

## Do As We Say & Not As We Do To Avoid A \$10K Fine, Upland Solons Tell Residents

*Clean up your own backyard  
Oh, don't you hand me none of your lines  
Clean up your own backyard  
You tend to your business; I'll tend to mine*  
-Elvis Presley

Twenty-three of 290 Upland residents whose properties are being encumbered by additional tax assessments that were selectively placed on them turned the tables on the Upland City Council this week, during a spontaneous rather than planned contesting of those offi-

cials' municipal authority.

Despite the efforts of the council members to brand two dozen of their constituents as scofflaws and impose on them what were labeled as "exorbitant" and "draconian" fines and penalties for their alleged failure to maintain their prop-

erty, some of those being singled out for the city's sanctions were able to marshal evidence to demonstrate that the city's public property – for which all five members of the council are at the ultimate level officially responsible – is being maintained in a state that is equally or more abysmal, in many cases, to their own.

According to the city, 290 primarily residential properties in the city at

one point or another this year were overgrown with weeds. Of those, as of last month 24 were yet out of compliance to the point that the city had contractors remove the vegetation deemed to not be in code or which was creating a potential fire hazard. Any property owner whose yard elicited the attention of city employees in this manner was immediately subjected to a \$72 fine. That would be the extent of it if the landowner rap-

idly complied with the city's demand that the weeds be removed. Those who tarried would see that cost escalate, and in some cases, escalate dramatically. Owners whose properties were cited and not immediately purged of the complained-about vegetation were subject to an initial \$72 citation fee, another \$72 posting fee, and thereafter a \$278 administrative fee or a \$350 non-compliance fee, abatement

See P 2

## Suit Filed Against Goldman Sachs Over Continuously Smoldering Desert Disposal Pit

Thirty-one residents of the High Desert, represented by two San Diego-based law firms, have sued Synagro Technologies and its corporate ownership, the American multinational investment bank Goldman Sachs, citing the environmental havoc from the fire in its unenclosed waste pit that has been burning out of control for close to two-and-a-half months.

On behalf of Cath-

erine A. Blevins, Barbara Bryson, Alice M. Carrigan, Theresa Carter, Judy Ceja, Guadalupe Ceja, Veronica Davila, Terry Deaton, Justine Dellavechia, April Evans, Mariah Evans, Patricia A. Evans, Andrea M. Figueroa, Jeff Gerhart, Norman Halstead, Delfina Harrell, Alexandra Hendley, James Hood, Brianna Hoody, Brooklyn Hoody, Erica Jackson, Dorothy Ann Jackson, Sean E. Mac-

Donald, Sandra Martin, Daniela Natale, John Natale, Carlos Ozuna, Helen Ozuna, Bryan Douglas Powers, Ilean Sanchez, and Lisa R. Sollars, attorneys Natasha N. Serino, Alexander M. Schack and Shannon F. Nocon of the Schack Law Group and Gregory J. Hout filed suit, alleging negligence, strict liability for ultrahazardous activity, trespass, public nuisance and private nuisance.

Named as defendants in the suit are Synagro Technologies, Inc. and Goldman Sachs Group, Inc., as well as Nursery Products, LLC and Synagro-WWT, I.

Beginning some 17 years ago, near the midway point of the first decade of the Third Millennium, Jeff Meberg, a wealthy resident of San Clemente, founded a company he called Nursery Products, Inc. and

scanned the Southern California horizon for a location where the political leadership would be lame enough to allow him to set up an operation to which he might import waste products originating from as far away as Rancho California, San Clemente, Santa Margarita, the South Orange County Wastewater Authority in Dana Point and Laguna, the Hyperion Plant in

See P 5

## West Valley Water District Now Free Of The Young-Taylor Clash That Recently Defined It

By Mark Gutglueck

As much as any political entity in San Bernardino County and far more than most, the West Valley Water District Board of Directors has over the last eight months undergone an orientational, organizational and compositional change.

Despite its size and status among far larger local governmental organizations and its rela-

tively confined function, over the last five years the West Valley Water District has proven to be the most politically contentious governmental operation in San Bernardino County.

The dynamics of the relationship between two of the district's leaders, which began amiably enough but devolved into a bitter enmity and power struggle, dominated the district. As of

last month, both of those personalities have left.

Clifford Young, who in 2004 served an abbreviated stint on the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors, was arguably the region's most influential African American Republican. An educator and administrator at Cal State San Bernardino, Young was elected to the West Valley Water District Board of Directors in 2013. One

of his neighbors was Mike Taylor, a law enforcement professional who had risen to the position of Baldwin Park police chief. He, too, was a Republican. Taylor, at Young's suggestion, ran for the West Valley board in 2015, but was unsuccessful. The board oversees the district, which provides water to some 80,000 residents in portions of Fontana, Rialto, Colton, Bloom-

ington and northern Riverside County. In 2017, with Young seeking reelection to the board, he joined forces with Taylor in a combined election campaign that proved successful for both.

In the aftermath of the 2015 departure of the district's general manager, Anthony "Butch" Araiza, who had guided the district for two decades, Young had sought to assert his

See P 3

## Woman, 40, Being Held For Murder & Carjacking After Apparent Lam Attempt To Mexico

Daniella Hess Prieto has gotten herself into a mess of trouble.

Previously, her affinity for methamphetamine had complicated her life. Nevertheless, her previous run-ins with the law generally extended to simple possession of drugs charges, primarily misdemeanors.

Earlier this year things escalated somewhat when she was arrested on a charge of

maintaining premises where drugs were sold or could be obtained.

Now she is charged with capital murder. The circumstance of her arrest would seem to indicate she was making a dash for the border, and was about to go underground in Mexico.

Now 40 years old, Daniella Maria Hess Prieto has been somewhat itinerant, moving around to different locations

mostly in San Bernardino County, departing for a different locale when elements of her lifestyle have caught up with her. Most recently, she was living in Wonder Valley, having gone there after she was accused of running a drug house in Big Bear.

Over the weekend, when members of her family had not heard from her, even after several attempts to reach

her by phone, one of those family members contacted the Morongo Basin Sheriff's Station, requesting that a welfare check on her be carried out. Deputies were dispatched to her latest known residence in the 7000 block of Nablee Road in Wonder Valley around 8:36 a.m. Sunday morning. As the deputies came up on the residence, they discovered a man, later identified as

56-year-old Gary Simrak of Wonder Valley, lying in the road. Simrak had sustained a gunshot wound and could not be revived. He was pronounced dead at the scene.

When deputies sought to raise Hess Prieto at her residence, she was not there.

Homicide investigators who were summoned in short order came to the

See P 12

## Matchups Set In All But A Few Of November Municipal Races

All but a few of this election season's mayoral and council races in San Bernardino County have shaped up as of today, with the elapsing of today's 5 p.m. across-the-board filing deadline for candidates in 21 of the county's 22 cities and both towns that are to hold municipal races in November. The lone exceptions are in those contests where the incumbent is not seeking election, which by law requires that the deadline be extended another five days, in this case until August 17.

Both Loma Linda and San Bernardino held their municipal elections in correspondence with the June 7 primary. The two incumbent councilmen who ran in Loma Linda, Phill Dupper and Ronald Dailey, prevailed, as did the three incumbent council members in San Bernardino, First Ward Councilman Ted Sanchez, Second Ward Councilwoman Sandra Ibarra and Fourth Ward Councilman Fred Shorett. Helen Tran and James Penman proved the top vote-getters in the seven-person race for mayor, and they are slated to go head-to-head in the final match-up in November.

Because the filing deadline fell so close to the *Sentinel's* deadline and because the cities of Chino Hills, Chino, Highland, Needles and Upland have not posted information with regard to their elections on their respective websites, the contestants in all of the races cannot presently be listed.

In Adelanto, Diana Emeralda, Tonya Edwards, Tracy Hernandez, Jacquelin Diaz, Roy Isaiah III, Dominic Cisneros, Edward C. Reyes and JayShawn Johnson are challenging

See P 3

## City Insists It Used A By-The-Book Enforcement Process; Upland Residents Dispute That *from front page*

costs equal to what the city contractor charged for removing the weeds from the property and an abatement supervision fee tacked on by the city. Multiple homeowners were hit with charges of \$700 or greater, several with charges exceeding \$800 and a handful sustained charges beyond that, approaching or exceeding in some cases \$10,000.

To levy those fines and assessments, the city council was required to hold a public hearing which gives property owners charged with abatement costs and/or administrative fees a chance to address the council prior to the council approving the list of assessments that city staff represents as intended to defray the costs of carrying out the inspections of the subject properties, citing the property owners and informing them of having to remove the unwanted vegetation, monitoring the property for compliance and, in those cases where the vegetation removal did not occur, bringing in a city contractor to effectuate the weed abatement.

Monday night the Upland City Council was due to accept a report on the city's annual weed abatement program and sign off on placing assessments on the properties of city residents the city's code enforcement division says it took abatement action against earlier this year.

City officials sought, and initially succeeded, in setting the frame of reference and defining the issue.

Under the guidance of Robert Dalquest, Upland's Director of Development Services, Julie Hernandez, the city's weed abatement coordinator, initially assured the city council that the city carries out its inspection, citation, reinspection, follow-up and abatement processes in a by-the-book fashion, giving those cited ample warning and adequate information to allow the

excessive vegetation to be removed prior to the abatement by the city contractor taking place, which entails greater expense for the property owner. She used a power point presentation which was visible to those within the council chambers as well as anyone viewing the meeting on the local cable network and on the city's website.

According to Hernandez, every inspection and notice was uniformly done for every property found to be out of compliance. That work, she said, was carried out without favoritism or bias.

"It was all the same for every property in Upland," she said.

The city council in February approved a resolution declaring what the city defined as "unmaintained" properties and those where fire hazards existed as code violations. On March 1, Hernandez said, the city initiated inspections of properties. A file was opened on properties deemed to be in violation and the property owners were given a ten-day timeframe to bring the properties into compliance, followed by a site inspection. That action triggered a minimum \$72 charge to the property owner, she said.

Residents were given adequate warning of the program and an explanation of the standards the city was applying, Hernandez said. "The residents were notified by the city website, the [City Hall] marquee, social media," she said. "Also, a notice was included in all water or utility bills that were sent for residents in the City of Upland. That was the first notification that inspections would be starting in the city. On March 26, I held a public education meeting at the Carnegie Building, just so that anybody that got a notice, if they had any questions, I was there to personally answer any questions they might have."

If the properties were at that point considered to be in compliance, she said, the case was considered to be closed. If compliance with the city's code was not achieved, she said, photos of the violations and further notation of the situation was

made in the case file for that property not brought into compliance. At a council meeting on June 13, the council declared non-compliant properties as hazards and requested the abatement of fire hazards and nuisances.

Abatements were initiated June 14, with site inspections and postings on the property occurring before the abatement was begun, Hernandez said.

"Site inspection and postings before abatement were done," Hernandez said. "If the violations were corrected, then the case was closed. So, at the posting time, we went up to every door and knocked and were able to meet with most people to let them know that an abatement was going to happen. If they weren't available at the time of posting, then we posted the notice on their door."

From June 18 until July 24, she said, abatements were completed on 24 properties.

As a result, she said, those cited whose properties were abated were subject to an initial \$72 citation fee, another \$72 inspection fee; a \$278 administrative fee to cover the cost of taking photos, updating the file and preparing a report for the city council.

Thus, according to Hernandez, the lion's share of those caught up in the code enforcement action with regard to weed abatement were being fined \$422.

"There are invoices for \$422," she said. "This amount includes the initial \$72 and an additional \$72 for the second inspection, a \$278 administrative fee that includes the case update, photos, the council report preparation. If the property was in compliance at this time, then the case was closed. So, there will be \$422 invoices. Because the violation existed there, there are administrative fees for the notice and the photos and things that happen after."

Ultimately, if further action was required, another \$72 posting fee was levied, along with a \$350 non-compliance fee, as well as abatement costs and abatement supervision costs, Hernandez said.

"Any invoice over the \$422 includes the \$72

initial inspection fee, then \$350 for the second inspection and the non-compliance, then there was a \$72 posting fee," Hernandez said. "We actually conducted an inspection at the time of posting to let the people know that we were going to come out to do the abatement, so that's \$72 for that. On each of the abatements I was present just to make sure that what we were requesting was done and if there were any questions from the property owner or any concerns. I was there to answer them, and it wasn't just the contractor. I was there at every one of the abatements."

"Today, we're here for the final city council meeting where we're asking permission to place the fees and administrative costs on the property taxes," Hernandez said. "A total of 290 properties were assessed. In 2019, there were 376 properties assessed. I just wanted to make sure you had that information so that you understood this was how the process was throughout, for every case that we had."

During the public hearing, 23 people were heard from, 21 who were present in the council chambers and two who spoke by phone.

Many disputed what Hernandez said. Some claimed that they had been given less than clear indication of what the lack of compliance they were cited for entailed and they claimed they were not given explicit instructions as to what they needed to do. Others said they had removed the weeds or made the corrections requested but that the city had not acknowledged that they had done so. Others said they were unable to make contact with city employees in the aftermath of receiving the notices, despite making efforts to do so.

Doug Mullane said he was intent on contesting the fine against his property of \$10,928.03.

"I got my first and only notice in April," Mullane said. "I called in to get some feedback on the notice. The only call I got back from them, in that call they pretty much responded in the same way that code enforce-

## 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

ment has in that, 'As long as you make progress on the work, that's great. You won't be fined.' I made sure to ask, 'Can I call you back to get feedback on my property to get support, to find out what I need to work more on, what I need to focus more on?' From April to late June, I called seven times. I left six messages and never heard one response. Because I heard nothing back, I had no idea I was not doing enough. As a result of all of this stuff they did on my property, you killed at a minimum at least 24 of my fruit trees, in containers and in the ground, big healthy fruit trees, destroyed a lot of my property. Some things, really, had nothing to do with weed abatement. Throwing away a big picnic table? How is that weed abatement? What gives the city, this forum, the right to destroy my property, to kill my fruit trees? What does that have to do with weed abatement?"

Mullane added, "The fine of \$10,000 plus is way excessive."

Michael Gillooly, who came to the podium with his wife Sandra, told the council that he and his wife had just moved to Upland in December 2021. He said notices had come to his home in the name of the previous property owner.

"We never once got a notice," Gillooly said. "It was all sent to the old property owner."

He said he the property was posted on June 17, after which he said he used his weed eater to take out a shrub in his front yard. "I emailed Ms. Hernandez several times," Gillooly said, displaying several sheets of

paper in his hand. "I have all of the correspondence right here. I even copied the mayor, city council, and no one returns my call or memorializes their comments in an email. I find it a bit disingenuous when Ms. Hernandez suggests she is returning or being open in assisting the folks here in the City of Upland when in fact I never got a return email. No one could have just responded and told me how I can redress this or how I can fix this?"

Gillooly questioned Hernandez's representations and veracity.

"She mentions that the information that we're supposed to have our weed abatement squared away via our notices for our water bill, but I've got two months' worth of water bills here and not a single mention is listed on there about weed abatement," Gillooly said. "I'm hopeful that someone can identify where that is. My wife was there, too, the day that you folks showed up with your vendors, and they were literally there for two minutes. I was talking to my wife because I was at work. She says that Ms. Hernandez was not there. It just seems there are too many holes with respect to the process and how all this went down."

Gillooly said he wanted to contest the \$700 fee he and his wife had been hit with less than a year after moving to the city. "It's an overreach," he said.

Hernandez and Dalquest had the use of the city's photo- and video-display system and overhead projectors to assist them in their presentation. They were able to present

*Continued on Page 3*

### Cliff Young & Mike Taylor Were Originally Political Allies from front page

leadership. The election of Taylor, with whom he was aligned, made it possible, at least initially, for Young to achieve his goal. Less than month after the election and even before Taylor was sworn in, the two – alpha male types both – sought to make the district over into their image. Initially each cooperated with and went along with the

other's designs.

Young, Taylor and their two Republican allies on the board, Greg Young (who is no blood relation to Cliff Young) and Kyle Crowther, moved at once to purge the district of those who had earlier obstructed Clifford Young's agenda, those being District General Manager Matthew Litchfield; Assistant General Manager Greg Gage; the district's human resources manager, Karen Logue; the board's secretary, Shanae Smith;

and Chief Financial Officer Marie Ricci. The only Democrat on the board, Don Olinger, had been the lone dissident in those sackings.

Taylor, for his part, was able to obtain to key appointments/hirings at West Valley that fit his intentions: the hiring of Baldwin Park City Attorney Robert Tafoya as the district's general counsel as well as of Baldwin Park City Councilman Ricardo Pacheco into a lucrative and essentially do-nothing assignment

as one of the district's assistant general managers.

For a time, there was a honeymoon between Young and Taylor as they erected their empire, one in which public money provided by ratepayers and taxpayers could be used to intensify cronyism and assist in achieving political objectives unrelated to the district. But inevitably, fissures in their relationship widened, and less than a year after Taylor's election he used his Repub-

lican ally on the board – Crowther – to form a crossover alliance with the sole Democrat on the board – Olinger – to depose Young as board president and insert himself into that position. From that point on, Taylor began to exploit his leadership position to hire into existing and newly created district positions political functionaries such as then-Hesperia City Councilman and one-time San Bernardino County Republican Party Executive

Director Jeremiah Brosowski. While serving in those sinecures – as in Brosowski's case assistant general manager – Taylor's allies were able to engage in a host of activities supporting the political advancement of those aligned with Taylor. Simultaneously, those high-paying positions would be used as rewards to others who had engaged in past efforts to advance the agenda of Taylor, his allies and the

*Continued on Page 12*

### Most Matchups For November Municipal Races Are Set from front page

incumbents Daniel Ramos and Joy Jeannette for their positions on the city council.

It does not appear that Mayor Gabriel Reyes has filed for reelection, which has extended the filing deadline until next Friday.

In Apple Valley, incumbent Councilman Scott Nassif, who was last elected to the town council at-large in 2018, is the only person who had pulled papers to run for mayor in what is to be the first direct mayoral vote in the town's 34-year history. Until now, the mayor has been chosen from among the five members of the council. Kari Leon, who was elected at-large to the council in 2018, is seeking election to the council in its recently created District 3. Also running for the District 3 post is Xochiti Baker. Curt Emick, last elected to the council at-large in 2018, is running for election in the town's District 4. Running against him is Matthew Rutledge. Nassif, Leon and Emick filed their nomination papers and the registrar of voters office has verified that the required number of voter endorsements of their candidacies. The registrar has yet to verify the signatures of the signatories on Baker's and Rutledge's filings.

In Barstow, Tim Silva, the incumbent councilman in District 1 is not seeking reelection. That has extended the filing deadline in that race until August 19. Carmen Hernandez and Martha O'Brien have pulled papers and qualified their candidacies to replace Silva. Kelly Parker has pulled papers but the

signatures endorsing his/her candidacy had not yet been verified as of 5 p.m. today.

In Barstow's District 2, incumbent James Noble has qualified his candidacy in this year's election as has his challenger, Terri Peralta.

In Big Bear Lake, incumbent Councilman Rick Herrick, who is currently serving as the city's appointed mayor, has qualified his candidacy in the city's District 2. He is being challenged by Omar Torres Cazares and Kirk Seigel, whose candidacies had yet to be certified through the confirmation of the signatures endorsing them. Incumbent District 3 Councilman Randall Putz has qualified his candidacy for this year's race as has Paul Sokoloff, who is opposing him. Kirk Seigel pulled papers to run in District 3, but had not qualified his candidacy as of this afternoon. Appointed incumbent Councilwoman Perri Melnick has qualified her candidacy in District 4. She will face Robert Barton and Cory Blake Micholich if they succeed in getting their candidacies qualified.

A recall against District 1 Councilman Alan Lee has been qualified for the November ballot. Kendi Segovia and Jim Eakin are vying against one another in the race to replace Lee, if indeed District 1's voters choose to remove him from office.

In Chino, Marc Lucio is running to remain on the council representing District 3. It has not been disclosed whether any other candidates are seeking the position. The candidate filing deadline for the District 2 position on the council is extended

to August 17, 2022 at 5:30 pm pursuant to California Elections Code Section 10225 since the incumbent, Walt Pocock, is not running. It is known that Greg Marquez is running in District 2.

In Chino Hills, Ray Marquez in District 1, Peter Rogers in District 2, and Brian Johsz in District 4 are seeking reelection. The city clerk's office has not disclosed who is running against them.

In Fontana, incumbent Mayor Acquanetta Warren is being challenged by Councilman Jesse Sandoval, who had not qualified his candidacy as of 5 p.m. today and Shannon O'Brien, whose candidacy is qualified. In District 1, incumbent Councilman Phillip Cothran Jr. is being challenged by Alfred Gonzales, whose candidacy has been qualified, and Ricardo Quintana, whose candidacy is awaiting verification. In District 4, incumbent John Roberts is facing Brian Kolde, whose candidacy was awaiting certification as of 5 p.m. today.

In Hesperia, Councilman Bill Holland is not seeking reelection, which has extended the filing period until August 17.

Cameron Gregg is seeking reelection in District 3, as is Brigit Bennington in District 4.

No information was available about the council race in Highland, where District 2 Councilwoman Anaëli Solano's and District 4 Councilman John Timmer's current terms end this year.

In Montclair Mayor John Dutrey will fend off a challenge by Oscar Miranda in November. Incumbent Councilwoman Corysa Martinez and Councilman Bill Ruh are being challenged by Juliet

Orozco and Xavier Mendez.

Information on candidates in Needles, where the two-year term of Mayor Jeff Williams is to end and the four-year terms of Zachery Longacre, Ed Paget and Wade Evans will come to a close, is not available.

In Ontario, Mayor Paul Leon is facing challenges from Councilman Ruben Valencia and Christian Garcia. Councilmen Alan Wapner and Jim Bowman are seeking reelection in the face of challenges by Celina Lopez, Norberto Corona and Aaron Bratton.

In Rancho Cucamonga, it appears that Mayor Lloyd D. Michael is unopposed for mayor.

Incumbent District 2 Councilwoman Kristine Scott is being challenged by David VanGorden and Joanne Nursall, both of whom have qualified their candidacies.

It appears that Third District incumbent Ryan Hutchison is unopposed

In District 1, where those vying will be elected to a shortened two-year to fill out the term to which the late Sam Spagnolo was elected in 2020, Floyd Clark and Mary Hannah have

qualified their candidacies and Erick Jimenez, Lawrence Henderson, Ashley Stickler and Rose Stephen Olmsted have taken out papers but the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters Office verification of the signatures endorsing their candidacies was pending at press time.

In Redlands, First District Councilwoman Denise Davis is being challenged by Rodgir Cohen, whose candidacy has been qualified, as well as Andrew Hoder and Tom Berg, who are awaiting a determination by the registrar of voters that the signatories of their candidacy papers are indeed registered voters in District 1.

In Redlands' District 3, the incumbent appointed councilman, Mick Gallagher, is not seeking reelection. The filing period for the District 3 post is extended until August 17, while Mario Saucedo has qualified his candidacy and Mike Saifee is awaiting qualification.

Incumbent District 5 Councilman Paul Barich is facing no opposition.

In Rialto, Councilman Ed Scott and Councilwoman Karla Perez are being challenged by Joe

Baca, Andrew Seyfried and Kelly Erving.

In Twentynine Palms, where District 3 Councilman Dan Mintz, District 4 Councilwoman and current Mayor Kamollette O'Gilvie and District 5 Councilman McArthur are up for reelection this year, information on who has qualified for this year's contest is not available.

In Upland, it is known that Second District Councilwoman Janice Elliot, Third District Councilman Carlos Garcia and Fourth District Councilman Rudy Zuniga are intent on seeking reelection, but there is no information available about whether anyone has qualified candidacies in opposition to them.

In Yucaipa, District 1 Councilman David Avila and District 2 Councilman Greg Bogh are scheduled to stand for reelection. The city clerk has not released any information relating to those races.

In the Town of Yucca Valley, James Schooler's term as District 1 council member is coming to a close this year as is that of District 3 Councilman Merl Abel.

*-Mark Gutglueck*

### Upland Council Didn't Blink At Levying \$10K Fine On Homeowner Over Yard Weeds from page 2

visual evidence of what they said were code violations and excessive weed growth at several properties in the form of photos. Those photos were visible on the overhead monitors in the council chamber, but were not displayed on the video broadcast on the

local cable channels or on the city's website. Several of the residents who spoke before the council brought with them photographic evidence intended to show the progress they had made in responding to the citations they had received.

Those addressing the council had three minutes to present their case. The city counted against those three minutes the time the residents had to expend in presenting their photographic evidence, which

was displayed on the overhead projectors within the council chambers. Despite that, the viewers of the video broadcast both on local cable channels and on the city's website were not able to see that evidence on their viewing screens. This, to some degree, undercut the case those residents were making. In real time, during the meeting, the Sentinel by text message pointed out to Councilman Carlos Garcia and Councilwoman

*Continued on Page 4*

## During Hearing, Upland Council Kept Evidence Contrary To The City's Case Hidden From The Public Viewing The Meeting By Video from page 3

an Janice Elliott that the video viewers were being deprived of the visual displays. No effort was made by the city, however, to adjust the broadcast to provide the home viewers or website viewers with that photographic evidence.

Adam Pone told the council, "A lot of people here are a little bit confused on how to correct it, because we have removed the weed[s]. We have a parcel that's out in front, maybe like 200-to-300-square feet of it. We cleared it. It's kind of like half-an-inch from the ground. It's clean, unless you want us to take out the topsoil. I don't know what else to do. It's not creating a pest situation or some type of vermin or anything like that. Are we supposed to completely like gut it? I think it's a lot of confusion that's going on and miscommunication. I think as residents of Upland we should be given the opportunity to just correct this effectively. There is nothing that's clear enough to say what we need to do. There's some kind of breakdown in communication here. That's what I'm hearing from other residents, too. We are in a drought. We're in the middle of a pandemic. We're not trying to flagrantly create any problems for the city or what have you here."

Glenda Tharp said, "I received a preliminary notice in the mail. Never had anybody come to my house on my yard. The weeds were mostly taken care of. They were all taken care. I am a handicapped senior citizen, and I am out there digging weeds. I talked to Ms. Hernandez and she said as long as the weeds weren't over three inches. When I got the second one for the fine, I had one visible weed. I did find another one over three inches, but it was not where it could be seen. I have pictures of my house. She probably does, too. I do have rocks in my yard. I also have a quote here to put artificial grass in my front yard. I'm waiting on a quote for drought-tolerant

landscaping. This will be taken care. Other than that weed right there," she said, referring to a photo that was visible on the overhead projector in the council chambers but which was not visible in the video broadcast on the city's cable outlets or on the city's website. "There are no weeds over three inches tall. For comparison, there is a neighbor who has weeds like this," she said, indicating another photo the city did not display within the video, "who did not get anything. My yard will be fixed. I think the fine is unfair, since I have one weed that is over three inches."

Theresa Litwinski said, "I'm a schoolteacher. I was home the whole time and, you know, no one came to my house. They supposedly did weed abatement. I don't know what they did, because I was there. I don't know what happened to you, Julie. I didn't get to see you."

Litwinski continued, "Now, admittedly, we had wind problems in January, and I have to redo my fence. Finally got somebody to come give me a quote. This is the way it happened: The first letter, I made sure there was no weeds. I even left a message: 'I will make sure it's all taken care of.' Then a second one. I guess I didn't meet the requirement. So, I called, left a message, saying, 'What else do you want from me? I don't know what's missing. Admittedly, the fence is coming down, but it's going to have a new one up in two weeks. I called and left messages. On the recording, it now says, 'If I don't get a hold of you, I will think the problem is resolved.' No one's called me. I have no missed calls. I was home from June 1 until August 1, and I stayed at home because of COVID, and I made sure and I tried to take care of things. We're talking about 36 feet. I do not want to be charged \$703, especially [since] someone supposedly came and took care of the weeds. What weeds? I took care of them all

myself. I bought my own weed whacker. I do not feel the \$703.12 should be charged to me. There's no weeds on the ground. The ivy is dying because I'm trying to kill it with the weed whacker."

Paul Furness said, "All I got was this letter. No photos. No previous knock on the door or notice on the door. We called the number. No response. I'm surprised. This is dated July 21. I don't know when this property was deemed to be unacceptable, but we've had a gardener for over three months now. I have pictures that I can show."

Upon showing photos of his front and side yard, Furness said, "I'm not really sure what's the matter with this. If you can point it out, I'd be interested."

Furness then launched a full frontal attack on the integrity of the city.

Displaying another photo, which the city once again did not include in the cable broadcast of the meeting or the city website broadcast of the meeting, he said, "I also took a picture here of Mountain Avenue, a pile of pine needles that are a part of the Upland area that you guys are responsible for. I felt like that was way more dangerous than my property. I think you would probably agree if you look at that picture. I'm miffed and stunned."

Emerson Levitt said, "We believe we received this letter in error because we don't have weeds in our yard."

To refute Levitt, Hernandez displayed on the council chamber's visual display monitors a photo of a home. That photo was not visible to those watching the video on the local cable channels or the city's website.

Levitt retorted, "That's not our house."

He then displayed on the chamber monitors a photo of his home. "That is our house with very, very little to no weeds. I have a letter from my gardener, which tells me that he takes care of like 80 percent of the weeds, and I do the other maybe 20 percent. When we called about it, we left a message that said we'd get a call back in two days, which is a common theme, I guess, and we didn't receive a call back. We're

asking that this be waived because it's the wrong house."

If Furness had landed a gut punch that knocked the wind out of the city council, Edward Bobich landed a series of head shots that left the five members either on their backs on the canvas counting lights or against the ropes.

Dr. Bobich, who has a PhD in biology from UCLA and is a professor at Cal Poly Pomona, told the city council, "I am a plant ecologist. I have also eight years landscaping experience before I got my PhD. In April, we received a notice, with pictures, stating that we had violated the weed abatement program or at least the goals of the weed abatement program. We weren't sure how. So, I did contact Julie [Hernandez] and she stated that it wasn't weeds that were the issue. It was the access to the house by the fire department, which is something that I had never heard before."

Displaying photos that were visible to those in physical attendance at the meeting but which were not displayed in the video broadcast on the city's cable networks or the city's website, Bobich said, "I don't know how easily you can see my house there, but that was in April. There aren't nearly as many plants there now

but we have our sidewalks completely clear. There are spaces between all of the plants."

Displaying more photographs, Bobich said, "They could easily walk to the front of the house. This is the side of the house. This is the drive leading up. This is the back here. This is the front of the house showing a completely cleared area in front. So, I'm kind of confused. I went and I trimmed shrubs. I didn't hear anything. We received another notice on July 21. This one didn't have any explanation as to why we would receive this. I don't know if we were ever charged before or not. So, now I'm kind of confused. If it's about weeds, I don't know. We have tiny little weeds in our yard, spurge that don't grow more than a couple of inches tall. We had poppies in our yard. Those are not weeds."

At that point, Bobich put some further photos on display, ones which again could be seen on the overhead monitors by all of those within the council chambers but not by those viewing the meeting from their homes on the local networks or by means of the video on the city's website. He then let the city council members have it square on their jaws.

"Here's some pictures I took, though, of Moun-

es that are in my yard. Basically, what I'd like to say is that the weed abatement program is kind of a joke if the City of Upland is not taking care of the weeds like in Green Belt Park or in any other area."

Kevin Maloncon displayed a photo of the city-owned property near the 10 Freeway near the sidewalk on an unspecified street.

"My house had weeds," Maloncon acknowledged. "I went and bought a brand new cordless grass trimmer, mower and one of those backpack things with the weed [whacker], so I could kill it because I used the salt and vinegar, [which] didn't work. So, I had to get the pool acid. Then I get another notice, and I'm like, 'Why is that?' So, I look at the ordinance, and it says that if you get rid of your weeds, you'll be good. But then if you have dead grass and dirt, you're still in violation. I can't win."

Maloncon paused. "I think you guys should reevaluate this," he continued. "As you can see, everybody's kind of upset that Upland's got weeds running up and down the city and you want us to pay for the guys to come out and look at our house. No one ever came out to my house. I did all the work."

Darrell Medina said, "I received a notice a few months back. It talked



**Lactuca serriola, otherwise known as wild lettuce, is growing out of control to heights of more than three feet, surrounded by an inches-thick layer of highly combustible pine needles on city property along Mountain Avenue. Photo: Mark Gutglueck**

because the flowers are gone."

He then switched to a different photo, which again was not visible to those viewing the video. "I have a picture of it today," he said. "I don't know what kind of access the fire department needs,

tain Avenue going up to 16th Street in property that is owned by the city," Bobich said. "These are weeds that are three feet tall. They're Lactuca serriola, which is wild lettuce. There's also pine needles all over the place. These are the same spurge-

about weeds and trash in the yard. I didn't really have weeds and trash in the yard. So, I called. They said, 'It was some of your plants are sort of overgrown.' So, I went out and trimmed them and never heard another

*Continued on Page 6*

## Proponent Was Able To Set Up Substandard Composting Plant At A Remote Desert Location By Paying Off Current & Former County Politicians *from front page*

Los Angeles, Carson, Van Nuys, Corona, Redlands, Rialto, Morongo, Cabazon, Riverside, Beaumont, Mira Loma, Chino, Lake Arrowhead and Big Bear, as well as Adelanto, Barstow, Lancaster, Palmdale, Harper Lake and Moorpark, and there set up a composting facility. The waste products were to include all order of organic materials, green waste such as tree and grass trimmings, as well as sewage system byproducts, euphemistically referred to as “half biosolids,” which are nothing more than partially-treated human waste.

Meberg settled upon the City of Adelanto, which had a history of dysfunctional city councils he believed he could buffalo into approving his plan. When Adelanto officials resisted after a small but vocal band of the city’s residents took stock of what Meberg was attempting to do, he shifted gears, resolving to grease San Bernardino County’s politicians, correctly calculating that by doing so he could get clearance to proceed at a more remote location.

Meberg made generous donations to the then-members of the board of supervisors, including Brad Mitzelfelt, Josie Gonzales, Gary Ovitt, Paul Biane and later and Janice Rutherford. As a consequence, the board gave Meberg permission to proceed with the waste processing and sludge-to-agricultural-grade-composting operation at a location in the east Mojave Desert at 14479 Cougar Road in Helendale, which is roughly eight miles from Helendale and eight miles from Hinkley and approximately 17 miles from Barstow.

That permission was given despite penetrating questions that were raised with regard to environmental concerns. The Center for Biological Diversity, an environmental group, stepped in to assist HelpHinkley.org, a group dedicated to fighting environmental issues on behalf of Hinkley residents, in an effort to derail the

project.

While the Center for Biological Diversity prevailed with regard to several issues pertaining to environmental considerations and succeeded in getting judgments in its favor, Nursery Products again and again neglected to make good on paying the judgments against it granted by the judges who heard the suits brought against the company, which included the requirement that it pay to cover the Center for Biological Diversity’s and HelpHinkley.org’s legal expenses.

Even though Nursery Products lost those battles, it won the war. Meberg, pleading financial hardship, claimed to San Bernardino County’s supervisors, who were inclined to listen to him because of his generosity toward them and their electioneering funds, that his company could not pay for the mitigations that the environmentalists wanted in the design of the facility. One of those mitigations was putting a cover over the open-air waste pit that was the main feature of the plant.

Consequently, those design modifications that should have been logically applied were not incorporated into the plant because of the cost.

The facility was permitted to process 400,000 “wet tons” of material annually.

Unbeknownst to many people, the incineration of a portion of the waste products that are trucked to the facility has always been a part of the plant’s operation.

It is less than clear how much material actually comes to the facility and how much compost goes out. Whatever those totals, far greater tonnages came in than a final product for use as compost was being created. What has long been ongoing is that the waste was simply dumped into a huge 80-acre hole in the ground. The vast majority of the material deposited there would dry out through evaporation in the hot desert environment, at

which point it would be ignited. This represented the so-called processing the plant was credited with performing.

The problem is the oxidation of the material – its burning – created noxious smoke. Moreover, substances which were not supposed to be present in the waste material, including chemicals, plastics, inorganics and pharmaceuticals, as well as organic byproducts such as non-edible vegetable derivatives, fruit derivatives or meat derivatives, were dropped into the waste pit. Upon being burned, pollutants would be released into the atmosphere.

In November 2016, Synagro Technologies, Inc. acquired Nursery Products from Meberg.

In 2020, Synagro Technologies Inc. was acquired by Goldman Sachs.

The management at the plant – whether it was under Nursery Products, Synagro or Goldman Sachs – was engaging in all of this unpermitted activity without the knowledge or consent of the Mojave Air Quality Management District. A calculation was that the remote location of the facility allowed such environmental crimes to go undetected. That calculation was relatively accurate. Nevertheless, those who lived close to the plant or downwind of it or who commuted through the area became aware of what was going on.

For quite some time, there were occasional complaints lodged about odors or smoke emanating from the plant. In the past there may have been instances where the fires in the waste pit defied, at least for a time, control and could not be doused. Eventually, though, they would be put out, in all known cases, in less than two weeks.

At some precisely unknown time, probably the last week of May of this year, a fire was lit in the pit that has yet to be contained.

Though the operations there previously were conducted outside official governmental scrutiny, since May 28 it has been widely known that the open-air pit has been on fire, with smoke pouring

out of it, detectable, depending on wind conditions and visibility, as far away as Barstow.

There were 167 complaints about the smoke, odor and hazard from the smoldering feces and organics mix in June. So far this year, despite the facility being in a relatively obscure section of the desert, it has attracted more complaints to the Air Quality Management District than any other single entity or facility.

In June, the Mojave Air Quality Management District issued a citation, coupled with an order that Synagro extinguish the fire in the pit. The company did not comply.

On August 4 Serino, Schack, Nocon and Hout filed suit on behalf of their 31 clients, alleging that the “Defendants have operated the facility in an unreasonable, unsafe and dangerous condition,” such that the operation “has been out of compliance with state and county regulations and contained dangerous conditions that posed a foreseeable risk of harm to plaintiffs. Among other things, the facility has repeatedly accepted excessive waste tonnage beyond the daily maximum... processed unpermitted forms of waste, allowed waste and litter to accumulate on its property, and engaged in unpermitted off-site dumping. The conditions at the facility were inherently dangerous, created sanitary risks, and pose a continuous threat, annoyance, nuisance and harm to the public. Despite knowledge of the dangerous conditions that existed at the waste facility, defendants failed to disclose this information to plaintiffs or the public. Defendants also failed to take any steps to correct the conditions.”

According to the suit, “On or around May 28, 2022, an uncontrolled fire began at the facility. As result of said fire and the other dangerous conditions at the facility, the facility has and continues to emit smoke, noxious or offensive gases, odors, pollutants, toxins, physical or particulate matter, contaminants and/or chemicals within at least a 25-mile radius surrounding the Nursery Products Hawes Com-

posting Facility.”

According to the suit, “Plaintiffs have been subjected to noxious air from pollutants, chemicals, particulate matter, contaminants and toxins caused by the fire and by defendants’ failure to maintain the facility in a reasonably safe condition. The exposure to the smoke, noxious or offensive gases, odors, pollutants, toxins, physical or particulate matter, contaminants and/or chemicals, has caused significant injuries to plaintiffs including but not limited to breathing problems, chest tightness, burning eyes, headaches, nausea, sinus issues, coughing and/or a myriad of other illnesses.”

Serino, Schack, Nocon and Hout maintain that “Due to the nature of the waste processed at the facility and the contaminants involved, defendants’ operation of the waste facility is an ultrahazardous activity. If not operated in a reasonably safe manner, there is a foreseeable risk of harm to the surrounding public. Since at least January 2022, defendants have been operating the facility in an unreasonably dangerous manner. This includes accepting excessive waste, failing to control fires at the facility, improperly dumping waste off site, putting mixed waste and unpermitted waste into the composting pit, allowing waste and litter to gather on the property, processing unacceptable forms of waste, and operating the facility in a manner that causes smoke, noxious or offensive gases, odors, pollutants, toxins, physical or particulate matter, contaminants and/or chemicals to emanate into the surrounding area and enter the properties of plaintiffs.”

Furthermore, according to the suit, “As a result of defendants’ failure to operate the facility in a reasonably safe manner, the waste pit caught fire on or around May 28, 2022 and has since fueled embers, smoke and emissions in the area surrounding the facility. It has resulted in extreme noxious air for areas within 25 miles from the facility and beyond, including in Hinkley. The

conditions at the facility and their effect on the surrounding area have also fueled complaints of ailments by members of the public who live and/or work in the areas surrounding the facility. Residents in this area have reported pungent and unbearable odors, smoke and matter in the air. There have also been reports of headaches, nausea, respiratory problems and animal illness. The facility has a history of dangerous conditions and ignoring State regulations. As further alleged herein, throughout 2022, defendants have repeatedly violated State laws and regulations and have been cited for violations multiple times by government agencies, including but not limited to the County of San Bernardino and the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District. In violation of California Public Resources Code § 44002, the facility received more than the maximum daily tonnage of 2,000 wet tons on multiple occasions between April 2022 and June 2022. According to a San Bernardino County Environmental Health Services report (filed June 24), defendants exceeded the intake limit on multiple occasions before the fire started, including multiple times the week of the fire. Alleged intake violations occurred on April 1, 5, 6, 7, and 11, 2022 and on May 10, 12, 17, 20, 24, 25 and 26, 2022.”

The suit maintains, “Defendants have also processed and continue to process unacceptable forms of waste. Between November 2020 and April 2022, the County of San Bernardino cited the facility for approximately 39 health and safety code violations. Among one of the repeated violations was defendants’ practice of contaminating its pit with unpermitted forms of waste including mixed waste, raw sewage, industrial materials, mixed demolition and construction debris, plastics, food material and/or brewery waste. The facility, however, is only allowed to accept two forms of waste: biosolids and green materials. On information and belief, de-

*Continued on Page 12*

## Compliance Officer's Narrative Shifted As Questions About Cited Residents' Inability To Get City Feedback Were Posed *from page 4*

thing. I thinned some of this out and then I got another notice. So, since then I have taken the honeysuckles, which I had planted because we were low on bees and I thought I'd plant those. So, anyway, they're gone. The plants out in the parkway – the only thing you can get to grow out in the parkway is succulents and a couple of palms. They seem to be doing well. I don't think they look bad. Like everyone else, I just want to know what to do. Just tell me what to do. If someone would've left a note on my door – no one left a note on my door; if they said, 'These trees, get rid of them,' okay, I would have got rid of them. But now you guys want \$480? No one's came out and no one's trimmed anything. I've cut everything down myself. Now, I've got to plant new plants because I think I may have overcut, because I really wasn't sure of what people wanted. I think that's why everybody's here. Everybody talks about, 'Oh, yeah, we left notes on the door.' I never got a note on the door. I got two letters in the mail. The honeysuckles are gone. I just got the house repainted. [I'm] redoing the fence on the alleyway in the back. I'm putting a lot of money into the house. I don't mind [fixing] things that are not in code. Like everyone else, I just want to know what to do."

James Bean said, "I got my first notice in May. Shortly thereafter, we took care of the problem. We sent a voice mail plus pictures to the weed abatement people. We thought that it was all over and never heard back from them, never got a second notice. [I] walked out of my door a couple months later and I've got a posting on the front door. So, I called them back, finally got through to them, and said I'd like somebody to come out and show me what needs to be done on an issue I thought was already taken care of. Nobody ever came out. I got another notice, and just got one here in July that said they've abated

the problem and I've got other charges which I don't understand because nobody ever came out. All of my calls and all my emails have gone unanswered. Maybe one of you guys up their ought to do what they call an undercover boss and call weed abatement just to see what the whole program's about, because I'm telling you, they're a tough group to get a hold of. It's not that we don't want to take care of the problem, it's just that we need a little help to understand what you guys need. I think you need a little tuning up on this program."

Lisa Mayoral said "We never did receive a notice on any type of doors to do whatever we needed to do."

She noted that a tree on a neighboring property had been blown down and landed on property owned by her mother earlier this year.

While Hernandez

pulled it off. We are renovating that property. Right now, we are planting on the hill, but it does take time to renovate a property. We gutted the whole unit. That would be the last part of it. We are just requesting that you look over this and waive the fee that is going to be attached to her property tax."

Cynthia Zubiati told the city council, "There was no notice sent to us. There was nothing with our bill. There was no notice sent. Nobody came to our house. There was no notice left on the door. The only notice we have is this notice we received. You see the date is July 21 and it's addressed to my father-in-law, who doesn't live with us. So, I know it is illegal to open somebody else's mail. We didn't open it until he was able to come over and open that. So, we had no idea that this was an issue."

Zubiati's husband, Randy Griffin, referenced the photos of the property in question that were on display on the overhead monitors which were visible in the council cham-

cleaning up and maintaining. There are six palm trees that were put on our property prior to us moving in. About four weeks after we moved in, they got into our pipes, and we had a flood in the home. We ended up having to pay \$25,000 to get everything taken care of. Since then, we've really been on our Ps and Qs when it comes to the property."

James Donaldson told the council, "I am frustrated by the fact that I did my best to comply with the original notice that I received, did not receive a follow-up notice detailing the findings of the re-inspection. I received no knock on my door. I don't profess to be the smartest guy in the world, but based on the information that I was given, I took the necessary steps to be compliant and apparently just can't crack the code that was embedded in my initial notice. It's also upsetting to receive a letter of this nature on a Thursday afternoon when City Hall is closed on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. The office of weed abatement will not return your

ers that be will not only address the issue of weed abatement fees but what I perceive to be a certain ineptitude as to how the weed abatement department handles its affairs."

In reaction to the public statements, members of the council questioned Hernandez about some of the specific cases and her general representations.

At that point, Hernandez marshaled evidence to support the city's action, and she offered for public view photos of one specific property that appeared to be a particularly egregious case. Those photos were visible on the video broadcast to the cable subscribers in the city and the one posted on the city's website.

As Hernandez was subjected to less-than-exacting questioning by the council, discrepancies became apparent between Hernandez's earlier insistence of a thorough and meticulously documented code enforcement and abatement process and her description of how the process was carried out.

"Do you take a photo of the completion of the project?" Maust asked Hernandez at one point.

"Yes," said Hernandez.

"So, all the photos we saw tonight are prior," said Maust. "You also have photos of their completed yards that you could show us?"

"Right," said Hernandez.

"So, every address that we pulled up that we saw the before [photos], every address you have after [photos]?" Maust asked.

"Not all of them," Hernandez acknowledged.

"Do you go back to the property after to spot check and say, 'Okay, they're clear' and then you do not photograph it?" Maust asked.

"No, I just put 'Closed. Complied.'" Hernandez said.

"Is that per our city or your program?" Maust asked.

"Based just on the fact that there is no guideline on that," Hernandez said. "I would [make a conclusion of] 'close and complied' once I saw the violation was taken care. I didn't take pictures on all of them. On some."

Hernandez was questioned about the claims that phone calls and

emails from those cited were not responded to.

"I do take notes and we have been making phone calls back," Hernandez said. "Some of the people, we've got more than one phone call. We were calling every day."

In response to Maust's request, Hernandez showed notes relating to Mullane's property, located in the 1100 block of Winston Court. While Hernandez maintained that the notes reflected open communication with the property owner, the notes showed merely that on May 12 Hernandez spoke with the property owner "who advised of progress. Advised will be by Monday to update progress."

The next entry in Hernandez's notes on the case is on July 14, one that reads, "Spoke to PO to advise abatement will be done Friday July 15."

The next notation in the notes, entered on July 16, states, "11XX Winston Court part two of a Batement (sic) trees shrubs against the fence line."

The next notation, on August 3, states "7/16/2022: Abatement Complete."

The final entry states, "Abatement Invoice Breakdown: \$350 Non compliant administrative fee; \$72 Posting administrative fee; \$320 Abatement Administrative fee; \$10,186.03 Contractor Abatement Cost. Total: \$10,928.03"

In Hernandez's notes with regard to Mullane's Winston Court property, no substantive exchange nor any type of exchange with Mullane is reflected between the May 12 notation relating to progress having been made and the July 14 advisal to Mullane that a removal of trees and shrubs against the property's fence line, a job for which the contractor was paid \$10,186.03, was to take place the following day.

Dahlquest defended the application of administrative fees and invoicing for the recovery of costs to defray the work of contractors carrying out such abatements, saying, "We've been doing this for a long time, almost 40 years. Our department

*Continued on Page 11*



**Underbrush and dried out pine needles along with twigs and downed limbs and branches litter the ground on city property along Mountain Avenue in Upland, kindling just waiting for a spark before it flashes into a conflagration. Photo: Mark Gutglueck**

displayed on the council chamber's overhead monitors photos of Mayoral's mother's property which were not visible on the video of the meeting broadcast on the city's local channels or the one streaming on the city's website, Mayoral said, "I don't know where they said that they came out to do an abatement. I'm not sure what was abated, because as you can see that hill has just dirt. There was a cactus that was growing on it, and we

bers but which were not displayed on the video of the meeting that was broadcast on the city's cable channels or posted to the city's website. He stated, "What you see is already taken care of, whether we received a notice or not – because we didn't – until we got this last week. We maintain our property regularly. You can ask our children. They're out there with us. They clean the leaves at their own discretion to help out. We're always

call for at least 48 hours. The problem is compounded with the fact that my lawn is completely dead as the consequence of a sidewalk refurbishment project on my street, which resulted in the contractors tearing out the sprinkler lines in my parkway, rendering my irrigation system non-functional, also necessitating the removal of several trees which were deemed unstable as a result of the contractor's action. I hope that the pow-

## Public Notices

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2213999

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: CHRISTINE HUNT DOMINGUEZ filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

CHRISTINE HUNT DOMINGUEZ to CHRISTINE HUNT SWAIN

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: SEPTEMBER 6, 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.

Filed: July 18, 2022  
Judge John Pacheco  
Rosanna Gaitan, Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court.  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 22 & July 29 and August 5 & August 12, 2022.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE

NUMBER CIV SB 2213530 TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: Burt Lavarez Labios filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

Burt Lavarez Labios to Norberto Lavarez Labios 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: 08/24/2022  
Time: 08:30 AM  
Department: S16

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino San Bernardino County Superior Court 8303 Haven Avenue Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730 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: 06/23/2022  
Judge of the Superior Court: John M. Pacheco  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 07/22/2022, 07/29/2022, 08/05/2022, 08/12/2022

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL)

## Public Notices

CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO) 37-2021-00034610-CU-PA-NC NOTICE TO ALFREDO ALVAREZ VAZQUEZ AND DOES 1 TO 10 (AVISO DEMANDADO):

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): APRIL E. ORTIZ

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

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

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site ([www.lawhelpcalifornia.org](http://www.lawhelpcalifornia.org)), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center ([www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp)), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

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

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

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de referencia a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, ([www.lawhelp-california.org](http://www.lawhelp-california.org)), en el Centro de

## Public Notices

Ayuda de las Cortes de California, ([www.sucorte.ca.gov](http://www.sucorte.ca.gov)), o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación da \$10,000 o mas de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corta antes de que la corta pueda desechar el caso.

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

325 S. MELROSE DRIVE VISTA, CA 92801  
NORTH COUNTY DIVISION

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

EDWARD ALBEROLA, ESQ.; BAR NO: 243431  
CARLTON & ALBEROLA  
23792 ROCKFIELD BLVD, SUITE 101  
LAKE FOREST, CA 92630  
949-356-6444

Telephone: 949-356-6444  
DATE (Fecha): 08/13/2021  
Clerk (Secretario), by ASHLEY CARINI

Published in the SAN BERNARDINO SENTINEL on: 07/22/2022, 07/29/2022, 08/05/2022, 08/12/2022

STATEMENT OF DAMAGES (PERSONAL INJURY OR WRONGFUL DEATH) CASE NUMBER: 37-2021-00034610-CU-PA-NC TO ALVAREZ VAZQUEZ AND DOES 1-10 THE PLAINTIFF APRIL E. ORTIZ SEEKS DAMAGES IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED ACTION, AS FOLLOWS:

1. GENERAL DAMAGES: A. PAIN, SUFFERING, AND INCONVENIENCE FOR \$500,000.00

2. SPECIAL DAMAGES: A. MEDICAL EXPENSES (TO DATE) FOR \$10,000.00  
B. FUTURE MEDICAL EXPENSES (PRESENT VALUE) FOR \$50,000.00  
C. LOSS OF EARNINGS (TO DATE) FOR \$4,000.00  
D. LOSS OF FUTURE EARNING CAPACITY (PRESENT VALUE) FOR \$125,000.00  
DATE: 08/13/2021

s/EDWARD ALBEROLA, ESQ.  
Published in the SAN BERNARDINO SENTINEL on: 07/22/2022, 07/29/2022, 08/05/2022, 08/12/2022

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN 20220006147

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: LUNA PARTY RENTALS, 121 W CARLTON ST, ONTARIO, CA 91762  
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY  
Mailing Address: LUNA PARTY RENTALS CORP 121 W CARLTON ST, ONTARIO, CA 91762

State of Inc./Org./Reg. CA, Inc./Org./Reg. No. 5101746  
Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION  
Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

s/ANGELICA CASTRO, CEO  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 06/27/2022

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

N/A  
County Clerk,  
NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).  
07/22/2022, 07/29/2022, 08/05/2022, 08/12/2022

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20220003583

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: KJ FLIP FLOPPING, 6302 APPLE AVE, RIALTO, CA 92377; JOSEPH F SANCHEZ, 6302 APPLE AVE, RIALTO, CA 92377; KERRI SANCHEZ, 6302 APPLE AVE, RIALTO, CA 92377  
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Mailing Address: 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).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 05/06/2022, 05/13/2022, 05/20/2022, 05/27/2022; Corrected on 06/10/2022, 06/17/2022, 06/24/2022, 07/01/2022 Corrected on 7/22/2022, 7/29/22, 8/5/22 & 8/12/22.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FBN20220006844

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: NORTON DELGADO FAMILY MEDICINE 8283 GROVE AVE STE 202 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; NORTON DELGADO FAMILY MEDICINE 8283 GROVE AVE STE 202 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY  
Mailing Address: 6302 APPLE AVE, RIALTO, CA 92377.

Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California as 3720499

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/LAURA A. NORTON, CEO  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 07/20/2022

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

Began Transacting Business: N/A  
County Clerk G8420,

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 7/22/2022, 7/29/22, 8/5/22 & 8/12/22.

FBN20220006714  
The following person(s) is(are)

## Public Notices

doing business as: LOTUS GARDEN 1639 N MOUNTAIN AVE UPLAND, CA 91784 THE 168 TRADING, INC 5547 BRISAS CT RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739

Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California as 4697804

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/JUN XU, President  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 07/20/2022

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

Began Transacting Business: N/A  
County Clerk G8420

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 7/22/2022, 7/29/22, 8/5/22 & 8/12/22.

FBN20220006319

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: LUNA CINEMATICS 4195 CHINO HILLS PKWAY #405 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709; MICHAEL LUNA 4195 CHINO HILLS PKWAY #405 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709  
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

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

s/MICHAEL C. LUNA  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 06/30/2022

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

Began Transacting Business: June 14, 2022  
County Clerk J2530

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 7/22/2022, 7/29/22, 8/5/22 & 8/12/22.

FBN20220006875

The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: SMILE321 PHOTO BOOTHS 6851 HUDSON COURT RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701 DANDY J SANSOME 6851 HUDSON COURT RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701  
[and] APRIL C SANSOME 6851 HUDSON COURT RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701  
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Business is Conducted By: A MARRIED COUPLE

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/DANDY J SANSOME  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 07/21/2022

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

Began Transacting Business: June 12, 2022  
County Clerk G8420

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

## Public Notices

name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 7/22/2022, 7/29/22, 8/5/22 & 8/12/22.

T.S. No. 20-20197-SP-CA Title No. 200079866-CA-VOI A.P.N. 1050-661-09-0-000 NOTICE OF TRUSTEE'S SALE. YOU ARE IN DEFAULT UNDER A DEED OF TRUST DATED 01/22/2007. UNLESS YOU TAKE ACTION TO PROTECT YOUR PROPERTY, IT MAY BE SOLD AT A PUBLIC SALE. IF YOU NEED AN EXPLANATION OF THE NATURE OF THE PROCEEDING AGAINST YOU, YOU SHOULD CONTACT A LAWYER. A public auction sale to the highest bidder for cash, (cashier's check(s) must be made payable to National Default Servicing Corporation), drawn on a state or national bank, a check drawn by a state or federal credit union, or a check drawn by a state or federal savings and loan association, savings association, or savings bank specified in Section 5102 of the Financial Code and authorized to do business in this state; will be held by the duly appointed trustee as shown below, of all right, title, and interest conveyed to and now held by the trustee in the hereinafter described property under and pursuant to a Deed of Trust described below. The sale will be made in an "as is" condition, but without covenant or warranty, expressed or implied, regarding title, possession, or encumbrances, to pay the remaining principal sum of the note(s) secured by the Deed of Trust, with interest and late charges thereon, as provided in the note(s), advances, under the terms of the Deed of Trust, interest thereon, fees, charges and expenses of the Trustee for the total amount (at the time of the initial publication of the Notice of Sale) reasonably estimated to be set forth below. The amount may be greater on the day of sale. Trustor: Haidee S Royal, wife of Grantor herein, a married woman as her sole and separate property Duly Appointed Trustee: National Default Servicing Corporation Recorded 01/31/2007 as Instrument No. 2007-0062975 (or Book, Page) of the Official Records of San Bernardino County, CA. Date of Sale: 09/08/2022 at 1:00 PM Place of Sale: At the Main (South) Entrance to the City of Chino Civic Center, 13220 Central Avenue, Chino, CA. 91710 Estimated amount of unpaid balance and other charges: \$235,713.70 Street Address or other common designation of real property: 1459 South Euclid Avenue #17 Ontario, CA 91762 A.P.N.: 1050-661-09-0-000 The undersigned Trustee disclaims any liability for any incorrectness of the street address or other common designation, if any, shown above. If no street address or other common designation is shown, directions to the location of the property may be obtained by sending a written request to the beneficiary within 10 days of the date of first publication of this Notice of Sale. If the Trustee is unable to convey title for any reason, the successful bidder's sole and exclusive remedy shall be the return of monies paid to the Trustee, and the successful bidder shall have no further recourse. The requirements of California Civil Code Section 2923.5(b)/2923.55(c) were fulfilled when the Notice of Default was recorded. NOTICE TO POTENTIAL BIDDERS: If you are considering bidding on this property lien, you should understand that there are risks involved in bidding at a trustee auction. You will be bidding on a lien, not on the property itself. Placing the highest bid at a trustee auction does not automatically entitle you to free and clear ownership of the property. You should also be aware that the lien being auctioned off may be a junior lien. If

## Public Notices

you are the highest bidder at the auction, you are or may be responsible for paying off all liens senior to the lien being auctioned off, before you can receive clear title to the property. You are encouraged to investigate the existence, priority, and size of outstanding liens that may exist on this property by contacting the county recorder's office or a title insurance company, either of which may charge you a fee for this information. If you consult either of these resources, you should be aware that the same lender may hold more than one mortgage or deed of trust on the property. NOTICE TO PROPERTY OWNER: The sale date shown on this notice of sale may be postponed one or more times by the mortgage, beneficiary, trustee, or a court, pursuant to Section 2924g of the California Civil Code. The law requires that information about trustee sale postponements be made available to you and to the public, as a courtesy to those not present at the sale. If you wish to learn whether your sale date has been postponed, and, if applicable, the rescheduled time and date for the sale of this property, you may call or visit this Internet Web site [www.ndscorp.com/sales](http://www.ndscorp.com/sales), using the file number assigned to this case 20-20197-SP-CA. Information about postponements that are very short in duration or that occur close in time to the scheduled sale may not immediately be reflected in the telephone information or on the Internet Web site. The best way to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. NOTICE TO TENANT\*: You may have a right to purchase this property after the trustee auction pursuant to Section 2924m of the California Civil Code. If you are an "eligible tenant buyer," you can purchase the property if you match the last and highest bid placed at the trustee auction. If you are an "eligible bidder," you may be able to purchase the property if you exceed the last and highest bid placed at the trustee auction. There are three steps to exercising this right of purchase. First, 48 hours after the date of the trustee sale, you can call 888-264-4010, or visit this internet website [www.ndscorp.com](http://www.ndscorp.com), using the file number assigned to this case 20-20197-SP-CA to find the date on which the trustee's sale was held, the amount of the last and highest bid, and the address of the trustee. Second, you must send a written notice of intent to place a bid so that the trustee receives it no more than 15 days after the trustee's sale. Third, you must submit a bid so that the trustee receives it no more than 45 days after the trustee's sale. If you think you may qualify as an "eligible tenant buyer" or "eligible bidder," you should consider contacting an attorney or appropriate real estate professional immediately for advice regarding this potential right to purchase. \*Pursuant to Section 2924m of the California Civil Code, the potential rights described herein shall apply only to public auctions taking place on or after January 1, 2021, through December 31, 2025, unless later extended. Date: 07/22/2022 National Default Servicing Corporation c/o Tiffany & Bosco, P.A., its agent, 1455 Frazee Road, Suite 820 San Diego, CA 92108 Toll Free Phone: 888-264-4010 Sales Line 855-219-8501; Sales Website: [www.ndscorp.com](http://www.ndscorp.com) By: Jesse Gonzalez, Trustee Sales Representative 07/29/2022, 08/05/2022, 08/12/2022 CPP352848

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: CHARLES RODRIGUEZ aka CHUCK RODRIGUEZ CASE NO. PROSB2201006 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate,

## Public Notices

or both of CHARLES RODRIGUEZ aka CHUCK RODRIGUEZ has been filed by RITA JEAN RODRIGUEZ in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that RITA JEAN RODRIGUEZ be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that the decedents 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 AUGUST 15, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

Filed: JULY 11, 2022

VALARIE URUENA, Deputy Court Clerk IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: July 11, 2022 Attorney for Rita Jean Rodriguez: 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 July 29, August 5 and August 12, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: PAULINE LOPEZ ESPARZA CASE NO. PROSB2200487 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of PAULINE LOPEZ ESPARZA aka PAULINE APOLINAR LOPEZ ESPARZA aka PAULINE ESPARZA A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by GENARA

## Public Notices

ROBERT ESPARZA and PAULINE NATALIA GRINAGER in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that GENARA ROBERT ESPARZA and PAULINE NATALIA GRINAGER be appointed as personal representatives to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S-37 at 9:00 a.m. on SEPTEMBER 14, 2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for Genera Robert Esparza and Pauline Natalia Grinager:

ANTONIETTE JAUREGUI (SB 192624) 1894 S. COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 29, August 5 and August 12, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: REBECCA CATHERINE ALMANZA CASE NO. PROSB2201058 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of REBECCA CATHERINE ALMANZA A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by BRENDA CATHERINE ALMANZA in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that BRENDA CATHERINE ALMANZA be appointed as personal representatives to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the

## Public Notices

estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S-37 at 9:00 a.m. on AUGUST 24, 2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for Brenda Catherine Almanza:

ANTONIETTE JAUREGUI (SB 192624) 1894 S. COMMERCENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 29, August 5 and August 12, 2022.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON PETITION FOR TERMINATION OF PARENT - CHILD RELATIONSHIP CASE NUMBER JS21265 SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA IN MARICOPA COUNTY

Juvenile Department PARENT/GUARDIAN NAMES: Tiffany Araujo - Mother; Malik Russell Etheridge - Father

Petitioner Tiffany Araujo In the Matter of Minor: Delani Nicole Van Damme (10/30/2012)

This is an important notice from the court. Read it carefully. A petition about termination of parent-child relationship has been filed with the court, and a hearing has been scheduled related to your child. Your rights may be affected by the proceedings. You have a right to appear as a party in the proceeding.

If you fail to participate in the court proceedings, the court may deem that you have waived your legal rights and admit to the allegations made in the petition. Hearings may go forward in your absence and may result in the termination of your parental rights.

Facility Assignment: Durango Juvenile Court Center 3131 W. Durango St, Phoenix, AZ 85009.

Judicial Officer: Honorable Lauren R. Guyton

Hearing Date/Time: October 13, 2022, at 9:30 a.m.

## Public Notices

Hearing Type: Severance-Initial Hearing Location - Court Connect Remote Appearance Court Connect Hearing: Yes Video: https://tinyurl.com/jbazmc-juc02

Phone: (917) 781-4590, Participant Code 312 434 5#

How can I prepare for the hearing? Any supporting documentation must be filed with the Clerk of Court at least seventy-two hours in advance of the set hearing date.

If I have questions or concerns who can I contact?

For questions concerning filing, please contact the Clerk of Court at (602) 372-5375. For questions about the hearing, contact the Juvenile Department at (602) 506-4533, Option 2 to reach the assigned Judicial Officer's staff. If you have legal questions, seek legal counsel.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel July 29, August 5, August 12 & August 19, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MICHAEL C. MADDUX aka MICHAEL CHARLES MADDUX CASE NO. PROSB2201012 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MICHAEL C. MADDUX aka MICHAEL CHARLES MADDUX A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by SHAYNA STEWART in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that SHAYNA STEWART be appointed as personal representatives to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on AUGUST 18, 2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk.

Filed: JUNE 15, 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 personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk.

Filed: JUNE 15, 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 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.

## Public Notices

1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk.

Filed: July 14, 2022 Sabrina Felix, Deputy Clerk of the Court Pro Se: Shayna Stewart 3260 Little Mountain Drive

San Bernardino, CA 92405 Telephone No: (951) 941-9878 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on July 29, August 5 & August 12, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JAVIER RAMIREZ aka JAVIER MAGALLAN RAMIREZ CASE NO. PROSB2200901 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JAVIER RAMIREZ aka JAVIER MAGALLAN RAMIREZ has been filed by VICTOR PATROCINIO RAMIREZ MONROY in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that VICTOR PATROCINIO RAMIREZ MONROY be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that the decedents 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 NOVEMBER 3, 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: JUNE 15, 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 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.

## Public Notices

Filed: JUNE 15, 2022 Attorney for VICTOR PATROCINIO RAMIREZ MONROY 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 August 5, August 12 and August 19, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JOHN T. CHRISTENSON CASE NO. PROSB2201056 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JOHN T. CHRISTENSON has been filed by SUSAN PEDERSON in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that SUSAN PEDERSON be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that the decedents 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 AUGUST 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.

Filed: JULY 18, 2022

Sasha Rodriguez, Deputy Court Clerk IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: JULY 18, 2022 Attorney for Susan Pederson 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 August 5, August 12 and August 19, 2022.

## Public Notices

REDLANDS, CA 92373 Phone (909) 328 7000 Fax (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on August 5, August 12 and August 19, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: GEORGE SCHAUT CASE NO. PROSB2201068 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of GEORGE SCHAUT has been filed by CHRISTINA CARREON in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that CHRISTINA CARREON 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 31, 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: JULY 22, 2022

SASHA RODRIGUEZ, Deputy Court Clerk IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: JULY 22, 2022 Attorney for Christina Carreon 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 August 5, August 12 and August 19, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARY LEE WARREN CASE NO. PROSB2201069

Public Notices

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MARY LEE WARREN has been filed by SHELIA DAVIS in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that SHELIA DAVIS 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 AUGUST 31, 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: JULY 22, 2022

SASHA RODRIGUEZ, Deputy Court Clerk IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: JULY 22, 2022 Attorney for SHELIA DAVIS 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 August 5, August 12 and August 19, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: BRANDON BRIGHT CASE NO. PROSB2201074 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of BRANDON BRIGHT has been filed by ANDREA BRIGHT in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

Public Notices

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ANDREA BRIGHT 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 31, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. Filed: JULY 22, 2022

JENNIFER SALDANA, Deputy Court Clerk IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: JULY 22, 2022 Attorney for ANDREA BRIGHT 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 August 5, August 12 and August 19, 2022.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIVSB 2213752 TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: DEBORAH STROTZ OBETSANOV and CHARLES STROTZ, JR. filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows: CHARLES KURT STROTZ, III to KIRKY CHUCK STROTZ 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

Public Notices

granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing Date: September 6, 2022 Time: 10:00 AM Department: S36 The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition. Dated: 08/03/2022 Judge of the Superior Court: MICHELLE H. GILLECE Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 08/05/2022, 08/12/2022, 08/19/2022 & 08/26/2022

FBN 20220006980 The following person is doing business as: LAW OFFICE OF JON F. HAMILTON 700 E. REDLANDS BLVD., SUIT U #165 REDLANDS, CA 92373

JON F. HAMILTON 1320 GARDEN STREET REDLANDS, CA 92373

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JULY 1, 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/ JON F. HAMILTON, Individual Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/26/2022

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 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 8/5, 8/12, 8/19 & 8/26, 2022.

FBN 20220006199 The following person is doing business as: BIMA SERVICES 3837 N SILVER TREE CT RIALTO, CA 92377: URSULA MACIAS 3837 N SILVER TREE CT RIALTO, CA 92377

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: MAY 1, 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/ URSULA MACIAS, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 06/27/2022

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 J1677

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 7/1, 7/8, 7/15 & 7/22, 2022. Corrected on 8/5, 8/12, 8/19 & 8/26

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: DEBORAH JENNINGS aka DE'BORA JENNINGS

Case NO. PROSB2200398 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise

be interested in the will or estate, or both of DEBORAH JENNINGS aka DE'BORA JENNINGS A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Polly Mallett in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Polly Mallett 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 person or by your attorney. 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. Attorney for the Petitioner: MARY M. BADER 9227 HAVEN AVENUE, SUITE 368 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 Telephone: (909) 945-2775 Fax: (909) 945-2778

Public Notices

be interested in the will or estate, or both of DEBORAH JENNINGS aka DE'BORA JENNINGS

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

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Polly Mallett 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. S37 at 09:00 AM on 10/13/2022 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 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.

George M. Halimi 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1100, Los Angeles, CA 90067

Telephone No: 310.553.5562 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on: 08/12/2022, 08/19/2022, & 08/26/2022.

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 08/12/2022, 08/19/2022, & 08/26/2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: DAVID MICHAEL MOLINO CASE NO. PROSB2201106 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, and contingent creditors of DAVID MICHAEL MOLINO, and persons who may be otherwise interested in the will or estate, or both: A petition has been filed by STEVE MOLINO in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO, requesting that STEVE MOLINO be appointed special administrator to administer the estate with general powers.

The petition requests authority to administer the estate under

Public Notices

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.

The petition is set for hearing in Dept. No. S36 at SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT - PROBATE DIVISION 247 W. 3rd STREET SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415-0212 on SEPTEMBER 6, 2022 at 09:00 AM

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

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

YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are interested in the estate, you may request special notice of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Section 1250 of the California Probate Code.

Attorney for the Petitioner: MARY M. BADER 9227 HAVEN AVENUE, SUITE 368 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 Telephone: (909) 945-2775 Fax: (909) 945-2778

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on August 12, 19 & 26, 2022.

FBN 20220007079 The following entity is doing business as: CUNNING DENTAL GROUP 9595 CENTRAL AVE. MONTCLAIR, CA 91763

RONALD CUNNING, DDS, INC. 9595 CENTRAL AVE. MONTCLAIR, CA 91763

Mailing Address: 9595 CENTRAL AVE. MONTCLAIR, CA 91763

The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the state of California as C0605742

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: AUGUST 24, 1970

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/ KEITH CUNNING, Secretary

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 07/29/2022

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 D5511

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on August 12, 19, 26 & September 2, 2022

Public Notices

FBN 20220007224 The following entity is doing business as: MOOMUCCA 12714 HILLTOP DR REDLANDS 92373 SOPHIA R FRYE 12714 HILLTOP DR REDLANDS 92373 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY Principal Place Of Business

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/ SOPHIA R FRYE

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/03/2022

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 August 12, 19, 26 & September 2, 2022

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIVSB2206514

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: DYCIE RANSOM filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

ZI'AHN KHARI SKIPPER TO ZI'AHN KHARI MCCALL 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: 09/12/2022 Time: 08:30 AM Department: S16

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino San Bernardino District-Civil Division 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition. Dated: 07/27/2022 Judge of the Superior Court: JOHN M. PACHECO

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 08/19/2022, 08/26/2022, 09/02/2022, 09/09/2022

FBN 20220006641 The following person is doing business as: YESENIA'S GLAM STUDIO. 5533 PHILADELPHIA STREET SUITE #132 CHINO, CA 91710

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/ YESENIA LOPEZ, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 13, 2022

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original state-

Public Notices

ment 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 07/22/2022, 07/29/2022, 08/05/2022, 08/12/2022 CNBB2920208MT

FBN 20220006689

The following person is doing business as: BIG PROFIT; RAP AFFILIATED PRODUCTIONS; RAP AFFILIATED PUBLISHING; R.A.P. RECORDS; R.A.P. TV; R.A.P. FILMS INC.; R.A.P. GEAR CLOTHING; SCHOOL OF R.A.P.; RAP AFFILIATED POSSE; RAP AFFILIATED POSSE; RAP AFFILIATED PROMOTIONS; IT'S A R.A.P. (BLUNT WRAPS); IT'S A CRIP R.A.P. (BLUNT WRAPS); IT'S A BLOOD R.A.P. (BLUNT WRAPS); MEDINA TEQUILA; TEQUILA MEDINA; COCINA MEDINA; R.A.P. IT UP CONDOMS 6617 DICARLO PLACE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RAP AFFILIATED, INC. 6617 DICARLO PLACE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739

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/ EDUARDOMEDINA, PRESIDENT

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 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

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 07/22/2022, 07/29/2022, 08/05/2022, 08/12/2022 CNBB2920207MT

FBN 20220006450

The following person is doing business as: JZ REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT COM. 387 E HEATHER ST RIALTO, CA 92376 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JENNY ZUNIGA 387 E HEATHER ST RIALTO, CA 92376. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

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

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

s/ JENNY ZUNIGA, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 06, 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 07/22/2022, 07/29/2022, 08/05/2022, 08/12/2022 CNBB2920206MT

FBN 20220006706

The following person is doing business as: LILY'S QUALITY WATER; LILY'S JUICE BAR 638 E FRANCIS ST ONTARIO, CA 91761 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ANA L. SANDOVAL 638 E FRANCIS ST ONTARIO, CA 91761. 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/ ANA L. SANDOVAL, OWNER

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 13, 2022

I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original state-



**Public Notices**

CNBB31202203MT

FBN 20220006873  
The following person is doing business as: AYONIMI LLC. 760 DAWN WAY FONTANA, CA 92336 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO AYONIMI LLC 760 DAWN WAY FONTANA, CA 92336 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/ ADENIYI DARAMOLA, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 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 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 08/05/2022, 08/12/2022, 08/19/2022, 08/26/2022 CNBB31202202MT

FBN 20220006872  
The following person is doing business as: RICK'S BARBER SHOP. 35063 YUCAIPA BLVD YUCAIPA, CA 92399 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO EACS 35063 YUCAIPA BLVD YUCAIPA, CA 92399 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/ CARO L. TORRES, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 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 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 08/05/2022, 08/12/2022, 08/19/2022, 08/26/2022 CNBB31202201MT

FBN 20220007112  
The following person is doing business as: BRIGHTLINE AUTO SALES. 21582 MAIN ST. SUITE M-102 GRAND TERRACE, CA 92313 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO CAPITAL CAR REPAIR LLC 21582 MAIN ST GRAND TERRACE, CA 92313. 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/ KENNETH W. BECKLEY, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: AUGUST 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 Sentinel 08/12/2022, 08/19/2022, 08/26/2022, 09/02/2022 CNBB32022071R

FBN 20220007380  
The following person is doing business as: PREMIER SECURITY SERVICES. 7744 HESS PL UNIT 1 RANCHO

**Public Notices**

CUCAMONGA, CA 91739; MAILING ADDRESS PO BOX 2122 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91729; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO CHRISTIAN V RIQUELME 7744 HESS PL UNIT 1 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: 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/ CHRISTIAN V RIQUELME, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: AUGUST 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 08/12/2022, 08/19/2022, 08/26/2022, 09/02/2022 CNBB32202206MT

FBN 20220007289  
The following person is doing business as: DANGER CORPORATION; LAGUNA BEACH DANGER RIDERS. 485 HIGHWAY 138 LAGUNA BEACH, CA 92325; MAILING ADDRESS 1278 GLENNEYRE ST BOX 241 LAGUNA BEACH, CA 92651; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO EVEREN OZAN 485 HIGHWAY 138 CRESTLINE, CA 92325. 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/ EVEREN OZAN, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: AUGUST 04, 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 08/12/2022, 08/19/2022, 08/26/2022, 09/02/2022 CNBB32202205MT

FBN 20220007267  
The following person is doing business as: ALOHA MINI DONUTS LLC. 1239 W 9TH STREET UPLAND, CA 91786; MAILING ADDRESS 7505 SANTA ANA LUCIA ST FONTANA, CA 92336; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ALOHA MINI DONUTS LLC 7505 SANTA LUCIA ST FONTANA, CA 92336 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/ BOBBIE G. STODDARD, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: AUGUST 04, 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 08/12/2022, 08/19/2022, 08/26/2022, 09/02/2022 CNBB32202204MT

**Public Notices**

FBN 20220007185  
The following person is doing business as: MADEX. 4085 GRAND AVE STUDIO 18 CHINO, CA 91710 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MADEX BEAUTY LLC 5973 SNOWGRASS TRAIL RIVERSIDE, CA 92509 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/ BIANCA M. BIN, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: AUGUST 03, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a

**Residents Cited For Weed & Excess Vegetation Growth Who Cured The Issue Were Not Notified They Were In The Clear** *from page 6*

has done it for most of those years, and the last 20 have been with one of the officers that had been doing it. We've followed the same process for the most part, using the state law, then of course using the process that has been laid out for quite a long time."

"I'm not sure how to justly resolve this," said Councilwoman Janice Elliott. "I think this program is problematic in that there is a lot of personal judgment as to what constitutes blight and what constitutes an actual harmful situation. It would seem like there should be some real clarity on this, but it doesn't appear that there is at all. There is not in my mind, either. So, I am very concerned about these assessments. I can understand why people would want to have large trees and shrubbery, because that shields your house from the sun, and it is a passive solar cooling. When you don't have a lawn and you get some weeds that sprout up in the spring, that does happen and as long as they're not an eyesore and we've got the three inches [height limitation], that shouldn't be a problem. But a number of people said that these weren't three inches, so, I'm deeply disturbed by this meeting and by these assessments."

While the council superficially dealt with some of the issues raised by those who had spoken during the public hearing, its members assiduously avoided some of the more pointed criticisms that had been leveled at the city and danced around the assertions by several of the

**Public Notices**

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 08/12/2022, 08/19/2022, 08/26/2022, 09/02/2022 CNBB32202203MT

FBN 20220007188  
The following person is doing business as: LATINA BEAUTY BAR LLC. 219 S RIVERSIDE AVE #102 RIALTO, CA 92376 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LATINA BEAUTY BAR LLC 219 S RIVERSIDE

residents that they had not been able to engage with Hernandez and the city to get a clear understanding of what the city considered to be code violations. Nor did the other members of the council make any further exploration of the issues raised by Elliott vis-à-vis whether vegetation that some residents purposefully planted as landscaping could or should be interpreted as weeds, what the proper degree of pruning, trimming and thinning of trees, shrubbery, plants, flowers and vegetation is, or where a property owner's sense of aesthetics ends and where the proper public definition of aesthetics and safety begins. The council did not want to address head-on the suggestions that in levying the fines, fees and assessments Hernandez had cut corners. Nor was it willing to so much as consider what Bobich and Furness had said directly and which Maloncon hinted at, which is that the city itself is the most prolific violator of its own codes with regard to the overgrowth of weeds within its borders and that in this way, Hernandez was falling down on the job.

Hernandez endeavored to defend her performance.

She suggested that she had made a straightforward effort to bring those who were not holding the weeds on their properties in check and that those who had been cited were guilty as charged.

"When I started here in Upland and started driving through the neighborhoods, I noticed that about 80 to 85 percent of the properties, they take care of their property," she said. "They mow their lawn. They keep the trees limbed. They remove the dead material. They do the landscaping and the maintenance. The ones that I actually stopped and took pictures and sent notices

**Public Notices**

AVE RIALTO, CA 92376 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/ VANESSA MENDEZ, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: AUGUST 03, 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 fil-

**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 08/12/2022, 08/19/2022, 08/26/2022, 09/02/2022 CNBB32202202MT FBN 20220007242

The following person is doing business as: BLUE SPA. 5933 ADOBERD TWENTYNINE PALMS, CA 92277 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JUNG HEE CHO 5933 ADOBERD TWENTYNINE PALMS, CA 92277. 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

**Public Notices**

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/ JUNG HEE CHO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: AUGUST 04, 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 08/12/2022, 08/19/2022, 08/26/2022, 09/02/2022 CNBB322022011R

were the ones that stood out."

Still, by Hernandez's own numbers, that would indicate that some 3,300 to 4,400 of the city's residential properties were out of compliance. As she had taken action against a mere 290 of those, this suggested the city was engaging in selective or arbitrary enforcement.

Councilman Carlos Garcia hinted at that when he mused about whether the city with its weed abatement program was "going to go straight across the board for everybody. Is it the lack of manpower that we're not capturing everything? Is it just hit or miss, the luck of the draw?"

Mayor Velto leapt to Hernandez's defense at that point, saying, "With 22,000 houses, I don't think you're going to catch everyone. It's absolutely a manpower issue in order to get every single property done at the same time and get notices sent out at the exact same time. The process itself is not perfect. We just have to get better each year at doing this."

Nevertheless, in acknowledging the manpower issue, Velto laid bare the issue surrounding the accusation of misrepresentation that had been leveled at Hernandez.

Initially, she had claimed that every inspection, notice and abatement action was uniformly carried out on every property she encountered, without favoritism or bias.

"It was all the same for every property in Upland," she said.

But with Velto's response when Garcia had raised the question of "across-the-board" enforcement, what soon tumbled out was that the process was not uniformly carried out. Hernandez's claim that she had assiduously paid attention to every case and stayed on

top of their details collapsed under her and Dahlquest's later assertion that the sheer number of weed-overgrown properties were overwhelming and that she was scrambling and struggling in the effort to keep up.

Velto tried to establish that Hernandez used the same protocol with every abatement.

"I saw a picture with one notice on the door," Velto observed and then asked Hernandez, "Did you take pictures each time?"

"Yes," Hernandez said. "So, you have pictures of every one of those that you posted?" Velto asked Hernandez.

"Yes, there were 24 that I had to post," she replied.

Hernandez quickly qualified that answer.

"Or I had to hand them [out]," she said. "I handed them to the property owner."

So, you have evidence you posted them on the door?" Velto again inquired.

"Yes," said Hernandez. "There were only 24 and I went to every one of the doors and spoke to most all of the people and let them know what was going to happen the next - during the weekend - and/or if they weren't there, I posted it on the door. There were only 24. Not every one of the notices did I post."

"What do you mean?" Velto, having picked up on the discrepancy, asked.

"Not every single notice that I mailed," Hernandez said.

"I'm talking about the ones for recovery, said Velto.

"Right," responded Hernandez.

"You actually did physical work?" Velto asked. "You have evidence - pictures on the door?"

"Yes, I do," said Hernandez.

Dahlquest endeavored

### In A Clash Between The Word Of Residents And A City Employee, Upland Mayor Says He Has No Choice But To Side With The Employee *from page 11*

to take the heat off Hernandez, suggesting that the overwhelming nature and sheer volume of the assignment kept her from being as thorough as she had earlier claimed to be.

“Keep in mind there’s 290 properties on this list,” said Dahlquest. “This is basically a part-time program, so we don’t have the manpower to go out and knock on every door. Julie tries to do the best she can. We’re following the same process that we’ve followed for many years.”

Hernandez at one point took a stab at explaining away what had seemed an obvious discrepancy. Some of those who addressed the city council expressed dismay at having been told – by Hernandez – that if they reduced the weeds on their property to a height of three inches or less, they would be deemed to be in compliance. They had cut or mowed the weeds to the indicated level but were still hit with fines and assessments or subject to abatement action by the city’s contractor, they complained.

Hernandez defended the city’s action, saying that abatement in such cases was justifiable because, she said, “The code does not address the height of the vegetation or the weeds.”

With regard to those residents who asserted that they had been cited, fined and assessed for violations on neighboring properties, Hernandez offered that “The Comcate application [i.e., a computerized location finding device] I use to do the inspections, it actually has a GIS function, so that it gives me the location that I’m sitting in front of. Occasionally, because of the Wi-Fi, it would put me off an address, and I did get calls that there were errors on the photos. So, what happened is I had to cancel them, you know, because the wrong picture’s on a notice. That’s something that needs to

be addressed later for the next set of inspections, but there were those problems.”

When pressed, Hernandez offered a less than satisfactory explanation of an aspect of the process that had caused tremendous confusion, and which she had previously misrepresented as well. Several residents who spoke Monday night indicated they had been told at one point that the action they took had redressed the problem, only to be informed later that they were being fined and assessed or that abatement of the vegetation on their property was going to occur. This was compounded by the consideration that those residents who did redress the weed growth on their property were never given an of-

### Suit Against Goldman Sachs Challenges Hinkley Waste Pit As An Environmental Catastrophe *from page 5*

defendants have also added fresh waste to processed compost that was about to be shipped out. Despite the prohibition on certain wastes, defendants have accepted and processed brewery muck, which includes spent barley or rice malt. This material is considered food material and is not a permitted form of waste for the facility. In April 2022, San Bernardino County raised concerns after the facility accepted unapproved brewery waste from the Anheuser-Busch’s Van Nuys brewery north of Los Angeles. Nevertheless, the conduct has continued.”

The lawsuit continues, “Defendants have also engaged in unauthorized dumping of harmful material. On information and belief, since approximately June 2022, defendants have been trucking rancid material off site and dumping it in unmarked areas in the Mojave Desert and in unpermitted areas. In addition, defendants have been cited for repeatedly failing to prevent off-site litter migration into the surrounding desert ecosystem. In particular, defendants have failed to clean up prevalent film plastic litter, which has

been found on the northeast of its property and frequently blows toward Hinkley. Defendants knew or should have known that the facility was accepting excessive waste, accepting waste with excessive contamination levels, processing unacceptable forms of

official indication that they were no longer on the city’s abatement list. Hernandez said that no explicit city notice of compliance was given to those who had knuckled under to the city’s standards on their property relating to vegetation growth.

“They get that last letter, the invoice letter stating there is a \$72 charge,” Hernandez said. “There is no additional letter in between, letting them know they are in compliance.”

Garcia explored that further. “Is there a follow up... where everything is right completely?” Garcia asked. “Is there a follow up with them?”

“Once I’ve verified that they’ve complied, then I close the case,” Hernandez said. “I don’t mail anything or make a

phone call to let the property owner know. I just close the case.”

Dahlquest, who had defended Hernandez’s performance throughout the meeting, insisted at one point, “This is Julie Hernandez and her sister and their company that we’ve hired,” said Dahlquest. “This is their first year. I think they’ve done the best job they could do. We have 22,000 properties in the city, and I think they’ve done a good job.”

Mayor Velto angered a number of people present by insisting that the city stood by Hernandez and was prepared to side with her in any sort of dispute, factual or otherwise, with the city’s residents, despite whatever discrepancies had come to light.

“I’m not faulting what you’re doing,” Velto said

to Hernandez, directly. “It’s a process and it’s a process that people don’t like.”

Velto then encouraged his council colleagues to put their faith and the city’s full backing behind Hernandez.

“Remember, this is someone that’s hired by the city,” Velto said, suggesting that gave Hernandez a specialized status which placed her above the city’s residents. “When she tells me she put those on the door, I have to believe her. I have to. I’m sorry. I have to believe her. This is what we hired her to do, to post those notices on the door.”

The city council voted to waive the fines and assessments of up to \$422 that had been levied on those who had been cited and penalized for initially

being out of compliance but who had eventually redressed the weed issues on their property and did not trigger the city’s employment of its contractor to abate their properties if they were among those who had attended the meeting or had phoned in to the meeting. By the same motion, the city resolved to collect the fines, fees and assessments levied on those who did not attend the meeting, even if they removed the weeds on their property short of the city using its contractor to effectuate the abatements. The city authorized the billing for reimbursement for the cost of using the city’s contractor to abate weeds on any property owner who was cited by Hernandez’s and her sister’s operation.

-Mark Gutglueck

### West Valley Water District Under New Leadership *from page 3*

San Bernardino County Republic Party machine in general.

Meanwhile, Young stewed. Eventually he launched a rare qui tam lawsuit against Taylor, alleging a sophisticated network of interconnections within the district involving bribes, graft, payoffs and corrupt practices.

Young was never able to regain his position of dominance in the district. Meanwhile, Taylor militated to strengthen his hold. He, however, was undercut by mul-

iple considerations. His efforts during the 2019 election season to defeat Clifford Young’s ally on the board, Greg Young, and support of his Democratic ally on the board, Olinger, both failed. Brosowski’s political career imploded with his 2019 removal from the Hesperia City Council by his colleagues, and revelations about the sinecure he had been given at West Valley led to his being force out of that post. The FBI and the U.S. Attorney began closing in on Pacheco, who was forced to resign from his post as a councilman in Baldwin Park. Pacheco has since been convicted of bribetaking

and began cooperating with the feds, including revealing questionable practices as West Valley during his tenure there. Revelations from the qui tam lawsuit brought by Young stunted Taylor’s further political progression.

In quick succession early this year, both Crowther, because he was moving out of the state, and Cliff Young, based on his wife’s death and his own health challenges, tendered their resignations from the board and were replaced, respectively, by Angela Garcia and Kelvin Moore.

In July, Taylor left Rialto to move to Arkan-

was, allowing litter to accumulate on the property and failing to control fires at the facility.”

According to the complaint, “The conduct of defendants was oppressive, malicious, and despicable in that it was intentional and done in conscious disregard for

the rights and safety of others.”

The suit seeks a judgment against the defendants, an order directing Synagro to comply with California law, including the California Public Resources Code, and the California Code of Regulations, repair, compensa-

tion for depreciation, and/or replacement of damaged property as well as loss of wages, earning capacity and/or profits or proceeds. Also sought are medical expenses, medical monitoring, legal expenses and attorney’s fees and other damages.

-Mark Gutglueck

Wonder Valley Woman Arrested On Suspicion Of Murder *from front page*

conclusion that she was involved in Simrak’s death. They obtained a warrant for her arrest on suspicion of murder. An all-points bulletin was issued for her.

In Chula Vista in San Diego County, an officer

might be armed, Chula Vista police surrounded the hotel and called in the department’s Special Weapons and Tactics Team. Hess Prieto was taken into custody, according to the department, “without incident.” She was handed over to San Bernardino sheriff’s deputies. She was originally taken to the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Depart-

ment Headquarters and Administration Building at 655 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in San Bernardino. She has since been booked into the West Valley Detention Center in Rancho Cucamonga, where she is being held without bail on suspicion of murder and carjacking. She is to appear in Morongo Superior Court in Joshua Tree on August 15.

-Mark Gutglueck

Concerned that she

might be armed, Chula Vista police surrounded the hotel and called in the department’s Special Weapons and Tactics Team. Hess Prieto was taken into custody, according to the department, “without incident.” She was handed over to San Bernardino sheriff’s deputies. She was originally taken to the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Depart-

ment Headquarters and Administration Building at 655 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in San Bernardino. She has since been booked into the West Valley Detention Center in Rancho Cucamonga, where she is being held without bail on suspicion of murder and carjacking. She is to appear in Morongo Superior Court in Joshua Tree on August 15.

-Mark Gutglueck

Concerned that she

might be armed, Chula Vista police surrounded the hotel and called in the department’s Special Weapons and Tactics Team. Hess Prieto was taken into custody, according to the department, “without incident.” She was handed over to San Bernardino sheriff’s deputies. She was originally taken to the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Depart-

ment Headquarters and Administration Building at 655 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in San Bernardino. She has since been booked into the West Valley Detention Center in Rancho Cucamonga, where she is being held without bail on suspicion of murder and carjacking. She is to appear in Morongo Superior Court in Joshua Tree on August 15.

-Mark Gutglueck

Concerned that she

might be armed, Chula Vista police surrounded the hotel and called in the department’s Special Weapons and Tactics Team. Hess Prieto was taken into custody, according to the department, “without incident.” She was handed over to San Bernardino sheriff’s deputies. She was originally taken to the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Depart-

ment Headquarters and Administration Building at 655 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in San Bernardino. She has since been booked into the West Valley Detention Center in Rancho Cucamonga, where she is being held without bail on suspicion of murder and carjacking. She is to appear in Morongo Superior Court in Joshua Tree on August 15.

-Mark Gutglueck