

Rialto Rocked By Claim Of Police & Fire Department Surveillance Of City Council

By Mark Gutglueck

Panicked paralysis has gripped Rialto City Manager Marcus Fuller and Rialto City Attorney Eric Vail, as they are dealing with a thorny issue involving their political masters and unsuccessful candidates for the city council going back nearly two decades.

Central to the matter are blackmail and election-swaying efforts by members of the fire and police departments

who were seeking to gain leverage in contract negotiations with the city. It is further alleged that former high ranking city officials were knowledgeable of and perhaps even involved in the extortion and efforts to impact voting in Rialto's municipal elections and votes made by the city council.

Fuller and Vail are frantically seeking to bring the matter to a quiet close before it breaks into a full-blown scandal. A

public airing of the seamy details of what occurred, Fuller and Vail fear, would carry with it a substantial possibility that the city's taxpayers will take an estimated \$25 million to \$30 million hit.

At the basis of the contretemps is that Rialto Councilman Ed Scott, who is currently the city's mayor pro tem, has filed claims totaling \$1.15 million against the city where intermittently over the last quarter of a century he

has been a member of the city council for nearly 19 years, including the last seven.

According to one of those claims, Rialto police officers and firefighters have accessed the State of California's law enforcement database on multiple occasions to obtain confidential information which was used in an attempt to prevent his election and reelection to office as well as for political purposes in opposing the electoral

or re-electoral efforts of other members of the city council.

Additional information gleaned by the *Sentinel* indicates that others competing for berths upon the Rialto City Council or the mayor's position were similarly subjected to having their profiles and personal information contained in what is supposed to be a restricted governmental data base accessed and used for either political purposes or **See P 2**

Sheriff's Office & Hesperia Part Company On Defense In Federal Discrimination Suit

San Bernardino County and its sheriff's department have parted ways with the City of Hesperia over their shared defense against the federal government's 2019 lawsuit alleging the city and the department discriminated against African Americans and Latinos with the 2015 passage and subsequent enforcement of Hesperia's "Crime Free Rental Housing Ordinance."

Throughout the first 31 months that the case was being litigated, the city and county shared the same law firm, Aleshire & Wynder, as their legal representative. Aleshire & Wynder is the firm in which Hesperia City Attorney Eric Dunn is a founding partner. With the city and sheriff's department, which provides contract law enforcement

services to the city, as well as the county represented by the same firm, the defense being put on was, at least ostensibly, coordinated and complimentary, with no showing of inconsistent or conflicting assertions of fact or legal theory as the case was progressing toward trial. In July, however, the county filed for a substitution of attorney, replacing Aleshire & Wynder with

the law firm of Lynberg & Watkins. Thereafter, attorneys with Lynberg & Watson, asserting that a conflict between the sheriff's department and the city had existed from the initiation of the litigation onward that Aleshire & Wynder failed to disclose and deal with forthrightly, sought to have the court, in the person of Federal Judge Andre Birotte, Jr., remove Aleshire & Wyn-

der as the city's legal representative in the case.

At this point, some 34 months after the federal lawsuit was filed and less than five-and-a-half months before the matter is scheduled to go to trial on March 22, 2022, the contretemps between the city and the county has thrown the defense of both into disarray. With 80 filings already made in the case, some **See P 3**

Unverified Report Of A Grim End To The Cho Missing Person Case

(October 9-Late) The *Sentinel* has received an unconfirmed report that there has been a break in the Lauren Cho missing person case.

Cho went missing on June 28, 2021, at approximately 5:10 p.m., when she reportedly walked away from the residence where she was staying in the 8600 block of Benmar Trail in Yucca Valley.

Investigators followed all traces and networked with her family and friends in an effort to discover new leads.

On July 24, 2021, sheriff's department fixed wing aircraft conducted aerial searches of the remote mountain terrain near the scene of her last known whereabouts.

On Saturday, July 31, 2021, at 6:00 **See P 4**

As Deadly Virus Mutates And Advances, Some Parents Want No Precautions In School Settings

As the first round of the coronavirus/COVID-19 pandemic permeated across the globe beginning in March 2020, schools in San Bernardino County as in all of California discontinued in-class instruction, going to a remote learning model, familiarizing students like never before with electronic forums such as Zoom, and engaging in

on-line learning sessions. Those measures were taken out of an abundance of caution, as the coronavirus in its earliest version and initial permutations was proving fatal among a portion of the population.

In general, medical masks were recommended and in time became de rigueur and ultimately mandatory in public places and businesses

which were not hit with closure orders. A segment of the population questioned the seriousness of the pandemic, dismissing COVID-19 as just another version of the flu and a not very serious one at that, and claimed that the circumstance was the outgrowth of a governmental hoax perpetrated to trigger panic and hysteria within the **See P 3**

Chaffey Community Show Band In Open Air Performance At Gardiner Spring October 25

The Ontario Chaffey Community Show Band will perform *Viva La Musica* on Monday October 25, 2021 at 7:30 p.m. on the front steps of the Gardiner W. Spring Auditorium in Ontario

Sponsored in part by the Petrocelli Family, *Viva La Musica* is intended as a musical tribute consistent with Hispanic Heritage Month.

The concert will be held

outdoors in compliance with the health restrictions currently in-place due to the pandemic.

Gardiner W. Spring Auditorium is located on the campus of Chaffey High School at 1250 N. Euclid Avenue. Admission to the performance is free.

The front steps of the auditorium are well-lit at night and present a resplendent view of the historic building. This will

provide a backdrop for the show band.

It is recommended that those attending bring a comfortable portable lawn chair and a warm jacket.

Parking will be available in both the Fourth and Fifth Street parking lots.

The program features a variety of Latin music, including folk songs, ballads, dancing, and instrumental selections. Solo artists include sev-

eral members of the show band.

Concertmaster Chris McAleer will sing a medley of Mexican folk songs; John Knapp will perform the trumpet solo on *Cherry Pink and Apple Blossoms White*; Musician/vocalist Isaac Gonzalez will sing two ballads from south of the border titled *Mujer* and *Accompaname*; Special guest artist and vocalist Dr. George Matamala

will be featured on *Volver Volver* and *Solamente Una Vez*; and renowned percussionist and educator Homero Chavez will be featured on timbales in *Los Timbales Felices*.

A highlight of the performance will be the dancing of show band musician Kathy Soderlund in her interpretation of *Passion Tango de Amor*, a piece written by Dr. Gabriel Petrocelli.

Allow Projects Of 46 And 100 Units Per Acre In Redlands' Downtown Core, Commissioners Recommend To The City Council

The already apparent discrepancy between the attitude of a substantial portion of Redlands residents and the city's municipal and political establishment with regard to the accelerated development of the city in the near term was given a crystal clear demonstration at the planning commission meeting on September 28.

Measure U, the controlled-growth initiative passed by Redlands voters overwhelmingly in 1997, was a companion piece to Proposition R passed in 1978 and Measure N passed in 1987, all of which were intended to reduce growth to manageable levels. Measure R put a limit on the annual growth rate, followed by further refinements and restrictions put in place under the auspices of Measures N and U, such that no more than 400 residential dwelling units can be approved or constructed within the city annually, and the city council is not empowered to suspend, waive or rescind those provisions.

Last year, in a ploy to water down the restrictions in Measure U, Measure R and Measure N, the pro-development city council place Measure G on the ballot. Measure G called for eliminating the collective Measure R, N and U requirements that:

* A four-fifths vote of the city council is needed to approve residential densities exceeding 18 dwelling units per acre;

* A four-fifths vote of the city council is needed to approve residential buildings exceeding two stories or 35 feet **See P 5**

Councilman Scott Filed A \$1 Million Claim Alleging Police & Firefighters Accessed Information Pertaining To Him In State Law Enforcement Database from front page

to dissuade them from engaging in public advocacy or taking certain official actions.

The allegations made by Scott came in one of the two claims for damages he filed with the city this year, and which exists in the form of a sworn statement together with a narrative submitted as an attachment to the claim lodged with the city.

In Rialto, as is the case with all other cities or governmental entities in California, an individual who has suffered damages as a consequence of the action or negligence of the city or governmental entity or its employees must lodge a claim with that entity before initiating legal action against it. The governing board of the jurisdiction, as in the case of a city its city council, can then acknowledge the claim as valid and pay either the claimed amount of damages or a negotiated amount to settle the claim and avoid a lawsuit. Once a claim is rejected, the claimant has six months to file a lawsuit against the city. In the vast majority of cases, claims against cities are rejected, and in the vast majority of the cases where rejections are made, the claimants do not follow up with a lawsuit.

Scott filed two claims against the city, one pertaining to police department and fire department personnel accessing information pertaining to him in the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System and another unrelated claim which hinges on the city's issuance of a permit for what Scott maintains was botched work on an electrical connection on property he owns in the city. The city council acknowledged receipt of the two claims, but neither accepted nor rejected them. Instead, the claims have been passed along to Eric Vail, Rialto's interim city attorney who has been serving in that capacity since the departure of Fred Galante as city at-

torney in March 2020.

According to the narrative attached to one of Scott's claims, filed on August 13, "On February 16, 2021 I made a verbal complaint to Rialto Police Chief Mark Kling that I had been informed that a confidential informant, a whistleblower who is a current employee of the City of Rialto, had been told by a member of the Rialto Fire Department that he had been involved in investigating myself to determine my residency and property I owned in Kernville, California and other information related to my personal life and background. In addition, I informed Sean Greyson, acting city manager and fire chief, that such an allegation had been made about the Rialto Fire Department."

According to Scott's narrative, Greyson spontaneously identified for him "the only person in the fire department who would have CLETS [California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System] access and would have done this. The name of this person shall not be disclosed at this time; however, the whistleblower has named the same individual as the person who told them they had done this. I have direct knowledge that for a person in [the] Rialto Fire Department to have been able to run my information [he] would [have] had to [have] requested it be done by going to a Rialto police sergeant [or individual of] higher rank or another agency. Additionally, it can only be done for a legitimate law enforcement purpose and have a case number assigned to it. None of this exists."

Scott's narrative attached to the claim continues, "Since making a complaint, I have been advised by the Rialto Police Department that there is an ongoing investigation into this and that in fact my information has been run several times for reasons not for legitimate law enforcement purposes, under my various names and nicknames and that it has been referred to the district attorney of San Bernardino County. These acts, while unknown specifically to me until a whistleblower came forward on February 16, 2021 and later confirmed by the Rialto Police

Department, were illegal acts [perpetrated] under a previous police chief and administration. Based on information I have received I believe that other members of the city council may have had similar acts committed against them."

Scott wrote, "I believe this behavior to be in violation of my civil rights under the Constitution [of the] United States and the Constitution of the State of California and its codes. I also believe that it was done for the intended purpose of manipulating elections and contracts negotiated by City of Rialto management and then ratified by the Rialto City Council. This is a pattern of conduct which has not been uncommon in the City of Rialto and was discovered in prior years by the FBI as a result of improper acts within the Rialto Police Department. Additionally, these illegal investigations may have been used to attempt to influence lawsuits against the City of Rialto."

Scott stated, "These illegal acts have created a hostile environment for me and others. Additionally, being a person with severe health problems it has caused my life to be stressful and created an environment of fear. As a result of this behavior, I have been hospitalized on several occasions."

The claim alleged Scott had suffered \$1 million in damages.

Four months and three weeks prior to the lodging of that claim, on March 22, 2021, Scott had filed another claim, one related to misfeasance in the city's building department.

According to the narrative submitted with that claim, "On September 24, 2020 Chief Building Official Trang Huynh sent a letter to Daniel Courtright at 142 S Riverside Ave, Rialto California 92376 stating that construction activity had occurred at the above address, which is owned by myself G Edward Scott. The installation of a new electrical service was done with the owner's (G Edward Scott) approval. Additionally other work was performed without owner's approval of permits or engineering, including but not limited to new air conditioning and electrical work and piercing a shear wall. The City

of Rialto issued a permit for new electrical service 100 amps to 200 amps without owner's approval or engineering and allowed substandard and unsafe installation work to be performed in violation of [the] state building code. The City of Rialto allowed an untrained and uncertified permit technician to issue permits and the former chief building official failed to properly supervise that employee and failed to follow California building codes. Additionally [the] building inspector failed to require permits for [the] air conditioner which was connected to [a] new electrical panel. On September 25, 2020 the City of Rialto red-tagged 1425 Riverside Ave for failure [to] correct and unsafe conditions."

The narrative goes on to state, "These damages have created a situation where owner is unable to make corrections and repairs as he does not have possession of [the] building and the inability to market and sale [the] building at market rate."

The claim seeks a total of \$150,000, \$75,000 to, according to Scott "bring the building back to code" and \$75,000 for "lost market value."

The claim filed on March 22 was considered by the city council at its April 13 meeting. The claim filed on August 13 was considered by the city council at its September 14 meeting.

The minutes of the March 22 and September 14 meetings leave unclear what action the council took regarding Scott's claims. According to Rialto City Clerk Barbara McGee, the council received the claims but did not accept them nor reject them. She referred further questions with regard to the status or processing of the claims to acting City Attorney Eric Vail.

In response to a host of questions the *Sentinel* posed to him, Vail in an email wrote, "I am not able to offer comments on open claims, investigations or ongoing legal actions."

With his terse response, Vail bypassed the substance of the *Sentinel's* inquiry, including where he now stands in laying out for the city council how it should ultimately respond to the claims, the actions cited in them, in particu-

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 Fortunate 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

lar those pertaining to the unauthorized use of the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System, and the validity of the claims.

That the city has not processed the claims after the time that has elapsed since their filings is an indication that there is some validity to the contents of each, and that their substance is both engaging and troubling. An alternate reading of the delay is that Vail's faculties as city attorney have been overmatched by the consideration that the claim was filed by one of his political masters.

The *Sentinel's* inquiry of Vail included if his examination of Scott's August 13 claim had determined whether information relating to Scott contained in the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System was accessed by members of the Rialto Police Department on multiple occasions and if that access had been made as the consequence of a legitimate investigation or legitimate investigations. The *Sentinel* asked Vail how many investigations of Councilman Scott there had been, what issues they had delved into and what the parameters of that investigation was or those investigations were. Vail was also queried as to who had accessed the database, whether more than one of the department's officers had accessed the system with regard to Scott and if any of the investigations into Councilman Scott were legitimate.

Vail's response to the *Sentinel* foreclosed answers to those questions, as well as to how high within the police department knowledge about the investigation or investigations

into Councilman Scott went, whether the police chief had knowledge of the investigation or investigations and whether the police chief had given a green light to the investigation[s]. Vail's non-response further left unanswered what the outcome[s] of the/those investigation[s] had been and whether Scott was determined to have been engaged in some form of illegal action/activity/comportment that would have warranted criminal charges being filed against him or whether he had been cleared by the investigation[s]. Vail additionally left unanswered whether any report with regard to the investigation or investigations had been generated and provided to the district attorney's office.

Ultimately, Vail's determination of the validity of Scott's claims, in particular the one relating to the alleged misuse of the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System data bank, could have tremendous consequence for the city and its taxpayers.

If Vail ascertains that Scott's claim is essentially accurate and on that basis advises the mayor and city council to settle the claim in Scott's favor, given the indication in the claim that other members of the city council were likewise the victims of city employees' misuse of the confidential information compiled with regard to them in the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System, a settlement with Scott might very well invite claims from the other members of the council. Thus, if Scott comes in

Continued on Page 4

In 2019, The U.S. Justice Department Sued Hesperia & The Sheriff's Department For Using The City's Crime Free Rental Housing Ordinance To Banish Negroes & Latinos From The City *from front page*

of them quite substantial, it will be a daunting, and expensive, task for the lawyers that will be representing the county, the city and the department to come up to speed with regard to the issues dealt with so far while contending with new filings by the government. Compounding that, the possibility that the two primary defendant agencies – the city and the sheriff's department – will be sniping at each other both before and during the trial renders doubtful that the matter will ultimately be resolved positively for either the city or the county. Accordingly, the city is looking to settle the case by negotiation with the U.S. Attorney's Office perhaps as early as next week.

In December 2019, the U.S. Justice Department, through the Civil Rights Section in the Civil Division of the United States Attorney's Office and the Housing and Civil Enforcement Section of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, filed a lawsuit alleging that the City of Hesperia and the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department misused the City of Hesperia's so-called Crime Free Rental Housing Ordinance, which was in effect between January 1, 2016 and its amendment on July 18, 2017, to unfairly banish from the city African American and Latino renters in violation of the Fair Housing Act.

The Crime Free Rental

Housing Ordinance required all rental property owners to evict tenants upon notice by the sheriff's department that the tenants had engaged in any alleged criminal activity on or near the property. The federal lawsuit alleged that the sheriff's department exercised its substantial discretion in enforcement to target African American and Latino renters and areas of Hesperia inhabited in the main by racial and ethnic minorities. The U.S. Attorney's Office maintained in its suit that although the ordinance purported to target "criminal activity," the sheriff's department notified landlords to begin evictions of entire families – including children – for conduct involving one tenant or even non-tenants, evictions of victims of domestic violence, and evictions based on mere allegations and without evidence of criminal activity.

The federal lawsuit alleged that the city, with substantial support from the sheriff's department, enacted the ordinance with the intent of addressing what one city councilmember called a "demographic problem" – the city's increasing African American and Latino population. The ordinance resulted in the evictions of numerous African American and Latino renters.

The lawsuit was based on an investigation and charge of discrimination by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, which found that African American and Latino renters were significantly more likely to be evicted under the ordinance than white renters, and that evictions disproportionately occurred in parts of Hesperia where the majority of homeowners or renters were members of a racial or ethnic minority. According to the

complaint, the Department of Housing and Urban Development determined that African American renters were almost four times as likely as non-Hispanic white renters to be evicted because of the ordinance, and Latino renters were 29 percent more likely than non-Hispanic white renters to be evicted. Sheriff's department data showed that 96 percent of the people the sheriff's department targeted for eviction under the ordinance in 2016 had lived in census blocks where racial and ethnic minority members constituted a majority of the residents.

Citing statements by city officials who expressed a desire to reverse "demographic" changes in Hesperia and persuade recent arrivals from Los Angeles County to get "the hell out of our town," the lawsuit alleged that city officials enacted the ordinance to drive African

American and Latino renters out of Hesperia.

Included among the plaintiff's attorneys involved in the case are Assistant Attorney General Kristen Clarke, Head of the Housing and Civil Enforcement Section Sameena Shina Majeed, Deputy Chief of the Housing and Civil Enforcement Section R. Tamar Hagler, Acting Deputy Chief of the Federal Coordination and Compliance Section Anna Medina, trial attorneys Aurora Bryant, Christopher D. Belen, Abigail A. Nurse and Alyssa C. Lareau, Acting United States Attorney in Los Angeles Tracy L. Wilkison, Chief of the Los Angeles Civil Division David Harris, Chief of the Los Angeles Civil Rights Division Karen Ruckert, Assistant United States Attorney Matthew Nickell and Assistant United States Attor-

Continued on Page 4

Convinced COVID Crisis Is A Hoax Or Government Plot, Some Parents Want No Virus Precautions At Schools *from front page*

population to grease the way for a set of oppressive government-imposed restrictions.

As it turned out, those below the age of majority, most specifically those of junior high school and elementary school age, proved to be particularly resistant to the affliction. Nevertheless, schools remained closed to the end of the 2019-20 school year and throughout the first semester of the 2020-21 school year. Selectively, certain schools began reopening in the spring of 2021, and the lion's share of school districts throughout California and San Bernardino County prepared for the reopening of schools with the initiation of the late summer/fall semester of the 2021-22 school year.

By the end of 2020, an experimental and, by traditional medical standards, untested vaccine was available. With the dawn of 2021, the vaccine, by virtue of its relatively benign showing within the limited element of the population that braved it, became more widely available and was distributed without cost to the

adult population willing to receive it.

In April 2021, just as a significant portion of the adult population was immunized, the Delta version of the coronavirus/COVID malady, the first substantial transmogrification of the disease, hit.

School openings in many venues continued, while in virtually all others, planning toward public school opening with the advent of the 2021-22 school year continued.

Paradoxically, the Delta variant turned out to be far more impactful upon its youthful infectees than the original version of the condition, such that a small percentage of infants, toddlers, children, adolescents and young adults became seriously ill upon contracting the pathosis. Some died.

In this way, the prospect of across-the-board school reopenings and the proximity of millions of students with one another, many of whom were now recognized as vulnerable to the potentially fatal virus, gave public health officials, school officials and government officials tremendous pause as the be-

ginning of the school year in August approached.

The California Public Health Department issued an order, which was refined and updated after the initiation of school in most districts statewide on September 1, mandating that everyone within an enclosed school setting, adults and children over the age of 2 in pre-school through high school, wear a mask. There were limited specified exemptions extending to those with medical conditions or disabilities that made wearing a mask impractical or risky. An exemption applied to everyone during mealtime.

A cross section of parents objected to the mandate, stating it was unnecessary, that it was an imposition on the students, that it ran contrary to the independence of action and thought that should be a principle in American life and which those parents were attempting to instill in their children, that it was an abridgment of the students' rights, and an effort on the part of the government to brainwash the students and cow them into conformance with government-issued orders and the surrendering of their rights.

A month later, the State of California and Governor Gavin Newsom, who

had easily outdistanced an effort to remove him from office during a statewide recall vote on September 14, upped the ante. State officials announced on October 1 that in accordance with the Food and Drug Administration giving approval for the administration of the vaccine to students of junior high school and high school age, students 12 years of age and up will be required to be vaccinated as early as January 1, 2022 and no later than July 1, 2022 in order to attend school. Those officials likened the move to the precautions long in place that require children be vaccinated for measles, mumps and rubella before they can begin school and the more recent requirement that they be vaccinated against pertussis. Some parents expressed disappointment that the order did not immediately extend to kindergarten and grade school students. California officials added that the state will require the COVID vaccine for students in kindergarten through sixth grade upon the federal government giving approval for the provision of the vaccine to children between the ages of 5 and 11,

Some, however, remain highly skeptical of the government's move to protect the population

from either the original coronavirus pandemic – COVID-19 – or its mutations or intensifications, such as the Delta variant.

According to some of those railing against the government's COVID precaution mandates, the entire effort is a conspiracy by government in conjunction with the major corporations on the planet to bring about "a great reset" which is to move everyone to a worldwide cashless society system tied directly to vaccine passports that in the near future will further entail the addition of a carbon tax to track and trace everywhere that people travel. This will lead to restrictions on permissible movement by the population, these conspiracists maintain. The governmental establishment has been lying about the COVID crisis all along, and is continuously changing its story to effectuate the eventual enslavement of the vast majority of the human population, those who advocate against accepting the restrictions propound. The anti-vaxxers have put out that the government is using manufactured fear to control the populace. All of this is part of a "new-world agenda" to take people's cars away from them, those saying the COVID pandemic is

a hoax maintain, and they assert that the death rates from COVID-19 were and are greatly exaggerated or non-existent. Each piece of the COVID doomsayers' story does not stand up to common sense or science, the government's critics hold. Those advocating resistance to the government-imposed restrictions cite early government misstatements minimizing the seriousness of the coronavirus and its spread and that it would not jump from China where it was first detected to the United States, which was quickly and abruptly followed by a reversal that included mandates, martial law and lockdowns, which, they say, was accompanied by governmental assertions that a two-week shutdown of commerce and socializing would stem the spread. The government continuously extended the lockdown in an effort to "flatten the curve" of the rise in the spread of the disease, followed by the creation of a game plan that called for ending the crisis with the advent of a vaccine, those taking issue with the government's action say. The hospitals were not filled with the sick and dying during the pandemic as the government claimed, the con-

Continued on Page 11

Misuse Of Law Enforcement Information System By Rialto Employees Targeted City's Politicians, Councilman Alleges

from page 2

for a \$1 million payday, so too could Mayor Deborah Robertson, Councilman Rafael Trujillo, Councilman Andy Carrizales and Councilwoman Karla Perez.

Further, if as the circumstance and Scott's claim suggest, the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System was being used by city employees for political use and to influence the outcome of city elections, the number of those whose constitutional and privacy rights were violated could extend to 28 others yet living going back two decades, those being former Rialto council members and mayors as well as those who vied for those offices. Those would in-

clude Mayor Grace Vargas, Councilman Joe Baca, Jr., Councilman Ed Palmer, Councilwoman Winifred Lee Hanson and Councilman Kurt Wilson, as well as candidates Andrew Karol, Theresa Schneider, Michael Taylor, Stacy Augustine, Ana Gonzalez, Nicholas Nieblas, Lynn Hirtz, Jesse Aguayo, David D. Phillips, Lindsey Fretter, Kevin Moore, Joe Britt, Steve Miller, Sarmad Syed, June Hayes, Joe Sampson, John Sanchez, Big Mark Ferretiz, Clifford Friedeck, Dale Estvander, Pamela Whyte, Albert Roman and Victor Edinburgh.

The timeline on the alleged misuse of the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System is not clear. Scott was first elected to the city council in 1996. He left the council in 2000 as a consequence of his unsuccessful run for county supervisor that year. He returned to the council in 2004, was reelected in 2008, and left the city council in 2012 as

a consequence of his unsuccessful run for mayor against Robertson. He was elected to the council in 2014 and reelected in 2018.

Using the \$1 million Scott is seeking as a baseline, the city would conceivably be on the hook for \$33 million if his claim succeeds and evidence surfaces to show that city employees, either on their own or in conjunction with union activity, made consistent use of the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System in researching Rialto's politicians. A city effort to bar recovery by former officeholders or council/mayoral hopefuls on the basis of the statute of limitations could be overcome if those seeking such recovery demonstrate that the discovery of the violation of their rights and privacy did not come until Scott's current uncovering of what had occurred.

Many consider Scott's claims against the city of which he is a councilman of long standing and cur-

rently the mayor pro tem to be in poor form. Indeed, as one of the city's highest ranking officials responsible for its oversight and monitoring how it is run, his claim in some respects can be seen as an acknowledgment of his own lack of diligence. Moreover, that he made such a claim against the city could be used against him politically next year, when his current term expires and he must stand for reelection to remain in office. Given the health issues he referenced in his claim, he may not seek reelection in 2022. Whatever his future political intent, with his claim relating to the police department's/fire department's use of the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System to violate his constitutional and privacy rights, he appears to have opened a can of worms that from the standpoint of City Hall and the interest of Rialto's taxpayers might better have remained sealed.

Within the circle of

those involved in civic affairs in Rialto there is discomfiture with the manner in which Vail has not moved decisively to foreclose Scott's claims by advising the council to simply reject them. In the view of at least some, Vail showed more deference for Scott's political status than was prudent by holding off on and continuing to delay a decision on the matter of the claims. One individual aware of the circumstance characterized the temporizing that has gone on with regard to the claims as "gutless," saying that Vail should have long

ago managed the crisis by seeing that the claim relating to the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System was rejected, thereby putting the burden on Scott to marshal whatever proof he believes he has, which would include exposing those who have provided him with the information upon which his claim is based.

The *Sentinel* this week made an effort to obtain from Scott further detail with regard to the claims and the narratives contained as attachments in them. Scott had not responded by press time.

Cho Found? from front page

a.m., detectives assigned to the Morongo Basin Station and a search and rescue team executed a search warrant in the 8600 block of Benmar Trail. During the search warrant service seven canines searched the last known location where Cho was seen and surrounding unincorporated

areas for evidence.

Investigators with San Bernardino County Sheriff's Specialized Investigations Division were brought in to assist the Morongo Basin Station in the effort to locate Cho, a 30-year-old resident of New Jersey in September.

Based on present indicators and the circumstance, the outcome appears to be grim.

Hesperia & Sheriff's Department No Longer Presenting A United Front In Defense Against Federal Discrimination Lawsuit from page 3

ney Katherine M. Hikida

In July, lawyers with Aleshire & Wynder raised an unspecified issue they thought might represent a conflict between the city and the sheriff's department, and sought to withdraw from representing the county entities, those being the sheriff's department and the county itself.

The county's new legal representatives, lawyers Shannon L. Gustafson and Amy R. Margolies with Lynberg & Watkins, on August 18 filed a motion to disqualify Aleshire & Wynder as Hesperia's counsel.

According to that motion, "On October 22, 2019, prior to the initiation of this lawsuit, but after HUD [the Department of Housing and Urban Development] issued its charge of discrimination, a precursor to this lawsuit, the county defendants tendered their defense pursuant to the contract between the city and the county for law enforcement services

in the City of Hesperia, defendant city accepted the tender, setting forth that, 'The city will accept the tender of defense of the County of San Bernardino in the matter of the discrimination charge.' Thereafter, all defendants (city, county and sheriff) were collectively represented by city defendant's attorneys, the law firm Aleshire & Wynder, LLP since the filing of this action by plaintiff. However, on July 6, 2021, more than 19-months into this litigation, Aleshire & Wynder notified the county defendants that an actual conflict of interest exists between the city and the county and abruptly dropped county defendants as clients, indicating that Aleshire & Wynder would no longer represent the county or the sheriff's department due to the conflict; but, elected to remain as counsel for city defendants. Based on Aleshire & Wynder's position that it would no longer represent them, the county defendants were forced to retain new counsel and a request for approval of substitution of counsel was filed on July 14, 2021, and approved by the court on July 22, 2021. On July 28, 2021, shortly after being confirmed as counsel of record, new defense

counsel pursuant to Central District Local Rule 7-3 initiated the meet and confer process with Aleshire & Wynder, setting forth the county defendants' position that the conflict of interest required the disqualification of Aleshire & Wynder. The parties met and conferred several times between July 28, 2021 and August 5, 2021 to attempt to resolve the conflict and were unable to do so. Aleshire & Wynder therefore requested time to meet with the Hesperia City Council to request permission to voluntarily withdraw and indicated that they would do so at the next available meeting on August 17, 2021. The county defendants therefore agreed to wait until after this meeting with the sincere hope that Aleshire & Wynder would do the right thing, given its former representation of the county. However, on August 18, 2021, San Bernardino County Counsel was informed that a voluntary withdrawal would not be filed. The county defendants have therefore made a good faith effort pursuant to Local Rule 7-3 to request that Aleshire & Wynder voluntarily withdraw, given its ethical obligations to its former client. It is now evident that this

motion is the only recourse the county defendants have to seek disqualification of Aleshire & Wynder for the reasons stated herein. County defendants make their motion on the grounds that city defendant's counsel has violated California Rule of Professional Conduct 3-310 by failing to obtain the informed written consent of each client as there was a potential conflict of interest from the beginning of the representation."

Furthermore, according to Gustafson and Margolies, Aleshire & Wynder are responsible "for creating an actual conflict of interest in violation of California Rule of Professional Conduct 1.7 when it ceased representation of the county defendants. Here, by electing to represent all defendants (city, county and sheriff's department) at the outset, and, for the last nineteen months, Aleshire & Wynder created an actual conflict of interest and sought to avoid this conflict by abruptly dropping county defendants like a hot potato, something the law prohibits. This tactic is a violation of Aleshire & Wynder's most sacred duties of confidentiality and loyalty. Furthermore, these violations have interfered with the orderly adminis-

tration of justice and the progress of this case. Accordingly, county defendants request that Aleshire & Wynder be disqualified from continuing to represent any party in this case and for ancillary relief."

It has not been publicly disclosed what the conflict referenced consisted of. There is some overlap between the sheriff's department and the city with regard to issues featured in the case. Aside from the sheriff's department serving as Hesperia's de facto police department under a contract to provide law enforcement services, the matter is complicated by the consideration that in 2015, Nils Bentsen was the commander of the Hesperia sheriff's station and was thus serving as what was essentially Hesperia's police chief. Bentsen was in large measure the architect of the Crime Free Rental Housing Ordinance, which was drafted over an extended period of time in 2015 and enacted by the city council in November 2015. The following month, Bentsen was appointed by the city council to assume the position of city manager, which he formally filled in January 2016 after his retirement from the sheriff's department. The city

did not implement the ordinance and its provisions until Bentsen moved into the city manager's post. In this way, Bentsen is a central figure in the federal suit in his capacity as both a sheriff's department and city employee.

On September 16, the court granted the motion to disqualify Aleshire & Wynder as the city's legal representative, and Aleshire & Wynder submitted its withdrawal intention the following day, but remains, technically, as Hesperia's legal counsel until the city retains another firm, which it must do under court mandate by October 26. Meanwhile, on October 14, Aleshire & Wynder is scheduled to engage with the U.S. Attorney's Office, in a settlement conference aimed at bringing the Justice Department's action against the city to a conclusion prior to trial.

The seriousness with which the situation is viewed by the county was demonstrated by the board of supervisors having been given a briefing on the matter during its closed session with the office of county counsel, the county's stable of in-house attorneys, during its meeting on Tuesday, October 5.

-Mark Gutglueck

Redlands Planning Commission Recommends Major Density Concentration In The City's Downtown Area *from front page*

in height;

* The need for developers to ensure that the level of traffic flow that exists at the intersections proximate to their projects prior to the construction of their projects be maintained after the projects are completed;

* The requirement that the voters of the city rather than the city council be solely authorized to establish any new land use designations in the city;

* The proponents of certain new development projects prepare a socio-economic-cost/benefit study before approval of those projects;

* Certain residential subdivision projects be subject to competitive review for issuance of building permits

* The developers of new projects pay 100 percent of the development impact fees that are imposed on those projects; and

* No more than 400 residential dwelling units be constructed within the city in any year.

In the March 3, 2020 election, Measure G was soundly defeated, with 14,407 residents or 64.88 percent opposing it and 7,798 voters or 35.12 percent supporting it.

Despite that, the Redlands Planning Commission, acting at the behest of the politicians who appointed them, voted unanimously twice within 12 minutes on September 28 to recommend to the city council that it grant dual exemptions to Measure U, and allow an out-of-town developer to erect buildings of density and height that exceed the more modest intensity standards city residents have repeatedly expressed as being their preference in the construction that is allowed to take place in the city of 71,707.

The planning commission's September 28 votes with regard to one three-acre so-called mixed-use project and another 1.49-acre residential project are not binding, but they represent a recommendation that the city council grant Measure U exemptions on both of the proj-

ects which lie within the city's downtown area. Those votes were the second and third such recommendations made by the planning commission with regard to aggressive development proposals in the downtown area in the last six months. In April, the Redlands Planning Commission made a recommendation that Village Partners Ventures LLC be allowed to transform the largely vacant 11.15-acre Redlands Mall into a melange of mixed-uses including residential, retail, office professional quarters, restaurants, recreational facilities and a six-story parking structure around a pedestrian plaza and swimming pool, with multi-story residential buildings of three, four and five vertical levels. The following month, the Redlands City Council approved Village Partners Ventures' request for the Measure U exemption for its proposed project, citing the planning commission's recommendation.

On September 28, the planning commission took up Vantage One Real Estate Investment's proposal to construct 138 apartments and three restaurant buildings on about three acres at 212 and 216 Brookside Avenue, the former sites of the long-shuttered San Bernardino County Superior Court Redlands Courthouse Annex and the city's former police station, safety hall and city council chamber, as well as two homes. The property lies across Brookside Avenue from the U.S. Post Office. Vantage One acquired the properties from the city in 2017, after which the city granted the company's request for a zone change to allow it to be developed commercially. In the three years since, Vantage One has revamped its original plan to transform the acreage into a dual purpose property that will cover both commercial and residential use. Of note is that in addition to the commercial component, consisting of three restaurants, the developer is seeking to place more than 45 units of housing per acre onto

the land, an intensity of use far beyond anything that currently exists in the city.

Vantage One also sought permission to undertake an even more intensive use of just under an-acre-and-a-half of property some 750 feet north of the mixed use proposal, one that would place 100 units per acre at the northeast corner of Redlands Boulevard and Eureka Street, on property located at 200 West Redlands Boulevard. That project, consisting of 149 apartment units on 1.49 acres of ground, is to supplant a 40,000 square foot furniture store. The commission also approved Vantage One's Measure U exemption request for the apartment complex. According to Vantage One, it will squeeze onto less than an acre-and-a-half the 149 multifamily units described, variously, as studio models and one-bedroom units ranging from 516 to 829 square feet, as well as a parking structure which will feature 220 parking spaces. Despite the placement of living quarters for some 250 people as well as an area adequate for them to park their cars on an expanse of land that in other areas of the city would accommodate no more than six to eight single family residences, the project will include, Vantage One maintains, an outdoor lounge, shade structures, a dog park and a private bar area, a center plaza with an outdoor pool, two spas, a game room and a fitness room as well as public and private open space.

In both cases, the developer is requesting that the city council ultimately make a finding that the proposed projects are exempt from Measure U. The basis for those exemptions relates to the projects falling within the city's controversial Transit Villages Specific Plan Area.

The Transit Villages Specific Plan calls for encouraging future development within the core areas of the city, in particular downtown, the area between Tennessee Street and New York Street and near the University of Redlands, where stops on the Redlands Passenger Rail Project are to be lo-

cated. The Redlands Passenger Rail Project, slated for completion as early as next year, is to link Redlands to San Bernardino and the Metrolink rail system running from San Bernardino to Union Station in downtown Los Angeles and back. The Transit Villages concept calls for constructing high density, multi-story housing within walking distance of the three railway stops in Redlands to discourage the residents who live there from using their personal vehicles such that they instead utilize the train system that is being developed in Southern California to allow those living in the inland areas to commute westward toward or into Los Angeles in the morning to work and return home by rail in the late afternoon or evening.

The element of the Transit Villages Specific Plan that calls for creating a dense living environment in Redlands' downtown area and allowing for high-rise apartments as well as parking structures clashes with many preservationists' idea of keeping the city's historic downtown intact. Moreover, the concerted efforts of a group of Redlands residents, who are determined to prevent any further development of structures of more than three stories, are out of sync with the Transit Villages Specific Plan.

Though the documentation presented to the planning commission did not specify the height of the structures on either of the projects, in the case of the Brookside Avenue development, the structures are likely to be three, four and five stories. To accomplish the erection of 149 units, a parking structure and promised amenities on the 1.49 acres on Redlands Boulevard, it is doubtful the buildings would be anything less than seven or eight stories.

The height of buildings in Redlands is a hotly contested issue. Those in favor of keeping buildings close to the ground appear to have the upper hand numerically. Nevertheless, the establishment at City Hall has other ideas.

In September, the grassroots group Friends of Redlands, working in

conjunction with another collection of residents, Redlands for Responsible Growth Management, began gathering signatures to force a vote on what the allowable height limit on Redlands buildings is to be. The proposed Friends of Redlands' initiative calls for disallowing buildings taller than two stories next to single-story homes without the consent of the owner of the single-story home, limiting the height of buildings downtown to no more than 50 feet, and the permitting of buildings to a height of no more than 62 feet – tantamount to four stories – in the area around New York Street. The initiative would further require that the city council unanimously approve making any density intensifications on projects, and it would layer greater parking provision requirements on developers seeking project approvals. To qualify the initiative for the ballot in 2022, the petitioners needed ten percent of Redlands' 42,000 voters to affix their signatures to the ballot application. To force the election to be held this year, within 109 days of the requisite number of signatures being verified, Friends of Redlands needed 15 percent of the city's voters – 6,409 – to sign the petition.

On June 7, 2021 Friends of Redlands and Redlands for Responsible Growth Management provided City Clerk Jeanne Donaldson with three huge boxes containing petitions calling for a special election to stop tall and dense development to which 7,715 signatures were affixed. It is not clear what Donaldson's count determined, though there has been no indication the vote is to be held this year. Rather, it appears the referendum on high rises is to be decided with a vote held next year that will coincide with the regularly scheduled municipal election and the gubernatorial general election.

It appears that city officials are militating to get multiple projects pertaining to development downtown – including Vantage One's three-acre three-, four- and five-story project on Brookside, its 1.49-acre seven- or eight-story project on Redlands

Boulevard and Village Partners Ventures LLC's 11.15-acre three-, four-, five- and six-level project on the Redlands Mall site approved before the height restrictions can be voted upon by the city's residents.

Of note is that citizen activists advocating low growth and controlled growth in Redlands have become suspicious about the role the planning commission plays in providing support and a rationale for the city council's more aggressive development stance. When confronted about their actions encouraging more intensive building activity in the city than a vocal contingent of citizens want, council members on occasion have said that their votes merely reflect the desire and direction of the community as embodied in the planning commission's votes and recommendations. Nevertheless, what has loomed into view is that the planning commission very often modulates its action in conformance with the city council's expectations, including ones that are expressed privately between members of the council and the commission, outside the scrutiny and earshot of the public. This circular rationale has led some to conclude that graft is a component of the city's land use decision-making process.

During the planning commission's discussion before the votes taken on the Vantage One projects, Planning Commission Chairman Conrad Guzowski, perhaps purposefully or perhaps inadvertently, put on display the level to which he and his colleagues are intent on facilitating high rise and intensely dense development downtown.

Acknowledging that Vantage One has not yet fleshed out what the projects are to entail, Guzowski indicated, even before the commission took its votes, that he and his colleagues were set on clearing the way for the multi-story projects intended to house upwards of 100 to 150 people per acre to take place.

"It is very clear to me," said Guzowski, "and I hope it is to all of you, that

Continued on Page 12

Public Notices

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CIV SB 2123259 TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS:

Petitioner BRUCE THOMAS GILSTRAP filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: BRUCE THOMAS GILSTRAP to BRUCE THOMAS BLACK

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: October 15, 2021 Time: 9:00 a.m. Department: S16

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415

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: SEPTEMBER 3, 2021 Lynn M. Poncin Judge of the Superior Court.

The attorney for Bruce Thomas Gilstrap is:

Cory Briggs Briggs Law Corporation 99 East C Street, Suite 111 Upland, CA 91786

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel September 17, 24, and October 1 & 8, 2021

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-20210008140

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: Motel 6 Barstow Lenwood, 2551 Commerce Parkway, Barstow, CA 92311, Mailing Address: 3237 Vista Pointe, Riverside, CA 92503, Lenwood Lodging LLC, 3237 Vista Pointe, Riverside, CA 92503

Business is Conducted By: A Limited Liability Company

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/ Mahendra Desai This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/06/21

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

Began Transacting Business: 07/20/2021

County Clerk, s/17122

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 09/03, 09/10, 09/17 & 09/24, 2021

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-20210008935

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: Certified Selections, 951 Feather Hollow Court, Chino Hills, CA 91709, Z&S Enterprises Inc, 951 Feather Hollow Court, Chino Hills, CA 91709

Business is Conducted By: A Corporation

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/ Siddique Rahman

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on:

Public Notices

08/27/21 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, s/11327

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 09/17/21, 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-20210008897

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: SG Metal Works LLC, 522 W. 1ST Street, Suit F, Rialto, CA 92376, Mailing Address: 8034 Alder Ave, Fontana, CA 92336, SG Metal Works LLC, 8034 Alder Ave, Fontana, CA 92336

Business is Conducted By: A Limited Liability Company

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/ Angelica Arellano

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/26/21

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

Began Transacting Business: 02/26/21

County Clerk, s/11327

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 09/17/21, 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-20210009057

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: XSA Investigative Services, 1535 N Third Ave, Upland, CA 91786, Mailing Address: 154 W. Foothill Blvd, STE A355, Upland, CA 91786, Kurt Donham, 1535 N Third Ave, Upland, CA 91786

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/ Kurt Donham

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/01/21

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

Began Transacting Business: 08/30/21

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).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/17/21, 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: BERNARD ANTHONY SIOW CASE NO. PROSB2100583

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of BERNARD ANTHONY SIOW:

A Petition for Probate has been filed by STEPHANIE L. SIOW in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO, THE PETITION FOR PRO-

Public Notices

BATE requests that STEPHANIE L. SIOW 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 OCTOBER 12, 2021 2021 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S35 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

SEPTEMBER 3, 2021

Kimberly Tilley, Deputy

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: September 3, 2021 Attorney for Stephanie M. Brown

R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620

REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 328 7000 sam@pricelawfirm.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel September 24, October 1 & October 8, 2021.

T.S. No. 19-20763-SP-CA Title No. 191072098-CA-VOI A.P.N. 1061-201-33-0-000 NOTICE OF TRUSTEE'S SALE. YOU ARE IN DEFAULT UNDER A DEED OF TRUST DATED 04/04/2005. 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. A public auction sale to the highest bidder for cash, (cashier's check(s) must be made payable to National Default Servicing Corporation), drawn on 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; will be held by the

Public Notices

duly appointed trustee as shown below, of all right, title, and interest conveyed to and now held by the trustee in the hereinafter described property under and pursuant to a Deed of Trust described below. The sale will be made in an "as is" condition, but without covenant or warranty, expressed or implied, regarding title, possession, or encumbrances, to pay the remaining principal sum of the note(s) secured by the Deed of Trust, with interest and late charges thereon, as provided in the note(s), advances, under the terms of the Deed of Trust, interest thereon, fees, charges and expenses of the Trustee for the total amount (at the time of the initial publication of the Notice of Sale) reasonably estimated to be set forth below. The amount may be greater on the day of sale. Trustor: Monica C Banacky, a widow Duly Appointed Trustee: National Default Servicing Corporation Recorded 04/14/2005 as Instrument No. 2005-0260110 (or Book, Page) of the Official Records of San Bernardino County, CA. Date of Sale: 10/28/2021 at 12:00 PM Place of Sale: At the North Arrowhead Avenue entrance to the County Courthouse, 351 North Arrowhead Avenue, San Bernardino, CA 92401 Estimated amount of unpaid balance and other charges: \$601,414.96 Street Address or other common designation of real property: 5070 Via Serena Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91701 A.P.N.: 1061-201-33-0-000 The undersigned Trustee disclaims any liability for any incorrectness of the street address or other common designation, if any, shown above. If no street address or other common designation is shown, directions to the location of the property may be obtained by sending a written request to the beneficiary within 10 days of the date of first publication of this Notice of Sale. If the Trustee is unable to convey title for any reason, the successful bidder's sole and exclusive remedy shall be the return of monies paid to the Trustee, and the successful bidder shall have no further recourse. The requirements of California Civil Code Section 2923.5(b)/2923.55(e) were fulfilled when the Notice of Default was recorded. 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 a 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 or visit this Internet Web site www.ndscorp.com/sales, using the file number assigned to this case 19-20763-SP-CA. 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

Public Notices

to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. Date: 09/16/2021 National Default Servicing Corporation c/o Tiffany & Bosco, P.A., its agent, 1455 Frazee Road, Suite 820 San Diego, CA 92108 Toll Free Phone: 888-264-4010 Sales Line 855-219-8501; Sales Website: www.ndscorp.com By: Rachael Hamilton, Trustee Sales Representative 09/24/2021, 10/01/2021, 10/08/2021 CPP351474

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIVSB2123514

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: Ashley Williams; Dewayne Cannon filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: Elijah Harlem Williams to Dewayne Kevin Cannon Jr.

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: 11/8/2021 Time: 9:00 AM Department: S16

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415

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: 9/8/2021 Lynn M. Poncin Judge of the Superior Court.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 9/24/2021, 10/1/2021, 10/8/2021, 10/15/2021

SUMMONS -- (CITACION JUDICIAL)

CASE NUMBER (NUMERODEL CASO) CVMV2000661 NOTICE TO JASLAYA EBONY WALKER; JESSICA WALKER; and Does 1 to 10 YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): DANIEL KINCAID NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons is served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the Califor-

Public Notices

nia Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y mas información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede mas cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corte que le de un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de referencia a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov), o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación da \$10,000 o mas de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la dirección de la corte es):

RIVERSIDE SUPERIOR COURT 13800 HEACOCK ST., STE D201, MORENO VALLEY, CA 92553

The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

WILLIAM C. KENNEDY, ESQ., SBN: 076992 LAW OFFICE OF KENNEDY & ASSOCIATES 3576 ARLINGTON AVENUE, SUITE 304 RIVERSIDE, CA 92506 Telephone: 951-784-8920

DATE (Fecha): 12/3/2020 Clerk (Secretario), by V. Reyes

Published in the The San Bernardino County Sentinel on: 9/24/2021, 10/1/2021, 10/8/2021, 10/15/2021

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-20210009661

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: ETE Solar, 1155 S. Milliken Ave, Suite E, Ontario, CA 91761, Earthtech Enterprise Inc, 3400 Cottage Way, Ste G2 3450, Sacramento, CA 95825

Business is Conducted By: A Corporation

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/ Vanessa Pan

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/23/21

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, 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).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 09/24/2021, 10/01/2021, 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-20210009528

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: ANOKI, 12824 Coriander Ct, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91739, Natively Inc, 12824 Coriander Ct, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91739

Business is Conducted By: A Corporation

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.

Public Notices

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/23/21

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, 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).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 10/15/21

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-20210009528

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: ANOKI, 12824 Coriander Ct, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91739, Natively Inc, 12824 Coriander Ct, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91739

Business is Conducted By: A Corporation

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/ Dana Green

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/20/21

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

Began Transacting Business: 08/30/21

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).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 10/15/21

FBN 20210009751

The following person is doing business as: BLUE SKY MESSAGE 1964 W. NINTH ST. SUITE C UPLAND, CA 91786; MING LI 1962 CANOPY LANE LA VERNE, CA 91750

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/ MING LI

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/24/2021 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 09/24/2021, 10/01/2021, 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021

APN: 0225-391-01-0-000 T.S. No.: 20-60065-ca Property Address: 6116 ROBERTS PL, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739 NOTICE OF TRUSTEE'S SALE YOU ARE IN DEFAULT UNDER A DEED OF TRUST DATED 2/22/2007. 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,

Public Notices

5102 of the Financial Code and authorized to do business in this state will be held by the duly appointed trustee as shown below, of all right, title, and interest conveyed to and now held by the trustee in the hereinafter described property under and pursuant to a Deed of Trust described below. The sale will be made, but without covenant or warranty, expressed or implied, regarding title, possession, or encumbrances, to pay the remaining principal sum of the note(s) secured by the Deed of Trust, with interest and late charges thereon, as provided in the note(s), advances, under the terms of the Deed of Trust, interest thereon, fees, charges and expenses of the Trustee for the total amount (at the time of the initial publication of the Notice of Sale) reasonably estimated to be set forth below. The amount may be greater on the day of sale.

Trustor: TRACIE GREATHOUSE Duly Appointed Trustee: DIRECT DEFAULT SERVICES, LLC Recorded 2/23/2007 as Instrument No. 2007-0117710 in book , page of Official Records in the office of the Recorder of San Bernardino County, California, Date of Sale: 10/25/2021 at 1:00 PM Place of Sale: Near the front steps leading up to the City of Chino Civic Center, 13220 Central Avenue, Chino, CA 91710 Amount of unpaid balance and other charges: \$114,929.09 Street Address or other common designation of real property: 6116 ROBERTS PL RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739 A.P.N.: 0225-391-01-0-000 The undersigned Trustee disclaims any liability for any incorrectness of the street address or other common designation, if any, shown above. If no street address or other common designation is shown, directions to the location of the property may be obtained by sending a written request to the beneficiary within 10 days of the date of first publication of this Notice of Sale.

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 (714) 986-9342 or visit this Internet Website www.superiordefault.com, using the file number assigned to this case 20-60065-CA. 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. For sales conducted after January 1, 2021: NOTICE TO TENANT: You may have a right to purchase this property after the trustee auction pursuant to Section 2924m of the

Public Notices

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 (714) 986-9342, or visit this internet website www.superiordefault.com, using the file number assigned to this case 20-60065-CA 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. Date: 9/13/2021 Trustee Sales Information: Sale Line: (714) 986-9342 www.superiordefault.com by: Gisela Clark, Authorized Signatory for Trustee Direct Default Services 3670 N Rancho Drive, Suite 101 Las Vegas, NV 89130 TS# 20-60065-ca SDI-21894 Published: 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 10/15/21

OTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: AGNOLIA DAVIS

CASE NO. PROSB2100347
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of AGNOLIA DAVIS

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by WHITNEY DAVIS in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that WHITNEY DAVIS be appointed as personal 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 in Dept. No. S37 at 9:00 a.m. on October 28, 2021 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West 3rd St, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0212, Branch Name: San Bernardino Justice Center

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.

Public Notices

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.

Attorney for Petitioner:
THOMAS M. ALEXANDER, JR.

THOMAS ALEXANDER LAW OFFICES
226 E. SIXTH STREET,
BEAUMONT, CA 92223
Telephone No: (310) 860-7678
Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on:
10/01/21, 10/08/21, 10/15/21

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: BERNARD ANTHONY SIOW SR.

CASE NO. PROSB2100583
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of BERNARD ANTHONY SIOW SR.:

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by TAYLOR FRANCES SIOW in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that TAYLOR FRANCES SIOW be appointed as personal representatives 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 in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on NOVEMBER 22, 2021 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.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ.
1894 COMMERCENTER

Public Notices

WEST, SUITE 108
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

Telephone No: (909) 890-2350
Fax No: (909) 890-0106

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/01, 10/08 & 10/15, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ANASTACIA BARRIOS GONZALES

CASE NO. PROSB2100675
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ANASTACIA BARRIOS GONZALES:

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by PHILLIP GONZALES in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that PHILLIP GONZALES be appointed as personal representatives 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 in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on OCTOBER 26, 2021 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.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ.
1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

Telephone No: (909) 890-2350
Fax No: (909) 890-0106

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/01, 10/08 & 10/15, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARY LOU BARAJAS

CASE NO. PROSB2100554
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MARY LOU BARAJAS:

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by LISA MARIE ECTOR in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that LISA MARIE ECTOR be appointed as personal representatives 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 in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on NOVEMBER 1, 2021 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.

Public Notices

of EVAMARIE D. SUMNER:
A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by AUBREY MINA SUMNER in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that AUBREY MINA SUMNER be appointed as personal representatives 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 in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on OCTOBER 20, 2021 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.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ.
1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

Telephone No: (909) 890-2350
Fax No: (909) 890-0106

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/01, 10/08 & 10/15, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARY LOU BARAJAS

CASE NO. PROSB2100554
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MARY LOU BARAJAS:

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by LISA MARIE ECTOR in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that LISA MARIE ECTOR be appointed as personal representatives 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 in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on NOVEMBER 1, 2021 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.

Public Notices

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 in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on NOVEMBER 1, 2021 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.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ.
1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

Telephone No: (909) 890-2350
Fax No: (909) 890-0106

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/01, 10/08 & 10/15, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARY LOU BARAJAS

CASE NO. PROSB2100554
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MARY LOU BARAJAS:

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by LISA MARIE ECTOR in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that LISA MARIE ECTOR be appointed as personal representatives 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 in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on OCTOBER 26, 2021 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.

Public Notices

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.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ.

1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

Telephone No: (909) 890-2350
Fax No: (909) 890-0106

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/01, 10/08 & 10/15, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: HEINZ LINSER

CASE NO. PROSB2100676
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of HEINZ LINSER:

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by CARA RENEE MORRIS in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that CARA RENEE MORRIS be appointed as personal representatives 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 in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on OCTOBER 26, 2021 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.

Public Notices

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.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ. 1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408

Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/01, 10/08 & 10/15, 2021.

FBN 20210009543
The following person is doing business as: MC BODY CONTOURING 141 W FOOTHILL BLVD SUITE C UPLAND, CA 91786 MARMIA ENTERPRISES INC 15407 ROCKWELL AVENUE FONTANA, CA 92336

Mailing Address: 15407 ROCKWELL AVENUE FONTANA, CA 92336
The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION

State of California: CALIFORNIA C4785478SN

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: 9/03/2021
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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ MARICEL DELA CUESTA CALILAO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/21/2021
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 D5511

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 10/01, 10/08, 10/15 & 10/22, 2021.

FBN 20210009748
The following person is doing business as: CHOSEN COFFEE COMPANY 1173 S CACTUS AVE #37 RIALTO, CA 92376 JULIAN J ESTRADA 1173 S CACTUS AVE #37 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: 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ JULIAN J ESTRADA
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/03/2021
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 I1327

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 10/01, 10/08, 10/15 & 10/22, 2021.

FBN 20210009264
The following person is doing business as: RADICAL 66 8401 COTTONWOOD AVE. APT #209 FONTANA, CA 92335. RADRAGE L.L.C. 8401 COTTONWOOD AVE. APT #209 FONTANA, CA 92335
The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
Registered with the State

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 10/01, 10/08, 10/15 & 10/22, 2021.

FBN 20210009264
The following person is doing business as: RADICAL 66 8401 COTTONWOOD AVE. APT #209 FONTANA, CA 92335. RADRAGE L.L.C. 8401 COTTONWOOD AVE. APT #209 FONTANA, CA 92335
The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
Registered with the State

Public Notices

of California: 202122910336
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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ RASHAD HERD
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/03/2021
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 D5511

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 10/01, 10/08, 10/15 & 10/22, 2021.

FBN 20210009567
The following person is doing business as: COLD STONE VICTORIA GARDENS 12451 NORTH MAINSTREET RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739. ALL PROFIT ENTERPRISES LLC 12451 NORTH MAINSTREET RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739

Mailing Address: 2783 ATHENS RIDGE DR HENDERSON, NEVADA 89052
The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

Registered with the State of California: 201023810103
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JANUARY 1, 2015
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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ WESLEY KIM
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/21/2021
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 D5511

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 10/01, 10/08, 10/15 & 10/22, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: WALTER PHILLIP HALL
CASE NO. PROSB2100691
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of WALTER PHILLIP HALL:
A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by JASON MARK HALL in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that JASON MARK HALL be appointed as personal representatives 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 in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on November 15, 2021 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino District.

Public Notices

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on OCTOBER 26, 2021 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.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ. 1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408
Telephone No: (909) 890-2350
Fax No: (909) 890-0106
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/08, 10/15 & 10/22, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: CHRISTINA MARIA FERREIRA.
CASE NO. PROSB2100733
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of CHRISTINA MARIA FERREIRA:

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by TANYA MARIE WASHINGTON and JONATHAN ANTHONY FERREIRA in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that TANYA MARIE WASHINGTON and JONATHAN ANTHONY FERREIRA be appointed as personal representatives 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 in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on November 15, 2021 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino District.

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on November 15, 2021 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street,

Public Notices

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.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ.

1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408
Telephone No: (909) 890-2350
Fax No: (909) 890-0106
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/08, 10/15 & 10/22, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: WILLIAM H. COOPER.
CASE NO. PROSB2100733
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of WILLIAM H. COOPER:

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by CHERYL L. COOPER in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that CHERYL L. COOPER be appointed as personal representatives 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 in Dept. No. S-37 at 9:00 a.m. on November 4, 2021 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.

Public Notices

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.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ.

1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408
Telephone No: (909) 890-2350
Fax No: (909) 890-0106
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/08, 10/15 & 10/22, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: VALTON BERISHA
CASE NO. PROSB2100699
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of VALTON BERISHA:

A Petition for Probate has been filed by BRIKENA BYTYQ in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that BRIKENA BYTYQ be appointed as personal 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 OCTOBER 29, 2021 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

March 3, 2021
Bridjae Houston, Deputy

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.

Public Notices

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: September 3, 2021
Attorney for Brikena Bytyq
R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603
PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 328 7000
sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/08, 10/15 & 10/22, 2021.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE
NUMBER CIVSB2125667
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: BRIAN GAZCON GUTIERREZ filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: BRIAN GAZCON GUTIERREZ to BRIAN GAZCON

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: NOVEMBER 16, 2021
Time: 9:00 AM
Department: S17
The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415

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: 9/8/2021
Lynn M. Poncin
Judge of the Superior Court.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/08, 10/15, 10/22 & 10/29, 2021.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE
NUMBER CIVSB2122384
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: ALEXIS NOUR KHALAF filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: ALEXIS NOUR KHALAF to ALEXIS NOUR BOCANEGRA

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 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.

Public Notices

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: September 3, 2021
Attorney for Jasaire Roe'shell Comeger
R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603
PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 328 7000
sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/08, 10/15 & 10/22, 2021.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE
NUMBER CIVSB2125667
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: BRIAN GAZCON GUTIERREZ filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: BRIAN GAZCON GUTIERREZ to BRIAN GAZCON

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: NOVEMBER 16, 2021
Time: 9:00 AM
Department: S17
The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415

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: 9/8/2021
Lynn M. Poncin
Judge of the Superior Court.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 10/08, 10/15, 10/22 & 10/29, 2021.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE
NUMBER CIVSB2122384
TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: ALEXIS NOUR KHALAF filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: ALEXIS NOUR KHALAF to ALEXIS NOUR BOCANEGRA

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 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.

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.

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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ PAOLA GONZALES, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/22/2021 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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CN-BB38202106MT

FBN 20210009589 The following person is doing business as: DIVINE LIFE, 30245 FRONTERA DEL SUR HIGHLAND, CA 92346; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); RESHMI S. KAPPATTIL 30245 FRONTERA DEL SUR HIGHLAND, CA 92346. 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ RESHMI S. KAPPATTIL, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/22/2021 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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CN-BB38202105MT

FBN 20210009609 The following person is doing business as: ARCHES & BEAUTY, 3116 ACACIA AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF

In The Face Of Mounting Deaths, A Significant Segment Of The Public Yet Sees The COVID Panic As A Political Ploy *from page 3*

spiracists maintain, and reports to that effect were “fake news” put out by the mainstream media which was in lockstep with the government. Emergency field hospitals set up to handle an overflow of emergency patients went largely unused, according to those who question the story put out by the government. The public, kept in the dark by virtue of being in lockdown, was unable to discern that there was in reality no crisis as the government’s false narrative claimed because they could not check out for themselves how empty the hospitals actu-

Public Notices

BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); EVELYN GONGORA 3116 ACACIA AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405. 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ EVELYN GONGORA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/22/2021 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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CN-B38202104CH

FBN 20210009576 The following person is doing business as: AIZE PRINCESS IDEMUDIA, 800 E. WASHINGTON ST. APT 740 COLTON, CA 92324 ; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); AIZE P IDEMUDIA 800 E. WASHINGTON ST. APT 740 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ AIZE P IDEMUDIA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/21/2021 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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CN-B38202103IR

ally were, those who deny the government’s sense of alarm say. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention changed the way that death due to coronavirus was calculated, those rejecting the governments representations report. Constantly rising COVID deaths claimed by the government were in reality deaths from other causes such as heart disease, cancer, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes or other life-threatening co-morbidities, they say.

In San Bernardino County, a manifestation of this distrust came at the September 16 Chino Joint Unified School District Board meeting. Board member Andrew Cruz, who was backed by his board colleague James Na, sought to gain majority board support for a resolution that much, if not all of the public effort

Public Notices

FBN 20210009629 The following person is doing business as: ZEBASTIAN’S CAR WASH, 17312 FOOTHILL BLVD. UNIT A FONTANA, CA 92335; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); [MAILING ADDRESS 8181 PALMETTO AVE. APT 115 FONTANA, CA 92335]; JUAN C PARDO ARIZA 8181 PALMETTO AVE. APT 115 FONTANA, CA 92335; JOHANNA A YEPES OVALLE 8181 PALMETTO AVE. APT 15 FONTANA, CA 92335. The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE. 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/JUANPCARDOARIZA,HUSBAND Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/22/2021 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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CNB-B38202102IR

FBN 20210009372 The following person is doing business as: SPARTAN TOWING L.L.C. 2155 1/2 OGDEN ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 2407; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); SPARTAN PAINTING L.L.C. 2155 1/2 OGDEN ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407 The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: AUG 24, 2021 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ EMMANUEL PALOMARES, OWNER/ MANAGER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/15/2021 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

at the state and local levels to arrest the progress of COVID-19 and its current mutation, the Delta variant, represents “government overreach.”

Cruz’s resolution opposed California’s COVID-19 vaccination mandates, and iterated his belief that “the use of coercion as a means to make individuals submit to vaccination is unacceptable” and that “the district opposes statewide vaccination mandates that put employment at risk and compromise personal freedom.”

There were elements in the crowd who concurred with Cruz, most particularly a group bearing the name Parent Association of Chino Valley, the members of which celebrate “Christian, conservative and family values,” while claiming more than 1,000 members in Chino and Chino Hills.

Public Notices

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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CN-BB38202101MT

FBN 202100010081 The following person is doing business as: FVA CLEANING SERVICES, 775 E. FOOTHILL BLVD. SPC 26 RIALTO, CA 92376;(PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); ANGELICA M VIRAMONTES-DORADO 775 E. FOOTHILL BLVD. SPC 26 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: 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ANGELICA M VIRAMONTES-DORADO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/04/2021 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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CNB-B39202107IR

FBN 2021000831 The following person is doing business as: JOHNSON’S TRANSPORT SERVICES, 3107 CRYSTAL LAKE RD ONTARIO, CA 91761; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); JOHNSON’S TRANSPORT SERVICES, LLC 3107 CRYSTAL LAKE RD ONTARIO, CA 91761; . The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

Public Notices

s/ KAMISHAN N. JOHNSON, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/28/2021 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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CNB-B39202106IR

FBN 20210009960 The following person is doing business as: ERIK’S BARBER COMPANY, 2587 W. ESPERANZA ST. SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); ERIK PEREZ 2587 W. ESPERANZA ST. SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410. 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ERIK PEREZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/30/2021 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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CNB-B39202105IR

FBN 20210009909 The following person is doing business as: RHINO TEX, INC. 15080 HILTON DR FONTANA, CA 92336; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); RHINO TEX, INC 15080 HILTON DR FONTANA, CA 92336; 15080 HILTON DR FONTANA, CA 92336;. The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all infor-

Public Notices

mation 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ RUSSELL A. COLEMAN, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/29/2021 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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CN-BB39202104MT

FBN 20210009840 The following person is doing business as: PIGFORD LANDSCAPING, 11428 KEYON WAY RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); CHRISTOPHER PIGFORD 11428 KENYON WAY RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701. 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 on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/CHRISTOPHERPIGFORD,OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/28/2021 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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CN-BB39202103MT

FBN 20210009473 The following person is doing business as: ALICE DARLENE DESIGNS, 5375 WALNUT AVE #1573 CHINO, CA 91708; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); ALICE D BILLS 5375 WALNUT AVE #1573 CHINO, CA 91708.

Public Notices

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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ALICE D BILLS, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/30/2021 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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CN-BB39202102MT

FBN 20210009826 The following person is doing business as: J. CERVANTES ROAD SERVICE, INC. 15957 RANDALL AVE #3 FONTANA, CA 92335; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); J. CERVANTES ROAD SERVICE, INC 15957 RANDALL AVE #3 FONTANA, CA 92335. The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/JAVIERCERVANTESLANDA,CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/28/2021 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 10/08/2021, 10/15/2021, 10/22/2021, 10/29/2021 CNB-B39202101IR

2020. As of Wednesday, December 23, 2020, 1,407 deaths of county residents had been attributed to the disease. Over the next two days there were 13 COVID-19-related deaths and a jump of 3,246 in the number of those with confirmed cases of the contagion countywide. Those numbers were a respite from what had occurred in the weeks previously. A serious advance of the syndrome took place between December 14 and December 21 inclusive, when 134 of those with the affliction died. That included 52 deaths over a 48-hour period on December 19 and 20. Deaths wholly or partially attributable to COVID-19 in San Bernardino County reached their apex on December 16, when 63 people died. As of Christmas Day 2020, over the previous four days, 55

Continued on Page 12

the spread of the virus and prevent the contagion from hurting or even killing their children.

Ultimately, Cruz’s effort to pass his resolution failed. While it garnered his colleague James Na’s vote, it was opposed by Board President Joe Schaffer, Don Bridge, and Christina Gagnier.

In the fall of 2020 moving into the winter, the original version of the deadly coronavirus – COVID-19 – hit what was once thought to be its deadliest crescendo.

According to San Bernardino County’s Department of Health, as of Wednesday, December 23, 2020, 170,855 of the county’s residents had contracted confirmed cases of COVID-19. As of December 21, 2020 a total of 1,375 county residents had perished from the disease from the onset of the outbreak in February

Those with Parent Association of Chino Valley who spoke emphasized that school district staff and the majority of the board they characterized as “liberals” were not listening to their concerns about how the imposition of the mandates were violations of their rights and their children’s rights, and that state and local officials were not considering the potential hazard of the vaccines developed to fight the coronavirus. Some demanded to know whether the district would accept liability if any of their children were harmed by the vaccine.

Within the crowd at the September 15 Chino school board meeting there was an even more numerous contingent of parents who supported the state and local district establishment’s strategy to use masking and eventual vaccination to reduce

Redlands Council Uses Planning Commission To Make Major Density Upgrade Downtown

from page 5

we're not acting upon a specific project, but we're really considering how the idea of the redevelopment of that mall – as at least was being depicted to us – how that fits into the property, its location and its relevance and proximity relationship to the downtown transit infrastructure that is being developed.”

Guzkowski suggested that what Vantage One is doing is merely to layer in more intensive development on top of what has already been set forth by Village Partners Ventures LLC.

“We worked our way through all of that and then it went on to council and that record is well established,” Guzkowski said. “So now we come to these two items. Here it comes, and now we have

something of a generalized description of how this property might move forward. The advantage on this one is we have some history to it. We've had a rezoning request on it, for example, so it's not as if it's a stranger to this commission, but again the question that was coming up was ‘What is it we're struggling with and what is it we're being asked to do with respect to Measure U, to not only be faithful to Measure U, be encouraging of development to take place in the city, particularly on properties that we are desperate or at least feel strongly, some or hopefully most of us, feel need to be developed in a new fashion to move forward?’ How do we make all that happen without jumping out in front of ourselves on a specific project approval? So, that's where I was struggling with it. In working with staff, what I actually did was draft a suggestion on how to make sure that we were communicating to all sides who had strong

opinions on this, whichever side that might be, as to how Measure U applies to future development in the Transit Village and downtown specifically here, how does it relate, and so we are communicating what we are really trying to tackle here. This is my interpretation on this. I am not saying it should be yours. So I drafted it, and staff has helped to refine it. The issue here is to say we're adopting the resolution, which is finding and recommending to the council that the subject property – we are dealing with the property and its future development – but it's the property that's meeting the threshold criteria that's identified for exemption, in the staff report for exemption from Measure U, and specifically category D. It's by virtue of its location within a quarter mile of the downtown transit station and that it provides for that threshold, at least that threshold density of 20 units to the acre.”

The category D exemp-

tion Guzkowski cited pertains to allowing greater density and greater height on buildings than would otherwise apply to meet the goal of large numbers of people living near the railway stations as envisioned in the Transit Villages areas.

“So we're not here – This is me speaking again – We're not here to say ‘Whatever is being proposed there in this illustration is now suddenly what we're going to be by implication sanctioning or suggesting is what we want to see in the future,’ Guzkowski said. “What we're saying is the developer in this particular application is demonstrating that the property that they're proposing to develop in the future and to submit applications for meets those thresholds, and that is the extent of the action we are taking today. No bias as to future action, no bias as to not allowing but rather say, ‘Yes, that property meets that threshold.’”

Guzkowski at that point broke into a sugges-

tion of how his colleagues should vote.

“I hope you're reading in a similar kind of fashion,” he said.

Guzkowski was barely able to contain his enthusiasm for packing as many residents into the downtown area as possible.

“That's the magic behind what you are seeing here,” he said. “It appears to me that we'll have at least a 20-to-the-acre density on the residential. That is a threshold test that is all I believe we are being asked to do. And I think that's faithful to the job at hand, pursuant to Measure U.”

Ultimately, Guzkowski and his colleagues voted unanimously to recommend that the city council allow 26 studio apartments, four studio apartments with a den, 71 apartment units with one bed and one bathroom, 25 units with one bedroom, one bathroom and one den and nine units with two bedrooms and two bathrooms and three units with two bedrooms, two

bathrooms and one den, along with three restaurants proposed as ranging from 3,450 to 3,505 square feet into what was called the Redlands City Center located on Brookside Avenue. They thereafter voted unanimously to approve the building of 149 multifamily units to include studio and one-bedroom units ranging between 516 square feet and 829 square feet and an accompanying parking structure at the site on Redlands Boulevard.

The hearing for the Brookside project began 57 minutes and 41 seconds into what was overall a two hour two minute and 21 second meeting. The hearing for the Brookside project concluded and the vote was taken at one hour 29 minutes and 43 seconds into the meeting. The commission immediately afterward took up the Redlands Boulevard project, and the voting on it was completed at one hour 41 minutes and 37 seconds into the meeting.

-Mark Gutglueck

COVID/Delta Deaths In San Bernardino Since Christmas Are At A Clip Of 14.41 Per Day

from page 11

deaths from the coronavirus had been recorded, a clip of thirteen-and-a-half people per day. That represented a weekly average of 94.5 deaths. Months before that, during the seven days of August 2 to August 9, 2020, inclusive, 129 people died in San Bernardino County.

Yet the statistics for all of 2020 in San Bernardino were tame, compared to what has been ongoing in the last nine-and-one-quarter months.

Following the close of 2020, there was for more than three months a gradual drawdown in the number of COVID-19 deaths, followed by a lull in the crisis, which some attributed to the substantial vaccination rate.

Nevertheless, the advent of the Delta variant has pushed the Coronavirus-affiliated death rate beyond what it had been previously. During the first ten months of the crisis, from February until Christmas 2020, there

had been 1,420 virus-related deaths in San Bernardino County, such that the county's residents were dying from COVID-connected-or-influenced conditions at a rate of roughly 4.25 per day.

As of today, October 8, there have been 5,556 total confirmed COVID-19/Delta variant related deaths in San Bernardino County since the disease penetrated the county in February 2020.

From Christmas Day 2020 to today, San Bernardino County residents have found themselves dying, from the ravages of the original version of COVID-19 and any variants including the more deadly Delta version, at a rate of 14.41 per day. That includes the dip in deaths in the months of January to March span, and the acceleration in morbidity that began in April with the local advent of the Delta variant.

External data is as alarming, particularly as pertains to children.

Across the country, where last year at this time pediatric COVID-19 cases accounted for well under 5 percent of the pandemic's reach, at present nationwide, 25 percent of the cases are

those infecting children. Over 243,000 children are known to have come down with COVID-19 in one of its various forms, including the Delta variant, between September 2 and September 9, 2021, the latest accounting period on children currently available. That represents the second highest number of cases among children in a single week since the pandemic began, according to the American Academy of Pediatrics.

While hospitalization of children for the condition was previously so rare as to be practically unheard of, as of September 29, 2021, 2.4 percent of patients hospitalized for COVID-19 in the United States were children. At this point, Arkansas, Florida, Nebraska and Iowa have discontinued reporting on childhood COVID cases. There have been, as of today, 520 childhood COVID-19 fatalities and rising throughout 46 reporting states, Washington, D.C., Guam and Puerto Rico.

At its September 14 meeting, the Morongo Valley Unified School District Board convened at Joshua Tree Elementary School in Joshua

Tree. On the agenda for that meeting was a presentation of the district's COVID-19 protocols that were to be enunciated by Superintendent Doug Weller and assistant superintendents Sharon Flores, Mike Ghelber, and Amy Woods. The policy extends to a universal masking mandate for kindergartners to 12th grade students that came from on high in Sacramento to schools throughout the state. Woods' intent was to explain how the district's failure to enforce the mask requirement would breach not only a legal duty, but also the primary responsibility of educators to protect students. Violation of mandatory public health guidance puts the health and safety of students, staff and their families needlessly at risk, Woods eventually stated, and would carry with it significant legal and financial risks.

Before that, or any official action could be gotten to, however, the board had to deal with a show of protest with regard to that protocol. Present at the meeting was a beefed-up security detail, consisting of San Bernardino County Sheriff's Sergeant

Omar Lastra and deputies Elizabeth Gonzalez and Jose Perez. The trio had been dispatched to the meeting because of reports that parents ready to contest the policy were to be in attendance.

As part of the protest, those parents had refused to don masks. That was problematic because part of the state's and the district's COVID protocol is that whenever anyone – children or adults – are indoors on school grounds, they are required to wear masks.

Inside the Joshua Tree Elementary multipurpose room were unmasked parents awaiting the arrival of the school board so that they could make clear their belief that a matter of principle is involved, one pertaining to freedom and the maintenance of rights to be free from government mandates for masking or vaccination or anything else. They were itching to make a case that masks and vaccine represent a health risk – ones that were as grave as the coronavirus itself. There are side effects to the vaccine, they said, and it has not been shown to be safe for children. Moreover, the masks route carbon dioxide back

into the noses and mouths of those wearing masks, they said.

The standoff continued as the school board members refused to come into the meeting room while the unmasked adults were present. Also present in the room were parents who were not part of the protest and who were masked.

Sergeant Lastra told the protesters that there would be no meeting if those present did not mask up. After a roughly 20 minute delay, with Lastra, Gonzalez and Perez glaring at them, the protesters relented. They did not put on masks, but left.

Some of the protesters, citing principle, said they simply could not put masks on and knuckle under to an illegal and unconstitutional mandate. One, who was prepared to confront the school board members with Benjamin Franklin's adage that “Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety,” suggested the school board and the district staff were cowardly in their unwillingness to be confronted by the protesters.

-Mark Gutglueck