. At issue is whether law enforcement agencies in general and the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department in particular, will be able to continue to engage in the wholesale vacuuming and interception of cell phone communica-

tions based on warrants and affidavits for their issuance that can be indefinitely withheld from disclosure.

The first round in the San Francisco-based Electronic Frontier Foundation's effort to shed light on the monitoring of cell phone and smart device communications of both criminal suspects and members of the general public who are not known to be engaged in any criminal activity in-

involved a lawsuit brought against the sheriff's department which resulted in the plaintiffs obtaining the basic identifying information pertaining to the warrants relating to the department's electronic monitoring. That first lawsuit has now been dismissed. The second round is now under way, with the Electronic Frontier Foundation having filed suit against the San Bernardino County Superior Court, seeking

to obtain the information contained in and upon which those warrants were issued, and challenging the court's routine practice of sealing those search warrants, in virtually all cases indefinitely.

In 2012, the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department acquired a so-called Stingray, a cell-tower simulator, capable of receiving cell phone signals in a targeted area, includ- See P 2

Kruse Reaches Tie & Then Overtakes Hernandez In Barstow Fourth District Race

Incumbent Barstow Councilwoman Carmen Hernandez, who had led Marilyn Dyer Kruse by a close margin since the election returns first began coming in on election November 3, has seen that lead erode until at this point, she has now fallen behind Kruse. On election night, November 3 at 10:30 p.m., with 12 of 19 precincts reporting, Hernandez had jumped off to a 10 vote lead, with 292 votes or 37.58 percent to Kruse's 282 votes or 36.29 percent. In third place was Martha O'Brien, with 203 votes or 26.13 percent. Wednesday morning, at 4 a.m. November 4, after all 19 of the precincts in District 4 had reported to the registrar of voters office, Hernandez retained her lead, but Kruse had picked up a single net vote in the overall polling. The incumbent had 379 votes to Kruse's 370 votes, a lead of 37.64 percent to 36.74 percent. O'Brien had 25.52 percent. Later that day, at 4 p.m., the vote count showed Hernandez had increased her lead. The councilwoman had 384 votes or 37.83 percent and Kruse had 371 or 36.55 percent. O'Brien's percentage stood at 25.52. At 4 p.m. on November 5, Kruse was again gaining on Hernandez. The at-that-time second-place challenger had 400 votes for 36.93 percent and Hernandez was eight votes up at 408, with 37.67 percent. O'Brien was at 25.3 percent. On Friday November 6 at 4 p.m., Hernandez appeared to be accelerating ahead of Kruse once more, as she at that point had laid claim See P 3

Offsetting Partisan Legislative Race Results Maintain County's Political Status Quo

By Mark Gutglueck

The balance among the number of Republicans as opposed to Democrats representing San Bernardino County at the legislative level remained unchanged as a result of the November 3 election. In a single case, a sitting Democratic Congressman was supplanted by a Republican. In a single case, an

incumbent Republican state senator has been replaced by a Democrat. In all of the other races, either the incumbent prevailed or the replacement will be a member of the incumbent's party.

In California's 33rd Assembly District, located wholly within San Bernardino County and which has been dominated by the Republi-

cans since its current district boundaries were established in 2012, two Republicans, Thurston Smith and Rick Herrick, were vying to replace Republican Jay Obernolte, who stepped up to run for Congress this year. Smith prevailed with 83,181 votes or 55.18 percent to Herrick's 67,573 votes of 44.82 percent.

In Assembly District 36, which straddles San Bernardino and Los Angeles counties, incumbent Republican Tom Lackey defeated Democratic challenger Steve Fox.

In Assembly District 40, contained entirely within San Bernardino County, incumbent Democrat James Ramos solidly defeated Repub-

lican challenger Jennifer Tullius, 107,127 votes or 58.36 percent to 76,436 votes, or 41.64 percent.

In Assembly District 41, which covers portions of both San Bernardino and Los Angeles counties, incumbent Chris Holden won convincingly, but actually lost in San Bernardino County, where he received 24,490 See P 3

Yucca Valley Film Festival On Line Today & This Weekend

The second edition of the Yucca Valley Film Festival is being held today, tomorrow and Sunday, November 13, 14 and 15. Because of the coronavirus pandemic, the event is being streamed digitally at Xerb, which is available on the internet at <https://xerb.tv/channel/yvff/virtual-events>

One must scroll down to near the bottom to access the portal to the Yuc-

ca Valley Film Festival. The event is sponsored and hosted by the City of Yucca Valley. Festival directors this year are director, scriptwriter and producer, Matt Beurois, as well as French producer, performer, singer and songwriter, Auregan. The kick-off for the event will take place today, Friday November 13, 2020, at 6:30 p.m., live on Facebook. Beginning at See P 7

More Than A Half Year Of Uncertainty Over MUSD Superintendent Ends With Resignation

After months of confusion that was exacerbated by the confidentiality requirements that apply to public employees, the status of Morongo Unified School District Superintendent Thomas Baumgarten became clear this week when he resigned from his position November 10, effective immediately.

In the aftermath of the forced exodus of former superintendent Cecelia

English in June 2014, Baumgarten, then the assistant superintendent of student services, was appointed interim superintendent. Baumgarten's steady-handed guidance of the district in the immediate aftermath of controversy relating to a move to provide English with a 5.77 percent raise over the \$175,000 annual salary conferred upon her the previous year when she left as the director of academics at

the Newark School District in Northern California to replace the previous superintendent, Jim Majchrzak was lauded in particular because Baumgarten appeared to be diligent in looking after the district's bottom line. Additionally, the greater degree of trust and comity Baumgarten had with the board was generally seen as substantive improvement in the district in terms of func- See P 7

In Latest Count, Residents In Six County Cities Embrace Increasing Local Tax

Six of seven municipal measures on the November 3 ballot that grew out of those cities' or town's elected leadership asking their residents to consent to taxing themselves to shore up those respective government's financial positions have passed. Two other municipal initiatives in San Bernardino County that did not consist of taxing or tax-raising proposals were on the ballot. One

of those was approved and one has been rejected by voters.

In Montclair, Measure L, which calls for levying upon all purchasers of taxable goods in that city an additional one percent sales tax to raise the current 8 percent sales tax to 9 percent, as of 4 p.m. today was headed toward passage, with 7,955 votes or 68.66 percent in favor of it and 3,631 or 31.34 percent

opposed.

The City of Chino Hills' Measure M, which proposed to expand the definition of "hotel" for purposes of the city's transient occupancy tax, known as the hotel or bed tax, and to increase the current transient occupancy tax rate from 10 percent to 12 percent, effective January 1, 2021 was endorsed by 23,072 or 65.05 percent of the city's voters and rejected

by 12,396 or 34.95 percent. In addition to being applicable to hotels, motels and inns, the transient occupancy tax as of January 1 will be levied on those staying in tourist homes or houses, studio hotels, bachelor hotels, lodging houses, rooming houses, apartment houses, dormitories, public or private clubs, mobile homes or house trailers at a fixed location, campgrounds

or other similar structures or facilities, or portions thereof, wherein overnight accommodations are offered for hire.

In Apple Valley, Measure O, which related to the imposition of a one percent sales tax that town officials predicted would generate approximately \$7 million annually off sales within the town limits, was soundly defeated, with 20,735 voters or 66.28 See P 3

Electronic Privacy Group Battling San Bernardino County Courts, District Attorney And Sheriff Over Access To Information On Diversion Of Cell Phone Users' Phone Hook-Ups To Communication Data Vacuum Operated By The Sheriff's Department *from front page*

ing those specifically sought by investigators as well as those of others using or simply carrying switched on cell phones within the range of the simulator who are not suspected of any criminal activity or not. For the first 18 months the device was its possession, the Sheriff's Department initially made indiscriminate use of the Stingray, utilizing it over 295 times without seeking any sort of warrant whatsoever for its employment. When department officials were informed that data obtained through the collections was inadmissible in a criminal proceeding, thereafter warrants were sought through the court as required by law. In October 2015, the California Legislature passed and then-Governor Jerry Brown signed into law the California Electronic Communications Privacy Act, which was co-sponsored by the Electronic Frontier Foundation and authored by California State Senators Mark Leno and Joel Anderson. That legislation imposed comprehensive requirements aimed toward enhancing digital and electronic privacy, and required that law enforcement agencies first obtain a warrant before they accessed or took possession of virtually any type of digital data emanating from, produced by, stored or contained within a device or the servers providing such digital service. Under the provisions of the California Electronic Communications Privacy Act, in order for law enforcement agencies to access the digital records pertaining to the cell phone or internet activity of an individual or group of people in anything other than an emergency/life-and-death situation, police must first obtain a warrant to do so. Hand held communication devices such as smart phones and the current generation of even-less-sophis-

ticated cell phones typically have a geographic position function which will allow a forensic analysis to ascertain the continuous geographic location of the individual in possession the device over the continuous span of time while the device is turned on. The privacy right to not be subjected to such tracking by a law enforcement agency is legally suspended only in those circumstances where the police have obtained from the individual being tracked a waiver of his or her privacy rights or in the extraordinary circumstance of an emergency in which public safety is at risk or issue and law enforcement or government agents must take action to avert, catastrophe, death or dire consequences. Another provision of the act is that government agencies are mandated to provide to the California Department of Justice information about warrants that don't identify a specific target or in cases where they want to delay notifying the target. The Department of Justice on an ongoing basis must provide that information to the public. References to the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department's Stingray both in the press and in other forms of public disclosure, including that the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department was using the simulator to target a far greater percentage of the county's population than any other law enforcement agencies within the State of California using identical or similar devices to track the cell phone traffic of the populations within their respective jurisdictions, summoned the attention of the Electronic Frontier Foundation. An article that ran in the Palm Springs Desert Sun, which had as its basis an analysis of California Department of Justice data, revealed

that on a per capita basis San Bernardino County law enforcement agencies sought and were granted more electronic warrants than all other law enforcement agencies in the State of California. According to the article, 93 percent of the California Electronic Communications Privacy Act warrants reported to the state by the San Bernardino Sheriff's Department "were granted to investigate people whose identity was unknown to the department." In August 2018, the Electronic Frontier Foundation made a request pursuant to the California Public Records Act to obtain search warrant information for six specific searches that were made public by the Sheriff's Department and which were disclosed to the Department of Justice. In the authorization requests for those six searches, the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department had misspelled the term simulator in seeking warrants to utilize "cell-site stimulators." In its request, the Electronic Frontier Foundation sought court case numbers associated with the search warrants in an effort to allow the foundation's researchers to locate in the various court files the search warrant affidavits spelling out the grounds for granting the warrants and to ascertain whether law enforcement agencies are complying with both the law and their own stated or written policies in obtaining the warrants. The request contained detailed information about each warrant, made public by the Department of Justice, such as the nature of the warrants, the precise start and end dates of the warrants and verbatim quotes about the grounds for each warrant. The request sought the specific case numbers associated with the warrants so the Electronic Frontier Foundation could determine through court records, such as affidavits, whether the warrants were justified. San Bernardino County denied the Electronic Frontier Foundation request, claiming it was

"vague, overly broad," and didn't describe an "identifiable record." The county also claimed that the material sought qualified as investigative records, and "that such records would be investigative records exempt from disclosure." On October 23, 2018, the Electronic Frontier Foundation filed a petition for a writ of mandate naming the County of San Bernardino and the San Bernardino County Sheriff to force disclosure with regard to what it said were the highest number of electronic warrants per resident in the state, 231 in 2018 alone, those being authorizations to use the Stingray in its possession. Those warrants, once granted, provided the department with clearance to use its cell-site simulator to gain access to cellphone communications of suspects, as well as sweep up the cellphone conversations of unsuspecting nearby cell phone users. The Electronic Frontier Foundation's petition sought to have the sheriff's department disgorge information relating to its collection of data using court ordered electronic surveillance warrants, citing how the department spurned the foundation's effort to track the same information using a California Public Records Act request. The Electronic Frontier Foundation explained its public records request for the court case numbers associated with the electronic search warrants would enable "researchers to locate court records" to ensure whether law enforcement was "following the law and their own policies when obtaining warrants" and their public records request was for "detailed information about each warrant" made public by the United States Department of Justice.

According to the Electronic Frontier Foundation, additionally in September 2018, EFF Senior Investigative Researcher Dave Maass reached out to San Bernardino County to inform their counsel that the California State Attorney General had "specifically informed him that

The San Bernardino County

Sentinel

Published in San Bernardino County.
The Sentinel's main office is located at 10788 Civic Center Drive in Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

A Fortunado Publication in conjunction with

Countywide News Service

Mark Gutglueck, Publisher

Call (951) 567-1936

to learn of locations where the Sentinel is available or to provide news tips

10808 Foothill Blvd., Suite 160-446

Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

SBCSentinel@yahoo.com

Legal Notice Department 909 957 9998

Message Line 909-276 5796

he can obtain the search warrant court numbers" confirming the Electronic Frontier Foundation's "request was narrow and contained granular detail on just six searches."

In response to the Electronic Frontier Foundation's petition for a writ of mandate filed at the San Bernardino Superior Court, Deputy San Bernardino County Counsel Miles Kowalski maintained to the court that the Electronic Frontier Foundation was seeking information that was rightfully being kept from the public, including the search warrant affidavits pertaining to ongoing investigations as well as the identities of confidential informants assisting the sheriff's department in its investigations. After some degree of back-and-forth it was established that the Electronic Frontier Foundation was not seeking that information at all, but rather simply the numbers of the search warrants, which the sheriff's department was refusing to disclose.

While the case against the sheriff's department was ongoing, the Electronic Frontier Foundation did obtain the warrant numbers from the Sheriff's Department, while encountering roadblock upon roadblock in its efforts to unlock the information relating to how the Stingray was being employed, against whom, and what collateral information the department was accumulating, including the whereabouts and communication contacts of tens of thousands of San Bernardino County residents who were and are being unknowingly

caught up in the department's vacuuming of cell phone data, and what the ultimate disposition of that data is, extending to whether the department is continuing to warehouse that information for possible future use or analysis.

On May 16, 2019, Electronic Frontier Foundation attorneys Michael T Risher, Stephanie J Lacambra and David Greene wrote a letter to the presiding judge of the San Bernardino County Superior Court, Judge John P. Vander Feer, in an effort to induce the court to unseal the search warrants and their affidavits to allow for public access to the information relating to the use of the cell phone simulators in the sheriff's department's possession in accordance with the California Electronic Communications Privacy Act.

"We are writing on behalf of the Electronic Frontier Foundation to ask that the court review and unseal 22 of its files that from what we can tell are indefinitely and completely sealed in violation of the Penal Code and Rule of Court 2.551," Risher's, Lacambra's and Greenes' letter states. "The San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department has informed us that these files relate to search warrants authorizing electronic searches under Penal Code §1545.1 and pen register trap trace orders issued under Penal Code § 638.52. The statutory schemes governing these warrants and orders allow sealing only until they are executed or ex-

Continued on Page 4

Six-Sevenths Of Municipal Tax Increase Measures Across County Passed Last Week

from front page

percent turning thumbs down on the initiative, and 10,547 or 33.72 percent supporting it.

In Victorville, it was nip and tuck as to whether Measure P, which would raise the sales tax in the city another one percent, from the current 7.75 percent to 8.75 percent, would pass. With

more than 36,000 voters participating in the referendum, the call for increasing the tax was ahead by a mere seven votes, with 18,250 yes votes or 50.01 percent to 18,233 no votes or 49.99 percent.

In Adelanto, voters were lopsidedly in favor of Measure R, which calls for levying fees on undeveloped property beyond what is already collected from the owners of that land in property tax.

The measure calls for setting a tax of \$200 per acre within the city's

airport development district and its airport park; \$600 per acre in the city's business park area; \$600 per acre on commercial property; \$50 per acre on property zoned for desert living, i.e., residential use; \$600 per acre for land zoned for light manufacturing; \$600 per acre for land zoned for manufacturing/industrial use; \$500 per acre for land zoned for mixed use; \$50 per acre for land zoned as open space; no charge for land designated for public utility use; \$300 per acre for land desig-

nated for development as single family residential homes; \$400 per acre for land zoned for medium density residential development; \$300 per acre for land designated for high density residential use; and \$200 per acre for properties without any fixed zoning. Measure R had the backing of 5,244 or 65.67 percent of the city's voters, while 2,741 or 34.33 percent were against it.

In the county seat, the City of San Bernardino, which declared bankruptcy in 2012 and did not exit from that status

until 2017, has seen the more than \$30 million in reserves it accumulated while it was functioning under the protection of the federal bankruptcy court steadily dwindle over the last three years until it is now on the brink of insolvency once again. In 2007, San Bernardino's voters approved Measure Z levying a 0.25 percent sales tax throughout the city earmarked exclusively for public safety. With Measure Z scheduled to sunset in 2022, the city council put Measure S on the ballot this year,

calling for the extension of the 0.25 cents per dollar Measure Z tax, presumably for another 15 years, as well as the imposition of another 0.75 percent tax on top of that, providing the city with a one percent sales tax that would go into effect as of April 2021. The total sales tax in San Bernardino would then become 8.75 percent per year. The additional 0.75 percent sales tax would translate into \$27 million in additional revenue to

Continued on Page 7

Kruse Pulls Ahead Of Hernandez In Barstow's Fourth District

from front page

to 427 votes or 38.13 percent to Kruse's 412 votes or 36.79 percent. O'Brien

was yet well off the pace at 25 percent. There was a single write-in vote that had been received. After the week-end break, on Monday November 9, the registrar of voters office's tally, released at 4 p.m., showed Hernandez unable to shake Kruse's

close and relentless pursuit. Hernandez was up by just seven votes at that point, with 458 votes or 37.66 percent to Kruse's 451 votes or 37.09 percent. O'Brien was 25.25 percent. On November 10, Tuesday at 4 p.m., the incoming ballots over the

previous 24 hours ran in Kruse's favor, as 13 ballots for Kruse came in as opposed to six for Hernandez, such that each had a total 464 or 37.21 percent. O'Brien had 319 votes or 25.58 percent. Yesterday, Thursday, November 12, when the tally of the county's ballots

at that time was released, Kruse, with 522 votes or 38.16 percent, had pulled 18 votes ahead of Hernandez, who at that point had notched 504 or 36.84 percent. O'Brien had 25 percent of the vote.

Today, at 4 p.m. the registrar of voters office released the latest

tally of the votes, showing Kruse widening her lead over Hernandez. At this point, Kruse has 546 votes or 37.66 percent to Hernandez's 525 or 36.21 percent. O'Brien has register 26.14 percent.

-Mark Gutglueck

County Legislative Races An Even Divide Between GOP and Democrats

from front page

votes or 49.12 percent to Republican hopeful Robin Hhvidston's 25,370 votes or 50.88 percent. The overwhelming number of Democrats in the portion of Assembly District 41 outside San Bernardino County carried the day for Holden.

In Assembly District 42, where former Yucca Valley Mayor Chad Mayes is the incumbent, a unique situation, ultimately beset by paradox, existed. Mayes had been for the entirety of his political career a rock-ribbed conservative Republican and, as such, was elected to the Assembly in 2014, re-elected in 2016 and again in 2018. On December 6, 2019, Mayes left the Republican party, opting to file for re-election as an independent, while decrying the partisan bickering that has gripped Sacramento. In the November 3 contest, he was facing Republican San Jacinto Mayor Andrew Kotyuk. Paradoxically, Mayes did more poorly in the San Bernardino portion of Assembly District 42, despite that having been his political base previously. In San Bernardino County,

Kotyuk hauled in 26,411 votes or 52.48 percent to Mayes's 23,914 or 47.52 percent. In Riverside County from which Kotyuk hails, Mayes outpolled him decidedly, such that overall in the district Mayes has won with 55.9 percent of the vote to Kotyuk's 44.1 percent.

In Assembly District 49, which falls entirely within San Bernardino County, incumbent Democrat Eloise Gomez Reyes trounced Republican challenger Matthew Gordon 104,575 votes or 69.1 percent to 46,768 votes or 30.9 percent.

In Assembly District 52, which includes a portion of both San Bernardino and Los Angeles counties, Democrat incumbent and former Pomona Mayor Freddie Rodriguez won solidly over Republican Challenger Toni Holle on both sides of the county line.

In Assembly District 55, which is spread out through southwesterly San Bernardino County, southeasterly Los Angeles County and northeasterly Orange County, incumbent Phillip Chen faced a challenge from Democrat Andrew Rodriguez. Chen overall prevailed with 55 percent of the vote to Rodriguez's 45 percent. In San Bernardino County, Chen polled 19,605 votes

or 54.1 percent to Rodriguez's 16,621 votes or 45.88 percent.

In California State Senate District 21, which lies within the eastern Mojave Desert and spans into Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties, incumbent Republican Scott Wilk beat Democratic challenger Kipp Mueller.

In Senate District 23, which perambulates over San Bernardino and Riverside counties and where Republican Rosilic Ochoa-Bogh and Democrat Abigail Medina were vying to replace Republican Mike Morrell, Ochoa-Bogh appears to have prevailed with 52.4 percent of the vote, though early in the tabulation of results last week, Medina had taken a slight lead, which has now evaporated.

In Senate District 25, which lies on both sides of the Los Angeles County/San Bernardino County divide, incumbent Democrat Anthony Portantino, with 64.1 percent, overwhelmed Republican Kathleen Hazelton, with 35.9 percent of the vote.

In Senate District 29, the incumbent, Ling Ling Chang, had acceded to that office in 2018 after Democrat Josh Newman, who had defeated Chang in 2016 by 2,498 votes, was recalled from

office as a consequence of the Republicans targeted him for being one of 81 legislators to vote in favor of increasing the state's tax on gasoline.

Politics in the 29th District are complex. The district includes a substantial swath of northeast Orange County, Diamond Bar and surrounding cities in Los Angeles County and Chino Hills in San Bernardino County. While a plurality of the district's voters are registered Democrats at 38.7 percent, the Republicans, who generally turn out in larger numbers at the polls than Democrats, account for 31.3 percent of the district's voters. In this way, the 25.3 percent of the district's voters who are unaffiliated with any party are the deciding factor in who holds office. While Chang, as of today had outpolled Newman in San Bernardino County, 18,451 votes or 52.84 percent to 17,361 votes or 47.16 percent, in the district overall, Newman is well enough ahead of Chang, 212,585 or 51.3 percent to Chang's 201,959 votes or 48.7 percent that the position is now considered Newman's for the next four years. This represents the one legislative office representing San Bernardino County in whole or in part that

the Democrats have flipped.

In the 8th Congressional District, where Republican incumbent Paul Cook chose to depart this year in favor of successfully seeking the First District San Bernardino County Supervisor's position, current 33rd District Assemblyman Jay Obernolte, the Republican in the race, has beaten Democrat Chris Bubser. The 8th Congressional District is the largest in California, including much of San Bernardino County's Mojave Desert and stretching northward to include all of Mono and Inyo counties.

In the 27th Congressional District, comprising parts of Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties including much of the San Gabriel Foothills, incumbent Democrat Judy Chu has defeated Republican challenger John Nalbandian, though within San Bernardino County Nalbandian outpolled Chu 11,105 votes or 52.9 percent to 9,887 votes or 47.1 percent.

In the 31st Congressional District, which lies entirely within San Bernardino County, incumbent Democrat Pete Aguilar had little difficulty with GOP standard bearer Agnes Gibboney. Aguilar collected 167,481 votes or 61.24

percent to Gibboney's 106,006 or 38.76 percent.

In the 35th Congressional District, which includes cities and territory in both San Bernardino and Los Angeles County, incumbent Democrat Norma Torres dispatched Republican challenger Mike Cargile, 69.3 percent to 30.7 percent.

In the 39th Congressional District, Gil Cisneros ran for office in 2018 successfully, utilizing a portion of the wealth that had fallen to him after he won a Mega Millions jackpot worth \$266 million in 2010. Cisneros, an 11-year Navy veteran, had been a Republican but left the party in 2008 out of a belief that the GOP had become "too ideological." In the 2018 race, Cisneros, running as a Democrat, outdistanced Young Kim by collecting 126,002 votes or 51.56 percent to Kim's 118,391 votes or 48.44 percent.

In a rematch this year, Kim, a Republican, came roaring back, polling 172,253 votes or 56.61 percent to 168,108 votes or 49.39 percent for Cisneros. Kim's victory marks the one legislative position that the GOP picked up in San Bernardino County as a consequence of the November 3 election.

Court, DA & Sheriff's Office Resisting Releasing Information In Warrants Pertaining To Cell Call Interception

from page 2

pire, respectively. Thus, these files should long ago have been unsealed under these provisions. Nevertheless, it appears that at the request of the Sheriff's Department these court files remain completely sealed until further order of the court."

A trap and trace device records or decodes electronic or other impulses which identify the numbers called or otherwise transmitted on the telephone line to which that device is dedicated. A pen register is similar to a trap and trace device. A trap and trace device shows what numbers had called a specific telephone, i.e., all incoming phone numbers.

"In the course of this litigation," the letter continues, "the sheriff's department has provided the search warrant numbers of these six warrants, but refuses to provide the warrants themselves, asserting among other things that it cannot do so because they have all been indefinitely sealed by this court. The Electronic Frontier Foundation has since requested 18 other warrants pertaining to electronic searches that the sheriff's department obtained under similar circumstances from this court. The department has provided two of them but has refused to provide the rest, again on the grounds that they are sealed. The two warrants that it did provide both contain sealing requests that were denied by the issuing magistrates, warrant numbers VVSW18-1048 and VVSW18-1286. It thus appears that the sheriff's department requests indefinite sealing orders as part of every application for a warrant or court order under these statutes."

The letter to Judge Judge John P. Vander Feer continues, "Although the sealing orders prevent us from reviewing information about the proffered justification for sealing or even

if any such justification was asserted, we believe that these files should be unsealed in whole or in part. Pen register or trap and trace orders must be disclosed after they expire. Some of the files at issue apparently involve orders "authorizing or approving the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device which are methods of obtaining routing and dialing information for telephone calls and other electronic communications, respectively. These orders may be issued for periods of up to 60 days and extended for additional 60 day periods if there is continuing probable cause to do so. Until recently, a magistrate issuing these types of orders was required to direct that the order be sealed until otherwise ordered by the court. These indefinite sealing orders may well have violated the First Amendment."

In their letter, Risher, Lacambra and Greene go on to state, "The legislature addressed this problem in 2016 by changing this provision so that it now requires that an order or extension order authorizing or approving the installation and use of a pen register or a trap and trace device shall direct that the order be sealed until the order including any extension expires. This legislative history and the language of the amended statute make it clear that these sealing orders must now expire when the underlying order does, particularly given the constitutional requirement that the statute be read so as to promote public access. But it appears that the warrant application forms submitted by the sheriff's department fail to comply with this statutory change, though it may well be that that issuing magistrates in many of these cases were not aware of this statutory noncompliance. Law enforcement must provide notice to the target if known within 30 days of the expiration of the order. The issuing court may grant delays [to] this period under certain conditions. If there is no identified target, the agency must provide notice to the Department

of Justice after the order and any authorized delay periods expire. The department must then post information about the order on its website within 90 days. Information about all of the orders in question appears on the department's website, which shows that they have been executed and that any nondisclosure order has expired."

Electronic Frontier Foundation attorneys Risher, Lacambra and Greene further argued in their letter to Judge Vander Feer, "Executed search warrants become public ten days after they are issued. Many of the orders in question authorize the use of a cell site simulator. These devices commonly known as Stingrays, a brand name, masquerade as cell phone towers and allow law enforcement to locate specific cell phones by diverting these phone signals to the simulator rather than to the carrier's real tower. They can also be used to determine the unique international mobile subscriber identifiers of unknown devices. Law enforcement must obtain a special kind of search warrant under the California Electronic Communications Privacy Act before deploying a cell site simulator. Warrants issued under the California Electronic Communications Privacy Act must comply with specific requirements mandated by statute and aimed to improve public oversight and transparency. They must also comply with Penal Code §1534, which makes all warrants and related documents public 10 days after they are issued, assuming they have been executed."

Penal Code §1534 states in part, "A search warrant shall be executed and returned within 10 days after date of issuance. The documents and records of the court relating to the warrant need not be open to the public until the execution and return of the warrant or the expiration of the 14-day period after issuance. Thereafter if the warrant has been executed, the documents and records shall be open to the public as a judicial

record."

Risher's, Lacambra's and Greene's letter maintained, "As with pen registers, the police must provide information about these warrants to the target if known, after execution; if the target is unknown they must provide the information to the Department of Justice, which then posts it on its website. Although the police may apply to the court for authorization to delay notice for up to 90 days at a time, the fact that information about these warrants was posted on the Department of Justice website shows that any such periods have long since expired."

In their letter, Risher, Lacambra and Greene called upon Judge Vander Feer to "examine these warrant files and unseal any parts of them that are not properly sealed. Since orders to seal court records implicate the public's right of access under the First Amendment, they inherently are subject to ongoing judicial scrutiny, including at the trial court level. Thus, the 'court on its own motion may move ... to unseal a record' 'entirely or in part.'" The lawyers told the judge that "any party seeking to restrict access has a continuing burden to show that the materials currently meet the standards for sealing" and "The court may order the records unsealed entirely or in part. If redaction of a record is sufficient, sealing the entire record is improper."

While conceding that "The court may partially seal an affidavit as necessary to protect the identity of a confidential informant, which is protected under Evidence Code 1041," Risher, Lacambra and Greene insisted that "any portions of the sealed materials which if disclosed would not reveal or tend to reveal the informant's identity must be made public."

Controlling law and case precedent further requires disclosure of any parts of sealed materials that can be provided with appropriate redactions and which will not compromise the identity of an informant or informants, even pertaining to matters that

have yet to result in a prosecution, according to Risher, Lacambra and Greene in their letter to Judge Vander Feer.

And while "affidavits and related materials may be sealed in whole or in part as necessary to protect a criminal defendant's Sixth Amendment right to a fair trial and minor victims' rights to privacy," Risher, Lacambra and Greene told Judge Vander Feer, "The Court of Appeal held that under both the First Amendment and the Rules of Court the public's right to access to these materials may be denied only if the court after notice and hearing makes four supported findings: i) there exists an overriding interest supporting closure and for sealing; ii) there is a substantial probability that the interest will be prejudiced absent closure and/or sealing; iii) the proposed closure and/or sealing is narrowly tailored to serve the overriding interest; and iv) there is no less restrictive means of achieving the overriding interest."

Risher, Lacambra and Greene argue, "these files should be completely or partially unsealed," expressing their belief that "an examination of the materials will show that they should be unsealed under these rules at least in part because... information about these warrants and orders is available on the Department of Justice website indicates that any period for which the government statutes authorize sealing has long since expired. These statutes therefore make them public unless some other statute or constitutional provision overrides that presumption. There can be no justification for sealing boilerplate parts of the files such as the outdated indefinite sealing orders or other parts containing general legal propositions unrelated to any specific case that were presented to the court. This information cannot be privileged, and because it does not relate to any individual case, cannot implicate any constitutional right. Moreover, there is no compelling interest that justifies sealing these

materials. Both the Penal Code and the First Amendment therefore require that they be unsealed."

Citing case law that evolved out of two prosecutions, *People v Hobbs* in 1994 and *People v Jackson* in 2005, Risher, Lacambra and Greene told Judge Vander Feer "The court will have to determine whether any of the facts presented to support these delayed notification orders should continue to be sealed, but the remainder of these documents must be unsealed. We are not aware of any precedent authorizing a court to seal a warrant or judicial order as opposed to the supporting affidavit after it has expired or been executed. The trio then reasoned that "this makes sense because it seems unlikely that a search warrant would itself contain much if any information that would meet the standards for sealing" as "warrants do not generally contain the names of informants or the type of information that would jeopardize the right to a fair trial or constitute such a severe infringement on personal privacy so as to merit sealing.

"And there is an extremely significant countervailing public interest in government transparency and accountability by allowing the public to see how and why courts are authorizing the police to conduct digital searches," Risher, Lacambra and Greene continued, adding, "Information that has already been disclosed cannot be sealed because there is no justification for sealing records that contain only facts already known or available to the public," and they asserted, it "seems likely that much of the information in the sealed documents has been revealed in the course of criminal proceedings, either in discovery provided to the defense without any sort of protective order or in the preliminary hearings trials or other evidentiary hearings.

"Summary sealing of the entirety of the requested search warrants and supporting materials

Continued on Page 8

Public Notices

FBN 20200008418
The following entity is doing business as OPTIMIST PACKAGING 206 E MISSION BLVD POMONA, CA 91766 MARTIN HERNANDEZ 206 E MISSION BLVD POMONA, CA 91766

This Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ MARTIN HERNANDEZ
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 9/15/2020

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: AUGUST 31, 2020

County Clerk, Deputy D5511

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 9/25, 10/02, 10/09 & 10/16, 2020. CORRECTED 10/23, 10/30, 11/06 & 11/13, 2020.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIVDS 2021647

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner ERIC JON ZUCK filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: ERIC JON ZUCK to ERIC JON OATES

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing: Date: 12/07/20 Time: 9:00 a.m. Department: S17

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District - Civil Division, 247 West Third Street, Same as above, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0210, San Bernardino

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: OCTOBER 5, 2020
Lynn M. Poncin
Judge of the Superior Court.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/23/20, 10/30/20, 11/06/20 & 11/13/20, 2020.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIVDS 2020684

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner FRANK HURTADO JR. filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: FRANK HURTADO JR. to FRANK MACIAS

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the

Public Notices

name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing: Date: 12/07/20 Time: 9:00 a.m. Department: S16

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District - Civil Division, 247 West Third Street, Same as above, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0210, San Bernardino

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: OCTOBER 8, 2020
Lynn M. Poncin
Judge of the Superior Court.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/23/20, 10/30/20, 11/06/20 & 11/13/20, 2020.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIVDS20121410

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner JAVIER BRIZUELA C filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: JAVIER BRIZUELA C to JAVIER BRIZUELA ORTEGA

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing: Date: 12/02/20 Time: 9:00 a.m. Department: S16

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District - Civil Division, 247 West Third Street, Same as above, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0210, San Bernardino

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: OCTOBER 14, 2020
Lynn M. Poncin
Judge of the Superior Court.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/23/20, 10/30/20, 11/06/20 & 11/13/20, 2020.

FBN 20200009420
The following entity is doing business as KERRY APEX (KUL) 5490 EAST FRANCIS STREET ONTARIO, CA 91761 KULS, LLC 577 AIRPORT BOULEVARD, SUITE 800 BURLINGAME, CA 94010

This Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ LENA CHEUNG
This statement was filed with

Public Notices

the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/13/2020

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: N/A

County Clerk, Deputy I5199

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/23, 10/30, 11/06 & 11/13, 2020.

FBN 20200009279

The following entity is doing business as EQUITY LAW GROUP 5862 PINE AVE UNIT B8 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709 DAVID S KOZICH 5862 PINE AVE UNIT B8 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709

This Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ DAVID S KOZICH
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/07/2020

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: N/A

County Clerk, Deputy D5511

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/23, 10/30, 11/06 & 11/13, 2020.

FBN 20200009686

The following entity is doing business as BEST BUILDING SERVICES 875 W. 23RD STREET UPLAND, CA 91784 HECTOR A. MOLINA 875 W. 23RD STREET UPLAND, CA 91784

This Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ HECTOR A. MOLINA
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/07/2020

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: N/A

County Clerk, Deputy I1327

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/23, 10/30, 11/06 & 11/13, 2020.

FBN 20200009056

The following entity is doing business as BAM BALLOONS 26495 VERONICA CT LOMA LINDA, CA 92354 ANICA M TIJERINA 26495 VERONICA CT LOMA LINDA, CA 92354

This Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A regis-

Public Notices

trant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ ANICA M TIJERINA

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/02/2020

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: JANUARY 3, 2020

County Clerk, Deputy D5511

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/23, 10/30, 11/06 & 11/13, 2020.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF JOHN CHARLES ANICIC JR,

CASE NO. PROPS2000803

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, and contingent creditors of JOHN CHARLES ANICIC JR, and persons who may be otherwise interested in the will or estate, or both:

A petition has been filed by JOHN CHARLES ANICIC III in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO, requesting that JOHN CHARLES ANICIC III be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of JOHN CHARLES ANICIC JR. Decedent died intestate. (The petition requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. This will avoid the need to obtain court approval for many actions taken in connection with the estate. However, before taking certain actions, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or have consented to the proposed action. The petition is set for hearing in Dept. No. S35 at SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT - PROBATE DIVISION 247 W. 3rd STREET SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415-0212 on December 10, 2020 at 09:00 AM IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the deceased, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 58 of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery of the notice to you under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are interested in the estate, you may request special notice of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Section 1250 of the California Probate Code. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are interested in the estate, you may request special notice of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Section 1250 of the California Probate Code.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/30/20, 11/06/20, 11/13/20, 11/20/20

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO20200007704

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: NK Jewelers, 2450 Vineyard Ave, Ontario, CA 91761, Mailing Address: 17780 Mesa Rd, Fontana, CA 92336, Noeila K. Moreno, 17780 Mesa Rd, Fontana, CA 92336 Business is Conducted By: An Individual Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ Noeila Moreno This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 8/25/20 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: 09/01/2015 County Clerk, s/ D5511

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). 9/25/20, 10/02/20, 10/09/20, 10/16/20 Corrected on 10/30/20, 11/6/20, 11/13/20, 11/20/20

FBN 20200009910 The following person is doing business as: BLUE SKY MESSAGE 1964 W 9TH ST, SUITE C UPLAND, CA 91786 APE MEDICAL INC. 243 S ROSEMEAD BLVD PASADENA, CA 91107

This Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION

BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A regis-

Public Notices

FBN 20200008485
The following entity is doing business as LANGA CELLARS 30082 RED HILL ROAD HIGHLAND, CA 92346 LANGA CELLARS LLC 3002 RED HILL ROAD HIGHLAND, CA 92346 Mailing Address: 30082 RED HILL ROAD HIGHLAND, CA 92346 This Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ CHARLES CHAO PANG

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/26/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: N/A

County Clerk, Deputy I1327

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/30/20, 11/06/20, 11/13/20 & 11/20/20

FBN 20200009950 The following person is doing business as: PRO DIAMOND CLEAN LLC 3894 N. MOUNTAIN AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405 PRO DIAMOND CLEAN LLC 3894 N. MOUNTAIN AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405

This Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ DENISE URRUTIA
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/27/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: JUNE 30, 2020

County Clerk, Deputy D5511

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/30/20, 11/06/20, 11/13/20 & 11/20/20

FBN 20200009949
The following person is doing business as: HOMETOWN REALTY 23570 KNAPPS CUTOFF CRESTLINE, CA 92404 ROSEMARIE LABADIE 23570 KNAPPS CUTOFF CRESTLINE, CA 92325 Mailing Address: PO BOX 3046 CRESTLINE, CA 92325

This Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ DENISE URRUTIA
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/27/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: OCTOBER 21, 2020

County Clerk, Deputy I1327

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). 9/25/20, 10/02/20, 10/09/20, 10/16/20 Corrected on 10/30/20, 11/6/20, 11/13/20, 11/20/20

FBN 20200009932 The following person is doing business as: I'M SO INTO ME [and] UNITY NOW OFFICIAL 301 S LILAC AVE, SUITE #23 RIALTO, CA 92376 MIA D JACKSON 301 S LILAC AVE, SUITE #23 RIALTO, CA 92376

Mailing Address: 219 S RIVERSIDE AVE, SUITE #221 RIALTO, CA 92376

Telephone: 909-310-1823
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 11/06, 11/13 & 11/20, 2020

Public Notices

trant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ CHARLES CHAO PANG

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/26/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: N/A

County Clerk, Deputy I1327

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/30/20, 11/06/20, 11/13/20 & 11/20/20

FBN 20200009950 The following person is doing business as: PRO DIAMOND CLEAN LLC 3894 N. MOUNTAIN AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405 PRO DIAMOND CLEAN LLC 3894 N. MOUNTAIN AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405

This Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ DENISE URRUTIA
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/27/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: JUNE 30, 2020

County Clerk, Deputy D5511

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/30/20, 11/06/20, 11/13/20 & 11/20/20

FBN 20200009949
The following person is doing business as: HOMETOWN REALTY 23570 KNAPPS CUTOFF CRESTLINE, CA 92404 ROSEMARIE LABADIE 23570 KNAPPS CUTOFF CRESTLINE, CA 92325 Mailing Address: PO BOX 3046 CRESTLINE, CA 92325

This Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ DENISE URRUTIA
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/27/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: OCTOBER 21, 2020

County Clerk, Deputy I1327

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). 9/25/20, 10/02/20, 10/09/20, 10/16/20 Corrected on 10/30/20, 11/6/20, 11/13/20, 11/20/20

FBN 20200009932 The following person is doing business as: I'M SO INTO ME [and] UNITY NOW OFFICIAL 301 S LILAC AVE, SUITE #23 RIALTO, CA 92376 MIA D JACKSON 301 S LILAC AVE, SUITE #23 RIALTO, CA 92376

Mailing Address: 219 S RIVERSIDE AVE, SUITE #221 RIALTO, CA 92376

Telephone: 909-310-1823
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 11/06, 11/13 & 11/20, 2020

Public Notices

This Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware

Public Notices

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that TIF-FANY STANLEY be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests the decedent's wills and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The will and any codicils are available for examination in the file kept by the court.

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority.

A hearing on the petition will be held DECEMBER 3, 2020 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S-37 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney.

IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code.

Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law.

YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk.

Filed: OCTOBER 26, 2020
 Attorney for the Petitioner: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603
 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC
 300 E STATE STREET
 SUITE 620
 REDLANDS, CA 92373
 (909) 475 8800
 sam@pricelawfirm.com
 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 11/06, 11/13 & 11/20, 2020

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ROBERT GERALD LIGHTFOOT
 CASE NO. PROPS 2000021
 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ROBERT GERALD LIGHTFOOT
 A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by REBECCA ANN LIGHTFOOT in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that REBECCA ANN LIGHTFOOT be appointed as personal rep-

Public Notices

representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority.

A hearing on the petition will be held JANUARY 7, 2021 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S-35 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney.

IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code.

Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law.

YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk.

Filed: NOVEMBER 2, 2020
 Attorney for the Petitioner: TYLER H. BROWN, ESQ.
 1152 N. MOUNTAIN AVE, SUITE 210
 UPLAND, CA 91786
 Telephone No: (909) 982-5086

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 11/13, 11/20 & 11/27, 2020

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-20200009425

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: Holiday Pet Grooming Spa, 116 N. Riverside, Rialto, CA 92376, Wendy L. Hackett, 2955 Bautista Street, Riverside, CA 92506

Business is Conducted By: An Individual

Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ Wendy L Hackett
 This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/13/20

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: 10/09/2015

County Clerk, s/ D5511
 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement

Public Notices

must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

11/06/20, 11/13/20, 11/20/20, 11/27/20

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-20200010172

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: AZQ Photobooth, 17631 Valley Blvd Suit A, Fontana, CALIF 92316, Mailing Address: 13214 Kochi Dr, Moreno Valley, CALIF 92553, Antoni Z. Quebec, 13214 Kochi Dr, Moreno Valley, CALIF 92553

Business is Conducted By: An Individual

Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ Antoni Quebec
 This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/30/20

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: 10/29/20

County Clerk, s/ D5511

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

11/06/20, 11/13/20, 11/20/20, 11/27/20

Foreclosure Notice

A.P.N.: 1005-311-53-0-000

Trustee Sale No.:2019-2412
 NOTICE OF TRUSTEE'S SALE UNDER A NOTICE OF A NOTICE OF DELINQUENT ASSESSMENT AND CLAIM OF LIEN. YOU ARE IN DEFAULT UNDER A NOTICE OF DELINQUENT ASSESSMENT DATED 2/18/2020 UNLESS YOU TAKE ACTION TO PROTECT YOUR PROPERTY, IT MAY BE SOLD AT A PUBLIC SALE. IF YOU NEED AN EXPLANATION OF THE NATURE OF THE PROCEEDING AGAINST YOU, YOU SHOULD CONTACT A LAWYER. Notice is hereby given that on 12/7/2020 at 1:00 PM, S.B.S. Lien Services As the duly appointed Trustee under and pursuant to Notice of Delinquent Assessment, recorded on 2/24/2020 as Document No. 2020-0063515 Book Page of Official Records in the Office of the Recorder of San Bernardino County, California, The original owner: LESLIE A WRIGHT The purported new owner: LESLIE A WRIGHT WILL SELL AT PUBLIC AUCTION TO THE HIGHEST BIDDER payable at time of sale in lawful money of the United States, by a cashier's check drawn by a State or national bank, a check drawn by a state or federal credit union, or a check drawn by a state or federal savings and loan association, savings association, or savings bank specified in section 5102 of the Financial Code and authorized to do business in this state.: NEAR THE FRONT STEPS LEADING UP TO THE CITY OF CHINO CIVIC CENTER, 13220 CENTRAL AVENUE, CHINO, CALIFORNIA 91710 All right, title and interest under said Notice of Delinquent Assessment in the property situated in said County, as more fully described on the above referenced assessment lien. The street address and other common designation, if any of the real property described above is purported to be: 1333 NORTH HILLS DR UPLAND CA 91784 The undersigned Trustee disclaims any liability for any incorrectness of the street address and

Public Notices

other common designation, if any, shown herein. Said sale will be made, but without covenant or warranty, expressed or implied, regarding title, possession, or encumbrances, to pay the remaining principal sum due under said Notice of Delinquent Assessment, with interest thereon, as provided in said notice, advances, if any, estimated fees, charges, and expenses of the Trustee, to-wit: \$8,932.16 accrued interest and additional advances, if any, will increase this figure prior to sale. The claimant, UPLAND NORTH HILLS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION under said Notice of Delinquent Assessment heretofore executed and delivered to the undersigned a written Declaration of Default and Demand for Sale, and a written Notice of Default and Election to Sell. The undersigned caused said Notice of Default and Election to Sell to be recorded in the county where the real property is located and more than three months have elapsed since such recordation. NOTICE TO POTENTIAL BIDDERS: If you are considering bidding on this property lien, you should understand that there are risks involved in bidding at a trustee auction. You will be bidding on a lien, not on the property itself. Placing the highest bid at a trustee auction does not automatically entitle you to free and clear ownership of the property. You should also be aware that the lien being auctioned off may be a junior lien. If you are the highest bidder at the auction, you are or may be responsible for paying off all liens senior to the lien being auctioned off, before you can receive clear title to the property. You are encouraged to investigate the existence, priority, and size of outstanding liens that may exist on this property by contacting the county recorder's office or a title insurance company, either of which may charge you a fee for this information. If you consult either of these resources, you should be aware that the same lender may hold more than one mortgage or deed of trust on the property. NOTICE TO PROPERTY OWNER: The sale date shown on this notice of sale may be postponed one or more times by the mortgagee, beneficiary, trustee, or a court, pursuant to Section 2924g of the California Civil Code. The law requires that information about trustee sale postponements be made available to you and to the public, as a courtesy to those not present at the sale. If you wish to learn whether your sale date has been postponed, and, if applicable, the rescheduled time and date for the sale of this property, you may call FOR SALES INFORMATION, PLEASE CALL (855) 986-9342 or visit this Internet Web site www.superiordefault.com, using the file number assigned to this case 2019-2412. Information about postponements that are very short in duration or that occur close in time to the scheduled sale may not immediately be reflected in the telephone information or on the Internet Web site. The best way to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. NOTICE TO TENANT: You may have a right to purchase this property after the trustee auction if conducted after January 1, 2021, pursuant to Section 2924m of the California Civil Code. If you are an "eligible tenant buyer," you can purchase the property if you match the last and highest bid placed at the trustee auction. If you are an "eligible bidder," you may be able to purchase the property if you exceed the last and highest bid placed at the trustee auction. There are three steps to exercising this right of purchase. First, 48 hours after the date of the trustee sale, you can call FOR SALES INFORMATION, PLEASE CALL (855) 986-9342, or visit this internet website www.superiordefault.com,

Public Notices

using the file number assigned to this case 2019-2412 to find the date on which the trustee's sale was held, the amount of the last and highest bid, and the address of the trustee. Second, you must send a written notice of intent to place a bid so that the trustee receives it no more than 15 days after the trustee's sale. Third, you must submit a bid so that the trustee receives it no more than 45 days after the trustee's sale. If you think you may qualify as an "eligible tenant buyer" or "eligible bidder," you should consider contacting an attorney or appropriate real estate professional immediately for advice regarding this potential right to purchase. THE PROPERTY IS BEING SOLD SUBJECT TO THE NINETY DAY RIGHT OF REDEMPTION CONTAINED IN CIVIL CODE SECTION 5715(b). Date: 11/2/2020. S.B.S LIEN SERVICES, 31194 La Baya Drive, Suite 106, Westlake Village, California, 91362. By: Annissa Young, Sr. Trustee Sale Officer (11/13/2020, 11/22/2020, 11/27/2020 | TS#2019-2412 SDI-19730)

SUMMONS

(FAMILY LAW) NOTICE TO RESPONDENT (AVISO AL DEMANDADO): SHARON JOY PEDIGO YOU HAVE BEEN SUED. Read the information below and on the next page. Lo han demandado. Lea la informacion a continuacion y en la pagina siguiente. PETITIONER'S NAME IS (Nombre del demandante): LAWRENCE ROBERT BOYER, JR. CASENUMBER20P5FL00848 You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this Summons and Petition are served on you to file a Response (Form FL-120) at the court and have a copy served on the petitioner. A letter or phone call will not protect you. If you do not file your Response on time, the court may make orders affecting your marriage or domestic partnership, your property, and custody of your children. You may be ordered to pay support and attorney fees and costs. For legal advice, contact a lawyer immediately. Get help finding a lawyer at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), at the California Legal Services Website (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), or by contacting your local county bar association. Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de haber recibido la entrega legal de esta Citacion y Peticion para presentar una Respuesta (formulario FL-120) ante la corte y efectuar la entrega legal de una copia al demandante. Una carta o llamada telefonica o una audiencia de la corte no basta para protegerlo. Si no presenta su Respuesta a tiempo, la corte puede dar ordenes que afecten su matrimonio o pareja de heco, sus bienes y la custodia de sus hijos. La corte tambien le puede ordenar que pague manutencion, y honorarios y costos legales. Para asesoramiento legal, pongase en contacto de inmediato con un abogado. Puede obtener informacion para encontrar un abogado en el Contro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en el sitio web de los Servicios Legales de California (www.lahelpca.org) o poniendose en contacto con el colegio de abogados de su condado. NOTICE - Restraining orders on page 2: These restraining orders are effective against both spouses or domestic partners until the petition is dismissed, a judgement is entered, or the court makes further orders. They are enforceable anywhere in California by any law enforcement office who has received or seen a copy of them. AVISO - Las ordenes de restricción se encuentran en la pagina 2 : Las ordenes de restricción estan en vigencia en cuanto a

Public Notices

ambos conyuges o miembros de la pareja de hecho hasta que se despida la peticion, se emita un fallo o la corte de otras ordenes. Cualquier agencia del orden publico que haya recibido o visto una copia de estas ordenes puede hacerlas acatar en cualquier lugar de California. FEE WAIVER : If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the clerk for a fee waiver form. The court may order you to pay back all or part of the fees and costs that the court waived for you or the other party. Exencion de cuotas : Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentacion, pida al secretario un formulario de execion de cuotas. La corte puede ordenar que usted pague, ya sea en parte o por completo, las cuotas y costos de la corte previamente exentos a peticion de usted o de la otra parte. FL-100 PETITION FOR Dissolution (Divorce) of: Marriage 1. LEGAL RELATIONSHIP: We are married. 2. RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS: a. Petitioner [and] have been residents of this state for at least six months and of this country for at least three months immediately preceding the filing of this petition. (For divorce, at least one person in the legal relationship described in items 1a and 1c must comply with this requirement.) 3. STATISTICAL FACTS A (1) Date of marriage: March 8, 2003 (2) Date of separation: September 11, 2011 (3) Time from date of marriage to date of separation: 8 years 6 Months 4. MINOR CHILDREN: There are no minor children. 5. LEGAL GROUNDS: Irreconcilable Differences 8. SPOUSAL OR DOMESTIC PARTNER SUPPORT: Terminate (end) the court's ability to ward support to Petitioner [and] Respondent. SEPARATE PROPERTY: There are no such assets or debts that I know of to be confirmed by the court. COMMUNITY AND QUASI-COMMUNITY PROPERTY: There are no such assets or debts that I know of to be divided by the court. OTHER REQUESTS: Such other and further orders as the court deems just and proper. The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y direccion de la corte son): SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

400 Civic Center Plaza
 Pomona, California 91766
 The name, address and telephone number of petitioner's attorney, or petitioner without an attorney, are: (El nombre, direccion y numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante si no tiene abogado, son): LAWRENCE ROBERT BOYER, JR. IN PRO PER

417 S. SHELLMAN AVENUE
 SAN DIMAS, CALIFORNIA 91773
 DATE (Fecha): July 13, 2020
 by O Navarro, Deputy (Asistente) of Sherri R. Carter Executive Officer/Clerk of the Court (Secretario) Published in The San Bernardino County Sentinel on 11/13, 11/20, 11/27 & 12/04, 2020

FBN 20200010183
 The following person is doing business as: JOSEPH BRADY, INC. [and] ALLIANCE MANAGEMENT GROUP [and] BARSTOW REAL ESTATE GROUP 240 E WILLIAMS ST BARSTOW, CA 92311 JOSEPH BRADY, INC., 12138 INDUSTRIAL BLVD., SUITE 250 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395
 Mailing Address: PO BOX 2710 VICTORVILLE, CA 92393-2710
 This Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION
 BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes

Public Notices

Public Record upon filing. S/ JOSEPH W. BRADY
 This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/30/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: DECEMBER 4, 1989
 County Clerk, Deputy A9730
 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 11/13/20, 11/20/20, 11/27/20 & 12/04/20.

FBN 20200010182
 The following person is doing business as: JOSEPH BRADY, INC. [and] THE BRADCO COMPANIES [and] BRADCO HIGH DESERT REPORT [and] THE SHOPS AT SPANISH TRAIL [and] THE SHOPPES AT SPANISH TRAIL [and] MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY REAL ESTATE GROUP [and] BRADCO COMMERCIAL LEASING GROUP [and] BRADCO DEVELOPMENT [and] MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE [and] BRADCO MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE [and] HIGH DESERT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL [and] MOJAVE RIVER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT [and] MOJAVE RIVER ECONOMIC GROUP [and] HIGH DESERT VALLEY SURVEY (which began transacting business 08/01/2019) [and] MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY SURVEY (for which no date for commencing service is provided) 12138 INDUSTRIAL BLVD., SUITE 250 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395 JOSEPH BRADY, INC., 12138 INDUSTRIAL BLVD., SUITE 250 VICTORVILLE, CA 92395
 Mailing Address: PO BOX 2710 VICTORVILLE, CA 92393-2710
 This Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION
 BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

S/ JOSEPH W. BRADY
 This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/30/2020 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: DECEMBER 4, 1989
 County Clerk, Deputy A9730
 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 11/13/20, 11/20/20, 11/27/20 & 12/04/20.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-20200010303

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: Talamanca's Products, 203 E Park St, Ontario, CALIF, 91761, Javier Castillo, 203 E Park St, Ontario, CALIF 91761
 Business is Conducted By: An Individual
 Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ Javier Castillo
 This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/05/20
 I hereby certify that this is a cor-

Public Notices

rect copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: N/A

County Clerk, s/ H327

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

11/13/20, 11/20/20, 11/27/20, 12/04/20

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-20200010078

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: KA Brand Shop Online USA, 7360 GUTHRIE ST, San Bernardino, CA 92410, Kimath Im, 7360 GUTHRIE ST, San Bernardino, CA 92410

Business is Conducted By: An Individual

Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ Kimath Im

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/28/20

I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: 10/22/20

County Clerk, s/ E4004

NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in

Public Notices

the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

11/13/20, 11/20/20, 11/27/20, 12/04/20

FBN 20200008679

The following person is doing business as: SB CASH AND CARRY 240 N. WATERMAN SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408; SB CASH AND CARRY 240 N. WATERMAN SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: 07/13/2020

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ JOUN SEDER, PRESIDENT

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/21/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/16/2020, 10/23/2020, 10/30/2020, 11/06/2020 CNBB41202001MT

FBN 20200009340

Public Notices

The following person is doing business as: BEACH TO HILLS HOMES 15931 JANINE DRIVE WHITTIER, CALIF 90603; SHANNON BROWN REAL ESTATE GROUP, INC. 15931 JANINE DRIVE WHITTIER, CALIF 90603

The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: 10/18/2019

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ SHANNON COLLETTE BROWN, PRESIDENT

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/08/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/16/2020, 10/23/2020, 10/30/2020, 11/06/2020 CNBB41202002IR

FBN 20200009343

The following person is doing business as: YUMMY BITES FONTANA 16163 COLEEN STREET FONTANA, CA 92337; RADCHI A FLORES 16163 COLEEN STREET FONTANA, CA 92337; VIOLA M FLORES 16163 COLEEN STREET FONTANA, CA 92337

The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE

Public Notices

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ RADCHI A. FLORES, HUSBAND

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/08/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/16/2020, 10/23/2020, 10/30/2020, 11/06/2020 CNBB41202003MT

FBN 20200009344

The following person is doing business as: LEGACY SMOKERS 1091 S MOUNT VERNON AVE COLTON, CA 92324; MAILING ADDRESS P.O. BOX 1501 COLTON, CA 92324; DINA A ABDELHADI 1091 S MOUNT VERNON AVE COLTON, CA 92324

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ CHALYSA L. DIXON, GENERAL PARTNER

Public Notices

aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ DINA A. ABDELHADI, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/08/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/16/2020, 10/23/2020, 10/30/2020, 11/06/2020 CNBB41202004IR

FBN 20200009415

The following person is doing business as: ROYALCLDS 2523 DUFFY ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; CHALYSA L. DIXON 2523 DUFFY ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; CHADONA L. DIXON 2523 DUFFY ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; CHADEN L. DIXON 2523 DUFFY ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407

The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ CHALYSA L. DIXON, GENERAL PARTNER

Public Notices

the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/13/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/16/2020, 10/23/2020, 10/30/2020, 11/06/2020 CNBB41202005MT

FBN 20200009404

The following person is doing business as: MARINE'S TAX SERVICE 390 N PALM AVE STE A RIALTO, CA 92376; MAILING ADDRESS P.O. BOX 1868 RIALTO, CA 92376; MARGARITA MARINELARENA 390 N PALM AVE STE A RIALTO, CA 92376

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: 11/20/2014

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ MARGARITA MARINELARENA, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/13/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/16/2020, 10/23/2020, 10/30/2020, 11/06/2020 CNBB41202007IR

Public Notices

ness name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/16/2020, 10/23/2020, 10/30/2020, 11/06/2020 CNBB41202006IR

FBN 20200009414

The following person is doing business as: DUARTE'S MITIGATION 777 S. TEMESCAL ST. SPC. 13 CORONA, CA 92879; VANESSA DUARTE 777 S. TEMESCAL ST. SPC. 13 CORONA, CA 92879

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ VANESSA DUARTE, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/13/2020

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 10/16/2020, 10/23/2020, 10/30/2020, 11/06/2020 CNBB41202007IR

Yucca Valley Film Festival This Weekend

from front page

7 p.m. tonight are the opening films, The Music Box (a short) and Sweet Sunshine (a feature). At 8:45 p.m., the team that made Sweet Sunshine will take live questions on Facebook.

On Saturday at 10 a.m. are the documentaries The Maroon Bomber and Iron Duck. At 1 p.m. the Kids Section, with the animated films Super Generic, My Tagalong, Selfie Cat, Deep Fears, Maestro, Treasure and Krampouezh, will be available. At 2 p.m. is the hour of the Drone Films, including Bavaria; Unseen Australia, El Valle, A Journey Through the Cocle Province of Panama; Würm – A Scotland Journey; and Inclined to Beauty.

At 3 p.m., the festival goes live with William Baldwin, including the introduction with director Rouald Boulanger, on Facebook, followed by Talk, a short film, whereupon the audience is free to participate via

Facebook in “Ask Me Anything, Live with William Baldwin.”

At 7 p.m. is the screening of the Short Films Section, featuring Exit Package, Ms. Rossi, The Matchmaker, Very Nick and Zach: High Desert Day, Lessons With Martha, Rum Go! R.A.S., and the Fixer, followed by a Facebook discussion. At 9 p.m. the festival will

How SBC's Municipal Measures Fared

from page 3

the city per year, according to projections. San Bernardino's voters on November 3 approved Measure S, with 31,881 votes cast or 56.54 percent in favor of the measure and 24,508 or 43.46 percent in opposition.

In Redlands, voters were asked to consider Measure T, which pertained to the enactment of a one percent transactions and use tax – in common parlance referred to as a sales tax – to the cost paid for goods and services in the city, with an “exemption from this tax with respect to certain sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal

feature Fright Night, consisting of the short films Bench, Vegan's Blood, Hunters, Old Book, Wild Love and at 9:30 p.m. the feature film Fright Night. A panel is to follow with the lead actors. On Sunday at 1 p.m. is the Scriptwriters Roundtable on Facebook.

At 2 p.m. five visual arts and experimental films are to be shown:

property.” Measure T lays out no such exemption for prescription drugs or food, which are both exempt under California's tax code.

Measure T had, as of today, 19,685 votes or 57.02 percent in favor of it and 14,838 opposed.

There were two non-tax measures pertaining to San Bernardino County cities on this year's ballot. In Hesperia, Measure N called for changing the zoning on larger parcels of vacant land currently zoned for residential use at densities of up to 8 units per acre, which allow subdivisions into lot sizes which average 4,500 square feet, to a new zoning designation of 14,520 square feet for each single family residential lot, reducing the num-

Sand in My Blood, The Dawn, No Runners, Quick Fix and Things I've Seen in my Dreams. At 2:30 p.m. the program will advance to dance films, which are to include Paris You Got Me, Black Canvas, Trapped, Shadow, and De-Eschatology. At 3 p.m., music videos will be previewed, those being Nice Shoes, Love-

making and Off the Wall – That One Girl, followed by a Facebook live panel with arts, dance and music video filmmakers. At 7 p.m., the closing of the festival will ensue, with the awards publication, and a replay of the winners. An audience vote on the films is to take place online. The Yucca Valley Town Council in June 2019

voted to initiate the Yucca Valley Film Festival as a family friendly mission to entertain and gather the people of Yucca Valley and the Morongo Basin around a multi-day, annual event, based on a recommendation by the Yucca Valley Parks and Recreation Cultural Commission.

48 precincts reporting showed a narrow vote in favor of Measure Q's passage, 50.83 percent to 49.17 percent, the majority has reverse until today Measure Q appears

Baumgarten Resigns

from front page

tion and teacher morale. The school board dropped the “acting” prefix from Baumgarten's superintendent title in February 2015. Later that year, Baumgarten initiated an inquiry, which led to a full audit, of Hope Academy Charter School and its executive director, Jared Mecham. Hope Academy had been sponsored by the Morongo Valley Unified School District. That

to be going down to defeat with 18,427 votes or 51.98 percent against it and 17,022 or 48.02 percent in support of it.

audit uncovered and documented multiple fiscal irregularities, questionable expenditures, nepotistic arrangements and inappropriate related-party transactions at the charter school. Baumgarten said his suspicions had been raised after he learned that Mecham had expanded Hope Academy's operations into several adjacent and distant districts located in San Bernardino, Kern and Riverside counties without the district's express permis-

Continued on Page 8

Suit Over Sheriff's Department Withholding Warrants For Electronic Monitoring *from page 4*

is not narrowly tailored to serve any legitimate government interest in sealing," Risher, Lacambra and Greene propounded, noting that the materials relating to one of the search warrants being withheld were sealed by the court when that was not actually the case. "Some of the court's files may be erroneously designated as sealed," the letter states. "A boilerplate checkbox on the second page of one of the warrants that we did obtain from the sheriff's department indicates that it is sealed until further order of the court even though the issuing magistrate specifically refused the requested sealing order. Because it appears that this application is a standard template and that the sheriff's department always asks that these orders be sealed, this may lead to confusion and to the erroneous withholding from the public of files that a judge of this court has refused to seal."

Risher, Lacambra and Greene asked that Judge Vander Feer review the 22 search warrants they referenced "to determine whether they are in fact sealed, unseal any files or parts of files that are not properly sealed under Rule of Court 2.551 (h) and the standards discussed above [and] take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that similar files both in the past and in the future are open to the public as required by law."

On June 8, 2019, Judge Vander Feer responded to Risher, Lacambra and Greene. "I write today to inform you I do not intend to act on your request," Judge Vander Feer wrote. There are two reasons. First, your request and contentions are before the court in a petition for writ of mandate, which proceeding appears to be approaching trial. Second, my position as presiding judge does not provide authority to second guess a trial judge or to sua sponte investigate

our law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies. As the statutory law you discuss makes clear, it is the role of the judge presiding over the proceeding to limit the reach of each warrant."

At an October 9, 2020, court hearing in electronic Frontier Foundation's lawsuit against the Superior Court, lawyers for the foundation confirmed that the case against the sheriff's department and the county was dismissed after the foundation was provided with the identification relating to the electronic warrants it had sought and was provided with its attorney fees.

San Bernardino County County Counsel Kowalski told the Sentinel, "During the course of the litigation, the county was able to identify the search warrant numbers and give them [the Electronic Frontier Foundation] those sealed search warrant numbers. The county agreed to pay for their costs during the course of the litigation, and they dismissed the case. So, they partially succeeded in that they were able to get the numbers of the search warrants. The search warrants themselves were sealed by the court. They are currently involved in another matter seeking to unseal the search warrants. That is separate from this litigation."

The Electronic Frontier Foundation, however, did not consider the limited success it had achieved with regard to being able to identify the warrants to be sufficient, as its overriding goal had been to ensure that the sheriff's office and the county were making disclosure of its electronic monitoring activity in compliance with the California Electronic Communications Privacy Act.

Thwarted at obtaining the full range of information with regard to the electronic warrants granted by the San Bernardino County Superior Court by Judge Vander Feer's decision not to release the sought after documents specified in Risher's, Lacambra's and Greene's May 16, 2019 letter, the Electronic Frontier Foundation on October 8, 2019 filed its

verified petition to unseal court records against the San Bernardino Superior Court, seeking to have the court identify all of the electronic search warrants it has issued, unseal 12 search warrants authorizing electronic searches under Penal Code Section 1546.1 and 638.52 and other related documents and that it disclose, in keeping with the California Electronic Communications Privacy Act, the First Amendment and Penal Code §1534 and consistent with the limitations in a defendant's Sixth Amendment guarantee of a fair trial and the confidentiality protection due to a law enforcement informant under Evidence Code § 1041, information contained within the search warrants themselves and the affidavits prepared to convince a judge to issue them.

Named as real parties in interest in the suit are the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department and the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office.

In its verified petition to unseal court records filed against the San Bernardino Superior Court, the Electronic Frontier Foundation claims "these files should long ago have been unsealed, at least in part" under the laws, which "do not allow for indefinite sealing." the Electronic Frontier Foundation asserts the laws require that "copies of the warrants" are to "be provided to the target of the search and made public after they are executed or expire" if the target is known.

"Although the court has some authority to issue orders delaying notification under certain conditions, it cannot do so indefinitely," the Electronic Frontier Foundation reasons, citing public information about warrants issued in 2017 and 2018, posted on the website of the California Department of Justice, which it asserts demonstrates "any such orders have expired."

Additionally, the Electronic Frontier Foundation cites California Rules of Court that "require that any continued sealing of the

records, even in part, be justified by specific findings on the record that have not to date been made" and the public's First Amendment Right of access to the records "also requires unsealing" by the court.

The Electronic Frontier Foundation maintains that "contrary to these provisions" the San Bernardino Superior Court has allowed these records to "remain completely sealed until further order of the court."

In response to The Electronic Frontier Foundation's verified petition to unseal court records, a demurrer has been filed, which is an objection to the continuance of the suit, consisting of a defense asserting that even if all the factual allegations in the complaint are true, they are insufficient to establish a valid cause of action.

The matter is being heard by Judge Dwight Moore. Steve Pascover is representing the Superior Court. Deputy District Attorney Mark Vos and Deputy District Attorney Christine Masonek have represented the district attorney's office in the matter. Representing the sheriff's department is Deputy San Bernardino County Counsel Miles Kowalski.

Initially, the verified petition first sought the release of six warrants. In a letter dated January 24, 2020, the Electronic Freedom Foundations asked for six more warrants.

At an August 5, 2020, hearing the court confirmed that a stipulated agreement had been reached by the parties to have nine of the 12 warrants sought released from under seal reviewed by San Bernardino County Counsel and the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office to determine if they have any objections to the release of the warrants with any objections to be forwarded to the court.

Vos told the Sentinel, "The San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office is opposed to the unsealing of the warrants to be handled in *EFF v. Superior Court*, as there is a potential

risk to the safety of certain parties named in these warrants. Regardless of whether a person is a victim, witness, or defendant, our office, along with law enforcement as a whole, has an obligation to do our best to ensure the safety of those who have matters handled in the criminal justice system."

The court had scheduled for today, Novem-

ber 13, 2020, a hearing on the demurrer. Because, however, of a misunderstanding by which Rischer believed he could make his appearance telephonically from San Francisco and Judge Moore expected all of the legal representatives of the parties would be present in his courtroom, the hearing was postponed to January 15, 2021.

Baumgarten Leaves MUSD *from page 4*

sion or knowledge, despite a requirement that any proposed expansion for a new independent study resource center outside the district's boundaries would be explicitly communicated to the Morongo Unified School District.

Baumgarten appeared to be riding high, but events at Yucca Valley High School last year and early this year undid much of the goodwill toward him. That contretemps grew out of a conflict between Jay Stepp, the Yucca Valley High School's cross country and track coach, and his assistant coach, Holly Brimhall. Stepp felt that Holly Brimhall was undercutting his authority as coach with several of his athletes. This was exacerbated by Brad Brimhall who had been the Trojans' baseball coach since October 2019, perhaps understandably, siding with Holly Brimhall and assailing Stepp in several emails, described variously as "unfortunate" or "ill-conceived" and "tartly-worded." When Baumgarten declined Stepp's request that Holly Brimhall be relieved of her coaching assignment, Stepp resigned.

Beginning in April, Baumgarten took an unexplained leave of absence. Because of the COVID-19 situation, whether Baumgarten was in place as superintendent or not was unclear as the 2019/20 school year ended at the end of May. The school board, in the meantime, temporarily elevated assistant superintendent of human resources Doug Weller to serve as acting superintendent. The district was less than clear

throughout the summer as to whether Baumgarten was functioning in the role of superintendent.

When the 2020/21 school year began in August, it seemed Baumgarten was once again back in the saddle at the district. A press release from the district after he tendered his resignation indicated, contrary to the information available publicly from April until recently, that Baumgarten was actively leading the district during the late summer and early fall. The press release maintained that during Baumgarten's stint as superintendent, the district's schools were advantaged by his command of the district curriculum, the instructors, his constant assessment, his compassion and commitment to students, noting "His persistence during the COVID-19 pandemic also ensured that all of the students in our district would have access to computers to ensure their education continued."

Word came in October that Baumgarten had been placed on administrative leave. Thereafter, closed door discussions with regard to Baumgarten's status ensued. Confidentiality laws prevented any disclosure of what the issues were between the district and Baumgarten. On November 10, the board accepted Baumgarten's resignation, in which he informed the board that he was departing "for personal reasons."

Board President Hilary Slotta thanked Baumgarten "for his more than 33 years of exemplary service to the students and staff of Morongo Unified School District."

-Mark Gutglueck