

State Hearings In Which Arrowhead H₂O Diversions Are At Issue Commence

By Mark Gutglueck

The Administrative Hearing Office of the State Water Resources Control Board today concluded its first week of hearings regarding whether a proposed cease-and-desist order issued to BlueTriton Brands, Inc. relating to its drafting of water from the San Bernardino National Forest's Strawberry Canyon at the approximate 5,200-foot to 5,600-foot elevation in the San Bernardino Mountains, should be finalized.

In March 2021, One Rock Capital Partners, LLC in partnership with Metropoulos & Company formed Triton Water Holdings, Inc. to purchase Nestlé Waters North America, Inc. in a leveraged buyout involving corporate cash, loans, high-yield and high-risk bonds and unknown investors.

The buyout from Nestlé S.A., a food and drink processing conglomerate headquartered in Vevey, Switzerland, included Arrowhead® Brand Moun-

tain Spring Water along with other water bottling operations in the U.S. and Canada, with the exception of Nestlé Waters North America's Perrier division. One Rock Capital Partners, LLC and Metropoulos & Company rechristened Nestlé Waters North America, Inc. as BlueTriton Brands, Inc. Obtained in the purchase were Poland Spring® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Deer Park® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Ozarka® Brand 100%

Natural Spring Water, Ice Mountain® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Zephyrhills® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Arrowhead® Brand Mountain Spring Water, Pure Life® and Splash.

Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water had been obtained by Nestlé Waters North America, Inc. as a consequence of Nestlé's 1991 acquisition of Perrier, which came amidst some confusion about the chain of title to Arrowhead, which was included within

the portfolios of otherwise non-existent entities or shell companies such as the Arrowhead Water Corporation and Great Springwaters. Perrier had acquired Arrowhead from the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company, a division of Beatrice Foods, in 1987.

There had been several companies bottling water under brands incorporating the Arrowhead name going back to the first decade of the 20th Century, Arrowhead See P 2

Fees Aimed At Conserving Water In Indian Wells Valley Trigger Adjudication Effort

The effort by the collective governments in San Bernardino, Kern and Inyo counties to come into compliance with the State of California's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act in the remote Indian Wells Valley has now been simplified or complicated, depending on your perspective, by a move to adjudicate water rights in the region.

In the face of a four-year running drought, Califor-

nia state officials in 2014 undertook efforts to head off the absolute depletion of the state's regional water sources. In September 2014, then-California Governor Jerry Brown signed into law the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, which requires local agencies to draft plans to bring groundwater aquifers into balanced levels of pumping and recharge. That was followed in 2015 by Brown man-

dating water-saving measures throughout the state. In response, pursuant to a joint exercise of powers agreement, the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority was formed with Kern County, San Bernardino County, Inyo County, the City of Ridgecrest and the Indian Wells Valley Water District as general members and the United States Navy and the United States Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management as associate members, with each general member having one voting seat on the authority board and the federal associate members participating in all board discussions, but not having a vote.

The joint powers authority took as its mandate counteracting the overdraft of the aquifer underlying Indian Wells Valley, which lies at the extreme northwestern end of the Mojave

Desert and the confluence of the northwestern corner of San Bernardino County, the southeastern end of Kern County and the southwestern extension of Inyo County. Based upon a survey of water usage patterns undertaken by an engineering consultant, Carlsbad-based Stetson Engineers, the authority and the Indian Wells Valley Water District sought to derive a strategy for See P 7

Defying State Housing Mandate, Chino Hills Nixes Caballero Ranch 22-Unit-Per-Acre Density

This week, Chino Hills took a further stride toward contesting the State of California's usurpation of what has traditionally been local land use authority.

In what is widely seen, both positively and negatively, as a daring social experiment, the State of California has, through Government Code §65580, required each jurisdiction in the state to assist in alleviating the state's homelessness crisis by complying with what the

California Department of Housing and Community Development deems to be each city's new housing responsibility. Under the so-called Regional Housing Need Allocation process, a determination is made of what number of dwelling units according to affordability type each community is to accommodate over an eight-year period. The expectation is that those cities will comply by granting developers clearance to build the specified

number of houses over that time period.

In the case of Chino, the state's expectation was that the city welcome 3,720 more dwelling units from October 2021 to October 2029. Previously Chino Hills stood up to Sacramento, counterproposing that instead of the 3,720 homes, it allow 1,797 units, a 52 percent reduction.

On Tuesday, the Chino Hills City Council ventured even further down the path of resisting hav-

ing to surrender land use authority within its 44.75 square mile confines by complying with an outpouring of resident sentiment contemplating allowing the construction of up to 220 units on 10-acre Caballero Ranch, located at Peyton Drive and Eucalyptus Avenue. The city had tentatively opened the property to intensified development after another proposal for high density apartments/condominiums within Crossroads

Marketplace fell through. Officials had included Caballero Ranch on a list of properties that is to be forwarded to the state as potential locations for high density development. To the chagrin of Ed McCoy of Fairfield Residential LLC, the prospective developer of Caballero Ranch who was salivating with the anticipation of stacking 22 units per acre on the property, the city council removed the parcel from the list.

square miles of unincorporated areas within the 20,105-square mile county. Residents were sent notices of the district's expansion, and were invited to object to it. Those who sent in letters of protest were deemed to have voted against being included in the enlarged FP-5. Those who did not respond were deemed to have supported the being brought inot F-5. If 25 percent had protest- See P 8

formed to defray the cost of providing enhanced fire and paramedic service to the desert communities of Silverlakes and Helendale in 2006.

Though California's Proposition 218 required that any new tax must be approved by a vote of those who must pay for it, the county used a protest vote process to gain clearance to enlarge FP-5 to cover the roughly 18,899

Residents In Redlands Sue To Prevent Conversion Of England Grove To 28 Homes

A month after the Redlands City Council gave developer Jeff Burum and his company permission to proceed with the construction of a housing tract on the grounds of the historic England/Atwood/Heeney Estate, a cross section of the city's residents has filed suit to prevent the project from proceeding.

Burum and his partner, Matt Jordan, worked through a limited liability subdivision of Burum's company, Diversified Pacific, in pursuing that project. That entity, Redlands Palm Investment, LLC, sought and obtained the approvals and entitlements needed to develop a 28-home planned development on a historic orange grove property located at the southeast corner of West Palm Avenue and Alvarado Street.

In 1891, Thomas Y. England planted that grove, consisting of naval orange trees, The grove involved a gravity-fed irrigation system, and in 1893 England set within the grove a home in the Victorian style, which included a carriage house immediately behind it. England had also established on a portion of the property facing Alvarado Avenue a Queen Anne cottage. In 1914 the Victorian home at 301 West Palm Avenue was altered by a subsequent owner, Guy Hunter, into a prairie style home.

The England Estate containing all of its historic and still-functioning assets was sold by the Hunter Family to James and Annie Attwood in 1922. The Attwoods in turn passed it along to their daughter, Mary Attwood Heeney, and her husband Thomas J. Heeney, who continued to operate it as a citrus-producing grove.

The grove, its appurtenances, the estate See P 3

County Residents To Get Another Shot At Rescinding Fire Tax In June Election

More than three years after the county board of supervisors used its administrative authority to bypass the county's voters and place roughly 94 percent of the county's land mass within a fire assessment district, a group of governmental accountability activists achieved a milestone in its second effort to rescind the \$160 annual tax imposed on the landowners in the county's

unincorporated areas that was a consequence of the board's action.

Prior to 2018, fire protection in the county's unincorporated areas – those places where the city and town limits of the county's 22 cities and two incorporated towns do not extend – was part of the service provided through county government's routine function. Then-County Fire Chief Mark Hartwig, as-

serting that the traditional methods of taxation and revenue generation for local government were no longer adequate to ensure the county fire department was sufficiently manned, outfitted and prepared to ensure the public safety, led a move to place all of the unincorporated county areas his department serviced within a fire protection assessment zone, known as FP-5, originally

formed to defray the cost of providing enhanced fire and paramedic service to the desert communities of Silverlakes and Helendale in 2006.

Though California's Proposition 218 required that any new tax must be approved by a vote of those who must pay for it, the county used a protest vote process to gain clearance to enlarge FP-5 to cover the roughly 18,899

Valdivia Found Immediate And Continued Political Success By Trading His Willingness To Serve His Donors In Exchange For Their Campaign Cash

from front page

Puritas, Arrowhead Hot Springs Company, Arrowhead Corporation, Arrowhead Springs Corporation, Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water Company, Coca-Cola Bottling of Los Angeles, Rheem, and California Consolidated Water Co. among them. Those bottling operations had drawn water from a source near the privately-owned historic Arrowhead Hotel as well as from Arrowhead Springs on the east side of Arrowhead Mountain and in Coldwater Canyon at a level below the National Forest, which was established higher up in the San Bernardino Mountains in 1893. The springs were said to come from rock bank fissures and crevices that fed Coldwater Creek where the water was first collected for the hotel and bottling.

In 1929, the California Consolidated Waters Company was formed and purchased the Arrowhead Water bottling operation from the Arrowhead Springs Hotel. The purchase merged three Los Angeles-based companies that bottled and distributed "Arrowhead Water," "Puritas Water" and "Liquid Steam." The property, bottling operations, water distribution and administration of Arrowhead Springs Company, Arrowhead Puritas and the water bottling division of Merchants Ice and Storage were all administered by California Consolidated Waters Company, which was owned by the California Consumers Company. Soon after, California Consolidated Waters, on the basis of a single pipeline permit that was not based on any water rights and without having obtained a diversion permit, in August 1930 started diverting spring water from a single "bedrock crevice" spring in the San Bernardino National Forest along Strawberry Creek at an elevation of 5,600 feet. Subsequently, in 1933 and 1934, the company put in place tunnels, ultimately accompanied by holes and horizontal wells at or near the headwaters of Strawberry Creek in Strawberry

Canyon. Strawberry Creek was noted in maps and springs studies prior to diversion to be a perennial stream which was fed by abundant flowing headwaters springs.

It was the seller Arrowhead Springs Corporation, not the United States Forest Service nor the State Water Resources Board, that granted California Consolidated Waters Co. the unwarranted right to develop the springs and divert the water from the Strawberry Creek headwaters. By 1934, California Consolidated Waters, had developed three springs using adits – horizontal passages bored into rock for drainage purposes – and then added 10 horizontal borehole wells to tap spring water aquifers in the mountain-side, thereby diverting the forest spring water through a pipeline down the mountain, giving twenty percent to half of the water thus obtained to the hotel and then bottling and selling the rest. This unauthorized twenty percent giveaway to the Arrowhead Springs owners is still going on today.

While water withdrawal diversions can take place on National Forest land, all water diversions must be authorized by the State Water Resource Control Board, and a valid water right is required. The San Bernardino Forest reserved the water resources within it upon its founding in 1893. Valid claims preexisting 1893 were required to legally draft water from the forest after its establishment as a national forest. Federal reserve rights and the authority of the overlaying landowner are applicable to such situations where groundwater rights are at stake, and the appropriation of water rights through adverse possession or unauthorized use, known as prescriptive rights, is not applicable to U.S. Forest lands. The use of surplus water above forest reservation needs might be authorized if the user possesses a valid water right, but given the arid nature and drought in Southern California it would appear there would be no basis of to declare forest water "surplus."

The tunnels, boreholes and horizontal wells established in Strawberry Canyon were not in place at the time of the founding of the San Bernardino National Forest on February 25, 1893. Nor were they put in place pre-1914, as Nestlé once claimed without sub-

stantiation.

In California, water rights obtained prior to 1914 are given special status as a "pre-1914 appropriative water right." A water user with a pre-1914 right, on non-federal land, needs no water right permit unless the use of the water increases beyond the amount of water used prior to 1914, in which case the use must obtain a permit for the new amount unless it can be established that there was a plan in place before 1914 to use the additional water after 1914.

The historic record shows the tunnels, boreholes and horizontal wells at the higher elevation of 5,600 were established no earlier than August 1930, which in any event were located on federal land where no water rights could be established.

Arrowhead Puritas, the corporate predecessor to BCI-Arrowhead, Beatrice Foods, Perrier, Nestlé and now BlueTriton Brands, held no valid water rights to the water being drawn from Strawberry Canyon, as is now asserted by BlueTriton Brands. Although, BlueTriton Brands claims a pre-1914 water right for its water withdrawals, no predecessor interest had a pre-1914 water right in the Strawberry Creek headwaters on the public Forest lands. Any possible pre-1914 water right was on the private lands of the Arrowhead Springs property, at Arrowhead Springs or in Coldwater Canyon, all outside the national forest. Those water rights were either not transferred upon sale or deeded back to the Arrowhead Springs property owner during the 1930s.

The Arrowhead Hotel property was leased to the U.S. government in 1920 to 1924 as a sanitarium for gassed and shell-shocked WW I veterans. Thereafter, in late 1924, the government returned the hotel to the Arrowhead Springs Company. From 1915 onward and into the 1920s Strawberry Creek was stocked with trout for recreational fishing and was a noted trout fishing stream on the 1915 American Auto Club 101 Mile Drive on the Rim of the World map.

The Arrowhead Springs hotel had sustained significant damage from the government lease and needed extensive renovation. Plans for expansion and renovation were made. During the government lease Ar-

rowhead maintained the rights to water for bottling. Ads for this product circulating at that time show the water came from Indian Springs near the landmark Arrowhead. In 1925, The Arrowhead Head Springs Hotel and water bottling operation was sold to a hotel conglomerate which then used "61/2% Gold Bonds" to finance renovation efforts using the hotel property and bottling operations as collateral for the bonds that would come due in 1929. In 1928, Charles Anthony, general manager of the bottling operation and vice president of Arrowhead Springs Corp., acting president of the Arrowhead Springs resort property and Arrowhead Springs Corporation in the 1920s and 1930s, entered into talks with California Consumers Co., parent of California Consolidated Waters Co., founded in February 1929, regarding the sale of the Arrowhead water bottling operations. Anthony was to be paid a commission of \$100,000 to execute the deal. Arrowhead was to provide a warranty title of water rights. Former Arrowhead Springs attorney and former state assemblyman Byron Waters wrote a letter about the "water rights." In the February 14, 1929 letter from the 79-year-old attorney, who represented himself as a sixty-year resident familiar with the San Bernardino Valley and the legal representative for the Arrowhead Hot Springs property, Byron Waters, in typical lawyerly fashion described the water rights to be sold in the deal with words "belonging to the company." The letter, asserting the company's ownership without providing any documentary proof to that effect, indicates that the 1929 "Indian Springs tunnels" located on adjacent Forest lands as "whatever rights and interests Arrowhead Springs Corporation owns and possess in waters flowing from Indian Springs." A 1929 survey and Waters' letter's legal description show this referenced "Indian Springs" was in Waterman Canyon on adjacent Forest lands. The 1929 Warranty Title policy insurance policy accompanying the sale states exclusions on U.S. and state reservations and restrictions on occupancy of these lands which would have excluded any possible operations on 1929 "Indian Springs" or Strawberry

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

Canyon. The filed accompanying warranty deed excluded all water from surface streams and hot springs. In August 1930, California Consolidated Waters Co. filed a deed that says false and fraudulent claims were made regarding the water and nature of water rights represented by Arrowhead Springs Corp employees in the sale of the water bottling operation, but that a new agreement to correct errors was made. In this agreement Arrowhead Springs, not the United States Forest Service or State Water Resources Control Board, granted unwarranted rights and authority for California Consolidated Water Co. to extract water from springs in Strawberry Canyon and build a pipeline to the hotel property and give the Arrowhead Springs water half of the water from the Strawberry Creek's headwaters springs. In return California Consolidated Water Corp deeded back to the Arrowhead Springs owners any possible pre-1914 water rights. Again, Arrowhead Springs Corporation sold water rights on public Forest lands they did not own. According to the 'Nemo dat quod non habet' legal principle, an individual cannot sell what he does not own, and any such transaction invalidates the legal title of the purchaser.

Arrowhead Springs, California Consolidated Water Co. and California Consumers Co. entered the quiet title Del Rosa Lawsuit to get water rights in upper Strawberry Canyon on National Forest land.

In 1931, the Del Rosa Mutual Water Company, an appropriator of water on East Twin Creek downstream of the Arrowhead Springs Hotel (and downstream of the confluence of Strawberry Creek and East Twin Creek), filed a lawsuit

to enjoin the taking of any water either by Arrowhead Springs Corporation or California Consolidated Water Company from East Twin Creek or Strawberry Creek.

The Del Rosa suit did not involve the San Bernardino National Forest nor the State of California. A finding in that case was that neither Arrowhead Springs Corp nor California Consumers Co. had previous water rights.

Federal property is excluded in adverse possession claims. Thus, Strawberry Canyon and any water originating there could not be obtained via adverse possession prescriptive rights. Today BlueTriton claims it has rights because the Del Rosa suit grant one of its corporate predecessor's water rights on federal land. The BlueTriton Corporation, during the current administrative hearing, acknowledged the San Bernardino National Forest, as the overlaying landowner of Strawberry Canyon, held the rights to water being extracted there for BlueTriton's bottling purposes. This, by extension, was a recognition that Charles Anthony sold a bottling operation with no valid water rights in the National Forest to California Consolidated Waters Company as he collected a hefty commission and paid off Arrowhead Springs Corp's bond obligations. Arrowheads' Strawberry Canyon water rights were never verified. Nor, however, were those rights ever challenged, and for decades, the United States Forest Service, acting on the assumption that precedent diversions of water from Strawberry Creek were based on legal grounds and some order of water rights possession, simply allowed Arrowhead's operation to

Continued on Page 6

City Council Waded Through Resident Opposition & Commission Hesitancy To Approve England Estate Development from front page

and its structures have remained intact, though dilapidating, until the present, even as the lion's share of Redlands' once ubiquitous citrus groves, beginning in the 1950s and then over the next six decades were steadily eradicated and replaced primarily with residential development.

In Redlands, more than in most other areas of the Inland Empire, an effort to preserve the vestiges of the city's agricultural history has taken root, such that the city has ten sometimes overlapping historic zones. The Redlands Conservancy exists as an independent endowment dedicated to historical preservation in the community. Meanwhile, in 1986, Redlands voters passed Measure O, which approved a bond to pay for purchasing and thereafter dedicating for preservation historic citrus groves in the city.

More than a decade ago, Thomas Heeney's grandson Christopher Brumett along with his wife Jacquelyn signaled their willingness to sell the England Estate including its grove property, which totals 8.8 acres. The City of Redlands, with its available grove-preservation bond money, and the Redlands Conservancy, showed interest. The Redlands Conservancy offered \$3 million for the property. The Brumetts turned that offer down, saying they wanted roughly twice that amount. Another offer, this one for \$4 million, was tendered by preservationists. Again, the Brumetts balked at that offer. Thereafter, Burum and Jordan approached the Brumetts with their own offer. In June 2019, the Brumetts accepted Diversified Pacific's \$2.35 million bid for the 8.8 acres. Burum, Jordan and Diversified Pacific applied with the city to convert six of the England Grove Estate's 8.8 acres into 32 2,000-to 2,600 square foot homes on what were mostly 6,200-square-foot lots. The approved number of residences was reduced, ultimately, from 32 to 28.

It was Burum's contention that "The only way for

anyone to save the historical nature of the estate is to buy the property and use the surplus land to build something that can be marketed and sold so you can use the money to save the historical structures, the two houses and the barn."

The city began to consider the project proposal in earnest in 2020, allowing Redlands Palm Investment, LLC, to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for the project rather than insisting upon a much more exhaustive environmental impact report on the proposal to give the project its environmental certification. On October 1, October 15, and December 17 of 2020, and then on March 4, 2021 the Redlands Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission reviewed and discussed the initial study the city had completed as part of the proposed mitigated negative declaration. Ultimately, the historic and scenic preservation commission adopted a resolution at its March 4, 2021 meeting documenting its findings that the proposed mitigated negative declaration and cultural resources report did not adequately identify and address the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources, while recommending that a full environmental impact report be prepared for the project to comprehensively identify and analyze any potentially significant impacts. The Redlands Planning Commission took up consideration of the project at its May 11, 2021 and June 8, 2021 meetings, during which its various members expressed misgivings and reservations about what were in the end deemed by five of its members to be minor issues. The commission, prior to a final vote on the matter, consented to appointing commissioners Karah Shaw and Steve Frasher to a subcommittee, which was to make a more in-depth examination of the project. After considering the input of the Frasher/Shaw subcommittee, on June 22, 2021, the commission voted 5-to-2, with Dr. Angela Keller and Matt Endsley dissenting, to recommend that the city council provide the project with a mitigated negative declaration with a proviso that roughly 56 of the trees would be retained and a kiosk would be erected that would recite the history of the England Estate and its significance to Redlands.

The city council convened on July 20, 2021 to consider the project, but not before a number of Redlands residents formed a group tentatively calling itself Save The Grove, which retained attorney John McClendon to represent it. The council balked at adopting the mitigated negative declaration at the July 20 meeting after McClendon cited what he said were multiple shortcomings in the fashion in which the environmental certification for the project was being conducted. McClendon maintained inadequate consideration was being given to the cultural and historical elements of the estate, which the city was obliged to see preserved. The council again deferred action on the project at its September 6, 2021 meeting, at which receiving and accepting a socioeconomic cost/benefit study prepared for the proposed project as well as approving both a tentative parcel map for the project and a conditional use permit for the project were slated. Instead, in apparent deference to issues McClendon had raised, the council, while stopping short of undertaking a full blown environmental impact report, complied with Development Services Director Brian Desatnik's recommendation that the study for the mitigated negative declaration be recirculated once more, with the intent of bringing the matter back for reconsideration in November. That action was endorsed by Paige H. Gosney, an attorney representing Diversified Pacific.

In the agenda for the city council's November 16 meeting, the socioeconomic cost/benefit study, the tentative parcel map, the conditional use permit, a tentative tract map and variances for the project were scheduled for discussion, while no mention of the mitigated negative declaration was made. After McClendon pointed that omission out to the city, Mayor Paul Barich directed that the council not conduct the hearing on the issue, postponing the matter. The project was rescheduled for consideration at its December 7 meeting, with the posted agenda for the meeting properly listing the mitigated negative declaration among the actions the council had the option of approving. Noticing to residents living in proximity to the project site, however,

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CIRCULATE RECALL PETITION TO THE HONORABLE Mayor Reyes:

Pursuant to Section 11020, California Elections Code, the undersigned registered qualified voters of Adelanto, in the State of California, hereby give notice that we are the proponents of a recall petition and that we intend to seek your recall and removal from the office of Mayor, in the City of Adelanto, California, and to demand election of a successor in that office. The grounds for the recall are as follows:

- 1. Corruption/Graft/ Conflict of Interest
A. The Mayor has received campaign funding from cannabis companies who have businesses in Adelanto. It is reported that the Mayor and City Manager are receiving bribes from cannabis entrepreneurs.
B. Mayor Reyes approved a solar business to come into our city after receiving a \$10,000 bribe to give to any church. He gave it to the church he and his wife attend. He did not abstain, and approved the solar business.
2. Lack of Integrity/Transparency
A. Claims he wants to sit down with constituents, but spends the majority of his time outside the city. Fails to meet with constituents and lies about the reasons.
B. Refused the residents a Special Election and continued the appointment process that was not agreed to among the counsel. The applicant he approved was the Former Chair of the Planning Commission and had failed to meet the deadline requirements.
3. Bigot Mindset/ Incompetence
A. Removed an African-American councilwoman from the Mayor Pro Tem position. Bypassed senior councilmembers to replace with his former employee and loyal friend
B. Approved spending covid-relief funding on a \$120,000 Mercedes van that has been used for personal and political advantages.

The printed names, signatures, and residence addresses of the proponents are as follows:

Table with 3 columns: NAME, ADDRESS, SIGNATURE. Contains 30 entries of names and addresses with handwritten signatures.

failed to include reference to the mitigated negative declaration. The council on December 7 gave unanimous approval to the project.

McClendon, on behalf

of the collection of city residents which have now officially adopted the identifying moniker Save The Redlands Orange Groves, filed a petition for a writ of mandate, with the city as

the respondent and Redlands Palm Investment, LLC as the real party in interest, challenging the city's approval of Redlands Palm

Continued on Page 7

Public Notices

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF SYLVIA CORRALEZ
Case No. PROSB2100955

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of SYLVIA CORRALEZ.
A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Christina Bailey in the Superior Court of California, County of LOS ANGELES.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Christina Bailey 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 111 N. Hill St., Los Angeles, CA 90012.

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 petitioner:
RICHARD A RODGERS ESQ
SBN 210196
SHANE DIGIUSEPPE & RODGERS LLP
3125 OLD CANEJO ROAD
THOUSAND OAKS CA 91320
CN983114 CORRALEZ Dec 31, 2021, Jan 7, 14, 2022

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

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

A hearing on the petition will

Public Notices

be held in SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA OF SAN BERNARDINO, SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT-PROBATE 247 W. THIRD STREET in Dept. S36 at 9:00 AM on 1/25/2022.

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:
CICELY T. RAY
4740 GREEN RIVER ROAD,
SUITE 314, CORONA, CA, 92880
951-735-2488

Published in the SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SENTINEL on:

12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 1/7/2022

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME
CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2131227

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: JOAN BRAVO SANCHEZ filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

JOAN BRAVO SANCHEZ to MARTHA JOAN BRAVO SANCHEZ

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: 1/24/2022
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: 10/28/2021
John M. Pacheco
Judge of the Superior Court.
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 12/24, 12/31, 2021 and 1/7 & 1/14, 2022.

FBN 20210012541

The following entity is doing business as: ESOTERIC PUBLICATIONS 7615 ETIWANDA AVENUE, SUITE 534 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739; MICHAEL JOURDAIN 7615 ETIWANDA AVENUE SUITE 534 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: December 3, 2021

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

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/21/2021

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy 11327

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 on 12/24, 12/31, 2021 and 1/7 & 1/14, 2022.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO- FBN2021001826

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: PUFF AND UP SMOKE AND VAPE SHOP, 1705 E. WASHINGTON ST., 122A, COLTON, CA, 92324, SAN BERNARDINO

Mailing Address : PUFF AND UP INC

Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

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

s/DEEP SHANKAR SUBEDI
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 11/24/2021

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

Began Transacting Business: 3/28/2017

County Clerk,

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

12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 1/7/2022, 1/14/2022

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO- FBN20210012095

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: FRESHENUP, 1705 E. WASHINGTON ST STE 111, COLTON, CA, 92324.

SAN BERNARDINO
Mailing Address: 23175 GLENDO-RADR, GRAND TERRACE, CA 92313, PUFF AND UP INC

Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION

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

s/DEEP SHANKAR SUBEDI
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/6/2021

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

Began Transacting Business: 11/22/2021

County Clerk,

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

12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 1/7/2022, 1/14/2022

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO- FBN20210012527

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: GVK CONSULTANCY, 8279 HIGHRIDGE PL, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA, 91730, SAN BERNARDINO

Mailing Address : GVKCONSULTANCY.COM LLC

Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

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

s/KAVITHA PEDDI
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/21/2021

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

Began Transacting Business: N/A
County Clerk,

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

Public Notices

12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 1/7/2022, 1/14/2022

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO- FBN20210012330

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: MBA BAGGA ENTERPRISES LLC, 15091 KITFOX LN, VICTORVILLE, CA, 92394.

SAN BERNARDINO
Mailing Address: 15091 KITFOX LN, VICTORVILLE, CA, 92394, MBA BAGGA ENTERPRISES LLC

Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

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

s/RAGHBIR BAGGA

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/15/2021

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

Began Transacting Business: N/A
County Clerk,

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

12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 1/7/2022, 1/14/2022

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: DOROTHY JO MIMS-MOYLE CASE NO. PROSB2101125

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of DOROTHY JO MIMS-MOYLE: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by MARJORIE E. MASON in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S-36 at 9:00 a.m. on JANUARY 31, 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 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel December 31, 2021 and January 7 & 14, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JANE BLEDSOE aka EVELYN JANE BLEDSOE. NO. PROSB 2101083

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JANE BLEDSOE aka EVELYN JANE BLEDSOE A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by JENNIFER FEJZIC in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S35 at 9 a.m. on JANUARY 20, 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 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel December 31, 2021 and January 7 & 14, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: Angel

Public Notices

Rosales
CASE NO. PROSB2100936

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

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

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Alma Moreno 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 20, 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
Kimberly Tilley, Deputy

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

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

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

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

Filed: November 12, 2021
Attorney for Alma Moreno
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.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JANE BLEDSOE aka EVELYN JANE BLEDSOE. NO. PROSB 2101083

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JANE BLEDSOE aka EVELYN JANE BLEDSOE A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by JENNIFER FEJZIC in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S35 at 9 a.m. on JANUARY 20, 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 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel December 31, 2021 and January 7 & 14, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: Angel

Public Notices

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 15, 2021
Cesar Marin, Court Deputy Clerk
Jennifer Fejzic
Daniel Nordina
St. Redlands, CA 92373
Telephone No: (909) 792-9244 Fax No: (909) 235-4733
Email address: team@lawofficeofjenniferdaniel.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel December 31, 2021 and January 7 & 14, 2022.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME
CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2131872

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: CHELSEA MAE CARINO MOLINA filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

CHELSEA MAE CARINO MOLINA to CHELSEA MAE CARINO MOLINA-TIANGCO
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: 2/15/2022
Time: 09:00 AM
Department: S-16
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: 12/28/2021
John M. Pacheco
Judge of the Superior Court.
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 12/24, 2021 and 1/7, 1/14 & 1/21, 2022.

FBN 20210012060

Public Notices

proval. 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 31, 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.

Filed: December 28, 2021
Amy Gamez-Reyes, Deputy Court Clerk
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 Tamara Caple: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 7, 14 & 21, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: DELICIA VARELA CASE NO. PROSB2100790 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of DELICIA VARELA has been filed by ANGELA MARIE VEGA in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ANGELA MARIE VEGA to 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 FEBRUARY 2, 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.

Filed: January 3, 2022
Amy Gamez-Reyes, Deputy Court Clerk
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 Kathryn M. Sessions: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 7, 14 & 21, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JIA JIA CASE NO. PROSB2100428 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JIA JIA has been filed by XIANXI MENG in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE

Public Notices

Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: December 8, 2021
Attorney for Angela Marie Verga: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 7, 14 & 21, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: PATRICIA A. BRAUN CASE NO. PROSB2200001 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of PATRICIA A. BRAUN has been filed by KATHRYN M. SESSIONS in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that KATHRYN M. SESSIONS 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 FEBRUARY 2, 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.

Filed: January 3, 2022
Amy Gamez-Reyes, Deputy Court Clerk
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 Kathryn M. Sessions: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 7, 14 & 21, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JIA JIA CASE NO. PROSB2100428 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JIA JIA has been filed by XIANXI MENG in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE

Public Notices

requests that XIANXI MENG 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 FEBRUARY 28, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S37 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

Filed: September 27, 2021
Cesar Marin, Deputy Court Clerk
IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: September 27, 2021
Attorneys for Xianxi Meng: Peter Deng/Sergio Castaneda SBNs 337726/208642
Law Office of Peter Deng
211 West Orange Grove Avenue Arcadia, CA 91006
PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (626) 383 4273 peterdenglaw@gmail.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 7, 14 & 21, 2022.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2200086

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: SARBJIT KAUR filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: SARBJIT KAUR to SARBJIT KAUR RANDHAWA 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: 2/17/2022 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: 01/06/2022 John M. Pacheco Judge of the Superior Court. Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 1/7, 1/14, 1/21 & 1/28, 2022.

Public Notices

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: EDWARD LEWIS CLARK CASE NO. PROSB2100861 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of EDWARD LEWIS CLARK: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by DANNIELLE GAILYNN OWENS in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that DANNIELLE GAILYNN OWENS be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on JUNE 20, 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 with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ. 1894 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 14, 21 & 28, 2022.

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO20210008935 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: CERTIFIED SELECTIONS, 951 FEATHER HOLLOW COURT, CHINO HILLS, CA 91709, (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); Z&S ENTERPRISES INC, 951 FEATHER HOLLOW COURT, CHINO HILLS, CA 91709 Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ SIDDIQUE RAHMAN, OWNER/PRESIDENT This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/27/21 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: N/A County Clerk, s/ 11327 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/17/21, 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 01/21/22, 01/28/22, 02/04/22, 02/11/22

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ALBERT MARCOS MENDIVIL CASE NO. PROSB2100592 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ALBERT MARCOS MENDIVIL: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by JESSIE LYN MCCABE in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that JESSIE LYN MCCABE 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

Public Notices

an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on March 28, 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 COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 14, 21 & 28, 2022.

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO20210008935 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: CERTIFIED SELECTIONS, 951 FEATHER HOLLOW COURT, CHINO HILLS, CA 91709, (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); Z&S ENTERPRISES INC, 951 FEATHER HOLLOW COURT, CHINO HILLS, CA 91709 Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ SIDDIQUE RAHMAN, OWNER/PRESIDENT This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/27/21 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: N/A County Clerk, s/ 11327 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/17/21, 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 01/21/22, 01/28/22, 02/04/22, 02/11/22

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO20210008935 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: IST METAL WORKS LLC, 522 W. 1ST STREET, SUITE F, RIALTO, CA 92376, (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); Mailing Address: 8034 ALDER AVE, FONTANA, CA 92336; SG METAL WORKS LLC, 8034 ALDER AVE, FONTANA, CA 92336 Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ANGELICA ARELLANO, MANAGER This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/26/21 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: 02/26/21 County Clerk, s/ 11327 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/17/21, 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 01/21/22, 01/28/22, 02/04/22, 02/11/22

Public Notices

01/28/22, 02/04/22, 02/11/22 AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO20210009057 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: XSA INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES, 1535 N THIRD AVE, UPLAND, CA 91786, (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); Mailing Address: 154 W. Foothill Blvd, Ste A355, Upland, CA 91786; KURT DONHAM, 1535 N THIRD AVE, UPLAND, CA 91786 Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ KURT DUNHAM, OWNER/CEO This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/01/21 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: 08/30/21 County Clerk, s/ D511 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/17/21, 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 01/21/22, 01/28/22, 02/04/22, 02/11/22

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO20210009661 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: ETE SOLAR, 1155 S. MILLIKEN AVE, SUITE E, ONTARIO, CA 91761, (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); EARTHTECH ENTERPRISE INC, 3400 COTTAGE WAY, STE G2 3450, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825 Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ VANESSA PAN, PRESIDENT This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/23/21 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: N/A County Clerk, s/ 11327 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 01/15/22, 01/21/22, 01/28/22, 02/04/22, 02/11/22

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO20210009528 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: ANOKI 12824 CORIANDER CT, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739, (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); NATIVELY INC, 12824 CORIANDER CT, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739 Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ DANA GREEN, CEO This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/20/21 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: 08/30/21 County Clerk, s/ 11327 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 01/15/21, 01/21/22, 01/28/22, 02/04/22, 02/11/22

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2200137

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: Natalie Lai-Ying Hui filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: Natalie Lai-Ying Hui to Natalie Lai-Ying Chuk 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.

Public Notices

Notice of Hearing: Date: 02/22/2022 Time: 09:00 AM Department: S17 Room: 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: 01/07/2022 John M. Pacheco Judge of the Superior Court. Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 01/13/2022, 01/20/2022, 01/27/2022, 02/03/2022

NOTICE OF SALE OF AUTOMOBILE

Notice is hereby given pursuant to Sections 3071 of the Civil Code of the State of California the undersigned will sell the following vehicle(s) at lien sale at said address below on: 01/28/2022 09:00 AM Year of Car / Make of Car / Vehicle ID No. / License No. (State) HUMMER/ 5GRGN23U94H116023 7GYF397CA To be sold by AIR EXPRESSWAY TOWING 17435 CATALPA ST HESPERIA CA 92345 Said sale is for the purpose of satisfying lien for together with costs of advertising and expenses of sale.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20210012736

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: CAMP SPOT NOW, 8780 19TH ST #134, ALTA LOMA, CA 91701 SAN BERNARDINO Mailing Address: Business is Conducted By: AN LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ Mellie This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/29/2021 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: N/A County Clerk, NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/27/2022, 02/04/2022

FBN 20210012747 The following person is doing business as: EXQUISITE TOUCH 17711 DIANTHUS AVE FONTANA, CA 92355; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO) ; MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR SUITE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701 ; GJUVONYA MARTINEZ 17711 DIANTHUS AVE FONTANA, CA 92355 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ GJUVONYA MARTINEZ, OWNER This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/29/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice- This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 01/07/2022 CNBB0120201CV

FBN 20210012415 The following person is doing business as: GENERAL THINGS FOR YOU 23859 SOUTH ROAD APPLE VALLEY, CA 92307; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO) ; GONZALO TOVAR 23859 SOUTH ROAD APPLE VALLEY, CA 92307 RAMIRO TOVAR 923859 SOUTH ROAD APPLE VALLEY, CA 92307 The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A reg-

Public Notices

istrant 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/ GONZALO TOVAR, GENERAL PARTNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/17/2021
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 01/07/2022 CNBB01202202SL

FBN 20210012442
The following person is doing business as: INLAND MARKET 11436 CEDAR AVE BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); PHOENIX MARKET, LLC 11436 CEDAR AVE 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: DEC 07, 2021
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
s/SYEDAZAIDI, OWNER/MANAGER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/20/2021
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 01/07/2022 CNBB01202203MT

FBN 20210012431

Public Notices

The following person is doing business as: W&B AUTO BODY 16572 CERES AVE SPC #4 FONTANA, CA 92335; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); ANDREZ MORA 1672 CERES AVE SPC #4 FONTANA, CA 92335
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/ ANDREZ MORA, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/17/2021
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 01/07/2022 CNBB01202204IR

FBN 20210012451
The following person is doing business as: RC TRANSPORTATION, 5446 N E ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); RAUL CARDENAS 5466 N E ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407.
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/ RAUL CARDENAS, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/20/2021
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 12/17/2021, 12/24/2021, 12/31/2021, 01/07/2022 CNBB01202207IR

BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company applied to extend the permit. In 1987, while that application was still pending, Perrier purchased the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company. Later the name "Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water Company" was handwritten on the permit. The name "Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water Company" is not in BlueTriton's chain of title. Nevertheless, it was used during the 1990s in United States Forest Service correspondence, including on invoices and in spring site records for the water pipeline system in Strawberry Canyon. At this time newspaper articles with this name show the company was bottling and shipping Arrowhead water to Japan. This was water extracted from public land - Strawberry Canyon in the San Bernardino National Forest. The diversion of that water left a parched and dewatered forest canyon below, which burnt in "Old Fire" in 2003.

The water pipeline conveyance extraction special use permit renewal process entailed a U.S. Forest Service review of the water drafting arrangement and its environmental/ecological impact, which

Public Notices

pires 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 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNBB202208IR

FBN 20210012748
The following person is doing business as: SEWER TECH HYDRO JETTING, 1468 W BANYON ST RIALTO, CA 92377; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); MIGUEL MARTINEZ 1468 W BANYON ST RIALTO, CA 92377.
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/ MIGUEL MARTINEZ, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/29/2021
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNBB202207IR

FBN 20210012762
The following person is doing business as: SEWER TECH PLUMBING, 3229 N. E ST. SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); MIGUEL MARTINEZ JR 3229 N. E ST. SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405.
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
s/ SEAN D CALHOUN, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/29/2021
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNBB202206IR

Nestlé's intensive water-drafting activity, which was long been decried by environmentalists, came under increasing fire as a statewide drought, which lasted for more than five years after it first manifested in 2011, advanced. In 2015 environmental groups were gearing up to file a

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/ MIGUEL MARTINEZ JR, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/29/2021
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNBB202206IR

FBN 20210012743
The following person is doing business as: REOL HELP, 8305 VINEYARD AVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); SEAN D CALHOUN 8305 VINEYARD AVE 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/ SEAN D CALHOUN, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/29/2021
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNBB202204IR

lawsuit claiming the U.S. Forest Service had violated protocols and harmed the ecology of the mountain by allowing Nestlé Waters North America to continue its operations in Strawberry Canyon for 28 years after its permit expired. At that point, the Forest Service moved to make an environmental review. In the meantime, Nestlé continued its water extraction, pumping an average of 62.56 million gallons of water annually from the San Bernardino Mountains. Environmentalists lodged protests with the water rights division of the California Water Resources Control Board, alleging Nestlé was diverting water without rights, making unreasonable use of the water it was taking, failing to monitor the amount drawn or make an accurate accounting of the water it was taking, and wreaking environmental damage by its action.

Following a two-year investigation, state officials in late 2017 arrived at a tentative determination that Nestlé could continue to divert up to 26 acre-feet of water (8.47 million gallons) per year. Nestlé had gone far beyond the water drafting limit the company was entitled to, the State

Public Notices

01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNBB202205IR

FBN 20210012694
The following person is doing business as: ROSE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION, 26772 UNION ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); ROSE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION, INC. 26772 UNION ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346; 26772 UNION ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346; .
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/ AMADOR GARCIA, CEO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/28/2021
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNBB202204IR

FBN 20210012689
The following person is doing business as: SANTIAGO'S APPLIANCE, 273 WEST E ST COLTON, CA 92324; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); FILIBERTO RODRIGUEZ 273 WEST E ST COLTON, CA 92324; AGUSTIN RODRIGUEZ JIMENEZ 273 WEST E ST COLTON, CA 92324.
The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or

Public Notices

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/ FILIBERTO RODRIGUEZ, GENERAL PARTNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/28/2021
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNBB202203IR

FBN 20220000048
The following person is doing business as: SCHOLARSHIP OF OVERSEAS SUPPORT ASSOCIATION 25827 MARIPOSA ST LOMA LINDA, CA 92354; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); MISSION FOR TOMORROW 25827 MARIPOSA ST LOMA LINDA, CA 92354; 25827 MARIPOSA ST LOMA LINDA, CA 92354; .
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/ RICHARD C LEE, PRESIDENT
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 01/10/2022
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 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNBB202202MT

FBN 20210012524
The following person is doing business as: SHAKE IT UP. TEAM 1 RIALTO, 638 WEST BASELINE RD RIALTO, CA 92376; [MAILING ADDRESS 13183 YELLOWWOOD ST MORENO VALLEY, CA 92553]; (PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); JULIO CESAR MORENO 638 WEST BASELINE RD RIALTO, CA 92376.
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
s/ JULIO CESAR MORENO, OWNER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/21/2021
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/07/2022, 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022 CNBB202201IR

proceed under the aegis of a pipeline special use permit since 1930.

In 2015, Nestlé Waters of North America was challenged in Federal Court for operating on an expired pipeline permit in the San Bernardino National Forest. Soon after complaints were filled with State Water Resource Control Board to investigate the validity of Nestlé's water rights in Strawberry Canyon. The original 1978 permit was issued to Arrowhead Puritas, then under the ownership of Beatrice Foods, in 1978 for a pipeline conveyance system permit involving water drafting in Strawberry Canyon for a standard fee of \$524. The permit granted no water rights and required valid claims. Under the ownership of Beatrice Foods, Arrowhead Puritas had morphed into the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company. When the Arrowhead Puritas water drafting permit in Strawberry Canyon expired, the

Water Resources Control Board said, and was actually drafting 192 acre-feet (62.56 million gallons), such that 166 acre-feet (54.09 million gallons) the company was taking was unauthorized, according to a report released on December 21, 2017.

The Water Rights Division of the State Water Resources Control Board called upon Nestlé to immediately end its diversions beyond the 26-acre-foot threshold or otherwise marshal evidence supporting its level of diversion.

Nestlé, despite being unable to produce any historical record of water rights approaching the volume of its diversion, continued to maintain it had established rights to roughly 190 acre-feet of water per year in Strawberry Canyon. The company refused to comply with the State Water Resources Board's mandate, continuing to take 144 acre-feet in 2017, 141 acre-feet in 2018, 210 acre-feet in 2019, and 180-acre feet in 2020. By 2020, Nestlé was in negotiations with One Rock Capital Partners, LLC and Metropoulos & Company for the sale of Nestlé Waters North America. In late March 2021, in what was represented as a \$4.3 billion transaction, that deal

was closed.

A month later, on April 23, 2021 the State Water Resources Control Board's Division of Water Rights, through its permitting and enforcement branch issued, a cease and desist order relating to the Strawberry Canyon water diversion activity. Initially, that cease and desist order went to Nestlé Waters North America, as the State Water Resources Control Board had not been informed of the buyout of Nestlé Waters North America, including the Arrowhead Spring Water bottling operation, by One Rock Capital Partners, LLC and Metropoulos & Company.

By that point, the State Water Board had revised the maximum amount of water to diverted from Strawberry Canyon to 7.26 acre feet per year.

In the April 23, 2021 notice, signed by Julé Rizzardo, the assistant deputy director for the permitting and enforcement branch of the State Water Board's Division of Water Rights, a revised report of investigation and a draft cease and desist order was served upon Nestlé Waters North America, Inc., informing it to end its unauthorized and

In Departing Shot, Councilman Foster Called Residents 'Disingenuous' For Their Opposition To Grove Development *from page 3*

Investment LLC's project.

"Petitioner contends that respondent's preparation and approval of a mitigated negative declaration for the project, and its approval by the city's elected city council, violate specific provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and the guidelines for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act. Petitioner is challenging the project because (among other things) it is a project that may result in significant impacts on the environment that have not been adequately assessed or mitigated."

According to the McClendon, the city and the city council "ignored fair arguments supported by expert opinion and substantial evidence that the development and operation of the project upon the property would cause significant unmitigated impacts on the environment. In refusing to prepare and certify a legally adequate environmental impact report that fully disclosed and analyzed all of the potential impacts that will result from the project, refusing to consider feasible and environmentally superior alternatives to the project, and failing to make all mitigation measures fully enforceable, respondent has disregarded or treated as a mere formality the specific and substantive requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act."

McClendon further asserted that the city's "approval of the project violates California's Planning and Zoning Law (Gov. Code §§ 65000, et sequitur) as well as the city's own laws because the project is inconsistent with the city's general plan and a voter-enacted initiative known as 'Measure U.'"

Measure U was an initiative approved by Redlands voters in 1997 to enact several principles of managed development within the City of Redlands. Measure U required that developers defray the cost of any public infrastructure that had to be built to accommodate their projects. Measure U also called for the preserva-

tion of agricultural and citrus production in the city.

The petition for a writ of mandate called upon the court to "vacate and set aside respondent's approval of the project and the mitigated negative declaration."

The most preoccupying of the elements of the petition is McClendon's contention that neither Diversified Pacific nor any other entity should be permitted to develop the Engand Estate property because of restrictions set out in Measure U calling for the property to be preserved as functioning agricultural land.

McClendon cited a portion of Measure U stating that "No land undeveloped as of March 1, 1997 and designated in whole or in part as 'Urban Reserve' or 'Urban Reserve (Agricultural)' in the Redlands general plan in effect as of June 1, 1987, and/or any land parcel that was in active agricultural production on November 3, 1986 regardless of zoning, shall be re-designated or rezoned to permit residential density greater than the Estate Residential (R-E) classification, as the same existed on June 1, 1987, in the Redlands city zoning ordinance, unless mandatory findings are made and the re-designation or rezoning is approved by four-fifths vote of the total authorized membership of the city council." Those mandatory findings extended to a certification that "overriding economic or social benefits to the city and its residents and taxpayers from the proposed density increase, [that] the proposed density increase will not cause adverse environmental impacts, [that] the proposed density increase will not convert viable agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, [that] the proposed density increase will not have a growth-inducing effect on other property, [that] the resulting use will be compatible with uses on adjacent land [and that] the proposed density increase will not require substantial expansion of public infrastructure, facilities or services."

The council made no such findings in approving the project, McClendon pouped.

The petition states, "The property is one of the city's most unique historical treasures. Known as the England Estate, its original (1893) main house, Queen

Anne cottage, carriage house and barn make it one of the last examples of a fully intact grove estate in the city. Among the many things making the property and its cultural context so remarkably unique are its original hand-cut stone walls and its nearly 700 heritage orange trees, planted between 1891 and 1893 on prime farmland that are still productive and watered by the last remaining example of a 19th Century gravity-fed irrigation system in the city."

According to McClendon, "the city violated the due process rights of property owners surrounding the property" when it failed to give them notice prior to the December 7, 2021 meeting at which the project was approved that the council was to consider a mitigated negative declaration for the project.

Further, McClendon maintains, "Respondent further did not proceed in the manner required by law in that it caused a mitigated negative declaration to be produced that was biased in favor of the proposed project's approval and, therefore, failed to constitute the full disclosure document intended to objectively inform decision-makers and the public of the project's true impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives."

Repeated efforts by the Sentinel to reach Burum as well as two attorneys representing Diversified Pacific, Mark Ostoich and Paige Gosney, were not successful prior to press time this week.

Previously, Burum told the Sentinel that the Redlands Palm project, which will keep the 1893 England home, its accompanying carriage house/barn and the Queen Anne cottage intact, is a "quality historical preservation." He said efforts to save the grove and its watering system were not worth pursuing. The grove he said, as a cultural and historic asset, was "not something that was so overwhelming that it had to remain. That grove has been dying for some time. It makes no sense to save an ancient water system that is no longer functioning and never functioned efficiently, especially in light of the drought and challenge to our state's water availability."

The night of December 7, when the project was approved by the city coun-

cil, then-Councilman Paul Foster, who voted with his colleagues to approve the project, said of those members of the community who compose Save Redlands Orange Groves, "Many of those of you that are upset about this project are living in homes that are sitting on property that was the original grove. So, for you to come and say that this private property owner shouldn't be able to move forward with his project is really quite disingenuous. You have your piece of Redlands so nobody else should have it? That's simply not right. That's just not

Water Rights Adjudication Prompted By Usage Fees Aimed At Conservation Dispute Over *from front page*

both reducing water use in the valley and increasing groundwater recharge to reach a balance of both that will end the overdraft. Several different plans, or models, were contemplated. Basically, the concept was to decrease the drafting of water from the regional aquifer through conservation, increased recycling of water and perhaps the minimization of evaporation, augmented by the importation of water from outside the valley to achieve, no later than 2040, a balance of water coming in with the amount of water usage, such that the depletion of the aquifer will end. Stetson Engineers was designated the water resources manager for Indian Wells Valley, and the authority's board in January 2020 passed a tentative proposed groundwater sustainability plan and voted to submit it to the state. Thereafter it made adjustments to the plan, which contained water use limitation elements and water replenishment measures. The plan incorporated a farmland fallowing option as well as an increase in the monthly assessment or fee that was imposed on the extraction of water by major pumpers. That fee had been previously collected to cover the costs associated with the administrative activity of the groundwater authority. After a survey of water use by well owners both collectively and individually was made, the authority assigned water use allowances to the region's well owners. Excess use fees, referred to

fair."

Foster has left the council, and has relocated to Camano Island in Possession Sound, a section of Puget Sound in Washington State.

The staff report for the action taken by the city council in approving the project on December 7, prepared by Senior Planner Sean Reilly, submitted by Development Services Director Brian Desatnik, reviewed by City Attorney Daniel J. McHugh, Assistant City Manager Janice McConnell and Management Services/Finance Director Danielle Garcia

and recommended by City Manager Charles Duggan, Sean Reilly stated "the project's impacts remain less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures."

Reilly told the city council on December 7, "The mitigated negative declaration contains a total of nine mitigation measures that have been recommended to reduce potential impacts associated with biological resources, cultural resources, geology & soils, noise and tribal cultural resources."

-Mark Gutglueck

as augmentation fees, were formulated for application to those well owners who pump above their allowances as well as on any farmer whose use exceeds his respective share of the water supply set aside for agricultural usage. Money generated in this way is used to purchase imported water and pay for the infrastructure needed to bring in the imported water. In September 2020, Searles Valley Minerals, based in the San Bernardino County community of Trona, represented by Eric Garner, Jeffrey Dunn and Maya Mouawad with the law firm of Best Best & Krieger, filed a lawsuit in Kern County Superior Court against the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority in an effort to protect what Garner, Dunn and Mouawad asserted are the company's groundwater rights within the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin, and to stop the collection of what they characterized as an illegal and unfair groundwater replenishment fee and a tax disguised, they assert, as an "extraction fee." Searles Valley Minerals uses solution mining, which involves soaking portions of the company's dry Searles Lake in San Bernardino County with water to precipitate brine which is then extracted and processed to produce boric acid, sodium carbonate, sodium sulfate, several specialty forms of borax, and salt. The groundwater replenishment fee, Garner, Dunn and Mouawad maintained, is unprecedented and exorbitant, and will increase the company's water costs by 7,000 percent or \$6 million per year – pushing Searles Valley Minerals out of business after more than 140 years of operation, and threatening the

livelihood of the company's 700 employees. The groundwater replenishment fee ignores and violates Searles Valley Minerals' adjudicated water rights, according to the lawsuit. Searles Valley Minerals' 91-year-old water rights are the most senior in the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin. Garner, Dunn and Mouawad took issue with the fashion in which the China Lake Naval Air Station is not subject to the restrictions in the plan nor its fees. "Searles Valley Minerals' right to pump water in the basin for domestic uses is senior to any water right reserved to [the] Weapons Station, and because [the] water district's groundwater pumping began no earlier than 1955, its appropriative right, if any, to basin water remains junior to Searles Valley Minerals' right," according to the lawsuit. "The authority falsely asserts in its groundwater sustainability plan that any pumping allocations under the groundwater sustainability plan will be 'consistent with existing groundwater rights and priorities.'"

Other entities beside Searles Valley Minerals contesting the groundwater replenishment fee were the companies Mojave Pistachios and Sierra Shadows Ranch, along with John Thomas Conaway and the Nugent Family Trust, which collectively sued the groundwater authority and the Indian Wells Valley Water District as the lead agency in that joint authority.

Growing out of that litigation was a cross complaint from the Indian Wells Valley Water District in the form of Indian Wells Valley Water District v. All Persons Who Claim a Right to Ex-

Continued on Page 8

Receding From Censuring Mayor, SB Council Allowing Allegedly Graft-Tainted Selection Process To Proceed from page 11

unlawful activities, which was defined in the cease and desist order as taking any more than 7.26 acre-feet (2.342 million gallons) of water annually out of Strawberry Canyon.

The draft order alleged that Nestlé's diversion and use of water from Strawberry Creek in San Bernardino County violated or threatened to violate the prohibition in Water Code section 1052 against the unauthorized diversion or use of water subject to Division 2 of the Water Code. The draft cease and desist order notice, issued under Water Code section 1834, advised Nestlé that, if Nestlé wanted to request a hearing on the draft order, it had to submit a written request for a hearing to the administrative hearing office within 20 days from Nestlé's receipt of the notice.

On May 11, 2021, eighteen days after the issuance of the notice, Robert E. Donlan of Ellison Schneider Harris & Donlan, L.L.P., the law firm representing BlueTriton Brands, Inc., filed a request for a hearing on the matters and allegations in the draft cease and desist order notice. The request for a hearing stated that BlueTriton is the "successor by name change" to Nestlé, is "the owner of the water rights and obligations subject to the notice, and is authorized to request a hearing in this matter."

BlueTriton, through Donlan and Ellison Schneider Harris & Donlan, on August 5, 2021 made a motion to dismiss the State Water Board prosecution team's draft cease and desist order.

On September 10, 2021 several other parties made requests to add additional hearing issues. Those additional parties eventually grew to include the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District; the Center for Biological Diversity; the Sierra Club; the California Department of Fish and Wildlife; the Story of Stuff Project; Steve Loe, a retired U.S. Forest Service biologist; Hugh Bialecki, a Lake Arrowhead-based dentist who is the president

of the Save Our Forest Association; Amanda Frye, a Redlands resident who has done extensive historical research relating to water rights holdings and claims by various entities and corporations in San Bernardino County; Victor Vasquez, who has worked within the Division of Water Rights of the State Water Resources Control Board; Anthony Serrano, a resident of Highland and water user in the Bunker Hill Basin, where water originating in Strawberry Canyon eventually flows; and Thomas Eggers.

On November 4, 2021, the administrative hearing officer assigned to the case, Alan Lilly, rejected the motion to dismiss the prosecution team's draft cease and desist order, ruling that the public hearing to be conducted will involve examining evidence and considering arguments relevant to 1) whether the respondent, BlueTriton Brands, is violating prohibitions against the unauthorized diversion or use of water; 2) If any such violations or threatened violations are occurring, whether the State Water Board should issue a binding cease-and-desist order to BlueTriton Brands under Water Code section 1831; and 3) if the State Water Board decides to issue a cease-and-desist order to BlueTriton Brands under Water Code section 1831, then what provisions should be in the order. Lilly rejected the prosecution team's motion to add the issue of public trust violations to the ground to be covered in the hearing since that accusation was not contained in the original draft cease and desist order.

Lilly also issued a ruling that other parties' requests to add additional hearing issues will be evaluated as the hearing proceeds based on whether the information to be provided is relevant to the three issues circumscribed as pertinent to the purpose of the overall hearing and the addition of any further possible hearing issues as the proceedings warrant.

Prior to the initiation of the hearings on Monday, January 10, Donlan on January 7 filed on BlueTriton Brand's behalf a motion in limine which sought to exclude the testimony of several members of the public who had registered to participate in the hearings and to exclude the evidence those individuals wanted to present, including those

who are anticipated to weigh in with regard to the ecological havoc to the forest wrought by the water diversions, the reduction of water availability downstream from Strawberry Canyon as a consequence of the water diversions as well as the non-existence of the water rights in Strawberry Canyon which Nestlé had formerly asserted and which BlueTriton Brands is currently claiming.

BlueTriton's second attorney Shawnda Grady verbally entered a second motion in limine during the January 13th hearing. BlueTriton's purpose, in particular, appeared aimed at preventing both Loe and Frye and the Story of Stuff, a public interest organization which has been involved in the effort to end the water diversions from Strawberry Canyon since 2015, from speaking on the record during the hearings or submitting evidence for the hearing. Ultimately, Lilly denied the motion, reiterating his November 4 ruling that testimony and statements will be permitted by parties and the water board encouraged public participation by those who

met the established deadline to register to participate in the hearing insofar as their input is relevant to the issues being considered in the course of the hearing.

This week's proceedings were initially taken up with the state prosecution team's initial round of presentations and the testimony of Tomas Eggers, a water resource control engineer with the State Water Resources Control Board; Natalie Stork, hydrologist and investigator assigned to the Office of Research, Planning and Performance and the Groundwater Management Program with the California Environmental Protection Agency and the California Regional Water Board; Victor Vasquez, who is employed within the Division of Water Rights of the State Water Resources Control Board; and Mary Ann Dickinson, a Lake Arrowhead resident and the past president and chief executive officer of the Alliance for Water Efficiency. Thereafter, BlueTriton began to put on its case in chief with the input of that company's primary expert witness Larry Lawrence, the natural resources

manager with BlueTriton Brands. Lawrence held a similar position with Nestlé Waters North America.

A mechanical engineer by training, Lawrence offered an overview of the water collection and diversion facilities in use by BlueTriton Brands at the confluence of the east and west forks of Strawberry Creek.

Lawrence said that prior to 2021, the excess water collected by Nestlé from Strawberry Creek had been deposited in Waterman Canyon, two watersheds over from Strawberry Canyon, where the cisterns that Nestlé had for the collection of the water ultimately used in the Arrowhead Spring Water bottling operation are located. Since 2021, Lawrence said, Nestlé and now BlueTriton had in large measure been complying with the Forest Service's instructions to discharge the excess water in lower Strawberry Canyon, although roughly 20 percent of the Forest Strawberry Creek headwaters is sent to the mountain base grounds of the historic Arrowhead Hotel now owned by the San Manuel Mission Indian Tribe.

Lawrence was cross-examined by multiple parties.

The water diverted from Strawberry Canyon is conveyed to the Arrowhead Water collection site between Old Waterman Canyon and Coldwater Canyon by means of a 23,000-foot-long gravity-fed pipeline coming down the mountain from Strawberry Canyon. Arrowhead Spring Water Company trucks transport the water from the cisterns and tanks at the Arrowhead Water collection site to the Arrowhead Spring Water bottling facility in Ontario.

During his testimony, Larry Lawrence mentioned that a stock sale was involved so that to so that One Rock Capital Partners, LLC and Metropoulos & Company could effectuate Triton Water Holdings, Inc.'s acquisition of Nestlé Waters North America.

The hearing is scheduled to resume January 31, after a site visit on January 26 and January 27. Rebuttal testimony is scheduled for February 14. Much of the hearing was rescheduled to accommodate BlueTriton's attorneys' complaints that they needed more time to read the other parties' evidence files.

Second Measure To Revoke Fire Tax from front page

ed, the matter would have been taken to an actual vote in which landowners would cast straightforward yes or no ballots to determine whether to allow or disallow the assessment district expansion. If 50 percent plus one or more had voted

in opposition, the district expansion would have been considered rejected. Less than three percent of the unincorporated county landowners returned letters of protest.

The Red Brennan Group, asserting the protest process was a backhanded method of securing support for FP-5's expansion, collected enough signatures to place an initiative on the November 2020 Ballot. Measure U

asked county voters if they wanted to repeal the enlargement of FP-5 and end its taxing authority. Measure U was defeated, with 109,483 votes in favor of it, or 47.97 percent and 118,772 votes against it, or 52.03 percent.

The Red Brennan Group, believing county resident sentiment may have changed, has again collected sufficient signatures to place another measure seeking to free all of the county

other than Helendale and Silverlakes from inclusion in FP-5 and the imposition of its \$161.98 per parcel per year fire protection tax.

On Tuesday, the board of supervisors, faced with a sufficient number of county voters having signed petitions calling for the measure to go before the county's voters, consented to putting the initiative on the countywide ballot in the June primary election.

Water Rights Adjudication Prompted By Usage Fees Aimed At Conservation Dispute Over from page 7

tract Groundwater in the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin. Essentially, that suit calls for a survey of water usage among all water users and purveyors in the region, data from which will ultimately form the basis of water use allotments being apportioned to those users. Those users will be afforded the opportunity to object to or provide input regarding those allotments, which will ultimately be determined by an Orange County Superior Court judge.

The disputes over water in the Indian Wells Valley Region have been assigned to the Orange County Superior Court to avoid bias that might manifest if the hearings were held in a court in Kern, Inyo or San Bernardino counties.

One issue complicating the matter is that both the Bureau of Land Management and the China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station, as federal entities, are exempt from the groundwater sustainability plan and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, and therefore not subject to the restrictions that will be imposed in the groundwater sustainability plan. The China Lake Naval Air

Weapons Station encompasses two ranges and totals over 1,100,000 acres or 1,719 square miles, much of that within Indian Wells Valley. While the China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station has made strides in recent years in reducing its water use, it still drafts some 1,600 acre-feet of water from the aquifer annually.

District sources have said the adjudication, which riled the populace after the district sent out 20,000 letters dated December 16, 2021 to all individual pumpers and local landowners who use the basin informing them of their opportunity to respond to protect their individual water rights, is intended to forge a final and

overarching practical and legal determination of water rights for all pumpers in the Indian Wells Valley basin, the Navy included.

In a posting to the Indian Wells Valley Water District's website, General Manager Don Sbeda wrote, "Recently, the water district's board of directors voted to file a comprehensive adjudication that does include Navy participation and allows all those who may claim a right to pump or store water in the basin to participate, assert and prove any rights they may claim. A case management conference has been set by the court for March 15, 2022."