

A 3rd Time, County Thwarting Public Interest Group's Victory At The Polls

By Mark Gutglueck

As what is arguably the most dynamic independent public interest association in San Bernardino County, the Red Brennan Group this week scored what was by some counts its sixth major victory for the hearts and minds of the 2.2 million people that live in the county.

Nevertheless, and despite strides other entities involved in public policy advocacy can only marvel at, the coalition once again finds itself on the verge of being outmaneuvered by the political

and legal establishment it is up against, such that all of the group's efforts involving the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars and the investment of thousands of man-hours and woman-hours toward achieving its goal of reform are likely to come to naught.

On Tuesday, the county's voters by a comfortable margin gave approval to Measure Z, which called for the rescission of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors' 2018 move to expand the applicability of

Fire Protection District Service Zone Five.

Fire Protection District Service Zone Five, known by its acronym FP-5, was originally formed in 2006, as a construct for the county fire department to provide the desert communities of Silverlakes and Helendale with firefighting and emergency medical service. The creation of FP-5 carried with it the annexation of Silverlakes and Helendale into a fire service assessment zone, by which the landowners there agreed through a vote

to pay yearly assessments to defray the cost of the county fire department's operations therein.

Between 2015 and 2017, four of the county's incorporated municipalities – San Bernardino, Twentynine Palms, Needles and Upland – at the direction of their respective city councils, closed out their traditional municipal or local fire departments and had the entirety of their city limits annexed into FP-5, entailing each parcel owner in those jurisdictions paying an annual assessment of

approximately \$150 to have the county fire department provide those communities, under the auspices of FP-5, firefighting and emergency medical service. In each of those four cases, the existing local or municipal fire departments were shuttered.

In 2018, a proposal to expand FP-5 to cover 19,073 square miles of unincorporated land in the county along with the cities of San Bernardino, Twentynine Palms, Needles and Upland was made and ultimately approved by a **See P 2**

Ibarra & Elliott Set For A Photo Finish Amid SBPOA Intrigue In 2nd Ward Race

The race to represent the Second Ward on the San Bernardino City Council over the next four years is a dead heat, one so close that there is a chance it will not be decided this summer but will require a run-off in November.

The issue of who will occupy the Second Ward position carries with it significance as to the makeup and complexion of government in the county seat going forward. It has further poignancy with regard to whether the city's police

department and its officers will remain as a potent, respected and feared political force in the city of 222,101.

A consequence of the race as it was carried out this year may be that whatever moral authority the police department once possessed has been squandered, a development which some of the department's members have acknowledged and most others at this juncture do not want to address. Competing head-to-in the race are incumbent Sandra Ibarra, a community activ-

ist who was first elected to the city council in 2018, and Terry Elliott, a church pastor and an essential political newcomer who was brought forth by elements within the community as an alternative to Ibarra.

Ibarra was elected in 2018 with the endorsement of the San Bernardino Police Officers Association.

According to members of the union, as the 2018 election season progressed, it became clear that John Valdivia, then the city's Third District councilman,

would prevail in that year's mayoral election, and the city would be led at least for the next four years by a coalition of council members he headed. After the June 2018 primary, in which then-incumbent Second Ward Councilman Benito Barrios, who was loosely aligned with Valdivia, was eliminated from the running, Valdivia threw his support to Ibarra. This prompted the San Bernardino Police Officers Association to endorse Ibarra, its calculation being

that establishing a rapport with what was to become a council majority would benefit the association during its negotiations with the city over officer salaries and fringe benefits.

Relations between Ibarra and the union remained cordial, but soured in the wake of the protest-turned riot-turned-lootings that occurred on May 31/June 1, 2020 following the Minneapolis Police Department's murder of George Floyd.

A significant **See P 3**

Cetina Bests Armendarez In The First Round Of This Year's 2nd District Race; Now On To A Run-Off

As was almost universally anticipated by San Bernardino County's political prognosticators, Luis Cetina and Jesse Armendarez will compete in a run-off in the November general election to determine who will succeed Janice Rutherford as county supervisor in the 2nd District, based on the results of this week's primary election voting.

Unexpected by most of

those familiar with the five-person match-up was that Cetina outdistanced Armendarez for first place and that DeJonae Shaw, a neophyte political figure, did as well as she did.

Under the ground rules for San Bernardino County's supervisorial district contests, a candidate who manages to capture at least one more vote than fifty percent in the race which corresponds with

that year's primary election can claim victory outright. If no single candidate eclipses fifty percent, then a run-off is held in conjunction with that year's general election. Two of those involved in this year's Second District race, Armendarez and Nadia Renner, competed two years ago in the 2020 Fifth District supervisorial election. Late last year, in the aftermath of the 2020 **See P 3**

Harrison Abruptly Departs A Year Into His Tenure At AVFPD

In a move the reasons for which are too opaque to assimilate, the Apple Valley Fire Protection District and Fire Chief Ken Harrison have parted ways, less than a year after he was installed in that position following an impressive firefighting career in Orange County.

It was previously thought that the 56-year-old Harrison would remain as the head of the Apple Valley Fire Department until he reached the

age of 60. He was brought in last year to replace former Fire Chief Lorenzo Gigliotti.

While lavishing recognition upon the professionalism and competence of the crews he oversaw, Harrison hinted at but was not explicit about shortcomings with the attitude and direction of the fire district's board. It was unclear what issues led to Harrison's departure. Because of rules of confidentiality relating to governmental **See P 5**

Leyva Never Got On Track And Proved No Match For Hagman In 4th District Race

What slim prospect the Democrats had of breaking the Republican nut lock on San Bernardino County's governmental structure was dashed on Tuesday with incumbent Fourth District Supervisor Curt Hagman's drubbing of challenger Connie Leyva.

Hagman's polling of 8,901 votes or 53.21 percent of the 16,727 votes counted and 86 of 218 precincts reporting as of midnight on the night of the election,

four hours after the polls had closed, was taken as an indication that Hagman was going to take the race running away, with little chance of a run-off. By 4 p.m. today, Friday, June 10, with all 218 precincts accounted for and 19,299 mail-in ballots from District 4 voters counted, Hagman had widened his lead to 13,559 votes of the 24,346 cast so far, or 55.69 percent, to Leyva's 9,009 votes or 37 percent.

The third-place candidate

in the race, Larry Wu, as of 4 p.m. today has received 1,778 votes or 7.3 percent.

In San Bernardino County, county supervisorial races can be decided in the primary elections if a candidate secures at least fifty percent plus one vote.

Hagman's victory means that he will serve his third and final term on the board of supervisors after having first been elected to that post in the 2014 election. Since 2006, members of the board

of supervisors have been subject to a three four-year term limit.

From a purely mathematical standpoint, Hagman's grip on the Fourth District supervisorial post would seem unlikely. His victory Tuesday all the more stands as a tribute to his consummate political skill, at least as it applies to the venues in which he has held elective office.

In the course of one municipal election, three pri-

mary elections for California Assemblyman, three general elections for the California Assembly, three elections for supervisor during the primary balloting and one election for supervisor held during a November general election – eleven contests in all – Hagman has never lost or failed to advance to the general election.

When competing in districts where registration favored Republicans, he took full advantage **See P 6**

The Valdivia Era In San Bernardino Draws To A Puerile Close

A little more than a decade after the initiation of John Valdivia's political hold on the City of San Bernardino, the city's voters have brought the curtain down on the career of one of the most brazenly corrupt public officials in county history.

Despite an overwhelming financial advantage by which he had virtually twice as much money in his campaign war chest than all six of his opponents combined, Valdivia found himself far behind the front runner and outdistanced by the second-place finisher with whom he was once politically aligned, relegated to third place and out of the competition to remain as the kingfish of a dilapidated paradise whose citizens are no longer willing to tolerate his outsized ego and deprecations.

Early handicapping of the race projected that he would capture approaching or more than 30 percent of the votes in the seven-candidate primary contest, leaving him in first place with less than half of the vote but qualifying him for a November run-off against the second-place finisher. But more than two years of unremittingly negative publicity damaged his reputation beyond salvage as he was pummeled by revelation after revelation of abuse of his elected authority, from diversions of perquisites to misappropriation of funds to cronyism to the sexual abuse of his staff to outright bribery, ultimately eroding his re-electability.

Valdivia first showed political ambition in 2009, when as a 34-year-old he sought election to the city council. He was soundly rejected by the city's voters in the Fourth Ward in that race, during which he captured 182 votes or 5.68 percent in a contest that featured four candidates including the winner and his career-long rival Fred Shorett. Within two years, Valdivia, made a calculated relocation to the city's Third Ward, **See P 5**

Seeking Reform Has Meant The Red Brennan Group Has Threatened The Financial Status Of Establishment Politicians, Who Have Used The Machinery Of Government At Their Disposal To Resist & Maintain The Status Quo *from front page*

3-to-2 vote of the board of supervisors in October of that year. As in the cases of San Bernardino, Twentynine Palms, Needles and Upland, residents were not given the opportunity to vote on approving the annexation of their community into the assessment zone/service zone. Those transitions were procedurally effectuated by the conducting of a so-called protest process. During a one month period, those landowners or residents to be annexed into the annexation zone were permitted to lodge a protest against the annexation. If 25 percent of the residents or voters or landowners in the areas to be annexed had lodged a written protest with the government, then a vote on the formation would have been held. If fifty percent or more had lodged a written protest, then the annexation would have been nixed outright. Since fewer than two percent of the citizenry offered any protest, the 2018 annexation of the entirety of the county's unincorporated area into FP-5 proceeded without a hitch. Essentially, any resident, landowner or registered voter in one of the districts to be annexed who did not lodge a protest in effect casted a vote in favor of the zone expansion.

At that point, the Red Brennan Group inserted itself into the circumstance, asserting that the county's blanket annexation of the county's remaining unincorporated county areas other than Helendale and Silverlakes into the FP-5 Assessment District using the protest process was not a vote and was thus unconstitutional, violating that element of the California Constitution that was enacted with the voters' approval of Proposition 218, which requires that any new special tax must be approved by a vote of those who must pay it. The Red Brennan Group set about gathering signatures to place an initiative on the ballot that would ask the voters whether the FP-5 assessment should be applied to the entirety of the county's unincorporated areas.

In an attempt to derail the Red Brennan Group's effort, the county government's legal representatives in the summer of 2019 imposed

on the repeal petitioners a requirement that they obtain more than three times the number of signatures set by California's Constitution as the threshold requirement to force a vote on the matter. The county now acknowledges it misapplied the California Government Code in the summer of 2019 when it told the Red Brennan Group that it would need to gather the signatures of ten percent of the 261,831 voters living in the county's unincorporated areas to qualify the ballot petition they were requesting, i.e., 26,184 signatures. In actuality, there was a signature gathering threshold that under the California Constitution should have been applied, one which would have required far fewer signatures. That threshold was ten percent of the voters who had participated in the most recent countywide vote, that being the November 2018 election, when 546,041 voters throughout San Bernardino County, including ones living within incorporated cities and towns as well as within the county's unincorporated areas, had gone to the polls or sent in mail ballots. Of those 546,041 voters casting votes in November 2018, 472,515 of them lived in the county's cities and incorporated towns. In the county's unincorporated communities, where Fire Protection Zone 5 was to be overlaid, 73,526 voters had taken part in the November 2018 election.

Thus, instead of the Red Brennan Group being told it needed to gather the valid signatures of 27,303 residents to qualify the measure, it should have been held to the standard of gathering 7,353 signatures. Ultimately, after a substantial degree of going back and forth between the Red Brennan Group's attorneys, San Bernardino County's office of county counsel and the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, county counsel in February 2020 acknowledged the analysis provided by the Red Brennan Groups' legal team was correct and 10 percent of the of the voters who fell within the confines of where the FP-5 District was applied who voted in the last gubernatorial election was the correct standard.

Ultimately, after it had

gone to tremendous expense imposed upon it by the county's legal team's application of a standard it knew ahead of time it was not legal to apply, the Red Brennan Group qualified the measure, which was designated as Measure U, which called for the repeal of the FP-5 assessment from everywhere it was applied other than Helendale and Silverlakes, for the November 2020 ballot.

That same 2020 election season, the Red Brennan Group undertook and achieved what was probably – before it was short-circuited by governmental intervention – its most far-reaching reform démarche. In doing so, it harkened back to an epic undertaking from eight years previously.

In 2012, what was then the forerunner of the Red Brennan Group, a collection of residents led by Kiernan "Red" Brennan, had sought political reform in San Bernardino County by sponsoring an initiative, which was designated in that year's balloting as Measure R, which called for downscaling the five individual San Bernardino County supervisors' then-yearly \$151,971 salaries and \$67,500 in benefits to \$50,000 in salary and \$10,000 in benefits annually, a drop in total compensation from \$219,471 per year to \$60,000.

The members of the board of supervisors, alarmed at the prospect that they would be subject to seeing their pay reduced by more than two-thirds but simultaneously recognizing that the public's appetite for reform was intense, used their authority as government officials to place what they said was a "substitute reform" initiative onto the ballot. That initiative, Measure Q, called for instituting "reform" by allowing the supervisors' individual salaries of \$151,971 to remain in place, while reducing their annual benefits then valued at \$67,500 by \$5,000 to \$62,500. Because of their status as supervisors, they did not need to gather any signatures to put the Measure Q "reform" initiative reducing their total annual compensation to \$214,471 on the ballot.

Adopting the Measure R advocates' calls for reform, the supervisors and their supporters, as the proponents of Measure Q, did not in any overt fashion campaign against Measure R, but rather expounded in generic terms what they represented as Measure Q's "sensible" and "moderate" approach for achieving compensation

reduction for the supervisors.

In the November 2012 election, Measure R passed by a convincing 64.25 percent to 35.75 percent, with 326,939 voters in favor of it and 181,907 opposed. Measure Q passed as well, by a 67.28 percent to 32.72 percent margin, 344,226 votes in support to 157,369 against it. Because Measure Q garnered more votes than Measure R, the former went into effect rather than the latter. Instead of the supervisors seeing their \$219,471 per year total compensation packages reduced to \$60,000, they were instead cut back to \$214,202.

In 2013, Brennan, a U.S. Navy submariner during World War II whose brushes with death as a young man in the service of his country while seeking to export democracy around the world impressed on him the need to refine democracy at home and led to his intensive civil engagement, died. Those who had been involved in his committed government reform movement redoubled their efforts, formalizing the founding of a nonprofit entity named after him. For the 2020 election, in addition to the successful move to place Measure U on the ballot, the group revived the Measure R concept from 2012 and, again facing intense opposition by the board of supervisors, qualified an initiative that covered the same ground as that of Measure R for the November 2020 ballot, along with a further provision limiting a member of the board of supervisors to a single term.

After once more forcing the Red Brennan Group to clear several both unrealistically high and legally indefensible hurdles to qualify that initiative for the ballot, which was designated Measure Z, the county board of supervisors and the county's in-house team of lawyers, as it had in 2012, used the board of supervisors' authority to again put on the ballot its own "reform" measure, which was designated as Measure J.

Measure K's provisions consisted of limiting supervisors to a total annual compensation – including salary and all benefits – of \$60,000 and a single four-year term. According to the Red Brennan Group, \$60,000 matched the salary and benefit package paid to an average resident of the county and limiting supervisors to a single term would ultimately lead to "citizen legislators" rather than career politicians monopolizing county

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 951 567 1936

Message Line 951-567 1936

government's top decision-making positions. Moreover, the Red Brennan Group reasoned, the dual reduction in salary/benefits and limitation to a single term would eliminate virtually entirely the phenomenon of supervisors collecting hundreds of thousands of dollars in political donations to repeatedly seek reelection, donations which have been provided, historically, by individuals and companies with business, investments, projects and franchises involving the county or impacted by county governmental decisions, representing conflicts of interest that have ushered corruption into the political process whereby members of the board of supervisors have consistently made decisions that are more beneficial to their donors than to the constituents they serve.

The county board of supervisors pushed Measure J, which provided for allowing the members of the board of supervisors a \$270,000 per year stipend including salary and benefits and the option of serving three four-year terms, subject to the will of the voters in three separate elections.

As it turned out, the county supervisors' ploy that had worked in 2012 of offering an alternative "reform" measure to what had been proposed to the voters did not work in 2020. Measure K did much better at the polls than did Measure J. Measure K passed with 516,184 or 66.84 percent of the 772,282 voters participating supporting it, and 256,098 voters or 33.16 percent opposed.

According to the final certified election results released by the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters, Measure J passed, with 378,964 votes or 50.72 percent of the 747,188 votes cast supporting it and 368,224 or 49.28 percent opposed.

Meanwhile, Measure U,

calling for shrinking FP-5 back to its original proportion in the county's unincorporated areas to apply merely to Helendale and Silverlakes, was also considered by the voters. In the run-up to the election, the union representing the county's firefighters campaigned vigorously, maintaining that withdrawing the funding that the expanded FP-5's fire service area represented would severely compromise public safety throughout the county's rural areas. The public found that dire warning convincing enough to result in Measure U failing, with 109,483 county residents or 47.97 percent of those participating supporting it and 118,772 or 52.03 percent opposing it.

In the immediate aftermath of the 2020 election, the county governmental establishment accepted the public's judgment with regard to Measure U.

As for measures J and K, however, that was a different matter. Under the California Government Code and the California Elections Code, if two measures are on the ballot together which are in conflict and both pass, the one that passes with the greater number of votes takes precedence. That was the principle that was applied in 2012, when Measure R, with its provision to pay members of the board of supervisors a total annual compensation of \$60,000, and Measure Q, calling for the supervisors to receive a total of \$214,471 in yearly combined salary and benefits, both passed.

Measure Q, which received 17,287 more votes than Measure R, was made operative. Playing by the same rules, it seemed that following the 2020 election, Measure K, which called for a \$60,000 salary and benefit package for the supervisors and received 137,220 more votes

Continued on Page 6

Despite Armendarez's Financial Advantage & Accompanying Energetic Campaign, Cetina Outpolled Him By Well Over 4 Percent In The Primary Balloting *from front page*

U.S. Census, the county redrew its supervisorial district map. Both Renner and Armendarez are residents of east Fontana. They, along with Dan Flores, lost to the eventual winner in the Fifth District, Joe Baca, two years ago. Whereas what is roughly the easternmost third of Fontana was formerly in the Fifth District, with the redistricting that took place last year all of Fontana was placed into the Second Supervisorial District, which now includes north Upland, San Antonio Heights, Mt. Baldy, Rancho Cucamonga and Fontana.

As of 4 p.m. today, Friday, June 10, counting all of the voting that took place at the district's precincts between 7 a.m. and 8 p.m. Tuesday and mail-in ballots that have come in to the registrar of voters' office since late April up until this afternoon, Cetina polled 9,853 or 34.12 percent of the 28,875 votes cast, followed by 8,541 votes for Armendarez or 29.58 percent; 5,876 votes for Shaw or 20.35 percent; 2,444 endorsements of Eric Eugene Coker's candidacy or 8.46 percent; and 2,161 ballot markings for Renner or 7.48 percent.

Like most races in San Bernardino County and California in general on Tuesday, voter turnout was poor in comparison to elections in recent years. There are 249,392 registered voters in the Second District. The voter turnout in the district

so far stands at roughly 11.58 percent, with mail-in ballots that have yet to come in pending inclusion in the final tally.

Third place went to Shaw, who lives in Upland. She had a relatively strong showing, given that she had never run for office previously. Her ability to more than hold her own and capture over one-fifth of the vote was a reflection of her voter registration as a Democrat in a race that featured no other Democrats. Armendarez and Cetina are Republicans and Renner and Coker have no affiliation with any political party. While local governmental races in California under the Government Code and Elections Code are supposed to be nonpartisan, in San Bernardino County all elections are influenced by party affiliation and party identification of both the candidates and the voters. Throughout the mid-to-late 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and into the early years of the Third Millennium, registered Republicans outnumbered registered Democrats in the Second District as they did throughout San Bernardino County. In 2009, however, the number of Democrats eclipsed the number of Republicans in the county. At present in the Second District, 108,328 or 43.4 percent of its registered voters are Democrats and 69,283 or 27.8 percent are Republicans while 54,115 or 21.7 percent express no political preference. The re-

maining 7 percent are members of more obscure political parties.

In addition to being a Democrat, Shaw is also active in the union at Kaiser Hospital where she works as a nurse.

Despite the steadily rising number of Democrats in San Bernardino County, it remains a GOP bastion. At present four of the five members of the board of the supervisors are Republicans. Seventeen of the county's city and town councils have a majority of Republicans, including the three cities in the Second District: Upland, Rancho Cucamonga and Fontana.

In their campaigning for office this spring, Armendarez and Cetina heavily emphasized their Republicanism, with Armendarez stressing that he and not Cetina had the endorsement of the Republican Central Committee and most of the county's Republican establishment members. Armendarez is a former member of the Fontana City Council, where he was part of the Republican ruling coalition established there by Mayor Acquannetta Warren. Warren is the most prominent Republican African American political figure in San Bernardino County. Included as members of Warren's political machine are Phil Cothran, Sr and Phil Cothran Jr. The elder Cothran is currently the chairman of the Republican Central Committee, and his son is a Fontana City Councilman.

As a member of Warren's political machine, Armendarez had the advantage of monetary support from the Republican Party generally; the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee, over which Phil Cothran, Sr has tremendous sway; and individual Republican donors. Moreover, Armendarez, a successful real estate broker and the past president of the Inland Valley Association of Realtors, has money of his own which he has previously used to support other Republican candidates as well as his own campaigns for school board, city council and Fifth District supervisor.

Cetina expended \$124,630.05 on the race between January 1 and May 21, and collected \$81,750 in donations through this week since January 1, which was added to the \$95,000 he had in his electioneering fund when he decided in November to run for supervisor. He has substantially less immediately available money than

Armendarez, but he is confident enough in his electoral prospects that he is willing to accumulate some debt to run his campaign. A question still stands, however, as to whether he will have the staying power in the final electoral round that will end in November, as money is no object with Armendarez.

Both the amount in Cetina's campaign war chest and the money he spent was dwarfed by the \$345,865.19 Armendarez had banked for his campaign, which was augmented with more than \$100,000 in spending on his behalf by an independent expenditure committee, Citizens Against Wasteful Spending.

While Armendarez and his supporters doubtless spent more on the campaign than did Cetina, there is a question as to how wisely he spent it. At least some of the electioneering material he or those supporting him sent out hurt him as much as it assisted him. A case in point were mailers that belabored that Armendarez had the support of Republican stalwarts and the official support of the Republican Party while Cetina did not, many of which went to mixed political households, that is families where one member was a Republican but another, a spouse or child or parent, are not Republicans and very likely Democrats. Mentioning Cetina in this way may have boosted his candidacy in the June election and may very well redound to assist him in November.

One factor that may have favored Cetina, perhaps immensely, was the support he has received from Stephen Larson. Larson is the attorney for developer Jeff Burum, who two decades ago was one of the most prolific political donors in San Bernardino County. For more than a decade, Burum took a far lower profile as a political donor while he was in the midst of legal difficulty from which Larson ultimately extracted him. During that period of legal travail, Burum desisted in providing money to politicians. Now, he is back in the saddle again. Judging by the donation patterns of some of Burum's closest associates – including Raymond Crebs, Chris Leggio, James Previti, Nick Cacciolo, James Erwin and Nicholas Previti – it would appear that Burum would be inclined to support Armendarez, and support him with considerable generosity. Nevertheless, Burum's relationship with Larson and the latter's ability to serve

as a moderating influence upon the wealthy developer may have dissuaded Burum from getting foursquare behind Armendarez. Indeed, Larson appears to have convinced Burum to support Cetina, albeit with what was for Burum a rather modest \$500. Campaign finance records show that Burum does not hesitate to supply candidates he favors with donations of \$5,000, \$10,000, \$20,000, \$25,000, \$50,000 or even \$100,000.

Unknown at this point is whether Burum will continue to hold himself in check and not come across with a substantial amount of money for Armendarez during the campaign for the November race. Burum's influence on the contest could be huge, since his not supporting Armendarez going forward or, conversely, his willingness to do so could signal to his associates whether they too should hold off on enabling Armendarez or, in the alternative, whether they should swell his campaign coffers to the point that he could bury Cetina.

While Armendarez, his campaign and those independent actors supporting him did endeavor to attack Cetina during the primary campaign, those attacks were relatively tepid and not pointedly personal. Given that Cetina achieved a 4.54 percent edge over Cetina in the primary as counted so far, it would be logical for the Armendarez camp to step up the attacks on Cetina and get ugly when the race hits the clubhouse turn in late September or early October. Still, in Tuesday's election, which had poor voter turnout, the relatively mild negative campaign tactics used against Cetina were not particularly effective and may have had the opposite effect on the high propensity voters who did show up to vote. If the low voter turnout of June repeats itself in November and there are not as large of a number of poorly-focused voters participating in the general election this year as there are normally, Armendarez might see those voters who are concerned about serious issues impacting government and the Second District reject his candidacy if he insists on engaging in a mudfest.

Armendarez's political chops stem from his heavy involvement as a political donor, a term on the Fontana Unified School District Board of Directors and one term on the Fontana City Council.

Cetina was elected to the

Cucamonga Valley Water District Board of Directors in November 2012, eight years after the entity he was elected to represent had changed its name from the Cucamonga County Water District. He represents Division 4 within the district. He has served on the district's water resources and government as well as its public affairs committees, and he represents the district on the Chino Basin Water Bank Planning Authority as that entity's chairman. Further, he is the Cucamonga Valley Water District's representative on the Fontana Union Water Company Board of Directors as well as on the Rancho Cucamonga Chamber of Commerce. He was elected to the Association of California Water Agencies Region 9 Board of Directors in 2018, again in 2020 and will serve his third term through 2023. He also serves on that entity's agriculture and water quality committees.

Cetina is the chairman of the Gateway Chambers Alliance, a member of the San Gabriel Valley Legislative Coalition of Chambers, a Rancho Cucamonga Chamber of Commerce board member and an active participant in the Inland Empire Chamber Alliance.

This spring, both Cetina and Armendarez seemed determined to sell themselves as what they characterized as true Republicans, embracing conservatism and suggesting they had little sympathy for those who aren't disciplined or don't work hard. Neither hesitated at disclosing he has a mean streak.

"Criminals can be tough," one of Armendarez's mailers stated. "Jesse Armendarez is tougher."

The mailer asked, "You want tough?" before noting that Armendarez, while on the Fontana City Council "stood up to radicals wanting to defund the police, and when they tried to riot, he backed the police and sent the criminals packing. Jesse is the only candidate endorsed by the law enforcement officers who keep us safe."

Cetina, in one of his mailers mirrored what Armendarez had said. "As your next supervisor, I will use my experience in business and public policy to fully support our police and sheriffs and fight the liberals who are trying to defund the police. We must hold criminals accountable for their actions." Cetina further vowed to "clean out the homeless camps."

-Mark Gutglaeck

Too Close To Call In SB's 2nd Ward *from front page*

portion of the Highland Avenue Commercial Corridor in San Bernardino lies within the Second Ward. The businesses on Highland Avenue were as hard-hit by that social maelstrom as any others in the 62.45-square mile city. Merchants there expressed dismay at the destruction of their stores and the loss of merchandise they experienced while members of the police department, who were present that evening nearby en masse, did not physically engage with or obstruct the looters. Ibarra publicly referenced those businesses' owners' distress.

Ibarra stated she did not think the San Bernardino

Police Department's response was aggressive enough in protecting property and businesses that were under siege. She suggested that there were institutional problems with the department that preexisted the May 31/June 1, 2020 riots that had become apparent with that event. Those included, she said, a department that was top heavy and overweighted with brass, one that had too many upper management positions and too few uniformed officers on the streets. She questioned whether the sergeants, lieutenants and captains in the department were "helping the people who work and live in the city."

The department, from its top echelon to the officers on the streets, took that as

Continued on Page 4

Ibarra's Criticism Of Police Department's Passive Response To Rioting & Looting Induced It To Endorse Her Opponent Despite His Extensive Criminal History *from page 3*

an affront, with members of the department maintaining they had done the best they could under the circumstances. The police department's defenders expressed the view that if the police had been more confrontational and applied any degree of force, given the social and situational atmospherics, injuries and death may have ensued, creating an even greater contretemps than what the city already had to deal with.

In an open letter, the San Bernardino Police Officers Association blasted Ibarra, saying she had "blatantly attacked the integrity of the men and women of the San Bernardino Police Department," asserting "Ms. Ibarra's claim that the San Bernardino Police Department was ineffective is... false."

Members of the department and the police officers association were intent on seeing Ibarra removed from the council, and looked forward to the 2022 election during which they committed to supporting whoever might emerge as her opponent. To their chagrin, however, no competitor from within the Second Ward organically surfaced to challenge her. Just prior to the opening of the filing period for this year's city council race, Elliott, previously a resident of the city's Seventh Ward, established a bootlegged domicile in the Second Ward that did not have rental permits with either the city or the county. Members of the police department, it was reported, had encouraged Elliott to make the residency transition to allow him to challenge Ibarra in this year's contest. That encouragement, according to one report, included financial assistance to Elliott in making that residency accommodation.

When the campaign season began in earnest earlier this year, the San Bernardino Police Officers Association endorsed Elliott.

In conferring the endorsement on Elliott, the police officers association purposefully neglected to carry out a background investigation on him, bypassing an official or even unofficial production of a report with regard to several specifics about what at least some of the association's members already knew, which was that he has an ex-

tensive criminal record and has been challenged both in court and elsewhere over his financial exploitation of members of the churches he has led.

In 1984, Elliott was convicted in Los Angeles County on four of the 13 felony counts he had been charged with in November 1983 relating to forgery and check fraud, and was thereafter given a three-year prison sentence. He was given an early good-conduct release in April 1985 after serving one year at the California Institution for Men in Chino.

Subsequent to his release, young Elliott felt a calling from God and embarked on his life's work as a man of the cloth, becoming, in time, the pastor of the Good Samaritan Baptist Church in Los Angeles. On April 21, 1994, he was charged with felony grand theft after he embezzled money from the church. He entered a guilty plea to those charges on June 10, 1994. That conviction and accusations that he had conned some of his church's congregants out of money complicated his status as a preacher in Los Angeles County.

Elliott relocated to San Bernardino, where in 1998, following the death of the Reverend Henry Campbell, he stepped in to become the pastor of a church, known as The Ship, which had been established by Campbell in 1962.

In 1999, Elliott, together with James Marshall, founded the Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church, located at 1895 Del Rosa Avenue in San Bernardino, as a California nonprofit corporation. Elliott was shown as the pastor and president and Marshall was designated as the chairman and head deacon in the church's charter.

Elliott entered into untoward and unethical financial relationships with some of his church's congregants. One of those involved Tina Satterwhite, who in 2004 found herself in a state of crisis when her son was killed in a shooting and her bout of depression over the matter led her into a further downward spiral in which she lost her job. That created a circumstance in which she was no longer able to make her mortgage payments. Foreclosure proceedings were about to be initiated

against her. At that point, Satterwhite confided in Elliott, who informed her that members of her own family were on the verge of seeking a conservatorship over her.

Elliott convinced Satterwhite to sell her house before it was foreclosed upon and to then turn the net \$107,147.89 proceeds from the sale over to him for safekeeping in a trust account he said he would open for her and which he claimed the members of her family who were seeking to take over her affairs by means of the conservatorship would not have access to. In fact, no such trust account for Satterwhite was established and instead the money was put into the "Mount Zion Community Redevelopment Corporation account" to which Elliott had unfettered access. Elliott then withdrew more than \$75,000 from the account for his own personal use. Ultimately, her money gone, Satterwhite was unable to pay her rent and was evicted, ultimately rendered homeless.

A local lawyer, Michael Scaffiddi, took up Satterwhite's cause, and he was able to convince San Bernardino County Superior Court Judge John Pacheco that after subtracting a roughly \$12,000 tithe that Satterwhite had made to the church and \$19,783 in disbursements that Elliott had made to Satterwhite over time from the \$107,147.89 proceeds from the sale of the house deposited into the church's "redevelopment" account, that Satterwhite was owed the difference. In March 2010, Judge Pacheco entered a \$75,166.21 judgment in favor of Satterwhite against Elliott and Mt. Zion plus interest of \$3,994.46 and another \$1,225 in attorney's fees and costs, for a judgment total of \$80,385.67.

When Scaffiddi attempted to collect the judgment for Satterwhite, however, Elliott, who had by that point declared bankruptcy on behalf of Mount Zion, used those proceedings to duck out of paying Satterwhite the money owed her. Using his attorney, Greta Sedeal Curtis, who was also the attorney representing Mount Zion Church in the bankruptcy, Elliott engaged in ploy after ploy, including changing the name of the Mount Zion Church and its tax status, to evade the payment demands. As a consequence of her efforts on behalf of Elliott and the church during the bankruptcy proceedings, Curtis was

ultimately disbarred and can no longer practice as an attorney in California.

Upon Scaffiddi and Satterwhite finally moving beyond the roadblocks strewn in their way by Curtis, they managed to bring the matter involving Satterwhite and Elliott before U.S. Bankruptcy Judge William V. Altenberger, who on June 11, 2014 rendered a decision and order relating to the final extinguishment of the bankruptcy Elliott had filed on behalf of Mt. Zion Church.

In his ultimate finding, Judge Altenberger characterized Elliott, essentially, as a conman.

"Based upon the debtor's [Elliott's] representation that he would hold the funds in trust for her, Satterwhite endorsed the check for the net proceeds from the sale of her house over to the church and gave it to the debtor. Instead of creating a trust for Satterwhite, the debtor deposited the check into the Mount Zion Community Redevelopment Corporation account, and never created a trust account for the benefit of Satterwhite."

Judge Altenberger stated that Elliott "was at times evasive and uninformed about what had occurred, indicating that other officials of the church knew what had occurred. Additionally, this court observes that Satterwhite was a person of limited financial means. It is simply not credible that a person of limited financial means would sell her home and give away all of the net proceeds, even to a church."

Judge Altenberger continued, "The evidence presented by Satterwhite establishes that the debtor deceived Satterwhite into turning over the net proceeds from the sale of her house by telling her that he would open a trust account in her name and hold the funds in that trust solely for her benefit and that he knew at the time he made these representations that they were false and deceptive. The debtor's intent to deceive may be inferred from the surrounding circumstances. Accordingly, this court concludes that the debtor obtained the funds from Satterwhite by false pretenses, a false representation or actual fraud. Satterwhite is entitled to judgment against the debtor in the amount of \$75,166.21."

To this date, one day short of eight years after Judge Altenberger's ruling, Elliott has yet to pay any of the money he owes Satterwhite. He continually

ghosts the process servers who have sought to serve subpoenas upon him.

According to a member of the San Bernardino Police Officers Association, members of the department and members of the association were aware of the multiple derogatories in Elliott's past, including his criminal convictions, but they were so desperate to find an alternate candidate to Ibarra that they purposefully bypassed carrying out a background check on him that upon open scrutiny by the association's members would have resulted in the association withholding its endorsement of him. Instead, the union substituted the consideration that Elliott had already been vetted by the department to take on a role as a department chaplain years ago. The failure of the department to have carried out a full background investigation of Elliott is an issue that is likely to become problematic for both the department and its chaplain program in the near future, the officer said.

According to the officer, the association's first priority in making its endorsements is stacking the city council with members who will not oppose the association's proposals during the collective bargaining process, to thus ensure that officers receive wage and salary increases coupled with the continuation of benefits. In the past, the officer said, the association has endorsed city council candidates with personal, legal, and situational blemishes which have rendered them vulnerable to public exposure and have left them inclined to support the association in getting for its members adequate remuneration. While the officer said that blackmail is perhaps too strong of a word to use in describing how the association desires to have council members amenable to persuasion, the goal was to have council members who equate a well-paid constabulary with a commitment to public safety.

In this way, Elliott's checkered past as well as personal financial shortcomings on the part of another candidate in this year's city council competition, Teresa Parra Craig, who was running against incumbent Fred Shorett in the city's Fourth Ward, are seen by the association's members not as demerits but rather features that would allow the association and the police

department need their support. The San Bernardino Police Officers Association this year endorsed Parra Craig over Shorett.

In a similar fashion, the association collectively was in favor of the reelection of Mayor John Valdivia in this year's race because of a host of personal vulnerabilities in his makeup, including excessive womanizing, his willingness to receive under-the-table payments from entities doing business with the city, his questionable use of city resources, personnel and facilities as well as his participation in backroom deals that he would prefer to keep out of the limelight. The negative publicity which has attended much of Valdivia's action, however, made it difficult if not impossible to publicly endorse the incumbent mayor, the officer said, so the association chose instead to make no endorsement under the assumption that Valdivia, who had more than \$300,000 in his campaign war chest when the election season began, would achieve reelection. As it turned out, that calculation did not hold, as Valdivia finished third in the seven-person race for mayor, meaning he will not qualify for the mayoral runoff in November.

Another calculation the association and its leadership made in endorsing both Elliott and Parra Craig was that the derogatory information relating to their criminal or civil court or personal financial entanglements would not reach the public before the election. While Parra Craig in essence succeeded in keeping some troubling elements relating to her personal finances from becoming public fodder, Elliott did not escape exacting scrutiny of his financial, civil and criminal misadventures. Both the *Sentinel* and the San Bernardino *Sum* in May ran exposés detailing his criminal and civil tribulations and his reputation for financially exploiting members of his congregation.

Faced with a wide cross section of the public having learned about the criminal record of a candidate it had endorsed in the Second Ward council race, the San Bernardino Police Officers Association doubled down, insisting in the weeks leading up to the election that it would not rescind its endorsement of Elliott.

"The SBPOA has not changed its position regard-

Continued on Page 11

With His Political Skill, Valdivia Managed To Climb The Ladder To Ever Higher Positions Of Prestige And Public Trust, Reaping Benefits For Himself As He Ascended *from front page*

where he once again vied for the council. In that race, he first revealed his willingness to market his authority – or presumed authority – trading money provided to him for his future votes in a public capacity.

By 2011, then-Mayor Patrick Morris and then-City Manager Charles McNeely were struggling with financial challenges and nearly decade-long deficit spending which had depleted the city's reserves, which left the municipality teetering over a financial abyss. Morris, a former Superior Court judge, had come to recognize that exorbitant personnel costs were driving the city toward an inevitable bankruptcy and he was desperately seeking to form a consensus on the city council to hold the line on further employee salary and benefit increases, as 92 percent of the city's budget went to defray employee pay and benefits, with 69 percent of the budget devoted to the salaries and perks of the city's public safety personnel, i.e., sworn police officers and the city's firefighters.

A key Morris ally in this regard had been Third Ward Councilman Tobin Brinker, who represented a crucial city council vote in support of Morris's strategy to reduce spending by not giving in to city employee union demands for continuing raises and benefit enhancements. Meanwhile, the city's employee unions, including the city's powerful public safety employees' unions – the San Bernardino Police Officers Association and the San Bernardino Firefighters Association – were alarmed at the call to freeze the pay of firefighters and police officers. With the unions' support, Valdivia in the November 2011 election trounced Brinker, 826 votes or 69.24 percent to 367 votes or 30.76 percent.

Both before and after the election, Valdivia confidently declared that the city was flush with money, and that no municipal financial crisis existed. A week after his March 2012 swearing in, Valdivia offered assurances that the city was shipshape financially. Four months later it was disclosed that the city's ship of state was listing economically, and in August 2012, the city declared bankruptcy with a Chapter 9 filing. To this day, Valdivia refuses to talk about that early faux pas

in his political tenure.

In February 2014, just a little less than two years after he had assumed municipal office, Valdivia announced he would seek the Republican nomination for Congress in the 31st Congressional District. Within a short period of time, however, Valdivia and his advisors thought better of that, since such a campaign would unequivocally identify him as a Republican, and in the City of San Bernardino, Democrats outnumbered Republicans 48 percent to 22 percent, and in the Third Ward that margin was 49 percent to 18 percent.

In 2015, Valdivia retained his position as Ward Three councilman when no one surfaced to run against him.

Valdivia sought to cultivate a reputation as both a fiscal and social conservative who was mindful of the cost of various city programs and as someone who was adamantly opposed to the proliferation of marijuana.

Nevertheless, in 2015, Valdivia's financial profligacy was put on display when the city council, in its efforts to guide San Bernardino, the oldest of the county's municipalities and the county seat, out of bankruptcy, was forced to close out its 148-year-old fire department in favor of a contract with the county fire department, and to shutter the municipal sanitation department. Loss of its fire department was a severe blow to the city's prestige. Remarkably, Valdivia was able to keep hidden from most of his Republican constituents that he had sided with the unions in continuing to grant city employees raises and higher benefits and he, at least for a time, bypassed scrutiny of how his unwillingness in 2012 to stabilize city employee pay and benefits resulted in the bankruptcy that ultimately led to the loss of the city's fire and sanitation departments.

In 2016, a move by the city council and activists in the city was made to change the city charter, which had been in place since 1905, revamping city governance. The new charter presented to voters that year called for changing the city's treasurer, city attorney and city clerk positions from elected to appointed ones, moving its elections from odd-numbered to even-numbered years, and reducing the power and admin-

istrative reach of the mayor from what it had been since 1905, such that the mayor no longer had co-regency with the city manager and control over direct hiring and firing of city employees. Valdivia, who coveted strong mayoral authority for himself, had opposed the charter change.

Likewise, the city's voters in 2016 had given approval to Measure O, which allowed for the sale of marijuana within the city. Before the initiative passed and while the matter was in doubt, Valdivia hewed to the Republican line, maintaining he was fiercely opposed to marijuana availability in the city.

In 2018, despite the charter change that had significantly reduced the mayor's authority, Valdivia challenged Carey Davis, who in 2013 had succeeded Morris as mayor with Morris's endorsement.

Valdivia prevailed in that election, with 19,155 votes or 52.51 percent to Davis's 17,327 votes or 47.49 percent.

Upon being sworn into office on December 18, 2018, Valdivia had barely let his hand down to his side when he began gunning to replace City Manager Andrea Travis-Miller, whom he considered to be a vestige of the Davis Administration. His intention was to install a city manager of his own choosing, one who would be willing to broker a deal that would give him the de facto authority to hire and fire city employees and department heads, and thus provide him with the power as mayor that had been attenuated with the 2016 charter change. As of December 2018, Valdivia essentially controlled four votes on the city council and by the end of May 2019, when a special election held to fill the Third Ward council position he had vacated to move into the mayor's post resulted in a victory by his ally Juan Figueroa, he effectively con-

trolled five of the city council's seven votes.

Valdivia seemingly went off in a dozen directions at once, effectuating Travis-Miller's removal as city manager, replacing her with soon-to-retire Assistant City Manager Teri Ledoux and then cutting deals every which way intended to benefit his political benefactors.

He simultaneously began to enrich himself by utilizing his position and authority as mayor. Unsatisfied with his \$106,793 mayoral salary, \$8,768 in stipends for attending meetings of regional boards, joint powers authorities and other governmental entities and committees along with medical, dental and other benefits such as a car and travel allowance totaling \$24,665 and retirement benefits of \$29,322.40, for a total taxpayer-defrayed compensation of \$169,548.40 annually paid to him by the city's taxpayers, he went into simultaneous money-making mode. Using his consulting company AAdvantage Comm LLC, Valdivia convinced clients they would have something to gain by hiring the mayor of San Bernardino to intercede for them, as he could use his influence and ability to engage in backroom political horse-trading to ensure that their applications for project approval or government contracts or franchises would achieve for them desired results.

Of major significance was the way in which Valdivia in the aftermath of the 2016 passage of Measure O in San Bernardino and the statewide passage of Proposition 64, the adult use of marijuana act, made a 180-degree flip from a politician adamantly opposed to the sale of marijuana in his city to an advocate of multiple individuals and entities seeking permits and licenses to operate marijuana-related and cannabis-related busi-

nesses in San Bernardino. More than a dozen would-be commercial cannabis business applicants have related how Valdivia took money from them, either in the form of political contributions or under-the-table payments, in exchange for promises that he would ensure their applications for cannabis-related business permits would be approved. It soon became apparent that the stance he had taken as a staunch opponent of marijuana liberalization was a pose he assumed to draw votes from the city's conservative and Republican voters. Once there was money in it for him, he began gladhanding with would-be commercial marijuana enterprise operators, hailing them as the new breed of entrepreneurs that were to lead San Bernardino into a prosperous future.

As Mayor, Valdivia soon developed a further reputation for taking money from anyone who needed the city to take action that would benefit them or their company business-wise. Through AAdvantage Comm LLC, he accepted consulting fees, assuring his clients he could deliver for them the approvals they needed. As mayor, he wielded the gavel at city council meetings, controlled the ebb and flow of discussion and debate, had sway over what matters would be discussed and what actions contemplated, but he did not possess a vote, although he could do so to break a tie, and he had mayoral veto power. Thus, he rationalized, he could take money from those with business before the city council, since he would not *himself* be voting. Nevertheless, once his ally Figueroa was on the council, he controlled, essentially, five of the seven votes and was the head of a ruling coalition that essentially ran the city. He let all of AAdvantage Comm's clients

and prospective clients know that he had command over the council, and the money poured in. To sidestep any conflict-of-interest issues, he duly reported as personal income on his official California Form 700 statements of economic interest the money he was making as the owner of AAdvantage Comm, cleverly omitting exactly who AAdvantage Comm's clients were.

With Ledoux in place as his handpicked city manager who was to see her pension upon retirement zoom from the \$125,000-per year range to near \$180,000 as a consequence of the promotion Valdivia had provided her accompanied by his control over five-sevenths of the city council, Valdivia in the summer of 2019 was at the apex of his power, bestriding San Bernardino as a political colossus.

There were cracks, however, in the magnificent monument he had constructed for himself.

First, his chief of staff, Bill Essayli, left to take a position with an Orange County law firm. Then, one by one, as Valdivia pursued objectives that they saw as averse to their own or that he was using their votes and support to construct quid pro quos with his clients in which he was given money for their votes, three of the members of his coalition – Sandra Ibarra, Henry Nickel and Ted Sanchez – parted political company from him, rendering it so that he no longer had five reliable votes on the council but only two to support whatever he was attempting to achieve.

There followed a series of revelations: cannabis entrepreneurs came out of the woodwork, regaling newspaper reporters and the public with how he had promised marijuana operation licenses and permits to those who had

Continued on Page 6

Harrison Leaves AVFPD *from front page*

agency personnel decisions and action, no explicit explanation was given as to who or what is at the basis of Harrison's departure.

At the time of Harrison's arrival in June of last year, Sid Hultquist, then an Apple Valley Fire Protection District board member and now the board present, was enthusiastic about Harrison's hiring. Harrison, who was previously employed with the Carlsbad Fire Department, Tahoe-Douglas Fire Protection District and Riv-

erside City Fire Department, at the time of his hiring was a battalion chief with the Orange County Fire Authority with an office in Irvine and an assignment overseeing the aircraft rescue program at John Wayne Airport. In 2019, he had been offered, but ultimately did not accept, the position of fire chief in South Lake Tahoe. Hultquist is an experienced firefighting professional himself, having recently served as fire chief in Barstow.

Word is that it was Harrison's discontent with the district rather than the other way around which brought him and the district to this

crossroads. Something mentioned was a philosophy clash between the board and the chief. It is not clear if Harrison included Hultquist among those he was at odds with.

On June 4, the board held a special meeting in which discussion items listed on the meeting agenda related to consulting services with Eide Bailly in open session and a public employee performance evaluation of Harrison together with possible anticipated litigation in a closed session. It is not clear whether that litigation related to Harrison. Reportedly, during that meeting Harrison told the board he was con-

templating resigning as chief. In response, the board placed him on paid non-disciplinary administrative leave.

The board then scheduled another special meeting for June 8, at which the only items on the agenda pertained to Harrison's "performance evaluation," his possible "discipline/dismissal/release" and a "public employee appointment," apparently a reference to the appointing of a replacement acting or interim chief.

The meeting concluded with Harrison's departure being formally confirmed and the board advancing Buddy Peratt to replace Harrison on an interim basis.

Since Last Year Valdivia Has Feverishly Spent Campaign Money On Lawyers *from page 5*

applied for them in exchange for cash; an employee in his office, Mirna Cisneros, told of how he had made sexual advances to her and how he misused city funds to engage in travel and activity that had nothing to do with city business and was taking money from those with business before the city; another employee of the mayor's office, Karen Cervantes, related how the mayor had made sexual advances toward her; his field representative, Jackie Aboud, likewise said Valdivia had pressured her to accommodate his sexual needs; Alissa Payne, a single mother whom Valdivia appointed to two city commissions, said Valdivia had made

similar indecent overtures to her; Valdivia's field representative Don Smith related how he had been present while Valdivia made a late night rendezvous with a city tow service franchise holder who handed Valdivia an envelope stuffed with cash; Matt Brown, who had succeeded Essayli as Valdivia's chief of staff, came forward to say that Valdivia attempted to have him make fraudulent unfavorable work reviews of Cisneros, Cervantes, Aboud and Smith to justify their firings and discredit them with regard to the allegations they had made.

Based on a host of Valdivia's actions, the city found itself facing nearly a dozen lawsuits.

With untoward accusations mounting, Valdivia continued to engage in questionable, bold and risky behaviors, utilizing city resources, funding and personnel to provide or defray the cost of providing materials

and services relating to political promotions of himself and his associates while using city money to cover the cost of travel, meals and lodging while he was engaged in matters unrelated to his duty or function as mayor.

Looking toward his 2022 election campaign, Valdivia created a political war chest titled John Valdivia For Mayor 2022. In 2021, he received donations of \$380,987.21 into that account. In the first five months of 2022, he received another \$106,500 into that account for a total over 18 months of \$487,487.21.

Valdivia also created another fund, the Mayor John Valdivia Legal Defense Fund. With legal challenges against him mounting, he began transferring money out of the John Valdivia For Mayor 2022 account into the Mayor John Valdivia Legal Defense Fund, in the amount of \$165,400 in 2021 and \$57,295.24 in 2022. In 2021, the Mayor John Valdivia

Legal Defense Fund paid Pacheco & Neach, the law firm of his lawyer, Rod Pacheco, \$199,885.40. This year, through the first five months of 2022, the Mayor John Valdivia Legal Defense Fund paid Pacheco & Neach \$51,933.25.

As of 4 p.m. today Valdivia was in third place with 2,127 votes or 17.88 percent,

behind second-place finisher, former City Attorney Jim Penman, with 2,368 votes or 19.91 percent and the top vote-getter, Helen Tran with 4,902 votes or 41.22 percent.

A one-time Valdivia associate/political supporter this week observed that if Valdivia had used the money provided to him by his donors as they intended it for

electioneering purposes rather than diverting it to defray his legal bills, he would have been reelected.

The *Sentinel* sought to engage with Valdivia this week but could not reach him. He was said to have embarked on a trip to Europe via the East Coast as of today, Friday, June 10.

-Mark Gutglueck

Hagman Drubs Leyva *from front page*

of that circumstance to advance to the position of city councilman or assemblyman. When competing in districts where registration favored, and in at least two cases heavily favored, the Democratic Party, Hagman defied the odds and ran aggressive and brilliant campaigns that overcame his opposition. When he found his political way forward obstructed by members of his own party, through backroom maneuvering he disposed of that competition. If that created resentment toward him among Republicans, his control of the local GOP political machinery rendered that complication irrelevant to his power climb.

Prior to his 2014 election to the Fourth District supervisor's post, the district, consisting of Carbon Canyon, Chino Hills, Los Serranos, Chino, the West End, Montclair, Ontario, Guasti and southern Upland, had grown predominantly Democratic, with more voters registered as Democrats than with the GOP. Voter registration in the district has progressively grown more favorable to the Democrats on a constant basis, until at present 101,946 or 44.1 percent of the district's 230,975 voters are Democrats and 61,271 or 26.5 percent are registered as Republicans with 51,832 or 22.4 percent claiming no party preference and 7 percent belonging to more obscure political parties.

As a Republican, Hagman would seem to have been at a distinct disadvantage to Leyva, a Democrat. Nevertheless, just as he was seemingly at a disadvantage to his opponent in the 2014 and 2018 races, Gloria Negrete-McLeod, Hagman simply outlasted the opposition, proving more energetic, attentive, aggressive, creative and above all ruthless in promoting his candidacy.

While local governmental races in California are by state law non-partisan ones, in San Bernardino County, all of politics is guided by party affiliation.

Though the Democrats are the dominant political party in California overall, with both of its U.S. Senators and 42 of its 53 Congress members Democrats and its governor, lieutenant governor, state attorney general, secretary of state, insurance commissioner, controller, treasurer, auditor, comptroller, and superintendent of public instruction all being Democrats and the Democrats holding supermajorities in both houses of the state legislature, there are five bastions of Republicanism in the Golden State, one of which is San Bernardino County.

The Republican primacy in the county would likewise seem unlikely, given a similar registration advantage that falls to the Democrats overall in the county. At present, 469,552 or 41.3 percent of the county's 1,137,606 voters are registered Democrats and 332,495 or 29.2 percent are Republicans, with 244,344

or 21.5 percent expressing no party preference and 8 percent being members of various smaller parties. Nevertheless, the Republicans in San Bernardino County have proven far more energetic, coordinated, focused and intent than their Democratic counterparts when it comes to electioneering and far more willing to raise and spend money in the effort to promote Republican candidates and Republican causes than are the Democrats willing to monetarily support their party's candidates and initiatives. The Republicans have proven themselves far more adept and skilled at appealing to voters unaligned with any party and those members of the offshoot parties. In addition, Republican voter turnout in the United States generally, in California and particularly in San Bernardino County is higher than that of the Democrats. As a consequence, four of the county's five supervisors are Republicans and in 17 out of the county's 24 cities and incorporated towns there are more Republicans than Democrats.

Hagman, who was a member of the Chino Hills City Council from 2004 until 2008, including a short stint as mayor, was elected to the California Assembly in 2008. In 2014, he was obliged to leave the Assembly as a consequence of what were then the strictures of California's term limits, which restricted a member of the Assembly to three two-year terms. In 2013, ahead of the 2014 election

Red Brennan Group: Multiple Victories, Yet Little To Show For It *from page 2*

than Measure J which called for paying the supervisors some \$270,000 per year all told, would go into effect.

Members of the board of supervisors, however, who were not prepared to accept a \$210,000 per year compensation reduction, went to court to dispute not only the outcome of Measure K, but its provisions as well. Instead

season, Hagman ruthlessly deposed Robert Rego as the chairman of the San Bernardino Republican Central Committee, taking that position for himself and then using that post to intimidate Gary Oviatt, a Republican who was then the incumbent Fourth District supervisor, into not seeking reelection.

In 2014, Negrete-McLeod and two lesser-known candidates also ran for Fourth District supervisor. McLeod was at that point a sitting Democratic Congresswoman who had captured that position in 2012 when her maiden candidacy for Congress had been infused with more than \$3 million by New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg, who did so because he wanted to remove the incumbent Negrete-McLeod was running against that year as a consequence of California's open primaries, fellow Democrat Joe Baca Sr, whom Bloomberg considered unsympathetic toward his gun control agenda.

After less than a single term in Congress, Negrete-McLeod wanted out of Washington, D.C., and had set her sights on the Fourth District supervisorial position.

Hagman, recognizing that Negrete-McLeod throughout her political career had been at best a lackluster candidate who had again and again experienced serendipitous boosts of her fortune in running for office, as when Bloomberg had endowed her with \$3 million in funding she would never have come up

of using the county's staff attorneys—the office of county counsel—to take that legal action, it hired outside legal representatives in the form of the Sutton Law Firm, and, in particular three of the firm's attorneys—Bradley Hertz, James Sutton and Nicholas Sanders—to represent them.

Through the Sutton Law Firm, the board of supervisors sued their own employee—San Bernardino County Clerk of the Board Lynna Monell—to prevent her from certifying as applicable the election results and implementing the provisions

of Measure K. In doing so, Hertz, Sutton and Sanders made a series of assertions, including that Measure K is “fatally flawed,” “violates [the] California Constitution by seeking to set supervisor compensation via citizen initiative...” “exceeds the initiative power of the electorate by intruding on matters that are exclusively delegated to the governing body, in this case the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors...” “[and its] term limit provision for members of the county board of super-
Continued on Page 12

tury younger than Negrete-McLeod, would prove a far more dynamic campaigner than the sluggish Negrete-McLeod and give Hagman a run for his money.

Hagman, however, came out from his corner swinging, and independent expenditure committees supporting him utilized the rise in gasoline prices brought on by the worldwide fuel shortage in the wake of the Russian invasion of Ukraine to suggest that Leyva, a current member of the California Legislature which has maintained high taxes on California gasoline, was responsible for “\$6 dollar-a-gallon gasoline.” Those ads carried the tagline, “We can't afford Connie Leyva.”

Hagman did not hesitate to make use of paradox and contradiction in carving out his victory. At the same time that Hagman was attacking Leyva as a tax-and-spend liberal, he was accepting the endorsements of the county's public employee unions, which are more closely affiliated with Democrats than Republicans. This cut right to the heart of Leyva's appeal to Democrats, as she built her political career on her previous position as the president of the California Labor Federation. Leyva was further hurt by Hagman's campaign spots with Democratic Congresswoman Norma Torres.

At no time during the spring did Leyva ever seem to get her campaign on track. She took a worse shellacking than Negrete-McLeod did in either 2014 or 2018.

-Mark Gutglueck

Public Notices

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2207605

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: SAMANTHA CHRISTINA HERMANDEZ and JOHN JAMES LU filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

KADEN JAMES LU to JAMES CALVIN LU

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: June 13, 2022

Time: 08:30 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: 04/06/2022

John M. Pacheco

Judge of the Superior Court.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on May 20 & 27 and June 3 & 10, 2022.

FBN 20220004468

The following person is doing business as: DSA FREIGHT INC 6142 GLEN ABBEY WAY FONTANA, CA 92336. DSA FREIGHT INC 6142 GLEN ABBEY WAY FONTANA, CA 92336

Mailing Address: POST OFFICE BOX 4607 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91729

The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JANUARY 14, 2012

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/ DARLENE S ARITA, President
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 05/09/2022

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 J2282

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 5/20, 5/27, 6/03 & 6/10, 2022.

FBN 20220004511

The following person is doing business as: PLUM TREE MARKET 6325 PUMA PLACE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91737; GEORGE ROLAND SLIVKA 6325 PUMA PLACE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91737

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to

Public Notices

transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAY 2, 2022

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/ GEORGE ROLAND SLIVKA

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 05/11/2022

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 18296

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 5/20, 5/27, 6/03 & 6/10, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: EDWARD LEE HOOVER CASE NO. PROSB2200681

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of EDWARD LEE HOOVER has been filed by CHRISTINE MARIE BOBICK aka CHRISTINE MARIE HOOVER in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that CHRISTINE MARIE BOBICK aka CHRISTINE MARIE HOOVER 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 JUNE 20, 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.

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 Christine Marie Bobick aka Christine Marie Hoover:

Public Notices

Neil Hedtkke, Esquire
SBN 273319
820 North Mountain Avenue
Upland, CA 91786
(909) 579 2233 Fax (909) 618 1622 hedtkelg@gmail.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on May 27, June 3 & June 10, 2022.

Neil Hedtkke, Esquire
SBN 273319
820 North Mountain Avenue
Upland, CA 91786
(909) 579 2233 Fax (909) 618 1622 hedtkelg@gmail.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on May 27, June 3 & June 10, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARGARET JEAN BARRETT CASE NO. PROSB2200683

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MARGARET JEAN BARRETT has been filed by GLORIA JEAN ERAZIM in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that GLORIA JEAN ERAZIM 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 JUNE 16, 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.

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 Gloria Jean Erazim:

Public Notices

Neil Hedtkke, Esquire
SBN 273319
820 North Mountain Avenue
Upland, CA 91786
(909) 579 2233 Fax (909) 618 1622 hedtkelg@gmail.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on May 27, June 3 & June 10, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: RAGNAR JOSEF SCHNEIDER, RAGNAR J. SCHNEIDER, aka RAGNAR SCHNEIDER CASE NO. PROSB2200734

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of RAGNAR JOSEF SCHNEIDER, RAGNAR J. SCHNEIDER, aka RAGNAR SCHNEIDER has been filed by ERIC OROZCO in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ERIC OROZCO 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 JUNE 30, 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.

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 Eric Orozco:

Leah Larkin (SB# 231329)
Law Offices of Leah Larkin
873 Beaumont Avenue
Beaumont, CA 92223
Phone (951) 845 5930 Fax (951) 845 5407 Leah@inland-law.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on

Public Notices

May 27, June 3 & June 10, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MIKE GARZA aka MICHAEL GARZA CASE NO. PROSB2200669

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MIKE GARZA aka MICHAEL GARZA has been filed by SUSAN KNOBLER in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that SUSAN KNOBLER 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 be held JUNE 14, 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: MAY 6, 2022

VALARIE GOLDSTEIN, 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. Attorney for Susan Knobler: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373
Phone (909) 328 7000 Fax (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on May 27, June 3 & June 10, 2022.

Public Notices

FBN 20220003723
The following person is doing business as: SANCHEZ CARRIERS WAREHOUSE 14587 VALLEY BLVD. FONTANA, CA 92335; YOER SANCHEZ-GOMEZ 8971 ROBINIA ST FONTANA, CA 92335 [and]

BRENDA G ORTIZ VILLEGAS 8971 ROBINIA ST FONTANA, CA 92335

Mailing Address: 8971 ROBINIA ST FONTANA, CA 92335

The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE

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

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ YOER SANCHEZ-GOMEZ
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 04/21/2022

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 G8420

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 5/20, 5/27, 6/03 & 6/10, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF:

David Westcott Eichler
Case NO. PROSB2200705

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of David Westcott Eichler

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

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Layla Eichler be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. S36 at 09:00 AM on 06/23/2022 Room: at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District-Probate Division at 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415 IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney.

IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the

Public Notices

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.

Anna Sacco-Miller
38975 Sky Canyon Drive,
Suite 104, Murrieta, CA 92563
Telephone No: (951) 296-1775
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on:
05/27/2022, 06/03/2022,
06/10/2022

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: RICHARD JOHN SCHUERGER CASE NO. PROSB2200742

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of RICHARD JOHN SCHUERGER has been filed by JOHN H. TAYLOR III in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that JOHN H. TAYLOR III be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

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

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held June 21, 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: MAY 19, 2022
SABRINA FELIX, 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)

Public Notices

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: MAY 19, 2022 Attorney for John H. Taylor: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 Phone (909) 328 7000 Fax (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on June 3, 10 and June 17, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: GLORIA JEAN HOWARD aka GLORIA JEAN NORWARD CASE NO. PROSB2200759

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of GLORIA JEAN HOWARD aka GLORIA JEAN NORWARD has been filed by MICHAEL CHATMAN in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that MICHAEL CHATMAN 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 June 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: MAY 24, 2022
JENNIFER SELDANA, 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 credi-

Public Notices

tor. 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: MAY 19, 2022 Attorney for Michael Chatman: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 Phone (909) 328 7000 Fax (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on June 3, 10 and June 17, 2022.

FBN20220001529
The following person is doing business as: GOLD STANDARD EVENTS 11100 4TH STREET G301 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: VISIONAIRE CONSULTING GROUP LLC 11100 4TH STREET G301 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730
Mailing Address: 11100 4TH STREET G301 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730
The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California 20201601125
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: February 13, 2022
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/ JENNIFER JONES, CEO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 02/18/2022
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 I8296
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 3/11, 3/18, 3/25 & 4/1, 2022.
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 3/11, 3/18, 3/25 & 4/1, 2022 and corrected on 4/22, 4/29, 5/6 & 5/13, 2022. Recorrected on 6/03, 6/10, 6/17 & 6/24, 2022

FBN20220002054
The following person is doing business as: MOO MOO COWS 6870 ROVATO PLACE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701: BLUE WHALE LOGISTICS INC 1826 W MOSSBERG AVE WEST COVINA, CA 91790
The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California as C4681738
The registrants 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/ YING GUAN, Chief Financial Officer
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 03/08/2022
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 I1327
Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 3/11, 3/18, 3/25 & 4/1, 2022 and corrected on 4/22, 4/29, 5/6 & 5/13, 2022. Recorrected on 6/03, 6/10, 6/17 & 6/24, 2022

FBN20220003546
The following person is doing business as: BIG BEAR PHYSICAL THERAPY & WELLNESS 39031 WATERVIEW DRIVE BIG BEAR LAKE, CA 92315: RECREATE PHYSICAL THERAPY & WELLNESS, 2108 N ST. STE N SACRAMENTO, CA 95816
Mailing Address: PO BOX 120821 BIG BEAR LAKE, CA 92315
The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered in California 4862859.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: APRIL 8, 2022
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/ THOMAS BRADLEY
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 04/15/2022
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 J2534
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 3/11, 3/18, 3/25 & 4/1, 2022 and corrected on 4/22, 4/29, 5/6 & 5/13, 2022. Recorrected on 6/03, 6/10, 6/17 & 6/24, 2022

Public Notices

FBN FBN20220003079
The following person is doing business as: ELEV8 SPORTS PERFORMANCE 12223 HIGHLAND AVE STE 106 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 92585: NICOLE M WALKER 27658 BIG BEND DR MENIFFEE, CA 92585
Mailing Address: 27658 BIG BEND DR MENIFFEE, CA 92585
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/ NICOLE M WALKER
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 04/05/2022
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 J2534
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 April 8, 15, 22 & 29, 2022.
Corrected on 6/03, 6/10, 6/17 & 6/24, 2022

FBN20220001810
The following person is doing business as: EPITOME CONSTRUCTION [and] EPITOME LANDSCAPING [and] EPITOME STAGING [and] EPITOME CONSULTING 1632 WILSON AVE UPLAND, CA 91784: GEO COE LLC 1632 WILSON AVE UPLAND, CA 91784
Mailing Address: 318 BALLENA DRIVE DIAMOND BAR, CA 91765
The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
S/ Geoffrey T. Huang
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 03/02/2022
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 I1327
Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 3/04, 3/11, 3/18 & 3/25, 2022. Corrected on 4/08, 4/15, 4/22 & 4/29, 2022.

FBN FBN20220003546
The following person is doing business as: BIG BEAR PHYSICAL THERAPY & WELLNESS 39031 WATERVIEW DRIVE BIG BEAR LAKE, CA 92315: RECREATE PHYSICAL THERAPY & WELLNESS, 2108 N ST. STE N SACRAMENTO, CA 95816
Mailing Address: PO BOX 120821 BIG BEAR LAKE, CA 92315
The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered in California 4862859.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: APRIL 8, 2022
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/ THOMAS BRADLEY
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 04/15/2022
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 J2534
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 3/04, 3/11, 3/18 & 3/25, 2022. Corrected on 4/08, 4/15, 4/22 & 4/29, 2022.

Public Notices

Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 4/22, 4/29, 5/6 & 5/13, 2022.
Corrected on 6/03, 6/10, 6/17 & 6/24, 2022

FBN 20220003180
The following person is doing business as: RIG RUNNER 2941 N. LOCUST AVE RIALTO, CA 92377: EZE TRUCKING, LLC 2941 N. LOCUST AVE RIALTO, CA 92377
Mailing Address: 24955 145 NORTH SUITE 300 THE WOODLANDS, TX 77380
The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered in Delaware 200907710317.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAY 1, 2018
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
S/ DATREN WILLIAMS
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 04/08/2022
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 I1327
Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 4/22, 4/29, 5/6 & 5/13, 2022. Corrected on 6/03, 6/10, 6/17 & 6/24, 2022.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO DISPOSE OF SURPLUS SCHOOL DISTRICT - PROPERTY

Notice is hereby given to any public district, public authority, public agency, public corporation, or any other political subdivisions in this state, the federal government, and qualifying nonprofit entities, in accordance with Government Code Section 54222 and Education Code Section 17464, that the Baker Valley Unified School District intends to dispose of the real property described below, by sale.

The subject property is located near the Baily Road Exit of California Interstate 15, near mile post 171.50 in the County of San Bernardino, State of California, Assessor's Parcel Numbers 0572-091-02-0000; 0572-091-03-0000; and 0572-091-23-0000 ("MountainPass Property") and the property is offered under the legal priorities and for the purposes set forth in Government Code Sections 54220 to 54232, inclusive, and Education Code Section 17464. For the purposes of acquiring said property pursuant to Government Code Section 54220 to 54232, inclusive, any eligible interested party is required to notify the selling agency (the District) of its intention to acquire within sixty (60) days after the third publication of this notice which the District has published pursuant to Education Code Section 17464.

Please give such notice in writing and address to: Leopoldo C. Santiago Erickson Law Firm A.P.C. 2878 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 115 San Diego, California 92108

THE LAND REFERRED TO HEREIN BELOW IS SITUATED IN THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

Parcel One:
S 1/2 NE 1/4 NE 1/4 SW 1/4 SEC 13 TP 16N R 13E (EX PTN TO LOS ANGELES SMSA LTD SBE LAND CHG FOR 91 PG 7).
Assessor's Parcel No.: 0572-091-02-0000
Parcel Two:
N 1/2 SE 1/4 NE 1/4 SW 1/4 SEC 13 TP 16N R 13E
Assessor's Parcel No.: 0572-091-03-0000
Parcel Three:
MAP 2532 36 13 PARCEL NO 1 (POSS INT ONLY) ***** SBE LAND CHG FOR 91 PG 7 *****
Assessor's Parcel No.:

ANTONIETTE JAUREGUI (SB 192624) 1894 S. COMMERCE 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 June 10, June 17 & June 24, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: STEVEN CRAIG JONES, AKA STEVEN C. JONES, AKA STEVE JONES CASE NO. PROSB2200840

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of STEVEN CRAIG JONES, AKA STEVEN C. JONES, AKA STEVE JONES has been filed by PAUL JONES in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

Public Notices

0572-091-23-0000
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JOHN FATU CASE NO. PROSB2200795

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JOHN FATU A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by GEORGE FATU in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that GEORGE FATU be appointed as personal representatives to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held July 14, 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.

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 Paul Jones: Leah Larkin (SB# 231329) Law Offices of Leah Larkin 873 Beaumont Avenue Beaumont, CA 92223 Phone (951) 845 5930 Fax (951) 845 5407 Leah@inlandlaw.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on June 10, June 17 & June 24, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MIKE EUGENE WILLIAMS, aka MIKE E. WILLIAMS, aka MIKE WILLIAMS CASE NO. PROSB2200840

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MIKE EUGENE WILLIAMS, aka MIKE E. WILLIAMS, aka MIKE WILLIAMS has been filed by MICHAEL J. WILLIAMS in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that MICHAEL J. WILLIAMS 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

Public Notices

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that PAUL JONES 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 July 14, 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.

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 Paul Jones: Leah Larkin (SB# 231329) Law Offices of Leah Larkin 873 Beaumont Avenue Beaumont, CA 92223 Phone (951) 845 5930 Fax (951) 845 5407 Leah@inlandlaw.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on June 10, June 17 & June 24, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MIKE EUGENE WILLIAMS, aka MIKE E. WILLIAMS, aka MIKE WILLIAMS CASE NO. PROSB2200840

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MIKE EUGENE WILLIAMS, aka MIKE E. WILLIAMS, aka MIKE WILLIAMS has been filed by MICHAEL J. WILLIAMS in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that MICHAEL J. WILLIAMS 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

Public Notices

court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held July 13, 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.

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 Michael J. Williams: Leah Larkin (SB# 231329) Law Offices of Leah Larkin 873 Beaumont Avenue Beaumont, CA 92223 Phone (951) 845 5930 Fax (951) 845 5407 Leah@inlandlaw.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on June 10, June 17 & June 24, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: CAROL L. ROYAL CASE NO. PROSB2200598

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of CAROL L. ROYAL has been filed by BRET ROYAL in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that BRET ROYAL 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 August 3, 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: APRIL 27, 2022
NICOLE CARTWRIGHT, 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 person-

Public Notices

al 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: APRIL 27, 2022 Attorney for BRET ROYAL: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 ESTATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 Phone (909) 328 7000 Fax (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on June 10, June 17 & June 24, 2022.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER CIV BA 2200218 TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: PAULA ISHAK BEKHEET DAWOOD filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: PAULA ISHAK BEKHEET DAWOOD to MASRI ISHAK DAWOOD

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: July 18, 2022 Time: 1:30 P.M. Department: B-2 The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 235 East Mountain View Street, Barstow, CA 92311, Barstow 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: 05/18/2022 Judge James R. Baxter Judge of the Superior Court. Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on June 10, 17 & 24 and July 1, 2022.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20220004676

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: L.A. Marketing Group, 10950 ARROW RTE #1962, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91729 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY Mailing Address: , JOEL D QUIROZ, 10950 ARROW RTE #1962, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91729 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/JOEL QUIROZ, OWNER This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 05/13/2022 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Public Notices

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). 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022, 06/24/2022, 07/01/2022

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20220003232

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: LITTLE BEAR BOTTLE SHOP, 28578 STATE HIGHWAY 18, UNIT A, SUITE 3, SKYFOREST, CA 92385 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY Mailing Address: PO BOX 857, SKYFOREST, CA 92385, LITTLEBEAR LLC, 28578 STATE HIGHWAY 18, UNIT A, SUITE 3, SKYFOREST, CA 92385

STATE OF INC./ORG./REG. CA 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/NATHAN SAMUEL HAZARD, CEO

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 04/11/2022

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

Began Transacting Business: 06/04/2021 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). 05/06/2022, 05/13/2022, 05/20/2022, 05/27/2022, 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022, 06/24/2022, 07/01/2022

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20220003583

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: KJ FLIP FLOPPING, 6302 APPLE AVE, RAILTO, CA 92377 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY Mailing Address: 6302 APPLE AVE, RAILTO, CA 92377, JOSEPH F SANCHEZ, 6302 APPLE AVE, RAILTO, CA 92377, KERRI SANCHEZ, 6302 APPLE AVE, RIALTO, CA 92377 Business is Conducted By: A MARRIED COUPLE

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/JOSEPH F SANCHEZ, OWNER This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 04/18/2022

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

Began Transacting Business: 04/11/2022 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). 05/06/2022, 05/13/2022, 05/20/2022, 05/27/2022, 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022, 06/24/2022, 07/01/2022

FBN 20220004651 The following person is doing business as: HIGHLAND VILLAGE DENTISTRY, 7291 BOULDER AVE STE 2B HIGHLAND, CA 92346 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO CHANDRA CHOKALINGAM 7291 BOULDER AVE STE 2B HIGHLAND, CA 92346. The business is conducted

Public Notices

ed 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/ CHANDRA CHOKALINGAM, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 13, 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 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 05/20/2022, 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022 CNB-BB20220271R

FBN 20220004104

The following person is doing business as: PACIFIC WEST HVAC-R, 790 N TULARE WAY UPLAND, CA 91786 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO FIDEL MEZA JR 790 N TULARE WAY UPLAND, CA 91786. 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/ ABEL TOROSIAN, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 12, 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 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 05/20/2022, 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022 CNB-B20220216R

FBN 20220004151 The following person is doing business as: VENTURA'S TOWING & TRANSPORTATION LLC, 451 W. 9TH STREET APT 2 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92401 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO VENTURA'S TOWING & TRANSPORTATION LLC 451 W. 9TH STREET #2 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92401; 451 W. 9TH STREET APT 2 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92401; . The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ JOSEPH F SANCHEZ, OWNER This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 04/18/2022 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.

Began Transacting Business: 04/11/2022 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 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 05/20/2022, 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022 CNB-BB20220215MC

FBN 20220004628 The following person is doing business as: ZENJAY CONTRACTING, 14050 CHERRY AVE SUITE R #333 FONTANA, CA 92337 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ZENJAY 12300 MORRISON ST MORENO VALLEY, CA 92555; 14050 CHERRY AVE SUITE R #333 FONTANA, CA 92337; . 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 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.

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 12, 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 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 05/20/2022, 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022 CN-BB20220204SB

FBN 20220004570

The following person is doing business as: LEOS AUTO BODY, 2018 W FOOTHILL BLVD UPLAND, CA 91786 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ABEL TOROSIAN 2018 W FOOTHILL BLVD UPLAND, CA 91786. 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/ ABEL TOROSIAN, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 12, 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 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 05/20/2022, 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022 CN-BB20220206MT

FBN 20220004415

The following person is doing business as: NEW PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, LLC, 517 N MOUNTAIN AVE NUM 104 UPLAND, CA 91786 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO NEW PROPERTY MANAGEMENT LLC 517 N MOUNTAIN AVE NUM 104 UPLAND, CA 91786; 517 N MOUNTAIN AVE NUM 104 UPLAND, CA 91786; . The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ TOMOTHY S TIMMERMAN, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 11, 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 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 05/20/2022, 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022 CN-BB20220202MT

FBN 20220004274

The following person is doing business as: OMO-OYE ENTERPRISE, 16405 VALENCIA AVE #206 FONTANA, CA 92335 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO OYEJIDE SOYENPEMI 16405 VALENCIA AVE #206 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/ OYEJIDE SOYENPEMI, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 05, 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 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 05/20/2022, 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022 CN-BB20220205MT

FBN 20220004476

The following person is doing business as: THE LIGHT HOUSE, 23964 SPRUCE DRIVE GREEN VALLEY LAKE, CA 92341 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO TEAM SHAKE & BAKE ESTATE INC 33078 ARROWBEAR DRIVE RUNNING SPRINGS, CA 92382; 23964 SPRUCE DRIVE GREEN VALLEY LAKE, CA 92341; . 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.

Public Notices

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 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 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 05/20/2022, 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022 CN-BB20220204SB

FBN 20220005194

The following person is doing business as: DANNY KATY TRUCKING, 7231 BOULDER AVE #171 HIGHLAND, CA 92346 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO KATHLEEN A. HARPER 6934 SEINE AVE HIGHLAND, CA 92346. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

FBN 20220004542

The following person is doing business as: T'S CONSTRUCTION, 32798 KENTUCKY ST YUCAIPA, CA 92399 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO TOMOTHY S TIMMERMAN 32798 KENTUCKY ST YUCAIPA, CA 92399. 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/ LUIS MATA, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 13, 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

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 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022 CNB-B22022023CV

FBN 20220003956

The following person is doing business as: JOY B JEWELRY, 10935 TERRA VISTA PKWY #264 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO MOHAMMAD JOYBARI 10935 TERRA VISTA PKWY #264 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/ MOHAMMAD JOYBARI, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: APRIL 27, 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 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 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022 CN-BB20220201FA

Public Notices

ing 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 05/20/2022, 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022 CN-BB20220201MT

FBN 20220004298

The following person is doing business as: TRAPGUMMIES 15847 ARBURY ST HESPERIA, CA 92345 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ANDRE VICTOR PEREZ 15847 ARBURY ST HESPERIA, CA 92345. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: APR 29, 2022

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/ LUIS MATA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 05, 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

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 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022 CN-BB220220204MC

FBN 20220004682

The following person is doing business as: STUFF BOYS, 7537 MCKINLEY AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO LUIS MATA 7537 MCKINLEY AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ LUIS MATA, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 13, 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

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 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022 CNB-B220220218R

FBN 20220004913

The following person is doing business as: CHURCH'S CHICKEN #10753; CHURCH'S CHICKEN, 14507 PALMDALE ROAS VICTORVILLE, CA 9239211408 FIGTREE TERRACE ROAD CORONA, CA 92392 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO FSPS GROUP, INC. 11408 FIGTREE ROAD CORONA, CA 92883; 14507 PALMDALE ROAS VICTORVILLE, CA 92392; 11408 FIGTREE TERRACE ROAD CORONA, CA 92392. 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/ SAMEER SARKER, PRESIDENT

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 23, 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

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 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022 CNB-B220220218R

FBN 20220004913

The following person is doing business as: CHURCH'S CHICKEN #10753; CHURCH'S CHICKEN, 14507 PALMDALE ROAS VICTORVILLE, CA 9239211408 FIGTREE TERRACE ROAD CORONA, CA 92392 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO FSPS GROUP, INC. 11408 FIGTREE ROAD CORONA, CA 92883; 14507 PALMDALE ROAS VICTORVILLE, CA 92392; 11408 FIGTREE TERRACE ROAD CORONA, CA 92392. 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/ MOHAMMAD JOYBARI, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: APRIL 27, 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

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 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022 CN-B220220201FA

Public Notices

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 05/27/2022, 06/03/2022, 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022 CNB-B220220201R

FBN 20220004790

The following person is doing business as: CORNER EATERY, 6889 RAMONA AVE ALTA LOMA, CA 91701311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701

PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO LEAH G SUMPTER 6889 RAMONA AVE ALTA LOMA, CA 91701.

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

Public Notices

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 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022, 06/24/2022, 07/01/2022 CN-BB23202210MT

FBN 20220005190
The following person is doing business as: ESTRELLAS SHOP, 16194 TAWNEY RIDGE LN VICTORVILLE, CA 92394
PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO VIRIDIANA VERA 16194 TAWNEY RIDGE LN VICTORVILLE, CA 92394. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: 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/ VIRIDIANA VERA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 31, 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 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

Public Notices

ty Sentinel 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022, 06/24/2022, 07/01/2022 CN-BB23202209MT

FBN 20220005195
The following person is doing business as: DONA MARIA, 9134 FOOTHILL BLVD RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730
PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SABB BERNARDINO I.E. LLC 6339 TAYLOR CANYON PL RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739; 9134 FOOTHILL BLVD RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; . The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ISIDRO J. ESCOBAR, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 31, 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 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

FBN 20220005291
The following person is doing business as: THE DELI STATION, 3990 CONCOURS ST SUITE 108 ONTARIO, CA 917643210 E GUASTI RD ONTARIO, CA 91761

FBN 20220005291
The following person is doing business as: THE DELI STATION, 3990 CONCOURS ST SUITE 108 ONTARIO, CA 917643210 E GUASTI RD ONTARIO, CA 91761

Public Notices

PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO JNA EVENTS SERVICES LLC 3210 E GUASTI RD ONTARIO, CA 91761; 3990 CONCOURS ST SUITE 108 ONTARIO, CA 91764; 3210 E GUASTI RD ONTARIO, CA 91761. The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ JEREMY MICHALSKI, MANAGER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JUNE 01, 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 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

FBN 20220005282
The following person is doing business as: HABLAME/TALK FOR ME, LANGUAGE SERVICES (HTFM), 17230 CORONADO AVE FONTANA, CA 92336
PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SABB BERNARDINO TALK FOR ME HABLAME INC 17230 CORONADO AVE FONTANA, CA 92336; 17230 CORONADO AVE FONTANA, CA 92336. The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all 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/ MAYBE OLIVAS ARMENTA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 26, 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 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

FBN 20220005292
The following person is doing business as: THE LOADED HOAGIE, 3281 E GUASTI RD SUITE 150 ONTARIO, CA 917613210 E GUASTI RD ONTARIO, CA 91761
PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO JNA EVENTS SERVICES LLC 3210 E GUASTI RD ONTARIO, CA 91761; 3281 E GUASTI RD SUITE 150 ONTARIO, CA 91761; 3210 E GUASTI RD ONTARIO, CA 91761. The business is conducted by: A LIM-

Public Notices

ITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ JEREMY MICHALSKI, MANAGER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JUNE 01, 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 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

FBN 20220005082
The following person is doing business as: CAMILAS REGISTRATION, 16375 ARROW BLVD SUITE B FONTANA, CA 9233515725 DIANTHUS AVE FONTANA, CA 92335
PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO MAYBEOOLIVASARMENTA15725DIANTHUS AVE 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/ STEVANO SUBANDHI, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 24, 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 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

FBN 20220005282
The following person is doing business as: HABLAME/TALK FOR ME, LANGUAGE SERVICES (HTFM), 17230 CORONADO AVE FONTANA, CA 92336
PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SABB BERNARDINO TALK FOR ME HABLAME INC 17230 CORONADO AVE FONTANA, CA 92336; 17230 CORONADO AVE FONTANA, CA 92336. The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all 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/ MAYBE OLIVAS ARMENTA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 26, 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 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

Public Notices

aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ANARARCHIBOLDDMEJIA,CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JUNE 01, 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 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

FBN 20220005082
The following person is doing business as: CAMILAS REGISTRATION, 16375 ARROW BLVD SUITE B FONTANA, CA 9233515725 DIANTHUS AVE FONTANA, CA 92335
PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO MAYBEOOLIVASARMENTA15725DIANTHUS AVE 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/ STEVANO SUBANDHI, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 24, 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 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

FBN 20220005082
The following person is doing business as: CAMILAS REGISTRATION, 16375 ARROW BLVD SUITE B FONTANA, CA 9233515725 DIANTHUS AVE FONTANA, CA 92335
PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO MAYBEOOLIVASARMENTA15725DIANTHUS AVE 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/ STEVANO SUBANDHI, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 24, 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 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

Public Notices

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 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022, 06/24/2022, 07/01/2022 CNB-B23202204IR

FBN 20220004935
The following person is doing business as: NINEPOINT, 997 W GROVE ST RIALTO, CA 92377
PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO NINEPOINT LLC 997 WEST GROVE STREET RIALTO, CA 92376; 997 W GROVE ST RIALTO, CA 92377; . The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ STEVANO SUBANDHI, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 24, 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 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

Public Notices

06/24/2022, 07/01/2022 CNB-B23202202IR

FBN 20220004886
The following person is doing business as: LSGFITCO; FOSTER AGENCY; FOSTER GOODS; SHADOW DESIGN; LYONS DESIGN. 10300 ARROW RTE 1612 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; [MAILING ADDRESS PO BOX 523 RANCHI CUCAMONGA, CA 91739;] PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO SHADOW SUCCESS SOLUTIONS LLC 1401 21ST STREET SUITE R SACRAMENTO, CA 95811; 10300 ARROW RTE 1612 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; PO BOX 523 RANCHI CUCAMONGA, CA 91739. The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ STEPHANIE A. LYONS, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 23, 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 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

06/24/2022, 07/01/2022 CNB-B23202201IR

FBN 20220005291
The following person is doing business as: THE DELI STATION, 3990 CONCOURS ST SUITE 108 ONTARIO, CA 917643210 E GUASTI RD ONTARIO, CA 91761

SBPOA Surrendered Moral Authority & Credibility With A Questionable Endorsement from page 4

ing Elliott’s endorsement,” Tamrin Olden, the association’s spokesperson said. Moreover, Olden insisted there was no substance to the suggestion that the union was seeking to place Elliott on the city council because his personality flaws, criminal convictions and history of scandal involving theft from a church where he was the pastor and from a member of his own congregation left him vulnerable to exposure and would allow the police union to control his votes, and exploit that particularly when it came to approving union contracts and raises for the department’s officers. “To make a statement claiming that our endorsement process, specifically our current council endorsements, is dictated by some alternate agenda is simply incorrect and unfair to both the political action committee and association members,” she said.

Just as the police association had supported Ibarra in 2018 and by this year was standing in opposition to her reelection, Valdivia, who in 2018 endorsed her and helped her to victory in that

year’s November run-off, this year was actively militating against her. Valdivia’s campaign consultant, Chris Jones, assisted Elliott in his campaign.

Elliott’s campaign fund through May 27 had taken in \$27,493.00 and had utilized most of that money in directly supporting his electoral effort.

Elliott’s campaign was further boosted through the efforts of an independent expenditure committee calling itself the Committee for Ethical Government to Support Elliott and Oppose Ibarra for City Council 2022, which by May 27 had collected \$22,100 and had spent \$19,607.82 for mailers attacking Ibarra.

Ibarra, who ran a grassroots campaign, had spent \$1,352.99 since the beginning of the year, primarily on signs and her filing fee for her candidacy.

In the teeth of Elliott’s aggressive and comparatively well-funded campaign, Ibarra found herself outgunned, as Elliott’s signs were located virtually everywhere within the Second Ward, as well as in the visual spread near the vital road choke points surrounding the district.

The only advantages that had accrued to Ibarra as the Tuesday June 7 election day approached was her incumbency, fair name recognition and her performance in office over the previous three-and-a-half years.

Shortly after the polls closed on Tuesday night, the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters released its first results, consisting of the mail ballots that had come in up to that point.

Of the ward’s 13,263 voters, 670 had sent in mail ballots early enough to arrive before the polls had closed on election day, June 7. Elliott was off to a slim nine-vote lead, as he claimed 336 votes or 50.15 percent to Ibarra’s 327 votes or 48.81 percent. Another seven votes or 1.04 percent in the form of write-ins went to Alissa Payne.

At 10 p.m. on election night, no further mail-in ballots had come in, but the polling results from ten of Ward Two’s 17 precincts had been counted. Those additions reflected an amazingly minuscule voter turnout, with a mere 58 votes having been registered at the ten precincts. Ibarra logged 30 of those and Elliott claimed 26. Two were what the registrar of voters’ office called “unresolved write-in” votes. Elliot led by five votes, 362-to-357. Whereas previously he had claimed a majority of the votes cast, Elliott’s total had dipped below 50 percent, which made for a crucial distinction. To win the race outright under San Bernardino’s charter, a candidate must capture a majority vote, that is 50 percent and at least one more vote. But with Elliott’s tally of 362 votes and Ibarra’s total

of 357 plus what were at that point nine write-in votes, Elliott’s percentage of the vote had dropped to 49.73, while Ibarra was at 49.04 percent.

Two hours later, at midnight, one further precinct reported, making 11 out of 17. A total of 65 votes were cast at that precinct, which was more than the number of votes at the 10 previously counted precincts combined. Ibarra received 28 of those votes while Elliott scored 36. There was a single unresolved write-in vote in the precinct’s ballot box. At that point, Elliott had recaptured a majority of the vote counted that far, a total of 398 out of 793 votes cast, equal to 50.19 percent. Ibarra had registered 385 votes or 48.55 percent.

Two hours later, as of 2 a.m. on June 8, no further precincts had reported but three more votes for Elliott were recorded. It is not clear whence those votes came. The additional votes boosted his total to 401 of 796 votes cast, or 50.38 percent. Ibarra remained static with 385 votes, though her percentage dipped to 48.37.

At 4 a.m., the results from the final six precincts were tallied and reported, showing that just one vote had been cast at the half dozen precincts, that single vote being for Ibarra. That pushed her combined number of 327 mail ballot votes and 59 polling place votes to 386 total votes or 48.43 percent, while Elliott held a ma-

majority of the 797 votes cast with 401 or 50.31 percent.

That afternoon at 4 p.m. on June 8, the registrar posted an update of the tally, consisting of the incoming mail ballots received and counted that morning and afternoon. Ibarra received 20 more mail-in votes and Elliott 14. Thus, Elliott remained in front, with 415 of the 831 votes cast and Ibarra trailing by nine with 406 votes. At that point, Elliott could no longer claim to have a majority of the vote needed to win the election outright, as his vote ratio stood at 49.94 percent to Ibarra’s 48.86 percent.

The following day, 24 hours later at 4 p.m. on Thursday June 9, another updated posting was made. Ibarra picked up 25 more votes from incoming mail-in ballots, pushing her vote total to 431. Elliott picked up 13 votes, which meant that he had suffered a deficit relative to Ibarra of 12, which dropped him into second place by three votes. At that point, Ibarra was ahead, 431 votes to 428. Two of the write-in votes received at the polls were declared to have been for Payne, giving her a total of nine votes. The other write-in vote that had been cast at one of the precincts was disregarded. Neither Ibarra nor Elliott could claim outright victory, as neither had a majority of the vote, with Ibarra favored by 49.65 percent of those voting and Elliott supported by

49.31 percent.

At 4 p.m. today, Friday June 10, the mail-in votes that had come in since the previous day – 90 for Ibarra, 90 for Elliott and two write-ins for Payne – were counted. Thus, at present and pending a potential change based upon any further mail-in votes that could yet straggle in, Ibarra is the winner in a photo finish, with 521 or 49.62 percent of the 1,050 total votes cast so far in the Second Ward, with Elliott nipping at her heels with 518 votes or 49.33 percent.

According to the post office, it is not likely that a significant number of ballots posted at or prior to 5 p.m. on Tuesday June 7 will arrive at their destination at any point after tomorrow’s mail delivery, meaning the unofficial election outcome should be known by the next posting of results, which is scheduled for Monday June 13 at 4 p.m. Unless Elliott picks up at least 15 more votes than Ibarra in the remaining counts or unless Ibarra picks up at least 11 more votes over Elliott in the remaining counts such that the difference between the two becomes greater than the number of write-in votes for Payne and any other unresolved write-in candidates so one or the other is able to lay claim to more than 50 percent of the votes cast, the two appear to be headed for a run-off in November.

-Mark Gutglueck

Reform Efforts Have Put The Red Brennan Group On The Wrong Side Of The Political Establishment *from front page 6*

visors violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution [by] impermissibly infringing on voters' and incumbents' First and Fourteenth Amendment rights." Additionally, the writ of mandate drawn up by Hertz, Sutton and Sanders maintained Measure K violates "the single subject rule" pertaining to voter initiatives and that "Measure K must not be implemented because it does not embrace a single subject."

In making that final assertion, Hertz, Sutton and Sanders, ignored that Measure J, which they maintained should be operative rather than Measure K, likewise "embraced" more than a single subject.

Ultimately, Judge Donald Alvarez in a ruling issued on August 31, 2021, while rejecting much of what Hertz, Sutton and Sanders had maintained in their suit on behalf of the supervisors, found that Measure K cannot be implemented because limiting members of the board of supervisors to four years on the dais "violates the 1st and 14th amendments of the U.S. Constitution."

The Red Brennan Group has appealed Judge Alvarez's ruling. As a consequence of the legal challenge to it, the provisions of Measure K have never been in effect.

Despite the thicket of resistance that the Red Brennan Group has had to fight its way through with virtually every reform proposal it has made, it has not given up on those efforts, showing resolve to subject governance in San Bernardino County to scrutiny and appeal to the region's citizenry to consider revamping those elements of the way both the county and its cities operate where such changes seem appropriate.

The Red Brennan Group's leadership, which is convinced that the county had made misrepresentations about the necessity and validity of the FP-5 expansion and sincerely believes that the county board of supervisors' straight out violated the basic tenant in the California Constitution granting taxpayers the right to ratify by a majority vote any taxes they are going to pay with its use of a protest process to expand the boundaries of the FP-5 assessment zone to cover all of

the county's unincorporated areas, further believes that the San Bernardino County Firefighters Association's assertions made during its 2020 campaign in opposition to Measure U that the county does not have the means to continue to provide fire service to its remote rural areas as it has historically done was disingenuous. In previous years, the Red Brennan Group notes, based upon the revenue the county receives from landowners in those area in the form of unfettered ad valorem property tax, the county met its obligation to provide all types of basic services, including fire protection. While property owners in the unincorporated county areas are now being strapped with a FP-5 assessment they never approved and never before were obliged to pay, according to the Red Brennan Group, the county is accumulating substantial financial reserves defrayed by an illegal form of double taxation. The reform collective pressed forward with an effort to qualify once more an initiative for the ballot challenging the FP-5 expansion, and indeed succeeded in gathering a sufficient number of signatures to put another version of Measure U on the ballot this year, one designated as Measure Z, after the registrar of voters certified that enough valid signatures had been affixed to the petitions seeking the initiative. The county and its fire district/fire department sued the county registrar of voters to prevent it from including Measure Z on the ballot.

In that lawsuit, the county/fire district/fire department asserted that the petition used by the Red Brennan Group was factually incorrect and had misled voters who signed it. The Red Brennan's contention that the tax is unconstitutional was false, the county maintains, since in previous legal sparring over FP-5, San Bernardino Superior Court Judge Donald Alvarez made specific references to court precedent in other jurisdictions in California whereby the language in California's Constitution requiring a two-thirds vote on general or special taxes was held to not apply in circumstances involving annexations into previously existing assessment districts, as is the case

with what San Bernardino County did with FP-5, the county claimed.

Judge David Cohn, who considered the case, rejected the Red Brennan Group's contention that the will of the requisite number of voters who had signed the petition had to be complied with, and he ruled in favor of the fire district. On March 29, Cohn made a finding that the petition misrepresented the fire tax as unconstitutional. The Red Brennan Group disputed that and filed a petition to a state appeals court. The appeals court, seeing that there was an April 1 deadline for printing the June 7 ballots, agreed to hear the matter and ordered that the ballots be printed with Measure Z on it.

The county pushed forward with its challenge of Measure Z. On May 31, after the appeals court denied the petition from the Red Brennan Group and lifted its earlier stay, Judge Cohn ruled that his judgment that Judge Alvarez's ruling that FP-5 is constitutional should be upheld was consistent with the law and case law. Thus, Judge Cohn ruled, even if the voters on June 7 passed Measure Z, the rescission of FP-5's applicability to all other unincorporated areas outside of Silverlakes and Helendale will not stand.

On June 7, the county's voters indeed passed Measure Z. As of today, Friday, June 10, the registrar of voters' tally of the Measure Z results show 27,554 votes or 58.69 percent in favor of it and 19,395 or 42.31 percent opposed to it.

Judge Cohn's ruling will not necessarily prove the last word on whether the FP-5 assessment is applied to the entirety of unincorporated San Bernardino County, according to the Red Brennan Group.

"If current returns hold, voters have enthusiastically opted to repeal the Fire Protection Service Zone Five special tax," the Red Brennan Group said in a statement. "Election returns to date indicate the 'Yes' or repeal votes for Measure Z are nearly 60 percent while the 'No' votes trail at 40 percent. Local headlines have trumpeted the demise of Measure Z at the hands of Superior Court Judge David Cohn. However, an appeal of Judge Cohn's decision was in place prior to the election. Final passage of Measure Z is still an entirely viable scenario."

Consistently, while Kiernan Brennan was yet alive and in the time that the group now functioning in his

memory have been pushing for public agency reform in San Bernardino, those advocates have time and again found themselves, as a consequence of their advocacy, at odds with the expense of government and the seeming nonchalance by which government officials confer generosity upon themselves through the application of their authority. Six times – in passing Measure R in 2012, in qualifying Measure K in 2020 while being held to a seemingly impossibly high and unconstitutional signature-gathering standard, in qualifying Measure U for the ballot the same year while fighting the county's similarly unlawful signature-gathering requirement, in achieving passage of Measure K, in getting Measure Z on the ballot in face of the county's resistance and Judge Cohn's ruling and in achieving the voters' passage of Measure Z – the Red Brennan Group has used the citizen initiative process to further its reform agenda, only to see the forces of the government thwart its accomplishments.

Few entities or individuals, or perhaps none at all, have equaled or surpassed the Red Brennan Group in earning the enmity of the political establishment in San Bernardino County.

With the Measure R effort a decade ago, Kiernan Brennan alarmed the members of the board of supervisors, as it was then composed and which at that time had but a single member who is on that panel today, over the prospect that their own financial interest might be impacted by the reform he and his cohorts were seeking. Today, the board, with four different members than were serving in 2012, is as fiercely resistant to seeing its members' personal financial circumstances affected by reform.

In 2020, when the board of supervisors sued its own clerk to prevent the actuation of Measure K, the Red Brennan Group leapt into the breach, asking the court to take stock of the consideration that legal action the board was taking was against an individual answerable to the board – its own secretary and clerk – who would not be likely to resist with any intensity the board's interpretation of the law and the California Constitution. The Red Brennan Group's attorney, Aaron Burden, made a motion before the court that the Red Brennan Group be granted status, as the sponsor of Measure K, to intervene and

participate in the lawsuit the county board of supervisors was pursuing in the effort to overturn Measure K. Also seeking to intervene and oppose the board of supervisors in preventing Measure K from being implemented was the Inland Oversight Committee, a separate group of citizens represented by attorney Cory Briggs.

Judge David Cohn, who heard the case, initially, held that neither Burden nor Briggs nor the Red Brennan Group nor the Inland Oversight Committee were parties involved in the matter, as the board of supervisors' suit was filed against the clerk of the board, and as such they as outsiders did not have status to involve themselves in the proceedings.

After nearly two weeks of consideration, Judge Cohn, in accordance with settled law, relented and approved the Red Brennan Group's motion to intervene, though he ruled the Inland Oversight Committee had no standing in the matter.

Immediately upon Cohn granting the Red Brennan Group status to intervene, Burden made a preemptory challenge of Judge Cohn, based on the Red Brennan Group's belief it would not be able to have a fair and impartial trial or hearing before him. The matter was then sent to Judge Alvarez for his consideration.

The Red Brennan Group's action in challenging Judge Cohn, based upon whatever rationale Burden and the organization's leadership had, whether it was valid or invalid or for whatever tactical reasons they possessed, was ultimately a strategic faux pas of the first magnitude. Having already established itself as pursuing an agenda contrary to that of the county's political establishment, the Red Brennan Group's suggestion by its challenge that Judge Cohn was incapable of dealing with the issues the group was raising fairly and squarely was taken not only as an affront by Judge Cohn but by the remainder of the Brethren on the San Bernardino County Superior Court bench.

As the champion of San Bernardino County's common men and common women, the Red Brennan Group long ago assumed a stance out of step with the ethos of rank and privilege that comes with the territory of serving as a so-called "public servant" in San Bernardino County, a station which by its very definition paradoxically place such

"servants" above their "masters," the masters being the average citizens whom the system of governance was originally intended to serve. In San Bernardino County, the servants have been invested with an authority that can be defied only at one's peril. Burning whatever bridge the group might have had with the ultimate arbiters of and determiners of the social pecking order in the county, no matter how tenuous that link might have been, did not redound in any way to the Red Brennan Group's benefit. Rather, Judge Alvarez, at some level ultimately to the vindication of his colleague Judge Cohn, entered a decision last year that has so far prevented the Red Brennan Group from taking possession of the victory it scored with the passage of Measure K by a supermajority of San Bernardino County's voters.

The Red Brennan Group has appealed Judge Alvarez's decision, and the appellate court has yet to make its decision on whether the voters' call for restoring the members of the board of supervisors to the status of citizen legislators is one that should be heeded.

Most recently, when the board of supervisors challenged the Red Brennan Group's successful effort to put Measure Z on this week's ballot, the San Bernardino County Superior Court's executive echelon routed the case to the courtroom of Judge Cohn, with whom, as a consequence of its December 2020 challenge of his fairness, it was automatically off on the wrong foot.

Such is the fate of those who challenge what they consider tyranny, at least in San Bernardino County.

Tom Murphy, a spokesman for the Red Brennan Group said, "Despite news headlines to the contrary, Measure Z remains very much alive both from a political and legal standpoint. From the political perspective, it is obvious district voters see the special tax exactly for what it is – a scheme concocted by senior county bureaucrats to end run voter-enacted limits set by Propositions 13 and 218. From the legal perspective, the proponents' attorney appealed Judge Cohn's flawed decision the moment it was released. The matter is now in the hands of California's 4th District Court of Appeal. If Judge Cohn's decision is overturned, and it should be, Measure Z will be enacted and voters freed from this unjust tax."