

Blackout On Rodriguez Trial Information As Its Political Nature Grows Apparent

The San Bernardino County and Victorville political and legal establishments this week grew both self-conscious and secretive with regard to the ongoing effort to prosecute Victorville City Councilwoman Blanca Gomez's associate, Robert Daniel Rodriguez, on what were originally six, but have now been reduced to five, misdemeanor counts relating to his public com-

portment. At display in the prosecution is the degree to which governmental officials, a

cross section of politicians as well as elements within the sheriff's department, in cooperation with District Attorney Jason Anderson, are accurately, though nevertheless selectively, presenting a version of events to cast Rodriguez in a rather unattractive light. By extension, Gomez is being demonized, while prosecutors are shielding as best they can from the scrutiny of both the jury and the public actions by one of Gomez's chief political rival's closest associates, that being the

husband of Gomez's political nemesis, Victorville Mayor Debra Jones.

The Rodriguez trial and the trial of Gomez which is to follow is a classic pitting of a group of coordinated, sophisticated, enabled, powerful and well-heeled government insiders against two pathetically naive perennial outsiders, whose command of protocol and the law is so poor as to be virtually nonexistent. Yet, the expectation that Rodriguez would simply collapse under the weight of the pros-

ecutorial authority of the state that is being brought to bear on him and in doing so would set the stage for Gomez's undoing as a political entity has not yet been met. Aided by a still wet-behind-the-ears deputy public defender, Rodriguez in carrying out his Hail Mary defense is angling toward, if not acquitting himself of the charges lodged against him, exposing the double standard that those who wield the gavel of public authority employ in maintaining their positions of public trust and

the degree to which the lawgivers in San Bernardino County – the county's largest law enforcement agency and the prosecutor's office – are willing to go to ward off challenges to the county's dominating class which controls the public treasury from which those entities' budgetary allowances are made.

Gomez, a political neophyte with an imperfect understanding, at best, with regard to the function of local government, was elected to the Victorville **See P 2**

Clarity Emerges On The County District Map Supervisors Officially Adopted Tuesday

After initial confusion, there is now greater clarity with regard to the boundaries of the county's newly created supervisorial districts.

Throughout all political jurisdictions in the United States from the federal down to local levels, following each decennial census reapportionment is conducted. In addition to the states' addition or subtraction of congressional seats in the House of Representatives,

the determination of the size of each state's representation in the U.S. Electoral College, the geographical lines of congressional districts and state legislative districts, counties and cities also redraft the borders of the districts or zones for the offices of county supervisors and municipal council wards within cities which utilize by-district voting in choosing city council members.

Since 2012, San Bernardino County's First Dis-

trict has been the largest geographical jurisdiction as well as its least densely populated one overseen by a single supervisor, consisting of Hesperia, Adelanto, Wrightwood, Amboy, Wheaton Springs, Apple Valley, West Cajon Valley, Argus, Oak Hills, Bagdad, Nipton, Baker, Oro Grande, Baldy Mesa, Vidal Junction, Big River, Saltus, Cadiz, Searchlight Junction, Calico, Pinon Hills, Cima, Daggett, Earp, Newberry

Springs, El Mirage, Spring Valley Lake, Essex, Fenner, Goffs, Helendale, Hinkley, Phelan, Homer, Kelso, Ivanpah, Lenwood, Mountain Pass, Needles, Randsburg, Ludlow, Red Mountain, Rice, Kramer Junction, Silverlakes, Havasu Lake, Summit Valley, Fort Irwin, Trona, Victorville, Yermo and some other unincorporated communities which do not bear a name.

In the same time frame up to the present, the Sec-

ond District included and includes north Upland, Rancho Cucamonga, the westernmost two-thirds of Fontana, Devore, Lytle Creek, San Antonio Heights, and Mt. Baldy as well as Lake Arrowhead, Crestline, Lake Gregory, Blue Jay, Cedar Glen, Valley of Enchantment, Twin Peaks, Cedar-pines Park and Green Valley Lake.

The Third District encompasses the eastern portion of San Ber- **See P 3**

City & Town Councils Select Who Will Serve As Mayors Over The Next 12 Months

At least a half dozen of San Bernardino County's municipalities this month and late last month rotated their mayor back to a spot on the city council while elevating another council member to pick up the mayor's gavel and serve as the presiding officer over their respective city or town council at least for the next 12 months.

In 13 of the county's 24

cities and incorporated towns – the cities of Chino, Montclair, Ontario, Upland, Rancho Cucamonga, Fontana, Rialto, Colton, Grand Terrace, San Bernardino, Adelanto, Barstow and Needles – the mayor is directly elected. In the remaining eleven cities and towns – Chino Hills, Loma Linda, Highland, Redlands, Big Bear, Yucaipa, Hesperia, Apple Valley, Yuca

Valley, Twentynine Palms and Victorville – the mayor is not directly elected, and rather that honorific is conferred upon a member of the city council in processes determined by the councils in each individual case.

On December 14, the Apple Valley Town Council voted to appoint Kari Leon as that 73,661-population town's newest mayor.

On December 7, Brigit Bennington named mayor of Hesperia, where 96,393 people call home.

The Chino Hills City Council on November 23 designated Ray Marquez mayor of Chino Hills, with its 85,081 residents, for the next year.

On December 14, the Twentynine Palms City Council voted Karmolette O'Gilvie in as the mayor in

that city of 25,477 strong for the next year.

Jim Schooler was chosen to serve as Yucca Valley town mayor, leading that community of 21,949 for the next 12 months.

In Yucaipa on December 13, the city council chose David Avila to serve as mayor of that city and its 54,649 residents over the coming year.

Congressman Aguilar Grabs Limelight In Accusing Trump Chief Of Staff Of Sedition

Local Congressman Pete Aguilar in recent days has loomed into national attention as members of his party have been pressing what they believe is an advantage in establishing that former President Donald Trump was directly involved in the effort to subvert democracy early this year by obstructing the certification of the November 2020 election of his successor, Joseph Biden.

Aguilar, a Democrat from Redlands, is a member of the House select committee investigating the January

6 insurrection. It was in the midst of the rioting that took place at the nation's capital that day that the Senate, presided over by President Trump's running mate, Mike Spence, was verifying the presidential election outcome, which according to official tallies, Biden had won in the Electoral College 306 to 232. It is alleged that President Trump, in league with other conspirators, sought to have Spence use his position as the Senate's presiding officer to throw out votes in critical states

where President Trump had narrowly edged Biden, such that Trump would be declared the winner.

During a hearing that was widely broadcast on multiple media outlets, Aguilar was seen and heard saying, "On January 3, Mr. Meadows was exchanging text messages with a lawmakers about the pressure campaign to get state legislatures to overturn the results of the election. In one text message to a lawmaker, Mr. Meadows wrote he – he presumably being President

Trump - 'He thinks the legislatures have the power but the VP has power to[o]'. Power to do what? We could guess the power to overturn the election results. The power to reject the will of the voters. And days later, a violent mob tried to get Vice President Pence to do just that. We'd like to ask Mr. Meadows about that."

Meadows is ducking a subpoena to testify before the committee.

The *Sentinel* requested Aguilar identify the member of Congress he refer-

enced as exchanging text messages with Meadows. Aguilar declined. The *Sentinel* has identified that lawmaker as Congressman Jim Jordan of Ohio.

Aguilar's statements were hailed by Democrats and those who have a low opinion of Donald Trump. Meanwhile, Republicans have lodged an ethics complaint against Aguilar and another Democrat on the committee, Adam Schiff, based on assertions that the text messages Aguilar quoted from had been altered.

Upland Moves Toward Issuing H₂O & Lease Revenue Bonds As Ploy To Transfer And Extend Pension Debt To Future Generations

Two months after Upland officials were thwarted in their effort to issue \$120 million in pension obligation bonds to defer for another 20 years having to come face to face with the City of Gracious Living's overwhelming pension debt, the council this week signed off on another bond funding scheme to pass the city's past and current financial commitments to keep its former employees comfortable in their golden years on to the city's succeeding generations.

The funding mechanism the five members of the city council unanimously embraced involves, according to Assistant City Manager/Finance Director Steven Parker, a blending of water bonds and general fund lease revenue bonds.

According to Parker, what the city is going to do consists of the council "authorizing the transfer of \$10 million from the city's Section 115 Pension Trust to make an additional discretionary payment to the California Public Employees' Retirement System" and "authorizing an additional discretionary payment from the city's enterprise funds to pay off their current share of the city's unfunded actuarial liability."

The city's enterprise funds extend to the money generated by the city's provision of services to residents and businesses, such as the money the city takes in with the water department's provision of water to households and businesses.

The strategy further consists of, according to Parker "approving a revised pension funding policy," together with "a revised investment policy." **See P 8**

Alleging Racism Left & Right, Gomez Burned Multiple Bridges In Victorville from front page

City Council in 2016. A Democrat and social activist convinced that Hispanics have been historically oppressed by the white population in California and elsewhere in the United States, she was intent on crusading for the enablement and ascendancy of Latinos and Latinas at each turn. With a chip on her shoulder that is an outgrowth of her belief that the Anglos are inveterately intent on exploiting Hispanics at every opportunity, she routinely takes recourse in accusing those taking issue with her efforts and approach of having racist motivation. Complicating the situation in general is that the position to which she was elected—the Victorville City Council—is a panel of relatively modest authority in comparison to her grand political objectives, one that is dedicated to overseeing municipal government in Victorville, with its most notable reach being the ultimate authority on local land use decision and having last say with regard to the city's budget. Gomez's focus was elsewhere, as she was intent on promoting the interests of Hispanics, and crusading against the injustices—within the legal system, economically and at large—she was convinced were being perpetrated against disadvantaged minorities by the white establishment.

Victorville was a poor venue for such a crusade. Together with the City of Colton, Victorville stood as one of two of the counties 24 municipalities historically—at least going back over the previous 45 years—in which not only had the sleeping Hispanic political giant awakened but where the community at large had embraced and enabled its Latino element to be assimilated into the governmental and larger social structure. In 1976, when Victorville had formed what was for all intents and purposes its first modern professional fire department, shedding the essentially volunteer fire department that had come into being first in 1926 and which was assimilated by the city upon its 1962 incorporation, it had turned to Rudolfo Cabriales, a one-time border patrol agent with the Immigration and Naturalization Service who

had transitioned to a career as a firefighter in his hometown of Calexico before rising to become the fire chief of Coachella in Riverside County. Victorville officials convinced Cabriales to relocate to Victorville and become the city's first bonafide fire chief. In the 24 years before Gomez was elected, Victorville had elected to its city council, which was during that nearly quarter of a century the most stable of city/town councils in the county with least amount of council member turnover, five Hispanic members—Felix Diaz, Angela Valles, Gloria Garcia, Eric Negrete and Cabriales after he had retired as fire chief. Two years after Gomez was elected, the city elected another Hispanic council member, Rita Ramirez. And two years later, when Gomez was reelected, another Latina, Elizabeth Becerra, was elected to the council. Neither Gomez nor anyone else could credibly assert that Hispanics in Victorville had been politically disenfranchised. What was more, those Latinos and Latinas who had made it onto the council, or a majority of them, were members of the city's dominant Republican political establishment. Every bit as much as their white counterparts, Cabriales, Valles, Garcia, Negrete and Becerra were not just members or even members in good standing of the Victorville's GOP vanguard but leaders within that establishment. Theirs was an approach that called for policies that limited government interference with, and allowed expansion of, the private sector as means of enhancing the community's economic development to provide entrepreneurial and employment opportunities across the board, enabling business owners and their employees to prosper. This clashed with the Democratic approach, which entailed substantial governmental regulation of businesses, higher taxation and what most Republicans considered to be a too-expensive and cumbersome social welfare system that placed burdens on small businesses that greatly increased their chances of failure.

Nearly from the outset of her tenure in office, Gomez clashed with all of her fellow and sister officeholders. The situation was exacerbated by Gomez's oftentimes antagonistic and contentious style often involving provocative acts, as when she draped herself in a Mexican

flag during a council meeting. Even more than this put her at odds with the Anglo members of the council, it really rubbed the Hispanic Republican members of the city council the wrong way. Gloria Garcia, who was mayor throughout Gomez's entire first term on the council, and former Councilman Eric Negrete, who was on the council for the first two years Gomez was a council member, along with current Councilwoman Elizabeth Becerra all consider Gomez's tactics embarrassing and counterproductive, holding her in particular contempt.

Garcia as mayor had continual confrontations and showdowns with Gomez, whose lack of knowledge and respect for parliamentary protocol formed the basis of multiple heated exchanges with the mayor, and occasions where Garcia called upon deputies with the sheriff's department, who served in the capacity of sergeants-at-arms during council meetings, to forcibly remove Gomez from the council dais and the meeting chamber.

In 2020, with 22 candidates vying for three positions on the council up for election/reelection, Garcia failed to gain reelection, while the voters retained Gomez. Thereafter, the council in choosing from among its ranks a new mayor, bypassed Gomez, despite the considerations that at that point she was the longest serving member of the council and that tenure on the council was traditionally a criterion in conferring the honorific of mayor on one of the council members. The mayor's gavel was instead presented to Debra Jones, who was elected to the council in 2018, two years after Gomez's maiden election. Like Garcia before her, Jones as mayor has had a testy relationship with Gomez.

Elected to the Victorville City Council along with Jones in 2018 was Rita Ramirez. Ramirez is a Democrat. On some issues, Ramirez was in consonance with Gomez, and Ramirez's presence on the council to a degree reduced Gomez's isolation. In the 2020 election, the voters returned Gomez to office, while turning Garcia out. Also elected in 2020 were Leslie Irving, a Democrat, and Becerra, a Republican. For the first time in more than a generation, the Democrats, in December 2020 after the new members of the council

were sworn in, were in ascendancy on the Victorville City Council. That circumstance proved short-lived, as Ramirez, who had injured her foot in a December 2019 fall in which internal bruising occurred but initially went undetected, was forced to undergo a series of foot and then lower leg amputations in early 2020 and had thereafter been brought by her grown son to the family's vacation home in Twentynine Palms to recover. Based upon Ramirez's failure to attend an extended number of council meetings, she was voted off the council in March of this year, on a 3-to-2 vote, with Jones, Becerra and Irving prevailing and Ramirez and Gomez dissenting. Since that time, the council has remained at four-fifths strength, as Republicans Jones and Becerra are not willing to accept any Democrat Irving and Gomez would support and Irving and Gomez are unwilling to put into office any Republican whom Jones and Becerra might support.

Despite the low regard Gomez is held in by her council colleagues, her message has nevertheless resonated with a cross section of the community, which redounded to her 2020 reelection to the council.

At present, 27,489 or 44.2 percent of Victorville's 62,226 voters are registered as Democrats, while 14,620 or 23.5 percent are registered Republican and 13,779 or 22.1 percent express no party affiliation. The remaining 10.2 percent of the city's voters identify as members of the Peace & Freedom, American Independent, Green, Libertarian or other more obscure political parties. Despite the substantial voter registration advantage the Democrats have over them, Republicans in Victorville, as elsewhere in the county, have continued to remain politically viable and ascendant by outhustling the Democrats, better and more sophisticated party and campaign organization, superior fundraising efforts and more aggressive campaigning during election season, stronger appeals to independent voters and concentrated efforts to drive Republican voters to the polls or to vote by mail, such that Republican voter turnout is roughly twice that of Democrats or better. In the face of all of this, Gomez has nevertheless found a niche in Victorville, and she has a coterie of supporters who can be counted upon

The San Bernardino County

Sentinel

Published in San Bernardino County.

The Sentinel's main office is located at 10788 Civic Center Drive in Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

A Fortunado Publication in conjunction with Countywide News Service

Mark Gutglueck, Publisher

Call (951) 567-1936

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

10808 Foothill Blvd., Suite 160-446

Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

SBCSentinel@yahoo.com

Legal Notice Department 909 957 9998

Message Line 909-276 5796

to turn out at public events and meetings, closing ranks with her and fending off the occasional attacks vectored at her from her opponents or those who have taken umbrage at the way she conducts herself.

Among those is Rodriguez, who had become, by early this year, a mainstay at city council meetings.

As events fell out, the manner in which Gomez and Rodriguez, as one of her primary political supporters, conduct themselves presented Gomez's opponents an opportunity to take her down a peg or two.

On June 2, on the premises of the Panera Bread bakery-café at 11838 Amargosa Road in Victorville while both Gomez and Rodriguez were having lunch there, Rodriguez, somewhat ill-advisedly, began vaping. Things grew confrontational when an employee asked him to step out of the café because neither smoking nor vaping is allowed indoors at commercial establishments in Victorville. Sheriff's deputies soon arrived, and amidst Gomez making a patented claim of racism while using her cell phone to videotape the incident and Rodriguez declining to identify himself to the responding officers, both Gomez and Rodriguez were detained by the deputies, Rodriguez for "trespassing" by having vaped and Gomez for "assault," by having videotaped the Panera Bread employees.

The sheriff's department provides contract law enforcement services to the City of Victorville as its de facto police department. Gomez phoned Victorville Sheriff's Station Captain John Wickum, to complain about the treatment she and Rodriguez had been subjected to. Both Gomez and Rodriguez, who had been handcuffed and placed into a sheriff's vehicle until he

was released upon deputies succeeding in identifying him, were cited but not taken into custody.

On July 6, during the Victorville City Council meeting, a fracas broke out when city officials became warily regardful of Rodriguez, and Mayor Debra Jones called for the San Bernardino County Sheriff's deputies who were on standby to maintain order at the council meeting to take action, to which Rodriguez reacted vocally and loudly. As a consequence, he was forcefully removed from the council chambers by the deputies on the scene.

On July 20, while she was presiding over that evening's council meeting, Mayor Jones objected to Rodriguez, who was wearing a hat and what appeared to be a ski mask while sitting near Jones' husband in the gallery within the council chamber, using a device to video-record the meeting. The circumstance was complicated by the consideration that Jones' husband was also, apparently, recording the meeting, which was remarked upon by City Attorney Andre de Bortnowsky. Gomez, sitting at her position on the council dais to Jones' right with Councilwoman Irving between them, was also using a camera to video-record. Mayor Jones vectored sheriff's deputies to Rodriguez, after which a confrontation between deputies and Rodriguez ensued, with Gomez making verbal note that Mr. Jones was not being dealt with by deputies in the way in which Rodriguez was, and that she had herself video-recorded that discrepancy. When Gomez left her place at the council dais to move into the gallery, an altercation with deputies took place, and both she and Rodriguez were arrested.

Continued on Page 7

County's 1st, 2nd, 3rd & 5th Districts Making Substantial Boundary Shifts Operation from front page

San Bernardino, Grand Terrace, Loma Linda, Highland, Redlands, Yucaipa, Big Bear Lake, Angeles Oaks, Yucca Valley, Twentynine Palms and Barstow.

The Fourth District extends to Chino Hills, Chino, Ontario, Montclair and the southern portion of Upland, as well as Guasti, Los Seranos, Carbon Canyon, Tres Hermanos Ranch, Prado and Frontera.

The Fifth District, the county's smallest geographically and most densely populated, consists of Colton, east Fontana, Rialto, San Bernardino, Bloomington, El Rancho Verde, Glen Helen, Arrowhead Farms, Muscoy, Little Third and Rosena Ranch.

Though the county's governmental structure made a public show of involving the public in the effort to draft a district map, holding 18 public meetings at various places around the county to allow a geographically diverse participation in hashing out the new districts, in the end the multiple districting and mapping proposals put forth by a number of county residents were given short shrift and the options for redistricting taken most seriously by the board of supervisors were three generated in-house by the county with the assistance of a county consultant, Northern California-based Redistricting Insights. Indeed, one of those three was never in the running either, as a clear majority of the county board of supervisors by the end of October was gravitating toward accepting the map ultimately chosen, one known as Map 2 Version 2, while entertaining the concept of going with Map 3, which essentially was a replication of the currently existing districts with some relatively small changes.

The board of supervisors essentially did not allow itself to get bogged down in considering the minutiae of the various map submissions and then comparing and contrasting them to arrive at an in-depth conclusion as to their relative merits because doing so would have been so intensive of an effort that it would have made it unlikely that the board of supervisors could

conclude the process by December 15. If the board did not adopt a specific map by that date, then the drawing of the maps would have fallen under the purview of the San Bernardino County Superior Court.

In addition, the setting of the map would necessarily involve the county surveyor's office, and for that department to complete its work, roughly ten days of knowing the precise boundaries set by the board was needed. Thus, the action taken this week, based on a decision made last week, on December 7, was foreordained, such that there was no prospect that the board would vote any other way than it did.

The First District yet encompasses Hesperia, Apple Valley, Victorville, Adelanto, Wrightwood, Oak Hills, Four Corners, Helendale, Silverlakes, Oro Grande, Baker, Trona, Kelso and Zzyxx, the northernmost portion of the county and much of the county lying north of Highway 40 with the exception of Barstow and a few relatively small desert communities.

North Upland, Rancho Cucamonga, all of Fontana, San Antonio Heights, Lytle Creek and Mount Baldy are located within the new Second District.

Grand Terrace, east San Bernardino, Redlands, Yucaipa, Yucca Valley, Twentynine Palms, Needles, Barstow, Devore, Lenwood, Amboy, Daggett, Yermo, Ludlow, Cadiz, Danby, Essex, Fenner, Harvard, Newberry Springs, Loma Linda, Big Bear Lake, Lucerne Valley, Johnson Valley, Cedarpines Park, Lake Gregory, Crestline, Lake Arrowhead, Blue Jay, Twin Peaks, Valley of Enchantment, Cedar Glen, Arrowbear, Angeles Oaks and Forest Falls are in the new Third District.

Chino Hills, Chino, Montclair, Ontario and lower Upland fall within the new Fourth District, as do Guasti, Prado, Frontera, Carbon Canyon and Tres Hermanos Ranch.

Rialto, Colton, a major portion of San Bernardino, Bloomington, El Rancho Verde, Arrowhead Farms, Muscoy, Little Third and Rosena Ranch remain in the new Fifth District.

Goffs, which covers an extensive geographical area, falls in both the First and Third districts.

Geographically speaking, the First District has historically been the coun-

ty's largest district, encompassing all, or virtually all of the county's Mojave Desert expanse. It remains the county's largest district land-wise, but just barely. The redistricting effectuated in 2012 cut the Third District in on a goodly portion of the desert. With the redistricting going into effect next year, the Third District will now claim roughly 40 percent of the county's desert. The Fifth District will remain the county's smallest district geographically.

For the last ten years, the First District encompassed 15,753 of the county's total 20,105 square miles, accounting for 78.3 percent of the county's total land. Next year it will be reduced to 10,063 square miles, just a tad over half – roughly 50.05 percent – of the county's land mass.

The Third District, presently the county's second largest district in size at 3,807 square miles, currently composes 18.93 percent of the county's territory. It will more than double in size and actually go a good way toward tripling its expanse, growing to 9,640 square miles. Thus, the Third District will account for near 47.95 percent of the county's real estate, including urban areas, mountains and desert.

The Second District, which for ten years has been by a comfortable margin the third-largest district at 333 square miles, was given a sizable trimming to fit within next year's district map, losing its claim to the expanse on the eastern side of the San Bernardino Mountains. It now stands at 174 square miles.

The Fourth District, presently at 139 square miles, remains as the fourth largest or second smallest district after picking up two square miles, such that it now extends to 141 square miles.

The Fifth District, at this time the smallest of the five districts at 121 square miles, will pick up 13 square miles when the new map goes into effect, but yet remains the most compact of the five county supervisorial jurisdictions at 134 square miles.

Ideally, the goal has always been that the districts each account for one-fifth, 20 percent, of the county's population, a target that is very difficult to achieve.

In 2012, the population in the First District stood at 391,385; the Second District was home to 418,604 people; the Third District

accounted for 406,395; the Fourth District had 411,309 inhabitants; and the 407,480 resided in the Fifth District.

Next year, the redrawn First District will have roughly 430,041 dwelling within its confines; the Second District will number some 441,285 constituents; the Third District will boast 431,037 residents; 440,910 will call the Fourth District home; and the Fifth District will be 436,879 strong.

According to the county's redistricting consultant, Matt Rexroad, the population deviation among the various districts is 2.6 percent, which falls under the maximum 5 percent which the office of county counsel, the county's stable of in-house lawyers, said was the maximum deviation it was believed the county could justify in court if the map were to be legally challenged.

While the current board members – First District Supervisor Paul Cook, Second District Supervisor Janice Rutherford, Third District Supervisor Dawn Rowe, Fourth District Supervisor Curt Hagman and Fifth District Supervisor Joe Baca Jr. – will continue to represent the districts to which they were most recently elected for the time being, the new districts will be in effect for the June 2022 supervisorial elections, when the Second and Fourth District supervisorial positions are to be contested. It has yet to be determined when the existing supervisors will officially become the representatives of the new districts corresponding to their current numerical supervisorial designation.

The map was approved with the support of supervisors Cook, Rowe, Hagman and Baca and over the objection of Supervisor Rutherford. Rutherford said she had to “respectfully disagree” with the sentiment expressed by her colleagues, in particular Cook, as well as with Fontana Mayor Acquafredda Warren and Fontana Councilman Pete Garcia, who had called for ensuring that the new district map kept cities – in particular Fontana – in the same district rather than splitting them between two districts.

At the November 16 board of supervisors meeting, Rutherford said, “When you are talking about a city having power and control and being united, that's why you have city boundaries. But our job up here – the

five of us – is to represent unincorporated populations because for the most part the decisions we make on this board don't affect residents of your city. We govern the county services that serve everybody in the county, but we don't make the decisions about your city laws. We, the county, is not what makes Fontana a unique and distinct community from any other. You do that in the city. You make it distinct. Our job as a supervisor – and I came off the Fontana Council, so I know what it is to represent Fontana as a city and now at the county level. My concerns about the maps are to make sure the unincorporated residents of San Bernardino County have good voices on this board regardless of who the five people sitting here are, that the maps are drawn such that there is a significant enough unincorporated population in each district to make sure that unincorporated residents have their needs served up here. I believe that is accomplished in Map 3 much more than in Map 2. My concerns are not only about the Fontana issue but even more so for the Rim of the World communities.”

The Rim of the World communities Rutherford referenced consists of Cedarpines Park, Lake Gregory, Crestline, Lake Arrowhead, Blue Jay, Twin Peaks, Valley of Enchantment and Cedar Glen.

“Rim of the World [is] not incorporated, but is a distinct community of interest,” Rutherford said. “It is a distinct community of interest from Big Bear – the Big Bear area, which has incorporated and unincorporated – but they have distinct needs, as well. And I think people who live in the Rim who came out ten years ago and said they wanted to be in one district as the mountains, have come to understand the value of having two members on this board who represent rural mountain communities. I think there is a value to that. I would encourage my Fontana friends to also consider how much much more valu-

able it is to a community to have not only two votes on this board but two votes on SBCTA [the San Bernardino County Transportation Agency] and two votes on OmniTrans [the regional rapid transit agency] and two built-in friends of Fontana wherever you go. You get that in Map 3. You don't get that in Map 2. Having been in both positions and having lived under a different version of these districts and lived under what 's basically Version 3 today, I think Version 3 gives the best voice to our rural and unincorporated residents.”

Supervisor Rowe, whose Third District is to subsume the Rim of the World communities from Rutherford's Second District, at the November 16 meeting offered what she said was a “volley” to Rutherford's statement.

“In our redistricting commission meetings – all 16 that took place – we heard from our mountain residents that they wanted to be one, so based on that public testimony for this – and we did go through the redistricting process – if we were going to adopt Map 3, I'm not sure why we wouldn't have just adopted Map 3 outright and why we went through the redistricting process to have the outside influence of not only the commissioners but our public. So, they did provide the two maps. The third map was added late, so I can make an argument for both sides, but our general public at those meetings came out and said they wanted one voice for the mountain. So, with that spirit in mind that, it would be Map 2.”

At both the December 7 and December 14 meetings, while Rutherford cast a vote in opposition to the adoption of Map 2 Version 2, she remained silent and did not give discourse to the grounds for her opposition.

Property or Estate Caretaker

**Reliable
Bonded**

**Call (951) 567 1936
Ask for Adam**

Public Notices

T.S. No. 19-21058-SP-CA Title No. 191149382-CA-VOI A.P.N. 0218-891-66-0-000 NOTICE OF TRUSTEE'S SALE. YOU ARE IN DEFAULT UNDER A DEED OF TRUST DATED 12/19/2006. 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 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: Sergio Reyna, a married man as his sole and separate property Duly Appointed Trustee: National Default Servicing Corporation Recorded 01/02/2007 as Instrument No. 2007-0001112 (or Book, Page) of the Official Records of San Bernardino County, CA. Date of Sale: 01/10/2022 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: \$549,341.62 Street Address or other common designation of real property: 3034 Rocky Lane Ontario, CA 91761 A.P.N.: 0218-891-66-0-000 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)(2)923.55(c) 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

Public Notices

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 or visit this Internet Web site www.ndscorp.com/sales, using the file number assigned to this case 19-21058-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 to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. Date: 11/22/2021 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 12/03/2021, 12/10/2021, 12/17/2021 CPP351729

NOTICE OF SALE OF VESSEL

Notice is hereby given the undersigned will sell the following vessel and trailer at lien sale at said address below on: 12/31/2021 9:00 am VESSEL 2334HD, 81 SANG SANJIC-589M81A, CA DATE OF SALE-12-31-2021 TIME OF SALE-09:00 AM LOCATION OF SALE-18409 CHERRY AVE #B FONTANA CA 92335

To be sold by HOUSE OF BOATS 18409 CHERRY AVE #B FONTANA CA 92335 Said sale is for the purpose of satisfying lien for together with costs of advertising and expenses of sale. Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel December 17, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: Gary Lemos

CASE NO. PROSB2100944 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of Gary Lemos:

A Petition for Probate has been filed by Mary L. Cabral in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Mary L. Cabral 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 DECEMBER 21, 2022 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.

November 12, 2021 Jennifer Saldana, 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

Public Notices

by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code.

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

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

Filed: November 12, 2021 Attorney for Mary L. Cabral 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 December 3, 10 & 17, 2021.

FBN 20210011818 The following entity is doing business as: FEEL BEAUTIFUL AESTHETICS 11513 FOOTHILL BLVD RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; MARGARET M. HERNANDEZ 10818 CLAREMONT BLVD BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316

Mailing Address: P O BOX 651 BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316 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/ MARGARET M. HERNANDEZ Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/24/2021

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 11327

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 on 12/03, 12/10, 12/17 & 12/24, 2021.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2129348

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: Aida Guadalupe Angeles Cornejo filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

Aida Guadalupe Angeles Cornejo to Aida Angeles

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

Notice of Hearing: Date: 12/30/2021 Time: 09:00 AM Department: S-17

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

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: 11/18/2021

Public Notices

John M. Pacheco Judge of the Superior Court. Published in the San Bernardino City News on 12/03/2021, 12/10/2020, 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021

SUMMONS-(FAMILYLAW) NOTICE TO RESPONDENT (AVISO AL DEMANDADO): JINGA LUCIOUS MAYO YOU HAVE BEEN SUED. Read the information below and on the next page. Lo han demandado. Lea la informacion a continuacion y en la pagina siguiente. PETITIONER'S NAME IS (Nombre del demandante): CHINYERE CHRISTINE MAYO CASE NUMBER FAMS2101845 You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this Summons and Petition are served on you to file a Response (Form FL-120) at the court and have a copy served on the petitioner. A letter or phone call will not protect you. If you do not file your Response on time, the court may make orders affecting your marriage or domestic partnership, your property, and custody of your children. You may be ordered to pay support and attorney fees and costs. For legal advice, contact a lawyer immediately. Get help finding a lawyer at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), at the California Legal Services Website (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), or by contacting your local county bar association. Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO despues de haber recibido la entrega legal de esta Citacion y Peticion para presentar una Respuesta (formulario FL-120) ante la corte y efectuar la entrega legal de una copia al demandante. Una carta o llamada telefonica o una audiencia de la corte no basta para protegerlo. Si no presenta su Respuesta a tiempo, la corte puede dar ordenes que afecten su matrimonio o pareja de heco, sus bienes y la custodia de sus hijos. La corte tambien le puede ordenar que pague manutencion, y honorarios y costos legales. Para asesoramiento legal, pongase en contacto de inmediato con un abogado. Puede obtener informacion para encontrar un abogado en el Contro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.suocorte.ca.gov), en el sitio web de los Servicios Legales de California (www.lahelpca.org) o poniendose en contacto con el colegio de abogados de su condado. NOTICE - Restraining orders on page 2: These restraining orders are effective against both spouses or domestic partners until the petition is dismissed, a judgement is entered, or the court makes further orders. They are enforceable anywhere in California by any law enforcement officer who has received or seen a copy of them. AVISO - Las ordenes de restricción se encuentran en la pagina 2 : Las ordenes de restricción estan en vigencia en cuanto a ambos conyuges o miembros de la pareja de hecho hasta que se despida la peticion, se emita un fallo o la corte de otras ordenes. Cualquier agencia del orden publico que haya rocebido o visto una copia de estas ordenes puede hacerlas acatar en cualquier lugar de California. FEE WAIVER : If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the clerk for a fee waiver form. The court may order you to pay back all or part of the fees and costs that the court waived for you or the other party. Exencion de cuotas : Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentacion, pida al secretario un formulario de exencion de cuotas. La corte puede ordenar que usted pague, ya sea en parte o por completo, las cuotas y costos de la corte previamente exentos a peticion de usted o de la otra parte. FL-100 PETITION FOR Dissolution (Divorce) of: Marriage 1. LEGAL RELATIONSHIP: We are married. 2. RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS: a. Petitioner [and] have been residents of this state for at least six months and of this country for at least three months immediately preceding the filing of this petition. (For divorce, at least one person in the legal relationship described in items 1a and 1c must comply with this requirement.) 4. MINOR CHILDREN: There are no minor children. 5. LEGAL GROUNDS: Irreconcilable Differences 8. SPOUSAL OR DOMESTIC PARTNER SUPPORT: Terminate (end) the court's ability to ward support to Respondent. SEPARATE PROPERTY: There are no such assets or debts that I know of to be confirmed by the court.

Public Notices

COMMUNITY AND QUASI-COMMUNITY PROPERTY: There are no such assets or debts that I know of to be divided by the court. OTHER REQUESTS: Such other and further orders as the court deems just and proper. The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y direccion de la corte son): SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN BERNARDINO 351 N. ARROWHEAD AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415 The name, address and telephone number of petitioner's attorney, or petitioner without an attorney, are: (El nombre, direccion y numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante si no tiene abogado, son): IN PRO PER

CHRISTINE MAYO 6774 KAISER AVENUE FONTANA, CA 92336 DATE (Fecha): July 30, 2021 by Krystal Lerma (Asistente) for Clerk of the Court (Secretario)

This case is assigned to Agron Department S 50 Published in The San Bernardino County Sentinel on 12/03, 12/10, 12/17 & 12/24, 2021

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: RUFUS BIAS, JR. CASE NO. PROSB2100054

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of RUFUS BIAS, JR.: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by ELLA LOUISE CARODINE in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ELLA LOUISE CARODINE 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 FEBRUARY 2, 2022 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: James Lee, Esquire 100 N. Euclid Avenue, Second Floor Upland, CA 91786 Telephone No: (909) 608-7426 Email address: mail@w e f i g h t 4 y o u . c o m Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 10, 17 & 24, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ROBERT DANIEL STONE CASE NO. PROSB2101032

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ROBERT DANIEL STONE has been filed by ROBERT JOSEPH STONE in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ROBERT JOSEPH STONE be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests that the decedent's wills and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The wills 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 im-

Public Notices

& 24, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARCUS MARCEL McCOWEN CASE NO. PROSB2100727

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MARCUS MARCEL McCOWEN: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by CLEAFERSE McCOWEN JR. in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that CLEAFERSE McCOWEN JR. 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 FEBRUARY 7, 2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: December 8, 2021 Attorney for the Robert Joseph Stone: 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 December 10, 17 & 24, 2021.

FBN 20210012158

The following person is doing business as: SU CENTRO HISPANO MULTI-SERVICE 15058 ESCALANTE CT VICTORVILLE, CA 92394; LAURA NAVA 15058 ESCALANTE CT VICTORVILLE, CA 92394 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: DECEMBER 29, 2016 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/ LAURA NAVA Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/08/2021 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 15199 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 12/10/2021, 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021 & 12/31/2021

FBN 20210012185

The following person is doing business as: SHIEKH IMPACT 1774 S. VINTAGE AVENUE ONTARIO, CA 91761 SITARA FOUNDATION INC. 10540 SUNBURST DRIVE RANCHO CUCAMON-

Public Notices

portant actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held JANUARY 13, 2022 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. Sabrina Felix, Deputy December 8, 2021 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: December 8, 2021 Attorney for the Robert Joseph Stone: 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 December 10, 17 & 24, 2021.

FBN 20210012185

The following person is doing business as: SHIEKH IMPACT 1774 S. VINTAGE AVENUE ONTARIO, CA 91761 SITARA FOUNDATION INC. 10540 SUNBURST DRIVE RANCHO CUCAMON-

Public Notices

GA, CA 91730
Mailing Address: 10540 SUNBURST DRIVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730
The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION.

Incorporated with the State of California C2408434 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/ IRUM SHIEKH
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/10/2021 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 15199 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 12/10/2021, 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021 & 12/31/2021

FBN 20210012031

The following person is doing business as: LEAN ON ME PET SITTING 8774 KNOLLWOOD DR RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: MICHELLE M MORENO 8774 KNOLLWOOD DR RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

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/ MICHELLE M MORENO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/03/2021

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 11327

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 12/10/2021, 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021 & 12/31/2021

ABANDONMENT OF A FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME

NUMBER 20210012133
The following entity was doing business as: THE BELAIRE APARTMENT HOMES 8255 VINEYARD AVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: WC WOODSONG LLC 2082 MICHELSON DRIVE, 4TH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92612

Registered with the State of Delaware 20180190172

Mailing Address: 2082 MICHELSON DRIVE, 4TH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92612
The business is conducted by: A LIMITED PARTNERSHIP.

The original FBN Number was FBN 20180007520 The date of filing was 03/14/2018

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JANUARY 23, 2018 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/ MICHAEL B EARL

Public Notices

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/08/2021 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 15199 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 12/10/2021, 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021 & 12/31/2021

T.S. No. 18-21030-SP-CA Title No. 180599804-CA-VOI A.P.N. 1048-383-06-0-000 NOTICE OF TRUSTEE'S SALE. YOU ARE IN DEFAULT UNDER A DEED OF TRUST DATED 10/10/2006. 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 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. Trustor: Antonio Fuentefria, a married man as his sole and separate property Duly Appointed Trustee: National Default Servicing Corporation Recorded 10/18/2006 as Instrument No. 2006-0709369 (or Book, Page) of the Official Records of San Bernardino County, CA. Date of Sale: 01/20/2022 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: \$498,084.05 Street Address or other common designation of real property: 632 East G Street Ontario, CA 91764 A.P.N.: 1048-383-06-0-000 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)(2)2923.55(c) 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 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 18-21030-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 to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. Date: 12/10/2021 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: Raehael Hamilton, Trustee Sales Representative 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021 CPP351770

Public Notices

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF JOSE RUBEN RIVERA LOPEZ
Case No. PROSB2100920
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of JOSE RUBEN RIVERA LOPEZ.
A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Maria Rivera in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.
THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Maria Rivera 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 on Feb. 14, 2022 at 9:00 AM in Dept. No. S36 located at 247 W. Third St., San Bernardino, CA 92415.
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.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF JOSE RUBEN RIVERA LOPEZ
Case No. PROSB2100920
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of JOSE RUBEN RIVERA LOPEZ.
A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Maria Rivera in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.
THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Maria Rivera 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 on Feb. 14, 2022 at 9:00 AM in Dept. No. S36 located at 247 W. Third St., San Bernardino, CA 92415.
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.

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 or visit this Internet Web site www.ndscorp.com/sales, using the file number assigned to this case 18-21030-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 to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. Date: 12/10/2021 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: Raehael Hamilton, Trustee Sales Representative 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021 CPP351770

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: FREDDIE MAE CUMMINGS CASE NO. PROSB2101044
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of FREDDIE MAE CUMMINGS: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by HARVEY LEE CARTER in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.
THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that HARVEY LEE CARTER 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 on Feb. 14, 2022 at 9:00 AM in Dept. No. S36 located at 247 W. Third St., San Bernardino, CA 92415.
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.

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 or visit this Internet Web site www.ndscorp.com/sales, using the file number assigned to this case 18-21030-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 to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. Date: 12/10/2021 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: Raehael Hamilton, Trustee Sales Representative 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021 CPP351770

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: FREDDIE MAE CUMMINGS CASE NO. PROSB2101044
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of FREDDIE MAE CUMMINGS: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by HARVEY LEE CARTER in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.
THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that HARVEY LEE CARTER 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 on Feb. 14, 2022 at 9:00 AM in Dept. No. S36 located at 247 W. Third St., San Bernardino, CA 92415.
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.

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 or visit this Internet Web site www.ndscorp.com/sales, using the file number assigned to this case 18-21030-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 to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. Date: 12/10/2021 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: Raehael Hamilton, Trustee Sales Representative 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021 CPP351770

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: FREDDIE MAE CUMMINGS CASE NO. PROSB2101044
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of FREDDIE MAE CUMMINGS: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by HARVEY LEE CARTER in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.
THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that HARVEY LEE CARTER 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 on Feb. 14, 2022 at 9:00 AM in Dept. No. S36 located at 247 W. Third St., San Bernardino, CA 92415.
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.

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 or visit this Internet Web site www.ndscorp.com/sales, using the file number assigned to this case 18-21030-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 to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. Date: 12/10/2021 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: Raehael Hamilton, Trustee Sales Representative 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021 CPP351770

Public Notices

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:
SLAV KASRELIOVICHESQ
SBN 256807
ABIR COHEN TREYZON
SALOLLP
16001 VENTURA BLVD
STE 200
ENCINO CA 91436
CN982569 LOPEZ Dec 17,24,31, 2021

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: LUCILLE DAVIS CASE NO. PROSB2101036
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of LUCILLE DAVIS has been filed by KENNETH DAVIS in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.
THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that KENNETH 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 JANUARY 11, 2022 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. Aspen Jackson, Deputy December 8, 2021
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.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARINA EUGENIA POLANCO CASE NO. PROSB2100620
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of MARINA EUGENIA POLANCO
A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Pamela A. Hernandez in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.
THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Pamela A. Hernandez 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. S36 at 9:00 a.m. on January 25, 2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino, 247 West 3rd St. San Bernardino, CA 92415-0212, San Bernardino District - Probate
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.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: FREDDIE MAE CUMMINGS CASE NO. PROSB2101044
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of FREDDIE MAE CUMMINGS: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by HARVEY LEE CARTER in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.
THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that HARVEY LEE CARTER 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. S36 at 9:00 a.m. on January 25, 2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino, 247 West 3rd St. San Bernardino, CA 92415-0212, San Bernardino District - Probate
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.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: NANCY RUTH WHITE CASE NO. PROSB2101034
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of NANCY RUTH WHITE has been filed by CHRIS-

Public Notices

TOPHER KINSMAN WHITE in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that CHRISTOPHER KINSMAN WHITE be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests that the decedent's wills and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The wills 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 JANUARY 13, 2022 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. Selyna Razo, Deputy December 8, 2021
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.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARINA EUGENIA POLANCO CASE NO. PROSB2100620
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of MARINA EUGENIA POLANCO
A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Pamela A. Hernandez in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.
THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Pamela A. Hernandez 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. S36 at 9:00 a.m. on January 25, 2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino, 247 West 3rd St. San Bernardino, CA 92415-0212, San Bernardino District - Probate
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.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: NANCY RUTH WHITE CASE NO. PROSB2101034
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of NANCY RUTH WHITE has been filed by CHRIS-

Public Notices

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 JANUARY 12, 2022 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 COMMERCENT-ER 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 December 17, 24 & 31, 2021.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARINA EUGENIA POLANCO CASE NO. PROSB2100620
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of MARINA EUGENIA POLANCO
A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Pamela A. Hernandez in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.
THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Pamela A. Hernandez 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. S36 at 9:00 a.m. on January 25, 2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino, 247 West 3rd St. San Bernardino, CA 92415-0212, San Bernardino District - Probate
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

Public Notices

ment becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ CARLOS QUINTEROS CARRILLO, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/14/2021 Thereby 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 viola-

Public Notices

tion 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 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 01/07/2021 CNBB49202110 FBN 20210012288 The following person is doing business as: HELPING HAND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES INC 9923 LIME AVENUE FONTANA, CA 92335; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); APPLE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES INC 9923 LIME AVENUE FONTANA, CA 92335

Public Notices

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/ JO R.ROCA-TUAZON, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/14/2021

Public Notices

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 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021,

Public Notices

12/31/2021, 01/07/2021 CN-BB49202111MT FBN 20210012106 The following person is doing business as: K-MARTINEZ CONSTRUCTION 764 N. DALLAS AVE. SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); KEVIN G. MARTINEZ 764N.DALLAS AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business

Public Notices

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/ KEVIN G. MARTINEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/07/2021 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

Public Notices

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 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 01/07/2021 CNB-B49202112IR

Establishment Seeking To Apply Legal Cure To Gomez's Political Indelicacy
from page 2

On November 1, in a complaint sworn out and filed by Deputy District Attorney Britt Imes, Rodriguez was charged with two counts of obstructing a police officer/resisting arrest; two counts of disturbing a public meeting, conspiracy to commit a crime and disrupting a business operation – stemming from his actions on June 2, July 6 and July 20, 2021.

In a separate complaint, Imes on behalf of the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office and the People of the State of California charged Gomez with one misdemeanor count of PC148(a)1, resisting, obstructing or delaying of a peace officer and one misdemeanor count of PC242 – battery, both stemming from the June 2 incident and additionally charged her with two misdemeanor counts of PC148(a)1 – resisting, obstructing or delaying of a peace officer and one count of PC403 – disturbance of a public meeting, relating to her action on July 20. Gomez was not criminally charged in the goings-on of July 6.

While Gomez and Rodriguez are considered co-defendants with regards to the crimes they are alleged to have engaged in on June 2 and July 20, Rodriguez, remarkably, has not waived his right to a speedy trial. He is therefore being tried separately from Gomez, who has consented to a delay.

At the very least, the criminal filing against Gomez and her sidekick was intended take Gomez aback, knock the wind out of her sails and illustrate in no uncertain terms that she is not the force driving things in Victorville or anywhere else. It was hoped that the criminal filing would do more than that; on top of the cascade of negative publicity Gomez had already sustained, it was figured that criminal charges, the publicity of a trial and an eventual conviction might very well bring to a close Gomez's

run as a politician, rendering her reelection to the council in 2024 or election to any other office highly unlikely. It went without saying that it was governmental authority that was in control. It was no secret that Gomez was pennurious and Rodriguez was equally impoverished. Neither had the means to secure top drawer nor even middle drawer legal representation. Gomez, in her function as a city official, long before had demonstrated she hadn't a jot of procedural expertise, and there was nothing to suggest she or Rodriguez knew anything about the law. Both were on a track, or so it seemed, to perdition.

In less than a month, however, Rodriguez was able to reverse the tables.

Under the Sixth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the criminally accused have a right to a speedy trial. In accordance with California law and precedent, a speedy trial is defined as within 60 days of being charged for felonies and 30 days for misdemeanors. Since the complaint against Rodriguez had been executed on November 1, prosecutors had until, presumably, December 1 to initiate the trial. Meanwhile the cases against Gomez and Rodriguez during the month of November had wended their procedural way into the courtrooms of no fewer than six judges - David Driscoll, Christopher Pallone, Kawika Smith, Dwight Moore, Scott Seeley and Ronald Gilbert, all of whom at some level recognized the matter for the political show event that is and most of whom wanted nothing to do with it. One by one each managed, or seemed to manage, to slip out from underneath it as the procedure moved on into the courtroom of the next jurist. With each succeeding day, the December 1 deadline loomed closer and closer and Rodriguez had not waived his right to a speedy trial. The assumption on the prosecutorial side was that given his lack of sophistication and the degree to which he was ill-equipped to engage in any sort of criminal defense, Rodriguez would naturally want to delay the proceedings. November turned to

December.

On December 1, the case against Rodriguez had made its way into the courtroom of a seventh judge – Judge John Vander Feer. Representing Rodriguez was Deputy Public Defender Matthew Canty. Deputy District Attorney Justin Crocker, who was not in the courtroom but was appearing telephonically, told Judge Vander Feer the prosecution was not ready for trial, had never indicated it was ready for trial, and had not secured its witnesses.

On December 2, again before Judge Vander Feer, Canty was representing Rodriguez. The prosecutor's office, which had so confidently filed the matter a month and a day previously, had scrambled to get there. The lawyer who it was intended would take the matter to trial, assuming it went to trial, was Deputy District Attorney Jason Wilkinson. Wilkinson, however, was engaged elsewhere. Appearing on behalf of the People of the State of California was Supervising Deputy District Attorney Britt Imes, who had filed the case against Gomez and Rodriguez.

Imes original involvement in the case had been more of a psychological tactic than anything else. For more than a decade-and-a-half, Imes has functioned as one of the district attorney's office's leading prosecutors, assigned to some of the most serious matters in the county – murders, multiple murders, gangland activity involving lifetime criminals trafficking in massive amounts of narcotics or participating in layered conspiracies. No one seriously contemplated having him following through on the prosecution of misdemeanors normally reserved for recently hired deputy prosecutors who had just passed the bar, let alone minor issues involving vaping in a public place or speaking out of turn or too loudly at council meeting. With Imes there, Judge Vander Feer on the morning of December 2 determined that the parties were ready to go to trial and assigned the case to Judge Kawika Smith in Victorville Department 5.

The selection of Judge Kawika Smith was an interesting one. He had been on the bench on December 2 four months to the day, having been elevated to a judgeship by Governor Gavin Newsom in July, whereupon he was sworn in on August 2. A Democrat, he had spent his entire law career previously in San Bernardino County as a member of the public defender's office, where he had been hired in 1995 and where he had been promoted to a supervisor in 2014. As someone who was accustomed to defending the criminally accused, Judge Smith as jurist with the San Bernardino County Superior Court was somewhat akin to a fish on land. Throughout the San Bernardino County court system the watchword has long been that the benefit of the doubt should be provided to those who represent the law and advocate on behalf of its enforcement and application – police officers, sheriff's deputies and the prosecutor's office – and that technicalities in the law should not be applied or interpreted to allow the guilty to walk free. In the San Bernardino County Superior Court, a consistent standard is that the accused are entitled to a presumption of innocence only upon each making a demonstration of that innocence. While Governor Newsom's appointment entitled Judge Smith to his place on the bench, he yet needs, to be granted full entrance into the inner sanctum of Brethren and Sistren arbiters who embody the traditional spirit of San Bernardino County's ultimate lawgivers, to demonstrate that he is prepared to function in accordance with the values of the Victorville and High Desert political and legal establishment and hold accountable those who break the law and defy the conventions of decent society and the Republican ethos that is in ascendancy locally. As such, he was under tremendous pressure to keep the prosecution of Rodriguez and Gomez on track.

Judge Smith had no idea that Rodriguez's trial was to commence that day in his courtroom until liter-

ally minutes before it began and he learned that Judge Vander Feer has assigned the matter to him forthwith.

Judge Smith's first major test came that day, December 2, when Gomez was present in the courtroom as an observer of the process to mete out justice to Rodriguez. The prosecutors, seizing upon the prospect that Gomez might be a witness in the case, wanted her removed. Judge Smith ordered Gomez to not have contract with the other potential witnesses, and she was ordered as well to not enter the courthouse parking lot or the courthouse until further notice of the court. The court minutes hinted at the elements of Gomez's personality and relationship with authority that had led to that juncture, stating, "The record will reflect that Blanca Gomez absconded from the courtroom while the court was giving orders to her and was returned to the courtroom by the bailiff. Also, while the court was giving orders to Blanca Gomez, her back was turned to the court."

Judge Smith's second test came on December 6, when he heard Canty's arguments with regard to a Penal Code 1382 motion he had filed, which propounded that the case against Rodriguez had to be dismissed because his right to a speedy trial had been violated. Though he had sufficient grounds for granting the motion given that more than thirty days had elapsed from the filing of the charges against Rodriguez and the commencement of his trial, Judge Smith denied that motion, reasoning that Rodriguez had been arraigned on November 3 and the disheveled shuffling of Imes into his courtroom on December 2 sufficed as the beginning of Rodriguez's trial.

An atmosphere of show trial spectacle hovers about the case. Not one, not two, not three but four prospective jury fields were hurriedly put together by the court as potential panels to assess Rodriguez's guilt or innocence and brought into the courtroom, the first on December 2. After questioning of the men and women, known as voir dire, began,

two of those prospective jurors were dismissed, but the balance returned the next day, a Friday. The day ended without a jury and alternates being chosen. On Monday, December 6, the jurors from the previous Thursday and Friday, referred to as Panel A, had returned, augmented by another set of potential jurors, that being Panel B. They waited outside the courtroom while inside the courtroom Canty asserted that the prosecution should be banned from calling any of its scheduled witnesses because the prosecution had not provided timely disclosure of those witnesses to the defense team, which has a right under state evidentiary rules and the U.S. Constitution to examine ahead of time the information, evidence and witnesses to be used by the prosecution. Judge Smith denied that motion.

The focus of the court, the prosecution and the defense then returned to the jury panels. Canty made a motion to dismiss all of the jurors because of an apparent error by the court prejudicial to the defendant. Judge Smith dismissed all of the jurors, both Panel A and Panel B.

On December 7, Wilkinson and Canty engaged in some low intensity legal sparring, and Judge Smith agreed to hold a bail hearing for Rodriguez the next day.

Early on December 8, Judge Smith heard from Canty that witnesses he considered crucial to the case and whom he intended to call - Mayor Debra Jones; Mayor Jones' husband, Ernest Jones; Victorville City Manager Keith Metzler; Victorville City Attorney Andre de Bortnowsky; Assistant to the City Manager Jenelle Davidson; and Victorville Municipal Purchasing Services Manager John Mendiola – were resisting having to testify and were ducking subpoenas. There was discussion relating to juror confidentiality issues, apparently pertaining to potential tainting of the jury pool by the prosecution and members of the Victorville political establishment hostile to Gomez and therefore hostile to Rodriguez.

Continued on Page 8

Despite Legal Questions, Upland To Issue Bonds As Pension Panacea from front page

Thereafter, according to Parker's game plan, the city is to "to assemble the financing team, and prepare related legal documents for subsequent council approval of the issuance of the 2022 water bonds" to be augmented with city staff taking measures "to prepare the necessary legal documents for an internal general fund lease revenue bond issue (sale) for purchase by the water and sewer funds."

City officials maintain that by issuing pension obligation bonds at a lower interest rate than the percentage of payment demanded annually by the California Public Employees Retirement System and which that system will continue to demand in the future, the city can reap a relative savings in the millions of dollars over what will otherwise be required for it to meet its pension system obligation going forward.

Legal experts say the

plan as being hatched by Parker entails some risk, as funds in the city's water department accounts must remain sequestered and cannot, under California law, be utilized for anything other than water operations or providing capital improvements for the drafting of, storage of, distribution of and/or improving the quality of water. Using that money to pay for pensions or any other purpose would run, those attorneys say, afoul of the law.

The city, however, is in a financial fix, and desperate circumstances call for bold action, city officials say.

A major factor in how Upland got to this point consisted of the depredations of John Pomierski, who served as Upland's mayor from 2000 to 2011. Taking all order of bribes from individuals and businesses that had applications for franchises, contracts or project approvals at City Hall, Pomierski's activity came to the attention of a wide cross section of city employees. With the assistance of his handpicked city manager, Robb Quincey, Pomierski arranged to buy the silence of those mu-

nicipal workers by offering them employment contract enhancements that included a significant increase in the pension payouts those employees would receive through the California Public Employees Retirement System.

Ultimately, Pomierski and Quincey were caught. After an extensive investigation by the FBI, Pomierski was indicted on bribery charges in 2011 and convicted in 2012, whereupon he was sentenced to two years in a federal penitentiary. Quincey, who was fired in 2011, was charged by the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office in 2012 with misappropriation of public funds, gaining personal interest from a public contract and perjury. In 2014, after extended plea negotiations with prosecutors, he pleaded guilty to reduced charges.

Despite Pomierski's and Quincey's legal travails, their conspirators in the scams they had pulled – the city employees who had maintained their silence about what they knew was going on at City Hall – continue to reap the fruit of the

arrangement they had made with the disgraced mayor and city manager to keep the corruption at City Hall under wraps. None of those employees were ever asked to undo the generous salary increases and accompanying pension enhancements they were provided during the Pomierski administration.

Consequently, the city's pension debt – known in municipal parlance as an unfunded liability – continued to escalate at an astronomical rate.

As of June 2012, the City of Upland had an \$88,994,066 unfunded pension liability. That debt had reached \$99,976,917 as of June 30, 2019, and then climbed more steeply thereafter, hitting \$112,039,675 at mid-fiscal year of 2019-20 and \$120,920,721 as of June 30, 2020. Unofficial documentation available to the *Sentinel* suggests that by March 2021, Upland's unfunded pension liability had climbed to \$130,185,277. Given recent earnings by the California Public Employees' Retirement System's investments, according to Parker, the city's actual but

somewhat dated actuarial liability is \$127,706,000.

In fiscal year 2020-21, 20.65 percent of the city's operating costs were devoted to paying those who were no longer actively working for the city, with \$8,996,364 of the city's \$43,559,950.78 general fund budget being utilized in paying off its pension debt.

Projections are that 11 years from now, in 2032, with more and more of the city's current employees joining the rolls of the city's retirees drawing pensions at ever higher and higher rates, the city will be expending nearly 50 percent of its operating budget on paying pensions to former city employees, resulting in the city either drastically reducing the municipal services it provides, declaring bankruptcy or disincorporating to allow the City of Ontario, the City of Rancho Cucamonga or the County of San Bernardino to inherit the burden of continuing to administer government in the 15.62-square mile city.

At present, the current city council is afraid to request that the city's municipal employees unions

have the employees they represent give back the generous pension allotments made during the Pomierski regime or, in the alternative, allow the exorbitant pensions to continue but have the employees pay for them through their salaries. Seeking such a reversal of the concessions made to the city's public employees unions in the past might trigger the city employee unions to run campaigns to keep the current members of the city council from being reelected. As a consequence, the city council asked Parker to come up with a way to pass the city's past and current financial commitments on to the children and grandchildren of the city's current taxpayers.

In response Parker formulated the plan to issue \$120 million in pension obligation bonds. The Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, however, stepped in and contested that approach, and the city abandoned it in October.

The plan to issue the water bonds and general fund lease revenue bonds is the latest permutation of that strategy,

Judge Kawika Smith Seeking To Come To Terms With Presiding Over A Political Show Trial from page 7

Thereafter the court and attorneys devoted themselves to considering a third group of prospective jurors present that day, designated Panel C. Due to undisclosed considerations, Panel C in its entirety was dismissed.

Canty made a motion for dismissal based upon due process violations, which was taken under submission by Judge Smith.

A fourth jury panel was considered, and after questioning and the dismissal of one of the prospective jurors, a jury to hear the case was impaneled and sworn in. The complaint against Rodriguez was read in open court.

Ultimately, outside the presence of the jury, Judge Smith denied the motion to dismiss the case and during a bond hearing ruled that Rodriguez's bail would remain in place and he would not be released on his own recognizance.

On December 9, what was considered to be the official sixth day of trial, prior to the jury coming into the courtroom, Judge Smith

granted the prosecution's motion to dismiss one of the resisting arrest/obstructing a police officer charges against Rodriguez. Indications were made that the trial would run, most likely, until December 23.

At 9:08 a.m. the opening statements by the prosecution began, followed by the defense's opening statements, all of which were concluded by 9:37 a.m.

Thereafter came the testimony of Maria Weatherby, an employee at the Victorville Panera Bread bakery-café.

Upon Weatherby's testimony concluding, prosecution witness Robert Harriman began his testimony. His testimony upon conclusion was followed by testimony from another prosecution witness, Jorge Duran. Duran's testimony had not concluded when the day's court proceedings ended.

Duran returned to testify early Friday, December 10.

A video of the June 2 incident at Panera Bread café was played for the jury. Duran's testimony resumed and a second video was played for the jury. Hearings were held outside the presence of the jury. Duran's testimony before the jury resumed.

Further off-the-record exchanges occurred involving the judge, prosecutor

and defense.

After 3 p.m. a second amended criminal complaint against Rodriguez was read.

Duran resumed his testimony after further off-the-record discussion, Canty made a motion to dismiss the charges against his client. Judge Smith denied the motion after the prosecution argued in opposition.

The trial resumed this week on Monday, December 13 and continued through Friday.

By Monday, the court had become extremely self-conscious about the proceedings against Rodriguez to the point that in its routine record keeping of the proceeding, it grew apprehensively secretive. Whereas the court minutes had previously been forthcoming in disclosing the nature of the discussion between the attorneys and the court, including either generic or precise descriptions of the motions made and the court's rulings, that specificity ended abruptly on December 13. Included in the informational blackout were identifications of the witnesses testifying.

It is unknown, precisely, what triggered the court cutting off the informational flow relating to the Rodriguez trial. Of some embarrassment to the court, apparently, is what was

termed the "squandering" of an increasingly important court resource, that being jury panels, during the current circumstance involving limitations brought on by the COVID crisis. The San Bernardino County Superior Court has consistently evoked emergency orders suspending defendants' rights to speedy trials on matters of far greater seriousness than the low-level misdemeanors under examination in the Rodriguez case. Earlier this year, the court and the prosecutor's office three times refused to accommodate a defendant, charged with murder and three felony enhancements, who has insisted upon going to trial at once without any further waiving of his right to a speedy trial. That defendant was denied a speedy trial on the basis of the court's assertion that the COVID-19 circumstance made it so a courtroom for such a lengthy trial could not be secured and a jury to hear the case could not be impaneled. In contrast, in Rodriguez's case, involving what were originally six misdemeanors which on a granted motion from the prosecution has been reduced to five misdemeanor counts, the court indulged the prosecution in facilitating bringing the matter to trial at once, recruiting not just one but four prospective

juries to hear the case, dismissing three of those panels after they were brought to the courthouse and seated in Judge Smith's courtroom.

As of Monday, virtually the only information available from the court record is that proceedings were held, Judge Smith was the judicial officer, Doreen Smith served as the judge's assistant, Michelle Swal, Sara Guillen, Numia Fata and Tracy Nestle were the court reporters, S. Himes served as the bailiff, that Rodriguez was present and in custody and that Wilkinson and Canty appeared for the prosecution and defense, respectively, with Imes substituting for Wilkinson on December 15.

Reportedly, Judge Smith, while adhering to the expectation that he allow the criminal proceedings to continue, has grown highly disturbed at the manner in which he and his courtroom have been utilized to straitjacket Rodriguez into a criminal case ultimately aimed at criminalizing Gomez for her political activity, lack of social grace, dearth of politesse and general incivility, which while gratifying and aggravating, do not rise to the level of criminal behavior. Hence the change in the openness and transparency with which the proceedings in Judge Smith's courtroom were formerly

reported on the county's court website, such that now he is limiting to the greatest extent that he can the damage to his reputation to be wrought as he presides over what larger and larger numbers of the county's residents now recognize as a political prosecution. Nevertheless, in virtually all of his rulings Judge Smith comes across as bending over backwards to accommodate the district attorney's office.

With the restriction on information emanating from the courtroom, it is largely unknown to what degree Judge Smith will ultimately comply with the wishes of the San Bernardino County/Victorville political establishment, which has put a high premium on getting convictions against first Rodriguez and then Gomez, and simultaneously limit Canty in the current trial from exploring, with regard to the July 20 incident, the comportment of others on the opposite side of the political divide between Gomez and her political rivals, in particular Mayor Jones's husband Ernest Jones, who engaged in activity no differently than Rodriguez and were not themselves arrested, charged or in any fashion held to account for their behavior.

-Mark Gutglueck