

FBI Delving Into WVWD Political Intrigue & Graft, Document Reveals

The extent to which festering political corruption in the Los Angeles County city of Baldwin Park migrated to inhabit the structure of governance and management within San Bernardino County's West Valley Water district was put on display late last week with the unsealing of a document that accompanied the announcement of former San Bernardino County Planning Commissioner Gabe Chavez's

guilty pleas on bribery and money laundering charges related to a payola scheme for obtaining marijuana-related business operating permits.

Key players in the panorama of graft and the exploitation of the public trust are former Baldwin Park Councilman and one-time West Valley Water District Assistant General Manager, former Baldwin Park Police Chief and former West Valley Board President

Mike Taylor and former Baldwin Park City Attorney and West Valley General Counsel Robert Tafoya.

According to a narrative compiled by the FBI, the trio engaged in a free-flowing exchange of political campaign assistance, lucrative employment and contractual opportunities that involved both the Los Angeles County city and the San Bernardino County water district which were

demonstrable quid pro quos. All of this was an outgrowth of an illicit shakedown operation which originally involved efforts by Pacheco, who was being advised by Tafoya and Taylor, to profit through under-the-table payments from entities and individuals looking to establish marijuana/cannabis related businesses in Baldwin Park, according to the FBI.

Contributing to the atmosphere that allowed

what was initially activity confined to Los Angeles County was the opportunity for Taylor's transition from his profession in law enforcement to a political career that was presented by a mini-revolt of several members of the water district's senior management that occurred right around the time of Taylor's election to a position on the water board.

Ironically, the revelations that pro-

See P 2

Judge Tosses Travis-Miller's Suit Against SB Over Ibarra's Defense Of Her Firing

Judge Michael Sachs has entered a ruling which does not sustain former San Bernardino City Manager Andrea Travis-Miller's civil complaint that a 2020 social media posting by Councilwoman Sandra Ibarra not only defamed her but violated her employment termination agreement with the city.

Travis-Miller endured two stints as the head of San Bernardino's municipal operations, each under what turned out to be very trying circumstances. The first time she left willingly and the second time she was forced out. Her time in San Bernardino would arguably and perhaps actually represent both the high points and low points of her public career. In addition, circumstances would lead her into twice suing the city.

In 2012, Travis Miller was promoted from deputy city manager to acting manager when former City Manager Charles McNeely departed as the city was foundering financially. Travis-Miller was handed the reins as the city was teetering over a financial abyss, facing a \$45.8 million deficit and \$180 million in ongoing unfunded liabilities. Working with Jason Simpson, who was then the city's finance director, Travis-Miller made a review of the city's financial books, the conclusions of which were so startling that the city council in July 2012 resolved to file for Chapter 9 bankruptcy protection on the basis of a 45-page report from Travis-Miller recommending doing just that. The city did so the follow-

See P 3

School District Won't Release Video Of Principal's Tussle With Second Grader

The San Bernardino City Unified School District has refused the *Sentinel's* request that it release a video of George Brown Elementary School Principal Dr. Christine Ramirez's altercation with a second grade student that took place early this school year.

On August 5, for a yet unexplained reason, interaction between the

student, a seven-year-old, turned violent.

According to an account of what occurred that was provided to the *Sentinel*, Dr. Ramirez first engaged with the student in an outdoor area of the school grounds, after which he was taken into a classroom.

A teacher who went into the room shortly thereafter saw two other

teachers restraining the student restrained on the floor. The *Sentinel* was further told that several students saw what was going on, as did at least two teachers. According to an individual with knowledge about what occurred, some of the students and at least one of the teachers found the incident to be traumatizing.

The *Sentinel* was

informed, and subsequently confirmed, that there is a video of Dr. Ramirez's interaction with the second grader. The video was reportedly turned over to the San Bernardino Police Department.

Despite repeated and persistent efforts by the *Sentinel* to learn from the department's official spokesman, Sergeant Equino Thomas, what

action and determination the department has made on the basis of that video, no information has been forthcoming from the department. As best as can be determined, Dr. Ramirez has not been arrested or charged or relieved of her position. No formal statement to that effect has been provided by the police department.

The *Sentinel*

See P 3

Eyebrows Raise As County GOP Central Committee Chairman Unleashes Attack On Fellow Republican

The Republican versus Republican match-up in this year's Second District county supervisorial race has created a lurid political spectacle that is threatening to fracture the solidarity that has for generations allowed the GOP to maintain an upper hand in far flung San Bernardino County.

Most remarkable is that the county's top Republican - San Bernardi-

no County Central Committee Chairman Phil Corthran Sr. - is playing a central role in the contretemps.

Concern is intensifying among a growing number of the local members of the Party of Lincoln that as a consequence of the ongoing Republican-on-Republican mayhem, the traditionally meek and inef-

fectual Democrats just might inherit San Bernardino County.

Indeed, there is talk among a number of deep-pocketed donors to the Republican cause that a shake-up at the top of the county party is in order and that if Cothran does not step down or if he is not removed, they will close their checkbooks.

Time was

See P 5

Hesperia On The Brink Of Pulling The Plug On Marijuana Businesses

Hesperia city officials are giving serious contemplation to rescinding the city's policy, adopted in 2018, that allows for limited commercial cannabis/marijuana activity within the city.

If indeed the city council pulls the plug on the city's cannabis products sales program, Hesperia will be the first San Bernardino County city

to deliberalize marijuana laws, a trend that spread among only a handful of the county's 24 municipalities, beginning in 2012.

Indeed, that Hesperia joined the ranks of Needles, Adelanto, San Bernardino and now Barstow and Fontana in going along with marijuana availability in their jurisdictions was un-

See P 5

San Bernardino Amazon Air Hub Operations Threatened By Labor Walkouts

San Bernardino's grand embrasure of Amazon, the fourth largest corporation in the world ranked by revenue, has turned problematic.

When the city's politicians approved the 659,000-square foot Amazon Air Regional Air Hub distribution facility less than three years ago, they justified their action by referencing the employment opportunities

the project would create upon its creation.

The jobs that have come into existence at the company's distribution facility have turned out to be, those that hold them say, far less than they were cracked up to be. Those workers say their positions are lowly ones which pay them less than a livable wage while exposing them to hazards.

The Air Hub grounds are being targeted today, Friday, October 14, for a worker walkout coordinated by the Warehouse Worker Resource Center and Inland Empire Amazon Workers United.

Workers cited Amazon's unfair labor practices, which have suppressed previous efforts to dialogue and negotiate higher per-hour pay, they say. Additionally, the

workers said, the company has retaliated against the more vocal elements of the work force by changing their working assignments and hours/shifts.

The protesters are demanding a \$5 per hour pay raise.

The company countered by effectuating an across-the-board \$1 per hour raise to all of its distribution center employ-

ees nationwide, effective this week.

Workers said that was not enough.

The pay increase that Inland Empire Amazon Workers United is calling for would raise the \$17 per hour base pay the warehouse workers are currently provided to \$22 an hour.

"Amazon is making record profits, while responding

See P 3

Taylor and Young, Allies During The 2017 Election Cycle, Entangled Themselves In Problematic Hirings Of Baldwin Park Figures To Fill Key West Valley Water District Roles from front page

ceeded from the unsealing of the documents and began registering with San Bernardino County residents over the weekend and throughout this week came less than two months after the death of Cliff Young, a former West Valley Water Board president who was, initially, one of Taylor's political mentors who became, ultimately, his primary political rival who would prove instrumental in Taylor's political unraveling.

As summer dawned in 2017, Michael Taylor was at a crossroads. He had recently been force out of a position near the pinnacle of his law enforcement profession and he was carrying on a serious debate with himself about whether he should seek to return to life as a cop or just retire. At the same time, he was torn as to whether he should again roll the dice on bid for elected office, after having lost in his first attempt at political office two years previously. Some three-and-a-half decades earlier, in 1982, Taylor had been hired as a patrolman with the Baldwin Park Police Department. He had made a steady progress up the ranks of the department under police chiefs David Snowden, Richard Hoskin, Carmine R. Lanza, Edward Lopez and Lili Hadsell, and was made police chief in 2013. In 2016, Taylor was fired, just as the City of Baldwin Park began in earnest to litigate a lawsuit brought against it in which Hadsell had alleged gender discrimination that resulted in her being unjustifiably terminated as police chief and that Taylor, as one of her highest-ranking subordinates, had undermined her in tandem with Baldwin Park City Councilman Ricardo Pacheco.

Taylor did not live in

Baldwin Park, but rather 36 miles east on the I-10 Freeway in one of the nicest neighborhoods in Rialto. One of Taylor's neighbors was Clifford Young, a professor at Cal State University San Bernardino. The two had much in common. Both had risen near or toward the top of their chosen professions within the public as opposed to the private sectors. Both were Republicans, with Young having a disputed claim to being the most prominent African American member of the GOP in San Bernardino County. A point of historical fact was that in 2003 and 2004, Young had been appointed to the position of Fifth District San Bernardino County Supervisor, which made him the first, and so far only, Black member of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors since that august panel's inception in 1853. Both Young and Taylor were extensively educated, having each earned doctorates. And both were bona fide alpha types, with dominant personalities that propelled them to success in life. They had met as neighbors, grew acquainted and were friendly.

Young had been involved in academia as the chairman of the California State University at San Bernardino as School of Public Administration, a position to which he returned after his two-year stint on the board of supervisors ended in 2004. In 2013, he had reentered the political fray, capturing a seat on the board of the West Valley Water District. In 2015, he had encouraged Taylor to make a run for the board. That had not been successful.

In Baldwin Park, the city was facing financial challenges. Like most of the cities in California, the politicians and establishment there had not, exactly, welcomed the legalization of marijuana for medical use that had come with the passage of 1996's Proposition 215, the Compassionate Use of Marijuana Act. It had not moved to allow marijuana dispensaries into the city. But in 2016, the residents of Califor-

nia had passed Proposition 64, the Adult Use of Marijuana Act, which opened the state up for those of the age of majority in California to use marijuana for its intoxicative effect. Some municipal officials, particularly ones who oversaw cash-strapped cities, took that as their cue to clear the way for entrepreneurs ready to market the drug, to set up shop in their cities and hopefully capture the tax windfall that many anticipated would accompany the marijuana-ification of California. Ultimately, with Pacheco as the spark plug, Baldwin Park, guided by City Attorney Robert Tafoya, moved toward formulating and adopting a policy of allowing those marijuana entrepreneurs to obtain permits to operate in the city, such that fees and taxes paid by and through those operations would pour money into the financially challenged municipality's coffers. Pacheco and Tafoya informally conferred with Taylor, who had spent his entire career harassing and arresting marijuana smokers and arresting those who sold them the product they were smoking, about what the law enforcement reaction to the city reversing course now that the substance had been legalized and whether the police force would be willing to sit still if pot shops were to be opened at various locations around the 6.79 square mile city.

Meanwhile, in at the Rialto headquarters of the West Valley Water Agency, Young's aggressive personality had begun to grate on some of the district's employees, particularly those placed higher up on the totem pole. They were resentful over the way in which, according to them, he had overstepped his authority as a board member. Young would question or press them with regard to policy or operations, which in their view was not in keeping with way policy and operational directives are normally and properly filtered through to staff, which involves a process by which the elected board sets policy, explains and delivers that policy to the general

manager, who then has the authority to direct department heads as to what should be accomplished and how to accomplish it. In addition, differences had manifested between Young and another board member, Linda Gonzalez, who had been elected to the council in 2013 in the same election cycle as Young and was therefore scheduled to run again in November 2017 when he would again be on the ballot. Accordingly, both surreptitiously and openly, a band of district employees were working on behalf of Gonzalez and in opposition to Young. Once again, Young encouraged Taylor to run for a position on the West Valley Water Board, this time with the hope that if the voters chose to retain him, they might also elect Taylor in place of Gonzalez, which would leave him with not only the authority but a mandate to act decisively in putting down the brewing staff insurrection.

Taylor's second shot at elected office was far better orchestrated than his first. Young provided him with financial support and campaign advice, and Taylor had obtained a substantial degree of financial assistance from elsewhere. He also employed as his campaign manager David Morgan, who had previously worked on the staff of Republican Assemblyman/California State Senator Bill Emmerson. Morgan brought a degree of sophistication and resourcefulness to the 2017 campaign that Taylor had lacked in 2015. Ultimately, in the 2017 contest, in which two four-year board positions were up for selection, Young finished in first, with 14,28 votes or 27.53 percent, Taylor proved the second-leading vote-getter with 1,404 or 27.06 percent, Gonzalez claimed 1,345 votes or 25.93 percent and Anthony Araiza, who had been for two decades the general manager of the district finished with 1,011 votes or 19.49 percent. Also elected to a two-year term on the board, a special election which was necessitated to fill the final two years of the term to which Alan Dyer had been elected in

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

2015 as a consequence of Dyer's resignation, Kyle Crowther, who was considered to be an ally to both Young and Taylor was elected.

Fresh off that victory for the three, things moved rapidly and remarkably at the district, and simultaneously, in Baldwin Park.

Whereas just months before Taylor had been at a fork in the road where off in one direction had been the possibility of seeking to reignite his law enforcement career that had flamed out with his firing as police chief in Baldwin Park and in the other direction pursuing a life in politics, of a sudden he found himself in the position where he could, and in fact did, follow both paths.

Even before Young Taylor and Crowther were sworn into office at the first West Valley Water District board meeting in December 2017, less than two weeks after Taylor's election to the West Valley Water District Board, on November 15, 2017, the Baldwin Park City Council voted to rehire Taylor as police chief, to return him to his former role under a contract that was to pay him \$183,368.08 in annual salary, another \$8,565.86 in other pay, \$54,782.03 in benefits and a \$47,878.57 contribution to his pension for a total yearly compensation of \$294,594.54. The employment contract with Taylor was worded by Baldwin Park City Attorney Robert Tafoya to preclude the city from firing Taylor unless he was convicted of a felony, and the contract further pro-

hibited the city council from engaging in annual evaluations of Taylor's performance.

Upon being sworn in to office in December 2017, Young, Taylor, and Crowther acted in concert with Young's existing ally on the board, Greg Young, who is no blood relation to Cliff Young to sack, suspend or place on administrative leave district general manager Matthew Litchfield; Assistant General Manager Greg Gage; the district's human resources manager, Karen Logue; and the board's secretary, Shanae Smith. They terminated chief financial officer Marie Ricci. Don Olinger, the lone Democrat on the board at that time, was the lone dissident in that vote.

Virtually simultaneously, the district retained a new general legal counsel, hiring Tafoya, who was yet serving in the capacity of Baldwin Park city attorney.

With the staff leadership of district having been more than decimated, indeed roughly three-fifths eliminated, the board brought in former Loma Linda Mayor Bob Christman to serve as interim district manager. The board acted to rescind the suspension of Litchfield, who thereupon chose to retire. The others who had been terminated or suspended – Gage, Logue, Smith and Ricci – initiated legal action against the district, which Tafoya at once went to work on contesting or resolving. In April 2018, five months after Taylor's and

Continued on Page 4

San Bernardino City School District Unwilling To Address Principal's Altercation With 7-Year-Old *from front page*

has the name of the student but is withholding it from publication while conducting further inquiries with the district about the matter.

On September 29, the *Sentinel* made a request under the California Public Records Act that the district provide "a copy of the video footage depicting the physical interaction/confrontation/altercation between Principal Dr. Christine Ramirez and [the student] which took place on or around August 5, 2022 at George Brown Jr. Elementary School."

On October 11, the *Sentinel* received a response from Harold Sullins, the district's associate superintendent for business, facilities, and operations.

"Your request is denied pursuant to Government Code sections 6254(c), 6254(k) and 6255, individual privacy rights existing under the

California Constitution and the United States Constitution, Education Code sections 49060, et seq., and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, known as 'FERPA'(20 U.S.C. section 1232g; see also *Rim of the World Unified School District v. Superior Court, et al.* (2002) 104 Cal.App.4th 1393, 1399 and *Poway Unified School District v. Superior Court* (Copley Press) (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 1496,1506.)"

Government Code Section 6254(c) pertains to withholding from disclosure any information, data or material requested under the California Public Records Act "Personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."

Government Code Section 6254(k) pertains to withholding from disclosure any information, data or material requested under the California Public Records Act "Records, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law, including, but not limited to, provisions of the Evi-

dence Code relating to privilege."

Government Code Section 6255, pertains to withholding from disclosure any information, data or material requested under the California Public Records Act the agency shall justify withholding any record on the basis that express provisions of the government code exempt disclosure or "on

the facts of the particular case the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record."

Government Code Section 6255, nonetheless contains a provision that a government agency in withholding the records or documents from disclosure can do so only "by demonstrating that

the record in question is exempt."

Sullins offered no such demonstration or explicit explanation of how or why the video is exempt.

Sullins' citation of with its reference to "provisions of the Evidence Code relating to privilege" implies but does not explicitly state that there is an ongoing investigation into the matter or a pending legal

action arising from it." Sullins, however, offered no further clarification of how Government Code Section 6254(k) applied to the video.

The *Sentinel* is conferring with legal counsel and examining its options on how to obtain further information with regard to the August 5 incident involving Principal Ramirez and the student.

San Bernardino Overrode Environmental Objections To Get Amazon Warehouse Where Workers Now Detest Working Conditions *from front page*

to workers demanding improved working conditions w/ intimidation & threats," IEAmazon-Workers stated in a tweet.

According to the workers, the temperature inside the facility has soared to unbearable levels.

There were 24 days in July when the temperature at the airport facility reached 95 degrees or hotter. August was worse. That was topped by record breaking heat during the first week of

September.

Amazon maintains that the temperature inside the Air Hub has never topped 79 degrees.

In recent years, Amazon has sought to substantially increase the number of its distribution facilities and its logistics capacity within Southern California, the Inland Empire and San Bernardino County in particular. While most jurisdictions where these projects have been proposed have been welcoming, there is increasing resident opposition to warehouses.

Increasingly, some elected officials, local residents and futurists are questioning whether warehouses constitute the highest and best use of the property available

for development in the region. The glut of logistics facilities in the Inland Empire has some thinking their numbers are out of balance. In refuting the assertions of the proponents of warehouses that they constitute positive economic development, their detractors cite the relatively poor pay and benefits provided to those who work in distribution facilities, the large diesel-powered semi-trucks that are part of those operations with their unhealthy exhaust emissions, together with the bane of traffic gridlock they create. While that is a moot point with the Amazon Air Regional Air Hub, as it is already in existence, its approval did attract a

lawsuit, one which was filed by former California Attorney General Xavier Becerra and local environmental justice groups alleging the City of San Bernardino in its approval process for the project indulged the site's master developer Hillwood Enterprises, Amazon, the Federal Aviation Administration and the San Bernardino International Airport Authority, which manages the airport, disregarded serious and significant health risks the massive air cargo landing and distribution center poses to the surrounding community, where large numbers of residents live.

While the environmental challenges have failed, labor groups

Travis-Miller Twice Reached The Pinnacle Of SB City Management *from front page*

ing month. Travis-Miller gamely soldiered on as acting city manager, leaving in 2013. Upon doing so, she left on the table a payout she was supposed to receive for accrued vacation time and sick leave owed to her from prior to August 2012, as she was considered one of the city's creditors under the bankruptcy filing. When the city got around to settling with those pre-bankruptcy creditors, she was cataloged with those deemed eligible to receive one percent of what they were owed – one penny on the dollar.

Upon leaving San Bernardino the first time, she became the executive director of the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments. In March 2015, she accepted the position of city manager in Co-

vina.

In 2016, Travis-Miller was persuaded to return to San Bernardino, where she was installed as the city's contract assistant city manager under then-City Manager Mark Scott. She was in place in June 2017 when the city made its exit, after nearly five years, from bankruptcy.

When Scott of his own volition departed as city manager toward the end of Summer 2017, the city council, at that point led by Mayor Carey Davis, turned to Miller to lead the city. Seeking continuity and stability, the council conferred upon Travis-Miller a five-year contract, providing her a \$253,080 annual salary and \$93,000 in total yearly benefits. John Valdivia, then a councilman in the city's Third Ward, wrung from her a commitment to remain as city manager for the full five years and not surrender to the temptation to move on to a more lucrative or

prestigious management position elsewhere.

Less than a year-and-a-half later, however, Valdivia had moved up from his council position, vying successfully in 2018 against Davis to defeat him in that November's mayoral election. As soon as he had the mayoral gavel in his hand, Valdivia clashed with Travis-Miller.

On December 19, 2018, the day Valdivia was sworn in as mayor along with two new council members with whom he was then allied, Second Ward Councilwoman Sandra Ibarra and First Ward Councilman Ted Sanchez, he undertook to attenuate Travis-Miller's power as a ploy to reassert the power of the mayor's office, which had been attenuated by a charter revision passed by the city's voters in 2016 which had done away with the strong mayor form of governance the city had been functioning under since 1905. That

day, at Ibarra's suggestion, the council undertook to carry out a closed door evaluation of Travis-Miller's performance. Thereafter, in January, February and March of 2019, the council engaged in closed session reviews of Travis-Miller's work and accomplishments, compliance with the council's directives and the general direction of the city under her guidance, amid a series of episodes both public and private in which Valdivia and Travis-Miller locked horns.

Travis-Miller took issue with Valdivia's travel plans, including two sojourns to Washington, D.C., three trips to Sacramento, and international travel which included junkets to South Korea, China, and Taiwan, which she maintained exceeded the amount budgeted for such purposes.

In the fray, Valdivia had seized upon the manifestation of what was approaching a \$7

million shortfall in the city's revenue over what had been projected for 2018-19, brought on in no little measure by a steep downturn in the city's gasoline tax receipts. The departure of Finance Director Brent Mason early in 2019 further compromised Travis-Miller's standing with some members of the city council who interpreted Mason's departure as a sign that the city under Travis-Miller's guidance was faltering financially.

There was for the first five months of Valdivia's tenure as mayor insufficient support on the council to actuate Valdivia's intent to terminate Travis-Miller, but in May 2019, when Valdivia's ally Juan Figueroa was elected in a special election to fill the gap in the on the council when Valdivia's position as Third Ward councilman had been vacated with his elevation to mayor in December 2018, five votes to relieve her of her position as city

manager were manifest, those of Ibarra, Sanchez and Figueroa along with then-Councilman Henry Nickel and Councilwoman Bessine Richard.

The council made that firing without citing cause.

Under the terms of her contract, Travis-Miller was to be provided with a 30-day notice of her termination and, upon termination, a severance payout equal to one year's salary, an amount of \$253,080 shown in her original contract along with "benefits then in effect as provided for herein including, but not limited to, vacation, health and life insurance, and CalPERS [California Public Employees Retirement System] retirement service credit accrual for twelve months or through the original term of the contract, whichever is shorter."

Thus, from the time of her termination, Travis-Miller was due \$253,080 *Continued on Page 7*

Pacheco Was So Obviously On The Take That The FBI Rolled Him Up With Ease

from page 2

Crowther's elections and Cliff Young's reelection and four months after their swearing-in and Tafoya's hiring as West Valley general legal counsel, the district, prompted by Taylor, hired Pacheco, who was yet at that time a councilman in Baldwin Park to serve in the post of assistant general manager at an annual salary of \$189,592 plus benefits.

Pacheco had little to recommend him for the West Valley Water District position, as he had no expertise, experience or licensing in water operations. Taylor, however, convinced his board colleagues to go ahead with the hiring, persuasively arguing that Pacheco indeed had licensing as an electrical engineer; that electricity was a vital element of the district's operations; that shoring up the district's managerial team was sorely needed in the aftermath of the departures of Litchfield, Gage, Logue, Smith and Ricci; and that Pacheco had previously been employed at the Metropolitan Water Company in Los Angeles, the latter assertion being a somewhat risky ploy, given that Pacheco had actually been terminated from Metropolitan under rather telling circumstances. That bluff worked, however, as the remainder of the board accepted Taylor's suggestion that Pacheco be installed in the position. Significantly, when the actual vote to hire Pacheco was made, Taylor abstained.

Christman was having health challenges and at any rate had little experience in running a water operation, sought assistance in managing the district. Since Pacheco had no real ability to oversee the operations, Christman convinced the board to allow him to hire Clarence Mansell, who as spring advanced to summer in 2018 had just left the employ of Veolia Water in which he played a leading role in overseeing municipal water operations for the City of Ri-

alto, as a consultant. Essentially, Christman had Mansell there to serve as what was essentially the district's co-manager in charge of operations.

In October Christman died. Almost simultaneously, Taylor initiated a coup by which, having formed an alliance with Crowther and Olinger, he deposed Cliff Young as board president, taking on the district's political leadership himself.

Once in control of the district, Taylor moved to hire Mansell Jr. as the district's interim general manager, hinting that upon Mansell proving himself, he might be given the full-fledged general manager's position. Mansell was a journeyman water operations professional with nearly 40 years experience, including work with the Los Angeles County Sanitation District, the cities of Los Angeles, Corona, and Rialto as well as in his role as a water operations troubleshooting consultant.

The atmospherics in the district, which had evened out somewhat over the months as the forced departures of Litchfield, Gage, Logue, Smith and Ricci became more temporally distant and the district's political leadership appeared to be an unbreachable monolith, changed almost at once, with a new tension coming into play as district employees sensed that once again there was a power struggle at the top and their jobs might be at stake if it turned out they had sided with the eventual loser.

In March of 2019, Cliff Young linked up with the water district's chief financial officer, Naisha Davis, and an analyst in the district's administrative services division, Patricia Romero, to file a qui tam legal action in which they alleged Taylor, Pacheco, Tafoya, the law firm of Albright, Yee & Schmit, along with the Kaufman Law Firm and consultant Robert Katherman engaged in an elaborate bribery and kickback scheme that provided gifts, travel accommodations, entertainment and political contributions to members of the water board,

in particular Taylor and Crowther, in exchange for unnecessary or questionable services being rendered for the district which resulted in the diversion of public money.

In May 2019, Mansell, at Taylor's prompting and assured that board members Kyle Crowther and Don Olinger supported the move, hired then-Hesperia City Councilman Jeremiah Brosowske with a contract to serve as the district's assistant general manager at an annual salary of \$189,592 along with benefits and add-ons valued at over \$62,000 per year. Brosowske had no experience, no training, held no certificates or licenses, and possessed no expertise in water operations or public agency administration or management.

Meanwhile, in the City of Baldwin Park, where the city council in August of 2017 had approved a cannabis cultivation ordinance, Pacheco was making progress in getting his council colleagues to consider and approve permits and arrangements with individuals and businesses looking to cultivate and sell marijuana within the city. As early as 2018 word had reached law enforcement, including both the Baldwin Park Police Department and the FBI, that Pacheco was soliciting and receiving bribes from applicants for cannabis-related business operations in the city. It is unclear to what degree Taylor, who at that time was Baldwin Park's police chief, was aware of the suspicion that had fallen upon Pacheco nor what evidence against him had been gathered at that point.

Within the FBI, scrutiny was being given to the cannabis-related business approval processes and protocols in use by the city.

Tafoya and his firm drafted the City of, which was approved by the city council in 2017. Elements of Baldwin Park's commercial cannabis licensing program, the blueprint for which consists of the ordinance drafted by Tafoya, involved the potential for conflicts of interest and favoritism toward businesses, the

FBI concluded. That ordinance and other legal documents drawn up by Tafoya are riddled with irregularities, federal investigators observed.

to accepting \$37,900 in bribes from a Baldwin Park police officer who was a member of the officers union but was working undercover for the FBI.

Convinced that Pacheco was on the take, the FBI designed a sting operation against him, one that was not based on commercial marijuana-related activity but rather another area of responsibility that fell to the council, city employee contracts. In 2018, a Baldwin Park police officer involved with the police officers union made contact with Pacheco. Unknown to the councilman was that the officer was working in cooperation with the FBI. In exchange for Pacheco's promise to vote in favor of the Baldwin Park police officers' union's contract with the city, which Pacheco made good on during a city council meeting in March 2018 the officer paid or made arrangements to convey \$37,900 in bribes to the councilman from January through October 2018.

That money included \$17,900 was distributed through checks made out to Pacheco's church and to what the U.S. Attorney's Office referred to as "sham political committees" under the names of other people but controlled by Pacheco, as well as an envelope with \$20,000 in cash that the officer gave Pacheco at a Baldwin Park coffee shop, according to a plea agreement with federal prosecutors.

Shortly after that money was delivered to Pacheco, the FBI served search warrants at his home, where they found \$83,145 in cash, including \$62,900 that Pacheco had buried in his backyard in two locations.

Thereafter, Pacheco was secretly cooperating with the FBI, turning over to federal agents and the U.S. Attorney's office or allowing them to monitor his phone calls, text messages and emails.

Relatively soon after he had been hired into the

assistant general manager's position at the West Valley Water District, it had become clear to Taylor's board colleagues and senior staff at the district that Pacheco had no qualifications for the post, which was of little consequence, as the job he had been provided with was an essentially do-nothing assignment, meant as a highly lucrative sinecure down out of political favor. While he had rarely shown up to work at the district headquarters, for most of the final nine months of 2018 and the first three months of 2019, he made occasional appearances there. Beginning in April 2019, he was absolutely absent from the district offices. In May, it was announced that Pacheco was on paid administrative leave, and he continued to draw his full pay until November 2019, a total of more than \$135,000. In November 2019, Pacheco's employment with the district was terminated, at which point he was provided with a severance equal to nine months salary, \$146,459.82. Cliff Young protested that payout, calling it a "gift of public funds." Young further lamented that in the 19 months Pacheco was employed by the district, including the 13 months he was reporting as the assistant general manager and the six months he was on leave, Pacheco "did no work. He simply accepted money for having hired Mike Taylor as police chief in Baldwin Park. In return, Mike Taylor hired him as assistant general manager. It was a straight trade-off. They were giving each other kickbacks in the form of jobs. Robert Tafoya was in on it, when he was hired as our general counsel."

In the fall of 2019, with approach of the November 2019 election, the first in the district's history to be conducted by-district as opposed to at-large, Taylor militated to maintain political control of the district.

With Crowther seeking reelection in that portion of the district – Division 1 – covering Fontana and a part of Bloomington, Olinger in that section of the dis-

trict – Division 4 – covering a portion of Rialto, and Greg Young seeking reelection in that expanse within the district – Division 5 – covering much of Bloomington, Taylor threw his support behind getting both Olinger and Crowther reelected and in seeking to unseat Greg Young. Taylor transferred or spent some \$1,392.50 from his own campaign fund to support Crowther in his run against challengers Betty Gosney and Linda Gonzalez; \$25,050.25 in support of Olinger in his contest against Channing Hawkins; and another \$16,128.04 to support Angel Ramirez, a Fontana resident who relocated into a rented room in Bloomington just before the election filing period so he could run against Greg Young.

Taylor further utilized Brosowske, who had previous experience working on more than 40 campaigns of Republican candidates for public office, to assist Crowther, Olinger and Ramirez in their electioneering efforts.

Ultimately, things went Taylor's way in only one of those three elections. Crowther outdistanced his two challengers, Betty Gosney and Linda Gonzalez, claiming 278 votes or 53.05 percent to Gosney's 32 votes or 6.11 percent and Gonzalez's 211 votes or 40.27 percent. Channing Hawkins beat Don Olinger in a head-to-head contest, 618 votes or 65.05 percent to 332 votes or 34.95 percent. Greg Young with 338 votes or 52.73 percent leapt passed Angel Ramirez, who pulled in 228 votes or 35.57 percent. A third candidate in District 5, Jackie Cox, collected 75 votes or 11.7 percent.

At that point, Taylor's political hold on the West Valley Water District appeared to have elapsed. With Olinger gone and Greg Young reelected, the reascension of Dr. Young was at hand. At the December 5, 2019 West Valley Water District Board meeting, Hawkins was installed as a member of the board with his swearing in, which was conducted

Continued on Page 6

Six Of County's City's So Far Looking To Cut A Fat Hog With Marijuana Taxation *from front page*

expected and surprising when it occurred, having been inspired by the persuasiveness of a once-highly-favored politician who held sway in the city for a short period in 2018 but is now considered a pariah. Additionally, demonstrable incidents of political corruption that advanced with the permitting of commercial marijuana operations in other San Bernardino County cities and an incident of bribery involving a cannabis-based Hesperia

business and a former Hesperia city employee has convinced city officials the time may now be propitious to end the city's tolerance of marijuana and marijuana-based product sales in the city.

For 89 years beginning in 1907, marijuana was a banned substance in California, as well as the rest of the country. In 1996, California's voters passed Proposition 215, the Compassionate Use of Marijuana Act, which permitted marijuana to be used for medical purposes by those who had obtained a prescription for that purpose. The proposition, while allowing those jurisdictions

that were in favor of permitting dispensaries to do so, also allowed local authorities – meaning city and county officials – to continue to ban such operations. That is what occurred across the board in San Bernardino County for more than 15 years, as the county government itself, all 22 of its cities and its two incorporated towns balked at allowing sale of the drug to take place.

In 2012, Needles became the first city in the county to buck that ban, when it permitted first five dispensaries to set up shop there, followed by permitting cultivators to grow the weed in indoor nurseries. Three years

later, Adelanto moved to allow the cultivation of medical marijuana in indoor facilities located within its industrial park district. With California voters' passage in 2016 of Proposition 64, the Adult Use of Marijuana Act, which legalized the use of marijuana for its intoxicative effect, the then-council majority of Mayor Rich Kerr, Councilman Jermaine Wright and Councilman John Woodard acted in concert to legalize all forms of commercial marijuana activity in the city, including cultivation, cannabis product derivation and refinement, manufacturing of cannabis products, wholesal-

ing the substance, retail sales, warehousing the drug, scientific research into marijuana and cannabis, and distribution of the drug, with Kerr enunciating the intent of turning Adelanto into the "marijuana capital of California" as a means of generating fees and taxes to redress the city's financial challenges.

That same year, voters in the City of San Bernardino passed Measure O, which called for allowing marijuana to be re-tailed in the city. The San Bernardino City Council subsequently, based on the Measure O and Proposition 64, moved to legalize a host of marijuana-related businesses

in the county seat.

In the aftermath of the State of California's passage of Proposition 64, Hesperia city officials found themselves being heavily lobbied by former San Bernardino County Supervisor Bill Postmus to consider allowing marijuana-based enterprises to transact business in the City of Progress. As the proprietor of the Mountain States Consulting Group, a public issue engagement and political donation laundering firm which also employed Jeremiah Brosowske, Postmus was promoting would-be cultivators and purveyors of marijuana, which included a marijuana-related businesses

Continued on Page 7

For More Than A Half Century, Republicans Have Been Ascendant Politically In San Bernardino County, Even When They Have Been Outnumbered By Their Democratic Rivals *from front page*

when San Bernardino County's Republicans needed fear no Democrat. In January 1964, the Democratic Party's claim to San Bernardino County began to slip when Congressman Harry Sheppard opened three \$10,000 accounts in each of eight savings and loan associations and deposited another \$35,000 in banks in Washington, D.C. and the surrounding Maryland and Virginia metropolitan areas. The New Deal Democrat imploded in scandal thereafter as questions emerged about where he had gotten the \$275,000 in question, and his 28-year career as a legislator came to an end when he opted not to seek reelection that year. Two years later, Sheppard's Democratic successor as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Kenneth Dyal, was defeated by Republican Jerry Pettis, in the same election that brought Ronald Reagan to the Governor's Mansion in Sacramento.

San Bernardino County has been a Republican bastion ever since. Indeed, in the 56 years since Ronald Reagan's first public office electoral victory, with only a few notable exceptions, Republicans have held the majority of political offices at the local agen-

cy, municipal, county and state level in San Bernardino County. Even as the rest of California was falling more and more under the sway of the Democrats, San Bernardino County resisted that trend.

For more than 40 years, Republicans simply outnumbered Democrats in the county overall, with there being only a few heavy blue collar pockets within its 20,105-square mile expanse where Democrats predominated.

In 2009, that statistical edge for the GOP ended, and for the first time in more than four decades, the number of Democrats in the county eclipsed the number of Republicans. That trend has continued, such that at this point, 472,601 or 41.3 percent of the county's 1,144,227 total voters are registered as Democrats, while 333,863 voters or 29.2 percent affiliate with the Party of Lincoln.

Remarkably, however, local Republicans, despite the registration disadvantage they face, have succeeded in holding onto most of the county's elective offices they controlled in their heyday, at least so far. This has largely occurred because Republicans turn up to vote in far higher percentages than do Democrats

nationally, statewide and particularly locally. In San Bernardino County, as well, the party structure the Republicans have has proven far more energetic, efficient and engaged than the local Democratic Party. Republicans have had little trouble getting all of their horses hitched up to the same side of the wagon and getting them to pull in the preferred direction at once, proving far more effective at raising money than the Democrats and have more experience and are therefore more accomplished in employing the money they have to run convincing and targeted campaigns – using newspaper ads and both television and radio spots, billboards, handbills, mailers, phone banks and polls and door-to-door voter appeals – to drive Republican voters to the polls and wage efforts against their Democratic opponents. Until relatively recently, the Republicans lived by the 11th Commandment, "Thou shalt not speak ill of a fellow Republican." At present, four of the five members of the county board of supervisors are Republicans and in 17 of the county's 24 municipalities there are more Republican members of the city or town councils than Democratic members.

Beginning in 2013, however, a minor rift in the county GOP opened when Curt Hagman, then a member of the California Assembly who was

to be termed out of the statehouse after what was to be the end of his sixth year in state office in 2014, settled on perpetuating his political career by running for county supervisor in the Fourth District, representing Chino Hills, Chino, Ontario, Montclair and south Upland. The Fourth District supervisorial post he coveted was at that time occupied by another Republican, Gary Ovitt. Refusing to honor Ovitt's incumbency, Hagman threatened to challenge him for the supervisor's seat. To strengthen himself for that run, Hagman in late 2013 moved to depose Robert Rego as the chairman of the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee and assume the position himself. Rego had done yeoman's work for the county Republican Party, raising funds and creating a well-oiled and maintained political machine to promote the candidacies of Republican candidates throughout the county. By pushing Rego out, Hagman was able to seize command of local party operations and cut Ovitt off from party support, and instead direct that assistance to his own campaign. Ovitt opted out of seeking reelection. Hagman achieved victory in 2014, running successfully for Fourth District supervisor against Gloria Negrete-McLeod, then an incumbent Democratic congresswoman.

Despite his personal

success, Hagman planted seeds of dissension within the local Republican Party. Whereas previously there had been an ethos of party loyalty among Republicans that essentially held individual personal ambition in check, Hagman's willingness to cut Ovitt off at the pass became a model for other Republicans thereafter. Since that time there have been multiple examples of one Republican moving to challenge another incumbent Republican, efforts which have met with varying degrees of success and failure.

In 2016, four Republicans – Angela Valles, Rick Roelle, Paul Russ and Bill Holland – challenged incumbent Republican First District San Bernardino County Supervisor Robert Lovin-good. The four challengers lost. That same year, Republican stalwart Tim Donnelly angled at unseating incumbent Republican 8th Congressional District Congressman Paul Cook. Donnelly failed. In 2018, Donnelly again took an unsuccessful run at Cook. Then-incumbent Republican 40th District Assemblyman Marc Steinorth challenged incumbent Republican Second District San Bernardino County Supervisor Janice Rutherford. Steinorth narrowly lost. John Valdivia, then an incumbent Republican San Bernardino City Councilman, challenged Carey Davis, the incumbent Republican mayor of San Bernardino. Valdivia

defeated Davis in the November 2018 San Bernardino mayoral runoff election. In 2019, Hesperia City Councilman Jeremiah Brosowske, who had made his mark in local politics as a young and energetic political operative working on behalf of a score of Republican candidates, turned on his fellow Republican and fellow councilman, Bill Holland, who had been instrumental in appointing Brosowske to the city council the previous year as a replacement for Mayor Russ Blewett, who had died in office. Brosowske heavily involved himself in a petition process to qualify a recall election targeting Holland. That effort failed, after which Holland and two of the members of the all-Republican city council, Larry Bird and Cameron Gregg, bounced Brosowske off the city council, based on their determination that Brosowske was not meeting the residency requirements to serve on the city council.

One upshot of all of this is that the rising level of acrimony among the county's Republicans appears to be gradually weakening the local GOP.

Jan Leja had been elected chairwoman of the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee in January 2017. During her four years in that post, she had not proven to be a strong enough personality to

Continued on Page 13

Pacheco Became A Vortex That Sucked Everyone Who Cut A Deal With Him Into A Thorough Going-Over By The FBI *from page 4*

by Rialto Mayor Deborah Robertson, while and Fontana Mayor Acquanetta Warren performed the swearing in of Crowther and Greg Young. The next order of business after the investiture was the reorganization of the board's officers, i.e., the newly-composed board settling on who among its members would serve in the capacity of president. It was widely assumed that either Dr. Clifford Young or Greg Young, who had been relegated to the role of minority members at odds with the ruling coalition of Taylor, Crowther and Olinger for the previous 14 months, now strengthened with the replacement of Olinger by Hawkins, would be elevated to board president.

The canny Taylor, however, was not yet prepared to surrender to Clifford Young command over the district. He was yet, until a new president was selected, in possession of the district gavel and in control of the proceedings. As soon as the item was taken up, without recognizing anyone else and allowing one of the Youngs to nominate the other for the president's post, he immediately launched into a narrative about how since the election had concluded he had the opportunity to meet and familiarize himself with Hawkins, whom he had found to be "a very bright and gifted person who has an amazing degree of maturity for a person of his age." With no further ado, he nominated Hawkins to serve as board president. Without hesitation and not waiting for Crowther to second the nomination, Hawkins himself voiced the second. So stunned were both Youngs by the staccato-paced maneuver, which had rather obviously been choreographed in advance between Taylor and Hawkins, that nei-

ther was able to offer a substitute motion or competing nomination before the vote was called for and taken. Greg Young abstained and Clifford Young, bowing to the inevitable, joined with Taylor, Crowther and Hawkins in voting to establish Hawkins as board president. Immediately after the vote, Taylor handed the president's gavel to Hawkins and he assumed the position of board president. The next order of business was the selection of the board vice-president. Taylor immediately nominated his ally, Crowther, to serve as vice-president, which was followed by a 3-to-1 vote in favor of Crowther, with Greg Young abstaining and Dr. Young opposed.

Taylor, by his astute and quick action, had effectuated a mini-coup. While he had to surrender the presidency of the board, that outcome was inevitable. Still, he had prevented Clifford Young from reasserting himself into a position of control and he had further prevented Greg Young, who was second in seniority on the board to Dr. Young and was the most logical appointee to a leadership role on the board, from obtaining appointment to either the president's position or the vice-president's position. Furthermore, by his gambit, Taylor headed off the manifestation of any hard feeling that perhaps existed on Hawkins' part toward him over his support of his opponent, Olinger, in the November 5 contest, in particular the \$22,620.48 of Taylor's own campaign funds that had been used in the effort to keep Hawkins out of office. By forging a bond with Hawkins through ensuring his elevation to board president immediately after coming into office, a highly unusual advancement in the world of politics where such honorifics are not normally extended until an office holder has gained some years of experience in office, Taylor obstructed the formation of a natural and what otherwise might have been an inevitable alliance between Hawkins and

Dr. Young, and put himself into position to make further amends with Hawkins and establish a working political relationship with the board's newest member that over the next two years proved effective in stymying Clifford Young's hope of once again asserting his own control over the district.

While Taylor was proving himself more adept at outmaneuvering the aging Dr. Young with regard to issues and developments within the immediate orbit of the water district in Rialto, in the larger context of the ongoing FBI investigation that was spreading across the landscape of Southern California from Los Angeles County and into San Bernardino County, events were on a pace, albeit a glacial one, to eventually overtake Taylor.

Somehow, perhaps because federal agents by design had endeavored to be discreet in carrying out their operations, the search warrant that was served on Pacheco at his home, including the unearthing of the buried cash in his backyard, drew no public attention. The councilman had quietly agreed to cooperate with investigators in assisting them in determining the depth of corruption in the City of Baldwin Park's transition to a community that hosted marijuana-based commercial activity. That cooperation included allowing agents to set up points of vantage with regard to a whole host of interactions between Pacheco, who was still a councilman and mayor pro tem in Baldwin Park, and businessman, other politicians, political operatives and community leaders.

In March 2020, the U.S. Attorney's Office filed criminal charges against Pacheco, but kept the case secret to facilitate the FBI's continuing investigation of public corruption, with which the councilman was participating as a confidential informant. In June 2020, Pacheco entered into a plea arrangement with the government, a condition of which was

that he resigned from office. To protect the yet ongoing investigation, no disclosure of the plea arrangement was made by the U.S. Attorney's Office. Pacheco publicly stated that he had resigned so he could spend more time with his family and pursue other professional endeavors. Federal officials did nothing to contradict that, and obscuring the matter further were reports that Pacheco's resignation had come shortly after Baldwin Park officials had come across indications that he had used a city-issued credit card at strip clubs and amid reports that he had asked for inappropriate favors from the police department, including fixing traffic tickets.

To those that were paying close attention, there were some yellow caution lights all glaring all around Pacheco. There were explicit accusations about him in the qui tam lawsuit which had been lodged in federal court by Cliff Young, Naisha Davis and Patricia Romero, which, incidentally, FBI agents had focused intently upon. His extended absence from his West Valley Water District assistant general manager's post in 2019 had raised, at least for some, red flags. His out-of-the-blue resignation from the council was, at least, a rather curious development.

In September 2020, recently retired Baldwin Park Police Lieutenant Christopher Kuberry, who had overseen the city's cannabis businesses inspections, filed a sworn declaration in which he said three different operators of commercial marijuana-related concerns told him they were put in the position of "having to pay \$250,000 in a brown paper bag to city officials." Disclosed was that under the city's licensing program, a company, Rukli Inc., was given an exclusive franchise as the city's sole transporter/distributor of marijuana in the city, such that cultivators and manufacturers had to use Rukli to transport their product.

If those around Pacheco were able to re-

main blissfully ignorant of the vortex-to-hell he represented, that state of comfort was pretty much shattered on October 28, 2020, when the FBI served search warrants at the home of Compton City Councilman Isaac Galvan, the downtown Los Angeles law office of Robert Tafoya and the Upland home of San Bernardino County Planning commissioner Gabe Chavez.

An analysis of the search warrants and the entire circumstance led those whose premises had been searched to the inescapable conclusion that Pacheco was an FBI informant. If they failed to fully grasp that reality, it was brought home to them in no uncertain terms three months later when the U.S. Attorney's Office in January 2021 publicly trumpeted Pacheco's June 2020 guilty plea and the details relating to his acceptance of bribes from the officer with the police union, unsealing unsealed the criminal information that had been filed against him and partially unsealing the plea agreement by which Pacheco had agreed to fully cooperate in ongoing public corruption investigations. Those redactions were intended, the U.S. Attorney's Office said, "to protect the integrity of ongoing aspects of those investigations."

The cat was out of the bag. Everyone who had been involved with Pacheco in any of his various depredations at that point knew he was on the FBI's radar screen.

It was at that point that Taylor, who was no longer serving in the capacity of police chief in Baldwin Park and who had vied, unsuccessfully, for a position on the Rialto City Council in November 2020, began to reexamine his political aspirations. He had been granted an extra year in office on the West Valley Water District Board of Directors when the district had transitioned from odd-number year elections to even-number year elections. Privately, he resolved that he would not seek reelection to when in 2022 his

term was set to elapse. He made no mention of that decision, but for those close to the board and district operations, it was apparent that something was different, as Taylor was no longer so intensely focused on trying to force himself into being, with Hawkins, the co-regent of the district. He seemed distracted.

Indeed, he was. His disengagement with community went beyond his intent to step down from the water board. He was concerned that the pox upon the houses of the City of Baldwin Park and West Valley Water District was to soon infect him. Hoping that he might elude being drawn into a very ugly situation, he began plotting his exit from Southern California. He would, he decided, leave California altogether. The further he went, he figured, the better.

Interestingly, both Crowther and Clifford Young would beat Taylor to the punch. In November 2021, Crowther, announcing he had been offered an out-of-state employment offer, resigned. In December, dealing with heavy blow of the death of his wife, Jacquelynne, and himself facing a health challenge, Young tendered his resignation to allow him to move from Rialto to live with family members to look after him during his treatment and presumed recovery.

Taylor remained on the board five months longer than did Clifford Young, but tendered his resignation in June and in July moved to Arkansas. The board moved to replace him with Dan Jenkins.

In August, Clifford Young passed away.

Other than that sobering news, throughout the summer things remained relatively quiet. But late last week, things heated up. On October 7, the U.S. Attorney's Office filed a criminal information against Chavez and plea agreement with him on a single charge alleging he had participated in and facilitated a scheme by Pacheco to accept and launder bribes from two companies in exchange for his votes to approve

Travis-Miller Sued & Prevailed Over City's Failure To Honor Provision's Of Her Contract When It Sacked Her; A Second Suit Claimed But Did Not Establish That Councilwoman Ibarra Dwelling On Her Firing Defamed Her *from page 3*

plus \$106,612.51 in benefits, of which \$53,976.62 was a contribution toward her retirement fund. Thus, she was due to receive, under her contract, \$305,715.89 to be paid out to her in 12 monthly installments of \$25,476.32 over the year-long period following her departure. In addition, the city was to make the \$53,976.62 annual contribution to the California Public Employees Retirement System for the last year she worked and another \$53,976.62 contribution to the California Public Retirement System for the follow-on year roughly matching 2019-20.

In June, however, the city failed to provide Travis-Miller with the first \$25,476.32 installment of her severance pay, fueling speculation it might amend its May 29 action firing her to allege cause. Again in July, the city was delinquent in making the payment. At that point Miller, who is herself an attorney, filed a claim against the city, a prerequisite to the filing of a lawsuit. In August, the city likewise did not come forth with the severance installment due Travis-Miller. The city, however, did nothing to adjust its termination of her as having been carried out for no cited

cause. In September, Travis-Miller, represented by attorneys Bradley Gage, Milad Sadr and Terry Goldberg, filed suit against the city.

In that breach-of-contract suit, filed in San Bernardino County Superior Court, Travis-Miller and her attorneys maintained she was retaliated against, subjected to a "hostile" work environment, discriminated against and suffered gender bias. The suit said tension between her and Valdivia and his staff members was at the root of much of the shabby treatment she endured. Reiterating many of the issues she previously highlighted in her July claim against the city, the suit fleshed out further detail with regard to how the city and its leaders failed to take any corrective action or discipline those who were responsible for what she experienced. According to the lawsuit, several of the city's elected officials knowingly and deliberately violated the city's revamped charter, particularly with regard to provisions that empowered her as city manager vis-à-vis the mayor.

According to her suit, Travis-Miller was the victim of "a concerted effort" orchestrated by

Valdivia and his minions to marginalize her. Valdivia evinced a shocking degree of chauvinism, according to the suit, including having "questioned why the city had a female city manager or the wisdom of having women in government," which ultimately had the effect of leaving Travis-Miller isolated from other members of city, excluded from meetings, and shunted aside in such a way that she was "cut off [from] the flow of information or communications intrinsic to her essential job duties." She was, according to the suit, unjustifiably subjected to "negative performance reviews, reduction in authority, administrative leave and termination. Miller was subjected to unwanted harassing conduct because she is a woman. The harassing conduct from [the] defendants and each of them, was so severe, widespread, or persistent that a reasonable person in the plaintiffs circumstances would have considered the work environment to be hostile or abusive."

Over the next six months, Travis-Miller, along with Gage, Sadr and Goldberg prepared to go to trial.

On Wednesday, April 1, 2020, the city council approved a settlement agreement with Travis-Miller in which the city denied any liability growing out of Travis-Miller's claims but none-

theless agreed to pay her \$750,000 to resolve all of her claims in exchange for her waiver of all claims and dismissal thereof. In announcing the settlement, the city made a public declaration, it said, "to clarify that Ms. Miller was terminated without cause because the city wanted to go in a new direction. During her tenure as city manager, Ms. Miller received strong performance evaluations. Contrary to any previous public statements or published comments, there is no evidence that Ms. Miller ever engaged in any professional improprieties or corrupt behaviors. The city appreciates the assistance that Ms. Miller provided the city and her astute financial guidance in leading the City of San Bernardino out of bankruptcy."

Of note was that the \$750,000 settlement conferred upon Travis-Miller exceeded by \$310,854.55 the \$439,145.45 that was due her under the terms of her contract, consisting of the \$25,476.32 in monthly pay and benefits she would have been provided for the month she would have remained on the city payroll following notification of her termination, the \$305,715.89 to be paid out to her in 12 monthly installments of \$25,476.32 over the year following her termination, and the two separate \$53,976.62 contributions toward her retirement fund for 2018-19 and 2019-20.

The settlement carried with it a mutual non-disparagement clause which prohibited either side from badmouthing the other, with the statement provided by the city in announcing the settlement on April 4, 2020 to be the final and only public comment from either side with regard to the matter.

Less than a month later, however, Councilwoman Ibarra was engaged in a series of exchanges with members of the public on the social media platform Facebook in which the city's settlement with Travis-Miller was questioned. At issue was the \$310,854.55 in excess of the \$439,145.45 owed to Travis-Miller under her contract the ra-

tionale for the settlement and why it was that Travis-Miller had been let go in the first place. While Ibarra had been considered to be a political ally of Valdivia in the initial stage of Valdivia's tenure as mayor and her first six months or so as a councilwoman, by that point Ibarra had broken with Valdivia. Nevertheless, in the Facebook exchange, Ibarra referenced the difficulty she had with Travis-Miller, extending back to prior to her election to the city council, when as a community activist in the city's Second Ward, she had not been able to get City Hall to act with regard to issues Ibarra felt needed to be redressed in her neighborhood.

"The truth always prevails and for what it's worth, those comments made by the city are false. I stand behind my vote of letting Andrea go, just as I do with others who aren't performing and aren't letting the city move forward. Just remember I'm one of 7 votes up there. Not many up there listen to the speakers."

In an apparent response to attorney Tristan Pelayes, who was representing several city employees who were suing Valdivia over mistreatment, Ibarra sought to counter Pelayes's suggestion that she was yet aligned with the mayor. Pelayes had suggested that her vote to fire Travis-Miller served as a demonstration that she was in league with Valdivia. Ibarra countered that observation with her assertion that she had come to the conclusion that Travis-Miller should be terminated independent of Valdivia's militating against her.

"Tristan, I would recommend reading Andrea Miller's contract to start with," Ibarra posted. "Then see if you all can gain access to the official performance reviews we submitted to the city last year. I stand behind my votes to let Andrea go. I knew enough about Andrea's performance before being elected because I was out in the community and things weren't getting done."

Upon those Facebook exchanges being brought

to Travis-Miller's attention, she had discourse with Gage, Sadr and Goldberg, who in short order characterized what Ibarra had said as "defamatory" and a violation of the non-disparagement clause of Travis-Miller's settlement with the city. The Goldberg & Gage Law Firm filed a claim with the city over Ibarra's postings.

Gage went on record as saying Ibarra's remarks were a perpetuation of the action that had led to the filing of the lawsuit against the city the previous year and that Ibarra was engaged in "a continuing act of discrimination, harassment and retaliation" against Travis-Miller based on her age and gender as well as for having stood up to the city in the past.

When the city rejected the claim, Gage, Sadr and Goldberg sued the city and Ibarra on Travis-Miller's behalf.

According to the lawsuit, Ibarra's posts were false, defamatory, malicious and harmed Travis-Miller's reputation, damaging her ability to find work in the field of municipal management.

Moreover, they violated the \$750,000 settlement agreement, necessitating that the city pay Travis-Miller even more money.

Judge Michael Sachs, in his finding with regard to both the city's and Ibarra's motions for summary judgment, concluded Ibarra was expressing an opinion protected by the First Amendment when she made what were critical but objectively less than defamatory statements about Travis-Miller in her Facebook postings. The postings qualified as "opinion," Judge Sachs said, about someone, i.e., Travis-Miller, who was serving in a public capacity. As such, the judge said, what Ibarra wrote did not meet the threshold of being "highly offensive to a reasonable person in Miller's position."

Nor did Ibarra's postings breach the settlement agreement between the city and Travis-Miller, Judge Sachs ruled.

Postmus & Brosowske Convinced Hesperia Solons They Should Jump On The Marijuana Gravy Train *from page 5*

juana growing operation he and his business partner John Dino DeFazio, were attempting to make profitable. Postmus and Brosowske, who was a Republican Party political operative, pushed the five members of the Hesperia City Council, all of whom were Republicans, to accept that marijuana, for so long considered anathema to the conservative, hard right, Republican pro-law enforcement crowd, represents the wave of the future in terms of investment op-

portunities and tax generation.

Postmus and Brosowske held particular sway over then-Hesperia Mayor Paul Russ. While the city council stopped short of allowing all order of marijuana-related business to operate in the city, it did consent to a first step in that direction by allowing marijuana distributorships — ones which functioned out of warehouses in a limited section of the city's industrial zone lying between Santa Fe Avenue East to the west and I Avenue to the east, and Juniper Street to the south and Smoke Tree Street to the north along with a limited series of properties lying along I

Avenue between Juniper and Lemon streets. Those delivery businesses were allowed to make delivery of the product they dealt in to customers inside and outside the city. Those businesses are required to maintain a low profile, with no signage or storefronts or on-premise sales, in secured facilities where cultivation is prohibited. In 2018, Hesperia's voters approved Measure T, which authorized the city's collection of a tax running from a rate of 1 percent to 6 percent on any commercial cannabis operations transacting business within the city or by businesses based in the city. A month after *Continued on Page 13*

Public Notices

Notice is hereby given pursuant to Sections 3071 of the Civil Code of the State of California the undersigned will sell the following vehicle(s) at lien sale at said address below on: 10/28/2022 09:00 AM

Year of Car / Make of Car / Vehicle ID No. / License No. (State)

2015 DODGE 3C4PD-CBG8FT72469 8RZK256 CA

To be sold by CROWN AUTOBODY & PAINT 1141 W HOLT STE 3 ONTARIO CA 91762

Said sale is for the purpose of satisfying lien for together with costs of advertising and expenses of sale.

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 14.

T.S. No.: LO-32755-CA Loan No. *****2866

APN: 1061-131-32-0-000 NOTICE OF TRUSTEE'S SALE YOU ARE IN DEFAULT UNDER A DEED OF TRUST DATED 6/9/2017. 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 drawn on a state or national bank, check drawn by a state or federal credit union, or a check drawn by a state or federal savings and loan association, or 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, 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: Michael W. Robb and Jacqueline Robb, Husband and Wife as Joint Tenants Duly Appointed Trustee: Nationwide Reconveyance, LLC

Recorded 6/14/2017 as Instrument No. 2017-0243476 in book XX, page XX of Official Records in the office of the Recorder of San Bernardino County, California, Date of Sale: 10/24/2022 at 1:00 PM Place of Sale: NEAR THE FRONT STEPS LEADING UP TO THE CITY OF CHINO CIVIC CENTER, 13220 CENTRAL AVENUE, CHINO, CA 91710 Amount of unpaid balance and other charges: \$424,141.30 Street Address or other common designation of real property: 5406 Sard Street Alta Loma, CA 91701-1312 A.P.N.: 1061-131-32-0-000 The undersigned Trustee disclaims any liability for any incorrectness of the street address or other common designation, if any, shown above. If no street address or other common designation is shown, directions to the location of the property may be obtained by sending a written request to the beneficiary within 10 days of the date of first publication of this Notice of Sale. NOTICE TO POTENTIAL BIDDERS: If

Public Notices

you are considering bidding on this property lien, you should understand that there are risks involved in bidding at a trustee auction. You will be bidding on a lien, not on the property itself. Placing the highest bid at a trustee auction does not automatically entitle you to free and clear ownership of the property. You should also be aware that the lien being auctioned off may be a junior lien. If you are the highest bidder at the auction, you are or may be responsible for paying off all liens senior to the lien being auctioned off, before you can receive clear title to the property. You are encouraged to investigate the existence, priority, and size of outstanding liens that may exist on this property by contacting the county recorder's office or a title insurance company, either of which may charge you a fee for this information. If you consult either of these resources, you should be aware that the same lender may hold more than one mortgage or deed of trust on the property. NOTICE TO PROPERTY OWNER: The sale date shown on this notice of sale may be postponed one or more times by the mortgagee, beneficiary, trustee, or a court, pursuant to Section 2924g of the California Civil Code. The law requires that information about trustee sale postponements be made available to you and to the public, as a courtesy to those not present at the sale. If you wish to learn whether your sale date has been postponed, and, if applicable, the rescheduled time and date for the sale of this property, you may call (714) 986-9342 or visit this Internet Web site www.superiordefault.com, using the file number assigned to this case LO-32755-CA. Information about postponements that are very short in duration or that occur close in time to the scheduled sale may not immediately be reflected in the telephone information or on the Internet Web site. The best way to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. For sales conducted after January 1, 2021:

NOTICE TO TENANT: You may have a right to purchase this property after the trustee auction pursuant to Section 2924m of the California Civil Code. If you are an "eligible tenant buyer," you can purchase the property if you match the last and highest bid placed at the trustee auction. If you are an "eligible bidder," you may be able to purchase the property if you exceed the last and highest bid placed at the trustee auction. There are three steps to exercising this right of purchase. First, 48 hours after the date of the trustee sale, you can call (714) 986-9342, or visit this internet website www.superiordefault.com using the file number assigned to this case LO-32755-CA to find the date on which the trustee's sale was held, the amount of the last and highest bid, and the address of the trustee. Second, you must send a written notice of intent to place a bid so that the trustee receives it no more than 15 days after the trustee's sale. Third, you must submit a bid so that the trustee receives it no more than 45 days after the trustee's sale. If you think you may qualify as an "eligible tenant buyer" or "eligible bidder," you should consider contacting an attorney or appropriate real estate professional immediately for advice regarding this potential right to purchase. Date: 9/20/2022 Nationwide Reconveyance, LLC 5677 Oberlin Drive, Suite 210 San Diego, California 92121 Sale Line: (714) 986-9342 By: Rhonda Rorie, Trustee (TS# LO-32755-ca SDI-24592) Published in the San Bernardino Sentinel. Published on: 09/23/2022, 09/30/2022, 10/07/2022 & 10/14/2022

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS

Public Notices

NAME FBN 20220008358
The following person(s) is(are) doing business in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY as: SHIFTING MOTORS LLC 1680 S E ST #B-97 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408: SHIFTING MOTORS LLC 1680 S E ST #B-97 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408
Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.
S/ HANBAL A ZEAD, Manager

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 09/08/2022

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, J2282

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

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/23/2022, 9/30/2022, 10/07/2022 & 10/14/22.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE

NUMBER CIVSB 2217310 TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: LOAN CUU THI NGUYEN filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

LOAN CUU THI NGUYEN TO ELLE NGUYEN

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 for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing
Date: November 4, 2022
Time: 8:30 AM
Department: S16

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 09/07/2022
Judge of the Superior Court: JOHN M. PACHECO

140 West Rialto Avenue, Apartment F

San Bernardino, CA 92408 (909) 751-5852

lunachan1075@gmail.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on September 23 & 30 and October 7 & 14, 2022.

SUMMONS - (FAMILY LAW)

NOTICE TO RESPONDENT (AVISO AL DEMANDADO): SARORN BON

YOU HAVE BEEN SUED. Read the information below and on the next page. Lo han demandado. Lea la informacion a continuacion y en la pagina siguiente.

PETITIONER'S NAME IS (Nombre del demandante): JOVON FRADIUE, SR.

Public Notices

CASE NUMBER

FLR12202965

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this Summons and Petition are served on you to file a Response (Form FL-120) at the court and have a copy served on the petitioner. A letter or phone call will not protect you. If you do not file your Response on time, the court may make orders affecting your marriage or domestic partnership, your property, and custody of your children. You may be ordered to pay support and attorney fees and costs. For legal advice, contact a lawyer immediately. Get help finding a lawyer at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.cagov/selfhelp), at the California Legal Services Website (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), or by contacting your local county bar association.

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de haber recibido la entrega legal de esta Citación y Peticion para presentar una Respuesta (formulario FL-120) ante la corte y efectuar la entrega legal de una copia al demandante. Una carta o llamada telefonica o una audiencia de la corte no basta para protegerlo. Si no presenta su Respuesta a tiempo, la corte puede dar ordenes que afecten su matrimonio o pareja de hecho, sus bienes y la custodia de sus hijos. La corte tambien le puede ordenar que pague manutencion, y honorarios y costos legales. Para asesoramiento legal, pongase en contacto de inmediato con un abogado. Puede obtener informacion para encontrar un abogado en el Contro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en el sitio web de los Servicios Legales de California (www.lahelpca.org) o poniendose en contacto con el colegio de abogdgos de su condado.

NOTICE - Restraining orders on page 2: These restraining orders are effective against both spouses or domestic partners until the petition is dismissed, a judgment is entered, or the court makes further orders. They are enforceable anywhere in California by any law enforcement office who has received or seen a copy of them.

AVISO - Las ordenes de restriction se encuentran en la pagina 2 : Las ordenes de restriction estan en vigencia en cuanto a ambos conyuges o miembros de la pareja de hecho hasta que se despida la peticion, se emita un fallo o la corte de otras ordenes. Cualquier agencia del orden publico que haya recibido o visto una copia de estas ordenes puede hacerlas acatar en cualquier lugar de California.

FEE WAIVER : If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the clerk for a fee waiver form. The court may order you to pay back all or part of the fees and costs that the court waived for you or the other party.

Exencion de cuotas : Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentacion, pida al secretario un formulario de execion de cuotas. La corte puede ordenar que usted pague, ya sea en parte o por completo, las cuotas y costos de la corte previamente exentos a peticion de usted o de la otra parte.

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

RIVERSIDE FAMILY LAW COURTHOUSE
4175 MAIN STREET
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501

The name, address and telephone number of petitioner's attorney, or petitioner without an attorney, are: (El nombre, direccion y numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante si no tiene abogado, son):

IN PRO PER
JOVON FRADIUE, SR.
P.O. BOX 820
CABAZON, CA 92230
(909) 269-1716

email: jovonfradiue83@gmail.com
(Asistente) for Clerk of the

Public Notices

Court (Secretario)

Case electronically filed: April 20, 2022 by D. Thomsen
Order for summons filed: August 23, 2022 by G. Molina
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on September 23, 30, October 7 & October 14, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: ROSE MARIE GARCIA

CASE NO. PROSB2201367 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of ROSE MARIE GARCIA has been filed by RICHARD GARCIA in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that RICHARD GARCIA 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 NOVEMBER 2, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S37 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. Filed: SEPTEMBER 26, 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: September 26, 2022

Attorney for Richard Garcia:

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 September 30, October 7 & 14, 2022.

Public Notices

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2217956

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

ALBERTO TORRES to ALBERT TORRES

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

Notice of Hearing:
Date: 11/01/2022
Time: 08:30 AM
Department: S16

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino,

247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415,

San Bernardino District-Civil Division 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: 08/05/2022
Judge of the Superior Court: John M. Pacheco

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/30, 10/07, 10/14 & 10/21, 2022.

Notice of Trustee's Sale
T.S. No. 22-01242-FS-CA Title No. 2165753 A.P.N. 0210-652-56-0-000 NOTICE OF TRUSTEE'S SALE.

YOU ARE IN DEFAULT UNDER A DEED OF TRUST DATED 05/30/2017. 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

Public Notices

greater on the day of sale. Trustor: Yew Seng Chin and Birong Zhong, husband and wife as joint tenants Duly Appointed Trustee: National Default Servicing Corporation Recorded 06/12/2017 as Instrument No. 2017-0238933 (or Book, Page) of the Official Records of San Bernardino County, CA. Date of Sale: 11/15/2022 at 9:00 AM Place of Sale: Chino Municipal Court, North West Entrance in the Courtyard, 13260 Central Avenue, Chino, CA 91710 Estimated amount of unpaid balance and other charges: \$320,966.86 Street Address or other common designation of real property: 3068 E Via Rosso Ontario, CA 91764-7405 A.P.N.: 0210-652-56-0-000 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 you are the highest bidder at the auction, you are or may be responsible for paying off all liens senior to the lien being auctioned off, before you can receive clear title to the property. You are encouraged to investigate the existence, priority, and size of outstanding liens that may exist on this property by contacting the county recorder's office or a title insurance company, either of which may charge you a fee for this information. If you consult either of these resources, you should be aware that the same lender may hold more than one mortgage or deed of trust on the property. NOTICE TO PROPERTY OWNER: The sale date shown on this notice of sale may be postponed one or more times by the mortgagee, beneficiary, trustee, or a court, pursuant to Section 2924g of the California Civil Code. The law requires that information about trustee sale postponements be made available to you and to the public, as a courtesy to those not present at the sale. If you wish to learn whether your sale date has been postponed, and, if applicable, the rescheduled time and date for the sale of this property, you may call or visit this Internet Web site www.ndscorp.com/sales, using the file number assigned to this case 22-01242-FS-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

Public Notices

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, using the file number assigned to this case 22-01242-FS-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: 09/29/2022 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 By: Gabriela Sanchez, Trustee Sales Representative 10/07/2022, 10/14/2022, 10/21/2022 CPP353291

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARGARET LUBA TUSANYUKA CASE NO. PROSB2201401
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MARGARET LUBA TUSANYUKA has been filed by SARAH OLIVE KAYODI in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that SARAH OLIVE KAYODI 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 NOVEMBER 8, 2022 at 9:00 A.M. in Dept. No. S35 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District.

IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1)

Public Notices

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 Sarah Olive Kayodi:

Neil Hedtke, Esquire
SBN 273319
820 North Mountain Avenue
Upland, CA 91786
(909) 579 2233 Fax (909) 618 1622 hedtkelg@gmail.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 7, 14 & 21, 2022.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIVSB 2218737

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner NICOLE AMBER MARQUEZ filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
NICOLE AMBER MARQUEZ to NICOLE AMBER SERRANO

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

Notice of Hearing
Date: November 14, 2022
Time: 8:30 AM
Department: S16
The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 09/29/2022
Judge of the Superior Court: JOHN M. PACHECO
Nicole Amber Marquez, In Pro Per
1126 West F Street
Ontario, CA 91762
(909) 541-1565
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2022.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIVSB 2218781

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioners RAMON JOSE MARQUEZ and ELIZABETH CASTANEDA on behalf of minor children filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:
RICO ANDRES MAR-

Public Notices

QUEZ to RICO ANDRES SERRANO
[and]
AYDEN ISALIAH MARQUEZ to AYDEN ISALIAH SERRANO
[and]
LOU CARLOS MARQUEZ to LOU CARLOS SERRANO

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

Notice of Hearing
Date: November 16, 2022
Time: 8:30 AM
Department: S16

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 09/29/2022
Judge of the Superior Court: JOHN M. PACHECO
Ramon Jose Marquez and Elizabeth Castaneda, on behalf of minor children
4800 Rosewood St.
Montclair, CA 91763
(909) 964-8512
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2022.

FBN 20220009221
The following entity is doing business as SH TRANS 11391 MOUNTAIN VIEW DRIVE, #40 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 principally in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY: MSB MANAGEMENT SERVICE INC 11391 MOUNTAIN VIEW DRIVE, #40 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California under the number 5212674.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: SEPTEMBER 26, 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/ HOBIN LEE, President
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/04/2022

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 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 October 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2022

FBN 20220009162
The following entity is doing business as SPJH GROUP 11210 4TH ST #1320 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 principally in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY: HOMAR TORRES 11210 4TH ST #1320 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

The business is conducted by:

Public Notices

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/ HOMAR TORRES
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/03/2022

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 October 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2022

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: LORRAINE JUNE aka LORRAINE DEBRA JUNE

CASE NO. PROSB2201410

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

THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on NOVEMBER 10, 2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for the James David June:

ANTONIETTE JAUREGUI (SB 192624) 1894 S. COMMERCENT-ER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408
Telephone No: (909) 890-2350
Fax No: (909) 890-0106
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 14, 21 & 28, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: LORELEI JUARE

CASE NO. PROSB2201404

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of LORELEI JUARE has been filed by WILLIAM JUARE in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that WILLIAM JUARE be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests full 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 16, 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: OCTOBER 4, 2022
SABRINA FELIX, Deputy Court Clerk
IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for the James David June:

Public Notices

must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for the James David June:

ANTONIETTE JAUREGUI (SB 192624) 1894 S. COMMERCENT-ER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408
Telephone No: (909) 890-2350
Fax No: (909) 890-0106
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on October 14, 21 & 28, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: LORELEI JUARE

CASE NO. PROSB2201404

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of LORELEI JUARE has been filed by WILLIAM JUARE in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that WILLIAM JUARE be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests full 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 16, 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: OCTOBER 4, 2022
SABRINA FELIX, Deputy Court Clerk
IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for the James David June:

Public Notices

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 Paula Ostrowski: 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 October 14, 21 & 28, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JOHN RICHARD WILSON

CASE NO. PROSB2201429

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JOHN RICHARD WILSON has been filed by PAULA OSTROWSKI in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that PAULA OSTROWSKI be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests full 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 21, 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: OCTOBER 11, 2022
SELYNA RAZO, Deputy Court Clerk
IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for Paula Ostrowski: 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 October 14, 21 & 28, 2022.

Summons - (CITATION JUDICIAL)
CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO): 21ST CV 45171
NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO DEMANDADO):
RODRIGO FRANCISCO MANUEL, AKA RODRIGO F. MANUEL, AKA RODRIGO FRANCISCO
YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): DEOMAR LEE LALU SY, MARIA JOSE VILLEGAS, ESTELITA SY
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 and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.
There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can

Public Notices

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 Paula Ostrowski: 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 October 14, 21 & 28, 2022.

SUMMONS - (CITATION JUDICIAL)

CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO): 21ST CV 45171

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO DEMANDADO):

RODRIGO FRANCISCO MANUEL, AKA RODRIGO F. MANUEL, AKA RODRIGO FRANCISCO

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

DEOMAR LEE LALU SY, MARIA JOSE VILLEGAS, ESTELITA SY

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 and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.
There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can

Public Notices

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

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

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

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

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

Spring Street Courthouse
310 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

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

Oscar E. Toscano State Bar #84736
625 W. Broadway, Suite B
Glendale, CA 91204
Phone: (818) 241-0806
DATE (Fecha): December 10, 2021

Clerk (Secretario), by R. Clifton, Deputy (Adjunto)

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on: 10/14, 10/21, 10/28 & 11/04, 2022.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME

FBN 20220009000
The following person(s) is(are) doing business in SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY as: SPEEDWAY MUFFLER 10459 8TH

Public Notices

STREET RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: RICARDO C DEL ROSARIO 9104 CHELSEA ST RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL

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

S/ HANBAL A ZEAD, Manager

This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 10/11/2022

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

Began Transacting Business: October 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 10/14/22, 10/21/22, 10/28/22 & 11/04/22.

AMENDED NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: MARIA G. ARIAS CASE NO. PROSB2200891

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of MARIA G. ARIAS

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by ANACELIA BOJORQUEZ aka ANACELIA GONZALEZ, in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.

THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ANACELIA BOJORQUEZ aka ANACELIA GONZALEZ, be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent.

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

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

A hearing on the petition will be held in Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District-Probate Division 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415 in Dept. S35 at 09:00 AM on 07/25/2022.

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

IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as

Public Notices

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: ANACELIA BOJORQUEZ aka ANACELIA GONZALEZ
12473 DEL SUR STREET, VICTORVILLE, CA. 92392
909 238-2508 OR 909 837-0251

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on: 10/14/2022, 10/21/2022, 10/28/2022

SUMMONS – (CITACION JUDICIAL)

CASE NUMBER (NUMERO DEL CASO): CIV SB 2128492

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:

(AVISO DEMANDADO): KULWANT KAUR aka KULWANT KAURA aka KULWANT KURA, SETHI CHANCHAL, and DOES 1 to 10, inclusive

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): MTC FINANCIAL INC. dba TRUSTEE CORPS

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

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

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

Public Notices

version. Lea la información a continuación

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

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

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

San Bernardino Justice Center
247 West Third Street
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0210

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

John C. Steele, Steele LLP,
17272 Red Hill Avenue,
Irvine, CA 92614
Phone: (949) 222-1161
DATE (Fecha): November 10, 2021

Clerk (Secretario), by Sylvia Guajardo, Deputy (Adjunto)

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on: 10/14/2022, 10/28/2022, 11/04/2022 & 11/11/2022.

FBN 20220008681

The following person is doing business as: LIBERTY IMMIGRATION CENTER. 12564 CENTRAL AVE SUITE C CHINO, CA 91710 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO ANAMARIA TEJADA 12564 CENTRAL AVES SUITE C 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/ ANAMARIA TEJADA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 19, 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

FBN 20220008628
The following person is doing business as: ROOTED WILLOW MASSAGE. 11799 SEBASTIAN WAY SUITE 103 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO TANYA LUIS 11799 SEBASTIAN WAY SUITE 103 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ TANYA LUIS, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 16, 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

FBN 20220008474
The following person is doing business as: PYRAMID FREIGHT. 4573 SAN BENITO ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LUIS E GUZMAN 4573 SAN BENITO ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; JOHN J GUZMAN 4573 SAN BENITO ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407. The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A 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/ JOHN J GUZMAN, PARTNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 12, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008495
The following person is doing business as: VALFER QUALITY PAINTING. 2804 9TH ST RIALTO, CA 92376 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO HECTOR A LIAS 2804 9TH 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/ HECTOR A LIAS, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 14, 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

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO TANYA LUIS 11799 SEBASTIAN WAY SUITE 103 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ TANYA LUIS, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 16, 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

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO TANYA LUIS 11799 SEBASTIAN WAY SUITE 103 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ TANYA LUIS, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 16, 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

FBN 20220008399
The following person is doing business as: LOGISTIC IMPORTS. 7117 TENNESSE RIVER CT MIRA LOMA, CA 91752 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO JAMES LEE 7117 TENNESSE RIVER CT MIRA LOMA, CA 91752. 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/ JAMES LEE, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

Public Notices

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 09/23/2022, 09/30/2022, 10/07/2022, 10/14/2022 CNB-BB382022010R

FBN 20220008474
The following person is doing business as: PYRAMID FREIGHT. 4573 SAN BENITO ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LUIS E GUZMAN 4573 SAN BENITO ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; JOHN J GUZMAN 4573 SAN BENITO ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407. The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A 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/ JOHN J GUZMAN, PARTNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 12, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008495
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

FBN 20220008425
The following person is doing business as: RANCHO CUCAMONGA. 91730 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RANBARRAN R CLIFTON 12183 HIGHGATE CT 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/ RANBARRAN R CLIFTON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy

Public Notices

rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 09/23/2022, 09/30/2022, 10/07/2022, 10/14/2022 CNB-BB38202207MT

FBN 20220008770
The following person is doing business as: LAURA'S PROPERTY MANAGEMENT. 734 E. RALSTON AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LAURA B CHAVEZ 734 E. RALSTON AVE. SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404. 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/ LAURA B CHAVEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 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

FBN 20220008770
The following person is doing business as: LAURA'S PROPERTY MANAGEMENT. 734 E. RALSTON AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LAURA B CHAVEZ 734 E. RALSTON AVE. SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404. 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/ LAURA B CHAVEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 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

FBN 20220008770
The following person is doing business as: LAURA'S PROPERTY MANAGEMENT. 73

Amid Widespread Dissatisfaction With Warehouses, Workers Now Engaging In Labor Actions *from page 3*

are now attempting to impose on Amazon, through work stoppages and protests, conditions

that the company did not count upon when it took action to locate major distribution facilities in this

region.

According to Inland Empire Amazon Workers United, Amazon is the largest private sector employer in the region. Thus, the organization

maintains, either getting the company to willingly or, in the alternative, forcing the company to increase the wages it pays its workers would represent a major boost to the

local economy.

The labor action in San Bernardino does not come in a vacuum, as throughout the United States Amazon has been hit with concerted union

organizing activity that threatens to change the complexion of what is a largely nonunionized warehouse and delivery workforce.

Some Cities' Involvement In The Cannabis Trade Led To The Corruption Of Their Political Leaders *from page 7*

Measure T's passage, the city council set the city's cannabis/marijuana product tax rate at 4 percent.

Beginning in 2018, the Barstow City Council began serious discussion of opening the city to commercial activity, and in 2021 dispensed with the previous restrictions on selling marijuana within city limits.

Earlier this year, Fontana, which had consistently prohibited any sort of commercial marijuana operations, relented, opening the way for the city to host three businesses at which retail marijuana sales are to be allowed.

After the May 2018 death of then-Hesperia Mayor Russ Blewett, the city council two months

later, after promoting Councilman Bill Holland to replace Blewett, voted 3-to-1 to appoint Brosowske to the city council to bring its ranks back up to five-member full strength.

In relatively short order after some of the county's cities allowed commercial cannabis businesses to set up within their jurisdictions, problems manifested.

In Adelanto, upon the city beginning to accept applications for cannabis/marijuana-related business permits, long lines of would-be entrepreneurs formed at the planning window, with many of those seeking operating licenses carrying briefcases full of cash to be provided to city officials

so that those applications would be expedited. In 2017, Adelanto Councilman Jermaine Wright was arrested by the FBI and charged by the U.S. Attorney's Office with accepting a \$10,000 bribe in return for ensuring that a putative businessman seeking a marijuana distribution permit in the city, who was actually an undercover FBI agent, would be able to operate without interference from the city's code enforcement division. In 2021, less than three years after Adelanto Mayor Rich Kerr was voted out of office in November 2018, he was arrested by the FBI and charged by the U.S. Attorney's Office with bribery related to his acceptance of kickbacks from marijuana business operators in the city. In June 2022, Wright was convicted on that brib-

ery charge. He has been sentenced to five years in federal prison. Kerr is awaiting trial.

In San Bernardino, after the 2018 election of John Valdivia as mayor, many of those who wanted to get their commercial marijuana operations permitted hired his consulting business, AAdvantage Comm LLC, or made substantial contributions to his electioneering fund or otherwise conveyed money to him, based on his assurances he would get their applications approved. Valdivia has yet to be arrested or charged, but in June was voted out of office in the midst of considerable adverse publicity about the manner he conducted himself while he headed the county's largest city.

In Hesperia, upon Brosowske easing into his appointed position

on the council in July 2018 and then after being elected to the council to represent the city's District 4 in that city's first ever by-district council race in November 2018, he advocated intensely that the city expand the scope of the commercial marijuana operations that were permitted in the city from the half dozen delivery services that had been licensed there to ones that would involve cultivation, cannabis product manufacturing and storefront retail sales.

By 2019, eight marijuana delivery businesses were up and running in Hesperia. Another 35 applications for delivery business permits were being processed.

Also in 2019, Brosowske involved himself in an effort to have his council colleague, Bill Holland, who had

been instrumental in appointing him to the city council the previous year, recalled from office. Holland surmised that several companies interested in setting up marijuana retail operations in the city, including some that had distributorships there, were bankrolling the recall effort. This led to some serious reconsideration of the city's liberalization of its marijuana policy. Subsequently, it was revealed that the high-ranking city employee put in charge of monitoring the marijuana delivery companies that had set up their businesses in the city for their compliance with the city's codes and regulations had accepted free marijuana and cannabis-based products and palliatives from some of those businesses.

Continued on Page 16

Cothran & Armendarez Bought A Ride On Warren's Coattails To Reach Political Power *from front page*

curtail the Republican-versus-Republican violence. In January 2021, Leja was succeeded as central committee chairperson by Phil Cothran, Sr.

Cothran's initiation into the Republican inner sanctum began with his support, going back some two-and-a-half decades, of Republican candidates in Fontana, where he is a leading businessman and the operator of a successful insurance agency.

Despite local elections in California being, under the Government Code and Elections Code, officially nonpartisan, in San Bernardino County local politics is shot through with considerations as to any given candidate's party affiliation. This has been as true in Fontana as anywhere else in the county. From the advent of the Fontana Steel Mill in 1941 until its final shuttering in 1983, Fontana was a steel town, with all

that implies. The Steelworkers Union was as much of an institution in Fontana as the steel mill. Thus, by default, given the Democratic Party's close alignment with unions and its adherence to unionism, Fontana was an inherently Democratic city through and through, one of the earlier referenced areas of San Bernardino County where the Democrats were in ascendancy. With the demise of the steel mill and the eventual evaporation of the Steelworkers Union in Fontana, however, a struggle for the political heart and soul of Fontana ensued. Over the years, John Roberts, Mark Nuami, Frank Scialdone, Janice Rutherford and Acquanetta Warren have all advanced not only the Republican cause in Fontana but the Republican hold on the city. Roberts was first elected to the city council in 1992 and is yet a member of the city council and is now one of the longest serving politicians in San Bernardino County. Mark Nuami was elected mayor of Fontana in 2002, defeating then-Democratic

Mayor Dave Eshleman. Frank Scialdone was Fontana's police chief before he was elected to the council and became mayor. Janice Rutherford served on the city council before moving on to become the county's Second District supervisor in 2010. Warren was appointed to the council in 2002 and elected and reelected to it in her own right in 2004 and 2008 before being elected mayor in 2010 and then reelected in 2014 and 2018.

Demographically, Fontana remains a Democratic city. Of its 109,285 voters, 54,355 or 49.7 percent are Democrats. Republicans within the city number 22,199 or 20.3 percent, which is less than the 24,910 or 22.8 percent who affiliate with no political party. The remaining 7.1 percent of the city's voters are registered with Peace & Freedom Party, American Independent Party, the Libertarians, the Green Party or other more obscure blocs.

Despite the seeming overwhelming numerical advantage the Democrats enjoy in Fontana, four of

the five members of the city council are Republicans – Warren, Roberts, Pete Garcia and Phil Cothran Jr.

Since the 1990s, Phil Cothran Sr. has bankrolled Republican candidates for the Fontana City Council, including Roberts, Nuami, Rutherford, Scialdone and Warren, among others. In 2018, with Warren's backing, Cothran's son and namesake ran for city council, successfully. Two years before Phil Cothran Jr. joined Warren on the council dais, Jesse Armendarez in 2016 was elected to the council. Two years before that, in 2014, Armendarez had been elected to the Fontana Unified School District Board of Trustees, also with Warren's assistance.

Armendarez had gotten into Warren's good graces primarily on the basis of money. Like Cothran, he was a successful businessman, in his case, selling real estate. He was not hesitant to put money into local campaigns. As it turned out, Republicans were on a roll in Fontana and

Armendarez, astutely for someone who must stay on the right side of City Hall, was risk averse, meaning he felt it best to support incumbents rather than challengers. His continuing and steady support of Warren and her handpicked candidates ingratiated him with her. In 2014, she rewarded him when he indicated he might be interested in a political career himself, and she gave him a boost in landing the school board slot. In 2016, she supported him for city council in an effort to defeat one of her primary rivals on the panel, Lydia Salazar-Wibert. With a combination of his own money and some more Warren was able to scare up for him, together with the guidance of political consultants, Armendarez defeated Salazar-Wibert.

From the time she was first elected mayor until the present, Warren had held the advantage of having a ruling coalition of Republicans on the dais with her. She has converted the advantage of incumbency into hefty campaign contributions

from business interests who must obtain permits and project approval from the city. The combination of the money she has raised on her own and the money provided to her by both Armendarez and Phil Cothran Sr., the father of her council ally, Phil Cothran Jr., has made her into a virtually unstoppable juggernaut.

In the meantime, Phil Cothran, who has long been active with the County of San Bernardino as a member of the Workforce Development Board, was looking to further his political reach, strengthen Warren's political machine and enhance his ability to assist his son in his political career. He ran for and succeeded in capturing a position on the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee.

In 2020, when Jesse Armendarez was due to stand for reelection to the Fontana City Council, he took a shot at running for the position that was opening up on the county board of supervisors in the Fifth District. Josie Gonzales, then the lone

Continued on Page 15

Multiple Quid Pro Quos Tied Taylor To Pacheco & Tafoya, Involving Trades Of Political Power For Lucrative Employment *from page 6*

their cannabis-related business permits. According to that information and plea agreement, Chavez, the proprietor of Xavier Batteries and a member of the Ontario Planning Commission before he was appointed to the county planning commission, between August 2017 and March 2018 through his Claremont-based internet marketing company, Market Share Media Agency, received \$170,000 from the two companies and passed through to Pacheco between \$80,000 and \$93,000 in cash.

In conjunction with that announcement, the U.S. Attorney's Office unsealed a set of documents detailing the activity Pacheco was involved in, including his interactions with the commercial marijuana companies who obtained permits to operate in Baldwin Park, Tafoya, Chavez and Taylor, among others.

Those documents include Pacheco's unexpurgated signed plea agreement, an accompanying statement of facts, and a narrative of events put together by FBI agents. In the statement of facts, several of the entities are described not by name but by numerical references. Nevertheless, through context, descriptions as to circumstance and those individuals' roles and positions, as well as specific detail, the identities of several of those whose actions and interactions with Pacheco can be accurately surmised.

In the document, Tafoya is referred to as "Person 1." His identity is given away by the description offered of an individual who "served as the Baldwin Park City Attorney since in or around December 2013," which in all respects applies to Tafoya and Tafoya alone. Taylor is referred to as "Person 2," which is established by several points of factual convergence in the state-

ment of facts, including the date upon which Pacheco voted as a member of the Baldwin Park City Council to approve the contract under which Taylor was reinstated as police chief.

The statement of facts indicates that there were several quid pro quos exchanged among Pacheco, Taylor and Tafoya, many of which correspond in many respects or even precisely with the allegations of bribery and kickbacks described in the qui tam lawsuit that was brought by Young, Davis and Romero.

According to the statement of facts, "Beginning in at least July 2017 and continuing through at least November 2019, defendant [Pacheco] entered into agreement with Person 2 [Taylor], in which defendant would fund Person 2's campaign for the water district board and help him secure a contract with the city [the City of Baldwin Park]. In exchange, when Person 2 became a board member and an agent of the water district, Person 2 would provide defendant a job at the water district. Defendant directed and/or arranged for Person 2's campaign to receive approximately \$20,500, which represented almost the entirety of \$21,797 in monetary contributions received by Person 2's campaign. These donations obtained by defendant came from individuals with business before the city. Defendant further arranged for Person 2's campaign to receive \$4,789.098 of in-kind contributions from CEC [the California Education Coalition], the PAC [political action committee], defendant controlled. These in-kind donations were never disclosed by Person 2's election committee in an effort to conceal defendant's agreement with Person 2. As the result of his appointment to the Water District, defendant received at least \$300,000 in total salary from April 2018 through October 2019. In addition to this amount, defendant received approximately \$142,194 in a severance package in November 2019."

The statement of facts continues, "More specifically regarding the origin of this agreement, in approximately July 2017, defendant and Person 2 had a conversation at Baldwin Park City Hall in which Person 2 told defendant he planned to run for [the] West Valley Water district Board and needed defendant's help, which defendant understood to mean Help fundraising for the campaign. During this conversation, Person 2 told defendant that the water district had job openings and that if defendant helped Person 2 with his campaign, defendant would try to get him a job at the water district. Specifically, Person 2 said that once he got elected to the water district's board, 'we'll get you in.'" Person 2 and defendant also discussed how this position would assist defendant with maxing out his California state pension so that defendant would receive the most money possible in retirement. Defendant agreed to raise money for Person 2 in exchange for a position at the water district. Later, on a different date, Person 2 changed the terms of his deal with defendant and told defendant that he wanted their deal to include defendant's vote and support for the renewal of Person 2's contract with the city (collectively, with the agreement to raise funds for Person 2's campaign in exchange for a water district job for defendant, the 'Water District Agreement.'). In furtherance of the Water District Agreement, Person 2 involved Person 5, an elected official, to further the effort to obtain a job for [the] defendant at the water district. Person 5 told defendant that if [the] defendant helped Person 2 and Person 5 get elected, then Person 2 and Person 5 would 'help' [the] defendant."

According to the statement of facts, Pacheco approached Sharone Barshatski, the principal in a marijuana-related company that ultimately obtained an operating permit in Baldwin Park, and had him provide a \$10,000 check to Taylor's campaign, which was

received on September 14, 2017. Barshatski also provided a \$10,000 check to Pacheco's California Education Coalition, and Pacheco thereafter arranged for the California Education Coalition to make a \$7,000 donation to Taylor's campaign on September 26, 2017.

According to the statement of facts, "On October 9, 2017, Person 2 sent a text message to defendant's cellphone that stated: "Okay we are making our big push and I really need the 5 k bro. Otherwise i'm completely broke this week and we are don,' meaning that the success of Person 2's campaign depended on defendant's help with fundraising."

According to the statement of facts, Pacheco came through by having Michael Glanakis, a land developer from Southgate come through with a \$1,500 donation on October 10 and having four checks from the California Education Coalition totaling \$3,289.08 delivered to David Morgan, Taylor's campaign manager, one of which covered \$2,699.94 that was owed to a printing company and \$589.14 to pay for mailing campaign literature. On October 28, according to the statement of facts, Pacheco had the California Education Coalition provide Taylor's campaign with two more checks totaling \$1,500, with one payable to a printing company for \$767.34 and the other two the U.S. Postal Service for \$732.66. The statement of facts states, "Person 2's campaign never reported these in-kind donations on its California Fair Political Practices Commission forms."

The statement of facts states, "Defendant understood from Person 7 [Morgan] that the money paid by CEC to the printing company and United States Postal Service was in part to pay for a 'hit piece,' that is, a negative advertisement, against Person 2 and Person 5's opponents. The 'hit piece' had been designed by Person 1 [Tafoya] who himself was seeking to obtain a contract for legal services from the water district. In addition

to these contributions, defendant solicited donations from Person 2's campaign from Person 8, a business owner, and, in response, received two checks totaling \$1,000 from Person 8. Defendant also solicited donations from Person 9, a business owner, and, in response, received a \$1000 check from Person 9.

The *Sentinel* has identified Person 8 as Joseph White of Phoenix, Arizona and Person 9 as Sandra Espinoza, the owner of Lumen Source in Alhambra.

According to the statement of facts, "On November 8, 2017, the day after the election, defendant sent the following text message to Person 2: 'Assistant GM [general manager],' which signified the water district position defendant wanted in exchange for his help with Person 2's campaign. Approximately 30 minutes later, Person 2 responded: 'Really? We will talk if my contract goes through.' Approximately two minutes later, defendant sent the next two messages: "Because you can't afford me anywhere else. I make 180K plus benefits' and 'Make a second AGM spot for more efficient program.' Less than a minute later, Person 2 responded: 'Working on it.' On November 9, 2017, Person 2 sent the following text message to defendant: 'Okay we all just won we are in.' In response, defendant asked: 'Can we discuss the GM position.'"

The statement of facts continues, "On November 9, 2017 and November 10, 2017, defendant sought to pressure another city councilmember to vote in favor of renewing Person 2's contract with the city. The councilmember explained to defendant that she would not vote for the new contract proposal because it had materially changed from the one she had originally agreed to support. During a text message exchange, defendant wrote the following three messages within the same minute: 91) "I just need your support"; (2) "Plus he just won in a large water district";

and (3) "Think about the possibilities," by which defendant meant that the councilmember could obtain financial benefits from the water district, herself, and Person 2 if the councilmember supported Person 2's contract renewal."

According to the statement of facts, "On November 15, 20a7, in furtherance of the Water District Agreement, defendant voted in favor of renewing Person 2's contract. The city council voted to renew Person 2's contract by a 3-2 margin. In December 2017, at the victory celebration for Person 2 and Person 5, Person 2 and Person 5 confirmed for defendant that they would make good on their promise of providing him a position at the water district."

According to the statement of facts, "After becoming an agent of the water district, Person 2 worked to create a new position of assistant general manager for the water district and to hire defendant for the position pursuant to their water district agreement. On March 29, 2018, in accordance with the Water District Agreement, the water district hired him as an assistant manager and shortly thereafter elevated and added additional responsibilities, which provided defendant an annual salary of \$189,592 and the use of a water district vehicle. The board voted 4-0 in favor of defendant's contract with Person 2 abstaining, which was done in an effort to further conceal the Water District Agreement."

The statement of facts relates that "On December 13, 2018, FBI special agents executed a search warrant on defendant's residence and vehicle. Once the search had finished and on the same day, defendant met with Person 2 at a city event and told him about the FBI's search of his home. Between March 2019 and April 30, 2019, defendant spoke with Person 2 and detailed evidence the FBI had gathered concerning the Police Association Scheme. Person 2 the provided defendant false

Continued on Page 16

Hit Pieces Feature Half Truths & Disingenuity from front page

Democrat among the supervisors, was being termed out after serving four terms. Armendarez figured he would run, hoping he might overwhelm a single opponent if there was only one other person in the race. If more than one candidate jumped into the contest, he figured, four things could happen: He might win outright; Another candidate might win outright; he might finish first or second without anyone getting a majority of the vote, meaning he would have the opportunity to compete in a runoff; or he might finish in third or lower, such that he would be out of running. If he won, that was that and he would be the next Fifth District Supervisor. If he qualified for a runoff, he would run as hard as he could for supervisor come November. If he lost in the primary, he would lick his wounds and run for reelection to the city council.

Gonzales had endorsed her chief of staff, Dan Flores, another Democrat who was also a member of the Colton Joint Unified School District Board of Trustees. Also competing in the contest were Nadia Renner, who had no party affiliation, and Rialto Councilman Joe Baca Jr, a Democrat.

By the time of the March 2020 primary election, \$336,299.86 had been deposited in Armendarez's election fund, of which \$27,688.83 was a loan from himself. Flores had \$312,966.39 in his campaign war chest. Baca had deposited a total of \$116,443 in political donations into his campaign fund. Renner had \$19,100 to carry out her campaign.

Armendarez bested Flores and Renner in the March primary election but ran behind Baca. Thus, in the November 2020 runoff, it was the Republican Armendarez vs. the Democrat Baca. Armendarez pulled out all of the stops in the final, throwing a lot of his own money into the contest, including \$91,076.83

in loans to himself. Ultimately, \$507,164.08 was contributed to Armendarez's supervisorial campaign fund in what was a losing cause. By contrast, between January 1, 2020 and the end of the election, Baca raised \$353,450. Despite outspending Baca, Armendarez was not able to overcome the five-to-two Democratic voter-to-Republican advantage of his opponent, and Baca prevailed, capturing the position of Fifth District supervisor.

It was early in 2021 that Armendarez's friend and supporter, Phil Cothran Sr., made his move to capture the chairmanship of the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee. With Armendarez's support and that of the entirety of the Fontana Republican contingent as well as other committee members from around the county, the gavel of the Republican Central Committee was bestowed on Cothran Sr.

The redistricting of the county's electoral districts was undertaken in 2021 based upon the 2020 Census. Whereas previously, the east-west dividing line between the Fifth District and the Second District ran through Fontana such that about three-fifths of the western side of the city was in the Second District and two-fifths of the city on the east side was in the Fifth District, after the 2021 redistricting, all of Fontana was placed in the Second District. In this way, both Armendarez and Renner, who had run for Fifth District Supervisor just two years previously, were eligible to run for supervisor in the Second District this year. That is indeed what they both did.

Also competing in the race were Luis Cetina, a board member of the Cucamonga Valley Water District; Dejonae Shaw and Eric Coker. Ultimately, Cetina captured the most votes among the five candidates, with 14,848 or 33.01 percent. Armendarez was not too far off the pace, with 13,257 or 30.51 percent, for second place.

Like Armendarez, Cetina is a Republican.

A nicety that is ob-

served in California politics, which is not a civility at all, is that candidates try not to directly attack their opponents. Though that practice is not always observed, the idea is that a candidate, in his speeches and literature, makes a presentation of himself by putting his own best foot forward and through expounding on what his qualifications are and what he intends to do or accomplish if elected. It is considered poor form for a candidate to make attacks on his opposition. Instead, such distasteful assignments are left to an "independent" expenditure committee, one that, ostensibly or supposedly, is not connected to or tied in any way to the candidate. Under the rules laid out in the election code, these "independent" committees are not to interact with or coordinate with the candidate but exist so that the public at large – or whoever has the money and means to operate an independent expenditure committee – can make his or her or their feelings known. The expressions of an independent expenditure committee are supposed to be separate from the candidate.

What an independent expenditure committee does is offer a candidate a fig leaf in attacking his opponent. If his opponent or his opponent's supporters or the public at large finds the attack to be false or mean-spirited or in poor taste or vulgar or reckless or small-minded, the candidate can maintain he had nothing to do with it and did not approve it.

In reality, more often than not, the product of an independent expenditure is not independent at all but a weapon against his opponent the candidate does not want to be accused of using.

Following the June 7, 2022 Primary Election, there was a three-month lull, at which point the campaign for the November 8 election began in earnest. As September progressed, mailers began landing in mailboxes throughout the Second District relating to the Armendarez-Cetina match-up.

The first round of

mailers were ones that originated with either campaign, with those sent by Cetina presenting him as a wholesome family man who works for the Metropolitan Water District, oversees the operations of the Cucamonga Valley Water District as a board member and has some ideas about how the county should be run. Those sent by Armendarez presented him as a wholesome family man who runs a successful business, once oversaw the operations of the City of Fontana as a councilman and has some ideas about how the county should be run. The next round of mailers touted either candidate as one who believes in public safety, safeguarding public money and has endorsements of other known public figures. All of those originated either with Cetina's campaign or Armendarez's campaign.

Thereafter, intersticed with the positive mailers about each came a fusillade of so-called "hit pieces," all of which targeted Cetina. Virtually all of those were selectively sent. Some were sent to Democrat households. Some were sent to Republican households. Assiduously, the material sent to voters who were Democrats celebrated elements of Cetina's life and character that might appeal to Republicans but which, generically at least, are anathema to Democrats. Those mailers were not provided to Republicans. Similarly, the mailers that were sent to Republicans celebrated Cetina as having leanings or feelings or ideas that would appeal to your garden variety Democrat, but which were a bit off-kilter with Republicans. The upshot of the message to Republicans was: Cetina is a Democrat masquerading as a Republican. The message to Democrats was: Cetina is a Republican.

The mailers originated from different "independent" expenditure committees, some of which had names or titles which connoted that they were created to deal with political issues in general. Others had names or titles which suggested they

exist primarily to deflate Cetina's candidacy while advancing Armendarez's prospect of election.

One of those, "Cucamonga Valley Ratepayers to Oppose Cetina and Support Armendarez for Supervisor 2022," dispensed with any semblance of independence, making no bones about being in league with Armendarez. Its mailer dwelt on the consideration that while Cetina has been on the board of directors for the Cucamonga Water District, the rates on the price of water has increased. The mailer did not mention that while Armendarez was a member of the Fontana City Council, he voted along with Warren and the rest of the council to increase the rates paid by the city's residents with regard to one of the utilities he oversaw, that being the city's trash service.

For some Republicans, the effort to demonize Cetina crossed a crucial line with a mailer, sent by the Inland Empire Business Alliance. That missive informed voters that "Luis Cetina opposes a woman's right to choose," calling upon voters to "Stop Luis Cetina from cutting funding for woman's health clinics that provide safe and legal abortions."

The board of supervisors, the panel Cetina and Armendarez are vying to join, has no say in and no sway over the legality or availability of abortion at the local, state or federal level. Moreover, Armendarez, in seeking the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee's endorsement, enunciated his opposition to abortion. That is omitted from hit piece.

The independent expenditure committee behind the mailer is the Inland Empire Business Alliance Political Action Committee. Phil Cothran Sr. founded the Inland Empire Business Alliance Political Action Committee. Of note is that Cothran in the past has made much of his Christian faith and his opposition to abortion. Cothran Sr. has made three yet-outstanding loans to the Inland Empire Business Alliance

Political Action Committee, one of \$240.13, another of \$3,697.89 and another for \$13,549.93, for a total of \$17,487.95, all of which are shown on the political action committee's disclosure form for the period between January 1 and June 30 of this year. Cothran Sr.'s money has recently been augmented with a \$25,000 contribution from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians; \$1,000 from Tri-Land, Inc, a company jointly owned by Bill Postmus and John Dino DeFazio; James Previti of Frontier Enterprises, who put up \$24,000; Burrtec Waste Industries, Inc, which donated \$20,000; DW Development owner David Weiner, who provided \$49,000; Singh Trucking of Riverside, which put up \$32,000; Coarchi, Incorporated of Corona, which supplied \$17,000; Frontier Homes II, owned by James Previti, which provided another \$25,000; another \$70,000 from the David Wiener Family Trust; \$35,000 from the Friends of Acquannetta Warren; \$70,000 from Jeff Burrem; another \$45,000 from James Previti; \$10,000 from Michael G. Rademaker; \$5,000 from the Colonies Crossroads, Inc.; an additional \$70,000 from the Survivor's Trust under the David Wiener Family; and \$6,000 from Brentwood Consulting, among multiple other contributions.

As the founder and director of the Inland Empire Business Alliance Political Action Committee, Cothran Sr. had total discretion on how the funds entrusted to the political action committee were to be utilized. There are multiple examples of the Inland Empire Business Alliance Political Action Committee's money being brought to bear in hit pieces damaging to Republican candidates, as in the case of what was done to Cetina.

Agnes Gibboney, the Republican standard bearer in the 2020 election when she ran, unsuccessfully, against Democrat Pete Aguilar, the incumbent congressman in California's 31st District, said, "I was shocked to learn who is behind
Continued on Page 16

Latest Report Is That Taylor Is Talking To The FBI, Trying To Cut A Deal To Head Off Being Prosecuted

from page 14

exculpatory statement that Person 2 suggest defendant could tell the FBI, such as falsely stating that the he accepted from PO-1 were merely campaign contributions.”

The statement of facts related how Tafoya was, consigliere-like behind the scenes, instruct-

ing Pacheco, Taylor and Chavez on how to comport themselves in carrying out the activity they were engaging in, including formulating the consulting agreement between Chavez’s marketing firm and the cannabis companies which served as a vehicle for Pacheco to hide and launder the kickbacks he was receiving for approving those company’s operating permits in Baldwin Park.

The contention in the statement of facts that Pacheco had confided

to Taylor immediately after the FBI raid that it had taken place clashes, the *Sentinel* has learned, with Taylor’s representations to members of the board and senior management employees at the West Valley Water District made at the time of the announcement of Pacheco’s guilty plea in 2021 that he had known nothing of the FBI’s action targeting Pacheco.

The revelations contained in the statement of facts sent many officials throughout South-

ern California, in both Los Angeles County and San Bernardino County, in Baldwin Park and in the West Valley Water District, as well as elsewhere, reeling.

Tafoya submitted his resignation as Baldwin Park City Attorney to the city council, which on Wednesday, October 12, accepted it.

The *Sentinel* has learned that Taylor has sojourned from his residence in Arkansas to Southern California. One report was that he was

meeting with the FBI in an effort to negotiate a deal by which he would turn states evidence to either avoid prosecution or obtain leniency if he is prosecuted. The *Sentinel* was not able to locate Taylor and had not confirmed that report as of press time.

At present, Tafoya remains as the general counsel to the West Valley Water District. The water district board is next scheduled to meet next week.

One individual close

to the situation in the water district told the *Sentinel*, “This isn’t the first time the FBI has come through here. They got everybody’s attention with the announcement of Ricardo’s guilty plea last year. What it looks like is the FBI is shaking the tree one last time to see what rotten fruit comes falling out in the form of people that can be flipped. After that, everyone was involved in all of this who hasn’t come forth will be left holding the bag.”

GOP Central Committee Chairman Used His PAC To Ambush Fellow Republican Cetina

from page 15

the attacks on the reputation of county supervisor candidate Luis Cetina. Cetina has been a registered Republican for 18 years, supported Republican candidates, donated regularly to our county party, and served four

years on the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee. The mailers and ads mocking and attacking Cetina’s reputation are from a PAC [political action committee] heavily funded by a corporation owned by Phil Cothran Sr. The most shocking is an ad critical of Cetina because he is opposed to abortion. This is from a PAC created by Phil Cothran, the Inland Empire

Business Alliance, which now has his associate Danielle Holley as the principal officer.”

Giboney said, “Our county party leadership has taken the GOP 11th Commandment, ‘Thou shalt not speak ill of any fellow Republican,’ shredded it, doused it with gasoline, burned it and buried the ashes. Their judgment and actions seem to be directed by a blind allegiance to

fellow Team Fontana associates. It is hurting Republican candidates and our party’s reputation. If we cannot display ethical values and conduct, the value of our endorsement is diminished. This needs to change.”

In examining what is happening to Cetina, some harkened to the closing weeks of the November 2020 Second District supervisorial race, when polling

done by the Armendarez campaign showed that he was running behind Baca. Despite assertions that the Armendarez camp was not coordinating with any of several independent expenditure committees that were militating on his behalf, an end-stage blitz of mailers began landing in the mailboxes of the Fifth District’s high propensity Democrat voters which associated Baca with

then-President Donald Trump, implying Baca, who is a Democrat, was a Republican. The ploy did not work. Baca prevailed in the contest, 69,710 or 58.49 percent to 49,471 votes or 41.51 percent.

Efforts to reach Phil Cothran Sr. through the Republican Central Committee and his Fontana insurance office prompted no response.

-Mark Gutglueck

Weed Distributors Loading Up To Sue Hesperia If Their Permits Lapse

from page 13

With the recall effort against Holland ongoing, two of the council’s members, then-Mayor Larry Byrd and Councilman Cameron Gregg, rallied to Holland’s defense. Holland, Byrd and Gregg, based on their contention that Brosowske was not actually living in Hesperia, removed him from the council on a 3-to-2 vote in September 2019. They replaced him with Brigit Bennington, a longtime resident of that portion of the city lying within what was designated as District 4 who had run against Brosowske in the 2018 election.

Despite the contention of many marijuana delivery business operators that they were not in league with Brosowske in the Holland recall effort, which ultimately failed, the balance of the city council had grown distrustful of the cannabis industry, which sustained multiple black eyes as the Wright/marijuana, Kerr/marijuana and Valdivia/

marijuana controversies/scandals deepened. There were repeated suggestions that Hesperia had ill-advisedly rushed into its liberalization of its marijuana restrictions, accompanied by calls for toughening the standards relating to the business that were allowed to operate, including making certain that they were not underreporting their income and avoiding paying taxes.

In October 2019, the Hesperia City Council voted to revamp its cannabis business ordinance and adjust its municipal code relating to the ongoing audits of those operations and the fees paid for operating permits, while upping the amount of money those companies had to pay up front to defray the city’s cost in carrying out the audits – a total of \$7,250. The marijuana delivery business owners asserted that the audits intruded into multiple areas of each business’s operations, including how each tracked its inventory, kept its books, delivered the product it provided to its customers and complied with all standing regulations.

Many of the city’s marijuana/cannabis-

based businesses protested, saying the fees, which were automatically assessed prior to, and without regard for, any business activity those companies engaged in. They said the upfront fees they were being forced to pay for the audits threatened the profitability of the operations. Holland, Byrd and Gregg and Bennington felt that employing the audits was a reasonable measure to ensure the businesses were in compliance with the city’s regulations as well as those imposed by the State of California on marijuana-related businesses, and offered an assurance that the full extent of the sales each of the businesses was making were properly and fully reported, allowing the city to impose the proper amount of tax on those operations. This was particularly appropriate, the council majority was convinced, given the reports of irregularities that plagued many of the marijuana businesses elsewhere in the county.

In November 2019, the council adopted an ordinance that froze the number of commercial cannabis permits at what were approved at that time and

ceased the acceptance of any new applications for marijuana delivery businesses. In time, the city relented and allowed some of the applications that had been put on hold to be processed to completion, although its strict application of the existing standards did result in the denial of multiple applications.

Last month, on September 20, 2022, the city council directed staff to prepare for it a consideration of both changing the tax rate and repealing the commercial cannabis program altogether.

This has upset many, indeed perhaps all, of the owner/operators of entities that currently have a license to operate a cannabis distribution business in the city. Several of those individuals have indicated they believe that the considerable investments they have made in establishing those operations entitle them to continue in business, and they feel that the city’s threat of doing away with the marijuana business ordinance altogether intrudes on their rights.

The majority of city officials, on the other hand, feel that the city’s indulgence of the can-

nabis trade during the time it has put up with the delivery operations in the city by no means entitles anyone to anything, and that the ability to sell marijuana or cannabis from a base of operations in the city is a privilege rather than a right. They point out that the ability of the existing cannabis-related businesses to function is not absolute. Under Chapter 3.18, pertaining to the city’s cannabis business tax; Chapter 5.50, pertaining to city business licenses and regulations; and Title 16, the city’s development code in the Hesperia Municipal Code, there are certain limitations on the city’s commercial cannabis activities. Section 5.50.040(C) provides that delivery dispensary permits shall automatically expire after one year and, moreover, Section 5.50.040(D) provides that the annual renewal of permits is subject to the same process as new applications. The granting of a privilege to operate a marijuana distribution facility in Hesperia is not an automatic one.

What the council is to take up next week is a consideration of whether to prohibit any renewals

of existing permits pending the repeal of the commercial cannabis program, and whether city staff should be directed to prepare ordinances necessary to repeal the program.

If the resolution that is to come before the council is adopted, staff will prepare ordinances necessary to repeal the commercial cannabis program in the coming weeks or months.

Several owners of the marijuana distribution businesses that now exist in the city, which have been, in some cases for several years, in competition with one another for customers and profits, are ready to set aside their differences and to come together to hire legal counsel to sue the city if it discontinues their ability to run their distribution businesses out of the city.